

Submitted to Bernoulli

On uniform consistency of nonparametric tests I

*

MIKHAIL ERMAKOV

*Institute of Problems of Mechanical Engineering RAS, Bolshoy pr., 61, VO, 1991178 St.
Petersburg and St. Petersburg State University, Universitetsky pr., 28, Petrodvoretz, 198504
St. Petersburg, RUSSIA
E-mail: erm2512@gmail.com*

For widespread nonparametric tests we point out necessary and sufficient conditions of uniform consistency of nonparametric sets of alternatives approaching to hypothesis. Nonparametric sets of alternatives can be defined both in terms of distribution functions and in terms of densities (or signals in the problem of signal detection in Gaussian white noise). In this part of paper such conditions are provided for χ^2 -tests having increasing number of cells with growth of sample size, Cramer-von Mises tests, tests generated \mathbb{L}_2 - norms of kernel estimators and tests generated quadratic forms of estimators of Fourier coefficients.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62F03, 62G10, 62G20

Keywords: Cramer-von Mises tests, chi-squared test, consistency, goodness of fit tests, signal detection.

1. Introduction

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be sample of i.i.d.r.v.'s having c.d.f. $F \in \mathfrak{F}$. Here \mathfrak{F} is set of all distribution functions of random variables having values into interval $(0,1)$

We explore problem of testing hypothesis

$$\mathbb{H}_0 : F(x) = F_0(x) = x, \quad x \in [0, 1] \quad (1.1)$$

versus sets of alternatives defined in terms of

distribution functions

$$\mathbb{H}_n : F \in \Upsilon_n, \quad \Upsilon_n \subset \mathfrak{F} \quad (1.2)$$

or in terms of densities $p(x) = 1 + f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx}$

$$\mathbb{H}_{1n} : f \in \Psi_n, \quad \Psi_n \subset \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1). \quad (1.3)$$

*The research has been supported by RFFI Grant 20-01-00273.

Here $\mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$ is Hilbert space of all quadratically integrable functions $g(t)$, $t \in (0, 1)$ with \mathbb{L}_2 -norm $\|g\| = (\int g^2(t) dt)^{1/2}$.

For part of setups the problem of goodness of fit testing for distribution function or density is replaced with the problem of signal detection in Gaussian white noise. This allows to simplify technical part of paper.

We are interested in uniform consistency of nonparametric tests. If test or test statistic is uniformly consistent for sets of alternatives, we say that these sets of alternatives are uniformly consistent for these tests or test statistics.

For setups mentioned above we point out necessary and sufficient conditions of uniform consistency of sets of alternatives (1.2) and (1.3) for test statistics of

Kolmogorov tests;

Cramer-von Mises tests;

chi-squared tests having increasing number of cells with growth of sample size;

tests generated quadratic forms of estimators of Fourier coefficients of orthogonal expansion of signal;

tests generated \mathbb{L}_2 -norms of kernel estimators.

Last four of above mentioned tests statistics have quadratic structure. The results and proofs for these test statistics are similar. We provide these results in first part of paper. The results about Kolmogorov tests are provided in second part of paper.

Denote \hat{F}_n – empirical distribution function of X_1, \dots, X_n .

If sets of alternatives are defined in terms of distribution functions, necessary and sufficient conditions of consistency will be provided in the framework of distance method.

Test statistics can be considered as functionals $T_n(\hat{F}_n)$ depending on empirical distribution functions. Functionals $T_n(F)$ admits interpretation as norms or seminorms defined on the set of differences of distribution functions. Established uniform consistency of tests statistics on sets of alternatives

$$\Upsilon_n(T_n, \rho_n) = \{ F : T_n(F) > \rho_n > 0, F \in \mathfrak{F} \}$$

allows to make a conclusion about uniform consistency of any sequence of sets of alternatives Υ_n in terms of their distances or semidistances

$$\inf_{F \in \Upsilon_n} T_n(F)$$

from hypothesis.

For specially selected sequences $\rho_n, \rho_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in papers [7, 9, 8] (see Theorems 6.3, 4.3, 5.2 as well) we established uniform consistency of sets $\Upsilon_n(T_n, \rho_n)$ of alternatives for χ^2 -tests having increasing number of cells with growth of sample size, tests generated \mathbb{L}_2 - norms of kernel estimators and tests generated quadratic forms of estimators of Fourier coefficients. Moreover asymptotic minimaxity of tests on these sets has been established. In this part of paper we establish uniform consistency of sets $\Upsilon_n(T, \rho_n)$ of alternatives for Cramer - von Mises test (see Theorem 7.1. Some similar results will be established for Kolmogorov test in the second part of paper.

Proof of results on uniform consistency of sets of alternatives (1.3) defined in terms of densities or signals are based on these results.

Problem of signal detection is considered for the following setup. We observe a realization of random process $Y_n(t)$ defined stochastic differential equation

$$dY_n(t) = f(t) dt + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} dw(t), \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad \sigma > 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where $f \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$ is unknown signal and $dw(t)$ is Gaussian white noise.

The following nonparametric sets of alternatives (see [12, 6, 9, 15, 16, 17, 21, 25]) are often explored

$$\mathbb{H}_n : f \in V_n = \{ f : \|f\|^2 \geq \rho_n, f \in U \subset \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1) \}, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Here U is a convex set.

We answer on four questions given below. The answer on the first question is provided for problem of signal detection in Gaussian white noise and does not touch test statistics mentioned above.

For which bounded convex sets U there are $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that there is uniformly consistent sequence of tests for sets V_n of alternatives ?

We show that uniformly consistent test exists, if and only if, set U is relatively compact (see Theorems 3.1 and 3.3). Note that necessary and sufficient condition of existence of consistent nonparametric estimator on nonparametric set is relative compactness of this set [14], [18]. The same compactness condition arises in solution of ill-posed inverse problems with deterministic errors [5]. The problem of existence of consistent tests has been explored for different setups. The most complete bibliography one can find in [10].

The answer on the next three questions is provided for i.i.d.r.v.'s model in the case of Cramer-von Mises tests and chi-squared tests. Test statistics generated quadratic forms of estimators of Fourier coefficients or tests generated \mathbb{L}_2 - norms of kernel estimators are explored for problem of signal detection in Gaussian white noise.

Let $\rho_n = n^{-r}$, $0 < r \leq 1/2$, and r is fixed. How to define biggest bounded sets U such that sets V_n are uniformly consistent for one of above mentioned test statistics ?

We call such sets U -maxisets The exact definition of maxisets is provided in section 2. For $0 < r < 1/2$, for test statistics having quadratic structure we show (see Theorems 4.4, 5.1, 6.1, 7.2), that maxisets are bodies in Besov spaces $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $P_0 > 0$. Here $r = \frac{2s}{1+4s}$ for chi-squared test statistics, test statistics being \mathbb{L}_2 - norms of kernel estimator and test statistics being quadratic forms of estimators of Fourier coefficients of signal. For Cramer- von Mises tests we have $r = \frac{s}{2+2s}$.

If $r = 1/2$, we could not find sets satisfying all requirements of the definition of maxisets. However, we show that bounded convex sets of functions having a fixed finite number of nonzero Fourier coefficients satisfy similar requirements. In further statements of this section for $r = 1/2$, and therefore in the corresponding theorems, the maxisets can be replaced with such sets.

Uniform consistency of chi-squared tests and Cramer-von Mises tests for above mentioned Besov bodies has been established Ingster [15].

For nonparametric estimation the notion of maxisets has been introduced Kerkyacharian and Picard [19]. Maxisets of nonparametric estimators have been comprehensively explored in [4], [20], [27] (see also references therein). For nonparametric hypothesis testing completely different definition of maxisets has been introduced Autin, Clausel, Freyermuth and Marteau [2].

Let each set Ψ_n be bounded in $\mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$. Then Cramer- von Mises tests, chi-squared tests, tests generated \mathbb{L}_2 -norms of kernel estimators and quadratic forms of estimators of Fourier coefficients of signal are uniformly consistent, if and only if, these sets Ψ_n of alternatives does not contain inconsistent sequence of simple alternatives $f_n \in \Psi_n$. In other words sets of alternatives are uniformly consistent, if and only if, all sequences of simple alternatives $f_n \in \Psi_n$ are consistent. Thus the problem of uniform consistency for sets Ψ_n of alternatives is reduced to the problem of consistency of any sequence of simple alternatives $f_n \in \Psi_n$.

How to describe all consistent and inconsistent sequences of simple alternatives having given rate of convergence to hypothesis ?

We explore this problem as problem of testing hypothesis

$$\bar{\mathbb{H}}_0 : f(x) = 0, \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad (1.6)$$

versus sequence of simple alternatives

$$\bar{\mathbb{H}}_n : f = f_n, \quad cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}, \quad (1.7)$$

where $0 < r \leq 1/2$ and $0 < c < C < \infty$.

For above mentioned test statistics answer on this question is provided in terms of concentration of Fourier coefficients (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2). In Theorem 4.5 we propose the following interpretation of these results:

sequence of simple alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, is consistent, if and only if, functions f_n admit representation as functions f_{1n} from maxiset with the same rate of convergence to hypothesis plus functions $f_n - f_{1n}$ orthogonal to functions f_{1n} .

In Theorem 4.6 we show that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are maxiset and functions f_{1n} from maxiset such that the differences of type II error probabilities for alternatives f_n and f_{1n} is smaller ε and f_{1n} is orthogonal to $f_n - f_{1n}$.

Thus, each function of consistent sequence of alternatives with fixed rate of convergence to hypothesis contains sufficiently smooth function as an additive component and this function carries almost all information on its type II error probability.

What can we say about properties of consistent and inconsistent sequences of alternatives having fixed rate of convergence to hypothesis in \mathbb{L}_2 - norm?

In Theorem 4.7 we establish that asymptotic of type II error probabilities of sums of alternatives from consistent and inconsistent sequences coincides with the asymptotic for consistent sequence.

We call sequence of alternatives f_n purely consistent if there does not exist inconsistent sequence of alternatives f_{2n} having the same rates of convergence to hypothesis and such that f_{2n} are orthogonal to $f_n - f_{2n}$.

It is easy to show that any sequence of alternatives from maxisets with fixed rates of convergence to hypothesis is purely consistent.

In Theorem 4.8, in terms of concentration of Fourier coefficients we point out analytic assignment of purely consistent sequences of alternatives.

In Theorem 4.9 we show that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, for any purely consistent sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, there are maxiset and some sequence f_{1n} from this maxiset, such that there holds $\|f_n - f_{1n}\| \leq \varepsilon n^{-r}$.

Paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce main definitions. In section 3, the answer on the first question is provided. In sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, for $0 < r < 1/2$, above mentioned results are established respectively for test statistics based on quadratic forms of estimators of Fourier coefficients, \mathbb{L}_2 – norms of kernel estimators, χ^2 –tests and Cramer– von Mises tests. In section 8 we focus on the case $r = \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof of all Theorems is provided in Appendix.

We use letters c and C as a generic notation for positive constants. Denote $\mathbf{1}_{\{A\}}$ the indicator of an event A . Denote $[a]$ whole part of real number a . For any two sequences of positive real numbers a_n and b_n , $a_n \asymp b_n$ implies $c < a_n/b_n < C$ for all n and $a_n = o(b_n)$ implies $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For any complex number z denote \bar{z} complex conjugate number.

Denote

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x \exp\{-t^2/2\} dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^1,$$

standard normal distribution function.

Let ϕ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, be orthonormal system of functions in $\mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$. For each $P_0 > 0$ define set

$$\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0) = \left\{ f : f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j, \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^{2s} \sum_{j>\lambda} \theta_j^2 \leq P_0, \theta_j \in \mathbb{R}^1 \right\}. \quad (1.8)$$

If some assumptions about basis ϕ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, holds, functional space

$$\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s = \left\{ f : f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j, \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^{2s} \sum_{j>\lambda} \theta_j^2 < \infty, \theta_j \in \mathbb{R}^1 \right\}$$

is Besov space $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$ (see [27]). In particular, $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s$ is Besov space if ϕ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, is trygonometric basis.

If $\phi_j(t) = \exp\{2\pi i j x\}$, $x \in (0, 1)$, $j = 0, \pm 1, \dots$, denote

$$\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(P_0) = \left\{ f : f = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j, \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^{2s} \sum_{|j|>\lambda} |\theta_j|^2 \leq P_0 \right\}.$$

Since here ϕ_j are complex functions, then θ_j are complex numbers as well and $\theta_j = \bar{\theta}_{-j}$ for all $-\infty < j < \infty$.

For the same basis denote

$$\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0) = \left\{ f : f = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j, f \in \mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(P_0), \theta_0 = 0 \right\}.$$

Balls in Nikolskii classes

$$\int (f^{(l)}(x+t) - f^{(l)}(x))^2 dx \leq L|t|^{2(s-l)}, \quad \|f\| < C,$$

are Besov balls in $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$. Here $l = [s]$.

2. Main definitions

2.1. Consistency and n^{-r} -consistency

For any test K_n denote $\alpha(K_n)$ its type I error probability, and $\beta(K_n, f)$ its type II error probability for alternative $f \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$. Similar notation $\beta(K_n, F)$ is implemented if alternative is c.d.f. F .

Definition of consistency will be slightly different in each section. In section 3 problem of existence of uniformly consistent tests and uniform consistency of sets of alternatives is considered among all tests.

In section 4 consistency is considered for a fixed sequence of test statistics T_n . For kernel-based tests and chi-squared tests, consistency is explored for whole population of test statistics depending on kernel width and number of cells respectively. In section 7 we have only one test statistic.

We showed that problem of uniform consistency of sets of alternatives is reduced to the problem of consistency of sequences of simple alternatives. Thus, in sections 4 - 7, we explore this setup.

Below we provide definition of consistency for setup of sections 4 and 7. In sections 5 and 6 the definitions will be different in the sense mentioned above.

We say that sequence of simple alternatives f_n is *consistent* if for any α , $0 < \alpha < 1$, for sequence of tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$, generated test statistics T_n , there holds

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta(K_n, f_n) < 1 - \alpha. \quad (2.1)$$

If $cn^{-r} < \|f_n\| < Cn^{-r}$ additionally, we say that sequence of alternatives f_n is n^{-r} -consistent (see [30]).

We say that sequence of alternatives f_n is *inconsistent* if, for each sequence of tests K_n generated test statistics T_n , there holds

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\alpha(K_n) + \beta(K_n, f_n)) \geq 1. \quad (2.2)$$

Suppose we consider problem of testing hypothesis (1.1) versus alternatives (1.3) where Ψ_n can be also sets of signals.

For tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha + o(1)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, generated test statistics T_n denote $\beta(K_n, \Psi_n) = \sup_{f \in \Psi_n} \beta(K_n, f)$. We say that sequence of sets Ψ_n of alternatives is uniformly consistent if

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta(K_n, \Psi_n) < 1 - \alpha. \quad (2.3)$$

For sets of alternatives Υ_n defined (1.2) definition of uniform consistency is the same.

2.2. Purely consistent sequences

We say that n^{-r} -consistent sequence of alternatives f_n is *purely n^{-r} -consistent* if there does not exist subsequence f_{n_i} such that $f_{n_i} = f_{1n_i} + f_{2n_i}$ where f_{2n_i} is orthogonal to f_{1n_i} and sequence f_{2n_i} , $\|f_{2n_i}\| > c_1 n^{-r}$, is inconsistent.

2.3. Maxisets

Let ϕ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, be orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{L}_2(0,1)$. We say that a set U , $U \subset \mathbb{L}_2(0,1)$, is ortho-symmetric with respect to this basis if $f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j \in U$ implies $\tilde{f} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\theta}_j \phi_j \in U$ for any $\tilde{\theta}_j = \theta_j$ or $\tilde{\theta}_j = -\theta_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$

For closed ortho-symmetric bounded convex set U , $U \subset \mathbb{L}_2(0,1)$, denote Ξ functional space with unite ball U .

For the problem of signal detection we call bounded ortho-symmetric closed set U , $U \subset \mathbb{L}_2(0,1)$, *maxiset* and functional space Ξ *maxispace* if

i. any subsequence of alternatives $f_{n_i} \in \gamma U$, $cn_i^{-r} < \|f_{n_i}\| < Cn_i^{-r}$, $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, is consistent,

ii. if $f \notin \Xi$, then, in any convex, ortho-symmetric set V that contains f , there is inconsistent subsequence of alternatives $f_{n_i} \in V$, $cn_i^{-r} < \|f_{n_i}\| < Cn_i^{-r}$, where $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

ii. implies that U is the largest set satisfying i.

For problem of hypothesis testing on a density, in definition of maxiset we make additional assumption:

ii. is considered only for functions $f = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta_i \phi_i$ (or $f = 1 + \sum_{|i| \geq 1} \theta_i \phi_i$) satisfying the following condition.

D. There is $l_0 = l_0(f)$ such that, for all $l > l_0$, functions $1 + \sum_{|i| > l} \theta_i \phi_i$ are nonnegative (are densities).

D allows to analyze tails $f_{n_j} = \sum_{|i| \geq j} \theta_i \phi_i$ of orthogonal expansions of f to establish ii.

It is clear that if, U is maxiset, then γU , $0 < \gamma < \infty$, is maxiset as well.

Simultaneous assumptions of convexity and ortho-symmetry of set V is rather strong. If $f \in V$, $f = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta_i \phi_i$, then any $f_{\eta} \in V$ with $f_{\eta} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \eta_i \phi_i$, $|\eta_i| < |\theta_i|$, $1 \leq i < \infty$.

Test statistics of tests generated \mathbb{L}_2 - norms of kernel estimators and Cramer-von Mises tests admit representation as a linear combination of squares of estimators of Fourier coefficients. Therefore, for these test statistics, consistency of sequence f_n implies consistency of any sequence of ortho-symmetric functions \tilde{f}_n generated f_n . Moreover, type II error probabilities of sequences f_n and \tilde{f}_n have the same asymptotic. Thus the requirement of ortho-symmetry seems natural for test statistics admitting representation as a linear combination of squares of estimators of Fourier coefficients. For chi-squared tests, by Theorem 6.1 given in what follows, similar situation takes place.

2.4. Another approach to definition of maxisets

Requirement of ortho-symmetry of set U does not allow to call maxiset any convex set W generated equivalent norm in Ξ . In definition of maxiset given below we do not make such an assumption.

Let $\Xi \subset \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$ be Banach space with a norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Xi}$. Denote $U = \{f : \|f\|_{\Xi} \leq \gamma, f \in \Xi\}$, $\gamma > 0$, a ball in Ξ .

Define subspaces Π_k , $1 \leq k < \infty$, by induction.

Denote $d_1 = \max\{\|f\|, f \in U\}$ and denote e_1 function $e_1 \in U$ such that $\|e_1\| = d_1$. Denote Π_1 linear subspace generated vector e_1 .

For $i = 2, 3, \dots$ denote $d_i = \max\{\rho(f, \Pi_{i-1}), f \in U\}$ with $\rho(f, \Pi_{i-1}) = \min\{\|f - g\|, g \in \Pi_{i-1}\}$. Define function e_i , $e_i \in U$, such that $\rho(e_i, \Pi_{i-1}) = d_i$. Denote Π_i linear subspace generated functions e_1, \dots, e_i .

For any function $f \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$ denote f_{Π_i} projection of function f on subspace Π_i and denote $\tilde{f}_i = f - f_{\Pi_i}$.

Thus we associate with each $f \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$ sequence of functions \tilde{f}_i , $\tilde{f}_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

For the problem of signal detection we say that set U is *maxiset* for test statistics T_n and Ξ is *maxispace* if the following two statements take place.

i. any subsequence of alternatives $f_{n_j} \in U$, $cn_j^{-r} < \|f_{n_j}\| < Cn_j^{-r}$, $n_j \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, is consistent,.

ii. for any $f \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$, $f \notin \Xi$, there are sequences i_n and j_{i_n} with $i_n \rightarrow \infty$, $j_{i_n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, such that subsequence \tilde{f}_{i_n} is inconsistent and $cj_{i_n}^{-r} < \|\tilde{f}_{i_n}\| < Cj_{i_n}^{-r}$.

For problem of hypothesis testing on a density, ii. is verified only for functions f such that $1 + \tilde{f}_i$ are densities for all $i > i_0$.

We provide proofs of Theorems for definition of maxisets in terms of subsection 2.3. However it is easy to see that slight modification of this reasoning provide proofs for definition of subsection 2.4 as well. Basis ϕ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, in subsection 2.3 coincides in this reasoning with basis e_j .

3. Necessary and sufficient conditions of uniform consistency

We consider problem of signal detection in Gaussian white noise discussed in Introduction. Problem is explored in terms of sequence model.

Stochastic differential equation (1.4) can be rewritten in terms of a sequence model based on orthonormal system of functions ϕ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, in the following form

$$y_j = \theta_j + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \xi_j, \quad 1 \leq j < \infty, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$y_j = \int_0^1 \phi_j dY_n(t), \quad \xi_j = \int_0^1 \phi_j dw(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_j = \int_0^1 f \phi_j dt.$$

Denote $\mathbf{y} = \{y_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$.

We can consider $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as a vector in Hilbert space \mathbb{H} with the norm $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^\infty \theta_j^2\right)^{1/2}$. We implement the same notation $\|\cdot\|$ in \mathbb{L}_2 and in \mathbb{H} . Sense of this notation will be always clear from context.

In this notation the problem of hypothesis testing can be rewritten in the following form. One needs to test the hypothesis

$$\mathbb{H}_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0} \quad (3.2)$$

versus alternatives

$$\mathbb{H}_n : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in V_n = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\| \geq \rho_n, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in U, U \subset \mathbb{H}\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Here U is bounded convex set.

We say that $\mathbf{0} = \{0, 0, \dots\}$ is inner point of set U if for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{H}$ there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda \mathbf{y} \in U$ and $-\lambda \mathbf{y} \in U$.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that bounded set U is convex and $\mathbf{0}$ is inner point of U . Then there is sequence $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that there is uniformly consistent sequence of tests for sets of alternatives V_n with this sequence ρ_n , if and only if, set U is relatively compact.*

If set U is relatively compact, there is consistent estimator (see [14] and [18]). Therefore we can choose \mathbb{L}_2 -norm of consistent estimator as uniformly consistent test statistics.

Remark 3.1. *Suppose K is convex hull of points $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \dots$ and $\mathbf{0}$ is inner point of K . Suppose K is not relatively compact and $K \subset U$ where the set U is not necessarily convex. Then, by Theorem 3.1, for problem of testing hypothesis (3.2) versus alternatives (3.3), there does not exist uniformly consistent tests for all sequences $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Version of Theorem 3.1 holds for problem of testing hypothesis on a density in a following setup. Let \mathbf{P} be probability measure on σ -algebra \mathfrak{F} defined on set D . Denote $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbf{P})$ set of measurable functions $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ such that

$$\int_S f^2 d\mathbf{P} < \infty.$$

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d.r.v.'s having probability measure \mathbf{Q} , having density $q = \frac{d\mathbf{Q}}{d\mathbf{P}}$ such that $q \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathbf{P})$.

Problem is to test hypothesis $\mathbb{H}_0 : q(s) = 1$ for all $s \in D$ versus alternative $\mathbb{H}_1 : q(s) - 1 \in V_n = \{f : \|f\| \geq \rho_n, f \in U, U \subset \mathbb{L}_2(\mathbf{P})\}$. Here $\|f\|$ denotes $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbf{P})$ - norm of function f . and U is bounded convex set in $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbf{P})$

Define function $\mathbf{0}(s) = 0$ for all $s \in D$.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that set U is bounded convex into $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbf{P})$. Let set U be such that for any function $f \in U$ function $1 + f$ is probability density. Let $\mathbf{0}$ be inner point of U . Then there is sequence $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that there is uniformly consistent sequence of tests for sets of alternatives V_n with this sequence ρ_n , if and only if, set U is relatively compact.*

Reasoning in the proof of Theorem 3.2 coincides with the reasoning of proof of Theorem 3.1 with unique difference we implement Theorem 4.1 in [10] instead of Theorem 5.3 in [10]. We omit this reasoning.

Similar Theorem holds for problem of signal detection in linear inverse ill-posed problem.

In Hilbert space \mathbb{H} , we observe a realization of Gaussian random vector

$$\mathbf{y} = A\boldsymbol{\theta} + \epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad \epsilon > 0, \quad (3.4)$$

where $A : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is known linear operator and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is Gaussian random vector having known covariance operator $R : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbf{E}[\boldsymbol{\xi}] = 0$.

We explore the same problem of hypothesis testing $\mathbb{H}_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} = 0$ versus alternatives $\mathbb{H}_n : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in V_n$.

For any operator $S : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ denote $\mathfrak{R}(S)$ the rangespace of S .

Suppose that the nullspaces of A and R equal zero and $\mathfrak{R}(A) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}(R^{1/2})$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let operator $R^{-1/2}A$ be bounded. Suppose that bounded set U is convex and $\mathbf{0}$ is inner point of U . Then the statement of Theorem 3.1 holds.*

Remark 3.2. *In papers another definition of uniform consistency is often explored (see, for example, [15]). In this definition, (2.3) is replaced with the requirement of existence of sequence of tests K_n such that $\alpha(K_n) \rightarrow 0$ and $\beta(K_n, V_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Theorem on exponential decay of type I and type II error probabilities (see [23] and [29]), the statements of Theorems 3.1 – 3.3 for this definition of consistency follows from these Theorems.*

4. Quadratic test statistics

4.1. General setup

We explore problem of signal detection in Gaussian white noise (1.4) and (1.7) with $0 < r < 1/2$ discussed in Introduction. Problem is provided in terms of sequence model (3.1).

If U is compact ellipsoid

$$U = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} : \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \theta_j^2 \leq P_0, \boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}, \theta_j \in \mathbb{R}^1 \right\}$$

with $a_j > 0$, $a_j \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, asymptotically minimax test statistics for sets of alternatives V_n are quadratic forms

$$T_n(Y_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 y_j^2 - \sigma^2 n^{-1} \rho_n$$

with some specially defined coefficients κ_{nj}^2 (see Ermakov [6]). Here $\rho_n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2$.

If coefficients κ_{nj}^2 satisfy some regularity assumptions, test statistics $T_n(Y_n)$ are asymptotically minimax (see [9]) for wider sets of alternatives

$$\mathbb{H}_n : f \in \Upsilon_n(R_n, c) = \{ f : R_n(f) > c, f \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1) \}$$

with

$$R_n(f) = A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sigma^{-4} n^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_j^2.$$

and $f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j$.

A sequence of tests $L_n, \alpha(L_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, is called *asymptotically minimax* if, for any sequence of tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) \leq \alpha$, there holds

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\beta(K_n, \Upsilon_n(R_n, c)) - \beta(L_n, \Upsilon_n(R_n, c))) \geq 0.$$

Sequence of test statistics T_n is called asymptotically minimax if tests generated test statistics T_n are asymptotically minimax.

We make the following assumptions.

A1. For each n sequence κ_{nj}^2 is decreasing.

A2. There are positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that, for each n , there holds

$$C_1 < A_n = \sigma^{-4} n^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^4 < C_2. \quad (4.1)$$

A3. There are positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that $c_1 n^{-2r} \leq \rho_n \leq c_2 n^{-2r}$.

Denote $\kappa_n^2 = \kappa_{nk_n}^2$ with $k_n = \sup \left\{ k : \sum_{j < k} \kappa_{nj}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \rho_n \right\}$.

A4. There are C_1 and $\lambda > 1$ such that, for any $\delta > 0$ and for each n we have

$$\kappa_{[n, (1+\delta)k_n]}^2 < C_1(1+\delta)^{-\lambda} \kappa_n^2.$$

A5. There holds $\kappa_{n1}^2 \asymp \kappa_n^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For any $c > 1$ there is C such that $\kappa_{n, [ck_n]}^2 \geq C \kappa_n^2$ for all n .

Example. Let

$$\kappa_{nj}^2 = n^{-\lambda} \frac{1}{j^\gamma + cn^\beta}, \quad \gamma > 1,$$

with $\lambda = 2 - 2r - \beta$ and $\beta = (2 - 4r)\gamma$. Then A1 – A5 hold.

Note that A1-A5 imply

$$\kappa_n^4 = \kappa_{nk_n}^4 \asymp n^{-2} k_n^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad k_n \asymp n^{2-4r}. \quad (4.2)$$

Theorems 4.1 – 4.10 given below represent realization of program announced in Introduction.

4.2. Analytic form of necessary and sufficient conditions of consistency

The results will be provided in terms of Fourier coefficients of functions $f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume A1-A5. Sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, is consistent, if and only if, there are c_1, c_2 and n_0 such that there holds*

$$\sum_{|j| < c_2 k_n} |\theta_{nj}|^2 > c_1 n^{-2r} \quad (4.3)$$

for all $n > n_0$.

Versions of Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.8 hold for setups of other sections. In setups of these sections indices j may accept negative values and θ_{nj} may be complex numbers. By this reason we write $|j|$ instead of j and $|\theta_{nj}|$ instead of θ_{nj} in (4.3), (4.4) and (4.9).

Theorem 4.2. *Assume A1-A5. Sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, is inconsistent, if and only if, for any c_2 , there holds*

$$\sum_{|j| < c_2 k_n} |\theta_{nj}|^2 = o(n^{-2r}) \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof of Theorems is based on Theorem 4.3 on asymptotic minimaxity of test statistics T_n .

Define sequence of tests $K_n(Y_n) = \mathbf{1}_{\{n^{-1}T_n(Y_n) > (2A_n)^{1/2}x_\alpha\}}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, where x_α is defined by the equation $\alpha = 1 - \Phi(x_\alpha)$.

Theorem 4.3. Assume A1-A5. Then sequence of tests $K_n(Y_n)$ is asymptotically minimax for the sets $\Upsilon_n(R_n, c)$ of alternatives. There hold $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha + o(1)$ and

$$\beta(K_n, f_n) = \Phi(x_\alpha - R_n(f_n)(2A_n)^{-1/2})(1 + o(1)) \quad (4.5)$$

uniformly onto all sequences f_n such that $R_n(f_n) < C$ for any $C > 0$.

A version of Theorem 4.3 for the problem of signal detection with heteroscedastic white noise has been proved in [8].

Such a form of conditions in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 can be explained by concentration of coefficients κ_{nj}^2 in zone $j = O(k_n)$ for test statistics T_n and for $A_n(\theta_n)$.

Version of Theorem 4.3 for problem of hypothesis testing on distribution function provides necessary and sufficient conditions of uniform consistency of sets of alternatives defined in terms of distribution functions.

4.3. Maxisets. Qualitative structure of consistent sequences of alternatives

Denote $s = \frac{r}{2-4r}$. Then $r = \frac{2s}{1+4s}$.

Theorem 4.4. Assume A1-A5. Then balls $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $P_0 > 0$, are maxisets for test statistics $T_n(Y_n)$.

For maxisets $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ with deleted "small" \mathbb{L}_2 - ball asymptotically minimax tests have been found in [11]. In [16], similar result has been obtained for Besov bodies in $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$ defined in terms of wavelets coefficients.

Theorem 4.5. Assume A1-A5. Then sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, is consistent, if and only if, there are maxiset $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $P_0 > 0$, and sequence $f_{1n} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $c_1n^{-r} \leq \|f_{1n}\| \leq C_1n^{-r}$, such that f_{1n} is orthogonal to $f_n - f_{1n}$, that is, there holds

$$\|f_n\|^2 = \|f_{1n}\|^2 + \|f_n - f_{1n}\|^2, \quad (4.6)$$

Therefore, if we have maxiset $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $P_0 > 0$, sequence of arbitrary functions $f_{1n} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $c_1n^{-r} \leq \|f_{1n}\| \leq C_1n^{-r}$ and sequence of arbitrary functions f_{2n} , $c_1n^{-r} \leq \|f_{2n}\| \leq C_1n^{-r}$ orthogonal to f_{1n} , then sequence of simple alternatives $f_n = f_{1n} + f_{2n}$ is consistent.

Theorem 4.6. Assume A1-A5. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, for any consistent sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$ there are maxiset $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $P_0 > 0$, and sequence of functions f_{1n} , $c_1n^{-r} \leq \|f_{1n}\| \leq C_1n^{-r}$, belonging to maxiset $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ such that there holds

function f_{1n} is orthogonal to $f_n - f_{1n}$

for any α , $0 < \alpha < 1$, for the tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, there is n_ε such that, for any $n > n_\varepsilon$, there hold

$$|\beta(K_n, f_n) - \beta(K_n, f_{1n})| \leq \varepsilon \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\beta(K_n, f_n - f_{1n}) \geq 1 - \alpha - \varepsilon. \quad (4.8)$$

If functions $f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$ satisfy $c_1 n^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq C_1 n^{-r}$, then for any c there is P_0 such that $f_{1n} = \sum_{j=1}^{[ck_n]} \theta_{nj} \phi_j \in \mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ (see Lemma A.4). Since coefficients κ_{nj}^2 , $j > ck_n$, are relatively small for large c , this allows to prove Theorems 4.5 and 4.6.

Maxisets $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $P_0 > 0$ in Theorems 4.5, 4.6 and 4.9 can be replaced with arbitrary maxiset U .

4.4. Interaction of consistent and inconsistent sequences of alternatives. Purely consistent sequences

Theorem 4.7. Assume A1-A5. Let sequence of alternatives f_n be consistent. Then, for any inconsistent sequence of alternatives f_{1n} , for tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, generated test statistics T_n , there holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\beta(K_n, f_n) - \beta(K_n, f_n + f_{1n})) = 0.$$

Theorem 4.8. Assume A1-A5. Sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, is purely n^{-r} -consistent, if and only if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $C_1 = C_1(\varepsilon)$ such that there holds

$$\sum_{|j| > C_1 k_n} |\theta_{nj}|^2 \leq \varepsilon n^{-2r} \quad (4.9)$$

for all $n > n_0(\varepsilon)$.

Theorem 4.9. Assume A1-A5. Then sequence f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, is purely n^{-r} -consistent, if and only if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is γ_ε and sequence of functions f_{1n} belonging to maxiset $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(\gamma_\varepsilon)$ such that $\|f_n - f_{1n}\| \leq \varepsilon n^{-r}$ and (4.6) holds.

Theorem 4.10. Assume A1-A5. Then sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} < \|f_n\| < Cn^{-r}$, is purely n^{-r} -consistent, if and only if, for any inconsistent subsequence of alternatives f_{1n_i} , $cn_i^{-r} < \|f_{1n_i}\| < Cn_i^{-r}$, there holds

$$\|f_{n_i} + f_{1n_i}\|^2 = \|f_{n_i}\|^2 + \|f_{1n_i}\|^2 + o(n_i^{-r}), \quad (4.10)$$

where $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 4.1. Let $\kappa_{nj}^2 > 0$ for $j \leq l_n$ and let $\kappa_{nj}^2 = 0$ for $j > l_n$ with $l_n \asymp n^{2-4r}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Analysis of proofs of Theorems shows that Theorems 4.1 - 4.10 remain valid for this setup if A4 and A5 are replaced with

A6. For any c , $0 < c < 1$, there is c_1 such that $\kappa_{n,[cl_n]}^2 \geq c_1 \kappa_{n1}^2$ for all n .

In all corresponding reasoning we should put $\kappa_n^2 = \kappa_{n1}^2$ and $k_n = l_n$.

Theorems 4.2 and 4.8 hold with the following changes. It suffices to put $c_2 < 1$ in Theorem 4.2 and to take $C_1(\epsilon) < 1$ in Theorem 4.8.

Proof of corresponding versions of Theorems 4.1 - 4.10 is obtained by simplification of provided reasoning and is omitted.

5. Kernel-based tests

We continue to explore problem (1.6) and (1.7) of signal detection in Gaussian white noise with $0 < r < 1/2$. We suppose additionally that signal f belongs to $\mathbb{L}_2^{per}(\mathbb{R}^1)$ the set of 1-periodic functions such that $f(t) \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$. This allows to extend our model on real line \mathbb{R}^1 putting $w(t+j) = w(t)$ for all integer j and $t \in [0, 1)$ and to write the forthcoming integrals over all real line.

Define kernel estimator

$$\hat{f}_n(t) = \frac{1}{h_n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K\left(\frac{t-u}{h_n}\right) dY_n(u), \quad t \in (0, 1), \quad (5.1)$$

where $h_n > 0$, $h_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The kernel K is bounded function such that the support of K is contained in $[-1, 1]$, $K(t) = K(-t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(t) dt = 1$.

Denote $K_h(t) = \frac{1}{h} K\left(\frac{t}{h}\right)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $h > 0$.

In (5.1) we supposed that, for any v , $0 < v < 1$, we have

$$\int_1^{1+v} K_{h_n}(t-u) dY_n(u) = \int_0^v K_{h_n}(t-1-u) f(u) du + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^v K_{h_n}(t-1-u) dw(u)$$

and

$$\int_{-v}^0 K_{h_n}(t-u) dY_n(u) = \int_{1-v}^1 K_{h_n}(t-u+1) f(u) du + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{1-v}^1 K_{h_n}(t-u+1) dw(u).$$

Define kernel-based test statistics

$$T_n(Y_n) = T_{nh_n}(Y_n) = nh_n^{1/2} \sigma^{-2} \gamma^{-1} (\|\hat{f}_n\|^2 - \sigma^2 (nh_n)^{-1} \|K\|^2),$$

where

$$\gamma^2 = 2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(t-s) K(s) ds \right)^2 dt.$$

We call sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, n^{-r} -consistent if, there is constant c_1 such that (2.1) holds for any tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$. $0 < \alpha < 1$, generated sequence of test statistics T_n with $h_n < c_1 n^{4r-2}$, $h_n \asymp n^{4r-2}$.

We call sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, n^{-r} -inconsistent if sequence of alternatives f_n is inconsistent for any tests generated arbitrary test statistics T_n with $h_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Problem will be explored in terms of sequence model.

Let we observe a realization of random process $Y_n(t)$ with $f = f_n$.

For $-\infty < j < \infty$, denote

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{K}(jh) &= \int_{-1}^1 \exp\{2\pi ijt\} K_h(t) dt, \quad h > 0, \\ y_{nj} &= \int_0^1 \exp\{2\pi ijt\} dY_n(t), \quad \xi_j = \int_0^1 \exp\{2\pi ijt\} dw(t), \\ \theta_{nj} &= \int_0^1 \exp\{2\pi ijt\} f_n(t) dt.\end{aligned}$$

In this notation we can write kernel estimator in the following form

$$\hat{\theta}_{nj} = \hat{K}(jh_n) y_{nj} = \hat{K}(jh_n) \theta_{nj} + \sigma n^{-1/2} \hat{K}(jh_n) \xi_j, \quad -\infty < j < \infty, \quad (5.2)$$

and test statistics T_n admit the following representation

$$T_n(Y_n) = nh_n^{1/2} \sigma^{-2} \gamma^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{\theta}_{nj}|^2 - n^{-1} \sigma^2 \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{K}(jh_n)|^2 \right). \quad (5.3)$$

If we put $|\hat{K}(jh_n)|^2 = \kappa_{nj}^2$, we get that definitions of test statistics $T_n(Y_n)$ in this section and in sections 4 are almost coincide. The setup of section 5 differs from setup of section 4 only heteroscedastic white noise. Another difference in the setup is that the function $\hat{K}(\omega)$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^1$, may have zeros. Since differences are insignificant the same results are valid. Denote $k_n = \lfloor n^{2-4r} \rfloor$.

Theorem 5.1. *The statements of Theorems 4.1, 4.2, 4.5-4.10 hold for this setup as well. The statement of Theorem 4.4 holds also with $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$ replaced with $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$.*

In version of Theorem 4.4, ii. in definition of maxisets holds for test statistics T_n having arbitrary values $h_n > 0$, $h_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Denote

$$T_{1n}(f) = T_{1n}(f, h_n) = \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{h_n} \int K\left(\frac{t-s}{h_n}\right) f(s) ds \right)^2 dt.$$

For sequence $\rho_n > 0$, define sets

$$\Upsilon_{nh_n}(T_{1n}, \rho_n) = \{f : T_{1n}(f) > \rho_n, f \in \mathbb{L}_2^{per}(\mathbb{R}^1)\}.$$

Define sequence of kernel-based tests $K_n = \mathbf{1}_{\{T_n(Y_n) \geq x_\alpha\}}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, with x_α defined the equation $\alpha = 1 - \Phi(x_\alpha)$.

Proof of Theorems is based on the following Theorem 5.2 on asymptotic minimaxity of kernel-based tests K_n (see Theorem 2.1.1 in [8]).

Theorem 5.2. *Let $h_n^{-1/2}n^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, $h_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let*

$$0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\rho_n h_n^{1/2} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\rho_n h_n^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Then sequence of kernel-based tests K_n , is asymptotically minimax for the sets of alternatives $\Upsilon_{nh_n}(T_{1n}, \rho_n)$. There hold $\alpha(L_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$ and

$$\beta(K_n, f_n) = \Phi(x_\alpha - \gamma^{-1}\sigma^{-2}nh_n^{1/2}T_{1n}(f_n))(1 + o(1)) \quad (5.4)$$

uniformly onto sequences $f_n \in \mathbb{L}_2^{per}(R^1)$ such that $nh_n^{1/2}T_{1n}(f_n) < C$.

We have

$$T_{1n}(f_n) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{K}(jh_n)|^2 |\theta_{nj}|^2. \quad (5.5)$$

Note that the unique difference of setups of Theorems 5.2 and 4.3 is heteroscedastic noise. Thus roof of Theorem 5.2 can be obtained by easy modification of the proof of Theorem 4.3.

6. χ^2 -tests

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d.r.v.'s having c.d.f. $F \in \mathfrak{F}$. Let c.d.f. $F(x)$ have a density $1 + f(x) = dF(x)/dx$, $x \in (0, 1)$, $f \in L_2^{per}(0, 1)$.

We explore the problem of testing hypothesis (1.6) versus alternatives (1.7) with $0 < r < 1/2$ discussed in Introduction.

For any sequence m_n , denote $\hat{p}_{nj} = \hat{F}_n(j/m_n) - \hat{F}_n((j-1)/m_n)$, $1 \leq j \leq m_n$.

Test statistics of χ^2 -tests equal

$$T_n(\hat{F}_n) = n m_n \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} (\hat{p}_{nj} - 1/m_n)^2.$$

Let

$$f_n = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \theta_{nj} \phi_j, \quad \phi_j(x) = \exp\{2\pi i j x\}, \quad x \in (0, 1).$$

We call sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, n^{-r} -consistent, if there is c_1 such that, (2.1) holds for any tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$. $0 < \alpha < 1$, generated sequence of chi-squared test statistics T_n with number of cells $m_n > c_1 n^{2-4r}$, $m_n \asymp n^{2-4r}$.

We call sequence of alternatives f_n , $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$, n^{-r} -inconsistent if sequence of alternatives f_n is inconsistent for all tests generated test statistics T_n having number of cells m_n , $m_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Denote $k_n = \left\lceil n^{\frac{2}{1+4s}} \right\rceil \asymp n^{2-4r}$.

The differences in versions of Theorems 4.1–4.10 for this setup are caused only the requirement that functions f_n , f_{1n} and f_{2n} should be densities.

Theorem 6.1. *The statements of Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4-4.6, 4.8-4.10 hold for this setup with the following differences.*

In version of Theorem 4.4 balls $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$ is replaced with bodies $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s$.

In version of Theorem 4.4, ii. in definition of maxisets holds for test statistics T_n with arbitrary choice of number of cells m_n , $m_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In version of Theorem 4.6 we consider only sequences of alternatives f_n such that the following assumption holds.

B. *There is c_0 such that, for all $c > c_0$, functions*

$$1 + f_{cn} = 1 + \sum_{|j| > cm_n} \theta_j \phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + f_n - f_{cn} = 1 + \sum_{|j| < cm_n} \theta_j \phi_j$$

are densities.

We implement definition of purely consistent sequences only for sequences f_n satisfying B.

In proof of version of Theorem 4.6 for chi-squared tests, we show that there is $C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon, c, C, c_0)$ such that, for densities $1 + f_{1n} = 1 + \sum_{|j| < C_\varepsilon m_n} \theta_j \phi_j$, (4.6), (4.7) and (4.9) hold. By Lemma A.4 given below, there is γ_ε such that $f_{1n} \in \gamma_\varepsilon U$.

In Theorem 6.2, given below, definitions of consistency and inconsistency proposed in subsection 2.1 are treated if simple alternatives f_n are replaced with distribution functions F_n and hypothesis is $\mathbb{H}_0 : F(x) = F_0(x) = x$, $x \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 6.2. *Let sequence of alternatives F_n be consistent. Let F_{1n} be inconsistent sequence of alternatives such that $F_{2n} = F_n(x) + F_{1n}(x) - F_0(x)$ are distribution functions. Then for tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha(1 + o(1))$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, there holds*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\beta(K_n, F_n) - \beta(K_n, F_{2n})) = 0.$$

Proof of Theorems are based on the following Theorem 6.3 on asymptotic minimaxity of chi-squared tests given below. Theorem 6.3 is summary of results of Theorems 2.1 and 2.4 in [7].

For sequence $\rho_n > 0$, define sets of alternatives

$$\Upsilon_n(T_n, \rho_n) = \left\{ F : T_n(F) \geq \rho_n, F \in \mathfrak{S} \right\}.$$

The definition of asymptotic minimaxity of tests is the same as in section 4.

Define the tests

$$K_n = \mathbf{1}_{\{2^{-1/2}m_n^{-1/2}(T_n(\hat{F}_n) - m_n + 1) > x_\alpha\}}$$

where x_α is defined the equation $\alpha = 1 - \Phi(x_\alpha)$.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $m_n \rightarrow \infty$, $m_n^{-1}n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let*

$$0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_n^{-1/2} \rho_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_n^{-1/2} \rho_n < \infty.$$

Then χ^2 -tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha + o(1)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, are asymptotically minimax for the sets of alternatives $\Upsilon_n(T_n, \rho_n)$. There holds

$$\beta(K_n, F_n) = \Phi(x_\alpha - 2^{-1/2}m_n^{-1/2}T_n(F_n))(1 + o(1))$$

uniformly onto sequences F_n such that $T_n(F_n) \leq Cm_n^{1/2}$.

Note that for implementation of Theorem 6.3 to proof of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 we need to make a transition from indicator functions to trigonometric functions. Such a transition is realized in Appendix.

7. Cramer – von Mises tests

We consider Cramer – von Mises test statistics as functional

$$T^2(\hat{F}_n - F_0) = \int_0^1 (\hat{F}_n(x) - F_0(x))^2 dF_0(x)$$

depending on empirical distribution function \hat{F}_n . Here $F_0(x) = x$, $x \in [0, 1]$.

Denote $K_n = K_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ sequence of Cramer- von Mises tests.

A part of further results holds for setup (1.1) and (1.2) with $\Upsilon_n = \Upsilon_n(a) \doteq \Upsilon_n(T^2, an^{-1})$, $a > 0$.

We say that Cramer - von Mises test is asymptotically unbiased if, for any $a > 0$, for any α , $0 < \alpha < 1$, for tests K_n , $\alpha(K_n) = \alpha + o(1)$, there holds

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{F \in \Upsilon_n(a)} \beta_F(K_n) < 1 - \alpha. \quad (7.1)$$

Nonparametric tests satisfying (7.1) are called also uniformly consistent (see Ch. 14.2 in [24]).

Proof of results is based on the following Theorem 7.1.

Theorem 7.1. *The following three statements hold.*

i. *For sequence of alternatives F_n , there is sequence of Cramer - von Mises tests K_n such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\alpha(K_n) + \beta_{F_n}(K_n)) = 0, \quad (7.2)$$

holds, if and only if, there holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n T^2(F_n - F_0) = \infty. \quad (7.3)$$

- ii. Cramer - von Mises tests are asymptotically unbiased.
- iii. For any sequence of Cramer - von Mises tests K_n ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\alpha(K_n) + \beta_{F_n}(K_n)) \geq 1,$$

holds, iff, there holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n T^2(F_n - F_0) = 0.$$

Sufficiency in i. and iii. in Theorem 7.1 is wellknown (see [15]). Necessary conditions in i. and in iii. follows easily from ii.

From now on we explore the problem of testing hypothesis (1.6) versus alternatives (1.7) with $0 < r < 1/2$ discussed in Introduction.

If c.d.f. F has density, we can write the functional $T^2(F - F_0)$ in the following form (see Ch.5, [28])

$$T^2(F - F_0) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (\min\{s, t\} - st) f(t) f(s) ds dt$$

with $f(t) = d(F(t) - F_0(t))/dt$.

If we consider the orthonormal expansion of function

$$f(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j(t)$$

on trigonometric basis $\phi_j(t) = \sqrt{2} \cos(\pi j t)$, $1 \leq j < \infty$, then we get

$$n T^2(F - F_0) = n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_j^2}{\pi^2 j^2}. \quad (7.4)$$

Denote $k_n = [n^{(1-2r)/2}]$.

In Theorems 7.2 and 7.3 given below, we follow the definition of consistency provided in subsection 2.1.

Theorem 7.2. *For orthonormal system of functions $\phi_j(t) = \sqrt{2} \cos(\pi j t)$, $t \in [0, 1)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, the bodies $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ with $s = \frac{2r}{1-2r}$, $r = \frac{s}{2+2s}$, are maxisets for Cramer - von Mises test statistics.*

In previous sections functionals T_n depend on n . In this setup we explore the unique functional T for all n and for different values of r , $0 < r < 1/2$. To separate the study

of sequences of alternatives for different r , we consider for fixed r only sequences of alternatives satisfying G1.

G1. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is c_ε such that there holds

$$n \sum_{|j| < c_\varepsilon k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 j^{-2} < \varepsilon$$

for all $n > n_0(\varepsilon, c_\varepsilon)$.

If G1 does not hold for some $c_\varepsilon = c_n \rightarrow 0$, $c_n k_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and functions $1 + \bar{f}_n = 1 + \sum_{j < c_n k_n} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$ are densities, then (2.1) holds for some sequence of functions \bar{f}_n , $\|\bar{f}_n\| = o(n^{-r})$. Thus this case of consistency can be studied in the framework of the faster rate of convergence of sequence of alternatives.

Theorem 7.3. *Let sequence of alternatives f_n satisfies G1. Then for sequence f_n the statements of Theorems 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8 and 4.10 are valid with the following changes.*

In version of Theorem 4.6 it is supposed that B holds.

In Theorem 7.3 definition of pure consistency is considered for sequences of functions f_n satisfying B.

Theorem 7.4. *The statement of Theorem 6.2 holds for this setup as well.*

8. $n^{-1/2}$ - rate of convergence

In section we extend results of sections 4 – 7 to the case $r = 1/2$. We show that, for $r = 1/2$, the sets

$$U(l, P_0) = \{f : f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j, \|f\| \leq P_0, f \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)\}$$

with $l = 1, 2, \dots$ and $P_0 > 0$ and the linear space $\Xi = \{f : f \in U(l, P_0) \text{ for some integer } l \text{ and } P_0 > 0\}$ satisfy *i.* and *ii.* respectively in definition of maxisets. Moreover sets $U(l, P_0)$ can replace with maxisets in versions of Theorems 4.5, 4.6 and 4.9.

Problems of hypothesis testing in sections 4, 5 and 7 are covered the following setup.

We observe sequence of independent random variables $y_j = \theta_j + n^{-1/2} \sigma_j \xi_j$ where ξ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, are Gaussian random variables, $\mathbf{E}\xi_j = 0$ and $\mathbf{E}[\xi_j^2] = 1$.

Define functional

$$T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \theta_j^2, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_j\}_1^\infty,$$

where coefficients κ_j^2 satisfy the following conditions.

D1. Sequence κ_j^2 is decreasing and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 < \infty$.

D2 There is $C > 0$ such that $0 < \sigma_j < C$ for all $1 \leq j < \infty$.

Problem is to test hypothesis

$$\mathbb{H}_0 : \theta_j = 0, \quad 1 \leq j < \infty \quad (8.1)$$

versus alternatives

$$\mathbb{H}_n : \theta_j = \theta_{nj}, \quad 1 \leq j < \infty, \quad (8.2)$$

where $T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n) \asymp n^{-1}$ with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \{\theta_{nj}\}_1^\infty$.

Theorem 8.1. *For $r = 1/2$ sets $U(l, P_0)$, $l = 1, 2, \dots$, $P_0 > 0$, and linear space Ξ satisfy i. and ii. respectively in definition of maxisets.*

Theorem 8.2. *Assume D1 and D2. Then Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4 - 4.10 are valid with $k_n = 1$ and sets $\mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ replaced with sets $U(l, P_0)$, where $l = 1, 2, \dots$ and $P_0 > 0$.*

Proof of Theorem 8.2 is based on Theorem 8.3 given below and evident modification of iii. in Theorem 7.1 on this setup. Reasoning are akin to proof of Theorems in section 4 and is omitted. Note only that for verifying ii in definition of maxisets we put $\bar{f}_l = \sum_{j=l}^\infty \theta_j \phi_j$ (see proof of Theorem 4.4). After that we implement version of Theorem 4.2 for this setup.

Denote $z_j = n^{1/2}y_j$ and $\eta_j = n^{1/2}\theta_j$. Then problem of hypothesis testing (8.1) and (8.2) is replaced with the following.

We observe independent random variables $z_j = \eta_j + \sigma_j \xi_j$. Problem is to test hypothesis

$$\mathbb{H}_0 : \eta_j = 0, \quad 1 \leq j < \infty \quad (8.3)$$

versus alternatives

$$\mathbb{H}_n : \eta_j = \tau_j, \quad 1 \leq j < \infty, \quad (8.4)$$

where $0 < T(\boldsymbol{\tau}) < \infty$ with $\boldsymbol{\tau} = \{\tau_j\}_1^\infty$.

For $a > 0$, define sets of alternatives

$$\Upsilon(a) = \{\boldsymbol{\eta} : T(\boldsymbol{\eta}) > a, \boldsymbol{\eta} = \{\eta_j\}_1^\infty, \eta_j \in \mathbb{R}^1\} \quad (8.5)$$

We say that test K is unbiased [24], if

$$\alpha(K) + \beta(K, \Upsilon(a)) < 1. \quad (8.6)$$

Denote $\mathbf{z} = \{z_j\}_1^\infty$.

Theorem 8.3. *Assume D1 and D2. Then tests K , $\alpha(K) = \alpha$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, generated test statistics $T(\mathbf{z})$ are unbiased.*

Proof of Theorem 8.3 is provided in A.5.

For chi-squared tests with number of cells $m_n = m = \text{const}$ similar Theorem holds for $r = 1/2$ with the same definition of consistency as in section 6.

Theorem 8.4. For $r = 1/2$, for chi-squared tests Theorem 8.1 holds as well. Statement of Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5, 4.6, 4.8-4.10 hold with the same changes as in Theorem 6.1 and with $k_n = 1$.

Emphasize that Besov bodies $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ in versions of Theorems 4.5, 4.6 and 4.9 are replaced with sets $U(l, P_0)$, $l = 1, 2, \dots$ and $P_0 > 0$.

For proof of Theorem 8.4 we implement wellknown fact that $nT_n(F_n) > c$ is necessary and sufficient condition for consistency of sequence of alternatives $F_n \in \mathfrak{F}$ for chi-squared tests with fixed number of cells.

Theorem 8.3 allows to obtain versions of Theorems 7.2-7.4 for problem of hypothesis testing 8.3 and 8.4 with test statistics T having $\kappa_j^2 \asymp j^{-2\lambda}$, $2\lambda > 1$.

Such a setup arises in particular for test statistics T constructed on the base of technique of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces [13].

Theorem 8.5. Let $\kappa_j^2 \asymp j^{-2\lambda}$, $2\lambda > 1$. Then statements of Theorems 7.2 – 7.4 holds with $s = \frac{2\lambda r}{1-2\lambda r}$ and $k_n \asymp n^{\frac{1-2r}{2\lambda}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. All assumptions caused the requirement of density non-negativity are omitted.

Proof of Theorem 8.5 is akin to proof of Theorems 7.2-7.4 and is omitted.

Appendix A: Proof of Theorems

A.1. Proof of Theorems of section 3

It suffices to prove only necessary conditions.

We suppose set U is closed. General setup can be reduced easily to this one.

First we prove Theorem 3.1 if set U is center-symmetric.

We remind that set U is center-symmetric if $\theta \in U$ implies $-\theta \in U$.

Lemma A.1. Suppose that set U is bounded, convex and center-symmetric. Then the statement of Theorem 3.1 holds.

For any vectors $\theta_1 \in \mathbb{H}$ and $\theta_2 \in \mathbb{H}$ define segment $\text{int}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \{\theta : \theta = (1 - \lambda)\theta_1 + \lambda\theta_2, \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$.

Proof of Lemma A.1 is based on the following Lemma A.2.

Lemma A.2. For any vectors $\theta_1 \in U$ and $\theta_2 \in U$ we have $\text{int}\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}, \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}\right) \subset U$. There holds $0 \in \text{int}\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}, \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}\right)$ and segment $\text{int}\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}, \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}\right)$ is parallel to segment $\text{int}(\theta_1, \theta_2)$.

Remark 3.1. Let we have segment $\text{int}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \subset U$. Let η and $-\eta$ be the points of intersection of the line $L = \{\theta : \theta = \lambda(\theta_1 - \theta_2), \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^1\}$ and the boundary of set U . Then, by Lemma A.2, we get $\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| \leq 2\|\eta\|$.

Proof of Lemma A.2. Segments $\text{int}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \subset U$ and $\text{int}(-\theta_1, -\theta_2) \subset U$ are parallel. For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we have $(1 - \lambda)\theta_1 + \lambda\theta_2 \in \text{int}(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ and $-\lambda\theta_1 - (1 - \lambda)\theta_2 \in \text{int}(-\theta_1, -\theta_2)$. The middle $\theta_\lambda = ((1 - 2\lambda)\theta_1 - (1 - 2\lambda)\theta_2)/2$ of segment $\text{int}((1 - \lambda)\theta_1 + \lambda\theta_2, -\lambda\theta_1 - (1 - \lambda)\theta_2) \subset U$ belongs to segment $\text{int}\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}, \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}\right)$ and, for each point θ of segment $\text{int}\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}, \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}\right)$, there is $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ such that $\theta = \theta_\lambda$. Therefore $\text{int}\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}, \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2}\right) \subset U$. \square

Proof of Lemma A.1. Define sequence of orthogonal vectors e_i by induction.

Define vector e_1 , $e_1 \in U$, such that $\|e_1\| = \sup\{\|\theta\| : \theta \in U\}$. Denote Π_1 linear subspace generated e_1 . Denote Γ_1 linear subspace orthogonal to Π_1 .

Define vector $e_i \in U \cap \Gamma_{i-1}$ such that $\|e_i\| = \sup\{\|\theta\| : \theta \in U \cap \Gamma_{i-1}\}$. Denote Π_i linear subspace generated vectors e_1, \dots, e_i . Denote Γ_i linear subspace orthogonal to Π_i .

Denote $d_i = \|e_i\|$. Note that $d_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Otherwise, by Theorem 5.3 in [10], there does not exist uniformly consistent tests for the problem of testing hypothesis $\mathbb{H}_0 : \theta = 0$ versus alternative $\mathbb{H}_1 : \theta = e_i, i = 1, 2, \dots$

For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ denote $l_\varepsilon = \min\{j : d_j < \varepsilon, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$.

Denote $B_r(\theta)$ ball having radius r and center θ .

It suffices to show that, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there is finite coverage of set U by balls $B_{\varepsilon_1}(\theta)$.

Denote $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1/9$.

Denote U_ε projection of set U onto subspace Π_{l_ε} .

Denote $\tilde{B}_r(\theta)$ ball in Π_{l_ε} having radius r and center $\theta \in \Pi_{l_\varepsilon}$. There is ball $\tilde{B}_{\delta_1}(0)$ such that $\tilde{B}_{\delta_1}(0) \subset U$. Denote $\delta = \min\{\varepsilon, \delta_1\}$.

Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ be δ -net in U_ε .

Let η_1, \dots, η_k be points of U such that θ_i is projection of η_i onto subspace Π_{l_ε} for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Let us show that $B_{\varepsilon_1}(\eta_1), \dots, B_{\varepsilon_1}(\eta_k)$ is coverage of set U .

Let $\eta \in U$ and let θ be projection of η onto Π_{l_ε} . There is $i, 1 \leq i \leq k$, such that $\|\theta_i - \theta\| \leq \delta$. It suffices to show that $\eta \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(\eta_i)$.

By Lemma A.2, $\text{int}\left(\frac{\eta_i - \eta}{2}, \frac{\eta - \eta_i}{2}\right) \subset U$. Since $\theta_i - \theta \in \Pi_{l_\varepsilon}$ and $\theta_i - \theta \in \tilde{B}_\delta(0)$, then $(\theta_i - \theta)/2 \in U$. Since set U is center-symmetric and convex we have $\frac{1}{2}((\eta_i - \eta)/2) - \frac{1}{2}((\theta_i - \theta)/2) \in U$. Note that vector $(\eta_i - \theta_i) - (\eta - \theta)$ is orthogonal to the subspace Π_{l_ε} . Therefore $\|((\eta_i - \theta_i) - (\eta - \theta))/4\| \leq 2\varepsilon$. Therefore $\|\eta - \eta_i\| \leq 8\varepsilon + \|\theta - \theta_i\| < 9\varepsilon$. This implies $\eta \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(\eta_i)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We say that set \bar{W} is trimmed symmetrization of set W if $x \in \bar{W}$ holds, if and only if, $x \in W$ and $-x \in W$. If W is convex, then \bar{W} is convex as well.

Since $\bar{U} \subset U$, then there is consistent tests for problem of testing hypothesis $\theta = 0$ versus alternatives $\bar{\mathbb{H}}_n : \theta \in \bar{V}_n = \{\theta : \|\theta\| \geq \rho_n, \theta \in \bar{U}\}$ if there is consistent test for sets of alternatives V_n .

Therefore set \bar{U} is compact. We show that this implies that set U is compact as well.

Suppose otherwise. Then there are points $\mathbf{x}_i \in U$, $1 \leq i < \infty$, and positive constant b such that $\rho(\mathbf{x}_i, \Pi_{i-1}) > b$ for $2 \leq i < \infty$. Here Π_{i-1} is hyperplane generated points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1}$. Then convex hull $L \subset U$ of points $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots$ is not compact as well.

Denote M hyperplane generated by points \mathbf{x}_i , $1 \leq i < \infty$. Without loss of generality we can suppose $\mathbf{0} \notin M$. There is $\lambda < 0$ such that $\mathbf{x}_0 = \lambda \mathbf{w} \in U$ where $\mathbf{w} = \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2}{2}$.

Denote K convex hull of points $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots$. Let \bar{K} be trimmed symmetrization of K . Then $\bar{K} \subset \bar{U}$ and therefore \bar{K} is compact. Let us show that there is $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{x}_0 + \delta(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_0) \in \bar{K}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore set of points $\mathbf{x}_0 + \delta(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_0)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, is compact. We will come to contradiction.

Denote $d = \sup\{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| : \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in U\}$.

Denote α_k angle between vectors $\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_0$ and $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x}_0$.

Denote β_k angle between vectors $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x}_k$ and $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x}_0$.

Then angle γ_k between vectors $\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_k$ and $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x}_0$ equals $\beta_k - \alpha_k$.

If we show $\gamma_k > c > 0$ for all k , we prove the existence $\delta > 0$.

Denote \mathbf{w}_k projection of \mathbf{x}_k on a line passing through points \mathbf{x}_0 and \mathbf{w} .

Then $\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{w}\| \geq b$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{w}_k\| \leq \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_k\| \leq d$.

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k &= \arctan \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{w}_k\|}{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_k\|} - \arctan \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{w}_k\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{w}_k\|} \\ &\geq \arctan \frac{b}{d - \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{w}\|} - \arctan \frac{b}{d} > c > 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.3. . Proof of Theorem 3.1 is based on Theorem 5.3 in [10]. For linear inverse ill-posed problems (3.4), Theorem 5.5 in [10] is akin to Theorem 5.3 in [10]. Thus it suffices to implement Theorem 5.5 in [10] instead of Theorem 5.3 in [10] in proof of Theorem 3.1. □

A.2. Proof of Theorems of section 4

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Theorem 4.3 and its version for Remark 4.1 setup can be deduced straightforwardly from Theorem 1 in [6].

Lower bound follows from reasoning of Theorem 1 in [6] straightforwardly.

Upper bound follows from the following reasoning. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 y_j^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_{nj}^2 + 2 \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_{nj} \xi_j + \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \xi_j^2 \\ &= n^{-2} A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n) + 2 J_{1n} + J_{2n} \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

with

$$\mathbf{E}[J_{2n}] = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \rho_n, \quad \mathbf{Var}[J_{2n}] = 2 \frac{\sigma^4}{n^4} A_n \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$\mathbf{Var}[J_{1n}] = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^4 \theta_{nj}^2 \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \kappa_n^2}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_{nj}^2 = o(n^{-4} A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n)). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By Chebyshov inequality, it follows from (A.1) - (A.3), that, if $A_n = o(A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\beta(L_n, f_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus it suffices to explore the case

$$A_n \asymp A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n) = n^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_{nj}^2. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

If (A.4) holds, then, implementing the reasoning of proof of Lemma 1 in [6], we get that (4.5) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let (4.3) hold. Then, by A5 and (4.2), we have

$$A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n) = n^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_{nj}^2 \geq C n^2 \kappa_n^2 \sum_{j=1}^{c_2 k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 \asymp n^2 \kappa_n^2 n^{-2r} \asymp 1.$$

By Theorem 4.3, this implies sufficiency.

Necessary conditions follows from sufficiency conditions in Theorem 4.2. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let (4.4) hold. Then, by (4.2) and A2, we have

$$A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n) \leq C n^2 \kappa_n^2 \sum_{j < c_2 k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 + C n^2 \kappa_{n, [c_2 n]}^2 \sum_{j > c_2 n} \theta_{nj}^2 \asymp o(1) + O(\kappa_{n, [c_2 n]}^2 / \kappa_n^2). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By A4, we have

$$\lim_{c_2 \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{n, [c_2 n]}^2 / \kappa_n^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

By Theorem 4.3, (A.5) and (A.6) together, we get sufficiency. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Statement *i*. follows from Theorem 4.1 and Lemma A.3 provided below.

Lemma A.3. *Let $f_n \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(c_1)$ and $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$. Then, for $l_n = C_1 n^{2-4r}(1+o(1)) = C_1 n^{\frac{r}{s}}(1+o(1))$ with $C_1^{2s} > 2c_1/c$, there holds*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{l_n} \theta_{nj}^2 > \frac{c}{2} n^{-2r} (1 + o(1)). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Proof. Let $f_n \in c_1 U$. Then we have

$$l_n^{2s} \sum_{j=l_n}^{\infty} \theta_{nj}^2 = C_1^{2s} n^{2r} \sum_{j=l_n}^{\infty} \theta_{nj}^2 (1 + o(1)) \leq c_1 (1 + o(1)).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{j=l_n}^{\infty} \theta_{nj}^2 \leq c_1 C_1^{-2s} n^{-2r} \leq \frac{c}{2} n^{-2r} (1 + o(1)). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Therefore (A.7) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.4 . Suppose opposite that *ii.* does not valid. Then $f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tau_j \phi_j \notin \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s$. This implies that there is sequence m_l , $m_l \rightarrow \infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$m_l^{2s} \sum_{j=m_l}^{\infty} \tau_j^2 = C_l \quad (\text{A.9})$$

with $C_l \rightarrow \infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$.

Define a sequence $\boldsymbol{\eta}_l = \{\eta_{lj}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\eta_{lj} = 0$ if $j < m_l$ and $\eta_{lj} = \tau_j$ if $j \geq m_l$.

Since V is convex and ortho-symmetric we have $\tilde{f}_l = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{lj} \phi_j \in V$.

For alternatives \tilde{f}_l we define sequence n_l such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_l\|^2 \asymp n_l^{-2r} \asymp m_l^{-2s} C_l. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Then

$$n_l \asymp C_l^{-1/(2r)} m_l^{s/r} = C_l^{-1/(2r)} m_l^{\frac{1}{2-4r}}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Therefore we get

$$m_l \asymp C_l^{(1-2r)/r} n_l^{2-4r}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By A4, (A.12) implies

$$\kappa_{n_l m_l}^2 = o(\kappa_{n_l}^2). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Using (4.2), A2 and (A.13), we get

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n_l}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_l) &= n_l^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{n_l j}^2 \eta_{lj}^2 \leq n_l^2 \kappa_{m_l n_l}^2 \sum_{j=m_l}^{\infty} \theta_{nj}^2 \\ &\asymp n_l^{2-2r} \kappa_{n_l m_l}^2 = O(\kappa_{n_l m_l}^2 \kappa_{n_l}^{-2}) = o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

By Theorem 4.3, (A.14) implies n_l^{-r} -inconsistency of sequence of alternatives \tilde{f}_l . \square

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Theorem 4.5 follows from Lemmas A.4 – A.6.

Lemma A.4. For any c and any C there is $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ such that, if $f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{ck_n} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$, and $\|f_n\| \leq C n^{-r}$, then $f_n \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$.

Proof. Let C_1 be such that $k_n = C_1 n^{r/s} (1 + o(1))$. Then we have

$$k_n^{2s} \sum_{j=1}^{ck_n} \theta_{nj}^2 \leq C_1 n^{2r} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{nj}^2 (1 + o(1)) < C C_1 (1 + o(1)).$$

\square

Lemma A.5. *Necessary conditions in Theorem 4.5 are fulfilled.*

Proof. Let $f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$ and let $f_{1n} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{nj} \phi_j$. Denote $\zeta_{nj} = \theta_{nj} - \eta_{nj}$, $1 \leq j < \infty$.

For any $\delta > 0$, c_1 and C_2 , there is c_2 such that, for each sequence $f_{1n} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$, $\|f_{1n}\| \leq C_2 n^{-r}$, there holds

$$\sum_{j > c_2 k_n} \eta_{nj}^2 < \delta n^{-2r}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

To prove (A.15) it suffices to put $c_2 k_n = l_n = C_1 n^{2-4r}(1+o(1))$ in (A.8) with $C_1^{2s} > \delta c_1$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &= \left| \sum_{j > c k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 - \sum_{j > c k_n} \zeta_{nj}^2 \right| \leq \sum_{j > c k_n} |\eta_{nj}(2\theta_{nj} - \eta_{nj})| \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{j > c k_n} \eta_{nj}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(2 \left(\sum_{j > c k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum_{j > c k_n} \eta_{nj}^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \leq C \delta^{1/2} n^{-2r}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

By (4.6), using (A.15) and (A.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j < c k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{nj}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \zeta_{nj}^2 - \sum_{j \geq c k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 \geq \sum_{j < c k_n} \eta_{nj}^2 - J_n \\ &\geq \sum_{j < c k_n} \eta_{nj}^2 - C \delta^{1/2} n^{-2r} \geq \|f_{1n}\|^2 - \delta n^{-2r} - C \delta^{1/2} n^{-2r}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

By Theorem 4.1, (A.17) implies consistency of sequence f_n . \square

Lemma A.6. *Let sequence of alternatives f_n , $c n^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq C n^{-r}$, be consistent. Then (4.6) holds.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, there are c_1 and c_2 such that sequence $f_{1n} = \sum_{j < c_2 k_n} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$ is consistent and $\|f_{1n}\| \geq c_1 n^{-r}$. By Lemma A.4, there is $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ such that $f_{1n} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$. \square

\square

Proof of Theorem 4.6. By A4 and (4.2), for any $\delta > 0$, there is c such that we have

$$n^2 \sum_{j > c k_n} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_{nj}^2 \leq \delta. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

By Lemma A.4, there is P_0 such that $f_{1n} = \sum_{j < c k_n} \theta_{nj} \phi_j \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$. By Theorem 4.3 and (A.18), for sequence of alternatives f_{1n} , (4.7) and (4.8) hold. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.7. Let $f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$ and let $f_{1n} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta_{nj} \phi_j$. Denote $\eta_n = \{\eta_{nj}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$.

By Cauchy inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_n(\theta_n) - A_n(\theta_n + \eta_n)| &= n^2 \left| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 \theta_{nj}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{nj}^2 (\theta_{nj} + \eta_{nj})^2 \right| \\ &\leq 2 A_n^{1/2}(\theta_n) A_n^{1/2}(\eta_n) + A_n(\eta_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

By Theorem 4.3, inconsistency of sequence f_{1n} implies $A_n(\eta_n) = o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, by (A.19), $|A_n(\theta_n) - A_n(\theta_n + \eta_n)| = o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, by Theorem 4.3, we get Theorem 4.7. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.8 . For proof of sufficiency suppose opposite. Then there is sequence n_i , $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ such that $f_{n_i} = f_{1n_i} + f_{2n_i}$,

$$\|f_{n_i}\|^2 = \|f_{1n_i}\|^2 + \|f_{2n_i}\|^2, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

$c_1 n_i^{-r} < \|f_{1n_i}\| < C_1 n_i^{-r}$, $c_2 n_i^{-r} < \|f_{2n_i}\| < C_2 n_i^{-r}$ and sequence f_{2n_i} is inconsistent.

Let $f_{n_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{n_i j} \phi_j$, $f_{1n_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{1n_i j} \phi_j$ and $f_{2n_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{2n_i j} \phi_j$.

Then, by Theorem 4.2 and by (4.9), we get that there are ε_i , $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ and $C_i = C(\varepsilon_i)$, $C_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\sum_{j > C_i k_n} \theta_{n_i j}^2 = \sum_{j > C_i k_n} (\theta_{1n_i j} + \theta_{2n_i j})^2 = o(n^{-2r}), \quad \sum_{j < C_i k_n} \theta_{2n_i j}^2 = o(n^{-2r}). \quad (\text{A.21})$$

By (A.20) and (A.21), we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{n_i j}^2 = \sum_{j < C_i k_n} \theta_{n_i j}^2 + o(n^{-2r}) = \sum_{j < C_i k_n} \theta_{1n_i j}^2 + o(n^{-2r}). \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Hence, by (A.20), we get $\|f_{2n_i}\| = o(n^{-r})$. We come to contradiction.

To prove necessary conditions suppose (4.9) does not hold. Then there are $\varepsilon > 0$ and sequences $C_i \rightarrow \infty$, $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\sum_{j > C_i k_{n_i}} \theta_{n_i j}^2 > \varepsilon n_i^{-2r}.$$

Then, by A4 and (4.2), we get

$$n_i^2 \sum_{j > C_i k_{n_i}} \kappa_{n_i j}^2 \theta_{n_i j}^2 = o(1).$$

Therefore, by Theorem 4.3, subsequence $f_{1n_i} = \sum_{j > C_i k_{n_i}} \theta_{n_i j} \phi_j$ is inconsistent. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.9. For proof of necessary conditions, it suffices to put

$$f_{1n} = \sum_{j < C_1(\epsilon)k_n} \theta_{nj}\phi_j.$$

By Lemma A.4, there is $P_0 > 0$ such that $f_{1n} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$. Proof of sufficiency is simple and is omitted. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.10. Necessary conditions are rather evident, and proof is omitted. Proof of sufficiency is also simple.

Lemma A.7. *Let for sequence f_n , $cn^{-r} < \|f_n\| < Cn^{-r}$, (4.10) hold. Then sequence f_n is purely n^{-r} -consistent.*

Suppose $f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{nj}\phi_j$ is not purely n^{-r} -consistent. Then, by Theorem 4.8, there are c_1 and sequences n_i , and $c_{n_i}, c_{n_i} \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$\sum_{j > c_{n_i}k_{n_i}} \theta_{n_i j}^2 > c_1 n_i^{-r}.$$

Therefore, if we put $f_{1n_i} = \sum_{j > c_{n_i}k_{n_i}} \theta_{n_i j}\phi_j$, then (4.10) does not hold. \square

A.3. Proof of Theorems of section 5

Proof of version of Theorem 4.1. . Since $\hat{K}(\omega)$ is analytical function and $\hat{K}(0) = 1$ there is $b > 0$ such that $|\hat{K}(\omega)| > c > 0$ for $|\omega| < b$.

Let (4.3) hold. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{1n}(f_n) &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{K}(jh_n)|^2 |\theta_{nj}|^2 \geq \sum_{|j|h_n < b} |\hat{K}(jh_n)|^2 |\theta_{nj}|^2 \\ &\asymp \sum_{|j| < c_2 k_n} |\hat{K}(jh_n)|^2 |\theta_{nj}|^2 \asymp n^{-1} h_n^{-1/2} \asymp n^{-2r} \end{aligned}$$

for $c_2 k_n < b h_n^{-1}$. By Theorem 5.2, this implies consistency. \square

Proof of version of Theorem 4.4. We verify only *iv.*. Let $f = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \tau_j \phi_j \notin \mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$. Then there is sequence $m_l, m_l \rightarrow \infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$m_l^{2s} \sum_{|j| \geq m_l} |\tau_j|^2 = C_l \tag{A.23}$$

with $C_l \rightarrow \infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$.

It is clear that we can define a sequence m_l such that

$$m_l^{2s} \sum_{m_l \leq |j| \leq 2m_l} |\tau_j|^2 > \delta C_l, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where δ , $0 < \delta < 1/2$, does not depend on l .

Otherwise, we have

$$2^{2s(i-1)} m_l^{2s} \sum_{j=2^{i-1}m_l}^{2^i m_l} \tau_j^2 < \delta C_l$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, that implies that the left hand-side of (A.23) does not exceed $2\delta C_l$.

Define a sequence $\eta_l = \{\eta_{lj}\}_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}$ such that $\eta_{lj} = \tau_j$ if $|j| \geq m_l$, and $\eta_{lj} = 0$ otherwise.

Denote

$$\tilde{f}_l(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_{lj} \exp\{2\pi i j x\}.$$

For alternatives $\tilde{f}_l(x)$ we define sequence n_l such that $\|\tilde{f}_l(x)\| \asymp n_l^{-r}$.

Then

$$n_l \asymp C_l^{-1/(2r)} m_l^{s/r}.$$

We have $|\hat{K}(\omega)| \leq \hat{K}(0) = 1$ for all $\omega \in R^1$ and $|\hat{K}(\omega)| > c > 0$ for all $|\omega| < b$. Hence, if we put $h_l = h_{n_l} = 2^{-1}b^{-1}m_l^{-1}$, then, by (A.24), there is $C > 0$ such that, for all $h > 0$, there holds

$$T_{1n_l}(\tilde{f}_l, h_l) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{K}(jh_l) \eta_{lj}|^2 > C \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{K}(jh) \eta_{lj}|^2 = C T_{1n_l}(\tilde{f}_l, h).$$

Thus we can choose $h = h_l$ for further reasoning.

By (A.24), we get

$$T_{1n_l}(\tilde{f}_l) = \sum_{|j| > m_l} |\hat{K}(jh_l) \eta_{lj}|^2 \asymp \sum_{j=m_l}^{2m_l} |\eta_{lj}|^2 \asymp n_l^{-2r}. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

If we put in estimates (A.11), (A.12), $k_l = [h_{n_l}^{-1}]$ and $m_l = k_l$, then we get

$$h_{n_l}^{1/2} \asymp C_l^{(2r-1)/2} n_l^{2r-1}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

By (A.25) and (A.26), we get

$$n_l T_{1n_l}(\tilde{f}_l) h_{n_l}^{1/2} \asymp C_l^{-(1-2r)/2}.$$

By Theorem 5.2, this implies inconsistency of sequence of alternatives \tilde{f}_l . \square

A.4. Proof of Theorems of section 6

We have

$$n^{-1}m_n^{-1}T_n(F) = \sum_{l=0}^{m_n-1} \left(\int_{l/m_n}^{(l+1)/m_n} f(x)dx \right)^2.$$

Using representation $f(x)$ as Fourier series

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \theta_j \exp\{2\pi i j x\},$$

we get

$$\int_{l/m_n}^{(l+1)/m_n} f(x)dx = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_j}{2\pi i j} \exp\{2\pi i j l/m_n\} (\exp\{2\pi i j/m_n\} - 1)$$

for $1 \leq l < m_n$.

In what follows, we shall use the following agreement $0/0 = 0$.

Lemma A.8. *There holds*

$$n^{-1}m_n^{-1}T_n(F) = m_n \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq km_n} \frac{\theta_j \bar{\theta}_{j-km_n}}{4\pi^2 j(j-km_n)} (2 - 2 \cos(2\pi j/m_n)). \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Proof of Lemma A.8. We have

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1}m_n^{-1}T_n(F) &= \sum_{l=0}^{m_n-1} \left(\sum_{j \neq 0} \frac{\theta_j}{2\pi i j} \exp\{2\pi i j l/m_n\} (\exp\{2\pi i j/m_n\} - 1) \right) \\ &\times \left(\sum_{j \neq 0} \frac{-\bar{\theta}_j}{2\pi i j} \exp\{-2\pi i j l/m_n\} (\exp\{-2\pi i j/m_n\} - 1) \right) = J_1 + J_2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \sum_{l=0}^{m_n-1} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j_1=j-km_n} \frac{\theta_j \bar{\theta}_{j_1}}{4\pi^2 j j_1} \exp\{2\pi i l k\} \\ &\times (\exp\{2\pi i j/m_n\} - 1)(\exp\{-2\pi i j_1/m_n\} - 1) \\ &= m_n \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_j \bar{\theta}_{j-km_n}}{4\pi^2 j(j-km_n)} (2 - 2 \cos(2\pi j/m_n)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= \sum_{l=0}^{m_n-1} \sum_{j \neq 0} \sum_{j_1 \neq j-km_n} \frac{\theta_j \bar{\theta}_{j_1}}{4\pi^2 j j_1} \exp\{2\pi i (j-j_1)l/m_n\} \\ &\times (\exp\{2\pi i j/m_n\} - 1)(\exp\{-2\pi i j_1/m_n\} - 1) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

where $j_1 \neq j - km_n$ signifies that summation is performed over all j_1 such that $j_1 \neq j - km_n$ for all integer k .

In the last equality of (A.30), we make use of the identity

$$\sum_{l=0}^{m_n-1} \exp\{2\pi i(j - j_1)l/m_n\} = \frac{\exp\{2\pi i(j - j_1)m_n/m_n\} - 1}{\exp\{2\pi i(j - j_1)/m_n\} - 1} = 0,$$

if $j - j_1 \neq km_n$ for all integer k .

By (A.28) - (A.30) together, we get (A.27). \square

For any c.d.f F and any k denote \tilde{F}_k the function having the derivative

$$1 + \tilde{f}_k(x) = 1 + \sum_{|j| > k} \theta_j \exp\{2\pi i j x\}$$

and such that $\tilde{F}_k(1) = 1$.

Denote $i_n = [dm_n]$ where $d > 1 + c$.

Lemma A.9. *There holds*

$$n^{-1}m_n^{-2}T_n(\tilde{F}_{i_n}) \leq Cm_n^{-1}i_n^{-1} \sum_{|j| > i_n} |\theta_j|^2. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Proof. Denote $\eta_j = \theta_j$ if $|j| > i_n$ and $\eta_j = 0$ if $|j| < i_n$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1}m_n^{-2}T_n(\tilde{F}_{i_n}) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq km_n} \frac{\eta_j \bar{\eta}_{j-km_n}}{4\pi^2 j(j - km_n)} (2 - 2\cos(2\pi j/m_n)) \\ &\leq C \sum_{|j| > i_n} \left| \frac{\eta_j}{j} \right| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\eta_{j+km_n}}{j + km_n} \right| \\ &= C \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\eta_{j+km_n}}{j + km_n} \right| \sum_{k_1=-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\eta_{j+(k+k_1)m_n}}{j + (k + k_1)m_n} \right| \\ &= C \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\eta_{j+km_n}}{j + km_n} \right| \right)^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \left(\sum_{|k| > d-1} |\eta_{j+km_n}|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{|k| > d-1} (j + km_n)^{-2} \right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\eta_j|^2 \sum_{|k| > d} (km_n)^{-2} \leq Cm_n^{-1}i_n^{-1} \sum_{|j| > i_n} |\theta_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of version of Theorem 4.1.. We prove sufficiency. Suppose (4.3) holds. Denote

$$\tilde{f}_n = \tilde{f}_{n,c_2 k_n} = \sum_{|j| > c_2 k_n} \theta_{nj} \phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{f}_n = \bar{f}_{n,c_2 k_n} = f_n - \tilde{f}_n$$

Denote \tilde{F}_n, \bar{F}_n the functions having derivatives $1 + \tilde{f}_{n,c_2 k_n}$ and $1 + \bar{f}_{n,c_2 k_n}$ respectively and such that $\tilde{F}_n(1) = 1$ and $\bar{F}_n(1) = 1$.

Let T_n be chi-squared test statistics with a number of cells $m_n = [c_3 k_n]$ where $c_2 < c_3$. Denote $\mathbb{L}_{2,n}$ linear space generated functions $\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in ((j-1)/m_n, j/m_n)\}}$, $1 \leq j \leq m_n$.

Denote \bar{h}_n orthogonal projection of \bar{f}_n onto $\mathbb{L}_{2,n}$. Denote \tilde{h}_n orthogonal projection of \tilde{f}_n onto the line $\{h : h = \lambda \bar{h}_n, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^1\}$.

Note that $n^{-1/2} T_n^{1/2}(F_n)$ equals the $\mathbb{L}_{2,n}$ -norm of function f_n . Hence we have

$$n^{-1/2} m_n^{-1} T_n^{1/2}(F_n) \geq \|\bar{h}_n + \tilde{h}_n\|. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Thus, by Theorem 6.3, it suffices to show that, for some choice of c_3 , there holds $\|\bar{h}_n + \tilde{h}_n\| \asymp n^{-r}$ if $m_n > c_3 k_n$.

Denote $\bar{g}_n = \bar{f}_n - \bar{h}_n$ and $\tilde{g}_n = \tilde{f}_n - \tilde{h}_n$.

Denote

$$\bar{p}_{jn} = \frac{1}{m_n} \int_{(j-1)/m_n}^{j/m_n} \bar{f}_n(x) dx, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m_n.$$

By Lemmas 3 and 4 in section 7 of [31], we have

$$\|\bar{g}_n\|^2 = m_n \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \int_{(j-1)/m_n}^{j/m_n} (\bar{f}_n(x) - \bar{p}_{jn})^2 dx \leq 2\omega^2\left(\frac{1}{m_n}, \bar{f}_n\right). \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Here

$$\omega^2(h, f) = \int_0^1 (f(t+h) - f(t))^2 dt, \quad h > 0,$$

for any $f \in \mathbb{L}_2^{per}$. If $f = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \theta_j \phi_j$, then

$$\omega^2(s, f) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\theta_j|^2 (2 - 2 \cos(2\pi js)). \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Since $1 - \cos(x) \leq x^2$, then, by (A.33) and (A.34), we have

$$\|\bar{g}_n\| \leq 4\pi (c_2 k_n / m_n)^{1/2} \|\bar{f}_n\| = \delta \|\bar{f}_n\| (1 + o(1)), \quad (\text{A.35})$$

where $\delta = 4\pi (c_2 / c_3)^{1/2}$.

By (4.3), (A.33) and (A.35), we get that there is c_{30} , such that

$$\|\bar{h}_n\| > \frac{c_1}{2} n^{-r} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

for $c_3 > c_{30}$.

For any functions $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{L}_2(0, 1)$ denote (g_1, g_2) inner product of g_1 and g_2 .

We have

$$0 = (\bar{f}_n, \tilde{f}_n) = (\bar{h}_n, \tilde{h}_n) + (\bar{g}_n, \tilde{f}_n). \quad (\text{A.37})$$

By (A.35), we get

$$|(\bar{g}_n, \tilde{f}_n)| \leq \|\bar{g}_n\| \|\tilde{f}_n\| \leq \delta C^2 n^{-2r}.$$

Therefore we get

$$|(\bar{h}_n, \tilde{h}_n)| \leq \delta C^2 n^{-2r}. \quad (\text{A.38})$$

By (A.36) (A.38), we get that, for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, there holds $\|\bar{h}_n + \tilde{h}_n\| \asymp n^{-r}$. Hence, using (A.32) and implementing Theorem 6.3, we get sufficiency. \square

Proof of version of Theorem 4.2. We prove sufficiency. Let $k_n = [c_1 n^{2-4r}]$. For $c_2 > 2c_1$, we have

$$T_n^{1/2}(F_n) \leq T_n^{1/2}(\bar{F}_n) + T_n^{1/2}(\tilde{F}_n). \quad (\text{A.39})$$

By Lemma A.9, we have

$$n^{-1}m_n - 2T_n(\tilde{F}_n) \leq c_2^{-1}m_n k_n^{-1} \|\tilde{f}_n\|^2 \leq c_2^{-1}c_1 C n^{-2r}. \quad (\text{A.40})$$

We have

$$\|\bar{f}_n\| \geq n^{-1/2}m_n^{-1}T_n^{1/2}(\bar{F}_n). \quad (\text{A.41})$$

Since one can take arbitrary value c_2 , $c_2 > 2c_1$, then, by Theorem 6.3, (4.4) and (A.39) - (A.41) together, we get inconsistency of sequence f_n . \square

Proof of version of Theorem 4.4. Let us prove *ii*. Suppose opposite. Then there is sequence i_l , $i_l \rightarrow \infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$i_l^{2s} \|\tilde{f}_{i_l}\|^2 = C_l,$$

with $C_l \rightarrow \infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Here $f = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \tau_j \phi_j$ and $\tilde{f}_{i_l} = \sum_{|j| > i_l} \tau_j \phi_j$.

Define sequence n_l such that $n_l^{-r} \asymp \|\tilde{f}_{i_l}\|$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$.

Then, estimating similarly to (A.11) and (A.12), we get $i_l^{-1/2} \asymp C_l^{(2r-1)/2} n_l^{2r-1}$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$.

If $m_l = o(i_l)$, then, by Lemma A.9, we get

$$m_l^{-1/2} T_{n_l}(\tilde{F}_{i_l}) \leq m_l^{1/2} i_l^{-1} n_l \sum_{|j| > i_l} |\tau_j|^2 \asymp m_l^{1/2} i_l^{-1} n_l^{1-2r} = o(C_l^{(2r-1)/2}). \quad (\text{A.42})$$

Let $m_l \asymp i_l$ or $i_l = o(m_l)$. Then we have

$$n_l^{-2r} \asymp \|\tilde{f}_{i_l}\|^2 \geq n_l^{-1} m_l^{-2} T_{n_l}(\tilde{F}_{i_l}). \quad (\text{A.43})$$

Therefore

$$m_l^{-1/2} T_{n_l}(\tilde{F}_{i_l}) \leq C m_l^{-1/2} n_l^{1-2r} = C m_l^{-1/2} i_l^{1/2} C_l^{(2r-1)/2} = o(1). \quad (\text{A.44})$$

By Theorem 6.3, (A.42) - (A.44) imply *ii*. \square

Proof of version of Theorem 4.6. Let $f_{1n} = \sum_{|j| < ck_n} \theta_{nj} \phi_j$. Then, by Lemma A.4, there is maxiset $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$ such that $f_{1n} \in \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{2\infty}^s(P_0)$.

Denote F_{1n} function having derivative $1 + f_{1n}$ and such that $F_{1n}(1) = 1$.

We have

$$|T_n^{1/2}(F_n) - T_n^{1/2}(F_{1n})| \leq T_n^{1/2}(F_n - F_{1n} + F_0). \quad (\text{A.45})$$

If $m_n = [c_0 k_n]$ and $c > 2c_0$, then, by Lemma A.9, we have

$$n^{-1} T_n(F_n - F_{1n} + F_0) \leq c_0 c^{-1} \|f_n - f_{1n}\|^2. \quad (\text{A.46})$$

Since the choice of c is arbitrary, by Theorem 6.3, (A.45) and (A.46) imply (4.7) and (4.8). \square

Proof of *i.* in version of Theorem 4.4 and versions of Theorems 4.5, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 follows from Theorem 6.3 and versions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 using the same reasoning as in subsection A.2. Proof of Theorem 6.2 is akin to proof of Theorem 4.7 and is omitted.

A.5. Proof of Theorems of section 7 and Theorem 8.3

Lemma A.10 given below allows to carry over corresponding reasoning for Brownian bridge $b(t)$, $t \in (0, 1)$, instead of empirical distribution functions.

Lemma A.10. *For any $x > 0$, we have*

$$P_{F_n}(nT^2(\hat{F}_n - F_0) < x) - P(T^2(b(t) + \sqrt{n}(F_n(t) - F_0(t))) < x) = o(1) \quad (\text{A.47})$$

uniformly onto sequences c.d.f.'s F_n such that $T(F_n - F_0) < cn^{-1/2}$.

If $\sqrt{n}(F_n - F_0) \rightarrow G$ in Kolmogorov - Smirnov distance, (A.47) has been proved Chibisov [3] without any statements of uniform convergence.

Lemma A.10 follows from Lemmas A.11 and A.13 given below after implementation of Hungary construction (see Th. 3, Ch. 12, section 1, [28]).

Lemma A.11. *For any $x > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}(T^2(b(F_n(t)) + \sqrt{n}(F_n(t) - F_0(t))) < x) \\ & - \mathbf{P}(T^2(b(t) + \sqrt{n}(F_n(t) - F_0(t))) < x) = o(1) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.48})$$

uniformly onto sequences of c.d.f.'s F_n such that $T(F_n - F_0) < cn^{-1/2}$.

Lemma A.11 follows from Lemmas A.12 and A.13 given below.

Lemma A.12. *There holds*

$$\mathbf{E}[|T^2(b(F_n(t))) - T^2(b(t))|] < cT^{1/4}(F_n - F_0). \quad (\text{A.49})$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}^2 [|T^2(b(F_n(t)) - T^2(b(t)))|] &\leq \mathbf{E}^2 [| (T(b(F_n(t)) - T(b(t))) (T(b(F_n(t)) + T(b(t)))) |] \\
&\leq \mathbf{E} [((T(b(F_n(t))) - T(b(t)))^2] \mathbf{E} [(T(b(F_n(t))) + T(b(t)))^2] \\
&\leq C \mathbf{E} [((T(b(F_n(t)) - T(b(t))))^2] \leq C \mathbf{E} [T^2(b(F_n(t)) - b(t))] \\
&= C \int_0^1 (F_n(t) - F_n^2(t) - 2 \min(F_n(t), F_0(t)) + 2F_n(t)F_0(t) + F_0(t) - F_0^2(t)) dt \\
&= C \int_0^1 F_n(t) + F_0(t) - 2 \min(F_n(t), F_0(t)) - (F_n(t) - F_0(t))^2 dt \\
&= C \int_0^1 |F_n(t) - F_0(t)| - (F_n(t) - F_0(t))^2 dt \\
&\leq C \int_0^1 |F_n(t) - F_0(t)| dt \leq T^{1/2}(F_n - F_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.50}$$

□

Lemma A.13. Densities of c.d.f.'s $\mathbf{P}(T^2(b(t) + n^{1/2}(F_n(t) - F_0(t))) \leq x)$ are uniformly bounded onto the set of all c.d.f. F_n such that $nT^2(F_n - F_0) < C$. Here C is arbitrary.

Proof. Brownian bridge $b(t)$ admits representation

$$b(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\xi_j}{\pi j} \psi_j(t)$$

where $\psi_j(t) = \sqrt{2} \sin(\pi j t)$ and ξ_j , $1 \leq j < \infty$, are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables, $\mathbf{E} \xi_j = 0$ and $\mathbf{E} \xi_j^2 = 1$.

Therefore, if $F_n(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{nj} \psi_j$, then

$$T^2(b(t) + n^{1/2}(F_n(t) - F_0(t))) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\xi_j}{\pi j} + n^{1/2} \theta_{nj} \right)^2. \tag{A.51}$$

The right hand-side of (A.51) is a sum of independent random variables. Thus it suffices to show that, for any C , random variables

$$(\xi_1 + n^{1/2} \theta_{n1})^2 + (\xi_2/2 + n^{1/2} \theta_{n2})^2$$

have uniformly bounded densities onto $n^{1/2} |\theta_{n1}| \leq C$ and $n^{1/2} |\theta_{n2}| \leq C$.

Densities $(\xi_1 + a)^2$ and $(\xi_2 + b)^2$ have wellknown analytical form, and proof of uniform boundedness of densities of $(\xi_1 + a)^2 + \frac{1}{4}(\xi_2 + b)^2$ with $|a| \leq C$ and $|b| \leq C$ is obtained by routine technique. We omit these standard estimates. □

For proof of Theorem 7.1 it suffices to prove *ii*. Hungary construction allows to reduce reasoning to proof of corresponding statement for Brownian bridge $b(t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$. Thus Theorem 7.1 follows from Theorem 8.3.

Proof of Theorem 8.3. Denote $\zeta = \{\zeta_j\}_1^\infty$, $\zeta_j = \sigma_j \xi_j$.

Suppose opposite that (8.6) does not valid. Then there is subsequence of vectors $\eta_n = \{\eta_{nj}\}_1^\infty \in \Upsilon(a)$ such that we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(T(\eta_n + \zeta) \leq x_\alpha) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{A.52})$$

Denote $\theta_{nj} = \kappa_j \eta_{nj}$, $1 \leq j < \infty$.

There are $\theta = \{\theta_j\}_1^\infty$ and subsequence $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\theta_{n_i j} \rightarrow \theta_j$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for each j , $1 \leq j < \infty$.

Therefore there are sequences $C_k \rightarrow \infty$ and $i_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j < C_k} \theta_{n_{i_k} j}^2}{\sum_{j < C_k} \theta_j^2} = 1 \quad (\text{A.53})$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j < C_k} (\theta_{n_{i_k} j} - \theta_j)^2 = 0 \quad (\text{A.54})$$

We consider two cases.

i. There holds

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j > C_k} \theta_{n_{i_k} j}^2 = 0.$$

ii. There holds

$$\sum_{j > C_k} \theta_{n_{i_k} j}^2 > c \quad \text{for all } k > k_0.$$

If *i.* holds, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{j > C_k} \kappa_j \zeta_j \theta_{n_{i_k} j} \right)^2 = \sum_{j > C_k} \sigma_j^2 \theta_{n_{i_k} j}^2 = o(1). \quad (\text{A.55})$$

By (A.54), we get

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{j < C_k} \kappa_j \zeta_j (\theta_{n_{i_k} j} - \theta_j) \right)^2 = \sum_{j < C_k} \kappa_j^2 \sigma_j^2 (\theta_{n_{i_k} j} - \theta_j)^2 = o(1). \quad (\text{A.56})$$

By (A.55) and (A.56), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_{n_{i_k} j})^2 < x_\alpha\right) \\
&= \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j < C_k}(\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_{n_{i_k} j})^2 + \sum_{j > C_k} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 < x_\alpha (1 + o_P(1))\right) \\
&= \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j < C_k}(\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_j)^2 + \sum_{j > C_k} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 < x_\alpha (1 + o_P(1))\right) \\
&< \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 < x_\alpha\right) (1 + o(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma A.14 given below.

Lemma A.14. *Let $\theta = \{\theta_j\}_1^\infty$ be such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \theta_j^2 > c$. Then there holds*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 < x_\alpha\right) > \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_j)^2 < x_\alpha\right). \quad (\text{A.57})$$

Proof. For simplicity of notation the reasoning will be provided for $\theta_1 \neq 0$. Implementing Anderson Theorem [1], we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_j)^2 < x_\alpha\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{-\kappa_1^{-1} \sigma_1^{-1} \sqrt{x_\alpha} - \eta_1}^{\kappa_1^{-1} \sigma_1^{-1} \sqrt{x_\alpha} - \eta_1} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2}\right\} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=2}^{\infty}(\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_j)^2 < x_\alpha - (\kappa_1 \sigma_1 x + \theta_1)^2\right) dx \\
&\leq (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{-\kappa_1^{-1} \sigma_1^{-1} \sqrt{x_\alpha} - \eta_1}^{\kappa_1^{-1} \sigma_1^{-1} \sqrt{x_\alpha} - \eta_1} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2}\right\} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 < x_\alpha - (\kappa_1 \sigma_1 x + \theta_1)^2\right) dx \\
&= \mathbf{P}\left((\kappa_1 \zeta_1 + \theta_1)^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 < x_\alpha\right) < \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 < x_\alpha\right).
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.58})$$

For the proof of last inequality in (A.58) it suffices to note that $\mathbf{P}(\kappa_1 \zeta_1^2 < x) > \mathbf{P}((\kappa_1 \zeta_1 + \theta_1)^2 < x)$ for $x \in (0, x_\alpha)$, and, for any $\delta, 0 < \delta < x_\alpha$, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that the function $\mathbf{P}(\kappa_1 \zeta_1^2 < x) - \mathbf{P}((\kappa_1 \zeta_1 + \theta_1)^2 < x) - \delta_1$ is positive onto interval (δ, x_α) . \square

Suppose *ii.* holds. We suppose $n_{i_k} = n$. This allows to implement more simple notation. Then we have

$$T(\eta_n + \zeta) = \sum_{j < C_n} (\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_{nj})^2 + J_{2n}, \quad (\text{A.59})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2n} &= \sum_{j \geq C_n} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 + 2 \sum_{j \geq C_n} \kappa_j \zeta_j \theta_{nj} \\ &+ \sum_{j \geq C_n} \theta_{nj}^2 = J_{21n} + 2J_{22n} + J_{23n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.60})$$

We have

$$J_{21n} = o_P(1) \quad \text{and} \quad J_{22n} \leq J_{21n}^{1/2} J_{23n}^{1/2} = o_P(1). \quad (\text{A.61})$$

By (A.59) - (A.61), implementing Anderson Theorem [1], we get that, for any $0 < \delta < c/2$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_{nj})^2 < x\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j < C_n} (\kappa_j \zeta_j + \theta_{nj})^2 \leq x - c - o_P(1)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j < C_n} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 \leq x - c + \delta\right)(1 + o(1)) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 \leq x - c + 2\delta\right)(1 + o(1)) < \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \kappa_j^2 \zeta_j^2 \leq x\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.62})$$

where last inequality follows from Proposition 7.1 in [26]. \square

Proof of version of Theorem 4.1. Let (4.3) hold. Then we have

$$n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_{nj}^2}{\pi^2 j^2} \geq n \sum_{j < c_2 k_n} \frac{\theta_{nj}^2}{\pi^2 j^2} \geq c_2^{-2} n k_n^{-2} \sum_{j < c_2 k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 \asymp 1.$$

By (7.3), this implies sufficiency. \square

Proof of version of Theorem 4.2. Let (4.4) hold. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\theta_{nj}^2}{\pi^2 j^2} &= n \sum_{j < c_2 k_n} \frac{\theta_{nj}^2}{\pi^2 j^2} + n \sum_{j > c_2 k_n} \frac{\theta_{nj}^2}{\pi^2 j^2} \\ &\leq o(1) + (c_2 k_n)^{-2} n \sum_{j > c_2 k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 \asymp o(1) + (c_2 k_n)^{-2} n^{1-2r} = O(c_2^{-2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.63})$$

Since c_2 is arbitrary, then, by (7.3), (A.63) implies sufficiency. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2. Proof of *i* akin to proof of *i*. in Theorem 4.4. The statement follows from (4.3) and Lemma A.15 provided below.

Lemma A.15. *Let $f_n \in \mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s(c_1)$ and $cn^{-r} \leq \|f_n\| \leq Cn^{-r}$. Then, for $k_n = C_1 n^{(1-2r)/2}(1+o(1))$ with $C_1^{2s} > 2c_1/c$, there holds*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \theta_{nj}^2 > \frac{c}{2} n^{-2r}.$$

Proof of Lemma A.15 is akin to proof of Lemma A.3 and is omitted.

Reasoning in proof of *ii.* is akin to proof of *ii.* in Theorem 4.4. Suppose opposite. Then there are $f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tau_j \phi_j \notin \mathbb{B}_{2\infty}^s$ and a sequence $m_l, m_l \rightarrow \infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, such that (A.9) holds. Define sequences η_l, n_l and \tilde{f}_l by the same way as in the proof of Theorem 4.4.

Then we have

$$n_l \asymp C_l^{-1/(2r)} m_l^{s/r} = C_l^{-1/(2r)} m_l^{\frac{2}{1-2r}}.$$

Therefore we get

$$m_l \asymp C_l^{(1-2r)/(4r)} n_l^{\frac{1-2r}{2}}.$$

Hence we get

$$n_l \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\eta_{lj}^2}{j^2} \leq n_l m_l^{-2} \sum_{j=m_l}^{\infty} \eta_{lj}^2 \asymp n_l^{1-2r} m_l^{-2} \asymp C_l^{\frac{2r-1}{2r}} = o(1). \quad (\text{A.64})$$

By Theorem 7.1, (A.64) implies inconsistency of sequence of alternatives \tilde{f}_l . \square

Proof of Theorem 7.4. By Lemma A.10, it suffices to prove that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that, for $n > n_0(\varepsilon)$, the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{P}(T^2(b(F_n(t) + F_{1n}(t) - F_0(t)) + \sqrt{n}(F_n(t) + F_{1n}(t) - 2F_0(t))) > x_\alpha) \\ & - \mathbf{P}(T^2(b(F_n(t)) + \sqrt{n}(F_n(t) - F_0(t))) > x_\alpha)| < \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.65})$$

Since T is a norm, by Lemma A.13, proof of (A.65) is reduced to proof that, for any $\delta_1 > 0$, there hold

$$\mathbf{P}(|T(b(F_n(t) + F_{1n}(t) - F_0(t))) - T(b(F_n(t)))| > \delta_1) = o(1), \quad (\text{A.66})$$

and there is sequence $\delta_n, \delta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, such that there holds

$$n^{1/2}|T(F_n(t) + F_{1n}(t) - 2F_0(t)) - T(F_n(t) - F_0(t))| < \delta_n. \quad (\text{A.67})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & |T(b(F_n(t) + F_{1n}(t) - F_0(t))) - T(b(F_n(t)))| \\ & \leq T(b(F_n(t)) + F_{1n}(t) - F_0(t)) - b(F_n(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.68})$$

and

$$|T(F_n(t) + F_{1n}(t) - 2F_0(t)) - T(F_n(t) - F_0(t))| \leq T(F_{1n}(t) - F_0(t)). \quad (\text{A.69})$$

By Lemma A.11, we have

$$\mathbf{E} T^2(b(F_n(t) + F_{1n}(t) - F_0(t)) - b(F_n(t))) \leq T^{1/4}(F_{1n} - F_0) = o(1). \quad (\text{A.70})$$

By (A.68) and (A.70), we get (A.66).

Since sequence of alternatives f_{1n} is inconsistent, we have

$$nT^2(F_{1n}(t) - F_0(t)) = o(1) \quad (\text{A.71})$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By (A.69) and (A.71), we get (A.67). \square

Theorem 7.1, G1 and B reduce proof of Theorem 7.3 to the analysis of sums $\sum_{ck_n < j < Ck_n} \theta_{nj}^2$ with $C > c$. Such an analysis has been provided in details in subsection A.2 with another parameters r and s . We omit proof of Theorem 7.3.

References

- [1] Anderson, T. (1955) The integral of a symmetric unimodal function. *Proc.Amer.Math.Soc.* **6**(1) 170-176.
- [2] Autin, F., Clausel,M., Jean-Marc Freyermuth, J. and Marteau C. (2018). Maxiset point of view for signal detection in inverse problems. arxiv 1803.05875.
- [3] Chibisov, D.M. (1965) An investigation of the asymptotic power of tests of fit. *Theor.Prob. Appl.* **10** 421 -437.
- [4] Cohen, A., DeVore, R., Kerkyacharian, G. and Picard, D. (2001). Maximal spaces with given rate of convergence for thresholding algorithms, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **11** 167 -191
- [5] Engl, H., Hanke, M. and Neubauer, A. (1996). Regularization of Inverse Problems. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [6] Ermakov, M.S. (1990) Minimax detection of a signal in a Gaussian white noise. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **35** 667-679.
- [7] Ermakov, M.S. (1997). Asymptotic minimaxity of chi-squared tests. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **42** 589-610.
- [8] Ermakov, M.S. (2003). On asymptotic minimaxity of kernel-based tests. *ESAIM Probab. Stat.* **7** 279-312
- [9] Ermakov, M.S. (2006). Minimax detection of a signal in the heteroscedastic Gaussian white noise. *J. Math. Sci. (NY)*, **137** 4516-4524.
- [10] Ermakov, M.S. (2017). On consistent hypothesis testing. *J. Math. Sci. (NY)*, **225** 751-769.
- [11] Ermakov, M.S. (2018). On asymptotically minimax nonparametric detection of signal in Gaussian white noise. *Zapiski Nauchnih Seminarov POMI RAS.* **474** 124-138 (in Russian), arxiv.org 1705.07408.
- [12] Gine E. and Nickl R. (2015) Mathematical Foundation of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models. Cambridge University Press Cambridge
- [13] Gretton A., Borgwardt K., Rasch M., Scholkopf B. and Smola A. A kernel two-sample test. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Mar):723773, 2012.
- [14] Ibragimov,I.A. and Khasminskii, R.Z. (1977). On the estimation of infinitely dimensional parameter in Gaussian white noise. *Dokl.AN USSR* **236** 1053-1055.
- [15] Ingster, Yu.I. (1987). On comparison of the minimax properties of Kolmogorov, ω^2 and χ^2 -tests. *Theory. Probab. Appl.* **32** 346-350.
- [16] Ingster,Yu.I. and Suslina,I.A. (2002). *Nonparametric Goodness-of-fit Testing under Gaussian Models*. Lecture Notes in Statistics **169** Springer: N.Y.
- [17] Ingster,Yu. I., Sapatinas, T. and Suslina, I. A. (2012) *Minimax signal detection in ill-posed inverse problems*. — *Ann. Statist.*, **40** 1524 -1549.

- [18] Johnstone, I. M. (2015). Gaussian estimation. Sequence and wavelet models. *Book Draft* <http://statweb.stanford.edu/~imj/>
- [19] Kerkycharian, G. and Picard, D. (1993). Density estimation by kernel and wavelets methods: optimality of Besov spaces. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **18** 327 - 336.
- [20] Kerkycharian, G. and Picard, D. (2002). Minimax or maxisets? *Bernoulli* **8**, 219-253.
- [21] Laurent, B., Loubes, J. M., and Marteau, C. (2011). Testing inverse problems: a direct or an indirect problem? *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **141** 1849-1861.
- [22] Le Cam, L. and Schwartz, L. (1960). A necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of consistent estimates. *Ann.Math.Statist.* **31** 140-150.
- [23] Le Cam, L. (1973). Convergence of estimates under dimensionality restrictions. *Ann.Statist.* **1** 38-53.
- [24] Lehmann, E.L. and Romano, J.P. (2005). *Testing Statistical Hypothesis*. Springer Verlag, NY.
- [25] Lepski, O.V. and Tsybakov, A.B.(2000). Asymptotically exact nonparametric hypothesis testing in sup-norm and at a fixed point. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **117**:1, 1748.
- [26] Lifshits, M. (2012) *Lectures on Gaussian Processes*. Springer. NY.
- [27] Rivoirard, V. (2004). Maxisets for linear procedures. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **67** 267-275
- [28] Shorack, G.R. and Wellner, J.A. (1986) *Empirical Processes with Application to Statistics*. J.Wiley Sons NY
- [29] Schwartz, L. (1965). On Bayes procedures. *Z.Wahrsch.Verw. Gebiete* **4** 10-26.
- [30] Tsybakov, A. (2009). *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Berlin: Springer.
- [31] Ulyanov, P. L. (1964). *On Haar series*. Mathematical Sbornik. **63(105)**:2 356-391. In Russian.