

Finite samples inference and critical dimension for stochastically linear models

Vladimir Spokoiny*

Weierstrass Institute and HU Berlin,
Mohrenstr. 39, 10117 Berlin, Germany
spokoiny@wias-berlin.de

December 13, 2022

Abstract

The aim of this note is to state a couple of general results about the properties of the penalized maximum likelihood estimators (pMLE) and of the posterior distribution for parametric models in a non-asymptotic setup and for possibly large or even infinite parameter dimension. We consider a special class of stochastically linear smooth (SLS) models satisfying two major conditions: the stochastic component of the log-likelihood is linear in the model parameter, while the expected log-likelihood is a smooth function. The main results simplify a lot if the expected log-likelihood is concave. For the pMLE, we establish a number of finite sample bounds about its concentration and large deviations as well as the Fisher and Wilks expansion. The later results extend the classical asymptotic Fisher and Wilks Theorems about the MLE to the non-asymptotic setup with large parameter dimension which can depend on the sample size. For the posterior distribution, our main result states a Gaussian approximation of the posterior which can be viewed as a finite sample analog of the prominent Bernstein–von Mises Theorem. In all bounds, the remainder is given explicitly and can be evaluated in terms of the effective sample size and effective parameter dimension. The results are dimension and coordinate free. In spite of generality, all the presented bounds are nearly sharp and the classical asymptotic results can be obtained as simple corollaries. Interesting cases of logit regression and of estimation of a log-density with smooth or truncation priors are used to specify the results and to explain the main notions.

AMS 2010 Subject Classification: Primary 62F15. Secondary 62F25

*Financial support by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the Collaborative Research Center 1294 “Data assimilation” is gratefully acknowledged.

Keywords: penalized MLE, Fisher and Wilks expansion, posterior, Laplace approximation

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Classical asymptotic theory	5
1.2	Challenges and goals	6
1.2.1	Model misspecification	6
1.2.2	I.i.d. of independent samples, effective sample size	7
1.2.3	Effective parameter dimension	7
1.2.4	Bias-variance trade-off	8
1.3	Setup. Main steps of study	8
1.3.1	Stochastically linear smooth models	8
1.3.2	Concentration of the pMLE	9
1.3.3	Fisher and Wilks expansions	9
1.3.4	Concentration of the posterior	10
1.3.5	Gaussian approximation of the posterior	10
2	Properties of the pMLE \tilde{v}_G	11
2.1	Conditions	11
2.2	Concentration of the pMLE \tilde{v}_G	12
2.3	A general condition of the stochastic gradient	13
2.4	A bound for a sup-norm	14
2.5	Fisher and Wilks expansions	15
2.6	Effective sample size and critical dimension in pMLE	16
2.7	The use of \tilde{D}_G^2 instead of D_G^2	16
2.8	Smoothness and bias	17
2.9	Loss and risk of the pMLE	18
2.10	Confidence sets	20
2.10.1	Elliptic confidence sets	20
2.10.2	Likelihood-based confidence sets	21
2.10.3	Bootstrap technique and data-driven confidence sets	21
3	Laplace approximation of the posterior	22
3.1	Posterior concentration	23

3.2	Posterior contraction	24
3.3	Gaussian approximation of the posterior	25
3.4	Critical dimension in Bayesian inference	26
3.5	Laplace approximation with inexact parameters	27
3.6	Laplace approximation and Bernstein–von Mises Theorem	28
3.7	Posterior mean	30
3.8	Non-Gaussian priors	31
4	Smooth priors and rate over Sobolev classes	32
4.1	Bias-variance trade-off under G_0 -smoothness	33
4.2	Smooth penalty and rate of estimation over Sobolev balls	35
4.3	Bayesian inference under Sobolev smoothness	37
5	Anisotropic logistic regression	37
5.1	Setup and conditions	38
5.2	Check of general conditions	39
5.3	General properties	42
5.4	Truncation and smooth priors	43
6	Log-density estimation	43
6.1	Conditions	44
6.1.1	Check of conditions (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4)	46
6.1.2	Check of $(\nabla\zeta)$	47
6.2	Smoothness, bias-variance trade-off	48
6.2.1	Rate optimality under Sobolev smoothness	49
7	Dimension free bounds for Laplace approximation	50
7.1	Setup and conditions	50
7.1.1	Concavity	52
7.1.2	Laplace effective dimension	53
7.1.3	Local smoothness conditions	53
7.2	Error bounds for Laplace approximation	54
7.2.1	Critical dimension	55
7.2.2	Kullback-Leibler divergence	55
7.2.3	Mean and MAP	56
7.3	Inexact approximation and the use of posterior mean	57
7.4	Tools and proofs	59

7.4.1	Overall error of Laplace approximation	60
7.4.2	Lower and upper Gaussian measures	62
7.4.3	Gaussian moments	62
7.4.4	Local approximation	63
7.4.5	Tail integrals	67
7.4.6	Local concentration	69
7.4.7	Finalizing the proof of Theorem 7.1 and 7.2	70
7.4.8	Proof of Theorem 7.4 and Theorem 7.5	70
7.4.9	Finalizing the proof of Theorem 7.6 and Corollary 7.7	72
A	Local smoothness conditions	73
A.1	Smoothness in Gateaux sense and self-concordance	73
A.2	Fréchet derivatives and smoothness of the Hessian	75
A.3	Quadraticity and near quadraticity	76
A.3.1	A linear perturbation	76
A.3.2	Quadratic penalization	80
B	Examples of priors	83
B.1	Truncation and smooth priors	83
B.2	Effective dimension	84
B.3	Sobolev classes and smooth priors	85
B.4	Properties of the sub-projector P_G	86
C	Deviation bounds for quadratic forms	88
C.1	Moments of a Gaussian quadratic form	88
C.2	Deviation bounds for Gaussian quadratic forms	91
C.3	Deviation bounds for non-Gaussian quadratic forms	93
C.4	Weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s: univariate case	99
C.5	Deviation bounds for weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s in a ℓ_2 -norm . . .	101

1 Introduction

This paper presents some general results describing the properties of the *penalized Maximum Likelihood Estimator* (pMLE) and of the *posterior distribution*.

Our starting point is a parametric assumption about the distribution \mathbb{P} of the data \mathbf{Y} : \mathbb{P} belongs a given parametric family $(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y})$ dominated by a sigma-finite measure μ_0 . This assumption is usually an idealization of reality and the true distribution

\mathbb{P} is not an element of $(\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}})$. However, a parametric assumption, even being wrong, may appear to be very useful, because it yields the method of estimation. Namely, the MLE $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is defined by maximizing the log-likelihood function $L(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{v}) = L(\boldsymbol{v}) = \log \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}{d\mu_0}(\boldsymbol{Y})$ over the parameter set \mathcal{T} :

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{T}} L(\boldsymbol{v}).$$

For a penalty function $\operatorname{pen}_G(\boldsymbol{v})$ on \mathcal{T} , the *penalized MLE* $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G$ is defined by maximizing the penalized MLE $L_G(\boldsymbol{v}) = L(\boldsymbol{v}) - \operatorname{pen}_G(\boldsymbol{v})$:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G = \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{T}} L_G(\boldsymbol{v}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{T}} \{L(\boldsymbol{v}) - \operatorname{pen}_G(\boldsymbol{v})\}.$$

The sub-index G in the penalty relies to its quadratic structure:

$$\operatorname{pen}_G(\boldsymbol{v}) = \frac{1}{2} \|G\boldsymbol{v}\|^2$$

for a symmetric $p \times p$ positive definite matrix $G \in \mathfrak{M}_p$.

In the Bayesian setup with a prior measure Π_G on \mathcal{T} having a density π_G , the posterior distribution is a random measure on \mathcal{T} defined by normalizing the product $\pi_G(\boldsymbol{v}) \exp L(\boldsymbol{v})$:

$$\boldsymbol{v}_G \mid \boldsymbol{Y} \propto \pi_G(\boldsymbol{v}) \exp L(\boldsymbol{v}).$$

In particular, the posterior mode defined as the point of maximum of the posterior density coincides with the penalized MLE $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G$ for the penalty $\operatorname{pen}_G(\boldsymbol{v}) = -\log \pi_G(\boldsymbol{v})$. The sub-index G relies to the Gaussian prior with parameters $\mathcal{N}(0, G^2)$. The use of the penalty and the prior centered at zero is only for notational convenience. Everything below can be extended to the case of an arbitrary center \boldsymbol{v}_0 .

1.1 Classical asymptotic theory

The classical Fisher parametric theory assumes that \mathcal{T} is a subset of a finite-dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^p , the underlying data distribution \mathbb{P} indeed belongs to the considered parametric family $(\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}})$, that is, $\boldsymbol{Y} \sim \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}^*}$ for some $\boldsymbol{v}^* \in \mathcal{T}$. In addition, some regularity of the family $(\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}})$, or, equivalently, of the log-likelihood function $L(\boldsymbol{v})$ is assumed. This, in particular, enables us to apply the third order Taylor expansion of $L(\boldsymbol{v})$ around the point of maximum $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ and to obtain a Fisher expansion

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} - \boldsymbol{v}^* \approx \mathbb{F}^{-1} \nabla L(\boldsymbol{v}^*).$$

Here $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}^*)$ is the total Fisher information at \mathbf{v}^* defined as a negative Hessian of the expected log-likelihood function $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$:

$$\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}).$$

Under standard parametric assumptions, $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})$ is symmetric positive definite, $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$. Moreover, if the data \mathbf{Y} is generated as a sample of independent random variables Y_1, \dots, Y_n , then the log-likelihood has an additive structure: $L(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(Y_i, \mathbf{v})$. This allows to establish asymptotic standard normality of the standardized score $\boldsymbol{\xi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{F}^{-1/2} \nabla L(\mathbf{v}^*)$ and hence, to state Fisher and Wilks Theorems: as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{v}^*) &\approx \boldsymbol{\xi} \quad \xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \\ 2L(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) - 2L(\mathbf{v}^*) &\approx \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \xrightarrow{d} \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 \sim \chi_p^2, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is a standard Gaussian vector in \mathbb{R}^p and χ_p^2 is a chi-squared distribution with p degrees of freedom. These results are fundamental and build the basis for the most statistical applications like analysis of variance, canonical and correlation analysis, uncertainty quantification and hypothesis testing etc. We refer to [van der Vaart \(1998\)](#) for a comprehensive discussion and an historical overview of the related results including the general LAN theory by L. Le Cam.

In the Bayesian framework, the Laplace approximation of the integral $\int \pi(\mathbf{v}) e^{L(\mathbf{v})} d\mathbf{v}$ leads to the prominent Bernstein – von Mises Theorem claiming asymptotic normality of the posterior with mean $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ and the covariance \mathbb{F}^{-1} :

$$\Pi\{\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \mid \mathbf{Y}\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{1.2}$$

Again, this is one of most fundamental results in statistical inference allowing to effectively construct elliptic credible sets in typical applications; see e.g. [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#) and references therein.

1.2 Challenges and goals

Modern statistical problems require to extend the classical results in several directions.

1.2.1 Model misspecification

First, the model can be misspecified and the underlying data generating measure \mathbb{P} is not an element of the family $(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y})$. This means that the used log-likelihood function is not necessarily a true log-likelihood. In particular, the condition $\mathbb{E} \exp L(\mathbf{v}) = 1$ does

not hold true. Also the target of estimation \boldsymbol{v}^* has to be redefined as the maximizer of the expected log-likelihood:

$$\boldsymbol{v}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}L(\boldsymbol{v})$$

leading to some modelling bias as the distance between \mathbb{P} and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}^*}$. This also concerns the use of a penalty or an impact of the prior leading to some estimation bias. When operating with the penalized log-likelihood $L_G(\boldsymbol{v})$, the target of estimation becomes

$$\boldsymbol{v}_G^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}L_G(\boldsymbol{v}), \quad (1.3)$$

which might be significantly different from \boldsymbol{v}^* . Everywhere we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}(\boldsymbol{v}) &= -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\boldsymbol{v}), \\ \mathbb{F}_G(\boldsymbol{v}) &= -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\boldsymbol{v}) = \mathbb{F}(\boldsymbol{v}) + G^2. \end{aligned}$$

We also write

$$\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}(\boldsymbol{v}_G^*), \quad \mathbb{F}_G = \mathbb{F}_G(\boldsymbol{v}_G^*) = \mathbb{F} + G^2.$$

1.2.2 I.i.d. of independent samples, effective sample size

Another important issue is a possibility to relax the assumption of an i.i.d. of independent sample. Below we operate with the general likelihood, its structure does not need to be specified. In fact we can even proceed with just one observation. However, in the case of an independent sample $\boldsymbol{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the function $L(\boldsymbol{v})$ is of additive structure; see (5.1) below for the GLM case. The same applies to the information matrix $\mathbb{F}(\boldsymbol{v}) = -\nabla^2 L(\boldsymbol{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\boldsymbol{v})$; see (5.2). Moreover, if the Y_i 's are i.i.d. then $\mathbb{F}(\boldsymbol{v})$ is proportional to n . Therefore, we use the value $n = \|\mathbb{F}^{-1}\|^{-1}$ as a proxy for the ‘‘sample size’’. It can be called the *effective sample size*.

1.2.3 Effective parameter dimension

One more important issue is the parameter dimension p . The classical theory assumes p fixed and n large. We aim at relaxing both conditions by allowing a large/huge/infinite parameter dimension and a small n . It appears that all the results below rely on the so called *effective dimension* p_G defined as

$$p_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{tr}\{\mathbb{F}_G^{-1} \operatorname{Var}(\nabla L(\boldsymbol{v}_G^*))\}.$$

This quantity replaces the original dimension p and it can be small or moderate even for p infinite. One of the main intension of our study is to understand the range of applicability of the mentioned results in terms of the effective parameter dimension p_G and the effective sample size n . It appears that the most of the results below apply under the condition $p_G \ll n$ which replaces the classical signal-to-noise relation: the effective number of parameters to be estimated is smaller in order than the effective sample size. The only one final result about a Gaussian approximation of the posterior requires a much stronger condition $p^3(\mathbf{v}) \ll n$ with

$$p(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}\{\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})\}.$$

1.2.4 Bias-variance trade-off

Introducing a quadratic penalty $\|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$ or, equivalently, a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$ allow to consider in a unified way the classical parametric situation with p fixed and n large and the nonparametric situation with p large or infinite. The link is given by the value p_G which smoothly decreases as G^2 increases. From the other side, an increase of the penalty yields an increase of the bias measured by the difference $\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$ in some norm. For most of tasks in nonparametric statistics such as minimax risk estimation or model selection, etc, one has to balance the variance term p_G and the squared bias yielding the optimal rate of estimation.

1.3 Setup. Main steps of study

Now we briefly describe our setup and the main focus of analysis.

1.3.1 Stochastically linear smooth models

Below we limit ourselves to a special class of *stochastically linear smooth* (SLS) statistical models. The major condition on this class is that the stochastic component $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ of the log-likelihood $L(\mathbf{v})$ is linear in parameter \mathbf{v} . We also assume that the expected log-likelihood is a smooth function of the parameter \mathbf{v} . This class includes popular Generalized Linear Models but it is much larger. In particular, by an extending the parameter space, one can consider many nonlinear models including nonlinear regression or nonlinear inverse problems as a special case of SLS; see [Spokoiny \(2019\)](#). We also focus on the case of a quadratic penalization $\text{pen}_G(\mathbf{v}) = \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$ or a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$. This would not affect the SLS conditions. The assumption of stochastic linearity helps to avoid heavy tools of empirical process theory which is

typically used in the analysis of pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ or the posterior $\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{Y}$; see e.g. van der Vaart (1998), Ghosal and van der Vaart (2017), Ginè and Nickl (2015). We only need some accurate deviation bounds for quadratic forms of the errors; see Section C in the appendix.

Our aim is to establish possibly sharp and accurate results under realistic assumptions on a SLS model and the amount of data. The study includes several steps.

1.3.2 Concentration of the pMLE

The first step of our analysis is in establishing a concentration result for the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ defined by maximization of $L_G(\mathbf{v})$. If the expected log-likelihood $\mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ is strictly concave and smooth in \mathbf{v} then $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ well concentrates in a small elliptic vicinity \mathcal{A}_G of the “target” \mathbf{v}_G^* from (1.3):

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbb{F}_G^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| > \mathbf{r}_G + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}},$$

where $\mathbf{r}_G^2 \asymp \mathbf{p}_G$. The result becomes sensible provided that $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n$ with $n^{-1} \asymp \|\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}\|$.

1.3.3 Fisher and Wilks expansions

Having established the concentration of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$, we can restrict the analysis to this vicinity and use the Taylor expansion of the penalized log-likelihood function $L_G(\mathbf{v})$. This helps to derive rather precise approximation of the values $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*$ and $L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{F}_G^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - \boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2 &\lesssim \omega_G \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2, \\ \left| L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2 \right| &\lesssim \omega_G \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = \mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2}\nabla L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$. The accuracy of approximation is controlled by the value ω_G and the presented results require $\omega_G \ll 1$. In typical examples $\omega_G \asymp \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G/n}$ and again we come to the condition $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n$. The first result in (1.4) about the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ will be referred to as *the Fisher expansion*, while the second one about $L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ is called *the Wilks expansion*. These two expansions provide a finite sample analog of the asymptotic statements (1.1) and are informative even in the classical parametric situation. In fact, under standard assumptions, the normalized score vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G$ is asymptotically normal $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_G)$ with $\Sigma_G = \mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2}V^2\mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ and $V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla L(\mathbf{v})) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$. Stochastic linearity implies that the matrix V^2 does not depend on the point \mathbf{v} . If the model is correctly specified, then Σ_G approaches the identity as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and we obtain the

classical results (1.1). Note that the use of stochastic linearity allows to obtain much more accurate bounds than in Spokoiny (2012) or Spokoiny (2017).

1.3.4 Concentration of the posterior

The study of the posterior $\boldsymbol{v} \mid \boldsymbol{Y}$ also starts with a concentration result that claims that the dominating part of the posterior distribution is located in an elliptic vicinity \mathcal{A} of the pMLE $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G$. The set \mathcal{A} has to be slightly larger than \mathcal{A}_G . A great advantage of stochastic linearity is that it allows to replace the log-likelihood $L_G(\boldsymbol{v})$ in the Bayes formula with the expected log-likelihood $\mathbb{E}L_G(\boldsymbol{v})$. Further one can use quadratic approximation of $\mathbb{E}L_G(\boldsymbol{v})$ within the vicinity \mathcal{A} and concavity of $\mathbb{E}L_G(\boldsymbol{v})$ outside of \mathcal{A} . The concentration result for the posterior is much more involved than the concentration result for pMLE. However, the required conditions are very similar. In particular, we need a relation $\mathfrak{p}(\boldsymbol{v}) \ll n$, where $\mathfrak{p}(\boldsymbol{v})$ is the *Laplace effective dimension* at \boldsymbol{v} :

$$\mathfrak{p}(\boldsymbol{v}) = \text{tr}\{\mathbb{F}(\boldsymbol{v})\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}(\boldsymbol{v})\}.$$

Note that in typical situations $\mathfrak{p}(\boldsymbol{v}) \asymp \mathfrak{p}_G$ for \boldsymbol{v} from a local vicinity of \boldsymbol{v}_G^* .

1.3.5 Gaussian approximation of the posterior

The desired Gaussian approximation of the posterior is a relatively simple corollary of smoothness properties of the expected log-likelihood using the ideas of Laplace approximation for the exponent of a smooth concave function. Our main result claims that the posterior distribution for a SLS model can be well approximated by a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_G^{-1})$, where $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_G = \mathbb{F}_G(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G)$. This is again a direct extension of the classical BvM result (1.2). It is curious that the Gaussian approximation of the posterior does not rely on any CLT result, it is a purely analytic result. Moreover, one can establish a very careful approximation accuracy for centrally symmetric sets of order $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}^3/n$, where $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{p}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G)$. However, the condition on critical dimension becomes much more strict: now we need $\mathfrak{p}^3(\boldsymbol{v}) \ll n$.

We can summarize as follows: all the classical statistical results established for linear models can be extended to SLS modeling. For most of classical results in parametric statistics, one can state a finite sample SLS version. For the majority of our results, it is sufficient to ensure the relation $\mathfrak{p}_G \ll n$ or $\mathfrak{p}(\boldsymbol{v}) \ll n$. For Gaussian approximation of the posterior, we need a stronger condition $\mathfrak{p}(\boldsymbol{v}) \ll n^{1/3}$.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some important properties of the penalized MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ including concentration, Fisher and Wilks expansion, bias and risk. Section 3 describes the properties of the posterior $\mathbf{v}_G | \mathbf{Y}$. The main result describes the accuracy of Gaussian approximation for this posterior. Section 5 specifies the result to the case of logistic regression. The appendix collects some very useful facts about Laplace approximation for the integral $\int e^{f(\mathbf{v})} d\mathbf{v}$ for a smooth concave function f as well as some deviation bounds for Gaussian and non-Gaussian quadratic forms.

2 Properties of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$

This section collects general results about concentration and expansion of the pMLE. The use of self-concordance conditions from Section A helps to substantially improve the bounds from Spokoiny and Panov (2021). We assume to be given a pseudo log-likelihood random function $L(\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, $p < \infty$. Given a quadratic penalty $\|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$, define

$$L_G(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2.$$

Typical examples of choosing G^2 are given in Section B.1. Consider the penalized MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and its population counterpart \mathbf{v}_G^*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmax}} L_G(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbf{v}_G^* = \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}).$$

The corresponding Fisher information matrix $\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2.$$

We assume $\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v})$ to be positive definite for all considered \mathbf{v} . By $D_G(\mathbf{v})$ we denote a positive symmetric matrix with $D_G^2(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v})$, and $\mathbb{F}_G = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$, $D_G = \mathbb{F}_G^{1/2}$.

2.1 Conditions

Now we present our conditions. The most important one is about linearity of the stochastic component $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) = L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$.

- (ζ) *The stochastic component $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ of the process $L(\mathbf{v})$ is linear in \mathbf{v} . We denote by $\nabla\zeta \equiv \nabla\zeta(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ its gradient.*

Below we assume some concentration properties of the stochastic vector $\nabla\zeta$. More precisely, we require that $\nabla\zeta$ obeys the following condition; see (C.18) of Theorem C.10.

($\nabla\zeta$) Let $V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla\zeta)$ and $D_G^2 = D_G^2(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$. Then for any considered $\mathbf{x} > 0$

$$\mathbf{P}(\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| \geq \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where for $\mathbf{p}_G = \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}V^2)$ and $\lambda_G = \|D_G^{-1}V^2D_G^{-1}\|$

$$\mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}\lambda_G}. \quad (2.2)$$

This condition can be effectively checked if the errors in the data exhibit sub-Gaussian or sub-exponential behaviour; see Section C.3. The important value $\mathbf{p}_G = \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}V^2)$ can be called the *effective dimension*; see Spokoiny (2017).

We also assume that the deterministic part $\mathbf{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ of the penalized log-likelihood is a concave function. It can be relaxed using localization; see Spokoiny (2019).

(\mathcal{C}_G) \mathcal{Y} is an open and convex set in \mathbf{R}^p . The function $\mathbf{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ is concave on \mathcal{Y} .

In Section 3.1 we consider a stronger condition of semi-concavity of $\mathbf{E}L(\mathbf{v})$. Further we will also need some smoothness conditions on the function $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{E}L(\mathbf{v})$. The class of models satisfying the conditions (ζ), ($\nabla\zeta$) with a smooth function $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ will be referred to as *stochastically linear smooth* (SLS). This class includes regression, generalized linear models (GLM) and log-density models; see Spokoiny and Panov (2021) or Section 6 later. However, this class is much larger. For instance, nonlinear regression and nonlinear inverse problems can be adapted to the SLS framework by an extension of the parameter space; see Spokoiny (2019).

2.2 Concentration of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$

This section discusses some concentration properties of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} L_G(\mathbf{v})$.

Given \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{r}_G = \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})$ from (2.2), define for some $\nu < 1$ the set \mathcal{U}_G by

$$\mathcal{U}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{u}: \|D_G\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_G\}. \quad (2.3)$$

The result of this section states the concentration properties of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ in the local vicinity \mathcal{A}_G of \mathbf{v}_G^* of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathcal{U}_G = \{\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathbf{u}: \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_G\} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^\circ.$$

Local Gateaux-regularity of $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ within \mathcal{A}_G will be measured by the error of the second order Taylor approximation

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) &= f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle, \\ \delta_3'(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) &= \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

More precisely, define

$$\omega_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_G} \frac{2|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}_G^*, \mathbf{u})|}{\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}, \quad \omega'_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_G} \frac{2|\delta'_3(\mathbf{v}_G^*, \mathbf{u})|}{\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}. \quad (2.5)$$

The quantities ω_G and ω'_G can be effectively bounded under smoothness conditions (\mathcal{T}_3) or (\mathcal{S}_3) given in Section A. Under (\mathcal{T}_3) at $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_G^*$ with $\mathbf{M}^2(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = D_G^2$ and $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_G$, by Lemma A.1, it holds for a small constant τ_3

$$\omega'_G \leq \tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G, \quad \omega_G \leq \tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G / 3.$$

Furthermore, under (\mathcal{S}_3) , the same bounds apply with $\tau_3 = c_3 n^{-1/2}$; see Lemma A.2.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose (ζ) , $(\nabla\zeta)$, and (\mathcal{C}_G) . Let also*

$$1 - \nu - \omega'_G \geq 0; \quad (2.6)$$

see (2.5) and (2.3). Then $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$ on a set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}$, i.e.

$$\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G. \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. By $(\nabla\zeta)$, on a the random set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}$, it holds $\|D_G^{-1} \nabla\zeta\| \leq \mathbf{r}_G$. Now the result follows from Proposition A.6 with $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$, $g(\mathbf{v}) = L_G(\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{r} = \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G$, and $\mathbf{A} = \nabla\zeta$. \square

2.3 A general condition of the stochastic gradient

The results about pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ strongly rely on the condition $(\nabla\zeta)$ describing the concentration set of $\nabla\zeta$ in the form $\|D_G^{-1} \nabla\zeta\| \leq \mathbf{r}_0$. Here we discuss some possible extensions using other norms than ℓ_2 .

$(\nabla\zeta)_\circ$ *There exists a norm $\|\cdot\|_\circ$ and for any $\mathbf{x} > 0$ a radius $\mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{r}_0(\mathbf{x})$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\nabla\zeta\|_\circ > \mathbf{r}_0) \leq \mathbf{C}_\circ e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

Previous results were stated for $\|\nabla\zeta\|_\circ = \|D_G^{-1} \nabla\zeta\|$. Another example of choosing the norm $\|\cdot\|_\circ$ is given in Section 2.3.

Let $\|\cdot\|_*$ be the corresponding dual norm for $\|\cdot\|_\circ$:

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\|\mathbf{w}\|_\circ \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \rangle.$$

Given \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{r}_G = \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})$, define for some $\nu < 1$ the set \mathcal{U}_G by

$$\mathcal{U}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{u}: \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G \|\mathbf{u}\|_*\}. \quad (2.8)$$

The next result states the concentration properties of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ in the local vicinity \mathcal{A}_G of \mathbf{v}_G^* of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathcal{U}_G = \{\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathbf{u}: \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_G\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^\circ.$$

The quantities ω_G and ω'_G are defined by (2.5) with the set \mathcal{U}_G from (2.8).

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose (ζ) , $(\nabla\zeta)_\circ$, and (\mathcal{C}_G) . Let also ω'_G from (2.5) and ν from (2.8) fulfill*

$$1 - \nu - \omega'_G \geq 0.$$

Then on a set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - \mathfrak{C}_\circ e^{-\mathbf{x}}$, it holds $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$, that is,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^* \in \mathcal{U}_G.$$

Remark 2.1. If $\mathbb{M}^2 \leq D_G^2$ then $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{M}} = \mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{M}}$ on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with the local set

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{M}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{v}: \|\mathbb{M}\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G \|\mathbf{u}\|_*\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Below we restrict ourselves to the random set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ and assume that $\|\nabla\zeta\|_\circ \leq \mathbf{r}_G$. Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ for any \mathbf{u}

$$|\langle \nabla\zeta, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \sup_{\|\mathbf{w}\|_\circ \leq \mathbf{r}_G} |\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \rangle| = \mathbf{r}_G \|\mathbf{u}\|_*.$$

If $\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}_G$, then by definition (2.8) it holds $\mathbf{r}_G \|\mathbf{u}\|_* \leq \nu \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2$. Further we proceed as in the case of condition $(\nabla\zeta)$. \square

2.4 A bound for a sup-norm

Now we consider the case with bounding the vector $\nabla\zeta$ in some ℓ_∞ -norm. Suppose that the components of $\nabla\zeta$ are sub-Gaussian r.v.'s satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}(|(\nabla\zeta)_j| > z_j(\mathbf{x})) \leq \mathfrak{C}_0 e^{-\mathbf{x}},$$

where $z_j(\mathbf{x})$ is typically $v_j \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}$ for $v_j^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla\zeta)_j$. Let also π be a positive measure on the discrete set $\{1, \dots, p\}$. Given \mathbf{x} , define $\mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{x} - \log \pi_j$. Using the Bonferroni

device, we can bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_j \frac{|(\nabla\zeta)_j|}{z_j(\mathbf{x}_j)} > 1\right) \leq \sum_j \mathbb{P}(|(\nabla\zeta)_j| > z_j(\mathbf{x}_j)) \leq \mathbf{C}_0 \sum_j e^{-x_j} = \mathbf{C}_0 e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

Introduce the diagonal matrix $\mathbf{z} = \text{diag}(z_j(\mathbf{x}_j))$. Then $(\nabla\zeta)_\circ$ is fulfilled with $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\circ = \|\mathbf{z}^{-1}\mathbf{u}\|_\infty$ and $\mathbf{r}_G = 1$. Further,

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_* = \sup_{\|\mathbf{w}\|_\circ \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = \sup_{\|\mathbf{z}^{-1}\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{z}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}^{-1}\mathbf{w} \rangle = \|\mathbf{z}\mathbf{u}\|_1.$$

Suppose now that there exists a diagonal matrix \mathbb{M}^2 such that $D_G^2 \geq \mathbb{M}^2$. Consider the set $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{M}$ from (2.9). This set $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{M}$ can be described explicitly. Indeed, with $a_j = (2\nu)^{-1}z_j(\mathbf{x}_j)/\mathbb{F}_j$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_\mathbb{M} &= \left\{ \mathbf{u}: \sum_j \mathbb{F}_j u_j^2 \leq \nu^{-1} \sum_j z_j |u_j| \right\} = \left\{ \mathbf{u}: \sum_j \mathbb{F}_j (|u_j| - a_j)^2 \leq \sum_j \mathbb{F}_j a_j^2 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbf{u}: \|\mathbb{M}(|\mathbf{u}| - \mathbf{a})\|^2 \leq (2\nu)^{-1} \|\mathbb{M}^{-1}\mathbf{z}\|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the set $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{M}$ has an elliptic shape in each quadrant of \mathbb{R}^p with the center shifted from zero to the point \mathbf{u}_m from this quadrant with $|\mathbf{u}_m| = \mathbf{a}$. For a uniform measure π with $\pi_j = 1/p$ and $z_j(\mathbf{x}) = \nu_j \sqrt{x}$, we derive

$$\|\mathbb{M}^{-1}\mathbf{z}\|^2 = \sum_j \frac{z_j^2(\mathbf{x} + \log p)}{\mathbb{M}_j^2} = (\mathbf{x} + \log p) \sum_j \frac{\nu_j^2}{\mathbb{M}_j^2}.$$

The sum $\sum_j \nu_j^2/\mathbb{M}_j^2$ has the same meaning as the effective dimension $\mathbf{p}_G = \text{tr}\{\text{Var}(\nabla\zeta)\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}\}$. It will be assumed that this value is small relatively to each \mathbb{M}_j^2 . This assures the desired concentration of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$.

2.5 Fisher and Wilks expansions

This section presents some finite sample results about the behavior of the penalized MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and the excess $L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$. Proposition 2.1 states the concentration properties of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ around \mathbf{v}_G^* . Now we show that this concentration can be used to establish a version of the Fisher expansion for the estimation error $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*$ and the Wilks expansion for the excess $L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$.

Theorem 2.3. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.1 with $\nu = 2/3$. Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\begin{aligned} 2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|^2 &\leq \frac{\omega_G}{1 - \omega_G} \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|^2, \\ 2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|^2 &\geq -\omega_G \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|^2 &\leq \frac{3\omega_G}{(1-\omega_G)^2} \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|^2, \\ \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| &\leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G} \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. The result follows from Proposition A.7 similarly to Proposition 2.1. \square

2.6 Effective sample size and critical dimension in pMLE

This section discusses the important question of the critical parameter dimension still ensuring the validity of the presented results. A very important feature of our results is their dimension free and coordinate free form. The true parametric dimension p can be very large, it does not show up in the error terms. Neither do we use any spectral decomposition or sequence space structure, in particular, we do not require that the Fisher information matrix \mathbf{F} and the penalty matrix G^2 are diagonal or can be jointly diagonalized. The results are stated for the general data \mathbf{Y} and a quasi log-likelihood function. In particular, we do not assume independent or progressively dependent observations and additive structure of the log-likelihood. The *effective sample size* n can be defined via the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix $\mathbf{F}_G = D_G^2 = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$:

$$n^{-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\mathbf{F}_G^{-1}\|.$$

Our results apply as long as this value is sufficiently small. Below in Section 5 and Section 6 we will see that such defined value is closely related to the sample size n .

For the concentration result of Proposition 2.1 we need the basic conditions (ζ) and (\mathcal{C}_G) . Further, $(\nabla\zeta)$ identifies the radius \mathbf{r}_G of the local vicinity \mathcal{A}_G . The final critical condition is given by (2.6). Essentially it says that the values ω_G and ω'_G are significantly smaller than 1. Under (\mathcal{S}_3) , $\omega'_G \leq c_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G n^{-1/2}$; see Lemma A.2. So, (2.6) means $\mathbf{r}_G^2 \ll n$. Moreover, definition (2.1) of \mathbf{r}_G yields that $\mathbf{r}_G^2 \asymp \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}V^2) = \mathbf{p}_G$, where \mathbf{p}_G is the *effective dimension* of the problem. We conclude that the main properties of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ are valid under the condition $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n$ meaning sufficiently many observations per effective number of parameters.

2.7 The use of \tilde{D}_G^2 instead of D_G^2

The penalized information matrix $D_G^2 = D_G^2(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ plays an important role in our results. In particular, D_G describes the shape of the concentration set $\mathcal{A}_G =$

$\mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathcal{U}_G$. However, this matrix is not available as it involves the unknown point \mathbf{v}_G^* . If the matrix function $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v})$ is locally constant in \mathcal{A}_G , one can replace \mathbf{v}_G^* with its estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$. Variability of $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v})$, or, equivalently, $\mathbf{F}_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2$ can be measured under the Fréchet smoothness of $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ by the value ω_G^+ from (A.4) $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_G^*$, $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) = D_G$, and $\mathbf{r} = \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_G$.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and let $\omega_G^+ \leq 1/2$; see (A.4). The random matrix $\tilde{D}_G^2 = \mathbf{F}_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ fulfills on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$*

$$\|D_G^{-1}\tilde{D}_G^2 D_G^{-1} - I_p\| \leq \omega_G^+, \quad \|D_G \tilde{D}_G^{-2} D_G - I_p\| \leq \frac{\omega_G^+}{1 - \omega_G^+}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$(1 - \omega_G^+) \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \|\tilde{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq (1 + \omega_G^+) \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2.$$

Proof. The value $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*$ belongs to \mathcal{U}_G on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ and (2.12) follows from (A.5). \square

2.8 Smoothness and bias

Due to Proposition 2.1, the penalized MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ is in fact an estimator of the vector \mathbf{v}_G^* . However, \mathbf{v}_G^* depends on penalization which introduces some bias. This section discusses whether one can use $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ for estimating the underlying truth \mathbf{v}^* defined as the maximizer of the expected log-likelihood: $\mathbf{v}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$. First we describe the bias $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$ induced by penalization. It is important to mention that the previous results about the properties of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ require strong concavity of the expected log-likelihood function $\mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ at least in a vicinity of the point \mathbf{v}_G^* . In some sense, this strong concavity is automatically forced by the penalizing term in the definition of \mathbf{v}_G^* . However, the underlying truth $\mathbf{v}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ is the maximizer of the non-penalized expected log-likelihood, and the corresponding Hessian $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}^*) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}^*)$ can degenerate. This makes evaluation of the bias more involved. To bypass this situation, we assume later in this section that the Hessian $\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ cannot change much in a reasonably large vicinity of \mathbf{v}^* . This allows to establish an accurate quadratic approximation of $f(\mathbf{v})$ and to evaluate the bias $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$.

Define \mathbf{D}_G by $\mathbf{D}_G^2 = \mathbf{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$; cf. $D_G^2 = \mathbf{F}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$. Let also Q be a symmetric matrix satisfying $Q^2 \leq \mathbf{D}_G^2$. Typical examples include $Q^2 = \mathbf{F}_G$, $Q^2 = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}^*)$, and $Q^2 = nI_p$. Later we bound the norm $\|Q\mathbf{b}_G\|$. Introduce two vectors

$$\mathbf{A}_G = -G^2 \mathbf{v}^*, \quad \mathbf{a}_G = Q \mathbf{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G = -Q \mathbf{D}_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*. \quad (2.13)$$

Also denote $\mathbf{r}_o = \nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{a}_G\| = \nu^{-1} \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|$ for $\nu = 2/3$ and

$$\omega_G^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u}: \|Q\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}_o} \|\mathbb{D}_G^{-1} \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^* + \mathbf{u}) \mathbb{D}_G^{-1} - I_p\|; \quad (2.14)$$

cf. (A.4) and (A.5) for $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$. Note that the definition of ω_G^\dagger in Proposition 2.4 uses another $\mathbf{r} = \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G$, therefore, different notation. Proposition A.10 yields the following result.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\mathbb{D}_G^2 = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$, \mathbf{A}_G and \mathbf{a}_G be given by (2.13), $\nu \leq 2/3$, and $\mathbf{r}_o = \nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{a}_G\|$. Let also $\omega_G^* \leq 1/3$; see (2.14). Then the bias $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$ fulfills*

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q \mathbf{b}_G\| &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|\mathbf{a}_G\| = \frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|, \\ \|Q(\mathbf{b}_G - \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G)\| &\leq \frac{\omega_G^*}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|\mathbf{a}_G\| = \frac{\omega_G^*}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

As special cases of (2.15), consider $Q = \mathbb{D}_G$ and $Q = I_p$.

Corollary 2.6. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.5. Then*

$$\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{b}_G\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|\mathbb{D}_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|, \quad \|\mathbf{b}_G\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|\mathbb{D}_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|. \quad (2.16)$$

The same bounds apply with $D_G^2 = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ in place of $\mathbb{D}_G^2 = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$.

The last statement follows from Remark A.1.

2.9 Loss and risk of the pMLE

Now we combine the previous results about the stochastic term $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*$ and the bias term $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$ to obtain the sharp bounds on the loss and risk of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$.

Theorem 2.7. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and 2.5. Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}$, it holds with $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta$, \mathbf{r}_G from (2.2), and $n^{-1} = \|D_G^{-2}\|$*

$$\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| + \frac{\|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|}{1 - \omega_G^*} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G} \mathbf{r}_G + \frac{\|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|}{1 - \omega_G^*}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\| \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\omega_G}}{\sqrt{n}(1 - \omega_G)} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| + \frac{\|D_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|}{1 - \omega_G^*} \leq \frac{3\mathbf{r}_G}{\sqrt{n}} + 3\|D_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|. \quad (2.18)$$

Proof. Let $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ be the random set from $(\nabla \zeta)$ on which with $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| \leq \mathbf{r}_G$. It follows from (2.11) of Theorem 2.3 that on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$

$$\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*) + D_G \mathbf{b}_G\| \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|.$$

This and (2.16) imply (2.17). \square

Now we state the results about the risk of the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$. To avoid technical burden, we fix a large \mathbf{x} , $\mathbf{r}_G = \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})$, and exclude an event $\{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| > \mathbf{r}_G\}$ having an exponentially small probability; see condition (2.1) of Proposition 2.1.

Theorem 2.8. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.5. Then for a set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}$, it holds with $\mathbf{p}_G = \text{tr}(D_G^{-2} V^2)$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}\{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*) \mathbb{I}(\Omega(\mathbf{x}))\}\| &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\| + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G} \mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| + \mathbf{C}_1 e^{-\mathbf{x}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\| + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G} \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G} + \mathbf{C}_1 e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\{\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \mathbb{I}(\Omega(\mathbf{x}))\} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G}\right)^2 \mathbf{p}_G + \left(\frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\| + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G} \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G} + \mathbf{C}_1 e^{-\mathbf{x}}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Remark 2.2. For ω_G^* , ω_G small, (2.20) yields classical bias-variance decomposition:

$$\mathbb{E}\{\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \mathbb{I}(\Omega(\mathbf{x}))\} \leq (\mathbf{p}_G + \|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|^2) \{1 + o(1)\}. \quad (2.21)$$

With $n^{-1} = \|D_G^{-2}\|$, we also obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\{n\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \mathbb{I}(\Omega(\mathbf{x}))\} \leq (\mathbf{p}_G + n\|D_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|^2) \{1 + o(1)\}.$$

Moreover, under the small bias condition $\|D_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \ll \mathbf{p}_G/n$, the impact of the bias induced by penalization is negligible. The relation $\|D_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \asymp \mathbf{p}_G/n$ is usually referred to as ‘‘bias-variance trade-off’’. Our bound is sharp in the sense that even for the special case of a linear models, (2.21) becomes equality.

Proof. Below we denote $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}\eta = \mathbb{E}\{\eta \mathbb{I}(\Omega(\mathbf{x}))\}$ for any r.v. η . As $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = 0$, we derive

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}\{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^* - \boldsymbol{\xi}_G) - \mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\xi}_G \mathbb{I}(\Omega^c(\mathbf{x})).$$

For the first term we apply (2.11) and (2.16) yielding

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^* - \boldsymbol{\xi}_G)\| \leq \frac{\|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|}{1 - \omega_G^*} + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_G \mathbf{p}_G}}{1 - \omega_G}.$$

To show (2.19), we also have to bound the tail moments of $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|$:

$$\|\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\xi}_G \mathbb{I}(\Omega^c(\mathbf{x}))\| \leq \mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| \mathbb{I}(\Omega^c(\mathbf{x})) \leq e^{-x/2}.$$

This can be easily done using deviation bounds for the quadratic form $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2$; see Theorem C.9. Similarly one can bound the variance of $D_G \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$. With $B_G = D_G^{-1} V^2 D_G^{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{x}}(D_G \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} \{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\} \{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\}^\top \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_G \boldsymbol{\xi}_G^\top) = \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2\omega_G}}{1 - \omega_G}\right)^2 B_G. \end{aligned}$$

This yields for the quadratic risk $\mathbb{E}\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \leq \text{tr} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{x}}\{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\} + \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}} D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2$$

and (2.20) follows. \square

2.10 Confidence sets

This section discusses the issue of constructing some frequentist confidence sets (CS) for the true parameter \mathbf{v}^* . We consider two possible approaches. The first one is based on the Fisher expansion (2.11) for the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and leads to elliptic CS. For the construction, one has to only specify the central point and the scale matrix. The second approach is motivated by the Wilks expansion (2.10) and leads to likelihood-based CS. However, due to (A.18), both constructions are close to each other.

2.10.1 Elliptic confidence sets

The Fisher expansion $D_G(\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) \approx \boldsymbol{\xi}_G$ from (2.11) for $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta$ lead to elliptic confidence sets $\mathcal{E}_G(z_\alpha)$:

$$\mathcal{E}_G(z_\alpha) = \{\mathbf{v} : \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| \leq z_\alpha\}, \quad (2.22)$$

where the radius z_α is fixed to ensure $\mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| > z_\alpha) \approx \alpha$. Unfortunately, there are several issues related to this construction. First of all, it involves the matrix $D_G^2 = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ which is unknown unless the model is linear and the noise variance is precisely known. Furthermore, the radius z_α relates to the $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the distribution of the norm $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|$ which is unknown as well. Finally, the Fisher expansion provides an approximation for the difference $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*$ while we are interested in covering the true value \mathbf{v}^* . This requires to account for the bias $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$.

The first problem can be bypassed by using the matrix $\tilde{D}_G = D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ instead of D_G ; see Section 2.7. The second problem is more severe and cannot be addressed in the whole generality. Under additional structural assumptions on the data \mathbf{Y} like a sample $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$ of independent Y_i 's, one can use one or another version of bootstrap resampling technique sketched below; see also Spokoiny and Zhilova (2015) and reference therein. The bias issue can be addressed under the “small bias” condition $\|D_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\| \ll r_G$.

2.10.2 Likelihood-based confidence sets

Theorem 2.3 suggests to consider the likelihood-based confidence sets of the form

$$\mathcal{E}_G(\mathfrak{z}_\alpha) = \{\mathbf{v}: L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}) \leq \mathfrak{z}_\alpha\}. \quad (2.23)$$

A great advantage of this construction is that it is entirely based on the penalized log-likelihood $L_G(\mathbf{v})$. The main issue for practical applications is the choice of the value \mathfrak{z}_α . Due to the Wilks expansion from Theorem 2.3, the quantities z_α from (2.22) and \mathfrak{z}_α are related as $2\mathfrak{z}_\alpha \approx z_\alpha^2$. Again, a resampling technique can be used for a data-driven choice of \mathfrak{z}_α under the small bias condition.

2.10.3 Bootstrap technique and data-driven confidence sets

The resampling procedure from Spokoiny and Zhilova (2015) can be sketched as follows. Assume the additive structure of the log-likelihood for the sample $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)$:

$$L(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i(Y_i, \mathbf{v}),$$

where ℓ_i is the log-density of the i th observation Y_i .

1. Draw i.i.d. bootstrap weights $W^{(m)} = (w_i^{(m)})$ from $\text{Exp}(1)$ or $\mathcal{N}(1, 1)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $m = 1, \dots, M$, and build the corresponding bootstrap weighted log-likelihood

$$L^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i(Y_i, \mathbf{v})w_i^{(m)};$$

2. compute for each m the corresponding bootstrap estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G^{(m)} = \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} L_G^{(m)}(\mathbf{v})$ for $L_G^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}) = L^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}) - \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$.

3. \mathfrak{z}_α from (2.23) is fixed as the minimal value ensuring

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{I}(L_G^{(m)}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G^{(m)}) - L_G^{(m)}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) > \mathfrak{z}_\alpha) \leq \alpha.$$

Similarly, the value z_α from (2.22) can be fixed by

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{I}(\|\tilde{D}_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G^{(m)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G\| > z_\alpha) \leq \alpha.$$

The proof of validity of this procedure is quite involved, the main technical issue apart the mentioned Fisher and Wilks expansions is a Gaussian approximation of the score vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G$ for the original and the bootstrap data as well as some bounds from the random matrix theory; see e.g. Spokoiny and Zhilova (2015) for more details. A further discussion lies beyond the scope of this note.

3 Laplace approximation of the posterior

This section studies the properties of the posterior $\mathbf{v}_G | \mathbf{Y}$. Our main result states Gaussian approximation of the posterior by $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G, \tilde{D}_G^{-2})$. More specifically, our aim is, for any bounded measurable function g , to compare the conditional moments of $g(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ and of $g(\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma})$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is standard normal conditionally on \mathbf{Y} . The use of $\nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) = 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{g(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) | \mathbf{Y}\} &= \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) e^{L_G(\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{L_G(\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)} d\mathbf{u}} \\ &= \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Now consider the Bregman divergence of the expected log-likelihood $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$

$$f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) = f_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

As the stochastic term of $L(\mathbf{v})$ and thus, of $L_G(\mathbf{v})$ is linear in \mathbf{v} , it holds for any \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}

$$L_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla L_G(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle = f_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle = f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}).$$

Given $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \mathbf{v}$, we derive from (3.1)

$$\mathbb{E}\{g(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) | \mathbf{Y}\} = \mathbb{E}\{g(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) | \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \mathbf{v}\} = \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}. \quad (3.2)$$

This basic identity will be systematically used below. Laplace's approximation means nothing but the use of the second order Taylor approximation of the function $f_G(\cdot)$ at \mathbf{v} . Namely, $f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \approx -\|D_G(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^2/2$ and

$$\frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \approx \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|D_G(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|D_G(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}.$$

The analysis includes two major steps: posterior concentration and a Gaussian approximation of the posterior distribution.

3.1 Posterior concentration

We start with the important technical result describing the concentration sets of the posterior. In all our result, the value \mathbf{x} is fixed to ensure that $e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ is negligible.

Proposition 2.1 enables us to restrict the study to the case with $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$. To describe the concentration properties of the posterior we need a slightly stronger concavity condition on $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$, concavity of $\mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ is not sufficient.

(C) The function $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ is concave.

This condition can be relaxed to *weak concavity*.

(C_o) There exists $G_o^2 \leq G^2$ such that for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$, the function $2\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - \|G_o \mathbf{u}\|^2$ is concave in \mathbf{u} .

(C) is a special case of (C_o) with $G_o = 0$. In what follow we assume (C). However, all the results apply under (C_o) after replacing D^2 with $D_o^2 = D^2 + G_o^2$. Define

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}\{D^2(\mathbf{v})D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})\}, \quad \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}; \quad (3.3)$$

cf. (2.2) for \mathbf{p}_G and \mathbf{r}_G . This ensures with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ standard normal

$$\mathbb{P}(\|D(\mathbf{v}) D_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v}) \boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}},$$

see (C.9) of Corollary C.6. With some fixed $\nu \leq 1$, e.g. $\nu = 2/3$, define for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{u}: \|D(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})\}. \quad (3.4)$$

With $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ and $\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$ from (2.4), local smoothness of $f(\cdot)$ at \mathbf{v} will be measured by the value $\omega(\mathbf{v})$:

$$\omega(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})} \frac{1}{\|D\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} |\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})|; \quad (3.5)$$

cf. (2.5). Under (\mathbf{S}_3) , it holds $\omega(\mathbf{v}) \leq \nu^{-1} c_3 \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) n^{-1/2}/3$; see Lemma A.2.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose (ζ) , $(\nabla\zeta)$, and (\mathbf{C}) . Let also $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$ be defined by (3.3) and $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})$ by (3.4). If $\omega(\mathbf{v})$ from (3.5) satisfies*

$$\omega(\mathbf{v}) \leq 1/3, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G, \quad (3.6)$$

then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$, it holds with $\tilde{D} = D(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{r}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\|\tilde{D}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| > \tilde{\mathbf{r}} \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. Let us fix $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \mathbf{v}$ and apply (3.2) with $g(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{1}(\|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \notin \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}))$. Then it suffices to bound uniformly in $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ the ratio

$$\rho(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{1}(D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})) e^{f_G(\mathbf{v};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f_G(\mathbf{v};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}.$$

Bound (7.10) of Theorem 7.1 yields the result. \square

3.2 Posterior contraction

Now we bring together all the previous results to bound the posterior deviations $\mathbf{v}_G - \mathbf{v}^*$. The difference $\mathbf{v}_G - \mathbf{v}^*$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{v}_G - \mathbf{v}^* = (\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) + (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*). \quad (3.8)$$

Result (2.18) of Theorem 2.7 provides a deviation bound for $\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\|$ while Proposition 3.1 claims concentration of the posterior on the set $\{\|\tilde{D}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\}$. We conclude by the following result.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 2.7 and Proposition 3.1 and let $\|D^{-2}(\mathbf{v})\| \leq n^{-1}$ for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$. It holds on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{v}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\| \geq \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\| + \nu^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{r}}/\sqrt{n} \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \quad (3.9)$$

and $\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\|$ satisfies (2.18), while $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \leq (1 - \omega_G^+)^{-1/2} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$.

Proof. Bound (3.9) follows from decomposition (3.8) and Proposition 3.1. Further, the use of (2.12) of Proposition 2.4 yields $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \leq (1 - \omega_G^+)^{-1/2} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$. \square

The use of (2.18) of Theorem 2.7 implies that the most of posterior mass is concentrated in the root- n vicinity of \mathbf{v}^* :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{v}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\| \geq 3\|D_G^{-2}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\| + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}}(\mathbf{r}_G + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

A prior ensuring the bias-variance trade-off leads to the optimal contraction rate which corresponds to the optimal penalty choice in penalized maximum likelihood estimation.

3.3 Gaussian approximation of the posterior

This section presents our main results about the accuracy of Gaussian approximation of the posterior $\mathbf{v}_G \mid \mathbf{Y}$ in the total variation distance. The use of self-concordance type conditions from Section A helps to obtain very accurate and precise finite sample guarantees, which gradually improve the bounds from Spokoiny and Panov (2021).

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ be the σ -field of all Borel sets in \mathbb{R}^p , while $\mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)$ stands for all centrally symmetric sets from $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume (ζ) , $(\nabla\zeta)$, and (\mathcal{C}) . Furthermore, let*

$$\omega(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) \leq 2/3, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G;$$

cf. (3.6). Then with

$$\diamond_2(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{0.75\omega(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})}{1 - \omega(\mathbf{v})}$$

and $\tilde{\diamond} = \diamond_2(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$, it holds on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\gamma \in A) \right| \leq \frac{2(\tilde{\diamond} + e^{-\mathbf{x}})}{1 - \tilde{\diamond} - e^{-\mathbf{x}}} \leq 4(\tilde{\diamond} + e^{-\mathbf{x}}). \quad (3.10)$$

Here \mathbb{P}' means a standard Gaussian distribution of γ given \mathbf{Y} .

Now we present more advanced bounds on the error of Gaussian approximation under conditions (\mathcal{T}_3) and (\mathcal{T}_4) (resp. (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4)) from Section A for $\Upsilon^\circ = \mathcal{A}_G$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) = D(\mathbf{v})$.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume (ζ) , $(\nabla\zeta)$, (\mathcal{C}) , (\mathcal{T}_3) , and let $\tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) \leq 3/4$ for $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$ from (3.3) and all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$. Then the concentration bound (3.7) holds. Moreover, let*

$$\tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) \leq 2, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G. \quad (3.11)$$

With $\omega(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_3 \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})/3 \leq 1/4$, define

$$\diamond_3(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\tau_3}{4\{1 - \omega(\mathbf{v})\}^{3/2}} \{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) + 1\}^{3/2}.$$

Then the result (3.10) applies on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\tilde{\diamond} = \diamond_3(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$. Moreover, under (\mathcal{T}_4) ,

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in A) \right| \leq \frac{2(\tilde{\diamond}_4 + e^{-\mathbf{x}})}{1 - \tilde{\diamond}_4 - e^{-\mathbf{x}}} \leq 4(\tilde{\diamond}_4 + e^{-\mathbf{x}})$$

with $\tilde{\diamond}_4 = \diamond_4(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ and

$$\diamond_4(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{16\{1 - \omega(\mathbf{v})\}^2} \left[\tau_3^2 \{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) + 2\}^3 + 2\tau_4 \{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) + 1\}^2 \right].$$

The results continue to apply with (\mathcal{S}_3) (resp. (\mathcal{S}_4)) in place of (\mathcal{T}_3) (resp. (\mathcal{T}_4)) and $\mathbf{c}_3 n^{-1/2}$ (resp. $\mathbf{c}_4 n^{-1}$) in place of τ_3 (resp. τ_4).

Proof of Theorem 3.3 (resp. Theorem 3.4). Similarly to the proof of Proposition 3.1, we restrict ourselves to the event $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$. Then we fix any possible value $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and use (3.2) to represent the posterior probability of a set A in the form

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{\int_A e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}.$$

Now the result follows by Theorem 7.1 (resp. Theorem 7.2). \square

Under self-concordance conditions (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4) , constraint (3.11) reads as

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \frac{\mathbf{c}_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})}{n^{1/2}} \leq 2. \quad (3.12)$$

As $\omega(\mathbf{v}) \leq 1/4$, Theorem 3.4 yields on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{p}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in A) \right| &\leq 2\mathbf{c}_3 \sqrt{\frac{(\tilde{\mathbf{p}} + 1)^3}{n}} + 4e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \\ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in A) \right| &\leq \frac{\mathbf{c}_3^2 (\tilde{\mathbf{p}} + 2)^3 + 2\mathbf{c}_4 (\tilde{\mathbf{p}} + 1)^2}{2n} + 4e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

3.4 Critical dimension in Bayesian inference

Posterior concentration in Proposition 3.1 only requires $\omega(\mathbf{v}) \ll 1$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$. Under (\mathcal{S}_3) , one can bound $\omega(\mathbf{v}) \asymp \sqrt{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})/n}$ yielding the condition $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) \ll n$ on the critical dimension which is essentially the same as the condition $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n$ for the pMLE. This is an important finding and an essential improvement of Spokoiny and Panov (2021). The main result of Theorem 3.3 requires $\omega(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) \ll 1$ which is much stronger because of the multiplicative factor $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})$. Under (\mathcal{S}_3) , the remainder \diamond_3 is of order $\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^3(\mathbf{v})/n}$ while under (\mathcal{S}_4) , $\diamond_4 \asymp \mathbf{p}^3(\mathbf{v})/n$, still requiring $\mathbf{p}^3(\mathbf{v}) \ll n$. In some cases, e.g. for additive

structure of the log-likelihood, it can be relaxed. However, it seems that the $\mathfrak{p}^3(\mathbf{v}) \ll n$ condition is inherent in the problem and cannot be relaxed in general situation. We guess that in the region $n^{1/3} \ll \mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{v}) \ll n$, another non-Gaussian type of limiting behavior of the posterior is well possible.

3.5 Laplace approximation with inexact parameters

Our main result of Theorem 3.3 states an approximation of the posterior distribution by the Gaussian measure with parameters $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and \tilde{D}_G^{-2} . However, the vector $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} L_G(\mathbf{v})$ is typically hard to compute, because it solves a high dimensional optimization problem. If $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and thus $\tilde{D}_G = D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ are not available, one would be interested to use something more simple in place of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$. Suppose to be given a vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ close to $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and a matrix H^2 close to $\hat{D}_G^2 = D_G^2(\hat{\mathbf{v}})$. A typical example to keep in mind corresponds to $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ being the numerically evaluated posterior mean and H^2 being the posterior covariance, also evaluated numerically. Below we aim at presenting some sufficient conditions that ensure a reasonable approximation of the posterior by $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}, H^{-2})$ using general results on Gaussian comparison; see Götze et al. (2019) and references therein. Of course, for this result we need all the conditions of Theorem 3.3 corresponding to the special case with $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and $H^2 = \tilde{D}_G^2$. We write $\hat{D} = D(\hat{\mathbf{v}})$. Also we restrict ourselves to the class $\mathcal{B}_{el}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ of elliptic sets A in \mathbb{R}^p of the form

$$A = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|Q(\mathbf{v} - \hat{\mathbf{v}})\| \leq \mathbf{r}\}$$

for some linear mapping $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\mathbf{r} > 0$. Given two symmetric q -matrices Σ_1, Σ_2 and a vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, define

$$d(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \mathbf{a}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\frac{1}{\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{Fr}}} + \frac{1}{\|\Sigma_2\|_{\text{Fr}}} \right) \left(\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2\|_1 + \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \right), \quad (3.14)$$

where $\|\Sigma\|_{\text{Fr}}^2 = \operatorname{tr} \Sigma^2$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1$ is the vector of eigenvalues of Σ_1 arranged in the non-increasing order and similarly for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2$; see Götze et al. (2019) for this and related definitions. By the Weilandt–Hoffman inequality, $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2\|_1 \leq \|\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2\|_1$, see e.g. Markus (1964). Here $\|M\|_1 = \operatorname{tr} |M| = \sum_j |\lambda_j(M)|$ for a symmetric matrix M with eigenvalues $\lambda_j(M)$. Obviously, if $\Sigma_1 \geq \Sigma_2$, then $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2\|_1 = \|\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2\|_1 = \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2)$.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 3.3 to be fulfilled. Let also $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{A}_G$. Given $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$, define $\Sigma_1 = Q\tilde{D}_G^{-2}Q^\top$, $\Sigma_2 = QH^{-2}Q^\top$, $\mathbf{a} = Q(\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ and suppose $\|\Sigma_j\|^2 \leq 3\|\Sigma_j\|_{\text{Fr}}^2$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{r} > 0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\|Q(\mathbf{v}_G - \hat{\mathbf{v}})\| \leq \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\|QH^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \leq \frac{2(\diamond + e^{-x})}{1 - \diamond - e^{-x}} + \mathfrak{C}d(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \mathbf{a}),$$

where \diamond is from Theorem 3.3, $d(\cdot)$ from (3.14), and \mathbf{C} is an absolute constant.

Proof. Use Theorem 7.8 with $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{x}^* = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$, $\mathbf{x} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}$, and $\mathbf{D} = \tilde{D}_G$. \square

The result is particularly transparent if $H = \tilde{D}_G$ or, if these two matrices are sufficiently close. Theorem 7.9 yields the following bound.

Corollary 3.6. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.5, it holds on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{r}>0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\|Q(\mathbf{v}_G - \hat{\mathbf{v}})\| \leq \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\|Q\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \leq \frac{2(\diamond + e^{-\mathbf{x}})}{1 - \diamond - e^{-\mathbf{x}}} + \frac{\mathbf{C}\|Q(\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\|^2}{\|Q\tilde{D}_G^{-2}Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}}.$$

3.6 Laplace approximation and Bernstein–von Mises Theorem

The prominent Bernstein–von Mises (BvM) Theorem claims asymptotic normality of the posterior distribution with the mean corresponding to the standard MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} L(\mathbf{v})$ and the variance $\tilde{D}^{-2} = D^{-2}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}})$. In particular, the prior does not show up in this result, its impact on the posterior distribution becomes negligible as the sample size n grows. In our setup, the situation is different. The main results of Theorems 3.3 through 3.4 state another Gaussian approximation of the posterior with the mean $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and the variance \tilde{D}_G^{-2} both depending on the prior covariance G^{-2} . This dependence is important because the accuracy of approximation is given in terms of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{p}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ also depending on G^{-2} . It is of interest to describe a kind of phase transition from the classical BvM approximation by $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{D}^{-2})$ to the prior-dependent Laplace approximation by $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G, \tilde{D}_G^{-2})$. Intuitively it is clear that the prior impact can be measured by the relation between the model-based Fisher information matrix D^2 and the prior precision matrix G^2 . The main result below confirms this intuitive guess, however, the result is not trivial and requires a careful treatment based on Theorem 3.3 and the Gaussian comparison technique mentioned in Section 3.5. Implicitly we assume that the conditions ensuring concentration of the MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ corresponding to $G^2 = 0$ to be fulfilled. In particular, we need that $D^2(\mathbf{v})$ is sufficiently large for all \mathbf{v} in the vicinity of \mathbf{v}^* . The radius of this vicinity is given by the value $\mathbf{r}_x = \sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(D^{-2}V^2)} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}$; see (2.2) of $(\nabla\zeta)$. Under correct model specification, it holds $V^2 \leq \mathbf{C}D^2$ and $\mathbf{r}_x^2 \leq \mathbf{C}p$.

Theorem 3.7. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.3, it holds on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{r}>0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\|Q(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}})\| \leq \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\|Q\tilde{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{2(\diamond + e^{-\mathbf{x}})}{1 - \diamond - e^{-\mathbf{x}}} + \frac{\mathbf{C}\|Q(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\|^2}{\|Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}} + \mathbf{C}\|\tilde{D}_G^{-1}G^2\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\| \frac{\operatorname{tr}(Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top)}{\|Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, with $Q = \tilde{D}$, $\mathbf{r}_x = \sqrt{\text{tr}(D^{-2}V^2)} + \sqrt{2x} \leq \mathbf{C}\sqrt{p}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{r}>0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\|\tilde{D}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}})\| \leq \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\|\gamma\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \\ & \lesssim \diamond + e^{-x} + \|G\mathbf{v}^*\|^2/\sqrt{p} + \|D_G^{-1}G^2D_G^{-1}\|^2\sqrt{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Theorem 3.5 yields in view of $\tilde{D}^{-2} \geq \tilde{D}_G^{-2}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{r}>0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\|Q(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}})\| \leq \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\|Q\tilde{D}^{-1}\gamma\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{2(\diamond + e^{-x})}{1 - \diamond - e^{-x}} + \frac{\mathbf{C}\|Q(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\|^2}{\|Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}} + \frac{\mathbf{C} \text{tr}\{Q(\tilde{D}^{-2} - \tilde{D}_G^{-2})Q^\top\}}{\|Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last term here can easily be bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}\{Q(\tilde{D}^{-2} - \tilde{D}_G^{-2})Q^\top\} &= \text{tr}\{Q\tilde{D}^{-1}(I_p - \tilde{D}\tilde{D}_G^{-2}\tilde{D})\tilde{D}^{-1}Q^\top\} \\ &\leq \|I_p - \tilde{D}\tilde{D}_G^{-2}\tilde{D}\| \text{tr}(Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top) = \|\tilde{D}_G^{-1}G^2\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\| \text{tr}(Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that

$$\|\tilde{D}_G^{-1}G^2\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\| = \|\tilde{D}_G^{-1}(\tilde{D}_G^2 - \tilde{D}^2)\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\| = \|I - \tilde{D}_G^{-1}\tilde{D}^2\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\| = \|I_p - \tilde{D}\tilde{D}_G^{-2}\tilde{D}\|.$$

For $Q = \tilde{D}$, we use that $\|Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}} = \sqrt{p}$, $\text{tr}(Q\tilde{D}^{-2}Q^\top) = p$, and apply the Fisher expansion (2.11) of Theorem 2.3 to $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$. On $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$, it holds $\|D^{-1}\nabla\| \leq \mathbf{r}_x$ and with ω from (2.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \|D(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| &\leq \|D(\mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| + \|(I - DD_G^{-2}D)D^{-1}\nabla\| \\ &\quad + \|D(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{v}^*) - D^{-1}\nabla\| + \|D(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^* - D_G^{-2}\nabla)\| \\ &\leq \|D(\mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| + \mathbf{C}\|D_G^{-1}G^2D_G^{-1}\|\mathbf{r}_x + \mathbf{C}\omega\mathbf{r}_x. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.15) of Proposition 2.5

$$\|D(\mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2 \leq \|DD_G^{-2}D^\top\| \|G\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \leq \|G\mathbf{v}^*\|^2.$$

As $\mathbf{r}_x^2 \leq \mathbf{C}p$, $\omega\sqrt{p} \leq \mathbf{C}\diamond_3$, $\tilde{D}^2 \leq 2D^2$, and $\tilde{D}_G^{-2} \leq 2D_G^{-2}$, the assertion follows. \square

Remark 3.1. The use of BvM requires rather strong bounds on the penalizing matrix G^2 and the related bias $\|G\mathbf{v}^*\|$. We need the condition of “light penalization” $\|D_G^{-1}G^2D_G^{-1}\| \ll p^{-1/2}$ which is much stronger than $G^2 \ll D^2$. Similarly, the “light bias” condition $\|G\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \ll p^{1/2}$ is more restrictive than the “small bias” or “under-smoothing” condition $\|G\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \ll p$.

3.7 Posterior mean

This section addresses an important question of using the posterior mean in place of the MAP $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ for Bayesian inference. Our main result justifies the use of the posterior mean in place of the MAP under the same critical dimension condition $\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{v}) \ll n^{1/3}$ which is required for the Gaussian approximation result. First we quantify the deviation of the posterior mean $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G$ from $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$. Then we apply Corollary 3.6 to measure the impact of using $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G$ in place of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$. By definition

$$\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_G | \mathbf{Y}) - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \frac{\int (\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) e^{L_G(\mathbf{v})} d\mathbf{v}}{\int e^{L_G(\mathbf{v})} d\mathbf{v}}.$$

More precisely, we consider a linear mapping $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ and evaluate the value $\|Q(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\|$. The choice of Q is important. In particular, we cannot take $Q = D_G$ because this choice makes the bound dependent and linearly growing with p .

Theorem 3.8. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.4 and let $Q^\top Q \leq D^2(\mathbf{v})$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$. Then it holds with some absolute constant \mathfrak{C}*

$$\|Q(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| \leq 2.4 \mathfrak{c}_3 \|Q \tilde{D}^{-2} Q^\top\|^{1/2} (\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} + 1)^{3/2} n^{-1/2} + \mathfrak{C} e^{-x}.$$

Proof. One can apply the same trick as before: by $\nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) = 0$

$$Q(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) = \frac{\int Q \mathbf{u} \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}.$$

For any particular value $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \mathbf{v}$, stochastic linearity allows to replace the Bregman divergence of the log-likelihood $L_G(\mathbf{v})$ by the similar one for the expected log-likelihood $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$. This yields

$$\|Q(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| \leq \left\| \frac{\int Q \mathbf{u} e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \right\|.$$

Now we may apply (7.17) of Theorem 7.6 with $D = D_G(\mathbf{v})$. □

Now we specify the result for the special choice $Q = \tilde{D}$.

Corollary 3.9. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.4. Then*

$$\|\tilde{D}(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| \leq 2.4 \mathfrak{c}_3 (\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} + 1)^{3/2} n^{-1/2} + \mathfrak{C} e^{-x}.$$

Now we put together the result of Theorem 3.8 and the accuracy bound from Theorem 3.5. To make the result more transparent, assume $Q = \tilde{D}$ and $H = \tilde{D}_G$.

Theorem 3.10. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.4. Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{r}>0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\|\tilde{D}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\| \leq \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\|\tilde{D}\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{(\tilde{\mathfrak{P}} + 1)^{3/2}}{n^{1/2}} + e^{-\mathbf{x}} \right).$$

We conclude that the use of posterior mean in place of posterior mode is possible under the same condition $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}^3 \ll n$. This is a non-trivial result based on recent progress in Gaussian probability from Götze et al. (2019) and it is only valid if we limit ourselves to elliptic credible sets.

3.8 Non-Gaussian priors

All the results of the paper are stated for Gaussian priors $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$. Of course, everything can be extended to the case of a prior $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{v}_0, G^2)$ by a parameter shift. Relaxing the assumption of a Gaussian prior requires a bit more work. Indeed, the effective dimension \mathfrak{p}_G - one of most important notions in the paper - is defined in terms of the prior precision matrix G^{-2} . Here we discuss how the case of a general prior can be covered.

Let the (quasi) log-likelihood $L(\mathbf{v})$ satisfy **(ζ)**, that is, the gradient $\nabla\zeta$ of the stochastic component $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ does not depend on \mathbf{v} . Let also $\pi_G(\mathbf{v})$ stand for the prior density. Define the penalized log-likelihood

$$L_G(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L(\mathbf{v}) + \log \pi_G(\mathbf{v}).$$

We assume that the function $L_G(\mathbf{v})$ is *strongly concave* in the sense that

$$D_G^2(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\nabla^2 L_G(\mathbf{v}) \geq G^2$$

for some fixed positive matrix G^2 . This enables us to define in a unique way the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and its population counterpart \mathbf{v}_G^* :

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G &= \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmax}} L_G(\mathbf{v}), \\ \mathbf{v}_G^* &= \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}), \end{aligned}$$

as well as positive matrices

$$D^2(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_G^2(\mathbf{v}) - G^2 > 0.$$

Note that $D^2(\mathbf{v})$ does not coincide with $-\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{v})$ unless $-\nabla^2 \log \pi_G(\mathbf{v}) = G^2$, that is, π_G corresponds to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{v}_0, G^2)$. From this point, we can proceed as in the case of a

Gaussian prior. In particular, the *Laplace effective dimension* $\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{v})$ is defined exactly as in the case of a Gaussian prior:

$$\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}\{D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})D^2(\mathbf{v})\} = \text{tr}\{I_p - D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})G^2\}.$$

All the smoothness conditions including (\mathcal{T}_3) , (\mathcal{T}_4) , (\mathcal{S}_3) , (\mathcal{S}_4) concern the function $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) + \log \pi_G(\mathbf{v})$. In the contrary, condition (ζ) only relies on the stochastic component of log-likelihood $L(\mathbf{v})$. Condition $(\nabla\zeta)$ effectively requires exponential moments of $D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta$ for $D_G = D_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$.

One may conclude that the approach extends in a straightforward way to the case when the function $L_G(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) + \log \pi_G(\mathbf{v})$ is *strongly concave*, *smooth*, and *stochastically linear* with bounded exponential moments.

4 Smooth priors and rate over Sobolev classes

This section presents some examples of choosing G^2 for achieving the “bias-variance trade-off” and obtaining rate optimal results. Define the background true parameter

$$\mathbf{v}^* = \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\text{argmax}} \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}).$$

Remind the notation $L_G(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L(\mathbf{v}) - \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underset{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}}{\text{argmax}} L_G(\mathbf{v}) \quad \mathbf{v}_G^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underset{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}}{\text{argmax}} \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}).$$

Also, for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2.$$

Posterior concentration relies on the *Laplace effective dimension*

$$\mathfrak{p}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}\{\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})\}$$

for \mathbf{v} in a small vicinity \mathcal{A}_G . The pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ concentrates in a vicinity of \mathbf{v}_G^* and the concentration radius is described via the *effective dimension*

$$\mathfrak{p}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}(\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}V^2),$$

where for $\mathbb{F}_G = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ and $V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla\zeta)$. It is worth noting that under conditions of Proposition 2.5 $\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$ can be used in place of \mathbb{F}_G . Moreover, $V^2 = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}^*)$ under the correct model specification.

Theorem 2.8 yields the following bound for the risk of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$:

$$\mathbb{E}\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \lesssim \mathfrak{p}_G + \|D_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\|^2.$$

This suggest to select the operator G^2 which ensures the ‘‘bias-variance trade-off’’ $\|D_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \asymp \mathfrak{p}_G$.

4.1 Bias-variance trade-off under G_0 -smoothness

Suppose that \mathbf{v}^* is G_0 -smooth, that is, for a given matrix G_0^2

$$\|G_0\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \leq 1. \quad (4.1)$$

Consider the univariate family of penalizing/precision matrices G^2 of the form $G^2 = wG_0^2$. Later we discuss a choice of the value w ensuring the bias-variance relation $\|D_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \asymp \mathfrak{p}_G$. Note first that

$$\|D_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \leq \|G\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 = w \|G_0\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 = w.$$

Next we consider the variance term measured by the effective dimension \mathfrak{p}_G . Under the conditions of Proposition 2.5 and correct model specification, we may slightly change the definition to

$$\mathfrak{p}_G = \mathfrak{p}(w) = \text{tr}(\mathbb{D}^2 \mathbb{D}_G^{-2}) = \text{tr}\{\mathbb{D}^2(\mathbb{D}^2 + wG_0^2)^{-1}\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathbb{D}^2 = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}^*)$. The definition is particularly transparent for $\mathbb{D}^2 = nI_p$:

$$\mathfrak{p}(w) = \text{tr}(I_p + n^{-1}w G_0^2)^{-1}.$$

Define also

$$\mathfrak{r}(w) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}(w)} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}.$$

Theorem 2.7, (2.17), yields the following bound.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume $\|G_0\mathbf{v}^*\| \leq 1$. Consider $G^2 = wG_0^2$, $\mathbb{D}_G^2 = \mathbb{D}^2 + wG_0^2$. Suppose the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and 2.5 hold for this choice of G^2 . Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$, the estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ fulfills for some fixed constant \mathfrak{C}*

$$\|\mathbb{D}_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq 2\mathfrak{r}(w) + \nu^{-1}w^{1/2}.$$

Clearly $\mathfrak{p}(0) = p$ and $\mathfrak{p}(w)$ monotonously decreases to zero as w grows to infinity provided that G_0^2 is positive definite. Therefore, for any fixed \mathfrak{C}_0 , the equation

$$\mathfrak{r}(w) = \mathfrak{C}_0 w^{1/2} \quad (4.3)$$

has a unique solution $w = m_0$ leading to the desired “bias-variance trade-off”.

Theorem 4.2. *Assume $\|G_0 \mathbf{v}^*\| \leq 1$. With a fixed \mathfrak{C}_0 , define m_0 by $\mathfrak{p}(m_0) = \mathfrak{C}_0 m_0$; see (4.2). Define also $G_{m_0}^2 = m_0 G_0^2$, $\mathbb{D}_{m_0}^2 = \mathbb{D}^2 + m_0 G_0^2$. Suppose the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and 2.5 hold for this choice of $G^2 = G_{m_0}^2$. Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$, the estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{m_0} = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{G_{m_0}}$ fulfills for some fixed constant \mathfrak{C}*

$$\|\mathbb{D}_{m_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{m_0} - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \mathfrak{C} m_0^{1/2}.$$

With $\mathbb{D}^2 = nI_p$, this implies

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{m_0} - \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \leq \mathfrak{C} m_0/n.$$

Remark 4.1. The value $\mathfrak{p}(w)$ from (4.2) can be written as

$$\mathfrak{p}(w) = \text{tr}(I_p + w\mathbb{D}^{-1}G_0^2\mathbb{D}^{-1})^{-1}.$$

The operator $P(w) = (I_p + w\mathbb{D}^{-1}G_0^2\mathbb{D}^{-1})^{-1}$ is obviously a sub-projector in \mathbb{R}^p . In many situation, its trace can be well approximated by the dimension of the subspace in \mathbb{R}^p on which $w\mathbb{D}^{-1}G_0^2\mathbb{D}^{-1} \leq I_p$; see the example later for the case of Sobolev smoothness. In particular, with $\mathbb{D}^2 = nI_p$, the corresponding subspace is spanned by the eigenvectors of G_0^2 with eigenvalues $g_j^2 \leq n/w$.

The obtained bound can be extended to the case when the smoothness of \mathbf{v}^* is measured using a different operator G_0 than G . An important example corresponds to a (s, w) -smooth prior and a signal \mathbf{v}^* is from a Sobolev ball with the smoothness degree $s_0 \neq s$; see Section B.1. Suppose \mathbf{v}^* is G_0 -smooth, and m_0 is the corresponding solution of (4.3) leading to $G_{m_0}^2 = m_0 G_0^2$ and $\mathbb{D}_{m_0}^2 = \mathbb{D}^2 + m_0 G_0^2$. We now consider some other penalizing matrix G^2 .

Theorem 4.3. *Let \mathbf{v}^* follow (4.1) and m_0 solve (4.3). Fix $G_{m_0}^2 = m_0 G_0^2$ and $\mathbb{D}_{m_0}^2 = \mathbb{D}^2 + m_0 G_0^2$. Suppose for some other G^2 , it holds*

$$\mathbb{D}_G^{-2}G^2 \leq \mathfrak{C}_G \mathbb{D}_{m_0}^{-2}G_{m_0}^2 \quad (4.4)$$

with a fixed constant C_G , and the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and 2.5 hold for this choice of G^2 . Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $n^{-1} = \|\mathbf{D}_G^{-2}\| \vee \|\mathbf{D}_{m_0}^2\|$

$$\sqrt{n}\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\| \leq \mathsf{C} \mathsf{C}_G m_0^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Apply (2.18) and (4.4). □

Some sufficient conditions for (4.4) are given in Lemma B.4.

4.2 Smooth penalty and rate of estimation over Sobolev balls

This section illustrates the general results for the case of a smooth penalty G^2 for a smooth signal \mathbf{v}^* in a Sobolev sense. Our main intension is to demonstrate that the obtained finite sample bounds imply the well known results on the rate of estimation under standard smoothness assumptions. We follow the setup of Section B and assume the diagonal structure of the penalizing matrix $G^2 = \text{diag}(g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2)$ with eigenvalues g_j^2 satisfying the condition of polynomial growth (B.3). We also assume that the information matrix $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}^*)$ satisfies (B.4):

$$\mathsf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \langle \mathbb{F} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq \mathsf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (4.5)$$

while V^2 satisfies (B.6):

$$\mathsf{C}_V^{-1} \|\mathbb{F} \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \|V \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \mathsf{C}_V n \|\mathbb{F} \mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (4.6)$$

Here n means a sample size; see, e.g., Section 6.

To illustrate the obtained results, assume that \mathbf{v}^* belongs to a Sobolev ball $\mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$:

$$\mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \mathbf{v} = (v_j) : \sum_{j \geq 1} j^{2s_0} v_j^2 \leq w_0 \right\} \quad (4.7)$$

with $s_0 > 0$ and $w_0 \asymp 1$; see Section B.1. First we discuss a smoothness-aware choice of $G^2 = \text{diag}(g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2)$ assuming $s_0 > 1/2$ known. By C we denote some fixed constant possibly depending on the other constants in our conditions like $\mathsf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}$, C_V , s_0 , c_3 , C_G .

Theorem 4.4. *Let also (4.5) and (4.6) hold and $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$, $s_0 > 1/2$. Define $G^2 = \text{diag}(g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2)$ with $g_j^2 = w w_0^{-1} j^{2s_0}$ for $w \geq \mathsf{C} w_0 n^{1-2s_0}$. Suppose the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and 2.5 hold for this choice of G^2 . Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \lesssim (w^{-1} w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0)} + w. \quad (4.8)$$

Furthermore, the choice

$$w = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m_0 \quad (4.9)$$

leads to

$$G^2 = m_0 w_0^{-1} \text{diag}\{j^{2s_0}\}_{j \geq 1} = w_0^{-2s_0/(2s_0+1)} n^{1/(2s_0+1)} \text{diag}\{j^{2s_0}\}_{j \geq 1} \quad (4.10)$$

and yields for $n \geq \mathfrak{C}_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 &\lesssim m_0 = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}, \\ \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 &\lesssim m_0 n^{-1} = w_0^{1/(2s_0+1)} n^{-2s_0/(2s_0+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. Define m by the relation $g_m^2 \approx n$. This leads to $m \approx (w^{-1} w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0)}$. By Lemma B.1 $p_G \asymp m$. The condition $w \geq \mathfrak{C} w_0 n^{1-2s_0}$ with a properly selected \mathfrak{C} ensures $p_G \ll n$ and hence, $\mathbf{r}_G n^{-1/2}$ is sufficiently small. This enables us to apply Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 2.3. Furthermore, smoothness of $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ and the definition of $G^2 = w w_0^{-1} \text{diag}\{j^{2s_0}\}_{j \geq 1}$ imply $\|G\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \leq w$ and hence, $\|D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \leq w$. This and (2.21) prove (4.8). Optimizing its right hand-side w.r.t. w leads to the $w \asymp m_0 = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$. The condition $m_0 \ll n$ reads $n^{2s_0} \geq \mathfrak{C} w_0$ and it is automatically fulfilled for n sufficiently large. This yields the final result (4.11). \square

With $w_0 \asymp 1$, this result yields the optimal rate of estimation $\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \lesssim n^{-2s_0/(2s_0+1)}$ over the smoothness class $\mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ from (4.7) for the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ with G^2 from (4.10).

Further we check the situation when $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ but we use $G^2 = w^{-1} \text{diag}\{j^{2s}\}_{j \geq 1}$ for $s \neq s_0$. The main question is a proper choice of the scaling factor w to ensure the same in order accuracy as for the s_0 -aware choice. Lemma B.1 provides the key argument: the index m_0 from (4.9) should be preserved. Due to Lemma B.4, to make the construction rigorous we also need to ensure $s \geq s_0$. This can be achieved by selecting a reasonably large s , e.g. $s = 4$ or $s = 5$. Now the approach can be summarized as follows. Under the assumption $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ and $n^{-1} \asymp \|D^{-2}\|$, we fix m_0 by (4.9). With $G^2 = w^{-1} \text{diag}\{j^{2s}\}$, the index m corresponding to $g_m^2 \approx n$ is given by $m \approx (w n)^{1/(2s)}$. This leads to the relation

$$(w n)^{1/(2s)} \approx m_0 = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)} \quad (4.12)$$

and to the solution

$$w \approx n^{-1} m_0^{2s} = n^{-1} (w_0 n)^{2s/(2s_0+1)}. \quad (4.13)$$

Alternatively one can apply the m_0 -truncation prior with m_0 from (4.12). The next result assumes again $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ but for any $s_0 > 0$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let also $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$, $s_0 > 0$. Define $G^2 = w^{-1} \text{diag}\{j^{2s}\}_{j \geq 1}$ for some $s > 1/2$, $s \geq s_0$, and w from (4.12) or (4.13). Suppose the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and 2.5 hold for this choice of G^2 . Then bounds (4.11) continue to hold on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ provided $n \geq \mathbf{C}_0$.*

Proof. Lemma B.1 yields $\mathbf{p}_G \asymp (wn)^{1/(2s)} \asymp m_0$. Further, Lemma B.4 ensures condition (4.4) of Proposition 4.3 $D_G^{-2}G^2 \leq \mathbf{C}_G D_{G_0}^{-2}G_0^2$ for a constant \mathbf{C}_G depending on s_0 and s only. The result follows now similarly to (4.11). \square

4.3 Bayesian inference under Sobolev smoothness

Here we continue the discussion of Section 4.2 assuming $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ with $w_0 \asymp 1$. A rate-optimal choice of the prior covariance G^2 is an issue to address.

Theorem 4.6. *Assume (ζ) , $(\nabla\zeta)$, (\mathbf{C}) , (\mathcal{S}_3) . Let also (4.5) hold and $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$, $s_0 > 0$. Define $G^2 = w^{-1} \text{diag}\{j^{2s}\}_{j \geq 1}$ for $s > 1/2$, $s \geq s_0$, and w from (4.12) or (4.13). Then for $n \geq \mathbf{C}_0$, it holds on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G\| > \mathbf{C}n^{-s_0/(2s_0+1)} \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq e^{-x}.$$

Moreover, if $s_0 > 1$, then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ for $n \geq \mathbf{C}_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in A) \right| &\leq \mathbf{C}n^{(1-s_0)/(2s_0+1)}, \\ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in A) \right| &\leq \mathbf{C}n^{(2-2s_0)/(2s_0+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. We proceed similarly to Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5. Let m_0 be given by (4.12). Then $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) \asymp m_0 = (w_0n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$ yielding (3.7) for $n \geq \mathbf{C}_0$. For validity of Laplace approximation (3.13) in Theorem 3.4, we have to only check an addition condition (3.11). It can be spelled out as $m_0^3 \ll n$. For $s_0 > 1$, it is fulfilled automatically if n is sufficiently large. Bounds in (4.14) are obtained from (3.13) by using $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \asymp m_0$. \square

5 Anisotropic logistic regression

This section specifies the general results for a popular logistic regression model. It is widely used e.g. in binary classification in machine learning for binary classification or

in binary response model in econometrics. The results presented here can be viewed as extension of [Spokoiny and Panov \(2021\)](#) to the case of non-regular models. Such an extension is very important for practical applications where the underlying probability of success can be very close to zero or one. Most of existing theoretical studies fail in such cases and the analysis becomes very involved. Moreover, another type of limiting behavior of the posterior may happen; see e.g. [Bochkina and Green \(2014\)](#) for some examples of model with non-Gaussian posterior approximation in non-regular regression. Our results indicate that the use of a sufficiently strong Gaussian prior on the canonical parameter vector allows to eliminate such cases and to establish a uniform Gaussian approximation of the posterior.

5.1 Setup and conditions

Suppose we are given a vector of independent observations/labels $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$ and a set of the corresponding features vectors $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Each binary label Y_i is modelled as a Bernoulli random variable with the parameter $\theta_i^* = \mathbb{P}(Y_i = 1)$. Logit regression operates with the canonical parameter $v_i^* = \log \frac{\theta_i^*}{1-\theta_i^*}$ and assumes a linear dependence $v_i^* = \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v}^* \rangle$ for the parameter vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The corresponding log-likelihood reads

$$L(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \phi(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle) \right\} \quad (5.1)$$

with $\phi(v) = \log(1 + e^v)$. For simplicity we assume that the $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_i$ are deterministic, otherwise we need to condition on them.

A penalized MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ is defined by maximization of the penalized log-likelihood $L_G(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$ for the quadratic penalty $\|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p} L_G(\mathbf{v}).$$

In the Bayesian setup we consider a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$ on \mathbf{v} . The posterior density is given by

$$\pi(\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{\exp L_G(\mathbf{v})}{\int \exp L_G(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}}.$$

Inference for the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and for the posterior density is well studied in regular situations when the true parameter \mathbf{v}^* belongs to a bounded set \mathcal{T} ; see e.g. [Spokoiny \(2017\)](#); [Spokoiny and Panov \(2021\)](#). Here we explain how the general results of Section 2 and Section 3 apply in the GLM case.

5.2 Check of general conditions

The truth and the penalized truth are defined via the expected log-likelihood

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}^* &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}), \\ \mathbf{v}_G^* &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}).\end{aligned}$$

The Fisher information matrix $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})$ at \mathbf{v} is given by

$$\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi^{(2)}(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i^\top. \quad (5.2)$$

Note that the matrix $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})$ is not diagonal even if $\boldsymbol{\Psi} \boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top$ is diagonal. Indeed, j, j' -element of $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ is $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})_{j,j'} = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{i,j} \psi_{i,j'} \phi^{(2)}(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle)$. The penalized Fisher information matrix $\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v})$ at \mathbf{v} is given by

$$\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2.$$

As usual, we write $D_G^2 = D_G^2(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$.

Let $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i) \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ be the stochastic component of $L(\mathbf{v})$. It is obviously linear in \mathbf{v} with

$$\nabla \zeta = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i.$$

Therefore, **(C)** is granted by construction. Convexity of $\phi(\cdot)$ yields concavity of $L(\mathbf{v})$ and thus, **(C)**. Now we check **(D)**. It holds with $\varepsilon_i = Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i$

$$V^2 = \operatorname{Var}(\nabla \zeta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \operatorname{Var}(\varepsilon_i) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i^\top = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i^\top.$$

Note that under correct GLM specification $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i^*)$ with $\theta_i^* = e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v}^* \rangle} / (1 + e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v}^* \rangle})$ for the true parameter \mathbf{v}^* , it follows $V^2 = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}^*)$.

Define the *effective dimension*

$$\mathfrak{p}_G = \operatorname{tr}(D_G^{-2} V^2).$$

Let \mathbf{x} be such that

$$1/\lambda_G \geq \mathbf{x}^{1/2}/2 + (\mathbf{x} \mathfrak{p}_G/4)^{1/4}$$

with $\lambda_G = \max_i \|D_G^{-1}\Psi_i\|$. By Lemma C.15, on a set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-x}$

$$\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| \leq \mathbf{r}_G = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}},$$

yielding $(\nabla\zeta)$.

We need one more condition on regularity of the design Ψ_1, \dots, Ψ_n . For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$, define $w_i(\mathbf{v}) = \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle)$ so that

$$D^2(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_i \Psi_i^\top w_i(\mathbf{v})$$

and for any vector \mathbf{u}

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 w_i(\mathbf{v}) = \|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2.$$

Design regularity usually treated in the sense that each summand $\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 w_i(\mathbf{v})$ is smaller in order that the whole sum. We also need a bound on the fourth moments of the design distribution. Suppose a subset $\mathcal{Y}^\circ \subset \mathcal{Y}$ is fixed.

(Ψ) (i) For some \mathbf{C}_n and all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$

$$\max_{i \leq n} |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \frac{\mathbf{C}_n}{n^{1/2}} \|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

(ii) For some \mathbf{C}_Ψ and all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^4 w_i(\mathbf{v}) \leq \left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_\Psi}{n} \|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2 \right)^2, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

It is straightforward to see that $\mathbf{C}_n \geq \mathbf{C}_\Psi$. However, this bound is usually too rough and it is useful to separate these constants.

Now we check (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4) .

Lemma 5.1. *Assume (Ψ) . Consider*

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}\{D^2(\mathbf{v})D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})\}, \quad \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}, \quad (5.3)$$

and assume for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{-1} \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) n^{-1/2} &\leq 1/2, \\ \nu^{-1} \sqrt{e} \mathbf{C}_\Psi \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) n^{-1/2} &\leq 1/3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Then (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4) hold with $\mathbf{m}^2(\mathbf{v}) = n^{-1}D^2(\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{c}_3 = \sqrt{e}\mathbf{C}_\Psi$, and $\mathbf{c}_4 = \sqrt{e}\mathbf{C}_\Psi^2$. Moreover, $\nu^{-1} \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v}) n^{-1/2} \leq 1/3$.

Proof. We start with some technical statements. First observe that the function $\phi(v) = \log(1 + e^v)$ satisfies for all $v \in \mathbb{R}$

$$|\phi^{(k)}(v)| \leq \phi^{(2)}(v), \quad k = 3, 4. \quad (5.5)$$

Indeed, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(v) &= \frac{e^v}{1 + e^v}, \\ \phi^{(2)}(v) &= \frac{e^v}{(1 + e^v)^2}, \\ \phi^{(3)}(v) &= \frac{e^v}{(1 + e^v)^2} - \frac{2e^{2v}}{(1 + e^v)^3}, \\ \phi^{(4)}(v) &= \frac{e^v}{(1 + e^v)^2} - \frac{6e^{2v}}{(1 + e^v)^3} + \frac{6e^{3v}}{(1 + e^v)^4}. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to see that $|\phi^{(k)}(v)| \leq \phi^{(2)}(v)$ for $k = 3, 4$ and any v .

Next we check local variability of $\phi^{(2)}(v)$. Namely, for any $b > 0$, any $v^\circ \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sup_{|v - v^\circ| \leq b} |\phi^{(2)}(v)| \leq e^b \phi^{(2)}(v^\circ).$$

To see this, suppose that $v^\circ < 0$. As the function $\phi^{(2)}(v)$ is monotonously increasing in $v < 0$, it holds

$$\sup_{|v - v^\circ| \leq b} \frac{\phi^{(2)}(v)}{\phi^{(2)}(v^\circ)} = \frac{\phi^{(2)}(v^\circ + b)}{\phi^{(2)}(v^\circ)} \leq e^b \quad (5.6)$$

and the result follows.

Putting together (5.5) and (5.6) leads to a bound on variability of $D(\mathbf{v})$. Let us fix $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$ and any \mathbf{u} with $\|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$. By definition

$$D^2(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i^\top \phi^{(2)}(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \rangle).$$

By (5.4), for each $i \leq n$, it holds $|\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq 1/2$ and by (5.6)

$$\phi^{(2)}(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \rangle) \leq \sqrt{e} \phi^{(2)}(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle).$$

This yields

$$D^2(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) \leq \sqrt{e} D^2(\mathbf{v}). \quad (5.7)$$

As the next step we evaluate the derivative $\nabla^k f(\mathbf{v})$ for $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ and $k \geq 2$. Let $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ and any $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{U}$, $k \geq 2$,

$$\langle \nabla^k f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{u}_k \rangle = - \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^k \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \phi^{(k)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle),$$

and, in particular,

$$\|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2 = -\langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle).$$

With $w_i(\mathbf{v}) = \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle)$, for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$ and any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{U}$, we derive by (ii) of **(Ψ)**, **(5.5)**, and **(5.7)** for $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle| \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w} \rangle) \\ &\leq \sqrt{e} \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle| \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 w_i \leq \sqrt{e} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 w_i(\mathbf{v}) \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^4 w_i(\mathbf{v}) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{e} \frac{C_\Psi}{n^{1/2}} \|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{w}\| \|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields **(\mathcal{S}_3)** with $m^2(\mathbf{v}) = n^{-1}D^2(\mathbf{v})$ and $c_3 = \sqrt{e}C_\Psi$. Similarly **(\mathcal{S}_4)** holds with $c_4 = \sqrt{e}C_\Psi^2$. \square

5.3 General properties

All the conditions of Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.5 have been already checked for GLM. The results of Section 2 for the pMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ can be summarized as follows.

Theorem 5.2. *Let Y_i be independent Bernoulli, $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i^*)$. Consider GLM **(5.1)**. Given G^2 , assume **(Ψ)**. Let also with $\nu = 2/3$ and $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$ from **(5.3)**, conditions **(5.4)** hold true. Then on a set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-x}$, the concentration bound **(2.7)** of Proposition 2.1 and the Fisher-Wilks expansions **(2.10)** and **(2.11)** of Theorem 2.3 apply. Bound **(2.17)** of Theorem 2.7 for the loss $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*$ and bound **(2.20)** of Theorem 2.8 for the corresponding risk apply similarly.*

Now we continue with the properties of the posterior $\mathbf{v}_G | \mathbf{X}$ for a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$. Theorem 6.5 ensures a concentration of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ on a local set \mathcal{A}_G which is a subset of the local ball $\mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$. The next result is just a specification of the general statements of Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 5.3. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 5.2. The the concentration result (3.7) of Proposition 3.1 as well as the contraction bound (3.9) of Proposition 3.2 hold on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$. Moreover, under (3.12), Laplace approximation (3.13) of Theorem 3.4 continues to apply.*

5.4 Truncation and smooth priors

Here we specify the results to the case of a regular design when all the eigenvalues of the matrix information $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}) = D^2(\mathbf{v})$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ are of order n . With smooth or truncation priors of Section B, we now state a finite sample version of the standard nonparametric *rate optimal* results about concentration of the pMLE and posterior contraction; cf Castillo and Nickl (2014), Castillo and Rousseau (2015). We use that $\tilde{D}_G^2 \geq n \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 I_p$ and $n^{-1} z_G^2 \asymp n^{-1} m_0 \asymp w_0^{1/(2s_0+1)} n^{-2s_0/(2s_0+1)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $s_0 > 0$. The error term is of order $n^{(2-2s_0)/(2s_0+1)}$ and it tends to zero only as $n \rightarrow \infty$ only if $s_0 > 1$.

Theorem 5.4. *Assume conditions of Theorem 5.2. Define $m_0 = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$. For the m -truncation prior with $m = m_0$ or for the (s, w) -smooth prior with $(w n)^{1/(2s)} = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)} = m_0$, it holds on the same set $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{v}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 > \mathfrak{C} w_0^{1/(2s_0+1)} n^{-2s_0/(2s_0+1)} \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq 3e^{-x}.$$

6 Log-density estimation

Suppose we are given a random sample X_1, \dots, X_n in \mathbb{R}^d . The density model assumes that all these random variables are independent identically distributed from some measure P with a density $f(\mathbf{x})$ with respect to a σ -finite measure μ_0 in \mathbb{R}^d . This density function is the target of estimation. By definition, the function f is non-negative, measurable, and integrates to one: $\int f(\mathbf{x}) d\mu_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1$. Here and below, the integral \int without limits means the integral over the whole space \mathbb{R}^d . If $f(\cdot)$ has a smaller support \mathcal{X} , one can restrict integration to this set. Below we parametrize the model by a linear decomposition of the log-density function. Let $\{\psi_j(\mathbf{x}), j = 1, \dots, p\}$ with $p \leq \infty$ be a collection of functions in \mathbb{R}^d (a dictionary). For each $\mathbf{v} = (v_j) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, define

$$\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v_1 \psi_1(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + v_p \psi_p(\mathbf{x}) - \phi(\mathbf{v}) = \langle \Psi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle - \phi(\mathbf{v}),$$

where $\Psi(\mathbf{x})$ is a vector with components $\psi_j(\mathbf{x})$ and $\phi(\mathbf{v})$ is given by

$$\phi(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \int e^{\langle \Psi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle} d\mu_0(\mathbf{x}). \quad (6.1)$$

It is worth stressing that the data point \mathbf{x} only enters in the linear term $\langle \Psi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle$ of the log-likelihood $\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$. The function $\phi(\mathbf{v})$ is entirely model-driven. Below we restrict \mathbf{v} to a subset \mathcal{Y} in \mathbb{R}^p such that $\phi(\mathbf{v})$ is well defined and the integral of $e^{\langle \Psi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle}$ is finite. Linear log-density modeling assumes

$$\log f(\mathbf{x}) = \ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}^*) = \langle \Psi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v}^* \rangle - \phi(\mathbf{v}^*) \quad (6.2)$$

for some $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. A nice feature of such representation is that the function $\log f(\mathbf{x})$ in the contrary to the density itself does not need to be non-negative. One more important benefit of using the log-density is that the stochastic part of the corresponding log-likelihood is *linear* w.r.t. the parameter \mathbf{v} . With $S = \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi(X_i)$, for a given penalty operator G^2 , the penalized log-likelihood $L_G(\mathbf{v})$ reads as

$$L_G(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi(X_i), \mathbf{v} \rangle - n\phi(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{2} \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2 = \langle S, \mathbf{v} \rangle - n\phi(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{2} \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2.$$

The penalized MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ and its population counterpart \mathbf{v}_G^* are defined as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}} L_G(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbf{v}_G^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}).$$

6.1 Conditions

For applying the general results of Section 2 and Section 3, it suffices to check the general conditions of Section 2 for the log-density model. First note that the generalized linear structure of the model automatically yields conditions **(C)** and **(ζ)**. Indeed, convexity of $\phi(\cdot)$ implies that $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) = \langle \mathbb{E}S, \mathbf{v} \rangle - n\phi(\mathbf{v})$ is concave. Further, for the stochastic component $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$, it holds

$$\nabla \zeta(\mathbf{v}) = \nabla \zeta = S - \mathbb{E}S = \sum_{i=1}^n [\Psi(X_i) - \mathbb{E}\Psi(X_i)],$$

and **(ζ)** follows. Further, the representation $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) = \langle \mathbb{E}S, \mathbf{v} \rangle - n\phi(\mathbf{v})$ implies

$$\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{v}) = n\nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}).$$

To simplify our presentation, we assume that X_1, \dots, X_n are indeed i.i.d. and the density $f(\mathbf{x})$ can be represented in the form (6.2) for some parameter vector \mathbf{v}^* . This can be easily extended to non i.i.d. case at cost of more complicated notations. Then

$$\mathbf{v}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}} \{ \langle \mathbb{E}S, \mathbf{v} \rangle - n\phi(\mathbf{v}) \} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}} \{ \langle \bar{\Psi}, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \phi(\mathbf{v}) \}, \quad (6.3)$$

where $\bar{\Psi} = \mathbb{E} \Psi(X_1)$ and $\mathbb{E} S = n \bar{\Psi}$. This yields the identity

$$\nabla \phi(\mathbf{v}^*) = \bar{\Psi}.$$

Moreover, by (6.1), $\nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}^*) = \text{Var}\{\Psi(X_1)\}$ and

$$V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla \zeta) = n \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}^*) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}^*). \quad (6.4)$$

Here we present our conditions. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\varrho > 0$, define $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})$ by $\mathbf{m}^2(\mathbf{v}) = \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v})$ and consider the corresponding balls in \mathbb{R}^p

$$\mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \varrho\} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \leq \varrho^2\}.$$

- (f) X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. from a density f satisfying $\log f(\mathbf{x}) = \Psi(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{v}^* - \phi(\mathbf{v}^*)$.
- (Y) The set \mathcal{Y} is open and convex, the value $\phi(\mathbf{v})$ from (6.1) is finite for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$, \mathbf{v}^* from (6.3) is an internal point in \mathcal{Y} such that $\mathcal{B}_{2\varrho}(\mathbf{v}^*) \subset \mathcal{Y}$ for a fixed $\varrho > 0$.
- (φ) For the Bregman divergence $\phi(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \phi(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - \phi(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla \phi(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle$, it holds

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_{2\varrho}(\mathbf{v})} \exp \phi(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \leq \mathbf{C}_\varrho. \quad (6.5)$$

Introduce a measure $P_{\mathbf{v}}$ by the relation:

$$\frac{dP_{\mathbf{v}}}{d\mu_0}(\mathbf{x}) = \exp\{\langle \Psi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v} \rangle - \phi(\mathbf{v})\}. \quad (6.6)$$

Identity (6.1) ensures that $P_{\mathbf{v}}$ is a probabilistic measure. Moreover, under (6.2), the data generating measure \mathbb{P} coincides with $P_{\mathbf{v}^*}^{\otimes n}$.

(Ψ₄) There are $\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,3} \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,4} \geq 3$ such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{\mathbf{v}} \langle \Psi(X_1) - E_{\mathbf{v}} \Psi(X_1), \gamma \rangle^3| &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\Psi,3} E_{\mathbf{v}}^{3/2} \langle \Psi(X_1) - E_{\mathbf{v}} \Psi(X_1), \gamma \rangle^2, \\ E_{\mathbf{v}} \langle \Psi(X_1) - E_{\mathbf{v}} \Psi(X_1), \gamma \rangle^4 &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\Psi,4} E_{\mathbf{v}}^2 \langle \Psi(X_1) - E_{\mathbf{v}} \Psi(X_1), \gamma \rangle^2. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, conditions (φ) and (Ψ₄) follow from (Y) and can be considered as a kind of definition of important quantities \mathbf{C}_ϱ , $\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,3}$, and $\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,4}$ which will be used for describing the smoothness properties of $\phi(\mathbf{v})$. The matrix $\nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v})$ is supposed well conditioned for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)$.

(∇²φ) For the information matrix $\nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v})$, it holds with some $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} \geq 1$

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_p \leq \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}) \leq \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{I}_p, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*). \quad (6.7)$$

Later we show that it suffices to check (6.7) at \mathbf{v}^* , then it will be fulfilled in $\mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v}^*)$ with a slightly larger constant \mathbf{C}_F .

6.1.1 Check of conditions (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4)

Let $P_{\mathbf{v}}$ be defined by (6.6). It is straightforward to check that $E_{\mathbf{v}}\Psi(X_1) = \nabla\phi(\mathbf{v})$ and $\text{Var}_{\mathbf{v}}(\Psi(X_1)) = \nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{v})$. Further, if $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{Y}$, then

$$\phi(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) = \log E_0 \exp\{\langle \Psi(X_1), \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \rangle\} = \log E_{\mathbf{v}} \exp\{\langle \Psi(X_1), \mathbf{u} \rangle + \phi(\mathbf{v})\}.$$

This yields in view of $E_{\mathbf{v}}\Psi(X_1) = \nabla\phi(\mathbf{v})$ that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \Psi(X_1) - E_{\mathbf{v}}\Psi(X_1)$ fulfills

$$\begin{aligned} \log E_{\mathbf{v}} \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle) &= \phi(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - \phi(\mathbf{v}) - \langle E_{\mathbf{v}}\Psi(X_1), \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ &= \phi(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - \phi(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla\phi(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Lemma 6.1. *The function $\phi(\mathbf{v})$ satisfies for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v}^*)$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^p$*

$$|\langle \nabla^3\phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 3} \rangle| \leq \mathbf{C}_{\Psi,3} \langle \nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle^{3/2}, \quad (6.9)$$

$$|\langle \nabla^4\phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 4} \rangle| \leq (\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,4} - 3) \langle \nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle^2. \quad (6.10)$$

Moreover, for any $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$|\langle \nabla^3\phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,4} \langle \nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^{\otimes 2} \rangle} \langle \nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle.$$

Proof. Denote $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = X_1 - E_{\mathbf{v}}X_1$. By (6.8) with $\mathbf{u} = t\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ for t sufficiently small

$$\chi(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log E_{\mathbf{v}} \exp(t\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle) = \phi(\mathbf{v} + t\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \phi(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla\phi(\mathbf{v}), t\boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle,$$

and by (Ψ_4) with $\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,4} \geq 3$

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi^{(3)}(0)| &= |E_{\mathbf{v}}\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^3| \leq \mathbf{C}_{\Psi,3} E_{\mathbf{v}}^{3/2}\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^2, \\ |\chi^{(4)}(0)| &= |E_{\mathbf{v}}\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^4 - 3E_{\mathbf{v}}^2\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^2| \leq (\mathbf{C}_{\Psi,4} - 3)E_{\mathbf{v}}^2\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 \neq \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ then we may proceed in a similar way with the bivariate function $\chi(t_1, t) = \log E_{\mathbf{v}} \exp\{t_1\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 \rangle + t\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle\}$. Its mixed derivative at zero satisfies

$$\left| \frac{\partial^3}{\partial t_1 \partial t^2} \chi(0, 0) \right| = |E_{\mathbf{v}} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 \rangle \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^2| \leq \{E_{\mathbf{v}} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 \rangle^2 E_{\mathbf{v}} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^4\}^{1/2}$$

and the result follows as well. \square

Lemma 6.2. *If $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v}^*)$ then with $c_\phi = \sqrt{\mathbb{C}_{\Psi,4} \mathbb{C}_\rho}$*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v})} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{\langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle}{\langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle} \leq c_\phi. \quad (6.11)$$

Proof. Let $\langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \leq \rho^2$. By (6.8) with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = X_1 - E_{\mathbf{v}} X_1$

$$\nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) = \nabla^2 \log E_{\mathbf{v}} e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} = \frac{E_{\mathbf{v}} \{ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} \}}{(E_{\mathbf{v}} e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle})^2} - \frac{E_{\mathbf{v}} \{ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} \} E_{\mathbf{v}} \{ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} \}^\top}{(E_{\mathbf{v}} e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle})^2}$$

and by (6.10) and (6.5) in view of $E_{\mathbf{v}} e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle &\leq E_{\mathbf{v}} \{ \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^2 e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} \} \\ &\leq E_{\mathbf{v}}^{1/2} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^4 E_{\mathbf{v}}^{1/2} e^{2\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{C}_{\Psi,4} \mathbb{C}_\rho} \langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v}^*)$ and $\mathbf{r} \leq \rho \sqrt{n}$. Then $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^*} L(\mathbf{v})$ satisfies (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4) with $h(\mathbf{v}) = \langle \nabla \phi(\mathbf{v}^*), \mathbf{v} \rangle - \phi(\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{m}^2(\mathbf{v}) = \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v})$, and constants c_3 and c_4 depending on \mathbb{C}_ρ , $\mathbb{C}_{\Psi,3}$, and $\mathbb{C}_{\Psi,4}$ only.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v}^*)$. For any \mathbf{u} with $\|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}/\sqrt{n} \leq \rho$, by (6.9) and (6.11)

$$\frac{|\langle \nabla^3 \phi(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^3} \leq \frac{\mathbb{C}_{\Psi,3} \|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u})\mathbf{u}\|^3}{\|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^3} \leq \mathbb{C}_{\Psi,3} c_\phi^{3/2},$$

and (\mathcal{S}_3) follows with $c_3 = \mathbb{C}_{\Psi,3} c_\phi^{3/2}$. The proof of (\mathcal{S}_4) is similar. \square

6.1.2 Check of $(\nabla \zeta)$

Now we check the deviation bound for $\nabla \zeta = \mathbf{S} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{S}$ under (\mathbf{f}) and (\mathbf{Y}) . I.i.d. structure of $\mathbf{S} = \sum_i X_i$ and (6.4) yield $\text{Var}(\mathbf{S}) = V^2 = n \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}^*)$. Further, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}_\rho(\mathbf{v}^*)$, again by the i.i.d. assumption and by (6.8)

$$n^{-1} \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^*} \exp \{ \langle \nabla \zeta, \mathbf{u} \rangle \} = \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^*} e^{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{u} \rangle} = \phi(\mathbf{v}^* + \mathbf{u}) - \phi(\mathbf{v}^*) - \langle \nabla \phi(\mathbf{v}^*), \mathbf{u} \rangle.$$

Fix $\mathbf{r} \leq \rho n^{1/2}$ and consider all \mathbf{u} with $n \langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}^*), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \leq \mathbf{r}^2$. Then by (\mathcal{S}_3) and (A.3) of Lemma A.2

$$\phi(\mathbf{v}^* + \mathbf{u}) - \phi(\mathbf{v}^*) - \langle \nabla \phi(\mathbf{v}^*), \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq \frac{1 + c_3 \mathbf{r} n^{-1/2}/3}{2} \langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}^*), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \leq \langle \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{v}^*), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle$$

provided that $c_3 \mathbf{r} \leq 3n^{1/2}$. This implies (C.13) with $\mathbf{g} = \rho \sqrt{n}$ and thus, the deviation bound (C.18) of Theorem C.10 implies $(\nabla \zeta)$ for $\rho \sqrt{n}$ sufficiently large.

6.2 Smoothness, bias-variance trade-off

To handle the bias term, we impose some smoothness conditions on the underlying density parameter \mathbf{v}^* ; see Section 4. We also limit ourselves to the penalty matrices G^2 which ensure a kind of bias-variance trade-off.

$$(\mathbf{G}_0\mathbf{v}^*) \quad \|G_0\mathbf{v}^*\|^2 \leq 1 \text{ for some fixed } G_0^2.$$

Later we follow the suggestion of Section 4 and apply the penalizing matrix $G^2 = wG_0^2$. Set $\mathbf{D}^2 = n\nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{v}^*)$, $\mathbf{D}_G^2 = \mathbf{D}^2 + G^2$. The particular value $w = m_0$ can be selected by the bias-variance relation (4.3). First we evaluate the bias term. This is important to ensure that the point \mathbf{v}_G^* is still in the local vicinity $\mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)$.

Proposition 6.4. *Assume (\mathbf{f}) , (ϕ) , (Ψ_4) , (Υ) , $(\mathbf{G}_0\mathbf{v}^*)$. Let $G^2 = wG_0^2$, $\mathbf{D}_G^2 = n\nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{v}^*) + G^2$, and $\nu^{-1}w^{1/2}n^{-1/2} \leq \varrho$. Then $\mathbf{v}_G^* \in \mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)$ and*

$$\|\mathbf{D}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \nu^{-1}w^{1/2}. \quad (6.12)$$

Proof. We intend to apply Proposition 2.5 with $Q = \mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{r}_o = \nu^{-1}\|\mathbf{D}_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\|$ for $\nu = 2/3$. It holds by $(\mathbf{G}_0\mathbf{v}^*)$ in view of $G^2 \leq \mathbf{D}_G^2$ and $G^2 = wG_0^2$

$$\mathbf{r}_o = \nu^{-1}\|\mathbf{D}_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}^*\| \leq \nu^{-1}w^{1/2}\|G_0\mathbf{v}^*\| = \nu^{-1}w^{1/2}.$$

Further, $\nu^{-1}w^{1/2}n^{-1/2} \leq \varrho$ ensures that the set $\{\mathbf{v} : \|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \mathbf{r}_o\}$ belongs to the ball $\mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)$. Now Lemma 6.3 yields (\mathcal{S}_3) for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)$. By Lemma A.3, it holds $\omega_G^* \leq c_3\mathbf{r}_o \leq c_3\nu^{-1}w^{1/2}n^{-1/2} \leq 1/3$ for $n \geq n_0$. Now Proposition 2.5 yields (6.12) and $\mathbf{v}_G^* \in \mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}^*)$. Also by Lemma A.3, the matrix $D_G^2 = D_G^2(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ satisfies $(1 - \omega_G^*)\mathbf{D}_G^2 \leq D_G^2 \leq (1 + \omega_G^*)\mathbf{D}_G^2$. \square

For $G^2 = wG_0^2$, the effective dimension \mathfrak{p}_G is given by (4.2):

$$\mathfrak{p}_G = \mathfrak{p}(w) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-2}) = \text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}^2(\mathbf{D}^2 + wG_0^2)^{-1}\}.$$

A particular value m_0 is defined by the bias-variance relation reads $\mathfrak{p}(w) \asymp w$; see (4.3). Fix some \mathbf{x} and consider

$$\mathbf{r}_G = \mathbf{r}(w) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}(w)} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}.$$

Now expansion (2.17) of Theorem 2.7 applies provided that the concentration set $\|\mathbf{D}_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_G$ is contained in $\mathcal{B}_\varrho(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$. Proposition 6.4 allows to use \mathbf{D}_G in place of D_G in this condition. In our results, \mathfrak{C} stands for a fixed constant depending on the other constants in our conditions like s_0 , \mathfrak{C}_F , c_ϕ , ϱ , and $\mathfrak{C}_{\Psi,4}$.

Theorem 6.5. Assume (f) , (ϕ) , (Ψ_4) , (\mathcal{R}) , $(G_0 \mathbf{v}^*)$, and let $G^2 = wG_0^2$. If $\nu^{-1}w^{1/2}n^{-1/2} \leq \varrho$ with $\nu = 2/3$ and $\mathbf{r}(w)n^{-1/2} \leq \varrho$, then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$

$$\|\mathbb{D}_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq 2\nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}(w) + \nu^{-1}w^{1/2}.$$

If $\mathbf{r}(m_0) = C_0 m_0^{1/2}$ then it holds on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ for $G^2 = m_0 G_0^2$ and $\mathbb{D}_{m_0}^2 = \mathbb{D}^2 + m_0 G_0^2$

$$\|\mathbb{D}_{m_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{m_0} - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq C C_0 m_0^{1/2}.$$

Under the same conditions one can specify the results of Section 2 including the Fisher–Wilks expansions of Theorem 2.3. Moreover, for a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$ with $G^2 = wG_0^2$, one can derive the results about concentration and contraction of the posterior $\mathbf{v}_G \mid \mathbf{X}$. Only Laplace’s approximation of the posterior in Theorem 3.4 requires a stronger condition on critical dimension: $c_3 \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}(w) \mathbf{p}(w) \leq 2n^{1/2}$.

6.2.1 Rate optimality under Sobolev smoothness

To state standard rate-optimal results and to compare our conclusions with the existing results in the literature, we consider the univariate case $d = 1$ and introduce the condition on Sobolev smoothness of the log-density $\log f(\mathbf{x})$.

$$(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{w}_0) \quad \mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} = (v_j) : \sum_j v_j^2 j^{2s_0} \leq w_0 \right\} \text{ for } s_0 > 0.$$

The assumption $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ is standard in log-density estimation; cf. Castillo and Nickl (2014) or Spokoiny and Panov (2021). However, one usually requires $s_0 > 1$, while our results below are valid for $s_0 > 0$. The only exception is the final Gaussian approximation result requiring $s_0 > 1$. We also assume that $w_0 \asymp 1$.

Now we state the results under the smoothness condition $(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{w}_0)$. The precision/penalization matrix G^2 is taken of the (s, w) -form: $G^2 = \text{diag}(g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2)$ with $g_j^2 = j^{2s}/w$. One can take any degree $s > 1/2$, $s \geq s_0$, we recommend a large value like $s = 4$ or $s = 5$. Only the factor w should be fixed carefully to get the optimal accuracy of estimation from the relation $(wn)^{1/(2s)} \approx (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$; see (4.12) or (4.13). Under $(\nabla^2 \phi)$, the corresponding effective dimension \mathbf{p}_G and the Laplace effective dimension $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{v})$ are determined by the index m for which $g_m^2 \approx n$. Alternatively one can use a m_0 -truncation prior with $m_0 \approx (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$. Such a choice of the prior parameters is frequently used for nonparametric *rate optimal* results about concentration of the pMLE and posterior contraction; cf. Castillo and Nickl (2014), Castillo and Rousseau (2015).

Note that the mentioned results require $s_0 > 1$, while our concentration and contraction results apply under $s_0 > 0$. Theorem 4.4 through Theorem 4.6 yield the following results.

Theorem 6.6. *Assume (\mathbf{f}) , $(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon})$, (ϕ) , (Ψ_4) , $(\nabla^2 \phi)$ and $(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{w}_0)$. Fix $s > 1/2$, $s \geq s_0$ and define $g_j^2 = w^{-1} j^{2s}$ with w satisfying $(wn)^{1/(2s)} \approx (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$; see (4.12) or (4.13). Then on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ for $n \geq n_0$,*

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\| \leq \mathbf{C} n^{-s_0/(2s_0+1)},$$

and the posterior measure $\mathbf{v}_G | \mathbf{X}$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G\| > \mathbf{C} n^{-s_0/(2s_0+1)} \mid \mathbf{X}\right) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

Our main result about Gaussian approximation requires more smoothness of the log-density $\log f(\cdot)$. Namely, we require $(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{w}_0)$ with $s_0 > 1$.

Theorem 6.7. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 6.6 and $(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{w}_0)$ with $s_0 > 1$. Define $m_0 = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$. For the m -truncation prior with $m = m_0$ or for the (s, w) -smooth prior with $(wn)^{1/(2s)} = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)} = m_0$, on $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ for $n \geq n_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in A) \right| &\leq \mathbf{C} n^{(1-s_0)/(2s_0+1)}, \\ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in A) \right| &\leq \mathbf{C} n^{(2-2s_0)/(2s_0+1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

The error terms in (6.13) tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because $s_0 > 1$.

7 Dimension free bounds for Laplace approximation

Here we present several issues related to Laplace approximation. Section 7.2 states general results about the accuracy of Laplace approximation for finite samples. Section 7.3 discusses inexact approximation and the use of posterior mean. Technical assertions and proofs are collected in Section 7.4.

7.1 Setup and conditions

Let $f(\mathbf{x})$ be a function in a high-dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^p such that $\int e^{f(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{C} < \infty$, where the integral sign \int without limits means the integral over the whole space

\mathbb{R}^p . Then f determines a distribution \mathbb{P}_f with the density $\mathfrak{C}^{-1}e^{f(\mathbf{x})}$. Let \mathbf{x}^* be a point of maximum:

$$f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p} f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}).$$

We also assume that $f(\cdot)$ is at least three time differentiable. Introduce the negative Hessian $\mathbb{F} = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ and assume \mathbb{F} strictly positive definite. We aim at approximating the measure \mathbb{P}_f by a Gaussian measure $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbb{F}^{-1})$. Given a function $g(\cdot)$, define its expectation w.r.t. \mathbb{P}_f after centering at \mathbf{x}^* :

$$\mathcal{I}(g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}. \quad (7.1)$$

A Gaussian approximation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{F}}(g)$ for $\mathcal{I}(g)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{F}}(g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} = \mathbb{E}g(\gamma_{\mathbb{F}}), \quad \gamma_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{F}^{-1}). \quad (7.2)$$

The choice of the distance between \mathbb{P}_f and $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbb{F}^{-1})$ specifies the considered class of functions g . The most strong total variation distance can be obtained as the supremum of $|\mathcal{I}(g) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{F}}(g)|$ over all measurable functions $g(\cdot)$ with $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$:

$$\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_f, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbb{F}^{-1})) = \sup_{\|g\|_{\infty} \leq 1} |\mathcal{I}(g) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{F}}(g)|.$$

The results can be substantially improved if only centrally symmetric functions $g(\cdot)$ with $g(\mathbf{x}) = g(-\mathbf{x})$ are considered. Obviously, for any $g(\cdot)$

$$\mathcal{I}(g) = \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)} d\mathbf{u}}.$$

Moreover, as $\mathbf{x}^* = \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$, it holds $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(g) = \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}, \quad (7.3)$$

where $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$ is the Bregman divergence

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle. \quad (7.4)$$

Implicitly we assume that the negative Hessian $\mathbb{F} = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is sufficiently large in the sense that the Gaussian measure $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{F}^{-1})$ concentrates on a small local set \mathcal{U} . This allows to use a local Taylor expansion for $f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) \approx -\|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$ in \mathbf{u} on \mathcal{U} . If

$f(\cdot)$ is also strongly concave, then the \mathbb{P}_f -mass of the complement of \mathcal{U} is exponentially small yielding the desirable Laplace approximation.

Motivated by applications to statistical inference, we consider f in a special form

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \ell(\mathbf{x}) - \|G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|^2/2 \quad (7.5)$$

for some \mathbf{x}_0 and a symmetric p -matrix $G^2 \geq 0$. Here $\ell(\cdot)$ stands for a log-likelihood function while the quadratic penalty $\|G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|^2/2$ corresponds to a Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_0, G^{-2})$. We also assume that $\ell(\cdot)$ is concave with $D^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\nabla^2 \ell(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$. Then

$$-\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) = -\nabla^2 \ell(\mathbf{x}) + G^2 = D^2 + G^2.$$

In typical asymptotic setups, the log-likelihood function $\ell(\mathbf{x})$ grows with the sample size or inverse noise variance, while the prior precision matrix G^2 is kept fixed. Decomposition (7.5) is of great importance for obtaining the dimension free results. The main reason is that the quadratic penalty does not affect smoothness properties of the function $\ell(\cdot)$ but greatly improves the quadratic approximation term.

7.1.1 Concavity

Below we implicitly assume decomposition (7.5) with a *weakly concave* function $\ell(\cdot)$. More specifically, we assume the following condition.

(C₀) *There exists an operator $G^2 \leq -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ in \mathbb{R}^p such that the function*

$$\ell(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}) + \|G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$$

is concave.

If $\ell(\cdot)$ in decomposition (7.5) is concave then this condition is obviously fulfilled. More generally, if $\ell(\cdot)$ in (7.5) is weakly concave, so that $\ell(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}) - \|G_0\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$ is concave in \mathbf{u} with $G_0^2 \leq G^2$, then **(C₀)** is fulfilled with $G^2 - G_0^2$ in place of G^2 .

The operator D^2 plays an important role in our conditions and results:

$$D^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*) - G^2 \quad (= -\nabla^2 \ell(\mathbf{x}^*) \text{ under (7.5)}). \quad (7.6)$$

Remark 7.1. The condition of strong concavity of f on the whole space \mathbb{R}^p can be too restrictive. This condition can be replaced by its local version: f is concave on a set \mathcal{X}_0 such that the Gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_0, G^{-2})$ concentrates on \mathcal{X}_0 and the maximizer \mathbf{x}_G^* belongs to \mathcal{X}_0 . In all the results, the integral over \mathbb{R}^p has to be replaced by the integral over \mathcal{X}_0 .

7.1.2 Laplace effective dimension

With decomposition (7.6) in mind, we use another notation for $\mathbb{F} = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*)$:

$$\mathbf{D}_G^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{D}^2 + G^2.$$

Also we write $\mathcal{I}_G(g)$ instead of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{F}}(g)$ in (7.2). The *Laplace effective dimension* $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}^*) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-2}). \quad (7.7)$$

Of course, $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq p$ but a proper choice of the penalty G^2 in (7.5) allows to avoid the “curse of dimensionality” issue and ensure a small effective dimension $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ even for p large or infinite; see Section B.1 for more rigorous discussion.

Later we write \mathbf{p} instead of $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ without risk of confusion because the parameter dimension p does not show up anymore. The value \mathbf{p} helps to describe a local vicinity \mathcal{U} around \mathbf{x}^* such that the most of mass of \mathbb{P}_f concentrates on \mathcal{U} ; see Section 7.4.5. Namely, let us fix some $\nu < 1$, e.g. $\nu = 2/3$, and some $\mathbf{x} > 0$ ensuring that $e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ is our significance level. Define

$$\mathbf{r} = 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}, \quad \mathcal{U} = \{\mathbf{u}: \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}\}. \quad (7.8)$$

7.1.3 Local smoothness conditions

Let $p \leq \infty$ and let $f(\cdot)$ be a three times continuously differentiable function on \mathbb{R}^p . We fix a reference point \mathbf{x} and local region around \mathbf{x} given by the local set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ from (7.8). Consider the remainder of the second and third order Taylor approximation

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &= f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) - \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle / 2, \\ \delta_4(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &= f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) - \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle / 2 - \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle / 6 \end{aligned}$$

with $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})$ from (7.4). The use of the Taylor formula allows to bound

$$|\delta_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{1}{k!} \left| \langle \nabla^k f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes k} \rangle \right|, \quad k \geq 3.$$

Note that the quadratic penalty $-\|G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|^2/2$ in f does not affect the remainders $\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ and $\delta_4(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$. Indeed, with $f(\mathbf{x}) = \ell(\mathbf{x}) - \|G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|^2/2$, it holds

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle = \ell(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) - \|G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$$

and the quadratic term in definition of the values $\delta_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ cancels, $k \geq 3$. Local smoothness of $f(\cdot)$ or, equivalently, of $\ell(\cdot)$, at \mathbf{x} will be measured by the value $\omega(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\omega(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}} \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} |\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})|; \quad (7.9)$$

cf. (A.1). We also denote $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \omega(\mathbf{x}^*)$. Our results apply if $\omega \ll 1$. Local concentration of the measure \mathbb{P}_f requires $\omega \leq 1/3$; see Proposition 7.23. The results about Gaussian approximation are valid under a stronger condition $\omega \mathbf{p} \leq 2/3$ with \mathbf{p} from (7.7).

7.2 Error bounds for Laplace approximation

Our first result describes the quality of approximation of the measure \mathbb{P}_f by the Gaussian measure $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{D}_G^{-2})$ with mean \mathbf{x}^* and the covariance \mathbf{D}_G^{-2} in total variation distance. In all our result, the value \mathbf{x} is fixed to ensure that $e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ is negligible. First we present the general results which will be specified later under the self-concordance condition.

Theorem 7.1. *Suppose (\mathcal{C}_0) . Let also \mathbf{p} be defined by (7.7) and \mathbf{r} and \mathcal{U} by (7.8). If ω from (7.9) satisfies $\omega \leq 1/3$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}_f(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{x}^* \notin \mathcal{U}) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \quad (7.10)$$

If $\omega \mathbf{p} \leq 2/3$, then for any $g(\cdot)$ with $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$, it holds for $\mathcal{I}(g)$ from (7.1)

$$|\mathcal{I}(g) - \mathcal{I}_G(g)| \leq \frac{2(\diamond + e^{-\mathbf{x}})}{1 - \diamond - e^{-\mathbf{x}}} \leq 4(\diamond + e^{-\mathbf{x}}) \quad (7.11)$$

with

$$\diamond = \diamond_2 = \frac{0.75\omega \mathbf{p}}{1 - \omega}. \quad (7.12)$$

This section presents more advanced bounds on the error of Laplace approximation under conditions (\mathcal{T}_3) and (\mathcal{T}_4) with $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}^*$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{D}$ or (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4) with $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}^*$ and $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}^*) = n^{-1/2}\mathbf{D}$.

Theorem 7.2. *Suppose (\mathcal{C}_0) and (\mathcal{T}_3) and let $\tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} \leq 3/4$ for \mathbf{r} from (7.8). Then the concentration bound (7.10) holds. Moreover, if*

$$\tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{p} \leq 2, \quad (7.13)$$

then the accuracy bound (7.11) applies with

$$\diamond = \diamond_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\tau_3(\mathbf{p} + 1)^{3/2}}{4(1 - \omega)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{\tau_3(\mathbf{p} + 1)^{3/2}}{2}, \quad (7.14)$$

where $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} / 3 \leq 1/4$. Furthermore, under (\mathcal{T}_4) , for any symmetric function $g(\mathbf{u}) = g(-\mathbf{u})$, $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$, the accuracy bound (7.11) applies with

$$\diamond = \diamond_4 = \frac{\tau_3^2 (\mathbf{p} + 2)^3 + 2\tau_4(\mathbf{p} + 1)^2}{16(1 - \omega)^2} \leq \frac{\tau_3^2 (\mathbf{p} + 2)^3 + 2\tau_4(\mathbf{p} + 1)^2}{8}.$$

Under (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4) instead of (\mathcal{T}_3) and (\mathcal{T}_4) , the results apply with $\tau_3 = \mathbf{c}_3 n^{-1/2}$ and $\tau_4 = \mathbf{c}_4 n^{-1}$.

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ be the σ -field of all Borel sets in \mathbb{R}^p , while $\mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)$ stands for all centrally symmetric sets from $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)$. By \mathbf{X} we denote a random element with the distribution \mathbb{P}_f , while $\gamma_G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, D_G^{-2})$.

Corollary 7.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 7.2, it holds for $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathbb{P}_f$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}_f(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{x}^* \in A) - \mathbb{P}(\gamma_G \in A) \right| &\leq 4(\diamond_3 + e^{-x}), \\ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}_f(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{x}^* \in A) - \mathbb{P}(\gamma_G \in A) \right| &\leq 4(\diamond_4 + e^{-x}). \end{aligned}$$

7.2.1 Critical dimension

Here we briefly discuss the important issue of *critical dimension*. Theorem 7.2 states concentration of \mathbb{P}_f under the condition $\tau_3 \mathbf{r} \leq 1$. Under (\mathcal{S}_3) , we can use $\tau_3 = \mathbf{c}_3 n^{-1/2}$. Together with $\mathbf{r} \approx \sqrt{\mathbf{p}}$, this yields the condition $\mathbf{p} \ll n$. Gaussian approximation applies under $\mathbf{c}_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{p} n^{-1/2} \leq 2$; see (7.13), yielding $\mathbf{p}^3 \ll n$. We see that there is a gap between these conditions. We guess that in the region $n^{1/3} \lesssim \mathbf{p} \lesssim n$, non-Gaussian approximation of the posterior is possible; cf. [Bochkina and Green \(2014\)](#).

7.2.2 Kullback-Leibler divergence

Theorem 7.1 through 7.2 quantify the approximation $\mathbb{P}_f \approx \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2})$ in the total variation distance. Another useful characteristic could be the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between \mathbb{P}_f and $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2})$. The KL divergence $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) = \mathbb{E}_1 \log(d\mathbb{P}_1/d\mathbb{P}_2)$ is asymmetric, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) \neq \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1)$ with few exceptions like the case of Gaussian measures \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_2 . Moreover, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)$ can explode if \mathbb{P}_1 is not absolutely continuous w.r.t. \mathbb{P}_2 . We present two bounds for each ordering. For ease of presentation, we limit ourselves to the case when either (\mathcal{T}_3) or (\mathcal{S}_3) meets.

Theorem 7.4. *Suppose (\mathcal{C}_0) and (\mathcal{T}_3) and let $\omega \mathbf{p} \leq 2/3$. With $\mathbb{P}_G = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2})$,*

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_f, \mathbb{P}_G) \leq 4\diamond_3 + 4e^{-x} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\tau_3(\gamma_G)}{(1 - \omega)^{3/2}} + 4e^{-x}. \quad (7.15)$$

Moreover, under (\mathcal{S}_3)

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_f, \mathbb{P}_G) \leq 2c_3 \sqrt{\frac{(\mathfrak{p} + 1)^3}{n}} + 4e^{-x}.$$

Now we briefly discuss the value $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_G, \mathbb{P}_f)$. We already know that \mathbb{P}_f concentrates on \mathcal{U} and can be well approximated by \mathbb{P}_G on \mathcal{U} . However, this does not guarantee a small value of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_G, \mathbb{P}_f)$. It can even explode if e.g. \mathbb{P}_f has a compact support. In fact, the log-density of \mathbb{P}_G w.r.t. \mathbb{P}_f reads

$$\log \frac{d\mathbb{P}_G}{d\mathbb{P}_f}(\mathbf{x}) = -f(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{D}_G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|^2 - \mathbb{C}_G$$

for some constant \mathbb{C}_G , and an upper bound on $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_G, \mathbb{P}_f)$ requires that the integral of $f(\mathbf{x})$ w.r.t. the measure \mathbb{P}_G is finite.

Theorem 7.5. *Suppose (\mathcal{C}_0) and (\mathcal{S}_3) and let $\omega \mathfrak{p} \leq 2/3$. Let also $\rho_G = 2\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{r}^2$; see (7.8). If $\ell(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) = \ell(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}) - \ell(\mathbf{x}^*) - \langle \nabla \ell(\mathbf{x}^*), \mathbf{u} \rangle$ fulfills*

$$\int |\ell(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})| \exp\{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \rho_G \|\mathbb{D} \mathbf{u}\|^2/2\} d\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbb{C}_\ell \quad (7.16)$$

for some fixed constant \mathbb{C}_ℓ then

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_G, \mathbb{P}_f) \leq c_3 \sqrt{\frac{(\mathfrak{p} + 1)^3}{n}} + (2 + \mathbb{C}_\ell)e^{-x}.$$

7.2.3 Mean and MAP

Here we present the bound on $|\mathcal{I}(g) - \mathcal{I}_G(g)|$ for the case of a linear vector function $g(\mathbf{u}) = Q\mathbf{u}$ with $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$, $q \geq 1$. A special case of $Q = I_p$ corresponds to the mean value $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ of \mathbb{P}_f . The next result presents an upper bound for the value $Q(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*)$ under the conditions of Theorem 7.2 including (\mathcal{S}_3) .

Theorem 7.6. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 7.2 and let $Q^\top Q \leq \mathbb{D}^2$. Then*

$$\|Q(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*)\| \leq 2.4 c_3 \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} Q^\top\|^{1/2} \sqrt{(\mathfrak{p} + 1)^3/n} + \mathbb{C}e^{-x}. \quad (7.17)$$

Now we specify the result for the special choice $Q = \mathbb{D}$.

Corollary 7.7. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 7.2. Then*

$$\|\mathbb{D}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*)\| \leq 2.4 c_3 \sqrt{(\mathfrak{p} + 1)^3/n} + \mathbb{C}e^{-x}. \quad (7.18)$$

Remark 7.2. An interesting question is whether the result of Theorem 7.6 or Corollary 7.7 applies with $Q = D_G$. This issue is important in connection to inexact Laplace approximation; see the next section. The answer is negative. The problem is related to the last term $\mathbf{C}e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ in the right hand-side of (7.17). The constant \mathbf{C} involves the moments of $\|Q(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{x}^*)\|^2$ which explode for $Q = D_G$ and $p = \infty$.

7.3 Inexact approximation and the use of posterior mean

Now we change the setup. Namely, we suppose that the true maximizer \mathbf{x}^* of the function f is not available, but \mathbf{x} is somehow close to the point of maximum \mathbf{x}^* . Similarly, the negative Hessian $D_G^2(\mathbf{x}^*) = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is hard to obtain and we use a proxy H^2 . We already know that \mathbb{P}_f can be well approximated by $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D^{-2})$ with $D^2 = D^2(\mathbf{x}^*)$. This section addresses the question whether $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, H^{-2})$ can be used instead. Here we may greatly benefit from the fact that Theorem 7.1 provides a bound in the total variation distance between \mathbb{P}_f and $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2})$ yielding

$$\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_f, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, H^{-2})) \leq \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_f, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2})) + \text{TV}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, H^{-2}), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2})).$$

Therefore, it suffices to bound the TV-distance between the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2})$ naturally arising in Laplace approximation, and the one used instead. Pinsker's inequality provides an upper bound: for any two measures P, Q

$$\text{TV}(P, Q) \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{K}(P, Q)/2},$$

where $\mathcal{K}(P, Q)$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence between P and Q . The KL-divergence between two Gaussians has a closed form:

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2}), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, H^{-2})) = \frac{1}{2} \{ \|D_G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 + \text{tr}(H^{-2}D_G^2 - I_p) + \log \det(H^{-2}D_G^2) \}.$$

Moreover, if the matrix $B_G = H^{-1}D_G^2H^{-1} - I_p$ satisfies $\|B_G\| \leq 2/3$ then

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, D_G^{-2}), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, H^{-2})) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|D_G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)\| + \sqrt{\text{tr } B_G^2} \right).$$

However, Pinsker's inequality is only a general upper bound which is applied to any two distributions P and Q . If P and Q are Gaussian, it might be too rough. Particularly the use of $\text{tr } B_G^2$ is disappointing, this quantity is full dimensional even if each of D_G^{-2} and H^{-2} has a bounded trace. Also dependence on $\|D_G(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)\|$ is very discouraging. Devroye et al. (2018) provides much sharper results, however, limited to the case of the

same mean. Even stronger results can be obtained if we restrict ourselves to the class $\mathcal{B}_{el}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ of elliptic sets A in \mathbb{R}^p of the form

$$A = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|Q(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x})\| \leq \mathbf{r}\}$$

for some linear mapping $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and $\mathbf{r} > 0$. Given two symmetric q -matrices Σ_1, Σ_2 and a vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, define

$$d(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \mathbf{a}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\frac{1}{\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{Fr}}} + \frac{1}{\|\Sigma_2\|_{\text{Fr}}} \right) \left(\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2\|_1 + \|\mathbf{a}\|^2 \right),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1$ is the vector of eigenvalues of Σ_1 arranged in the non-increasing order and similarly for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2$, and $\|\Sigma\|_{\text{Fr}}^2 = \text{tr}(\Sigma^\top \Sigma)$. By the Weilandt–Hoffman inequality, $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2\|_1 \leq \|\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2\|_1$, see e.g. Markus (1964). Götze et al. (2019) stated the following bound for $\gamma_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_1)$ and $\gamma_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_2)$: with an absolute constant \mathbf{C}

$$\sup_{\mathbf{r} > 0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\|\gamma_1 + \mathbf{a}\| \leq \mathbf{r}) - \mathbb{P}(\|\gamma_2\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \leq \mathbf{C} d(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \mathbf{a})$$

provided that $\|\Sigma_k\|^2 \leq \|\Sigma_k\|_{\text{Fr}}^2/3$, $k = 1, 2$. Here $\|M\|_1 = \text{tr} |M| = \sum_j |\lambda_j(M)|$ for a symmetric matrix M with eigenvalues $\lambda_j(M)$.

Theorem 7.8. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 7.1 with \mathbf{x}^* being the maximizer of f and $\mathbf{D}_G^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*)$. For any \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{H} , it holds with $\gamma_{\mathbf{H}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{H}^{-2})$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}_f(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{x} \in A) - \mathbb{P}(\gamma_{\mathbf{H}} \in A) \right| \\ & \leq 4(\diamond + e^{-\mathbf{x}}) + \text{TV}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H}^{-2}), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{D}_G^{-2})), \end{aligned}$$

where $\diamond = \diamond_2$, see (7.12), or $\diamond = \diamond_3$, see (7.14).

Furthermore, for $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathbb{P}_f$ and $\gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$, any linear mapping $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$, it holds under $3\|Q \mathbf{D}_G^{-2} Q^\top\|^2 \leq \|Q \mathbf{D}_G^{-2} Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{r} > 0} \left| \mathbb{P}_f(\|Q(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{x})\| \leq \mathbf{r}) - \mathbb{P}(\|Q \mathbf{H}^{-1} \gamma\| \leq \mathbf{r}) \right| \\ & \leq 4(\diamond_3 + e^{-\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{\mathbf{C}}{\|Q \mathbf{D}_G^{-2} Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}} \left(\|Q(\mathbf{D}_G^{-2} - \mathbf{H}^{-2}) Q^\top\|_1 + \|Q(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

As a special case, consider the use of the posterior mean $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ instead of \mathbf{x}^* :

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbf{x} e^{f(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x}}.$$

Theorem 7.9. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 7.6 and Theorem 7.8. Then it holds for any linear mapping $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ with $Q^\top Q \leq D^2$*

$$\sup_{r>0} \left| \mathbb{P}_f(\|Q(\mathbf{X} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\| \leq r) - \mathbb{P}(\|Q\gamma_G\| \leq r) \right| \leq 4(\diamond_3 + e^{-x}) + \frac{\mathfrak{C}\|Q(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*)\|^2}{\|Q D_G^{-2} Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}},$$

where $\|Q(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*)\|$ follows (7.17) and (7.18).

The case $Q = D$ is particularly transparent. In view of (7.18) of Corollary 7.7 and $\|Q D_G^{-2} Q^\top\|_{\text{Fr}}^2 = \text{tr}\{(D D_G^{-2} D^\top)^2\} \asymp \mathfrak{p}$, the following result holds.

Corollary 7.10. *Under the conditions of Corollary 7.7, it holds for $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathbb{P}_f$*

$$\sup_{r>0} \left| \mathbb{P}_f(\|D(\mathbf{X} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})\| \leq r) - \mathbb{P}(\|D\gamma_G\| \leq r) \right| \leq \mathfrak{C} \left(\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}^3/n} + e^{-x} \right).$$

The same bound applies with $Q = n^{1/2}I_p$ in place of D provided that $D^2 \geq \mathfrak{C}_0 n I_p$ for some fixed $\mathfrak{C}_0 > 0$. We may conclude that the use of posterior mean $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ in place of the posterior mode \mathbf{x}^* is justified under the same condition on critical dimension $\mathfrak{p}^3 \ll n$ as required for the main result about Gaussian approximation.

7.4 Tools and proofs

Here we collect the proofs of the main results and some useful technical statements about the error of Laplace approximation. Below we write \mathbf{x} instead of \mathbf{x}^* . After passing to representation (7.3), many results below apply to any \mathbf{x} , not necessarily for $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^*$. We only use $D_G^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$ and ω instead of $\omega(\mathbf{x})$. Everywhere we assume the local set \mathcal{U} to be fixed by (7.8). We separately study the integrals over \mathcal{U} and over its complement. The local error of approximation is measured by

$$\diamond = \diamond(\mathcal{U}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right|. \quad (7.19)$$

As a special case with $g(\mathbf{u}) \equiv 1$ we obtain an approximation of the denominator in (7.3). In addition, we have to bound the tail integrals

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \rho(\mathcal{U}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}, \\ \rho_G &= \rho_G(\mathcal{U}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

Everywhere later $\gamma_G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, D_G^{-2})$ is a Gaussian element in \mathbb{R}^p . The analysis will be split into several steps.

7.4.1 Overall error of Laplace approximation

First we show how to seam together the error \diamond of local approximation and the bounds for the tail integrals ρ and ρ_G ; see (7.20).

Proposition 7.11. *Suppose that for a function $g(\mathbf{u}) \in [0, 1]$ and some \diamond, \diamond_g*

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond, \quad (7.21)$$

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond_g. \quad (7.22)$$

Then with ρ and ρ_G from (7.20)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \rho_G - \diamond} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} + \frac{\rho + \diamond_g}{1 - \rho_G - \diamond}, \\ \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} &\geq \frac{1}{1 + \rho + \diamond} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} - \frac{\rho_G + \diamond_g}{1 + \rho + \diamond}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

Proof. It follows from (7.21)

$$\begin{aligned} \int e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} &\geq \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \geq \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} - \diamond \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\geq (1 - \diamond - \rho_G) \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} + \rho \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq (1 + \diamond + \rho) \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.25)$$

Similarly for $g(\mathbf{u}) \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} &\geq \int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} - \diamond_g \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\geq \int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} - (\rho_G + \diamond_g) \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} + \rho \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} + (\rho + \diamond_g) \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting together all these bounds yields (7.23). \square

The next corollary is straightforward.

Corollary 7.12. *Let $\rho_G \leq \rho^*$, $\rho \leq \rho^*$; see (7.20). Let also for a function $g(\mathbf{u})$ with $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$, (7.21), (7.22) hold with $\diamond_g \leq \diamond$. If $\diamond + \rho^* \leq 1/2$ then*

$$\left| \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} - \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \frac{2(\rho^* + \diamond)}{1 - \rho^* - \diamond} \leq 4(\rho^* + \diamond).$$

Sometimes we need an extension to the case of an unbounded function g . This particularly arises when evaluating the moment of the posterior; see Theorem 7.6. The next result corresponds to estimation of posterior mean with a linear function g and posterior variance with g quadratic.

Proposition 7.13. *Given a function $g(\mathbf{u})$, assume (7.21), (7.22), and define*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_g &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) |g(\mathbf{u})| e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}, \\ \rho_{G,g} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) |g(\mathbf{u})| e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}, \end{aligned}$$

while ρ and ρ_G are given in (7.20). Then for $\mathcal{I}_G(g) = \mathbb{E}g(\gamma_G)$, $\gamma_G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{D}_G^{-2})$,

$$\left| \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} - \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \frac{\rho_g + \rho_{G,g} + \diamond_g}{1 - \rho_G - \diamond} + \frac{|\mathcal{I}_G(g)|(\rho + \diamond)}{1 - \rho_G - \diamond}.$$

In particular, if $\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} = 0$ then

$$\left| \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \frac{\rho_g + \rho_{G,g} + \diamond_g}{1 - \rho_G - \diamond}. \quad (7.26)$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{I}_G(g) \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} - \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} - \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \right| + \mathcal{I}_G(g) \left| \frac{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} - 1 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By definitions

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} - \int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \right| + \left| \int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \right| \\
& \leq (\rho_g + \rho_{G,g} + \diamond_g) \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}
\end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows by (7.24) and (7.25). \square

7.4.2 Lower and upper Gaussian measures

This section introduces the lower and upper Gaussian measure which locally sandwich the measure \mathbb{P}_f using the decomposition from condition (\mathcal{C}_0) . Denote $-\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{D}_G^2$. Definition (7.9) enables us to bound with $\omega = \omega(\mathbf{x})$

$$\frac{1}{2}(\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{u}\|^2) \leq f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 + \omega \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{u}\|^2)$$

yielding two Gaussian measures which bounds \mathbb{P}_f locally from above and from below. The next technical result provides sufficient conditions for their contiguity.

Proposition 7.14. *Let ω from (7.9) satisfy $\omega \leq 1/3$. Then with \mathbf{p} from (7.7)*

$$\det(\mathbf{I} + \omega \mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1}) \leq \exp(\omega \mathbf{p}), \quad (7.27)$$

$$\det(\mathbf{I} - \omega \mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1})^{-1/2} \leq \exp\{3/2 \log(3/2) \omega \mathbf{p}\}. \quad (7.28)$$

Proof. W.l.o.g. assume that $\mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1}$ is diagonal with eigenvalues $\lambda_j \in [0, 1]$. As $-x^{-1} \log(1-x) \leq 3 \log(3/2)$ for $x \in [0, 1/3]$, it holds by (7.9)

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \det(\mathbf{I} - \omega \mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1})^{-1} &= - \sum_{j=1}^p \log(1 - \omega \lambda_j) \leq 3 \log(3/2) \sum_{j=1}^p \omega \lambda_j \\
&= 3 \log(3/2) \omega \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1}) = 3 \log(3/2) \omega \mathbf{p}
\end{aligned}$$

yielding (7.28). The proof of (7.27) is similar using $\log(1+x) \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$. \square

7.4.3 Gaussian moments

The presented bounds involve the Gaussian moments $\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D} \gamma_G\|^k$ for $k = 3, 4, 6$ and $\gamma_G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{D}_G^{-2})$. We make use of the following lemma.

Lemma 7.15. *It holds for $\gamma_G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, D_G^{-2})$*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^3 &\leq (\mathfrak{p} + 1)^{3/2}, \\ \mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^4 &\leq (\mathfrak{p} + 1)^2, \\ \mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^6 &\leq (\mathfrak{p} + 2)^3.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Represent $\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^2 = \|\mathbb{D}D_G^{-1}\gamma\|^2 = \langle B_G\gamma, \gamma \rangle$ with $B_G = \mathbb{D}D_G^{-2}\mathbb{D} \leq I_p$ and $\gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. By Lemma C.1

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^4 &= \mathbb{E}\langle B_G\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 \leq \{\text{tr}(B_G) + 1\}^2 = (\mathfrak{p} + 1)^2, \\ \mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^6 &= \mathbb{E}\langle B_G\gamma, \gamma \rangle^3 \leq \{\text{tr}(B_G) + 2\}^3 = (\mathfrak{p} + 2)^3,\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^3 \leq \mathbb{E}^{3/4}\|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^4 \leq (\mathfrak{p} + 1)^{3/2}$. \square

7.4.4 Local approximation

This section presents the bounds on the error \diamond of local approximation (7.19). The first result only uses $\omega\mathfrak{p} \leq 2/3$. More advanced bounds also assume (\mathcal{T}_3) and (\mathcal{T}_4) with $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{D}$. We also present some extensions for the moments of \mathbb{P}_f .

Proposition 7.16. *Let $\omega = \omega(\mathbf{x})$ from (7.9) and \mathfrak{p} from (7.7) satisfy*

$$\omega\mathfrak{p} \leq 2/3. \quad (7.29)$$

Then for any function $g(\mathbf{u})$ with $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond \quad (7.30)$$

with

$$\diamond = \diamond_2 = \frac{0.75\omega\mathfrak{p}}{1-\omega}.$$

Proof. The condition $\omega\mathfrak{p} \leq 2/3$ from (7.29) and bound (7.28) imply

$$\det(I - \omega\mathbb{D}_G^{-1}\mathbb{D}^2\mathbb{D}_G^{-1})^{-1/2} \leq \exp\{3/2\log(3/2)\omega\mathfrak{p}\} \leq 3/2. \quad (7.31)$$

Define for $t \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2+t\delta_3(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}. \quad (7.32)$$

Then for $t \in [0, 1]$ by (7.9)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}'(t)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + t\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| e^{-(\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2)/2} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.33)$$

Now we make change of variable $\Gamma \mathbf{u}$ to \mathbf{w} with $\Gamma^2 = I - \omega \mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1}$. By (7.31) $\det \Gamma^{-1} \leq 3/2$ and also $\|\Gamma^{-1}\| \leq (1 - \omega)^{-1/2}$. By (7.9) and (7.33)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\mathcal{R}'(t)| \leq \frac{\omega}{2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 e^{-(\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2)/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{3\omega}{4} \int \|\mathbf{D}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{u}\|^2 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \leq \frac{3\omega}{4(1 - \omega)} \int \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{D}\gamma_G\|^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-2})$ for a standard normal γ , we derive

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)|}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{3\omega}{4(1 - \omega)} \frac{\int \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{3\omega \mathbf{p}}{4(1 - \omega)}$$

and (7.30) follows. \square

Proposition 7.17. *Assume (\mathcal{T}_3) with $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{D}$, and let $\tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{p} \leq 2$. Define $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} / 3$. Then bound (7.30) applies with*

$$\diamond = \diamond_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\tau_3 \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{D}\gamma_G\|^3}{4(1 - \omega)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{\tau_3 (\mathbf{p} + 1)^{3/2}}{4(1 - \omega)^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same line as for Proposition 7.16. Under (\mathcal{T}_3) , it holds $|\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \tau_3 \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^3 / 6$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq \frac{\tau_3 \det(\Gamma^{-1})}{6} \int \|\mathbf{D}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{u}\|^3 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{\tau_3}{4(1 - \omega)^{3/2}} \int \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^3 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \end{aligned} \quad (7.34)$$

yielding the statement in view of $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{D}\gamma_G\|^3 \leq (\mathbf{p} + 1)^{3/2}$; see Lemma 7.15. It remains to note that by Lemma A.1 $\omega \leq \tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} / 3$. Hence, $\tau_3 \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{p} \leq 2$ implies $\omega \mathbf{p} \leq 2/3$. \square

The result can be extended to the case of a m -homogeneous function $g(\mathbf{u})$.

Proposition 7.18. *Suppose the conditions of Proposition 7.16 and (\mathcal{T}_3) . Then for $m \geq 1$ and any m -homogeneous function $g(\cdot)$ with $g(t\mathbf{u}) = t^m g(\mathbf{u})$*

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \frac{\tau_3 \mathbb{E}\{|g(\gamma_G)| \|\mathbf{D}\gamma_G\|^3\}}{4(1 - \omega)^{(m+3)/2}}. \quad (7.35)$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 7.16, under (\mathcal{T}_3) , it holds for $\mathcal{R}(t)$ from (7.32)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq \frac{\tau_3 \det(\Gamma^{-1})}{6} \int \|\mathbb{D} \Gamma^{-1} \mathbf{u}\|^3 |g(\Gamma^{-1} \mathbf{u})| e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{\tau_3}{4(1-\omega)^{(m+3)/2}} \int \|\mathbb{D} \mathbf{u}\|^3 |g(\mathbf{u})| e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \end{aligned}$$

yielding similarly to (7.34)

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)|}{\int e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{\tau_3}{4(1-\omega)^{(m+3)/2}} \frac{\int \|\mathbb{D} \mathbf{u}\|^3 |g(\mathbf{u})| e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}.$$

This yields (7.35). \square

Important special cases correspond to $m = 1$.

Proposition 7.19. *Suppose the conditions of Proposition 7.18. Then it holds for any linear mapping $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ and any vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^q$*

$$\frac{|\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} \langle Q\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a} \rangle d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} \langle Q\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a} \rangle d\mathbf{u}|}{\int e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{\tau_3 \mathbb{E}\{|\langle Q\gamma_G, \mathbf{a} \rangle| \|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^3\}}{4(1-\omega)^2}. \quad (7.36)$$

Now we state a sharper result based on (\mathcal{T}_4) .

Proposition 7.20. *Suppose the conditions of Proposition 7.16 and (\mathcal{T}_4) . Then for any function $g(\mathbf{u})$ with $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$ and $g(\mathbf{u}) = g(-\mathbf{u})$*

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond_4 \quad (7.37)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \diamond_4 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{16(1-\omega)^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x}), \gamma_G^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 + 2\tau_4 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^4 \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{16(1-\omega)^2} \left\{ \tau_3^2 (\mathfrak{p} + 2)^3 + 2\tau_4 (\mathfrak{p} + 1)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.38)$$

If the function $g(\cdot)$ is not bounded by one but it is symmetric and $2m$ -homogeneous, i.e. $g(t\mathbf{u}) = t^{2m}g(\mathbf{u})$, then (7.37) still applies with

$$\diamond_4 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{16(1-\omega)^{2+m}} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x}), \gamma_G^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 g(\gamma_G) + 2\tau_4 \|\mathbb{D}\gamma_G\|^4 g(\gamma_G) \right\}. \quad (7.39)$$

Proof. We write $f^{(3)}$ and $\delta_k(\mathbf{u})$ in place of $\nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x})$ and $\delta_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$, $k = 3, 4$. It holds

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = \int_{\mathcal{U}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\|\mathbb{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2} + \delta_3(\mathbf{u})\right\} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}.$$

Define for $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\mathcal{R}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2} + t\delta_3(\mathbf{u})\right\} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}.$$

Symmetry of \mathcal{U} and $g(\mathbf{u}) = g(-\mathbf{u})$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}'(0) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) \{\delta_3(\mathbf{u}) + \delta_3(-\mathbf{u})\} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) \bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u}) g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \end{aligned} \quad (7.40)$$

with $\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u}) = \{\delta_4(\mathbf{u}) + \delta_4(-\mathbf{u})\}/2$. Moreover, as $|\delta_3(\mathbf{u})| \leq \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$, it holds for $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}''(t)| &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta_3^2(\mathbf{u}) \exp\left\{-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2} + t\delta_3(\mathbf{u})\right\} |g(\mathbf{u})| d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta_3^2(\mathbf{u}) \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\delta_3(\mathbf{u}) = \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle / 6 + \delta_4(\mathbf{u})$ and $|\delta_4(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$, one can bound for $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}''(t)| &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{U}} \{\bar{\delta}_4^2(\mathbf{u}) + |\langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle / 6|^2\} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{U}} \{|\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u})| + \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 / 36\} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned}$$

This and (7.40) yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq |\mathcal{R}'(0)| + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\mathcal{R}''(t)| \leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u})| e^{-(\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2)/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{36} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 e^{-(\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2)/2} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned}$$

Change of variable $(\mathbf{I} - \omega \mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1})^{1/2} \mathbf{u}$ to \mathbf{w} yields by (7.31) in view of $\omega \leq 1/3$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{36} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{3/2}{36(1-\omega)^3} \int \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{w}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{w}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{w}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly by (T4)

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u})| \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u} \leq \frac{3/2}{24(1-\omega)^2} \int \tau_4 \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^4 \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{w}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{w}.$$

The use of $\omega \leq 1/3$ implies that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)|}{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{3/2}{24(1-\omega)^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \langle f^{(3)}, \gamma_G^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 + 2\tau_4 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}\gamma_G\|^4 \right\} \leq \diamond_4$$

and (7.37) follows. Further, (\mathcal{S}_3) yields $\langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 \leq \tau_3^2 \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^6$. Now (7.38) follows from Lemma 7.15. The proof of (7.39) is similar. \square

7.4.5 Tail integrals

In this section we also write \mathbf{x} in place of \mathbf{x}^* . Below we evaluate ρ from (7.20) which bounds the integral of $e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})}$ over the complement of the local set \mathcal{U} of a special form $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathbf{u}: \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}\}$ for \mathbf{D} from (\mathcal{C}_0) . Our results help to understand how the radius \mathbf{r} should be fixed to ensure ρ sufficiently small. The main tools for the analysis are deviation probability bounds for Gaussian quadratic forms; see Section C.

Proposition 7.21. *Suppose (\mathcal{C}_0) . Given $\nu < 1$ and $\mathbf{x} > 0$, let \mathcal{U} and \mathbf{r} be defined by (7.8). Let also ω from (7.9) satisfy $\omega \leq 1 - \nu$. Then*

$$\frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq 4e^{-\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}/2}, \quad (7.41)$$

$$\frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}/2}. \quad (7.42)$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}$, i.e. $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| > \mathbf{r}$ with $\mathbf{r} = \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}$. Define $\mathbf{u}^c = \mathbf{r}\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^{-1}\mathbf{u}$ yielding $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c\| = \mathbf{r}$. We also write $\mathbf{u} = (1 + \tau)\mathbf{u}^c$ for $\tau > 0$. By (7.9) and $\nabla^2 \ell(0) = -\mathbf{D}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\mathbf{u}^c) - \ell(0) - \langle \nabla \ell(0), \mathbf{u}^c \rangle &\leq -(1 - \omega) \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c\|^2/2, \\ \langle \nabla \ell(\mathbf{u}^c) - \nabla \ell(0), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^c \rangle &\leq -(1 - \omega) \langle \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{u}^c, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^c \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (7.43)$$

Concavity of $\ell(\mathbf{u})$ implies for $\mathbf{u} = (1 + \tau)\mathbf{u}^c$,

$$\ell(\mathbf{u}) \leq \ell(\mathbf{u}^c) + \langle \nabla \ell(\mathbf{u}^c), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^c \rangle$$

yielding by (7.43) in view of $\langle \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c, \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u} \rangle = \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c\| \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|$

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\mathbf{u}) - \ell(0) - \langle \nabla \ell(0), \mathbf{u} \rangle &= \ell(\mathbf{u}) - \ell(\mathbf{u}^c) - \langle \nabla \ell(\mathbf{u}^c), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^c \rangle \\ &\quad + \ell(\mathbf{u}^c) - \ell(0) - \langle \nabla \ell(0), \mathbf{u}^c \rangle + \langle \nabla \ell(\mathbf{u}^c) - \nabla \ell(0), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^c \rangle \\ &\leq (1 - \omega) \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c\|^2/2 - (1 - \omega) \langle \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c, \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u} \rangle \leq -(1 - \omega) \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c\| \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|/2. \end{aligned}$$

We now use that $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}^c\| = \mathbf{r}$, $\mathbf{u}^c = \mathbf{u}/(1 + \tau)$, and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - f(0) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle &= \ell(\mathbf{u}) - \ell(0) - \langle \nabla \ell(0), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 \\ &\leq -(1 - \omega)\mathbf{r}\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|/2 - \|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields by $\mathbf{r} = \nu \mathbf{r} \leq (1 - \omega)\mathbf{r}$ with $T = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{D}_G^{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) \exp\{f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp(-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2) d\mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| > \mathbf{r}) \exp\{-(1 - \omega)\mathbf{r}\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|/2 - \|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp(-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2) d\mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \exp\{-\mathbf{r}\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|/2 + \|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2/2\} \mathbb{I}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > \mathbf{r}) \end{aligned}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ standard normal in \mathbb{R}^p . Next, define

$$\mathcal{R}_0(\mathbf{r}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E} \exp(-\mathbf{r}\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|/2 + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2/2) \mathbb{I}(\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > \mathbf{r}).$$

Integration by parts allows to represent the last integral as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_0(\mathbf{r}) &= - \int_{\mathbf{r}}^{\infty} \exp(-\mathbf{r}z/2 + z^2/2) d\mathbb{P}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > z) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > \mathbf{r}) + \int_{\mathbf{r}}^{\infty} (z - \mathbf{r}/2) \exp(-\mathbf{r}z/2 + z^2/2) \mathbb{P}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem C.4, for any $z \geq \sqrt{\mathbf{p}}$ for $\mathbf{p} = \text{tr}(T T^\top) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-2})$

$$\mathbb{P}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > z) \leq \exp\{-(z - \sqrt{\mathbf{p}})^2/2\}$$

yielding for $z \geq \mathbf{r} = 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > z) \leq \exp\{-(z - \sqrt{\mathbf{p}})^2/2\} \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}/2}$$

and for $\mathbf{r} \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathbf{x} \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_0(\mathbf{r}) &\leq e^{-\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}/2} + \int_{\mathbf{r}}^{\infty} (z - \mathbf{r}/2) \exp\left\{-\frac{\mathbf{r}z}{2} + \frac{z^2}{2} - \frac{(z - \sqrt{\mathbf{p}})^2}{2}\right\} dz \\ &\leq e^{-\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}/2} + \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{r} - \sqrt{\mathbf{p}})^2}{2}\right) \int_0^{\infty} \left(z + \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2}\right) \exp\left\{-\frac{(\mathbf{r} - 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}})z}{2}\right\} dz \\ &\leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{p}/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the result (7.41). Statement (7.42) is about Gaussian probability $\mathbb{P}(\|T\gamma\| \geq r)$ for a standard normal element γ , and we derive

$$\mathbb{P}(\|T\gamma\| \geq 2\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{2x}) \leq \exp\{-(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{2x})^2/2\} \leq \exp(-x - p/2)$$

and (7.42) follows. \square

The next result extends (7.41).

Proposition 7.22. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 7.21 with*

$$r \geq 2\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{2x} + m$$

for some $m \geq 0$. Then (7.41) can be extended to

$$\frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^m e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq 4e^{-x-p/2},$$

$$\frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^m e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq e^{-x-p/2}.$$

Proof. The case $m > 0$ can be proved similarly to $m = 0$ using $m \log z \leq mz$. \square

7.4.6 Local concentration

Here we show that the measure \mathbb{P}_f well concentrates on the local set \mathcal{U} from (7.8).

Again we fix $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^*$.

Proposition 7.23. *Assume $\omega \leq 1/3$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \geq e^{-\omega p/2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}. \quad (7.44)$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}^c} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \leq 4e^{-x-(1-\omega)p/2} \leq e^{-x}. \quad (7.45)$$

Proof. By (7.9)

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} = \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \delta_3(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \geq \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 - \omega\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}.$$

Change of variable $(\mathbf{I} + \omega \mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1})^{1/2} \mathbf{u}$ to \mathbf{w} yields by (7.27)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} &\geq \det(\mathbf{I} + \omega \mathbf{D}_G^{-1} \mathbf{D}^2 \mathbf{D}_G^{-1})^{-1/2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w} \\ &\geq e^{-\omega p/2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w}, \end{aligned}$$

and (7.44) follows. This and (7.41), (7.42) of Proposition 7.21 imply

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}^c} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} &= \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}^c} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} + \int_{\mathcal{U}^c} e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq \frac{4e^{-x-p/2} \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{e^{-\omega p/2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} + 4e^{-x-p/2} \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq 4e^{-x-(1-\omega)p/2} \end{aligned}$$

as required in (7.45). \square

7.4.7 Finalizing the proof of Theorem 7.1 and 7.2

These results are proved by compiling the previous technical statements. Proposition 7.21 provides some upper bounds for the quantities ρ and ρ_G , while Proposition 7.16, Proposition 7.17, and Proposition 7.20 bound the local errors \diamond and \diamond_g . The final bound (7.11) follows from Corollary 7.12.

7.4.8 Proof of Theorem 7.4 and Theorem 7.5

Define

$$\mathbb{C}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} - \log \int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}.$$

For $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*$, it holds as in (7.3)

$$\mathbb{P}_f \sim \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{u}} = \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})-f(\mathbf{x}^*)}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x})-f(\mathbf{x}^*)} d\mathbf{u}} = \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} = \frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})+\mathbb{C}_G}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}.$$

Further, with $\mathbb{P}_G = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{D}_G^{-2})$

$$\log \frac{d\mathbb{P}_f}{d\mathbb{P}_G}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) - \|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \mathbb{C}_G = \delta_3(\mathbf{u}) + \mathbb{C}_G$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{P}_f, \mathbb{P}_G) = e^{\mathbb{C}_G} \frac{\int \delta_3(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} + \mathbb{C}_G.$$

Similarly to (7.33) and (7.34), we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta_3(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \right| &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\delta_3(\mathbf{u})| e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 - \omega \|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4(1-\omega)^{3/2}} \int \tau_3(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned}$$

On the complement $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^c$, we use that

$$\delta_3(\mathbf{u}) = f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 = \ell(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2. \quad (7.46)$$

The last inequality is based on concavity of $\ell(\cdot)$ and local approximation $\ell(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) \approx -\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$ within \mathcal{U} yielding $\ell(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u}) < 0$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^c$. By Proposition 7.22 with $m = 2$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}^c} \delta_3(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{U}^c} \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \leq e^{-x} \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}.$$

We conclude that

$$\frac{\int \delta_3(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\tau_3(\gamma_G)}{4(1-\omega)^{3/2}} + e^{-x} \leq \diamond_3 + e^{-x}.$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{\mathbf{C}_G} - 1| &= \left| \frac{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} - \int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| + \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}^c} e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} + \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}^c} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\tau_3(\gamma_G)}{4(1-\omega)^{3/2}} + 2e^{-x} \leq \diamond_3 + 2e^{-x}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields $e^{\mathbf{C}_G} \leq 1 + \diamond_3 + 2e^{-x}$ and $\mathbf{C}_G \leq \diamond_3 + 2e^{-x}$. Putting all together results in

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{P}_f, \mathbb{P}_G) \leq (1 + \diamond_3 + 2e^{-x})(\diamond_3 + e^{-x}) + \diamond_3 + 2e^{-x} < 4\diamond_3 + 4e^{-x}$$

provided that $4\diamond_3 + 4e^{-x} \leq 1$, and (7.15) follows.

The proof of Theorem 7.5 is similar and even simpler except one special part, namely, the bound for the tail integral of $-\delta_3(\mathbf{u})$. By definition $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| \geq \mathbf{r}_G$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^c$. This implies by (7.16) similarly to (7.46)

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\mathcal{U}^c} \delta_3(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}^c} |\ell(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})| e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \rho_G \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} e^{-\rho_G \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq e^{-\rho_G \mathbf{r}_G^2/2} \int |\ell(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})| e^{-\|\mathbf{D}_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \rho_G \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell e^{-x}, \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

7.4.9 Finalizing the proof of Theorem 7.6 and Corollary 7.7

For Theorem 7.6, we follow the same line as for Theorem 7.2. Note first that

$$Q(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*) = \frac{\int Q(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} - Q\mathbf{x}^* = \frac{\int Q\mathbf{u} e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}$$

and

$$\|Q(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*)\| = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^q: \|\mathbf{a}\|=1} |\langle Q(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*), \mathbf{a} \rangle| = \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^q: \|\mathbf{a}\|=1} \left| \frac{\int \langle Q\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a} \rangle e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \right|.$$

Now fix $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $\|\mathbf{a}\| = 1$ and $g(\mathbf{u}) = \langle Q\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a} \rangle$. (7.26) implies

$$\left| \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \frac{\rho_g + \rho_{G,g} + \diamond_{3,g}}{1 - \rho_G - \diamond_3}.$$

The bound $1 - \diamond_3 - \rho_G \geq 1/2$ has been already checked. Proposition 7.22 for $m = 1$ helps to bound the values ρ_g and $\rho_{G,g}$ by Ce^{-x} . Next we bound $\diamond_{3,g}$. Under (\mathcal{S}_3) , (7.36) of Proposition 7.19 combined with Lemma 7.15 and Lemma C.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} 4\diamond_{3,g} &= \frac{1}{(1-\omega)^2} \mathbb{E}\{|\langle Q\gamma_G, \mathbf{a} \rangle| \tau_3(\gamma_G)\} = \frac{c_3 n^{-1/2}}{(1-\omega)^2} \mathbb{E}\{|\langle Q\gamma_G, \mathbf{a} \rangle| \|D\gamma_G\|^3\} \\ &\leq \frac{c_3 n^{-1/2}}{(1-\omega)^2} \mathbb{E}^{3/4}\|D\gamma_G\|^4 \mathbb{E}^{1/4}\langle Q\gamma_G, \mathbf{a} \rangle^4 \leq \frac{3^{1/4} c_3 (\mathfrak{p} + 1)^{3/2}}{(1-\omega)^2 \sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\mathbf{a}^\top Q D_G^{-2} Q^\top \mathbf{a}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $\mathbb{E}\langle Q\gamma_G, \mathbf{a} \rangle^4 = \mathbb{E}\langle \gamma, D_G^{-1} Q^\top \mathbf{a} \rangle^4 = 3(\mathbf{a}^\top Q D_G^{-2} Q^\top \mathbf{a})^2$. Now (7.17) follows from $3^{1/4}(1-\omega)^{-2} \leq 2.4$ and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^q: \|\mathbf{a}\|=1} \mathbf{a}^\top Q D_G^{-2} Q^\top \mathbf{a} = \|Q D_G^{-2} Q^\top\|.$$

With $Q = D$, this implies (7.18).

A Local smoothness conditions

This section discusses different local smoothness characteristics of a multivariate function $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

A.1 Smoothness in Gateaux sense and self-concordance

Below we assume that the function $f(\mathbf{v})$ is three or sometimes even four times Gateaux differentiable in $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$. For any particular direction $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we consider the univariate function $f(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u})$ and measure its smoothness in t . Local smoothness of f will be described by the relative error of the Taylor expansion of the third or four order. Namely, define

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) &= f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle, \\ \delta'_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) &= \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\delta_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle - \frac{1}{6} \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle.$$

Now, for each \mathbf{v} , suppose to be given a positive symmetric operator $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ defining a local metric and a local vicinity around \mathbf{v} :

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}\}$$

for some radius \mathbf{r} . If f is strongly concave, then the Hessian $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ is positive definite and one can use $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v})$.

Local smoothness properties of f are given via the quantities

$$\omega(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u}: \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}} \frac{2|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})|}{\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2}, \quad \omega'(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u}: \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}} \frac{2|\delta'_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})|}{\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The Taylor expansion yields for any \mathbf{u} with $\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}$

$$|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{\omega(\mathbf{v})}{2} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad |\delta'_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{\omega'(\mathbf{v})}{2} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The introduced quantities $\omega(\mathbf{v})$, $\omega'(\mathbf{v})$ strongly depend on the radius \mathbf{r} of the local vicinity $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})$. The results about Laplace approximation can be improved provided a homogeneous upper bound on the error of Taylor expansion. Assume a subset \mathcal{Y}° of \mathcal{Y} to be fixed.

(\mathcal{T}_3) There exists τ_3 such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$

$$|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{\tau_3}{6} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^3, \quad |\delta'_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{\tau_3}{2} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^3, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}).$$

(\mathcal{T}_4) There exists τ_4 such that for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$

$$|\delta_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{\tau_4}{24} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^4, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}).$$

Lemma A.1. Under (\mathcal{T}_3), the values $\omega(\mathbf{v})$ and $\omega'(\mathbf{v})$ from (A.1) satisfy

$$\omega(\mathbf{v}) \leq \frac{\tau_3 \mathbf{r}}{3}, \quad \omega'(\mathbf{v}) \leq \tau_3 \mathbf{r}, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ.$$

Proof. For any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})$ with $\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}$

$$|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{\tau_3}{6} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^3 \leq \frac{\tau_3 \mathbf{r}}{6} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^2,$$

and the bound for $\omega(\mathbf{v})$ follows. The proof for $\omega'(\mathbf{v})$ is similar. \square

The values τ_3 and τ_4 are usually very small. Some quantitative bounds are given later in this section under the assumption that the function $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ can be written in the form $-f(\mathbf{v}) = nh(\mathbf{v})$ for a fixed smooth function $h(\mathbf{v})$ with the Hessian $\nabla^2 h(\mathbf{v})$. The factor n has meaning of the sample size; see Section 2.6 or Section 6.

(\mathcal{S}_3) $-f(\mathbf{v}) = nh(\mathbf{v})$ with $h(\mathbf{v})$ satisfying $|\nabla^2 h(\mathbf{v})| \leq \mathbf{m}^2(\mathbf{v})$ and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u}: \|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}/\sqrt{n}} \frac{|\langle \nabla^3 h(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^3} \leq \mathbf{c}_3.$$

(\mathcal{S}_4) the function $h(\cdot)$ satisfies (\mathcal{S}_3) and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u}: \|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}/\sqrt{n}} \frac{|\langle \nabla^4 h(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 4} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u}\|^4} \leq \mathbf{c}_4.$$

(\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4) are local versions of the so called self-concordance condition; see Nesterov (1988). In fact, they require that each univariate function $h(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u})$ of $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is self-concordant with some universal constants \mathbf{c}_3 and \mathbf{c}_4 . Under (\mathcal{S}_3) and (\mathcal{S}_4), we can use $\mathbf{M}^2(\mathbf{v}) = n \mathbf{m}^2(\mathbf{v})$ and easily bound the values $\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$, $\delta_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$, and $\omega(\mathbf{v})$, $\omega'(\mathbf{v})$.

Lemma A.2. Suppose (\mathcal{S}_3). Set $\mathbf{M}^2(\mathbf{v}) = n \mathbf{m}^2(\mathbf{v})$. Then (\mathcal{T}_3) follows with $\tau_3 = \mathbf{c}_3 n^{-1/2}$. Moreover, for $\omega(\mathbf{v})$ and $\omega'(\mathbf{v})$ from (A.1), it holds

$$\omega(\mathbf{v}) \leq \frac{\mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{r}}{3n^{1/2}}, \quad \omega'(\mathbf{v}) \leq \frac{\mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{r}}{n^{1/2}}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Also (\mathcal{T}_4) follows from (\mathcal{S}_4) with $\tau_4 = \mathbf{c}_4 n^{-1}$.

Proof. For any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, by the Taylor expansion of the third order

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| &\leq \frac{1}{6} |\langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle| = \frac{n}{6} |\langle \nabla^3 h(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle| \leq \frac{n c_3}{6} \|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^3 \\ &= \frac{n^{-1/2} c_3}{6} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^3 \leq \frac{n^{-1/2} c_3 \mathbf{r}}{6} \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (\mathcal{T}_3) as well as (A.3); see (A.2). The statement about (\mathcal{T}_4) is similar. \square

A.2 Fréchet derivatives and smoothness of the Hessian

For evaluation of the bias, we also need stronger smoothness conditions in the Fréchet sense. Let f be a strongly concave function. Essentially we need some continuity of the negative Hessian $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v})$. For $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$, define $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v})$ and

$$\omega^+(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u}: \|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{|\langle \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}), \gamma^{\otimes 2} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v})\gamma\|^2}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

This definition of $\omega^+(\mathbf{v})$ is, of course, stronger than the one-directional definition of $\omega(\mathbf{v})$ in (A.1). However, in typical examples these quantities $\omega(\mathbf{v})$ and $\omega^+(\mathbf{v})$ are similar; see the examples from Section 5 and Section 6.

We also present a Fréchet version of (\mathcal{S}_3) .

(\mathcal{S}_3^+) $-f(\mathbf{v}) = nh(\mathbf{v})$ with $h(\cdot)$ strongly concave, $\mathbf{m}^2(\mathbf{v}) = \nabla^2 h(\mathbf{v})$, and

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}/\sqrt{n}} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{|\langle \nabla^3 h(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u} \otimes \gamma^{\otimes 2} \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v})\gamma\|^2} \leq c_3.$$

Lemma A.3. With $\omega^+(\mathbf{v})$ from (A.4), it holds for any \mathbf{u} with $\|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}$

$$\|\mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) \mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{I}_p\| \leq \omega^+(\mathbf{v}). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Moreover, (\mathcal{S}_3^+) yields $\omega^+(\mathbf{v}) \leq c_3 \mathbf{r} n^{-1/2}$ and for any \mathbf{u} with $\|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}$

$$\|\mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) \mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{I}_p\| \leq \frac{c_3}{n^{1/2}} \|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \frac{c_3 \mathbf{r}}{n^{1/2}}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proof. Denote $\Delta(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})$. Then by (A.4) for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\delta = \mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v})\gamma$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) \mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{I}_p, \gamma^{\otimes 2} \rangle| &= |\langle \Delta(\mathbf{u}), \delta^{\otimes 2} \rangle| \\ &\leq \omega^+(\mathbf{v}) \|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \delta\|^2 = \omega^+(\mathbf{v}) \|\gamma\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (A.5). Bound (A.6) can be proved by arguments from Lemma A.2. \square

Define now for any \mathbf{u}

$$\mathring{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^1 \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}) dt. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Lemma A.4. *Under the conditions of Lemma A.3, for any \mathbf{u} with $\|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}$*

$$\|\mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \mathring{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \mathbb{F}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{v}) - I_p\| \leq \omega^+(\mathbf{v}). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Moreover,

$$\{1 - \omega^+(\mathbf{v})\} \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) \leq \mathring{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \leq \{1 + \omega^+(\mathbf{v})\} \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Proof. For any $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, the definition (A.4) implies

$$|\langle \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle| \leq \omega^+(\mathbf{v}) \|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2.$$

This obviously yields under (\mathcal{S}_3^+)

$$|\langle \mathring{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\otimes 2} \rangle| \leq \frac{\mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{r}}{n^{1/2}} \|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 \int_0^1 t dt = \frac{\mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{r}}{2n^{1/2}} \|\mathbb{F}^{1/2}(\mathbf{v}) \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2$$

and (A.8) follows as in Lemma A.3. \square

A.3 Quadraticity and near quadraticity

Let $f(\mathbf{v})$ be a smooth concave function,

$$\mathbf{v}^* = \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmax}} f(\mathbf{v}),$$

and $D^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}^*)$. Later we study the question how the point of maximum and the value of maximum of f change if we add a linear or quadratic component to f .

A.3.1 A linear perturbation

This section studies the case of a linear change of f . More precisely, let another function $g(\mathbf{v})$ satisfy for some vector \mathbf{A}

$$g(\mathbf{v}) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) = \langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{A} \rangle + f(\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{v}^*). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

A typical example corresponds to $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ and $g(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v})$ for a random function $L(\mathbf{v})$ with a linear stochastic component $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$; see (ζ) . Then (A.10) is satisfied with

$$\mathbf{A} = \nabla \zeta.$$

The aim of the analysis is evaluate the values

$$\mathbf{v}^\circ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmax}} g(\mathbf{v}), \quad g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) = \max_{\mathbf{v}} g(\mathbf{v}). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The results will be stated mainly in terms of the quantity $\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|$. First we consider the case of a quadratic function f .

Lemma A.5. *Let $f(\mathbf{v})$ be quadratic with $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}) \equiv -D^2$. If $g(\mathbf{v})$ satisfy (A.10), then*

$$\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^* = D^{-2}\mathbf{A}, \quad g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) = \frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Proof. If $f(\mathbf{v})$ is quadratic, then, of course, under (A.10), $g(\mathbf{v})$ is quadratic as well with $\nabla^2 g(\mathbf{v}) \equiv -D^2$. This implies

$$\nabla g(\mathbf{v}^*) - \nabla g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) = D^2(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*).$$

Further, (A.10) and $\nabla f(\mathbf{v}^*) = 0$ yield $\nabla g(\mathbf{v}^*) = \mathbf{A}$. Together with $\nabla g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) = 0$, this implies $\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^* = D^{-2}\mathbf{A}$. The Taylor expansion of g at \mathbf{v}° yields by $\nabla g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) = 0$

$$g(\mathbf{v}^*) - g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) = -\frac{1}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2$$

and the assertion follows. \square

The next result describes the concentration properties of \mathbf{v}° from (A.11) in a local elliptic set of the form

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{v}: \|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \mathbf{r}\}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where \mathbf{r} is slightly larger than $\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|$.

Proposition A.6. *Let $f(\mathbf{v})$ be a concave function with $f(\mathbf{v}^*) = \max_{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{v})$ and $D^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}^*)$. Let further $g(\mathbf{v})$ and $f(\mathbf{v})$ be related by (A.10) with some vector \mathbf{A} . Fix $\nu \leq 2/3$ and \mathbf{r} such that $\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\| \leq \nu \mathbf{r}$. Suppose now that $f(\mathbf{v})$ satisfy (A.1) for $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^*$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}^*) = D$, and ω' such that*

$$1 - \nu - \omega' \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Then \mathbf{v}° from (A.11) satisfies

$$\|D(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \mathbf{r}.$$

Proof. The bound $\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\| \leq \nu \mathbf{r}$ implies for any \mathbf{u}

$$|\langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{u} \rangle| = |\langle D^{-1}\mathbf{A}, D\mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \nu \mathbf{r} \|D\mathbf{u}\|.$$

If $\|D\mathbf{u}\| > \mathbf{r}$, then $\mathbf{r}\|D\mathbf{u}\| \leq \|D\mathbf{u}\|^2$. Therefore,

$$|\langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \nu \|D\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \|D\mathbf{u}\| > \mathbf{r}.$$

Let \mathbf{v} be a point on the boundary of the set $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})$ from (A.13). We also write $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*$. The idea is to show that the derivative $\frac{d}{dt}g(\mathbf{v}^* + t\mathbf{u}) < 0$ is negative for $t > 1$. Then all the extreme points of $g(\mathbf{v})$ are within $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})$. We use the decomposition

$$g(\mathbf{v}^* + t\mathbf{u}) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) = \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{u} \rangle t + f(\mathbf{v}^* + t\mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{v}^*).$$

With $h(t) = f(\mathbf{v}^* + t\mathbf{u})$, it holds

$$\frac{d}{dt}g(\mathbf{v}^* + t\mathbf{u}) = \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + h'(t). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

By definition of \mathbf{v}^* , it also holds $h'(0) = 0$. The identity $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}^*) = -D^2$ yields $h''(0) = -\|D\mathbf{u}\|^2$. Bound (A.2) implies for $|t| \leq 1$

$$|h'(t) - th''(0)| = |h'(t) - h'(0) - th''(0)| \leq t^2 |h''(0)| \omega'.$$

For $t = 1$, we obtain by (A.14)

$$h'(1) \leq h''(0) - h''(0)\omega' = -|h''(0)|(1 - \omega') < 0.$$

Moreover, concavity of $h(t)$ and $h'(0) = 0$ imply that $h'(t)$ decreases in t for $t > 1$. Further, summing up the above derivation yields

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt}g(\mathbf{v}^* + t\mathbf{u}) \right|_{t=1} \leq -\|D\mathbf{u}\|^2(1 - \nu - \omega') < 0.$$

As $\frac{d}{dt}g(\mathbf{v}^* + t\mathbf{u})$ decreases with $t \geq 1$ together with $h'(t)$ due to (A.15), the same applies to all such t . This implies the assertion. \square

The result of Proposition A.6 allows to localize the point $\mathbf{v}^\circ = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} g(\mathbf{v})$ in the local vicinity $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})$ of \mathbf{v}^* . The use of smoothness properties of g or, equivalently, of f , in this vicinity helps to obtain rather sharp expansions for $\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*$ and for $g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - g(\mathbf{v}^*)$; cf. (A.12).

Proposition A.7. *Under the conditions of Proposition A.6*

$$-\frac{\omega}{1+\omega}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 \leq 2g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - 2g(\mathbf{v}^*) - \|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 \leq \frac{\omega}{1-\omega}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \|D(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*) - D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 &\leq \frac{3\omega}{(1-\omega)^2} \|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2, \\ \|D(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*)\| &\leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2\omega}}{1-\omega} \|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Proof. By (A.1), for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})$

$$\left| f(\mathbf{v}^*) - f(\mathbf{v}) - \frac{1}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \right| \leq \frac{\omega}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{v}) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) - \frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 &= \langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{A} \rangle + f(\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{v}^*) - \frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*) - D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 + f(\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{v}^*) + \frac{1}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

As $\mathbf{v}^\circ \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})$ and it maximizes $g(\mathbf{v})$, we derive by (A.18)

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) - \frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 &= \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})} \left\{ g(\mathbf{v}) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) - \frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*) - D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 + \frac{\omega}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, $\max_{\mathbf{u}} \{\omega\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2\} = \frac{\omega}{1-\omega}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2$ for $\omega \in [0, 1)$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, yielding

$$g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) - \frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 \leq \frac{\omega}{2(1-\omega)}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2.$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) - \frac{1}{2}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 &\geq \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*) - D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2 - \frac{\omega}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \right\} \\ &= -\frac{\omega}{2(1+\omega)}\|D^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

These bounds imply (A.16).

Now we derive similarly to (A.19) that for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r})$

$$g(\mathbf{v}) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) \leq \langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{A} \rangle - \frac{1-\omega}{2}\|D(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2.$$

A particular choice $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^\circ$ yields

$$g(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - g(\mathbf{v}^*) \leq \langle \mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{A} \rangle - \frac{1-\omega}{2} \|D(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2.$$

Combining with (A.20) allows to bound

$$\langle \mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{A} \rangle - \frac{1-\omega}{2} \|D(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|D^{-1} \mathbf{A}\|^2 \geq -\frac{\omega}{2(1+\omega)} \|D^{-1} \mathbf{A}\|^2.$$

Further, for $\boldsymbol{\xi} = D^{-1} \mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{u} = D(\mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v}^*)$, and $\omega \in [0, 1/3]$, the inequality

$$2\langle \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle - (1-\omega) \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \geq -\frac{\omega}{1+\omega} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2$$

implies

$$\left\| \mathbf{u} - \frac{1}{1-\omega} \boldsymbol{\xi} \right\|^2 \leq \frac{2\omega}{(1+\omega)(1-\omega)^2} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2$$

yielding for $\omega \leq 1/3$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\xi}\| &\leq \left(\omega + \sqrt{\frac{2\omega}{1+\omega}} \right) \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1-\omega} \leq \frac{\sqrt{3\omega} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1-\omega}, \\ \|\mathbf{u}\| &\leq \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2\omega}{1+\omega}} \right) \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1-\omega} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\omega} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1-\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

and (A.17) follows. \square

A.3.2 Quadratic penalization

Here we discuss the case when $g(\mathbf{v}) - f(\mathbf{v})$ is quadratic. The general case can be reduced to the situation with $g(\mathbf{v}) = f(\mathbf{v}) - \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$. To make the dependence of G more explicit, denote

$$f_G(\mathbf{v}) = f(\mathbf{v}) - \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2.$$

With $\mathbf{v}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{v}_G^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} f_G(\mathbf{v})$, we study the bias $\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$ induced by this penalization under Fréchet-type smoothness conditions. To get some intuition, consider first the case of a quadratic function $f(\mathbf{v})$.

Lemma A.8. *Let $f(\mathbf{v})$ be quadratic with $\mathbb{F} \equiv -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{A}_G \equiv -G^2 \mathbf{v}^*$. Then it holds with $\mathbb{F}_G = \mathbb{F} + G^2$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^* &= \mathbb{F}_G^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G = -\mathbb{F}_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*, \\ f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_G\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Quadraticity of $f(\mathbf{v})$ implies quadraticity of $f_G(\mathbf{v})$ with $\nabla^2 f_G(\mathbf{v}) \equiv -\mathbb{F}_G$. This implies

$$\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*).$$

Further, $\nabla f(\mathbf{v}^*) = 0$ yielding $\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = \mathbf{A}_G = -G^2 \mathbf{v}^*$. Together with $\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = 0$, this implies $\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^* = \mathbb{F}_G^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G$. The Taylor expansion of f_G at \mathbf{v}_G^* yields with $D_G = \mathbb{F}_G^{1/2}$

$$f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) - f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = -\frac{1}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G\|^2$$

and the assertion follows. \square

Now we turn to the general case with f smooth in Fréchet sense. Let $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v})$. For $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, define

$$\mathring{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^1 \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}) dt; \quad (\text{A.21})$$

cf. (A.7). Similarly define $\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2$ and

$$\mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^1 \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}) dt = \mathring{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) + G^2. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Lemma A.9. For the vector $\mathbf{b}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$, define $\mathring{\mathbb{F}} = \mathring{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbf{v}^*; \mathbf{b})$. Then

$$\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^* = \mathring{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Proof. First we show for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ that

$$\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}) = -\mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{u}. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Indeed, for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p$, consider the univariate function $h(t) = \langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}), \gamma \rangle$. Statement (A.24) follows from definitions (A.21), (A.22), and the identity $h(1) - h(0) = \int_0^1 h'(t) dt$.

Further, the definition $\mathbf{v}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{v})$ yields $\nabla f(\mathbf{v}^*) = 0$ and

$$\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = \nabla f(\mathbf{v}^*) - G^2 \mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{A}_G.$$

In view of $\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = 0$, we derive

$$\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = -\mathbf{A}_G.$$

Representation (A.24) with $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^*$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{b}_G$ yields (A.23). \square

Representation (A.23) is very useful to bound from above the bias $\mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*$. Indeed, assuming that \mathbf{v}_G^* is in a local vicinity of \mathbf{v}^* we may use Fréchet smoothness of f in terms of the value $\omega^+(\mathbf{v}^*)$ from (A.4) to approximate $\mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G \approx \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$ and $\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^* \approx -\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v}^*) G^2 \mathbf{v}^*$.

Proposition A.10. *Define \mathbb{D}_G by*

$$\mathbb{D}_G^2 = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^*),$$

and let $Q \leq \mathbb{D}_G$. Fix

$$\mathbf{r}^* = \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\| = \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G\|$$

and $\mathbf{r}_\circ > \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}^*$ with $\nu = 2/3$. Assume

$$\omega_G^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u}: \|Q\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}_\circ} \|\mathbb{D}_G^{-1} \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^* + \mathbf{u}) \mathbb{D}_G^{-1} - I_p\| \leq \frac{1}{3}; \quad (\text{A.25})$$

cf. (A.5). Then $\|Q(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \mathbf{r}_\circ$ or, equivalently,

$$\mathbf{v}_G^* \in \mathcal{A}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{v}: \|Q(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq \mathbf{r}_\circ\}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Moreover,

$$\|Q(\mathbf{b}_G - \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G)\| \leq \omega_G^* \mathbf{r}_\circ. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Proof. First we check that \mathbf{v}_G^* concentrates in the local vicinity \mathcal{A}_G from (A.26). Strong concavity of f_G implies that the solution \mathbf{v}_G^* exists and unique. Let us fix any direction $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\|Q\gamma\| = \mathbf{r}_\circ$. Due to (A.23), we are looking at the solution $\mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G(\mathbf{v}^*; s\gamma) s\gamma = \mathbf{A}_G$ in s and γ . It suffices to ensure that

$$s Q \gamma = Q \mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G(\mathbf{v}^*; s\gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G \quad (\text{A.28})$$

is impossible for $s \geq 1$. For $s = 1$, we can use that $\mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G(\mathbf{v}^*; \gamma) \geq (1 - \omega_G^*) \mathbb{D}_G^2$; see (A.9) of Lemma A.4. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q \mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v}^*; \gamma) \mathbf{A}_G\| &\leq \|Q \mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v}^*; \gamma) \mathbb{D}_G^2 Q^{-1}\| \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G\| \\ &\leq (1 - \omega_G^*)^{-1} \mathbf{r}^* < \mathbf{r}_\circ \end{aligned}$$

and (A.28) with $s = 1$ is impossible because $\|Q\gamma\| = \mathbf{r}_\circ$. It remains to note that the matrix $s \mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G(\mathbf{v}^*; s\gamma)$ grows with s as

$$s \mathring{\mathbb{F}}_G(\mathbf{v}^*; s\gamma) = s \int_0^1 \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^* + t s \gamma) dt = \int_0^s \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^* + t \gamma) dt.$$

Now we bound $\|Q \mathbf{b}_G\|$ assuming that $\|Q(\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*)\| \leq r_o$ and (A.25) applies. Statement (A.9) of Lemma A.4 implies $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} \leq (1 - \omega_G^*)^{-1} \mathbb{D}_G^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q \mathbf{b}_G\| &= \|Q \overset{\circ}{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} \mathbb{D}_G^2 Q^{-1} Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G\| \leq \|Q \overset{\circ}{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} \mathbb{D}_G^2 Q^{-1}\| \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G\| = \frac{r^*}{1 - \omega_G^*}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way we derive

$$\|Q(\mathbf{b} - \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G)\| = \|Q(\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} - \mathbb{D}_G^{-2}) \mathbf{A}_G\| \leq \frac{\omega_G^*}{1 - \omega_G^*} \|Q \mathbb{D}_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G\|,$$

and (A.27) follows as well. \square

Remark A.1. Inspection of the proofs of Proposition A.10 indicates that the results (A.26) through (A.27) can be restated with $D_G^2 = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ in place of $\mathbb{D}_G^2 = \mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$.

B Examples of priors

This section presents two typical examples of priors and some properties including the bounds for *effective dimension* and *Laplace effective dimension*.

B.1 Truncation and smooth priors

Below we consider two non-trivial examples of Gaussian priors: truncation and smooth priors. To make the presentation clear, we impose some assumptions on the considered setup. Most of them are non-restrictive and can be extended to more general situations. We assume to be given a growing sequence of nested linear approximation subspaces $\mathbb{W}_1 \subset \mathbb{W}_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ of dimension $\dim(\mathbb{W}_m) = m$. Below Π_m is the projector on \mathbb{W}_m and \mathbb{W}_m^c is the orthogonal complement of \mathbb{W}_m . A *smooth prior* is described by a self-adjoint operator G such that $\|G\mathbf{u}\|/\|\mathbf{u}\|$ becomes large for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{W}_m^c$ and m large. One can write this condition in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \|G\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq g_m^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, & \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{W}_m, \\ \|G\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\geq g_m^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, & \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{W}_m^c. \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

Often one assumes that \mathbb{W}_m is spanned by the eigenvectors of G^2 corresponding to its smallest eigenvalues $g_1^2 \leq g_2^2 \leq \dots \leq g_m^2$. We only need (B.1). A typical example is given by $G^2 = \text{diag}(g_j^2)$ with $g_j^2 = w^{-1} j^{2s}$ for $s > 1/2$ and some window parameter w . Below we refer to this case as (s, w) -*smooth prior*.

A *m-truncation prior* assumes that the prior distribution is restricted to \mathbb{W}_m . This formally corresponds to a covariance operator G_m^{-2} with $G_m^{-2}(I - \Pi_m) = 0$. Equivalently, we set $g_{m+1} = g_{m+2} = \dots = \infty$ in (B.1).

B.2 Effective dimension

This section explains how the *effective dimension* and *Laplace effective dimension* can be evaluated for some typical situations.

Let \mathbb{F} be a generic information matrix while G^2 a penalizing matrix. With $\mathbb{F}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{F} + G^2$, define a sub-projector P_G in \mathbb{R}^p by

$$P_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{F}_G^{-1} \mathbb{F} = (\mathbb{F} + G^2)^{-1} \mathbb{F}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Also define the *Laplace effective dimension*

$$p(G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr} P_G = \text{tr}\{(\mathbb{F} + G^2)^{-1} \mathbb{F}\}.$$

The penalizing matrix G^2 will be supposed diagonal, $G^2 = \text{diag}\{g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2\}$. Moreover, we implicitly assume that the values g_j^2 grow with j at some rate, *polynomial* or *exponential*, yielding for all $m \geq 1$

$$\sum_{j>m} g_j^{-2} \leq C_g m g_m^{-2}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Our leading example is given by $g_j^2 = w^{-1} j^{2s}$ for $s > 1/2$. Then (B.3) holds with $C_g = (2s - 1)^{-1}$.

Concerning the matrix \mathbb{F} , we assume

$$C_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \langle \mathbb{F} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq C_{\mathbb{F}} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

for some $C_{\mathbb{F}} \geq 1$. It appears that the value $p(G)$ is closely related to the index m for which $g_m^2 \approx n$.

Lemma B.1. *Let \mathbb{F} satisfy (B.4). Let also $G^2 = \text{diag}\{g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2\}$ with g_j^2 satisfying (B.3). Define the index m as the smallest index j with $g_j^2 \geq n$:*

$$m = m(G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{j: g_j^2 \geq n\}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{C_{\mathbb{F}} + 1} \leq \frac{p(G)}{m} \leq 1 + C_{\mathbb{F}} C_g.$$

Proof. By (B.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr}(P_G) &\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n}{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n + g_j^2} \leq m + \sum_{j > m} \frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n}{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n + g_j^2} \leq m + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n \sum_{j > m} g_j^{-2} \\ &\leq m + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n \mathbf{C}_g m g_m^{-2} \leq m(1 + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{C}_g). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\operatorname{tr}(P_G) \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} n}{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} n + g_j^2} \geq m \frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} n}{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} n + g_m^2} \geq m \frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1}}{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} + 1},$$

and the assertion follows. \square

This result yields an immediate corollary.

Corollary B.2. *Let G_1^2 and G_2^2 be two different penalizing matrices satisfying (B.3) and such that $m(G_1) = m(G_2)$; see (B.5). Then*

$$\frac{\mathfrak{p}(G_1)}{\mathfrak{p}(G_2)} \leq (1 + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{C}_g)(1 + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}).$$

Now we evaluate the *effective dimension* $\mathfrak{p}_G = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbb{F}_G^{-1} V^2)$, where the *variance matrix* V^2 satisfies the condition

$$\mathbf{C}_V^{-1} \|\mathbb{F} \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \|V \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{C}_V n \|\mathbb{F} \mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p \quad (\text{B.6})$$

with some constant $\mathbf{C}_V \geq 1$; cf. (B.4).

Lemma B.3. *Assume (B.4) for \mathbb{F} and (B.6) for V^2 . Let also $G^2 = \operatorname{diag}\{g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2\}$ with g_j^2 satisfying (B.3) and let m be given by (B.5). Then $\mathfrak{p}_G = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbb{F}_G^{-1} V^2)$ satisfies*

$$\frac{\mathbf{C}_V^{-1}}{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} + 1} \leq \frac{\mathfrak{p}_G}{m} \leq \mathbf{C}_V (1 + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{C}_g).$$

Proof. It follows from (B.4) and (B.6) that

$$\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{I}_p + G^2)^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{C}_V^{-1} \leq \operatorname{tr}(\mathbb{F}_G^{-1} V^2) \leq \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_p + G^2)^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} \mathbf{C}_V.$$

Further we may proceed as in the proof of Lemma B.1. \square

B.3 Sobolev classes and smooth priors

This section illustrates the introduced notions and results for a typical situation of a (s, w) -smooth prior with $g_j^2 = w j^{2s}$.

B.4 Properties of the sub-projector P_G

For the sub-projector P_G from (B.2), this section analyzes the operator $I_p - P_G$ which naturally appears in the evaluation of the bias $\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$; see Section 2.8. It turns out that the main characteristic of P_G is the index m defined by (B.5). The sub-projector P_G approximates the projector on the space \mathbb{W}_m . The quality of approximation is controlled by the growth rate of the eigenvalues g_j^2 : the faster is this rate the better is the approximation $P_G \approx \Pi_m$. To illustrate this point, we consider the situation with two operators $I_n - P_G$ and $I_n - P_{G_0}$ for two different penalizing matrices G^2 and G_0^2 with the same characteristic m . We slightly change the notations and assume that

$$G^2 = w^{-1} \text{diag}\{g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2\}, \quad G_0^2 = w_0^{-1} \text{diag}\{g_{1,0}^2, \dots, g_{p,0}^2\},$$

with some fixed constants w and w_0 and growing sequences (g_j^2) and $(g_{j,0}^2)$ satisfying

$$w^{-1} g_m^2 \approx w_0^{-1} g_{m,0}^2 \approx n. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

To simplify the presentation we later assume that these relations in (B.7) are precisely fulfilled. We also assume that

$$g_{j,0}^2/g_{m,0}^2 \leq g_j^2/g_m^2, \quad j \leq m, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

meaning that $g_{j,0}^2$ grows faster than g_j^2 .

Lemma B.4. *Let \mathbb{F} satisfy (B.4), and let G^2 and G_0^2 be diagonal penalizing matrices satisfying (B.7) and (B.8) for some $m \leq p$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} (I_p - P_G)\Pi_m &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^2 (I_p - P_{G_0})\Pi_m, \\ (\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} + 1)^{-1} \Pi_m^c &\leq (I_p - P_G)\Pi_m^c \leq \Pi_m^c, \end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$I_p - P_G \leq \mathbf{C} (I_p - P_{G_0}), \quad \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \vee (\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} + 1). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Proof. The definition implies $I_p - P_G = (\mathbb{F} + G^2)^{-1} G^2$ and by (B.4)

$$(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}} n I_p + G^2)^{-1} G^2 \leq (\mathbb{F} + G^2)^{-1} G^2 \leq (\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^{-1} n I_p + G^2)^{-1} G^2.$$

Further, for $j \leq m$, (B.7) and $g_j^2/g_m^2 \leq g_{j,0}^2/g_{m,0}^2$ imply $w^{-1} g_j^2 \leq w_0^{-1} g_{j,0}^2$ that is,

$$G^2 \Pi_m \leq G_0^2 \Pi_m.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (I_p - P_G)\Pi_m &= \mathbb{F}_G^{-1}G^2 \Pi_m \leq (\mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}^{-1}nI_p + G^2)^{-1}G^2 \Pi_m \\ &\leq (\mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}^{-1}nI_p + G_0^2)^{-1}G_0^2 \Pi_m \leq \mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\mathbb{F} + G_0^2)^{-1}G_0^2 \Pi_m. \end{aligned}$$

After restricting to the orthogonal complement \mathbb{W}_m^c , both operators $I_p - P_G$ and $I_p - P_{G_0}$ behave nearly as projectors: in view of $g_j^2 \geq n$ for $j > m$

$$(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{F} + 1)^{-1}\Pi_m^c \leq (I_p - P_G)\Pi_m^c \leq \Pi_m^c$$

and similarly for $I_p - P_{G_0}$. \square

Finally we evaluate the quantity $\|Q(I - P_G)\mathbf{v}\|$ assuming $\|G_0\mathbf{v}\|$ bounded.

Lemma B.5. *It holds for any $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ and any G^2*

$$\|Q(I - P_G)\mathbf{v}\|^2 \leq \|Q\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}Q^\top\| \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2.$$

Moreover, let \mathbb{F} satisfy (B.4), and let G^2 and G_0^2 be diagonal penalizing matrices satisfying (B.7) and (B.8) for some $m \leq p$. Then

$$\|Q(I - P_G)\mathbf{v}\| \leq \mathbb{C}\|Q\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{-1}Q^\top\|^{1/2} \|G_0\mathbf{v}\| \quad (\text{B.10})$$

with \mathbb{C} from (B.9).

Proof. It holds $(I - P_G)\mathbf{v} = \mathbb{F}_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}$ and in view of $G^2 \leq \mathbb{F}_G$

$$\|Q(I - P_G)\mathbf{v}\| = \|Q\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}\| \leq \|Q\mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2}\| \|\mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2}G^2\mathbf{v}\| \leq \|Q\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}Q^\top\|^{1/2} \|G\mathbf{v}\|.$$

For the second statement, we apply (B.9) of Lemma B.4. As $\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}G^2 \leq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{-1}G_0^2$ implies $\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{1/2}\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}G^2 \leq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{-1/2}G_0^2$, it follows in a similar way

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}\| &\leq \|Q\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{-1/2}\| \|\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{1/2}\mathbb{F}_G^{-1}G^2\mathbf{v}\| \\ &\leq \mathbb{C}\|Q\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{-1/2}\| \|\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{-1/2}G_0^2\mathbf{v}\| \leq \mathbb{C}\|Q\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{-1/2}\| \|G_0\mathbf{v}\| \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

For the case of $Q = \mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{1/2}$, we obtain a corollary of (B.10)

$$\|\mathbb{F}_{G_0}^{1/2}(I - P_G)\mathbf{v}\| \leq \mathbb{C}\|G_0\mathbf{v}\|.$$

C Deviation bounds for quadratic forms

Here we collect some useful results from probability theory mainly concerning Gaussian and non-Gaussian quadratic forms.

C.1 Moments of a Gaussian quadratic form

Let γ be standard normal in \mathbb{R}^p for $p \leq \infty$. Given a self-adjoint trace operator B , consider a quadratic form $\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle$.

Lemma C.1. *It holds*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle &= \text{tr } B, \\ \text{Var}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle &= 2 \text{tr } B^2.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \text{tr } B)^2 &= 2 \text{tr } B^2, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \text{tr } B)^3 &= 8 \text{tr } B^3, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \text{tr } B)^4 &= 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 12(\text{tr } B^2)^2,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 &= (\text{tr } B)^2 + 2 \text{tr } B^2, \\ \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^3 &= (\text{tr } B)^3 + 6 \text{tr } B \text{tr } B^2 + 8 \text{tr } B^3, \\ \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^4 &= (\text{tr } B)^4 + 12(\text{tr } B)^2 \text{tr } B^2 + 32(\text{tr } B) \text{tr } B^3 + 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 12(\text{tr } B^2)^2, \\ \text{Var}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 &= 8(\text{tr } B)^2 \text{tr } B^2 + 32(\text{tr } B) \text{tr } B^3 + 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 8(\text{tr } B^2)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $B \leq I_p$ and $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr } B$, then $\text{tr } B^m \leq \mathfrak{p}$ for $m \geq 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 &\leq \mathfrak{p}^2 + 2\mathfrak{p} && \leq (\mathfrak{p} + 1)^2, \\ \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^3 &\leq \mathfrak{p}^3 + 6\mathfrak{p}^2 + 8\mathfrak{p} && \leq (\mathfrak{p} + 2)^3, \\ \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^4 &\leq \mathfrak{p}^4 + 12\mathfrak{p}^3 + 44\mathfrak{p}^2 + 48\mathfrak{p} && \leq (\mathfrak{p} + 3)^4, \\ \text{Var}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 &\leq 8\mathfrak{p}^3 + 40\mathfrak{p}^2 + 48\mathfrak{p}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\chi = \gamma^2 - 1$ for γ standard normal. Then $\mathbb{E}\chi = 0$, $\mathbb{E}\chi^2 = 2$, $\mathbb{E}\chi^3 = 8$, $\mathbb{E}\chi^4 = 60$. Without loss of generality assume B diagonal: $B = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)$.

Then

$$\xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle - \text{tr } B = \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j (\gamma_j^2 - 1),$$

where γ_j are i.i.d. standard normal. This easily yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\xi^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j^2 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_j^2 - 1)^2 = \mathbb{E}\chi^2 \text{tr } B^2 = 2 \text{tr } B^2, \\ \mathbb{E}\xi^3 &= \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j^3 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_j^2 - 1)^3 = \mathbb{E}\chi^3 \text{tr } B^3 = 8 \text{tr } B^3, \\ \mathbb{E}\xi^4 &= \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j^4 (\gamma_j^2 - 1)^4 + \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_i^2 \lambda_j^2 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_i^2 - 1)^2 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_j^2 - 1)^2 \\ &= (\mathbb{E}\chi^4 - 3(\mathbb{E}\chi^2)^2) \text{tr } B^4 + 3(\mathbb{E}\chi^2 \text{tr } B^2)^2 = 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 12(\text{tr } B^2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

ensuring

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^2 &= (\mathbb{E}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle)^2 + \mathbb{E}\xi^2 = (\text{tr } B)^2 + 2 \text{tr } B^2, \\ \mathbb{E}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^3 &= \mathbb{E}(\xi + \text{tr } B)^3 = (\text{tr } B)^3 + \mathbb{E}\xi^3 + 3 \text{tr } B \mathbb{E}\xi^2 \\ &= (\text{tr } B)^3 + 6 \text{tr } B \text{tr } B^2 + 8 \text{tr } B^3, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle^2 &= \mathbb{E}(\xi + \text{tr } B)^4 - (\mathbb{E}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle)^2 \\ &= (\text{tr } B)^4 + 6(\text{tr } B)^2 \mathbb{E}\xi^2 + 4 \text{tr } B \mathbb{E}\xi^3 + \mathbb{E}\xi^4 - ((\text{tr } B)^2 + 2 \text{tr } B^2)^2 \\ &= 8(\text{tr } B)^2 \text{tr } B^2 + 32(\text{tr } B) \text{tr } B^3 + 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 8(\text{tr } B^2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the results of the lemma. \square

Now we compute the exponential moments of centered and non-centered quadratic forms.

Lemma C.2. *Let $\|B\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Then for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle - \mathbf{p})\right\} = \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2}.$$

Moreover, with $\mathbf{p} = \text{tr } B$ and $\mathbf{v}^2 = \text{tr } B^2$

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle - \mathbf{p})\right\} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{4(1 - \mu)}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

If B is positive semidefinite, $\lambda_j \geq 0$, then

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mu}{2} (\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \mathfrak{p}) \right\} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \mathfrak{v}^2}{4}.$$

Proof. Let λ_j be the eigenvalues of B , $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$. By an orthogonal transform, one can reduce the statement to the case of a diagonal matrix $B = \text{diag}(\lambda_j)$. Then $\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j \gamma_j^2$ and by independence of the γ_j 's

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mu}{2} \langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle \right\} = \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\mu}{2} \lambda_j \varepsilon_j^2 \right) = \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \mu \lambda_j}} = \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2}.$$

Below we use the simple bound:

$$\begin{aligned} -\log(1-u) - u &= \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{u^k}{k} \leq \frac{u^2}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u^k = \frac{u^2}{2(1-u)}, \quad u \in (0, 1), \\ -\log(1-u) + u &= \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{u^k}{k} \leq \frac{u^2}{2}, \quad u \in (-1, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Now it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mu}{2} (\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \mathfrak{p}) \right\} &= \log \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2} - \frac{\mu \mathfrak{p}}{2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \{ \log(1 - \mu \lambda_j) + \mu \lambda_j \} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\mu^2 \lambda_j^2}{4(1-\mu)} = \frac{\mu^2 \mathfrak{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

The last statement can be proved similarly. \square

Now we consider the case of a non-centered quadratic form $\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle/2 + \langle \mathbf{A}, \gamma \rangle$ for a fixed vector \mathbf{A} .

Lemma C.3. *Let $\lambda_{\max}(B) < 1$. Then for any \mathbf{A}*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle + \langle \mathbf{A}, \gamma \rangle \right\} = \exp \left\{ \frac{\|(I - B)^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}\|^2}{2} \right\} \det(I - B)^{-1/2}.$$

Moreover, for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\log \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{\mu}{2} (\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \mathfrak{p}) + \langle \mathbf{A}, \gamma \rangle \right\} \\ &= \frac{\|(I - \mu B)^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}\|^2}{2} + \log \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2} - \mu \mathfrak{p} \\ &\leq \frac{\|(I - \mu B)^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}\|^2}{2} + \frac{\mu^2 \mathfrak{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)}. \end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

Proof. Denote $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{I} - B)^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}$. It holds by change of variables $(\mathbf{I} - B)^{1/2} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$ for $\mathbb{C}_p = (2\pi)^{-p/2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle\right\} &= \mathbb{C}_p \int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\langle (\mathbf{I} - B)\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}\rangle\right\} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \mathbb{C}_p \det(\mathbf{I} - B)^{-1/2} \int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u}\rangle\right\} d\mathbf{u} = \det(\mathbf{I} - B)^{-1/2} e^{\|\mathbf{a}\|^2/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality (C.2) follows by (C.1). \square

C.2 Deviation bounds for Gaussian quadratic forms

The next result explains the concentration effect of $\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle$ for a centered Gaussian vector $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{V}^2)$ and a symmetric trace operator B in \mathbb{R}^p , $p \leq \infty$. We use a version from Laurent and Massart (2000). For completeness, we present a simple proof of the upper bound.

Theorem C.4. *Let $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{V}^2)$ be a Gaussian element in \mathbb{R}^p and B be symmetric such that $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$ is a trace operator in \mathbb{R}^p . Then with $\mathbf{p} = \text{tr}(W)$, $\mathbf{v}^2 = \text{tr}(W^2)$, and $\lambda = \|W\|$, it holds for each $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - \mathbf{p} > 2\mathbf{v} \sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\lambda\mathbf{x}\right) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

It also implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - \mathbf{p}| > z_2(W, \mathbf{x})\right) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

with

$$z_2(W, \mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\mathbf{v} \sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\lambda\mathbf{x}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Proof. W.l.o.g. assume that $\lambda = \|W\| = 1$. We use the identity $\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle = \langle W\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle$ with $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. We apply the exponential Chebyshev inequality: with $\mu > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle W\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle > z^2\right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\mu\langle W\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle/2 - \mu z^2/2\right).$$

Given $\mathbf{x} > 0$, fix $\mu < 1$ by the equation

$$\frac{\mu}{1 - \mu} = \frac{2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{v}} \quad \text{or} \quad \mu^{-1} = 1 + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Let λ_j be the eigenvalues of W , $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$. It holds with $\mathbf{p} = \text{tr} W$ in view of (C.1)

$$\log \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle W\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rangle - \mathbf{p})\right\} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{4(1 - \mu)}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

It remains to check that the choice μ by (C.5) and $z = z(W, \mathbf{x})$ yields

$$\frac{\mu^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)} - \frac{\mu(z^2 - \mathbf{p})}{2} = \frac{\mu^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)} - \mu(\mathbf{v}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{x}) = \mu\left(\frac{\mathbf{v}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}}{2} - \mathbf{v}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\right) = -\mathbf{x} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

as required. The last statement (C.3) is obtained by applying this inequality twice to W and $-W$. \square

Corollary C.5. *Assume the conditions of Theorem C.4. Then for $z > \mathbf{v}$*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - \mathbf{p}| \geq z) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{z^2}{(\mathbf{v} + \sqrt{\mathbf{v}^2 + 2\lambda z})^2}\right\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{4\mathbf{v}^2 + 4\lambda z}\right). \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Proof. Given z , define \mathbf{x} by $2\mathbf{v}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\lambda\mathbf{x} = z$ or $2\lambda\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{v}^2 + 2\lambda z} - \mathbf{v}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - \mathbf{p} \geq z) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}} = \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{\mathbf{v}^2 + 2\lambda z} - \mathbf{v})^2}{4\lambda^2}\right\} = \exp\left\{-\frac{z^2}{(\mathbf{v} + \sqrt{\mathbf{v}^2 + 2\lambda z})^2}\right\}.$$

This yields (C.8) by direct calculus. \square

Of course, bound (C.8) is sensible only if $z \gg \mathbf{v}$.

Corollary C.6. *Assume the conditions of Theorem C.4. If also $B \geq 0$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2(B, \mathbf{x})) = \mathbb{P}(\|B^{1/2}\xi\| \geq z(B, \mathbf{x})) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

with

$$z(B, \mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\mathbf{p} + 2\mathbf{v}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\lambda\mathbf{x}} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{2\lambda\mathbf{x}}.$$

Also

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - \mathbf{p} < -2\mathbf{v}\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

Proof. The definition implies $\mathbf{v}^2 \leq \mathbf{p}\lambda$. One can use a sub-optimal choice of the value $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \{1 + 2\sqrt{\lambda\mathbf{p}/\mathbf{x}}\}^{-1}$ yielding the statement of the corollary. \square

As a special case, we present a bound for the chi-squared distribution corresponding to $B = \mathcal{V}^2 = I_p$, $p < \infty$. Then $\text{tr}(W) = p$, $\text{tr}(W^2) = p$ and $\lambda(W) = 1$.

Corollary C.7. *Let γ be a standard normal vector in \mathbb{R}^p . Then for any $\mathbf{x} > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\gamma\|^2 \geq p + 2\sqrt{p\mathbf{x}} + 2\mathbf{x}) &\leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \\ \mathbb{P}(\|\gamma\| \geq \sqrt{p} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) &\leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \\ \mathbb{P}(\|\gamma\|^2 \leq p - 2\sqrt{p\mathbf{x}}) &\leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

The bound of Theorem C.4 can be represented as a usual deviation bound.

Theorem C.8. *Assume the conditions of Theorem C.4 with $B \geq 0$. Then for $z > \sqrt{\bar{p}} + 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2}{2\lambda}\right\}, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle^{1/2} \mathbb{I}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2)\} \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2}{2\lambda}\right\},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \mathbb{I}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2)\} \leq \frac{2z}{z - \sqrt{\bar{p}}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2}{2\lambda}\right\}. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Proof. Bound (C.10) follows from (C.9). It obviously suffices to check the bound for the excess risk for $\lambda = 1$. It follows with $\eta = \|B^{1/2}\xi\|$ for $z \geq \sqrt{\bar{p}} + 1$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\eta \mathbb{I}(\eta > z)\} = \int_z^\infty \mathbb{P}(\eta \geq z) dz \leq \int_z^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{(x - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2}{2}\right\} dx \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2}{2}\right\}.$$

Similarly

$$\mathbb{E}\{\eta^2 \mathbb{I}(\eta^2 > z^2)\} = \int_{z^2}^\infty \mathbb{P}(\eta^2 \geq \mathfrak{z}) d\mathfrak{z} \leq \int_{z^2}^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{\mathfrak{z}} - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2}{2}\right\} d\mathfrak{z}.$$

By change of variables $\sqrt{\mathfrak{z}} - \sqrt{\bar{p}} = u$ for $z > \sqrt{\bar{p}} + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{z^2}^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{\mathfrak{z}} - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2}{2}\right\} d\mathfrak{z} &\leq 2 \int_{z - \sqrt{\bar{p}}}^\infty (u + \sqrt{\bar{p}}) \exp\{-u^2/2\} du \\ &\leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{\bar{p}}}{z - \sqrt{\bar{p}}}\right) \exp\{-(z - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2/2\} = \frac{2z}{z - \sqrt{\bar{p}}} \exp\{-(z - \sqrt{\bar{p}})^2/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

C.3 Deviation bounds for non-Gaussian quadratic forms

This section collects some probability bounds for non-Gaussian quadratic forms starting from the subgaussian case. Then we extend the result to the case of exponential tails. Let ξ be a random vector in \mathbb{R}^p , $p \leq \infty$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\xi = 0$. We suppose that there exists an operator \mathcal{V} in \mathbb{R}^p such that

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{V}^{-1}\xi \rangle) \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

In the Gaussian case, one obviously takes $\mathcal{V}^2 = \text{Var}(\xi)$. In general, $\mathcal{V}^2 \geq \text{Var}(\xi)$. We consider a quadratic form $\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle$, where ξ satisfies (C.12) and B is a given symmetric

non-negative operator in \mathbb{R}^p such that $B \leq \mathcal{V}^{-2}$ and $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$ is a trace operator:

$$\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr}(W) < \infty.$$

Denote also

$$\mathfrak{v}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}(W^2).$$

We show that under these conditions, the quadratic form $\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle$ follows the same deviation bound $\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2(W, \mathbf{x})) \leq e^{-x}$ with $z^2(W, \mathbf{x})$ from (C.4) as in the Gaussian case.

Theorem C.9. *Suppose (C.12). Let $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr} W < \infty$ for $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle > z^2(W, \mathbf{x})) \leq e^{-x}.$$

The bounds (C.10) through (C.11) of Theorem C.8 continue to apply as well.

Proof. For any $\mu < 1$, we use the identity

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B\xi, \xi \rangle / 2) = \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}_{\gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} \exp(\mu^{1/2} \langle \mathcal{V}B^{1/2}\gamma, \mathcal{V}^{-1}\xi \rangle)$$

Application of Fubini's theorem and (C.12) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B\xi, \xi \rangle / 2) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\mu^2 \text{tr} W^2}{4(1-\mu)} + \frac{\mu \text{tr} W}{2}\right).$$

Further we proceed as in the Gaussian case. □

Now we turn to the main case of light exponential tails of ξ . Namely, we suppose that $\mathbb{E}\xi = 0$ and for some fixed $\mathfrak{g} > 0$

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{V}^{-1}\xi \rangle) \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathfrak{g}, \quad (\text{C.13})$$

for some self-adjoint operator \mathcal{V} in \mathbb{R}^p , $\mathcal{V} \geq I_p$. In fact, it suffices to assume that

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathfrak{g}} \mathbb{E} \exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{V}^{-1}\xi \rangle) \leq C.$$

Then one can use the fact that existence of the exponential moment $\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda_0\xi}$ for a centered random variable ξ and some fixed λ_0 implies that the moment generating function $f_\xi(\lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \mathbb{E}e^{\lambda\xi}$ is analytic in $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ with $f_\xi(0) = f'_\xi(0) = 0$ and hence, it can be well majorated by a quadratic function in a smaller interval $[0, \lambda_1]$ for $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$; see Golubev and Spokoiny (2009).

Remind the notation $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$. By normalization, one can easily reduce the study to the case $\|W\| = 1$. Let $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr}(W)$, $\mathfrak{v}^2 = \text{tr}(W^2)$, and $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ be defined by $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + \frac{\mathfrak{v}}{2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}})^{-1}$; see (C.5). Obviously $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ grows with \mathbf{x} . Define the value \mathbf{x}_c as the root of the equation

$$\frac{\mathfrak{g} - \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}\mu(\mathbf{x})}}{\mu(\mathbf{x})} = z(W, \mathbf{x}) + 1. \quad (\text{C.14})$$

The left hand-side here decreases with \mathbf{x} , while the right hand-side is increasing in \mathbf{x} to infinity. Therefore, the solution exists and is unique. Also denote $\mu_c = \mu(\mathbf{x}_c)$ and

$$\mathfrak{g}_c = \mathfrak{g} - \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}\mu_c}, \quad (\text{C.15})$$

so that

$$\mathfrak{g}_c/\mu_c = z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1.$$

Theorem C.10. *Let (C.13) hold and let B be such that $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$ satisfies $\|W\| = 1$ and $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr}(W) < \infty$. Define \mathbf{x}_c by (C.14) and \mathfrak{g}_c by (C.15), and suppose $\mathfrak{g}_c \geq 1$. Then for any $\mathbf{x} > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z_c^2(W, \mathbf{x})) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}} + e^{-\mathbf{x}_c} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{x}_c) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \quad (\text{C.16})$$

where $z_c(W, \mathbf{x})$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} z_c(W, \mathbf{x}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \sqrt{\mathfrak{p} + 2\mathfrak{v}\mathbf{x}^{1/2} + 2\mathbf{x}}, & \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c, \\ \mathfrak{g}_c/\mu_c + 2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c)/\mathfrak{g}_c, & \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c, \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}, & \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c, \\ \mathfrak{g}_c/\mu_c + 2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c)/\mathfrak{g}_c, & \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if, given \mathbf{x} , it holds

$$\mathfrak{g} \geq \mathbf{x}^{1/2}/2 + (\mathfrak{p}\mathbf{x}/4)^{1/4}, \quad (\text{C.17})$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|B^{1/2}\xi\| \geq \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \quad (\text{C.18})$$

Remark C.1. Depending on the value \mathbf{x} , we have two types of tail behavior of the quadratic form $\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle$. For $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c$, we have essentially the same deviation bounds as

in the Gaussian case with the extra-factor two in the deviation probability. For $\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c$, we switch to the special regime driven by the exponential moment condition (C.13). Usually \mathbf{g}^2 is a large number (of order n in the i.i.d. setup) yielding \mathbf{x}_c also large, and the second term in (C.16) can be simply ignored. The function $z_c(W, \mathbf{x})$ is discontinuous at the point \mathbf{x}_c . Indeed, $z_c(W, \mathbf{x}) = z(W, \mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{x}_c$, while by (C.14), it holds $\mathbf{g}_c/\mu_c = z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1$. However, the jump at \mathbf{x}_c is at most one.

As a corollary, we state the result for the norm of $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ corresponding to the case $\mathcal{V}^{-2} = B = I_p$ and $p < \infty$. Then

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{v}^2 = p.$$

Corollary C.11. *Let (C.13) hold with $\mathcal{V} = I_p$. Then for each $\mathbf{x} > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \geq z_c(p, \mathbf{x})) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}} + e^{-\mathbf{x}_c} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{x}_c),$$

where $z_c(p, \mathbf{x})$ is defined by

$$z_c(p, \mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} (p + 2\sqrt{p\mathbf{x}} + 2\mathbf{x})^{1/2}, & \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c, \\ \mathbf{g}_c/\mu_c + 2\mathbf{g}_c^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c), & \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c. \end{cases}$$

If $\mathbf{g} \geq \mathbf{x}^{1/2}/2 + (p\mathbf{x}/4)^{1/4}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \geq z(p, \mathbf{x})) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

Proof of Theorem C.10. First we consider the most interesting case $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c$. We expect to get Gaussian type deviation bounds for such \mathbf{x} . The main tool of the proof is the following lemma.

Lemma C.12. *Let $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $\mathfrak{z}(\mu) = \mathbf{g}/\mu - \sqrt{\mathbf{p}/\mu} > 0$. Then (C.13) implies*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) \mathbb{I}(\|\mathcal{V}B\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu)) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{\mu^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)} + \frac{\mu \mathbf{p}}{2}\right). \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Proof. Let us fix for a moment some $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mu < 1$ and define

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathcal{V}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad \Sigma = \mu W = \mu \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}.$$

Consider the Gaussian measure $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma} = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{a}, \Sigma^{-1})$, and let $\mathbf{U} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma^{-1})$. By the Girsanov formula

$$\log \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma}}{d\mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}}(\mathbf{u}) = \langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle$$

and for any set $A \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma}(A) = \mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}(A - \mathbf{a}) = \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \left[\exp \left\{ \langle \Sigma \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{a} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle \right\} \mathbb{I}(A) \right].$$

Now we select $A = \{\mathbf{u}: \|\Sigma \mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{g}\}$. Under $\mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}$, one can represent $\Sigma \mathbf{U} = \Sigma^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mu^{1/2} \mathcal{V} B^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ with a standard Gaussian $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}(A - \mathbf{a}) &= \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})} (\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{a})\| \leq \mathbf{g}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})} (\|\Sigma^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \mathbf{g} - \|\Sigma \mathbf{a}\|). \end{aligned}$$

We now use that $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})} (\|\Sigma^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 \leq \text{tr}(\Sigma)) \geq 1/2$ with $\text{tr}(\Sigma) = \mu \text{tr}(W) = \mu \mathbf{p}$. Therefore, the condition $\|\Sigma \mathbf{a}\| + \sqrt{\mu \mathbf{p}} \leq \mathbf{g}$ implies in view of $\langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle = \mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle$

$$1/2 \leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma}(A) = \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \left[\exp \left\{ \langle \Sigma \mathbf{U}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle - \mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2 \right\} \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathbf{U}\| \leq \mathbf{g}) \right]$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp(\mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \mathbf{g} - \sqrt{\mu \mathbf{p}}) \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \left[\exp \left\{ \langle \Sigma \mathbf{U}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle \right\} \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathbf{U}\| \leq \mathbf{g}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now take the expectation of the each side of this equation w.r.t. $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, change the integration order, and use (C.13) yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \mathbf{g} - \sqrt{\mu \mathbf{p}}) &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \exp(\|\Sigma \mathbf{U}\|^2 / 2) \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})} \exp(\mu \|\Sigma^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 / 2) = 2 \det(\mathbf{I} - \mu W)^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We also use that for any $\mu > 0$

$$\log \det(\mathbf{I} - \mu W)^{-1/2} - \frac{\mu \text{tr} W}{2} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \text{tr} W^2}{4(1 - \mu)};$$

see (C.6), and the first statement follows in view of $\Sigma \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mu \mathcal{V} B \boldsymbol{\xi}$. \square

The use of $\mu = \mu_{\mathbf{x}}$ from (C.5) in (C.19) yields similarly to the proof of Theorem C.4

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle > z^2(W, \mathbf{x}), \|\mathcal{V} B \boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}}) \right) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \quad (\text{C.20})$$

It remains to consider the probability of large deviation $\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{V} B \boldsymbol{\xi}\| > \mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}}))$.

Lemma C.13. *For any $\mathbf{x}_c > 0$ such that $z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1 \leq \mathbf{g}_c / \mu_c$, it holds with $\mu_c = \{1 + \mathbf{v} / (2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}_c})\}^{-1}$ and $z_c = \mathfrak{z}(\mu_c) = \mathbf{g} / \mu_c - \sqrt{\mathbf{p} / \mu_c}$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{V} B \boldsymbol{\xi}\| > z_c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle > z_c^2) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}_c}.$$

Proof. Define

$$\Phi(\mu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mu^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)} + \frac{\mu \mathbf{P}}{2}.$$

It follows due to (C.5) and (C.7) for any $\mu \leq \mu_c$

$$\Phi(\mu) \leq \Phi(\mu_c) \leq \frac{\mu_c z^2(W, \mathbf{x}_c)}{2} - \mathbf{x}_c,$$

where the right hand-side does not depend on μ . Denote $\eta^2 = \langle B\xi, \xi \rangle$ and use that $\|\mathcal{V}B\xi\| \leq \|B^{1/2}\xi\| = \eta$. Then by (C.19)

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu\eta^2/2) \mathbb{I}(\eta \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu)) \leq 2 \exp \Phi(\mu) \leq 2 \exp \Phi(\mu_c). \quad (\text{C.21})$$

Define the inverse function $\mu(\mathfrak{z}) = \mathfrak{z}^{-1}(\mu)$. For any $\mathfrak{z} \geq z_c$, it follows from (C.21) with $\mu = \mu(\mathfrak{z})$

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\{\mu(\mathfrak{z})(\mathfrak{z}-1)^2/2\} \mathbb{I}(\mathfrak{z}-1 \leq \eta \leq \mathfrak{z}) \leq 2 \exp \Phi(\mu_c)$$

yielding

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{z}-1 \leq \eta \leq \mathfrak{z}) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\mu(\mathfrak{z})(\mathfrak{z}-1)^2/2 + \Phi(\mu_c)\right)$$

and hence,

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta > \mathfrak{z}) \leq 2 \int_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\infty} \exp\{-\mu(z)(z-1)^2/2 + \Phi(\mu_c)\} dz.$$

Further, $\mu \mathfrak{z}(\mu) = \mathbf{g} - \sqrt{\mathbf{P}\mu}$ and

$$\mathbf{g}_c = \mu_c z_c \leq \mu \mathfrak{z}(\mu) \leq \mathbf{g}, \quad \mu \leq \mu_c.$$

This implies the same bound for the inverse function:

$$\mathbf{g}_c \leq \mathfrak{z} \mu(\mathfrak{z}) \leq \mathbf{g}, \quad \mathfrak{z} \geq z_c,$$

and for $\mathfrak{z} \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta > \mathfrak{z}) &\leq 2 \int_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\infty} \exp\{-\mu(z)(z^2/2 - z) + \Phi(\mu_c)\} dz \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\infty} \exp\{-\mathbf{g}_c(z/2 - 1) + \Phi(\mu_c)\} dz \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\mathbf{g}_c} \exp\{-\mathbf{g}_c(\mathfrak{z}/2 - 1) + \Phi(\mu_c)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

Conditions $\mathbf{g}_c z_c = \mu_c^{-1} \mathbf{g}_c^2 \geq \mu_c \{z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1\}^2$ and $\mathbf{g}_c \geq 1$ ensure that $\mathbb{P}(\eta > z_c) \leq e^{-x_c}$. \square

Remind that \mathbf{x}_c is the largest \mathbf{x} -value ensuring the condition $\mathbf{g}_c \geq z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1$. We also use that for $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c$, it holds $\mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}}) \geq \mathfrak{z}(\mu_c) = z_c$. Therefore, by (C.20) and Lemma C.13

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2(W, \mathbf{x})) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2(W, \mathbf{x}), \|\mathcal{V}B\xi\| \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}})) + \mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z_c^2) \\ &\leq 2e^{-x} + e^{-x_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we consider $\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c$. Applying (C.22) yields by $\mathfrak{z} \geq z_c$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta > \mathfrak{z}) &\leq \frac{2}{\mu_c z_c} \exp\{-\mu_c z_c^2/2 + \mathbf{g} + \mu_c z^2(W, \mathbf{x}_c)/2 - \mathbf{x}_c\} \exp\{-\mu_c z_c(\mathfrak{z} - z_c)/2\} \\ &\leq e^{-x_c} \exp\{-\mathbf{g}_c(\mathfrak{z} - z_c)/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

The choice \mathfrak{z} by

$$\mathbf{g}_c(\mathfrak{z} - z_c)/2 = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c$$

ensures the desired bound.

Now, for a prescribed \mathbf{x} , we evaluate the minimal value \mathbf{g} ensuring the bound (C.16) with $\mathbf{x}_c \geq \mathbf{x}$. For simplicity we apply the sub-optimal choice $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}/\mathbf{x}})^{-1}$; see Remark C.6. Then for any $\mathbf{x} \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathbf{x}) \{z(W, \mathbf{x}) + 1\} &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}}} \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{p} + 2(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{p})^{1/2} + 2\mathbf{x} + 1} \right), \\ \mathbf{p} \mu(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{p}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is now straightforward to check that

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) \{z(W, \mathbf{x}) + 1\} + \sqrt{\mathbf{p}\mu(\mathbf{x})} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}/2 + (\mathbf{x}\mathbf{p}/4)^{1/4}.$$

Therefore, if (C.17) holds for the given \mathbf{x} , then (C.14) is fulfilled with $\mathbf{x}_c \geq \mathbf{x}$ yielding (C.18). \square

C.4 Weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s: univariate case

Let Y_i be independent Bernoulli(θ_i^*) and $w_i \in [0, 1]$. First we state a deviation bound for a centered sum on non i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables.

Lemma C.14. *Let Y_i be independent Bernoulli(θ_i^*) and $w_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Define*

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i w_i,$$

$$V^2 = \text{Var}(S) = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) w_i^2,$$

$$w^* = \max_i |w_i|.$$

Then it holds

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{\lambda(S - \mathbb{E}S)}{V}\right\} \leq \lambda^2, \quad \lambda \leq \log(2)V/w^*. \quad (\text{C.23})$$

Furthermore, suppose that given $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$,

$$V \geq \frac{3}{2} \mathbf{x}^{1/2} w^*. \quad (\text{C.24})$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(V^{-1}|S - \mathbb{E}S| \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \quad (\text{C.25})$$

Without (C.24), the bound (C.25) applies with V replaced by $V_{\mathbf{x}} = V \vee (3\mathbf{x}^{1/2}w^*/2)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $w^* = 1$, otherwise just rescale all the weights by the factor $1/w^*$. We use that

$$f(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \mathbb{E} \exp\{u(S - \mathbb{E}S)\} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\log(\theta_i^* e^{uw_i} + 1 - \theta_i^*) - uw_i \theta_i^* \right].$$

This is an analytic function of u for $|u| \leq \log 2$ satisfying $f(0) = 0$, $f'(0) = 0$, and, with $v_i^* = \log \theta_i^* - \log(1 - \theta_i^*)$,

$$f''(u) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{w_i^2 \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) e^{uw_i}}{(\theta_i^* e^{uw_i} + 1 - \theta_i^*)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{w_i^2 e^{v_i^* + uw_i}}{(e^{v_i^* + uw_i} + 1)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i(u) \{1 - \theta_i(u)\} w_i^2$$

for $\theta_i(u) = e^{v_i^* + uw_i} / (e^{v_i^* + uw_i} + 1)$. Clearly $\theta_i(u)$ and thus, $\theta_i(u)\{1 - \theta_i(u)\}$ monotonously increases with u and it holds for $\theta_i^* = \theta_i(0)$

$$\theta_i(u)\{1 - \theta_i(u)\} \leq e^{|u|} \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) \leq 2\theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*), \quad |u| \leq \log 2.$$

This yields

$$f(u) \leq V^2 u^2 \quad |u| \leq \log 2.$$

As $\mathbf{x} \leq 4V^2/9$, the value $\lambda = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}$ fulfills $\lambda/V = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}/V \leq \log 2 \leq 2^{-1/2}$. Now by the exponential Chebyshev inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(V^{-1}(S - \mathbb{E}S) \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}\right) &\leq \exp\{-2\lambda\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + f(\lambda/V)\} \\ &\leq \exp(-2\lambda\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + \lambda^2) = e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly one can bound $\mathbb{E}S - S$. □

C.5 Deviation bounds for weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s in a ℓ_2 -norm

Now we present a bound for the norm of the normalized vector $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{\Psi}(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)$, where $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ is a linear mapping $\boldsymbol{\Psi}: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$. Let

$$V^2 = \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}Y) = \boldsymbol{\Psi} \text{Var}(Y) \boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top.$$

We aim at bounding the norm $\|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}\|$, where an operator \mathbf{H} satisfies $\mathbf{H}^2 \geq V^2$.

Lemma C.15. *Let $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i^*)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let $(w_{i,\alpha})$, $\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$, be a collection of weighting schemes. Consider $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{\Psi}(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)$, and let $H^2 \geq \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$. Define*

$$w^* = \max_i \|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_i\|.$$

Then with $\mathbf{p} = \text{tr}(H^{-2}V^2)$, it holds

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \geq \sqrt{\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}},$$

provided that

$$1/w^* \geq \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}/2 + (\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}/4)^{1/4}. \tag{C.26}$$

Proof. We apply the general result of Theorem C.10 under conditions (C.13) and (C.17). For any vector \mathbf{u} , consider the scalar product $\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}(Y - \mathbb{E}Y), \mathbf{u} \rangle$. It is obviously a weighted centered sum of the Bernoulli r.v.'s $Y_i - \theta_i^*$ with

$$\text{Var}\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|^2.$$

One can write with $\varepsilon_i = Y_i - \theta_i^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_i)$

$$\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1}\mathbf{u} \rangle.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it holds

$$\|\Psi^\top H^{-1} \mathbf{u}\|_\infty = \max_i |(\mathbf{H}^{-1} \Psi_i)^\top \mathbf{u}| \leq w^* \|\mathbf{u}\|.$$

The bound (C.23) of Lemma C.14 on the exponential moments of $\langle H^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle$ implies

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp\{\langle H^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle\} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \log(2)/w^*.$$

Therefore, (C.13) is fulfilled with $\mathcal{V}^2 = 2H^2$ and $\mathbf{g} = \sqrt{2} \log(2)/w^*$, and (C.17) follows from (C.26). The deviation bound (C.18) of Theorem C.10 yields the assertion. \square

References

- Bochkina, N. A. and Green, P. J. (2014). The Bernstein–von Mises theorem and nonregular models. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(5):1850–1878.
- Castillo, I. and Nickl, R. (2014). On the Bernstein – von Mises phenomenon for non-parametric Bayes procedures. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(5):1941–1969.
- Castillo, I. and Rousseau, J. (2015). A Bernstein–von Mises theorem for smooth functionals in semiparametric models. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(6):2353–2383.
- Devroye, L., Mehrabian, A., and Reddad, T. (2018). The total variation distance between high-dimensional gaussians with the same mean. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08693>.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference*, volume 44 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ginè, E. and Nickl, R. (2015). *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- Golubev, Y. and Spokoiny, V. (2009). Exponential bounds for minimum contrast estimators. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 3:712–746.
- Götze, F., Naumov, A., Spokoiny, V., and Ulyanov, V. (2019). Large ball probabilities, gaussian comparison and anti-concentration. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2538–2563. arXiv:1708.08663.

- Laurent, B. and Massart, P. (2000). Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Ann. Statist.*, 28(5):1302–1338.
- Markus, A. S. (1964). The eigen- and singular values of the sum and product of linear operators. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 19(4):91–120.
- Nesterov, Y. E. (1988). Polynomial methods in the linear and quadratic programming. *Sov. J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 26(5):98–101.
- Spokoiny, V. (2012). Parametric estimation. Finite sample theory. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(6):2877–2909. arXiv:1111.3029.
- Spokoiny, V. (2017). Penalized maximum likelihood estimation and effective dimension. *AIHP*, 53(1):389–429. arXiv:1205.0498.
- Spokoiny, V. (2019). Bayesian inference for nonlinear inverse problems. <https://arxiv.org/1912.12694>.
- Spokoiny, V. and Panov, M. (2021). Accuracy of Gaussian approximation for high-dimensional posterior distributions. *Bernoulli*. in print. arXiv:1910.06028.
- Spokoiny, V. and Zhilova, M. (2015). Bootstrap confidence sets under model misspecification. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(6):2653–2675. arXiv:1410.0347.
- van der Vaart, A. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.