

# Asymptotics for M-type smoothing splines with non-smooth objective functions

Ioannis Kalogridis

Department of Mathematics, KU Leuven, Belgium

February 8, 2022

## Abstract

M-type smoothing splines are a broad class of spline estimators that include the popular least-squares smoothing spline but also spline estimators that are less susceptible to outlying observations and model-misspecification. However, available asymptotic theory only covers smoothing spline estimators based on smooth objective functions and consequently leaves out frequently used resistant estimators such as quantile and Huber-type smoothing splines. We provide a general treatment in this paper and, assuming only the convexity of the objective function, show that the least-squares (super-)convergence rates can be extended to M-type estimators whose asymptotic properties have not been hitherto described. We further show that auxiliary scale estimates may be handled under significantly weaker assumptions than those found in the literature and we establish optimal rates of convergence for the derivatives, which have not been obtained outside the least-squares framework. A simulation study and a real-data example illustrate the competitive performance of non-smooth M-type splines in relation to the least-squares spline on regular data and their superior performance on data that contain anomalies.

**Keywords:** Nonparametric regression, smoothing splines, M-estimators, auxiliary scale, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces.

## 1 Introduction

Based on data  $(t_{1n}, Y_1), \dots, (t_{nn}, Y_n)$  with non-random  $t_{in} \in [0, 1]$  that are allowed to vary with  $n$ , consider the classical nonparametric regression model

$$Y_i = f_o(t_{in}) + \epsilon_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \quad (1)$$

where  $f_o$  is a sufficiently smooth function that we would like to estimate and the  $\epsilon_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) are independent and identically distributed error terms, commonly assumed to have zero mean and finite variance  $\sigma^2$ .

A popular estimation method involves restricting  $f_o$  to the so-called Hilbert-Sobolev space of smooth functions denoted by  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  and defined as

$$\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1]) = \{f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f \text{ has } m - 1 \text{ absolutely continuous derivatives } f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(m-1)} \text{ and } \int_0^1 |f^{(m)}(x)|^2 dx < \infty\},$$

and finding  $\hat{f}_n \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  which minimizes

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i - f(t_{in})|^2 + \lambda \int_0^1 |f^{(m)}(x)|^2 dx, \quad (2)$$

for some  $\lambda > 0$  that governs the trade-off between smoothness and goodness-of-fit. The problem is well-defined for  $n \geq m$  and its solution is a  $2m$ th order natural spline with knots at  $t_{1n}, \dots, t_{nn}$ . The subsequent least-squares smoothing spline can be computed very efficiently with the Kimeldorf-Wahba representer theorem and can be shown to attain the optimal rates of convergence, under the usual Gauss-Markov conditions on the error term. The interested reader is referred to [Wahba \(1990\)](#), [Green and Silverman \(1994\)](#) and [Eubank \(1999\)](#) for detailed theoretical developments and illustrative examples.

The focus of this chapter is theoretical, as we aim show that, under weak assumptions,  $f_o$  may be optimally estimated even if the error lacks moments. The estimator in consideration is the M-type smoothing spline introduced by [Huber \(1979\)](#) and defined as the solution of

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i - f(t_{in})) + \lambda \int_0^1 |f^{(m)}(x)|^2 dx \right], \quad (3)$$

for some convex nonnegative function  $\rho$  that is symmetric about zero and satisfies  $\rho(0) = 0$ . Clearly, the least-squares smoothing spline fulfils these conditions but the benefit of the above formulation is that it allows for more general loss functions that reduce the effect of large residuals and make for resistant estimation of  $f_o$ . Popular examples include the resistant absolute value loss  $|x|$  and Huber's function

$$\rho_k(x) = \begin{cases} x^2, & |x| \leq k \\ 2k(|x| - k/2), & |x| > k \end{cases}$$

where the tuning parameter  $k$  controls the blending of square and absolute losses. It is shown below that under general conditions a solution to (3) exists, although as [Cox \(1983\)](#) and [Eggermont and LaRiccia \(2009\)](#) remark, it may not be unique unless  $\rho$  is strictly convex. Similarly to the least-squares setting, if  $n \geq m$  then this minimizer must be a  $2m$ th order natural spline with knots at the design points.

In general, for  $\rho$ -functions that include a tuning parameter it is advisable to standardize the losses with a robust scale estimate  $\hat{\sigma}$  so that only observations sufficiently far from the

center of the data are subjected to down-weighting. Thus, the minimization problem (3) should be amended to

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho \left( \frac{Y_i - f(t_{in})}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) + \lambda \int_0^1 |f^{(m)}(x)|^2 dx \right]. \quad (4)$$

Originally, [Huber \(1979\)](#) proposed simultaneous scale estimation but nowadays it is recognized that preliminary scale estimates tend to perform better, see, e.g., ([Maronna et al., 2006](#)). Such scale estimates may be obtained either from preliminary model fitting, that is, from fitting a robust regression estimator to the data and computing a robust scale from its residuals, or from robust scale estimates involving linear combinations of the  $Y_i$ s, ([Cunningham et al., 1991](#); [Boente et al., 1997](#)). Inclusion of  $\hat{\sigma}$  adds a new theoretical layer to the smoothing spline problem and its asymptotic properties influence those of the smoothing spline estimator.

In stark contrast to least-square smoothing splines, where numerous theoretical results have been obtained ranging from equivalent kernels to convergence rates of the derivatives, only a few works have delved into the theory of general M-type smoothing splines. [Cox \(1983\)](#) and [Oh et al. \(2007\)](#) obtained an asymptotic linearization of M-type estimators with  $\rho$  functions in  $\mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R})$  and used this to show that smooth M-type estimators attain the least-squares convergence rates. [Cunningham et al. \(1991\)](#) complemented the work of the first author by showing that for the special case of  $m = 2$  the optimal rates of convergence are retained if one uses a root-n preliminary scale provided that the error term possesses a first moment. [van de Geer \(2002\)](#) was able to reduce the smoothness requirements to a Lipschitz condition on  $\rho$ , but her work does not address either the case of auxiliary scale estimates or estimation of derivatives. Finally, [Eggermont and LaRiccia \(2009\)](#) study the least-absolute deviations smoothing spline in detail, but only under the assumption that it is asymptotically contained in a ball around  $f_o$ .

We provide a unified treatment of the M-type smoothing spline problem in this chapter, including preliminary scale estimation and estimation of derivatives. Our main assumptions center around a convex loss function, two mild regularity conditions on the errors  $\epsilon_i$  that have been widely used in the non-penalized case, and approximate uniformity of the design points. These conditions do not require the existence of any moments of the error allowing for very heavy-tailed distributions that would render the least-squares estimator inconsistent. Furthermore, we show that these conditions barely change with the inclusion of auxiliary scale estimates constructed either from pseudo-residuals or preliminary regression estimates. Our treatment is potentially of independent mathematical interest, as it relies on the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces instead of the nowadays commonly used theory of empirical processes ([van de Geer, 2000, 2002](#))).

## 2 Main results: existence of solutions and rates of convergence

We begin by introducing some useful notation. We denote the standard  $\mathcal{L}^2([0, 1])$  inner product by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$ . Its associated norm  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is given by  $\langle f, f \rangle_2^{1/2}$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^2([0, 1])$ . Throughout, we endow  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  with the inner product given by

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{m,\lambda} = \langle f, g \rangle_2 + \lambda \langle f^{(m)}, g^{(m)} \rangle_2, \quad (5)$$

for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$ . The associated norm is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{m,\lambda}$ . Norms depending on the smoothing parameter have also been used by [Silverman \(1996\)](#) and [Eggermont and LaRiccia \(2009\)](#), for example. Denoting the M-type smoothing spline by  $\hat{f}_n$ , we shall see that an advantage of this norm is that establishing rates of convergence with respect to  $\|\hat{f}_n - f_o\|_{m,\lambda}$  will semi-automatically yield rates of convergence for the derivatives with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_2$ .

By an extension of the Sobolev embedding theorem, [Eggermont and LaRiccia \(2009\)](#) showed that for all  $x \in [0, 1]$  and all  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  there exists a constant  $c_m$ , depending only on  $m$ , such that

$$|f(x)| \leq \frac{c_m}{\lambda^{1/4m}} \|f\|_{m,\lambda}. \quad (6)$$

This result implies that point-evaluation is a continuous linear functional with the inner product (5). It follows that  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space and there exists a symmetric function  $\mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(x, y)$ , the reproducing kernel, such that  $\mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  for every  $x \in [0, 1]$  and for every  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$ ,

$$f(x) = \langle f, \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(x, \cdot) \rangle_{m,\lambda}. \quad (7)$$

Consequently, by (6),

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]} \|\mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(x, \cdot)\|_{m,\lambda} \leq \frac{c_m}{\lambda^{1/4m}}, \quad (8)$$

with the same constant  $c_m$ . The above bounds will play a key role in the establishment of our results.

We first deal with the existence of the M-type smoothing spline and show that the problem (3) is well-defined, in the sense that it possesses at least one solution in  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$ . The theorem requires only a weak form of continuity of  $\rho$  and may therefore be useful in other settings as well.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $\rho$  is lower semicontinuous and  $n \geq m$ , the minimization problem*

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i - f(t_{in})) + \lambda \|f^{(m)}\|_2^2 \right],$$

*has a solution in  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$ .*

Arguing in a standard way now shows that a minimizer may be found in the space of natural splines of order  $2m$  with knots at  $t_{1n}, \dots, t_{nn}$ . Convex  $\rho$ -functions satisfy the condition of Theorem 1, being continuous. As mentioned previously, existence can be strengthened to uniqueness if one uses a strictly convex  $\rho$ -function, such as the logistic  $\rho$ -function. See Proposition 2.1 of [Cox \(1983\)](#).

We may now treat the asymptotics of M-type estimators with scale either known or, more realistically, not needed. The required regularity conditions on  $\rho$ , the error term and the design points  $t_{in}, \dots, t_{nn}$  are as follows.

(A1) The loss function  $\rho(x)$  is absolutely continuous and convex with  $\psi(x)$  any choice of its subgradient.

(A2) There exist constants  $\kappa$  and  $M_1$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $|y| < \kappa$ ,

$$|\psi(x+y) - \psi(x)| \leq M_1.$$

(A3) There exists a constant  $M_2$  such that

$$\sup_{|t| \leq h} \mathbb{E}\{|\psi(\epsilon_1 + t) - \psi(\epsilon_1)|^2\} \leq M_2|h|,$$

as  $h \rightarrow 0$ .

(A4)  $\mathbb{E}\{|\psi(\epsilon_1)|^2\} < \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\{\psi(\epsilon_1)\} = 0$  and there exists a constant  $\xi > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\psi(\epsilon_1 + t)\} = \xi t + o(t), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

(A5) The family of the design points  $\{t_{in}\}_n$  is quasi-uniform in the sense of [Eggermont and LaRiccia \(2009\)](#), that is, there exists a constant such that, for all  $n \geq 2$  and all  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{1,1}([0, 1])$ ,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_{in}) - \int_0^1 f(t) dt \right| \leq \frac{\text{const.}}{n} \int_0^1 |f'(t)| dt$$

Condition (A1) is standard in the asymptotic theory of M-estimators for unpenalized linear models, see, for example, ([Yohai and Maronna, 1979](#); [Bai and Wu, 1994](#)). Condition (A2) requires that  $\psi$  has uniformly bounded local increments and is the only condition that is imposed directly on  $\psi$ . This needs to be contrasted with the restrictive smoothness conditions of ([Cox, 1983](#)), ([Cunningham et al., 1991](#)) and ([Oh et al., 2007](#)), all of whom assumed a twice-differentiable  $\psi$ -function with bounded second derivative. In the same spirit, conditions (A3)-(A4) trade differentiability of  $\psi$  with some regularity of the distribution of the error term. They are very mild. Condition (A3) is a mean-square continuity condition on  $m(t) := \psi(\epsilon_1 + t)$  and holds quite generally. For example, [Bai and Wu \(1994\)](#) demonstrated that in some cases it may be possible to have the much tighter bound  $M_2|h|^2$  on the right-hand

side of the inequality, even for  $\psi$ -functions that have jumps. See also (Welsh, 1989) for this point. Condition (A4) ensures the Fisher-consistency of the estimates and has been widely used for many types of M-estimators, see (Maronna et al., 2006; Huber and Ronchetti, 2009) for relevant discussions. A number of interesting estimators can be covered by condition (A4), as we now show.

Example 1 (LAD and quantile regression). Consider M-estimation with  $\rho(x) = |x|$ . Then, provided that  $\epsilon_1$  has a distribution function  $F$  that is symmetric about zero and a positive density  $f$  on an interval about zero,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\text{sign}(\epsilon_1 + t)\} = 2f(0)t + o(t), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

cfr. (Pollard, 1991). This generalizes easily to M-estimation with  $\rho_\alpha(x) = |x| + (2\alpha - 1)x$ , provided that in this case one views the regression function as the  $\alpha$ -quantile function, that is,  $\Pr(Y_i \leq f_\alpha(x_i)) = \alpha$ .

Example 2 (Huber). For  $k > 0$ ,  $\psi_k(x) = 2x\mathcal{I}(|x| \leq k) + 2k \text{sign}(x)\mathcal{I}(|x| > k)$  we may assume that  $F$  is absolutely continuous and symmetric about zero so that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\psi_k(\epsilon_1 + t)\} = (2F(k) - 1)t + o(t), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

Example 3 ( $\mathcal{L}^p$  regression estimates with  $1 < p \leq 2$ ). Clearly,  $\psi_p(x) = p|x|^{p-1} \text{sign}(x)$  and if we assume that  $F$  is symmetric about zero and has a differentiable density  $f$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\psi_p(\epsilon_1 + t)\} = \left\{ -2p \int_0^\infty x^{p-1} f'(x) dx \right\} t + o(t), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0,$$

provided that the integral converges and is positive, which will be the case if  $f$  is unimodal. For  $p = 2$  it is easy to check that  $\int_0^\infty x df(x) = -1/2$  so that the least-squares score function is recovered.

Finally, condition (A5) ensures that the responses are observed at a sufficiently regular grid. It is a quite weak assumption that can be shown to hold for all frequently employed designs such as  $t_{in} = i/n$  or  $t_{in} = 2i/(2n + 1)$ . Call  $F_n$  the distribution function that jumps  $n^{-1}$  at each  $t_{in}$ . An integration by parts argument shows

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_{in}) - \int_0^1 f(x) dx = \int_0^1 \{x - F_n(x)\} f'(x) dx,$$

and (A5) is satisfied, if, for example,  $F_n$  approximates well the uniform distribution function in either the Kolmogorov or  $\mathcal{L}^2([0, 1])$  metrics.

Our first asymptotic result is Theorem 2, which establishes the optimality of general M-type smoothing splines, provided that the smoothing parameter  $\lambda$  decays to zero a little more slowly than in the typical least-squares smoothing spline problem.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume (A1)-(A5),  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$  and further that the limit conditions  $\lim_n n^m \lambda = \lim_n n^{(m-1)} \lambda^{(2m-1)/2m} = \infty$  hold. Then there exists a sequence of M-type smoothing splines  $\hat{f}_n$  satisfying*

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f_o\|_{m,\lambda}^2 = O_P(\lambda + (n\lambda^{1/2m})^{-1}).$$

The limit requirements of Theorem 2 replace the least-squares requirement  $n^{2m}\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $\lambda \asymp n^{-2m/(2m+1)}$  and  $m > 1$  these conditions are met and we are lead to  $\|\widehat{f}_n - f_o\|_2^2 = O_P(n^{-2m/(2m+1)})$ , which is the optimal rate of convergence for  $f_o \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  (Stone, 1982). For such  $\lambda$ , the Sobolev embedding theorem (6) allows us to deduce that  $\|\widehat{f}_n - f\|_\infty = O_P(n^{(1-2m)/(2m+1)})$ , which implies that convergence can be made uniform.

Corollary 1 below establishes (optimal) rates of convergence for the derivatives  $\widehat{f}_n^{(j)}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m-1$  and tightness of  $\widehat{f}_n^{(m)}$  in the  $\mathcal{L}^2([0, 1])$  metric.

**Corollary 1.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem 2 hold. Then, for any  $\lambda \asymp n^{-2m/(2m+1)}$  and  $m > 1$  the M-type sequence  $\widehat{f}_n$  of Theorem 2 satisfies*

$$\|\widehat{f}_n^{(j)} - f^{(j)}\|_2^2 = O_P(n^{-2(m-j)/(2m+1)}).$$

As noted previously, with the exception of the work of Eggermont and LaRiccia (2009) on the least-absolute deviations smoothing spline, we are unaware of results concerning derivatives of general M-type estimates. Corollary 1 serves to remedy this deficiency.

A rather interesting feature of the least-squares smoothing spline is the possibility for a bias-reduction, under certain boundary conditions on the derivatives of  $f_o$ , see, e.g., (Rice and Rosenblatt, 1981; Eubank, 1999). This phenomenon leads to superior convergence rates and is known as super-convergence. As Corollary 2 shows, super-convergence carries over to the general M-case.

**Corollary 2.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem 2 hold and further that  $f_o \in \mathcal{W}^{2m,2}([0, 1])$  and  $f_o^{(s)}(0) = f_o^{(s)}(1) = 0$  for all  $m \leq s \leq 2m-1$ . Then, there exists a sequence of M-type smoothing splines  $\widehat{f}_n$  satisfying*

$$\|\widehat{f}_n - f_o\|_{m,\lambda}^2 = O_P(\lambda^2 + (n\lambda^{1/2m})^{-1}).$$

A consequence of this corollary is that if  $\lambda \asymp n^{-2m/(4m+1)}$  then  $f_o$  can be estimated with an integrated squared error decaying like  $n^{-4m/(4m+1)}$  asymptotically. Of course, had we suspected that  $f_o \in \mathcal{W}^{2m,2}([0, 1])$  then an appropriate modification of the penalty would also yield the rate  $n^{-4m/(4m+1)}$ . In this light, as Eubank (1999, pp. 259) notes, the higher rate of convergence may be viewed as a bonus of the smoothing-spline estimator for some situations where the regression function is smoother than anticipated.

We now turn to the problem of M-type smoothing splines with an auxiliary scale estimate. We aim to extend Theorem 2 and its corollaries to this case under suitable assumptions on  $\rho$ ,  $\epsilon$  and  $\widehat{\sigma}$ . The revised set of assumptions is as follows.

- (B1)  $\rho$  is a convex function on  $\mathbb{R}$  with derivative  $\psi$  that exists everywhere and is Lipschitz. Further, for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $M_\epsilon$  such that

$$|\psi(tx) - \psi(sx)| \leq M_\epsilon |t - s|,$$

for any  $t > \epsilon, s > \epsilon$  and  $-\infty < x < \infty$ .

(B2) For any  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\{\psi(\epsilon_1/\alpha)\} = 0$  and

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\psi\left(\frac{\epsilon_1}{\alpha} + t\right)\right\} = \xi(\alpha)t + o(t), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0,$$

for some function  $\xi(\alpha)$  such that  $0 < \inf_{|\sigma-\alpha|\leq\delta}\xi(\alpha) \leq \sup_{|\sigma-\alpha|\leq\delta}\xi(\alpha) < \infty$  for some  $\delta > 0$ .

(B3) There exists a  $c > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}\{|\epsilon_1|^c\} < \infty$ .

(B4)  $n^{m/(2m+1)}(\hat{\sigma} - \sigma) = O_P(1)$ , for some  $\sigma > 0$  that need not be the standard deviation of  $\epsilon_1$ .

(B5) (A5).

The above conditions essentially require a somewhat smoother  $\rho$ -function and a well-behaved scale. Condition (B1) is borrowed from (He and Shi, 1995) and requires the score function to change slowly in the tail. It automatically implies its boundedness. Condition (B2) extends the linearization imposed by (A4) to a neighbourhood around  $\sigma$ . These conditions are not stringent and are satisfied by, e.g., the Huber score function with  $\xi(\alpha) = 2F(k/\alpha) - 1$ . Condition (B3) contains a small moment assumption on  $\epsilon$ . Since  $c > 0$  can be very small, it is expected that all heavy-tailed distributions satisfy this assumption. For example, the Cauchy distribution satisfies this condition if  $c$  is any number in  $(0, 1)$ . Therefore, this condition is much weaker than the first moment assumed by Cunningham et al. (1991) and Oh et al. (2007) or the second moment assumed by He and Shi (1995).

Assumption (B4) imposes a minimal rate of convergence for  $\hat{\sigma}$ , namely the optimal non-parametric rate of convergence. To the best of our knowledge, this is the weakest condition that is currently available in the literature, as it can be fulfilled not only by scale estimates obtained from linear combinations of the  $Y_i$ , i.e., pseudo-residuals, but also by scale estimates that are constructed from the residuals of an initial regression estimator. The former class of scale estimates normally converges at root-n rate, see, e.g., (Cunningham et al., 1991; Boente et al., 1997), while the latter class generally converges at the optimal non-parametric rate required herein.

We denote the sequence of M-estimates with auxiliary scale  $\hat{f}_{n,\hat{\sigma}}$ . Theorem 2 now generalizes to Theorem 3 below.

**Theorem 3.** *Assume (B1)-(B5) and further that  $\lambda \asymp n^{-\gamma}$  for some  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\lim_n n^m \lambda = \lim_n n^{2m-1} \lambda^{(4m-1)/2m} = \infty$ . Then there exists a sequence of M-type smoothing splines  $\hat{f}_{n,\hat{\sigma}}$  satisfying*

$$\|\hat{f}_{n,\hat{\sigma}} - f_o\|_{m,\lambda}^2 = O_P\left(\lambda + (n\lambda^{1/2m})^{-1}\right).$$

Since the proofs of Corollaries 1 and 2 regarding optimal estimation of derivatives and bias reduction do not depend on the existence of a scale estimate, they carry over immediately to this setting. We omit the details.



### 3 Computation and smoothing parameter selection

The M-type smoothing spline can be efficiently computed with a straightforward modification of the well-known Iteratively Reweighted Least Squares algorithm, see [Maronna et al. \(2006\)](#); [Huber and Ronchetti \(2009\)](#) for the algorithm in unpenalized robust regression and [Cunningham et al. \(1991\)](#) for its penalized variant. The algorithm essentially works by solving a weighted least-squares problem at each iteration and under mild conditions can be shown to converge to a stationary point of the objective function in (4), irrespective of the starting point. The algorithm cannot be directly applied for quantiles on account of the corner of the check function. However, this corner can be smoothed out using, for example, the recipe of [Nychka et al. \(1995\)](#). To ensure banded, easily invertible matrices one may use the B-spline representation of natural splines ([de Boor, 2001](#); [Hastie et al., 2009](#)).

In order to select the smoothing parameter  $\lambda$  we propose to use the weighted generalized cross-validation criterion introduced by [Cunningham et al. \(1991\)](#). That is, we propose to select  $\lambda$  as the minimizer of

$$\text{GCV}(\lambda) = \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i(\hat{f}_n) |r_i(\hat{f}_n)|^2}{(1 - n^{-1} \text{Tr } \mathbf{H}(\lambda))^2},$$

where  $r_{in} = Y_i - \hat{f}_n(t_{in})$ ,  $W_i = \psi(r_i)/r_i$  and  $\mathbf{H}$  denotes the pseudo-influence matrix. In order to produce a fully automatic method we recommend carrying out the minimization with the help of a numerical derivative-free optimizer such as the Nelder-Mead method ([Nocedal and Wright, 2006](#), 238–240). The method is available in standard software, converges fast and, in our experience, works well for a wide variety of problems. It is therefore our preferred choice for the simulation experiments and the real data analysis presented herein.

### 4 A Monte-Carlo study

In our simulation experiments we compare the performance of the Huber-type smoothing spline with tuning parameter equal to 1.345 corresponding to 95% efficiency in the location model, the least-absolute deviation smoothing spline and the least-squares smoothing spline in a variety of shapes of the regression function and tails of the error. For the Huber-type estimator we compute the scale in two ways, reflecting the asymptotic considerations of Section 2. On the one hand, we use the robustified Rice estimator proposed by [Boente et al. \(1997\)](#) and given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_{PS} = (2^{1/2} 0.6745)^{-1} \text{median}_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} |Y_{i+1} - Y_i|.$$

On the other hand, call  $\mathbf{r}$  the residual vector that results from an initial Huber-type smoothing spline fit to the data with scale  $\hat{\sigma}_{PS}$ . A robust scale that converges slower than root- $n$  is

$$\hat{\sigma}_{PR} = \tau(\mathbf{r}),$$

where  $\tau(\cdot)$  stands for the  $\tau$ -scale introduced by [Yohai and Zamar \(1988\)](#). As discussed in the introduction, the least-absolute deviations smoothing spline does not require an auxiliary scale estimate. We denote the resulting smoothing splines by  $\hat{f}_{HPS}$  and  $\hat{f}_{HPR}$  respectively, while we use  $\hat{f}_{LAD}$  and  $\hat{f}_{LS}$  as abbreviations for the least-absolute deviations smoothing spline and the least-squares smoothing spline respectively.

We investigate the performance of the estimators in the regression model  $Y_i = f(t_i) + \epsilon_i$  where  $t_i = i/n$  and  $f_o$  is each of the following three functions

1.  $f_1(t) = \cos(2\pi t)$
2.  $f_2(t) = 1/(1 + \exp(-20(t - 0.5)))$
3.  $f_3(t) = \sin(2\pi t) + e^{-3(t-0.5)^2},$

All three regression functions are smooth; the first regression function is bowl-shaped, the second is a sigmoid and the third is essentially a shifted sinusoid with more variable slope. We shall estimate these functions with cubic smoothing splines, that is, with  $m = 2$ . In order to assess the effect of outliers on the estimates different distributions for the error term were considered. Other than the standard Gaussian distribution, we have complemented our set-up with a t-distribution with 3 degrees of freedom, a mixture of mean-zero Gaussians with standard deviations equal to 1 and 9 and weights equal to 0.85 and 0.15 respectively, as well as Tukey's Slash distribution. These error distributions reflect increasingly severe contamination scenarios.

All computations were carried out in the freeware R ([R Core Team, 2018](#)). The Huber-type and least absolute deviations cubic smoothing splines are computed using custom-made functions implementing the method outlined in Section 3, while the least-squares cubic spline is computed with the built-in R-function `smooth.spline`. By default for the least-squares smoothing spline, the penalty parameter  $\lambda$  is selected via generalized cross-validation. The mean-squared-errors of the experiment are summarized in Table 1 for sample sizes of 60 and 1000 replications.

$f$	Dist.	$\hat{f}_{HPS}$		$\hat{f}_{HPR}$		$\hat{f}_{LAD}$		$\hat{f}_{LS}$	
		Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
$f_1$	Gaussian	0.096	0.002	0.097	0.002	0.131	0.003	0.100	0.003
	$t_3$	0.128	0.003	0.129	0.003	0.182	0.005	0.454	0.100
	M. Gaussian	0.179	0.005	0.181	0.005	0.290	0.007	1.66	0.102
	Slash	0.664	0.013	0.643	0.012	0.700	0.001	4e+04	3e+04
$f_2$	Gaussian	0.064	0.001	0.064	0.001	0.122	0.004	0.084	0.003
	$t_3$	0.088	0.002	0.087	0.002	0.147	0.005	0.315	0.040
	M. Gaussian	0.093	0.003	0.089	0.002	0.160	0.007	1.51	0.104
	Slash	0.352	0.012	0.323	0.010	0.455	0.035	2e+05	1e+05
$f_3$	Gaussian	0.143	0.005	0.143	0.003	0.223	0.002	0.112	0.003
	$t_3$	0.240	0.003	0.242	0.003	0.290	0.007	0.413	0.044
	M. Gaussian	0.260	0.003	0.258	0.003	0.308	0.111	2.900	0.152
	Slash	0.521	0.010	0.501	0.009	0.690	0.009	4e+07	3e+07

Table 1: Means and standard errors of 1000 MSEs with  $n = 60$  of the Huber-type estimator with preliminary scale, the Huber-type estimator with scale computed from robust regression residuals, the least-absolute deviations estimator and the least-squares estimator.

The results in Table 1 indicate the extreme sensitivity of the least-squares estimator to even mild deviations from the ideal assumptions. In particular, the t-distribution with 3 degrees of freedom and the mixture-Gaussian distribution have finite second moments and first moments equal to zero, so that the least-squares assumptions are technically fulfilled. Nevertheless, in all three of our examples the performance of the least-squares estimator markedly deteriorates as one moves away from the Gaussian ideal. By contrast, the robust estimators match the performance of the least-squares estimator in ideal data and exhibit a large degree of resistance in the t- and mixture Gaussian distributions. Their performance deteriorates with the extremely heavy-tailed Slash distribution but clearly not to the same extent as the performance of the least-squares estimator, which appears to suffer a catastrophic breakdown.

Comparing the robust estimators  $\hat{f}_{HPS}$ ,  $\hat{f}_{HPR}$  and  $\hat{f}_{LAD}$ , it is seen that the Huber estimators outperform the least-absolute deviations estimator in all settings considered. Under Gaussian errors, in particular,  $\hat{f}_{LAD}$  exhibits the well-known inefficiency relative to the least-squares estimator. The estimator  $\hat{f}_{HPR}$  performs slightly better than  $\hat{f}_{HPS}$  under heavy contamination due to its more robust scale, but only marginally so. This needs to be contrasted with the increased computational effort required by  $\hat{f}_{HPR}$ , which depends on the computation of two robust smoothing spline estimators. Overall, the present experiment indicates that the computationally simple  $\hat{f}_{HPS}$  presents a viable alternative to  $\hat{f}_{LS}$  in clean data and to  $\hat{f}_{HPR}$  in contaminated data.




Figure 1: Left: scatter plot of benzene versus temperature. Right: scatter plot of nitrogen oxide versus temperature. The symbols ( $\bullet$   $\blacklozenge$   $\blacktriangle$ ) denote weights in  $(0, 0.33]$ ,  $(0.33, 0.66]$  and  $(0.66, 1]$  respectively.

## 5 Real data example: urban air pollution in Italy

The present dataset consists of air pollution measurements from a gas multi-sensor device that was deployed in an undisclosed Italian city (De Vito et al., 2008). In particular, the dataset contains 9358 instances of hourly averaged responses from an array of 5 metal oxide chemical sensors embedded in the device. In this study we will focus on the effect of temperature on the concentration of Benzene and Nitrogen oxides in the atmosphere, the full dataset being available at <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Air+quality>. These gases are known carcinogens and are responsible for a series of acute respiratory conditions in high concentrations, so that the ability to forecast high concentrations may be helpful. Figure 1 presents the scatter plots of Benzene concentrations versus temperature and Nitrogen oxides concentration versus temperature on the left and right panel respectively.

The scatter plots indicate the presence of several atypical observations in the form of abnormally high concentrations at certain temperature ranges. Specifically, the concentration of Benzene seems more volatile in medium temperatures, while the concentration of Nitrogen oxides seems more unpredictable in lower temperatures. Computing the least-squares and Huber-type smoothing splines yields the solid red and solid blue curves respectively. It may be immediately seen that although the resulting smoothing spline estimates do not qualitatively differ as to their main features, the least-squares estimate is more drawn towards these atypically high concentrations resulting in overestimation of the concentrations, particularly in the case of Nitrogen oxides.

For a better understanding of the discrepancy between these estimates, figure 1 also includes a color and shape coding of the weights produced by the Huber estimator. These

weights demonstrate the usefulness of M-estimators with bounded score functions: while the least-squares estimator assigns equal weight to all observations and is thus unduly influenced by outliers, robust M-estimators significantly downweight observations sufficiently far from the center of the data resulting in resistant estimates. These atypical observations produce large residuals, which in turn allow for their detection. We may think of numerous examples in economics, medicine and other fields where resistant estimation combined with the possibility of outlier detection can be similarly useful.

Lastly, to examine the some of the characteristics of conditional distribution of the gases given the temperature, one may wish to obtain nonparametric estimates of the conditional quantiles. Figure 2 presents quantile smoothing spline estimates for the 10th, 30th, 50th, 70th and 90th percentiles. The estimates serve to confirm the extreme heavy-tailedness of the conditional distributions for medium and medium-low temperatures, casting doubt on the suitability of the least-squares estimator.




Figure 2: Left: scatter plot of benzene versus temperature. Right: scatter plot of nitrogen oxide versus temperature. The lines ( ---, ·····, —, - - -, —) correspond to estimated (0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9) quantiles respectively.

## 6 Concluding remarks

The asymptotic results of this chapter indicate that there is little theoretical difference between least-squares smoothing splines and general M-type smoothing splines derived from convex but possibly non-smooth objective functions. In particular, under general conditions, M-type smoothing splines enjoy the same rates of convergence for the regression function as well as its derivatives. Furthermore, the presence of reasonable auxiliary scale estimates does not diminish these rates. In practice, M-type smoothing splines may be efficiently computed with the help of well-established iterative algorithms and may be used to good effect in either

regular or contaminated datasets, thus providing a valuable tool for the applied scientist.

We believe that at least two extensions of the present chapter would be of great interest to theoreticians and practitioners alike. The first concerns the problem of estimating the smoothing parameter  $\lambda$ , which was barely touched upon in this chapter. We conjecture that the robust generalized cross-validation criterion proposed by [Cunningham et al. \(1991\)](#) would yield the optimal rate of decay for  $\lambda$  but formal verification is required. Another useful extension would be to the case of dependent errors, which arise, for example, in mean-estimation of discretely sampled functional data. We firmly believe that M-type smoothing spline estimators with repeated measurements would still enjoy the optimal rates, as derived by [Cai and Yuan \(2011\)](#), while also providing a considerably safer estimation method in the presence of atypical observations.

## 7 Software availability

An R-implementation of the Huber-type smoothing spline is available in <https://wis.kuleuven.be/statdatascience/robust/papers-2010-2019>, as part of the present paper.

## 8 Appendix: Proofs of the theoretical results

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $L_n(f)$  denote the objective function (3), that is,

$$L_n(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i - f(t_{in})) + \lambda \|f^{(m)}\|_2^2.$$

Let us first show that  $L_n : \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is weakly lower semicontinuous. Let  $\{f_k\}_k$  denote a sequence of functions in  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  converging weakly to some  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$ . By the reproducing property,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_k(t_{in}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_k, \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(t_{in}, \cdot) \rangle_{m,\lambda} = \langle f, \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(t_{in}, \cdot) \rangle_{m,\lambda} = f(t_{in}),$$

for all  $t_{in}$ . On the other hand, the functional  $f \mapsto \|f^{(m)}\|_2^2$  is convex and therefore lower semicontinuous under weak convergence. Putting these facts together, the lower semicontinuity of  $\rho$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(f) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i - f(t_{in})) + \lambda \|f^{(m)}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \liminf_k \rho(Y_i - f_k(t_{in})) + \lambda \liminf_k \|f_k^{(m)}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \liminf_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i - f_k(t_{in})) + \liminf_k \lambda \|f_k^{(m)}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \liminf_k L_n(f_k), \end{aligned}$$

establishing the weak lower semicontinuity of the objective function as a whole.

Now note that  $L_n(f)$  is bounded below by 0 for all  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$ , hence its infimum over  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  is finite. Let  $\{f_k\}_k$  denote a minimizing sequence, that is,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} L_n(f_k) = \inf_{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])} L_n(f).$$

By Taylor's theorem with integral remainder we may write

$$f_k(t) = p_k(t) + \int_0^1 \frac{(t-x)_+^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} f_k^{(m)}(x) dx, \quad (9)$$

where  $p_k$  is a polynomial of order  $m$  and  $(x)_+^{m-1} = x^{m-1} \mathcal{I}(x \geq 0)$ .

Let  $T : \mathcal{L}^2[0,1] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0,1])$  denote the integral operator  $g(t) \mapsto \int_0^t (t-x)^{m-1}/(m-1)! g(x) dx$ . We claim that  $T$  is compact. Indeed, let  $\{f_n\}_n$  denote a bounded sequence in  $\mathcal{L}^2([0,1])$  with  $\sup_n \|f_n\|_2 \leq M$ , say. By the Schwarz inequality

$$\sup_n |Tf_n(t)| \leq \frac{|t|^{(2m-1)/2}}{(2m-1)^{1/2}(m-1)!} \sup_n \|f_n\|_2 \leq \frac{M}{(2m-1)^{1/2}(m-1)!}.$$

Further, by uniform continuity for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|(t-x)_+^{m-1} - (t'-x)_+^{m-1}| < \epsilon$  uniformly in  $x \in [0,1]$  whenever  $|t-t'| < \delta$ . It follows that

$$|Tf_n(t) - Tf_n(t')| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{(m-1)!} \int_0^1 |f_n(x)| dx \leq \frac{\epsilon}{(m-1)!} \|f_n\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{(m-1)!} M.$$

Hence for bounded sequences  $\{f_n\}_n$ ,  $\{Tf_n\}_n$  is bounded and equicontinuous. By the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem there exists a subsequence  $\{Tf_{n_k}\}_k$  that converges uniformly to some element of  $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$ . Conclude that  $\{Tf_n\}_n$  is (relatively) compact for bounded  $\{f_n\}_n$ . This establishes the compactness of  $T$ .

Now assume without loss of generality  $L_n(f_k) \leq L_n(f_1)$  for all  $k \geq 1$ , passing to a subsequence if necessary. It follows that  $\|f_k^{(m)}\|_2^2 \leq \lambda^{-1} L_n(f_1)$  so that  $\|f_k^{(m)}\|_2$  is bounded. By the reflexivity of  $\mathcal{L}^2([0,1])$  we may assume that  $f_k^{(m)}$  converges weakly to some function  $\phi$ , again passing to a subsequence if necessary. By the weak lower semicontinuity of the norm we have

$$\|\phi\|_2^2 \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_k^{(m)}\|_2^2.$$

Since  $T$  is compact we also have  $\lim_k \sup_x |Tf_k(x) - T\phi(x)| = 0$ . The sequence  $\{f_k\}_k$  converges weakly in  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  and therefore is bounded in  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$ . By the embedding (6), it follows that  $\{f_k\}_k$  is also bounded in  $\mathcal{C}([0,1])$ . By the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem and diagonalizing if necessary, we may assume that the restrictions of the  $f_k$  to the design points,

$$(f_k(t_{1n}), \dots, f_k(t_{nn})),$$

converge in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to some vector  $v$ . From (9) we may now deduce that

$$\lim_k p_k(t_{in}) = v_{in} - T\phi(t_{in}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$



that is, the limit exists for each  $t_{in}$ . Let  $P$  denote the space of polynomials of order  $m$  on  $[0, 1]$  and note that  $P$  is finite-dimensional (for example, with the basis  $1, t, \dots, t^{m-1}$ ). Let  $\ell_i(p) := p(t_{in})$  denote the evaluation functionals and on  $P$  define the norm

$$S(p) := \sum_{i=1}^n |\ell_i(p)|.$$

It is easy to check that  $S$  is indeed a norm.  $S(p) = 0$  implies that  $p \in P$  has at least  $n$  roots. Since, by assumption,  $n \geq m$  it must be that  $p$  is the zero polynomial. Now note that, since the limit at each  $t_{in}$  exists,  $\{p_k\}_k$  is Cauchy under  $S(p)$  and as  $P$  is finite-dimensional, hence complete,  $\{p_k\}_k$  converges to a unique polynomial  $p$ .

Defining  $\psi := p + T\phi$  and noting that  $\psi \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  and  $(T\phi(t))^{(m)} = \phi(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  we obtain

$$L_n(\psi) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} L_n(f_k) = \inf_{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])} L_n(f).$$

The above shows that the infimum of  $L_n(f)$  is attained in  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

We next state and prove a lemma concerning minimization of convex functionals in the Hilbert space. The lemma is quite general and can thus be useful in a variety of optimization problems.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  denote a real Hilbert space of functions endowed with inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  and associated norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  and let  $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  denote a convex lower semicontinuous functional. Then, if*

$$L(0) < \inf_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}=1} L(f),$$

*there exists a (possibly non-unique) minimizer of  $L$  in the unit ball  $\{f \in \mathcal{H} : \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1\}$*

*Proof.* The proof consists of two steps

- (i) There exists a weakly compact level set.
- (ii) The infimum  $\inf_{f \in \mathcal{H}} L(f)$  is attained in  $B := \{f \in \mathcal{H} : \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1\}$ .

To prove (i), let  $y := \inf_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}=1} L(f)$ . To show that there exists a weakly compact level set it suffices to show that

$$D := \{f \in \mathcal{H}, L(f) \leq y\}$$

is weakly compact. Indeed, it is easy to see that, by the lower semicontinuity of  $L$ ,  $D$  is closed and, by the convexity of  $L$ , it is also convex. Appealing to a well-known theorem regarding reflexive Banach spaces, see, e.g., (Rynne and Youngston, 2008), to prove (i) it suffices to show that  $B$  is bounded. For this, we claim that  $D \subset B$ . Indeed, assume for



contradiction that there exists a  $g \in D$  such that  $g \notin B$ , that is,  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}} > 1$ . Noting that  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} < 1$ , the convexity of  $L$  implies

$$L\left(\frac{g}{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}}\right) = L\left(\frac{g}{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}} + \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}} - 1}{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}} 0\right) \leq \frac{1}{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}} L(g) + \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}} - 1}{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}} L(0) < y,$$

since, by hypothesis,  $L(0) < y$  and  $g \in D$ . As  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$  this contradicts the infimum property and the claim is established. We have thus proved that  $D$  is a weakly compact level set, completing the first step.

To prove (ii), we note that  $L(f)$  is bounded from below by zero for all  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  so that the infimum is finite. Thus, there exists a minimizing sequence  $f_n \in \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(f_n) = \inf_{f \in \mathcal{H}} L(f).$$

Assume without loss of generality that  $L(f_n) \leq y$  for all  $n$ , passing to a subsequence, if necessary. This implies that  $f_n \in D$  and since  $D$  is weakly compact we may assume that  $f_n$  converges weakly to some  $f \in D$ , again passing to a subsequence if necessary. But  $L$  is, by assumption, convex and lower semicontinuous implying that it is also weakly lower semicontinuous. The weak lower semicontinuity of  $L$  now yields

$$L(f) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(f_n) = \inf_{f \in \mathcal{H}} L(f),$$

and, as  $D \subset B$ , the infimum is attained in  $B$  completing the proof.  $\square$

We next state a quadrature lemma whose proof may be found in [Eggermont and LaRiccia \(2009\)](#) and will also be used in the following proofs.

**Lemma 2** (Quadrature). *Let  $m \geq 1$ . Assuming that the design is quasi-uniform in the sense of (A5), there exists a constant  $c_m$  depending only on  $m$  such that, for all  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1])$  and all  $n \geq 2$ ,*

$$\|f\|_2^2 - \frac{c_m}{n\lambda^{1/2m}} \|f\|_{m,\lambda}^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(t_{in})|^2 \leq \|f\|_2^2 + \frac{c_m}{n\lambda^{1/2m}} \|f\|_{m,\lambda}^2.$$

For notational convenience, throughout the following proofs we will suppress the dependence of the design points on  $n$  and write  $t_i$  instead of  $t_{in}$ . Generic constants will be denoted by  $\text{const.}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Write  $C_n = \lambda + (n\lambda^{1/2m})^{-1}$ . The theorem will be proven if we can establish that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a large enough constant  $D_\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left( \inf_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} L_n(f_o + C_n^{1/2} g) > L_n(f_o) \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon,$$

as this would, by Lemma 1, entail the existence of a minimizer  $\hat{f}_n$  such that  $\|\hat{f}_n - f_o\|_{m,\lambda}^2 = O_P(C_n)$ . We decompose  $L_n(f_o + C_n^{1/2}g) - L_n(f_o)$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
L_n(f_o + C_n^{1/2}g) - L_n(f_o) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i - f_o(t_i) - C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i - f_o(t_i)) \\
&\quad + \lambda \| (f_o + C_n^{1/2}g)^{(m)} \|_2^2 - \lambda \| f_o^{(m)} \|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)} \{ \psi(\epsilon_i + t) - \psi(\epsilon_i) \} dt \\
&\quad - C_n^{1/2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\epsilon_i) g(t_i) \\
&\quad + C_n \lambda \| g^{(m)} \|_2^2 + 2\lambda C_n^{1/2} \langle f_o^{(m)}, g^{(m)} \rangle_2 \\
&:= I_1(g) + I_2(g) + I_3(g),
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(g) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)} \{ \psi(\epsilon_i + t) - \psi(\epsilon_i) \} dt + C_n \lambda \| g^{(m)} \|_2^2 \\
I_2(g) &:= -C_n^{1/2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\epsilon_i) g(t_i) \\
I_3(g) &:= 2C_n^{1/2} \lambda \langle f_o^{(m)}, g^{(m)} \rangle_2.
\end{aligned}$$

With the Schwarz inequality, we immediately obtain

$$\sup_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} |I_3(g)| \leq 2\lambda C_n^{1/2} \|f_o^{(m)}\|_2 \|g^{(m)}\|_2 \leq 2C_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} \|g\|_{m,\lambda} \leq \text{const. } DC_n, \quad (10)$$

where we have used our assumption  $f_o \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  and the inequalities  $\lambda^{1/2} \|g^{(m)}\|_2 \leq \|g\|_{m,\lambda}$  and  $\lambda^{1/2} \leq C_n^{1/2}$ , which follows from the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_{m,\lambda}$  and  $C_n$  respectively.

The errors are independent and identically distributed and, by assumption,  $\mathbb{E}\{\psi(\epsilon_1)\} = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}\{|\psi(\epsilon_1)|^2\} < \infty$ . With the reproducing property we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2(g)| &= \frac{C_n^{1/2}}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\epsilon_i) g(t_i) \right| = \frac{C_n^{1/2}}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\epsilon_i) \langle g, \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(\cdot, t_i) \rangle_{m,\lambda} \right| \\
&= C_n^{1/2} \left| \langle g, n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\epsilon_i) \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(\cdot, t_i) \rangle_{m,\lambda} \right| \\
&\leq C_n^{1/2} \|g\|_{m,\lambda} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\epsilon_i) \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(\cdot, t_i) \right\|_{m,\lambda},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\epsilon_i) R_{m,\lambda}(\cdot, t_i) \right\|_{m,\lambda}^2 &= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \{ \psi(\epsilon_i) \psi(\epsilon_j) \} \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(t_j, t_i) \\
&\leq \text{const. } n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(t_i, t_i) \\
&= \text{const. } n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \| \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(t_i, \cdot) \|_{m,\lambda}^2 \\
&\leq \text{const. } n^{-1} \lambda^{-1/2m},
\end{aligned}$$

by (8). Given that  $n^{-1} \lambda^{-1/2m} < C_n$ , with Markov's inequality we may conclude that

$$\sup_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} |I_2(g)| = DC_n O_P(1). \quad (11)$$

Turning to  $I_1(g)$ , first note that by the reproducing property, the Schwarz inequality and (8),

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n^{1/2} \max_{i \leq n} |g(t_i)| &= C_n^{1/2} \max_{i \leq n} |\langle g, \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(\cdot, t_i) \rangle_{m,\lambda}| \\
&\leq C_n^{1/2} \|g\|_{m,\lambda} \max_{i \leq n} \| \mathcal{R}_{m,\lambda}(\cdot, t_i) \|_{m,\lambda} \\
&\leq c_m DC_n^{1/2} \lambda^{-1/4m},
\end{aligned}$$

and, since  $n^m \lambda \rightarrow \infty$  by assumption, it follows that  $C_n^{1/2} \max_{i \leq n} |g(t_i)| = o(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . With this in mind, applying Fubini's theorem and (A4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2} g(t_i)} \{ \psi(\epsilon_i + t) - \psi(\epsilon_i) \} dt \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2} g(t_i)} \mathbb{E} \{ \psi(\epsilon_i + t) \} dt \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2} g(t_i)} \{ \xi t + o(t) \} dt \\
&= \frac{\xi C_n}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n |g(t_i)|^2 \{ 1 + o(1) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Approximating the sum from below with the help of Lemma 2 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \{ I_1(g) \} &\geq \min(1, \xi/2) C_n \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |g(t_i)|^2 \{ 1 + o(1) \} + \lambda \|g^{(m)}\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\geq \min(1, \xi/2) C_n \left[ \left( \|g\|_2^2 - \frac{c_m}{n \lambda^{1/2m}} \|g\|_{m,\lambda}^2 \right) \{ 1 + o(1) \} + \lambda \|g^{(m)}\|_2^2 \right] \\
&= \text{const. } C_n \|g\|_{m,\lambda}^2 \{ 1 + o(1) \},
\end{aligned}$$

since  $n^{2m}\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows that

$$\inf_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} \mathbb{E}\{I_1(g)\} \geq \text{const. } C_n D^2 \{1 + o(1)\}, \quad (12)$$

where the constant is strictly positive.

We finally deal with  $I_1(g) - \mathbb{E}\{I_1(g)\}$ . Observe that

$$I_1(g) - \mathbb{E}\{I_1(g)\} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{in}(g),$$

with  $I_{in}(g)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) independent random variables defined by

$$I_{in}(g) := \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)} [\psi(\epsilon_i + t) - \psi(\epsilon_i)] - \mathbb{E}\{\psi(\epsilon_i + t) - \psi(\epsilon_i)\} dt.$$

We will now use this representation to show that

$$\sup_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda} \leq D} |I_1(g) - \mathbb{E}\{I_1(g)\}| = o_P(1) D C_n, \quad (13)$$

from which the statement of Theorem 2 would follow through comparison of (10), (11), (12) and (13). In particular, for large enough  $D$  these bounds would imply that  $\inf_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} \mathbb{E}\{I_1(g)\}$  would be positive and dominate all other terms.

For first, first note that  $I_{in}(g)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) are uniformly bounded, since by (A2) and (6)

$$\max_{i \leq n} |I_{in}(g)| \leq 2M_1 C_n^{1/2} \max_{i \leq n} |g(t_i)| \leq \underbrace{2M_1 c_m}_{:=M_1^*} D C_n^{1/2} \lambda^{-1/4m}. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, the total variance may be bounded using (A3), Lemma 2 and (8) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{I_{in}(g)\} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)} \{\psi(\epsilon_i + t) - \psi(\epsilon_i)\} dt \right\}^2 \\ &\leq M_2 \sum_{i=1}^n |C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)| \left| \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)} |t| dt \right| \\ &\leq 2^{-1} M_2 C_n^{3/2} \max_{i \leq n} |g(t_i)| \sum_{i=1}^n |g(t_i)|^2 \\ &\leq \underbrace{M_2 c_m}_{:=M_2^*} n \lambda^{-1/4m} D^3 C_n^{3/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

since  $c_m(n\lambda^{1/2m})^{-1} \leq 1$  for all large  $n$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}_D$  denote the ball of radius  $D$  in  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{m,\lambda}$ , that is,  $\mathcal{B}_D := \{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1]) : \|f\|_{m,\lambda} \leq D\}$  and note that for all  $(g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{B}_D \times \mathcal{B}_D$  with a fixed  $D$ , (A2) implies

$$|I_{in}(g_1) - I_{in}(g_2)| \leq 2M_1 C_n^{1/2} \|g_1 - g_2\|_\infty, \quad (16)$$

as  $C_n^{1/2} \lambda^{-1/4m} = o(1)$ . By our assumptions  $\lambda \in (0,1)$  for all large  $n$  and therefore for all  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  we have

$$\|f\|_{m,\lambda} \geq \lambda^{1/2} \|f\|_{m,1}.$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{B}_D \subset \{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1]) : \|f\|_{m,1} \leq \lambda^{-1/2} D\} := \mathcal{Z}_D.$$

Let  $N(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  denote the  $\epsilon$ -covering number of a set of functions  $\mathcal{F}$  in the supremum norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . By Proposition 6 of (Cucker and Smale, 2001) we deduce the existence of a constant  $K > 0$  such that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  we have

$$\log N(\epsilon, \mathcal{Z}_D, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq K \left( \frac{D}{\lambda^{1/2} \epsilon} \right)^{1/m},$$

from which we obtain  $\log N(\epsilon, \mathcal{B}_D, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq K D^{1/m} (\lambda^{1/2} \epsilon)^{-1/m}$ .

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . From the above we have

$$N((8M_1)^{-1} C_n^{1/2} D \epsilon, \mathcal{B}_D, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \exp \left( K \left\{ \frac{8M_1}{\epsilon C_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1/2}} \right\}^{1/m} \right).$$

For short, let  $N$  denote this covering number and let  $\mathcal{B}_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) denote the balls that cover  $\mathcal{B}_D$ . Select  $g_j \in \mathcal{B}_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) such that each  $g_j$  is also in  $\mathcal{B}_D$ . This is possible by the definition of the covering number  $N$ , for if some  $\mathcal{B}_j$  does not contain any points of  $\mathcal{B}_D$  then one can construct an even smaller cover by omitting this  $\mathcal{B}_j$ .

Letting  $R_n(g) := I_1(g) - \mathbb{E}\{I_1(g)\}$ , the construction of the cover and (16) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_D} |R_n(g)| &\leq \max_{j \leq N} |R_n(g_j)| + \max_{j \leq N} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_j} |R_n(g) - R_n(g_j)| \\ &\leq \max_{j \leq N} |R_n(g_j)| + \epsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $h : (1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ : x \mapsto (1+x) \log(1+x) - x$  and let

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &:= \epsilon^2 / (8M_2^* D) h((\epsilon M_1^*) / (M_2^* 2D)) \\ K_2 &:= K(8M_1/\epsilon)^{1/m}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $K$  is the constant appearing in the bound for the covering number. Boole's and Benett's inequalities [see, e.g., (Boucheron et al., 2013)] along with (14) and (15) now reveal

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left( \sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_D} |R_n(g)| \geq \epsilon DC_n \right) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \Pr(|R_n(g_j)| \geq \epsilon DC_n/2) \\ &\leq 2N \exp(-K_1 n \lambda^{1/4m} C_n^{1/2}) \\ &= 2 \exp(-K_1 n \lambda^{1/4m} C_n^{1/2} \{1 + K_2 K_1^{-1} n^{-1} C_n^{-(m+1)/2m} \lambda^{-3/4m}\}) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that  $n C_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1/4m} \rightarrow \infty$  and, by assumption,

$$n \lambda^{3/4m} C_n^{(m+1)/2m} \geq n^{(m-1)/2m} \lambda^{(2m-1)/4m^2} \rightarrow \infty,$$

for  $m > 1$ . These limit relations now imply that the exponential tends to zero and we have thus established (13). The claim of the theorem now follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.* The proof may be deduced from Eggermont and LaRiccia (2009, Chap. 13, Lem. 2.17) that establishes the embedding

$$\{ \|f\|_2^2 + \lambda^{j/m} \|f^{(j)}\|_2^2 \}^{1/2} \leq \text{const.}_{j,m} \|f\|_{m,\lambda}$$

for all  $j \leq m$  and  $f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  with the constant depending only on  $j$  and  $m$ . Since  $\mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0,1])$  is a vector space, Theorem 2 now implies that for any  $1 \leq j \leq m$

$$n^{-j/(2m+1)} \|\widehat{f}_n^{(j)} - f_o^{(j)}\|_2 \leq \text{const.}_{j,m} \|\widehat{f}_n - f_o\|_{m,\lambda} = O_P(n^{-m/(2m+1)}),$$

for  $\lambda \asymp n^{-2m/(2m+1)}$ . The result follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 2.* The essential modification to the proof of Theorem 2 concerns the treatment of  $I_3$ , which under the boundary conditions contributes  $\lambda$  to the error instead of the previous  $\lambda^{1/2}$ . In particular, writing  $C_n = \lambda^2 + (n \lambda^{1/(2m)})^{-1}$ ,  $m$ -fold integration by parts using the boundary conditions shows that

$$\left| \int_0^1 f_o^{(m)}(x) g^{(m)}(x) dx \right| = \left| (-1)^m \int_0^1 f_o^{(2m)}(x) g(x) dx \right| \leq \|f_o^{(2m)}\|_2 \|g\|_2.$$

The definition of  $\|\cdot\|_{m,\lambda}$  now yields

$$|I_3(g)| = 2C_n^{1/2} \lambda |\langle f_o^{(2m)}, g \rangle_2| \leq \text{const.} C_n^{1/2} \lambda \|g\|_2 \leq \text{const.} \|g\|_{m,\lambda} C_n,$$

as  $\lambda < C_n^{1/2}$  and, by assumption,  $f_o \in \mathcal{W}^{2m,2}([0,1])$ . The penalty term  $\lambda$  enters  $C_n$  only through  $I_3$ , therefore the proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Let  $L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f)$  denote the objective function (4) and, as previously, let  $C_n = \lambda + (n\lambda^{1/2m})^{-1}$ . By Lemma 1, It suffices to show that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $D_\epsilon$ , such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left( \inf_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o + C_n^{1/2}g) > L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o) \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

This would imply the existence of an M-type smoothing spline estimator  $\hat{f}_{n,\hat{\sigma}}$  satisfying  $\hat{\sigma}^{-1} \|\hat{f}_n - f_o\|_{m,\lambda} = O_P(C_n^{1/2})$  and consequently,  $\|\hat{f}_n - f_o\|_{m,\lambda} = O_P(C_n^{1/2})$ .

Now, consistency of  $\hat{\sigma}$  implies that for all  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left( \inf_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o + C_n^{1/2}g) > L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o) \right) = \\ \Pr \left( \inf_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o + C_n^{1/2}g) > L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o), |\hat{\sigma} - \sigma| \leq \delta \right) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence we may restrict attention to  $\hat{\sigma} \in [\sigma - \delta, \sigma + \delta]$ . With this in mind, decompose  $L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o + C_n^{1/2}g) - L_{n,\hat{\sigma}}(f_o) := I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma}) + I'_2(g, \hat{\sigma}) + I'_3(g, \hat{\sigma})$  with

$$\begin{aligned} I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma}) &:= \frac{1}{n\hat{\sigma}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2}g(t_i)} \left\{ \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i + t}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) - \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) \right\} dt + C_n \lambda \|g^{(m)}\|_2^2 \\ I'_2(g, \hat{\sigma}) &:= -C_n^{1/2} \frac{1}{n\hat{\sigma}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) g(t_i) \\ I'_3(g, \hat{\sigma}) &:= 2C_n^{1/2} \lambda \langle f_o^{(m)}, g^{(m)} \rangle_2. \end{aligned}$$

The argument in the proof of Theorem 2 immediately shows

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_D} |I'_3(g, \hat{\sigma})| = O(1)DC_n, \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_D := \{f \in \mathcal{W}^{m,2}([0, 1]) : \|f\|_{m,\lambda} \leq D\}$ .

To derive the order  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_D} |I'_2(g, \hat{\sigma})|$  write

$$\hat{\sigma} I'_2(g, \hat{\sigma}) = -C_n^{1/2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\sigma} \right) g(t_i) - C_n^{1/2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) g(t_i) - \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\sigma} \right) g(t_i) \right\}. \quad (18)$$

The first term in the RHS of (18) is the sum of independent random variables and its supremum may be expediently treated with condition (B2) to yield the order  $O_P(1)DC_n$ , in the same way as with the proof of Theorem 2. For the second term of (18), choose  $\epsilon = (2\sigma)^{-1}$  and note that for large  $n$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}^{-1} > \epsilon$  with high probability. Applying condition (B1), Lemma 2

and the Schwarz inequality now shows

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) g(t_i) - \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\sigma} \right) g(t_i) \right\} \right| &\leq \frac{2M_\sigma}{n\sigma^2} |\hat{\sigma} - \sigma| \sum_{i=1}^n |g(t_i)| \\
&\leq \text{const. } n^{-m/(2m+1)} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |g(t_i)|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \text{const. } n^{-m/(2m+1)} \|g\|_{m,\lambda},
\end{aligned}$$

with high probability, by (B4). But  $n^{-m/(2m+1)}$  is the optimal rate of convergence and therefore  $C_n^{-1/2} \leq n^{m/(2m+1)}$ , implying that the supremum of the second term in (18) is also of order  $O_P(1)DC_n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_D} |I'_2(g, \hat{\sigma})| = O_P(1)DC_n \quad (19)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Turning to  $I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma})$ , using (B2), the fact that  $\sigma - \delta \leq \hat{\sigma} \leq \sigma + \delta$  for any  $\delta > 0$  with probability tending to one and  $n^m \lambda \rightarrow \infty$  it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\|g\|_{m,\lambda}=D} \mathbb{E}\{I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma})\} &\geq \inf_{|\sigma-\alpha| \leq \delta} \xi(\alpha) \frac{1}{n(\sigma - \delta)} \sum_{i=1}^n |g(t_i)|^2 \{1 + o(1)\} + C_n \lambda \|g^{(m)}\|_2^2 \\
&\geq \text{const. } D^2 C_n \{1 + o(1)\},
\end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the positive constant depends only on  $\sigma$ .

To complete the proof we will now use a covering argument and a concentration inequality to show that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_D} |I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}\{I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma})\}| = o_P(1)DC_n. \quad (21)$$

Let  $R_n(g, \hat{\sigma}) := I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}\{I'_1(g, \hat{\sigma})\}$  and  $V_\sigma := [\sigma - \delta, \sigma + \delta]$ . Since  $\hat{\sigma} \in V_\sigma$  for all large  $n$  with high probability, it suffices to show  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_D, |\alpha - \sigma| \leq \delta} |R_n(g, \alpha)| = o_P(1)DC_n$ . Clearly, we may write

$$R_n(g, \alpha) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{in}(g, \alpha),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{in}(g, \alpha) &:= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2} g(t_i)} \left\{ \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i + t}{\alpha} \right) - \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\alpha} \right) \right\} du \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{-C_n^{1/2} g(t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i + t}{\alpha} \right) - \psi \left( \frac{\epsilon_i}{\alpha} \right) \right\} du.
\end{aligned}$$



For ease of notation we avoid specifying the constants in what is to follow. The random variables  $I_{in}(g, \alpha)$  are independent and the Lipschitz-continuity of  $\psi$  may be used to show that  $I_{in}(g, \alpha)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) are uniformly bounded on  $\mathcal{B}_D \times V_\sigma$ . In particular, by (6), we have

$$\max_{i \leq n} |I_{in}(g, \alpha)| \leq \text{const. } D^2 C_n \lambda^{-1/2m}, \quad (22)$$

for all  $(g, \alpha) \in \mathcal{B}_D \times V_\sigma$ . Similarly, Lemma 2 allows us to bound the total variance on  $\mathcal{B}_D \times V_\sigma$  by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{I_{in}(g, \alpha)\} \leq \text{const. } D^4 n C_n^2 \lambda^{-1/2m}. \quad (23)$$

To bound the differences  $I_{in}(g_1, \alpha_1) - I_{in}(g_2, \alpha_2)$  for  $(g_1, \alpha_1), (g_2, \alpha_2) \in (\mathcal{B}_D \times V_\sigma)^2$  we first note that by Boole's inequality and assumption (B3),

$$\Pr(\max_{i \leq n} |\epsilon_i| \geq n^{2/c}) \leq n \Pr(|\epsilon_1|^c \geq n^2) \leq n \frac{\mathbb{E}\{|\epsilon_1|^c\}}{n^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence we may assume without loss of generality that for large  $n$ ,  $|\epsilon_i| \leq n^{2/c}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ). From this and the fact that  $\psi$  is bounded and Lipschitz it may now be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{in}(g_1, \alpha_1) - I_{in}(g_2, \alpha_2)| &\leq \text{const. } C_n^{1/2} \|g_1 - g_2\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \text{const. } n^{2/c} D^2 C_n \lambda^{-1/2m} |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2|. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Construct a cover for  $\mathcal{B}_D$  such that the radius of each covering set  $\mathcal{B}_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) does not exceed  $DC_n^{1/2} \epsilon / 8$  up to a constant in the sup-norm. The argument in the proof of Theorem 2 may be used to show that

$$N \leq \exp \left( K \left\{ \frac{8}{\epsilon C_n^{1/2} \lambda^{1/2}} \right\}^{1/m} \right),$$

for some  $K > 0$  depending only on  $m$ . Further, let  $\mathcal{I}_k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, R$ ) denote a cover of  $V_\sigma$  such that the maximal radius does not exceed  $n^{-2/c} D^{-1} \lambda^{1/2m} \epsilon / 8$  up to a constant. From Theorem 2.5 of (van de Geer, 2000) we can have

$$R \leq \left( K' \frac{D n^{2/c}}{\epsilon \lambda^{1/2m}} + 1 \right)$$

for some  $K' > 0$ . Select  $g_j \in \mathcal{B}_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) and  $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{I}_k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, R$ ). By construction of the cover and (21) we have

$$\sup_{(g, \alpha) \in \mathcal{B}_D \times V_\sigma} |R_n(g, \alpha)| \leq \max_{j \leq N, k \leq R} |R_n(g_j, \alpha_k)| + \epsilon/2,$$

and by Boole's and Bennett's inequalities (Boucheron et al., 2013) along with (22)-(23) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left( \sup_{(g, \alpha) \in \mathcal{B}_D \times V_\sigma} |R_n(g, \alpha)| > DC_n \epsilon \right) &\leq \Pr \left( \max_{j \leq N, k \leq R} |R_n(g_j, \alpha_k)| > DC_n \epsilon / 2 \right) \\ &\leq 2NR \exp(-K_1 n \lambda^{1/2m}) \\ &= 2 \exp \left( -K_1 n \lambda^{1/2m} + K_2 (C_n \lambda)^{-1/2m} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + K_3 \log(n) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants  $K_1, K_2, K_3$  depending only on  $\epsilon, m$  and  $D$ . It is easy to see that  $n \lambda^{1/2m} \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore, since  $\lambda \asymp n^{-\gamma}$  with  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , it is clear that  $\lim_n (n \lambda^{1/2m})^{-1} \log(n) = 0$ . Lastly, by assumption, we have

$$(n \lambda^{1/m} C_n^{1/2m})^{2m} \geq n^{2m-1} \lambda^{(4m-1)/2m} \rightarrow \infty.$$

From these limit relations it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left( \sup_{(g, \alpha) \in \mathcal{B}_D \times V_\sigma} |R_n(g, \alpha)| > DC_n \epsilon \right) = 0,$$

establishing (21). The theorem follows through comparison of (17), (19), (20) and (21).  $\square$

## References

- Bai, Z.D., and Wu, Y. (1994) Limiting Behavior of M-estimators of Regression Coefficients in High Dimensional Linear models I. Scale-Dependent Case, *J. Multivariate Anal.* 51 211–239.
- Boente, G., Fraiman, R., and Meloche, J. (1997) Robust plug-in bandwidth estimators in nonparametric regression, *J. Stat. Plann. Infer.* 57 109–142.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. (2013) *Concentration Inequalities*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Cai, T.T., and Yuan, M. (2011) Optimal estimation of the mean function based on discretely sampled functional data: Phase transition, *Ann. Stat.* 39 2330–2355.
- Cox, D.D. (1983) Asymptotics for M-type smoothing splines, *Ann. Stat.* 11 530–551.
- Cucker, F. and Smale, S. (2001) On the Mathematical Foundations of Learning, *Bul. Amer. Math. Soc.* 39 1–49.
- Cunningham, J., Eubank, R.L., and Hsing, T. (1991) M-type smoothing splines with auxiliary scale estimation, *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.* 11 43–51.

- de Boor, C. (2001) *A Practical Guide to Splines*, Revised ed., Springer, New York.
- De Vito, S., Massera, E., Piga, M., Martinotto, L., and Di Francia, G. (2008) On field calibration of an electronic nose for benzene estimation in an urban pollution monitoring scenario, *Sens. Act. B: Chem.* 129 750–757.
- Eggermont, P.P.B., and LaRiccia, V.N. (2009) *Maximum Penalized Likelihood Estimation, Volume II: Regression*, Springer, New York.
- Eubank, R.L. (1999) *Nonparametric Regression and Spline Smoothing*, 2nd ed., CRC Press, New York.
- Green, P.J., and Silverman, B.W. (1994), *Nonparametric Regression and Generalized Linear Models: A roughness penalty approach*, Chapman & Hall, Suffolk, UK.
- Hastie, T.J. , Tibshirani, R.J., and Friedman, J. (2009) *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York.
- He, X., and Shi, P. (1995) Asymptotics for M-Type Regression Splines with Auxiliary Scale Estimation, *Indian J. Stat., Series A* 57 452-461.
- Huber, P.J. (1979) Robust Smoothing, in: R.L. Launer, G.N. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Robustness in Statistics*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 33–47.
- Huber, P.J., and Ronchetti, E.M., *Robust Statistics*, 2nd ed., Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2009.
- Maronna, R.A., Martin, D., and Yohai, V.J. (2006) *Robust Statistics*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Nocedal, J., and Wright, S.J. (2006) *Numerical Optimization*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York.
- Nychka, D., Martin, D., Haaland, P., and O’Connell, M. (1995) A nonparametric regression approach to syringe grading for quality improvement, *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.* 90 1171-1178.
- Oh, H.-S., Nyckha, D. W., and Lee, T.C.M. (2007) The role of pseudo data for robust smoothing with application to wavelet regression, *Biometrika* 94 893–904.
- Pollard, D. (1991) Asymptotics for least absolute deviation regression estimators, *Econometric Theory* 7 186–199.
- R Core Team (2018) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Rice, J., and Rosenblatt, M. (1981) Integrated mean squared error of a smoothing spline, *J. Approx. Theory* 33 353–369.
- Rynne, B., and Youngston, M.A. (2008) *Linear functional analysis*, Springer, London.
- Silverman, B.W. (1996) Smoothed functional principal components analysis by choice of norm, *Ann. Statist.* 24 1–24.

- Stone, C.J. (1982) Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression, *Ann. Stat.* 10 1040–1053.
- van de Geer, S. (2000) *Empirical Processes in M-Estimation*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- van de Geer, S. (2002) M-estimation using penalties or sieves, *J. Stat. Plann. Infer.* 108 5569.
- Wahba, G. (1990) *Spline models for observational data*, Siam, Philadelphia, Pen.
- Welsh, A.H. (1989) On M-processes and M-estimation, *Ann. Stat.* 17 337–361.
- Yohai, V.J., and Maronna, R.A. (1979) Asymptotic Behavior of M-Estimators for the Linear Model, *Ann. Stat.* 7 258–268.
- Yohai, V.J., and Zamar, R.H. (1988) High breakdown-point estimates of regression by means of the minimization of an efficient scale, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 83 406–413.