

Histogram Transform Ensembles for Density Estimation

Hanyuan Hang

HANYUAN.HANG@SAMSUNG.COM

AI Lab

Samsung Research China - Beijing

100028 Beijing, China

Abstract

We investigate an algorithm named histogram transform ensembles (HTE) density estimator whose effectiveness is supported by both solid theoretical analysis and significant experimental performance. On the theoretical side, by decomposing the error term into approximation error and estimation error, we are able to conduct the following analysis: First of all, we establish the universal consistency under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm. Secondly, under the assumption that the underlying density function resides in the Hölder space $C^{0,\alpha}$, we prove almost optimal convergence rates for both single and ensemble density estimators under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm and $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm for different tail distributions, whereas in contrast, for its subspace $C^{1,\alpha}$ consisting of smoother functions, almost optimal convergence rates can only be established for the ensembles and the lower bound of the single estimators illustrates the benefits of ensembles over single density estimators. In the experiments, we first carry out simulations to illustrate that histogram transform ensembles surpass single histogram transforms, which offers powerful evidence to support the theoretical results in the space $C^{1,\alpha}$. Moreover, to further exert the experimental performances, we propose an adaptive version of HTE and study the parameters by generating several synthetic datasets with diversities in dimensions and distributions. Last but not least, real data experiments with other state-of-the-art density estimators demonstrate the accuracy of the adaptive HTE algorithm.

Keywords: Density estimation, histogram transform, ensemble learning, learning theory

1. Introduction

Density estimation is now ubiquitous and vital in modelling more complex tasks due to the fact that once an explicit estimate of the density function is obtained, various kinds of statistical inference can be subsequently conducted, such as assessing the multimodality, skewness, or any other structure in the distribution of the data (Scott, 2015; Silverman, 1986), novelty detection (Pimentel et al., 2014), anomaly detection (Breunig et al., 2000; Angiulli and Pizzuti, 2002), summarizing the Bayesian posteriors, classification and discriminant analysis (Simonoff, 1996; Rodríguez et al., 2006), conducting single-level density-based clustering (Hartigan, 1975), and being proved useful in Monte Carlo computational methods like bootstrap and particle filter (Doucet et al., 2001). Other real-world applications, especially in the computer vision society, include image detection (Ma et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2018), gesture recognition (Chang, 2016), image reconstruction (Ihsani and Farncombe, 2016), deformable 3D shape matching (Vestner et al., 2017), image defogging (Jiang et al., 2017), hyper-spectral unmixing (Zhou et al., 2018), geographical

epidemiology (Bithell, 1990), pattern recognition (Lissack and Fu, 1976), just to name a few.

Formally speaking, the density estimation problem considered in this paper can be stated as follows. Based on i.i.d. observations $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ drawn from an unknown distribution P , we aim to estimate the underlying density f . Over the decades, there has been a wealth of literature focusing on finding different appropriate methods to solve density estimation problems as well as verifying the theoretical results on the consistency and convergence rates. Among all the attempts made in this direction, nonparametric density estimators prevail since weaker assumptions are applied to the underlying probability distribution (Hwang et al., 1994; Härdle et al., 2004). Typical nonparametric density estimators include the partition-based and kernel-based density estimators and each category has its own merits in its own regimes. In this study, we are interested in the former one, namely, partition-based density estimator, due to the simple idea, fairly convenient implementation and the nature of getting rid of outliers (see Freedman and Diaconis (1981); Lugosi and Nobel (1996)). To be specific, denote $\pi = (A_j)_{j=1}^m$ as a partition of the input space $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, then for $x \in A_j$, the partition-based density estimator is expressed as

$$f_{D,\pi}(x) := \frac{1}{n\mu(A_j)} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x_i) \quad (1)$$

where μ is the Lebesgue measure. Unfortunately, although consistency Glick (1973); Gordon and Olshen (1978) and a strong universal consistency Devroye and Györfi (1983) of the histograms are established, they are sub-optimal for not being smooth. Moreover, the non-smoothness of histogram and therefore insufficient accuracy brings great obstacles to practical applications. In order to conquer this problem and taking more smoothness into account, another popular algorithm called the kernel density estimation (KDE), also known as *Parzen-Rosenblatt estimation* comes into the public view. Hang et al. (2018) verifies that almost optimal convergence rates can be achieved with kernel and bandwidth chosen appropriately when dealing with cases where the density is assumed to be smooth. Theoretically, these optimal rates depend on the order of smoothness of density function on the entire input space. In the actual world, however, the smoothness of density function varies from areas to areas. That is to say, due to the lack of adaptivity, KDE can be largely sensitive to outliers, letting spurious bumps to appear, and tending to flatten the peaks and valleys of the density (see Terrell and Scott (1992); Botev et al. (2010)). With the aim of filling possible gaps, a wealth of literature is pulled into finding desirable density estimators based on appropriate partitions (see e.g., Klemelä (2009), Li et al. (2014)), wavelet (Donoho et al., 1996), extended Engle’s ARCH model (Hansen, 1994), Bayesian methods (Escobar and West, 1995; Liu and Wong, 2014, 2015), just to name a few. Nevertheless, as far as we know, it is a challenge for an algorithm to have the theoretical availability for both local and global analysis, the experimental advantages of achieving efficient and accurate prediction results on real data, and stronger resistance to the curse of dimensionality compared to the existing common algorithms.

This study is conducted under such background, aiming at solving these tough problems mentioned earlier. To be specific, motivated by the random rotation ensemble algorithms proposed in Rodríguez et al. (2006); López-Rubio (2013); Blaser and Fryzlewicz (2016), we investigated a density estimator named histogram transform ensembles which takes full

advantage of the histogram methods and ensemble learning. Specifically, its merits can be stated as twofold. First, the algorithm can be local adaptive by applying adaptive stretching with respect to samples of each dimension for a piecewise constant function to approximate the true density. Second, the global smoothness of our obtained density estimator is attributed to the randomness of different partitions together with the integration of multiple histograms. The algorithm starts with mapping the input space into transformed feature space under a certain histogram transform. Then, the process proceeds by partitioning the transformed space into non-overlapping cells with the unit bandwidth where the bin indices are chosen as the round points. Our histogram transform ensembles density estimator is finally specified by (1) in the corresponding cell in the input space. Last but not least, by integrating estimators generated by the above procedure, we obtain a density ensemble with satisfying asymptotic smoothness.

The contributions of this paper come from both the theoretical and experimental aspects:

- (i) Considering from a theoretical perspective, our histogram transform ensembles density estimator shows its power in achieving universal consistency and almost optimal convergence rates under some mild conditions. Firstly, we show that the universal consistency is obtained under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm. Secondly, by decomposing the error term into approximation error and estimation error, which correspond to data-free and data-dependent error terms, respectively, we obtain the convergence rate in the space $C^{0,\alpha}$ in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm and $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm both optimal up to a logarithmic factor. Thirdly, we present a theorem in the space $C^{1,\alpha}$ to illustrate the benefits of histogram transform ensembles over single histogram transform density estimators from a theoretical point of view. More precisely, we show that in the space $C^{1,\alpha}$ the histogram transform ensembles can attain the almost optimal rate $O((n/\log n)^{-(1+\alpha)/(2(1+\alpha)+d)})$ whereas a single histogram transform density estimator fails to achieve this rate whose lower bound is of order $O(n^{-1/(2+d)})$ under certain conditions.
- (ii) In the experimental results, we first verify the estimation power of ensemble estimators over the single ones, which corresponds our former theoretical demonstrations, based on HTE with independent splittings, also referred to as naïve histogram transform ensembles (NHTE). Note that we base the entire theoretical analysis on this NHTE algorithm. Then in order to further exert the prediction ability of this histogram-based density estimator, we take more sample information into consideration, and propose the adaptive histogram transform ensembles (AHTE). It is worth mentioning that the randomness of partitions originated from the distribution of histogram transform together with the inherent nature of ensembles allow us to build a density estimator with satisfying asymptotic smoothness, which greatly improves the progress of prediction. As a result, when conducting both synthetic and real data comparisons, our AHTE algorithm is predominant in accuracy compared with other state-of-the-art density estimators, including NHTE and the most commonly used KDE method.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is a preliminary section covering some required fundamental notations, definitions and technical histogram transform that is related to our one ensemble variation of histogram density estimator. Section 3 is concerned with main results on the consistency and convergence rates under different norms of our density estimator. To be specific, universal consistency under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm with relatively weak constraints is shown in Section 3.2, and the convergence rates under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm and $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm are derived in Section 3.3. Moreover, a more complete theory is obtained by conducting

upper and lower bounds to illustrate the benefits of histogram transform ensembles $f_{P,E}$ over single histogram transform density estimators $f_{P,H}$ in Section 3.4. Some comments and discussions related to the main results will also be presented in this section. Section 4 provides a detailed exposition of bounding decomposed error terms named approximation error and estimation error respectively. In Section 5, a numerical example is shown in Section 5.2 to illustrate the benefits of ensemble estimators over single ones, which coincides with the former theoretical analysis. For the rest of Section 5, we provide an adaptive version of histogram transform ensembles, namely AHTE, and conduct numerical comparisons among different density estimation methods based on both synthetic and real data sets. For the sake of clarity, we place all the proofs of Section 3 and Section 4 in Section 6. In Section 7, we close this paper with a conclusive summary, a brief discussion and several remarks.

2. Methodology

In this section, we aim to study an algorithm named histogram transform ensembles (HTE) for density estimation problem. Firstly, in Section 2.1, we introduce some mathematical notations to be used throughout the entire paper. Then in Section 2.2 we present the so called histogram transform approach through defining every crucial element such as rotation matrix R , stretching matrix S and translator vector b . Based on the partition of the input space induced by the histogram transforms, we are then able to formulate the HTE for density estimation in section 2.3.

2.1 Notations

Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a subset, $\mu := \lambda^d$ be the Lebesgue measure with $\mu(\mathcal{X}) > 0$, and P be a probability measure with support \mathcal{X} which is absolute continuous with respect to μ with density f . We denote B_r as the centered ball of \mathbb{R}^d with radius r , that is

$$B_r := [-r, r]^d := \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i \in [-r, r], i = 1, \dots, d\},$$

write $B_r^c := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_r$ for the complement of B_r , and for any $\delta \in (0, r/2)$,

$$B_{r,\delta}^+ := [\delta, r - \delta]^d := \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i \in [\delta, r - \delta], i = 1, \dots, d\}.$$

Moreover, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, $B_r(x)$ denote the ball with center x and radius r . Recall that for $1 \leq p < \infty$, the L_p -norm is defined as $\|x\|_p := (x_1^p + \dots + x_d^p)^{1/p}$, and the $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm is defined as $\|x\|_\infty := \max_{i=1, \dots, d} |x_i|$. Throughout this paper, we shall make frequent use of the following multi-index notations. For any vector $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and numbers $a, \underline{x}_0, \bar{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $[x] := ([x_i])_{i=1}^d$, $x^{-1} := (x_i^{-1})_{i=1}^d$, $a - x := (a - x_i)_{i=1}^d$, $\log(x) := (\log x_i)_{i=1}^d$ and $x \in [\underline{x}_0, \bar{x}_0]$ indicates $x_i \in [\underline{x}_0, \bar{x}_0]$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. In the sequel, we use the notation $a_n \lesssim b_n$ to denote that there exists a positive constant c such that $a_n \leq cb_n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.2 Histogram Transforms

To give a clear description of one possible construction procedure of histogram transforms, we introduce a random vector (R, S, b) which represents the rotation matrix, stretching matrix and translation vector, respectively. To be specific,

R denotes the rotation matrix which is a real-valued $d \times d$ orthogonal square matrix with unit determinant, that is

$$R^\top = R^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \det(R) = 1. \quad (2)$$

S stands for the stretching matrix which is a positive real-valued $d \times d$ diagonal scaling matrix with diagonal elements $(s_i)_{i=1}^d$ that are certain random variables. Obviously, there holds

$$\det(S) = \prod_{i=1}^d s_i. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, we denote

$$s = (s_i)_{i=1}^d, \quad (4)$$

and the bin width vector measured on the input space is given by

$$h = s^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

$b \in [0, 1]^d$ is a d dimensional vector named translation vector.




Figure 1: Histogram transforms, composed of random rotations, stretchings, and translations.

Here we describe a practical method for their construction we are confined to in this study. Starting with an $d \times d$ square matrix M , consisting of d^2 independent univariate standard normal random variates, a Householder QR decomposition [Householder \(1958\)](#) is applied to obtain a factorization of the form $M = R \cdot W$, with orthogonal matrix R and upper triangular matrix W with positive diagonal elements. The resulting matrix R is orthogonal by construction and can be shown to be uniformly distributed. Unfortunately, if R does not feature a positive determinant then it is not a proper rotation matrix according to definition (2). However, if this is the case then we can flip the sign on one of the column vectors of M arbitrarily to obtain M^+ and then repeat the Householder decomposition. The resulting matrix R^+ is identical to the one obtained earlier but with a change in sign

in the corresponding column and $\det(R^+) = 1$, as required for a proper rotation matrix, see [Blaser and Fryzlewicz \(2016\)](#) for a brief account of the existed algorithms to generate random orthogonal matrices.

After that, we build a diagonal scaling matrix with the signs of the diagonal of S where the elements s_k are the well known Jeffreys prior ([Jeffreys, 1946](#)), that is, we draw $\log(s_i)$ from the uniform distribution over certain interval of real numbers $[\log(\underline{s}_0), \log(\bar{s}_0)]$ for fixed constants \underline{s}_0 and \bar{s}_0 with $0 < \underline{s}_0 < \bar{s}_0 < \infty$. By (5), there holds $h_i \in [\bar{s}_0^{-1}, \underline{s}_0^{-1}]$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. For simplicity and uniformity of notations, in the sequel, we denote $\bar{h}_0 = \underline{s}_0^{-1}$ and $\underline{h}_0 = \bar{s}_0^{-1}$, then we can say $h_i \in [\underline{h}_0, \bar{h}_0]$, $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Moreover, the translation vector b is drawn from the uniform distribution over the hyper-cube $[0, 1]^d$.

Based on the above notations, we define the histogram transform $H : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ by

$$H(x) := R \cdot S \cdot x + b \quad (6)$$

as is shown in Figure 1, and the corresponding distribution by $P_H := P_R \otimes P_S \otimes P_b$, where P_R , P_S and P_b represent the distribution for rotation matrix R , stretching matrix S and translation vector b respectively.

Moreover, we denote H' as the affine matrix $R \cdot S$. Clearly, there holds

$$\det(H') = \det(R) \cdot \det(S) = \prod_{i=1}^d s_i. \quad (7)$$

The histogram probability $p(x|H', b)$ is defined by considering the bin width $h = 1$ in the transformed space. It is important to note that there is no point in using $h \neq 1$, since the same effect can be achieved by scaling the transformation matrix H' . Therefore, let $\lfloor H(x) \rfloor$ be the transformed bin indices, then the transformed bin is given by

$$A'_H(x) := \{H(x') \mid \lfloor H(x') \rfloor = \lfloor H(x) \rfloor\}. \quad (8)$$

The corresponding histogram bin containing $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is

$$A_H(x) := \{x' \mid H(x') \in A'_H(x)\} \quad (9)$$

whose volume is $\mu(A_H(x)) = (\det(H'))^{-1}$.

For a fixed histogram transform H , we specify the partition of B_r induced by the histogram rule (9). Let (A'_j) be the set of all cells generated by H , denote \mathcal{I}_H as the index set for H such that $A'_j \cap B_r \neq \emptyset$. As a result, the set

$$\pi_H := (A_j)_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} := (A'_j \cap B_r)_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H}$$

forms a partition of B_r . For notational convenience, if we substitute A_0 for B_r^c , then

$$\pi'_H := (A_j)_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}}$$

forms a partition of \mathbb{R}^d .

2.3 Histogram Transform Ensembles (HTE) for Density Estimation

2.3.1 HISTOGRAM TRANSFORM DENSITY ESTIMATOR

The histogram transform density of a probability measure Q can be defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Histogram Transform Density) *Let Q be a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d and H be the histogram transform defined as in (6). Then the function $f_{Q,H} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by*

$$f_{Q,H}(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \frac{Q(A_j) \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x)}{\mu(A_j)} \quad (10)$$

is called a histogram transform density of Q .

We demonstrate that $f_{Q,H}$ defines the density of a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d for $f_{Q,H}$ is measurable and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_{Q,H}(x) d\mu(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \frac{Q(A_j) \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x)}{\mu(A_j)} d\mu(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \int_{A_j} \frac{Q(A_j)}{\mu(A_j)} d\mu(x) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \frac{Q(A_j) \mu(A_j)}{\mu(A_j)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} Q(A_j) = Q(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that P is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d with the corresponding density function f , by taking $Q = P$ with $dP = f d\mu$, then for $x \in A_j$, we have

$$f_{P,H}(x) = \frac{P(A_j)}{\mu(A_j)} = \frac{\int_{A_j} f(x') d\mu(x')}{\mu(A_j)}. \quad (11)$$

Specifically, when Q is the empirical measure $D_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$, then $D_n(A)$ is the expectation of $\mathbf{1}_A$ with respect to D_n , which is

$$D_n(A) = \mathbb{E}_{D_n} \mathbf{1}_A = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}(A) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_A(x_i),$$

then the histogram transform density in this study can be expressed as

$$f_{D_n,H}(x) = \frac{D_n(A_j)}{\mu(A_j)} = \frac{1}{n\mu(A_j)} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x_i), \quad (12)$$

which can also be expressed in the transformed space as

$$f_{D_n,H}(x) = \frac{1}{n\mu(A_j)} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\lfloor H(x) \rfloor = \lfloor H(x_i) \rfloor\}}(x_i).$$

From now on, for notational simplicity, we will suppress the subscript n of D_n and denote $D := D_n$, e.g., $f_{D,H} := f_{D_n,H}$. The map from the training data to $f_{D,H}$ is called the histogram transform density rule with histogram transform H .

2.3.2 HISTOGRAM TRANSFORM ENSEMBLES (HTE) DENSITY ESTIMATOR

Now we formulate the histogram transform ensembles for density estimation. Ensembles consisting of different estimators have been highly recognized as an effective technique to improve the performance over single estimator in the study which inspire us to apply them to the histogram transform density estimator.

Let $\{f_{D,H_t}\}_{t=1}^T$ be T histogram transform density estimators generated by the histogram transforms $\{H_t\}_{t=1}^T$ respectively, which is defined by

$$f_{D,H_t}(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{H_t} \cup \{0\}} \frac{D(A_{t,j}) \mathbf{1}_{A_{t,j}}(x)}{\mu(A_{t,j})},$$

where $\{A_{t,j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{H_t}}$ is the random partition of B_r induced by histogram transform H_t . Therefore, the histogram transform ensembles for density estimation can be presented as

$$f_{D,E}(x) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{D,H_t}(x). \quad (13)$$

2.3.3 MAIN ALGORITHM

As is shown in Algorithm 1, histogram transform ensembles (HTE) for density estimation is constructed following the manner of *ensemble learning*. We first generate T histogram density estimators each induced by a random histogram transform partition, and then the ensemble estimator is built simply by taking the average.

Algorithm 1: HTE for Density Estimation

Input: Training data $D := (X_1, \dots, X_n)$;
Number of histogram transforms T ;
Lower and upper bound of bandwidth parameters \underline{h}_0 and \bar{h}_0 .
for $t = 1 \rightarrow T$ **do**
 Generate random affine transform matrix $H_t = R_t \cdot S_t + b_t$;
 Apply data independent splitting to the transformed sample space;
 Apply piecewise constant density estimators to each cell;
 Compute the histogram density estimator $f_{D,H_t}(x)$ induced by H_t .
end
Output: The histogram transform ensemble for density estimation is

$$f_{D,E}(x) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{D,H_t}(x).$$

3. Theoretical Results

In this section, we present main results on the convergence rates of our empirical decision function $f_{D,H}$ and $f_{D,E}$ to the Bayesian decision function f in the sense of different norms under certain restrictions.

This section is organized as follows. In Section 3.1, we firstly introduce some fundamental assumptions to be utilized in the theoretical analysis. Then we prove the universal consistency of the HTE under relatively weak assumptions in Section 3.2. In section 3.3, we show that almost optimal convergence rates can be attained by both single and ensemble HTE, whereas in Section 3.4, for the subspace $C^{1,\alpha}$ consisting of smoother functions, almost optimal convergence rates can only be established for the HTE ensembles and the lower bound of single HTE illustrates the benefits of ensembles over singles. Last but not least, we also present some comments and discussions on the obtained main results as is shown in Section 3.5.

3.1 Fundamental Assumptions

To demonstrate theoretical results concerning convergence rates, fundamental assumptions are required respectively for the target function f and the bin width h of stretching matrix S .

First of all, we introduce a general function space $C^{k,\alpha}$ consisting of (k, α) -Hölder continuous functions.

Definition 2 *Let $r \in (0, \infty)$, $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. We say that a function $f : B_r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is (k, α) -Hölder continuous, if there exists a constant $c_L \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

- (i) $\|\nabla^\ell f\| \leq c_L$ for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- (ii) $\|\nabla^k f(x) - \nabla^k f(x')\| \leq c_L \|x - x'\|^\alpha$ for all $x, x' \in B_r$.

The set of such functions is denoted by $C^{k,\alpha}(B_r)$.

Note that for the special case $k = 0$, the resulting function space $C^{0,\alpha}(B_r)$ coincides with the commonly used α -Hölder continuous function space $C^\alpha(B_r)$.

Now we assume the underlying true density f lies in the space $C^{k,\alpha}$.

Assumption 3 *Let f be the underlying true density, and assume that $f \in C^{k,\alpha}$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $k = 0, 1$.*

Then we assume the upper and lower bounds of the bin width h are of the same order, that is, in a specific partition, the extent of stretching in each dimension cannot vary too much. Mathematically, we assume that the stretching matrix S is confined into the class with width satisfying the following conditions.

Assumption 4 *Let the bandwidth h be defined as in (5), assume that there exists some constant $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$c_0 \bar{h}_0 \leq \underline{h}_0 \leq c_0^{-1} \bar{h}_0.$$

In the case that the bandwidth h depends on the sample size n , assume that there exist constants $c_{0,n} \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$c_{0,n} \bar{h}_{0,n} \leq \underline{h}_{0,n} \leq c_{0,n}^{-1} \bar{h}_{0,n}.$$

3.2 Universal Consistency under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm

In this subsection, we firstly establish the density estimator $f_{D,H_{t,n}}$ induced by a certain histogram transform H_t related with sample number n . Note that for the sake of the simplicity and uniformity of notations, we omit the index t for a fixed $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ and substitute f_{D,H_n} for $f_{D,H_{t,n}}$. Moreover, for the sake of convenience, we write $\nu_n := P^n \otimes P_H$.

We present results on the universal consistency property of the histogram transform density estimator f_{D,H_n} in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm. To clarify, an estimator f_{D,H_n} is said to be universally consistent in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm if f_{D,H_n} converges to f under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm ν_n -almost surely for arbitrary distributions of P and P_H .

It is worth mentioning that we adopt $L_1(\mu)$ -norm to show the consistency when the underlying density function lies in the space $C^{0,\alpha}$, because in this way, we are able to provide a more general conclusion under relatively weak assumptions, where Hölder continuity is not required.

Theorem 5 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4. If*

$$\bar{h}_{0,n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}{\log n} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

then the density estimator f_{D,H_n} is universally consistent in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm.

3.3 Results in the Space $C^{0,\alpha}$

3.3.1 CONVERGENCE RATES FOR SINGLE ESTIMATORS UNDER $L_1(\mu)$ -NORM

We firstly establish the convergence rates of single histogram transform density estimators under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm with three different tail assumptions imposed on P . In particular, analysis will be conducted in situations where the tail of the probability distribution P has a polynomial decay, exponential decay and disappears, respectively.

Theorem 6 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4. Moreover, suppose that the density $f \in C^{0,\alpha}$. We consider the following cases:*

- (i) $P(B_r^c) \lesssim r^{-\eta d}$ for some $\eta > 0$ and for all $r \geq 1$;
- (ii) $P(B_r^c) \lesssim e^{-ar^\eta}$ for some $a > 0$, $\eta > 0$ and for all $r \geq 1$;
- (iii) $P(B_{r_0}^c) = 0$ for some $r_0 \geq 1$;

and the sequences $\underline{h}_{0,n}$ are of the following forms:

- (i) $\underline{h}_{0,n} = (\log n/n)^{\frac{1+\eta}{(1+\eta)(2\alpha+d)-\alpha}}$;
- (ii) $\underline{h}_{0,n} = (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}} (\log n)^{-\frac{d}{\eta} \cdot \frac{1}{2\alpha+d}}$;
- (iii) $\underline{h}_{0,n} = (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}}$;

then with probability ν_n at least $1 - \frac{1}{n}$, there holds

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon_n,$$

where the convergence rates

- (i) $\varepsilon_n \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha\eta}{(1+\eta)(2\alpha+d)-\alpha}};$
- (ii) $\varepsilon_n \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}} (\log n)^{\frac{d}{\eta} \cdot \frac{\alpha+d}{2\alpha+d}};$
- (iii) $\varepsilon_n \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}}.$

3.3.2 CONVERGENCE RATES FOR SINGLE ESTIMATORS UNDER $L_\infty(\mu)$ -NORM

We now state our main results on the convergence rates of single histogram transform density estimators under $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm.

Theorem 7 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4. Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and the density function $f \in C^{0,\alpha}$ with $\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} < \infty$. Then for all $x \in B_{r,\sqrt{d}\cdot\bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$ and all $n \geq 1$, by choosing*

$$\underline{h}_{0,n} := (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}},$$

there holds

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}} \quad (14)$$

with probability ν_n at least $1 - \frac{1}{n}$.

3.3.3 CONVERGENCE RATES FOR ENSEMBLE ESTIMATORS UNDER $L_1(\mu)$ -NORM

In this subsection, we state the convergence rates of histogram transform ensembles. First of all, the following theorem establishes the convergence rates of $f_{D,E}$ in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm under three tail probability distributions.

Theorem 8 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4 and T be the number of single estimators contained in the ensembles. Moreover, suppose that the density $f \in C^{0,\alpha}$. We consider the following cases:*

- (i) $P(B_r^c) \lesssim r^{-\eta d}$ for some $\eta > 0$ and for all $r \geq 1$;
- (ii) $P(B_r^c) \lesssim e^{-ar^\eta}$ for some $a > 0$, $\eta > 0$ and for all $r \geq 1$;
- (iii) $P(B_{r_0}^c) = 0$ for some $r_0 \geq 1$;

and the sequences $\underline{h}_{0,n}$ are of the following forms:

- (i) $\underline{h}_{0,n} = (\log n/n)^{\frac{1+\eta}{(1+\eta)(2\alpha+d)-\alpha}};$
- (ii) $\underline{h}_{0,n} = (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}} (\log n)^{-\frac{d}{\eta} \cdot \frac{1}{2\alpha+d}};$

(iii) $\underline{h}_{0,n} = (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}};$

then with probability ν_n at least $1 - \frac{T}{n}$, there holds

$$\|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon_n,$$

where the convergence rates

$$(i) \quad \varepsilon_n \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha\eta}{(1+\eta)(2\alpha+d)-\alpha}};$$

$$(ii) \quad \varepsilon_n \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}} (\log n)^{\frac{d}{\eta}, \frac{\alpha+d}{2\alpha+d}};$$

$$(iii) \quad \varepsilon_n \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}}.$$

3.3.4 CONVERGENCE RATES FOR ENSEMBLE ESTIMATORS UNDER $L_\infty(\mu)$ -NORM

Finally, we present the convergence rates of the ensembles $f_{D,E}$ under $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm.

Theorem 9 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4 and T be the number of single estimators contained in the ensembles. Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $r \in (0, \infty)$ and the density function $f \in C^{0,\alpha}$. Then for any $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \underline{h}_{0,n}}^+$, there exists some $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N_0$, by choosing*

$$\underline{h}_{0,n} := (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}},$$

there holds

$$\|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}} \tag{15}$$

with probability ν_n at least $1 - \frac{T}{n}$.

At first glance, the ensembles and singles seem to share the same convergence rate. However, a closer look shows that the ensembles have even worse rates than single estimators, since they converge with probability $1 - \frac{T}{n}$ instead of $1 - \frac{1}{n}$ for a relatively large T . As a matter of fact, we can say that ensembles and singles converge at the roughly same rate only when T is a constant independent of n . As a result, with the above analysis in the space $C^{0,\alpha}$ we fail to explain how ensemble histogram transforms exceed single estimators. Therefore, we are motivated to search for theoretical clues of this remaining puzzle in the subspace $C^{1,\alpha}$.

3.4 Results in the Space $C^{1,\alpha}$

In this subsection, we turn to the subspace $C^{1,\alpha}$ and provide a result that illustrates the benefits of histogram transform ensembles over single density estimators by both verifying the optimal convergence rate for ensembles and establishing the lower bound of the single estimators.

As Theorem 11 shows below, single histogram transform density estimators do not benefit the stronger smoothness assumption and can not achieve the same rate as the ensembles due to the fact that the approximation error of single histogram transform density estimators is highly sub-optimal for such functions.

3.4.1 CONVERGENCE RATES FOR ENSEMBLE ESTIMATORS UNDER $L_\infty(\mu)$ -NORM

This subsection presents a theorem that verifies the optimal convergence rate of histogram transform ensembles $f_{D,E}$. Note that this result implies that our density estimator indeed benefits from ensembles.

Theorem 10 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4 and T_n be the number of single estimators contained in the ensembles. Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $r \in (0, \infty)$ and the density function $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$. Then for all $\tau > 0$ and $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, there exists some $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N_0$, by choosing*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{h}_{0,n} &:= (n/\log n)^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)+d}}, \\ T_n &:= n^{\frac{2\alpha}{2(1+\alpha)+d}}, \end{aligned}$$

there holds

$$\|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2(1+\alpha)+d}} \quad (16)$$

in the sense of $L_2(P_H)$ with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$.

3.4.2 LOWER BOUND OF SINGLE ESTIMATORS UNDER $L_\infty(\mu)$ -NORM

As mentioned at the beginning of this subsection, we now present a theorem to illustrate the benefit of ensembles over single estimators.

Theorem 11 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4. Furthermore, let the density function $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$. For fixed constants $\underline{c}'_f, \underline{c}_f, \bar{c}_f \in (0, \infty)$, let \mathcal{A}_f denote the set*

$$\mathcal{A}_f := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \left| \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i} \right| \geq \underline{c}'_f \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, d \text{ and } f(x) \in [\underline{c}_f, \bar{c}_f] \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Then for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_0}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$ and all $n > N_0$ with

$$N_0 := \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \bar{h}_{0,n} \leq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\sqrt{d} \underline{c}'_f c_{0,n}}{4\sqrt{3}c_L} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \left(\frac{d\sqrt{d}}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \frac{\underline{c}_f}{2d\sqrt{d}c_L}, \left(\frac{1}{4\bar{c}_f} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} \right\} \right\}, \quad (18)$$

by choosing

$$\bar{h}_{0,n} := n^{-\frac{1}{2+d}},$$

there holds

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \gtrsim n^{-\frac{1}{2+d}} \quad (19)$$

in the sense of $L_2(\nu_n)$ -norm.

Obviously, for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, the upper bound of ensemble histogram transforms (16) in Theorem 10 is essentially smaller than the lower bound (19) in Theorem 11 for single histogram transforms. This exactly illustrates the benefits for the convergence rates of ensemble predictors over single estimators.

3.5 Comments and Discussions

Through a statistical learning treatment, in this paper we investigated and explored the histogram transform ensembles for density estimation which takes full advantage of the diversity induced by random rotation transform and the ensemble nature. In this section, we present some comments and discussions on the obtained theoretical results on the consistency and convergence rates of $f_{D,E}$ and compares them with existing studies.

First of all, we point out that in this paper, theoretical analysis on convergence rates is conducted in the Hölder spaces $C^{0,\alpha}$ and $C^{1,\alpha}$ under different norms respectively. For the space $C^{0,\alpha}$, the universal consistency is obtained under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm. Furthermore, we highlight that the convergence rate $O((\log n/n)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+d)})$ derived in Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm and $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm are both optimal up to a logarithmic factor and of strong type “with high probability ν_n ” due to the use of the Bernstein’s inequality that takes into account the variance information of the random variables. However, we fail to show the benefits of histogram transform ensembles $f_{P,E}$ over single histogram transform density estimators $f_{P,H}$ theoretically. Therefore, we turn to the subspace $C^{1,\alpha}$ which is confined to a class of smoother functions and prove that in the space $C^{1,\alpha}$ ensemble estimators $f_{P,E}$ converges in type of “in expectation w.r.t. P_H and with high probability P^n ” faster than single estimators $f_{P,H}$ in weaker type of “in expectation w.r.t. ν_n ”. More precisely, Theorem 10 shows that the histogram transform ensembles $f_{P,E}$ can attain the almost optimal rate $O((n/\log n)^{-(1+\alpha)/(2(1+\alpha)+d)})$ whereas Theorem 11 shows that a single histogram transform density estimator fails to achieve this rate whose lower bound is of the order $O(n^{-1/(2+d)})$.

Recall that our study focuses on histogram partitions by applying random histogram transform ensembles to address the density estimation problem, see López-Rubio (2013). As a result, comparisons on consistency and convergence rates with other existing theoretical studies of histogram density estimators should be conducted. First of all, Lugosi and Nobel (1996) investigated histogram density estimations based on data-dependent partitions and established strong consistency in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm under general sufficient conditions which turns out to be stronger than ours. Concerning with the convergence rate of the histogram-based density estimators, Klemelä (2009) presents a multivariate histograms based on data-dependent partitions which are obtained by minimizing a complexity-penalized error criterion. The convergence rates obtained in his study are of the type $O((\log n/n)^{2\sigma/(2\sigma+1)})$ with respect to the weaker expected L_2 -norm under the assumption that function belongs to an anisotropic Besov class. By analyzing the proposed sieve maximum likelihood density estimator in Liu and Wong (2014) and further developed by a Bayesian method in Liu and Wong (2015), the concentration rate of the type $O(n^{-r/(2r+1)})$ up to a logarithmic factor which does not directly depend on the dimension. However, note that the satisfying dimension-free conclusion heavily relies on the strong assumptions imposed on the approximation errors which is discussed in detail and given the upper bound in our study. Li et al. (2014) presented an algorithm taking advantage of discrepancy, a concept originates from Quasi Monte Carlo analysis, to control the partition process and a piecewise constant estimator defined on a binary partition. The resulting algorithm is proved to have the optimal convergence rate of order $O(n^{-1/2})$ in certain Monte Carlo sense under more restrictive constraints on regions containing larger proportion of the sample. Moreover, there exist a flurry of studies in the literature exploring other density estimation

methods rather than histogram estimators. Several representative examples are listed below: under the same assumptions on the α -Hölder continuity of f , the convergence rate for the kernel density estimator derived in Jiang et al. (2017) is as fast as ours as well. Liu et al. (2011) formed kernel density estimates of bivariate and univariate marginals supposed in the α -Hölder class which turns out to be stronger assumptions than ours, and applied Kruskal's algorithm to estimate the optimal forest on held out data. Formally speaking, the convergence rate $O((\log n)^{1/2}((k^* + \hat{k})n^{-\beta/(2+2\beta)} + n^{-\beta/(1+2\beta)}))$ in probability are further verified.

4. Error Analysis

In this section, we conduct error analysis for the single and ensemble density estimators $f_{D,H}$ and $f_{D,E}$ in the Hölder spaces $C^{0,\alpha}$ and $C^{1,\alpha}$.

4.1 Analysis in the Space $C^{0,\alpha}$

By introducing the function $f_{P,H}$ in (11), obviously there holds

$$\|f_{D,H} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} + \|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)}. \quad (20)$$

The consistency and convergence analysis in our study will be mainly conducted in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ -norm with the help of inequality (11). Besides, for some specific case, i.e., when the density f is compactly supported, we are also concerned with the consistency and convergence of $f_{D,H}$ to f under $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm. In this case, there also holds the following inequality

$$\|f_{D,H} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} + \|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}. \quad (21)$$

It is easy to see that the first error term on the right-hand side of (20) or (21) is data-dependent due to the empirical measure D while the second one is deterministic because of its sampling-free. Loosely speaking, the first error term corresponds to the variance of the estimator $f_{D,H}$, while the second one can be treated as its bias although (20) or (21) is not an exact error decomposition. In our study, we proceed with the consistency and convergence analysis on $f_{D,H}$ by bounding the two error terms, respectively.

4.1.1 BOUNDING THE APPROXIMATION ERROR

Our first theoretical result on bounding the approximation error term shows that, the $L_1(\mu)$ -distance between $f_{P,H}$ and f can be arbitrarily small by choosing the bandwidth appropriately which leads to the result of universal consistency. Moreover, under the assumption $f \in C^{0,\alpha}$, the $L_\infty(\mu)$ -distance between the two quantities is shown to decrease polynomially. As a result, convergence rates under $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm can be derived.

Proposition 12 *Let the histogram transform H be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h satisfying Assumption 4.*

(i) *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $h_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $\bar{h}_0 \leq h_\varepsilon$, there holds*

$$\|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

(ii) If $f \in C^{0,\alpha}$, then for $\bar{h}_0 \leq (\varepsilon/c_L)^{1/\alpha}/d$ with c_L as in Definition 2, there holds

$$\|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

We now show that the $L_1(\mu)$ -distance between $f_{P,H}$ and f can be upper bounded by their difference on a compact domain B_r together with their difference outside the domain which is the crucial for obtaining the convergence rates under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm.

Proposition 13 *Let the histogram transform H be defined as in (6). Then, for all $r \geq 1$, we have*

$$\|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim 2^d r^d \|(f_{P,H} - f)\mathbf{1}_{B_r}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} + 2P(B_r^c).$$

4.1.2 BOUNDING THE ESTIMATION ERROR

Recall that for any histogram transform H , the set $\pi'_H := \{A_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}}$ forms a partition of \mathbb{R}^d . The following lemma shows that both of the $\|\cdot\|_{L_1(\mu)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}$ -distance between $f_{D,H}$ and $f_{P,H}$ can be estimated by the quantities $|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|$.

Lemma 14 *Let the histogram transform H be defined as in (6). Then the following equalities hold:*

$$(i) \quad \|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|.$$

$$(ii) \quad \|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} = \sup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)}.$$

Now, there is a need for some constraints on the complexity of the function set so that the set will have a finite VC dimension (Vapnik and Chervonenkis, 1971), and therefore make the algorithm PAC learnable (Valiant, 1984), see e.g., (Giné and Nickl, 2016, Definition 3.6.1).

Definition 15 (VC dimension) *Let \mathcal{B} be a class of subsets of \mathcal{X} and $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ be a finite set. The trace of \mathcal{B} on A is defined by $\{B \cap A : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Its cardinality is denoted by $\Delta^{\mathcal{B}}(A)$. We say that \mathcal{B} shatters A if $\Delta^{\mathcal{B}}(A) = 2^{\#(A)}$, that is, if for every $A' \subset A$, there exists a $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $A' = B \cap A$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let*

$$m^{\mathcal{B}}(k) := \sup_{A \subset \mathcal{X}, \#(A)=k} \Delta^{\mathcal{B}}(A).$$

Then, the set \mathcal{B} is a Vapnik-Chervonenkis class if there exists $k < \infty$ such that $m^{\mathcal{B}}(k) < 2^k$ and the minimal of such k is called the VC dimension of \mathcal{B} , and abbreviated as $\text{VC}(\mathcal{B})$.

Recall that H is a histogram transform, $\pi_H := (A_j)_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H}$ is a partition of B_r with the index set \mathcal{I}_H induced by H , and Π_H is the gathering of all partitions π_H . To bound the estimation error, we need to introduce some more notations. To this end, let π_h denote the collection of all cells in π_H , that is,

$$\pi_h := \{A_j : A_j \in \pi_H \subset \Pi_H\}. \quad (22)$$

Moreover, we define

$$\Pi_h := \left\{ B : B = \bigcup_{j \in I} A_j, I \subset \mathcal{I}_H, A_j \in \pi_H \subset \Pi_H \right\}. \quad (23)$$

Lemma 16 *Let π_h and Π_h be defined as in (22) and (23), respectively. Then we have*

$$\text{VC}(\pi_h) \leq 2^d + 2$$

and

$$\text{VC}(\Pi_h) \leq (d(2^d - 1) + 2) \left(\frac{2r\sqrt{d}}{\underline{h}_0} + 1 \right)^d. \quad (24)$$

To bound the capacity of an infinite function set, we need to introduce the following fundamental descriptions which enables an approximation by finite subsets, see e.g. (Steinwart and Christmann, 2008, Definition 6.19).

Definition 17 (Covering Numbers) *Let (X, d) be a metric space, $A \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. We call $A' \subset A$ an ε -net of A if for all $x \in A$ there exists an $x' \in A'$ such that $d(x, x') \leq \varepsilon$. Moreover, the ε -covering number of A is defined as*

$$\mathcal{N}(A, d, \varepsilon) = \inf \left\{ n \geq 1 : \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \text{ such that } A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n B_d(x_i, \varepsilon) \right\},$$

where $B_d(x, \varepsilon)$ denotes the closed ball in X centered at x with radius ε .

Let \mathcal{B} be a class of subsets of \mathcal{X} , denote $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}$ as the collection of the indicator functions of all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, that is, $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}} := \{\mathbf{1}_B : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Moreover, as usual, for any probability measure \mathbb{Q} , $L_1(\mathbb{Q})$ is denoted as the L_1 space with respect to \mathbb{Q} equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_1(\mathbb{Q})}$.

Lemma 18 *Let π_h and Π_h be defined as in (22) and (23), respectively. Then, for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exists a universal constant K such that for any probability measure \mathbb{Q} , there hold*

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}_{\pi_h}, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(\mathbb{Q})}, \varepsilon) \leq K(2^d + 2)(4e)^{2^d + 2} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{2^d + 1} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}_{\Pi_h}, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(\mathbb{Q})}, \varepsilon) \leq K \left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_0} \right)^d (4e)^{\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_0} \right)^d} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_0} \right)^d - 1}, \quad (26)$$

where the constant $c_d := 2^{1 + \frac{1}{d}} \cdot 3 \cdot d^{\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{2}}$.

Now, we are able to establish oracle inequalities under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm and $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm which can be used to derive the convergence rates.

Proposition 19 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4 with $\bar{h}_{0,n} \leq 1$. Then, for all $r \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$, there holds*

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f_{P,H_n}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{9 \log n (1 + 12(c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d)}{2n}} + \frac{2 \log n (1 + (c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d)}{n} + \frac{4}{n}$$

with probability ν_n at least $1 - \frac{1}{n}$.

Proposition 20 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4 with $\bar{h}_{0,n} \leq 1$. Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and the density function f satisfies $\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} < \infty$. Then for all $\tau > 0$, all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, and all $n \geq N_0$ with $N_0 := \max\{e, 2K, \mu(B_r)\}$ and K as in Lemma 18, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{D,H_n} - f_{P,H_n}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{3n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + \frac{2}{n} \end{aligned}$$

with probability ν_n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$.

4.2 Analysis in the Space $C^{1,\alpha}$

Recall that in the previous subsection where f lies in the space $C^{0,\alpha}$, a drawback to $L_1(\mu)$ -norm is that it does not admit an exact bias-variance decomposition and the usual Taylor expansion involved techniques for error estimation may not apply directly. Thus, we fail to tell how ensembles exceed single estimators in a theoretical point of view, and therefore we turn to the subspace $C^{1,\alpha}$.

In this subsection, we study the convergence rates of $f_{D,E}$ and $f_{D,H}$ to the true density $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$. To this end, there is a point in introducing some notations. First of all, for any $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, recall that the population version of f_{D,H_t} can be formulated as

$$f_{P,H_t}(x) = \mathbb{E}_P(f(X) | A_{H_t}(x)),$$

where $\mathbb{E}_P(\cdot | A_{H_t}(x))$ denotes the conditional expectation with respect to P on $A_{H_t}(x)$. With the ensembles of the population version

$$f_{P,E}(x) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{P,H_t}(x) \tag{27}$$

we make the $L_2(\nu_n)$ -error decomposition

$$\|f_{D,E}(x) - f(x)\|_{L_2(\nu_n)}^2 = \|f_{D,E}(x) - f_{P,E}(x)\|_{L_2(\nu_n)}^2 + \|f_{P,E}(x) - f(x)\|_{L_2(\nu_n)}^2. \tag{28}$$

In our study, the consistency and convergence analysis of the histogram transform ensembles $f_{D,E}$ in the space $C^{1,\alpha}$ will be mainly conducted with the help of the decomposition (28).

In particular, in the case that $T = 1$, i.e., when there is only single histogram transform density estimator, we are concerned with the lower bound of $f_{D,H}$ to f . With the population version

$$f_{P,H}(x) = \mathbb{E}_P(f(X)|A_H(x))$$

we make the $L_2(\nu_n)$ -error decomposition

$$\|f_{D,H}(x) - f(x)\|_{L_2(\nu_n)}^2 = \|f_{D,H}(x) - f_{P,H}(x)\|_{L_2(\nu_n)}^2 + \|f_{P,H}(x) - f(x)\|_{L_2(\nu_n)}^2. \quad (29)$$

It is important to note that both of the two terms on the right-hand side of (28) or (29) are data- and partition-independent due to the expectation with respect to D and H . Loosely speaking, the first error term corresponds to the expected estimation error of the estimators $f_{D,E}$ or $f_{D,H}$, while the second one demonstrates the expected approximation error. Besides, note that (28) and (29) are exact error decompositions, which are different from the error decompositions (20) and (21) conducted in Section 4.1.

4.2.1 BOUNDS ON THE APPROXIMATION ERROR

In this subsection, we firstly establish the upper bound for the approximation error term of histogram transform ensembles $f_{P,E}$ and further find a lower bound of the approximation error for single density estimator $f_{P,H}$.

Proposition 21 *Let the histogram transform H be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h satisfying Assumption 4 and T be the number of single estimators contained in the ensembles. Moreover, let the density function satisfy $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$. Then, for all $n \geq 1$, there holds*

$$\|f_{P,E} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq c_L \left(c_{0,n}^{-2d} \cdot \bar{h}_0^{2(1+\alpha)} + \frac{d}{T} \cdot \bar{h}_0^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

in the sense of $L_2(P_H)$ -norm, where the constant $c_{0,n}$ is as in Assumption 4.

Proposition 22 *Let the histogram transform H be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h satisfying Assumption 4. Furthermore, let the density function $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$ and \mathcal{A}_f be the set (17). Then for all $x \in B_{r,\sqrt{d}\bar{h}_0}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$ and all*

$$h_0 \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}c'_f c_0}{4\sqrt{3}c_L} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}},$$

we have

$$\|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \geq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{4} c'_f c_0 \cdot \bar{h}_0 \quad (30)$$

in the sense of $L_2(P_H)$ -norm, where the constant c_0 is as in Assumption 4.

4.2.2 BOUNDS ON THE ESTIMATION ERROR

The first proposition analyzes the estimation error term for ensemble density estimators.

Proposition 23 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4 with $\bar{h}_{0,n} \leq 1$. Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and the density function f satisfies $\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} < \infty$. Then for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d}\bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, all $\tau > 0$, and all $n \geq N_0$ with $N_0 := \max\{e, 2K, \mu(B_r)\}$ and K as in Lemma 18, there holds*

$$\|f_{D,E} - f_{P,E}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/h_{0,n}^d))}{nh_{0,n}^d}} + \frac{2(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/h_{0,n}^d))}{3nh_{0,n}^d} + \frac{2}{n}$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$.

Here, we further find a lower bound of the estimation error for single density estimators.

Proposition 24 *Let the histogram transform H_n be defined as in (6) with bandwidth h_n satisfying Assumption 4. Moreover, let the density function $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$ and \mathcal{A}_f be the set (17). Then for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d}\bar{h}_{0,n}}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$ and all $n \geq N'$ with*

$$N' := \min\left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \bar{h}_{0,n} \leq \min\left\{\left(\frac{d\sqrt{d}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \frac{c_f}{2d\sqrt{d}c_L}, \left(\frac{1}{4\bar{c}_f}\right)^{\frac{1}{d}}\right\}\right\}, \quad (31)$$

there holds

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f_{P,H_n}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{c_f}{4n\bar{h}_{0,n}^d}} \quad (32)$$

in the sense of $L_2(P^n)$ -norm.

5. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present the computational experiments that we have carried out. Firstly, in Section 5.1, we introduce some preliminary work including a brief account for the generation process of our histogram transforms, following by two effective measures of estimation accuracy named *MAE* and *ANLL*. Then we consider the origin algorithm proposed by López-Rubio (2013), referred to as naïve histogram transform ensembles (NHTE) which we conduct comprehensive theoretical analysis in the preceding sections. We extend the existing work to an illustrative example, which illustrates how ensemble estimators outperform the single ones in a experimental point of view in Section 5.2.

In Section 5.3, we introduce an adaptive version of histogram transform ensembles based on our proposed adaptive splitting method, termed as the adaptive histogram transform ensembles (AHTE). In Section 5.4, we design four types of distributions, study the behavior of our AHTE depending on the values of tunable parameters, and conduct comparisons with other state-of-the-art density estimators. Finally, in Section 5.5, we compare our approach with the counterparts for real data in terms of *ANLL*.

5.1 Experimental Setup

Recall that $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ are denoted as observations drawn independently from an unknown distribution P on \mathbb{R}^d with the density f . For the sake of constructing data sets, we need to detail the elements of histogram transform defined as in (6).

5.1.1 GENERATION PROCESS FOR HISTOGRAM TRANSFORMS

Firstly, note that the random rotation matrix R is generated in the manner coinciding with Section 2.2. For the elements of the scaling matrix S , applying the well known Jeffreys prior for scale parameters referred to [Jeffreys \(1946\)](#), we draw $\log(s_i)$ from the uniform distribution over certain real-valued interval $[\log(\underline{s}_0), \log(\bar{s}_0)]$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\log(\underline{s}_0) &:= s_{\min} + \log(\hat{s}), \\ \log(\bar{s}_0) &:= s_{\max} + \log(\hat{s}),\end{aligned}$$

where $s_{\min}, s_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$ are tunable parameters with $s_{\min} < s_{\max}$ and the scale parameter \hat{s} is the inverse of the bin width \hat{h} measured on the input space, which is defined by

$$\hat{s} := (\hat{h})^{-1} = (3.5\sigma)^{-1}n^{\frac{1}{2+d}}.$$

Here, the standard deviation $\sigma := \sqrt{\text{trace}(V)/d}$ with $V := \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(x_i - \bar{x})^\top$ and $\bar{x} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ combines the information from all the dimensions of the input space.

5.1.2 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

When it comes to the empirical performances for various different density estimators \hat{f} , we introduce two comparisons of options conducted over m test samples $\{x_j, j = 1, \dots, m\}$. In the case where the true density function f is known, by convention, we adopt the following Mean Absolute Error (*MAE*):

$$MAE(\hat{f}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m |\hat{f}(x_j) - f(x_j)|.$$

Obviously, lower *MAE* implies better performance of a density estimator \hat{f} .

Taking the real data application into consideration, namely, when the true density f is unknown, we turn to the measure of accuracy given by the Average Negative Log-Likelihood (*ANLL*):

$$ANLL(\hat{f}) = -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \log \hat{f}(x_j),$$

where $\hat{f}(x_j)$ represents the estimated probability density for the test sample x_j and the lower the *ANLL* is, the better estimation we obtain. However, the case $\hat{f}(x) = 0$ would imply $ANLL(\hat{f}) = \infty$, an undesirable state. We prefer to avoid this issue altogether by substituting all density estimation $\hat{f}(x)$ with $\hat{f}(x) + \varepsilon$, where ε is a infinitesimal number which can be obtained by function `numpy.spacing(1)` in Python. Last, note that the test set (m samples) must be disjoint with the training set (n samples) in all cases.

5.2 Comparisons between Ensemble and Single Estimators

In order to give a more comprehensive understanding of this section, the reader will be reminded of the significance to illustrate the benefits of our histogram transform ensembles over single estimator. Therefore, we start this simulation by constructing the above mentioned illustrative example as the synthetic data. To be specific, we base the simulations on one particular distribution construction approach generating a 2-dimensional toy example, where the density function $f : \mathcal{X}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$f = \text{Beta}(3, 10).$$

We emphasize that the bell-shaped density function f is compactly supported and bounded.

In experiment, we generate 1,000 testing samples, and let the number of training samples vary from 10 to 1000. We set hyper-parameters $s_{\min} = 0$ and $s_{\max} = 1$. Each experiment is repeated for 50 times and the average *MAE* is reported as a representative of testing accuracy.




Figure 2: *MAE* for different numbers of histogram transforms T applied for the synthetic data.

Figure 2 captures the *MAE* performance of our model for $T = 1, 2, 5, 20$, respectively. The result is twofold: First of all, lower *ANLL* of the steady state for $T > 1$ states that ensembles behave better than single estimators in terms of accuracy. Moreover, the difference of slope before the curves reach flat illustrates the lower bound of the convergence rate of single estimators to some extent.

5.3 Adaptive HTE for Density Estimation

Till now, the partition processes considered have only performed in an equal-size histogram manner, however, it fails to take into account information resides in data itself, and thus lacks

of local adaptivity. Therefore, in the following experiments, we extend the origin histogram transform ensembles, which we will then refer to as the naïve histogram transform ensembles (NHTE), to an adaptive version, the adaptive histogram transform ensembles (AHTE). That is, all histogram transforms in the following experiments adopt the adaptive random stretching criterion to significantly improve the balancing property of splits and hence to increase the accuracy.

5.3.1 ADAPTIVE SPLITTING

The *adaptive splitting* technique helps formulate a data dependent partition. In general, adaptive histogram transforms split more on sample-dense areas while split less on sample-sparse areas, for we adopt the recursive-based splittings, that is, the splitting process ceases with the number of samples containing in a cell less than a certain amount, denoted by the hyper-parameter *min_samples_split*. However, it’s worth pointing out that instead of selecting the bin indices as the round points, where each cell shares the same size, this adaptive method aims at diversifying the samples contained in each cell. In fact, high-dimensional samples are typically sparse. Therefore, it is of great necessity to recognize the area where samples densely cluster and to “cut it out”. Otherwise, the high volume of the sample-sparse areas will significantly lower the estimated density in the whole cell.

Moreover, we impose a stopping criterion when a cell contains less than m samples. Then we focus on every *qualified* cell with enough sample points, and select the to-be-split dimension as the one with the largest ratio, that is, with the least variance, scaled to $[0.5, 2.5]$, per range. In the process of split point selection, we choose the split point as a relatively far position from the sample mean. To be specific, if the sample mean is smaller than the 0.6 quantile, the split point is selected as the 0.618 quantile, otherwise as the 0.382 quantile of the sample points.

By this means, we’re able to make full use of the potential information containing in samples and to split at the area with as sparse points as possible. Thus, the sample-dense area will not be split too much, and therefore the local estimation of the underlying density function can be guaranteed. A concrete description of the construction process of *adaptive splitting* is shown in the following Algorithm 2.

5.3.2 ADAPTIVE HTE

To achieve the adaptive version of HTE, we simply apply *adaptive splittings* instead of data independent partitions, so that we are able to take into account more information of samples.

Note that in the adaptive version of HTE, the random affine transform matrix H_t only consists of random rotations. However, this doesn’t mean that we abandon stretchings or translations. As a matter of fact, instead of choosing bin indices, we split differently on different local areas. Thus the *adaptive splittings* can be viewed as a combination of *adaptive stretchings* and *adaptive translations*, with each local area stretched and translated to a different extent according to the sample distribution, only the effect of theses two transforms is achieved by adaptively selecting the split points. Also, the randomness of this adaptive partition is solely provided by random rotation transforms, with the implied stretchings and translations determined by sample distributions.

Algorithm 2: Adaptive Splitting

Input: Transformed sample space D^\top ;
Minimal number of samples required to split m ;
Number of splits p initiated as 1.

repeat
 k_t^p is the number of cells before the p -th split for the t -th partition;
 for $j = 1 \rightarrow k_t^p$ **do**
 if *number of samples in the j -th cell* $> m$ **then**
 for $i = 1 \rightarrow d$ **do**
 $range_i$ denotes the range of dimension i ;
 var_i denotes the scaled variance of dimension i ;
 $ratio_i = \frac{range_i}{var_i}$.
 end
 The to-be-split dimension is with the largest ratio.
 if $mean \leq 0.6$ *quantile* **then**
 | Select the split point as the 0.618 quantile of this dimension;
 else
 | Select the split point as the 0.382 quantile of this dimension;
 end
 end
 $p++$.
 end
until $\max(\text{number of samples in all cells}) \leq m$;
Output: Adaptive partition of the transformed sample space.

Algorithm 3: Adaptive HTE for Density Estimation

Input: Training data $D := (X_1, \dots, X_n)$;
Number of histogram transforms T .

for $t = 1 \rightarrow T$ **do**
 Generate random affine transform matrix $H_t = R_t$;
 Apply *adaptive splitting* to the transformed sample space;
 Apply piecewise constant density estimators to each cell;
 Compute the histogram density estimator $f_{D,H_t}(x)$ induced by H_t .
end
Output: The histogram transform ensemble for density estimation is

$$f_{D,E}(x) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{D,H_t}(x).$$

5.4 Synthetic Data Analysis

5.4.1 SYNTHETIC DATA SETTINGS

In this subsection, we start by applying our histogram transform ensembles and other density estimation methods including naïve histogram transforms and KDE on several artificial examples. To be specific, we base the simulations on four different types of distribution construction approaches with dimension $d = 2, 5$, respectively. More precisely, we assume that the sample vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ are independent with each other and with distributions as follows:

- **Type I:** $f_I = 0.3 * \text{Unif}(0.7, 1) + 0.7 * \text{Unif}(0, 0.4)$ with $X_i \sim f_I$, for $i = 1, \dots, d$;
- **Type II:** $f_{II} = 0.5 * \text{Beta}(2, 10) + 0.5 * \text{Unif}(0.5, 1)$ with $X_i \sim f_{II}$, for $i = 1, \dots, d$;
- **Type III:** $f_{III} = 0.5 * \text{Laplace}(0, \frac{1}{2}) + 0.5 * \text{Unif}(2, 4)$ with $X_i \sim f_{III}$, for $i = 1, \dots, d$;
- **Type IV:** $f_{IV} = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f(X_i) \cdot g(X_d)$ with $f = \text{Exp}(0.5)$ and $g = \text{Unif}(0, 5)$.









The above artificial examples represent different kinds of distributions. The first type f_I is piecewise constant, and the following two, f_{II} and f_{III} represent distributions with sectionally continuous probability distribution functions. Note that in the first three distributions, marginal distributions of each dimension are identically distributed, while in the last example f_{IV} , X_d obeys a different distribution from the first $d - 1$ dimensions.

5.4.2 STUDY OF THE PARAMETERS


In this subsection, we lubricate the study of parameters T and m in Algorithm 2 among different datasets and distinct dimensions. As it mentions above, T stands for the number of partitions in an ensemble and m represents the minimum number of samples required to split an internal node.

We conduct experiments based on synthetic datasets following four types of distributions defined as f_I , f_{II} , f_{III} and f_{IV} . For each distribution, we independently take 2000 and 10000 samples on $d = 2, 5$ as training data and test data respectively. In addition, we have carried out experiments with $T \in \{5, 20, 100\}$ and m varying respectively from 1 to 30 and 1 to 50 for $ANLL$ and MAE , the measurements of accuracy under each parameters combination.

As we can see in Figure 3, the performances of our AHTE estimator have the local optimal results on axis of m , that is, we can choose best m parameters to minimize the $ANLL$ and average MAE of each line. On the other hand, the results gain considerable improves when we go from $T = 5$ to $T = 100$, but then a steady state seems to be reached. Further more, average Negative log-likelihood loss function obtains better ability in tell the differences when T changes. Features above provide enormous convenience to parameter selection in experiments, since it means that we can not only possibly figure out the optimal parameter m , but also choose a rather big T as the number of partitions in an ensemble, for the further incrementation has no significant effect beyond certain limit.



(a) The study of parameters with $d = 2$, where each row respectively stands for each type of the four distributions. The left column indicates how $ANLL$ varies along parameters m and T , and the right column shows the variation of MAE .



(b) The study of parameters with $d = 5$, where each row respectively stands for each type of the four distributions. The left column indicates how $ANLL$ varies along parameters m and T , and the right column shows the variation of MAE .

Figure 3: Study of parameters for AHTE.

5.4.3 PERFORMANCE COMPARISONS

In the following experiments, comparisons are conducted among our adaptive histogram transform ensembles (AHTE), kernel density estimators (KDE) and Naïve Histogram transform ensembles (NHTE).

- KDE: the kernel density estimators (Parzen, 1962; Rosenblatt, 1956) where we take the Gaussian kernel.
- NHTE: the original HTE density estimator proposed by López-Rubio (2013).

Table 1: Average *ANLL* and *MSE* over synthetic data sets

Datasets	d	NHTE		KDE		AHTE	
		<i>ANLL</i>	<i>MAE</i>	<i>ANLL</i>	<i>MAE</i>	<i>ANLL</i>	<i>MAE</i>
I	2	-0.5942 (0.0556)	0.7029 (0.2060)	-0.3112 (0.0082)	0.8002 (0.0199)	-0.5768 (0.0143)	0.8204 (0.0463)
	5	0.5870 (0.4282)	8.7246 (1.1090)	-0.1295 (0.0135)	6.7247 (0.0426)	-0.5727 (0.0217)	6.3086 (0.1717)
II	2	-0.1339 (0.0608)	0.4941 (0.1639)	-0.0108 (0.0066)	0.5479 (0.0106)	-0.1526 (0.0181)	0.3791 (0.0830)
	5	1.4265 (0.6569)	3.4790 (0.6844)	0.4796 (0.0102)	2.5694 (0.0299)	0.2582 (0.0251)	2.4126 (0.1723)
III	2	3.2186 (0.0617)	0.0200 (0.0060)	3.2726 (0.0096)	0.0233 (0.0005)	3.1647 (0.0161)	0.0161 (0.0035)
	5	9.2211 (0.3222)	0.0011 (0.0002)	8.5674 (0.0130)	0.0008 (0.0000)	8.3585 (0.0168)	0.0008 (0.0001)
IV	2	2.1263 (0.0558)	0.0641 (0.0180)	2.1309 (0.0103)	0.0531 (0.0024)	2.0343 (0.0144)	0.0450 (0.0045)
	5	4.8812 (0.4528)	0.1820 (0.0303)	3.7944 (0.0208)	0.1489 (0.0032)	3.6513 (0.0226)	0.1227 (0.0033)

* The best results are marked in **bold**, and the standard deviation is reported in the parenthesis under each value.

We perform the experiment with $n = 2,000$ training points and $m = 10,000$ test samples. For our AHTE, we set $T = 100$. Besides, the hyper-parameter *min_samples_split*, the minimal number of samples required to split, is chosen by the grid search method, where the validation set consists of 30% samples randomly selected from the training data, and the optimal parameters are with the minimal validated *ANLL*. The grid is selected as $\{1, 3, 10, 20, 40\}$. For NHTE, the selection of the parameters s_{\min} and s_{\max} , is referred to the Nelder-Mead method (Nelder and Mead, 1965). And for KDE, we use the function *gaussian_kde* in the package *scipy* of python and adopt the default settings for bandwidth selection. For every method we have computed the average *ANLL* and *MAE* over the 100 runs.

As is shown in Table 1, our adaptive AHTE method outperforms the other two state-of-the-art algorithms NHTE and KDE in terms of *ANLL* and *MAE* measurements, only except for dataset I which was reduced to 2-dimension by PCA. The advantages brought by our AHTE model derives from the high efficiency of information utilization, making it possible for us to establish adaptive domains obtaining sample points with similarities.

Experimental results of synthetic data have so far shown part of its strength of our AHTE model. With data on high dimension space, our model can bring more accuracy to density estimation, proved by *ANLL* and *MAE* loss measurement respectively. Further more, as the synthetic data sets are more *regularized* data, the next step we take is to verify our model in complex real data situation.

5.5 Real Data Analysis

5.5.1 REAL DATA SETTINGS

We conduct the real data comparisons based on the following UCI datasets (Bache and Lichman, 2013), previously used to study the performance of other density estimators (Silva et al., 2011; Tang et al., 2012; Uria et al., 2013). Following Tang et al. (2012), we eliminated discrete-valued attributes and an attribute from every pair with a Pearson correlation coefficient greater than 0.98. Each dimension of the data was normalized to $[0, 1]$, and all results are reported on the normalized data.

- **WineQuality:** The *Wine Quality Data Set* is available on UCI. Two sub-datasets are included, related to red and white vinho verde wine samples, with continuous attributes representing acidity, pH, alcohol, etc. The **Redwine** data set consist of 1,599 observations of dimension 11, and the **Whitewine** data set consist of 4,898 of dimension 11. In experiment, each of the two data sets are reduced to 1, 3, 6 and 8 dimensions respectively through PCA.
- **Parkinsons:** The *Parkinsons Telemonitoring Data Set* available on UCI is composed of a range of biomedical voice measurements from 42 people with early-stage Parkinson’s disease. This data set contains 5,875 observations with 26 attributes concerning basic information of patients, vocal frequencies and vocal amplitudes. In experiment, instances in this data set are respectively reduced to 2, 4, 8 and 10 dimensions through PCA.
- **Ionosphere:** This data set is available on the UCI Repository with 351 observations and 34 continuous attributes. The radar data was collected by a system in Goose Bay, Labrador, which consists of a phased array of 16 high-frequency antennas. In experiment, instances in this data set are respectively reduced to 3, 10, 16 and 22 dimensions through PCA.

Note that in the data pre-processing, all data sets are reduced to various lower dimensions through PCA. The reasons are intuitive. Since real density often resides in a low-dimension manifold instead of filling the whole high-dimensional space, it becomes more reasonable to solve the density estimation problems after dimensionality reduction. However, the dimension of the specific manifold remains unknown, so we take it as a hyper-parameter and try several possible options.

In the following experiments, we adopt the same parameter settings as in Section 5.4.3. For our AHTE, we set $T = 100$. Besides, the hyper-parameter *min_samples_split*, the minimal number of samples required to split, is chosen by the grid search method, where the validation set consists of 30% samples randomly selected from the training data, and the optimal

parameters are with the minimal validated *ANLL*. The grid is selected as $\{1, 3, 10, 20, 40\}$. For NHTE, the selection of the parameters s_{\min} and s_{\max} , is referred to the Nelder-Mead method (Nelder and Mead, 1965). And for KDE, we use the function *gaussian_kde* in the package *scipy* of python and adopt the default settings for bandwidth selection.

5.5.2 REAL DATA COMPARISONS

Table 2: Average *ANLL* over real data sets

Datasets	d	NHTE	KDE	Our AHTE
Redwine	1	-0.9168 (0.1090)	-0.8933 (0.1016)	-0.9029 (0.1132)
	3	-2.3152 (0.3605)	-2.5608 (0.1517)	-2.7211 (0.1964)
	6	-3.0261 (1.3117)	-5.6829 (0.2179)	-6.1486 (0.3027)
	8	-2.6352 (1.2961)	-7.5382 (0.2517)	-7.9488 (0.3488)
Whitewine	1	-0.9561 (0.1151)	-0.9661 (0.1136)	-0.9402 (0.1161)
	3	-4.0290 (0.3888)	-4.1101 (0.3724)	-4.3077 (0.3847)
	6	-4.5044 (0.9711)	-6.5178 (0.4369)	-6.6920 (0.4314)
	8	-4.8352 (1.0595)	-8.7202 (0.4346)	-8.9497 (0.4217)
Parkinsons	2	-0.7765 (0.5245)	-0.2940 (0.0200)	-3.5291 (0.1230)
	4	-4.8725 (1.3322)	-1.9956 (0.0355)	-4.9030 (0.1285)
	8	-4.8511 (0.9005)	-6.0971 (0.1133)	-7.1145 (0.1580)
	10	-5.9335 (1.4770)	-10.2285 (0.1634)	-11.0099 (0.2096)
Ionosphere	3	-1.1516 (0.7316)	-1.5021 (0.2243)	-1.7826 (0.5222)
	10	-6.3828 (1.0471)	-7.8793 (1.1025)	-11.2895 (1.7528)
	16	-10.2635 (1.9343)	-13.2235 (1.8512)	-18.9552 (2.8121)
	22	-14.7161 (2.3818)	-18.7878 (2.3641)	-25.3548 (3.6542)

* The best results are marked in **bold**, and the standard deviation is reported in the parenthesis.

In Table 2, we summarize the comparisons with other two top-notch density estimators that demonstrates the accuracy of our histogram transform algorithm on four real datasets. For almost all of the redacted datasets, our AHTE model shows its superiority on accuracy. Meanwhile, with the incrementation of data dimension, our AHTE algorithm reveals itself with better performance on accuracy, obtaining a non-negligible edge over the popular KDE and NHTE algorithms.

6. Proofs

6.1 Proofs of Results in the Space $C^{0,\alpha}$

6.1.1 PROOFS RELATED TO SECTION 4.1.1

Proof [of Proposition 12] (i) Since the space of continuous and compactly supported functions $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we can find $\tilde{f} \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there holds

$$\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon/3, \quad (33)$$

and $B := \text{supp}(\tilde{f}) \subset B_r$ is a d -dimensional rectangle. Moreover, \tilde{f} is uniformly continuous, since it is continuous and $\text{supp}(\tilde{f})$ is compact. This implies that there exists a $\delta \in (0, 1]$

such that if $\|x - x'\|_1 \leq \delta$, then we have

$$|\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(x')| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3\mu(B_r)}. \quad (34)$$

Now we let $h_\varepsilon := \delta/d$ and define $\bar{f} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\bar{f}(x) := \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} \tilde{f}(x') d\mu(x'), \quad (35)$$

where $A_H(x)$ is as in (9). Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, (33) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} &\leq \|f - \tilde{f}\|_{L_1(\mu)} + \|\tilde{f} - \bar{f}\|_{L_1(\mu)} + \|\bar{f} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon/3 + \|\tilde{f} - \bar{f}\|_{L_1(\mu)} + \|\bar{f} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

If $x \in B_r^c$, then we have $x \in B^c$ and thus $\tilde{f}(x) = 0$. Moreover, there holds

$$\bar{f}(x) := \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} \tilde{f}(x') d\mu(x') = 0.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\|\tilde{f} - \bar{f}\|_{L_1(\mu)} = \int_{B_r} |\tilde{f}(x) - \bar{f}(x)| d\mu(x).$$

For $x \in B_r$ with $\mu(A_H(x)) > 0$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{f}(x) - \bar{f}(x)| &= \left| \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} \tilde{f}(x) d\mu(x') - \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} \tilde{f}(x') d\mu(x') \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(x')| d\mu(x'). \end{aligned}$$

For all $x' \in A_H(x)$, we have

$$\|x - x'\|_1 \leq d \cdot \bar{h}_0 \leq \delta,$$

Consequently,

$$|\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(x')| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3\mu(B_r)}.$$

As a result, we have

$$\|\tilde{f} - \bar{f}\|_{L_1(\mu)} = \int_{B_r} |\tilde{f}(x) - \bar{f}(x)| d\mu(x) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (37)$$

Finally, (35) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{f} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\bar{f}(x) - f_{P,H}(x)| \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x) d\mu(x) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \int_{A_j} |(\bar{f}(x) - f_{P,H}(x)) \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x)| d\mu(x) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \int_{A_j} \left| \frac{1}{\mu(A_j)} \int_{A_j} \tilde{f}(x') d\mu(x') - \frac{1}{\mu(A_j)} \int_{A_j} f(x') d\mu(x') \right| d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \int_{A_j} |\tilde{f}(x') - f(x')| d\mu(x') \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\tilde{f}(x') - f(x')| d\mu(x') \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the assertion by combining the estimates (36) and (37).

(ii) The assumption $f \in C^{0,\alpha}$ tells us that there exists a constant c_L as in Definition 2 such that for all $x', x'' \in A_H(x)$, we have

$$|f(x') - f(x'')| \leq c_L \|x' - x''\|_1^\alpha \leq c_L (\text{diam}(A_H(x)))^\alpha \leq c_L (d\bar{h}_0)^\alpha.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|f_{P,H}(x) - f(x)| &= \left| \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} f(x') d\mu(x') - f(x) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} f(x') - f(x) d\mu(x') \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} |f(x') - f(x)| d\mu(x') \\
&\leq c_L (d \cdot \bar{h}_0)^\alpha \\
&\leq \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently we obtain $\|f_{P,H}(x) - f(x)\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon$. ■

Proof [of Proposition 13] We decompose $\|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} &= \int_{B_r} |f_{P,H} - f| d\mu + \int_{B_r^c} |f_{P,H} - f| d\mu \\
&\leq \mu(B_r) \|(f_{P,H} - f) \mathbf{1}_{B_r}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} + \int_{B_r^c} f_{P,H} d\mu + \int_{B_r^c} f d\mu \\
&= 2^d r^d \|(f_{P,H} - f) \mathbf{1}_{B_r}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} + \int_{B_r^c} f_{P,H} d\mu + P(B_r^c).
\end{aligned}$$

Then (10) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_r^c} f_{P,H}(x) dx &= \int_{B_r^c} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \frac{P(A_j) \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x)}{\mu(A_j)} + \frac{P(B_r^c) \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}}{\mu(B_r^c)} d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{P(B_r^c)}{\mu(B_r^c)} \int_{B_r^c} \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}(x) d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{P(B_r^c)}{\mu(B_r^c)} \cdot \mu(B_r^c) \\
&= P(B_r^c).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two estimates, we obtain the desired conclusion. ■

6.1.2 PROOFS RELATED TO SECTION 4.1.2

Proof [of Lemma 14] (i) Since $B_r = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} A_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}| d\mu \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \frac{1}{\mu(A_j)} (D(A_j) - P(A_j)) \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(x) + \frac{1}{B_r^c} (D(B_r^c) - P(B_r^c)) \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} \right| d\mu \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \int_{A_j} \frac{1}{\mu(A_j)} |D(A_j) - P(A_j)| d\mu + \frac{1}{\mu(B_r^c)} \int_{B_r^c} |D(B_r^c) - P(B_r^c)| d\mu \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} |D(A_j) - P(A_j)| + |D(B_r^c) - P(B_r^c)| \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}| + |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}| \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|.
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) Using (11) and (12), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} &= \sup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \sup_{x \in A_j} |f_{D,H}(x) - f_{P,H}(x)| \\
&= \sup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \sup_{x \in A_j} \left| \frac{D(A_j)}{\mu(A_j)} - \frac{P(A_j)}{\mu(A_j)} \right| \\
&= \sup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H \cup \{0\}} \frac{|D(A_j) - P(A_j)|}{\mu(A_j)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the assertion. ■

To prove Lemma 16, we need the following fundamental lemma concerning with the VC dimension of purely random partitions which follows the idea put forward by [Bremain \(2000\)](#)

are two points denoted by p_1^B, p_2^B from class B separated by $2k + 1$ alternately appearing hyper-planes. Their locations can be represented by $p_1^B, H_1^A, H_2^B, H_3^A, H_4^B, \dots, H_{(2k+1)}^A, p_2^B$. According to this construction, we demonstrate that the smallest number of points that cannot be divided by p splits is $dp + 2$, which leads to $\text{VC}(\mathcal{B}(\pi_p)) \leq dp + 2$.

It should be noted that our hyper-planes can be generated both vertically and obliquely, which is in line with our splitting criteria for the random partitions. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Proof [of Lemma 16] The proof will be conducted by dint of geometric constructions.

For the first assertion, we choose a data set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\#(A) = 2^d + 2$ and consider firstly the general case that there exists $x \in A$ such that $x \in \text{Co}(A \setminus \{x\})$, that is, x lies in the convex hull of the set $A \setminus \{x\}$. Then there exists a set $A_1 \subset (A \setminus \{x\})$ such that

$$\#(A_1) = \#(A) - 2 \quad \text{and} \quad x \in \text{Co}(A_1).$$

Then for a fixed $B \in \pi_h$ with $A_1 \subset A \cap B$, there always holds

$$A_1 \cup \{x\} \subset A \cap B.$$

Clearly, there exists no $B \in \pi_h$ such that $A \cap B = A_1$ and therefore π_h cannot shatter A .

It remains to consider the case when $x \notin \text{Co}(A \setminus \{x\})$ holds for all $x \in A$. Obviously, the convex hull of A forms a hyper-polyhedron whose vertices are the points of A . Note that the hyper-polyhedron can be regarded as an undirected graph, therefore as usual, we define the distance $d(x_1, x_2)$ between a pair of samples x_1 and x_2 on the graph by the shortest path between them. Clearly, there exists a starting point $x_0 \in A$ such that $\deg(x) = 2^{d-1}$. Then we construct another data set $A_2 \neq A_1$ by

$$A_2 = \{y : d(x_0, y) \bmod 2 = 1, y \in A\}.$$

Again, for a fixed $B \in \pi_h$ such that $A_2 \subset A \cap B$, we deduce that there exists no $B \in \pi_h$ such that $A \cap B = A_2$ and therefore π_h cannot shatter A as well. By Definition 15, we immediately obtain

$$\text{VC}(\pi_h) \leq 2^d + 2.$$

Next, we turn to prove the second assertion. The choice $k := \lfloor \frac{2r\sqrt{d}}{\underline{h}_0} \rfloor + 1$ leads to the partition of B_r of the form $\pi_k := \{A_{i_1, \dots, i_d}\}_{i_j=1, \dots, k}$ with

$$A_{i_1, \dots, i_d} := \prod_{j=1}^d A_{i_j} := \prod_{j=1}^d \left[-r + \frac{2r(i_j - 1)}{k}, -r + \frac{2ri_j}{k} \right). \quad (39)$$

Obviously, we have $|A_{i_j}| \leq \frac{\underline{h}_0}{\sqrt{d}}$. Let D be a data set with

$$\#(D) = (d(2^d - 1) + 2) \left(\left\lfloor \frac{2r\sqrt{d}}{\underline{h}_0} \right\rfloor + 1 \right)^d.$$

Then there exists at least one cell A with

$$\#(D \cap A) \geq d(2^d - 1) + 2. \quad (40)$$

Moreover, for all $x, x' \in A$, the construction of the partition (39) implies $\|x - x'\| \leq \underline{h}_0$. Consequently, at most one vertex of A_j induced by histogram transform H lies in A , since the bandwidth of A_j is larger than \underline{h}_0 . Therefore,

$$\Pi_{h|A} := \{B \cap A : B \in \Pi_h\}$$

forms a partition of A with $\#(\Pi_{h|A}) \leq 2^d$. It is easily seen that this partition can be generated by $2^d - 1$ splitting hyper-planes. In this way, Lemma 25 implies that $\Pi_{h|A}$ can only shatter a dataset with at most $d(2^d - 1) + 1$ elements. Thus (40) indicates that $\Pi_{h|A}$ fails to shatter $D \cap A$ and therefore Π_h can not shatter the data set D as well. By Definition 15, we immediately get

$$\text{VC}(\Pi_h) \leq (d(2^d - 1) + 2) \left(\left\lfloor \frac{2r\sqrt{d}}{\underline{h}_0} \right\rfloor + 1 \right)^d$$

and the assertion is thus proved. \blacksquare

Proof [of Lemma 18] The first assertion concerning covering numbers of π_h follows directly from Theorem 9.2 in Kosorok (2008). For the second estimate, we find the upper bound (24) of $\text{VC}(\Pi_h)$ satisfies

$$(d(2^d - 1) + 2) \left(\frac{2r\sqrt{d}}{\underline{h}_0} + 1 \right)^d \leq ((d + 1)2^d) \left(\frac{3r\sqrt{d}}{\underline{h}_0} \right)^d \leq 2d \cdot 2^d \left(\frac{3r\sqrt{d}}{\underline{h}_0} \right)^d := \left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_0} \right)^d,$$

where the constant $c_d := 2^{1+\frac{1}{d}} \cdot 3 \cdot d^{\frac{1}{d}+\frac{1}{2}}$. Again, Theorem 9.2 in Kosorok (2008) yields the second assertion and thus completes the proof. \blacksquare

Proof [of Proposition 19] By Lemma 14, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}| + |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}| \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi_H \in \Pi_H} \sum_{A \in \pi_H} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A| + |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}|, \end{aligned}$$

where π_H is a partition of B_r and Π_H denotes the collection of all partitions π_H . We define

$$\mathcal{B}(\pi_H) := \left\{ B : B = \bigcup_{j \in I} A_j, I \subset \mathcal{I}_H, A_j \in \pi_H \right\}$$

as the collection of all $2^{|\mathcal{I}_H|}$ sets that can be expressed as the union of cells of π_H . Moreover, Π_h defined as in (23) also can be used to denote the collection of all such unions, as π_H ranges through Π_H , that is,

$$\Pi_h = \{ \mathcal{B}(\pi_H) : \pi_H \in \Pi_H \}$$

For a fixed π_H , we define

$$\tilde{A} = \bigcup_{A \in \pi_H: \mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A \geq \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A} A.$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{A \in \pi_H} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A| = 2(\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{A}} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{A}}) \leq 2 \sup_{B \in \Pi_h} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} &\leq \sup_{\pi_H \in \Pi_H} \sum_{A \in \pi_H} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A| + |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\pi_H \in \Pi_H} \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\pi_H)} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B| + |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}| \\ &= 2 \sup_{B \in \Pi_h} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B| + |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}|. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Let us first estimate

$$|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B|$$

by using Bernstein's inequality. For this purpose, we consider the map

$$\xi_i := \mathbf{1}_B(x_i) - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B,$$

where x_i is the i -th sample. Then, we verify the following conditions: Obviously, we have $\mathbb{E}_{P^n} \xi_i = 0$ and $\|\xi_i\|_\infty \leq 1$. Moreover, simple estimates imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{P^n} \xi_i^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B^2 - (\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B)^2 = \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B - (\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B)^2 \\ &= P(B) - P(B)^2 = P(B)(1 - P(B)) \leq \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Finally, it is easy to see that (ξ_i) are independent with respect to P^n . Therefore, we can apply Bernstein's inequality and obtain that for all $n \geq 1$, with probability at most $2e^{-\tau}$, there holds

$$|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B| = \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2n}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n}. \quad (43)$$

We choose $B_1, \dots, B_{m_1} \in \Pi_h$ such that $\{B_1, \dots, B_{m_1}\}$ is an ε -net of Π_h with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{L_1(D)}$. Note that here we have $m_1 = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}_{\Pi_h}, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(D)}, \varepsilon)$ as in Lemma 18. Using (43) and a union bound argument, we obtain

$$\sup_{j=1, \dots, m_1} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_j}| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2n}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n} \quad (44)$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - 2m_1 e^{-\tau}$.

Now, for any $B \in \Pi_h$, since $\{B_1, \dots, B_{m_1}\}$ is an ε -net of Π_h , there exists a B_j such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B| - |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_j}| \right| &\leq |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B - (\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_j})| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_j}| + |\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_j}|. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we estimate the terms on the right hand of the above inequality separately. For the first term, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_j}| &= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{1}_B(x_i) - \mathbf{1}_{B_j}(x_i)) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{1}_B(x_i) - \mathbf{1}_{B_j}(x_i)| = \|\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{B_j}\|_{L_1(D)} \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As for the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_j}| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \cdot (\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{B_j}) d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \cdot |\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{B_j}| d\mu \\ &= \|\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{B_j}\|_{L_1(\mu)} = \mathbb{E}_P(\|\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{B_j}\|_{L_1(D)}) \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B| \leq |\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_j}| + 2\varepsilon.$$

This together with (44) implies that for any $B \in \Pi_h$, there holds

$$|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_B - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_B| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2n}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n} + 2\varepsilon \quad (45)$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - 2m_1 e^{-\tau}$. Next, we focus on bounding the second term on the right side of (41). For a fixed $r > 0$, we consider the map

$$\tilde{\xi}_i := \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}(x_i) - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c},$$

where x_i is the i -th sample. Then, we verify the following conditions: Obviously, we have $\mathbb{E}_{P^n} \tilde{\xi}_i = 0$ and $\|\tilde{\xi}_i\|_\infty \leq 1$. Moreover, similar estimates as (42) imply

$$\mathbb{E}_{P^n} \tilde{\xi}_i^2 \leq P(B_r^c)(1 - P(B_r^c)) \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Also, we can see that $(\tilde{\xi}_i)$ are independent with respect to P^n . Therefore, we can apply Bernstein's inequality once again and obtain that for all $n \geq 1$, with probability P^n at most $2e^{-\tau}$, there holds

$$|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{B_r^c}| \geq \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2n}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n}. \quad (46)$$

Combining (45) and (46) yields

$$\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{9\tau}{2n}} + \frac{2\tau}{n} + 4\varepsilon$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - 2(m_1 + 1)e^{-\tau}$. By a simple variable transformation, we see that with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$, there holds

$$\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{9(\tau + \log(2m_1 + 2))}{2n}} + \frac{2(\tau + \log(2m_1 + 2))}{n} + 4\varepsilon. \quad (47)$$

Next, we estimate the term $\log(2m_1 + 2)$ with $m_1 = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}_{\Pi_h}, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(D)}, \varepsilon)$. Lemma 18 implies that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/\max\{e, 2K + 2\})$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \log(2m_1 + 2) &\leq \log\left(2K\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d (4e)^{\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d} + 2\right) \\ &\leq \log\left((2K + 2)\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d (4e)^{\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d}\right) \\ &= \log(2K + 2) + d \log\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right) + \left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d \log(4e) + \left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\leq 12\left(\frac{c_d r}{\underline{h}_{0,n}}\right)^d \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the last inequality is based on the following basic inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \log(2K + 2) &\leq \log(1/\varepsilon) \leq (c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \log(1/\varepsilon), \\ d \log(c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n}) &\leq (c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \leq (c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \log(1/\varepsilon), \\ (c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \log(4e) &\leq (c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \log(e^3) \leq 9(c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \log(1/\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Now, when choosing $\varepsilon = 1/n$ and plugging (48) into (47), we obtain

$$\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{9(\tau + 12(c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \log n)}{2n}} + \frac{2(\tau + (c_d r / \underline{h}_{0,n})^d \log n)}{n} + \frac{4}{n}$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. With the transformation $\tau := \log n$ we get the conclusion. \blacksquare

Proof [of Proposition 20] Since the density function f considered has a bounded support, we choose r large enough so that the entire support can be contained in B_r . According to Lemma 14, we have

$$\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} = \sup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)}. \quad (49)$$

Let π_h be as in (22). Then we have

$$\sup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} \leq \sup_{A \in \pi_h} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)}. \quad (50)$$

For a fixed $A \in \pi_h$, we estimate

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)}$$

by using Bernstein's inequality. For this purpose, we consider the map

$$\zeta_i := \frac{\mathbf{1}_A(x_i) - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)},$$

where x_i is the i -th sample. It is easy to see that (ζ_i) are independent with respect to P^n . Then, for all cell $A \in \pi_h$ with $\mu(A) \geq \underline{h}_{0,n}^d$, we verify the following conditions: Obviously, we have $\mathbb{E}_{P^n} \zeta_i = 0$ and

$$\|\zeta_i\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \leq \frac{1}{\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}.$$

Moreover, elementary considerations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{P^n} \zeta_i^2 &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A^2}{\mu^2(A)} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A}{\mu^2(A)} = \frac{P(A)}{\mu^2(A)} = \frac{1}{\mu^2(A)} \int_A f(x) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \frac{\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}}{\mu^2(A)} \int_A 1 d\mu(x) = \frac{\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}}{\mu(A)} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}}{\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can apply Bernstein's inequality and obtain that for all $n \geq 1$, with probability at most $2e^{-\tau}$, there holds

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}^\tau}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}. \quad (51)$$

For any probability measure Q , with

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} := \frac{\underline{h}_{0,n}^{2d} \varepsilon}{\underline{h}_{0,n}^d + \mu(B_r)}$$

we choose $A_1, \dots, A_{m_2} \in \pi_h$ such that $\{A_1, \dots, A_{m_2}\}$ is an $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ -net of π_h with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{L_1(Q)}$, where $m_2 = \mathcal{N}(\pi_h, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(Q)}, \tilde{\varepsilon})$. Then the estimate (51) together with a union bound argument yields that

$$\sup_{j \in \{1, \dots, m_2\}} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}^\tau}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} \quad (52)$$

holds with probability P^n at least $1 - 2m_2e^{-\tau}$. Moreover, the definition of an $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ -net implies that for any $A \in \pi_h$, there exists an A_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, m_2\}$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_A - \mathbf{1}_{A_j}\|_{L_1(Q)} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right\|_{L_1(Q)} &= \left\| \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A_j)} + \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A_j)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right\|_{L_1(Q)} \\ &\leq \frac{|\mu(A_j) - \mu(A)|}{\mu(A)\mu(A_j)} \cdot \|\mathbf{1}_A\|_{L_1(Q)} + \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_A - \mathbf{1}_{A_j}\|_{L_1(Q)}}{\mu(A_j)}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where $\mu(A) \geq \underline{h}_{0,n}^d$ and $\mu(A_j) \geq \underline{h}_{0,n}^d$. Now, we bound two terms on the right hand of the above inequality separately. For the second term, it can be apparently seen that

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{1}_A - \mathbf{1}_{A_j}\|_{L_1(Q)}}{\mu(A_j)} \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\mu(A_j)} \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}. \quad (54)$$

On the other hand, if Q is the uniform distribution on B_r , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mu(A) - \mu(A_j)|}{\mu(B_r)} &= \left| \int \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbf{1}_{A_j} d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu(B_r)} \int |\mathbf{1}_A - \mathbf{1}_{A_j}| d\mu = \|\mathbf{1}_A - \mathbf{1}_{A_j}\|_{L_1(Q)} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently we obtain

$$|\mu(A) - \mu(A_j)| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\mu(B_r). \quad (55)$$

If $Q = D$, combining (55) with (54), we can bound (53) by

$$\left\| \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right\|_{L_1(D)} \leq \frac{\underline{h}_{0,n}^d + \mu(B_r)}{\underline{h}_{0,n}^{2d}} \tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon. \quad (56)$$

Similarly, if $Q = P$, it can be deduced that

$$\left\| \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (57)$$

Then, (56) and (57) imply that for any $A \in \pi_h$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)} - \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} \right| &\leq \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right| + \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right\|_{L_1(D)} + \left\| \frac{\mathbf{1}_A}{\mu(A)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_j}}{\mu(A_j)} \right\|_{L_1(\mu)} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

and consequently we have

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)} \leq \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} + 2\varepsilon. \quad (58)$$

This together with (52) implies that for any $A \in \pi_h$, there holds

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}^\tau}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + 2\varepsilon \quad (59)$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - 2m_2 e^{-\tau}$. By a simple variable transformation, we see that for any $\mu(A_j) \geq \underline{h}_{0,n}^d$, there holds

$$\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + \log(2m_2))}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + \frac{2(\tau + \log(2m_2))}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + 2\varepsilon \quad (60)$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. Next, we estimate the term $\log(2m_2)$ with $m_2 := \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}_{\pi_h}, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(Q)}, \tilde{\varepsilon})$. The estimate (25) implies that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/\max\{e, 2K, \mu(B_r)\})$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \log(2m_2) &\leq \log(2K(2^d + 2)(4e)^{2^{d+2}}(1/\tilde{\varepsilon})^{2^{d+1}}) \\ &\leq \log(2K(2^d + 2)(4e)^{2^{d+2}}(\mu(B_r) + \underline{h}_{0,n}^d)^{2^{d+1}}(1/\varepsilon \underline{h}_{0,n}^{2d})^{2^{d+1}}) \\ &= \log(2K) + \log(2^d + 2) + (2^d + 2)\log(4e) + (2^d + 1)\log(\mu(B_r) + \underline{h}_{0,n}^d) \\ &\quad + (2^d + 1)\log(1/\varepsilon) + 2(2^d + 1)\log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d) \\ &\leq 8 \cdot 2^{d+1}\log(1/\varepsilon) + 2 \cdot 2^{d+1}\log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d) \\ &\leq 2^{d+4}\log(1/\varepsilon) + 2^{d+2}\log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where the last inequality is based on the following basic inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \log(2K) &\leq \log(1/\varepsilon) \leq 2^{d+1}\log(1/\varepsilon), \\ \log(2^d + 2) &\leq 2^d + 2 \leq 2^{d+1} \leq 2^{d+1}\log(1/\varepsilon), \\ (2^d + 2)\log(4e) &\leq 2^{d+1}\log(e^3) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{d+1}\log(1/\varepsilon), \\ (2^d + 1)\log(\mu(B_r) + \underline{h}_{0,n}^d) &\leq 2^{d+1}\log(2\mu(B_r)) \leq 2 \cdot 2^{d+1}\log(1/\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

If $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, then $\mu(A(x)) \geq \bar{h}_{0,n}^d$. Now, when choosing $\varepsilon = 1/n$ and plugging (61) into (60), there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + 2^{d+4}\log n + 2^{d+2}\log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\tau + 2^{d+4}\log n + 2^{d+2}\log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + \frac{2}{n} \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$ with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. ■

6.1.3 PROOFS RELATED TO SECTION 3.3

Proof [of Theorem 5] Since $\bar{h}_{0,n} \rightarrow 0$, there exists $n_1(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n > n_1$, Proposition 12 implies that

$$\|f_{P,H} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, Proposition 19 tells us that if $\log n / (n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d) \rightarrow 0$, there exists $n_2 > 0$ such that for all $n > n_2$, there holds

$$\|f_{D,H} - f_{P,H}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Combining the above two inequalities, we obtain the assertion. ■

Proof [of Theorem 6] (i) Combining the estimates in Proposition 19, Proposition 12 and Proposition 13, we know that with probability ν_n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{9(\tau + 12(c_d r / \underline{h}_0)^d \log n)}{2n}} + \frac{2(\tau + (c_d r / \underline{h}_0)^d \log n)}{n} + \frac{4}{n} \\ &\quad + c_L r^d \bar{h}_0^\alpha + 2P(B_r^c). \end{aligned}$$

When taking $\tau := \log n$, we have

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{r^d \log n}{n \underline{h}_0^d}} + r^d \bar{h}_0^\alpha + P(B_r^c).$$

Therefore, with probability $P^n \otimes P_H$ at least $1 - 1/n$ there holds

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{r^d \log n}{n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + r^{-\eta d} + r^d \bar{h}_{0,n}^\alpha.$$

By choosing

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{h}_{0,n} &:= (\log n / n)^{\frac{d+\eta}{\eta(2\alpha+d)+d(\alpha+d)}}, \\ r_n &:= (n / \log n)^{\frac{\alpha}{d\eta(2\alpha+d)+d(\alpha+d)}}, \end{aligned}$$

there holds

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim (\log n / n)^{\frac{\alpha\eta}{\eta(2\alpha+d)+d(\alpha+d)}}.$$

(ii) Similar to case (i), one can show that with probability $P^n \otimes P_H$ at least $1 - 1/n$ there holds

$$\|f_{D,H_n} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{r^d \log n}{n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + e^{-ar^n} + r^d \bar{h}_{0,n}^\alpha.$$

By choosing

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{h}_{0,n} &:= (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}} (\log n)^{-\frac{d}{\eta} \cdot \frac{1}{2\alpha+d}}, \\ r_n &:= (\alpha \log n / (a(2\alpha + d)))^{\frac{1}{\eta}},\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\|f_{\mathcal{D},H_n} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}} (\log n)^{\frac{d}{\eta} \cdot \frac{\alpha+d}{2\alpha+d}}.$$

(iii) Once again, similar to case (i), it can be showed that with probability $\mathbb{P}^n \otimes \mathbb{P}_H$ at least $1 - \frac{1}{n}$, there holds

$$\|f_{\mathcal{D},H_n} - f_{\mathcal{P},H_n}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + \bar{h}_{0,n}^\alpha.$$

With $\underline{h}_{0,n}$ chosen as

$$\underline{h}_{0,n} := (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}},$$

we obtain

$$\|f_{\mathcal{D},H_n} - f_{\mathcal{P},H_n}\|_{L_1(\mu)} \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+d}}.$$

The proof of Theorem 6 is thus completed. ■

Proof [of Theorem 7] Similar as the proof of Theorem 6 (iii), we conclude that the desired estimate is an easy consequence if we combine the estimates in Proposition 20 and Proposition 12 (ii) and choose

$$\underline{h}_{0,n} := (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}}.$$

We omit the details of the proof here. ■

Proof [of Theorem 8] Considering the relationship between the $L_1(\mu)$ -error of the histogram transform ensemble and the $L_1(\mu)$ -errors of single histogram transforms, there holds

$$\|f_{\mathcal{D},E} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} = \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (f_{\mathcal{D},H_t} - f) \right\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|f_{\mathcal{D},H_t} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)}.$$

In the following, we only present the analysis of the case (i) in the three tail probability distributions, since the proof of (ii) and (iii) are quite similar.

According to Theorem 6, for any $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, with

$$r_n := (n / \log n)^{\frac{\alpha}{d\eta(2\alpha+d) + d(\alpha+d)}},$$

then there exists a constant c such that

$$\|f_{D,H_t} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} > c(\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha\eta}{(2\alpha+d)\eta+(\alpha+d)}} =: \mathcal{E}$$

holds with probability ν_n at least $1 - 1/n$. Then the union bound yields that, for all $\tau > 0$, there holds

$$\nu_n(\|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} > \mathcal{E}) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \nu_n(\|f_{D,H_t} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} > \mathcal{E}) \leq T/n$$

and consequently

$$\|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_1(\mu)} \leq c(\log n/n)^{\frac{\alpha\eta}{(2\alpha+d)\eta+(\alpha+d)}}$$

holds with probability ν_n at least $1 - T/n$. ■

Proof [of Theorem 9] Let us first consider the relationship between the $L_\infty(\mu)$ -error of the histogram transform ensemble density estimator and the $L_\infty(\mu)$ -errors of single histogram transform estimators contained in the ensemble. For all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, there holds

$$\|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} = \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (f_{D,H_t} - f) \right\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|f_{D,H_t} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}.$$

The desired estimate can be obtained by choosing the same bandwidth for each partition in $\{\pi_{H_t}\}_{t=1}^T$, which is

$$\bar{h}_{0,n} = (\log n/n)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+d}}.$$

We omit the details of the proof here for it is similar to that of Theorem 8. ■

6.2 Proofs of Results in the Space $C^{1,\alpha}$

The following Lemma presents the explicit representation of $A_H(x)$ which will play a key role later in the proofs of subsequent sections.

Lemma 26 *Let the histogram transform H be defined as in (6) and A'_H , A_H be as in (8) and (9) respectively. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the set $A_H(x)$ can be represented as*

$$A_H(x) = \{x + (R \cdot S)^{-1}z : z \in [-b', 1 - b']\},$$

where $b' := H(x) - \lfloor H(x) \rfloor \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)^d$.

Proof [of lemma 26] For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $b' \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)^d$ according to the definition of H . Moreover, for all $x' \in A'_H(x)$, we define

$$z := H(x') - H(x) = (R \cdot S)(x' - x).$$

Then we have

$$x' = x + (R \cdot S)^{-1}z.$$

Moreover, since $\lfloor H(x') \rfloor = \lfloor H(x) \rfloor$, we have $z \in [-b', 1 - b']$. ■

6.2.1 PROOFS RELATED TO SECTION 4.2.1

Proof [of Proposition 21] For any $x \in B_r$, the independence of $\{f_{P,H_t}(x)\}_{t=1}^T$ implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H}(f_{P,E}(x) - f(x))^2 = (\mathbb{E}_{P_H}(f_{P,H}(x)) - f(x))^2 + \frac{1}{T} \cdot \text{Var}_{P_H}(f_{P,H}(x)). \quad (63)$$

Let us consider the first term in the RHS of (63). Lemma 26 implies that for any $x' \in A_H(x)$, there exist a random vector $u \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]^d$ and a vector $v \in [0, 1]^d$ such that

$$x' = x + S^{-1}R^\top(-u + v). \quad (64)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} dx' &= \det\left(\frac{dx'}{dv}\right)dv = \det\left(\frac{d(x + S^{-1}R^\top(-u + v))}{dv}\right)dv \\ &= \det(RS^{-1})dv = \left(\prod_{i=1}^d h_i\right)dv. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Taking the first-order Taylor expansion of $f(x')$ at x , we get

$$f(x') - f(x) = \int_0^1 (\nabla f(x + t(x' - x)))^\top (x' - x) dt. \quad (66)$$

Moreover, we obviously have

$$\nabla f(x)^\top (x' - x) = \int_0^1 \nabla f(x)^\top (x' - x) dt. \quad (67)$$

Thus, (66) and (67) imply that for any $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x') - f(x) - \nabla f(x)^\top (x' - x)| &= \left| \int_0^1 (\nabla f(x + t(x' - x)) - \nabla f(x))^\top (x' - x) dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 c_L(t\|x' - x\|_2)^\alpha \|x' - x\|_2 dt \\ &\leq c_L \|x' - x\|^{1+\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (64) yields

$$|f(x') - f(x) - \nabla f(x)^\top S^{-1}R^\top(-u + v)| \leq c_L \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}$$

and consequently there exists a constant $c_\alpha \in [-c_L, c_L]$ such that

$$f(x') - f(x) = \nabla f(x)^\top S^{-1}R^\top(-u + v) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}. \quad (68)$$

For any $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_0}^+$, there holds

$$f_{P,H}(x) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(A_H(x))}{\mu(A_H(x))} = \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} f(x') dx'.$$

This together with (68) and (65) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{P,H}(x) - f(x) &= \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} f(x') dx' - f(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{A_H(x)} (f(x') - f(x)) dx' \\
&= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^d h_i}{\mu(A_H(x))} \int_{[0,1]^d} \left(\nabla f(x)^\top S^{-1} R^\top (-u + v) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha} \right) dv \\
&= \left(\int_{[0,1]^d} (-u + v)^\top dv \right) R S^{-1} \nabla f(x) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2} - u \right)^\top R S^{-1} \nabla f(x) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}.
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Since the random variables $(u_i)_{i=1}^d$ are independent and identically distributed as $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H} \left(\frac{1}{2} - u_i \right) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \tag{70}$$

Combining (69) with (70), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H}(f_{P,H}(x) - f(x)) = 0 + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha} = c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}. \tag{71}$$

and consequently

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_{P_H}(f_{P,H_1}(x)) - f(x) \right)^2 \leq c_L^2 \bar{h}_0^{2(1+\alpha)}. \tag{72}$$

For the second term in the RHS of (63), using the assumption $f \in C^{1,\alpha}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}_{P_H}(f_{P,H_1}(x)) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_H}(f_{P,H_1}(x) - f(x))^2 \\
&\leq c_L^2 \mathbb{E}_{P_H}(\text{diam}(A_{H_1}(x)))^2 \leq d c_L^2 \bar{h}_0^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Combining (63) with (72) and (73), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H}(f_{P,E}(x) - f(x))^2 \leq c_L^2 c_{0,n}^{-2d} \bar{h}_0^{2(1+\alpha)} + \frac{1}{T} \cdot d c_L^2 \bar{h}_0^2,$$

which proves the assertion. ■

Proof [of Proposition 22] Lemma 26 implies that for any $x' \in A_H(x)$, there exist a random vector $u \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]^d$ and a vector $v \in [0, 1]^d$ such that

$$x' = x + S^{-1} R^\top (-u + v).$$

Then (69) yields

$$(f_{P,H}(x) - f(x))^2 = \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - u \right)^\top R S^{-1} \nabla f(x) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha} \right)^2. \tag{74}$$

The orthogonality (2) of the rotation matrix R tells us that

$$\sum_{i=1}^d R_{ij}R_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = k, \\ 0, & \text{if } j \neq k \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

and consequently we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \neq k} R_{ij}R_{ik} h_j h_k \cdot \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} \cdot \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_k} = \sum_{j \neq k} h_j h_k \cdot \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} \cdot \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_k} \sum_{i=1}^d R_{ij}R_{ik} = 0. \quad (76)$$

Since the random variables $(u_i)_{i=1}^d$ are independent and identically distributed as $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H} \left(\frac{1}{2} - u_i \right) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (77)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H} \left(\frac{1}{2} - u_i \right)^2 = \frac{1}{12}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \quad (78)$$

Then, for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \bar{h}_0}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$, (75), (76), (77), and (78) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{P_H} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - u \right)^\top R S^{-1} \nabla f(x) \right)^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{P_H} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left(\frac{1}{2} - u_i \right) \sum_{j=1}^d R_{ij} h_j \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{P_H} \left(\frac{1}{2} - u_i \right)^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^d R_{ij} h_j \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \mathbb{E}_{P_H} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d R_{ij}^2 h_j^2 \left(\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} \right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{d}{12} c_f'^2 h_0^2 \geq \frac{d}{12} c_f'^2 c_0^2 \bar{h}_0^2. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Combining (69) with (79) and using (77), we see that for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \bar{h}_0}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$, if

$$h_0 \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{d} c_f' c_0}{4\sqrt{3} c_L} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}},$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H} (f_{P,H}(x) - f(x))^2 \geq \frac{d}{16} c_f'^2 c_0^2 \bar{h}_0^2, \quad (80)$$

where the constant c_0 is as in Assumption 4. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

6.2.2 PROOFS RELATED TO SECTION 4.2.2

Proof [of Proposition 23] By (49) and (50), we obtain that for $t = 1, \dots, T$,

$$\|f_{D,H_t} - f_{P,H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} = \sup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{H_t}} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} \leq \sup_{A \in \pi_h} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\sup_{t=1,\dots,T} \|f_{D,H_t} - f_{P,H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \sup_{A \in \pi_h} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)}. \quad (81)$$

Similar to the proof of Proposition 20, for any $A \in \pi_h$, we also need to bound the term

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)}.$$

Choose $A_1, \dots, A_{m_2} \in \pi_h$ such that $\{A_1, \dots, A_{m_2}\}$ is an $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ -net of π_h with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{L_1(Q)}$, where $m_2 = \mathcal{N}(\pi_h, L_1(Q), \tilde{\varepsilon})$. Similar to the proof of Proposition 20, we get the same result as (58): for any $A \in \pi_h$, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, m_2\}$ such that

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_A - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_A|}{\mu(A)} \leq \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} + 2\varepsilon. \quad (82)$$

where

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} := \frac{\underline{h}_{0,n}^{2d} \varepsilon}{\underline{h}_{0,n}^d + \mu(B_r)}$$

This together with (81) yields

$$\sup_{t=1,\dots,T} \|f_{D,H_t} - f_{P,H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \sup_{j=1,\dots,m_2} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} + 2\varepsilon.$$

By Bernstein's inequality and union bound argument, we obtain the same result as (52), that is, with probability P^n at least $1 - 2m_2 e^{-\tau}$, there holds

$$\sup_{j \in \{1,\dots,m_2\}} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_D \mathbf{1}_{A_j} - \mathbb{E}_P \mathbf{1}_{A_j}|}{\mu(A_j)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \tau}{n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + \frac{2\tau}{3n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}.$$

By a simple variable transformation, we see that for any $\mu(A_j) \geq \underline{h}_{0,n}^d$,

$$\sup_{t=1,\dots,T} \|f_{D,H_t} - f_{P,H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} (\tau + \log(2m_2))}{n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} + \frac{2(\tau + \log(2m_2))}{3n \underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + 2\varepsilon \quad (83)$$

holds with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. Next, we estimate the term $\log(2m_2)$ with $m_2 := \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}_{\pi_h}, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(Q)}, \tilde{\varepsilon})$. The upper bound (25) of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}_{\pi_h}, \|\cdot\|_{L_1(Q)}, \tilde{\varepsilon})$ implies that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/\max\{e, 2K, \mu(B_r)\})$, there holds

$$\log(2m_2) \leq 2^{d+4} \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d),$$

This together with (83) implies that for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t=1, \dots, T} \|f_{D, H_t} - f_{P, H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + 2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. Taking $\varepsilon = 1/n$, then for any $n > N_0 := \max\{e, 2K, \mu(B_r)\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t=1, \dots, T} \|f_{D, H_t} - f_{P, H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + \frac{2}{n} \end{aligned}$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. Finally, we need to estimate the term

$$\|f_{D,E} - f_{P,E}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}.$$

For all $\delta > 0$ and all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\left\|\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{D, H_t} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{P, H_t}\right\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \delta\right) &\geq P\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|f_{D, H_t} - f_{P, H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \delta\right) \\ &\geq P\left(\sup_{t=1, \dots, T} \|f_{D, H_t} - f_{P, H_t}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \leq \delta\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for any $n > N_0$ and for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{D,E} - f_{P,E}\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + \frac{2}{n} \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. ■

Proof [of Proposition 24] Recall that for a fixed histogram transform H , the set π_H is defined as the collection of all cells in the partition induced by H , that is, $\pi_H := \{A_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{I}_H}$.

To estimate the first term in (29), we observe that for any $x \in B_r$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{P^n}((f_{D,H}(x) - f_{P,H}(x))^2 | \pi_H) &= \text{Var}_{P^n}(f_{D,H}(x) | \pi_H) \\
&= \text{Var}_{P^n}\left(\frac{1}{n\mu(A_H(x))} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{x_i \in A_H(x)\}} \middle| \pi_H\right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{n^2 \bar{h}_{0,n}^{2d}} \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_H(x))(1 - P(A_H(x))) \\
&= \frac{1}{n \bar{h}_{0,n}^{2d}} P(A_H(x))(1 - P(A_H(x))), \tag{85}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{P^n}(\cdot | \pi_H)$ and $\text{Var}_{P^n}(\cdot | \pi_H)$ denote the conditional expectation and conditional variance with respect to P^n on the partition π_H , respectively.

Lemma 26 implies that for any $x' \in A_H(x)$, there exist a random vector $u \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]^d$ and a vector $v \in [0, 1]^d$ such that

$$x' = x + S^{-1}R^\top(-u + v).$$

By (68) and (65), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(A_H(x)) &= \int_{A_H(x)} f(x') dx' \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^d h_i\right) \int_{[0,1]^d} (f(x) + \nabla f(x)^\top S^{-1}R^\top(-u + v) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}) dv \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^d h_i\right) \left(f(x) + \int_{[0,1]^d} \nabla f(x)^\top S^{-1}R^\top(-u + v) dv + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}\right) \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^d h_i\right) \left(f(x) + \left(\int_{[0,1]^d} (-u + v)^\top dv\right) RS^{-1}\nabla f(x) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}\right) \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^d h_i\right) \left(f(x) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - u\right)^\top RS^{-1}\nabla f(x) + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}\right). \tag{86}
\end{aligned}$$

Elementary Analysis tells us that for any $a_1, \dots, a_d \in \mathbb{R}$, there holds

$$\frac{a_1 + \dots + a_d}{d} \leq \sqrt{\frac{a_1^2 + \dots + a_d^2}{d}},$$

which implies that

$$\left|\left(\frac{1}{2} - u\right)^\top RS^{-1}\nabla f(x)\right| \leq d \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_0 \cdot c_L = \frac{d\sqrt{d}c_L}{2} \cdot \bar{h}_0.$$

This together with (86) yields that for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_0}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$, there hold

$$P(A_H(x)) \leq \bar{h}_0^d \left(\bar{c}_f + \frac{d\sqrt{d}c_L}{2} \cdot \bar{h}_0 + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha}\right) \tag{87}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(A_H(x)) \geq \bar{h}_0^d \left(\underline{c}_f - \frac{d\sqrt{d}c_L}{2} \cdot \bar{h}_0 + c_\alpha \bar{h}_0^{1+\alpha} \right). \quad (88)$$

Then for any $n > N'$ with N' as in (31), we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \underline{c}_f \bar{h}_0^d \leq \mathbb{P}(A_H(x)) \leq 2\bar{c}_f \bar{h}_0^d \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (89)$$

Combining (85) with (89), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{P^n}((f_{D,H}(x) - f_{P,H}(x))^2 | \pi_H) &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}(A_H(x))(1 - \mathbb{P}(A_H(x)))}{n\bar{h}_{0,n}^{2d}} \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}(A_H(x))}{2n\bar{h}_{0,n}^{2d}} \geq \frac{\underline{c}_f \bar{h}_{0,n}^d}{4n\bar{h}_{0,n}^{2d}} = \frac{\underline{c}_f}{4n\bar{h}_{0,n}^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for all $x \in B_{r,\sqrt{d}\cdot\bar{h}_0}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$ and all $n \geq N'$, there holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{P^n}((f_{D,H}(x) - f_{P,H}(x))^2) \geq \frac{\underline{c}_f}{4n\bar{h}_{0,n}^d}. \quad (90)$$

Thus, we proved the assertion. ■

6.2.3 PROOFS RELATED TO SECTION 3.4

Proof [of Theorem 10] Proposition 21 together with Proposition 23 yields that for all $x \in B_{r,\sqrt{d}\cdot\bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} &\leq e^{\tau/2} c_L^2 \left(c_{0,n}^{-2d} \bar{h}_{0,n}^{2(1+\alpha)} + \frac{d}{T} \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{2\|f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)}(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\tau + 2^{d+4} \log n + 2^{d+2} \log(1/\underline{h}_{0,n}^d))}{3n\underline{h}_{0,n}^d} + \frac{2}{n} \end{aligned}$$

in the sense of $L_2(P_H)$ -norm with probability P^n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. Then, for all $x \in B_{r,\sqrt{d}\cdot\bar{h}_{0,n}}^+$, by choosing

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{h}_{0,n} &:= (n/\log n)^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)+d}}, \\ T_n &:= n^{\frac{2\alpha}{2(1+\alpha)+d}}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\|f_{D,E} - f\|_{L_\infty(\mu)} \lesssim (\log n/n)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2(1+\alpha)+d}} \quad (91)$$

in the sense of $L_2(P_H)$ -norm with probability P_n at least $1 - e^{-\tau}$. ■

Proof [of Theorem 11] Recall the error decomposition (29) of single random histogram transform density estimator. Then (80) and (90) yield that for all $x \in B_{r, \sqrt{d} \cdot \bar{h}_0}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_f$ and all $n > N_0$, there holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_H \otimes P^n}(f_{D,H}(x) - f(x))^2 \geq \frac{d}{16} c_f^2 c_0^2 \cdot \bar{h}_{0,n}^2 + \frac{c_f}{4n \bar{h}_{0,n}^d}.$$

By choosing

$$\bar{h}_{0,n} := n^{-\frac{1}{2+d}},$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n}(f_{D,H}(x) - f(x))^2 \gtrsim n^{-\frac{2}{2+d}},$$

which proves the assertion. ■

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we study the density estimation problem with a nonparametric strategy named histogram transform ensembles (HTE) density estimator which provides an effective means taking full advantage of the nature of ensemble learning, large diversity due to the random histogram transform and the inherent local adaptiveness of histogram estimators. The main results presented in this paper cover the universal consistency under $L_1(\mu)$ -norm and the convergence rates in terms of several norms and convergence types under different reasonable tail assumptions. More precisely, for the case where f lies in the space $C^{0,\alpha}$, the convergence rates for both single and ensemble estimators are proved to be optimal up to certain logarithmic factor in the sense of $L_1(\mu)$ - and $L_\infty(\mu)$ -norm. In contrast, for the subspace $C^{1,\alpha}$, almost optimal convergence rates can merely be established for the ensembles and the lower bound of single estimators illustrates the benefits of histogram transform ensembles over single density estimator. In experiments, we propose an adaptive version of HTE. Numerical comparisons between our adaptive HTE and other density estimators further illustrate the satisfactory performance with respect to the estimation accuracy.

References

- Fabrizio Angiulli and Clara Pizzuti. Fast outlier detection in high dimensional spaces. In *Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, pages 15–27. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002.
- Kevin Bache and Moshe Lichman. UCI machine learning repository, 2013.
- John F. Bithell. An application of density estimation to geographical epidemiology. *Statistics in Medicine*, 9(6):691–701, 1990.

- Rico Blaser and Piotr Fryzlewicz. Random rotation ensembles. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(4):26, 2016.
- Zdravko I. Botev, Joseph F. Grotowski, and Dirk P. Kroese. Kernel density estimation via diffusion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(5):2916–2957, 2010.
- Leo Breiman. Some infinite theory for predictor ensembles. *University of California at Berkeley Papers*, 2000.
- Markus M. Breunig, Hans Peter Kriegel, Raymond T. Ng, and Jörg Sander. Lof: Identifying density-based local outliers. In *ACM Sigmod International Conference on Management of Data*, 2000.
- Ju Yong Chang. Nonparametric feature matching based conditional random fields for gesture recognition from multi-modal video. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 38(8):1612–1625, 2016.
- Luc Devroye and László Györfi. Distribution-free exponential bound on the l_1 error of partitioning estimates of a regression function. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Pannonian Symposium on Mathematical Statistics*, pages 67–76, 1983.
- David L. Donoho, Iain M. Johnstone, Gérard Kerkycharian, and Dominique Picard. Density estimation by wavelet thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(2):508–539, 1996.
- Arnaud Doucet, Nando de Freitas, and Neil Gordon. An introduction to sequential Monte Carlo methods. In *Sequential Monte Carlo methods in practice*, pages 3–14. Springer, New York, 2001.
- Michael D. Escobar and Mike West. Bayesian density estimation and inference using mixtures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430):577–588, 1995.
- David Freedman and Persi Diaconis. On the histogram as a density estimator: L_2 theory. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 57(4):453–476, 1981.
- Evarist Giné and Richard Nickl. *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-dimensional Statistical Models*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016.
- Ned Glick. Sample-based multinomial classification. *Biometrics*, 29:241–256, 1973.
- Louis Gordon and Richard A. Olshen. Asymptotically efficient solutions to the classification problem. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(3):515–533, 1978.
- Hanyuan Hang, Ingo Steinwart, Yunlong Feng, and Johan A. K. Suykens. Kernel density estimation for dynamical systems. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(35):1–49, 2018.
- Bruce E. Hansen. Autoregressive conditional density estimation. *International Economic Review*, 35(3):705–730, 1994.
- Wolfgang Härdle, Marlene Müller, Stefan Sperlich, and Axel Werwatz. *Nonparametric and Semiparametric Models*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- John A. Hartigan. *Clustering Algorithms*. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1975.
- Alston S. Householder. Unitary triangularization of a nonsymmetric matrix. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 5:339–342, 1958.
- Jenq-Neng Hwang, Shyh-Rong Lay, and Alan Lippman. Nonparametric multivariate density estimation: a comparative study. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 42(10):2795–2810, 1994.

- Alvin Ihsani and Troy H. Farncombe. A kernel density estimator-based maximum *a posteriori* image reconstruction method for dynamic emission tomography imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 25(5):2233–2248, 2016.
- Harold Jeffreys. An invariant form for the prior probability in estimation problems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society. London. Series A. Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 186: 453–461, 1946.
- Yutong Jiang, Changming Sun, Yu Zhao, and Li Yang. Fog density estimation and image defogging based on surrogate modeling for optical depth. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 26(7): 3397–3409, 2017.
- Jussi Klemelä. Multivariate histograms with data-dependent partitions. *Statistica Sinica*, 19(1): 159–176, 2009.
- Michael R. Kosorok. *Introduction to Empirical Processes and Semiparametric Inference*. Springer, New York, 2008.
- Dangna Li, Kun Yang, and Wing Hung Wong. Density estimation via discrepancy based adaptive sequential partition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.1425v4*, 2014.
- Tsvi Lissack and King Sun Fu. Error estimation in pattern recognition via L^α -distance between posterior density functions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 22(1):34–45, 1976.
- Han Liu, Min Xu, Haijie Gu, Anupam Gupta, John Lafferty, and Larry Wasserman. Forest density estimation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:907–951, 2011.
- Linxi Liu and Wing Hung Wong. Multivariate density estimation via adaptive partitioning (I): sieve MLE. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.2597*, 2014.
- Linxi Liu and Wing Hung Wong. Multivariate density estimation via adaptive partitioning (II): Posterior Concentration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.04812v1*, 2015.
- Xu Liu, Zilei Wang, Jiashi Feng, and Hongsheng Xi. Highway vehicle counting in compressed domain. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3016–3024, 2016.
- Ezequiel López-Rubio. A histogram transform for probability density function estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 36:644–656, 12 2013.
- Gábor Lugosi and Andrew Nobel. Consistency of data-driven histogram methods for density estimation and classification. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(2):687–706, 1996.
- Zheng Ma, Lei Yu, and Antoni B. Chan. Small instance detection by integer programming on object density maps. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3689–3697, 2015.
- John A Nelder and Roger Mead. A simplex method for function minimization. *The computer journal*, 7(4):308–313, 1965.
- Emanuel Parzen. On estimation of a probability density function and mode. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 33:1065–1076, 1962.
- Marco A. F. Pimentel, David A. Clifton, Clifton Lei, and Lionel Tarassenko. A review of novelty detection. *Signal Processing*, 99(6):215–249, 2014.

- Juan J Rodríguez, Ludmila I Kuncheva, and Carlos J Alonso. Rotation forest: A new classifier ensemble method. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 28(10):1619–1630, 2006.
- Murray Rosenblatt. Remarks on some nonparametric estimates of a density function. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(3):832–837, 1956.
- David W. Scott. *Multivariate Density Estimation*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, second edition, 2015.
- Ricardo Silva, Charles Blundell, and Yee Whye Teh. Mixed cumulative distribution networks. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 670–678, 2011.
- Bernard W. Silverman. *Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis*. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability. Chapman & Hall, London, 1986.
- Jeffrey S. Simonoff. *Smoothing Methods in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- Ingo Steinwart and Andreas Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer, New York, 2008.
- Yichuan Tang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep mixtures of factor analysers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.4635*, 2012.
- George R. Terrell and David W. Scott. Variable kernel density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 20(3):1236–1265, 1992.
- Benigno Uribe, Iain Murray, and Hugo Larochelle. RNADE: The real-valued neural autoregressive density-estimator. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2175–2183, 2013.
- Leslie G. Valiant. A theory of the learnable. *Communications of the ACM*, 27(11):1134–1142, 1984.
- Vladimir N. Vapnik and Alexey Ya Chervonenkis. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 16(2):264, 1971.
- Matthias Vestner, Roei Litman, Emanuele Rodola, Alex Bronstein, and Daniel Cremers. Product manifold filter: Non-rigid shape correspondence via kernel density estimation in the product space. In *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, July 2017.
- Yi Wang, Yuexian Zou, and Wenwu Wang. Manifold-based visual object counting. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 27(7):3248–3263, 2018.
- Yuan Zhou, Anand Rangarajan, and Paul D. Gader. A Gaussian mixture model representation of endmember variability in hyperspectral unmixing. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 27(5):2242–2256, 2018.