arXiv:1712.00711v2 [math.ST] 3 Jan 2018

The local geometry of testing in ellipses: Tight control via localized Kolmogorov widths

Yuting Wei[†] Martin J. Wainwright[†,⋆]

February 14, 2022

Department of Statistics[†], and
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences[⋆]
UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720

Abstract

We study the local geometry of testing a mean vector within a high-dimensional ellipse against a compound alternative. Given samples of a Gaussian random vector, the goal is to distinguish whether the mean is equal to a known vector within an ellipse, or equal to some other unknown vector in the ellipse. Such ellipse testing problems lie at the heart of several applications, including non-parametric goodness-of-fit testing, signal detection in cognitive radio, and regression function testing in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. While past work on such problems has focused on the difficulty in a global sense, we study difficulty in a way that is localized to each vector within the ellipse. Our main result is to give sharp upper and lower bounds on the localized minimax testing radius in terms of an explicit formula involving the Kolmogorov width of the ellipse intersected with a Euclidean ball. When applied to particular examples, our general theorems yield interesting rates that were not known before: as a particular case, for testing in Sobolev ellipses of smoothness α, we demonstrate rates that vary from $(\sigma^2)^{\frac{4\alpha}{4\alpha+1}}$, corresponding to the classical global rate, to the faster rate $(\sigma^2)^{\frac{8\alpha}{8\alpha+1}}$, achievable for vectors at favorable locations within the ellipse. We also show that the optimal test for this problem is achieved by a linear projection test that is based on an explicit lower-dimensional projection of the observation vector.

1 Introduction

Testing and estimation are two fundamental classes of problems in statistics [24, 25]. In a classical decision-theoretic framework, different methods are compared via their risk functions, and under the minimax formalism, methods are compared by their worst-case behavior over the entire parameter space. Such global minimax risk calculation are reflective of typical behavior when the risk function is close to constant over the entire parameter space. On the other hand, when the risk function varies substantially, then it is possible that a global minimax calculation will be unduly conservative. In such settings, one is motivated to study the notion of an adaptive or localized minimax risk (e.g., see references [10, 4] for early work in this vein).

Recent years have witnessed a rapidly evolving line of work on studying notions of local minimax risk for both estimation and testing. In the context of shape-constrained regression, Meyer and Woodruffe [28] introduced a notion of degrees of freedom that adapts to the geometry of the function being estimated. Focusing on the problem of isotonic regression, Chatterjee et al. [7] proved a range of convergence rates, depending on the structure of the true regression function. For the task of estimating a convex function at a point, Cai and Low [6] proposed a local minimax criterion to evaluate the performance of different estimators. This criterion was adapted to establish a form of instance-dependent optimality for convex set estimation by Cai et al. [5]. In the context of hypothesis testing, Valiant and Valiant [32] studied a class of compound testing problems for discrete distributions, and characterized the local minimax testing radius in the TV norm. Balakrishnan and Wasserman [2] studied an analogous problem for testing density functions, and also characterized the local testing radius in TV norm.

In this paper, we study the local geometry of testing a mean vector inside an ellipse against a compound alternative. More precisely, consider an ellipse of the form $\mathcal{E} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_j^2/\mu_j \leq 1\}$, where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^d$ is a non-negative sequence that defines the aspect ratios of the ellipse. Although we focus on finite-dimensional ellipses, all of our theory is non-asymptotic and explicit, so that we can obtain results for infinite-dimensional ellipses by taking suitable limits. Given an observation of a Gaussian random vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, our goal is to test whether its mean is equal to some known vector $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$, or equal to some unknown vector $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$ that is suitably separated from θ^* in Euclidean norm. As we discuss in more detail below, such ellipse testing problems lie at the heart of a number of applications, including non-parametric goodness-of-fit testing, signal detection in cognitive radio, and testing regression functions in kernel spaces.

Study of the ellipse testing problems date back to the seminal work of Ingster [19, 20, 21] and Ermakov [12], who focused their attention on the special case when the null is zero ($\theta^* = 0$), and the ellipse is induced by a Sobolev function class. For this particular class of testing problems, they provided a sharp characterization of the minimax testing radius. A more general question is whether it is possible to provide a geometric characterization of the minimax testing radius, both as a function of the ellipse parameters $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^d$ as well as of the location of null vector θ^* within the ellipse. The main contribution of this paper is to answer this question in the affirmative. In particular, we show how for any ellipse—including the Sobolev ellipses as special cases—the localized minimax testing radius is characterized by a formula that involves the Kolmogorov width of a particular set. The Kolmogorov width is a classical notion from approximation theory [29], which measures the "size" of a set in terms of how well it can be approximated by a lower-dimensional linear subspace of fixed dimension. Our formula involves the Kolmogorov width of the ellipse intersected with an Euclidean ball around the null vector θ^*, which leads to an equation involving both $\mathcal{E}$ and θ^* that can be solved to determine the localized minimax risk. We show that the zero case ($\theta^* = 0$) is the most difficult, in that the localized minimax radius is largest at this instance. Conversely, we exhibit other more favorable locations within ellipses for which the local minimax testing radius can be substantially smaller.

1.1 Some motivating examples

Before proceeding, let us consider some concrete examples so as to motivate our study.

Example 1 (**Non-parametric goodness-of-fit testing).** Consider a set of samples $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ drawn from an unknown distribution supported on a compact set $\mathcal{X}$. Assuming that the unknown distribution has a density, the goodness-of-fit problem is to test whether the samples have been drawn from some fixed density p^*, in which case the null hypothesis holds, or according to some other density $p \neq p^*$, referred to as the alternative hypothesis. In the non-parametric version of this problem, the alternative density p is allowed to vary over a broad function class; one example might be the class of all twice continuously differentiable densities with second derivative p'' belonging to the unit ball in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. There is a very broad literature on this topic, with the book of Ingster and Suslina [22] covering many different classes of alternative densities.

One way to approach non-parametric goodness-of-fit is via orthogonal series expansions. In particular, if we let $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis for $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, then the null density p^* and alternative p can be described in terms of their basis expansion coefficients

$$\theta_j^* = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_j(x) p^*(x) dx \; = \; \mathbb{E}_{p^*}[\phi_j(X)], \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_j = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_j(x) p(x) dx \; = \; \mathbb{E}_p[\phi_j(X)],$$

respectively, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Note that the sample averages $y_j := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_j(x_i)$ are unbiased estimates of coefficients of the true underlying density, so the testing problem can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \quad y = \theta^* + w \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \quad y = \theta + w, \quad \text{for some } \theta \neq \theta^*$$

where $w = \{w_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of noise variables. A typical smoothness constraint on the alternative—for instance, the condition $\int_{\mathcal{X}} (p''(x))^2 dx \leq 1$—amounts to requiring that, in a suitably chosen sinusoidal basis, the vector θ belongs an ellipse with parameters of the form $\mu_j = cj^{-4}$.

Example 2 (**Detection of unknown signals in noise).** In cognitive radio and other wireless applications (e.g., [1, 8, 30]), it is frequently of interest to test for the presence of unknown signals that might potentially interfere with transmission. More concretely, given an observation period $[0, T]$, one observes a continuous-time waveform $\{y(t) \mid t \in [0, T]\}$, and the goal is to determine whether it was generated by pure noise, or a by combination of some band-limited signal $\theta(t)$ plus noise. See Figure 1 for an illustration.

After applying the Fourier transform, the waveform and signal can be represented by sequences $y \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ and $\theta \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, respectively. Assuming that the Fourier frequencies are ordered from smallest to largest, a hard band-width constraint on the signal corresponds to the restriction that $\theta_j = 0$ for all $j > B$, where the integer B corresponds to the bandlimit cut-off. Note that this bandwidth constraint defines a (degenerate) ellipse in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. More generally, a soft bandwidth constraint can be imposed by requiring that the weighted sum $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \frac{\theta_j^2}{\mu_j}$ for some summable sequence of positive coefficients $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. As before, this constraint means that the unknown signal vector θ must belong to an ellipse $\mathcal{E}$.

Given this set-up, the problem of detecting the presence of an unknown signal versus noise corresponds to testing the null that $y \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$ versus the alternative $y \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2 I_d)$ for some $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$. More generally, one might be interested in testing between the null hypothesis $y \sim N(\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_d)$, for some fixed signal vector $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$, versus the same alternative. We refer the reader to the papers [1, 8, 30] for further details on this application.




Figure 1: Illustration of the unknown signal detection problem in cognitive radio. The left panel shows a continuous-time wave form that is pure noise, whereas the right panel shows the superposition of an unknown band-limited signal with a noise waveform. The testing problem is to distinguish the null hypothesis (pure noise) from the compound alternative (some band-limited signal has been added).

Example 3 (**Regression function testing in kernel spaces).** In the problem of fixed design regression, we observe pairs $(x_i, z_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$z_i = f(x_i) + \xi_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{1}$$

Here $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown function, and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are a sequence of zero-mean noise variables with variance σ^2. Based on the observation vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we might be interested in testing various hypotheses related to the unknown function f. For instance, is f a non-zero function? More generally, does f deviate significantly from some fixed class of parametric functions?

These questions are meaningful only if we impose some structures on the underlying function space, and given the observations (1) based on pointwise evaluation, one of the most natural is based on reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (e.g., [34, 14]). These function spaces are defined by a symmetric positive semidefinite kernel function $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$; as some simple examples, when $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$, the kernel function $\mathcal{K}(x, x') = 1 + \min\{x, x'\}$ defines a class of Lipschitz functions, whereas the Gaussian kernel $\mathcal{K}(x, x') = \exp(-\frac{1}{2t}(x - x')^2)$ with bandwidth $t > 0$ defines a class of infinitely differentiable functions.

For any choice of kernel, the pointwise observation model (1) can be transformed to a sequence model form. In particular, define the kernel matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with entries $K_{ij} = \mathcal{K}(x_i, x_j)/n$, and let $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_n \geq 0$ represent its ordered eigenvalues. In terms of this notation, the pointwise model with any function f in the unit norm Hilbert ball can be transformed to the model $y = \theta + w$, where the vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the ellipse constraint $\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\theta_j^2}{\mu_j} \leq 1$, and each entry of the noise vector is zero-mean with variance $\frac{\sigma^2}{n}$. We have thus arrived at another instance of our general ellipse problem.

1.2 Problem formulation

Having understood the range of motivations for our problem, let us set up the problem more precisely. Given a sequence of positive scalars $\mu_1 \geq \ldots \geq \mu_d > 0$, consider the associated ellipse

$$\mathcal{E} := \Big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{\theta_i^2}{\mu_i} \leq 1\Big\}. \tag{2}$$

Suppose that we make observations of the form $y = \theta + \sigma g$. Here $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$ is an unknown vector, whereas $g \sim N(0, I_d)$ is a noise vector, and the variance level σ^2 is known. For a given vector $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$, our goal is to test the null hypothesis $\theta = \theta^*$ versus the alternative $\theta \in \mathcal{E}\backslash\{\theta^*\}$.

Under this formulation, it is not possible to make any non-trivial assertion about the power of any test, since the alternative allows for vectors θ that are arbitrarily close to θ^*. In order to make quantitative statements, we need to exclude a certain ϵ-ball around θ^* from the alternative. Doing so leads to the notion of the *minimax testing radius* associated this composite decision problem. This minimax formulation was introduced in the seminal work of Ingster and co-authors [18, 22]; since then, it has been studied by many other researchers (e.g., [12, 31, 26, 27, 3]).

More precisely, for a given radius $\epsilon > 0$, we consider the compound testing problem specified by the observation model $y \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2 I_d)$, and the null and alternative

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta = \theta^* \in \mathcal{E} \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon, \theta \in \mathcal{E}. \tag{3}$$

We thus have a sequence of testing problems indexed by $\epsilon > 0$, and our goal is to calibrate their difficulty in terms of the noise level σ^2, the null vector θ^*, and the local geometry of the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$ around θ^*. To be clear, all the tests that we analyze in this paper are *not* given knowledge of ϵ; rather, it is a unknown quantity that is used to titrate the difficulty of the problem. See Figure 2 for an illustration of the testing problem (3).




Figure 2: An illustration of testing problem (3).

Letting $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \{0, 1\}$ be any measurable test function, we characterize its performance on the testing problem (3) in terms of the sum of its (type I) error under the null, and its (type II)

error uniformly over the alternative. In particular, we define the *uniform error*

$$\mathrm{Err}(\psi; \theta^*, \epsilon) := \mathbb{E}_{\theta^*}[\psi(y)] + \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}, \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_\theta[1 - \psi(y)], \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\theta$ denotes expectation over y under the $N(\theta, \sigma^2 I_d)$ distribution.

For a given error level $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we are interested in the smallest setting of ϵ for which there exists some test with uniform error at most ρ. More precisely, we define

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}) := \inf \Big\{ \epsilon \mid \inf_{\psi} \mathrm{Err}(\psi; \theta^*, \epsilon) \leq \rho \Big\}, \tag{5}$$

a quantity which we call the θ^*-*local minimax testing radius*. By definition, the local minimax testing radius $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E})$ corresponds to the smallest separation ϵ at which there exists *some test* that distinguishes between the hypotheses $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ in equation (3) with uniform error at most ρ. Thus, it provides a fundamental characterization of the statistical difficulty of the hypothesis testing as a function of θ^*. Our results also have consequences for the more classical *global minimax testing radius*, given by

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\rho) := \sup_{\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}} \epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}).$$

As we discuss in the sequel, this global quantity has been characterized for various Sobolev ellipses in past work [22].

1.3 Overview of our results

Having set up the problem, let us now provide a high-level overview of the main results of this paper. We will show that the testing radius is fully described by a purely geometric quantity, namely the *Kolmogorov k-width* of a set that localized at θ^*. Given a set A, the Kolmogorov width characterizes how well the set is approximated by a k-dimensional linear subspace. It is known that the Kolmogorov width provides risk upper bounds for the truncated series estimator (e.g. [23, 11]) and it also turns out to be a key quantity in problems such as density estimation, as well as compressed sensing (see the papers [15, 9]). We discuss the definition of the Kolmogorov width and its property at length in Section 2.2.

We will also show that the optimal test, as will be discussed in sequel, is given by a linear projection test that is based on the projection of observation vector to a particular lower dimensional subspace. More discussions on its formulation and background can be found in our Section 2.1. We state our main results and some of their important consequences in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to the proofs of our main theorems and corollaries. We defer the auxiliary lemmas for our main proofs to the appendices.

2 Background

Before proceeding to the statements of our main results, we introduce some background on linear projection tests, as well as the notion of Kolmogorov width.

2.1 Linear projection tests

In this paper, we prove some upper bounds on $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E})$ via a concretely defined class of tests, in particular those based on linear projections. Given an integer $k \in [d] := \{1, \ldots, d\}$, let Π_k denote an orthogonal projection operator, mapping any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to a particular k-dimensional subspace. Any projection Π_k defines a family of linear projection tests, indexed by the threshold $\beta \geq 0$, of the following form

$$\psi_{\beta,\Pi_k}(y) := \mathbb{I}\big[\|\Pi_k(y - \theta^*)\|_2 \geq \beta\big] \;=\; \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \|\Pi_k(y-\theta^*)\|_2 \geq \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

We use Ψ_{LPT} to denote the collection of all linear projection tests

$$\Psi_{\mathrm{LPT}} := \Big\{\psi_{\beta,\Pi_k} \;\mid k \in [d],\; \Pi_k \in \mathcal{P}_k,\; \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+\Big\},$$

obtained by varying the dimension $k \in [d]$, the projection Π_k over the space $\mathcal{P}_k$ of all k-dimensional orthogonal projections, and the threshold $\beta \geq 0$.

Given the family Ψ_{LPT}, we then define

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{LPT}}(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}) := \inf\Big\{\epsilon \;\mid \inf_{\psi \in \Psi_{\mathrm{LPT}}} \mathrm{Err}(\psi; \theta^*, \epsilon) \leq \rho\Big\}. \tag{7}$$

a quantity which we call θ^*-*local LPT testing radius*. When the error level ρ is clear from the context, we adopt the shorthand notation $\epsilon_{\mathrm{LPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ and $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$, with the implicit understanding that all of our analysis depends on the choice of ρ.

2.2 Kolmogorov width

Our characterization of testing difficulty involves a classical geometric notion known as the Kolmogorov width, which we introduce here; we refer the reader to the book by Pinkus [29] for more details.

For a given compact set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and integer $k \in [d]$, the Kolmogorov k-width is a measure of how well the set can be approximated by a k-dimensional subspace. More precisely, recalling that $\mathcal{P}_k$ denotes the set of all k-dimensional orthogonal linear projections, the *Kolmogorov k-width*, denoted by ω_k, is given by

$$\omega_k(C) = \min_{\Pi_k \in \mathcal{P}_k} \max_{\theta \in C} \|\theta - \Pi_k \theta\|_2. \tag{8}$$

Any Π_k achieving the minimum in the saddle point problem (8) is said to be an *optimal projection* for $\omega_k(C)$. By definition, the Kolmogorov widths are non-increasing as a function of the integer k—in particular, we have

$$r(C) = \omega_0(C) \geq \omega_1(C) \geq \ldots \geq \omega_d(C) = 0,$$

where $r(C) := \max_{\theta \in C} \|\theta\|_2$ is the diameter of the compact set C.

3 Main results and their consequences

We now turn to the statement of our main results, along with a discussion of some of their consequences.

3.1 Upper bound on the local minimax testing radius

In this section, we establish an upper bound on the minimax testing radius for problem (3) localized to a given vector θ^*. In order to do so, we study the behavior of the linear projection tests previously described in Section 2.1, It turns out that LPT testing radius $\epsilon_{\text{LPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ can be characterized by the Kolmogorov k-width—as defined in expression (8)—of a particular set.

Before stating the main result, let us first introduce some notation. For each $\epsilon > 0$, we define the *upper critical dimension*

$$k_u(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) := \arg \min_{1 \leq k \leq d} \Big\{ \omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \Big\}. \tag{9}$$

Here set $\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} := \{\theta - \theta^* \mid \theta \in \mathcal{E}\}$ for the ellipse defined in expression (2) and $\mathbb{B}(\epsilon) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|v\|_2 \leq \epsilon\}$. For any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, the Kolmogorov width $\omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon))$ is non-increasing with index k and it goes to zero as k approaches d (where d can grow as well, then we have an infinite dimensional ellipse) and $\omega_d(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)) = 0$. Therefore, the critical dimension is always well defined.

This dimension is used to define the optimal linear projection test at θ^*. We also use it to define for each error level $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$, the *upper critical radius*

$$\epsilon_u(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}) := \inf\{\epsilon \mid \epsilon \geq \frac{8}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sigma^2 \frac{\sqrt{k_u(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})}}{\epsilon} \Big\}. \tag{10}$$

For each choice of error level ρ, this radius defines the separation between null and alternative that can be distinguished with error controlled at level ρ. From the fact that the function $\epsilon \mapsto k_u(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$ is non-increasing, it follows that $\epsilon_u(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E})$ always exists, and is guaranteed to be unique and strictly positive. More details can be found in Section D.1.

With these two ingredients, we are ready to state our upper bound for the LPT testing radius localized to θ^*:

Theorem 1. *For any vector $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$ and any error level $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$, we have*

$$\inf_{\psi \in \Psi_{LPT}} \text{Err}(\psi; \theta^*, \delta) \leq \rho \qquad \text{for all } \delta \geq \epsilon_u(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}). \tag{11}$$

We prove this theorem in Section 4.1.

Recall the definition of the θ^*-localized minimax radius ϵ_{OPT} and θ^*-localized LPT radius ϵ_{LPT} from equations (5) and (7), respectively. In terms of this notation, Theorem 1 guarantees that

$$\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}) \overset{(i)}{\leq} \epsilon_{\text{LPT}}(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}) \overset{(ii)}{\leq} \epsilon_u(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}).$$

To be clear, the first inequality (i) is a trivial consequence of the definitions, whereas inequality (ii) is the substance of Theorem 1.

Structure of optimal linear test: Although we have stated the theorem in an existential way, our analysis also gives an explicit form of the test that achieves the error guarantee (11). The construction of this test consists of three steps:

- For a given error level ρ, first compute the critical radius $\epsilon_u(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E})$ using expression (10).
- Second, using equation (9), compute the induced critical upper dimension

$$k_u^* := k_u(\epsilon_u(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}), \theta^*, \mathcal{E}),$$

  as well as the associated projection matrix $\Pi_{k_u^*}$ that defines the Kolmogorov width indexed by k_u^*.
- Third, apply the linear projection test

$$y \mapsto \mathbb{I}\Big[\|\Pi_{k_u^*}(y - \theta^*)\|_2^2 \geq \sigma^2(k_u^* + \sqrt{4k_u^*/\rho})\Big]. \tag{12}$$

The proof of the theorem is based on analyzing this linear test (12) directly and explicitly controlling its type I and type II error.

In order to illustrate the use of Theorem 1, let us consider a very simple example.

Example 4 (Circular constraints). Suppose that the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$ is simply a circle in $\mathbb{R}^d$, say with $\mu_j = d$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, d$. Let us consider the case of testing at zero (so that $\theta^* = 0$) with a noise level $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. For any $\epsilon \in (0, \sqrt{d})$, we claim that the upper critical dimension (9) is equal to d. Indeed, for any projection matrix of dimension $k < d$, there is at least one dimension that is missing, and this dimension contains a vector of Euclidean length $\sqrt{d}$ inside the sphere. Consequently, solving for the upper critical radius from equation (10) yields that $\epsilon_u^2(0; \mathcal{E}) = \frac{8}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sigma^2\sqrt{d}$.

Note that this rate matches the minimax testing radius for a subspace of dimension d. This calculation makes sense, because for this particular example—that is, testing at the zero vector for a circle with the chosen scalings of μ_j and σ—the geometry and boundary of the circle actually plays no role.

In Section 3.3, we consider some more substantive applications of Theorem 1, and in particular, demonstrate that the local minimax testing radius varies substantially as a function of the location of θ^* within the ellipse.

3.2 Lower bound on the local minimax testing radius

Thus far, we have derived an upper bound for the localized testing radius for a particular procedure—namely, the LPT. Of course, it is of interest to understand when the LPT is actually an optimal test, meaning that there is no other test that can discriminate between the null and alternative for smaller separations. In this section, we use information-theoretic methods to prove a lower bound on the localized minimax testing radius $\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$. Whenever the radius $\epsilon_{\text{LPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ achievable by a linear projection test matches the lower bound for every θ^*, we can claim the linear projection tests are *locally minimax optimal*.

For the testing problem (3), it turns out that the local minimax testing radius $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ can also be lower bounded via the Kolmogorov k-width, as previously defined in equation (8), of a particular set. In order to state this lower bound, we fix a triplet of positive constants a, b, c linked by the relations

$$a > 3b, \text{ and } c = c(a,b) := \frac{b}{8\sqrt{2}} - \frac{\sqrt{a^2 - 9b^2}}{12\sqrt{2}} > 0. \tag{13}$$

Recall the recentered ellipse $\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} := \{\theta - \theta^* \mid \theta \in \mathcal{E}\}$, and Euclidean ball of radius ϵ centered at zero $\mathbb{B}(\epsilon) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|v\|_2 \leq \epsilon\}$.

For our upper bound, the upper critical dimension k_u from equation (9) played a central role. As the lower analogue to this quantity, let us define the *lower critical dimension*

$$k_\ell(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) := \arg \min_{1 \leq k \leq d} \{\omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \leq 3b\epsilon\}, \tag{14}$$

where the fixed choice of constants (a, b) should be understood implicitly. We then define the *lower critical radius*

$$\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) := \sup \left\{\epsilon \mid \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2 \frac{\sqrt{k_\ell(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})}}{\epsilon}\right\}, \tag{15}$$

From the fact that the function $\epsilon \mapsto k_\ell(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$ is non-increasing, it follows that ϵ_ℓ is well-defined and unique. More details can be found in Appendix D.1.

We prove a lower bound as a function of the quantity $\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ and also a second quantity, one which measures its proximity to the boundary of the ellipse. More precisely, for a given vector θ^* and constant $a > 0$, we define the mapping $\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ via

$$\Phi(\delta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \delta > \|\theta^*\|_2/a \\ 1 \wedge \min\left\{r \geq 0 \mid a^2\delta^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r^2}{(r+\mu_i)^2}(\theta_i^*)^2\right\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

As shown in Appendix D.2, this mapping is well-defined, and has the limiting behavior $\Phi(\delta) \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0^+$. Let us denote $\Phi^{-1}(x)$ as the largest positive number of δ such that $\Phi(\delta) \leq x$. Note that by this definition, we have $\Phi^{-1}(1) = \infty$.

We are now ready to state our lower bound for the optimal testing radius localized to θ^*:

Theorem 2. *Consider constants $a, b, c \in (0, 1)$ satisfying the conditions (13). Then for any $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$, we have*

$$\inf_\psi \operatorname{Err}(\psi; \theta^*, \delta) \geq \frac{1}{2} \qquad \textit{whenever} \quad \delta \leq c \min\left\{\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}), \quad \Phi^{-1}\big((\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1} - 1)^2\big)\right\}. \tag{17}$$

See Section 4.2 for the proof of this theorem.

Remarks: Regarding concrete choices of the constants (a, b, c) that underlie this theorem, if we set $a = \frac{\sqrt{43}}{12}$ and $b = \frac{1}{4}$, then $c = \frac{1}{288\sqrt{2}}$. Since our main interest is to understand the scaling of the testing radius with respect to σ and the geometric parameters of the problem, we have made no efforts to obtain the sharpest constants in the theorem statement.

Second, to clarify the role of the term $\Phi^{-1}\big((\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1} - 1)^2\big)$, it is not of primary interest and serves to measure whether or not θ^* is sufficiently far inside the ellipse. Concretely, if we assume that $\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1/2$, then $(\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1} - 1)^2 \geq 1$ therefore $\Phi^{-1}\big((\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1} - 1)^2\big) = \infty$ which means that

$$\min\Big\{\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}), \quad \Phi^{-1}\big((\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1} - 1)^2\big)\Big\} = \epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}).$$

A final remark on the proof of Theorem 2: it is based on constructing a prior distribution on the alternative $\mathcal{H}_1$ that is independent of observation y. This distribution is supported on precisely those points in $\mathcal{H}_1$ that are relatively hard to distinguish from $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then the testing error can be lower bounded through controlling the total variation (TV) distance between two marginal likelihood functions.

3.3 Some consequences of our results

One useful consequence of Theorems 1 and 2 is in providing a sufficient condition for the optimality of the LPT. In particular, suppose that the upper and lower dimensions defined in equations (9) and (14) differ only by constant pre-factors, which we write as

$$k_u(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) \asymp k_\ell(\epsilon; \theta^*, \mathcal{E}). \tag{18}$$

Under this condition, it follows that the critical upper and lower radii match—namely, that $\epsilon_u(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \asymp \epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$. Theorem 1 then guarantees that the linear projection test at θ^* is locally minimax optimal.

As previously discussed, the local optimality studied here provides a finer-grained distinction than the usual notion of global minimax optimality. All of the rates depend on the vector θ^* via the set $\mathcal{E}_\theta^* \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)$, whose shape changes as θ^* moves across the ellipse. The resulting changes in the local minimax radii can be quite substantial, as we now illustrate with some concrete examples.

3.3.1 Testing at zero

We begin our exploration by considering the testing problem (3) with $\theta^* = 0$. In order to characterize the θ^*-localized minimax testing radius (5), we define the functions

$$m_u(\delta; \mathcal{E}) := \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \{\mu_k \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta^2\}, \quad \text{and} \quad m_\ell(\delta; \mathcal{E}) := \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \{\mu_{k+1} \geq \frac{9}{16}\delta^2\}. \tag{19}$$

In order to ensure that both functions are well-defined, we restrict our attention to δ in the interval $\big(0, \min\{\sqrt{2\mu_1}, \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_2}\}\big)$. We now state a consequence of Theorems 1 and 2 in terms of these quantities:

Corollary 1. *Given an error level $\rho \in (0,1)$, the local minimax testing radius $\epsilon_{OPT}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ at $\theta^* = 0$ is bounded as*

$$\sup\Big\{\delta \mid \delta \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2 \frac{\sqrt{m_\ell(\delta;\mathcal{E})}}{\delta}\Big\} \;\leq\; \epsilon_{OPT}(0;\mathcal{E}) \;\leq\; \inf\Big\{\delta \mid \delta \geq \frac{8}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sigma^2 \frac{\sqrt{m_u(\delta;\mathcal{E})}}{\delta}\Big\}, \tag{20}$$

where we only consider $\delta \leq \min\{\sqrt{2\mu_1}, \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{\mu_2}\}$.

We prove Corollary 1 in Section 4.3.

The quantities defined on the left and right hand sides of expression (20) exist due to the fact that $m_u(\delta;\mathcal{E})$ and $m_\ell(\delta;\mathcal{E})$ are non-increasing functions of δ. Putting inequalities in (20) together, whenever m_u and m_ℓ differ only by constant factors, we have a tight characterization of the testing radius $\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(0;\mathcal{E})$ localized to $\theta^* = 0$.

In order to illustrate, we now apply Corollary 1 to some special cases of the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$, and see how the minimax testing radius localized to zero varies as a function of the ellipse parameters. In particular, let us consider two broad classes of decay rates for the ellipse parameters $\{\mu_j\}_j$.

γ-exponential decay: For some $\gamma > 0$, suppose the scalars $\{\mu_j\}_j$ satisfies a decay condition of the form $\mu_j = c_1 \exp(-c_2 j^\gamma)$, where c_1, c_2 are universal constants. Such exponential decay rates arise the problem of non-parametric regression testing (Example 3), in particular for reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces based on Gaussian kernels. From expression (19), we know $k_u = C\log^{1/\gamma}(1/\epsilon)$ and $k_B = c\log^{1/\gamma}(1/\epsilon)$ and solving the two inequalities from equation (20) yields

$$\epsilon^2_{\text{OPT}}(0) \asymp \sigma^2(\log(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}))^{1/2\gamma}. \tag{21}$$

Here $\asymp$ denotes equality up to a factor involving constants and terms of the order $\log\log(1/\sigma^2)$.

α-polynomial decay: Now suppose that the ellipse parameters $\{\mu_j\}_j$ satisfy a decay condition of the form $\mu_j = c_1 j^{-2\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 1/2$. As previously discussed, polynomial decay of this type arises in ellipses that are induced by Sobolev function spaces of smoothness α. From expression (19), we know $k_u = C\epsilon^{-1/\alpha}$ and $k_B = c\epsilon^{-1/\alpha}$ and solving the two inequalities in equation (20) yields

$$\epsilon^2_{\text{OPT}}(0) \asymp (\sigma^2)^{\frac{4\alpha}{1+4\alpha}}. \tag{22}$$

Here our notation $\asymp$ denotes equality up to constants independent of (σ, d), so that inequality (22) provides a characterization of the testing radius localized at zero that is tight up to constant factors. It is worth noticing that that rate (22) matches the (non-localized) globally minimax optimal testing radius established by Ingster [19, 20, 21]. Thus, testing at zero is as hard as the hardest testing problem in the ellipse. Intuitively, this correspondence makes sense because the ellipse contains a relatively large volume around zero, meaning that the compound alternative contains a larger number of possible vectors that need to be distinguished from the null.

Ingster [19] proves the lower bound by the direct analysis of a χ^2-type test, which is then shown to be optimal. For the estimation analogue of this problem, Ibragimov and Khasminskii [16, 17]

showed that the global minimax rate for estimation scales as $\epsilon_{\text{est}} \asymp (\sigma^2)^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)}$. This slower rate confirms the intuition that testing is an easier problem than estimation: we can detect a vector of length much smaller than the accuracy at which we can estimate.

Remark: As a final comment, Corollary 1 can be generalized to the ℓ_p-ellipse with $p \geq 2$, given by $\mathcal{E}_p := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\theta_i^p}{\mu_i} \leq 1\}$. Let us again consider testing at $\theta^* = 0$. Using the same technique to prove Corollary 1, it is easy to check that inequalities in equation (20) still hold with the definitions of m_u and m_ℓ in expression (19) replaced by

$$m_u(\delta; \mathcal{E}) := \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \{\mu_{k+1}^{2/p} \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta^2\}, \quad \text{and} \quad m_\ell(\delta; \mathcal{E}) := \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \{\mu_k^{2/p} \geq \delta^2\}.$$

3.3.2 Testing at extremal vectors

In the previous section, we studied the behavior of the minimax testing radius for $\theta^* = 0$, and recovered some known results from the classical literature. In this section, we study some non-zero cases of the vector θ^*. For concreteness, we restrict our attention to vectors that are non-zero some coordinate $s \in [d] = \{1, \ldots, d\}$, and zero in all other coordinates. Even for such simple vectors, our analysis reveals some interesting scaling of the minimax testing radius that is novel.

Given an integer $s \in [d]$ and a positive scalar δ, we define

$$m_u(\delta; s) := \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \Big\{\mu_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{64}\delta^2\mu_s\Big\}, \quad \text{and} \quad m_\ell(\delta; s) := \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \Big\{\mu_k^2 \geq \delta^2\mu_s\Big\}. \tag{23}$$

So as to ensure that these functions are well-defined, we restrict our attention to δ in the interval $\big(0, \mu_1/\sqrt{\mu_s}\big)$. By definition, we have $m_u(\delta; s) \geq m_\ell(\delta; s)$.

Before stating our corollary, let us define the upper and lower critical radii as follows

$$t_u^*(s, \mathcal{E}) = \inf\Big\{\delta > 0 \mid \delta \geq \frac{8}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sigma^2\frac{\sqrt{m_u(\delta; s)}}{\delta}\Big\} \tag{24a}$$

$$\text{and} \quad t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E}) = \sup\Big\{\delta > 0 \mid \delta \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2\frac{\sqrt{m_\ell(\delta; s)}}{\delta}\Big\}. \tag{24b}$$

Using the fact that $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$ and non-increasing functions satisfy $m_u(\delta; s) \geq m_\ell(\delta; s)$, we have $t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E}) \leq t_u^*(s, \mathcal{E})$. Again these two quantities do not depend on the θ^* that we are testing at. We then define the set

$$C(s; \mathcal{E}) := \Big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \theta_j = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \neq s, \text{ and } \quad \theta_s \in \big[\sqrt{\mu_s} - t_u^*(s, \mathcal{E}), \sqrt{\mu_s} - t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E})\big]\Big\}.$$

We are ready to state our corollary:

Corollary 2. *Consider any positive integer s such that $t_u^*(s, \mathcal{E}) \leq \sqrt{\mu_s}$. Then for any testing error level $\rho > 0$, we have*

$$t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E}) \leq \epsilon_{OPT}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \leq t_u^*(s, \mathcal{E}) \qquad \textit{for all } \theta^* \in C(s; \mathcal{E}). \tag{25}$$

See Section 4.4 for the proof of Corollary 2.

Corollary 2 characterizes the optimal testing radius for vectors that are sufficiently close to the boundary of the ellipse, In order to compare with the results of Section 3.3.1 for testing at zero, let us apply Corollary 2 to some special examples of the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$, and see how the testing radius varies as we vary the index $s \in [d]$. For these comparisons, we restrict our attention to ellipses for which the parameters $\{\mu_j\}$ decay at a polynomial rate.

α-Polynomial decay: Suppose that the scalars $\{\mu_j\}_j$ satisfy a decay condition of the form $\mu_j = c_1 j^{-2\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 1/2$. Recalling the definition (23), some calculations yield

$$\frac{\mu_{m_u}^2}{\mu_s} = \frac{m_u^{-4\alpha}}{s^{-2\alpha}} \geq \frac{\delta^2}{64} \implies m_u = \lfloor (64 s^{2\alpha})^{\frac{1}{4\alpha}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \rfloor, \qquad \text{and}$$
$$\frac{\mu_{m_\ell}^2}{\mu_s} = \frac{m_\ell^{-4\alpha}}{s^{-2\alpha}} \geq \delta^2 \implies m_\ell = \lfloor s^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \rfloor.$$

Solving the fixed point equations yields

$$t_u^*(s, \mathcal{E}) = \left(8^{\frac{4\alpha+1}{4\alpha}} \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} s^{\frac{1}{4}} \sigma^2\right)^{\frac{4\alpha}{8\alpha+1}} \qquad \text{and} \quad t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E}) = \left(\frac{1}{4} s^{\frac{1}{4}} \sigma^2\right)^{\frac{4\alpha}{8\alpha+1}}.$$

If we omit the dependence on the level ρ and constants, the optimal testing radius is given by

$$\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}^2(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \asymp (\sigma^2 s^{1/4})^{\frac{8\alpha}{1+8\alpha}} \qquad \text{and} \quad m_u, m_\ell \asymp (\sigma^{-2} s^{2\alpha})^{\frac{2}{8\alpha+1}} \tag{26}$$

whenever[1] $s \lesssim (\sigma^2)^{-2/(4\alpha+1)}$. As the choice of s is varied, inequality (26) actually provides us with a range of different results.

(a) First considering $s = 1$, suppose that θ^* is zero at every coordinate except the first: we then have

$$\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}^2(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \asymp (\sigma^2)^{\frac{8\alpha}{1+8\alpha}}, \tag{27}$$

where $\asymp$ means equal up to a constant that is independent of problem parameters d and σ. To the best of our knowledge, this is a novel result on ellipse testing. It shows that that the local minimax rate at this extremal vector is very different from the corresponding rate at zero, which as we have established in our Section 3.3.1 is equal $(\sigma^2)^{\frac{4\alpha}{1+4\alpha}}$.

(b) On the other hand, let us consider a sequence (indexed by σ) of the form $s = (\sigma^2)^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta \in \left(0, \frac{2}{(4\alpha+1)}\right)$. Over such a sequence, inequality (26) shows that the minimax testing radius scales as

$$\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}^2(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \asymp (\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\alpha(4-\beta)}{1+8\alpha}}. \tag{28}$$

As β ranges from 0 to $\frac{2}{(4\alpha+1)}$, the testing radius $\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}^2(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ ranges from $(\sigma^2)^{\frac{4\alpha}{1+4\alpha}}$ to $(\sigma^2)^{\frac{8\alpha}{1+8\alpha}}$.

[1]The constraint on s arises from the fact that $t_u^*(s, \mathcal{E}) \leq \sqrt{\mu_s}$.

4 Proofs of main results

We now turn to the proofs of our main results, with the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 given in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively, followed by the proofs of Corollary 1 and 2 in Sections 4.3 and 4.4, respectively. In all cases, we defer the proofs of certain more technical lemmas to the appendices.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

From our discussion following the statement of Theorem 1, recall that the optimal linear test (12) is based on the statistic

$$\psi(y) := \mathbb{I}\big[\|\Pi_{k_u^*}(y - \theta^*)\|_2^2 \geq \sigma^2(k_u^* + \sqrt{4k_u^*/\rho})\big], \tag{29}$$

where the critical upper dimension $k_u^* := k_u(\epsilon_u(\theta^*; \rho, \mathcal{E}), \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$ is computed from equation (9).

From here onwards, we adopt ϵ and k as convenient shorthands for the quantities ϵ_u and k_u^* respectively. We let Π_k denote the projection matrix that defines the Kolmogorov k-width of $\mathcal{E}_\theta^* \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)$—that is

$$\Pi_k := \arg \min_{\Pi_k \in \mathcal{P}_k} \max_{\Delta \in \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)} \|\Delta - \Pi_k \Delta\|_2^2. \tag{30}$$

Controlling the type I error: We first show that the test statistic (29) has type I error at most $\rho/2$. Under the null hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0$, we have $y \sim N(\theta^*, \sigma^2 I_d)$. Since Π_k is an orthogonal projection matrix, the rotation invariance of the Gaussian distribution guarantees that

$$T_k := \|\Pi_k(y - \theta^*)\|_2^2 \stackrel{d}{=} \|\tilde{w}\|_2^2, \qquad \text{where } \tilde{w} \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}_k).$$

Consequently, the statistic T_k/σ^2 follows a χ_k^2-distribution, and hence

$$\mathbb{P}_0\big[\psi(y) = 1\big] = \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}\big[T_k \geq \sigma^2(k + \sqrt{4k/\rho})\big] \leq \frac{\rho}{2}, \tag{31}$$

where the last step follows from Chebyshev's inequality.

Controlling the type II error: Under the alternative hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_1$, we have $y \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2 I_d)$ for some vector $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon$. Since Π_k is a linear operator, we have

$$T_k = \|\Pi_k(y - \theta^*)\|_2^2 = \|\Pi_k w + \Pi_k(\theta - \theta^*)\|_2^2, \qquad \text{where } w \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_d).$$

Using the fact that Gaussian distribution is rotation invariant, the statistic T_k/σ^2 follows a non-central $\chi_k^2(c_0)$ distribution, defined by the recentering $c_0 = \|\Pi_k(\theta - \theta^*)\|_2^2$.

For each vector $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon$, we claim that

$$c_0 = \|\Pi_k(\theta - \theta^*)\|_2^2 \geq \min_{u \in \mathcal{E}, \|u - \theta^*\|_2 = \epsilon} \{\|\Pi_k(u - \theta^*)\|_2^2\}. \tag{32}$$

We take inequality (32) as given for the moment, returning to prove it at the end of this section. Since Π_k is an orthogonal projection onto a subspace, the Pythagorean theorem guarantees that

$$\|\Pi_k(u-\theta^*)\|_2^2 = \|(u-\theta^*)\|_2^2 - \|(u-\theta^*) - \Pi_k(u-\theta^*)\|_2^2.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 = \|\Pi_k(\theta-\theta^*)\|_2^2 &\stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \min_{u\in\mathcal{E}, \|u-\theta^*\|_2=\epsilon} \left\{\|(u-\theta^*)\|_2^2 - \|(u-\theta^*) - \Pi_k(u-\theta^*)\|_2^2\right\} \\ &= \epsilon^2 - \max_{u\in\mathcal{E}, \|u-\theta^*\|_2=\epsilon} \|(u-\theta^*) - \Pi_k(u-\theta^*)\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \epsilon^2 - \max_{u\in\mathcal{E}, \|u-\theta^*\|_2\leq\epsilon} \|(u-\theta^*) - \Pi_k(u-\theta^*)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (i) makes use of inequality (32). Recalling the definition of Π_k from equation (30), we find that

$$c_0 \;\geq \epsilon^2 - \min_{\Pi_k\in\mathcal{P}_k} \max_{\theta\in\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}\cap\mathbb{B}(\epsilon)} \|\Delta - \Pi_k\Delta\|_2^2 \;=\; \epsilon^2 - \omega_k^2(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}\cap\mathbb{B}(\epsilon)) \stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2},$$

where inequality (ii) follows since the critical dimension k was chosen so that $\omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}\cap\mathbb{B}(\epsilon)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}$.

Now we are ready to bound the type II error. For any vector θ in the alternative, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta[\psi(y)=0] = \mathbb{P}_\theta\big[T_k \leq \sigma^2(k+\sqrt{4k/\rho})\big] = \mathbb{P}_\theta\left[\frac{T_k-\sigma^2k-c_0}{\sigma^2\sqrt{k}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\rho}} - \frac{c_0}{\sigma^2\sqrt{k}}\right].$$

Together, the two inequalities $c_0 \geq \epsilon^2/2$ and $\epsilon^2 \geq 8\rho^{-1/2}\sigma^2\sqrt{k}$ imply that $c_0/\sigma^2\sqrt{k} \geq 4\rho^{-1/2}$, whence

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta[\psi(y)=0] \leq \mathbb{P}_\theta\left[\frac{T_k-\sigma^2k-c_0}{\sigma^2\sqrt{k}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\rho}} - \frac{4}{\sqrt{\rho}}\right] \leq \frac{\rho}{2},$$

where the last inequality is again due to Chebyshev's inequality. Therefore whenever $\epsilon^2 \geq 8\rho^{-1/2}\sigma^2\sqrt{k}$, then type II error is upper bounded by

$$\sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{H}_1} \mathbb{P}_\theta\big[\psi(y)=0\big] \leq \frac{\rho}{2}. \tag{33}$$

Combining inequalities (31) and (33) yields the claim.

Proof of inequality (32)**:** The only remaining detail in the proof of Theorem 1 is to establish inequality (32). It suffices to show that the minimum

$$\min_{u\in\mathcal{E},\ \|u-\theta^*\|_2\geq\epsilon} \|\Pi_k(\theta-\theta^*)\|_2^2 \tag{34}$$

is always achieved by a vector $u^* \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\|u^*-\theta^*\|_2 = \epsilon$.

Noting the continuity of the objective and the compactness of the constraint set, Weierstrass' theorem ensures that the minimum is always achieved. Leting $\widehat{u}$ be any vector that achieves the minimum, we define the new vector

$$u^* := (1-\alpha)\theta^* + \alpha\widehat{u} \qquad \text{where } \alpha := \tfrac{\epsilon}{\|\widehat{u}-\theta^*\|_2} \in (0,1].$$

The convexity of $\mathcal{E}$ ensures that $u^* \in \mathcal{E}$, and moreover, by construction, we have $\|u^* - \theta^*\|_2 = \epsilon$. Thus, the vector u^* is feasible for the original problem (34), and by linearity of projection, we have

$$\|\Pi_k(u^* - \theta^*\|_2 \leq (1-\alpha)\|\Pi_k(0)\|_2 + \alpha\|\Pi_k(\widehat{u}-\theta^*)\|_2 \;\leq\; \|\Pi_k(\widehat{u}-\theta^*)\|_2,$$

showing that u^* is also a minimizer, as claimed.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2

We now turn to the proof of the lower bound stated in Theorem 2. This proof, as well as subsequent ones, makes use of the Bernstein width as a lower bound on the Kolmogorov width. Accordingly, we begin by introducing some background on it, as well stating an auxiliary lemma that shows how to obtain testing error lower bounds via Bernstein width.

4.2.1 Lower bounds via the Bernstein width

The Bernstein k-width of a compact set C is the radius of the largest $k+1$-dimensional ball that can be inscribed into C. Typically, we use the Euclidean (ℓ_2) norm to define the ball, but more generally, we can define widths respect to the ℓ_p-norms with $p \in [1,\infty]$. More precisely, for a given integer $k \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{S}_{k+1}$ denote the set of all $(k+1)$-dimensional subspaces. With this notation, the *Bernstein k-width in ℓ_p-norm* is given by

$$b_{k,p}(C) := \arg\max_{r \geq 0} \Big\{ \mathbb{B}_p^{k+1}(r) \subseteq C \cap S \quad \text{for some subspace } S \in \mathcal{S}_{k+1} \Big\}, \tag{35}$$

where $\mathbb{B}_p^{k+1}(r) := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1} \mid \|u\|_p \leq r\}$ denotes a $(k+1)$-dimensional ℓ_p-ball of radius r centered at zero.

An important fact is that the Kolmogorov k-width from equation (8) can always be lower bounded by the Bernstein k-width in ℓ_2—that is,

$$\omega_k(C) \geq b_{k,2}(C) \quad \text{for any } k = 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{36}$$

See Pinkus [29] for more details of this property. Moreover, comparing the Bernstein widths in ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ norm, we have the sandwich relation

$$b_{k,\infty}(C) \;\leq\; b_{k,2}(C) \;\leq\; \sqrt{k+1}\, b_{k,\infty}(C), \tag{37}$$

which is an elementary consequence of the fact that $1 \leq \frac{\|u\|_2}{\|u\|_\infty} \leq \sqrt{k+1}$ for any non-zero vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$.

We now use these definitions to define a lower bound on the testing error in terms of Bernstein width in ℓ_∞. Define the ℓ_∞-Bernstein lower critical dimension as

$$k_B(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) := \arg \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\{ k b_{k-1,\infty}^2(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}) \geq \epsilon^2 \right\}, \tag{38a}$$

and the corresponding lower critical radius

$$\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) := \sup \left\{ \epsilon \mid \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2 \frac{\sqrt{k_B(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})}}{\epsilon} \right\}. \tag{38b}$$

In terms of these quantities, we have the following auxiliary result:

Lemma 1. *For any vector $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$, we have*

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathrm{Err}(\psi; \theta^*, \delta) \geq \frac{1}{2} \qquad \text{for all } \delta \leq \epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}). \tag{39}$$

See Appendix A for the proof of this lemma.

Lemma 1 is useful because evaluating the Bernstein width is often easier than evaluating the Kolmogorov width. Note that we also have a (possibly weaker) lower bound in term of ℓ_2-Bernstein widths. In particular, suppose that we define the ℓ_2-Bernstein critical dimension

$$\widetilde{k}_B(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) := \arg \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\{ b_{k-1,2}^2(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}) \geq \epsilon^2 \right\} \tag{40}$$

and then define the critical radius ϵ_B using $\widetilde{k}_B$. By the sandwich relation (37), the lower bound (39) still holds.

4.2.2 Main portion of proof

Let $D := \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}} \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2$ denote the diameter of the ellipse with respect to θ^*. We need only consider testing radii $\epsilon \leq D$, since otherwise, the alternative is empty. Moreover, we need only consider noise standard deviations $\sigma \leq D$, since otherwise even the simple (non-compound) testing problem is hard.

Next, we claim that $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}^2(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \geq \sigma^2$. In order to establish this claim, we consider a simple hypothesis test between a pair (θ^*, θ) both in the ellipse, and such that $\|\theta^* - \theta\|_2 = \delta$ for some $\delta \in [\sigma, D]$. This single-to-single test requires separation $\delta^2 \geq \sigma^2$, a classical fact that can be proved by various arguments, for example, by analyzing the likelihood ratio and using Neyman-Pearson lemma. Since our composite testing problem (3) is at least as hard, it follows that $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}^2(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \geq \sigma^2$.

For the remainder of our analysis, we assume that $\sqrt{k_\ell} \geq 18$. (Otherwise, the squared critical radius ϵ_u from in equation (15)) is upper bounded by $9\sigma^2/2$, so that the claim of Theorem 2 follows by adjusting the constant c, combined with the lower bound $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}^2(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \geq \sigma^2$.) We now divide our analysis into two cases, depending on whether or not $\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1/2$.

Case 1: First, suppose that $\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1/2$, which implies that $\Phi(\delta) \leq (\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} - 1)^2 \leq 1$. In this case, we apply the ℓ_2-Bernstein-width based lower bound from Lemma 1 to establish our theorem. Define the quantities $\widetilde{k}_B(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) := \arg\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \Big\{ b_{k-1,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \geq b\epsilon \Big\}$, and

$$\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) := \sup \Big\{ \epsilon \mid b^2 \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2 \frac{\sqrt{\widetilde{k}_B(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})}}{\epsilon} \Big\}.$$

With this notation, an equivalent statement of Lemma 1 is that $\inf_\psi \operatorname{Err}(\psi; \theta^*, \delta) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $\delta \leq b\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$. (In this statement, we have replaced $b_{k-1,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*})$ by $b_{k-1,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon))$ for later theoretical convenience; doing so does not change the definition as $a > b$.)

In order to prove Theorem 2, we need to show that $c\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \leq b\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$, and we claim that it suffices to show that $k_\ell(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) \leq \widetilde{k}_B(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$. Indeed, supposing that the latter inequality holds, the definition of the lower critical radius in equation (15) implies that

$$\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) := \sup \Big\{ \epsilon \mid \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2 \frac{\sqrt{k_\ell(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})}}{\epsilon} \Big\}.$$

Comparing with the above definition of $\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ and using[2] the fact that $b \in (0, 1)$, we see that $\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \leq \epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$. Finally, since $c < b$, it follows that $c\epsilon_\ell(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \leq b\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$.

Now it is only left for us to show that $k_\ell(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) \leq \widetilde{k}_B(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$. By definition of the critical lower dimension $k_\ell(\epsilon, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$ in equation (14), we have $\omega_{k_\ell - 1}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) > 3b\epsilon$. So our proof for Case 1 will be complete once we establish that $b_{k_\ell,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \geq b\epsilon$. In order to do so, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *The following chain of inequalities hold*

$$\min\{a\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\} \overset{(i)}{\leq} b_{k,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \leq \omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \overset{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{3}{2}\omega_k(\mathcal{E} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \overset{(iii)}{=} \frac{3}{2}\min\{a\epsilon, \sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}. \tag{41}$$

See Appendix B.1 for the proof of this claim.

From Lemma 2, we have the string of inequalities

$$3b\epsilon < \omega_{k_\ell - 1}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \leq \frac{3}{2}\min\{a\epsilon, \sqrt{\mu_{k_\ell}}\},$$

and hence $b_{k_\ell,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \geq \min\{a\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu_{k_\ell}}\} \geq b\epsilon$, which completes the proof in Case 1.

Case 2: Otherwise, we may assume that $\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} > 1/2$, in which case $\Phi(\delta/c) \leq (\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} - 1)^2 < 1$, and hence by definition of the function Φ, we have $\delta < c\|\theta^*\|_2/a$.

Our analysis in this case makes use of the following auxiliary result (stated as Lemma 6 in Wei et al. [35]). Suppose that we observe a Gaussian random vector $y \sim N(\Delta, \sigma^2 I_d)$. For a set C, we

[2] It should also be noted that the right hand sides of both fixed point equations are non-increasing function of ϵ while the left hand side is non-decreasing.

use $\mathrm{Err}(\psi; \{0\}, C, \delta)$ to denote the uniform testing error defined by the compound testing problem (in the Gaussian sequence model) of distinguishing the null $\Delta = 0$ from the compound alternative $\Delta \in C \cap \mathbb{B}^c(\delta)$, where $\mathbb{B}^c(\delta) := \{v \mid \|v\|_2 \geq \delta\}$.

Lemma 3. *For every set C and probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ supported on $C \cap \mathbb{B}^c(\delta)$, we have*

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathrm{Err}(\psi; \{0\}, C, \delta) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'} \exp\Big(\frac{\langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle}{\sigma^2}\Big) - 1}, \tag{42}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'}$ denotes expectation with respect to an i.i.d pair $\eta, \eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}$.

In order to apply Lemma 3, we need to specify a suitable set C and probability distribution $\mathbb{Q}$. For our application, the relevant set is $C = \mathcal{E}_\theta^*$. In addition, we need to construct an appropriate distribution $\mathbb{Q}$ with which to apply Lemma 3. To this end, we introduce two more auxiliary results. In the following statement, we fix a constant $\epsilon > 0$, as well as pair $a, b \in (0,1)$ such that $a > 3b$, and recall that $k_\ell(\epsilon)$ denotes the lower critical dimension from equation (14). Also recall that the ellipse norm $\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \theta^T M \theta$ is defined in terms of the diagonal matrix M with diagonal entries $\{\frac{1}{\mu_i}\}_{i=1}^d$.

Lemma 4. *For any vector $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\|\theta^*\|_2 > a\epsilon$, there exists a vector $\theta^\dagger \in \mathcal{E}$, a collection of d-dimensional orthonormal vectors $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{k_\ell}$ and an upper triangular matrix of the form*

$$H := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & h_{3,2} & h_{4,2} & \cdots & h_{k_\ell,2} \\ & 1 & h_{4,3} & \cdots & h_{k_\ell,3} \\ & & 1 & \cdots & h_{k_\ell,4} \\ & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k_\ell-1)\times(k_\ell-1)}, \tag{43}$$

with ordered singular values $\nu_1(H) \geq \nu_2(H) \geq \cdots \geq \nu_{k_\ell-1}(H) \geq 0$ such that:

(a) The vectors u_1, $M\theta^\dagger$, and $\theta^\dagger - \theta^*$ are all scalar multiples of one another.

(b) We have $\|\theta^\dagger - \theta^*\|_2 = a\epsilon$.

(c) For each $i \in [k_\ell - 1]$, the i^{th} column $H_{i,\cdot}$ of the matrix H has its squared Euclidean norm upper bounded as $\|H_{\cdot,i}\|_2^2 \leq a^2/9b^2$.

(d) For each $i \in [k_\ell - 1]$, each of the vectors $\theta^\dagger \pm b\epsilon \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} u_2 & \cdots u_{k_\ell} \end{bmatrix}}_{:=U} H_{\cdot,i}$ belongs to the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$.

(e) For each pair of integers $(s,t) \in [k_\ell - 1] \times [k_\ell - 2]$, we have

$$\nu_s \overset{(i)}{\leq} \frac{a}{3b}\sqrt{\frac{k_\ell - 1}{s}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{t+1} \overset{(ii)}{\geq} 1 - \frac{t}{k_\ell - 1} - \sqrt{\frac{a^2 - 9b^2}{9b^2}}. \tag{44}$$

See Appendix B.2 for the proof of this lemma.

Let us write the SVD of the matrix H from equation (43) in the form $Q\Sigma V^T$. Since H is square and full rank, the matrices Q and V are square and orthogonal, and Σ is a square matrix of singular

values. By construction, we have $H^T H = V\Sigma^2 V^T$. Define matrix $A := V^T(UH)^T M(UH)V$ and write its diagonal as $(A_1, \ldots, A_{k_\ell - 1})$. We introduce index set $\mathcal{M}(r) := \{i \mid A_i \leq A_{(r)}\}$ which contains those elements that lie below the r-th quantile of A's diagonals elements. We assume that $(k_\ell - 1)/8$ is an integer; otherwise, the same argument can be applied by taking its floor function. Let $m_1 := (k_\ell - 1)/4$ and $m_2 := (k_\ell - 1)/2$. Fixing a sparsity level $s \leq m_2 - m_1 + 1$, let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all subsets of set $F := \{m_1, m_1 + 1, \ldots, m_2\} \cap \mathcal{M}(7(k_\ell - 1)/8)$ of size s. Note that from definitions, the cardinality of F is lower bounded by $(k_\ell - 1)/8$.

Given a subset $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and a sign vector $z^S = (z_1^S, \ldots, z_{k_\ell - 1}^S) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{k_\ell - 1}$, define the vector

$$\theta^S := \theta^* + b\epsilon \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2s}} XVz^S, \qquad \Delta^S := \theta^S - \theta^*, \tag{45}$$

where the matrix $X = UH$ was previously defined in Lemma 4. We then make the following claim:

Lemma 5. *Under the assumption of Lemma 4 and $\Phi(\epsilon) \leq (\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} - 1)^2$, for any subset $S \in \mathcal{S}$, there is a sign vector z^S supported on S such that:*

$$\theta^S(z^S) \overset{(i)}{\in} \mathcal{E}, \qquad \text{and} \quad \|\Delta^S\|_2 \overset{(ii)}{\geq} c\epsilon. \tag{46}$$

See Appendix B.3 for the proof of this lemma.

We now apply Lemma 3 with $\mathbb{Q}$ as the uniform distribution on those perturbation vectors $\Delta^S = \theta^S - \theta^*$ that are defined via expression (45). Note that the sign vector z^S is taken to be the one whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 5. For any $S \in \mathcal{S}$, due to inequality (46), we have $\|\Delta^S\|_2 \geq \epsilon$, and thus, with the choice $\delta := c\epsilon$, the distribution $\mathbb{Q}$ is supported on set $\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}^c(\delta)$

For simplicity of the notation, let us introduce the shorthand notation $t := m_2 - m_1 + 1$; notat that this integer satisfies the relations $t = k_\ell/4 \geq 81$ and $\lambda := \frac{1}{32\sigma^2} b^2 \epsilon^2 \nu_{m_1}^2$, where ν_{m_1} denotes the m_1-th largest eigenvalue of matrix H.

Lemma 6. *Given the distribution $\mathbb{Q}$ defined as above, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta, \eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}}\Big[\exp\big(\frac{\langle \eta,\, \eta' \rangle}{\sigma^2}\big)\Big] \leq \exp\left(-\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^2 + \exp\left(\frac{2 + \lambda}{\sqrt{t} - 1}\right)\right). \tag{47}$$

See Appendix B.4 for the proof of this lemma.

We can now complete the proof of Case 2. If the radius satisfies $\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{k_\ell}}{4}\sigma^2$, as a consequence of the eigenvalue bound (44), we find that

$$\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{t}} = \frac{\epsilon^2 b^2 \nu_{m_1}^2}{32\sigma^2\sqrt{m_2 - m_1 + 1}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{k_\ell} \cdot b^2 \cdot \frac{4a^2}{9b^2}}{144\sqrt{m_2 - m_1 + 1}} \leq \frac{1}{18},$$

where the last inequality uses $a < 1$ and $m_2 - m_1 + 1 = k_\ell/4$.

With control of these quantities in hand, we can bound the testing error. The right hand side in expression (47) can be upper bounded as

$$\exp\left(-\left(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^2+\exp\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{t}-1}+\frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{t}-1}\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{t}}\right)\right)\leq\exp\left(-\left(1-\frac{1}{9}\right)^2+\exp\left(\frac{1}{4}+\frac{9}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{18}\right)\right)<2,$$

where we use the fact that $t=k_\ell/4\geq 81$. As a consequence of Lemma 3, we have

$$\inf_{\psi}\mathrm{Err}(\psi;\{0\},\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*},c\epsilon)\geq 1-\frac{1}{2}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'}\,\exp(\frac{\langle\eta,\,\eta'\rangle}{\sigma^2})-1\Big]^{1/2}\;>\;\frac{1}{2}\geq\rho,$$

which completes the proof of Case 2, and hence the theorem.

4.3 Proof of Corollary 1

Our proof of Corollary 1 is based on a particular way of sandwiching the upper and lower critical radii, which we first introduce.

4.3.1 Sandwiching the upper and lower critical radii

Recall the upper and lower critical dimensions from equations (9) and (14), respectively. Suppose that we can find pair a pair of functions $(\hat{k}_\ell,\hat{k}_u)$ such that the sandwich relation

$$\hat{k}_\ell(\epsilon)\;\leq\;k_\ell(\epsilon)\;\leq\;k_u(\epsilon)\leq\hat{k}_u(\epsilon),\quad\text{for }\epsilon>0. \tag{48}$$

holds. Under an additional monotonicity property, any such pair can be used to bound the interval $[\epsilon_\ell,\epsilon_u]$.

Lemma 7. *Consider a pair of functions $\hat{k}_u$ and $\hat{k}_\ell$ that are each non-increasing in ϵ, and satisfy the sandwich relation* (48)*. Then we have $\big[\epsilon_\ell,\;\epsilon_u\big]\subseteq\big[\widehat{\epsilon}_\ell,\;\widehat{\epsilon}_u\big]$, where*

$$\widehat{\epsilon}_u:=\inf\left\{\epsilon\mid\epsilon\geq\frac{8}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sigma^2\frac{\sqrt{\hat{k}_u(\epsilon)}}{\epsilon}\right\}\quad\text{and}\quad\widehat{\epsilon}_\ell:=\sup\left\{\epsilon\mid\epsilon\leq\frac{1}{4}\sigma^2\frac{\sqrt{\hat{k}_\ell(\epsilon)}}{\epsilon}\right\}.$$

Proof. These bounds follow directly by replacing k_u by $\hat{k}_u$ (respectively k_ℓ by $\hat{k}_\ell$) in the definition of $\widehat{\epsilon}_u$ (respectively $\widehat{\epsilon}_\ell$). The non-increasing nature of the functions $(\hat{k}_\ell,\hat{k}_u)$ ensure that the quantities $(\widehat{\epsilon}_\ell,\widehat{\epsilon}_u)$ are well-defined. □

4.3.2 Proof of upper bound

We prove the upper bound via an application of Lemma 7 combined with Theorem 1. In particular, we construct functions[3] (f_k^ℓ,f_k^u) that sandwich local Kolmogorov width above and below by

$$f_k^\ell(\epsilon)\;\leq\;\omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}\cap\mathbb{B}(a\epsilon))\leq\omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}\cap\mathbb{B}(\epsilon))\;\leq f_k^u(\epsilon)\qquad\text{for every integer }1\leq k\leq d. \tag{49}$$

[3]Strictly speaking, these functions also depend on θ^* and the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$, but we omit this dependence so as to simplify notation.

Here $a \in (0,1)$ is the constant involved in the statement of Theorem 2. It is then straightforward to verify that the functions

$$\hat{k}_u(\epsilon) := \arg\min_{1 \leq k \leq d} \big\{ f_k^u(\epsilon) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \big\} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{k}_\ell(\epsilon) := \arg\min_{1 \leq k \leq d} \big\{ f_k^\ell(\epsilon) \leq 3b\epsilon \big\}. \tag{50}$$

satisfy the conditions of Lemma 7, so that it can be applied.

We begin by upper bounding the localized Kolmogorov width (8) of $\mathcal{E} \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)$. Let Π_k denote the orthogonal projection onto the first k coordinates of the ellipse. We then have

$$\omega_k^2(\mathcal{E}_\theta^* \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)) \leq \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}, \|\theta - \theta^*\|_2 \leq \epsilon} \|(\theta - \theta^*) - \Pi_k(\theta - \theta^*)\|_2^2 = \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}, \|\theta\|_2 \leq \epsilon} \sum_{i=k+1}^{d} \theta_i^2.$$

Since the scalars $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^d$ are ranked in non-increasing order, for any vector $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=k+1}^{d} \theta_i^2 = \sum_{i=k+1}^{d} \mu_i \frac{\theta_i^2}{\mu_i} \;\leq\; \mu_{k+1} \sum_{i=k+1}^{d} \frac{\theta_i^2}{\mu_i} \;\leq\; \mu_{k+1},$$

where the final inequality follows from the inclusion $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$. Consequently, we have proved that

$$\omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\epsilon)) \leq f_k^u(\epsilon) \;:=\; \underbrace{\min\{\epsilon, \sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}}_{=: f_k^u(\epsilon)}.$$

It is easy to check that the function $\epsilon \mapsto \hat{k}_u(\epsilon)$ from equation (50) is non-increasing, so that an application of Lemma 7 yields the claimed upper bound (20).

4.3.3 Proof of lower bound

We prove the lower bound by a combination of Lemma 7 and Theorem 2, and in order to do so, we need to lower bound the localized Kolmogorov width. As previously noted, the Bernstein width (35) is always a lower bound on the Kolmogorov width, so that

$$\omega_k(\mathcal{E} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \geq b_{k,2}(\mathcal{E} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) = \underbrace{\min\{a\epsilon, \sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}}_{=: f_k^\ell(\epsilon)}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that we can always inscribe a Euclidean ball of radius $\sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}$ centered at zero inside the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$ truncated to its first $(k+1)$-coordinates. It is straightforward to verify that the corresponding $\hat{k}_\ell$ that is defined in (50) is non-increasing in ϵ, so that the the claimed lower bound (20) follows by applying Lemma 7 with Theorem 2.

4.4 Proof of Corollary 2

We again separate our proof into two parts, corresponding to the upper bound and lower bounds. The upper bound is proved via an application of Lemma 7 and Theorem 1. On the other hand, we prove the lower bound by using Theorem 2 and Lemma 1 in conjunction with Lemma 7.

4.4.1 Proof of upper bound

Let us introduce the convenient shorthand $\theta^*_{-s} := (\theta^*_1, \ldots, \theta^*_{s-1}, \theta^*_{s+1}, \ldots, \theta^*_d)$. In terms of the the local minimax testing radius $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ previously defined in equation (5), Theorem 1 guarantees that $\epsilon_{\mathrm{OPT}}(\theta^*) \leq \epsilon_u(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$. Consequently, in order to establish the upper bound stated in Corollary 2, it suffices to show that for any vector θ^* with $\theta^*_s \geq \sqrt{\mu_s} - t^*_u(s, \mathcal{E})$ and $\theta^*_{-s} = 0$, we have $\epsilon_u(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \leq t^*_u(s, \mathcal{E})$. In order to do so, it suffices to show that

$$\omega_{m_u(\delta,s)}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\delta)) \leq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad \text{for each } \delta > 0. \tag{51}$$

It then follows that $m_u(\delta; s) \geq k_u(\delta)$, from which an application of Lemma 7 implies that $\epsilon_u(s, \mathcal{E}) \leq t^*_u(s, \mathcal{E})$, as desired.

Accordingly, the remainder of our argument is devoted to establishing inequality (51). Let Π_m denote the orthogonal projection onto the span of the first m standard basis vectors $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^m$. By definition (8), the localized Kolmogorov width is upper bounded by

$$\omega_m(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\delta)) \leq \underbrace{\max_{\theta \in C} \sqrt{\sum_{i=m+1}^d \theta_i^2}}_{=: T^u_m} \qquad \text{where} \quad C := \big\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\theta_i^2}{\mu_i} \leq 1, \quad (\theta_s - \theta^*_s)^2 + \sum_{i \neq s} \theta_i^2 \leq \delta^2\big\},$$

where we have used the fact that $\theta^*_{-s} = 0$.

Let us introduce the shorthand $m \backslash s := \{1, 2, \ldots, s-1, s+1, \ldots, m\}$. Observe that setting $\theta_j \neq 0$ for any $j \in m \backslash s$ only makes the constraints defining C more difficult to satisfy, and does not improve the objective function defining T^u_m. Therefore, we can reduce the problem to

$$\max_{\theta_s, \{\theta_i\}_{i=m+1}^d} \sum_{i=m+1}^d \theta_i^2, \quad \text{such that} \quad \sum_{i=m+1}^d \frac{\theta_i^2}{\mu_i} \leq 1 \text{ and } (\theta_s - \theta^*_s)^2 + \sum_{i=m+1}^d \theta_i^2 \leq \delta^2.$$

Since the scalars $\{\mu_i\}_{i=m+1}^d$ are ranked in non-increasing order, any optimal solution must satisfy $\theta_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{m+2, \ldots, d\}$. Putting pieces together, the optimal solution is defined by a pair (θ_s, θ_{m+1}) that satisfy the relations

$$(\theta_s - \theta^*_s)^2 + \theta^2_{m+1} = \delta^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\theta_s^2}{\mu_s} + \frac{\theta^2_{m+1}}{\mu_{m+1}} = 1.$$

Solving these equations yields

$$\theta_s = \frac{\theta^*_s}{1-t} - \sqrt{\frac{\delta^2 - \mu_{m+1}}{1-t} + \frac{t(\theta^*_s)^2}{(1-t)^2}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta^2_{m+1} = \delta^2 - \left(\sqrt{\frac{\delta^2 - \mu_{m+1}}{1-t} + \frac{t(\theta^*_s)^2}{(1-t)^2}} - \frac{t\theta^*_s}{1-t}\right)^2, \tag{52}$$

where we define $t := \mu_{m+1}/\mu_s$. We introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *For any $\delta \geq t^*_u(s, \mathcal{E})$ and $\sqrt{\mu_s} - t^*_u(s, \mathcal{E}) \leq \theta^*_s \leq \sqrt{\mu_s}$, we have $\theta^2_{m+1} \leq \frac{\delta^2}{2}$.*

See Appendix C for the proof of this result.

Therefore, the localized Kolmogorov width is at most $\omega_m^2(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(\delta)) \leq (T_m^u)^2 = \theta_{m+1}^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{2}$, which completes the proof of the upper bound stated in Corollary 2.

4.4.2 Proof of lower bound

In terms of the the local minimax testing radius $\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$ previously defined in equation (5), Lemma 1 guarantees that $\epsilon_{\text{OPT}}(\theta^*) \geq \epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E})$. Therefore, in order to establish the lower bound stated in Corollary 2, it is sufficient for us to show that for any vector θ^* with $\theta_s^* \leq \sqrt{\mu_s} - t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E})$ and $\theta_{-s}^* = 0$, we have $\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \geq t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E})$. Suppose that we can show that

$$m b_{m-1,\infty}^2(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}) \geq \delta^2, \tag{53}$$

where we have introduced the shorthand $m := m_\ell(\delta; s)$. It then follows that then $k_B(\delta) \geq m$, from which an application of Lemma 7 guarantees that $\epsilon_B(\theta^*; \mathcal{E}) \geq t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E})$. Here we apply Lemma 7 with respect to k_B and ϵ_B replacing quantities k_ℓ and ϵ_ℓ in the statement which holds by the same argument of the original proof.

The remainder of our argument is to devoted to proving inequality (53). Consider the set

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ \theta \mid \theta_s = \theta_s^*,\ \theta_{m+1}, \ldots, \theta_d = 0,\ \theta_i \in [-\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{M}|}}, \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{M}|}}],\ i \in \mathcal{M} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{M} := \{1 \leq i \leq m, i \neq s\}.$$

We claim that the set $\mathcal{H}$ is contained within the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$. In order to see this, first note that μ_i are ranked in a non-increasing order, so we have $\frac{\delta^2}{|\mathcal{M}|} \sum_{i \neq s}^m \frac{1}{\mu_i} \leq \delta^2 / \mu_m$. It implies

$$\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{\mu_s} + \sum_{i \neq s}^m \frac{\delta^2}{\mu_i |\mathcal{M}|} \leq \frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{\mu_s} + \frac{\delta^2}{\mu_m} = 1 - \frac{2w}{\sqrt{\mu_s}} + \frac{w^2}{\mu_s} + \frac{\delta^2}{\mu_m}, \tag{54}$$

where we plugged in $\theta_s^* = \sqrt{\mu_s} - w$ with $w \geq t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E})$. On one hand, inequality $w \leq \sqrt{\mu_s}$ guarantees that $\frac{w^2}{\mu_s} - \frac{w}{\sqrt{\mu_s}} < 0$. On the other hand, inequalities $\mu_k^2 \geq \delta^2 \mu_s$ and $\delta \leq t_\ell^*(s, \mathcal{E})$ yield that $\frac{\delta^2}{\mu_k} \leq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\mu_s}} \leq \frac{w}{\sqrt{\mu_s}}$. Combining these two facts, we have $\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq 1$ for every $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$, namely set $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{E}$.

It means that we are able to inscribe a $|\mathcal{M}| - 1$-dimensional ℓ_∞ ball with radius $\delta / \sqrt{|\mathcal{M}|}$ into the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$, namely $m b_{m-1,\infty}^2(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}) \geq \delta^2$. Putting pieces together, we finish the proof of the lower bound of Corollary 2.

5 Discussion

In this paper, we have studied the local geometry of compound testing problems in ellipses. Our main contribution was to show that it is possible to obtain a sharp characterization of the localized minimax testing radius at a given vector θ^* in terms of an equation involving the Kolmogorov width of a particular set. This set involves the geometry of the ellipse, but is localized to the vector

θ^* via intersection with a Euclidean ball. This form of localization and the resulting fixed point equation is similar to localization techniques that are used in proving optimal rates for estimation (e.g., [33]), and our work demonstrates that similar concepts are also useful in establishing optimal testing rates. We anticipate that this perspective will be useful in studying adaptivity and local geometry in other testing problems.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by Office of Naval Research grant DOD ONR-N00014, and National Science Foundation grant NSF-DMS-1612948 to MJW.

A Proof of Lemma 1

In order to simplify notation, we use k as a shorthand for k_B throughout this proof. Our goal is to prove that if $\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{k}\sigma^2}{4}$, then any test has testing error at least $1/2$. Let $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the standard basis vector with the i-th coordinate equal to one. The definition of k guarantees that we can construct a 2^k-sized collection of perturbation vectors of the form

$$\theta_b = \theta^* + \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i e_i, \quad b \in \{-1, +1\}^k \tag{55}$$

such that each θ_b lies on the boundary of the ℓ_∞ ball around θ^* with radius $\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{k}}$. This last property ensures that each θ_b belongs to the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$. At the same time, we have $\|\theta_b - \theta^*\|^2 = k(\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{k}})^2 = \epsilon^2$, valid for all Boolean vectors $b \in \{-1, +1\}^k$, so that each perturbation vector θ_b indexes a distribution in the alternative hypothesis class $\mathcal{H}_1$.

By Lemma 3, we can lower bound the testing error as

$$\inf_{\psi} \mathrm{Err}(\psi; \{\theta^*\}, \mathcal{E}, \epsilon) = \inf_{\psi} \mathrm{Err}(\psi; \{0\}, \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}, \epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta' \sim \mathbb{Q}} \exp(\frac{\langle \eta, \eta' \rangle}{\sigma^2}) - 1}.$$

Let $\mathbb{Q}$ denote the uniform distribution over the set $\{\theta_b - \theta^*, b \in \{-1, +1\}^k\}$. Introducing the

shorthand $N := 2^k$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta,\eta'\sim\mathbb{Q}} \exp(\frac{\langle \eta,\, \eta'\rangle}{\sigma^2}) \;=\; \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{b,b'} \exp(\frac{(\theta_b-\theta^*)^T(\theta_{b'}-\theta^*)}{\sigma^2}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{b} \exp(\frac{(\theta_b-\theta^*)^T(\epsilon 1_d/\sqrt{k})}{\sigma^2}) \quad (56)$$

$$= 2^{-k}\sum_{i=0}^{k}\binom{k}{i}\exp(\frac{\epsilon^2(k-2i)}{k\sigma^2})$$

$$= \Big(\frac{\exp(\epsilon^2/k\sigma^2)+\exp(-\epsilon^2/k\sigma^2)}{2}\Big)^k,$$

where we have used the symmetry of the problem. It can be verified via elementary calculation that $\frac{\exp(x)+\exp(-x)}{2} \le 1+x^2$ for all $|x| \le 1/2$. Setting $x = \frac{\epsilon^2}{k\sigma^2}$, we have $x \le \frac{1}{4\sqrt{k}} < 1/2$, and hence

$$\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{b,b'} \exp(\frac{(\theta_b-\theta^*)^T(\theta_{b'}-\theta^*)}{\sigma^2}) \le (1+\frac{\epsilon^4}{k^2\sigma^4})^k \le \exp(\frac{\epsilon^4}{k\sigma^4}),$$

where in the last step we used the standard bound $1+x \le e^x$. Therefore, the testing error is lower bounded by $1-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{e^{\epsilon^4/k\sigma^4}-1}$. Thus, whenever $\epsilon^2 \le \sqrt{k}\sigma^2/4$, the testing error is lower bounded as $\inf_\psi \mathrm{Err}(\psi;\{\theta^*\},\mathcal{E},\delta) \ge 1-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{e^{1/16}-1} \ge \frac{1}{2}$, which completes the proof of Lemma 1.

B Proofs for Theorem 2

In this appendix, we collect the proofs of various auxiliary results involved in the proof of Theorem 2.

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Note that the inequality $b_{k,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}\cap\mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \le \omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*}\cap\mathbb{B}(a\epsilon))$ follows as an immediate consequence of the relation between widths. It remains to prove inequalities (i)-(iii).

Proof of inequalities (i) and (iii): Recalling the definition of the Bernstein width, we claim that $\omega_k((\mathcal{E}\cap\mathbb{B}(a\epsilon))) = b_{k,2}(\mathcal{E}\cap\mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) = \min\{a\epsilon, \sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}$. In order to prove this claim, it suffices to show that

$$\omega_k(\mathcal{E}\cap\mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \overset{(i)}{\le} \min\{a\epsilon,\sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad b_{k,2}(\mathcal{E}\cap\mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \overset{(ii)}{\ge} \min\{a\epsilon,\sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}.$$

Inequality (i) follows easily by direct calculation after taking the k-dimensional projection in the definition of Kolmogorov width to be projecting to the span of $\{e_1,\ldots,e_k\}$. To show the second part, note that any vector $v\in\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|v\|_2 \le \sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}$ and $v_i = 0$ for all $i = k+2,\ldots,d$ satisfies

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d}\frac{v_i^2}{\mu_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1}\frac{v_i^2}{\mu_i} \overset{(a)}{\le} \frac{1}{\mu_{k+1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} v_i^2 \overset{(b)}{\le} 1,$$

where inequality (a) follows from the non-increasing ordering of the sequence $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^d$ and inequality (b) follows from the structure of vector v. Consequently, the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$ contains a $k+1$-dimensional ℓ_2 ball centered at 0 of radius $\sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}$. Therefore we have $b_{k,2}(\mathcal{E} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \geq \min\{a\epsilon, \sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}$. We complete the proof of inequality (iii).

Consider every vector $v \in \mathcal{E}$ that lies in the $k+1$-dimensional ℓ_2 ball that specified above. Since $\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1/2$, we have $\|2\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1$ which implies that $2\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$. By the convexity of $\mathcal{E}$, we have $\theta^* + v/2 \in \mathcal{E}$. It means that $b_{k,2}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \geq \min\{a\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}$, which completes the proof of inequality (i).

Proof of inequality (ii): Again consider projecting to the span of $\{e_1, \ldots, e_k\}$, therefore the Kolmogorov width can be controlled as

$$\omega_k^2(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \leq (a\epsilon)^2 \wedge \max\Big\{ \sum_{i=k+1}^d \Delta_i^2 \;\; | \;\; \|\theta^* + \Delta\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1, \;\; \|\Delta\|_2 \leq a\epsilon \Big\}.$$

By the triangle inequality, we obtain $\|\Delta\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1 + \|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 3/2$ where the last inequality uses $\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1/2$. Letting $\Delta_{k+1} = \sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}$ and $\Delta_i = 0$ for $i \neq k+1$, we have $\omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)) \leq \min\{a\epsilon, 3/2\sqrt{\mu_{k+1}}\}$ which thus proves the inequality (ii).

B.2 Proof of Lemma 4

We break the proof of Lemma 4 into two parts. In the first part, we construct the vector $\theta^\dagger$ and the collection $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{k_\ell}$, and show that the properties (a)–(d) hold. In the second part, we show that matrix H satisfies the eigenvalue property.

B.2.1 Part I

Recall that the ellipse norm is defined as $\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\theta_i^2}{\mu_i}$, so that $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$ is equivalent to $\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1$. Recall that M denotes a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $(1/\mu_1, \ldots, 1/\mu_d)$.

Constructing $\theta^\dagger$: Let us first define a vector $\theta^\dagger \in \mathcal{E}$ that satisfies the assumptions in Lemma 4. Define the function $\psi : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ via

$$\psi(r) := r^2 \|M(\mathbb{I}_d + rM)^{-1}\theta^*\|_2^2 = r^2 \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{(1 + r/\mu_i)^2} \frac{(\theta_i^*)^2}{\mu_i^2} = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r^2}{(\mu_i + r)^2} (\theta_i^*)^2.$$

Note that ψ is a continuous and non-decreasing function on $[0, \infty)$ such that $\psi(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{r \to +\infty} \psi(r) = \|\theta^*\|$. Since $a \in (0, 1)$, there must exists some $r > 0$ such that $\psi(r) = a\epsilon$. Given this choice of r, we then define $\theta^\dagger := (\mathbb{I}_d + rM)^{-1}\theta^*$. Since $r > 0$, our definition ensures that $\theta^\dagger \in \mathcal{E}$: more precisely, we have

$$\|\theta^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{(1 + r/\mu_i)^2} \frac{(\theta_i^*)^2}{\mu_i} < \|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq 1.$$

Now we are ready to construct orthogonal unit vectors $u_1, \ldots, u_{k_\ell}$ such that proper perturbations of $\theta^\dagger$ towards linear combinations of those directions still lie in the set $\mathcal{E}$. We do this in a sequential way.

Constructing the vector u_1. Defining the vector $v_1 := \theta^* - \theta^\dagger$, the definition of $\theta^\dagger$ guarantees that v_1 is parallel to both $\theta^\dagger - \theta^*$ and $M\theta^\dagger$, so that condition 1 of the lemma holds. Note also that $\|\theta^\dagger - v_1\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \|\theta^\dagger + v_1\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 - 4(\theta^\dagger)^T M v_1 \leq 1$ because $\theta^\dagger + v_1 = \theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$ and $(\theta^\dagger)^T M v_1 = r\|M\theta^\dagger\|_2^2 \geq 0$. These properties guarantee the inclusion $\theta^\dagger \pm v_1 \in \mathcal{E}$, whence by convexity, the ellipse $\mathcal{E}$ contains the line segment connecting the two points $\theta^\dagger \pm v_1$. We let u_1 be the normalized version of v_1—namely, $u_1 := v_1/\|v_1\|_2$.

Constructing u_2. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $k_\ell \geq 2$. By definition of k_ℓ, there exists a vector $\Delta \in \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)$ satisfying $\|\Delta - \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta)\|_2 \geq 3b\epsilon$. Accordingly, we may define

$$\Delta_2 := \arg \max_{\substack{\Delta \in \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon): \\ \|\Delta - \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta)\|_2 \geq 3b\epsilon}} \|\Delta - \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta)\|_{\mathcal{E}}. \tag{57}$$

With this choice, we set $v_2 := \Delta_2 - \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta_2)$ and $u_2 := v_2/\|v_2\|_2$. Note that these choices ensure that $\|v_2\|_2 \geq 3b\epsilon$ and $v_2 \perp v_1$.

In order to complete the proof, it suffices to show that $\theta^\dagger \pm \frac{1}{3} v_2 \in \mathcal{E}$. Indeed, when this inclusion holds, then we have $\theta^\dagger \pm b\epsilon \begin{bmatrix} u_2 & \cdots u_{k_\ell} \end{bmatrix} H_{\cdot,1} = \theta^\dagger \pm b\epsilon u_2 \in \mathcal{E}$. In order to show that the required inclusion holds, we begin by noting that since $\mathcal{E}$ is a convex set containing $\theta^\dagger - v_1$ and $\theta^* + \Delta_2$, it contains the segment connecting these two points. In particular, we have

$$\theta^\dagger + \frac{\|(\theta^\dagger - v_1) - \theta^\dagger\|_2}{\|(\theta^\dagger - v_1) - (\theta^* + \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta_2))\|_2} v_2 = \theta^\dagger + \frac{\|v_1\|_2}{\| - 2v_1 - \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta_2)\|_2} v_2 \in \mathcal{E},$$

a result that follows from the proportional segments theorem [13], when we consider a line passing through $\theta^\dagger$ that is parallel to v_2. See also Figure 3 for an illustration.




Figure 3: A geometric illustration of the proof.

Since $\|\Delta_2\|_2 \le a\epsilon \le \|v_1\|_2$ and $\|\Pi_{v_1}(\Delta_2)\|_2 \le \|\Delta_2\|_2$, we thus have $\|-2v_1 - \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta_2)\|_2 \le 3\|v_1\|_2$ and it implies that $\theta^\dagger + \frac{1}{3}v_2 \in \mathcal{E}$. Finally, using the fact that $\theta^\dagger + \frac{1}{3}v_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ and $v_2^T M \theta^\dagger = 0$, we have

$$\|\theta^\dagger - \frac{1}{3}v_2\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \|\theta^\dagger + \frac{1}{3}v_2\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 - \frac{2}{3}v_2^T M \theta^\dagger \le 1,$$

which completes the proof.

Constructing the remaining u_i. We sequentially construct pairs (v_i, v_i') for $i = 3, \ldots, k_\ell$ as follows and u_i is a just a scaled version of v_i. Given $v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}$ for $i \le k_\ell$, by definition of k_ℓ, there still exists some $\Delta_i \in \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)$ such that $\|\Delta_i - \Pi_{v_1,\ldots,v_{i-1}}(\Delta_i)\|_2 \ge 3b\epsilon$. We then define

$$v_i := \Delta_i - \Pi_{v_1,\ldots,v_{i-1}}(\Delta_i), \quad \text{and} \quad v_i' := \Delta_i - \Pi_{v_1}(\Delta_i),$$

which ensures that $\|v_i\|_2 \ge 3b\epsilon$ and both v_i and v_i' are perpendicular to v_1. Finally, we set $u_i := v_i/\|v_i\|_2$.

We now claim that

$$\theta^\dagger \pm \frac{1}{3}v_i' \in \mathcal{E}. \tag{58}$$

Taking this claim as given for the moment, let us first establish property (c) and (d). Observe that the vectors vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_i$ are orthogonal, so we can write v_i' as the linear combination of $v_2, \ldots, v_i$. For $i \ge 3$, there exist scalars $r_{i,j}$ such that

$$v_i' = h_{i,2}v_2 + \cdots + h_{i,i-1}v_{i-1} + v_i,$$

and by orthogonality of those v_i, we have

$$\|v_i' - v_i\|_2^2 = h_{i,1}^2\|v_2\|_2^2 + \cdots + h_{i,i-1}^2\|v_{i-1}\|_2^2.$$

For $i \geq 3$, since $(v_i' - v_i) \perp v_i$, it is further guaranteed that

$$\|v_i' - v_i\|_2^2 = \|v_i'\|_2^2 - \|v_i\|_2^2 \leq (a^2 - 9b^2)\epsilon^2$$

where the last inequality follows from fact $v_i' \in \mathbb{B}(a\epsilon)$ and the definition of fact that $\|v_i\|_2 \geq 3b\epsilon$. Putting the pieces together, we have

$$h_{i,1}^2 + \cdots + h_{i,i-1}^2 \leq \frac{(a^2 - 9b^2)\epsilon^2}{9b^2\epsilon^2} = \frac{a^2 - 9b^2}{9b^2}.$$

This proves property property (c) where $\|H_{i,\cdot}\|_2^2 \leq 1 + (a^2 - 9b^2)/9b^2$. Thus by relation (58), for $i \geq 3$ we have shown

$$\theta^\dagger \pm b\epsilon x_{i-1} = \theta^\dagger \pm b\epsilon(h_{i,2}u_2 + \cdots + h_{i,i-1}u_{i-1} + u_i) \in \mathcal{E},$$

which completes the proof of property (d).

It is only left to prove relation (58). To see this fact, first note $\|v_i\|_2 \leq \|v_i'\|_2$ due to Pythagoras theorem. Also, by the maximality of v_2 in inequality (57), note that $\|v_i'\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \|v_2\|_{\mathcal{E}}$. Thus,

$$\|\theta^\dagger + \frac{1}{3}v_i'\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \|\theta^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 + \frac{1}{9}\|v_i'\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq \|\theta^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 + \frac{1}{9}\|v_2\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \|\theta^\dagger + \frac{1}{3}v_2\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq 1,$$

where we have used the fact that v_i' and v_2 are perpendicular to $v_1 = rM\theta^\dagger$ to ignore the cross terms, as well as the fact that $\theta^\dagger + \frac{1}{3}v_2 \in \mathcal{E}$. Thus $\theta^\dagger + \frac{1}{3}v_i' \in \mathcal{E}$. We can also show $\theta^\dagger - \frac{1}{3}v_i' \in \mathcal{E}$ similarly as before since $\theta^\dagger M v_i' = 0$.

B.2.2 Part II

We deal with inequalities (i) and (ii) separately. For any $s \in [k_\ell - 1]$, we have

$$s\nu_s^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k_\ell - 1}\nu_i^2 = \text{trace}(H^T H) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k_\ell - 1}\|H_{i,\cdot}\|_2^2 \leq (k_\ell - 1)\frac{a^2}{9b^2},$$

where the last inequality uses property (c). It implies that $s\nu_s^2 \leq (k_\ell - 1)\frac{a^2}{9b^2}$ which proves inequality (i).

For any $t \in [k_\ell - 2]$, we claim that for any t-dimensional subspace $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, there exists some ℓ, such that standard basis vector e_ℓ satisfies that $\|e_\ell - \Pi_W(e_\ell)\|_2^2 \geq 1 - \frac{t}{m}$. In order to prove this claim, we take an orthonormal basis $z_1, \ldots, z_t$ of W and extend it to an orthonormal basis $z_1, \ldots, z_m$ for $\mathbb{R}^m$. We then have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \|e_i - \Pi_W(e_i)\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=t+1}^m \langle e_i, z_j\rangle^2 = \sum_{j=t+1}^m \sum_{i=1}^m \langle e_i, z_j\rangle^2 = m - t,$$

where the last equality is due to the fact that $e_i, 1 \le i \le m$ forms a standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$, and z_j is a unit vector. So the claim holds by the pigeonhole principle.

Now let $H^T = \sum_{i=1}^{k_\ell - 1} \sigma_i u_i v_i^T$ with $\sigma_1 \ge \cdots \ge \sigma_{k_\ell - 1}$ be the SVD of H^T. Take W be the span of the first t singular vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_t$. By taking dimension $m = k_\ell - 1$, the above claim implies there exists some e_ℓ such that $\|e_\ell - \Pi_W(e_\ell)\|_2^2 \ge 1 - \frac{t}{k_\ell - 1}$. Let $v := (h_{\ell,2}, \ldots, h_{\ell,\ell-1}, 0, \ldots, 0)$ so that the $\ell - 1$ row of H^T can be written as $H^T_{\cdot,\ell-1} = e_\ell^T + v$. Note by definition of matrix H, we have $\|v\|_2^2 \le a^2 - 9b^2$; thus

$$\|v - \Pi_W(v)\|_2 \le \|v\|_2 \le \sqrt{a^2 - 9b^2}/3b.$$

Applying the triangle inequality yields

$$\|H_{\cdot,\ell-1} - \Pi_W(H_{\cdot,\ell-1})\|_2 \ge \|e_\ell - \Pi_W(e_\ell)\|_2 - \|v - \Pi_W(v)\|_2 \ge 1 - \frac{t}{k_\ell - 1} - \frac{\sqrt{a^2 - 9b^2}}{3b}. \tag{59}$$

Define the matrix $\tilde{H} := \sum_{i=1}^{t} \sigma_i u_i v_i^T$, note that the rows of $\tilde{H}$ are the projections of the rows of H^T onto W, and therefore, the definition of the operator norm implies that

$$\|H^T - \tilde{H}\|_{op} \ge \|H_{\cdot,\ell-1} - \Pi_W(H_{\cdot,\ell-1})\|_2.$$

It is easy to check that $\|H^T - \tilde{H}\|_{op} = \sigma_{t+1}$. Combining with inequality (59), we have

$$\sigma_{t+1} \ge 1 - \frac{t}{k_\ell - 1} - \frac{\sqrt{a^2 - 9b^2}}{3b},$$

which completes the proof of inequality (ii).

Combining our results from Parts I and II concludes the proof of Lemma 4.

B.3 Proof of Lemma 5

We break our proof into two parts, corresponding to the two claims in the lemma.

Proof of inequality (i): This inequality is proved via a probabilistic argument. Recall that the ellipse norm is defined as $\|x\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{x_i^2}{\mu_i}$, and that we write $x \in \mathcal{E}$ to mean to $\|x\|_{\mathcal{E}} \le 1$. We use M to denote the diagonal matrix with entries $(1/\mu_1, \ldots, 1/\mu_d)$.

Let us define auxiliary vector

$$\tilde{\theta}^S := \theta^\dagger + \frac{b\epsilon}{2\sqrt{2s}} XVz^S, \tag{60}$$

where matrix $X := UH$ is defined in Lemma 4 and matrix H has eigen-decomposition $Q\Sigma V^T$. We claim that the following two facts:

(a) There exists a sign vector $z^S \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{k_\ell - 1}$ such that $\tilde{\theta}^S \in \mathcal{E}$.

(b) Defining $v_1 := \theta^* - \theta^\dagger$, we then have $\theta^* + v_1 \in \mathcal{E}$.

Taking these two facts as given for now, we can prove inequality (i). Noticing that $\theta^\dagger + v_1 = \theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\theta^\dagger + 2v_1 = \theta^* + v_1 \in \mathcal{E}$, by convexity of set $\mathcal{E}$, if $\theta^\dagger + u \in \mathcal{E}$ for some vector u then

$$\theta^* + \frac{1}{2}u = \theta^\dagger + v_1 + \frac{1}{2}u = \frac{1}{2}(\theta^\dagger + u) + \frac{1}{2}(\theta^\dagger + 2v_1) \in \mathcal{E}.$$

Letting $u := b\epsilon \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} XVz^S$, then $\theta^S := \theta^* + \frac{1}{2} b\epsilon \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} XVz^S = \theta^* + \frac{1}{2}u$. Then we have $\theta^S \in \mathcal{E}$.

It remains to establish claims (a) and (b) stated above.

Proof of claim (a): Let $z^S \in \{-1, +1\}^{|S|}$ be a vector of i.i.d. Rademacher random variables. Expanding the square yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\theta}^S\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 &= (\theta^\dagger)^T M \theta^\dagger + \frac{b\epsilon}{\sqrt{2s}} (\theta^\dagger)^T MXVz^S + \frac{b^2\epsilon^2}{8s} (XVz^S)^T MXVz^S \\
&= (\theta^\dagger)^T M \theta^\dagger + b^2\epsilon^2 \frac{1}{8s} (XVz^S)^T MXVz^S,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that $(\theta^\dagger)^T MX = 0$. Let us consider the expectation $\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{\theta}^S\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2$. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}(XVz^S)^T MXVz^S = \mathbb{E} \text{ trace}[(XVz^S)^T MXVz^S] \;=\; \mathbb{E} \text{ trace}[V^T X^T MXVz^S (z^S)^T],$$

where the last inequality uses the property of the trace function. By linearity, we can switch the order of the expectation and trace function, and doing so yields

$$\mathbb{E} \text{ trace}[V^T X^T MXVz^S (z^S)^T] = \text{trace}[\underbrace{V^T X^T MXV}_{:=A} \mathbb{E}[z^S (z^S)^T]] = \sum_{i \in S} A_i.$$

We claim $\sum_{i \in S} A_i \leq 8s \max_i \{x_i^T M x_i\}$. In order to show this, first note that

$$\text{trace}[A] = \text{trace}[V^T X^T MXV] = \text{trace}[X^T MX] = \sum_{i=1}^{k_\ell - 1} x_i^T M x_i,$$

using the fact that $VV^T = \mathbb{I}$. Since S is the subset of $F := \{m_1, m_1 + 1, \ldots, m_2\} \cap \mathcal{M}(7(k_\ell - 1)/8)$, so for $t := \frac{7(k_\ell - 1)}{8}$, we have

$$((k_\ell - 1) - t) A_{(t)} \leq \sum_{i=t}^{k_\ell - 1} A_{(i)} \leq \text{trace}[A] \leq (k_\ell - 1) \max_i \{x_i^T M x_i\}.$$

It implies that $A_{(t)} \leq 8 \max_i \{x_i^T M x_i\}$ which further verifies our claim.

Putting the pieces together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{\theta}^S\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 &= (\theta^\dagger)^T M\theta^\dagger + b^2\epsilon^2\frac{1}{8s}\mathbb{E}(XVz^S)^T MXVz^S \\ &\overset{(i)}{\leq} (\theta^\dagger)^T M\theta^\dagger + b^2\epsilon^2\frac{1}{8s}8s\max_i\{x_i^T Mx_i\} \overset{(ii)}{=} \|\theta^\dagger + b\epsilon x_j\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \overset{(iii)}{\leq} 1,\end{aligned}$$

where step (i) uses claim on the A_is, step (ii) uses fact that $\theta^\dagger Mx_j = 0$ and step (iii) uses the fact that $\theta^\dagger + b\epsilon x_j \in \mathcal{E}$. Since the average squared ellipse norm is at most one, there must exist at least one $\tilde{\theta}^S$ with $\|\tilde{\theta}^S\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \leq 1$, as claimed.

Proof of claim (b): Since $v_1 = \theta^* - \theta^\dagger$, the results of Lemma 4 guarantee that

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_1\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\frac{r(\epsilon)}{r(\epsilon)+\mu_i}\right)^2 (\theta_i^*)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r(\epsilon)^2\mu_i}{(r(\epsilon)+\mu_i)^2}\frac{(\theta_i^*)^2}{\mu_i} \\ &\leq \|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \max_{i=1,\ldots,d}\left\{\frac{r(\epsilon)^2\mu_i}{(r(\epsilon)+\mu_i)^2}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(r(\epsilon)+\mu_i)^2 \geq 4r(\epsilon)\mu_i$, we have $\|v_1\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{r(\epsilon)}}{2}\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}$. Triangle inequality guarantees that

$$\|\theta^* + v_1\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} + \|v_1\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{r(\epsilon)}}{2}\right)\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1,$$

where the last inequality uses assumption that $r(\epsilon) = \Phi(\epsilon) < (\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1} - 1)^2$ and $\|\theta^*\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq 1$.

Proof of inequality (ii): Letting $\tilde{\Delta}^S := \tilde{\theta}^S - \theta^\dagger$ and by construction $\Delta^S = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Delta}^S$. By definition, $\|\tilde{\Delta}\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{8s}b^2\epsilon^2\|U\Sigma Vz^S\|_2^2$. Substituting matrix H as its decomposition $Q\Sigma V^T$ yields

$$\|\tilde{\theta}^S - \theta^\dagger\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{8s}b^2\epsilon^2\|UQ\Sigma z^S\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{8s}b^2\epsilon^2\|\Sigma z^S\|_2^2, \tag{61}$$

where the last inequality uses the orthogonality of matrices U, Q.

Recall that set S is a subset of $\{m_1, \ldots, m_2\}$. Using eigenvalue bound (44)(ii) from part (e) of Lemma 4, we have $\|\Sigma z^S\|_2^2 \geq (1 - \frac{m_2}{t} - \frac{\sqrt{a^2-9b^2}}{3b})^2\|z^S\|_2^2$. Combining with equality (61) yields inequality (ii).

Finally, putting the two parts together completes the proof of Lemma 5.

B.4 Proof of Lemma 6

Let us denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{S}$ as $N := \binom{m_2-m_1+1}{s}$. Then the expectation can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\big(\frac{\langle\eta,\,\eta'\rangle}{\sigma^2}\big) = \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{S,S'\in\mathcal{S}}\exp\big(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\langle\Delta^S,\,\Delta^{S'}\rangle\big).$$

From the definition (45) of θ^S, we have

$$\langle \Delta^S, \Delta^{S'} \rangle = \frac{1}{32} b^2 \epsilon^2 \frac{1}{s} (z^S)^T V^T H^T U^T U H V z^{S'} = \frac{1}{32} b^2 \epsilon^2 \frac{1}{s} (z^S)^T \Sigma^2 z^{S'},$$

where we used the relation $H^T H = V \Sigma^2 V^T$, and the orthogonality of the matrices V and U. In order to further control the right hand side, note that

$$(z^S)^T \Sigma^2 z^{S'} = \sum_{i \in S \cap S'} \nu_i^2 z_i^S z_i^{S'} \leq \nu_{m_1}^2 \sum_{i \in S \cap S'} |z_i^S z_i^{S'}| = \nu_{m_1}^2 |S \cap S'|.$$

Combining these three inequalities above yields

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\big(\frac{\langle \eta, \eta' \rangle}{\sigma^2}\big) \leq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{S, S' \in \mathcal{S}} \exp\big(\frac{1}{32\sigma^2} b^2 \epsilon^2 \nu_{m_1}^2 \frac{|S \cap S'|}{s}\big).$$

Let us now further compute the right hand side above. Recall that we denote $t := m_2 - m_1 + 1$. Note that intersection cardinality $|S \cap S'|$ takes values in $\{0, 1, \ldots, s\}$. Given every set S and integer $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s\}$, the number of S' such that $|S \cap S'| = i$ equals to $\binom{s}{i}\binom{t-s}{s-i}$. Consequently, if we let $\lambda := \frac{1}{32\sigma^2} b^2 \epsilon^2 \nu_{m_1}^2$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\big(\frac{\langle \eta, \eta' \rangle}{\sigma^2}\big) = \binom{t}{s}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{s} \binom{s}{i} \binom{t-s}{s-i} e^{\lambda i / s} = \sum_{i=0}^{s} \frac{G_i z^i}{i!}, \tag{62}$$

where $z := e^{\lambda/s}$ and $G_i := \frac{(s!(t-s)!)^2}{((s-i)!)^2 t! (t-2s+i)!}$.

Let us set integer $s := \lfloor \sqrt{t} \rfloor$. We claim quantity G_i satisfies the following bound

$$G_i \leq \exp\Big(-(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}})^2 + \frac{2i}{\sqrt{t} - 1} \Big) \qquad \text{for all } i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s\}. \tag{63}$$

Taking expression (63) as given for now and plugging into inequality (62), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp(\frac{\langle \eta, \eta' \rangle}{\sigma^2}) \leq \exp\Big(-(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}})^2 \Big) \sum_{i=0}^{s} \frac{(z \exp(\frac{2}{\sqrt{t}-1}))^i}{i!} &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \exp\Big(-(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}})^2 \Big) \exp\left(z \exp(\frac{2}{\sqrt{t} - 1}) \right) \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} \exp\left(-\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^2 + \exp\left(\frac{2 + \lambda}{\sqrt{t} - 1} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where step (a) follows from the standard power series expansion $e^x = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^i}{i!}$ and step (b) follows by $z = e^{\lambda/s}$ and $s = \lfloor \sqrt{t} \rfloor > \sqrt{t} - 1$. We have thus established inequality (47).

It only remains to check inequality (63) for G_i. Using the fact that $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$, we have

$$G_0 = \frac{((t-s)!)^2}{t!(t-2s)!} = (1 - \frac{s}{t})(1 - \frac{s}{t-1}) \cdots (1 - \frac{s}{t-s+1}) \leq \exp(-s \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{1}{t - s + i}). \tag{64}$$

Recalling that $s := \lfloor \sqrt{t} \rfloor$, then we can bound the sum in expression (64) as

$$s \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{1}{t-s+i} \geq s \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{1}{t} = \frac{s^2}{t} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}})^2,$$

which, when combined with inequality (64), implies that $G_0 \leq \exp(-(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}})^2)$.

Moreover, direct calculations yield that we have

$$\frac{G_i}{G_{i-1}} = \frac{(s-i+1)^2}{t-2s+i} \;\leq\; \frac{G_1}{G_0} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, s, \tag{65}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\frac{(s-i+1)^2}{t-2s+i}$ is non-increasing with index i. Therefore, recalling that $s = \lfloor \sqrt{t} \rfloor$, we have

$$\frac{G_i}{G_{i-1}} \leq \frac{G_1}{G_0} \;\leq\; \frac{t}{t-2\sqrt{t}+1} = (1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}-1})^2 \leq \exp(\frac{2}{\sqrt{t}-1}),$$

where the last inequality follows from $1+x \leq e^x$. Putting pieces together validates bound (63) thus finishing the proof of inequality (47).

C Proof of Lemma 8

Letting $\Delta := \sqrt{\frac{\delta^2-\mu_{m+1}}{1-t} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2}{(1-t)^2}} - \frac{t\theta_s^*}{1-t}$, we then have $\theta_{m+1}^2 = \delta^2 - \Delta^2$. Direct calculations yield

$$\Delta = \frac{\frac{\delta^2-\mu_{m+1}}{1-t} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2}{(1-t)^2} - \frac{t^2(\theta_s^*)^2}{(1-t)^2}}{\sqrt{\frac{\delta^2-\mu_{m+1}}{1-t} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2}{(1-t)^2}} + \frac{t\theta_s^*}{1-t}} = \frac{\frac{\delta^2-\mu_{m+1}}{1-t} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2}{1-t}}{\sqrt{\frac{\delta^2-\mu_{m+1}}{1-t} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2}{(1-t)^2}} + \frac{t\theta_s^*}{1-t}}.$$

Re-organizing the terms yields

$$\Delta = \frac{\delta^2 - \mu_{m+1} + t(\theta_s^*)^2}{t\theta_s^* + \sqrt{(\delta^2-\mu_{m+1})(1-t) + t(\theta_s^*)^2}} = \delta\Big(\frac{1 + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2-\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2}}{\frac{t\theta_s^*}{\delta} + \sqrt{1 - t + \frac{t\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2-\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2}}}\Big).$$

Now let us first analyze the denominator. Since t is defined as $\frac{\mu_{m+1}}{\mu_s}$, we obtain $\frac{t\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2} = \frac{\mu_{m+1}^2}{\delta^2\mu_s}$; by $\theta_s^* \leq \sqrt{\mu_s}$, we obtain that $\frac{t\theta_s^*}{\delta} \leq \frac{t\sqrt{\mu_s}}{\delta} \leq \frac{\mu_{m+1}}{\delta\sqrt{\mu_s}}$. Plugging into the expression of Δ gives

$$\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \geq \frac{1 + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2-\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2}}{\frac{\mu_{m+1}}{\delta\sqrt{\mu_s}} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\mu_{m+1}^2}{\delta^2\mu_s} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2-\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2} - t}}.$$

Moreover, since m is chosen as the maximum index that satisfies $\mu_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{64}\delta^2\mu_s$, it is guaranteed that $\mu_{m+1}^2 \leq \frac{1}{64}\delta^2\mu_s$ which further implies that

$$\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \geq \frac{1 + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2-\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2}}{\frac{1}{8} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{64} + \frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2-\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2} - t}}. \tag{66}$$

Now, in order to control $\frac{\Delta}{\delta}$, we only need to control quantity $\frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2-\mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2}$. Recall that for any $\delta > t_u^*(s,\mathcal{E})$, we only consider those θ^* satisfying $\theta_s^* \geq \sqrt{\mu_s} - t_u^*(s,\mathcal{E})$. Let us write $\theta_s^* = \sqrt{\mu_s} - c\delta$ with $c \in [0,1]$, then

$$\frac{t(\theta_s^*)^2 - \mu_{m+1}}{\delta^2} = t\frac{(\sqrt{\mu_s} - c\delta)^2 - \mu_s}{\delta^2} = \underbrace{-2c\frac{\mu_{m+1}}{\delta\sqrt{\mu_s}}}_{:=x} + c^2 t.$$

Here $x := -2c\frac{\mu_{m+1}}{\delta\sqrt{\mu_s}} \geq -2\frac{\mu_{m+1}}{\delta\sqrt{\mu_s}} \geq -\frac{1}{4}$ since $c \leq 1$ and $\mu_{m+1}^2 \leq \frac{1}{64}\delta^2\mu_s$. Now we are ready to substitute this expression into inequality (66). Therefore it is guaranteed that

$$\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \geq \frac{1 + x + c^2 t}{\frac{1}{8} + \sqrt{\frac{65}{64} + x + c^2 t - t}} \geq \frac{1+x}{\frac{1}{8} + \sqrt{\frac{65}{64} + x}} \geq \min_{x \geq -1/4} \left\{ \frac{1+x}{\frac{1}{8} + \sqrt{\frac{65}{64} + x}} \right\} = \frac{3}{4}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\theta_{m+1}^2 = \delta^2 - \Delta^2 \leq \delta^2 - (\frac{3\delta}{4})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta^2.$$

D Auxiliary results on the critical radii

In this appendix, we collect a number of auxiliary results concerning the upper and low critical inequalities, as defined in equations (10) and (15), respectively.

D.1 Existence and uniqueness

First, let us show that there exists a unique and strictly positive solution to inequalities (10) and (15).

Let us prove this claim for the solution of inequality (10), since the argument for inequality (15) is entirely analogous. It suffices to show that the function $g(t) := k_u(t, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$ is non-increasing on the positive real line. Since the function $t \mapsto 1/t$ is strictly decreasing on the positive real line, we are then guaranteed that the function $t \mapsto \sqrt{g(t)}/t = \sqrt{k_u(t,\theta^*,\mathcal{E})}/t$ is strictly decreasing on the positive real line. This property ensures that inequality (10) has a unique and strictly positive solution: the left-side function t is strictly increasing, whereas the right-side function is strictly decreasing.

It remains to show that $g(t) = k_u(t, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$ is non-increasing. Equivalently, we need to show that for any $t > 0$, we have

$$g(ct) \;=\; k_u(ct, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) \geq k_u(t, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) \;=\; g(t) \qquad \text{for all } c \in (0,1].$$

By linearity of the Kolmogorov width, we have

$$k_u(t, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) := \arg\min_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\{ \omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(t)) \leq \frac{1}{2}t \right\} = \arg\min_{1 \leq k \leq d} \left\{ \omega_k(c(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(t))) \leq \frac{1}{2}c\,t \right\}. \tag{67}$$

Given any vector $v \in \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(t)$, convexity ensures that $cv \in \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(ct)$, which is equivalent to the containment $c\left(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(t)\right) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(ct)$. This containment implies that

$$\omega_k(c(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(t))) \leq \omega_k(\mathcal{E}_{\theta^*} \cap \mathbb{B}(ct)).$$

Combined with our earlier inequality (67), we conclude that $k_u(t, \theta^*, \mathcal{E}) \leq k_u(ct, \theta^*, \mathcal{E})$, as desired.

D.2 Well-definedness of the function Φ

In this appendix, we verify that the function Φ from equation (16) is well-defined. In order to provide intuition, Figure 4 provides an illustration of Φ.




Figure 4: Illustration of the function Φ.

We begin with the case when $\delta < \|\theta^*\|_2/a$. For notation simplicity, let $r(\delta) := \min\left\{r \geq 0 \mid a^2\delta^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r^2}{(r+\mu_i)^2}(\theta_i^*)^2\right\}$. Since each $\mu_i \geq 0$, function $f : r \to \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{r^2}{(r+\mu_i)^2}(\theta_i^*)^2$ is non-decreasing in r. It is easy to check that

$$\lim_{r \to 0^+} f(r) = 0, \qquad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \to \infty} f(r) = \|\theta^*\|_2^2.$$

Then quantity $r(\delta)$ is uniquely defined and positive whenever $\delta < \|\theta^*\|_2/a$. Note that as $\delta \to \frac{\|\theta^*\|_2}{a}$, $a^2\delta^2 \to \|\theta^*\|_2^2$ therefore $r(\delta) \to \infty$.

It is worth noticing that given any θ^* where $\|\theta^*\|_2$ does not depend on δ, r goes to zero when $\delta \to 0$, namely $\lim_{\delta \to 0^+} \Phi(\delta) = 0$.

References

[1] S. Atapattu, C. Tellambura, and H. Jiang. *Energy detection for spectrum sensing in cognitive radio*. Springer, 2014.

[2] S. Balakrishnan and L. Wasserman. Hypothesis testing for densities and high-dimensional multinomials: Sharp local minimax rates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.10003*, 2017.

[3] Y. Baraud. Non-asymptotic minimax rates of testing in signal detection. *Bernoulli*, 8(5):577–606, 2002.

[4] P. J. Bickel, C. A. Klaassen, P. J. Bickel, Y. Ritov, J. Klaassen, J. A. Wellner, and Y. Ritov. *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models*. Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore, 1993.

[5] T. T. Cai, A. Guntuboyina, and Y. Wei. Adaptive estimation of planar convex sets. *To appear in The Annals of Statistics, arXiv:1508.03744*, 2017+.

[6] T. T. Cai and M. G. Low. A framework for estimation of convex functions. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 423–456, 2015.

[7] S. Chatterjee, A. Guntuboyina, B. Sen, et al. On risk bounds in isotonic and other shape restricted regression problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(4):1774–1800, 2015.

[8] F. F. Digham, M.-S. Alouini, and M. K. Simon. On the energy detection of unknown signals over fading channels. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 55(1):21–24, 2007.

[9] D. L. Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, 2006.

[10] D. L. Donoho and J. M. Johnstone. Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *Biometrika*, 81(3):425–455, 1994.

[11] D. L. Donoho, R. C. Liu, and B. MacGibbon. Minimax risk over hyperrectangles, and implications. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1416–1437, 1990.

[12] M. S. Ermakov. Minimax detection of a signal in a Gaussian white noise. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 35(4):667–679, 1991.

[13] T. Friedrich et al. *Elementary geometry*, volume 43. American Mathematical Soc., 2008.

[14] C. Gu. *Smoothing spline ANOVA models*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, NY, 2002.

[15] R. Hasminskii, I. Ibragimov, et al. On density estimation in the view of Kolmogorov's ideas in approximation theory. *The Annals of Statistics*, 18(3):999–1010, 1990.

[16] I. A. Ibragimov and R. Z. Khasminskii. Asymptotic properties of some nonparametrie estimaters in a Gaussian white noise. In: *Proc 3rd Summer School on Probab, Theory and Math. Stat.*, pages 31–64, 1978.

[17] I. A. Ibragimov and R. Z. Khasminskii. *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*, volume 16. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[18] Y. I. Ingster. Minimax testing of nonparametric hypotheses on a distribution density in the L_p-metrics. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 31(2):333–337, 1987.

[19] Y. I. Ingster. Asymptotically minimax hypothesis testing for nonparametric alternatives. I. *Math. Methods Statist*, 2:85–114, 1993a.

[20] Y. I. Ingster. Asymptotically minimax hypothesis testing for nonparametric alternatives. II. *Math. Methods Statist*, 3:171–189, 1993b.

[21] Y. I. Ingster. Asymptotically minimax hypothesis testing for nonparametric alternatives. III. *Math. Methods Statist*, 4:249–268, 1993c.

[22] Y. I. Ingster and I. A. Suslina. *Nonparametric goodness-of-fit testing under Gaussian models*, volume 169. Springer Science and Business Media, 2012.

[23] A. Javanmard and L. Zhang. The minimax risk of truncated series estimators for symmetric convex polytopes. In *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2012 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 1633–1637. IEEE, 2012.

[24] E. L. Lehmann and G. Casella. *Theory of point estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[25] E. L. Lehmann and J. P. Romano. *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[26] O. V. Lepski and V. G. Spokoiny. Minimax nonparametric hypothesis testing: the case of an inhomogeneous alternative. *Bernoulli*, 5(2):333–358, 1999.

[27] O. V. Lepski and A. B. Tsybakov. Asymptotically exact nonparametric hypothesis testing in sup-norm and at a fixed point. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 117(1):17–48, 2000.

[28] M. Meyer and M. Woodroofe. On the degrees of freedom in shape-restricted regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1083–1104, 2000.

[29] A. Pinkus. *N-Widths in Approximation Theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2012.

[30] F. Shayegh and F. Labeau. On signal detection in the presence of weakly correlated noise over fading channels. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 62(3):797–809, 2014.

[31] V. G. Spokoiny. Adaptive and spatially adaptive testing a nonparametric hypothesis. *Math. Methods Statist*, 7:245–273, 1998.

[32] G. Valiant and P. Valiant. An automatic inequality prover and instance optimal identity testing. In *IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 51–60. IEEE, 2014.

[33] S. van de Geer. *Empirical Processes in M-Estimation*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[34] G. Wahba. *Spline models for observational data*. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics. SIAM, Philadelphia, PN, 1990.

[35] Y. Wei, M. J. Wainwright, and A. Guntuboyina. The geometry of hypothesis testing over convex cones: Generalized likelihood tests and minimax radii. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.06810*, 2017.