

# Minimum discrepancy principle strategy for choosing $k$ in $k$ -NN regression

Yaroslav Averyanov

*Inria MODAL project-team, Lille, France.*

E-mail: yaroslav.averyanov@inria.fr

Alain Celisse

*Paris 1 - Panthéon Sorbonne University, Paris, France.*

**Summary.** We present a novel data-driven strategy to choose the hyperparameter  $k$  in the  $k$ -NN regression estimator. We treat the problem of choosing the hyperparameter as an iterative procedure (over  $k$ ) and propose using an easily implemented in practice strategy based on the idea of *early stopping* and the *minimum discrepancy principle*. This model selection strategy is proven to be minimax-optimal, under the fixed-design assumption on covariates, over some smoothness function classes, for instance, the Lipschitz functions class on a bounded domain. The novel method shows consistent simulation results on artificial and real-world data sets in comparison to other model selection strategies, such as the Hold-out method and generalized cross-validation. The novelty of the strategy comes from reducing the computational time of the model selection procedure while preserving the statistical (minimax) optimality of the resulting estimator. More precisely, given a sample of size  $n$ , if one should choose  $k$  among  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , assuming that the nearest neighbors are already precomputed, the strategy reduces the computational time of the generalized cross-validation or Akaike's AIC criteria from  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  to  $\mathcal{O}(n^2(n-k))$ , where  $k$  is the proposed (minimum discrepancy principle) value of the nearest neighbors.

**Keywords:** Nonparametric regression,  $k$ -NN estimator, early stopping, minimum discrepancy principle, minimax estimator

**1. Introduction**

Nonparametric regression estimation is a fundamental problem in statistics and machine learning. The  $k$ -NN regression estimator (Györfi et al. 2006; Biau and Devroye 2015) is a very simple and popular choice in practice. For this estimator, the central issue is choosing properly the number of neighbors  $k$ .

The theoretical performance of the  $k$ -NN regression estimator has been widely studied since the 1970s (Devroye 1978; Collomb et al. 1979; Devroye et al. 1981; Bhattacharya and Mack 1987; Biau, Cérou, and Guyader 2010; Kpotufe 2011; Biau and Devroye 2015; Zhao and Lai 2019). For example, in (Biau and Devroye 2015, Chapter 12) the uniform consistency of the  $k$ -NN estimator is proved under the condition that  $k(n)/n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $n$  is the sample size. However, as it was shown in Györfi et al. 2006, the nearest neighbor estimator ( $k = 1$ ) is proved to be consistent only in the noiseless case. Therefore, it is necessary to let  $k$  grow with  $n$ .

Recently, researchers started to be interested in choosing  $k$  from the data (Györfi et al. 2006; Arlot and Bach 2009; Kpotufe 2011; Azadkia 2019). Apparently, the most common and simplest strategy to choose  $k$  is to assume some smoothness assumption on the regression function (e.g., the Lipschitz condition Györfi et al. 2006) and to find  $k$  that makes an upper bound on the bias and the variance of the  $k$ -NN regression estimator equal. This method has a clear lack: one needs to know the smoothness of the regression function (e.g., the Lipschitz constant). Arlot and Bach 2009 gave a *data-driven strategy* for choosing a hyperparameter for different linear estimators (e.g., the  $k$ -NN estimator) based on the idea of minimal penalty, introduced previously in Birgé and Massart 2007. The main inconvenience of this strategy is that one needs to compute all the estimators  $\mathbf{F}_n = \{f^k, k = 1, \dots, n\}$  of the regression function in order to choose the optimal one among them by comparing them via a special criterion that involves the empirical error (least-squares loss). To list other (similar) strategies, one can think about the Akaike's AIC (Akaike 1998), Mallows's  $C_p$  (Mallows 2000) criteria or generalized cross-validation (Li 1987; Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009), where one has to compute the empirical risk error plus a penalty term for any  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . Often it is computationally expensive and restricts the use in practice. This gives rise to the

problem of choosing the hyperparameter "in real-time", meaning that the practitioner should compute iteratively  $f^k \in \mathbf{F}_n$ . Eventually, this iterative process has to be stopped. This problem can be solved by applying the *early stopping rule*.

### *Review on early stopping rule*

The early stopping rule (ESR) is a regularization method that consists of stopping an iterative learning algorithm prior to its convergence. The main idea of ESR is preserving statistical optimality while lowering the computational complexity of a learning algorithm. Early stopping dates back to the 1970s and was originally proposed for solving ill-posed operator (matrix) problems (see the book Engl, Hanke, and Neubauer 1996 for a thorough review on the subject). After that there was a great interest in applying early stopping to train artificial neural networks (Prechelt 1998). The main concern of this heuristics was to show that during the training phase of learning, one can benefit from leaving apart a part of the data called the validation data. This way, the validation error on this part should give an approximation of the true risk error. This approach was purely practical, and until the 2000s there were no theoretical justifications for the ESR at all. Furthermore, until the work Raskutti, Wainwright, and Yu 2014, all the developed stopping rules (Bühlmann and Yu 2003; Zhang, Yu, et al. 2005; Bartlett and Traskin 2007; Yao, Rosasco, and Caponnetto 2007) were not data-dependent. In Raskutti, Wainwright, and Yu 2014, the authors proposed using the so-called localized Rademacher complexities (Bartlett, Bousquet, Mendelson, et al. 2005; Wainwright 2019) in order to recover the bias-variance trade-off for two learning algorithms: gradient descent and ridge (Tikhonov) regression in the unit ball of a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS)  $\mathcal{H}$ . The subsequent work Wei, Yang, and Wainwright 2017 extended the previous result to boosting algorithms with the same idea of properly controlling the localized Gaussian complexities in RKHS. However, the results in Raskutti, Wainwright, and Yu 2014 and Wei, Yang, and Wainwright 2017 were derived under the assumption that the regression function lies in the unit ball of  $\mathcal{H}$ , which restricts the use of these stopping rules in practice.

The first early stopping rule that could be potentially data-driven was proposed by

(Blanchard, Hoffmann, and Reiß 2016; Blanchard, Hoffmann, Reiß, et al. 2018; Celisse and Wahl 2020) for spectral filter iterative algorithms (see, e.g., Bauer, Pereverzev, and Rosasco 2007; Gerfo et al. 2008 for examples of such algorithms). The idea behind the construction of this early stopping rule is the so-called *minimum discrepancy principle* (MDP) that is based on finding a first iteration for which a learning algorithm starts to fit the noise. The key quantity for the analysis of the minimum discrepancy principle is the *empirical risk error* (the train error in the terminology of the machine learning community Goodfellow, Bengio, and Courville 2016), which is monitored throughout the whole learning process. The process thus is stopped if the empirical risk starts to fit the noise.

**Contribution.** In the present paper, we propose applying the minimum discrepancy principle stopping rule for the  $k$ -NN regression estimator in order to select  $k$ . We prove a non-asymptotic upper bound on the performance of the minimum discrepancy principle stopping rule measured in the empirical  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$  norm. This bound implies that, under a quite mild assumption on the regression function, the minimum discrepancy principle stopping rule provides a statistically (minimax) optimal functional estimator, in particular, over the class of Lipschitz functions on a bounded domain. Besides that, the proposed strategy lowers the computational time of the selection procedure compared to some well-known model selection strategies, such as the generalized cross-validation and Akaike’s AIC, i.e.,  $\mathcal{O}(n^2(n-k))$  for MDP( $k$ ) and  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  for Akaike’s AIC and generalized cross-validation, respectively. We emphasize that the proposed strategy for choosing  $k$  is *easy-to-implement* in practice since it involves only computing the empirical risk and estimation of the noise variance of the regression model.

**Outline of the paper.** The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the statistical model, its main assumption and introduces the notation that will be used along the paper. In Section 3, we introduce the  $k$ -NN estimator and explain how to compute the minimum discrepancy early stopping rule. Section 4 provides the main theoretical result that shows that the proposed rule is statistically optimal for some classes of functions (e.g., the well-known class of Lipschitz functions on a bounded domain). In Section 5, one can find simulation results for the proposed stopping rule. To

be precise, we compare this rule to the generalized cross-validation estimator, Akaike's AIC criterion,  $V$ -fold and Hold-out cross-validation stopping rules (Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010) tested on some artificial and real-world data sets. Section 6 concludes the paper. All the technical proofs are in the supplementary materials.

## 2. Statistical model, main assumption, and notation

In the nonparametric regression setting, one works with a sample  $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  that satisfies the statistical model

$$y_i = f^*(x_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where  $f^* : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , is a measurable function on some set  $\mathcal{X}$ , and  $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Gaussian noise variables  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . On the one hand, in the theoretical analysis in Section 4, we assume that the parameter  $\sigma^2 > 0$  is fixed and known. On the other hand, from the practical perspective in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, we estimate  $\sigma^2$  and provide experimental results on artificial and real-world data sets. One should point out here that the assumption of known variance  $\sigma^2$  is quite typical in the (theoretical) model selection literature with nonparametric regression (see, e.g., Li et al. 1986; Li 1987; Yang 2005; Cao and Golubev 2006). In addition to that, we assume that  $\{x_i \in \mathcal{X}\}_{i=1}^n$  are *fixed* covariates (corresponds to the so-called fixed design setting), thus we observe noise only in the responses  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . The goal of the present paper is to estimate optimally the regression function  $f^*$ . The term "optimally" will be explained in Section 3.

In the context of the *fixed design* setting, the performance of an estimator  $\hat{f}$  of  $f^*$  is measured in terms of the so-called *empirical norm* defined as

$$\|\hat{f} - f^*\|_n^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \hat{f}(x_i) - f^*(x_i) \right]^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\|h\|_n := \sqrt{1/n \sum_{i=1}^n h(x_i)^2}$  for any bounded on  $\mathcal{X}$  function  $h$ . We denote the empirical norm as  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ . For each bounded over  $\mathcal{X}$  functions  $h_1, h_2$ ,  $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle_n$  denotes the related inner product defined as  $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle_n := 1/n \sum_{i=1}^n h_1(x_i)h_2(x_i)$ . Further,  $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon$  denote the probability and expectation with respect to  $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ .

**Notation.** Throughout the paper,  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  are the usual Euclidean norm and related inner product.  $\|M\|_2$  and  $\|M\|_F$  signify the operator and Frobenius norms of

the matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , respectively. We denote the trace of the matrix  $M$  by  $\text{tr}(M)$ . In addition to that,  $\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}\}$  is equal to 1 if the probabilistic event  $\mathcal{E}$  holds true, otherwise it is equal to 0. For  $a \geq 0$ , we denote by  $\lfloor a \rfloor$  the largest natural number that is smaller than or equal to  $a$ . We denote by  $\lceil a \rceil$  the smallest natural number that is greater than or equal to  $a$ . Along the paper,  $I_n$  is the identity matrix of size  $n \times n$ .

We make the following assumption on the regression function  $f^*$  introduced earlier in Eq. (1).

**Assumption 1** (Boundness of the r.f.).  *$f^*$  is bounded on  $\mathcal{X}$ , meaning that there exists a constant  $\mathcal{M} > 0$  such that*

$$|f^*(x)| \leq \mathcal{M} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (3)$$

Assumption 1 is quite standard in the nonparametric regression literature (Györfi et al. 2006; Zhao and Lai 2019). In particular, Assumption 1 holds when the set  $\mathcal{X}$  is bounded, and the regression function  $f^*$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz with some positive constant  $L$  (cf. Györfi et al. 2006).

Along the paper, we use the notation  $c, c_1, C, \tilde{c}, \tilde{C}, \dots$  to show that numeric constants  $c, c_1, C, \tilde{c}, \tilde{C}, \dots$  can depend only on  $d, \sigma$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$ . The values of all the constants may change from line to line or even in the same line.

### 3. $k$ -NN estimator and minimum discrepancy stopping rule

#### 3.1. $k$ -NN regression estimator

Let us transform the initial nonparametric regression model (1) into its vector form

$$Y := [y_1, \dots, y_n]^\top = F^* + \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (4)$$

where the vectors  $F^* := [f^*(x_1), \dots, f^*(x_n)]^\top$  and  $\varepsilon := [\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n]^\top$ .

Define a  $k$ -nearest neighbor estimator  $f^k$  of  $f^*$  from (1) at the point  $x_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , as

$$f^k(x_i) := F_i^k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k(i)} y_j, \quad k = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_k(i)$  denotes the indices of the  $k$  nearest neighbors of  $x_i$  among  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  in the usual Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , where ties are broken at random. In words, in Eq. (5)

one weights by  $1/k$  the response  $y_j$  if  $x_j$  is a  $k$  nearest neighbor of  $x_i$  measured in the Euclidean norm. Note that other adaptive metrics (instead of the Euclidean one) have been also considered in the literature (Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009, Chap. 14).

One can notice that the  $k$ -NN regression estimator (5) belongs to the class of linear estimators (Arlot and Bach 2009; Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009), meaning that  $F^k \in \mathbb{R}^n$  estimates the vector  $F^*$  as it follows.

$$F^k := \left( f^k(x_1), \dots, f^k(x_n) \right)^\top = A_k Y, \quad (6)$$

where  $A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is the matrix described below.

$$\begin{cases} \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq n, (A_k)_{ij} \in \{0, 1/k\} \text{ with } k \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, (A_k)_{ii} = 1/k \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n (A_k)_{ij} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Saying differently,  $(A_k)_{ij} = 1/k$  if  $x_j$  is a  $k$  nearest neighbor of  $x_i$ , otherwise  $(A_k)_{ij} = 0$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

Define the mean-squared error (the risk error) of the estimator  $f^k$  as

$$\text{MSE}(k) := \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^k - f^*\|_n^2 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k(i)} y_j - f^*(x_i) \right)^2. \quad (8)$$

Further, we will introduce the (squared) bias and variance of the functional estimator  $f^k$  (see, e.g., Arlot and Bach 2009, Eq. (7)),

$$\text{MSE}(k) = B^2(k) + V(k), \quad (9)$$

where

$$B^2(k) = \|(I_n - A_k)F^*\|_n^2, \quad V(k) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \text{tr} \left( A_k^\top A_k \right) = \frac{\sigma^2}{k}.$$

Thus, the variance term  $\sigma^2/k$  is a decreasing function of  $k$ . Note that  $B^2(1) = 0$ ,  $V(1) = \sigma^2$ , and  $B^2(n) = (1 - 1/n)^2 \|f^*\|_n^2$ ,  $V(n) = \sigma^2/n$ . Importantly, the bias term  $B^2(k)$  can have *arbitrary* behavior on the interval  $[1, n]$ .

Ideally, we would like to minimize the mean-squared error (8) as a function of  $k$ . However, since the bias term is not known (it contains the unknown regression function),

one should introduce other quantities that will be related to the bias. In our case, this quantity will be the *empirical risk* at  $k$ :

$$R_k := \|(I_n - A_k)Y\|_n^2. \quad (10)$$

$R_k$  measures how well the estimator  $f^k$  fits  $Y$ . Remark that  $R_1 = 0$  (corresponds to the "overfitting" regime) and  $R_n = (1 - 1/n)^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2$  (corresponds to the "underfitting" regime), but there is no information about the monotonicity of  $R_k$  on the interval  $[1, n]$ .

Furthermore, some information about the bias is contained in the expectation (over the noise  $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ) of the empirical risk. To be precise, for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k &= \sigma^2 + B^2(k) - \frac{\sigma^2(2\text{tr}(A_k) - \text{tr}(A_k^\top A_k))}{n} \\ &= \sigma^2 + B^2(k) - V(k). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Let us illustrate all the mentioned quantities in one example in Fig 1. We take the regression function equal to  $f^*(x) = \|x - 0.5\|/\sqrt{3} - 0.5$  and the noise variance  $\sigma^2 = 0.01$ . We take  $n = 50$ , the uniform covariates  $x_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{U}[0, 1]^3$ , and plot the bias term  $B^2(k)$ , the variance term  $V(k)$ , risk error  $\text{MSE}(k)$ , empirical risk  $R_k$ , and its expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k$  versus the number of neighbours  $k$ .

Note that among all defined quantities, only the variance term  $V(k)$  can be proved monotonic (without an additional assumption on the smoothness of  $f^*$ ). Importantly, Fig 1 indicates that choosing  $k = 6$  will provide the user with the global optimum of the risk (the mean-squared error) curve. Thus, for instance, it would be meaningless (according to the risk curve) to compute all the estimators  $f^k$  (5) for  $k = 1, \dots, 6$ .

Our main concern is to design a data-driven strategy to choose  $\hat{k} \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , which can be seen as a mapping from the data  $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  to a positive integer so that the  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ -error  $\|f^{\hat{k}} - f^*\|_n^2$  is as small as possible. More precisely, the goal is to define a data-driven  $\hat{k}$  such that it satisfies the following non-asymptotic upper bound ("oracle-type inequality" Wainwright 2019):

$$\|f^{\hat{k}} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq C_n \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^{k_{\text{opt}}} - f^*\|_n^2 + r_n \quad (12)$$

with high (exponential) probability over  $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , where  $f^{k_{\text{opt}}}$  is a minimax-optimal estimator of the regression function  $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  is some a priori chosen function space.






Fig. 1: Sq. bias, variance, risk and (expected) empirical risk behaviour.

The leading constant  $C_n$  should be bounded, and the remainder term  $r_n$  is negligible (smaller) with respect to  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^{k_{\text{opt}}} - f^*\|_n^2$ .

### 3.2. Related work

The idea of choosing the hyperparameter  $k$  from the data has been already considered in the literature. For example, the classical procedures such as generalized cross-validation (Craven and Wahba 1978; Li 1987; Cao and Golubev 2006), penalized estimators (Li 1987; Mallows 2000; Arlot and Bach 2009; Arlot and Massart 2009), and different cross-validation methods (Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010) are popular choices for linear estimators. Let us consider them in more detail.

**Generalized CV (Li 1987; Cao and Golubev 2006; Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009).** This model selection method has been widely studied in the case of (kernel) ridge regression (Craven and Wahba 1978) and smoothing splines (Cao and Golubev 2006). In particular, Cao and Golubev 2006 proved a non-asymptotic oracle inequality for the generalized CV estimator when the variance  $\sigma^2$  is known. However, in a more general case, GCV estimates  $\sigma^2$  implicitly, which is an advantage of the method. In addition to that, GCV for  $k$ -NN regression is proved by Li 1987 to be an asymptotically

optimal model selection criterion (i.e.,  $\|f^{k_{\text{GCV}}} - f^*\|_n^2 / \inf_k \|f^k - f^*\|_n^2 \rightarrow 1$  in probability when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ) under the assumption  $\|A_k\|_2 \leq c$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , for some constant  $c$ . It is worth to mention that generalized cross-validation provides an approximation to the so-called leave-one-out cross-validation (Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010; Celisse and Mary-Huard 2018), which is an exhaustive model selection procedure. In the case of GCV, if the nearest neighbors' matrices are already precomputed, its computational time is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  elementary operations. The GCV strategy will be later considered in our simulations (see Section 5).

**Penalized estimators** date back to the work on AIC (Akaike 1998) or Mallows's  $C_p$  (Mallows 2000) criteria, where a penalty proportional to the dimension of the model is added to the quadratic loss (i.e., *the empirical risk error* in our notation (10)) when the noise level  $\sigma^2$  is known. As it was for the GCV strategy, the computational time of AIC and Mallows's  $C_p$  are  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ . After that, a new approach was developed by Birgé and Massart 2007, where the authors introduced the so-called "slope heuristics" for projection matrices. This notion was based on the introduction of the penalty  $\text{pen}(k) = K \text{tr}(A_k)$ , where  $\text{tr}(A_k)$  is the dimension of the model, and  $K$  is a constant that can depend on  $\sigma^2$ , in particular. It appeared that there exists a constant  $K_{\min}$  such that  $2K_{\min} \text{tr}(A_k)$  yields an asymptotically optimal model selection procedure. This gives rise to some strategies for the estimation of constant  $K_{\min}$  from the data, as it was done, for instance, by Arlot and Bach 2009 for a general linear estimator when  $\sigma^2$  is unknown.

**Cross-validation methods (Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010).** These model selection methods are the most used in practice. Compared to generalized cross-validation, for instance,  $V$ -fold cross-validation method (Geisser 1975; Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010) incurs a large computational cost (with  $V$ , which is not too small). To be precise, the  $V$ -fold cross-validation requires the model selection procedure to be performed  $V$  times for each value of  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Another alternative could be the Hold-out method (Wegkamp et al. 2003; Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010), which consists in randomly splitting the data into two parts for each value  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ : one is dedicated for training the estimator (5) and the other one is dedicated for testing (see, e.g., Section 5 for more details in a simulated example).

### 3.3. Bias-variance trade-off and minimum discrepancy principle rule

We are at the point to define our first "reference rule". Based on the nonparametric statistics literature (Wasserman 2006; Tsybakov 2008), the bias-variance trade-off usually provides an optimal estimator in the minimax sense:

$$k^* = \inf \{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid B^2(k) \geq V(k)\}. \quad (13)$$

The bias-variance trade-off stopping rule  $k^*$  does not always exist due to arbitrary behavior of the bias term  $B^2(k)$ . Thus, if no such  $k^*$  exists, set  $k^* = n$ . If it exists, then  $k^* \geq 2$  since  $V(1) > B^2(1)$ .

Notice that the stopping rule  $k^*$  is *not computable* in practice, since it depends on the unknown bias  $B^2(k)$ . Nevertheless, we can create a data-driven version of  $k^*$  by means of the empirical risk  $R_k$  from Eq. (10).

Eq. (11) gives us that the event  $\{B^2(k) \geq V(k)\}$  is equivalent to the event  $\{\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k \geq \sigma^2\}$ , so we conclude that  $k^* = \inf\{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k \geq \sigma^2\}$ . This gives rise to an estimator of  $k^*$  that we denote as  $k^\tau$ . This stopping rule is called *the minimum discrepancy principle* stopping rule and is defined as

$$k^\tau = \sup \{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid R_k \leq \sigma^2\}. \quad (14)$$

**Remarks.** If no such  $k^\tau$  exists, then set  $k^\tau = 1$ . Note that in Eq. (14), we introduced a supremum instead of the infimum from Eq. (13). That was done on purpose since there could be several points of the bias-variance trade-off, and apparently, the bias (and the empirical risk) could behave badly in the area "in-between". In order to calculate  $k^\tau$ , the user should, first, compute the empirical risk  $R_k$  at  $k = n$  (thus, the matrix  $A_n$  of  $n$  nearest neighbors). After that, one needs to decrease  $k$  until the event  $\{R_k \leq \sigma^2\}$  holds true. It is worth mentioning that it is not necessary to compute explicitly all the matrices  $A_k$ ,  $k = n, n-1, \dots$ , since, for instance, the matrix  $A_{n-1}$  could be easily derived from the matrix  $A_n$  (assuming that one has already arranged the neighbors and removed the  $n^{\text{th}}$  neighbors from the matrix  $A_n$ ), i.e.,

$$[A_{n-1}]_{ij} = \frac{n}{n-1} [A_n]_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (15)$$

It is one of the main computational advantages of the proposed rule (14). For more details on the efficient computation of the nearest neighbors' matrices, see, e.g., Bentley

1975; Omohundro 1989. In addition to all of that, we emphasize that the definition (14) of  $k^\tau$  does not require the knowledge of the constant  $\mathcal{M}$  from Assumption 1, and  $k^\tau$  does not require computing the empirical risk  $R_k$  for all values  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , while it is the case, for instance, for generalized cross-validation or Mallows's  $C_p$  (see Section 5). Moreover, we need to point out that the stopping rule (14) depends on the noise level  $\sigma^2$ , which should be estimated in practice, as for the AIC or Mallows's  $C_p$  criteria (Akaike 1974; Mallows 2000; Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009). We will provide a consistent estimator of  $\sigma^2$  in Section 5.3 while dealing with real-world data. Regarding the computational time of  $k^\tau$ , if the nearest neighbors' matrices are already computed, it is of the order  $\mathcal{O}(n^2(n - k^\tau))$ , which is less than  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  for the AIC/Mallows's  $C_p$  criteria, or GCV.

There is a large amount of literature (Engl, Hanke, and Neubauer 1996; Bauer, Pereverzev, and Rosasco 2007; Blanchard, Hoffmann, and Reiß 2016; Blanchard, Hoffmann, Reiß, et al. 2018; Celisse and Wahl 2020) on the minimum discrepancy principle for spectral filter algorithms such as gradient descent, ridge (Tikhonov) regularization, and spectral cut-off regression, and providing an exhaustive review on this strategy is out of the scope of the paper (e.g., Blanchard, Hoffmann, and Reiß 2016; Celisse and Wahl 2020 provides a thorough review). We should, however, emphasize that intuitively the minimum discrepancy principle determines the first time at which a learning algorithm starts to fit noise, which is measured by  $\sigma^2$  in the present context.

Moreover, one is able to notice that, if the empirical risk is close to its expectation,  $k^\tau$  should produce an optimal estimator in some sense. The main question that should be asked is "In which setting is it possible to quantify this gap between  $R_k$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k$  that will not be statistically large?". This question is the main technical obstacle of the present paper. In what follows, we show that for a quite large class of regression functions,  $k^\tau$  is optimal in the sense of Ineq. (12).

#### 4. Theoretical optimality result

Let us start to describe the main theoretical result of the present paper. The following theorem applies to the estimator defined in Eq. (6).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Under Assumption 1, for arbitrary  $u \geq 0$ ,*

$$\|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq 8V(k^*) + C_1 \left( \frac{u}{n} + \frac{\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + C_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \quad (16)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 16 \exp(-u)$ , where positive constants  $C_1, C_2$  can depend on  $d, \sigma$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Moreover, if  $k^*$  from Eq. (13) exists, then for arbitrary  $u \geq 0$ ,

$$\|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq \underbrace{4 \text{MSE}(k^*)}_{\text{Main term}} + \underbrace{C_1 \left( \frac{u}{n} + \frac{\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + C_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}}_{\text{Rem. term}} \quad (17)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 16 \exp(-u)$ , where constants  $C_1, C_2$  are from Ineq. (16).

*Proof.* The full proof is deferred to the supplementary materials. Let us provide a sketch of the proof here.

The main ingredients of the proof are two deviation inequalities (cf. Corollary D.1.1 and Lemma E.2 in the supplementary materials): for any  $x \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(V(k^\tau) > 2V(k^*) + x) \leq 2 \exp\left(-c_d n \min\left(\frac{x}{\sigma^2}, \frac{x^2}{\sigma^4}\right)\right), \quad (18)$$

and

$$B^2(k^\tau) \leq 2V(k^*) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + 2x, \quad (19)$$

where Ineq. (19) holds with probability at least  $1 - 12 \exp(-cn \min(x^2, x))$ .

After that, one can split the  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ -error at  $k^\tau$  into two parts:

$$\|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq 2B^2(k^\tau) + 2\|A_{k^\tau} \varepsilon\|_n^2.$$

It is sufficient to derive high probability control of  $\sup_k | \|A_k \varepsilon\|_n^2 - V(k) |$  for  $k = 1, \dots, n$  (see Appendix C in the supplementary materials). That was the reason why the term  $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)$  appeared in Eq. (16).

Finally, one can apply  $V(k^*) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{MSE}(k^*)$ , if  $k^*$  exists, and  $u = cn \min(x^2, x)$ . The claim follows. ■

In order to gain some intuition of the claim of Theorem 4.1, let us make some comments.

First of all, Ineq. (17) is non-asymptotic, meaning that it holds true for any sample size  $n \geq 1$ . Second, Ineq. (17) holds "with high probability", which is a stronger result than in expectation since (Li 1987) there are model selection procedures that are asymptotically optimal (when  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ) with high probability but not in expectation.

Third, the main term in Ineq. (17) is the risk error at the bias-variance trade-off times 4 (this constant could be improved). Ideally, one should rather introduce the oracle risk  $\inf_{k=1,\dots,n} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^k - f^*\|_n^2$  and compare  $\|f^{k^*} - f^*\|_n^2$  to it. However, to the best of our knowledge, a smoothness assumption is needed to connect the bias-variance trade-off risk and the oracle risk. That was the reason to keep the main term as it was stated. Fourth, the right hand side term of Ineq. (17) is of the order  $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)$ . Notice that the same rate for this term was achieved in Azadkia 2019 but in terms of the expectation over the noise.

A natural question would be to understand if the rate  $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)$  in Ineq. (16) or (17) is sufficiently fast. In order to do that, one should precise the function space  $\mathcal{F}$ , where  $f^*$  lies in. In what follows, we will mention one famous example (among others) of a such function space  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Example 1.** *Consider the class of functions*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{Lip}}(L) := \left\{ f : [0, 1]^d \mapsto \mathbb{R} \mid f(0) = 0, f \text{ is } L\text{-Lipschitz} \right\}, \quad (20)$$

where  $f$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz means that  $|f(x) - f(x')| \leq L\|x - x'\|$  for all  $x, x' \in [0, 1]^d$ . In this case (see, e.g., Györfi et al. 2006, Theorem 3.2 with  $p = 1$ ),

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|\widehat{f} - f^*\|_n^2 \geq c_1 n^{-\frac{2}{2+d}}, \quad (21)$$

for some positive constant  $c_1$ , for any measurable of the input data  $\widehat{f}$ .

Therefore, for the class of  $L$ -Lipshitz functions, the rate  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log n/n})$  is faster than the minimax-optimal rate  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{2}{2+d}})$  for any  $d > 2$ .

As for the main term  $8V(k^*)$  in Ineq. (16), it should be of a minimax-optimal order since the common strategy for obtaining optimal rates for the  $k$ -NN regression estimator is two-fold. First, one should derive a uniform (over  $k$ ) upper bound on the bias term (knowing the smoothness of the regression function), which is a non-decreasing function

of  $k$ . After that, this upper bound is made equal to the variance term, which results in the optimal  $k^{b/v}$ . Following this argument, one can conclude that  $k^{b/v} \leq k^*$ , which implies  $V(k^*) \leq V(k^{b/v})$ . We summarize our findings in the theorem and corollary below.

**Theorem 4.2** (Theorem 6.2 in Györfi et al. 2006). *Under the Lipschitz condition (20) on the regression function  $f^*$ , for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^k - f^*\|_n^2 \leq C \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{2/d} + \frac{\sigma^2}{k}, \quad (22)$$

where  $C$  may depend on  $d$  and  $L$ . Thus, Ineq. (22) gives  $k^{b/v} = \left\lceil \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{C}\right)^{d/(2+d)} n^{\frac{2}{2+d}} \right\rceil$ .

**Corollary 4.2.1.** *Set  $u = \log n$  in Ineq. (16), then, under the  $L$ -Lipschitz condition (20) on the regression function  $f^*$ , early stopping rule  $k^\tau$  from Eq. (14) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq c_u n^{-\frac{2}{2+d}}, \quad (23)$$

where positive constant  $c_u$  depends on  $d, \sigma$ , and  $L$ ;  $d > 2$ .

*Proof.* First, by taking the expectation of Ineq. (16), it gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 &= \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left[ \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \mathbb{I} \left\{ \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq 8V(k^*) + C_1 \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} + C_2 \frac{\log n}{n} \right\} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left[ \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \mathbb{I} \left\{ \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 > 8V(k^*) + C_1 \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} + C_2 \frac{\log n}{n} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

After that, due to Lemma A.4 from the supplementary materials,  $\|I_n - A_k\|_2 \leq c$  for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and  $|f^*(x_i)| \leq \mathcal{M}$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  due to the Lipschitz condition (20), which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 &\leq 2\|(I_n - A_{k^\tau})F^*\|_n^2 + 2\|A_{k^\tau}\varepsilon\|_n^2 \\ &\leq 2\|I_n - A_{k^\tau}\|_2^2 \|f^*\|_n^2 + 2\|A_{k^\tau}\|_2^2 \|\varepsilon\|_n^2 \\ &\leq c_1 + c_2 \|\varepsilon\|_n^2, \end{aligned}$$

where constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  depend only on  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $d$ . Thus,

$$\|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^4 \leq c_1 + c_2 \|\varepsilon\|_n^4 + c_3 \|\varepsilon\|_n^2. \quad (25)$$

From Ineq. (24) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it comes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 &\leq 8V(k^*) + C_1 \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} + C_2 \frac{\log n}{n} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^4} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 > 8V(k^*) + C_1 \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} + C_2 \frac{\log n}{n} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Ineq. (16) and Ineq. (25), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^{k^\tau} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq 8V(k^*) + C_1 \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} + C_2 \frac{\log n}{n} + \sqrt{c_1 + c_3 \sigma^4 + c_2 \sigma^2} \frac{4}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

The claim follows from  $V(k^*) \leq V(k^{b/v}) = \sigma^2/k^{b/v}$ , for  $k^{b/v}$  defined in Theorem 4.2. ■

Therefore, the function estimator  $f^{k^\tau}$  achieves (up to a constant) the minimax bound presented in Eq. (21), thus non-improvable in general for the class of Lipschitz functions on a bounded domain.

## 5. Empirical comparison to other model selection rules

The present section aims at comparing the practical behaviour of our stopping rule  $k^\tau$  from Eq. (14) with other existing and the most used in practice model selection rules. We split the section into three parts: Subsection 5.1 defines the competitive stopping rules and the "oracle" stopping rule. Subsection 5.2 presents experiments on some artificial data sets, while Subsection 5.3 presents experiments on some real data sets.

### 5.1. Description of the stopping rules to compare

In what follows, we will briefly describe five competitive model selection rules as well as the "undefeated" oracle rule.

#### *Akaike's AIC criterion*

The Akaike's information criterion (Akaike 1974; Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009) estimates the risk error by means of a log-likelihood loss function. In the case of  $k$ -NN regression with Gaussian noise, the maximum likelihood and least-squares are essentially the same things. This gives the AIC criterion as

$$R_{\text{AIC}}(f^k) = \frac{1}{n\hat{\sigma}^2} (\|Y - A_k Y\|^2 + 2\text{tr}(A_k)\hat{\sigma}^2), \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$



where  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  is an estimator of  $\sigma^2$  obtained from a low-bias model (i.e. with  $k = 2$ ). Using this criterion, we adjust the training error by a factor proportional to the "degree of freedom". Then, the AIC choice for the optimal  $k$  is

$$k_{\text{AIC}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{k=2,\dots,n} \left\{ R_{\text{AIC}}(f^k) \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Notice that in the mentioned case, AIC criterion is equivalent to Mallows's  $C_p$  criterion (Mallows 2000). AIC criterion has been widely criticized in the literature, especially for the constant 2 in the definition and/or its asymptotic nature. That is why some authors proposed corrections for the criterion (Schwarz et al. 1978; Yang 1999). Nevertheless, AIC,  $C_p$ , and other related criteria have been proved to satisfy non-asymptotic oracle-type inequalities (see Birgé and Massart 2007 and references therein). Notice that the computational time of the AIC criterion is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ , which is higher than  $\mathcal{O}(n^2(n - k^\tau))$  for the minimum discrepancy principle stopping rule  $k^\tau$  (14).

### *Generalized cross-validation.*

The generalized (GCV) cross-validation strategy (Craven and Wahba 1978; Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010) was introduced in least-squares regression as a rotation-invariant version of the leave-one-out cross-validation procedure. The GCV estimator of the risk error of the linear estimator  $A_k Y$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , is defined via

$$R_{\text{GCV}}(f^k) = \frac{n^{-1} \|Y - A_k Y\|^2}{(1 - n^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(A_k))^2},$$

The final model selection rule is

$$k_{\text{GCV}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{k=2,\dots,n} \left\{ R_{\text{GCV}}(f^k) \right\}. \quad (27)$$

GCV should be close to the AIC model selection procedure when the sample size  $n$  is large. The asymptotic optimality of GCV, meaning that  $\|f^{k_{\text{GCV}}} - f^*\|_n^2 / \inf_k \|f^k - f^*\|_n^2 \rightarrow 1$  in probability, has been proved for the  $k$ -NN estimator in Li 1987 under mild assumptions. As for the AIC criterion, the computational time of generalized cross-validation is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  elementary operations.

*Hold-out cross-validation stopping rule.*

The Hold-out cross-validation strategy (Geisser 1975; Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010) is described as follows. The data  $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are randomly split into two parts of equal size: the training sample  $S_{\text{train}} = \{x_{\text{train}}, y_{\text{train}}\}$  and the test sample  $S_{\text{test}} = \{x_{\text{test}}, y_{\text{test}}\}$  so that the training and test samples represent a half of the whole data set  $\approx n/2$ . For each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , one trains the  $k$ -NN estimator (5) and evaluates its performance by  $R_{\text{HO}}(f^k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_{\text{test}}} (f^k(x_i) - y_i)^2$ , where  $f^k(x_i)$  denotes the output of the algorithm trained for  $k$  and evaluated at the point  $x_i \in x_{\text{test}}$ . Then, the Hold-out CV stopping rule is defined via

$$k_{\text{HO}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{k=2, \dots, n} \left\{ R_{\text{HO}}(f^k) \right\}. \quad (28)$$

The main inconvenience of this model selection rule is the fact that a part of the data is lost, which increases the risk error. Besides that, the Hold-out strategy is not stable (Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010), which often requires some aggregation of it. The (asymptotic) computational time of the Hold-out strategy is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  elementary operations.

*V-fold cross-validation*

$V$ -fold cross-validation is certainly the most used cross-validation procedure: the data  $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  are randomly split into  $V = 5$  equal sized blocks, and at each round (among the  $V$  ones),  $V - 1$  blocks are devoted to training  $S_{\text{train}} = (x_{\text{train}}, y_{\text{train}})$ , and the remaining one is used for the evaluation  $S_{\text{test}} = (x_{\text{test}}, y_{\text{test}})$ . The risk error of the  $k$ -NN estimator is estimated by  $R_{\text{VFCV}}(f^k) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{j=1}^V \frac{1}{n/V} \sum_{i \in S_{\text{test}}(j)} (f^k(x_i) - y_i)^2$ , where  $f^k(x_i)$  denotes the output of the algorithm trained for  $k$  and evaluated at the point  $x_i \in S_{\text{test}}(j)$ , thus

$$k_{\text{VFCV}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{k=1, \dots, n} \left\{ R_{\text{VFCV}}(f^k) \right\} \quad (29)$$

$V$ -fold cross-validation is a more computationally tractable solution than other splitting-based model selection methods, such as the leave-one-out or leave- $p$ -out Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009; Arlot, Celisse, et al. 2010. Usually, the optimal  $V$  is equal to 5 or 10 due to the fact that the statistical error does not increase a lot for larger values of  $V$  whereas averaging over more than 10 folds becomes infeasible. To the best

of our knowledge, there are no theoretical results for the  $V$ -fold cross validation model selection strategy with the  $k$ -NN regression estimator.

### *Theoretical bias-variance trade-off stopping rule*

The fourth stopping rule is the one introduced in Eq. (13). This stopping rule is the classical bias-variance trade-off stopping rule that provides minimax-optimal rates (see the monographs Wasserman 2006; Tsybakov 2008):

$$k^* = \inf\{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid B^2(k) \geq V(k)\}. \quad (30)$$

The stopping rule  $k^*$  is introduced for comparison purposes only because it *cannot be computed* in practice. One can say that this stopping rule is minimax-optimal if  $f^*$  belongs, for instance, to the class of Lipschitz functions on a bounded domain (20). Therefore, it could serve as a (lower bound) reference in the present simulated experiments with artificial data.

### *Oracle stopping rule*

The "oracle" stopping rule is defined as

$$k_{\text{or}} := \operatorname{argmin}_{k=1, \dots, n} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^k - f^*\|_n^2 \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Note that this stopping rule is *not computable* from the data, since one has to know the regression function  $f^*$  to compute it. Moreover, we do not have access to the whole curve of the risk error. Nevertheless, it serves as a convenient lower bound on the risk error for the simulations with artificial data.

## **5.2. Artificial data**

First, the goal is to perform some simulated experiments (a comparison of mentioned stopping rules) on artificial data.

### **Description of the simulation design**

The data in this case is generated according to the regression model  $y_j = f^*(x_j) + \varepsilon_j$ , where  $\varepsilon_j \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$  (Gaussian),  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . We choose the uniform covariates




Fig. 2:  $k$ -NN estimator (5) with two noised regression functions: smooth  $f_1^*(x) = 1.5 \cdot [\|x - 0.5\|/\sqrt{3} - 0.5]$  for panel (a) and "sinus"  $f_2^*(x) = 1.5 \cdot \sin(\|x\|/\sqrt{3})$  for panel (b), with uniform covariates  $x_j \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathbb{U}[0, 1]^3$ . Each curve corresponds to the  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$  squared norm error for the stopping rules (14), (13), (31), (28), (27), averaged over 100 independent trials, versus the sample size  $n = \{50, 80, 100, 160, 200, 250\}$ .

$x_j \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathbb{U}[0, 1]^3$  (uniform),  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , and  $\sigma = 0.1$ . Consider two regression functions with different smoothness: a "smooth"  $f_1^*(x) = 1.5 \cdot [\|x - 0.5\|/\sqrt{3} - 0.5]$  and a "sinus"  $f_2^*(x) = 1.5 \cdot \sin(\|x\|/\sqrt{3})$  for any  $x \in [0, 1]^3$ . Notice that both functions belong to the class of Lipschitz functions (20) on  $[0, 1]^3$ . The sample size  $n$  varies from 50 to 250.

The  $k$ -NN algorithm (5) is trained first for  $k = n$ , after that we decrease the value of  $k$  until  $k = 1$  such that at each step of the iteration procedure we increase the variance of the  $k$ -NN estimator  $V(k) = \sigma^2/k$  (cf. Fig. 1). In other words, the model becomes more complex successively due to the increase of its "degree of freedom" measured by  $\text{tr}(A_k) = n/k$ . If the condition in Eq. (14) is satisfied, the learning process is stopped, and it outputs the stopping rule  $k^\tau$ .

The performance of the stopping rules is measured in terms of the empirical  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ -norm  $\|f^k - f^*\|_n^2$  averaged over  $N = 100$  repetitions (over the noise  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^n$ ).

For our simulations, we use a consistent (low-bias) estimator of  $\sigma^2$  described in Section 5.3 (see Eq. (33)).

### Results of the simulation experiments.

Figure 2 displays the resulting (averaged over 100 repetitions)  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ -error of  $k^\tau$  (14),  $k_{\text{or}}$  (31),  $k^*$  (13),  $k_{\text{HO}}$  (28), and  $k_{\text{GCV}}$  (27) versus the sample size  $n$ . In particular, Figure 2a shows the results for the "smooth" regression function, whereas Figure 2b provides the results for the "sinus" regression function.

First, from all the graphs, (almost) all curves do not increase as the sample size  $n$  grows. The best performance is achieved by the oracle stopping rule  $k_{\text{or}}$ . Actually, this good behaviour was expected since  $k_{\text{or}}$  corresponds to the minimum of the risk curve  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|f^k - f^*\|_n^2$ . One can notice that in both graphs, the prediction error of the Hold-out strategy has a high variance.

In more detail, Figure 2a indicates that, if we do not take into account the oracle performance, the best performance is achieved by  $k^*$  (non-computable in practice bias-variance trade-off). Besides that, the minimum discrepancy principle rule  $k^\tau$  is (almost) uniformly better than  $k_{\text{HO}}$  and has the same performance as the one of  $k_{\text{GCV}}$ . Moreover, the gap between  $k^\tau$  and  $k^*$  is getting smaller as the sample size  $n$  increases. This behavior supports the theoretical part of the present paper since  $k^\tau$  should serve as an estimator of  $k^*$ . Since  $k^*$  is the well-known bias-variance trade-off, the minimum discrepancy principle stopping rule seems to be a meaningful model selection method.

As for Figure 2b, the situation is quite similar. In this graph, the best performance is achieved again by  $k^*$  – a non-computable in practice stopping rule: its results are close to the results for the oracle rule. As for the data-driven model selection methods, the stopping rules  $k^\tau$  and  $k_{\text{HO}}$  perform almost equivalently. Increasing the number of repetitions of simulations experiments should reduce the performance gap between  $k^\tau$  and  $k_{\text{GCV}}$  (an asymptotically optimal model selection strategy).

### 5.3. Real data

Here, we tested the performance (prediction error and runtime) of the early stopping rule  $k^\tau$  (14) for choosing the hyperparameter in the  $k$ -NN estimator on four different data sets mostly taken from the UCI repository (Dua and Graff 2017).

#### Data sets description

The housing data set "Boston Housing Prices" concerns the task of predicting housing values in areas of Boston (USA), the input points are 13-dimensional.

The "Diabetes" data set consists of 10 columns that measure different patient's characteristics (age, sex, body mass index, etc), the output is a quantitative measure of disease progression one year after the baseline.

The "Power Plants" data set contains 9568 data points collected from a Combined Cycle Power Plant over 6 years (2006-2011), when the plant was set to work with the full load.

"California Houses Prices" data set (Pace and Barry 1997) contains information from the 1990's California census. The input variables are "total bedrooms", "total rooms", etc. The output variable is the median house value for households within a block (measured in US Dollars).

Notice that for "California Houses Prices" and "Power Plants" data sets we take the first 3000 data points in order to speed up the calculations.

### Description of the simulation design

Assume that we are given one of the data sets described above. Let us rescale each variable of this data set  $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that all the components  $\tilde{x}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , belong to  $[0, 1]$ :

$$\tilde{x}_i = \frac{\tilde{x}_i - \min(\tilde{x})}{\max(\tilde{x}) - \min(\tilde{x})}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $\min(\tilde{x})$  and  $\max(\tilde{x})$  denote the minimum and the maximum component of the vector  $\tilde{x}$ .

After that, we split the data set into two parts: one is denoted  $S_{\text{train}} = \{x_{\text{train}}, y_{\text{train}}\}$  (70 % of the whole data) and is made for training and model selection (model selection rules  $k^\tau$ ,  $k_{\text{GCV}}$ ,  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$ , and  $k_{\text{AIC}}$ ), the other one (30 % of the whole data) is denoted  $S_{\text{test}} = \{x_{\text{test}}, y_{\text{test}}\}$  and is made for making prediction on it. We denote  $n_{\text{train}}$  and  $n_{\text{test}}$  as the sample sizes of  $S_{\text{train}}$  and  $S_{\text{test}}$ , respectively. Then, our experiments' design is divided into four parts.

At the beginning, we create a grid of sub-sample size for each data set:

$$n_s \in \left\{ \lfloor n_{\text{train}}/5 \rfloor, \lfloor n_{\text{train}}/4 \rfloor, \lfloor n_{\text{train}}/3 \rfloor, \lfloor n_{\text{train}}/2 \rfloor, n_{\text{train}} \right\}, \quad (32)$$

and a grid of the maximum number of neighbors  $k_{\max} = 3\lceil \log(n_s) \rceil$ , where  $n_{\text{train}} = \lceil 0.7n \rceil$  and  $n$  is the sample size of the whole data.

Further, for each data set and sub-sample size from Eq. (32), we estimate the noise variance  $\sigma^2$  from the regression model (1). There is large amount of work on the estimation of  $\sigma^2$  in nonparametric regression (Rice et al. 1984; Hall and Marron 1990). In our simulated experiments, we take the estimator from Wasserman 2006, Eq. (5.86), which is a consistent estimator of  $\sigma^2$  under an assumption that  $f^*$  is "sufficiently smooth". It satisfies our simulation experiments' purposes.

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 := \frac{\|(I_{n_s} - A_k)y_s\|^2}{n_s(1 - 1/k)} \quad \text{with} \quad k = 2, \quad (33)$$

where  $y_s$  corresponds the vector of responses from the chosen sub-samples. After that, we compute our stopping rule  $k^\tau$  and other model selection strategies from Section 5.1. To do that, for each data set and each integer  $n_s$  from Eq. (32), we randomly sample  $n_s$  data points from  $S_{\text{train}}$ , compute the  $k$ -NN estimator (5) and the empirical risk (10) for  $k_{\max}$ , and at each step of the iteration process we reduce the value of  $k$  by one. Remark that one does not have to calculate the neighborhood matrix  $A_k$  for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, k_{\max}\}$ , since it is sufficient to do only for  $k_{\max}$  (cf. Eq. (15)). This process is repeated until the empirical risk crosses the threshold  $\hat{\sigma}^2$ . Fig. 3 provides two illustrations of the minimum discrepancy strategy  $k^\tau$  for two data sets: "Diabetes" and "Boston Housing Prices".

After that, the AIC criterion (26), 5-fold cross-validation (29), and the generalized cross-validation  $k_{\text{GCV}}$  are calculated. Let us describe how we do that in two steps. We start by defining a grid of values for  $k : \{1, 2, \dots, k_{\max}\}$ . Further, one should compute  $k_{\text{AIC}}$ ,  $k_{\text{GCV}}$ , and  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$  from Eq. (26), Eq. (27), and Eq. (29) over the mentioned grid.

In the final part, given  $k^\tau$ ,  $k_{\text{AIC}}$ ,  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$ , and  $k_{\text{GCV}}$ , the goal is to make a prediction on the test data set  $x_{\text{test}}$ . This can be done as follows. Assume that  $x_0 \in x_{\text{test}}$ , then the prediction of the  $k$ -NN estimator on this point can be defined as

$$f^k(x_0) = a_k(x_0)^\top y_s,$$

where  $a_k(x_0) = [a_k(x_0, x_1), \dots, a_k(x_0, x_{n_s})]^\top$  and  $x_s = [x_1^\top, \dots, x_{n_s}^\top]^\top$ , with  $a_k(x_0, x_i) = 1/k$  if  $x_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n_{\text{train}}\}$ , is a nearest neighbor of  $x_0$ , otherwise 0. Further, one can choose  $k$  to be equal  $k^\tau$ ,  $k_{\text{AIC}}$ ,  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$  or  $k_{\text{GCV}}$  that are already computed. Combining

all the steps together, one is able to calculate the prediction error  $\|f^k - y_{\text{test}}\|$ .

For each sub-sample size  $n_s$  from Eq. (32) and data set, the procedure has to be performed 25 times (via new sub-samples from the data set).

### **Results of the simulation experiments.**

Figures 4 and 5 display the averaged (over 25 repetitions) runtime (in seconds) and the prediction error of the model selection rules  $k^\tau$  (14),  $k_{\text{AIC}}$  (26), 5-fold cross-validation (29), and generalized cross-validation (27) for "Boston Housing Prices", "Diabetes" (in Figure 4), and "California Houses Prices", "Power Plants" data sets (in Figure 5).

Figures 4a, 4c indicate that the minimum discrepancy principle rule  $k^\tau$  has the smallest runtime among the model selection criteria. At the same time, Figure 4b shows that the prediction error of  $k^\tau$  has better performance than that of  $k_{\text{AIC}}$  and  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$ , and is similar to that of  $k_{\text{GCV}}$ . Figure 4d indicates that the performance of the minimum discrepancy stopping rule  $k^\tau$  is better than that of  $k_{\text{AIC}}$ ,  $k_{\text{GCV}}$ , and  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$  for the sub-sample size  $n_s \geq 100$ .

Let us turn to the results for the "California Houses Prices" and "Power Plants" data sets. Figures 5b, 5d display the prediction performance of the model selection rules: for the "California Houses Prices" data set, the prediction performance of  $k^\tau$  is comparable to the performance of  $k_{\text{GCV}}$  and is uniformly better than the 5FCV rule  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$  and  $k_{\text{AIC}}$ ; for the "Power Plants" data set, the prediction error of the minimum discrepancy principle is similar to that of  $k_{\text{AIC}}$ ,  $k_{\text{GCV}}$ , and  $k_{5\text{FCV}}$  for the sub-sample sizes  $n_s \leq 1000$ , and is little worse for  $n_s = 2100$ . This deterioration of the performance could be due to the estimation of the variance  $\sigma^2$  from Eq. (33). Figures 5a, 5c show the runtime of the stopping rules: one can conclude that the computational time of the minimum discrepancy rule  $k^\tau$  is less than the computational time of the generalized cross-validation, AIC criterion, and 5 fold cross-validation.

The overall conclusion from the simulation experiments is that the prediction error of the MDP stopping rule  $k^\tau$  is often better (or the same) than for standard model selection strategies, such as the generalized cross-validation or 5-fold cross-validation, while its computational time is lower.






Fig. 3: Stopping the learning process based on the rule (14) applied to two data sets: a) "Diabetes" and b) "Boston Housing Prices". "Threshold" horizontal line corresponds to the estimated variance from Eq. (33).

## 6. Conclusion

In the present paper, we tackled the problem of choosing the tuning parameter  $k$  in the  $k$ -NN regression estimator. A strategy based on early stopping and the minimum discrepancy principle was proposed. In Section 4, it was shown that the minimum discrepancy stopping rule  $k^\tau$  (14) provides a minimax-optimal estimator, in particular, over the class of Lipschitz functions on a bounded domain. Besides that, this theoretical result was confirmed empirically on artificial and real data sets: the stopping rule has the comparable performance to other model selection rules, such as generalized cross-validation or 5-fold cross-validation while reducing the computational time of the model selection procedure. The main inconvenience of the proposed strategy is that one has to estimate the variance  $\sigma^2$  of the regression model (as it is the case for the AIC or Mallows's  $C_p$  criteria), thus a plug-in estimator is needed. We have constructed such an estimator for simulated experiments with real-world data in Section 5.3.

As for perspectives of this work, we are interested in the theoretical performance of the Nadaraya-Watson regressor (Nadaraya 1964; Wasserman 2006). Apparently, it should




Fig. 4: Runtime (in seconds) and  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$  prediction error versus sub-sample size for different model selection methods: MD principle (14), AIC (26), GCV (27), and 5-fold cross-validation (29), tested on the "Boston Housing Prices" and "Diabetes" data sets. In all cases, each point corresponds to the average of 25 trials. (a), (c) Runtime versus the sub-sample size  $n \in \{70, 88, 118, 177, 354\}$ . (b), (d) Prediction error  $\|f^k - y_{\text{test}}\|$  versus the sub-sample size  $n \in \{70, 88, 118, 177, 354\}$ .




Fig. 5: Runtime (in seconds) and  $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$  prediction error versus sub-sample size for different model selection methods: MDP (14), AIC (26), GCV (27), and 5-fold cross-validation (29), tested on the "California Houses Prices" and "Power Plants" data set. In all cases, each point corresponds to the average of 25 trials. (a), (c) Runtime versus the sub-sample size  $n \in \{420, 525, 700, 1050, 2100\}$ . (b), (d) Prediction error  $\|f^k - y_{\text{test}}\|$  versus the sub-sample size  $n \in \{420, 525, 700, 1050, 2100\}$ .

be close to the one of the k-NN regression estimator since these two non-parametric estimators are closely related (see the monographs Györfi et al. 2006; Tsybakov 2008). The main difficulty should come from the fact that, if  $h$  is the bandwidth parameter and  $A_h$  is the smoothing matrix of the Nadarya-Watson estimator, then  $\text{tr}(A_h^\top A_h) \neq \text{tr}(A_h)$ . This fact implies that the expectation of the empirical risk minus the noise variance will not be equal to the difference between the bias and variance terms (see Eq. (11)). Therefore, there should be another concentration result that deals with this problem. Besides that, we should emphasize that the early stopping rules in this work were estimating the famous bias-variance trade-off Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009, Chapter 7. However, recently, (Belkin et al. 2019; Belkin, Hsu, and Xu 2020) the bias-variance balancing paradigm was rethought by discovering some settings (exact fit to the data) for which a phenomenon of the "double descent" of the risk curve appeared. It would be interesting to understand if early stopping can work for these settings. The reader can look at a very recent paper Dwivedi et al. 2020 and references therein for another reexamination of the paradigm.

## References

- [AB09a] Sylvain Arlot and Francis Bach. "Data-driven calibration of linear estimators with minimal penalties". In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:0909.1884 (Sept. 2009), arXiv:0909.1884. arXiv: 0909.1884 [math.ST].
- [AB09b] Sylvain Arlot and Francis R Bach. "Data-driven calibration of linear estimators with minimal penalties". In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2009, pp. 46–54.
- [AC+10] Sylvain Arlot, Alain Celisse, et al. "A survey of cross-validation procedures for model selection". In: *Statistics surveys* 4 (2010), pp. 40–79.
- [Aka74] Hirotugu Akaike. "A new look at the statistical model identification". In: *IEEE transactions on automatic control* 19.6 (1974), pp. 716–723.

- [Aka98] Hirotogu Akaike. “Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle”. In: *Selected papers of hirotugu akaike*. Springer, 1998, pp. 199–213.
- [AM09] Sylvain Arlot and Pascal Massart. “Data-driven Calibration of Penalties for Least-Squares Regression.” In: *Journal of Machine learning research* 10.2 (2009).
- [Aza19] Mona Azadkia. *Optimal choice of  $k$  for  $k$ -nearest neighbor regression*. 2019. arXiv: 1909.05495 [math.ST].
- [BBM+05] Peter L Bartlett, Olivier Bousquet, Shahar Mendelson, et al. “Local rademacher complexities”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 33.4 (2005), pp. 1497–1537.
- [BCG10] Gérard Biau, Frédéric Cérou, and Arnaud Guyader. “Rates of convergence of the functional  $k$ -nearest neighbor estimate”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 56.4 (2010), pp. 2034–2040.
- [BD15] Gérard Biau and Luc Devroye. *Lectures on the nearest neighbor method*. Vol. 246. Springer, 2015.
- [Bel+19] Mikhail Belkin et al. “Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias–variance trade-off”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116.32 (2019), pp. 15849–15854.
- [Ben75] Jon Louis Bentley. “Multidimensional binary search trees used for associative searching”. In: *Communications of the ACM* 18.9 (1975), pp. 509–517.
- [BHR16] Gilles Blanchard, Marc Hoffmann, and Markus Reiß. “Optimal adaptation for early stopping in statistical inverse problems”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.07702* (2016).
- [BHR+18] Gilles Blanchard, Marc Hoffmann, Markus Reiß, et al. “Early stopping for statistical inverse problems via truncated SVD estimation”. In: *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 12.2 (2018), pp. 3204–3231.

- [BHX20] Mikhail Belkin, Daniel Hsu, and Ji Xu. “Two models of double descent for weak features”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 2.4 (2020), pp. 1167–1180.
- [BM07] Lucien Birgé and Pascal Massart. “Minimal penalties for Gaussian model selection”. In: *Probability theory and related fields* 138.1-2 (2007), pp. 33–73.
- [BM87] PK Bhattacharya and YP Mack. “Weak convergence of k-NN density and regression estimators with varying k and applications”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* (1987), pp. 976–994.
- [BPR07] Frank Bauer, Sergei Pereverzev, and Lorenzo Rosasco. “On regularization algorithms in learning theory”. In: *Journal of complexity* 23.1 (2007), pp. 52–72.
- [BT07] Peter L Bartlett and Mikhail Traskin. “Adaboost is consistent”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 8.Oct (2007), pp. 2347–2368.
- [BY03] Peter Bühlmann and Bin Yu. “Boosting with the L<sub>2</sub> loss: regression and classification”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 98.462 (2003), pp. 324–339.
- [CG06] Y Cao and Y Golubev. “On oracle inequalities related to smoothing splines”. In: *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* 15.4 (2006), pp. 398–414.
- [CMH18] Alain Celisse and Tristan Mary-Huard. “Theoretical analysis of cross-validation for estimating the risk of the k-nearest neighbor classifier”. In: *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 19.1 (2018), pp. 2373–2426.
- [Col+79] G Collomb et al. “Estimation de la regression par la méthode des k points les plus proches: propriétés de convergence ponctuelle”. In: (1979).
- [CW20] Alain Celisse and Martin Wahl. “Analyzing the discrepancy principle for kernelized spectral filter learning algorithms”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08436* (2020).
- [CW78] Peter Craven and Grace Wahba. “Smoothing noisy data with spline functions”. In: *Numerische mathematik* 31.4 (1978), pp. 377–403.

- [Dev78] Luc Devroye. “The uniform convergence of nearest neighbor regression function estimators and their application in optimization”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 24.2 (1978), pp. 142–151.
- [Dev+81] Luc Devroye et al. “On the almost everywhere convergence of nonparametric regression function estimates”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 9.6 (1981), pp. 1310–1319.
- [DG17] Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. *UCI Machine Learning Repository*. 2017. URL: <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>.
- [Dwi+20] Raaz Dwivedi et al. “Revisiting complexity and the bias-variance tradeoff”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10189* (2020).
- [EHN96] Heinz Werner Engl, Martin Hanke, and Andreas Neubauer. *Regularization of inverse problems*. Vol. 375. Springer Science & Business Media, 1996.
- [GBC16] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. 2016.
- [Gei75] Seymour Geisser. “The predictive sample reuse method with applications”. In: *Journal of the American statistical Association* 70.350 (1975), pp. 320–328.
- [Ger+08] L Lo Gerfo et al. “Spectral algorithms for supervised learning”. In: *Neural Computation* 20.7 (2008), pp. 1873–1897.
- [Gyö+06] László Györfi et al. *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [HM90] Peter Hall and JS Marron. “On variance estimation in nonparametric regression”. In: *Biometrika* 77.2 (1990), pp. 415–419.
- [HTF09] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [KMR14] Felix Krahmer, Shahar Mendelson, and Holger Rauhut. “Suprema of chaos processes and the restricted isometry property”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 67.11 (2014), pp. 1877–1904.

- [Kpo11] Samory Kpotufe. “k-NN regression adapts to local intrinsic dimension”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2011, pp. 729–737.
- [Li+86] Ker-Chau Li et al. “Asymptotic optimality of  $CL$  and generalized cross-validation in ridge regression with application to spline smoothing”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 14.3 (1986), pp. 1101–1112.
- [Li87] Ker-Chau Li. “Asymptotic optimality for  $C_p$ ,  $CL$ , cross-validation and generalized cross-validation: discrete index set”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* (1987), pp. 958–975.
- [Mal00] Colin L Mallows. “Some comments on  $C_p$ ”. In: *Technometrics* 42.1 (2000), pp. 87–94.
- [Nad64] Elizbar A Nadaraya. “On estimating regression”. In: *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 9.1 (1964), pp. 141–142.
- [Omo89] Stephen M Omohundro. *Five balltree construction algorithms*. International Computer Science Institute Berkeley, 1989.
- [PB97] R Kelley Pace and Ronald Barry. “Sparse spatial autoregressions”. In: *Statistics & Probability Letters* 33.3 (1997), pp. 291–297.
- [Pre98] Lutz Prechelt. “Early stopping-but when?” In: *Neural Networks: Tricks of the trade*. Springer, 1998, pp. 55–69.
- [Ric+84] John Rice et al. “Bandwidth choice for nonparametric regression”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 12.4 (1984), pp. 1215–1230.
- [RV+13] Mark Rudelson, Roman Vershynin, et al. “Hanson-Wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration”. In: *Electronic Communications in Probability* 18 (2013).
- [RWY14] Garvesh Raskutti, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. “Early stopping and non-parametric regression: an optimal data-dependent stopping rule.” In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15.1 (2014), pp. 335–366.
- [Sch+78] Gideon Schwarz et al. “Estimating the dimension of a model”. In: *The annals of statistics* 6.2 (1978), pp. 461–464.



- [Tsy08] Alexandre B Tsybakov. *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [Wai19] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*. Vol. 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [Was06] Larry Wasserman. *All of nonparametric statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [Weg+03] Marten Wegkamp et al. “Model selection in nonparametric regression”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 31.1 (2003), pp. 252–273.
- [WYW17] Yuting Wei, Fanny Yang, and Martin J Wainwright. “Early stopping for kernel boosting algorithms: A general analysis with localized complexities”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2017, pp. 6067–6077.
- [Yan05] Yuhong Yang. “Can the strengths of AIC and BIC be shared? A conflict between model identification and regression estimation”. In: *Biometrika* 92.4 (2005), pp. 937–950.
- [Yan99] Yuhong Yang. “Model selection for nonparametric regression”. In: *Statistica Sinica* (1999), pp. 475–499.
- [YRC07] Yuan Yao, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Andrea Caponnetto. “On Early Stopping in Gradient Descent Learning”. In: *Constructive Approximation* 26.2 (2007), pp. 289–315. ISSN: 1432-0940. DOI: 10.1007/s00365-006-0663-2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00365-006-0663-2>.
- [ZL19] Puning Zhao and Lifeng Lai. “Minimax Rate Optimal Adaptive Nearest Neighbor Classification and Regression”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10513* (2019).
- [ZY+05] Tong Zhang, Bin Yu, et al. “Boosting with early stopping: Convergence and consistency”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 33.4 (2005), pp. 1538–1579.

## Supplementary materials

Below, one can find a plan of Appendix.

In Appendix A, we state some already known results that will be used along the other sections of Appendix.

Appendix B is devoted to the introduction of the main quantities for the derivation of the proofs.

The main goal of Appendix C is to provide a concentration inequality for the difference of the variance  $V(k^\tau)$  and its stochastic part  $\|A_{k^\tau}\varepsilon\|_n^2$  as well as a concentration inequality for  $\sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} |R_k - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k|$ .

In Appendix D, we derived a concentration inequality for controlling the variance term.

Appendix E is devoted to the derivation of a concentration inequality that deals with the deviation of the bias term.

After that, combining all the results from Appendices C, D, and E, we are able to provide a proof of Theorem 4.1.

### A. Auxiliary lemmas

The first result is concerned with the derivation of the concentration of a Gaussian linear form around zero.

**Lemma A.1** (Concentration of a linear term). *Let  $\xi$  be a standard Gaussian vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $Z := \langle \xi, \alpha \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \xi_j$ . Then for every  $x > 0$ , one has*

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon (|Z| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp \left[ -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2 \|\alpha\|^2} \right].$$

Further, we need to recall a concentration result for a quadratic form of Gaussian random variables.

**Lemma A.2** (Hanson-Wright's inequality for Gaussian random variables in Rudelson, Vershynin, et al. 2013). *If  $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$  and  $A$  is a  $n \times n$  matrix, then*

for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( |\varepsilon^\top A \varepsilon - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon[\varepsilon^\top A \varepsilon]| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left[ -c \min \left( \frac{t^2}{\sigma^4 \|A\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{\sigma^2 \|A\|_2} \right) \right]. \quad (34)$$

The next lemma provides us with a result that shows that the number of points among  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , such that  $x_i$  is one of their  $k$  nearest neighbors, is not more than a constant times  $k$ .

**Lemma A.3** (Corollary 6.1 in Györfi et al. 2006). *Assume that  $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathbb{P}_X$  for some probability measure  $\mathbb{P}_X$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $X$  is an independent copy of  $X_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , then, if there are no ties, a.s.*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I} \{X \text{ is among the } k\text{NNs of } X_i \text{ in the set } \{X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n\}\} \leq kc_d,$$

where constant  $c_d$  depends only on  $d$ .

After that, the operator norm of the matrix  $I_n - A_k$  is proved to be bounded.

**Lemma A.4.** *Recall that  $\mathcal{N}_k(i)$  denotes the set of the  $k$  nearest neighbors of  $x_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . For any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , define the matrix  $M_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  as*

$$(M_k)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 - 1/k, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{if } j \notin \mathcal{N}_k(i), \\ -1/k, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_k(i). \end{cases}$$

Then  $\|M_k\|_2 \leq c_d$ , where positive constant  $c_d$  depends only on  $d$ . Moreover, it implies that for the matrix  $A_k = I_n - M_k$ :  $\|A_k\|_2 \leq 1 + c_d$ .

*Proof.* We will adapt the proof of Azadkia 2019, Lemma 3.3.

Take  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\|x\| = 1$  and denote  $(M_k)_i$  as the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row of the matrix  $M_k$ .

Then, the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|M_k x\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \langle (M_k)_i, x \rangle^2 \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - 1/k)^2 x_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k(i)} x_j \right)^2 \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} 2 \|x\|^2 + \frac{2}{k} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_k(i)} x_j^2 \\
&= 2 \|x\|^2 + \frac{2}{k} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i: j \in \mathcal{N}_k(i)} x_j^2 \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} c_d \|x\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

(i) holds due to Jensen's inequality and (ii) is due to Lemma A.3. Hence,  $\|M_k\|_2 \leq c_d$ . ■

**Lemma A.5.** *For any  $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{2}V(k-1) \leq V(k) \leq V(k-1).$$

*Proof.* It is sufficient to notice that

$$V(k-1) - V(k) = \frac{\sigma^2}{k(k-1)} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{k} = V(k).$$

■

## B. Main quantities and notations

For more theoretical convenience (the variance term will be an increasing function, and the empirical risk will be approximately a decreasing function), define the following notation and stopping rules:

$$\lambda[k] := \text{tr}(A_k) = n/k \in \{1, n/(n-1), n/(n-2), \dots, n\} \quad (35)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1^* &:= \inf \left\{ \lambda \in \left\{ 1, \frac{n}{n-1}, \dots, n \right\} \mid B^2(\lambda) \leq V(\lambda) \right\}, & \lambda_1^\tau &:= \inf \left\{ \lambda \in \left\{ 1, \frac{n}{n-1}, \dots, n \right\} \mid R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 \right\} \\ \lambda_2^* &:= \sup \left\{ \lambda \in \left\{ 1, \frac{n}{n-1}, \dots, n \right\} \mid B^2(\lambda) \geq V(\lambda) \right\}, & \lambda_2^\tau &:= \sup \left\{ \lambda \in \left\{ 1, \frac{n}{n-1}, \dots, n \right\} \mid R_\lambda \geq \sigma^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Notice that there is a one-to-one map between  $k$  and  $\lambda[k]$  as it is suggested in Eq. (35).

In Eq. (36), we omit for simplicity the notation  $\lambda[k]$ . Moreover, in Eq. (36) we used the notation  $A_{\lambda[k]}$  (inside the definitions of  $B^2(\lambda)$ ,  $V(\lambda)$ , and  $R_\lambda$ ) to denote the matrix  $A_k$ , for  $k = n/\lambda$  corresponding to  $\lambda$ , i.e.,  $A_{\lambda[k]} \equiv A_k$ .

If  $\lambda_1^*$  does not exist, set  $\lambda_1^* = n$  whereas if  $\lambda_2^*$  does not exist, set  $\lambda_2^* = 1$ . If  $\lambda_1^\tau$  does not exist, set  $\lambda_1^\tau = n$ ; if  $\lambda_2^\tau$  does not exist, set  $\lambda_2^\tau = 1$ .

Note that  $\lambda_1^* \leq \lambda_2^*$ , and  $\lambda_1^\tau \leq \lambda_2^\tau$ . Besides that, the bias, variance, and (expected) empirical risk at  $\lambda_1^\tau$  are equal to the bias, variance, (expected) empirical risk at  $k^\tau$  defined in Eq. (14), respectively. The bias, variance, (expected) empirical risk at  $\lambda_2^*$  are equal to the bias, variance, (expected) empirical risk at  $k^*$  defined in Eq. (13), respectively.

The behavior of the bias term, variance, risk error, and (expected) empirical risk w.r.t. the new notation  $\lambda$  is presented in Fig. 6a. One can conclude that only the variance term is monotonic w.r.t.  $\lambda$  (it is an increasing function).

Denote  $\tilde{R}_\lambda$  as the tightest non-increasing lower bound on  $R_\lambda$  and  $\bar{R}_\lambda$  as the tightest non-increasing upper bound on  $R_\lambda$ . We precise the definitions of the latter quantities below.

**Definition B.1.** Assume that one has the grid of values  $\Lambda = \{1, n/(n-1), \dots, n\}$ , and the empirical risk curve is observed successively, meaning that one starts from  $\lambda = 1$  (corresponds to  $k = n$ ) and increases  $\lambda$  until the value  $n$  (corresponds to  $k = 1$ ). Then, consider the value of  $R_\lambda$  and its next increment  $R_{\lambda+\Delta}$  such that  $\lambda + \Delta \in \Lambda$ . Define  $\tilde{R}_1 := R_1$  and

$$\tilde{R}_{\lambda+\Delta} := \begin{cases} R_{\lambda+\Delta} & \text{if } R_{\lambda+\Delta} - R_\lambda \leq 0, \\ R_\lambda, & \text{otherwise; this way, one should wait until } R_{\tilde{\lambda}} \leq \tilde{R}_{\tilde{\lambda}} \text{ for } \tilde{\lambda} > \lambda. \end{cases} \quad (37)$$




Fig. 6: a) Sq. bias, variance, risk and (expected) empirical risk behavior in  $\lambda$  notation; b) lower  $\tilde{R}_\lambda$  and upper  $\bar{R}_\lambda$  bounds on the empirical risk.

**Definition B.2.** Assume that one has the grid of values  $\Lambda = \{1, n/(n-1), \dots, n\}$ , and the empirical risk curve is observed successively, meaning that one starts from  $\lambda = n$  (corresponds to  $k = 1$ ) and decreases  $\lambda$  until the value 1 (corresponds to  $k = n$ ). Then, consider the value of  $R_\lambda$  and its next increment  $R_{\lambda-\Delta}$  such that  $\lambda - \Delta \in \Lambda$ . Define  $\bar{R}_n := R_n$  and

$$\bar{R}_{\lambda-\Delta} := \begin{cases} R_{\lambda-\Delta} & \text{if } R_{\lambda-\Delta} - R_\lambda \geq 0, \\ R_\lambda, & \text{otherwise; this way, one should wait until } R_{\tilde{\lambda}} \geq \bar{R}_{\tilde{\lambda}} \text{ for } \tilde{\lambda} < \lambda. \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

Typical behaviour of the defined lower and upper bound  $\tilde{R}_\lambda, \bar{R}_\lambda$  is illustrated in Fig. 6b. Note that with these definitions:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1^\tau &= \inf\{\lambda \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid \tilde{R}_\lambda \leq \sigma^2\}, \\ \lambda_2^\tau &= \sup\{\lambda \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid \bar{R}_\lambda \geq \sigma^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define an additional stopping rule  $\lambda^{**}$  that will be helpful in the analysis.

$$\lambda^{**} := \sup \left\{ \lambda \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid B^2(\lambda) \geq V(\lambda) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \tilde{y} \right\}, \quad (39)$$

for some  $\tilde{y} \geq 0$  and a positive constant  $c_1$  that will be precised later (see Lemma E.2).

### C. Control of the stochastic part of the variance / the empirical risk

#### C.1. Control of the stochastic part of the variance

Consider  $v(\lambda_1^\tau) = \|A_{\lambda_1^\tau[k]}\varepsilon\|_n^2$  and  $V(\lambda_1^\tau) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\text{tr}(A_{\lambda_1^\tau[k]})$  for  $\lambda_1^\tau[k]$  from Section B. Then for any  $x > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(v(\lambda_1^\tau) > V(\lambda_1^\tau) + x) &= \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\left(\{\lambda_1^\tau[k] < 1\} \cap \{v(\lambda_1^\tau) - V(\lambda_1^\tau) > x\}\right)}_{=0} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\left(\{\lambda_1^\tau[k] \geq 1\} \cap \{v(\lambda_1^\tau) - V(\lambda_1^\tau) > x\}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\left(\sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left| \|A_k \varepsilon\|_n^2 - V(k) \right| > x\right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

In what follows, we will bound  $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\left(\sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left| \|A_k \varepsilon\|_n^2 - V(k) \right| > x\right)$ .

Let us define the set of matrices  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} := \{A_k, k = 1, \dots, n\}$ , then (Krahmer, Mendelson, and Rauhut 2014, Theorem 3.1)

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\left(\sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \|\mathbf{A}\varepsilon\|^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|\mathbf{A}\varepsilon\|^2 \right| \geq c_1 E + t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-c_2 \min\left(\frac{t^2}{V^2}, \frac{t}{U}\right)\right), \quad (41)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \gamma_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_2)(\gamma_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_2) + \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F) + \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_2, \\ U &= \left[ \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \right]^2, \\ V &= \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 (\gamma_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_2) + \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F), \end{aligned}$$

and  $\gamma_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_2)$  can be bounded via the metric entropy of  $(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_2)$  as

$$\gamma_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_2) \leq c \int_0^{\sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_2} \sqrt{\log N(\overline{\mathcal{A}}; \|\cdot\|_2; u)} du.$$

First, notice that, due to Lemma A.4, for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , one has  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \leq c_d$ . Moreover,  $\log N(\overline{\mathcal{A}}; \|\cdot\|_2; u) \leq \log n$  due to the definition of the metric entropy (see, e.g., Wainwright 2019, Chapter 5). These arguments imply

$$\begin{aligned} U &\leq c_d, \quad \text{and} \\ \gamma_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_2) &\leq c_{\gamma, d} \sqrt{\log n}, \end{aligned}$$

where constants  $c_d$  and  $c_{\gamma,d}$  depend only on  $d$ .

Second, as for the Frobenius norm,  $\sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \leq \sqrt{n}$  due to the definition (7). Combining all the pieces together, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \sup_{\mathbf{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \|\mathbf{A}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|\mathbf{A}\varepsilon\|_n^2 \right| \geq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t \right) \leq 2 \exp(-c_2 \min(nt^2, nt)),$$

where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  may depend on  $d$  and  $\sigma^2$ . Take  $x = c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t$  in (40), then for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( v(\lambda_1^\top) > V(\lambda_1^\top) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t \right) \leq 2 \exp(-cn \min(t^2, t)).$$

### C.2. Control of the empirical risk around its expectation

Define now the set of matrices  $\overline{\mathcal{M}} := \{M_k = I_n - A_k, k = 1, \dots, n\}$ , then, by the same arguments presented above, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \sup_{\mathbf{M} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}} \left| \|\mathbf{M}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|\mathbf{M}\varepsilon\|_n^2 \right| \geq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t \right) \leq 2 \exp(-c_2 \min(nt^2, nt)), \quad (42)$$

with  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  depending only on  $d$  and  $\sigma^2$ . Further, notice that for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$R_k - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k = \|M_k Y\|_n^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|M_k Y\|_n^2 = \|M_k \varepsilon\|_n^2 - \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) + 2\langle F^*, M_k^\top M_k \varepsilon \rangle_n.$$

Ineq. (42) implies that, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left| \|M_k \varepsilon\|_n^2 - \sigma^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \right| \geq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t \right) \leq 2 \exp(-c_2 \min(nt^2, nt)).$$

Moreover, Lemma A.1 gives us that, for any  $y > 0$  and any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( 2 \left| \langle F^*, M_k^\top M_k \varepsilon \rangle_n \right| \geq y \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left[ -\frac{n^2 y^2}{8\sigma^2 \|M_k^\top M_k F^*\|^2} \right] \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left[ -\frac{n^2 y^2}{8\sigma^2 \|M_k^\top M_k\|_2^2 \|F^*\|^2} \right] \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left[ -\frac{ny^2}{8c_d \sigma^2 \|f^*\|_n^2} \right] \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left[ -\frac{ny^2}{8c_d \sigma^2 \mathcal{M}^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$



Then, by using the union bound for the linear term with  $y = c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t$  and combining all the pieces together,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} |R_k - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_k| \geq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t \right) \leq 4 \exp[-c_2 \min(nt^2, nt)], \quad (43)$$

for any  $t > 0$ .

#### D. Deviation inequality for the variance term

This is the first deviation inequality for  $\lambda_1^\tau$  that will be used to control the variance term.

**Lemma D.1.** *Under Assumption 1, define  $\mathcal{K}_V \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that, for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_V$ , one has  $V(\lambda) \geq V(\lambda[k^* - 1]) + y$  for some  $y \geq 0$ . Recall the definition of  $\lambda_1^\tau$  from Eq. (36), then for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_V$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda_1^\tau > \lambda) \leq 2 \exp \left[ -c_d n \min \left( \frac{y^2}{\sigma^4}, \frac{y}{\sigma^2} \right) \right], \quad (44)$$

where constant  $c_d$  depends only on  $d$ .

*Proof.* We start with the following series of inequalities that can be derived from the definition of  $\lambda_1^\tau$  and the lower bound on the empirical risk  $\tilde{R}_\lambda$  (see Section B).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda_1^\tau > \lambda) &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\tilde{R}_\lambda > \sigma^2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\tilde{R}_\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda > \sigma^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(R_\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda > \sigma^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Due to Eq. (11), one has

$$\sigma^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda = V(\lambda) - B^2(\lambda) \geq V(\lambda) - V(\lambda[k^* - 1]) \geq y.$$

Moreover,

$$R_\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda = \|(I_n - A_{\lambda[k]})\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n} (n - \text{tr}(A_{\lambda[k]})) + 2\langle (I_n - A_{\lambda[k]})F^*, (I_n - A_{\lambda[k]})\varepsilon \rangle_n.$$

Define for simplicity  $M_{\lambda[k]} := I_n - A_{\lambda[k]}$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda_1^\tau > \lambda) \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \|M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n} (n - \text{tr}(A_{\lambda[k]})) \geq \frac{y}{2} \right) + \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( 2\langle M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon \rangle_n \geq \frac{y}{2} \right).$$

Further, we will concentrate the quadratic and linear terms as follows.

**First term.** The linear term  $2\langle M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon \rangle_n$ : using Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.4 gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( 2\langle M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon \rangle_n \geq \frac{y}{2} \right) &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \langle M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, \varepsilon \rangle \geq \frac{ny}{4} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -\frac{n^2y^2}{32\sigma^2 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}F^*\|^2} \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -\frac{ny^2}{32\sigma^2 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top\|_2^2 B^2(\lambda)} \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -\frac{ny^2}{32c_d\sigma^2 V(\lambda)} \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -\frac{ny^2}{32c_d\sigma^4} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**Second term.** Consider the quadratic term  $\|M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n} (n - \text{tr}A_{\lambda[k]})$ : combining Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.4 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \|M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n} (n - \text{tr}A_{\lambda[k]}) \geq \frac{y}{2} \right) &\leq \exp \left[ -c \min \left( \frac{n^2y^2}{4\sigma^4 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}\|_F^2}, \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \frac{ny}{2\sigma^2 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}\|_2} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -c_d \min \left( \frac{ny^2}{4\sigma^4}, \frac{ny}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where constant  $c_d$  depends only on  $d$ . ■

Based on Lemma D.1, due to the fact that the variance  $V(\lambda)$  is increasing w.r.t.  $\lambda \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the following corollary holds.

**Corollary D.1.1.** *For any  $y > 0$ , define  $0 \leq \Delta y \leq y$  as the distance between  $V(\lambda[k^* - 1]) + y$  and  $V(\lambda_0)$ , where  $V(\lambda_0)$  is the closest to  $V(\lambda[k^* - 1]) + y$  value of  $V(\lambda)$  which is lower than or equal to  $V(\lambda[k^* - 1]) + y$ , over the grid of  $\lambda \in \{\lambda[k^* - 1], \lambda[k^* - 2], \dots, n\}$ . Then due to the monotonicity of the variance term,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon (V(\lambda_1^\top) > V(\lambda[k^* - 1]) + y - \Delta y) \leq 2 \exp \left[ -c_d n \min \left( \frac{y - \Delta y}{\sigma^2}, \frac{(y - \Delta y)^2}{\sigma^4} \right) \right] \quad (45)$$

for constant  $c_d$  that depends only on  $d$ . Moreover, due to the definition of  $k^*$  (13) and Lemma A.5,  $\frac{1}{2}V(\lambda[k^* - 1]) \leq V(\lambda_2^*) \leq V(\lambda[k^* - 1])$ , which implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(V(\lambda_1^\tau) > 2V(\lambda_2^*) + y - \Delta y) \leq 2 \exp \left[ -c_d n \min \left( \frac{y - \Delta y}{\sigma^2}, \frac{(y - \Delta y)^2}{\sigma^4} \right) \right] \quad \forall y > 0.$$

Thus, one is able to control  $V(\lambda_1^\tau)$  via  $V(\lambda_2^*)$ , which is equal to  $V(k^*)$ .

## E. Deviation inequality for the bias term

What follows is the second deviation inequality for  $\lambda_1^\tau$  that will be further used to control the bias term.

**Lemma E.1.** *Under Assumption 1, define  $\mathcal{K}_B \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that, for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_B$ , one has  $B^2(\lambda) \geq V(\lambda) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$  for some positive constant  $c_1$ . Then if  $\mathcal{K}_B$  is not empty,  $\lambda_1^\tau$  from Eq. (36) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda_1^\tau < \lambda) \leq 10 \exp(-cn \min(y^2, y)), \quad (46)$$

where  $y = B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$  for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_B$ , constant  $c$  depends only on  $d, \sigma$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* Consider Ineq. (43) and the event

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{er}}(t) := \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \{1, \dots, n\}} |R_\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda| \geq c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + t \right\}$$

for any  $t > 0$ . Take  $t := B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_B$ . One notes from Ineq. (43) that

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{E}_{\text{er}}(B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda))) \leq 4 \exp\left(-cn \min\left([B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda)]^2, B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda)\right)\right). \quad (47)$$

Further, recall that  $\lambda_1^\tau \leq \lambda_2^\tau$  and  $\bar{R}_\lambda$  is the upper bound on  $R_\lambda$  from Section B, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda_1^\tau < \lambda) &= \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\{\lambda_1^\tau < \lambda\} \cap \{\lambda > \lambda_2^\tau\})}_{\mathcal{A}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\{\lambda_1^\tau < \lambda\} \cap \{\lambda \leq \lambda_2^\tau\})}_{\mathcal{B}}, \\ \mathcal{A} &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\bar{R}_\lambda < \sigma^2) \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(R_\lambda < \sigma^2) \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\left(R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right), \\ \mathcal{B} &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda \in (\lambda_1^\tau, \lambda_2^\tau]). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Consider the probability  $\mathcal{B}$  from (48).

$$\mathcal{B} = \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \{\lambda \in (\lambda_1^\tau, \lambda_2^\tau]\} \cap \{R_\lambda > \sigma^2\} \right)}_{\mathcal{C}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \{\lambda \in (\lambda_1^\tau, \lambda_2^\tau]\} \cap \{R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2\} \right)}_{\mathcal{D}}.$$

On the one hand,

$$\mathcal{D} \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon (R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2) \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right).$$

On the other hand, Ineq. (47) and the equality  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda = \sigma^2 + B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda)$  imply that the event

$$R_\lambda \in \left( \sigma^2 - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}, \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \quad \text{for any } \lambda \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - 4 \exp \left( -cn \min \left( [B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda)]^2, B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) \right) \right)$ .

Let us denote this event as  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ . Then,

$$\mathcal{C} = \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \{\lambda \in (\lambda_1^\tau, \lambda_2^\tau]\} \cap \{R_\lambda > \sigma^2\} \cap \{\bar{\mathcal{E}}\} \right)}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \{\lambda \in (\lambda_1^\tau, \lambda_2^\tau]\} \cap \{R_\lambda > \sigma^2\} \cap \{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^c\} \right)}_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

First,

$$\mathcal{G} \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon (\bar{\mathcal{E}}^c) \leq 4 \exp \left( -cn \min \left( [B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda)]^2, B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) \right) \right).$$

Second,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda \in \left( \sigma^2, \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right).$$

Combining the terms  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$ , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon (\lambda_1^\tau < \lambda) &\leq 3 \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \\ &\quad + 4 \exp \left( -cn \min \left( [B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda)]^2, B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) \right) \right) \\ &\leq 3 \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \\ &\quad + 4 \exp \left( -cn \min \left( \left[ B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right]^2, B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda \leq \sigma^2 - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda \leq - \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda - \sigma^2 - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda - \sigma^2 - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} = B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} =: y$  for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_B$  and

$$R_\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon R_\lambda = \|(I_n - A_{\lambda[k]})\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n}(n - \text{tr}(A_{\lambda[k]})) + 2\langle (I_n - A_{\lambda[k]})F^*, (I_n - A_{\lambda[k]})\varepsilon \rangle_n,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( R_{\lambda[k]} \leq \sigma^2 + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) &\leq \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \|M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n}(n - \text{tr}(A_{\lambda[k]})) \leq -\frac{y}{2} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( 2\langle M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon \rangle_n \leq -\frac{y}{2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the matrix  $M_{\lambda[k]} = I_n - A_{\lambda[k]}$ .

Further, we will concentrate the quadratic and linear terms as follows.

**First term.** The linear term  $2\langle M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon \rangle_n$ : using Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.4 gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( 2\langle M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon \rangle_n \leq -\frac{y}{2} \right) &= \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \langle M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}F^*, \varepsilon \rangle \leq -\frac{ny}{4} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -\frac{n^2 y^2}{32\sigma^2 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}F^*\|^2} \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -\frac{n^2 y^2}{32\sigma^2 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}\|_2^2 \|F^*\|^2} \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -\frac{ny^2}{32c_d \sigma^2 \|f^*\|_n^2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

**Second term.** Consider the quadratic term  $\|M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n}(n - \text{tr}A_{\lambda[k]})$ : combining Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.4 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \left( \|M_{\lambda[k]}\varepsilon\|_n^2 - \frac{\sigma^2}{n}(n - \text{tr}A_{\lambda[k]}) \leq -\frac{y}{2} \right) &\leq \exp \left[ -c \min \left( \frac{n^2 y^2}{4\sigma^4 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}\|_F^2}, \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \frac{ny}{2\sigma^2 \|M_{\lambda[k]}^\top M_{\lambda[k]}\|_2} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[ -c_d \min \left( \frac{ny^2}{4\sigma^4}, \frac{ny}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where constant  $c_d$  depends only on  $d$ .

Finally, it is sufficient to recall Assumption 1 in order to apply  $\|f^*\|_n^2 \leq \mathcal{M}^2$ . ■

**Lemma E.2.** *Under Assumption 1, recall the definitions of  $\lambda_1^\tau$  and  $\lambda_2^*$  from Eq. (36). Then, for any  $y > 0$  and  $\Delta y$  from Corollary D.1.1,*

$$B^2(\lambda_1^\tau) \leq 2V(\lambda_2^*) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + 2(y - \Delta y) \quad (50)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 12 \exp(-cn \min((y - \Delta y)^2, y - \Delta y))$ , where constants  $c, c_1$  depend only on  $d, \sigma$  and  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* Consider the event  $\mathcal{E}(\lambda)$  from Lemma E.1 for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_B$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{E}(\lambda)) \leq 10 \exp(-cn \min(x^2, x)),$$

for  $x = B^2(\lambda) - V(\lambda) - c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$ .

In what follows, two cases are distinguished.

**Case 1:** If  $\lambda_1^\tau > \lambda_2^*$ , then, by definition of  $\lambda_2^*$ , Corollary D.1.1 and monotonicity of the variance term,

$$B^2(\lambda_1^\tau) < V(\lambda_1^\tau) \leq 2V(\lambda_2^*) + y - \Delta y \quad (51)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_d n \min(\frac{y - \Delta y}{\sigma^2}, \frac{(y - \Delta y)^2}{\sigma^4}))$ ,  $\forall y > 0$ .

**Case 2:** If  $\lambda_1^\tau \leq \lambda_2^*$ , then take  $y - \Delta y$  from Ineq. (51) and define  $\lambda^{**} \leq \lambda_2^*$  as in Eq. (39) with  $\tilde{y} = y - \Delta y$ .

If no such point  $\lambda^{**}$  exists, then for any  $\lambda \leq \lambda_2^*$  one has  $B^2(\lambda) < V(\lambda) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + y - \Delta y$ . In particular, it holds true for  $\lambda_1^\tau$ , which implies that

$$B^2(\lambda_1^\tau) < V(\lambda_1^\tau) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + y - \Delta y \leq 2V(\lambda_2^*) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + 2(y - \Delta y)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-c_d n \min(\frac{y - \Delta y}{\sigma^2}, \frac{(y - \Delta y)^2}{\sigma^4}))$ , due to Corollary D.1.1.

If  $\lambda^{**}$  exists, notice that  $\lambda^{**} \in \mathcal{K}_B$  by its definition. Therefore, due to Lemma E.1, under the event  $\mathcal{E}^c(\lambda^{**})$ ,  $\lambda_1^\tau \geq \lambda^{**}$ , and

$$B^2(\lambda_1^\tau) < V(\lambda_1^\tau) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + y - \Delta y \leq 2V(\lambda_2^*) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + 2(y - \Delta y)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 10 \exp(-cn \min((y - \Delta y)^2, y - \Delta y))$ .

Combining **Case 1** and **Case 2** together,

$$B^2(\lambda_1^\tau) \leq 2V(\lambda_2^*) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + 2(y - \Delta y) \quad (52)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 12 \exp(-cn \min((y - \Delta y)^2, y - \Delta y))$ .

The claim is proved. ■

## F. Proof of Theorem 4.1

Define  $v(\lambda) := \|A_{\lambda[k]} \varepsilon\|_n^2$ , where  $\lambda[k] = \text{tr}(A_k) = n/k$  (see Section B for the definitions related to the notation  $\lambda$ ). Then, due to the inequality  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$  for any  $a, b \geq 0$ , Lemma E.2, Corollary D.1.1, and the control of the stochastic term in Appendix C (with  $t = y - \Delta y$ ), for  $\lambda_1^\tau[k]$  and  $\lambda_2^*[k]$  from Section B, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^{\lambda_1^\tau[k]} - f^*\|_n^2 &= \|(I_n - A_{\lambda_1^\tau[k]})F^*\|_n^2 + \|A_{\lambda_1^\tau[k]} \varepsilon\|_n^2 + 2\langle A_{\lambda_1^\tau[k]} \varepsilon, (I_n - A_{\lambda_1^\tau[k]})F^* \rangle_n \\ &\leq 2B^2(\lambda_1^\tau[k]) + 2v(\lambda_1^\tau[k]) \\ &\leq 4V(\lambda_2^*[k]) + 6(y - \Delta y) + 2V(\lambda_1^\tau[k]) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \\ &\leq 8V(\lambda_2^*[k]) + 8(y - \Delta y) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 16 \exp(-c_2 n \min((y - \Delta y)^2, y - \Delta y))$ , where  $y > 0$  is arbitrary;  $y - \Delta y \geq 0$ .

In addition to that, if  $\lambda_2^*$  from Eq. (36) exists, then  $V(\lambda_2^*[k]) \leq 1/2\text{MSE}(\lambda_2^*[k])$ , and

$$\|f^{\lambda_1^\tau[k]} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq 4\text{MSE}(\lambda_2^*[k]) + 8(y - \Delta y) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \quad (53)$$

with the same probability.

Define  $u := c_2 n \min((y - \Delta y)^2, y - \Delta y)$ , then one concludes that

$$\|f^{\lambda_1^\tau[k]} - f^*\|_n^2 \leq 4\text{MSE}(\lambda_2^*[k]) + C \left( \frac{\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{u}{n} \right) + c_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \quad (54)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 16 \exp(-u)$ , where  $u \geq 0$ , constants  $C$  and  $c_1$  can depend on  $d$ ,  $\sigma$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$ .

This figure "frog.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2008.08718v3>