

# Estimation and Inference for Change Points in Functional Regression Time Series

Shivam Kumar<sup>1</sup>, Haotian Xu<sup>2</sup>, Haeran Cho<sup>3</sup>, and Daren Wang<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,4</sup>Department of ACMS, University of Notre Dame

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Warwick

<sup>3</sup>School of Mathematics, University of Bristol

## Abstract

In this paper, we study the estimation and inference of change points under a functional linear regression model with changes in the slope function. We present a novel Functional Regression Binary Segmentation (FRBS) algorithm which is computationally efficient as well as achieving consistency in multiple change point detection. This algorithm utilizes the predictive power of piece-wise constant functional linear regression models in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space framework. We further propose a refinement step that improves the localization rate of the initial estimator output by FRBS, and derive asymptotic distributions of the refined estimators for two different regimes determined by the magnitude of a change. To facilitate the construction of confidence intervals for underlying change points based on the limiting distribution, we propose a consistent block-type long-run variance estimator. Our theoretical justifications for the proposed approach accommodate temporal dependence and heavy-tailedness in both the functional covariates and the measurement errors. Empirical effectiveness of our methodology is demonstrated through extensive simulation studies and an application to the Standard and Poor's 500 index dataset.

## 1 Introduction

Functional Data Analysis (FDA) studies data that are represented as random functions. The infinite dimension of functional data poses a significant challenge to the development of statistical methodologies. Functional Principal Component Analysis (FPCA), a pivotal approach in FDA, focuses on characterizing the dominant modes of variation in random functions. Seminal contributions to the development and application of FPCA include, for example, [Ramsay and Silverman \(2005\)](#) and [Yao et al. \(2005\)](#). Another important approach in this area employs strategies based on Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS) for estimating the mean, covariance, and slope functions, as demonstrated in [Cai and Yuan \(2010\)](#). Unlike non-parametric methods such as FPCA, the RKHS-based approach selects the most representative functional features in an adaptive manner from an RKHS. We refer to [Wang et al. \(2016\)](#) for a comprehensive overview of the FDA. Extensive treatments of the subject can also be found in [Ramsay and Silverman \(2002\)](#), [Kokoszka and Zhang \(2012\)](#), [Hsing and Eubank \(2015\)](#), and [Kokoszka and Reimherr \(2017\)](#).

Functional time series analysis is an important area within FDA, focusing on functional data with temporal dependence. From the modeling perspective, [Cai et al. \(2000\)](#) focused on functional regression via local linear modeling; [Kowal et al. \(2017\)](#) investigated functional linear models; and [Kowal et al. \(2019\)](#) explored functional autoregression. To analysis functional time series, [Panaretos and Tavakoli \(2013\)](#) employed a Fourier analysis-based approach and [Rubín](#)

and Panaretos (2020) considered the estimation of the dynamics of functional time series in a sparse sampling regime. We refer to Koner and Staicu (2023) for a comprehensive survey.

In this paper, we focus on a functional linear regression model with the slope function changing in a piece-wise constant manner. Given the data sequence  $\{(y_j, X_j)\}_{j=1}^n$ , we consider the model

$$y_j = \langle \beta_j^*, X_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \varepsilon_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \quad (1)$$

where  $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^n$  are the scalar responses,  $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$  the functional covariates,  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^n$  the centered noise sequence, and  $\{\beta_j^*\}_{j=1}^n$  the true slope functions. Here, we denote  $\langle \beta_j^*, X_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \int \beta_j^*(u) X_j(u) du$ . We assume that there exists a collection of time points  $\{\eta_k\}_{k=0}^{\mathcal{K}+1} \subset \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  with  $0 = \eta_0 < \eta_1 < \dots < \eta_{\mathcal{K}} < \eta_{\mathcal{K}+1} = n$  such that

$$\beta_j^* \neq \beta_{j+1}^* \quad \text{if and only if} \quad j \in \{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\mathcal{K}}\}. \quad (2)$$

We refer to the model specified in (1) and (2) as the functional linear regression model with change points. Our goals are twofold: to estimate the locations of the change points consistently, and to derive the limiting distributions of these estimators and consequently construct an asymptotically valid confidence interval around each change point.

The considered problems are part of the vast body of change point analysis. The primary interest of change point analysis is to detect the existence of change points and estimate change points' locations in various data types. Wang et al. (2020) and Sullivan and Woodall (2000) have addressed the detection of changes in the mean and covariance of a sequence of fixed-dimensional multivariate data, while Wang and Samworth (2018) and Kaul et al. (2023) have focused on high-dimensional settings. Change point problems have been investigated in various settings, such as signal processing (Tartakovsky et al., 2012), regression (Lee et al., 2016), networks (Barnett and Onnela, 2016), and factor models (Barigozzi et al., 2018), to name but a few. In functional settings, Dette and Kutta (2021) studied the detection of changes in the eigensystem, while Li et al. (2022), Harris et al. (2022), and Madrid Padilla et al. (2022) considered problems related to detecting changes in the mean and Jiao et al. (2023) that in the covariance. Change point detection problems within this context have also been investigated in the Bayesian framework, e.g. Li and Ghosal (2021). Beyond estimation of change points, recently, the limiting distributions of change point estimators have been studied in high-dimensional regression (Xu et al., 2022b; Kaul and Michailidis, 2021), multivariate non-parametric (Madrid Padilla et al., 2023) as well as functional (Aue et al., 2009, 2018) settings.

Despite these contributions, the estimation and inference of change points in functional linear regression settings remain unaddressed, and this paper aims to fill this gap. To this end, we first propose a two-step procedure based on RKHS, to detect and locate the multiple change points. Then, we investigate limiting distributions of change point estimators and introduce a new methodology to construct a confidence interval for each change point. This requires the estimation of long-run variance in the presence of temporal dependence which is of independent interest on its own, as highlighted by studies such as Khismatullina and Vogt (2020) and Hörmann and Kokoszka (2010).

The framework adopted in this study is general, accommodating heavy-tailedness and temporal dependence in both functional covariates and noise sequences. More specifically, our methodology only requires the existence of sixth moments and a polynomial decay of  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients for both functional covariates and noise sequences, which greatly expands its applicability. We also allow for the number of change points, denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ , to diverge with the sample size.

## 1.1 List of contributions

We briefly summarise the main contributions made in this paper below.

- To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first attempt at estimating and inferring change points in functional linear regression settings. Our theory only requires weak moment assumptions as well as accommodates temporal dependence and the number of change points to increase with the sample size. Besides the error bound for change point localization, we establish the corresponding minimax lower bound, thereby demonstrating the optimality of the proposed change point estimator.
- To facilitate the practicability of our inference procedure, we introduce a block-type long-run variance estimator and prove its consistency. This estimator is subsequently employed to construct an asymptotically valid confidence interval for each change point.
- We demonstrate the numerical performance of our proposed method through extensive numerical examples and real data analysis using Standard and Poor's 500 index datasets. Our approach numerically outperforms alternative change point estimation methods that rely on FPCA or high-dimensional regression methods.

## 1.2 Basics of RKHS

This section briefly reviews the basics of RKHS that are relevant to functional linear regression. We refer to [Wainwright \(2019\)](#) for a detailed introduction to RKHS.

For any compact set  $\mathcal{T}$ , denote the space of square-integrable functions defined on  $\mathcal{T}$  as

$$\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) = \left\{ f : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \int_{\mathcal{T}} f^2(u) du < \infty \right\}.$$

For any  $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ , let

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \int_{\mathcal{T}} f(u)g(u) du.$$

For a linear map  $F$  from  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$  to  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ , define  $\|F\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{\|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \|F(h)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ . A kernel function  $R : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a symmetric and nonnegative definite function. The integral operator  $L_R$  of  $R$  is a linear map from  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$  to  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$  defined as

$$L_R(f)(\cdot) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} R(\cdot, u) f(u) du.$$

Suppose in addition that  $R$  is bounded. Then, Mercer's theorem (e.g. Theorem 12.20 of [Wainwright \(2019\)](#)) implies that there exists a set of orthonormal eigenfunctions  $\{\psi_l^R\}_{l=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$  and a sequence of nonnegative eigenvalues  $\{\theta_l^R\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  sorted non-increasingly, such that

$$R(u_1, u_2) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \theta_l^R \psi_l^R(u_1) \psi_l^R(u_2).$$

Thus, we have that  $L_R(\psi_l^R) = \theta_l^R \psi_l^R$ . Define the RKHS generated by  $R$  as

$$\mathcal{H}(R) = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) : \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}(R)}^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\langle f, \psi_l^R \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2}{\theta_l^R} < \infty \right\}.$$

For any  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}(R)$ , denote

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}(R)} = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\langle f, \psi_l^R \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle g, \psi_l^R \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\theta_l^R}. \quad (3)$$

Define

$$R^{1/2}(u_1, u_2) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\theta_l^R} \psi_l^R(u_1) \psi_l^R(u_2).$$

Thus,  $L_{R^{1/2}}(\psi_l^R) = \sqrt{\theta_l^R} \psi_l^R$ . It follows that  $L_{R^{1/2}} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(R)$  is bijective and distance-preserving. In addition, if  $\{\Phi_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  is a  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$  basis, then  $\{L_{R^{1/2}}(\Phi_l)\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  is a basis of  $\mathcal{H}(R)$ . For any  $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ , denote

$$R[f, g] = \iint_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}} f(u_1) R(u_1, u_2) g(u_2) du_1 du_2.$$

Let  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  be any generic kernel functions. We denote the composition of  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  as

$$R_1 R_2(u_1, u_2) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} R_1(u_1, v) R_2(v, u_2) dv.$$

### 1.3 Notation and organization

For two positive real number sequences  $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  and  $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ , we write  $a_j \lesssim b_j$  or  $a_j = O(b_j)$  if there exists an absolute positive constant  $C$  such that  $a_j \leq C b_j$ . We denote  $a_j \asymp b_j$ , if  $a_j \lesssim b_j$  and  $b_j \lesssim a_j$ . We write  $a_j = o(b_j)$  if  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} b_j^{-1} a_j \rightarrow 0$ . For a sequence of  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variables  $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ , we denote  $X_j = O_{\mathbb{P}}(a_j)$  if  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_j \mathbb{P}(|X_j| \geq M a_j) = 0$ . We denote  $X_j = o_{\mathbb{P}}(a_j)$  if  $\limsup_j \mathbb{P}(|X_j| \geq M a_j) = 0$  for all  $M > 0$ . The convergences in distribution and probability are respectively denoted by  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $\xrightarrow{P}$ . With slight abuse of notations, for any positive integers  $s$  and  $e$  where  $0 \leq s < e < n$ , we use  $(s, e]$  to denote the set  $(s, e] \cap \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our new methodology for estimating multiple change points within functional linear regression settings. Section 3 studies the theoretical properties of the proposed estimators, establishing their minimax optimality and limiting distributions. In Section 4, we discuss the construction of confidence intervals around each change point and provide an asymptotically valid procedure for the long-run variance estimation. Finally, Section 5 demonstrates the superior performance of our proposed method through its application to both simulated and real-world datasets, highlighting its advantages over potential competitors. The implementation of the proposed methodology can be found at

<https://github.com/civamkr/FRBS>.

## 2 Change point estimation

In this section, we introduce our method for change point estimation under the functional linear regression model defined in (1). To motivate our approach, we first consider a closely related two-sample testing problem in the functional linear regression setting. Given data  $\{(y_j, X_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  generated from (1), consider

$$H_0 : \beta_{s+1}^* = \dots = \beta_e^* \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_a : \beta_{s+1}^* = \dots = \beta_t^* \neq \beta_{t+1}^* = \dots = \beta_e^*,$$

where  $0 < s < t < e \leq n$ . In other words, we are interested in testing whether there is a change in the slope function at time  $t$  within the interval  $(s, e]$ . The corresponding likelihood ratio statistic is

$$\widehat{W}_t^{s,e} = \frac{\max_{\beta \in \mathcal{H}(K)} \mathfrak{L}(\{y_j, X_j\}_{j=s+1}^e, \beta)}{\max_{\beta_1 \in \mathcal{H}(K)} \mathfrak{L}(\{y_j, X_j\}_{j=s+1}^t, \beta_1) \max_{\beta_2 \in \mathcal{H}(K)} \mathfrak{L}(\{y_j, X_j\}_{j=t+1}^e, \beta_2)} \quad (4)$$

where, assuming for the moment that  $\{\epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^n$  are i.i.d. standard normal, we have the likelihood function  $\mathfrak{L}(\{y_j, X_j\}_{j=s+1}^e, \beta) = \prod_{j=s+1}^e (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-(y_j - \langle X_j, \beta \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2/2}$ , and  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  denotes RKHS corresponding to kernel  $K$  defined in Assumption 2 below. Note that (4) can be further simplified to

$$\widehat{W}_t^{s,e} = \sum_{j=s+1}^e \left( y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left( y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(t,e]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2, \quad (5)$$

where  $\widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]}$  is the maximum likelihood estimator of the slope function based on  $\{(y_j, X_j)\}_{j=s+1}^e$ . In practice, finding  $\widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]}$  is a challenging task, as the intrinsic dimension of  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  is infinite. Inspired by Cai and Yuan (2012), we consider the following penalized estimator

$$\widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]} = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{H}(K)} \left\{ \frac{1}{(e-s)} \sum_{j \in (s,e]} (y_j - \langle X_j, \beta \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 + \lambda_{e-s} \|\beta\|_{\mathcal{H}(K)}^2 \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\lambda_{e-s}$  is a tuning parameter to ensure the smoothness of the estimator. While (6) is an optimization problem in an infinite-dimensional space, the solution can be found in a finite-dimensional subspace via the representer theorem in RKHS (Yuan and Cai, 2010), and is therefore statistically sound and numerically robust. In this case, the population counterpart of (5) is

$$W_t^{s,e} = \frac{(t-s)(e-t)}{(e-s)} \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^*, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^*], \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta_{(s,e]}^* = (e-s)^{-1} \sum_{j=s+1}^e \beta_j^*$ , and  $\Sigma$  is the covariance operator of  $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ , the centered and stationary covariate sequence, i.e.  $\Sigma(u_1, u_2) = \mathbb{E}(X_1(u_1)X_1(u_2))$ . To illustrate the effectiveness of the likelihood ratio statistics  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$  in revealing the location of a change point, we demonstrate in Figure 1 that displays  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$  and its population counterpart  $W_t^{s,e}$  in a situation where the interval  $(s, e]$  contains a single change point at  $\eta$ . We observe that  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$  closely approximates  $W_t^{s,e}$ , which is a ‘tent-shape’ function in  $t$  and is maximized at  $\eta$ , and thus  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$  attains its maximum close to  $\eta$  (in fact, exactly at  $\eta$  in this example).

In what follows, we propose a two-step method for change point estimation in functional regression time series. In Step 1, we propose a computationally efficient approach based on the statistic  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$ , to generate preliminary change point estimators. Then, in Step 2, we utilize the preliminary estimators from Step 1 to develop the final estimators with enhanced accuracy.

### Step 1: preliminary estimator

In Step 1, our goal is to consistently estimate change points with computational efficiency. Our approach utilizes the seeded binary segmentation first proposed in Kovács et al. (2023), which, with a set of deterministic intervals drawn as in Definition 1 below, systematically scans for change points in the data at multiple resolutions.




Figure 1: Plot of  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$  and its population version  $W_t^{s,e}$  with  $s = 0$  and  $e = 200$  over  $t = 1, \dots, 199$ . The data are simulated under Scenario 1 (Section 5.1) with  $n = 200$  and a change point occurs at  $\eta = 100$ . The estimator  $\widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]}$  is obtained with  $\lambda_{e-s} = 0.2$ . Both  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$  and  $W_t^{s,e}$  achieve their maximum at  $t = 100$ .

**Definition 1** (Seeded intervals). *Let  $n$  be the length of a given time series and  $\Delta$  a given integer satisfying  $0 < \Delta < n$ . Letting  $M = \lceil \log_2(n/\Delta) \rceil + 1$  be the total number of layers, denote  $\mathfrak{l}_k = n/2^{k-1}$  and  $\mathfrak{b}_k = \mathfrak{l}_k/2 = n/2^k$ , for the layer index  $k = 1, \dots, M$ . Then, the collection of seeded intervals is defined as*

$$\mathcal{J} = \bigcup_{k=1}^M \mathcal{J}_k \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{J}_k = \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^k-1} \left\{ \left[ \lfloor (i-1)\mathfrak{b}_k \rfloor, \lfloor (i-1)\mathfrak{b}_k + \mathfrak{l}_k \rfloor \right] \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_k$  is the seeded intervals in the  $k$ -th layer.

The total number of the intervals in  $\mathcal{J}$  is bounded from above by

$$|\mathcal{J}| = \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{n}{\Delta}) \rceil + 1} (2^k - 1) = 2^{\lceil \log_2(\frac{n}{\Delta}) \rceil + 2} - 3 - \left\lceil \log_2\left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) \right\rceil \leq 8 \left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right). \quad (8)$$

Note that by the construction of  $\mathcal{J}$ , each change point  $\eta_k$  is contained in exactly two intervals that belong to the last layer of the seeded intervals,  $\mathcal{J}_M$ . We exploit this fact in Step 2 for the refined change point estimator.

Algorithm 1 outlines the procedure of computing the preliminary change point estimators, which is called with  $(s, e] = (0, n]$ . This algorithm recursively detects change points based on the likelihood ratio statistics  $\{\widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m}, s_m < t < e_m\}$  defined in (5). Specifically, using the set of seeded intervals, the algorithm iteratively identifies the shortest interval associated with a strong signal for a change (in the sense that  $\widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m}$  exceeds a threshold  $\tau$ ), an idea first proposed by Baranowski et al. (2019) for detecting multiple change points in the mean of a univariate time series. Upon detection of each change point, it stores the estimator and proceeds to search for further change points separately within the sections of the data determined by two consecutive estimators previously detected. In the absence of a change point within a data section  $(s, e]$ , we expect all  $\widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m}$ ,  $s < t < e$ , to fall below the given threshold  $\tau$ , in which case the algorithm excludes the interval  $(s, e]$  from further consideration. In addition to the

threshold  $\tau$ , Algorithm 1 requires the choice of the regularization parameter  $\lambda_{e,s}$  for the local estimation of the slope function, which takes the form  $\lambda_{e-s} = \omega(e-s)^{-2r/(2r+1)}$  with some  $\omega > 0$  and  $r$  that controls the regularity of the regression coefficient (see Assumption 2). The choice of these tuning parameters are discussed in Section 5.

---

**Algorithm 1** Functional Regression Binary Segmentation: FRBS( $(s, e], \mathcal{J}, \omega, \tau$ ).

---

**INPUT:** Data  $\{(y_j, X_j)\}_{j=1}^n$ , seeded intervals  $\mathcal{J}$ , tuning parameters  $\omega, \tau > 0$ .

**Initialize:** If  $(s, e] = (0, n]$ , the estimated change point set  $\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \emptyset$ .

**for**  $(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}$  **do**

    compute  $\widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m}$  with  $\lambda_{e_m - s_m} = \omega(e_m - s_m)^{-\frac{2r}{2r+1}}$

**if**  $(s_m, e_m] \subset (s, e]$  **then**

$b_m \leftarrow \arg \max_{s_m < t < e_m} \widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m}$

$a_m \leftarrow \widehat{W}_{b_m}^{s_m, e_m}$

**else**

$a_m = 0$

**end if**

**end for**

$\mathcal{M}^{s,e} := \{m : a_m > \tau\}$

**if**  $\mathcal{M}^{s,e} \neq \emptyset$  **then**

$m^* \leftarrow \arg \min_{m \in \mathcal{M}^{s,e}} |e_m - s_m|$

$\widehat{\mathcal{B}} \leftarrow \widehat{\mathcal{B}} \cup \{b_{m^*}\}$

    FRBS  $((s, b_{m^*}], \mathcal{J}, \omega, \tau)$

    FRBS  $((b_{m^*}, e], \mathcal{J}, \omega, \tau)$

**end if**

**OUTPUT:**  $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ .

---

## Step 2: refined estimator

Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \{\widehat{\eta}_k, 1 \leq k \leq \widehat{\mathcal{K}} : \widehat{\eta}_1 < \dots < \widehat{\eta}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}\}$  denote the set of preliminary change point estimators returned by Algorithm 1. In this step, we produce the refined estimators  $\{\widetilde{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$  with enhanced accuracy.

For each  $k = 1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ , let  $(s_k^{(1)}, e_k^{(1)})$  and  $(s_k^{(2)}, e_k^{(2)})$  be the two seeded intervals in  $\mathcal{J}_M$  that contains  $\widehat{\eta}_k$ , where  $\mathcal{J}_M$  is the last layer of seeded intervals from Definition 1. Further, we write

$$s_k = \min\{s_k^{(1)}, s_k^{(2)}\}, \quad e_k = \max\{e_k^{(1)}, e_k^{(2)}\}. \quad (9)$$

The localization performance of our preliminary estimator ensures that, with high probability, the interval  $(s_k, e_k]$  contains one and only one change point  $\eta_k$  and it is sufficiently large (see Lemma C.3 in appendix). Over such  $(s_k, e_k]$ , we apply the following refinement procedure to further enhance the accuracy of the change point estimator, which also enables the investigation into the asymptotic distribution of the resultant estimator. For each  $k$ , let

$$\widetilde{\eta}_k = \arg \min_{s_k < t < e_k} \mathcal{Q}_k(t), \quad \text{where} \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_k(t) = \sum_{j=s_k+1}^t \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=t+1}^{e_k} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2.$$

As shown later in Section 3.2, the refined estimator  $\widetilde{\eta}_k$  attains the rate of localization matching the minimax lower bound, and thus is minimax optimal.

### 3 Theoretical properties

In this section, we establish theoretical properties of the change point estimators proposed in Section 2. We first introduce the required assumptions for the model (1)–(2), which permit temporal dependence and heavy-tailedness in the data.

To quantify the degree of temporal dependence, we adopt the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficient which is a standard tool commonly used in the time series literature. Recall that a stochastic process  $\{Z_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is said to be  $\alpha$ -mixing (strong mixing) if

$$\alpha(k) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha(\sigma(Z_s, s \leq t), \sigma(Z_s, s \geq t+k)) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where we write  $\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) - \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)|$  for any two  $\sigma$ -fields  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ . Assumption 1 concerns the distributions of the functional covariates and the noise sequence.

**Assumption 1.**

(i) The functional covariate sequence  $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[X_j] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\|X_j\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2] < \infty$ , and for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ , there exists some constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$(\mathbb{E}[\langle X_j, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^6])^{1/6} \leq c(\mathbb{E}[\langle X_j, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2])^{1/2}.$$

(ii) The noise sequence  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_j | X_j] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_j^6 | X_j] < \infty$ .

(iii) The sequence  $\{(X_j, \varepsilon_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  is stationary and  $\alpha$ -mixing with the mixing coefficients satisfying  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{1/3} \alpha^{1/3}(k) < \infty$ .

Under Assumption 1, the functional covariate and the noise sequences are allowed to possess heavy tails. In particular, Assumption 1 (i) assumes that the 6-th moment of the random variable  $\langle X_j, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$  is bounded by its second moment, which holds if e.g. each  $X_j$  is a Gaussian process. Similar assumptions on the moments of the functional covariate are made in Cai and Yuan (2012) for the investigation into the penalized slope estimator in (6) in the stationary setting. The  $\alpha$ -mixing condition essentially requires that  $\alpha(k) = o(1/k^4)$ , allowing the mixing coefficient to decay at a polynomial rate.

**Assumption 2.**

(i) The slope function satisfies  $\beta_j^* \in \mathcal{H}(K)$ , for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  is the RKHS generated by the kernel function  $K$ .

(ii) It holds that

$$K^{1/2} \Sigma K^{1/2}(t_1, t_2) = \sum_{l \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_l \phi_l(t_1) \phi_l(t_2),$$

where  $\{\phi_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  are the eigenfunctions and  $\{\mathfrak{s}_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  the corresponding eigenvalues satisfying  $\mathfrak{s}_l \asymp l^{-2r}$  for some constant  $r > 1$ .

Assumption 2 (i) requires that the slope functions are in the RKHS generated by the kernel function  $K$ , which regularizes the smoothness of the slope function. Assumption 2 (ii) requires that the function  $K^{1/2} \Sigma K^{1/2}$  admits an eigen-decomposition with polynomial-decaying eigenvalues, which controls the regularity of regression prediction. Both Assumption 2 (i) and (ii) are also found in Cai and Yuan (2012).

Under the model (1), we define the change size of two consecutive slope functions as

$$\kappa_k^2 = \Sigma[\beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*]. \quad (11)$$

The form of  $\kappa_k^2$  is closely related to the population counterpart (defined in (6)) of the likelihood ratio statistics  $\widehat{W}_t^{s,e}$  in (5). In fact, if the time interval  $(s, e]$  contains only one change point  $\eta_k$ , the statistic  $\widehat{W}_{\eta_k}^{s,e}$  converges asymptotically to  $W_{\eta_k}^{s,e}$ , which in turn satisfies

$$W_{\eta_k}^{s,e} = \frac{(\eta_k - s)(e - \eta_k)}{(e - s)} \Sigma[\beta_{(s,\eta_k)}^* - \beta_{(\eta_k,t)}^*, \beta_{(s,\eta_k)}^* - \beta_{(\eta_k,t)}^*] = \frac{(\eta_k - s)(e - \eta_k)}{(e - s)} \kappa_k^2. \quad (12)$$

The detectability of each change point  $\eta_k$  depends on both the change size  $\kappa_k$  and how far it is from the adjacent change points. Therefore, we define the minimal change size and the minimal spacing of change points as

$$\kappa = \min_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}} \kappa_k \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta = \min_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}+1} (\eta_k - \eta_{k-1}),$$

respectively. Assumption 3 specifies the signal-to-noise condition for the consistency of our method in terms of  $\kappa$  and  $\Delta$ .

**Assumption 3.** *Suppose that*

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\kappa^2 \Delta^2}{n \cdot n^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n)}, \frac{\kappa^2 \Delta^{r/(2r+1)}}{\log^{1+2\xi}(\Delta)} \right\} \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\xi > 0$  is some constant and  $r$  is defined in Assumption 2.

To establish the consistency of the preliminary estimators in Theorem 1, it is sufficient to have

$$\kappa^2 \Delta^2 / (n \cdot n^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n)) \rightarrow \infty.$$

The additional requirement that

$$\kappa^2 \Delta^{r/(2r+1)} / \log^{1+2\xi}(\Delta) \rightarrow \infty,$$

is required to derive the limiting distribution of the refined estimator in Theorem 2. When  $\Delta$  is of the same order as  $n$ , since  $r > 1$ , the first condition in Assumption 3 dominates and it is simplified to  $\kappa^2 \Delta^{2r/(2r+1)} \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar assumptions have been employed in Madrid Padilla et al. (2021, 2024) for nonparametric change point analysis, where the smoothness of the density function plays a similar role as  $r$ .

### 3.1 Consistency of the preliminary estimator

We first present the main theorem establishing the consistency of Algorithm 1 and the associated rate of localization.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Let  $c_{\tau,1} > 32$  and  $c_{\tau,2} \in (0, 1/20)$  denote absolute constants. Suppose that  $\tau$  satisfies*

$$c_{\tau,1} \left( \frac{n}{\Delta} \right) n^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n) < \tau < c_{\tau,2} \kappa^2 \Delta, \quad (13)$$

where  $r$  and  $\xi$  are defined in Assumptions 2 and 3, respectively, and that  $\omega > 1/2$  is any finite constant. Also, let  $\mathcal{J}$  be seeded intervals constructed according to Definition 1 with  $\Delta$  defined in Assumption 3. Then, FRBS( $(0, n], \mathcal{J}, \omega, \tau$ ) outputs  $\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \{\widehat{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$  which satisfies

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \widehat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}; \max_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}} \kappa_k^2 |\widehat{\eta}_k - \eta_k| \leq C_1 \left( \frac{n}{\Delta} \right) \Delta^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $2 < C_1 < c_{\tau,1}/16$ .

Theorem 1 shows that uniformly for all  $k = 1, \dots, \mathcal{K}$ ,

$$|\widehat{\eta}_k - \eta_k| = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \kappa_k^{-2} \left( \frac{n}{\Delta} \right) \Delta^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\Delta),$$

where the last equality follows from Assumption 3.

### 3.2 Consistency and the limiting distributions of the refined estimators

In this subsection, we analyze the consistency and the limiting distributions of the refined change point estimators. In particular, we demonstrate that the limiting distribution of the refined change point estimator  $\widetilde{\eta}_k$  is divided into two regimes determined by the change size  $\kappa_k$ : (i) the non-vanishing regime where  $\kappa_k \rightarrow \varrho_k$  for some positive constant  $\varrho_k > 0$ ; and (ii) the vanishing regime where  $\kappa_k \rightarrow 0$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Let  $\{\widetilde{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$  denote the refined change point estimators obtained as in (10) and assume that  $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}$ .*

- A. (Non-vanishing regime) *For any given  $k \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}\}$ , suppose  $\kappa_k \rightarrow \varrho_k$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $\varrho_k > 0$  being an absolute constant. Then  $|\widetilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . In addition, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\widetilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \min_{\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}} S_k(\gamma)$$

where, for  $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $S_k(\gamma)$  is a two-sided random walk defined as

$$S_k(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=\gamma}^{-1} \left\{ -2\varrho_k \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + \varrho_k^2 \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} & \text{for } \gamma < 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } \gamma = 0, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma} \left\{ 2\varrho_k \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + \varrho_k^2 \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} & \text{for } \gamma > 0, \end{cases}$$

with

$$\Psi_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^*}{\sqrt{\Sigma \left[ \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^*, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right]}}.$$

- B. (Vanishing regime) *For any given  $k \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}\}$ , suppose  $\kappa_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $|\widetilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\kappa_k^{-2})$ . In addition, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\kappa_k^2 (\widetilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \min_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \{ |\gamma| + \sigma_{\infty}(k) \mathbb{W}(\gamma) \},$$

where

$$\sigma_{\infty}^2(k) = 4 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j}{\kappa_k} \right), \quad (14)$$

and  $\mathbb{W}(\gamma)$  is a two-sided standard Brownian motion defined as

$$\mathbb{W}(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{B}_1(-\gamma) & \text{for } \gamma < 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } \gamma = 0, \\ \mathbb{B}_2(\gamma) & \text{for } \gamma > 0, \end{cases}$$

with  $\mathbb{B}_1(r)$  and  $\mathbb{B}_2(r)$  denoting two independent standard Brownian motions.

Theorem 2 establishes the localization error bound with rate  $\kappa_k^{-2}$  for the refined change point estimator as well as the corresponding limiting distributions. The localization error bound in Theorem 2 significantly improves upon that attained by the preliminary estimator derived in Theorem 1. Note that Theorem 2 assumes  $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = K$ , which holds asymptotically with probability tending to one by Theorem 1. We make a similar condition in Theorems 3 and 4 below.

In the following Lemma 1, we further provide a matching lower bound to show that the localization error rate established in Theorem 2 is minimax optimal.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\{(y_j, X_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  be a functional regression time series following the models in (1)–(2) with  $\mathcal{K} = 1$ , and suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let  $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa, \Delta}^n$  be the corresponding joint distribution. For any diverging sequence  $\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ , consider the class of distributions*

$$\mathfrak{P} = \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{\kappa, \Delta}^n : \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa^2 \Delta^2}{n \cdot n^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n)}, \frac{\kappa^2 \Delta^{r/(2r+1)}}{\log^{1+2\xi}(\Delta)} \right\} > \rho_n \right\}.$$

Then for sufficiently large  $n$ , it holds that

$$\inf_{\hat{\eta}} \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathfrak{P}} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\eta} - \eta(\mathbb{P})|] \geq \frac{1}{\kappa^2 e^2}.$$

The class of distributions  $\mathfrak{P}$  encompasses all possible scenarios where Assumption 3 is satisfied. Lemma 1 complements the upper bound established in Theorem 2 in both the vanishing and the non-vanishing regimes. The matching bounds in Theorem 2 and Lemma 1 indicate that our refined estimator is minimax optimal.

## 4 Confidence interval for the change points

In this section, we provide a practical way to construct confidence intervals for the true change points under the vanishing regime based on the limiting distribution derived in Theorem 2B. Since the limiting distribution in the vanishing regime contains an unknown long-run variance, we study a consistent estimator before proposing our method for constructing confidence intervals for true change points.

### 4.1 Long run variance estimation

To utilize the limiting distribution in the vanishing regime derived in Theorem 2B, we first need to consistently estimate the long-run variance  $\sigma_\infty^2(k)$  defined in (14). The long-run variance depends on the size of change  $\kappa_k$  at the change point  $\eta_k$  as defined in (11). To this end, we propose the plug-in estimator

$$\hat{\kappa}_k = \sqrt{\hat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k)} \left[ \hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k)} - \hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k)}, \hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k)} - \hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k)} \right]}, \quad (15)$$

where  $s_k$  and  $e_k$  are defined in (9),  $\hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k)}$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k)}$  are obtained in (6), and

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k)}(u_1, u_2) = \frac{1}{e_k - s_k} \sum_{j=s_k+1}^{e_k} X_j(u_1) X_j(u_2)$$

is the sample covariance operator for the functional data  $\{X_j\}_{j=s_k+1}^{e_k}$ . We show the consistency of  $\hat{\kappa}_k$  in Lemma D.1 in appendix. Note that for simplicity we use  $\hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k)}$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k)}$ , which are the by-products of Algorithm 1. It is also possible to construct a consistent estimator of

$\kappa_k$  using the refitted slope functions after obtaining the refined change point estimators  $\tilde{\eta}_k$ . For the same reason, we also use  $\hat{\beta}_{(s,e]}$  in Algorithm 2 to estimate the long-run variance.

For the estimation of  $\sigma_\infty^2(k)$ , we make use of a block-type strategy which has previously been adopted by Casini and Perron (2021) for the estimation of the long-run variance in a fixed-dimensional time series setting. In Algorithm 2, we outline our proposal for the estimation of  $\sigma_\infty^2(k)$ . Our proposed method first partitions the data into mutually disjoint blocks of size  $2q$  for some positive integer  $q$ , and filters out the intervals that contain change point estimators and which are adjacent to them. This filtering ensures that with high probability, the remaining intervals do not contain any change point. Let us denote the set of remaining intervals by  $\mathcal{P}$ . For each given  $\mathcal{I} = (m, m + 2q] \in \mathcal{P}$ , we first compute the statistic

$$Z_j = \hat{\kappa}_k^{-1} \cdot \left\langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k]} - \hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \cdot \left( y_j - \left\langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(m, m+2q]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)$$

at each  $j \in \mathcal{I}$ , which approximates the sequence  $\kappa_k^{-1} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j$ . Then, we compute the scaled sample average of the centered sequence  $Z_j - Z_{j+q}$ ,  $j = m+1, \dots, m+q$ , and denote it by  $F_{\mathcal{I}}$ . The estimator  $\hat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k)$  is obtained as the average of the square of  $F_{\mathcal{I}}$  over  $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Long run variance estimation:  $\text{LRV}(\{\hat{\beta}_{(s,e]}\}, \{\hat{\kappa}_k\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}, \{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}, q, \omega)$

---

**INPUT:** Preliminary estimators  $\{\hat{\kappa}_k\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$  and  $\{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$ , tuning parameter  $q \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

$$\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \{1, \dots, \lfloor n/2q \rfloor\} - \bigcup_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}} \{ \lfloor \tilde{\eta}_k/2q \rfloor - 1, \lfloor \tilde{\eta}_k/2q \rfloor, \lfloor \tilde{\eta}_k/2q \rfloor + 1 \}$$

$$\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \{ (2q \cdot (i-1), 2q \cdot i] \} \quad \triangleright \mathcal{P} \text{ is a collection of mutually disjoint intervals in } (0, n].$$

**for**  $k = 1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{K}}$  **do**

    Compute  $s_k$  and  $e_k$  as in (9),

**for**  $\mathcal{I} = (m, m + 2q] \in \mathcal{P}$  **do**

**for**  $j \in (m, m + 2q]$  **do**

$$Z_j \leftarrow \hat{\kappa}_k^{-1} \cdot \left\langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k]} - \hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \cdot \left( y_j - \left\langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(m, m+2q]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)$$

**end for**

$$F_{\mathcal{I}} \leftarrow \sqrt{2} q^{-1/2} \left\{ \sum_{j=m+1}^{m+q} (Z_j - Z_{j+q}) \right\}$$

**end for**

$$\hat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k) \leftarrow |\mathcal{P}|^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}} (F_{\mathcal{I}})^2$$

**end for**

**OUTPUT:**  $\{\hat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k)\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$ .

---

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that all the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold and that  $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}$ . In Algorithm 2, let  $\{(s_k, e_k)\}_{k=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$  be defined as in (9),  $\{\tilde{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$  be the refined estimators as in (10),  $\{\hat{\kappa}_k\}_{k=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$  be defined as in (15), and  $q$  be an integer satisfying

$$\left( \frac{\log^{2+2\xi}(\Delta)}{\kappa^2} \right)^{\frac{2r+1}{2r-1}} \ll q \ll \Delta. \quad (16)$$

Denote by  $\{\hat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k)\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$  the output of Algorithm 2. Then, for any given  $k \in \{1, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{K}}\}$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma_\infty^2(k)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

The choice of the tuning parameter  $q$  needs to balance the bias within each interval and the variance between all intervals in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The practical choice of  $q$  is outlined in Section 5.1.

## 4.2 Confidence interval construction

In this subsection, we outline the practical procedure for constructing an asymptotically valid confidence interval in the vanishing regime for each change point. For any given  $k \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}\}$  and confidence level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the construction of a  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  confidence interval for  $\eta_k$  is performed in two steps:

**Step I.** Let  $B \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $b \in \{1, \dots, B\}$ , define

$$\widehat{u}_k^{(b)} = \arg \min_{r \in (-\infty, \infty)} \left( |r| + \widehat{\sigma}_\infty(k) \mathbb{W}^{(b)}(r) \right) \quad (17)$$

where  $\widehat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k)$  is the long-run variance estimator obtained from Algorithm 2, and

$$\mathbb{W}^{(b)}(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=\lfloor nr \rfloor}^{-1} z_j^{(b)} & \text{for } r < 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } r = 0, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{\lceil nr \rceil} z_j^{(b)} & \text{for } r > 0, \end{cases}$$

with  $\{z_j^{(b)}\}_{j=-\infty}^\infty$  being i.i.d. standard normal random variables.

**Step II.** Let  $\widehat{q}_{k,\alpha/2}$  and  $\widehat{q}_{k,1-\alpha/2}$  be the  $\alpha/2$ -quantile and  $(1 - \alpha/2)$ -quantile of the empirical distribution of  $\{\widehat{u}_k^{(b)}\}_{b=1}^B$ . Then, the confidence interval for  $\eta_k$  is constructed as

$$\left[ \widetilde{\eta}_k - \frac{\widehat{q}_{k,\alpha/2}}{\widehat{\kappa}_k^2}, \widetilde{\eta}_k + \frac{\widehat{q}_{k,1-\alpha/2}}{\widehat{\kappa}_k^2} \right], \quad (18)$$

where  $\widehat{\kappa}_k^2$  is defined in (15).

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose that all the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold, and that  $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}$ . For any given  $k \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}\}$  and  $b = 1, \dots, B$ , let  $\widehat{u}_k^{(b)}$  be defined as in (17). Then, it holds that*

$$\frac{\widehat{\kappa}_k^2}{\widehat{\kappa}_k^2} \widehat{u}_k^{(b)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \min_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \{ |r| + \sigma_\infty(k) \mathbb{W}(r) \} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Theorem 4 implies that the confidence intervals proposed in (18) is asymptotic valid in the *vanishing regime* considered in Theorem 2B. Confidence interval construction under the non-vanishing regime remains a challenging problem as the limiting distribution involves random quantities of typically unknown distributions. There are some recent attempts on this problem (e.g. Kaul and Michailidis, 2021; Ng et al., 2022; Cho and Kirch, 2022). However, to the best of our knowledge, there are few theoretical studies for confidence interval construction under the non-vanishing regime in the presence of temporal dependence.

## 5 Numerical results

In this section, we perform numerical experiments on simulated and real datasets to investigate the performance of the proposed change point estimation and inference procedure, which contains three steps: (i) the preliminary estimation of the change points, (ii) the refinement of change point estimators and (iii) the construction of confidence intervals. Throughout, we refer to our combined procedure as ‘FRBS’.

## 5.1 Simulation studies

**Settings.** We modify the simulation settings of [Yuan and Cai \(2010\)](#) or [Cai and Yuan \(2012\)](#) by introducing temporal dependence in  $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$  and changes in  $\{\beta_j^*\}_{j=1}^n$ . Specifically, we simulate data from the model described in (1), where the error process  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^n$  is a sequence of i.i.d. standard normal random variables, and  $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$  is a stationary process following

$$X_j = \sum_{m=1}^{50} \zeta_m Z_{m,j} \phi_m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n,$$

with  $\phi_1 = 1$ ,  $\phi_{m+1} = \sqrt{2} \cos(m\pi t)$  for  $m \geq 1$  and  $\zeta_m = (-1)^{m+1} m^{-1}$ . For each  $m \geq 1$ ,  $\{Z_{m,j}\}_{j=1}^n$  is independently generated as an autoregressive process, i.e.  $Z_{m,j} = 0.3Z_{m,j-1} + \sqrt{1 - 0.3^2} \cdot e_{m,j}$  with  $e_{m,j} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ . Note that  $\zeta_m^2 = m^{-2}$  are the eigenvalues of the covariance function of  $X_j$ , and  $\phi_m$  are the corresponding eigenfunctions.

Let

$$\beta^{(0)} = 4 \sum_{m=1}^{50} (-1)^{m+1} m^{-4} \phi_m \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^{(1)} = (4 - c_\beta) \sum_{m=1}^{50} (-1)^{m+1} m^{-2} \phi_m,$$

where the coefficient  $c_\beta \in \{0.5, 1\}$ . We consider the slope functions

$$\beta_j^* = \begin{cases} \beta^{(0)} & \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, \eta_1\}, \\ \beta^{(1)} & \text{for } j \in \{\eta_1 + 1, \dots, \eta_2\}, \\ \vdots & \\ \beta^{(\mathcal{K} \bmod 2)} & \text{for } j \in \{\eta_{\mathcal{K}} + 1, \dots, n\}. \end{cases}$$

The cases with  $c_\beta = 0.5$  and  $c_\beta = 1$  correspond to the settings with small and large jump sizes, respectively. We further assume that for each  $j$ , the random function  $X_j$  is observed in an evenly spaced fixed grid with size  $p = 200$ . We choose the reproducing kernel Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  as the Sobolev space

$$\mathcal{W}_2^1 = \{f \in L^2[0, 1] : \|f^{(j)}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} < \infty, j = 0, 1\},$$

with the corresponding reproducing kernel

$$K(s, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\cosh(s) \cosh(1-t)}{\sinh(1)} & 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1, \\ \frac{\cosh(t) \cosh(1-s)}{\sinh(1)} & 0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that the reproducing kernel and the covariance function of  $X_j$  share a common ordered set of eigenfunctions (see [Cai and Yuan, 2012](#)).

**Evaluation measurements.** Let  $\{\eta_k\}_{k=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$  and  $\{\hat{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$  be the set of true change points and a set of estimated change points, respectively. To assess the performance of different methods in localization, we report (i) the proportions (out of 200 repetitions) of over- or under-estimating  $\mathcal{K}$ , and (ii) the average and the standard deviation of the scaled Hausdorff distances between  $\{\eta_k\}_{k=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$  and  $\{\hat{\eta}_k\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$  defined as

$$d_H = \frac{1}{n} \max \left\{ \max_{j=0, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{K}}+1} \min_{k=0, \dots, \mathcal{K}+1} |\hat{\eta}_j - \eta_k|, \max_{k=0, \dots, \mathcal{K}+1} \min_{j=0, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{K}}+1} |\hat{\eta}_j - \eta_k| \right\},$$

where we set  $\hat{\eta}_0 = 1$  and  $\hat{\eta}_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}+1} = n + 1$ . Given a confidence level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we evaluate the performance of the proposed confidence intervals by measuring their coverage of  $\eta_k$ , defined as

$$\text{cover}_k(1 - \alpha) = \mathbb{1} \left\{ \eta_k \in \left[ \tilde{\eta}_k + \frac{\hat{q}_u(\alpha/2)}{\hat{\kappa}_k^2}, \tilde{\eta}_k + \frac{\hat{q}_u(1 - \alpha/2)}{\hat{\kappa}_k^2} \right] \right\},$$

for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{K}\}$ . To ensure the validity of the above definition, we compute the averaged coverage among all the repetitions where we obtain  $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}$ .

**Comparison.** To the best of our knowledge, no competitor exists for the change point problem in the functional linear (scalar-on-function) regression setting we consider in this paper. However, considering that functional covariates are typically observed as high-dimensional vectors, we adopt the estimation and inference procedure developed for change points in high-dimensional linear regression (referred to as ‘HDLR’) (Xu et al., 2022b) as a competitor. Note that HDLR is analogous to FRBS in the sense that they are both two-step procedures producing preliminary and refined estimators. Thus, we compare their performance on both steps. Additionally, we include a method that combines FPCA and the HDLR in estimating the change point location. More specifically, we first perform the FPCA on the functional covariates and then perform the HDLR using the  $n \times K$  score matrix outputted by FPCA as the covariate matrix, which is referred to as ‘FPCA+LR’. To perform FPCA, we use the R package `fdapace` (Zhou et al., 2022) with the default settings.

**Selection of tuning parameters and estimation of unknown quantities.** Four tuning parameters are involved in the proposed change point localization and inference procedures. These are the number of layers  $M$  for the seeded intervals (see Definition 1),  $\omega$  and  $\tau$  for the FRBS algorithm (see Algorithm 1) and the block size  $2q$  for long-run variance estimation (see Algorithm 2) in the confidence interval construction. We set  $M = \lceil \log_2(10) \rceil + 1$ . In place of  $\omega$ , which is used in specifying  $\lambda_{e-s}$ , we propose to select a single  $\lambda_{e-s} = \lambda$  along with the threshold  $\tau$ , adapting the cross-validation method proposed by Rinaldo et al. (2021). Specifically, we first divide  $\{(y_j, X_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  into those with odd and even indices, respectively. For each possible combination of  $\lambda \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$  and  $\tau \in \{1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3\} \times n^{2/5}$ , we obtain the FRBS outputs  $(\hat{\mathcal{B}}, \hat{\mathcal{K}})$  and  $\{\hat{\beta}_k\}_{k=0}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$  based on the training set, and compute the least squared prediction error on the test set as the validation loss. We select the combination of  $\lambda$  and  $\tau$  that minimize the validation loss. Following the discussion after Theorem 3, we set  $q = \left\lceil \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq \hat{\mathcal{K}}} \{e_k - s_k\} \right)^{2/5} / 2 \right\rceil$  with  $\{(s_k, e_k)\}_{k=1}^{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}$  given in (9). We note that the simulation results remain robust against the choices of the tuning parameters  $M$  and  $q$ .

For the HDLR, we use the CV method in Xu et al. (2022a) to select the tuning parameters for the DPDU algorithm therein, with candidate sets  $\lambda \in \{0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  and  $\tau \in \{5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40\}$ , and use the default values of the other tuning parameters.

**Scenario: single change point.** Let  $\mathcal{K} = 1$  and  $\eta = n/2$ . We vary  $n \in \{200, 400, 600, 800\}$ ,  $c_\beta \in \{0.5, 1\}$  and fix  $p = 200$ . Tables 1 and 2 summarize the localization and inference performance of FRBS, HDLR and FPCA+LR. Table 2 excludes the case with  $n = 200$  where there are a large number of repetitions with mis-estimated  $\mathcal{K}$  for all methods.

In Table 1, comparing the Hausdorff distance computed with the preliminary ( $d_H^{\text{pre}}$ ) and the refined estimators ( $d_H^{\text{fin}}$ ), we see that the refinement step improves the performance for all methods in consideration as  $n$  increases and/or the jump size increases. The detection power improves with the sample size as evidenced by the decrease in the proportion of under-detection. At the same time, FRBS does not detect more false positives as the sample size increases, unlike HDLR and FPCA+LR. Overall, the proposed FRBS outperforms both competitors by a large margin, in its detection accuracy as well as localization performance, demonstrating the

advantage of adopting a functional approach over the high-dimensional one of HDLR. Although the RKHS and the covariance function of  $X_j$  are well-aligned, the dimension reduction-based approach of FPCA+LR comes short of the RKHS-based FRBS.

Table 2 shows that our proposed construction of confidence intervals performs well especially when the jump size is relatively high. In contrast, the intervals constructed based on HDLR perform poorly in capturing the change points, often with the intervals being too narrow. All these observations suggest the benefit of adopting the proposed functional approach.

Table 1: In Scenario 1, the proportions of under- ( $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} < \mathcal{K}$ ), over-detection ( $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} > \mathcal{K}$ ), and the average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of scaled Hausdorff distance over 200 repetitions are reported for FRBS, HDLR, and FPCA+LR. The single change point is located at  $\eta = n/2$ .

$\mathcal{K} = 1$ and $p = 200$				
$n$	$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} < \mathcal{K}$	$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} > \mathcal{K}$	$d_{\text{H}}^{\text{pre}}$	$d_{\text{H}}^{\text{fin}}$
FRBS, $c_{\beta} = 0.5$ (small jump size)				
200	0.310	0.015	0.198 (0.212)	0.190 (0.216)
400	0.105	0.045	0.091 (0.150)	0.084 (0.151)
600	0.045	0.030	0.060 (0.111)	0.048 (0.108)
800	0.005	0.020	0.033 (0.053)	0.020 (0.044)
FRBS, $c_{\beta} = 1$ (large jump size)				
200	0	0.025	0.033 (0.053)	0.027 (0.045)
400	0	0.025	0.018 (0.032)	0.013 (0.026)
600	0	0.020	0.017 (0.037)	0.012 (0.035)
800	0	0.010	0.013 (0.028)	0.009 (0.027)
HDLR, $c_{\beta} = 0.5$ (small jump size)				
200	0.630	0.050	0.350 (0.196)	0.354 (0.195)
400	0.275	0.070	0.200 (0.196)	0.201 (0.202)
600	0.100	0.110	0.127 (0.146)	0.126 (0.159)
800	0.080	0.105	0.112 (0.137)	0.105 (0.147)
HDLR, $c_{\beta} = 1$ (large jump size)				
200	0.080	0.150	0.118 (0.138)	0.115 (0.151)
400	0.005	0.180	0.066 (0.078)	0.063 (0.104)
600	0	0.100	0.041 (0.061)	0.034 (0.076)
800	0	0.135	0.040 (0.059)	0.033 (0.078)
FPCA+LR, $c_{\beta} = 0.5$ (small jump size)				
200	0.715	0.020	0.385 (0.181)	0.386 (0.183)
400	0.365	0.060	0.230 (0.212)	0.224 (0.222)
600	0.180	0.070	0.150 (0.181)	0.140 (0.189)
800	0.070	0.115	0.103 (0.134)	0.085 (0.147)
FPCA+LR, $c_{\beta} = 1$ (large jump size)				
200	0.125	0.100	0.130 (0.156)	0.126 (0.174)
400	0.025	0.110	0.067 (0.099)	0.053 (0.113)
600	0	0.070	0.037 (0.057)	0.026 (0.074)
800	0	0.050	0.027 (0.047)	0.017 (0.055)

An additional simulation study with unequally-spaced two change points is provided in the appendix. These results also show the effectiveness of the proposed method.

Table 2: In Scenario 1, the averaged coverage and the average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of the width of the confidence intervals from FRBS and HDLR over 200 repetitions are reported. The single change point is located at  $\eta = n/2$ .

$\mathcal{K} = 1$ and $p = 200$				
$n$	$\alpha = 0.01$		$\alpha = 0.05$	
	cover( $1 - \alpha$ )	width( $1 - \alpha$ )	cover( $1 - \alpha$ )	width( $1 - \alpha$ )
FRBS, $c_\beta = 0.5$ (small jump size)				
400	0.982	109.923 (38.551)	0.935	72.441 (24.811)
600	0.973	111.502 (28.749)	0.924	73.076 (19.474)
800	0.974	117.712 (32.737)	0.918	77.015 (20.509)
FRBS, $c_\beta = 1$ (large jump size)				
400	0.989	42.877 (9.479)	0.923	28.515 (6.469)
600	0.974	43.505 (7.582)	0.969	28.299 (4.811)
800	0.990	43.892 (7.125)	0.949	28.831 (4.435)
HDLR, $c_\beta = 0.5$ (small jump size)				
400	0.405	19.504 (4.493)	0.321	13.450 (2.944)
600	0.424	23.690 (4.432)	0.367	16.000 (2.849)
800	0.497	26.650 (4.294)	0.387	17.975 (2.685)
HDLR, $c_\beta = 1$ (large jump size)				
400	0.748	18.153 (3.826)	0.681	12.712 (2.464)
600	0.828	20.722 (3.553)	0.750	14.272 (2.344)
800	0.896	22.879 (3.551)	0.821	15.740 (2.284)

## 5.2 Real data analysis

We consider the daily closing price of the S&P 500 index, from Jan-02-2019 to Jan-19-2023<sup>1</sup>. Inspired by a series of papers (e.g. [Kokoszka and Zhang, 2012](#); [Kokoszka and Reimherr, 2013](#)), which study the predictability of stock prices using the intraday cumulative returns curves, we regress the daily returns ( $y_j$ ) on the intratime cumulative return curves ( $X_j$ ) of the previous one-month (i.e. 21 working days), and use our proposed FRBS as a tool to explore the potential changes in the relationship under the model (1). Specifically, we transform the closing price data ( $P_j$ ) into the log-ratio of close price between two consecutive days ( $y_j$ ), in percent,

$$y_j = 100 \cdot \log(P_j/P_{j-1}),$$

and the discretized  $X_j = (X_j(1), \dots, X_j(20))^\top$ , in percent,

$$X_j(k) = 100 \cdot \log(P_{j-k}/P_{j-21}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, 20.$$

With  $j$  ranging as  $j = 22, \dots, 1271$ , the sample size is  $n = 1250$ . Figure 2 plots  $y_j$  and  $X_j$ .

<sup>1</sup>The data set is available at <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/SP500>




Figure 2: The log-ratio of close price between two consecutive days ( $y_j$ , left); the cumulative growth rate ( $X_j(k)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq 20$ , right). The refined change point estimators are marked by dashed orange lines.

With the tuning parameters selected as discussed in Section 5.1, the proposed FRBS returns three change points at Jan-07-2020, Mar-11-2020, and May-07-2020 as the preliminary estimators and Jan-30-2020, Mar-11-2020, and Apr-16-2020 as the refined ones. The first estimated change point, with a narrow 95% confidence interval [Jan-28-2020, Feb-03-2020], coincides with the date when WHO officially declared a Public Health Emergency of International Concern. This period reflects investor’s concerns about the pandemic’s impact on the global economy which led to increased market volatility and a significant sell-off. The second estimated change point, with a 95% confidence interval [Feb-20-2020, Mar-30-2020], matches the date when COVID-19 was characterized as a pandemic by WHO. This declaration confirmed the severity and global scale of the outbreak. During this period, many countries implemented lockdown measures, which led to huge volatility in financial markets and a sharp drop in the S&P 500 index. The third estimated change point reflects that the initial impact of COVID-19

gradually settled. A series of economic and financial policies were introduced by the governments globally, and the market started to react to these policy changes. Our method produces a wide 95% confidence interval as [Mar-05-2020, May-18-2021].

In comparison, we consider the same transformed  $y_j$  and  $X_j$  but regard  $X_j$  as a covariate vector of dimensional 20 and use high-dimensional linear regression with change points (Xu et al., 2022b) to study the relationship between  $y_j$  and  $X_j$ . The HDLR algorithm outputs two change point estimators at Feb-18-2020 and Apr-14-2020.

## 6 Discussion

In this paper, we study the change point problem within the context of functional linear regression, with minimal assumptions while accommodating temporal dependence and heavy-tailed distributions. Our contribution includes deriving the consistency and the limiting distribution of the change point estimators, a novel advancement in this functional framework. Additionally, we propose a theoretically sound and numerically robust long-run variance estimator to enhance the practicality of our findings. We offer the numerical implementation of our proposed approach which is shown to perform well on synthetic and real datasets.

The theoretical analysis has illuminated several challenging and intriguing directions for future research. One direction could involve devising asymptotically valid confidence intervals in the non-vanishing regime with respect to the size of the change. Another direction could focus on developing methodologies to simultaneously distinguish between different regimes of the size of change, motivated by their difference in the limiting distribution in Theorem 2.

## References

- Aue, A., Gabrys, R., Horváth, L., and Kokoszka, P. (2009). Estimation of a change-point in the mean function of functional data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 100(10):2254–2269.
- Aue, A., Rice, G., and Sönmez, O. (2018). Detecting and dating structural breaks in functional data without dimension reduction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 80(3):509–529.
- Baranowski, R., Chen, Y., and Fryzlewicz, P. (2019). Narrowest-over-threshold detection of multiple change points and change-point-like features. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 81(3):649–672.
- Barigozzi, M., Cho, H., and Fryzlewicz, P. (2018). Simultaneous multiple change-point and factor analysis for high-dimensional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 206(1):187–225.
- Barnett, I. and Onnela, J.-P. (2016). Change point detection in correlation networks. *Scientific reports*, 6(1):18893.
- Cai, T. and Yuan, M. (2010). Nonparametric covariance function estimation for functional and longitudinal data. *University of Pennsylvania and Georgia institute of technology*.
- Cai, T. T. and Yuan, M. (2012). Minimax and adaptive prediction for functional linear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(499):1201–1216.
- Cai, Z., Fan, J., and Yao, Q. (2000). Functional-coefficient regression models for nonlinear time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(451):941–956.
- Casini, A. and Perron, P. (2021). Minimax mse bounds and nonlinear var prewhitening for long-run variance estimation under nonstationarity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.02235*.
- Cho, H. and Kirch, C. (2022). Bootstrap confidence intervals for multiple change points based on moving sum procedures. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 175:107552.
- Dette, H. and Kutta, T. (2021). Detecting structural breaks in eigensystems of functional time series. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(1):944 – 983.
- Doukhan, P. (2012). *Mixing: properties and examples*, volume 85. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Harris, T., Li, B., and Tucker, J. D. (2022). Scalable multiple changepoint detection for functional data sequences. *Environmetrics*, 33(2):e2710.
- Hörmann, S. and Kokoszka, P. (2010). Weakly dependent functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(3):1845 – 1884.
- Hsing, T. and Eubank, R. (2015). *Theoretical foundations of functional data analysis, with an introduction to linear operators*, volume 997. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ibragimov, I. A. (1962). Some limit theorems for stationary processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 7(4):349–382.
- Jiao, S., Frostig, R. D., and Ombao, H. (2023). Break point detection for functional covariance. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 50(2):477–512.
- Kaul, A. and Michailidis, G. (2021). Inference for change points in high dimensional mean shift models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.09150*.
- Kaul, A., Zhang, H., Tsampourakis, K., and Michailidis, G. (2023). Inference on the change point under a high dimensional covariance shift. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(168):1–68.
- Khismatullina, M. and Vogt, M. (2020). Multiscale inference and long-run variance estimation in non-parametric regression with time series errors. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 82(1):5–37.
- Kirch, C. (2006). *Resampling methods for the change analysis of dependent data*. PhD thesis, Universität zu Köln.
- Kokoszka, P. and Reimherr, M. (2013). Predictability of shapes of intraday price curves. *The*

- Econometrics Journal*, 16(3):285–308.
- Kokoszka, P. and Reimherr, M. (2017). *Introduction to functional data analysis*. CRC press.
- Kokoszka, P. and Zhang, X. (2012). Functional prediction of intraday cumulative returns. *Statistical Modelling*, 12(4):377–398.
- Koner, S. and Staicu, A.-M. (2023). Second-generation functional data. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 10:547–572.
- Kovács, S., Bühlmann, P., Li, H., and Munk, A. (2023). Seeded binary segmentation: a general methodology for fast and optimal changepoint detection. *Biometrika*, 110(1):249–256.
- Kowal, D. R., Matteson, D. S., and Ruppert, D. (2017). A bayesian multivariate functional dynamic linear model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(518):733–744.
- Kowal, D. R., Matteson, D. S., and Ruppert, D. (2019). Functional autoregression for sparsely sampled data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 37(1):97–109.
- Lee, S., Seo, M. H., and Shin, Y. (2016). The lasso for high dimensional regression with a possible change point. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 78(1):193–210.
- Li, J., Li, Y., and Hsing, T. (2022). On functional processes with multiple discontinuities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(3):933–972.
- Li, X. and Ghosal, S. (2021). Bayesian change point detection for functional data. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 213:193–205.
- Madrid Padilla, C. M., Wang, D., Zhao, Z., and Yu, Y. (2022). Change-point detection for sparse and dense functional data in general dimensions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:37121–37133.
- Madrid Padilla, C. M., Xu, H., Wang, D., Madrid Padilla, O. H., and Yu, Y. (2023). Change point detection and inference in multivariable nonparametric models under mixing conditions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11491*.
- Madrid Padilla, C. M., Xu, H., Wang, D., Madrid Padilla, O. H., and Yu, Y. (2024). Change point detection and inference in multivariate non-parametric models under mixing conditions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Madrid Padilla, O. H., Yu, Y., Wang, D., and Rinaldo, A. (2021). Optimal nonparametric multivariate change point detection and localization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(3):1922–1944.
- McLeish, D. L. (1975). A Maximal Inequality and Dependent Strong Laws. *The Annals of Probability*, 3(5):829 – 839.
- Ng, W. L., Pan, S., and Yau, C. Y. (2022). Bootstrap inference for multiple change-points in time series. *Econometric Theory*, 38(4):752–792.
- Panaretos, V. M. and Tavakoli, S. (2013). Fourier analysis of stationary time series in function space. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 568–603.
- Ramsay, J. and Silverman, B. (2005). Principal components analysis for functional data. *Functional data analysis*, pages 147–172.
- Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (2002). *Applied functional data analysis: methods and case studies*. Springer.
- Rinaldo, A., Wang, D., Wen, Q., Willett, R., and Yu, Y. (2021). Localizing changes in high-dimensional regression models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2089–2097. PMLR.
- Rubín, T. and Panaretos, V. M. (2020). Sparsely observed functional time series: estimation and prediction. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14(1):1137 – 1210.
- Sullivan, J. H. and Woodall, W. H. (2000). Change-point detection of mean vector or covariance matrix shifts using multivariate individual observations. *IIE transactions*, 32(6):537–549.
- Tartakovsky, A. G., Polunchenko, A. S., and Sokolov, G. (2012). Efficient computer network

- anomaly detection by changepoint detection methods. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 7(1):4–11.
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2004). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation, 2009*, volume 9.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence*. Springer New York, New York, NY.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press.
- Wang, D., Yu, Y., and Rinaldo, A. (2020). Univariate mean change point detection: Penalization, CUSUM and optimality. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14(1):1917 – 1961.
- Wang, J.-L., Chiou, J.-M., and Müller, H.-G. (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and its application*, 3:257–295.
- Wang, T. and Samworth, R. J. (2018). High dimensional change point estimation via sparse projection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 80(1):57–83.
- Xu, H., Padilla, O. M., Wang, D., and Li, M. (2022a). *changepoints: A Collection of Change-Point Detection Methods*. R package version 1.1.0.
- Xu, H., Wang, D., Zhao, Z., and Yu, Y. (2022b). Change point inference in high-dimensional regression models under temporal dependence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12453*.
- Yao, F., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2005). Functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal data. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 100(470):577–590.
- Yokoyama, R. (1980). Moment bounds for stationary mixing sequences. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 52(1):45–57.
- Yu, B. (1997). Assouad, fano, and le cam. In *Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam: research papers in probability and statistics*, pages 423–435. Springer.
- Yuan, M. and Cai, T. T. (2010). A reproducing kernel Hilbert space approach to functional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(6):3412 – 3444.
- Zhou, Y., Bhattacharjee, S., Carroll, C., Chen, Y., Dai, X., Fan, J., Gajardo, A., Hadjipantelis, P. Z., Han, K., Ji, H., Zhu, C., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2022). *fdapace: Functional Data Analysis and Empirical Dynamics*. R package version 0.5.9.

## A Additional simulation results

In this additional simulation, we consider the sample setting described in Section 5.1 with unequally-spaced two change points.

**Scenario: unequally-spaced two change points.** Let  $\mathcal{K} = 2$  and the unequally-spaced change points  $\{\eta_1, \eta_2\} = \{n/4, 5n/8\}$ . We vary  $n \in \{400, 600, 800\}$  and fix  $p = 200$ . Table 3 shows the localization performance of both preliminary and final estimators improve as  $n$  increases. Due to the overall poor detection performance HDLR / FRBS when  $c_\beta = 0.5$ , we only report the results from the confidence intervals produced by FRBS for the setting with  $c_\beta = 1$  in Tables 4 and 5. The comparison between Tables 4 and 5 reveals that our inference procedure performs better when applied to  $\eta_2$  associated with larger spacing with adjacent change points.

## B Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* For  $(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}$  and for all  $t \in (s_m, e_m]$  we define

$$\tilde{G}_t^{s_m, e_m} = \frac{(t - s_m)(e_m - t)}{e_m - s_m} \Sigma \left[ \beta_{(s_m, t]}^* - \beta_{(t, e_m]}^*, \beta_{(s_m, t]}^* - \beta_{(t, e_m]}^* \right].$$

Table 3: In Scenario 2, the proportions of under- ( $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} < \mathcal{K}$ ), over-detection ( $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} > \mathcal{K}$ ), and the average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of scaled Hausdorff distance over 200 repetitions are reported for FRBS and HDLR. The single change point is located at  $\eta = n/2$ . The two change points are located at  $\eta_1 = n/4$  and  $\eta_2 = 5n/8$ .

$\mathcal{K} = 2$ and $p = 200$				
$n$	$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} < \mathcal{K}$	$\widehat{\mathcal{K}} > \mathcal{K}$	$d_{\text{H}}^{\text{pre}}$	$d_{\text{H}}^{\text{fin}}$
FRBS, $c_{\beta} = 0.5$ (small jump size)				
400	0.460	0.015	0.194 (0.154)	0.190 (0.157)
600	0.265	0.025	0.120 (0.134)	0.108 (0.139)
800	0.150	0.015	0.081 (0.108)	0.068 (0.109)
FRBS, $c_{\beta} = 1$ (large jump size)				
400	0.010	0.025	0.029 (0.042)	0.024 (0.042)
600	0	0.015	0.020 (0.023)	0.011 (0.018)
800	0	0.015	0.015 (0.021)	0.011 (0.019)
HDLR, $c_{\beta} = 0.5$ (small jump size)				
400	0.930	0.015	0.275 (0.073)	0.300 (0.084)
600	0.890	0.010	0.252 (0.062)	0.275 (0.080)
800	0.895	0.015	0.249 (0.055)	0.273 (0.072)
HDLR, $c_{\beta} = 1$ (large jump size)				
400	0.820	0.020	0.224 (0.045)	0.244 (0.058)
600	0.900	0.015	0.229 (0.039)	0.244 (0.043)
800	0.865	0.005	0.228 (0.039)	0.239 (0.039)

Table 4: In Scenario 2, the averaged coverage and the average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of the width of the confidence intervals from FRBS over 200 repetitions for  $\eta_1$  are reported.

FRBS, $p = 200$				
$n$	$\alpha = 0.01$		$\alpha = 0.05$	
	$\text{cover}_1(1 - \alpha)$	$\text{width}_1(1 - \alpha)$	$\text{cover}_1(1 - \alpha)$	$\text{width}_1(1 - \alpha)$
$c_{\beta} = 1$ (large jump size)				
400	0.959	43.591 (12.428)	0.933	28.741 (7.823)
600	0.994	45.492 (12.807)	0.980	29.751 (8.081)
800	0.979	43.477 (9.224)	0.958	28.456 (5.528)

Table 5: In Scenario 2, the averaged coverage and the average and standard deviation (in parentheses) of the width of the confidence intervals from FRBS over 200 repetitions for  $\eta_2$  are reported.

FRBS, $p = 200$				
$n$	$\alpha = 0.01$		$\alpha = 0.05$	
	$\text{cover}_2(1 - \alpha)$	$\text{width}_2(1 - \alpha)$	$\text{cover}_2(1 - \alpha)$	$\text{width}_2(1 - \alpha)$
$c_{\beta} = 1$ (large jump size)				
400	0.980	45.114 (12.250)	0.938	29.389 (7.501)
600	0.990	44.142 (10.934)	0.980	28.909 (6.844)
800	0.990	44.067 (9.165)	0.958	28.798 (5.734)

For the interval  $(s_m, e_m]$ , consider the event

$$\mathcal{A}(s_m, e_m) = \left\{ \text{for all } t \in (s_m, e_m], \right. \\ \left. \left| \widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m} - \widetilde{G}_t^{s_m, e_m} \right| - 0.5 \widetilde{G}_t^{s_m, e_m} \leq \left( \frac{n}{\Delta} \right) (\log^{1+2\xi}(n)) \left( n^{1/(2r+1)} + 0.5 \right) \right\},$$

and define the event

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{A}(s_m, e_m). \quad (19)$$

We established in Lemma 3 that

$$P(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

All the analysis in the rest of this proof is under this asymptotically almost sure event  $\mathcal{A}$ . The strategy here is to use an induction argument. Denote

$$\vartheta_k = C_1 \frac{(n/\Delta) \Delta^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi} n}{\kappa_k^2}.$$

**Step 1:** We show that, FRBS will consistently reject the existence of change points if they are no undetected change points in  $(s, e]$ . By induction hypothesis, we have

$$|\eta_k - s| \leq \vartheta_k, \quad |e - \eta_{k+1}| \leq \vartheta_{k+1}.$$

For each  $(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(s_m, e_m] \subset (s, e]$ , there are four possible cases which are outlined below

- i)  $s_m < \eta_k < \eta_{k+1} < e_m$  with  $\eta_k - s_m \leq \vartheta_k$  and  $\eta_{k+1} - e_m \leq \vartheta_{k+1}$
- ii)  $\eta_k \leq s_m < e_m \leq \eta_{k+1}$  with  $s_m - \eta_k \leq \vartheta_k$  and  $\eta_{k+1} - e_m \leq \vartheta_{k+1}$ ,
- iii)  $\eta_{k-1} < s_m \leq \eta_k < e_m \leq \eta_{k+1}$  with  $\eta_k - s_m \leq \vartheta_k$ ,
- iv)  $\eta_{k-1} \leq s_m < \eta_k \leq e_m < \eta_{k+1}$  with  $e_m - \eta_k \leq \vartheta_k$ .

We shall consider the first case, all other cases are simpler and could be handled similarly. There are two previously detected change point  $\eta_k$  and  $\eta_{k+1}$  in  $(s_m, e_m]$  and we are going to show that FRBS shall not detect any change point in  $(s_m, e_m]$ . On the event  $\mathcal{A}$  we write that

$$\forall t \in (s'_m, e'_m] \quad \widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m} \leq \frac{3}{2} \widetilde{G}_t^{s_m, e_m} + \left( \frac{n}{\Delta} \right) \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \left( n^{1/(2r+1)} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ \leq 3\kappa_k^2(\eta_k - s_m) + 3\kappa_{k+1}^2(e - \eta_{k+1}) + 2 \left( \frac{n}{\Delta} \right) n^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \\ \leq (8C_1 + 2) \left( \frac{n}{\Delta} \right) n^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+2\xi}(n) < \tau$$

where the second last line follows from Lemma 7 and the last line just follows from the definition of  $\tau$ .

**Step 2:** We show that FRBS will correctly detect the existence of an undetected change point in  $(s, e]$ . In this case, there exists some change point,  $\eta_k$  in  $(s, e]$ , such that

$$\min\{\eta_k - s, e - \eta_k\} > \Delta - \vartheta_k,$$

for some  $1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}$ . Realize that  $\Delta - \vartheta_k > 4\Delta/5$ , asymptotically. For this step, it is sufficient to show that the set  $\mathcal{M}^{s,e}$ , from Algorithm 1, is not empty. From the construction of intervals

in  $\mathcal{J}$  and from Lemma 2, we can always find an interval  $(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $(s_m, e_m] \subset (s, e]$  containing  $\eta_k$  such that

$$e_m - s_m \leq \Delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \min\{\eta_k - s_m, e_m - \eta_k\} \geq \Delta/5. \quad (20)$$

On the event  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have

$$\max_{s_m < t \leq e_m} \widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m} \geq \widehat{W}_{\eta_k}^{s_m, e_m} \geq \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{G}_{\eta_k}^{s_m, e_m} - \left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \left(n^{1/(2r+1)} + \frac{1}{2}\right). \quad (21)$$

Since  $\eta_k$  is the only change point in  $(s_m, e_m]$ , using (20), we write that

$$\widetilde{G}_{\eta_k}^{s_m, e_m} = \kappa_k^2 \frac{(\eta_k - s_m)(e_m - \eta_k)}{(e_m - s_m)} \geq \frac{1}{2} \kappa_k^2 \min\{\eta_k - s_m, e_m - \eta_k\} \geq \frac{1}{10} \kappa_k^2 \Delta. \quad (22)$$

We may extend (21) to have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{s_m < t \leq e_m} \widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{G}_{\eta_k}^{s_m, e_m} - \left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \left(n^{1/(2r+1)} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{20} \kappa_k^2 \Delta - \left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) \left(\log^{1+2\xi}(n)\right) \left(n^{1/(2r+1)} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{20} \kappa_k^2 \Delta - o(\kappa_k^2 \Delta) > \tau. \end{aligned}$$

where the second last line follows from (22) and the last line follows from Assumption 3. Therefore  $\mathcal{M}^{s, e} \neq \emptyset$ .

**Step 3:** This is the localization step. We have  $\mathcal{M}^{s, e} \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $b = b_{m^*}$  be the chosen point in Algorithm 1. Let  $(s_{m^*}, e_{m^*}]$  be the corresponding interval. Since it is the narrowest one, we have  $(e_{m^*} - s_{m^*}) \leq (e_m - s_m) \leq \Delta$ , where  $(s_m, e_m]$  is the interval picked at (20). Therefore,  $(s_{m^*}, e_{m^*}]$  can contains exactly one change point  $\eta_k$ .

Without loss of generality, let's assume that  $b > \eta_k$ . Additionally, we shall assume that  $(b - \eta_k) > \frac{3}{2\kappa_k}$ ; if not, the localization rate follows directly. Since

$$\widehat{W}_b^{s_{m^*}, e_{m^*}} \geq \widehat{W}_{\eta_k}^{s_{m^*}, e_{m^*}}.$$

We write that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^b \left(Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_{m^*}, b]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\right)^2 + \sum_{j=b+1}^{e_{m^*}} \left(Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(b, e_{m^*}]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^{\eta_k} \left(Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_{m^*}, \eta_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\right)^2 + \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{e_{m^*}} \left(Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(\eta_k, e_{m^*}]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left( \left( \frac{b - \eta_k}{b - s_{m^*}} \right) + 1 \right)^2 \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^b \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \quad (23)$$

$$\leq \left( \sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^{\eta_k} \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_{m^*}, \eta_k]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^{\eta_k} \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \quad (24)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{e_{m^*}} \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(\eta_k, e_{m^*}]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{e_{m^*}} \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \quad (25)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^b \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s_{m^*}, b]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^b \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_{m^*}, b]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \quad (26)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{j=b+1}^{e_{m^*}} \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=b+1}^{e_{m^*}} \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(b, e_{m^*}]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \quad (27)$$

$$+ 2 \left( \frac{b - \eta_k}{b - s_{m^*}} \right) \left( \sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^b \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{(s_{m^*}, b]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right) \quad (28)$$

$$+ 2 \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^b \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right). \quad (29)$$

Therefore we have,

$$(23) \leq |(24)| + |(25)| + |(26)| + |(27)| + |(28)| + |(29)|.$$

**Step 3A: the order of magnitude of (24), (25), (26) and (27).** Following from the Lemma 4, we have

$$|(24)| = O_p \left( (n/\Delta) (\eta_p - s_{m^*}) \delta_{\eta_p - s_{m^*}} \log^{1+\xi}(\eta_p - s_{m^*}) \right),$$

$$|(25)| = O_p \left( (n/\Delta) (e_{m^*} - \eta_p) \delta_{e_{m^*} - \eta_p} \log^{1+\xi}(e_{m^*} - \eta_p) \right),$$

$$|(26)| = O_p \left( (n/\Delta) (b - s_{m^*}) \delta_{b - s_{m^*}} \log^{1+\xi}(b - s_{m^*}) \right),$$

$$|(27)| = O_p \left( (n/\Delta) (e_{m^*} - b) \delta_{e_{m^*} - b} \log^{1+\xi}(e_{m^*} - b) \right),$$

which lead us to

$$|(24)| + |(25)| + |(26)| + |(27)| = O_p \left( (n/\Delta) \Delta^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi}(\Delta) \right).$$

**Step 3B: the order of magnitude of (28) and (29).** Observe that from Lemma 20 we may have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^2} \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{t'} \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 \right] = O(t' - \eta_k),$$

and using Lemma 37, we may write

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}} \max_{1/\kappa_k^2 < t' < \eta_{k+1}} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{(t' - \eta_k)(\log^{1+\xi}((t' - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2) + 1)}} \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{t'} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 = O_p(\mathcal{K}). \quad (30)$$

Following this, we have

$$\left| \left( \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^b \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right) \right| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\mathcal{K}} \sqrt{(b - \eta_p) \kappa_k} \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}((b - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right),$$

which is a bound on (29). Similarly using (30), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left( \frac{b - \eta_k}{b - s_{m^*}} \right) \left( \sum_{j=s_{m^*}+1}^b \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_p}^* - \beta_{(s_{m^*}, b]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right) \right| \\ &= O_p \left( \sqrt{\mathcal{K}} \left[ \frac{b - \eta_k}{b - s_{m^*}} \right] \sqrt{(b - s_{m^*}) \kappa_k} \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}((b - s_{m^*})\kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right) \\ &= O_p \left( \sqrt{\mathcal{K}} \sqrt{(b - \eta_k) \kappa_k} \log^{1+\xi}((b - s_{m^*})\kappa_k^2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $\frac{b - \eta_p}{b - s_{m^*}} \leq 1$  and  $\log((b - s_{m^*})\kappa_k^2) > 1$  in the last line. This bound (28). Therefore

$$|(28)| + |(29)| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\mathcal{K}} \sqrt{(b - \eta_p) \kappa_k} \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}((b - \eta_p)\kappa_k^2) \right\} \right).$$

**Step 3C: the lower bound of (23):** Observe that from Lemma 19 we may have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^2} \left| \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{t'} \left( \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right) \right|^2 \right] = O(t' - \eta_k),$$

and using Lemma 37, we may write

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}} \max_{\frac{1}{\kappa_k^2} + \eta_k < t' < \eta_{k+1}} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{(t' - \eta_k)(\log^{1+\xi}((t' - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2) + 1)}} \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{t'} \left( \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right) \right|^2 = O_p(\mathcal{K}). \quad (31)$$

Following (31), we may write

$$\begin{aligned} (23) &= \left( \frac{b - \eta_k}{b - s_{m^*}} + 1 \right)^2 \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^b \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \left( \frac{b - \eta_k}{b - s_{m^*}} + 1 \right)^2 \left[ (b - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2 - O_p \left( \sqrt{\mathcal{K}} \sqrt{(b - \eta_k) \kappa_k} \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}((b - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right) \right] \\ &\geq (b - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2 - O_p \left( \sqrt{\mathcal{K}} \sqrt{(b - \eta_k) \kappa_k^2} \left( \log^{1+\xi}((b - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2) \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $\frac{b - \eta_k}{b - s_{m^*}} + 1 \geq 1$  and  $\log((b - s_{m^*})\kappa_k^2) > 1$  in the last line.

Following from step 3A, step 3B and step 3C, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (b - \eta_k)\kappa_p^2 - O_p\left(\sqrt{\mathcal{K}}\sqrt{(b - \eta_k)\kappa_k}\left\{\log^{1+\xi}(b - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2\right\}\right) \\ & \leq O_p\left((n/\Delta)\Delta^{1/(2r+1)}\log^{1+\xi}(\Delta)\right) + O_p\left(\sqrt{\mathcal{K}}\sqrt{(b - \eta_k)\kappa_k}\left\{\log^{1+\xi}(b - \eta_k)\kappa_k^2\right\}\right), \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathcal{K} \leq n/\Delta$ , it implies

$$(b - \eta_k)\kappa_p^2 = O_p\left((n/\Delta)\Delta^{1/(2r+1)}\log^{1+\xi}(\Delta)\right). \quad (32)$$

This concludes the induction step when  $(s, e]$  contains an undetected change point.  $\square$

## B.1 Technical results for the proof of Theorem 1

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $(s, e] \subset (0, n]$  be given. Let  $\eta_k$  be a point in  $(s, e]$ . Suppose  $\min\{\eta_k - s, e - \eta_k\} > 4\Delta/5$ . Then there exists an interval  $(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J} \cap (s, e]$  containing  $\eta_k$  such that*

$$e_m - s_m \leq \Delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \min\{\eta_k - s_m, e_m - \eta_k\} \geq \Delta/5.$$

*Proof.* There are at most two intervals in each layer  $\mathcal{J}_k$ , for  $1 \leq k \leq M$ , that contains any given point. We shall consider the layer with  $\mathfrak{l}_k = \Delta$  and  $\mathfrak{b}_k = \Delta/2$ . Without loss of generality, let  $\left(\frac{(i-1)\Delta}{2}, \frac{(i-1)\Delta}{2} + \Delta\right]$  and  $\left(\frac{i\Delta}{2}, \frac{i\Delta}{2} + \Delta\right]$  are intervals containing  $\eta_k$ .

**Case I:** Suppose  $\eta_k - i\Delta/2 > (i+1)\Delta/2 - \eta_k$ . Observe that  $\eta_k - i\Delta/2 \geq \Delta/4$ . The interval  $(s_m, e_m] = \left(\frac{i\Delta}{2}, \frac{i\Delta}{2} + \Delta\right]$  satisfies the required property because  $\eta_k - s_m = \eta_k - i\Delta/2 \geq \Delta/4$  and  $e_m - \eta_k > i\Delta/2 + \Delta - ((i-2)\Delta/2 + \Delta) = \Delta/2$ .

**Case II:** Suppose  $\eta_k - i\Delta/2 \leq (i+1)\Delta/2 - \eta_k$ . Using arguments akin to the previous case, the interval  $\left(\frac{(i-1)\Delta}{2}, \frac{(i-1)\Delta}{2} + \Delta\right]$  emerges as the necessary interval.  $\square$

### B.1.1 Large probability event

Recall for any  $a > 0$ ,  $\delta_a \asymp a^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\xi > 0$ . Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\forall (s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}, \quad \forall t \in (s_m, e_m], \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left| \widehat{W}_t^{s_m, e_m} - \widetilde{G}_t^{s_m, e_m} \right| - 0.5\widetilde{G}_t^{s_m, e_m} \leq \left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \left(n^{1/(2r+1)} + 0.5\right)\right) \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}$  be fixed. For notational simplicity, denote  $s = s_m$  and  $e = e_m$ . Denote

$$W_t^{*s, e} = \sum_{j=s+1}^e \left(Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s, e]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\right)^2 - \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left(Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s, t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\right)^2 - \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left(Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(t, e]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\right)^2.$$

We show in Step 1 that

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \left| \widehat{W}_t^{s, e} - W_t^{*s, e} \right| = O_p\left((e - s)^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi}(e - s)\right). \quad (33)$$

In Step 2, we show that

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left| W_t^{*s,e} - \tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \right| = O_p(1), \quad (34)$$

when  $\tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \neq 0$ . It follows from using  $4ab \leq (a+b)^2$  at (34) that

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{1}{0.5 \left( \tilde{G}_t^{s,e} + \log^{1+\xi}(t-s) \right)} \left| W_t^{*s,e} - \tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \right| = O_p(1).$$

Therefore,

$$P\left(\forall t \in (s, e], \left| \widehat{W}_t^{s,e} - \tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \right| - 0.5\tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \leq \left( n^{1/(2r+1)} + 0.5 \right) \log^{1+2\xi}(n) \right) \rightarrow 1, \quad (35)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The factor  $\log^\xi(n)$  is to make the event asymptotically almost surely. When  $(s, e]$  has no change point, we have  $W_t^{*s,e} = \tilde{G}_t^{s,e} = 0$  and (35) trivially holds. Following the cardinality of  $\mathcal{J}$  at (8), the main result now follows from the union bound.

**Step 1:** Using  $(a-b)^2 - (a-c)^2 = (b-c)^2 - 2(a-c)(b-c)$ , we may write

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{W}_t^{s,e} - W_t^{*s,e} \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{j=s+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]} - \beta_{(s,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_1} - \underbrace{\sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_2} - \underbrace{\sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(t,e]} - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_3} \\ & \quad + 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=s+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,e]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_4} \varepsilon_j - 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_5} \varepsilon_j - 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(t,e]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_6} \varepsilon_j \\ & \quad + 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=s+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,e]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_7} - 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_8} \\ & \quad - 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(t,e]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}_{\mathcal{B}_9}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

We will show the technique to bound  $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{B}_3$  and the result for  $\mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{B}_5, \mathcal{B}_6$  and  $\mathcal{B}_7, \mathcal{B}_8, \mathcal{B}_9$  follows from the same outlined idea and the corresponding Lemma 14 and Lemma 15 respectively.

Observe that for  $|\mathcal{B}_2|$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{s < t \leq e} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \max_{s < t \leq e} (t-s) \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s,t]} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \\ &\leq \max_{s < t \leq e} \left( (t-s)^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s) \right) \max_{s < t \leq e} \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s,t]} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right) \\ &= (s-e)^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi}(e-s) O_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the fact that  $z \mapsto z^a \log z$  is strictly increasing for any  $a \geq 0$  and the Lemma 13.

For  $|\mathcal{B}_1|$ , at  $t = e$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=s+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,e]} - \beta_{(s,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = (e-s)^{1/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi}(e-s) O_p(1).$$

The bound for the term  $|\mathcal{B}_3|$  follows by same argument as  $\mathcal{B}_1$ . This establish (33).

**Step 2:** Let  $\widetilde{G}_t^{s,e} \neq 0$ . Note that

$$\beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(s,e]}^* = \left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right) \left( \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right)$$

and

$$\beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,e]}^* = \left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right) \left( \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right).$$

Using  $(a-b)^2 - (a-c)^2 = (b-c)^2 - 2(a-c)(b-c)$ , we may write

$$\begin{aligned} W_t^{*s,e} &= \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(s,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + 2 \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,e]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + 2 \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,e]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &= \left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right)^2 \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + \left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right)^2 \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right) \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + 2 \left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right) \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad + 2 \left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right) \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &\quad + 2 \left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right) \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\widetilde{G}_t^{s,e} = \left( \frac{(t-s)^2(e-t)}{(e-s)^2} + \frac{(t-s)(e-t)^2}{(e-s)^2} \right) \Sigma \left[ \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^*, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right].$$

Also,  $\left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right)^2 \leq 1$ ,  $\left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right)^2 \leq 1$ ,  $\sum_{j=s+1}^t \Sigma[\beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^*] = 0$  and  $\sum_{j=t+1}^e \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^*] = 0$ . Using the triangle inequality, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| W_t^{*s,e} - \tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \right| \\ & \leq \left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right) \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] \right) \right| \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$+ \left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right) \left| \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left( \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e)}^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] \right) \right| \quad (38)$$

$$+ 2 \left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right) \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e)}^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right| + 2 \left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right) \left| \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right| \quad (39)$$

$$+ 2 \left( \frac{e-t}{e-s} \right) \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e)}^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[\beta_{(t,e)}^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^*] \right| \quad (40)$$

$$+ 2 \left( \frac{t-s}{e-s} \right) \left| \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] \right|. \quad (41)$$

Our approach involves bounding each of the six terms through four distinct sub-steps. In Step 2A, we establish the bound for equations (37) and (38). Progressing to Step 2B, we derive the bound for equation (39). Moving on to Step 2C, we obtain the bound for equations (40) and (41). Notably, all these derived bounds are uniform across  $t \in (s, e]$ . The final step, Step 2D, amalgamates these outcomes into a coherent result.

**Step 2A.** Using Lemma 19 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] \right) \right|^2 \right] = O(t-s) \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*].$$

Writing  $\Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] = \frac{(e-s)}{(t-s)(e-t)} \tilde{G}_t^{s,e}$ , we may also write it as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{(e-t)(t-s)}{(e-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] \right) \right|^2 \right] = O(t-s)$$

Using the Lemma 36, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{(e-t)}{(e-s)} \frac{1}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] \right) \right|^2 \right] = O(1) \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{(t-s)}{(e-s)} \frac{1}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left( \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e)}^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*, \beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{(t,e)}^*] \right) \right|^2 \right] = O(1), \end{aligned}$$

This lead us to

$$(37) + (38) = O_p \left( \sqrt{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right).$$

**Step 2B.** Using Lemma 20, we may have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(e-t)(t-s)}{(e-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 \right] = O(t-s).$$

And again from Lemma 36, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{(e-t)}{(e-s) \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 \right] = O(1) \\ \implies & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{(t-s)}{(e-s) \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=t+1}^e \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 \right] = O(1), \end{aligned}$$

This lead us to

$$(39) = O_p \left( \sqrt{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right).$$

**Step 2C.** Using Lemma 20, we may have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(e-t)(t-s)}{(e-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[\beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^*] \right|^2 \right] = O(t-s)$$

And again from Lemma 36, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{(e-t)}{(e-s) \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[\beta_{(t,e]}^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^*] \right|^2 \right] \\ &= O(1) \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{(t-s)}{(e-s) \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e}} \left| \sum_{j=t+1}^e \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[\beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(t,e]}^*] \right|^2 \right] \\ &= O(1), \end{aligned}$$

This lead us to

$$(40) + (41) = O_p \left( \sqrt{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right).$$

**Step 2D.** Combining the results in Step 2A, Step 2B and Step 2C, we get

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left| W_t^{*s,e} - \tilde{G}_t^{s,e} \right| = O_p(1).$$

□

**Lemma 4.** Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $(s, e] \subset (0, n]$ . Suppose  $\eta_{k-1} < s < \eta_k < e < \eta_{k+1}$ . Then we have uniformly for all  $t \in (s, e]$ ,

$$\sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 = O_p \left( (t-s) \delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s) \right), \quad (42)$$

$$\sum_{j=t+1}^e \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(t,e]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=t+1}^e \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(t,e]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 = O_p \left( (e-t) \delta_{e-t} \log^{1+\xi}(e-t) \right). \quad (43)$$

Consequently, following from the union bound we have uniformly for all  $(s_m, e_m] \in \mathcal{J}$  and for all  $t \in (s_m, e_m]$

$$\sum_{j=s_m+1}^t \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_m,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=s_m+1}^t \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s_m,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 = O_p \left( (n/\Delta) (t-s_m) \delta_{t-s_m} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s_m) \right). \quad (44)$$

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( Y_j - \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + 2 \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + 2 \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \end{aligned}$$

Following from Lemma 13, we have uniformly

$$\left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right| = O_p \left( (t-s) \delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s) \right).$$

From Lemma 14

$$\left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right| = O_p \left( (t-s) \delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s) \right).$$

From Lemma 15

$$\left| \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| = O_p \left( (t-s) \delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s) \right).$$

The (42) of this lemma follows from these three bounds. Given the cardinality of  $\mathcal{J}$  in (8), the expression (44) follows from (42) by the union bound.  $\square$

### B.1.2 Population CUSUM of functional data

All the notation used in this subsection are specific to this subsection only. We use these general results to prove some results earlier.

**Assumption 4.** Let  $\{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i=1}^m \in \mathcal{L}^2$ . Assume there are  $\{\mathbf{n}_p\}_{p=0}^{K+1} \subset \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $0 = \mathbf{n}_0 < \mathbf{n}_1 < \dots < \mathbf{n}_K < \mathbf{n}_{K+1} = m$  and

$$\mathbf{f}_t \neq \mathbf{f}_{t+1} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad t \in \{\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_p\}.$$

Let  $\inf_{1 \leq p \leq K} \|\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{n}_p} - \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{n}_{p+1}}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \inf_{1 \leq p \leq K} \mathfrak{R}_p^2 = \mathfrak{R}^2$ .

For  $0 \leq s < t < e \leq m$ , the CUSUM statistics is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e} = \sqrt{\frac{e-t}{(e-s)(t-s)}} \sum_{i=s+1}^t \mathbf{f}_i - \sqrt{\frac{t-s}{(e-s)(e-t)}} \sum_{i=t+1}^e \mathbf{f}_i. \quad (45)$$

It can be easily shown that the CUSUM statistics at (45) are translational invariant. Consequently assuming  $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{f}_i = 0$ , we may also write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e} = \left( \sum_{i=s+1}^t \mathbf{f}_i - \frac{t}{e-s} \sum_{i=s+1}^e \mathbf{f}_i \right) / \sqrt{\frac{(t-s)(e-t)}{(e-s)}} = \left( \sum_{i=s+1}^t \mathbf{f}_i \right) / \sqrt{\frac{(t-s)(e-t)}{(e-s)}}. \quad (46)$$

The form at (46) is useful proving many important properties of CUSUM.

The Lemma 5 below follows directly from the definition of CUSUM statistics.

**Lemma 5.** Suppose  $(s, e]$  contains only one change point  $\mathbf{n}_p$ , then

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \begin{cases} \frac{t-s}{(e-s)(e-t)} (e - \mathbf{n}_p)^2 \mathfrak{R}_p^2, & t \leq \mathbf{n}_p \\ \frac{e-t}{(e-s)(t-s)} (\mathbf{n}_p - s)^2 \mathfrak{R}_p^2, & t \geq \mathbf{n}_p. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, we may write

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \frac{(e - \mathbf{n}_p)(\mathbf{n}_p - s)}{(e - s)} \mathfrak{R}_p^2.$$

**Lemma 6.** Let  $(s, e]$  be such that

$$\mathbf{n}_{p-1} \leq s < \mathbf{n}_p < e.$$

Then for any  $s < t \leq \mathbf{n}_p$ ,

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \frac{(t-s)(e - \mathbf{n}_p)}{(\mathbf{n}_p - s)(e-t)} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{n}_p}^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2.$$

Consequently, we may write

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \max_{\mathbf{n}_p \leq t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2. \quad (47)$$

*Proof.* With the form outlined at (46)

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 &= \frac{e-s}{(t-s)(e-t)} \left\| \sum_{i=s+1}^t \mathbf{f}_i \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \frac{(e-s)(t-s)^2}{(t-s)(e-t)} \|\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{n}_p}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \frac{(t-s)(e-\mathbf{n}_p)}{(\mathbf{n}_p-s)(e-t)} \frac{(e-s)}{(\mathbf{n}_p-s)(e-\mathbf{n}_p)} (\mathbf{n}_p-s)^2 \|\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{n}_p}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \frac{(t-s)(e-\mathbf{n}_p)}{(\mathbf{n}_p-s)(e-t)} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $(s, e]$  contains exactly two change points  $\mathbf{n}_p$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{p+1}$ . Then*

$$\max_{s < t < e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \leq 2(e - \mathbf{n}_{p+1})\mathfrak{R}_{p+1}^2 + 2(\mathbf{n}_p - s)\mathfrak{R}_p^2.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$\mathbf{g}_t = \begin{cases} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{n}_{p+1}}, & \text{if } s \leq t \leq \mathbf{n}_p \\ \mathbf{f}_t, & \text{if } \mathbf{n}_p + 1 \leq t \leq \mathbf{n}_{p+1}. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\forall t \geq \mathbf{n}_r$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e} - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^{s,e} &= \sqrt{\frac{(e-s)}{(e-t)(t-s)}} \left( \sum_{i=s+1}^{\mathbf{n}_p} \mathbf{f}_i - \sum_{i=s+1}^{\mathbf{n}_p} \mathbf{g}_i + \sum_{i=\mathbf{n}_{p+1}}^t \mathbf{f}_i - \sum_{i=\mathbf{n}_{p+1}}^t \mathbf{g}_i \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{(e-s)}{(e-t)(t-s)}} (\mathbf{n}_p - s) (\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{n}_p} - \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{n}_{p+1}}). \\ \implies \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e} - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 &= \frac{(e-s)(\mathbf{n}_p-s)}{(e-t)(t-s)} (\mathbf{n}_p-s)\mathfrak{R}_p^2 \leq (\mathbf{n}_p-s)\mathfrak{R}_p^2.\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

Observe that

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathbf{n}_{p+1}}^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \frac{(e-\mathbf{n}_{p+1})(\mathbf{n}_{p+1}-s)}{(e-s)} \mathfrak{R}_{p+1}^2 \leq (e-\mathbf{n}_{p+1})\mathfrak{R}_{p+1}^2\tag{49}$$

where the equality follows from the fact that  $\mathbf{g}_t$  just have one change point and Lemma 5. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{s < t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 &= \max_{\mathbf{n}_p \leq t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \leq 2 \max_{\mathbf{n}_p \leq t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{s,e} - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + 2 \max_{\mathbf{n}_p \leq t \leq e} \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t^{s,e}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &\leq 2(\mathbf{n}_p - s)\mathfrak{R}_p^2 + 2(e - \mathbf{n}_{p+1})\mathfrak{R}_{p+1}^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from Lemma 6 and the triangle inequality, and the last line follows from (48) and (49). □

## C Proof of Theorem 2

Prior to presenting the proof of the main theorem, we will establish the existence and finiteness of the long-run variance.

**Lemma 8.** *Suppose the Assumption 1 hold. For  $k \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{K}\}$ , the long-run variance defined in (14) exists and is finite.*

*Proof.* Denote

$$Z_j = \frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j}{\kappa_k}.$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z_1|^3] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^6}{\kappa_k^6}\right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_j^6]} = O\left(\mathbb{E}^{3/2}\left[\frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2}{\kappa_k^2}\right]\right) = O(1),$$

where the second last equality follows from Assumption 1. Given that we have  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha^{1/3}(k) < \infty$  which is implied by  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{1/3} \alpha^{1/3}(k) < \infty$  in Assumption 1, all the conditions of Theorem 1.7 of [Ibragimov \(1962\)](#). It follows from therein that  $\sigma_{\infty}^2(k)$  exists and is finite.  $\square$

**Sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.** We refer to A1 and B1 jointly as uniform tightness. Their proof proceeds in multiple steps where we control diverse errors associated with time series functional linear regression modelling uniformly over the seeded intervals. Let

$$\mathcal{Q}_k^*(t) = \sum_{j=s_k+1}^t (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 + \sum_{j=t+1}^{e_k} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \quad (50)$$

be the population version of the objective function in (10). Observe that  $\tilde{\eta}_k$  is the minimiser of  $\mathcal{Q}_k(t)$  and  $\eta_k$  is the minimiser of the  $\mathcal{Q}_k^*(t)$ . Establishing the limiting distribution in A2, involves understanding the behavior of both  $\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + t) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k + t) - \mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k)$ , for fixed  $t$ . We show that  $\max_t |\mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k + t) - \mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + t) + \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k)| = o_p(1)$ , which in turn hinges on the convergence of  $\hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \tilde{\eta}_k)}$  to  $\beta_{\eta_k}^*$  and symmetrically, that of  $\hat{\beta}_{(\tilde{\eta}_k, e_k)}$  to  $\beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*$  in an appropriate norm. This establishes that  $\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + t) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k + t) - \mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k)$  have asymptotically same distribution. We then proceed to show that  $\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + t) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k)$  converges strongly to  $S_k(t)$ , and consequently,  $\mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k + t) - \mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k)$  converges to  $S_k(t)$  in distribution.

Finally, we leverage the Argmax continuous mapping theorem (e.g. Theorem 3.2.2 of [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) to translate the convergence from the functional to the minimizer of the functional, which leads to A2. In this regime, it is noteworthy that  $t$  is only taking discrete values, and we are not invoking any central limit theorems.

In the vanishing regime, additional complexities arise. Since  $\kappa_k$  converges to 0, in the light of tightness demonstrated in B1, we invoke the functional CLT and establish that  $\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + t\kappa_k^{-2}) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k)$  converges in distribution to a two-sided Brownian motion  $\mathbb{W}(t)$ , where  $1/\kappa_k^2$  acts as a local sample size. The subsequent steps parallels the non-vanishing case but additional intricacies arise due to the convergence behavior as  $\kappa_k \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let  $1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}$  be given. By construction and Lemma 10,  $(s_k, e_k]$  contains only one change point  $\eta_k$  and

$$\eta_k - s_k \geq \Delta/5, \quad e_k - \eta_k \geq \Delta/5,$$

for large enough  $n$ . Recall for any  $a > 0$ ,  $\delta_a \asymp a^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ .

Let  $\tilde{\eta}_k$  denote the minimiser at (10). Without loss of generality assume the minimiser  $\tilde{\eta}_k = \eta_k + \gamma$ , with  $\gamma > 0$ . The results presented here assume that what we establish in Theorem 1 holds.

$$\textbf{Uniform tightness: } \kappa_k^2 |\tilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k| = O_p(1)$$

Assume  $\gamma \geq \max\{1/\kappa_k^2, 2\}$ , if not, the uniform tightness follows directly. Let  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  be defined as in (10). Since  $\mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k + \gamma)$  is a minimum, we may write

$$0 \geq \mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k + \gamma) - \mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k) = \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2.$$

The preceding inequality is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right), \\ &= \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(s_k, \hat{\eta}_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$- \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(\hat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right) \quad (52)$$

$$+ \left( 2 \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right) \quad (53)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right). \quad (54)$$

Therefore, we have

$$(54) \leq |(53)| + |(52)| + |(51)|.$$

Recall  $\delta_\Delta = \Delta^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_k - s_k \geq \Delta/5 &\implies \delta_{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k} = O(\delta_\Delta), \\ e_k - \hat{\eta}_k \geq \Delta/5 &\implies \delta_{e_k - \hat{\eta}_k} = O(\delta_\Delta). \end{aligned}$$

Also using  $\gamma \geq 1/\kappa_k^2$  and  $r > 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\gamma^{3/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} &= O\left(\gamma^{-1/2}\right) = O\left(\kappa_k\right), \\ \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} &= O\left(\gamma^{-1/3}\right) = O\left(\kappa_k^{2/3}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{55}$$

From Assumption 3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\hat{\eta}-s} \log^{1+2\xi}(\hat{\eta} - s) &= O\left(\delta_\Delta \log^{1+2\xi}(\Delta)\right) = o(\kappa_k^2), \\ \delta_{e-\hat{\eta}} \log^{1+2\xi}(e - \hat{\eta}) &= O\left(\delta_\Delta \log^{1+2\xi}(\Delta)\right) = o(\kappa_k^2).\end{aligned}\tag{56}$$

With (55) and (56) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\gamma^{3/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k})^{1/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(\hat{\eta}_k - s_k)} &= o(\kappa_k^2) \\ \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k})^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(\hat{\eta}_k - s_k)} &= o(\kappa_k^2) \\ \delta_\gamma^{3/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{e_k - \hat{\eta}_k})^{1/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(e_k - \hat{\eta}_k)} &= o(\kappa_k^2) \\ \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{e_k - \hat{\eta}_k})^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(e_k - \hat{\eta}_k)} &= o(\kappa_k^2).\end{aligned}\tag{57}$$

Also, we have from Theorem 1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{\hat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{\hat{\eta}_k - s} \right| &\lesssim \left| \frac{\hat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{\Delta} \right| = o_p(1), \\ \left| \frac{\hat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{\hat{\eta}_k - e} \right| &\lesssim \left| \frac{\hat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{\Delta} \right| = o_p(1).\end{aligned}\tag{58}$$

**Step 1: the order of magnitude of (51).** Following from Lemma 9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(51) &= O_p\left(\gamma \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k})^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(\hat{\eta}_k - s_k)}\right) \\ &\quad + O_p\left(\gamma \delta_\gamma^{3/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k})^{1/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(\hat{\eta}_k - s_k)}\right) \\ &\quad + O_p\left(\gamma \kappa_k (\delta_{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k})^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(\hat{\eta}_k - s_k)}\right) + O_p\left(\gamma \delta_{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k} \log^{1+2\xi}(\hat{\eta}_k - s_k)\right) \\ &\quad + O_p\left(\sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\}\right) + O_p\left(\gamma \frac{\hat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{\hat{\eta}_k - s_k} \kappa_k^2\right) \\ &= o_p(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + O_p\left(\sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{59}$$

where the last line follows from (57) and (58).

**Step 2: the order of magnitude of (52).** Following from Lemma 9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(52) &= O_p \left( \gamma \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{e_k - \hat{\eta}_k})^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(e_k - \hat{\eta}_k)} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left( \gamma \delta_\gamma^{3/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} (\delta_{e_k - \hat{\eta}_k})^{1/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(e_k - \hat{\eta}_k)} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left( \gamma \kappa_k (\delta_{e_k - \hat{\eta}_k})^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+2\xi}(e_k - \hat{\eta}_k)} \right) + O_p \left( \gamma \delta_{\hat{\eta}-s} \log^{1+2\xi}(e_k - \hat{\eta}_k) \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right) + O_p \left( \gamma \frac{\hat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{e_k - \hat{\eta}_k} \kappa_k^2 \right) \\
&= o_p(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right). \tag{60}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (57) and (58).

**Step 3: the order of magnitude of (53).** Following from Lemma 20 and Lemma 37, we have

$$\max_{1/\kappa_k^2 < \gamma < \eta_{k+1} - \eta_k} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}(\log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1)} \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 = O_p(1). \tag{61}$$

Using (61), we have

$$(53) = O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right). \tag{62}$$

**Step 4: lower bound of (54).** Following from Lemma 19 and Lemma 37, we have

$$\max_{1/\kappa_k^2 < \gamma < \eta_{k+1} - \eta_k} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}(\log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1)} \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right) \right|^2 = O_p(1). \tag{63}$$

Using (63), we have

$$(54) \geq \gamma \kappa_k^2 + O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right). \tag{64}$$

Combining (59), (60), (62) and (64), we have uniformly for all  $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{\kappa_k^2}$

$$\gamma \kappa_k^2 + O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right) \leq O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right) + o_p(\gamma \kappa_k^2),$$

which gives us

$$\kappa_k^2 |\tilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k| = O_p(1).$$

### Limiting distribution:

Recall the definition of  $Q_k^*(\cdot)$  from (50). For any given  $k \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{K}\}$ , given the end points  $s_k$  and  $e_k$  and the true coefficients  $\beta_{\eta_k}^*$  and  $\beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(53) + (54) &= \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \\
&= Q_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma) - Q_k^*(\eta_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Following from the proof of uniform tightness, we have uniformly in  $\gamma$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , that

$$|\mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k + \gamma) - \mathcal{Q}_k(\eta_k) - (\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k))| \leq |(51)| + |(52)| + |(53)| + |(54)| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

With Slutsky's theorem, it is sufficient to find the limiting distribution of  $\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k)$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Non-vanishing regime.** For  $\gamma > 0$ , we have that when  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k) &= \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left\{ 2 \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left\{ 2 \varrho_k \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + \varrho_k^2 \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\gamma < 0$ , we have when  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k) &= \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=\eta_k+\gamma+1}^{\eta_k} \left\{ 2 \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{j=\eta_k+\gamma+1}^{\eta_k} \left\{ -2 \varrho_k \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + \varrho_k^2 \langle X_j, \Psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows because pointwise convergence implies convergence in  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ .

From stationarity, the Slutsky's theorem and the Argmax continuous mapping theorem (e.g. Theorem 3.2.2 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)), we have

$$\tilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \min_{\gamma} S_k(\gamma).$$

**Vanishing regime.** Let  $m = \kappa_k^{-2}$ , and we have that  $m \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $\gamma > 0$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma m) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k) &= \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} \left\{ 2 \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j + \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} \left\{ \frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\kappa_k} \varepsilon_j \right\} + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} \left\{ \frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2}{\kappa_k^2} - 1 \right\} + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} 1. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Following from the definition of the long-run variance and Theorem 6, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{\infty}(k)} \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} \left\{ \frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\kappa_k} \varepsilon_j \right\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{B}_2(\gamma). \tag{66}$$

We also have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} \left\{ \frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\kappa_k^2} - 1 \right\} \right|^2 \right] = O\left(\frac{\gamma}{m}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (67)$$

following from (89) in Lemma 19. Using (67), (66) and  $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma m} 1 \rightarrow \gamma$  in (65), we write

$$\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma m) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sigma_\infty(k) \mathbb{B}_2(\gamma) + \gamma$$

where  $\mathbb{B}_2(\gamma)$  is a standard Brownian motion.

Similarly, for  $\gamma < 0$ , we may have when  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k + \gamma m) - \mathcal{Q}_k^*(\eta_k) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} -\gamma + \sigma_\infty(k) \mathbb{B}_1(-\gamma),$$

where  $\mathbb{B}_1(r)$  is a standard Brownian motion. Let  $Z_j^* = \frac{\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}} - \beta_{\eta_k} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j}{\kappa_k}$ . To see the independence of  $\mathbb{B}_1(r)$  and  $\mathbb{B}_2(r)$  note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=-m\gamma}^{-1} Z_t^* \right) \left( \sum_{t=1}^{m\gamma} Z_t^* \right) \right] &= \frac{1}{m} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{m\gamma} k \mathbb{E}[Z_1 Z_{1+k}] + \sum_{k=m\gamma+1}^{2m\gamma} (2q-k) \mathbb{E}[Z_1 Z_{1+k}] \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{2m\gamma} k |\mathbb{E}[Z_1 Z_{1+k}]| \leq \frac{(2m\gamma)^{2/3}}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{2m\gamma} k^{1/3} \|Z_1\|_3^2 \alpha^{1/3}(k) = O\left(\frac{1}{m^{1/3}}\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality follows from Lemma 33 and stationarity and the last inequality follows from  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{1/3} \alpha^{1/3}(k) < \infty$  and

$$\|Z_1\|_3 = \mathbb{E}^{1/3} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^3} \langle X_1, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle^3 \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_1^3 | X_1] \right] \leq O(1) \mathbb{E}^{1/6} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^6} \langle X_1, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle^6 \right] = O(1),$$

which follows from Assumption 1.

From the Slutsky's theorem and the Argmax continuous mapping theorem we have

$$\tilde{\eta}_k - \eta_k \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \min_{\gamma} \{ |\gamma| + \sigma_\infty(k) \mathbb{W}(\gamma) \}.$$

□

### C.1 Technical result for the proof of Theorem 2

Recall for any  $a > 0$ ,  $\delta_a \asymp a^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ .

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $\eta_{k-1} < s < \eta_k < e < \eta_{k+1}$  be fixed. Let  $\xi > 0$ . Then,*

$$\max_{\gamma \in (1/\kappa_k^2, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_k)} \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}(\hat{\eta}_k - s, \gamma)} \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \hat{\beta}_{(s, \hat{\eta}_k]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \right) = O_p(1)$$

where for any  $t \in (s, e]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(t-s, \gamma) &= \gamma \left\{ \left( \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} + \delta_\gamma^{1/4} \right) \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi} \gamma} + \left( \kappa_k + \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} \right\} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} \\ &\quad + \kappa_k \sqrt{\gamma} \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} + \left| \frac{t - \eta_k}{t - s} \right| \gamma \kappa_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $t > \eta_k$ . The case when  $t \leq \eta_k$  follows similar to the proof outlined below. Observe that

$$\beta_{(s,t]}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* = \left( \frac{t - \eta_k}{t - s} (\beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^*) \right).$$

We may write the expression

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \right) \\ &= \left( \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \right). \quad (69)$$

We show in Step 1 that

$$\max_{\substack{t \in (s, e] \\ \gamma \in (1/\kappa_k^2, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_k)}} \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}_1(t-s, \gamma)} \left( \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 \right) = O_p(1), \quad (70)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1(t-s, \gamma) &= \gamma \left\{ \left( \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} + \delta_{\gamma}^{1/4} \right) \delta_{\gamma}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(\gamma)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \kappa_k + \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We show in Step 2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\substack{t \in (s, e] \\ \gamma \in (1/\kappa_k^2, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_k)}} \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}_2(\gamma)} \left( \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_{k+1}}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \left\{ \left( \frac{\eta_k - s}{t-s} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \gamma \kappa_k^2 \right) \\ &= O_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_2(\gamma) = \kappa_k \sqrt{\gamma} \left\{ \log^{1+\xi}(\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\}.$$

The bound for (68) follows from (70) and the bound for (69) follows from (71) and the realization that  $\left\{ 1 - \left( \frac{\eta_k - s}{t-s} \right)^2 \right\} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{\eta_k - s}{t-s} \right) = \left( \frac{t - \eta_k}{t-s} \right)$ .

**Step 1:** Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - 2 \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - 2 \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right| \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+2 \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \tag{73}$$

$$+2 \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|. \tag{74}$$

We are going to bound (72), (73) and (74) in the following three sub-steps. Following from Lemma 16 we have that

$$(72) = O_p \left( \gamma \left\{ \left( \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} + \delta_\gamma^{1/4} \right) \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(\gamma)} + \delta_{t-s}^{3/4} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right\} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} \right).$$

Following from Lemma 18, we have that

$$(73) = O_p \left( \gamma \left\{ \left( \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} + \delta_\gamma^{1/4} \right) \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(\gamma)} + \kappa_k \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} \right\} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \delta_{t-s}^{1/4} \right).$$

And following from Lemma 17, we have that

$$(74) = O_p \left( \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_\gamma}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right\} \delta_\gamma^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(\gamma)} \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right).$$

The stochastic bound (70) now follows directly from these three bounds on (72), (73) and (74).

**Step 2:** Observe that  $\beta_{(s,t)}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* = \frac{t-\eta_k}{t-s} (\beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^*)$ . We may write the expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \sum_{j=\eta_k}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t)}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 - \left\{ \left( \frac{\eta_k - s}{t-s} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \gamma \kappa^2 \right) \\
&= \left\{ \left( \frac{s - \eta_k}{t-s} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right) - 2 \left( \frac{t - \eta_k}{t-s} \right) \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} (Y_j - \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 - \left\{ \left( \frac{\eta_k - s}{t - s} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \gamma \kappa_k^2 \right| \\
& \leq \left| \left\{ \left( \frac{\eta_k - s}{t - s} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right) \right| + 2 \left| \left( \frac{t - \eta_k}{t - s} \right) \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right| \\
& \leq \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right) \right| \tag{75}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ 2 \left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|, \tag{76}$$

where the last two line follows from  $0 \leq \left\{ 1 - \left( \frac{\eta_k - s}{t - s} \right)^2 \right\} \leq 1$  and  $\left( \frac{t - \eta_k}{t - s} \right) \leq 1$ . For the expression (75), using (63), we get that

$$\left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \left( \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - \kappa_k^2 \right) \right| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi} (\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right). \tag{77}$$

For the expression (76), we use (61) to have

$$\left| \sum_{j=\eta_k+1}^{\eta_k+\gamma} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\gamma} \kappa_k \left\{ \log^{1+\xi} (\gamma \kappa_k^2) + 1 \right\} \right). \tag{78}$$

Bringing (77) and (78) together shall establish (71).  $\square$

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $(s_k, e_k]$  be the refined interval constructed in (9). Then, under the event  $\mathcal{A}$  defined in (19),  $\eta_k$  is the one and only change point lying in  $(s_k, e_k]$ . Additionally, under the same event  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have*

$$\min \left\{ e_k - \eta_k, s_k - \eta_k \right\} \geq \Delta/5.$$

*Since, event  $\mathcal{A}$  is asymptotically almost sure (Lemma 3). These results holds with probability converging to 1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* In the last seeded intervals layer, we have  $\mathfrak{l}_k = \Delta$  and  $\mathfrak{b}_k = \Delta/2$ . Let  $\hat{\eta}_k \in (i\Delta/2, (i+1)\Delta/2]$ , for some  $i$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $i = 1$ ; if not, we translate the intervals by  $(i-1)\Delta/2$  unit to right. Then  $\hat{\eta}_k$  would be contained in  $(0, \Delta]$  and  $(\Delta/2, 3\Delta/2]$  in this last seeded intervals layer. By construction, we have  $s_k = 0$  and  $e_k = 3\Delta/2$ . Following from Theorem 1, under the event  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have  $|\hat{\eta}_k - \eta_k| \leq \Delta/4$ . Therefore  $\eta_k \in (\Delta/4, 5\Delta/4]$ .  $\square$

## D Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{P} = \{J_1, J_2, \dots, J_S\}$ . Let  $J_1 = \{t_1, t_1 + 1, \dots, t_1 + (q-1), \dots, t_1 + (2q-1)\}$ . Denote  $\tilde{J}_1 = J_1 \setminus (J_1 + q) = \{t_1, t_1 + 1, \dots, t_1 + (q-1)\}$  and  $\bar{J}_1 = J_1 \setminus \tilde{J}_1 = \{t_1 + q, \dots, t_1 + (2q-1)\}$  as the two equal partition of the block  $J_1$ . Recall that  $\delta_a \asymp a^{-2r/2r+1}$  for any  $a > 0$ . Denote the population version of the process  $\{F_{J_v}^*\}_{v=1}^S$  as

$$F_{J_1}^* = \sqrt{\frac{2}{q}} \left\{ \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} (Z_t^* - Z_{t+q}^*) \right\} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{q}} \left\{ \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} Z_t^* - \sum_{t \in \bar{J}_1} Z_t^* \right\}.$$

where  $Z_t^* = \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle \varepsilon_t$ .

This proof is further divided into two steps. Firstly, we establish the consistency of the population version of the estimate. Secondly, we conclude the proof by demonstrating that the deviation of the estimate from the estimator is small in probability. The last redundant step is replacing  $\kappa_k$  with  $\hat{\kappa}_k$  and applying Lemma 11 along with the Slutsky's theorem.

**Step 1a:** Note that

$$\mathbb{E} [(F_{J_1}^*)^2] = 2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} Z_t^* \right)^2 \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{t \in \bar{J}_1} Z_t^* \right)^2 \right] - \frac{4}{q} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} Z_t^* \right) \left( \sum_{t \in \bar{J}_1} Z_t^* \right) \right].$$

Following stationarity, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{q} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} Z_t^* \right) \left( \sum_{t \in \bar{J}_1} Z_t^* \right) \right] &= \frac{1}{q} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^q t \mathbb{E}[Z_1 Z_{1+t}] + \sum_{t=q+1}^{2q} (2q-t) \mathbb{E}[Z_1 Z_{1+t}] \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{q} \sum_{t=1}^{2q} t |\mathbb{E}[Z_1 Z_{1+t}]| \leq \frac{(2q)^{2/3}}{q} \sum_{t=1}^{2q} t^{1/3} \|Z_1\|_3^2 \alpha^{1/3}(t) = O\left(\frac{1}{q^{1/3}}\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality follows from Lemma 33 and stationarity and the last inequality follows from  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{1/3} \alpha^{1/3}(k) < \infty$  and

$$\|Z_1\|_3 = \mathbb{E}^{1/3} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^3} \langle X_1, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle^3 \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_1^3 | X_1] \right] \leq O\left(\mathbb{E}^{1/6} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^6} \langle X_1, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle^6 \right]\right) = O(1), \quad (79)$$

which follows from Assumption 1.

From this, the definition of the long run variance and stationarity at (14), we can write

$$\mathbb{E} [(F_{J_v}^*)^2] \rightarrow \sigma_{\infty}^2(k), \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty, \quad (80)$$

for all  $J_v \in \mathcal{P}$ .

**Step 1b:** We have from Assumption 1 that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1)^{8/3-1} \alpha^{(4/3)/(8/3+4/3)}(k) < \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[Z_t^*] = 0$  and similar to (79) that

$$\|Z_1^*\|_4 = \mathbb{E}^{1/4} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^4} \langle X_1, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle^4 \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_1^4 | X_1] \right] \leq O\left(\mathbb{E}^{1/6} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_k^6} \langle X_1, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle^6 \right]\right) < \infty.$$

All of the conditions of Theorem 1 of [Yokoyama \(1980\)](#) are satisfied and therefore

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} Z_t^* \right|^{8/3} \right] = O(q^{4/3}).$$

Following stationarity for all  $v \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ , it implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |(F_{J_v}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} [(F_{J_v}^*)^2]|^{4/3} \right] \leq 2^{1/3} \mathbb{E} \left[ |(F_{J_v}^*)^2|^{4/3} \right] \leq 4 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} Z_t^* \right|^{8/3} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} Z_t^* \right|^{8/3} \right] \right) < \infty,$$

where we used  $(a+b)^{4/3} \leq 2^{1/3}(a^{4/3} + b^{4/3})$  in the last and the second last inequality. We also have  $\alpha(k) = O\left(\frac{1}{k^4}\right)$  which follows from the summability of  $\{k^{1/3}\alpha^{1/3}(k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ . With  $\rho = 8$  and  $p = 4/3$ , it is what follows that

$$\sum_{v=1}^S \frac{\mathbb{E}^{2/\rho} [|(F_{J_v}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} [(F_{J_v}^*)^2]|^p]}{v^p} \leq O(1) \sum_{v=1}^\infty \frac{1}{v^p} < \infty.$$

We have all the condition of Theorem 5 satisfied with  $\rho = 8$  and  $p = 4/3$ , therefore,

$$\frac{1}{S} \sum_{v=1}^S (F_{J_v}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E} [(F_{J_v}^*)^2] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Combining this with (80) and the stationarity of  $\{F_{J_v}^*\}_{v=1}^S$ , we write

$$\frac{1}{S} \sum_{v=1}^S (F_{J_v}^*)^2 \rightarrow \sigma_\infty^2(k) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (81)$$

**Step 2:** Let

$$\widehat{F}_{J_v} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{q}} \left\{ \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \frac{\langle X_t, \widehat{\beta}_k^{(1)} - \widehat{\beta}_k^{(2)} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\kappa_k} (Y_t - \langle X_t, \widehat{\beta}_J \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}) - \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} \frac{\langle X_t, \widehat{\beta}_k^{(1)} - \widehat{\beta}_k^{(2)} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\kappa_k} (Y_t - \langle X_t, \widehat{\beta}_J \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}) \right\}.$$

Observe that

$$\left( \widehat{F}_{J_v} \right)^2 = (A_v + F_{J_v}^* + B_v)^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_v = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\kappa_k \sqrt{q}} & \left\{ \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \hat{\beta}_k^{(1)} - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_t + \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \hat{\beta}_k^{(2)} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_t \right. \\
& + \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \hat{\beta}_k^{(1)} - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
& + \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \hat{\beta}_k^{(2)} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
& - \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \hat{\beta}_k^{(1)} - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_t - \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_1} \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \hat{\beta}_k^{(2)} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_t \\
& - \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \hat{\beta}_k^{(1)} - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
& \left. - \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \hat{\beta}_k^{(2)} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
B_v = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\kappa_k \sqrt{q}} & \left\{ \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right. \\
& \left. - \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Such an expansion is possible because, under the event outlined in Lemma 3, for  $1 \leq v \leq S$ ,  $J_v$  have no change point. This follows from their construction in Algorithm 2 and conditions specified in (16). As a consequence,  $\beta_{\tilde{J}_v}^* = \beta_{J_v}^* = \beta_{J_v}^*$ . Following from Lemma 13, Lemma 14, Lemma 16, Lemma 17 and the choice of the tuning parameter  $q$  detailed in (16), we may write

$$A_v = O_p \left( \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sqrt{q} \delta_q \log^{1+\xi}(q) \right) = O_p \left( \frac{1}{\kappa_k} q^{\frac{1/2-r}{2r+1}} \log^{1+\xi}(q) \right) = o_p(1).$$

For the term  $B_v$ , we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
B_v &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\kappa_k \sqrt{q}} \left\{ \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \left( \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \right] \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \sum_{t \in \tilde{J}_v} \left( \langle X_t, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_t, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \right] \right) \right\} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{2q}}{\kappa_k} \left\{ \left( \hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{J}_v} - \Sigma \right) \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \right] - \left( \hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{J}_v} - \Sigma \right) \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{J_v}^* - \hat{\beta}_{J_v} \right] \right\} \\
&= O_p \left( \frac{\sqrt{q}}{\kappa_k} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_q}{\sqrt{q}}} \log^{1+\xi}(q) \right) = O_p \left( \frac{1}{\kappa_k} \sqrt{q^{\frac{2r-1}{2r+1}}} \log^{1+\xi}(q) \right) = o_p(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality in the last line follows from the Holders inequality  $\left( \Sigma [a, b] \leq \sqrt{\Sigma [a, a] \Sigma [b, b]} \right)$ , (90) of Lemma 19, Lemma 12 and Lemma 13, the last equality follows from (16). Since

$A_v = o_p(1), B_v = o_p(1)$  and  $F_{J_v}^* = O_p(1)$ , we can write

$$\left(\widehat{F}_{J_v}\right)^2 - \left(F_{J_v}^*\right)^2 = \left(A_v + F_{J_v}^* + B_v\right)^2 - \left(F_{J_v}^*\right)^2 = o_p(1).$$

Therefore, from (81)

$$\frac{1}{S} \sum_{v=1}^S \left(\widehat{F}_{J_v}\right)^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma_\infty^2(k).$$

The main result now follows from the Slutsky's theorem because  $F_{J_v} = \frac{\kappa_k}{\widehat{\kappa}_k} \widehat{F}_{J_v}$ , and  $\frac{\kappa_k}{\widehat{\kappa}_k} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1$  by Lemma 11.  $\square$

## D.1 Technical results for the Proof of Theorem 3

**Lemma 11.** *Suppose that assumptions of Theorem 1 holds. The estimator  $\widehat{\kappa}_k$  defined in (15) satisfies*

$$\widehat{\kappa}_k^2 - \kappa_k^2 = O_p\left(\Delta^{-r/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi} \Delta\right).$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{\widehat{\kappa}_k^2}{\kappa_k^2} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* WLOG let  $\widehat{\eta}_k \geq \eta_k$ . Observe that

$$\beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^* - \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^* = \left(\frac{\eta_k - s_k}{\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k}\right) \left[\beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*\right]$$

and because  $\Delta/5 \leq \widehat{\eta} - s_k \leq \Delta$  from Lemma 10, following from Theorem 1 we have that

$$1 - \frac{\widehat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k} = \left(\frac{\eta_k - s_k}{\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We may write the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\kappa}_k^2 - \kappa_k^2 &= \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k]} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]} - \widehat{\beta}_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]} - \widehat{\beta}_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \right] - \Sigma \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \right] \\ &= \underbrace{\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k]} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]} - \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]} - \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^* \right]}_{A_1} + \underbrace{\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k]} \left[ \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}, \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \right]}_{A_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{2\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k]} \left[ \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^* - \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]} - \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^* \right]}_{A_3} + \underbrace{2\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k]} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]} - \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^*, \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]} \right]}_{A_4} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{2\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k]} \left[ \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^* - \widehat{\beta}_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}, \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^* - \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^* \right]}_{A_5} + \underbrace{\left(\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k]} - \Sigma\right) \left[ \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^* - \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^*, \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k]}^* - \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k]}^* \right]}_{A_6} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\left[ \left(\frac{\eta_k - s_k}{\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k}\right)^2 - 1 \right] \Sigma \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \right]}_{A_7}. \end{aligned}$$

Observing  $\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k = O(\Delta)$ , it follows from Lemma 16 that for  $j = 1, 2, 4$  we have

$$|A_j| = O_p\left(\delta_\Delta \log^{1+\xi} \Delta\right).$$

For the expression  $A_3$ , it follows from Lemma 18 that

$$\begin{aligned} |A_3| &= 2\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k)} \left[ \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k)}^* - \beta_{(\widehat{\eta}_k, e_k)}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k)} - \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k)}^* \right] \\ &\leq 2\widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k)} \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k)} - \beta_{(s_k, \widehat{\eta}_k)}^* \right] = O_p\left(\sqrt{\delta_\Delta} \log^{1+\xi} \Delta\right), \end{aligned}$$

and for the fifth expression we have  $|A_5| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\delta_\Delta} \log^{1+\xi} \Delta\right)$  following the same argument. For the expression  $A_6$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_6| &= \left( \frac{\eta_k - s_k}{\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k} \right)^2 \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k)} - \Sigma \right) \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \right] \\ &\leq \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s_k, e_k)} - \Sigma \right) \left[ \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^*, \beta_{\eta_k}^* - \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* \right] = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \kappa_k^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 19 and  $e_k - s_k = O(\Delta)$ . The deviation for the last expression

$$|A_7| = \left( 1 + \frac{\eta_k - s_k}{\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k} \right) \left( \frac{\widehat{\eta}_k - \eta_k}{\widehat{\eta}_k - s_k} \right) \kappa_k^2 \leq 6 \frac{5}{\Delta} \kappa_k^2 (\widehat{\eta}_k - \eta_k) = O_p\left(\delta_\Delta \log^{1+\xi}(\Delta)\right)$$

follows from the earlier observation  $\Delta/5 \leq \eta_k - s_k \leq \widehat{\eta}_k - s_k \leq \Delta$  and (32). The first part this current lemma  $\widehat{\kappa}_k^2 - \kappa_k^2 = O_p\left(\Delta^{-r/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi} \Delta\right)$  follows by combining this seven deviation bounds.

The deviation from the first part lead us to

$$\left| \frac{\widehat{\kappa}_k^2 - \kappa_k^2}{\kappa_k^2} \right| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_k^2} \Delta^{-r/(2r+1)} \log^{1+\xi}(\Delta)\right) = o_p(1),$$

where the last equality follows from Assumption 3. □

## E Proof of Theorem 4

*Proof.* Let  $k \in [1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{K}}]$  be given. For notational simplicity, we denote  $\widehat{u} = \widehat{u}_k^{(b)}$  and  $z_j = z_j^{(b)}$ .

The proof follows a similar pattern as the proof of Theorem 2. In the first step, we establish the uniform tightness of the minimizer. In the second step, we demonstrate the convergence of the objective function on a compact domain and use the Argmax continuous mapping theorem.

**Step 1.** Let  $\widehat{u}$  be a minimizer. Without loss of generality, assume  $\widehat{u} \geq 0$ . Since  $\widehat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k) = O_p(1)$ , we may write

$$\widehat{u} \leq -\widehat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n\widehat{u} \rfloor} z_j = O_p \left( \sqrt{\widehat{u} \log^{1+\xi}(\widehat{u})} \right),$$

where the stochastic bound follows from the uniform result Lemma 36. Therefore,  $\widehat{u} = O_p(1)$ .

**Step 2.** Let  $M > 0$ . We have  $\widehat{\sigma}_\infty^2(k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma_\infty^2(k)$  from Theorem 3. From functional CLT, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor nr \rfloor} z_j \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{B}_1(r),$$

uniformly for all  $0 \leq r \leq M$ . Therefore, with the Argmax continuous mapping theorem ( e.g. Theorem 3.2.2 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)), we have

$$\widehat{u} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \min_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \{|r| + \sigma_\infty(k) \mathbb{W}(r)\}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The main result now follows from the Slutsky's theorem. □

## F Deviation bounds in functional linear regression

### F.1 Notations

For any  $a > 0$ , we denote  $\delta_a \asymp a^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ . Also,  $\lambda_a \asymp a^{-2r/(2r+1)}$ . This is used in the observation (87) to denote  $\widehat{f}_{(s,t]}$  which is estimator of  $f_{(s,t]}^*$  from (86). The operator  $T$  is defined in (83) and its plug-in estimate  $T_{\mathcal{I}}$  is defined in (85). We use  $\mathbf{I}$  to denote the identity operator. The expression for  $g_{(s,t]}$  and  $H_{(s,t]}$  is defined in Proposition 1 and Lemma 21 respectively.

### F.2 Kernel tools

Following Riesz representation theorem, the norm associated with  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  from (3) can be equivalently defined through,

$$\langle f, L_K(g) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}(K)} := \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}.$$

One may note that

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle X, f \rangle^2] = \int f(s)\Sigma(s,t)f(t) ds dt = \langle L_{\Sigma}(f), f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \Sigma[f, f]. \quad (82)$$

Moving forward, the main operator of our interest is the linear operator corresponding to the bi-linear function  $K^{1/2}\Sigma K^{1/2}$  and the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions from its expansion. The linear operator on  $\mathcal{L}^2$  corresponding to  $K^{1/2}\Sigma K^{1/2}$  is given by

$$L_{K^{1/2}\Sigma K^{1/2}}(f)(*) = \langle K^{1/2}\Sigma K^{1/2}(\cdot, *), f(\cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}.$$

We denote the linear operator

$$T = L_{K^{1/2}\Sigma K^{1/2}}, \quad (83)$$

and by Assumption 2

$$T(\phi_l) = \mathfrak{s}_l \phi_l.$$

Following this, for any  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , the operator  $T^a$  is defined through the operation  $T^a(\phi_l) = \mathfrak{s}_l^a \phi_l$ . Also for any  $\beta \in \mathcal{H}(K)$  such that  $f = L_{K^{-1/2}}(\beta)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma[\beta, \beta] &= \Sigma[L_{K^{1/2}}(f), L_{K^{1/2}}(f)] = \langle L_{\Sigma}L_{K^{1/2}}(f), L_{K^{1/2}}(f) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &= \langle L_{K^{1/2}\Sigma K^{1/2}}(f), f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \langle T(f), f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \|T^{1/2}(f)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

The estimator of covariance function based on the sub-sample  $\mathcal{I} \subset (0, n]$  is given by

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}(u, v) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} X_j(u)X_j(v).$$

The empirical version of  $T$  is  $T_{\mathcal{I}} := L_{K^{1/2}\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}K^{1/2}}$  and its action can be viewed as

$$T_{\mathcal{I}}(h) = L_{K^{1/2}} \circ L_{\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}} \circ L_{K^{1/2}}(h) = L_{K^{1/2}} \left( \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(h) \rangle X_j \right) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(h) \rangle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j). \quad (85)$$

Since,  $\mathcal{L}^2$  is bijectively mapped to  $\mathcal{H}(K)$ , we may have  $f_{(s,t]}^*$  and  $\widehat{f}_{(s,t]}$  defined as

$$\frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t f_j^* = f_{(s,t]}^* = L_{K^{-1/2}}\beta_{(s,t]}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} = L_{K^{-1/2}}(\widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]}). \quad (86)$$

We may also observe that

$$\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{L}^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{(t-s)} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (y_j - \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(f) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 + \lambda_{(s,t]} \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} \quad (87)$$

Given  $(y^*, X^*)$  a copy of  $(y, X)$  independent of the training data, the excess risk based on  $(s, t]$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\langle X^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle^2] &= \int \int (\widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]}(x) - \beta_{(s,t]}^*(x)) \Sigma(x, y) (\widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]}(y) - \beta_{(s,t]}^*(y)) dx dy \\ &= \Sigma[\widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*] = \left\| T^{1/2}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

the last form can be obtained using (82), (84) and (86).

### F.3 Roughness regularized estimator and its properties

In order to evaluate the quality of estimation, we rely on the following lemmas. They help us control various deviation terms in the main result presented in this paper. All the proofs of the lemmas stated below are in the next section.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose  $(s, e] \subset (0, n]$ . Then*

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] = O_p(1).$$

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose  $(s, e] \subset (0, n]$ . Then*

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s,t]} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] = O_p(1).$$

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose  $(s, e] \subset (0, n]$ . Then*

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j = O_p(1).$$

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose  $(s, e] \subset (0, n]$ . Then*

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1).$$

**Lemma 16.** Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose  $(s', e']$  and  $(s, e]$  are the subsets of  $(0, n]$ . Then

$$\max_{\substack{s < t \leq e \\ s' < t' \leq e'}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}(t-s, t'-s')} \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s', t']} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s, t]} - \beta_{(s, t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s, t]} - \beta_{(s, t]}^* \right] = O_p(1),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{J}(t-s, t'-s') = \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right) \left\{ \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \delta_{t'-s'}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t'-s')} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right\} + \delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s).$$

**Lemma 17.** Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose  $(s', e']$  and  $(s, e]$  are the subsets of  $(0, n]$ . Then

$$\max_{\substack{s < t \leq e \\ s' < t' \leq e'}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{H}(t-s, t'-s')} \frac{1}{t'-s'} \sum_{j=s'+1}^{t'} \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s, t]} - \beta_{(s, t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j = O_p(1).$$

where

$$\mathfrak{H}(t-s, t'-s') = \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right) \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \delta_{t'-s'}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t'-s')} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

**Lemma 18.** Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose  $(s', e']$  and  $(s, e]$  are the subsets of  $(0, n]$ . Then

$$\max_{\substack{s < t \leq e \\ s' < t' \leq e'}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{G}(t-s, t'-s')} \frac{1}{t'-s'} \sum_{j=s'+1}^{t'} \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s, t]} - \beta_{(s, t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1).$$

where

$$\mathfrak{G}(t-s, t'-s') = \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right) \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \delta_{t'-s'}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t'-s')} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} + \kappa_k \sqrt{\delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

#### F.4 Markov type probability bounds

**Lemma 19.** Let  $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^t$  and  $h$  be non-random function in  $\mathcal{L}^2$ . Suppose  $\Sigma[f_j, f_j] \leq M < \infty$ , for all  $1 \leq j \leq t$ , where  $M$  is some absolute constant. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t \langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[f_j, h] \right|^2 \right] = O(t) \Sigma[h, h]. \quad (89)$$

When  $f_1 = \dots = f_t = f$ , Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t \langle X_j, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[f, h] \right|^2 \right] = O(t) \Sigma[h, h] \Sigma[f, f]. \quad (90)$$

*Proof.* Given any sequence of stationary random variables  $\{W_j\}_{j=1}^t$  with finite second moment it holds

$$\text{Var} \left( \sum_{j=1}^t W_j \right)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^t \text{Var} (W_j^2) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} (t-j) \text{Cov} (W_1, W_{1+j}). \quad (91)$$

We are going to establish (89). Let  $z_j = \langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[f_j, h]$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[z_j^2] &\leq \mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4]} \\ &\leq c^2 \mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2] c^2 \mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2] \\ &= c^4 \Sigma[f_j, f_j] \Sigma[h, h] \leq c^4 M \Sigma[h, h]. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

The (92) follows from the Assumption 1, where we have the sixth moment bounded by the second moment up to a constant factor  $c$ .

We have

$$\mathbb{E}[|z_j z_{j+k}|] = \text{Cov}(|z_j|, |z_{j+k}|) \leq \|z_j\|_3 \|z_{j+k}\|_3 \alpha^{1/3}(k),$$

following from Lemma 33. Following from

$$\|z_j\|_3 = \|\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma[f_j, h]\|_3 \leq \|\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_3 + \|\Sigma[f_j, h]\|_3 \leq 2 \|\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_3,$$

one may write

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_j\|_3 &\leq 2 \|\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_3 \\ &\leq 2 \|\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_6 \|\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_6 \\ &\leq 2c \|\langle X_j, f_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_2 \|2c \|\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_2 = 2c^2 \sqrt{\Sigma[f_j, f_j] \Sigma[h, h]} \leq 2c^2 \sqrt{M} \sqrt{\Sigma[h, h]}. \end{aligned}$$

The last line here follows the same argument as (92). Similarly

$$\|z_{1+j}\|_3 \leq 2c \sqrt{M} \sqrt{\Sigma[h, h]}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[|z_1 z_{1+j}|] \leq 4c^4 M \Sigma[h, h] \alpha^{1/3}(j).$$

Following (91), one may have the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t z_j \right|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^t z_j^2 \right] + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} (t-j) \mathbb{E}[z_1 z_{1+j}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^t z_j^2 \right] + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} (t-k) \mathbb{E}[|z_i z_{i+k}|]. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Using (93), we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t z_i \right|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^t z_j^2 \right] + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} (t-j) \mathbb{E}[|z_1 z_{1+j}|] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^t c^4 M \Sigma[h, h] + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} (t-k) 4c^4 M \Sigma[h, h] \alpha^{1/3}(j) \\ &\leq tc^4 M \Sigma[h, h] + 8c^4 M t \Sigma[h, h] \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \alpha^{1/3}(j) \\ &\leq tc^4 M \Sigma[h, h] + 8c^4 M t \Sigma[h, h] \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha^{1/3}(j) = (t \Sigma[h, h]) O(1). \end{aligned}$$

The last line follows from  $\sum_{j \geq 1} \alpha^{1/3}(j) < \infty$ .

The proof for (90) is very similar and therefore omitted.  $\square$

**Lemma 20.** *Let  $h$  be non-random function in  $\mathcal{L}^2$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 \right] = O(t \Sigma[h, h]).$$

*Proof.* The proof here closely follows the proof of the Lemma 19. Let  $z_j = \langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j$ . We can see  $\mathbb{E}[z_j] = 0$ .

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[z_j^2] = \mathbb{E}[\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_j^2 | X_j]] \leq O(1) \|\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_2^2 = O(1) \Sigma[h, h], \quad (94)$$

here we use the moment assumption outlined Assumption 1.

Following from

$$\mathbb{E}[|z_1 z_{1+j}|] \leq \|z_1\|_3 \|z_{1+j}\|_3 \alpha^{1/3}(j),$$

and

$$\|z_j\|_3 \leq (\mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^3 \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_j^3 | X_j]])^{1/3} \leq O(1) \|\langle X_j, h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}\|_3 = O(1) \sqrt{\Sigma[h, h]},$$

we may have

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, h \rangle \varepsilon_j \langle X_{j+k}, h \rangle \varepsilon_{j+k}] = \mathbb{E} [z_j z_{j+k}] = O(\Sigma[h, h]) \alpha^{1/3}(k). \quad (95)$$

The rest of proof follows from the exactly same arguments as the proof of Lemma 19 and therefore omitted.  $\square$

## F.5 Proofs of Lemmas from Appendix F.3

All the proofs in this section used the notations from Appendix F.1.

### F.5.1 Proof of Lemma 12

The proof of Lemma 12 follows from Lemma 24 with  $a = 1/2$  and  $b = 1$ .

### F.5.2 Proof of Lemma 13

*Proof.* Let  $0 < \nu < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4r}$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s,t)} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t)} - \beta_{(s,t)}^* \right] \\ &= \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \left\langle \widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*, T_{(s,t)}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &= \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \left\{ \left\langle \widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*, (T_{(s,t)} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \left\langle \widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*, T(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \right) \left\{ \left\| T^\nu(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\| T^{-\nu}(T_{(s,t)} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \left\| T^{1/2}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The term on the right is bounded by using Lemma 23 and Lemma 25. The term on the left is bounded by using Lemma 12.  $\square$

### F.5.3 Proof of Lemma 14

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{(t-s)} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j &= \left\langle \frac{1}{(t-s)} \sum_{j=s+1}^t X_j \varepsilon_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \left\langle \frac{1}{(t-s)} \sum_{j=s+1}^t L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) \varepsilon_j, \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \langle g_{(s,t]}, \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \langle T^{-1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s})^{-1/4} g_{(s,t]}, T^{1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s})^{1/4} \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&\leq \left\| T^{-1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s})^{-1/4} g_{(s,t]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\| T^{1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s})^{1/4} \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

From Lemma 26, we have

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left\| T^{-1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s})^{-1/4} g_{(s,t]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1),$$

and from Lemma 24

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left\| T^{1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s})^{1/4} \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1).$$

The above two bounds establish the result.  $\square$

#### F.5.4 Proof of Lemma 15

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] = 0,$$

because  $\beta_{(s,t]}^* = \sum_{j=s+1}^t \beta_j^* / (t-s)$ .

We may write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \left\langle \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*, T(f_j^* - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right) \\
&= \left\langle \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - T(f_j^* - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right), \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle G_{(s,t]}, \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \left\langle T^{-1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{-1/4} G_{(s,t]}, T^{1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{1/4} (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&\leq \left\| T^{-1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{-1/4} G_{(s,t]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\| T^{1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{1/4} (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $G_{(s,t]} = \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \left\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - T(f_j^* - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right)$ .

From Lemma 28, we have

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left\| T^{-1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{-1/4} G_{(s,t]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1),$$

and from Lemma 24

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left\| T^{1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{1/4} (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1).$$

The above two bounds establish the result.  $\square$

### F.5.5 Proof of Lemma 16

*Proof.* Let  $\nu < 1/2 - 1/4r$ . We may write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s',t']} \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \\
&\leq \left| \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s',t']} - \Sigma \right) \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right| + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \left\langle (T_{(s',t']} - T) (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*), \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \left\langle T^{-\nu} (T_{(s',t']} - T) (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*), T^{\nu} (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right| \\
&\leq \left\| T^{-\nu} (T_{(s',t']} - T) (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\| T^{\nu} (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right|,
\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

where the second line follows from the triangle inequality and the last line follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| T^{-\nu}(T_{(s',t']} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
& \leq \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right) \left[ \left\| T^{-\nu}(T_{(s',t']} - T)(T + \lambda_{t'-s'}\mathbf{I})^{-1/4}T^{-1/4} \right\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \left\| T^{1/4}(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1/4}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right] \\
& = O_p \left( \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right] \delta_{t'-s'}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t' - s')} \cdot \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t - s)} \right), \tag{97}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from Lemma 32 and the last line follows from Lemma 27 and Lemma 24. Following from Lemma 24, we have

$$\left\| T^{-\nu}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p \left( \delta_{t-s}^{\nu} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t - s)} \right) = O_p(1), \tag{98}$$

and from Lemma 12 we have

$$\left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right| = O_p \left( \delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t - s) \right). \tag{99}$$

The result now follows using (97), (98) and (99) to bound (96).  $\square$

### F.5.6 Proof of Lemma 17

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{t' - s'} \sum_{j=s'+1}^{t'} \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right| \\
& = \left| \left\langle \frac{1}{t' - s'} \sum_{j=s'+1}^{t'} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) \varepsilon_j, \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\
& = \left| \left\langle g_{(s',t]}, \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\
& \leq \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right) \left\| T^{-1/4}(T + \lambda_{t'-s'}\mathbf{I})^{-1/4}g_{(s',t']} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\| T^{1/4}(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1/4}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
& = O_p \left( \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right] \delta_{t'-s'}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t' - s')} \cdot \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t - s)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last line follows from Lemma 32 and the last line follows from Lemma 26 and Lemma 12.  $\square$

### F.5.7 Proof of Lemma 18

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{t' - s'} \sum_{j=s'+1}^{t'} \left\langle X_j, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\langle X_j, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_{(s',t']} - \Sigma \right) \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right] \right| + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right] \right| \\
& = \left| \left\langle (T_{(s',t']} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*), f_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - f_{\eta_k}^* \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right| \\
& = \left| \left\langle (T_{(s',t']} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*), (f_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - f_{\eta_k}^*) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right] \right| \\
& \leq \left\| (T_{(s',t']} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \left\| f_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - f_{\eta_k}^* \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right] \right|, \quad (100)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from the triangle inequality and the last line follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (T_{(s',t']} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
& \leq \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right) \left[ \left\| (T_{(s',t']} - T)(T + \lambda_{t'-s'} \mathbf{I})^{-1/4} T^{-1/4} \right\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \left\| T^{1/4} (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{1/4} (\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right] \\
& = O_p \left( \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\delta_{t'-s'}}{\delta_{t-s}} \right)^{1/4} \right] \delta_{t'-s'}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t' - s')} \cdot \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t - s)} \right), \quad (101)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from Lemma 32 and the last line follows from Lemma 27 and Lemma 24. Following from Lemma 12 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right] \right| \\
& \leq \sqrt{\Sigma \left[ \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^*, \widehat{\beta}_{(s,t]} - \beta_{(s,t]}^* \right]} \sqrt{\Sigma \left[ \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^*, \beta_{\eta_{k+1}}^* - \beta_{\eta_k}^* \right]} \\
& = O_p \left( \kappa_k \sqrt{\delta_{t-s} \log^{1+\xi}(t - s)} \right). \quad (102)
\end{aligned}$$

The result now follows using (101) and (102) to bound (100).  $\square$

### F.5.8 Technical results for this section

**Proposition 1.** *The analytical expression for the estimator in (87) is given by*

$$\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} = (T_{(s,t]} + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) + g_{(s,t]} \right)$$

where  $g_{(s,t]} = \frac{1}{(t-s)} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \varepsilon_j L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j)$ .

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\frac{\partial \langle f, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\partial f} = 2f \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}}{\partial f} = g.$$

Since the objective function is a quadratic form, we just need to differentiate and make it zero to find the minima. We may have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial f} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (y_j - \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(f) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2})^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right) \Big|_{f=\widehat{f}_{(s,t]}} \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial f} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + y_j^2 - 2y_j \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}) + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right) \Big|_{f=\widehat{f}_{(s,t]}} \\ &= \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( 2 \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - 2y_j L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) \right) + 2\lambda \widehat{f}_{(s,t]}. \end{aligned}$$

And it lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - y_j L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) \right) + \lambda \widehat{f}_{(s,t]}, \\ &= \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \varepsilon_j L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) + \lambda \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} \\ &= T_{(s,t]} \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - g_{(s,t]} + \lambda \widehat{f}_{(s,t]}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equation follows from the action of  $T_{\mathcal{I}}$  illustrated at (85) in the previous subsection and the result follows.  $\square$

One key component is the expansion of variance term in the error bound. The next lemma is to structure this variance term. Define

$$f_{(s,t]}^\lambda = (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} T f_{(s,t]}^* \tag{103}$$

**Lemma 21.** Given (103) and the form of the estimator in Proposition 1, the following holds

$$\left(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^\lambda\right) = (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} \left( (T - T_{(s,t)}) \left(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*\right) + g_{(s,t)} + (T - T_{(s,t)})f_{(s,t)}^* + H_{(s,t)} \right)$$

where  $H_{(s,t)} = (t-s)^{-1} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \left( \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - T f_j^* \right)$  and  $g_{(s,t)}$  defined in Proposition 1.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^\lambda \\ &= (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} \left( (T - T_{(s,t)})\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} + (T_{(s,t)} + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})f_{(s,t)}^\lambda \right) \\ &= (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} \left( (T - T_{(s,t)})\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} + g_{(s,t)} + \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - T f_{(s,t)}^* \right) \\ &= (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} \left( (T - T_{(s,t)}) \left(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*\right) + g_{(s,t)} + \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - T_{(s,t)} f_{(s,t)}^* \right) \\ &= (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} \left( (T - T_{(s,t)}) \left(\widehat{f}_{(s,t)} - f_{(s,t)}^*\right) + g_{(s,t)} + (T - T_{(s,t)})f_{(s,t)}^* \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t T f_j^* \right) \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we use the fact that  $f_{(s,t)}^* = \sum_{j=s+1}^t f_j^*/(t-s)$  and linearity of the operator  $T$ . The changes at the third last line follows from Proposition 1 and (103).  $\square$

**Lemma 22.** Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b > a > 0$ .

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)} \left\| T^a (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b} (f_{(s,t)}^\lambda - f_{(s,t)}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = O(1).$$

*Proof.* Note that because  $f_j$  is bounded, the population average  $f_{(s,t)}^*$  is also bounded. Precisely, if  $f_{(s,t)}^* = \sum_{l \geq 1} a_l^{s,t} \phi_l$ , then  $\sum_{l \geq 1} (a_l^{s,t})^2 \leq M < \infty$ , for some absolute constant  $M > 0$ , where  $\{\phi_l\}_{l \geq 1}$  is the  $\mathcal{L}^2$  basis coming from the spectral decomposition of  $K^{1/2} \Sigma K^{1/2}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 &= \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b} \left( (T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1} T f_{(s,t]}^* - f_{(s,t]}^* \right)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\
&= \sum_{l \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_l^{2a} (\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s})^{2-2b} \left( \frac{\mathfrak{s}_l}{\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s}} - 1 \right)^2 (a_l^{s,t})^2 \\
&= \sum_{l \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_l^{2a} \frac{\lambda_{t-s}^2}{(\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} (a_l^{s,t})^2 \\
&\leq \left\{ \max_{l \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_l^{2a} \frac{\lambda_{t-s}^2}{(\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \right\} \sum_{l \geq 1} (a_l^{s,t})^2 \tag{104} \\
&\leq \left\{ \max_{l \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_l^{2a} \frac{\lambda_{t-s}^2}{\left[ (1 - a/b)^{-(1-a/b)} \lambda_{t-s}^{1-a/b} (a/b)^{-a/b} \mathfrak{s}_l^{a/b} \right]^{2b}} \right\} \sum_{l \geq 1} (a_l^{s,t})^2 \tag{105} \\
&= (1 - a/b)^{2(1-a/b)} (a/b)^{2a/b} \lambda_{t-s}^{2(1+a-b)} \sum_{l \geq 1} (a_l^{s,t})^2 \\
&= O(1) \lambda_{t-s}^{2(1+a-b)} M = O\left(\lambda_{t-s}^{2(1+a-b)}\right) = O\left(\delta_{t-s}^{2(1+a-b)}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in (104) is from Holder's inequality and (105) follows from Young's inequality in the following form

$$a + b \leq (pa)^{1/p} (qb)^{1/q},$$

where  $a, b, p, q$  are positive real numbers and  $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 23.** *Let  $\xi > 0$ . Let  $0 < \nu < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4r}$ . Then*

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \left\| T^\nu \left( \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right) \right\| \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-\nu}}{\sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} = O_p(1).$$

*Proof.* Following from triangle inequality and the decomposition at Lemma 21 we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T^\nu(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} &\leq \|T^\nu(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \|T^\nu(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&\leq \|T^\nu(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \tag{106}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}(T - T_{(s,t]})T^{-\nu}\|_{\text{op}} \|T^\nu(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \tag{107}$$

$$+ \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}(T - T_{(s,t]})T^{-\nu}\|_{\text{op}} \|T^\nu(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \tag{108}$$

$$+ \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}g_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \tag{109}$$

$$+ \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}(T_{(s,t]} - T)\|_{\text{op}} \|f_{(s,t]}^*\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \tag{110}$$

$$+ \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}H_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \tag{111}$$

We are going to bound each of the four term uniformly to have result.

For (106), from Lemma 22, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad \|T^\nu(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^\nu.$$

For (107), from Lemma 27, we write that in high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}(T - T_{(s,t]})T^{-\nu}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^\nu \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)},$$

which would give us

$$(107) \leq o(1) \|T^\nu(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$$

in probability, in uniform sense.

Similarly for (108), from Lemma 27 and Lemma 22, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad (108) \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^{2\nu} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

For (109), from Lemma 26, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}g_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^\nu \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

For (110), from Lemma 27, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}(T_{(s,t]} - T)\|_{\text{op}} \|f_{(s,t]}^*\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \lesssim \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}(T_{(s,t]} - T)\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^\nu \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)},$$

here we used the fact that  $\|f_{(s,t]}^*\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} < \infty$ .

For (111), from Lemma 28, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad \|T^\nu(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1}H_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^\nu \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

This six individual bounds come together to give us the required result.  $\square$

**Lemma 24.** *Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b \geq a + 1/2 > 0$ .*

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{(b-a-1)}}{\sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left\| T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1).$$

*Proof.* Using triangle inequality we may write,

$$\left\| T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \left\| T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^\lambda) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \left\| T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \quad (112)$$

where  $f_{(s,t]}^\lambda$  is defined at (103). The second term on the right of (112) can be bounded using Lemma 22, which gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{(b-a-1)}}{\sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}} \left\| T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ & \leq \max_{s < t \leq e} \delta_{t-s}^{(b-a-1)} \left\| T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(f_{(s,t]}^\lambda - f_{(s,t]}^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Now, it is suffice is to bound the first term on the right of (112). Let  $0 < \nu < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4r}$ . Following the decomposition at Lemma 21, we may write

$$\|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1-b}(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T - T_{(s,t]})T^{-\nu}\|_{\text{op}}\|T^\nu(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \quad (113)$$

$$+ \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}g_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \quad (114)$$

$$+ \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T_{(s,t]} - T)\|_{\text{op}}\|f_{(s,t]}^*\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \quad (115)$$

$$+ \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}H_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \quad (116)$$

We are going to bound each of the four terms (113), (114), (115) and (116) uniformly over  $s < t \leq e$  to have the required result.

For (113), using Lemma 27 and Lemma 23, we write that with high probability

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \in (s, e], \quad & \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T - T_{(s,t]})T^{-\nu}\|_{\text{op}}\|T^\nu(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ & \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^{1+a-b} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \delta_{t-s}^\nu \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \\ & \leq \delta_{t-s}^{1+a-b} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}. \end{aligned}$$

For (114), from Lemma 26, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}g_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^{1+a-b} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

For (115), from Lemma 27, we write that with high probability

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \in (s, e], \quad & \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T_{(s,t]} - T)\|_{\text{op}}\|f_{(s,t]}^*\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ & \lesssim \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T_{(s,t]} - T)\|_{\text{op}} \\ & \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^{1+a-b} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}. \end{aligned}$$

here we used the fact that  $\|f_{(s,t]}^*\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} < \infty$ .

For (116), from Lemma 28, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e], \quad \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}H_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^{1+a-b} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

This four individual bounds come together to give us the required bound for the first term on the right of (112). □

**Lemma 25.** *Let  $0 < \nu < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4r}$ . Let  $p \in \{0, \nu\}$  and  $\xi > 0$ . Then*

$$\max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \|T^{-p}(T_{(s,t]} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = O_p(1).$$

*Proof.* Using the linear operator norm inequality, we may have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T^{-p}(T_{(s,t]} - T)(\widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ & \leq \left\| T^{-p}(T_{(s,t]} - T)(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1/4}T^{-1/4} \right\|_{\text{op}} \left\| T^{1/4}(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1/4} \left( \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We are going to bound each of the two terms here. For the first one, using Lemma 27, we write that with high probability

$$\forall t \in (s, e] \quad \left\| T^{-p}(T_{(s,t]} - T)(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-1/4}T^{-1/4} \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

And for the second term, we use Lemma 24 to have

$$\forall t \in (s, e] \quad \left\| T^{1/4}(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{1/4} \left( \widehat{f}_{(s,t]} - f_{(s,t]}^* \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \lesssim \delta_{t-s}^{1/2} \sqrt{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)}.$$

The two bounds come together to have the required result.  $\square$

**Lemma 26.** *Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b \geq a + 1/2 \geq 1/4$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}g_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] = O(1),$$

where  $g_{(s,t]} = \frac{1}{(t-s)} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \varepsilon_j L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j)$  defined in Proposition 1.

*Proof.* We may write

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}g_{(s,t]}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 &= \sum_{l \geq 1} \langle T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}g_{(s,t]}, \phi_l \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 1} \langle g_{(s,t]}, T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}\phi_l \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_l^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \langle g_{(s,t]}, \phi_l \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_l^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \left\langle \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{i=s+1}^t \varepsilon_i L_{K^{1/2}}(X_i), \phi_l \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_l^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \varepsilon_j \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}\phi_l \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

By linearity of the expectation it lead us to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}g_{(s,t)}\|^2 \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{l \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{(b-a-1)}}{(\log(t-s))^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_l^a}{(t-s)(\mathfrak{s}_l + \lambda_{t-s})^b} \sum_{j=1}^t \varepsilon_j \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}} \phi_l \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right] \\
& = O(1). \tag{117}
\end{aligned}$$

Here (117) follows from Lemma 29.  $\square$

**Lemma 27.** *Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b \geq a + 1/2 \geq 1/4$ . Let  $0 < \nu < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4r}$ . Suppose  $p \in \{0, \nu\}$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T_{(s,t)} - T)T^{-p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right] = O(1).$$

*Proof.* Using the definition of operator norm, we may write

$$\|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T - T_{(s,t)})T^{-p}\|_{\text{op}} := \sup_{\|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1} \left| \langle h, T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T - T_{(s,t)})T^{-p}h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right|.$$

Let  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2$  such that  $\|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1$ . This means  $h = \sum_{j \geq 1} h_j \phi_j$  and  $\sum_{j \geq 1} h_j^2 = 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle h, T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T - T_{(s,t)})T^{-p}h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \langle \phi_j, T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T - T_{(s,t)})T^{-p}\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \langle T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}\phi_j, (T - T_{(s,t)})T^{-p}\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \left\langle \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^a}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_{t-s})^b} \phi_j, (T - T_{(s,t)})\mathfrak{s}_m^{-p}\phi_m \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^a}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_{t-s})^b} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-p} \langle \phi_j, (T - T_{(s,t)})\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j^2 h_m^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-2p} \langle \phi_j, (T - T_{(s,t)})\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2} \\
&\tag{118}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-2\nu} \langle \phi_j, (T - T_{(s,t)})\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2} \tag{119}$$

The second last inequality (118) follows from Cauchy-Schwarz, where one may think  $\langle A, B \rangle = \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} A_{jm} B_{jm}$ . The last equality (119) follows from

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j^2 h_m^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} h_j^2 \sum_{m \geq 1} h_m^2 = 1,$$

by definition of  $h$ .

We have,

$$\|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T - T_{(s,t]})T^{-p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-2p} \langle \phi_j, (T - T_{(s,t]})\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \quad (120)$$

By linearity of expectation

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b}(T_{(s,t]} - T)T^{-p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-2p} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} |\langle \phi_k, (T_{(s,t]} - T)\phi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}|^2 \right] \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{1-2p} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Lemma 30, and  $\sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{1-2p} \asymp \sum_{m \geq 1} m^{-(1-2p)2r}$  is summable given we have  $(1-2p)2r > 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 28.** *Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b \geq a + 1/2 \geq 1/4$ . Suppose  $\{h_j\}$  be some  $\mathcal{L}^2$  sequence that satisfies  $\Sigma[L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j), L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j)] \leq M < \infty$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \left\| T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - Th_j) \right) \right\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right] = O(1). \quad (121)$$

Consequently, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b} H_{(s,t]}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right] = O(1), \quad (122)$$

where  $H_{(s,t]} = \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - Tf_j^*)$  defined in Lemma 21, and that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \|T^a(T + \lambda_{t-s}\mathbf{I})^{-b} G_{(s,t]}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right] = O(1), \quad (123)$$

where  $G_{(s,t]} = \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), f_j^* - f_{(s,t]}^* \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - T(f_j^* - f_{(s,t]}^*))$ .

*Proof.* We may write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| T^a (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{-b} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - Th_j) \right) \right\|_{\text{op}}^2 \\
&= \sum_{m \geq 1} \left\langle T^a (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{-b} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - Th_j) \right), \phi_m \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\
&= \sum_{m \geq 1} \left\langle \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - Th_j) \right), T^a (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{-b} \phi_m \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\
&= \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \left\langle \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - Th_j) \right), \phi_m \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\
&= \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}} \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \langle h_j, T \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

By linearity of the expectation it lead us to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq n} \left\| T^a (T + \lambda_{t-s} \mathbf{I})^{-b} \left( \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j), h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} L_{K^{1/2}}(X_j) - Th_j) \right) \right\|_{\text{op}}^2 \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq n} \left( \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{(b-a-1)}}{(\log(t-s))^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^a}{(t-s)(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_{t-s})^b} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}} \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \langle h_j, T \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= O(1). \tag{124}
\end{aligned}$$

Here (124) follows from Lemma 31 because we have  $\Sigma [L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j), L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j)] < \infty$ .

The result (122) follows from (121) because  $\|\beta_j^*\|_{\mathcal{H}(K)} < \infty$ . For (123), we can again use (121) as we have  $\Sigma [\beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^*, \beta_j^* - \beta_{(s,t)}^*] \leq O(1) \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \|\beta_{\eta_k}^*\|_{\mathcal{H}(K)} < \infty$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 29.** *Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b \geq a + 1/2 \geq 1/4$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \left| \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j \right|^2 \right] = O(1).$$

*Proof.* For simplicity, denote  $Y_{j,m} = \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \varepsilon_j$ . Observe that

$$\Sigma [L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m), L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m)] = \langle T \phi_m, \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \mathfrak{s}_m.$$

We are going to prove the result for a general interval  $\{1, \dots, T\}$ , the result for the  $(s, e]$  follows from translation and stationarity.

Using Lemma 20, we may write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] \leq O(t) \mathfrak{s}_m.$$

We apply Lemma 36 and to have this result: for any non-decreasing sequence  $\{\gamma_t\}_{t=1}^T$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{\gamma_t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] = C \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\gamma_t^2} \mathfrak{s}_m, \quad (125)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ .

Observe that

$$\frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{2b-(1+2a)+(1+2a)}} \leq \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\lambda_t^{2b-(1+2a)} (\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{(1+2a)}} \lesssim \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{1+2a}}.$$

It led us to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{2b}} \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{1+2a}} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \left\{ \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{\mathfrak{s}_m^{1+2a}} \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{\lambda_t^{1+2a}} \right\} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \\ \Rightarrow & \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{2b}} \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \lesssim \sum_{m \geq 1} \left\{ \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{\mathfrak{s}_m^{1+2a}} \wedge \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{\lambda_t^{1+2a}} \right\} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (126)$$

**Case I:**  $a \leq 0$

Let  $f_m = \lfloor m^{(2r+1)} \rfloor \wedge T$ . Using (126), we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{2b}} \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbf{I}\{t \leq f_m\} \mathfrak{s}_m^{2a} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{\lambda_t^{a+1/2} t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 + \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbf{I}\{t > f_m\} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-1} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

Observe that for  $2 \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( t \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2} \right) = t^{(1+r)/(2r+1)} (\log t)^{(\xi-1)/2} \left( \frac{1+r}{2r+1} + \frac{1+\xi}{2} \log t \right) > 0$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( t \lambda_t^{a+1/2} \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2} \right) = \lambda_t^{a+1/2} \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(\xi-1)/2} \left( \frac{1+r-(a+1/2)2r}{2r+1} \log t + \frac{1+\xi}{2} \right) > 0.$$

This says that  $\left\{t\delta_t^{1/2}(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}\right\}$  and  $\left\{t\lambda_t^{a+1/2}\delta_t^{1/2}(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}\right\}$  satisfies the criteria for  $\{\gamma_t\}$  in (125).

This observation on derivatives and (127) helps us to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq T} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{2b}} \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{2a} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq f_m} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{\lambda_t^{a+1/2} t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] + \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{f_m < t \leq T} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{2a} c \sum_{t \leq f_m} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi} t \lambda_t^{1+2a} t^2} \mathfrak{s}_m + \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-1} c \sum_{t > f_m} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} \mathfrak{s}_m \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} \sum_{m \geq \delta_t^{-1/2r}} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{1+2a}}{\lambda_t^{1+2a}} + c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} \sum_{m < \delta_t^{-1/2r}} 1 \\ & = c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} O(\delta_t^{-1/2r}) + c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} O(\delta_t^{-1/2r}) \\ & = \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{1}{t \log^{1+\xi} t} O\left(\frac{\delta_t^{-1-1/2r}}{t}\right) = \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{1}{t \log^{1+\xi} t} O(1) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

The (128) follows from (125) and (129) follows from (140) with the observation

$$\sum_{m \geq \delta_t^{-1/2r}} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{1+2a}}{\lambda_t^{1+2a}} \lesssim \sum_{m \geq \delta_t^{-1/2r}} \frac{1}{(m^{2r} \delta_t)^{1+2a}} \leq O(1) \int_{\delta_t^{-1/2r}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(x^{2r} \delta_t)^{1+2a}} dx.$$

## Case II: $a > 0$

Let  $f_m = \lfloor m^{(2r+1)} \rfloor \wedge T$ . Using (126), we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{2b}} \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbf{I}\{t < f_m\} \mathfrak{s}_m^{2a} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{\lambda_t^{a+1/2} t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 + \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbf{I}\{t \geq f_m\} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-1} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbf{I}\{t < f_m\} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{\lambda_{f_m}^{2a}} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{\lambda_t^{1/2} t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 + \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathbf{I}\{t \geq f_m\} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-1} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

We have  $t < f_m \Rightarrow \lambda_t > \lambda_{f_m}$  which gives us (130).

Observe that for  $2 \leq t \leq n$ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( t \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2} \right) = t^{(1+r)/(2r+1)} (\log t)^{(\xi-1)/2} \left( \frac{1+r}{2r+1} + \frac{1+\xi}{2} \log t \right) > 0$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( t \lambda_t^{1/2} \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2} \right) = \lambda_t^{1/2} \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(\xi-1)/2} \left( \frac{1}{2r+1} \log t + \frac{1+\xi}{2} \right) > 0.$$

This says that  $\left\{ t \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2} \right\}$  and  $\left\{ t \lambda_t^{1/2} \delta_t^{1/2} (\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2} \right\}$  satisfies the criteria for  $\{\gamma_t\}$  in (125).

This observation on derivatives and (130) helps us to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq T} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_t)^{2b}} \frac{\delta_t^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi} t} \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{\lambda_{f_m}^{2a}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t < f_m} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{\lambda_t^{1/2} t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] + \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{f_m \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{\delta_t^{-1/2}}{(\log t)^{(1+\xi)/2}} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{\lambda_{f_m}^{2a}} c \sum_{t < f_m} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{\log^{1+\xi} t \lambda_t t^2} \mathfrak{s}_m + \sum_{m \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_m^{-1} c \sum_{t \geq f_m} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} \mathfrak{s}_m \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} \sum_{m > \delta_t^{-1/2r}} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{1+2a}}{\lambda_t \lambda_{f_m}^{2a}} + c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} \sum_{m \leq \delta_t^{-1/2r}} 1 \\ & = c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} O(\delta_t^{-1/2r}) + c \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{\delta_t^{-1}}{t^2 \log^{1+\xi} t} O(\delta_t^{-1/2r}) \\ & = \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{1}{t \log^{1+\xi} t} O\left( \frac{\delta_t^{-1-1/2r}}{t} \right) = \sum_{1 < t \leq T} \frac{1}{t \log^{1+\xi} t} O(1) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

The (131) follows from (125). For (132), with the realization  $\lambda_{f_m} \asymp \mathfrak{s}_m$  we may write

$$\frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{1+2a}}{\lambda_t \lambda_{f_m}^{2a}} \leq c_2 \frac{1}{m^{2r} \lambda_t} \implies \sum_{m > \delta_t^{-1/2r}} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{1+2a}}{\lambda_t \lambda_{f_m}^{2a}} \leq c_2 \sum_{m > \delta_t^{-1/2r}} \frac{1}{m^{2r} \lambda_t} \leq c_2 \int_{\delta_t^{-1/2r}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^{2r} \lambda_t} dx = O(\delta_t^{-1/2r}),$$

similar idea is outlined at (140) which comes as a consequence from Lemma 34.  $\square$

**Lemma 30.** *Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b \geq a + 1/2 \geq 1/4$ . Then for any  $k \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \left| \langle \phi_k, (T_{[s,t]} - T) \phi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right|^2 \right] = O(\mathfrak{s}_k).$$

*Proof.* Denote  $u_{j,k} = \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_k) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$  and  $u_{j,m} = \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ . Let  $Y_{j,m}^k = u_{j,k}u_{j,m} - \mathbb{E}[u_{j,k}u_{j,m}] = \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_k) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \langle \phi_k, T\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ . Observe that

$$\langle \phi_k, (T_{(s,t]} - T)\phi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{i=s+1}^t Y_{j,m}^k.$$

Again, We are going to prove the result for a general interval  $\{1, \dots, T\}$ , the result for the  $(s, e]$  follows from translation and stationarity.

Using Lemma 19, we may write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m}^k \right|^2 \right] = O(t) \mathfrak{s}_k \mathfrak{s}_m.$$

We use Lemma 36 to establish for any non-decreasing sequence  $\{\gamma_t\}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{\gamma_t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m}^k \right|^2 \right] = C \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\gamma_t^2} \mathfrak{s}_k \mathfrak{s}_m, \quad (133)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ .

The rest of proof follows exactly as the proof of Lemma 29, just by replacing  $Y_{j,m}^k$  with  $Y_{j,m}$  and therefore omitted.  $\square$

**Lemma 31.** *Let  $\xi > 0$  and  $1 \geq b \geq a + 1/2 \geq 1/4$ . Let  $\{h_i\}$  be sequence of  $\mathcal{L}^2$  functions such that  $\Sigma[L_{K^{1/2}}(h_i), L_{K^{1/2}}(h_i)] \leq M < \infty$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s < t \leq e} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_m^{2a}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_{t-s})^{2b}} \frac{\delta_{t-s}^{2(b-a-1)}}{\log^{1+\xi}(t-s)} \left| \frac{1}{t-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^t (\langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \langle h_j, T\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}) \right|^2 \right] = O(1).$$

*Proof.* Let

$$Y_{j,m} = \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \langle h_j, T\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$$

Similar to the last two proofs, we are going to establish the result on a generic interval  $\{1, \dots, T\}$ , the case in the lemma follows from translation and stationarity.

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(h_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle X_j, L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}] = \langle h_j, T\phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2},$$

and

$$\Sigma[L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m), L_{K^{1/2}}(\phi_m)] = \langle T\phi_m, \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \mathfrak{s}_m.$$

Using this, from Lemma 19, we may establish

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] \leq O(1) \sum_{j=1}^t \mathfrak{s}_m.$$

Now, similar to (125), we apply Lemma 36 to have: for any non-decreasing sequence  $\{\gamma_t\}_{t=1}^T$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{\gamma_t} \sum_{j=1}^t Y_{j,m} \right|^2 \right] = C \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\gamma_t^2} \mathfrak{s}_m, \quad (134)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ .

The rest of proof follows exact same steps as the proof of Lemma 29 and therefore omitted.  $\square$

**Lemma 32.** *Let  $a, b, q > 0$ . Let  $p, r$  be some constant. Suppose  $D : \mathcal{L}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2$  be some linear operator. Suppose  $f, h \in \mathcal{L}^2$ . Then we have*

$$\|T^p Df\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\lambda_b}{\lambda_a} \right)^q \right) \|T^p D(T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^{-r}\|_{\text{op}} \|T^r (T + \lambda_a \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \quad (135)$$

$$|\langle h, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}| \leq \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\lambda_b}{\lambda_a} \right)^q \right) \|T^{-p} (T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^{-q} h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \|T^p (T + \lambda_a \mathbf{I})^q h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}. \quad (136)$$

*Proof.* We are going to establish (135) and the proof for (136) follows similarly. The proof is divided in three steps. We establish some necessary result in Step 1 and Step 2 and complete the proof in Step 3 by using them.

**Step 1:** For  $d \geq c$ , we are going to establish the following in this step.

$$\|T^p (T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \|T^p (T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \left( \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_d} \right)^q \|T^p (T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}, \quad (137)$$

Let  $f = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j \phi_j$ . Observe that  $j^{-2r} \asymp \mathfrak{s}_j > 0$  and

$$d \geq c \iff (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c) \geq (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_d) \iff \frac{1}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_d)} \geq \frac{1}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c)} \iff \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_d} \geq \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c}{\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_d}.$$

It lead us to

$$\|T^p (T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_j^{2p} (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_d)^{2q} a_j^2 \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_j^{2p} (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c)^{2q} a_j^2 = \|T^p (T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|T^p(T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \mathfrak{s}_j^{2p} (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c)^{2q} a_j^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} \left( \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c}{\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_d} \right)^{2b} \mathfrak{s}_j^{2p} (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_d)^{2q} a_j^2 \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_d} \right)^{2b} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2p}}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_d)^{2q}} a_j^2 = \left( \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_d} \right)^{2b} \|T^p(T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^{-q} f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

**Step 2:** For  $d \geq c$ , we are going to establish the following in this step.

$$\|T^p D(T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|T^p D(T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r\|_{\text{op}}. \quad (138)$$

Observe that

$$b \geq a \iff (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c) \geq (\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_b) \iff \frac{1}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_b)} \geq \frac{1}{(\mathfrak{s}_j + \lambda_c)}.$$

It lead us to

$$\begin{aligned}&\|T^p D(T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r\|_{\text{op}} \\ &= \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \langle h, T^p D(T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \langle \phi_j, T^p D(T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \langle T^p \phi_j, D(T + \lambda_c \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2p} \mathfrak{s}_m^{2r}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_c)^{2q}} \langle \phi_j, D \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{2p} \mathfrak{s}_m^{2r}}{(\mathfrak{s}_m + \lambda_d)^{2q}} \langle \phi_j, D \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \langle T^p \phi_j, D(T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} h_j h_m \langle \phi_j, T^p D(T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r \phi_m \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1}} \left| \langle h, T^p D(T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r h \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \\ &= \|T^p D(T + \lambda_d \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^r\|_{\text{op}}.\end{aligned}$$

**Step 3:** Using (137) and (138), we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|T^p Df\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&= \mathbf{I}\{b \geq a\} \|T^p D(T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^{-r} T^r (T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \mathbf{I}\{b \leq a\} \|T^p D(T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^{-r} T^r (T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&\leq \mathbf{I}\{b \geq a\} \|T^p D(T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^{-r}\|_{\text{op}} \|T^r (T + \lambda_a \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&\quad + \mathbf{I}\{b \leq a\} \left(\frac{\lambda_b}{\lambda_a}\right)^q \|T^p D(T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^{-r}\|_{\text{op}} \|T^r (T + \lambda_a \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\
&\leq \left(1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_b}{\lambda_a}\right)^q\right) \|T^p D(T + \lambda_b \mathbf{I})^{-q} T^{-r}\|_{\text{op}} \|T^r (T + \lambda_a \mathbf{I})^q f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

## G Lower bound

*Proof of Lemma 1.* We prove a more general result and the required result follows as a special case.

For  $Z_j = (Y_j, X_j)$ , let  $P_0^n$  be the joint distribution of  $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^n$  following

$$\begin{aligned} y_j &= \langle X_j, \beta \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \varepsilon_j, & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \Delta, \\ y_j &= \varepsilon_j, & \text{for } \Delta < j \leq n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$  is independent standard Brownian motion and  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ . Let  $P_1^n$  be the joint distribution of  $\{Z'_j\}_{j=1}^n$  with  $Z'_j = (Y'_j, X'_j)$  which follows

$$\begin{aligned} y'_j &= \langle X'_j, \beta \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \varepsilon'_j, & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \Delta + \delta, \\ y'_j &= \varepsilon'_j, & \text{for } \Delta + \delta < j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{X'_j\}_{j=1}^n$  is independent standard Brownian motion and  $\{\varepsilon'_j\}_{j=1}^n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ . We assume that the two datasets are independent. Observe that

$$KL(P_0^n; P_1^n) = \sum_{j=\Delta+1}^{\Delta+\delta} KL(P_0^{j,n}; P_1^{j,n}),$$

where  $P_0^{j,n}(y, x)$  and  $P_1^{j,n}(y, x)$  are distributions of  $(y_j, X_j)$  and  $(y'_j, X'_j)$  respectively. For  $\Delta < j \leq \Delta + \delta$ , one may write

$$\begin{aligned} KL(P_0^{j,n}; P_1^{j,n}) &= \iint \log \left\{ \frac{p_0^{j,n}(y|x)}{p_1^{j,n}(y|x)} \right\} p_0^{j,n}(y|x) p(x) dy dx \\ &= \iint \frac{1}{2} (\langle x, \beta \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 - 2y \langle x, \beta \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}) p_0^{j,n}(y|x) p(x) dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \langle x, \beta \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 p(x) dx = \frac{\kappa^2}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first line we used the conditional density  $p_0^{j,n}(y|x)$ ,  $p_1^{j,n}(y|x)$ , and  $p(x)$  as the density of  $X_j$ ; in the second and the last line we use the fact that  $y_j | X_j \sim N(0, 1)$  under  $p_0^{j,n}(y|x)$ . This lead us to  $KL(P_0^n; P_1^n) = \delta \kappa^2 / 2$  and we already have  $\eta(P_1^n) - \eta(P_0^n) = \delta$ . Following from LeCam's lemma (see e.g. [Yu, 1997](#) and Theorem 2.2 of [Tsybakov, 2004](#)), we may write

$$\inf_{\hat{\eta}} \sup_{P \in \mathfrak{P}} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\eta} - \eta(P)|] \geq \frac{\delta}{4} e^{-\delta \kappa^2 / 2}.$$

The result now follows by putting  $\delta = \frac{4}{\kappa^2}$  with the realization that, for large  $n$ ,  $\frac{4}{\kappa^2} \ll \Delta < n/2$ .  $\square$

## H $\alpha$ -mixing

The strong mixing or  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficient between two  $\sigma$ -fields  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined as

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} |P(A \cap B) - P(A)P(B)|.$$

**Lemma 33.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be random variables. Then for any positive numbers  $p, q, r$  satisfying  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$ , we have*

$$|Cov(X, Y)| \leq 4 \|X\|_p \|Y\|_q \{\alpha(\sigma(X), \sigma(Y))\}^{1/r}.$$

### H.1 Strong law of large numbers

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $\{Z_t\}$  be centered alpha mixing time series such that  $\alpha(k) = O\left(\frac{1}{(kL_k^2)^{\rho/(\rho-2)}}\right)$  for some  $\rho > 2$ , where  $L_k$  is non-decreasing sequence satisfying*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{kL_k} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad L_k - L_{k-1} = O(L_k/k).$$

Suppose for some  $1 \leq p \leq \rho < \infty$  one has

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}^{2/\rho} [|Z_t|^p]}{t^p} < \infty.$$

Then  $\sum_{t=1}^n Z_t/n$  converges a.s to 0.

*Proof.* Using  $L_n$  in the Definition 1.4 of [McLeish \(1975\)](#),  $\{\alpha(n)\}$  is sequence of size  $-\rho/(\rho-2)$ . Following their Remark 2.6b, the results directly follows from their Lemma 2.9 with  $g_t(x) = x^p$ ,  $d_t = 1$  and  $X_t = Z_t/t$ .  $\square$

### H.2 Central limit theorem

Below is the central limit theorem for  $\alpha$ -mixing random variable. For a proof, one may see [Doukhan \(2012\)](#).

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $\{Z_t\}$  be a centred  $\alpha$ -mixing stationary time series. Suppose that it holds for some  $\delta > 0$ ,*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha(k)^{\delta/(2+\delta)} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(|Z_1|^{2+\delta}) < \infty.$$

Denote  $S_n = \sum_{t=1}^n Z_t$  and  $\sigma_n^2 = \mathbb{E} [|S_n|^2]$ . Then

$$\frac{S_{[nt]}}{\sigma_n} \rightarrow W(t),$$

where the convergence is in Skorohod topology and  $W(t)$  is the standard Brownian motion on  $[0, 1]$ .

# I Inequalities

**Lemma 34.** Let  $f : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  be monotonically decreasing continuous function such that  $\int_1^\infty f(x)dx < \infty$ . Then

$$\int_1^\infty f(x)dx \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} f(k) \leq f(1) + \int_1^\infty f(x)dx \leq f(0) + \int_1^\infty f(x)dx.$$

**Lemma 35.** Let  $r > 1$  be a constant. For any positive sequence  $\mathfrak{s}_j \asymp j^{-2r}$  and  $\varphi \geq 1/2$  we have

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^\varphi}{(\alpha + \mathfrak{s}_j)^\varphi} \leq c_1 \alpha^{-1/2r} \quad (139)$$

given any  $\alpha > 0$ . Here  $c_1 > 0$  is some constant.

*Proof.* Given  $\mathfrak{s}_j \asymp j^{-2r}$ , we have some positive constants  $c_2$  and  $c_3$  such that  $c_2 j^{-2r} \leq \mathfrak{s}_j \leq c_3 j^{-2r}$ ,

$$\implies \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^\varphi}{(\alpha + \mathfrak{s}_j)^\varphi} \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(c_3 j^{-2r})^\varphi}{(\alpha + c_2 j^{-2r})^\varphi} = c_3 \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{1}{(\alpha j^{2r} + c_2)^\varphi}.$$

Now, we shall upper bound the quantity on the right of above equation using Lemma 34. Observe that the function defined by  $x \mapsto \frac{1}{(\alpha x^{2r} + c_2)^\varphi}$  satisfy the conditions of Lemma 34 and therefore

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{1}{(\alpha j^{2r} + c_2)^\varphi} \leq c_4 + \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(\alpha x^{2r} + c_2)^\varphi} dx$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^{(c_2/\alpha)^{1/2r}} \frac{1}{(\alpha x^{2r} + c_2)^\varphi} dx &\leq \int_1^{(c_2/\alpha)^{1/2r}} \frac{1}{(c_2)^\varphi} dx = \frac{c_5}{\alpha^{1/2r}} - c_4 \leq \frac{c_5}{\alpha^{1/2r}} \\ \int_{(c_2/\alpha)^{1/2r}}^\infty \frac{1}{(\alpha x^{2r} + c_2)^\varphi} dx &\leq \int_{(c_2/\alpha)^{1/2r}}^\infty \frac{1}{(\alpha x^{2r})^\varphi} dx = \frac{c_6}{\alpha^{1/2r}}. \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

Using (140) we may write,

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(\alpha x^{2r} + c_2)^\varphi} dx \leq \frac{c_5 + c_6}{\alpha^{1/2r}}$$

which lead us to the required result. □

**Corollary 1.** Let  $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be positive sequence converging to 0. Under assumptions of Lemma 35, we have

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{s}_j^{1+2t}}{(\alpha_n + \mathfrak{s}_j)^{1+2t}} = O\left(\alpha_n^{-1/2r}\right) \quad (141)$$

**Lemma 36.** Let  $\{Z_j\}$  be a sequence of random variable. Let  $\xi > 0$ . Suppose

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{m=1}^t Z_j \right|^2 \right] = O(t).$$

Then for any positive non-increasing sequence  $\{\gamma_t\}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq n} \left| \gamma_t \sum_{m=1}^t Z_j \right|^2 \right] = O(1) \sum_{t=2}^n \gamma_t^2. \quad (142)$$

Consequently we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq n} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{t \log^{1+\xi} t}} \sum_{m=1}^t Z_j \right|^2 \right] = O(1). \quad (143)$$

*Proof.* Observe that (142) follows directly from Theorem B.3 of Kirch (2006).

Note that  $\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{t \log^{1+\xi} t}} \right\}_{t=2}^n$  is a non-increasing sequence and from (142)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{1 < t \leq n} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{t \log^{1+\xi} t}} \sum_{m=1}^t Z_j \right|^2 \right] = O(1) \sum_{t=2}^n \frac{1}{t \log^{1+\xi} t},$$

and the (143) follows from the fact that  $\sum_{t=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t \log^{1+\xi} t} < \infty$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 37.** Let  $\nu > 0$ . Let  $\{Z_i\}$  be a sequence of random variable. Suppose we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |S_i^j|^2 \right] \leq c'(j - i),$$

where  $S_i^j = \sum_{k=i}^j Z_k$  and  $c' > 0$  is some absolute constant. Then for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$P \left( \forall r > 1/\nu, \quad |S_r| \leq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \sqrt{r} (\log r \nu + 1) \right) > 1 - \varepsilon,$$

where  $C_1 = \frac{\pi}{\log 2} \sqrt{\frac{c'}{6}}$ .

In other words

$$\max_{r > 1/\nu} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r} (\log(r\nu) + 1)} \left| \sum_{j=1}^r Z_j \right| = O_p(1).$$

*Proof.* Observe that using Lemma 36 with  $\gamma_t = 1$ , we can get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{i < t \leq j} |S_i^t|^2 \right] \leq c(j - i)$$

for some absolute constant  $c > 0$ .

We are going to use the peeling argument for the proof. With

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{m \leq k \leq 2m} \left| \frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{m \leq k \leq 2m} |S_k|^2 \right] \leq c.$$

Let's define  $A_j = [2^{j-1}/\nu, 2^j/\nu]$ . Using Markov's inequality we may write,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\max_{m \leq k \leq 2m} \left| \frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \right| \geq x\right) &\leq \frac{1}{x^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{m \leq k \leq 2m} \left| \frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \right|^2 \right] \leq cx^{-2} \\ \implies P\left(\bigcup_{k \in A_j} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \right| \geq \alpha j \right\}\right) &\leq \frac{c}{\alpha^2 j^2} \\ \implies P\left(\bigcup_{k \in A_j} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \right| \geq \alpha(\log_2 k\nu + 1) \right\}\right) &\leq \frac{c}{\alpha^2 j^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equation follows from

$$2^{j-1}/\nu \leq k \leq 2^j/\nu \implies j \leq \log_2 k\nu + 1 \leq j + 1.$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\bigcup_{r \geq 1/\nu} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_r}{\sqrt{r}} \right| \geq \alpha(\log_2 r\nu + 1) \right\}\right) \\ &= P\left(\bigcup_{j \geq 1} \bigcup_{k \in A_j} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \right| \geq \alpha(\log_2 k\nu + 1) \right\}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P\left(\bigcup_{k \in A_j} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \right| \geq \alpha(\log_2 k\nu + 1) \right\}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\alpha^2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j^2} = \frac{c\pi^2}{6\alpha^2}. \end{aligned}$$

With  $\alpha^2 = \frac{c\pi^2}{6\varepsilon \log^2 2}$  and  $\log(2) < 1$ , we can have

$$P\left(\max_{r \geq 1/\nu} |S_r| \geq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \sqrt{r}(\log r\nu + 1)\right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

□