

Rates of convergence for density estimation with generative adversarial networks

Denis Belomestny^{1,3}, Eric Moulines^{1,4}, Alexey Naumov¹,
Nikita Puchkin^{1,2}, and Sergey Samsonov¹

¹*HSE University, Russia, e-mail: anaumov@hse.ru; npuchkin@hse.ru; svsamsonov@hse.ru*

²*Institute for Information Transmission Problems RAS, Russia*

³*Duisburg-Essen University, Germany, e-mail: denis.belomestny@uni-due.de*

⁴*Ecole Polytechnique, France, e-mail: eric.moulines@polytechnique.edu*

Abstract: In this work we undertake a thorough study of the non-asymptotic properties of the vanilla generative adversarial networks (GANs). We derive theoretical guarantees for the density estimation with GANs under a proper choice of the deep neural networks classes representing generators and discriminators. In particular, we prove that the resulting estimate converges to the true density \mathbf{p}^* in terms of Jensen-Shannon (JS) divergence at the rate $(\log n/n)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)}$ where n is the sample size and β determines the smoothness of \mathbf{p}^* . To the best of our knowledge, this is the first result in the literature on density estimation using vanilla GANs with JS convergence rates faster than $n^{-1/2}$ in the regime $\beta > d/2$. Moreover, we show that the obtained rate is minimax optimal (up to logarithmic factors) for the considered class of densities.

MSC2020 subject classifications: primary 62G07; secondary 62G05, 68T07.

Keywords and phrases: generative model, excess risk bound, Jensen-Shannon risk.

1. Introduction

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. random elements with values in $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ drawn from a distribution P^* . We assume that P^* admits a density \mathbf{p}^* with respect to the Lebesgue measure μ and consider a celebrated density estimation problem. This problem was extensively studied in the literature and encounters numerous approaches such as kernel (see e.g. [35, Section 1.2] and [26]) and k-nearest neighbors density estimators [15], wavelet thresholding [16], and aggregation [29, 31, 8, 9, 14]. Recently, Goodfellow et al. [20] has introduced a novel approach for a related problem of generative modeling called generative adversarial networks (or simply GANs). A generative adversarial network consists of a generator and a discriminator. Given a known easy-to-sample distribution on a latent space Y with a density ϕ , the generator $g : Y \rightarrow X$ takes i.i.d. samples Y_1, \dots, Y_n from ϕ and produces fake ones $g(Y_1), \dots, g(Y_n)$ ¹. The goal of the discriminator D is to distinguish between the real samples and the fake ones. Usually, D can be thought of as a map $X \mapsto (0, 1)$, where larger values correspond to higher confidence that an input variable is drawn from \mathbf{p}^* . As a byproduct of the described generative approach, GANs also provide an

¹In what follows, we assume that $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and that g is a non-degenerate map from Y to X to ensure that the density of the fake samples is defined correctly.

implicit density estimate for \mathbf{p}^* . Indeed, if a statistician manages to find a good generator g , then the density of $g(Y)$ is a reasonable estimate of \mathbf{p}^* . Given a family of generators \mathcal{G} and a class of discriminators \mathcal{D} , Goodfellow et al. [20] suggested to solve the following minimax problem, also called *vanilla GAN*:

$$\min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \max_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ L(g, D) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbf{p}^*} \log D(X) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \phi} \log(1 - D(g(Y))) \right\}. \quad (1.1)$$

The intuition behind the problem (1.1) is that if \mathcal{D} contains all measurable functions, the minimax problem (1.1) reduces to (see [20, Theorem 1])

$$\min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*), \quad (1.2)$$

where JS is the Jensen-Shannon divergence (see (2.3) for the definition), and \mathbf{p}_g is the density of $g(Y)$, $Y \sim \phi$. Since the true distribution \mathbf{p}^* in (1.1) is unknown, we consider a plug-in estimate $\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}$ where \hat{g} is a solution of the empirical optimization problem

$$\hat{g} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \max_{D \in \mathcal{D}} L_n(g, D), \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$L_n(g, D) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log D(X_i) + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{j=1}^n \log(1 - D(g(Y_j))) \quad (1.4)$$

is the empirical version of the functional $L(g, D)$ defined in (1.1).

GANs are a flexible tool for sampling from an unknown distribution, and they have recently become extremely popular among practitioners. Using deep neural network classes \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} , one can reach the state-of-the-art generative performance in many changing tasks, including image super-resolution [23], video synthesis [21], and many others. Various GAN formulations were later proposed by varying the divergence measure in (1.2). For instance, f-GAN [27] generalized vanilla GAN by minimizing a general f-divergence; Wasserstein GAN (WGAN) [1] considered the first-order Wasserstein (Kantorovich) distance (W_1 distance); MMD-GAN [17] was based on the maximum mean discrepancy; energy-based GAN [37] minimizes the total variation distance as discussed in [1]; Quadratic GAN [18] aimed to find the distribution minimizing the second-order Wasserstein (Kantorovich) distance.

The empirical success of GANs motivated many researchers to analyze their theoretical properties. For example, in [4, 33], the authors carried out theoretical analysis of WGANs. In [4], the authors obtained upper bounds for the excess risk of GANs for parametric classes (including the class of neural networks). In contrast to [4], Schreuder et al. [33] considered generative models based on β times differentiable transformations of the d -dimensional unit hypercube and derived rates of convergence of order $O(n^{-\beta/d} \vee n^{-1/2})$ for the corresponding W_1 distance. Liang [24] used results from the empirical process theory to prove upper bounds for Sobolev GANs (i.e., when generators and discriminators belong to Sobolev classes \mathcal{W}^α and \mathcal{W}^β , respectively), MMD GANs, WGANs, and vanilla GANs. In case of Sobolev GANs, the obtained rate $n^{-(\alpha+\beta)/(2\beta+d)} \vee n^{-1/2}$ for the corresponding integral probability metric (IPM) is shown to be minimax optimal. The

research of Liang [24] was continued in [36] and [25] where the authors studied the performance of GANs in terms of Besov IPM losses and the Sinkhorn divergence, respectively. The vanilla GANs were studied in [24, 5, 2]. However, the rates of convergence for them in terms of Jensen-Shannon divergence are not yet fully understood. Biau et. al. [5] and Asatryan et. al. [2] improved approximation terms as compared to [24], but it remains unclear whether the rates obtained in [5, 2] are minimax optimal. In this work, we provide a refined analysis of the theoretical properties of the vanilla GANs and derive minimax convergence rates for the problem of density estimation via GANs.

Contributions Our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We prove (Theorem 1) a sharp oracle inequality for the case when the classes \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} are subsets of Hölder balls which significantly improves the existing inequalities in [5] and [2]. This inequality is the first step towards minimax bounds for vanilla GANs.
- Using Theorem 1 and choosing \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} to be classes of deep neural networks with ReQU activation functions, we derive the rates of convergence for the estimate $\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}$ to the true density \mathbf{p}^* in terms of the Jensen-Shannon divergence. Namely, we prove that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds

$$\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}, \quad (\text{Theorem 2})$$

provided that the actual density \mathbf{p}^* is the density of a random variable $g^*(Y)$ with Y being uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]^d$, for a smooth invertible transform g^* not necessarily belonging to \mathcal{G} . To the best of our knowledge, this is the first result in the literature providing convergence rates of the vanilla GAN's density estimate in the JS divergence faster than $n^{-1/2}$ for the case $\beta > d/2$. In order to prove this result, we study the approximation properties of deep neural networks with the ReQU activation function and derive novel approximation/complexity bounds that can be of independent interest.

- We show that the rate of Theorem 2 is minimax optimal up to a logarithmic factor. Namely, we prove that for any estimate $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$, it holds that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{p}^*} \text{E JS}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \gtrsim n^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}}, \quad (\text{Theorem 3})$$

where the supremum is taken with respect to the densities \mathbf{p}^* satisfying the same regularity assumptions as in Theorem 2. Hence, our results imply the minimax optimality of GANs for the problem of density estimation.

2. Preliminaries and notations

Density of fake random elements Given a smooth non-degenerate map $g : \mathbf{Y} \mapsto \mathbf{X}$ and a random element Y with the density ϕ supported on \mathbf{Y} , the corresponding density of $g(Y)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{p}_g(x) = |\det[\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))]|^{-1} \phi(g^{-1}(x)), \quad x \in \mathbf{X}. \quad (2.1)$$

In our paper, we focus on a case when ϕ is the uniform distribution on a compact set Y with $\text{Vol}(\mathsf{Y}) = 1$, so (2.1) simplifies to

$$\mathbf{p}_g(x) = |\det[\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))]|^{-1}, \quad x \in \mathsf{X}. \quad (2.2)$$

Kullback-Leibler and Jensen-Shannon divergences Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain. For two probability measures on a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$ with Lebesgue densities \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} , respectively, we define the Kullback-Leibler divergence between them as

$$\text{KL}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \begin{cases} \int \mathbf{p}(x) \log(\mathbf{p}(x)/\mathbf{q}(x)) dx, & \text{if } \mathbf{p} \ll \mathbf{q}, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By $\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$, we denote the Jensen-Shannon divergence

$$\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}\left(\mathbf{p}, \frac{\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}\left(\mathbf{q}, \frac{\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}}{2}\right). \quad (2.3)$$

Norms For a matrix A and a vector v , we denote by $\|A\|_\infty$ and $\|v\|_\infty$ the maximal absolute value of entries of A and v , respectively. $\|A\|_0$ and $\|v\|_0$ shall stand for the number of non-zero entries of A and v , respectively. Finally, the Frobenius norm and operator norm of A are denoted by $\|A\|_F$ and $\|A\|$, respectively, and the Euclidean norm of v is denoted by $\|v\|$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$ we write $\mathcal{B}(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|y - x\| \leq r\}$. For a function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} &= \sup_{x \in \Omega} \|f(x)\|, \\ \|f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} &= \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \|f(x)\|^2 dx \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}, \Omega)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} \|f(x)\|^2 \mathbf{p}(x) dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Sometimes, we omit the domain Ω in the notations $L_\infty(\Omega)$, $L_2(\Omega)$, $L_2(\mathbf{p}, \Omega)$ and simply write L_∞ , L_2 , and $L_2(\mathbf{p})$, respectively, if there is no ambiguity.

Smoothness classes For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the function space $C^s(\Omega)$ consists of those functions over the domain Ω which have partial derivatives up to order s in Ω , and these derivatives are bounded and continuous in Ω . Formally,

$$C^s(\Omega) = \{f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m : \|f\|_{C^s} := \max_{|\gamma| \leq s} \|D^\gamma f\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} < \infty\},$$

where, for any multi-index $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, the partial differential operator D^γ is defined as

$$D^\gamma f_i = \frac{\partial^{|\gamma|} f_i}{\partial x_1^{\gamma_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\gamma_d}}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|D^\gamma f\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \|D^\gamma f_i\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)}.$$

Here we have written $|\gamma| = \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i$ for the order of D^γ . To avoid confusion between multi-indices and scalars, we reserve the bold font for the former ones. For the matrix of first derivatives, we

use the usual notation $\nabla f = (\partial f_i / \partial x_j)$ $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. For a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi \in C^2(\Omega)$, we write $\nabla^2 \varphi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ for its Hessian at point x . For a function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and any positive number $0 < \delta \leq 1$, the *Hölder constant* of order δ is given by

$$[f]_\delta := \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \sup_{x \neq y \in \Omega} \frac{|f_i(x) - f_i(y)|}{\min\{1, \|x - y\|\}^\delta}. \quad (2.4)$$

Now, for any $\alpha > 0$, we can define the *Hölder ball* $\mathcal{H}^\alpha(\Omega, H)$. If we let $s = \lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ be the largest integer *strictly less* than α , $\mathcal{H}^\alpha(\Omega, H)$ contains all functions in $C^s(\Omega)$ with δ -Hölder-continuous, $\delta = \alpha - s > 0$, partial derivatives of order s . Formally,

$$\mathcal{H}^\alpha(\Omega, H) = \left\{ f \in C^s(\Omega) : \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha} := \max\{\|f\|_{C^s}, \max_{|\gamma|=s} [D^\gamma f]_\delta\} \leq H \right\}.$$

Note that if $f \in \mathcal{H}^{1+\beta}(\Omega, H)$ for some $\beta > 0$, then it holds for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial f_i(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f_i(y)}{\partial x_j} \right| \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1+\beta}} \cdot \|x - y\|^{1 \wedge \beta} \leq H \cdot \|x - y\|^{1 \wedge \beta}, \quad x, y \in \Omega$$

for any $x, y \in \Omega$, since $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\beta_1}} \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\beta_2}}$ for any $\beta_2 \geq \beta_1$. We will also write $f \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha(\Omega)$ if $f \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha(\Omega, H)$ for some $H < \infty$. We also introduce a class of Λ -regular functions $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda^\alpha(\Omega, H)$, $\Lambda > 1$:

$$\mathcal{H}_\Lambda^\alpha(\Omega, H) = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha(\Omega, H) : \Lambda^{-2} \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} \preceq \nabla f^\top \nabla f(x) \preceq \Lambda^2 \mathbf{I}_{d \times d} \text{ for all } x \in \Omega \right\}, \quad (2.5)$$

where for symmetric matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ we write $A \preceq B$ if $u^\top (B - A) u \geq 0$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Neural networks To give a formal definition of the neural network, we first fix an activation function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For a vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we define the shifted activation function $\sigma_v : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ as

$$\sigma_v(x) = (\sigma(x_1 - v_1), \dots, \sigma(x_p - v_p)), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Given a positive integer L and a vector $\mathcal{A} = (p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{L+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{L+2}$, a neural network of depth $L + 1$ (with L hidden layers) and architecture \mathcal{A} is a function of the form

$$f : \mathbb{R}^{p_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_{L+1}}, \quad f(x) = W_L \circ \sigma_{v_L} \circ W_{L-1} \circ \sigma_{v_{L-1}} \circ \dots \circ W_1 \circ \sigma_{v_1} \circ W_0 \circ x, \quad (2.6)$$

where $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{i+1} \times p_i}$ are weight matrices and $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ are shift vectors. Next, we introduce a special subclass class of neural networks of depth $L + 1$ with architecture \mathcal{A} :

$$\text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}) = \left\{ f \text{ of the form (2.6)} : \|W_0\|_\infty \vee \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \{\|W_\ell\|_\infty \vee \|v_\ell\|_\infty\} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The maximum number of neurons in one layer $\|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty$ is called the width of the neural network. The most common choice for the activation function is the rectified linear unit (ReLU):

$$\sigma^{\text{ReLU}}(x) = x \vee 0.$$

Unfortunately, it is not suitable for our purposes. The reason is that we want to use neural networks as generators. The density of the fake random elements $g(Y_1), \dots, g(Y_n)$ is given by

(2.2) and, to avoid differentiability issues, we use the ReQU (rectified quadratic unit) activation function, defined as

$$\sigma^{\text{ReQU}}(x) = (x \vee 0)^2.$$

From now on, we always use ReQU activation functions and write $\sigma(x)$ instead of $\sigma^{\text{ReQU}}(x)$ for short. In what follows, we consider sparse neural networks assuming that only a few weights are not equal to zero. For this purpose, we introduce a class of neural networks of depth $L + 1$ with architecture \mathcal{A} and with at most s non-zero weights:

$$\text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}, s) = \left\{ f \in \text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}) : \|W_0\|_0 + \sum_{\ell=1}^L (\|W_\ell\|_0 + \|v_\ell\|_0) \leq s \right\}.$$

3. Assumptions

Throughout the paper, we assume that \mathbf{p}^* is the density of a random element $g^*(Y)$ where Y is distributed uniformly on Y , and $g^* : \mathsf{Y} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}$ is a smooth regular map.

Assumption \mathbf{Ap}^* . There exist constants $\beta > 2$, $H^* > 0$ and $\Lambda > 1$ such that \mathbf{p}^* is of the form

$$\mathbf{p}^*(x) = \mathbf{p}_{g^*}(x) = |\det[\nabla g^*((g^*)^{-1}(x))]|^{-1}, \quad x \in \mathsf{X},$$

with $g^* \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda^{1+\beta}(\mathsf{Y}, H^*)$.

The structural assumption \mathbf{Ap}^* is not very restrictive and describes a quite large class of densities. The celebrated Brenier's theorem [7] implies that, for any density \mathbf{p} with a finite second moment, there exists a convex almost everywhere differentiable function φ such that $\nabla\varphi(Y) \sim \mathbf{p}$ where $Y \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1]^d)$. Caffarelli's regularity theory [10, 11, 12, 13] extends Brenier's result in the following way. If \mathbf{p} is bounded away from zero and infinity, $\Omega = \text{supp}(\mathbf{p})$ is convex, and \mathbf{p} is $C^\beta(\text{Int}(\Omega))$, then the potential φ is $C^{\beta+2}$.

We continue with assumptions on fake random elements $g(Y_1), \dots, g(Y_n)$. Throughout the paper, we require that Y_1, \dots, Y_n have a uniform distribution. Besides, we take \mathcal{G} as a subclass of Λ -regular functions $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda^2(\mathsf{Y})$ (see (2.5) for the precise definition).

Assumption \mathbf{AG} . The latent random elements Y_1, \dots, Y_n are uniformly distributed on a compact set Y with $\text{Vol}(\mathsf{Y}) = 1$. Moreover, there exist $H_{\mathcal{G}} > 0$ and $\Lambda > 1$ such that the class of generators fulfills

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda, H_{\mathcal{G}}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_\Lambda^2(\mathsf{Y}, H_{\mathcal{G}}).$$

Note that the map g^* inducing the true density \mathbf{p}^* does not necessarily belong to \mathcal{G} . In Section 4, we consider a class of neural networks as a particular example of the class \mathcal{G} . The conditions on the class of discriminators are quite similar. We assume that \mathcal{D} is a subclass of $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathsf{X})$ and additionally require the functions from \mathcal{D} to be bounded away from 0 and 1.

Assumption \mathbf{AD} . There exist constants $H_{\mathcal{D}} > 0$ and $0 < D_{\min} \leq D_{\max} < 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(D_{\min}, D_{\max}, H_{\mathcal{D}}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^1(\mathsf{X}, H_{\mathcal{D}}),$$

and each $D \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies

$$D(x) \in [D_{\min}, D_{\max}] \subset (0, 1) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathsf{X}.$$

Let us discuss the introduced assumptions. We start with Assumption **AD**. The requirement that all functions from \mathcal{D} are bounded away from 0 and 1 is needed for the $\log D$ and $\log(1 - D)$ to be well defined. Similar conditions appear in the literature for aggregation with the Kullback-Leibler loss (for instance, in [28, 3, 30, 9]). The fact that \mathcal{D} is a subset of the Hölder ball $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathsf{X}, H_{\mathcal{D}})$ ensures the regularity of discriminators. In the next section, we show that such a choice of the class \mathcal{D} ensures a good approximation quality of the class of best possible discriminators $D_g^* = \mathfrak{p}^*/(\mathfrak{p}_g + \mathfrak{p}^*)$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$, provided that the class of generators is appropriately chosen. Assumptions **AG** and **Ap*** ensure the well-posedness of the densities \mathfrak{p}^* and \mathfrak{p}_g , $g \in \mathcal{G}$. In particular, Assumptions **Ap*** and **AG** yield that the densities \mathfrak{p}^* and \mathfrak{p}_g , $g \in \mathcal{G}$, are bounded away from zero and infinity on X . Assumption **AG** implies regularity properties of \mathfrak{p}_g , which are similar to the ones in [5]. In particular, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, the density \mathfrak{p}_g is Lipschitz on X . The same holds for \mathfrak{p}^* , provided that **Ap*** is fulfilled. Furthermore, for almost all $x \in \mathsf{X}$, the map $g \mapsto \mathfrak{p}_g(x)$ is regular with respect to $g \in \mathcal{G}$.

Remark 1. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $D_g^* \in [D_{\min}, D_{\max}]$ for some $0 < D_{\min} \leq D_{\max} < 1$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, since under **Ap*** and **AG**,

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\min} \leq \mathfrak{p}_g(x) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{p}_{\min} \leq \mathfrak{p}^*(x) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}, \quad x \in \mathsf{X}, g \in \mathcal{G}$$

with $\mathfrak{p}_{\min} = \Lambda^{-d}$, $\mathfrak{p}_{\max} = \Lambda^d$. This result is proved in Lemma 3. Hence, we can always select D_{\min}, D_{\max} in such a way that $0 < D_{\min} \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\min}/(\mathfrak{p}_{\min} + \mathfrak{p}_{\max})$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{\max}/(\mathfrak{p}_{\min} + \mathfrak{p}_{\max}) \leq D_{\max} < 1$.

4. Main results

In this, section, we formulate the main results of our paper.

4.1. A general oracle inequality

We begin with a sharp oracle inequality for general classes \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} satisfying Assumptions **AD** and **AG**.

Theorem 1. *Assume **Ap***, **AD**, and **AG**. Let*

$$r_n^0(\mathcal{D}) = \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathsf{X})}, 1/n))$$

and

$$r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) = \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathsf{Y})}, 1/n)),$$

where $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}, 1/n)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})}, 1/n)$ are $(1/n)$ -covering numbers of the classes \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} , respectively. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathfrak{p}^*) - \Delta_{\mathcal{G}} - \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}(r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) + \log(2/\delta))}{n}} \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}(r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) + r_n^0(\mathcal{D}) + \log(2/\delta))}{n}} \\ &+ \frac{(r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) + r_n^0(\mathcal{D}) + \log(2/\delta))}{n}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{G}} := \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*), \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} := \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{D \in \mathcal{D}} [L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D)]$$

and

$$D_g^*(x) := \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*(x)}{\mathfrak{p}^*(x) + \mathfrak{p}_g(x)}, \quad x \in \mathbf{X}. \quad (4.2)$$

Here \lesssim stands for inequality up to a constant depending on the parameters d , Λ , $H_{\mathcal{G}}$, and $H_{\mathcal{D}}$, see proof of Theorem 1 (Section 5) for precise dependence.

Theoretical properties of the vanilla GANs were studied in [24, 5, 2]. The results of [2] mainly concern the case of highly smooth generators, so we postpone a comparison with their rates of convergence, and we will return to it after Theorem 2. To our knowledge, the first upper bound on the Jensen-Shannon divergence between the true density \mathfrak{p}^* and the vanilla GAN estimate $\mathfrak{p}_{\hat{g}}$ was obtained in [24, Theorem 13]. In [5], the authors significantly improved the approximation terms in the oracle inequality of [24, Theorem 13]. The closest result to our Theorem 1 in the literature is [5, Theorem 4.1], so let us focus on the comparison of these two results. First, we elaborate on the conditions of theorems. In [5], the authors assume that the generators and discriminators are parametrized by $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\gamma$ ($\mathcal{G} = \{g_\theta : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^\gamma\}$) and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^\eta$ ($\mathcal{D} = \{D_\nu : \nu \in V \subset \mathbb{R}^\eta\}$), respectively, where Θ and V are bounded subsets of \mathbb{R}^γ and \mathbb{R}^η , respectively. Here γ and η are some positive integers. Besides, Biau et. al. [5] require the maps $\theta \mapsto g_\theta(x)$ and $\theta \mapsto \mathfrak{p}_{g_\theta}(x)$ to be in $C^1(\Theta)$ for all $x \in \mathbf{X}$, and the map $(x, \nu) \mapsto D_\nu(x)$ to be in $C^1(\mathbf{X} \times V)$. These requirements yield polynomially growing $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ -covering numbers of the classes \mathcal{D} and $\{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$. Unfortunately, the authors do not provide any examples where these assumptions are fulfilled. In contrast, we impose assumptions on the classes of generators and discriminators, rather than on the underlying densities \mathfrak{p}_g , $g \in \mathcal{G}$. In fact, **AG** and **AD** can be considered as an alternative to the group of assumptions (H_{reg}) introduced in [5]. Besides, [5] requires that $D_{g_\theta}^*$ is bounded away from 0 and 1 for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Under the aforementioned assumptions, Biau et. al. [5] established the following theoretical guarantees on the excess JS risk of the vanilla GAN estimate $\mathfrak{p}_{\hat{g}}$:

$$\mathbb{E} \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathfrak{p}^*) - \Delta_{\mathcal{G}} - \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{\text{diam}(\Theta \times V)} \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta \times V, \|\cdot\|, u)} du. \quad (4.3)$$

In addition, one can use McDiarmid's inequality (see, e.g. [6, Corollary 4]) to get large deviation

bounds on $\text{JS}(p_{\hat{g}}, p^*)$ of the form

$$\text{JS}(p_{\hat{g}}, p^*) - \Delta_{\mathcal{G}} - \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^{\text{diam}(\Theta \times V)} \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\Theta \times V, \|\cdot\|, u)} du + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}, \quad (4.4)$$

which holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$. If the classes \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{D} are poor and cannot approximate g^* and \mathcal{D}_g^* , $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with high accuracy, then $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ are of order 1, and our rates show no improvements over [5]. However, in practice, one uses the classes of deep neural networks for \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} with good approximation quality and the bound (4.1) can be significantly better than (4.4).

Our next result concerns the approximation of p^* and D^* via deep neural networks with the ReQU activation function. It implies that $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ tend to 0 (with polynomial decay) as the sample size n tends to ∞ , provided that the parameters of the neural networks (width, depth, and the number of non-zero weights) are chosen carefully.

4.2. Rates of convergence for neural networks

In this section, we focus on the case when \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} are classes of neural networks with ReQU activations. For this purpose, we slightly modify Assumptions AG and AD.

Assumption AG'. Fix $L_{\mathcal{G}}, s_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{N}$, and an architecture $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{N}^{L_{\mathcal{G}}+2}$ with the first and the last component equal to d . There are constants $H_{\mathcal{G}} > 0$, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} > 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}, H_{\mathcal{G}}, L_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}, s_{\mathcal{G}}) = \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}}^2(\mathcal{Y}, H_{\mathcal{G}}) \cap \text{NN}(L_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}, s_{\mathcal{G}}).$$

Assumption AD'. Fix $L_{\mathcal{D}}, s_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathbb{N}$, and an architecture $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathbb{N}^{L_{\mathcal{D}}+2}$ with the first and the last components equal to d and 1, respectively. There are constants $H_{\mathcal{D}} > 0$, $0 < D_{\min} \leq D_{\max} < 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(D_{\min}, D_{\max}, H_{\mathcal{D}}, L_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}, s_{\mathcal{D}}) = \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X}, H_{\mathcal{D}}) \cap \text{NN}(L_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}, s_{\mathcal{D}}),$$

and each $D \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies

$$D(x) \in [D_{\min}, D_{\max}] \subset [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

For the sake of clarity and simplicity, we assume in the sequel that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = [0, 1]^d$. A natural question is how rich are the classes of generators and discriminators satisfying Assumptions AG' and AD' and what is their approximation power. We shall give the complete answer in Proposition 3. In particular, we show that for any $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}([0, 1]^d, H^*)$, $\beta > 1$, and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neural network with ReQU activation functions from the class $\mathcal{H}^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor}([0, 1]^d, H^* + \varepsilon)$ which approximates f within the accuracy ε with respect to the norm in $\mathcal{H}^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor}([0, 1]^d)$. While the precise statement and the architecture of the approximating neural network are provided in Proposition 3, the next corollary gives a qualitative overview.

Corollary 1. *Let $\beta > 2$, $H_G \geq 2H^* > 0$. Then for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $L_G = O(1)$, $s_G = O(\varepsilon^{-d/\beta})$, and an architecture \mathcal{A}_G with $\|\mathcal{A}_G\|_\infty = O(\varepsilon^{-d/\beta})$, such that*

$$\sup_{g^* \in \mathcal{H}_A^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{Y}, H^*)} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g - g^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, if additionally Assumptions \mathbf{Ap}^* is fulfilled, then there exist sufficiently large H_D , $L_D = O(1)$, $s_D = O(\varepsilon^{-d/\beta})$, and an architecture \mathcal{A}_D , $\|\mathcal{A}_D\|_\infty = O(\varepsilon^{-d/\beta})$, such that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \inf_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \|D_g^* - D\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Here the hidden constants in $O(\cdot)$ depend on $d, \lfloor \beta \rfloor$, and H^* .

Theorem 1 and Proposition 3 allow us to substantially improve the bound in [5, Theorem 4.1] and lead to the following statement.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = [0, 1]^d$. Assume that \mathbf{Ap}^* holds with $\beta > 2$. Let $H_G \geq 2H^*$, $A_G \geq 2A$, and let*

$$H_D \geq 2 \max \left\{ 1, A^{4d+1} d^{2+d/2} (H_G \vee H^*) \right\}.$$

There are positive integers L_G, s_G, L_D, s_D and architectures $\mathcal{A}_G \in \mathbb{N}^{L_G+2}$, $\mathcal{A}_D \in \mathbb{N}^{L_D+2}$ such that \mathbf{AG}' and \mathbf{AD}' define nonempty sets \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} , respectively. Moreover, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ the estimator (1.3) fulfills

$$\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}, \quad (4.5)$$

provided that $n \geq n_0$ with n_0 depending only on β, d, A, H^* , and H_G . In (4.5), \lesssim stands for an inequality up to a constant depending on d, β, A, H^*, H_G , and H_D .

Theorem 2 improves the dependence on both n and δ in the existing bounds on the JS-divergence between the vanilla GAN estimate $\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}$ and \mathbf{p}^* . In [2, Theorem 5.4], the authors proved that $\text{EJS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*)$ decays almost as fast as $n^{-1/2}$ if $2\beta > d$. Our results show that in this case the rate of convergence can be much faster. The reason for suboptimality of [2, Theorem 5.4] is the use of the chaining technique to control the supremum of the empirical process $\Delta_n(g, D) = L_n(g, D) - L(g, D)$. This approach was successfully applied to WGANs (see e.g. [24]) but in the case of vanilla GANs, one can prove better upper bounds for the supremum of $\Delta_n(g, D)$ in a local vicinity of the saddle point $(g^*, D_{g^*}^*)$. It is also worth mentioning that, if one used the bound (4.3) from [5, Theorem 4.1] and Proposition 3 to control Δ_G, Δ_D , he would get

$$\text{EJS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{2\beta/(4\beta+d)}, \quad (4.6)$$

leading to suboptimal rates of convergence. Finally, the second term $\log(1/\delta)/n$ in (4.5) significantly improves the standard rate $\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n}$ which follows from the McDiarmid's inequality.

The rate of Theorem 2 turns out to be minimax optimal up to some logarithmic factors in the class of densities satisfying \mathbf{Ap}^* .

Theorem 3. Let $\mathsf{X} = \mathsf{Y} = [0, 1]^d$ be a unit cube in \mathbb{R}^d . Let (X_1, \dots, X_n) be a sample of i.i.d. observations generated from a density \mathbf{p}^* satisfying **Ap***. Then for any estimate $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ of \mathbf{p}^* , that is, measurable function of X_1, \dots, X_n , it holds

$$\sup_{\mathbf{p}^*} \mathbb{E} \text{JS}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \gtrsim n^{-2\beta/(2\beta+d)}$$

with a hidden constant depending on Λ and d .

The proof of Theorem 3 relies on the van Trees inequality (see [22], p. 72, and [19]).

5. Proofs of the main results

5.1. Proof of Theorem 1

We begin with studying the excess risk

$$\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) \equiv \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*), \quad (5.1)$$

where we have introduced $\bar{g} \in \text{argmin}_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*)$. Observe that, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds that

$$\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) = L(g, D_g^*) + \log 2,$$

where $L(g, D)$ and D_g^* are defined in (1.1) and (4.2), respectively. We rewrite (5.1) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) &= L(\hat{g}, D_{\hat{g}}^*) - L(\bar{g}, D_{\bar{g}}^*) \\ &= \underbrace{(L(\hat{g}, D_{\hat{g}}^*) - L_n(\hat{g}, D_{\hat{g}}^*))}_{T_1} + \underbrace{(L_n(\hat{g}, D_{\hat{g}}^*) - L_n(\bar{g}, D_{\bar{g}}^*))}_{T_2} + \underbrace{(L_n(\bar{g}, D_{\bar{g}}^*) - L(\bar{g}, D_{\bar{g}}^*))}_{T_3}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The special structure of D_g^* together with assumptions **Ap*** and **AG** allows us to obtain high-probability bounds on $|L_n(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D_g^*)|$ (check Lemma 10 for more details).

Step 1. To control T_1 and T_3 in (5.2) we apply high-probability bounds on $|L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g, D_g^*)|$. We need the following result.

Proposition 1. Grant the assumptions of Theorem 1. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let \mathcal{G}_ε be a minimal ε -net of the set \mathcal{G} with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathsf{Y})}$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the following inequality holds simultaneously for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} |L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g, D_g^*)| &\leq C_{C.4a} \varepsilon + C_{C.4b} \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} \\ &\quad + C_{C.4c} \sqrt{\frac{(\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) \wedge \text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.4d} \frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) = L_n(g, D_g^*) + \log 2$ and the constants are given in (C.4a)–(C.4d).

The proof of Proposition 1 is provided in Supplement C.1. Taking $\varepsilon = 1/n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g, D_g^*)| \\
& \leq C_{C.4c} \sqrt{\frac{(\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) \wedge \text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \left(C_{C.4a} + C_{C.4b} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.4d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Now, (5.2), (5.3) and the inequality

$$\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) = \text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) + T_2 \leq \text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) + (T_2 \vee 0)$$

imply that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \\
& \leq T_2 + 2C_{C.4c} \sqrt{\frac{(\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) + (T_2 \vee 0)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + \frac{2}{n} \left(C_{C.4a} + C_{C.4b} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.4d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{\frac{(\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) + (T_2 \vee 0)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{(T_2 \vee 0) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \\
& \leq T_2 + 2C_{C.4c} \sqrt{\frac{(T_2 \vee 0) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + 2C_{C.4c} \sqrt{\frac{\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + \frac{2}{n} \left(C_{C.4a} + C_{C.4b} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.4d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

In order to bound $\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*)$, we apply Proposition 1 again. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \leq \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) + C_{C.4c} \sqrt{\frac{\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \left(C_{C.4a} + C_{C.4b} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.4d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{5 \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\bar{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*)}{4} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \left(C_{C.4a} + C_{C.4b} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + (C_{C.4c}^2 + C_{C.4d}) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where (a) follows from the inequality $ab \leq a^2/4 + b^2$.

Step 2. The remaining term to bound in the right-hand side of (5.4) is

$$T_2 = L_n(\widehat{g}, D_{\widehat{g}}^*) - L_n(\overline{g}, D_{\overline{g}}^*).$$

Let us introduce $\widehat{D}_g \in \operatorname{argmax}_{D \in \mathcal{D}} L_n(g, D)$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Then we can represent

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(\widehat{g}, D_{\widehat{g}}^*) - L_n(\overline{g}, D_{\overline{g}}^*) &= \left(L_n(\widehat{g}, \widehat{D}_{\widehat{g}}) - L_n(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_{\overline{g}}) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(L_n(\widehat{g}, D_{\widehat{g}}^*) - L_n(\widehat{g}, \widehat{D}_{\widehat{g}}) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(L_n(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_{\overline{g}}) - L_n(\overline{g}, D_{\overline{g}}^*) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Note that $L_n(\widehat{g}, \widehat{D}_{\widehat{g}}) - L_n(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_{\overline{g}}) \leq 0$ due to the definition of \widehat{g} . To control the differences $L_n(\widehat{g}, D_{\widehat{g}}^*) - L_n(\widehat{g}, \widehat{D}_{\widehat{g}})$ and $L_n(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_{\overline{g}}) - L_n(\overline{g}, D_{\overline{g}}^*)$, we apply the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *Grant the assumptions of Theorem 1. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let \mathcal{G}_ε and \mathcal{D}_ε be two finite ε -nets of the sets \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}$, respectively. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds simultaneously for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} &|L_n(g, D) - L(g, D) - L_n(g, D_g^*) + L(g, D_g^*)| \\ &\leq C_{C.8a}\varepsilon + C_{C.8b}\sqrt{\frac{(L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} \\ &\quad + C_{C.8c}\varepsilon\sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.8d}\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants are given in (C.8a)–(C.8d).

One can find the proof of Proposition 2 in Supplement C.2. Taking $\varepsilon = 1/n$, we obtain from Proposition 2 that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(g, D) - L_n(g, D_g^*) &\leq L(g, D) - L(g, D_g^*) \\ &\quad + C_{C.8b}\sqrt{\frac{(L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \left(C_{C.8a} + C_{C.8c}\sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.8d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

simultaneously for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $D \in \mathcal{D}$.

Let us introduce, for $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $\overline{D}_g \in \operatorname{argmax}_{D \in \mathcal{D}} L(g, D)$. Note that, in general, $\overline{D}_g \neq D_g^*$. Then,

using (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L_n(\widehat{g}, D_g^*) - L_n(\widehat{g}, \widehat{D}_g) &\leq L_n(\widehat{g}, D_g^*) - L_n(\widehat{g}, \overline{D}_g) \\
&\leq L(\widehat{g}, D_g^*) - L(\widehat{g}, \overline{D}_g) + C_{C.8b} \sqrt{\frac{\left(L(\widehat{g}, D_g^*) - L(\widehat{g}, \overline{D}_g)\right) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \left(C_{C.8a} + C_{C.8c} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.8d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right) \quad (5.8) \\
&\leq \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} + C_{C.8b} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{D}} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \left(C_{C.8a} + C_{C.8c} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.8d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Finally, for $L_n(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_g) - L_n(\overline{g}, D_g^*)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
L_n(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_g) - L_n(\overline{g}, D_g^*) &\leq -\left(L(\overline{g}, D_g^*) - L(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_g)\right) \\
&\quad + C_{C.8b} \sqrt{\frac{\left(L(\overline{g}, D_g^*) - L(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_g)\right) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \left(C_{C.8a} + C_{C.8c} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.8d} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Maximizing the right-hand side of the previous inequality over $L(\overline{g}, D_g^*) - L(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_g)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
n \left(L_n(\overline{g}, \widehat{D}_g) - L_n(\overline{g}, D_g^*) \right) &\leq C_{C.8a} + C_{C.8c} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \quad (5.9) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{C_{C.8d}^2}{4} + C_{C.8d} \right) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Combining (5.6), (5.8), and (5.9), we obtain the bound on T_2 :

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &\leq \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} + C_{C.8b} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{D}} \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{n} \left(C_{C.8a} + C_{C.8c} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta)}{n}} \right) \quad (5.10) \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{n} \left(\left(\frac{C_{C.8d}^2}{8} + C_{C.8d} \right) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/n}||\mathcal{D}_{1/n}|/\delta) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which holds with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$.

Step 3. Combining (5.4), (5.5), (5.10), and recalling that $\text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_{\overline{g}}, \mathfrak{p}^*) = \Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$, we obtain that, with

probability at least $1 - 4\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \Delta_{\mathcal{G}} - \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} \\ & \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{G}} \log(2\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}, 1/n)/\delta)}{n}} \\ & + \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{D}} \log(2\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})}, 1/n)\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}, 1/n)/\delta)}{n}} \\ & + \frac{\log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}, 1/n)) + \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{D}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})}, 1/n)) + \log(2/\delta)}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

5.2. Proof of Theorem 2

The main idea of the proof of Theorem 2 is to apply Theorem 1 to particular classes \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} . After that, we specify the architectures of neural networks from the classes of generators and discriminators, and then control the approximation terms $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ using Proposition 3 which concerns approximation properties of neural networks with ReQU activations. An upper bound on the metric entropies $r_n^1(\mathcal{G})$ and $r_n^0(\mathcal{D})$ follows from Lemma 19.

Step 1. Let us apply Theorem 1 with $H_{\mathcal{G}} \geq 2H^*$ and with $\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \geq 2\Lambda$ instead of Λ . For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \Delta_{\mathcal{G}} - \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} & \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{G}} (r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) + \log(8/\delta))}{n}} \\ & + \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{D}} (r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) + r_n^0(\mathcal{D}) + \log(8/\delta))}{n}} \\ & + \frac{(r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) + r_n^0(\mathcal{D}) + \log(8/\delta))}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{G}} := \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*), \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} := \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{D \in \mathcal{D}} [L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D)]$$

and

$$D_g^*(x) := \frac{\mathbf{p}^*(x)}{\mathbf{p}^*(x) + \mathbf{p}_g(x)}, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Due to the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, on the same event, one has

$$\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_{\hat{g}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \lesssim \Delta_{\mathcal{G}} + \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} + \frac{(r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) + r_n^0(\mathcal{D}) + \log(8/\delta))}{n}, \quad (5.11)$$

Our next goal is specify the architectures of neural networks and to provide upper bounds on $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$, $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$, $r_n^1(\mathcal{G})$, and $r_n^0(\mathcal{D})$.

Step 2. Let us bound $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$. Introduce an auxiliary parameter

$$K = \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/(2\beta+d)}.$$

Let the parameters $L_{\mathcal{G}}$, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$, and $s_{\mathcal{G}}$ be as follows:

$$L_{\mathcal{G}} = 2 + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + \lceil\log_2 d\rceil + 1,$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}} = (d, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}^{(1)}, (K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^d \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}^{(2)}, 8(K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^d (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 2)^d 9^{d\lfloor\beta\rfloor} H^*, d),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}^{(1)} &= (1, K + 4(K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1), 5 + 4(K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1), 4(K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor), \\ &\quad 4(K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 2), 8(K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 2) - 4, 8(K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 2) - 4, \\ &\quad 8(K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 2) - 12, \dots, 8(K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor + 3), K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor + 3), \\ \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}^{(2)} &= \underbrace{(2^{\lceil\log_2 d\rceil+1}, 2^{\lceil\log_2 d\rceil}, \dots, 4)}_{\lceil\log_2 d\rceil}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mathcal{G}} &= 16d(K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor\beta\rfloor-1)} H^* + 16d^3 (K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d \\ &\quad + 72d^2 \lfloor\beta\rfloor (K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor) + 4d^2 (K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3 yields that there is a neural network g_0 with ReQU activations, architecture $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$, and at most $s_{\mathcal{G}}$ non-zero weights, such that, for any $\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1\}$, it holds that

$$\|g^* - g_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\ell}([0,1]^d)} \leq \frac{H^* (\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^{\beta+1-\ell} d^{\beta+1}}{(\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1 - \ell)! K^{\beta+1-\ell}} + \frac{9^{d\lfloor\beta\rfloor} (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 2)^{2d+\beta+1} H^* d^{\beta+1}}{K^{\beta+1-\ell}}.$$

In particular, since $\beta > 1$,

$$\|g^* - g_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^2([0,1]^d)} \leq \frac{H^* (\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^{\beta-1} d^{\beta+1}}{(\lfloor\beta\rfloor - 1)! K^{\beta-1}} + \frac{9^{d\lfloor\beta\rfloor} (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 2)^{2d+\beta+1} H^* d^{\beta+1}}{K^{\beta-1}}.$$

The right hand side does not exceed $\min\{H^*, (4\Lambda^3\sqrt{d})^{-1}\}$, provided that K is sufficiently large. This yields that, in this case,

$$\|g_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^2([0,1]^d)} \leq \|g^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^2([0,1]^d)} + \|g^* - g_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^2([0,1]^d)} \leq 2H^* \leq H_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla g_0(x)^\top \nabla g_0(x) &= \nabla g^*(x)^\top \nabla g^*(x) + (\nabla g_0(x) - \nabla g^*(x))^\top \nabla g^*(x) \\ &\quad + \nabla g^*(x)^\top (\nabla g_0(x) - \nabla g^*(x)) + (\nabla g_0(x) - \nabla g^*(x))^\top (\nabla g_0(x) - \nabla g^*(x)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\nabla g^*(x) - \nabla g_0(x))^\top \nabla g^*(x) \right\| &\leq \|\nabla g^*(x) - \nabla g_0(x)\| \|\nabla g^*(x)\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda^{-3}}{4\sqrt{d}} \cdot \Lambda\sqrt{d} = \frac{\Lambda^{-2}}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}^{-2} I_{d \times d} \preceq \nabla g_0(x)^\top \nabla g_0(x) \preceq \Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}^2 I_{d \times d} \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, 1]^d.$$

Here we took into account that $0.5\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}} \geq \Lambda > 1$. Hence, we conclude that the class $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}}^2([0, 1]^d, H_{\mathcal{G}}) \cap \text{NN}(L_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}, s_{\mathcal{G}})$ is not empty. Moreover, according to Proposition 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g^* - g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0, 1]^d)} &\leq \frac{H^*(\lfloor \beta + 1 \rfloor)^\beta d^{\beta+1}}{\lfloor \beta \rfloor! K^\beta} + \frac{9^{d\lfloor \beta \rfloor} (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 2)^{2d+\beta+1} H^* d^{\beta+1}}{K^\beta} \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\beta/(2\beta+d)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the hidden constant depends on d, β , and H^* . Lemma 12 and Lemma 5 allow us to get an upper bound on $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathcal{G}} &= \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*) \lesssim \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|\mathfrak{p} - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g^* - g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0, 1]^d)}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. We obtain an upper bound on $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ in a similar way. Using (2.2) and the fact that $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}(H_{\mathcal{G}}, [0, 1]^d)$, $g^* \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}(H^*, [0, 1]^d)$, it is straightforward to check that, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$D_g^* = \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*}{\mathfrak{p}^* + \mathfrak{p}_g} \in \mathcal{H}^\beta(H^\circ, [0, 1]^d),$$

where H° is a constant, depending on $H_{\mathcal{G}}, H^*, \beta$, and d . If we set the parameters $L_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}$, and $s_{\mathcal{D}}$ equal to

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\mathcal{D}} &= 4 + 2(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 2) + \lceil \log_2 d \rceil + 1, \\ \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}} &= (d, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)}, (K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{(2)}, 8(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} H_{\mathcal{D}}, d), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} &= (1, K + 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1), 5 + 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1), 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor), \\ &\quad 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor), 8(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) - 4, 8(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) - 4, \\ &\quad 8(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) - 12, \dots, 8(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor + 2), K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor + 2), \\ \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{(2)} &= \underbrace{(2^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil + 1}, 2^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil}, \dots, 4)}_{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mathcal{D}} &= 16d(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} H^* + 16d^3(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d \\ &\quad + 72d^2 \lfloor \beta \rfloor (K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) + 4d^2(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d, \end{aligned}$$

then, according to Proposition 3, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, there exists a neural network $D_g^\circ \in \text{NN}(L_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}, s_{\mathcal{D}})$ such that for all non-negative integers $\ell \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor$ we have

$$\|D_g^* - D_g^\circ\|_{\mathcal{H}^\ell([0, 1]^d)} \leq \frac{H^\circ(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^{\beta+1-\ell} d^{\beta+1}}{(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1 - \ell)! K^{\beta+1-\ell}} + \frac{9^{d\lfloor \beta \rfloor} (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 2)^{2d+\beta+1} H^\circ d^{\beta+1}}{K^{\beta+1-\ell}}.$$

Hence, if n is greater than a constant n_0 , depending on $H_{\mathcal{G}}, H^*, \beta$, and d , then for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\|D_g^\circ\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0, 1]^d)} \leq 2\|D_g^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0, 1]^d)}.$$

Let us bound the right hand side. Consider a function $\varphi(u, v) = u/(u + v)$, $u, v > 0$. It is easy to check that

$$\frac{\partial \varphi(u, v)}{\partial u} = \frac{v}{(u + v)^2} \leq \frac{1}{u + v}, \quad \frac{\partial \varphi(u, v)}{\partial v} = -\frac{u}{(u + v)^2} \geq -\frac{1}{u + v}.$$

Thus, for any $u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 > 0$,

$$|\varphi(u_1, v_1) - \varphi(u_2, v_2)| \leq \frac{|u_1 - u_2| + |v_1 - v_2|}{(u_1 \wedge u_2) + (v_1 \wedge v_2)}.$$

Applying this inequality to $D_g^* = \mathbf{p}^*/(\mathbf{p}^* + \mathbf{p}_g)$ and taking Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 into account, we obtain

$$|D_g^*(x_1) - D_g^*(x_2)| \leq \frac{|\mathbf{p}^*(x_1) - \mathbf{p}^*(x_2)| + |\mathbf{p}_g(x_1) - \mathbf{p}_g(x_2)|}{(\mathbf{p}^*(x_1) \wedge \mathbf{p}^*(x_2)) + (\mathbf{p}_g(x_1) \wedge \mathbf{p}_g(x_2))} \leq \frac{\mathbf{L}_1 \|x_1 - x_2\|}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}}.$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1]^d$. Hence, for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_g^\circ\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0,1]^d)} &\leq 2\|D_g^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0,1]^d)} \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{\mathbf{L}_1}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}} \right\} \\ &= 2 \max \left\{ 1, \Lambda^{4d+1} d^{2+d/2} (H_{\mathcal{G}} \vee H^*) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If we choose

$$H_{\mathcal{D}} \geq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \Lambda^{4d+1} d^{2+d/2} (H_{\mathcal{G}} \vee H^*) \right\},$$

then all the approximating functions D_g° , $g \in \mathcal{G}$, belong to \mathcal{D} . Thus, with such a choice of $H_{\mathcal{D}}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \|D_g^* - D\|_{L_\infty([0,1]^d)} &\leq \frac{H^\circ(\lfloor \beta \rfloor)^\beta d^\beta}{\lfloor \beta \rfloor! K^\beta} + \frac{9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^{2d+\beta} H^\circ d^\beta}{K^\beta} \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\beta/(2\beta+d)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Using the equality

$$\begin{aligned} L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \log \frac{D_g^*(x)}{D(x)} \mathbf{p}^*(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int \log \frac{1 - D_g^*(x)}{1 - D(x)} \mathbf{p}_g(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{K}(D_g^*(x), D(x)) \frac{\mathbf{p}_g(x) + \mathbf{p}^*(x)}{2} dx, \quad \text{for all } g \in \mathcal{G}, \end{aligned}$$

where for any $u, v \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathcal{K}(u, v) = u \log \frac{u}{v} + (1 - u) \log \frac{1 - u}{1 - v},$$

and Lemma 6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathcal{D}} &= \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{D \in \mathcal{D}} (L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D)) \\ &\lesssim \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \|D_g - D\|_{L_\infty([0,1]^d)}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\beta/(2\beta+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 4. It remains to elaborate on covering numbers of the introduced classes \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0,1]^d)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_\infty([0,1]^d)}$. Lemma 19 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} r_n^0(\mathcal{D}) &\leq (s_{\mathcal{D}} + 1) \left(\log n + \log L_{\mathcal{D}} + L_{\mathcal{D}} \log 2 + (2^{L_{\mathcal{D}}} + 2) \sum_{i=1}^{L_{\mathcal{D}}} \log(1 + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D},i}) \right) \\ &\lesssim \log n \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{d/(2\beta+d)}, \\ r_n^1(\mathcal{G}) &\leq (s_{\mathcal{G}} + 1) \left(\log(2n) + \log(L_{\mathcal{G}}(L_{\mathcal{G}} + 1)) + (L_{\mathcal{G}} + 1) \log 2 + (2^{L_{\mathcal{G}}} + 2) \sum_{i=1}^{L_{\mathcal{G}}} \log(1 + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G},i}) \right) \\ &\lesssim \log n \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{d/(2\beta+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the bounds on $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$, $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$, $r_n^0(\mathcal{D})$, and $r_n^1(\mathcal{G})$ into (5.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) &\lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}} + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\log n \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{\frac{d}{2\beta+d}} + \log(8/\delta) \right) \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is finished.

5.3. Proof of Theorem 3

Let

$$h = h(n) = \left(\frac{1}{n\Lambda^{d+2}d^2} \right)^{1/(2\beta+d)}.$$

and let M be the $(2h)$ -packing number of $\mathsf{X} = [0, 1]^d$. It is clear that $M \gtrsim h^{-d}$. Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_M\} \subseteq \mathsf{X}$ be a $2h$ -separable set, that is, $\|x_i - x_j\| > 2h$ for all $i \neq j$. Let $g_0 : \mathsf{Y} \rightarrow \mathsf{X}$ be such that $g_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}(\mathsf{Y}, 0.5H^*)$ and

$$2\Lambda^{-2}\mathbf{I}_{d \times d} \preceq \nabla g_0(y)^\top \nabla g_0(y) \preceq 0.5\Lambda^2\mathbf{I}_{d \times d}, \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathsf{Y}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\det \nabla g_0(y) > 0$ for all $y \in \mathsf{Y}$. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function from the class $\mathcal{H}^{\beta+2}(\mathbb{R}^d, L)$ with some $L > 0$, such that $\text{supp}(\varphi) = \mathcal{B}(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, φ attains its maximum at 0, and $-\nabla^2 \varphi(0) \succeq \mathbf{I}_{d \times d}$. For any $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, let us define

$$\psi_j(u) = \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \varphi(u), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Here and further in the proof, g^{-1} stands for the inverse map of g . It is easy to observe that, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, ψ_j belongs to the Hölder class $\mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}(\mathbb{R}^d, 0.5H^*Ld)$ and $\text{supp}(\psi_j) = \mathcal{B}(0, 1)$. Consider a parametric class $\{g_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{B}(0, h) \subset \mathbb{R}^M\}$, where

$$g_\theta^{-1}(x) = g_0^{-1}(x) + h^\beta \sum_{j=1}^M \theta_j \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right).$$

The parameter $h = h(n)$ depends on the sample size n and tends to zero as n increases. Hence, for the sample size n large enough, g_θ satisfies \mathbf{Ap}^* for each $\theta \in \mathcal{B}(0, h) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$. Next auxiliary result provides a lower bound on the accuracy of estimation of the parameter θ .

Lemma 1. *Let Y_1, \dots, Y_n be i.i.d. random elements on \mathcal{Y} , $\text{Vol}(\mathcal{Y}) = 1$, drawn from the uniform distribution on \mathcal{Y} and assume that a learner observes a sample (X_1, \dots, X_n) where $X_i = g_\theta(Y_i)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Under the assumptions of Theorem 3, if n is large enough, for any estimate $\hat{\theta}$ taking its values in $\mathcal{B}(0, h) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ it holds that*

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbb{E}_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \gtrsim \frac{Mh^2}{nh^{2\beta+d}\Lambda^{d+2}d^2 + 1}.$$

Here we write \mathbb{E}_θ to emphasize that the expectation is taken with respect to the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{g_\theta}^{\otimes n}$ where \mathbb{P}_{g_θ} is a distribution of random element $X = g_\theta(Y)$ with Y uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]^d$. The proof of Lemma 1 is postponed to Appendix F.1 below. Denote by \mathbf{p}_{g_θ} a density of the measure \mathbb{P}_{g_θ} . Our next goal is to convert the result of Lemma 1 to the lower bound on

$$\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbb{E}_\theta \|\mathbf{p}_{g_{\hat{\theta}}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2$$

where the infimum is taken with respect to measurable functions $\hat{\theta}$ of the sample satisfying assumptions of Lemma 1. Recall that, for any $\theta \in \mathcal{B}(0, h)$, the log-density of r.v. $X = g_\theta(Y)$ is given by

$$\log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x) = \log \det \left(\nabla g_0^{-1}(x) + h^{\beta-1} \sum_{j=1}^M \theta_j \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right). \quad (5.12)$$

Before obtaining a minimax lower bound on $\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbb{E}_\theta \|\mathbf{p}_{g_{\hat{\theta}}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2$, we prove some properties of the map $\theta \mapsto \log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}$. The next lemma shows that, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, the partial derivative

$$\frac{\partial \log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_j}$$

is bounded away from zero in a vicinity of x_j .

Lemma 2. *Let*

$$r_0 = \frac{h}{\Lambda^2 \left(\Lambda^2 L + 0.25 \Lambda (H^*)^2 h \sqrt{d} \right)} \wedge \frac{h}{2}.$$

Then, under the assumptions of Theorem 3, for a sufficiently small $h > 0$ and any estimate $\hat{\theta}$ taking its values in $\mathcal{B}(0, h) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$, it holds that

$$\left| \frac{\partial \log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_j} \right| \geq h^{\beta-1} \Lambda^{-2} d, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0).$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is postponed until Appendix F.2. Lemma 2 implies that, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_j} \right| = \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)} \left| \frac{\partial \log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_j} \right| \geq \frac{h^{\beta-1} \Lambda^{-2} d}{\mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0).$$

(5.12) implies that for $x \in \mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0)$, $\frac{\partial \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_i} = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Hence, for $\theta, \theta' \in \mathcal{B}(0, h)$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{p}_{g_{\theta'}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 &\geq \sum_{j=1}^M \int_{\mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0)} (\mathbf{p}_{g_{\theta'}}(x) - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x))^2 dx \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^M \int_{\mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0)} \frac{h^{2\beta-2} \Lambda^{-4} d^2 (\theta'_j - \theta_j)^2}{\mathbf{p}_{g_{\theta(x)}}(x)^2} dx \end{aligned}$$

for some $\vartheta(x) = t(x)\theta + (1-t(x))\theta'$, $t(x) \in [0, 1]$. Lemma 3 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{p}_{g_{\theta'}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 &\geq \sum_{j=1}^M \int_{\mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0)} \frac{h^{2\beta-2} \Lambda^{-4} d^2}{4\Lambda^{2d}} (\theta'_j - \theta_j)^2 dx \\ &\gtrsim \sum_{j=1}^M \left(\frac{r_0}{h}\right)^d \frac{h^{2\beta-2+d}}{\Lambda^{2d+4}} (\theta'_j - \theta_j)^2 \\ &\gtrsim \Lambda^{-4d} \frac{h^{2\beta-2+d}}{\Lambda^{2d+4}} \|\theta' - \theta\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we write \gtrsim for inequality up to an absolute constant in power d . Hence, the application of Lemma 1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\mathbf{p}_{g_{\hat{\theta}}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 &\gtrsim \frac{h^{2\beta-2+d}}{\Lambda^{6d+4}} \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \\ &\gtrsim \frac{h^{2\beta}}{\Lambda^{6d+4} (nh^{2\beta+d} \Lambda^{d+2} d^2 + 1)} \end{aligned}$$

for any estimate $\hat{\theta}$ taking its values in $\mathcal{B}(0, h)$. Since $h = (nd^2 \Lambda^{d+2})^{-1/(2\beta+d)}$, we get

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\mathbf{p}_{g_{\hat{\theta}}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 \gtrsim \frac{1}{\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)}. \quad (5.13)$$

We now prove that (5.13) yields

$$\inf_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} \sup_{\mathbf{p}^*} \mathbf{E} \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 \gtrsim \frac{1}{\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)},$$

where \mathbf{p}^* satisfies $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{p}^*$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ is any estimate of \mathbf{p}^* . Let C_d be the hidden constant in (5.13), that is,

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\mathbf{p}_{g_{\hat{\theta}}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 \geq \frac{C_d}{\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)}. \quad (5.14)$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ be an arbitrary estimate. Since $\sup_{\mathbf{p}^*} \mathbf{E} \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 \geq \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2$, it is enough to show that

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2 \gtrsim \frac{1}{\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)}.$$

Let us introduce

$$\tilde{\theta} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\|\theta_0\| \leq h} \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_{\theta_0}}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2.$$

If

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_{\tilde{\theta}}}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2 \geq \frac{C_d}{4\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)},$$

then, by the definition of $\tilde{\theta}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2 &\geq \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_{\tilde{\theta}}}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{C_d}{4\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2 \leq \frac{C_d}{4\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)},$$

then the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (5.14) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\mathbf{p}_{g_\theta} - \mathbf{p}_{g_{\tilde{\theta}}}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2 - \sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}_{g_{\tilde{\theta}}}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{C_d}{4\Lambda^{6d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, Lemma 12 yields that, for any $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$, it holds almost surely

$$\text{JS}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \geq \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2}{8\rho_{\max}}.$$

Applying Lemma 3, we obtain

$$\text{JS}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \geq \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2}{8\Lambda^d}.$$

Hence, for any $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$, it holds that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{p}^*} \mathbf{E} \text{JS}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p}^*) \geq \sup_{\mathbf{p}^*} \frac{\mathbf{E} \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathbf{X})}^2}{8\Lambda^d} \gtrsim \frac{C_d}{\Lambda^{7d+4}} \left(\frac{1}{d^2 \Lambda^{d+2n}} \right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+d)},$$

where \gtrsim stands for inequality up to an absolute constant.

Funding

The article was prepared within the framework of the HSE University Basic Research Program.

References

- [1] ARJOVSKY, M., CHINTALA, S. and BOTTOU, L. (2017). Wasserstein Generative Adversarial Networks. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* (D. PRECUP and Y. W. TEH, eds.) **70** 214–223. PMLR.
- [2] ASATRYAN, H., GOTTSCHALK, H., LIPPERT, M. and ROTTMANN, M. (2020). A Convenient Infinite Dimensional Framework for Generative Adversarial Learning.

- [3] BELOMESTNY, D. and SPOKOINY, V. (2007). Spatial aggregation of local likelihood estimates with applications to classification. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 2287–2311. MR2363972
- [4] BIAU, G., SANGNIER, M. and TANIELIAN, U. (2020). Some Theoretical Insights into Wasserstein GANs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.02682*.
- [5] BIAU, G., CADRE, B., SANGNIER, M. and TANIELIAN, U. (2020). Some theoretical properties of GANs. *Annals of Statistics* **48** 1539–1566.
- [6] BOUCHERON, S., LUGOSI, G. and BOUSQUET, O. (2004). *Concentration Inequalities In Advanced Lectures on Machine Learning: ML Summer Schools 2003, Canberra, Australia, February 2 - 14, 2003, Tübingen, Germany, August 4 - 16, 2003, Revised Lectures* 208–240. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [7] BRENIER, Y. (1991). Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **44** 375–417. MR1100809
- [8] BUNEA, F., TSYBAKOV, A. and WEGKAMP, M. (2007). Sparse Density Estimation with l_1 Penalties. In *COLT*.
- [9] BUTUCEA, C., DELMAS, J.-F., DUTFOY, A. and FISCHER, R. (2017). Optimal exponential bounds for aggregation of estimators for the Kullback-Leibler loss. *Electron. J. Stat.* **11** 2258–2294. MR3654825
- [10] CAFFARELLI, L. A. (1991). Some regularity properties of solutions of Monge Ampère equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **44** 965–969. MR1127042
- [11] CAFFARELLI, L. A. (1992a). Boundary regularity of maps with convex potentials. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **45** 1141–1151. MR1177479
- [12] CAFFARELLI, L. A. (1992b). The regularity of mappings with a convex potential. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **5** 99–104. MR1124980
- [13] CAFFARELLI, L. A. (1996). Boundary regularity of maps with convex potentials. II. *Ann. of Math.* **144** 453–496. MR1426885
- [14] DALALYAN, A. and SEBBAR, M. (2017). Optimal Kullback-Leibler Aggregation in Mixture Density Estimation by Maximum Likelihood. *arXiv: Statistics Theory*.
- [15] DASGUPTA, S. and KPOTUFE, S. (2014). Optimal rates for k-NN density and mode estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (Z. GHAHRAMANI, M. WELLING, C. CORTES, N. LAWRENCE and K. Q. WEINBERGER, eds.) **27**. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [16] DONOHO, D. L., JOHNSTONE, I. M., KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (1996). Density estimation by wavelet thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics* **24** 508 – 539.
- [17] DZIUGAITE, G. K., ROY, D. M. and GHAHRAMANI, Z. (2015). Training generative neural networks via maximum mean discrepancy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.03906*.
- [18] FEIZI, S., FARNIA, F., GINART, T. and TSE, D. (2020). Understanding GANs in the LQG Setting: Formulation, Generalization and Stability. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*.
- [19] GILL, R. D. and LEVIT, B. Y. (1995). Applications of the Van Trees inequality: a Bayesian Cramér-Rao bound. *Bernoulli* **1** 59–79. MR1354456

- [20] GOODFELLOW, I., POUGET-ABADIE, J., MIRZA, M., XU, B., WARDE-FARLEY, D., OZAIR, S., COURVILLE, A. and BENGIO, Y. (2014). Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2672–2680.
- [21] KIM, H., GARRIDO, P., TEWARI, A., XU, W., THIES, J., NIESSNER, M., PÉREZ, P., RICHARDT, C., ZOLLHÖFER, M. and THEOBALT, C. (2018). Deep Video Portraits. *ACM Trans. Graph.* **37**.
- [22] L VAN TREES, H. (1968). *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory, Part 1* **1**.
- [23] LEDIG, C., THEIS, L., HUSZAR, F., CABALLERO, J., CUNNINGHAM, A., ACOSTA, A., AITKEN, A., TEJANI, A., TOTZ, J., WANG, Z. and SHI, W. (2017). Photo-Realistic Single Image Super-Resolution Using a Generative Adversarial Network. *CVPR, 2017* 105-114.
- [24] LIANG, T. (2021). How Well Generative Adversarial Networks Learn Distributions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **22** 1-41.
- [25] LUISE, G., PONTIL, M. and CILIBERTO, C. (2020). Generalization Properties of Optimal Transport GANs with Latent Distribution Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14641*.
- [26] McDONALD, D. (2017). Minimax Density Estimation for Growing Dimension. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* 194–203.
- [27] NOWOZIN, S., CSEKE, B. and TOMIOKA, R. (2016). f-gan: Training generative neural samplers using variational divergence minimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems* 271–279.
- [28] POLZEHL, J. and SPOKOINY, V. (2006). Propagation-separation approach for local likelihood estimation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **135** 335–362. MR2240690
- [29] RAKHLIN, ALEXANDER, PANCHENKO, DMITRY and MUKHERJEE, SAYAN (2005). Risk bounds for mixture density estimation. *ESAIM: PS* **9** 220-229.
- [30] RIGOLLET, P. (2012). Kullback-Leibler aggregation and misspecified generalized linear models. *Ann. Statist.* **40** 639–665. MR2933661
- [31] RIGOLLET, P. and TSYBAKOV, A. (2006). Linear and convex aggregation of density estimators. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **16** 260-280.
- [32] SCHMIDT-HIEBER, J. (2020). Nonparametric regression using deep neural networks with ReLU activation function. *Ann. Statist.* **48** 1875–1897.
- [33] SCHREUDER, N., BRUNEL, V.-E. and DALALYAN, A. (2020). Statistical guarantees for generative models without domination.
- [34] SCHUMAKER, L. L. (2007). *Spline functions basic theory*, 3rd ed. ed. *Cambridge mathematical library*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [35] TSYBAKOV, A. B. (2008). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [36] UPPAL, A., SINGH, S. and POZOS, B. (2019). Nonparametric Density Estimation: Convergence Rates for GANs under Besov IPM Losses. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32* 9089–9100. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [37] ZHAO, J., MATHIEU, M. and LECUN, Y. (2016). Energy-based generative adversarial network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03126*.

Appendix A: Properties of smooth maps of random elements with smooth densities

Lemma 3. Assume **AG**. Then, for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$ and any $g \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\min} \leq \mathfrak{p}_g(x) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max},$$

where

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\min} = \Lambda^{-d}, \quad \mathfrak{p}_{\max} = \Lambda^d. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Similarly, Assumption **Ap*** yields that

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\min} \leq \mathfrak{p}^*(x) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathsf{X}.$$

Proof. Fix any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $x \in \mathsf{X}$. Assumption **AG** implies that

$$\Lambda^{-d} = \sqrt{\det(\Lambda^{-2}\mathbf{I}_{d \times d})} \leq \sqrt{\det(\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))^\top \nabla g(g^{-1}(x)))} \leq \sqrt{\det(\Lambda^2\mathbf{I}_{d \times d})} = \Lambda^d.$$

Then the equality

$$\mathfrak{p}_g(x) = |\det \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))|^{-1}$$

yields

$$\Lambda^{-d} \leq \mathfrak{p}_g(x) \leq \Lambda^d.$$

Similarly, **Ap*** implies $\Lambda^{-d} \leq \mathfrak{p}^*(x) \leq \Lambda^d$ for all $x \in \mathsf{X}$. \square

Lemma 4. Assume **AG** (respectively, **Ap***). Then, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, the density \mathfrak{p}_g (resp. \mathfrak{p}^*) is Lipschitz, that is, for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathsf{X}$, it holds that

$$|\mathfrak{p}_g(x_1) - \mathfrak{p}_g(x_2)| \leq \mathbf{L}_1 \|x_1 - x_2\| \quad (\text{respectively, } |\mathfrak{p}^*(x_1) - \mathfrak{p}^*(x_2)| \leq \mathbf{L}_1 \|x_1 - x_2\|),$$

with

$$\mathbf{L}_1 = \Lambda^{3d+1} d^{2+d/2} (H_{\mathcal{G}} \vee H^*). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Proof. Let $y_1 = g^{-1}(x_1), y_2 = g^{-1}(x_2)$. Then $\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \Lambda \|x_1 - x_2\|$ and

$$|\mathfrak{p}_g(x_1) - \mathfrak{p}_g(x_2)| = |\det[\nabla g(y_1)]^{-1} - \det[\nabla g(y_2)]^{-1}|.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\det[\nabla g(y_1)]^{-1} - \det[\nabla g(y_2)]^{-1}| &\leq \det[\nabla g(y_1)]^{-2} |\det \nabla g(y_1) - \det \nabla g(y_2)| \\ &\leq \Lambda^{2d} |\det \nabla g(y_1) - \det \nabla g(y_2)|. \end{aligned}$$

Next, since for any $d \times d$ matrices A and B it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\det A - \det B| &\leq \|A - B\|_{\mathbb{F}} \frac{\|A\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d - \|B\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d}{\|A\|_{\mathbb{F}} - \|B\|_{\mathbb{F}}} \\ &\leq d \max\{\|A\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d, \|B\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d\} \|A - B\|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

and for all $y \in \mathsf{Y}$

$$\|\nabla g(y)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = \text{Tr}(\nabla g(y)^\top \nabla g(y)) \leq \Lambda^2 d,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\det \nabla g(y_1) - \det \nabla g(y_2)| &\leq \Lambda^d d^{1+d/2} \|\nabla g(y_1) - \nabla g(y_2)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \Lambda^d d^{2+d/2} H_{\mathcal{G}} \|y_1 - y_2\| \\ &\leq \Lambda^{d+1} d^{2+d/2} H_{\mathcal{G}} \|x_1 - x_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{X}$,

$$|\mathfrak{p}_g(x_1) - \mathfrak{p}_g(x_2)| \leq \Lambda^{3d+1} d^{2+d/2} H_{\mathcal{G}} \|x_1 - x_2\|,$$

and the first claim of the lemma follows. The proof of the inequality

$$|\mathfrak{p}^*(x_1) - \mathfrak{p}^*(x_2)| \leq \Lambda^{3d+1} d^{2+d/2} H^* \|x_1 - x_2\|$$

is absolutely similar. \square

Lemma 5. Under **AG**, for any $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ it holds that

$$\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}_f\|_{L_{\infty}(\mathbb{X})} \leq \mathbf{L}_2 \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{Y})},$$

where

$$\mathbf{L}_2 = d^{2+d/2} \Lambda^{3d} (1 + H_{\mathcal{G}} \Lambda \sqrt{d}). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Proof. Due to **AG**, $\nabla g(y)$ is non-degenerate for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $y \in \mathbb{Y}$. Thus, $\det \nabla g$ does not change its sign, and without loss of generality, we can assume that $\det \nabla f(f^{-1}(x))$ and $\det \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))$ are positive for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Let $u = f^{-1}(x) \in \mathbb{Y}$. Then $x = f(u)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^{-1}(x) - g^{-1}(x)\| &= \|f^{-1}(f(u)) - g^{-1}(f(u))\| = \|g^{-1}(g(u)) - g^{-1}(f(u))\| \\ &\leq \Lambda \|f(u) - g(u)\| \leq \Lambda \sqrt{d} \|f - g\|_{L_{\infty}(\mathbb{Y})} \end{aligned}$$

by the mean value theorem for vector valued functions. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{p}_f(x) - \mathfrak{p}_g(x)| &= |\det[\nabla f(f^{-1}(x))]^{-1} - \det[\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))]^{-1}| \\ &\leq \min \{ \det[\nabla f(f^{-1}(x))], \det[\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))] \}^{-2} \\ &\quad \cdot |\det \nabla f(f^{-1}(x)) - \det \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))| \\ &\leq \Lambda^{2d} |\det \nabla f(f^{-1}(x)) - \det \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))|. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that, due to **AG**,

$$\begin{aligned} \det[\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))]^{-1} &= \sqrt{\det([\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))]^{-\top} [\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))]^{-1})} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\det(\Lambda^2 \mathbf{I}_{d \times d})} = \Lambda^d, \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly, $\det[\nabla f(f^{-1}(x))]^{-1} \leq \Lambda^d$. Next, since for any $d \times d$ matrices A and B it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\det A - \det B| &\leq \|A - B\|_{\mathbb{F}} \frac{\|A\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d - \|B\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d}{\|A\|_{\mathbb{F}} - \|B\|_{\mathbb{F}}} \\ &\leq d \max\{\|A\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d, \|B\|_{\mathbb{F}}^d\} \|A - B\|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla f(f^{-1}(x))\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &= \text{Tr}(\nabla f(f^{-1}(x))^\top \nabla f(f^{-1}(x))) \leq \Lambda^2 d, \\ \|\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &= \text{Tr}(\nabla g(g^{-1}(x))^\top \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))) \leq \Lambda^2 d,\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\det \nabla f(f^{-1}(x)) - \det \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))| &\leq \Lambda^d d^{1+d/2} \|\nabla f(f^{-1}(x)) - \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \Lambda^d d^{1+d/2} \|\nabla f(f^{-1}(x)) - \nabla g(f^{-1}(x))\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\quad + \Lambda^d d^{1+d/2} \|\nabla g(f^{-1}(x)) - \nabla g(g^{-1}(x))\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \Lambda^d d^{2+d/2} \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})} \\ &\quad + \Lambda^d d^{2+d/2} H_{\mathcal{G}} \|f^{-1}(x) - g^{-1}(x)\| \\ &\leq \Lambda^d d^{2+d/2} (1 + H_{\mathcal{G}} \Lambda \sqrt{d}) \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|\mathfrak{p}_f - \mathfrak{p}_g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} \leq d^{2+d/2} \Lambda^{3d} (1 + H_{\mathcal{G}} \Lambda \sqrt{d}) \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}.$$

□

Appendix B: Auxiliary results

Lemma 6. *Let*

$$\mathcal{K}(u, v) = u \log \frac{u}{v} + (1 - u) \log \frac{1 - u}{1 - v}, \quad u, v \in (0, 1).$$

For any two functions $D_1, D_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [D_{\min}, D_{\max}]$, $0 < D_{\min} \leq D_{\max} < 1$, and any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, it holds that

$$\varkappa_{\min}(D_1(x) - D_2(x))^2 \leq \mathcal{K}(D_1(x), D_2(x)) \leq \varkappa_{\max}(D_1(x) - D_2(x))^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\varkappa_{\min} &= 8(D_{\min}(1 - D_{\min}) \wedge D_{\max}(1 - D_{\max})), \\ \varkappa_{\max} &= \frac{1}{8(D_{\min}(1 - D_{\min}) \wedge D_{\max}(1 - D_{\max}))^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix arbitrary $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and denote

$$\nu_1 = \log \frac{D_1(x)}{1 - D_1(x)}, \quad \nu_2 = \log \frac{D_2(x)}{1 - D_2(x)}.$$

Let $\Psi(\nu) = \log(1 + e^\nu)$. Then $\Psi(\nu_1) = -\log(1 - D_1(x))$, $\Psi(\nu_2) = -\log(1 - D_2(x))$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}(D_1(x), D_2(x)) &= D_1(x) \left(\log \frac{D_1(x)}{1 - D_1(x)} - \log \frac{D_2(x)}{1 - D_2(x)} \right) + \log \frac{1 - D_1(x)}{1 - D_2(x)} \\ &= \frac{e^{\nu_1}}{1 + e^{\nu_1}} (\nu_1 - \nu_2) - \Psi(\nu_1) + \Psi(\nu_2) = \Psi'(\nu_1) (\nu_1 - \nu_2) - \Psi(\nu_1) + \Psi(\nu_2).\end{aligned}$$

The Lagrange theorem implies that, for some ξ between ν_1 and ν_2 ,

$$\mathcal{K}(D_1(x), D_2(x)) = \frac{\Psi''(\xi)}{2}(\nu_1 - \nu_2)^2.$$

On the other hand, there exists $\zeta \in (\nu_1, \nu_2)$ (or $\zeta \in (\nu_2, \nu_1)$ if $\nu_2 < \nu_1$) such that

$$D_1(x) - D_2(x) = \Psi'(\nu_1) - \Psi'(\nu_2) = \Psi''(\zeta)(\nu_1 - \nu_2).$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{K}(D_1(x), D_2(x)) = \frac{\Psi''(\xi)}{2(\Psi''(\zeta))^2} (D_1(x) - D_2(x))^2. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

For any ν from the interval (ν_1, ν_2) (or (ν_2, ν_1)), it holds that

$$\Psi''(\nu) = \frac{e^\nu}{(1+e^\nu)^2} = \frac{e^\nu}{1+e^\nu} \left(1 - \frac{e^\nu}{1+e^\nu}\right) \in \left[D_{\min}(1 - D_{\min}) \wedge D_{\max}(1 - D_{\max}), \frac{1}{4} \right],$$

where we used the fact that the function $f(x) = x(1-x)$ is concave and achieves its minimum at one of the boundary points of the segment. Substituting $\Psi''(\xi)$ and $\Psi''(\zeta)$ in (B.1) by their upper and lower bounds, we obtain

$$\varkappa_{\min}(D_1(x) - D_2(x))^2 \leq \mathcal{K}(D_1(x), D_2(x)) \leq \varkappa_{\max}(D_1(x) - D_2(x))^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa_{\min} &= 8(D_{\min}(1 - D_{\min}) \wedge D_{\max}(1 - D_{\max})), \\ \varkappa_{\max} &= \frac{1}{8(D_{\min}(1 - D_{\min}) \wedge D_{\max}(1 - D_{\max}))^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7. *Grant Assumptions AD and AG. Let $D_1 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [D_{\min}, D_{\max}]$ be any function and $D_2 \in \mathcal{D}$. Then, for any $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_n(g_1, D_1) - L(g_1, D_1) - L_n(g_2, D_2) + L(g_2, D_2)| \\ & \leq \frac{4 \|D_1 - D_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{(1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}} + \frac{2dH_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_1 - g_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{1 - D_{\max}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_n(g_1, D_1) - L(g_1, D_1) - L_n(g_2, D_2) + L(g_2, D_2)| \\ & |L_n(g_1, D_1) - L_n(g_2, D_2)| + |L(g_1, D_1) - L(g_2, D_2)|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

To bound the first term, we note that

$$L_n(g_1, D_1) - L_n(g_2, D_2) =: R_{1,n} + R_{2,n},$$

where we have introduced the quantities

$$R_{1,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{D_1(X_i)}{D_2(X_i)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R_{2,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 - D_1(g_1(Y_i))) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 - D_2(g_2(Y_i))) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(\frac{1 - D_1(g_1(Y_i))}{1 - D_2(g_1(Y_i))}\right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(\frac{1 - D_2(g_2(Y_i))}{1 - D_2(g_1(Y_i))}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the Lagrange theorem,

$$|R_{1,n}| \leq \frac{\|D_1 - D_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{D_{\min}}$$

and

$$|R_{2,n}| \leq \frac{\|D_1 - D_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{1 - D_{\max}} + \frac{dH_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_1 - g_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{1 - D_{\max}}.$$

Here we used the fact that, due to [AD](#),

$$\|D_2 \circ g_2 - D_2 \circ g_1\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})} \leq dH_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_2 - g_1\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}.$$

As a result,

$$|L_n(g_1, D_1) - L_n(g_2, D_2)| \leq \frac{2 \|D_1 - D_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{(1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}} + \frac{dH_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_1 - g_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{1 - D_{\max}}.$$

Similarly,

$$|L(g_1, D_1) - L(g_2, D_2)| \leq \frac{2 \|D_1 - D_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{(1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}} + \frac{dH_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_1 - g_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{1 - D_{\max}}.$$

and the statement follows from [\(B.2\)](#). □

Lemma 8. *Under assumptions [AG](#), [AD](#), and [Ap*](#), for any $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &|L_n(g_1, D_{g_1}^*) - L(g_1, D_{g_1}^*) - L_n(g_2, D_{g_2}^*) + L(g_2, D_{g_2}^*)| \\ &\leq \frac{4 \|D_{g_1}^* - D_{g_2}^*\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{(1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}} + \frac{4\mathbb{L}_1 \|g_1 - g_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{(1 - D_{\max})p_{\min}}, \end{aligned}$$

with the constant \mathbb{L}_1 defined in [\(A.2\)](#).

Proof. Following the lines of [Lemma 7](#), it is enough to bound

$$L_n(g_1, D_{g_1}^*) - L_n(g_2, D_{g_2}^*) =: R_{1,n} + R_{2,n},$$

where

$$R_{1,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{D_{g_1}^*(X_i)}{D_{g_2}^*(X_i)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R_{2,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 - D_{g_1}^*(g_1(Y_i))) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 - D_{g_2}^*(g_2(Y_i))) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(\frac{1 - D_{g_1}^*(g_1(Y_i))}{1 - D_{g_2}^*(g_1(Y_i))}\right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(\frac{1 - D_{g_2}^*(g_2(Y_i))}{1 - D_{g_2}^*(g_1(Y_i))}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

Similarly to Lemma 7, we have

$$|\log D_{g_1}^*(X_i) - \log D_{g_2}^*(X_i)| \leq \frac{\|D_{g_1}^* - D_{g_2}^*\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{D_{\min}}$$

and

$$|\log(1 - D_{g_1}^*(g_1(Y_i))) - \log(1 - D_{g_2}^*(g_1(Y_i)))| \leq \frac{\|D_{g_1}^* - D_{g_2}^*\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{1 - D_{\max}}$$

for all i from 1 to n . To bound the second term in the right-hand side of (B.3), note that, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, it holds that

$$\left| \log \frac{1 - D_{g_2}^*(g_1(Y_i))}{1 - D_{g_2}^*(g_2(Y_i))} \right| \leq \frac{|D_{g_2}^*(g_1(Y_i)) - D_{g_2}^*(g_2(Y_i))|}{1 - D_{\max}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |D_{g_2}^*(g_1(Y_i)) - D_{g_2}^*(g_2(Y_i))| \\ &= \left| \frac{\mathbf{p}^*(g_1(Y_i))}{\mathbf{p}^*(g_1(Y_i)) + \mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_1(Y_i))} - \frac{\mathbf{p}^*(g_2(Y_i))}{\mathbf{p}^*(g_2(Y_i)) + \mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_2(Y_i))} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbf{p}^*(g_1(Y_i)) |\mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_1(Y_i)) - \mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_2(Y_i))|}{(\mathbf{p}^*(g_1(Y_i)) + \mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_1(Y_i))) (\mathbf{p}^*(g_2(Y_i)) + \mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_2(Y_i)))} \\ &+ \frac{\mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_1(Y_i)) |\mathbf{p}^*(g_1(Y_i)) - \mathbf{p}^*(g_2(Y_i))|}{(\mathbf{p}^*(g_1(Y_i)) + \mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_1(Y_i))) (\mathbf{p}^*(g_2(Y_i)) + \mathbf{p}_{g_2}(g_2(Y_i)))} \\ &\leq \frac{2L_1 \|g_1 - g_2\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 4. \square

Lemma 9. Assume AG. For any functions $D_1, D_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [D_{\min}, D_{\max}]$, $0 < D_{\min} \leq D_{\max} < 1$, and any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_n(g_1, D_1) - L(g_1, D_1) - L_n(g_2, D_2) + L(g_2, D_2)| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|D_1 - D_2\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}^*)}^2 \log(2/\delta)}{nD_{\min}^2}} + \frac{2\log(D_{\max}/D_{\min}) \log(2/\delta)}{3n} \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{2\|D_1 - D_2\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}_g)}^2 \log(2/\delta)}{n(1 - D_{\max})^2}} + \frac{2\log((1 - D_{\min})/(1 - D_{\max})) \log(2/\delta)}{3n}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{1,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{D_1(X_i)}{D_2(X_i)} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{D_1(X_i)}{D_2(X_i)} \right] \\ \mathcal{E}_{2,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{1 - D_1(g(Y_i))}{1 - D_2(g(Y_i))} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{1 - D_1(g(Y_i))}{1 - D_2(g(Y_i))} \right] \end{aligned}$$

The Bernstein inequality yields that, for any fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_{1,n}| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{E} \log^2 \left[\frac{D_1(X)}{D_2(X)} \right] \log(2/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2\log(D_{\max}/D_{\min}) \log(2/\delta)}{3n}$$

and

$$|\mathcal{E}_{2,n}| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{E} \log^2 \left[\frac{1-D_1(g(Y))}{1-D_2(g(Y))} \right] \log(2/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2 \log((1-D_{\min})/(1-D_{\max})) \log(2/\delta)}{3n}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. The assertion of the lemma follows from the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |\log D_1(X) - \log D_2(X)| &\leq \frac{|D_1(X) - D_2(X)|}{D_{\min}}, \\ |\log(1 - D_1(X)) - \log(1 - D_2(X))| &\leq \frac{|D_1(X) - D_2(X)|}{1 - D_{\max}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 10. *Under Assumptions \mathbf{Ap}^* and \mathbf{AG} , for any fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &|L_n(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D_g^*)| \\ &\leq \frac{2 \log(1 + \mathfrak{p}_{\max}/\mathfrak{p}_{\min})}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}} \|\mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{n}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2 \log(1 + \mathfrak{p}_{\max}/\mathfrak{p}_{\min})}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}} \|\mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{n}} \\ &\quad + \frac{C_D \log(2/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathfrak{p}_{\min} is given by (A.1) and constant C_D is equal to

$$C_D = \frac{2}{3} \log\left(\frac{1}{2(D_{\min} \vee D_{\max})}\right) + \frac{2}{3} \log\left(\frac{1}{2(1 - D_{\max})} \vee 2(1 - D_{\min})\right). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Proof. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{1,n} &= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \{2D_g^*(X_i)\} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \{2D_g^*(X_i)\} \right], \\ \mathcal{E}_{2,n} &= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \{2(1 - D_g^*(g(Y_i)))\} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \{2(1 - D_g^*(g(Y_i)))\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Bernstein's inequality, we obtain that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it simultaneously holds

$$|\mathcal{E}_{1,n}| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{E}[\log^2\{2D_g^*(X)\}] \log(2/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2(\log\{1/(2D_{\min})\} \vee \log 2D_{\max}) \log(2/\delta)}{3n},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}_{2,n}| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{E}[\log^2\{2(1 - D_g^*(g(Y)))\}] \log(2/\delta)}{n}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\log\{1/(2(1 - D_{\max}))\} \vee \log\{2(1 - D_{\min})\}) \log(2/\delta)}{3n}. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\log^2\{2D_g^*(X)\}] &= \int \log^2\left(\frac{2\mathfrak{p}^*(x)}{\mathfrak{p}^*(x) + \mathfrak{p}_g(x)}\right) \mathfrak{p}^*(x) \, dx \\
&\leq 4 \log^2\left(1 + \frac{\mathfrak{p}_{\max}}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}}\right) \int \frac{(\mathfrak{p}^*(x) - \mathfrak{p}_g(x))^2}{(\mathfrak{p}^*(x) + \mathfrak{p}_g(x))^2} \mathfrak{p}^*(x) \, dx \\
&\leq \frac{4 \log^2(1 + \mathfrak{p}_{\max}/\mathfrak{p}_{\min})}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2} \int (\mathfrak{p}^*(x) - \mathfrak{p}_g(x))^2 \mathfrak{p}^*(x) \, dx \\
&= \frac{4 \log^2(1 + \mathfrak{p}_{\max}/\mathfrak{p}_{\min})}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2} \|\mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\log^2\{2(1 - D_g^*(g(Y)))\}] &= \int \log^2\left(\frac{2\mathfrak{p}_g(x)}{\mathfrak{p}^*(x) + \mathfrak{p}_g(x)}\right) \mathfrak{p}_g(x) \, dx \\
&\leq \frac{4 \log^2(1 + \mathfrak{p}_{\max}/\mathfrak{p}_{\min})}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2} \|\mathfrak{p}^* - \mathfrak{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 11. Under *AG*, for any $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds that

$$\|D_{g_1}^* - D_{g_2}^*\|_{L_\infty(X)} \leq \frac{L_2}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}} \|g_1 - g_2\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(Y)},$$

where \mathfrak{p}_{\min} and L_2 are defined in Lemma 3 and Lemma 5, respectively.

Proof. Note that, due to Lemma 3, $\mathfrak{p}_{\min} \leq \mathfrak{p}_{g_1}(x) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{\min} \leq \mathfrak{p}_{g_2}(x) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}$ for all $x \in X$. Using the expression (4.2) for the optimal discriminator D_g^* , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D_{g_1}^* - D_{g_2}^*\|_{L_\infty(X)} &= \max_{x \in X} \left| \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*(x)(\mathfrak{p}_{g_1}(x) - \mathfrak{p}_{g_2}(x))}{(\mathfrak{p}^*(x) + \mathfrak{p}_{g_1}(x))(\mathfrak{p}^*(x) + \mathfrak{p}_{g_2}(x))} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_{g_1} - \mathfrak{p}_{g_2}\|_{L_\infty(Y)}}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}} \\
&\leq \frac{L_2}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}} \|g_1 - g_2\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(Y)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 5. □

Lemma 12. Under Assumption *AG*, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds that

$$\frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}^2} \leq \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*) \leq \frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and

$$\frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}^2} \leq \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*) \leq \frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where \mathfrak{p}_{\min} and \mathfrak{p}_{\max} are defined in (A.1). Moreover, if *Ap** holds, then

$$\text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}^*) \geq \frac{\|\mathfrak{p} - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(X)}^2}{4\mathfrak{p}_{\max}} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

for any density \mathfrak{p} .

Proof. Consider $f : [\mathfrak{p}_{\min}, \mathfrak{p}_{\max}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$f(u) = \frac{u}{2} \log \frac{2u}{u_0 + u} + \frac{u_0}{2} \log \frac{2u_0}{u_0 + u},$$

where $u_0 \in [\mathfrak{p}_{\min}, \mathfrak{p}_{\max}]$ is fixed. Direct calculations yield

$$f'(u) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{2u}{u_0 + u}, \quad f''(u) = \frac{u_0}{2u(u_0 + u)} \in \left[\frac{u_0}{4\mathfrak{p}_{\max}^2}, \frac{u_0}{4\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2} \right].$$

Then, taking into account that $f(u_0) = f'(u_0) = 0$ and using Taylor's expansion, we obtain

$$\frac{u_0(u - u_0)^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}^2} \leq f(u) \leq \frac{u_0(u - u_0)^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2}.$$

We apply this inequality to

$$\text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*) = \frac{1}{2} \int \left(\mathfrak{p}_g(x) \log \frac{2\mathfrak{p}_g(x)}{\mathfrak{p}_g(x) + \mathfrak{p}^*(x)} + \mathfrak{p}^*(x) \log \frac{2\mathfrak{p}^*(x)}{\mathfrak{p}_g(x) + \mathfrak{p}^*(x)} \right) dx$$

with $u = \mathfrak{p}_g(x)$ and $u_0 = \mathfrak{p}^*(x)$. We obtain

$$\frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}^2} \leq \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*) \leq \frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2}.$$

Similarly, if we take $u = \mathfrak{p}^*(x)$ and $u_0 = \mathfrak{p}_g(x)$ then

$$\frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}^2} \leq \text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*) \leq \frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_g - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\min}^2}.$$

Thus, the proof of (B.5) and (B.6) is finished. It only remains to derive (B.7).

Consider a function $h : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$h(u, v) = \frac{u}{2} \log \frac{2u}{u + v} + \frac{v}{2} \log \frac{2v}{u + v}.$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\frac{\partial h(u, v)}{\partial u} = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{2u}{u + v}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 h(u, v)}{\partial u^2} = \frac{v}{2u(u + v)},$$

and

$$\frac{\partial h(u, v)}{\partial v} = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{2v}{u + v}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 h(u, v)}{\partial v^2} = \frac{u}{2v(u + v)}.$$

If $0 \leq u \leq v \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}$, then

$$\frac{\partial^2 h(u, v)}{\partial u^2} = \frac{v}{2u(u + v)} \geq \frac{v}{4v^2} \geq \frac{1}{4\mathfrak{p}_{\max}}.$$

Taylor's expansion and the equalities $h(v, v) = \frac{\partial h(u, v)}{\partial u} \Big|_{u=v} = 0$ imply that

$$h(u, v) \geq \frac{(u - v)^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}} \quad \text{for all } u \leq v \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}.$$

If $u \geq v > 0$, $v \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}$, we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 h(u, v)}{\partial v^2} = \frac{u}{2v(u + v)} \geq \frac{v}{4v^2} \geq \frac{1}{4\mathfrak{p}_{\max}}.$$

Again, using Taylor's expansion and the equalities $h(u, u) = \frac{\partial h(u, v)}{\partial v} \Big|_{v=u} = 0$, we obtain

$$h(u, v) \geq \frac{(u - v)^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}} \quad \text{for all } u \geq v, v \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}.$$

Hence,

$$h(u, v) \geq \frac{(u - v)^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}} \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0, v \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\max}.$$

Finally, (B.7) follows from the inequality

$$\text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}^*) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} h(\mathfrak{p}(x), \mathfrak{p}^*(x)) dx \geq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{(\mathfrak{p}(x) - \mathfrak{p}^*(x))^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}} dx = \frac{\|\mathfrak{p} - \mathfrak{p}^*\|_{L_2(\mathcal{X})}^2}{8\mathfrak{p}_{\max}}.$$

□

Appendix C: Proof of Proposition 1 and Proposition 2

Recall that $L_n(g, D)$ is an empirical counterpart of

$$L(g, D) = \frac{1}{2} \int \log D(x) \mathfrak{p}^*(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int \log(1 - D(z)) \mathfrak{p}_g(z) dz, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

and, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ any $D \in \mathcal{D}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D) &= \frac{1}{2} \int \log \frac{D_g^*(x)}{D(x)} \mathfrak{p}^*(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int \log \frac{1 - D_g^*(x)}{1 - D(x)} \mathfrak{p}_g(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{K}(D_g^*(x), D(x)) \frac{\mathfrak{p}_g(x) + \mathfrak{p}^*(x)}{2} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where for any $u, v \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathcal{K}(u, v) = u \log \frac{u}{v} + (1 - u) \log \frac{1 - u}{1 - v}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

We also introduce the quantity

$$\Delta_n(g, D) = L_n(g, D) - L(g, D).$$

C.1. Proof of Proposition 1

Proposition 1. Assume *AG*, *AD*, and *Ap**. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let \mathcal{G}_ε be a minimal ε -net of the set \mathcal{G} with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the following inequality holds simultaneously for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} |L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g, D_g^*)| &\leq C_{C.4a} \varepsilon + C_{C.4b} \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} \\ &+ C_{C.4c} \sqrt{\frac{(\text{JS}(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*) \wedge \text{JS}_n(\mathfrak{p}_g, \mathfrak{p}^*)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.4d} \frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) = L_n(g, D_g^*) + \log 2$ and the constants are given by

$$C_{C.4a} = \frac{6(\mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_1)}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}((1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min})}, \quad (\text{C.4a})$$

$$C_{C.4b} = \frac{6\sqrt{2}(\mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_1) \log(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min})}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}}, \quad (\text{C.4b})$$

$$C_{C.4c} = \frac{16\mathbf{p}_{\max} \log(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min})}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}}, \quad (\text{C.4c})$$

$$C_{C.4d} = \left(\frac{3C_D}{2} + \frac{384\mathbf{p}_{\max}^2 \log^2(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min})}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}^2} \right), \quad (\text{C.4d})$$

$$\mathbf{L}_1 = \Lambda^{3d+1} d^{2+d/2} (H_G \vee H^*), \quad (\text{C.4e})$$

$$\mathbf{L}_2 = d^{2+d/2} \Lambda^{3d} (1 + H_G \Lambda \sqrt{d}). \quad (\text{C.4f})$$

Here \mathbf{p}_{\min} and \mathbf{p}_{\max} are defined in Lemma 3, and C_D is defined in (B.4).

Proof. For arbitrary $g \in \mathcal{G}$ let g_ε be an element of \mathcal{G}_ε , such that $\|g - g_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})} \leq \varepsilon$. Using Lemma 5, Lemma 8, and Lemma 11, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g, D_g^*)| &\leq |L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g, D_g^*) - L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) + L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)| \\ &\quad + |L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)| \\ &\leq \frac{4 \|D_g^* - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{(1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}} + \frac{4\mathbf{L}_1 \|g - g_\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{(1 - D_{\max})\mathbf{p}_{\min}} \\ &\quad + |L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)| \\ &\leq \frac{4(\mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_1)\varepsilon}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}((1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min})} \\ &\quad + |L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)|. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Lemma 10 and the union bound, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)| &\leq (\|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}^*)} + \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon})}) \\ &\quad \cdot \sqrt{\frac{8 \log^2(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min}) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n\mathbf{p}_{\min}^2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{C_D \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

with the constant C_D defined in (B.4). Minkowski's inequality and Lemma 5 imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}^*)} &\leq \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}^*)} + \|\mathbf{p}_g - \mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon}\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}^*)} + \mathbf{L}_2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon}\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon})} &\leq \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}_g)} + \|\mathbf{p}^* \circ g - \mathbf{p}^* \circ g_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\phi)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{p}_g \circ g - \mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon} \circ g\|_{L_2(\phi)} + \|\mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon} \circ g - \mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon} \circ g_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\phi)} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}_g)} + (2\mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2)\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 12, we get

$$\|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}^*)} \leq \mathbf{p}_{\max} \sqrt{8 \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*)}, \quad \|\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}_g\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}_g)} \leq \mathbf{p}_{\max} \sqrt{8 \text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*)}.$$

Hence, from (C.5) with the union bound, it follows that with probability at least $1 - |\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon|\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} |L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g, D_g^*)| &\leq \frac{4(\mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_1)\varepsilon}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}((1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min})} \\ &+ \frac{4(\mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_1) \log(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min})\varepsilon}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{n}} \\ &+ \frac{16\mathbf{p}_{\max} \log(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min})}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*) \log(2/\delta)}{n}} \\ &+ \frac{C_D \log(2/\delta)}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Let us denote $a = \sqrt{\text{JS}(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*)}$, $b = \sqrt{\text{JS}_n(\mathbf{p}_g, \mathbf{p}^*)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_1(n) &= \frac{16\mathbf{p}_{\max} \log(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min})}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{n}}, \\ C_2(n) &= \frac{4(\mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_1)\varepsilon}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}((1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min})} + \frac{C_D \log(2/\delta)}{n} \\ &+ \frac{4(\mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_1) \log(1 + \mathbf{p}_{\max}/\mathbf{p}_{\min})\varepsilon}{\mathbf{p}_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

we rewrite (C.6) as

$$|a^2 - b^2| \leq C_1(n)a + C_2(n). \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Solving the quadratic inequality with respect to a , we obtain

$$a \leq \frac{C_1(n) + \sqrt{C_1(n)^2 + 4(b^2 + C_2(n))}}{2} \leq b + C_1(n) + \sqrt{C_2(n)}.$$

Hence, (C.7) with Cauchy-Schwartz inequality imply

$$|a^2 - b^2| \leq C_1(n)(b \wedge a) + \frac{3}{2}C_2(n) + \frac{3}{2}C_1(n)^2.$$

Substituting for $a, b, C_1(n)$ and $C_2(n)$ yields the statement of lemma. \square

C.2. Proof of Proposition 2

Proposition 2. Assume $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{p}^*$, $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}$, and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let \mathcal{G}_ε and \mathcal{D}_ε be two finite ε -nets of the sets \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}$, respectively. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following holds simultaneously for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &|L_n(g, D) - L(g, D) - L_n(g, D_g^*) + L(g, D_g^*)| \\ &\leq C_{C.8a}\varepsilon + C_{C.8b} \sqrt{\frac{(L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D)) \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} \\ &+ C_{C.8c}\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}} + C_{C.8d} \frac{\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants are given by

$$C_{C.8a} = \frac{\mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{p}_{\min} + dH_{\mathcal{D}}\mathbf{p}_{\min}}{((1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}) \mathbf{p}_{\min}}, \quad (C.8a)$$

$$C_{C.8b} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{z}_{\min}}(D_{\min} \wedge (1 - D_{\max}))}, \quad (C.8b)$$

$$C_{C.8c} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_{\min} + dH_{\mathcal{D}}\mathbf{p}_{\min} + \mathbf{L}_2}{((1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}) \mathbf{p}_{\min}}, \quad (C.8c)$$

$$C_{C.8d} = \log \left(\frac{D_{\max} \vee (1 - D_{\min})}{D_{\min} \wedge (1 - D_{\max})} \right), \quad (C.8d)$$

$$\mathbf{L}_1 = \Lambda^{3d+1} d^{2+d/2} (H_G \vee H^*), \quad (C.8e)$$

$$\mathbf{L}_2 = d^{2+d/2} \Lambda^{3d} (1 + H_G \Lambda \sqrt{d}). \quad (C.8f)$$

Here \mathbf{p}_{\min} and \mathbf{p}_{\max} are defined in Lemma 3.

Proof. Fix any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$. Let g_ε and D_ε be the elements of \mathcal{G}_ε and \mathcal{D}_ε , respectively, such that $\|g_\varepsilon - g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})} \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|D_\varepsilon - D\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \leq \varepsilon$. Due to the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_n(g, D) - L(g, D) - L_n(g, D_g^*) + L(g, D_g^*)| \\ & \leq |L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) + L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)| \\ & \quad + |L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L_n(g, D) + L(g, D)| \\ & \quad + |L_n(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) + L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)|. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L_n(g, D) + L(g, D)| \\ & \leq \frac{4\|D - D_\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{(1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}} + \frac{2dH_{\mathcal{D}}\|g - g_\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{1 - D_{\max}}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8 and Lemma 11 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_n(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D_g^*) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) + L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)| \\ & \leq \frac{4\|D_g^* - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{(1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}} + \frac{4\mathbf{L}_1\|g - g_\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}}{(1 - D_{\max})\mathbf{p}_{\min}} \\ & \leq \frac{4(\mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2)\|g - g_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}}{((1 - D_{\max}) \wedge D_{\min}) \mathbf{p}_{\min}}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, due to Lemma 9 and the union bound, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L(g_\varepsilon, D_\varepsilon) - L_n(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*) + L(g_\varepsilon, D_{g_\varepsilon}^*)| \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\|D_\varepsilon - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}^*)}^2 \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{nD_{\min}^2}} + \frac{2\log(D_{\max}/D_{\min})\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{3n} \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\frac{2\|D_\varepsilon - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathbf{p}_{g_\varepsilon})}^2 \log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{n(1 - D_{\max})^2}} + \frac{2\log((1 - D_{\min})/(1 - D_{\max}))\log(2|\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon||\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon|/\delta)}{3n} \end{aligned}$$

simultaneously for all $g_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$, $D_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon$. Next, we have

$$\|D_\varepsilon - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)} \leq \|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)} + \|D - D_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)} + \|D_g^* - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)},$$

where, by Lemma 5,

$$\|D_g^* - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)} \leq \left\| \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*}{\mathfrak{p}^* + \mathfrak{p}_g} - \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*}{\mathfrak{p}^* + \mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon}} \right\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \leq \frac{\|\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon} - \mathfrak{p}_g\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}} \leq \frac{\mathbf{L}_2 \|g - g_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})}}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}}.$$

Hence,

$$\|D_g^* - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)} \leq \|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)} + \varepsilon + \frac{\mathbf{L}_2 \varepsilon}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_\varepsilon - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon})} &\leq \|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon})} + \|D - D_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon})} + \|D_g^* - D_{g_\varepsilon}^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon})} \\ &\leq \|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon})} + \varepsilon + \frac{\mathbf{L}_2 \varepsilon}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound $\|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon})}$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_{g_\varepsilon})} &= \|D \circ g_\varepsilon - D_g^* \circ g_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\phi)} \\ &\leq \|D \circ g - D_g^* \circ g\|_{L_2(\phi)} + \|D \circ g_\varepsilon - D \circ g\|_{L_2(\phi)} \\ &\quad + \|D_g^* \circ g - D_g^* \circ g_\varepsilon\|_{L_2(\phi)} \\ &\leq \|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)} + \|D \circ g_\varepsilon - D \circ g\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})} \\ &\quad + \|D_g^* \circ g - D_g^* \circ g_\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})}, \end{aligned}$$

where, due to AD,

$$\|D \circ g_\varepsilon - D \circ g\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})} \leq dH_{\mathcal{D}} \|g_\varepsilon - g\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})} \leq dH_{\mathcal{D}} \varepsilon$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D_g^* \circ g - D_g^* \circ g_\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{Y})} \\ &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left| \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*(g(y))}{\mathfrak{p}^*(g(y)) + \mathfrak{p}_g(g(y))} - \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*(g_\varepsilon(y))}{\mathfrak{p}^*(g_\varepsilon(y)) + \mathfrak{p}_g(g_\varepsilon(y))} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left| \frac{\mathfrak{p}^*(g(y)) |\mathfrak{p}_g(g(y)) - \mathfrak{p}_g(g_\varepsilon(y))| + \mathfrak{p}_g(g(y)) |\mathfrak{p}^*(g(y)) - \mathfrak{p}^*(g_\varepsilon(y))|}{(\mathfrak{p}^*(g(y)) + \mathfrak{p}_g(g(y)))(\mathfrak{p}^*(g_\varepsilon(y)) + \mathfrak{p}_g(g_\varepsilon(y)))} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2\mathbf{L}_1 \varepsilon}{\mathfrak{p}_{\min}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 4. Finally, note that, due to Lemma 6,

$$\|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}^*)}^2 \leq \varkappa_{\min}^{-1} \mathbf{E} \mathcal{K}(D_g^*(X), D(X))$$

and

$$\|D - D_g^*\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{p}_g)}^2 \leq \varkappa_{\min}^{-1} \mathbf{E} \mathcal{K}(D_g^*(g(Y)), D(g(Y))).$$

The equality

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E} \mathcal{K}(D_g^*(X), D(X)) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E} \mathcal{K}(D_g^*(g(Y)), D(g(Y))) = L(g, D_g^*) - L(g, D)$$

completes the proof. \square

Appendix D: Approximation properties of feed-forward deep neural networks with ReQU activations

In this section, we provide a rigorous statement concerning approximation properties of feed-forward deep neural networks with ReQU activation functions.

Proposition 3. *Let $\beta > 2$ and let $p, d, K \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, $f \in \mathcal{H}^\beta([0, 1]^d, H)$, there exists a neural network $h_f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ with ReQU activation function such that*

- for any $\ell \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \beta \rfloor\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - h_f\|_{\mathcal{H}^\ell([0,1]^d)} &\leq \varepsilon(\beta, \ell, K, d, H) \\ &:= \frac{H(\lfloor \beta \rfloor)^{\beta-\ell} d^\beta}{(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - \ell)! K^{\beta-\ell}} + \frac{9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^{2d+\beta} H d^\beta}{K^{\beta-\ell}}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

- h_f belongs to the class

$$\text{NN} \left(4 + 2(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 2) + \lceil \log_2 d \rceil + 1, (d, \mathcal{A}_1, (K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d \mathcal{A}_2, 8(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} H, p) \right),$$

where \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 are given in (D.5) and (D.6), respectively, and it has at most

$$p \left(16(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} H + 16d^2(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d + 72d\lfloor \beta \rfloor(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) + 4d(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d \right)$$

non-zero weights;

- $h_f \in \mathcal{H}^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor}([0, 1]^d, H_0)$ with $H_0 = H + \varepsilon(\beta, \beta, K, d, H)$

D.1. Proof of Proposition 3

Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_p)$. Fix $m \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and consider f_m .

Step 1. Consider for $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ vector $a = (a_1, \dots, a_{2q+K+1})$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= \dots = a_{q+1} = 0; \\ a_{q+1+j} &= j/K, \quad 1 \leq j \leq K-1; \\ a_{q+K+1} &= \dots = a_{2q+K+1} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

By Theorem 4, there exists a tensor-product splines $S_f^{[\beta],K} = (S_{f,1}^{[\beta],K}, \dots, S_{f,p}^{[\beta],K})$ of order $\lfloor \beta \rfloor \geq 2$ associated with knots at $\{(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, \dots, a_{j_d}) : j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K + 1\}\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - S_f^{q,K}\|_{\mathcal{H}^\ell([0,1]^d)} &\leq \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, p\}} \|f_m - S_{f,m}^{[\beta],K}\|_{\mathcal{H}^\ell([0,1]^d)} \\ &\leq \frac{H \lfloor \beta \rfloor^{\beta-\ell} d^\beta}{(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - \ell)! K^{\beta-\ell}} + \frac{9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^{2d+\beta} H d^\beta}{K^{\beta-\ell}}. \end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to show that $S_{f,m}^{[\beta],K}$ can be represented by a neural network g_{f_m} with ReQU activation functions. For this purpose, we use an expansion of $S_{f,m}^{[\beta],K}$ with respect to the basis

$$\{N_{j_1}^{[\beta],K}(x_1) \cdot N_{j_2}^{[\beta],K}(x_2) \cdot \dots \cdot N_{j_d}^{[\beta],K}(x_d) : j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \beta \rfloor + K\}\},$$

where $N_1^{[\beta],K}, \dots, N_{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K}^{[\beta],K}$ are normalized B -splines defined in (G.2). There exist coefficients $\{w_{m,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_d}^{(f)} : 1 \leq m \leq p, 1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_d \leq q + K\}$ such that, for any $m \in \{1, \dots, p\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{f,m}^{[\beta],K} &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_d=1}^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K} w_{m,j_1, \dots, j_d}^{(f)} \prod_{\ell=1}^d N_{j_\ell}^{[\beta],K}(x_\ell) \\ &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_d=1}^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K} w_{m,j_1, \dots, j_d}^{(f)} \prod_{\ell=1}^d (a_{j_\ell + \lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1} - a_{j_\ell}) B_{j_\ell}^{[\beta],K}(x_\ell), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where $B_{j_\ell}^{[\beta],K}(x_\ell)$ are (unnormalized) B -splines defined in (G.1).

Step 2. Applying Lemma 15 with $q = \lfloor \beta \rfloor$ component-wise for each $x_i, i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we obtain that the mapping

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \mapsto \left(x_1, K, B_1^{[\beta],K}(x_1), \dots, B_{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K}^{[\beta],K}(x_1), x_2, K, B_1^{[\beta],K}(x_2), \dots, B_{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K}^{[\beta],K}(x_d) \right) \quad (\text{D.4})$$

can be represented by a neural network from the class $\text{NN}(4 + 2(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 2), d\mathcal{A}_1)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &= (1, K + 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1), 5 + 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1), 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor), 4(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor), \\ &\quad 8(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) - 4, 8(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) - 4, 8(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor) - 12, \dots, 8(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor + 2), K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor + 2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Here $d\mathcal{A}_1$ is defined as an element-wise multiplication of \mathcal{A}_1 entries by d . Since each coordinate transformation in (D.4) can be computed independently, the number of parameters in this network does not exceed

$$72d\lfloor \beta \rfloor(K + 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor).$$

Using Lemma 13 with $k = d$, for fixed $j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \beta \rfloor + K\}$, we calculate all products $\prod_{\ell=1}^d B_{j_\ell}^{[\beta],K}(x_\ell)$ by a neural network $\text{NN}(\lceil \log_2 d \rceil, ((K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d, (K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d \mathcal{A}_2, 1))$ with the architecture

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \underbrace{(2^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil + 1}, 2^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil}, \dots, 4)}_{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil}. \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Note that this network contains at most

$$(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d 2^{2\lceil \log_2 d \rceil + 2} \leq 16d^2(K + \lfloor \beta \rfloor)^d$$

non-zero parameters.

Step 3. Based on the preliminary calculations from Step 2, we rewrite (D.3) as

$$S_{f,m}^{[\beta],K} = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_d=1}^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K} w_{m,j_1, \dots, j_d}^{(f)} \prod_{\ell=1}^d (a_{j_\ell + \lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1} - a_{j_\ell}) \prod_{\ell=1}^d B_{j_\ell}^{[\beta],K}(x_\ell). \quad (\text{D.7})$$

On Step 2 we constructed a network which calculates the products $\prod_{\ell=1}^d B_{j_\ell}^{[\beta],K}(x_\ell)$ for all $(j_1, \dots, j_d) \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \beta \rfloor + K\}^d$. Now we implement multiplications by

$$\tilde{w}_{m,j_1, \dots, j_d}^{(f)} := w_{m,j_1, \dots, j_d}^{(f)} \prod_{\ell=1}^d (a_{j_\ell + \lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1} - a_{j_\ell}).$$

Proposition 5 implies that

$$\left| w_{m,j_1,\dots,j_d}^{(f)} \right| \leq (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor\beta\rfloor-1)} \|f_m\|_{L_\infty([0,1]^d)} \leq (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor\beta\rfloor-1)} H.$$

(D.2) implies that for any $j \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor\beta\rfloor + K\}$, $0 \leq a_{j+\lfloor\beta\rfloor+1} - a_j \leq 1$. Lemma 16 yields that we can implement the multiplication by $\tilde{w}_{m,j_1,\dots,j_d}^{(f)}$ by a network of the class $\text{NN}(1, (1, 8|\tilde{w}_{m,j_1,\dots,j_d}^{(f)}|, 1))$. Hence the representation (D.7) implies that for any $m \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, the function $S_{f,m}^{\lfloor\beta\rfloor,K}$ can be represented by a neural network of the architecture

$$\text{NN}(4 + 2(\lfloor\beta\rfloor - 2) + \lceil\log_2 d\rceil + 1, (d, \mathcal{A}_1, (K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d \mathcal{A}_2, 8(K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor\beta\rfloor-1)} H, 1)),$$

where \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 are given in (D.5) and (D.6), respectively. Note that this network contains at most

$$16(K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d (2\lfloor\beta\rfloor + 1)^d 9^{d(\lfloor\beta\rfloor-1)} H + 16d^2 (K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d + 72d\lfloor\beta\rfloor (K + 2\lfloor\beta\rfloor) + 4d(K + \lfloor\beta\rfloor)^d$$

non-zero weights, which completes the proof.

D.2. Auxiliary lemmas for Proposition 3

Lemma 13. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2$. Then for any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ there exists a neural network which belongs to the class*

$$\text{NN}\left(\lceil\log_2 k\rceil, \left(k, 2^{\lceil\log_2 k\rceil+1}, 2^{\lceil\log_2 k\rceil}, \dots, 4, 1\right)\right), \quad (\text{D.8})$$

which implements the map $x \mapsto x_1 x_2 \dots x_k$. Moreover, this network contains at most $2^{2\lceil\log_2 k\rceil+2}$ non-zero weights.

Proof of Lemma 13. Let $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We first prove that the map $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto x_1 x_2$ belongs to the class $\text{NN}(1, (2, 4, 1))$. Let us define $W_2 = \frac{1}{4}(1, -1, -1, 1)^\top$ and

$$W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} W_2 \circ \sigma \circ W_1 x &= \frac{1}{4} (\sigma(x_1 + x_2) + \sigma(-x_1 - x_2) - \sigma(x_1 - x_2) - \sigma(x_2 - x_1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} ((x_1 + x_2)^2 - (x_1 - x_2)^2) = x_1 x_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Now, for any $k \geq 2$, we use the following representation

$$x_1 x_2 \dots x_k = x_1 x_2 \dots x_k \cdot \underbrace{1 \dots 1}_{2^{\lceil\log_2 k\rceil - k}}. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

Denote $v = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil$. Then it remains to note that for any $v \in \mathbb{N}$, we can implement a sequence of mappings

$$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2^v}) \mapsto (a_1 a_2, a_3 a_4, \dots, a_{2^v-1} a_{2^v}) \mapsto \dots \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^{2^v} a_i$$

by a neural network of the class

$$\text{NN}(v, (2^v, 2^{v+1}, 2^v, \dots, 4, 1)),$$

based on formula (D.9). Number of parameters in such network does not exceed

$$2^{2v+1} + 2^{2v} + \dots + 4 \leq 2^{2v+2}. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

The proof is completed combining (D.10) and (D.11). \square

Lemma 14. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q, K \in \mathbb{N}, q, K \geq 2$. Then the map*

$$x \mapsto \left(x, K, B_1^{2,K}(x), B_2^{2,K}(x), \dots, B_{K+2q-2}^{2,K}(x) \right)$$

can be represented by a network in the class

$$\text{NN}(4, (1, K + 4(K + 2q - 1), 5 + 4(K + 2q - 1), 4 + 4(K + 2q - 1), 4(K + 2q), K + 2q)), \quad (\text{D.12})$$

containing at most $54(K + 2q)$ non-zero parameters.

Proof. Note first that, applying [34, Theorem 4.32],

$$B_j^{2,K}(x) = \frac{K^3}{6} \left(\left(x - \frac{j-q-1}{K} \right)_+^2 - 3 \left(x - \frac{j-q}{K} \right)_+^2 + 3 \left(x - \frac{j-q+1}{K} \right)_+^2 - \left(x - \frac{j-q+2}{K} \right)_+^2 \right), \quad q+1 \leq j \leq q+K-2.$$

The functions $B_{q-1}^{2,K}$, $B_q^{2,K}$, $B_{q+K-1}^{2,K}$, and $B_{q+K}^{2,K}$ can be computed directly using (G.1), indeed, for any $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} B_{q-1}^{2,K}(x) &= K^3 \left(\frac{1}{K} - x \right)_+^2, \\ B_q^{2,K}(x) &= \frac{K^3}{4} \left(\left(\frac{2}{K} - x \right)_+^2 - 4 \left(\frac{1}{K} - x \right)_+^2 + 3(-x)_+^2 \right), \\ B_{q+K-1}^{2,K}(x) &= \frac{K^3}{4} \left(\left(x - \frac{K-2}{K} \right)_+^2 - 2 \left(x - \frac{K-1}{K} \right)_+^2 - 3(x-1)_+^2 \right), \\ B_{q+K}^{2,K}(x) &= K^3 \left(x - \frac{K-1}{K} \right)_+^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (G.1) implies that the remaining functions $B_1^{2,K}(x) = \dots = B_{q-2}^{2,K}(x) = 0$ and $B_{q+K+1}^{2,K}(x) = \dots = B_{2q+K-2}^{2,K}(x) = 0$. Hence, each of the functions $B_j^{2,K}/K^3, j \in \{1, \dots, 2q+K-$

2} can be exactly represented by a neural network from the class $\text{NN}(1, (1, 4, 1))$. Note also that an identity map $x \mapsto x$ belongs to $\text{NN}(1, (1, 4, 1))$:

$$x = ((x+1)^2 - (x-1)^2)/4 = (\sigma_{-1}(x) + \sigma_{-1}(-x) - \sigma_1(x) - \sigma_1(-x))/4. \quad (\text{D.13})$$

Combining the above arguments, the mapping

$$x \mapsto \left(x, B_1^{2,K}(x)/K^3, B_2^{2,K}(x)/K^3, \dots, B_{K+2q-2}^{2,K}(x)/K^3 \right) \quad (\text{D.14})$$

can be exactly represented by a network from the class $\text{NN}(1, (1, 4(K+2q-1), K+2q-1))$. Each of the functions $\left(x, B_1^{2,K}(x)/K^3, B_2^{2,K}(x)/K^3, \dots, B_{K+2q-2}^{2,K}(x)/K^3 \right)$ is computed independently, and the identity maps for different components also do not intersect. Hence, we can implement the map (D.14) by a network

$$g_S^{(1)}(x) \in \text{NN}(3, (1, 4(K+2q-1), 4(K+2q-1), 4(K+2q-1), K+2q-1)). \quad (\text{D.15})$$

Note that $g_S^{(1)}(x) = W_4 \circ \sigma \circ W_3 \circ \sigma \circ W_2 \circ \sigma \circ W_1 x$, where matrices W_2, W_3 and W_4 have block structure:

$$W_i = \begin{pmatrix} W_{1,i} \\ W_{2,i} \\ \dots \\ W_{K+2q-1,i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}, j \in \{1, \dots, K+2q-1\}, i = 2, 3.$$

Similarly, matrix W_4 consists of $K+2q-1$ blocks of size $\mathbb{R}^{4 \times 1}$ each. Hence, the network (D.15) contains at most

$$4(K+2q-1) + 16(K+2q-1) + 16(K+2q-1) + 4(K+2q-1) = 40(K+2q-1)$$

non-zero weights.

To complete the proof, we need to implement the multiplication by K^3 . To construct the number K^3 we use the net $\text{NN}(3, (1, K, 5, 4, 1))$, which implements a sequence of transformations

$$x \mapsto \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{K \text{ times}} \mapsto (K, K^2) \mapsto K^3.$$

Combining in parallel these two networks, we implement mapping

$$x \mapsto \left(x, K^3, B_1^{2,K}(x)/K^3, B_2^{2,K}(x)/K^3, \dots, B_{K+2q-2}^{2,K}(x)/K^3 \right)$$

by a network

$$g_S^{(2)}(x) \in \text{NN}(3, (1, K+4(K+2q-1), 5+4(K+2q-1), 4+4(K+2q-1), K+2q)), \quad (\text{D.16})$$

containing at most $40(K+2q-1) + 6K + 24$ parameters. Now it remains to implement $K+2q-2$ multiplications by K^3 . For this step, we remove the last layer of (D.16), and implement $K+2q-2$ pairwise multiplications as in (D.9). We end up with a network of architecture (D.12), with at most

$$36(K+2q-1) + 6K + 20 + 8(K+2q) + 4(K+2q) \leq 54(K+2q)$$

non-zero weights. \square

Lemma 15. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $K, q \in \mathbb{N}, K, q \geq 2$. Then for any $j \in \{1, \dots, q + K\}$, the map $x \mapsto \left(x, K, B_1^{q,K}(x), B_2^{q,K}(x), \dots, B_{q+K}^{q,K}(x)\right)$ belongs to the class

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{NN}(4 + 2(q - 2), (1, K + 4(K + 2q - 1), 5 + 4(K + 2q - 1), 4(K + 2q), 4(K + 2q)), \\ & 8(K + 2q - 2) + 12, 8(K + 2q - 2) + 12, 8(K + 2q - 3) + 12, \dots, 8(K + q + 2), K + q + 2)), \end{aligned}$$

with at most $72q(K + 2q)$ parameters.

Proof of Lemma 15. Fix an integer $q \geq 2$. We consider the family of B -splines $\{B_j^{m,K}(x), m \in \{2, \dots, q\}, j \in \{1, \dots, K + 2q - m\}\}$ and construct all elements of this family sequentially starting from $m = 2$. By Lemma 14, the map

$$x \mapsto \left(x, K, B_1^{2,K}(x), B_2^{2,K}(x), \dots, B_{K+2q-2}^{2,K}(x)\right)$$

can be represented by a network in the class (D.12), containing at most $54(K + 2q)$ non-zero weights. Let us now assume that for some $m \geq 3$ the mapping

$$x \mapsto \left(x, K, B_1^{m-1,K}(x), \dots, B_{K+2q-(m-1)}^{m-1,K}(x)\right)$$

belongs to the class

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{NN}(4 + 2(m - 3), (1, K + 4(K + 2q - 1), 5 + 4(K + 2q - 1), 4(K + 2q), 4(K + 2q)), \\ & 8(K + 2q - 2) + 12, 8(K + 2q - 2) + 12, 8(K + 2q - 3) + 12, \dots, \\ & 8(K + 2q - m + 3), K + 2q - m + 3)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.17})$$

Note that we can implement the mappings

$$(X, K) \mapsto \frac{x - a_j}{a_{j+m+1} - a_j}, \quad (X, K) \mapsto \frac{a_{j+m+1} - x}{a_{j+m+1} - a_j}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, 2q + K - m\}, \quad (\text{D.18})$$

each by a network $\text{NN}(1, (2, 4, 1))$. It is possible, since for j and m satisfying $a_{j+m+1} - a_j > 0$, it holds $a_{j+m+1} - a_j \geq 1/K$. We remove the last linear layer of (D.17), and concatenate the remaining part with the first layer of networks, implementing (D.18). We obtain a network with $4 + 2(m - 3)$ layers, and $8(K + 2q - m) + 12$ parameters on the last layer, that implements the mapping

$$x \mapsto \left(x, K, B_1^{m-1,K}(x), \dots, B_{K+2q-(m-1)}^{m-1,K}(x), \underbrace{\frac{x - a_j}{a_{j+m+1} - a_j}, \frac{a_{j+m+1} - x}{a_{j+m+1} - a_j}}_{j \in \{1, \dots, 2q + K - m\}}\right) \quad (\text{D.19})$$

after adding one more linear layer. Note that we have added at most

$$\underbrace{4(K + 2q - m + 3)}_{\text{to implement identity maps}} + \underbrace{32(K + 2q - m)}_{\text{to implement products}} = 36(K + 2q - m) + 12$$

non-zero weights. Now we apply the representation (G.1), that is, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, 2q + K - m\}$, we construct

$$B_j^{m,K}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{(x - a_j)B_j^{m-1,K}(x) + (a_{j+m+1} - x)B_{j+1}^{m-1,K}(x)}{a_{j+m+1} - a_j}, & \text{if } a_j < a_{j+m+1}, a_j \leq x < a_{j+m+1}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is enough to add to the network (D.19) one more layer with $4(K + 2q - m) + 8$ parameters on the last layer, which implements

$$x \mapsto \left(x, K, \underbrace{\frac{x - a_j}{a_{j+m+1} - a_j} B_j^{m-1, K}(x), \frac{a_{j+m+1} - x}{a_{j+m+1} - a_j} B_{j+1}^{m-1, K}(x)}_{j \in \{1, \dots, 2q+K-m\}} \right)$$

after adding one more linear layer. Note that we need at most

$$\underbrace{8}_{\text{to implement identity maps}} + \underbrace{32(K + 2q - m)}_{\text{to implement products}}$$

non-zero-weights. Combining the above representations, and adding the final linear layer with $4(K + 2q - m) + 8$ non-zero parameters, we obtain a network from the class

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{NN}(4 + 2(m - 3), (1, K + 4(K + 2q - 1)), 5 + 4(K + 2q - 1), 4(K + 2q), 4(K + 2q), \\ & 8(K + 2q - 2) + 12, 8(K + 2q - 2) + 12, 8(K + 2q - 3) + 12, \dots, \\ & 8(K + 2q - m + 2), K + 2q - m + 2)) \end{aligned}$$

with at most

$$68(K + 2q - m) + 28$$

non-zero weights added on the last iteration, apart from the last linear layers. The number of non-zero parameters in such network does not exceed $72m(K + 2q)$, since $m \geq 1$, and the statement follows. \square

Lemma 16. *Let $x, M \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the mapping $x \mapsto Mx$ can be represented by the network in the class*

$$\text{NN}\left(1, (1, 4^{1+(\lceil \log_4 |M| \rceil - 1)\vee 0}), 1\right).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $M > 0$ (otherwise we multiply all last layer weights by -1). Note that the map $x \mapsto 4x$ is in the class $\text{NN}(1, (1, 4, 1))$. Indeed,

$$\sigma_{-1}(x) + \sigma_{-1}(-x) - \sigma_1(x) - \sigma_1(-x) = ((x + 1)^2 - (x - 1)^2) = 4x.$$

Hence, concatenating $4^{(\lceil \log_4 |M| \rceil - 1)\vee 0}$ such networks side-by-side, we implement the mapping $x \mapsto 4^{\lceil \log_4 |M| \rceil} x$. It remains to note that $|M|/4^{\lceil \log_4 |M| \rceil} \leq 1$. \square

Appendix E: Bounds on covering numbers of neural networks with ReQU activations

Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{A} = (p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{L+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{L+2}$, and $f(x) : \mathbb{R}^{p_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_{L+1}}$ be a neural network

$$f(x) = W_L \circ \sigma_{v_L} \circ W_{L-1} \circ \sigma_{v_{L-1}} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_{v_1} \circ W_0 \circ x,$$

where $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{i+1} \times p_i}$ are weight matrices. First we introduce, following [32, Lemma 5], the following notations. For $k \in \{1, \dots, L+1\}$, $i \leq k$, $k \leq j \leq L$, we define functions $\mathbf{B}_{k,i}(x) : \mathbb{R}^{p_{i-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_k}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{j,k}f(x) : \mathbb{R}^{p_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_{j+1}}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_{k,i}(x) &= \sigma_{v_k} \circ W_{k-1} \circ \sigma_{v_{k-1}} \cdots \circ \sigma_{v_i} \circ W_{i-1} \circ x; \\ \mathbf{A}_{j,k}(x) &= W_j \circ \sigma_{v_j} \cdots \circ W_k \circ \sigma_{v_k} \circ W_{k-1} \circ x. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Set by convention $\mathbf{A}_{L,L+2}(x) = \mathbf{B}_{0,1}f(x) = x$. For notation simplicity, we write \mathbf{A}_j instead of $\mathbf{A}_{L,j}$, and \mathbf{B}_j instead of $\mathbf{B}_{j,1}$. Note that with this notation $f(x) = \mathbf{A}_1(x)$.

Let us introduce the functions

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(1)}(x) &= W_L^{(1)} \circ \sigma_{v_L^{(1)}} \circ W_{L-1}^{(1)} \circ \sigma_{v_{L-1}^{(1)}} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{v_1^{(1)}} \circ W_0^{(1)} \circ x, \\ f^{(2)}(x) &= W_L^{(2)} \circ \sigma_{v_L^{(2)}} \circ W_{L-1}^{(2)} \circ \sigma_{v_{L-1}^{(2)}} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{v_1^{(2)}} \circ W_0^{(2)} \circ x, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.2})$$

where the parameters $W_i^{(1)}, W_i^{(2)}, v_i^{(1)}, v_i^{(2)}$ satisfy

$$\left\| W_i^{(1)} - W_i^{(2)} \right\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \quad \left\| v_i^{(1)} - v_i^{(2)} \right\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } i \in \{0, \dots, L\}.$$

Lemma 17. For the neural networks $f^{(1)}(x)$ and $f^{(2)}(x)$ defined in (E.2) it holds

$$\left\| f^{(1)}(x) - f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon(L+1)2^L \prod_{\ell=0}^L (p_\ell + 1)^{2^\ell}. \quad (\text{E.3})$$

Proof. Denote by $\mathbf{A}_j^{(1)}, \mathbf{B}_j^{(1)}, \mathbf{A}_j^{(2)}, \mathbf{B}_j^{(2)}$ the corresponding functions in (E.1). Following [32, Lemma 5], we write

$$\left\| f^{(1)}(x) - f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty \leq \sum_{k=1}^{L+1} \left\| \mathbf{A}_{k+1}^{(1)} \circ \sigma_{v_k^{(1)}} \circ W_{k-1}^{(1)} \circ \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) - \mathbf{A}_{k+1}^{(1)} \circ \sigma_{v_k^{(2)}} \circ W_{k-1}^{(2)} \circ \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty.$$

Due to Lemma 20, functions $\mathbf{A}_{k+1}^{(1)} = \mathbf{A}_{L,k+1}^{(1)}$ are Lipschitz, and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| f^{(1)}(x) - f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{L+1} 2^{L-k} \prod_{\ell=0}^{L-k} (p_{L-\ell} + 1)^{2^\ell} \left(\left\| \mathbf{B}_k^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty \vee 1 \right)^{2^{L-k}} \times \\ &\quad \left\| \sigma_{v_k^{(1)}} \circ W_{k-1}^{(1)} \circ \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) - \sigma_{v_k^{(2)}} \circ W_{k-1}^{(2)} \circ \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sigma_{v_k^{(1)}} \circ W_{k-1}^{(1)} \circ \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) - \sigma_{v_k^{(2)}} \circ W_{k-1}^{(2)} \circ \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty &\leq \varepsilon(p_{k-1} + 1) \left(\left\| \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty \vee 1 \right) \times \\ \left(\left\| W_{k-1}^{(1)} \circ \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty + 1 \vee \left\| \mathbf{B}_k^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty + 1 \right) &\leq 2\varepsilon(p_{k-1} + 1)^2 \left(\left\| \mathbf{B}_{k-1}^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty \vee 1 \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous bounds and (E.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| f^{(1)}(x) - f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty &\leq \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{L+1} 2^{L-k+1} \left\{ \prod_{\ell=0}^{L-k} (p_{L-\ell} + 1)^{2^\ell} \right\} (p_{k-1} + 1)^2 \left(\left\| \mathbf{B}_k^{(2)}(x) \right\|_\infty^2 \vee 1 \right)^{2^{L-k}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon(L+1)2^L \prod_{\ell=0}^L (p_\ell + 1)^{2^\ell}, \end{aligned}$$

and the statement follows. \square

Now we need the counterpart of Lemma 17 for the Jacobians $\nabla f^{(1)}(x)$ and $\nabla f^{(2)}(x)$. We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 18. *For the neural networks $f^{(1)}(x)$ and $f^{(2)}(x)$ defined in (E.2) it holds*

$$\left\| \nabla f^{(1)}(x) - \nabla f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon L(L+1)2^{L+1} \prod_{\ell=0}^L (p_{\ell} + 1)^{2^{L+1}+1}. \quad (\text{E.4})$$

Proof. Note that for $f(x)$ defined in (E.2), it holds

$$\nabla f(x) = 2^L W_L \prod_{\ell=1}^L \{ \text{diag} [A_{L-\ell,1}(x) + v_{L-\ell+1} \vee 0] W_{L-\ell} \}. \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Let us define for $j \in \{0, \dots, L-1\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$ the quantities

$$\Delta_j^{(i)} = A_{j,1}(x) + v_{j+1}^{(i)} \vee 0.$$

Note that $\Delta_j^{(1)}, \Delta_j^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{j+1}}$. With the triangular inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla f^{(1)}(x) - \nabla f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_{\infty} &\leq 2^L \left\| (W_L^{(1)} - W_L^{(2)}) \prod_{\ell=1}^L \left\{ \text{diag} [\Delta_{L-\ell}^{(1)}] W_{L-\ell}^{(1)} \right\} \right\|_{\infty} + 2^L (p_L + 1) \times \\ &\sum_{k=1}^L \left\| \prod_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \left\{ \text{diag} [\Delta_{L-\ell}^{(1)}] W_{L-\ell}^{(1)} \right\} \left(\text{diag} [\Delta_k^{(1)}] W_k^{(1)} - \text{diag} [\Delta_k^{(2)}] W_k^{(2)} \right) \prod_{\ell=k+1}^L \left\{ \text{diag} [\Delta_{L-\ell}^{(2)}] W_{L-\ell}^{(2)} \right\} \right\|_{\infty} \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as in Lemma 17, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \text{diag} [\Delta_k^{(1)}] W_k^{(1)} - \text{diag} [\Delta_k^{(2)}] W_k^{(2)} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \varepsilon(k+1)2^k \prod_{\ell=0}^k (p_{\ell} + 1)^{2^k} + (p_k + 1) \left\| \Delta_k^{(1)} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon(k+1)2^k \prod_{\ell=0}^k (p_{\ell} + 1)^{2^k}, \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\left\| \text{diag} [\Delta_{L-\ell}^{(1)}] W_{L-\ell}^{(1)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \prod_{j=1}^{L-\ell} (p_{L-j} + 1)^{2^j}.$$

Combining the previous bounds, we obtain

$$\left\| \nabla f^{(1)}(x) - \nabla f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon 2^L \prod_{\ell=0}^L (p_{\ell} + 1)^{2^{L+1}} + \varepsilon L(L+1)2^L \prod_{\ell=0}^L (p_{\ell} + 1)^{2^{L+1}+1},$$

and the statement follows. \square

Lemma 19. *Consider neural networks of class $\text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}, s)$ with architecture $\mathcal{A} = (p_0, \dots, p_L, p_{L+1})$ and at most s non-zero weights satisfying $\|W_i\|_{\infty} \leq 1, \|v_i\|_{\infty} \leq 1, i \in \{0, \dots, L\}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}, s), \|\cdot\|_{L_{\infty}([0,1]^{p_0})}, \varepsilon) &\leq \left(2\varepsilon^{-1} L 2^L V^{2^L+2} \right)^{s+1}, \\ \mathcal{N}(\text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}, s), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0,1]^{p_0})}, \varepsilon) &\leq \left(2\varepsilon^{-1} L(L+1)2^{L+1} V^{2^{L+1}+2} \right)^{s+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.6})$$

where we have denoted $V = \prod_{\ell=0}^L (p_{\ell} + 1)$.

Proof. Fix arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $f^{(1)}(x), f^{(2)}(x) \in \text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}, s)$ be neural networks with weights $\|W_i^{(1)} - W_i^{(2)}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \|v_i^{(1)} - v_i^{(2)}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, i \in \{0, \dots, L\}$. Then Lemma 17 and Lemma 18 imply

$$\left\| \nabla f^{(1)}(x) - \nabla f^{(2)}(x) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})} \leq \varepsilon L(L+1)2^{L+1}V^{2^{L+1}+1}.$$

Note that for functions in class $\text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}, s)$ number of parameters is bounded by $\sum_{\ell=0}^L (p_\ell + 1)p_{\ell+1} \leq V$, hence, there are at most V^s possible combinations to allocate s non-zero weights. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\text{NN}(L, \mathcal{A}, s), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^1([0,1]^{p_0})}, \varepsilon) &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^s \left(2\varepsilon^{-1}L(L+1)2^{L+1}V^{2^{L+1}+2} \right)^\ell \\ &\leq \left(2\varepsilon^{-1}L(L+1)2^{L+1}V^{2^{L+1}+2} \right)^{s+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of covering number bound with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{L_\infty([0,1]^{p_0})}$ follows the same lines and is omitted. \square

Lemma 20. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|x\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{K}$. Then for $k, i \in \{1, \dots, L\}, k \geq i$*

$$\|B_{k,i}(x)\|_\infty \leq \left\{ \prod_{\ell=1}^{k-i+1} (p_{k-\ell} + 1)2^\ell \right\} (\mathcal{K} \vee 1)^{2^{k-i+1}}, \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Moreover, function $A_{j,k}(x)$ is Lipschitz for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{K}, \|y\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{K}$, that is,

$$\|A_{j,k}(x) - A_{j,k}(y)\|_\infty \leq 2^{j-k+1} \prod_{\ell=0}^{j-k+1} (p_{j-\ell} + 1)2^\ell (\mathcal{K} \vee 1)^{2^{j-k+1}} \|x - y\|_\infty. \quad (\text{E.8})$$

Proof. (E.7) follows from an easy induction in k . Indeed, if $k = i$, $B_{i,i} = \sigma_{v^{(i)}} \circ W_{i-1}x$, and

$$\|B_{i,i}\|_\infty \leq (\mathcal{K}p_{i-1} + 1)^2 \leq (p_{i-1} + 1)^2 (\mathcal{K} \vee 1)^2.$$

Using $\|B_{k,i}\|_\infty \leq (\|B_{k-1,i}\|_\infty p_{k-1} + 1)^2$ completes the proof.

To prove (E.8), we use an induction in j . Assume that (E.8) holds for any $k \in \{1, \dots, L+1\}$ and $j-1 \geq k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{j,k}(x) - A_{j,k}(y)\|_\infty &\leq p_j \|B_{j,k}(x) - B_{j,k}(y)\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2p_j \|A_{j-1,k}(x) - A_{j-1,k}(y)\|_\infty (\|A_{j-1,k}(x)\|_\infty \vee \|A_{j-1,k}(y)\|_\infty) \\ &\leq 2(p_j + 1)(p_{j-1} + 1) \prod_{\ell=1}^{j-k} (p_{j-\ell-1} + 1)2^\ell (\mathcal{K} \vee 1)^{2^{j-k}} \times \\ &\quad \|A_{j-1,k}(x) - A_{j-1,k}(y)\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

and the statement follows from the elementary bound

$$\|A_{k-1,k}(x) - A_{k-1,k}(y)\|_\infty \leq p_{k-1} \|x - y\|_\infty \leq p_{k-1} \|x - y\|_\infty (\mathcal{K} \vee 1).$$

\square

Appendix F: Proofs related to Theorem 3

F.1. Proof of Lemma 1

The main ingredient we use is the multivariate van Trees inequality (see [22], p. 72, and [19]). Choose a density λ of a prior distribution on the set of parameters $\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^M : \|\theta\| \leq h\}$ of the form

$$\lambda(\theta) = \frac{1}{h^M} \lambda_0 \left(\frac{\theta}{h} \right),$$

where λ_0 is a smooth density supported on $\mathcal{B}(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^M$. We write \mathbf{E}_λ for the expectation with respect to the density λ . Then, for any estimate $\hat{\theta}$, it holds that

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \geq \mathbf{E}_\lambda \mathbf{E}_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \geq \frac{M^2}{n \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbf{E}_\lambda \mathcal{I}_j(\theta) + \mathcal{J}(\lambda)}, \quad (\text{F.1})$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_j(\theta) = \mathbf{E}_\theta \left(\frac{\partial \log p_{g_\theta}(X)}{\partial \theta_j} \right)^2$$

is the Fischer information of one observation, $p_{g_\theta}(x)$ is the density of X , and

$$\mathcal{J}(\lambda) = \int_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \sum_{j=1}^M \left(\frac{\partial \lambda(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j} \right)^2 \frac{d\theta}{\lambda(\theta)}.$$

First, let us bound $\mathcal{J}(\lambda)$.

$$\mathcal{J}(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^M \int_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \frac{1}{h^{2M}} \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_0(\theta/h)}{\partial \theta_j} \right)^2 \frac{h^M}{\lambda_0(\theta/h)} d\theta$$

Substituting $\theta = h\nu$, $\nu \in \mathcal{B}(0, 1)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^M \int_{\|\nu\| \leq 1} h^{-2} \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_0(\nu)}{\partial \nu_j} \right)^2 \frac{d\nu}{\lambda_0(\nu)}.$$

Since $\int_{\|\nu\| \leq 1} \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_0(\nu)}{\partial \nu_j} \right)^2 \frac{d\nu}{\lambda_0(\nu)}$ is finite, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{J}(\lambda) \lesssim \frac{M}{h^2}.$$

Now, we focus on $\mathcal{I}_j(\theta)$.

$$\log p_{g_\theta}(x) = \log \det \left(\nabla g_0^{-1}(x) + h^{\beta-1} \sum_{j=1}^M \theta_j \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right),$$

For any $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ the partial derivative of $\log p_{g_\theta}$ with respect to θ_j is equal to

$$\frac{\partial \log p_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_j} = h^{\beta-1} \text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right),$$

where

$$A_\theta(x) = \nabla g_0^{-1}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^M \theta_j h^{\beta-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right).$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \text{Tr} \left(\left(I_{d \times d} + h^{\beta-1} \sum_{k=1}^M \theta_k \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_k \left(\frac{x - x_k}{h} \right) \right)^{-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

If $x \notin \mathcal{B}(0, h)$ then $\nabla \psi_j((x - x_j)/h) = 0$ and, consequently, $\text{Tr}(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi_j((x - x_j)/h)) = 0$. Otherwise, we have $\psi_k((x - x_k)/h) = 0$ for all $k \neq j$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{Tr} \left(\left(I_{d \times d} + h^{\beta-1} \sum_{k=1}^M \theta_k \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_k \left(\frac{x - x_k}{h} \right) \right)^{-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \text{Tr} \left(\left(I_{d \times d} + h^{\beta-1} \theta_j \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)^{-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (h^{\beta-1} \theta_j)^k \left(\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)^{k+1} \right) \right| \\ &\lesssim d \|\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x))\| \left\| \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right\| \lesssim \Lambda d. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $h^{\beta-1}|\theta_j| \leq h^\beta$ is small, provided that the samples size is large enough, and the last inequality holds due to **AG**. Then

$$\mathcal{I}_j(\theta) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(h^{\beta-1} \text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \right)^2 \mathfrak{p}_{g_\theta}(x) dx$$

Since ψ is supported on $\mathcal{B}(0, 1)$, the last expression is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & 2h^{2\beta-2} \int_{\mathcal{B}(0, h)} \left(\text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \right)^2 \mathfrak{p}_{g_\theta}(x) dx \\ &\lesssim h^{2\beta-2} \Lambda^2 d^2 \int_{\mathcal{B}(0, h)} \mathfrak{p}_{g_\theta}(x) dx \\ &\lesssim h^{2\beta+d-2} \Lambda^2 d^2 \mathfrak{p}_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that $h = h(n)$ tends to 0 as n grows and using Lemma 3, we obtain

$$\mathcal{I}_j(\theta) \lesssim h^{2\beta+d-2} \Lambda^{d+2} d^2.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\sup_{\|\theta\| \leq h} \mathbb{E}_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \geq \mathbb{E}_\lambda \mathbb{E}_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \geq \frac{M^2}{n \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{E}_\lambda \mathcal{I}_j(\theta) + \mathcal{J}(\lambda)} \gtrsim \frac{Mh^2}{nh^{2\beta+d} \Lambda^{d+2} d^2 + 1}.$$

F.2. Proof of Lemma 2

Recall that

$$\log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x) = \log \det \left(\nabla g_0^{-1}(x) + h^{\beta-1} \sum_{j=1}^M \theta_j \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right).$$

Then, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ the partial derivative of $\log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}$ with respect to θ_j is equal to

$$\frac{\partial \log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_j} = h^{\beta-1} \text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right),$$

where

$$A_\theta(x) = \nabla g_0^{-1}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^M \theta_j h^{\beta-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right).$$

Since, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$, ψ_j is supported on $\mathcal{B}(0, 1)$ and $\{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$ is a $(2h)$ -packing on \mathcal{X} , then, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ and for any $x \in \mathcal{B}(x_j, h/2)$,

$$A_\theta(x) = \nabla g_0^{-1}(x) + \theta_j h^{\beta-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right).$$

Consider $\text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)$. According to the inverse map theorem, $(\nabla g_0^{-1}(x))^{-1} = \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x))$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(\left(I_{d \times d} + \theta_j h^{\beta-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)^{-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by the construction,

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j(0) &= -\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla^2 \varphi(0) \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j))^\top \\ &= -\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j))^\top \succeq 2\Lambda^{-2} I_{d \times d}. \end{aligned}$$

Show that

$$-\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \succeq \Lambda^{-2} I_{d \times d}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0).$$

Due to the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\ & \quad + \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j(0) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\|. \end{aligned} \tag{F.2}$$

Consider the first term in the right-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\
& = \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \right\| \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla^2 \varphi(0) \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\nabla g_0(x)\| \leq \Lambda$ for all $x \in \mathsf{X}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+2}(\mathsf{X}, L)$, $\beta > 1$, it holds that

$$\left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \leq \frac{\Lambda^2 L \|x - x_j\|}{h}. \quad (\text{F.3})$$

The second term in the right-hand side of (F.2) does not exceed

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j(0) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \right\| \left\| \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \right\| \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \right\| \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi(0) \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $g_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}(\mathsf{X}, 0.5H^*)$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+2}(\mathsf{X}, L)$, $\beta > 1$, we have

$$\left\| \nabla^2 \varphi(0) \right\| \leq L, \quad \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \right\| \leq 0.5H^*,$$

and

$$\left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \right\| \leq 0.5H^* \left\| g_0^{-1}(x) - g_0^{-1}(x_j) \right\|.$$

Due to the fact that $\nabla g_0(x)^\top \nabla g_0(x) \succeq 2\Lambda^{-2} I_{d \times d}$ for all $x \in \mathsf{X}$, it holds

$$\left\| g_0^{-1}(x) - g_0^{-1}(x_j) \right\| \leq \Lambda \sqrt{d} \|x - x_j\|.$$

Thus, the second term in the right-hand side of (F.2) is bounded by

$$\left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j(0) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \leq 0.25\Lambda(H^*)^2 \sqrt{d} \|x - x_j\|. \quad (\text{F.4})$$

The inequalities (F.2), (F.3), and (F.4) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) - \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \nabla \psi_j(0) \right\| \\
& \leq \left(\Lambda^2 L + 0.25\Lambda(H^*)^2 h \sqrt{d} \right) \frac{\|x - x_j\|}{h}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since r_0 is such that

$$r_0 \leq \frac{h}{\Lambda^2 \left(\Lambda^2 L + 0.25\Lambda(H^*)^2 h \sqrt{d} \right)},$$

this yields

$$-\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \succeq \Lambda^{-2} I_{d \times d}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0).$$

Taking into account that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right\| &\leq \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \right\| \left\| \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x_j)) \right\| \left\| \nabla^2 \varphi \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \Lambda^2 L, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\left\| \theta_j h^{\beta-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right\| \leq \Lambda^2 L h^\beta < 1$$

for $h < (\Lambda^2 L)^{-1/\beta}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(I_{d \times d} + \theta_j h^{\beta-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta_j^k h^{k\beta-k} \left(-\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} &-\text{Tr} \left(\left(I_{d \times d} + \theta_j h^{\beta-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)^{-1} \nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta_j^k h^{k\beta-k} \left(-\nabla g_0(g_0^{-1}(x)) \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right)^{k+1} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta_j^k h^{k\beta-k} \Lambda^{-2k-2} \text{Tr}(I_{d \times d}) \geq \Lambda^{-2} d. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\left| \frac{\partial \log \mathbf{p}_{g_\theta}(x)}{\partial \theta_j} \right| = h^{\beta-1} \left| \text{Tr} \left(A_\theta(x)^{-1} \nabla \psi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j}{h} \right) \right) \right| \geq h^{\beta-1} \Lambda^{-2} d$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{B}(x_j, r_0)$.

Appendix G: Some properties of multivariate splines

In this section we provide some properties of multivariate splines. For more details we refer reader to the book [34].

G.1. Univariate splines

We start with one-dimensional case. Fix $K, q \in \mathbb{N}$. We call a function $S : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ a univariate spline of degree q with knots at $\{1/K, 2/K, \dots, (K-1)/K\}$, if

- for any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$, the restriction of S on $[i/K, (i+1)/K]$ is a polynomial of degree q ;
- S has continuous derivatives up to order $q-1$, that is, for any $m \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ and any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K-1\}$, $D^m S(i/K + 0) = D^m S(i/K - 0)$.

It is easy to observe that univariate splines of degree q with knots at $\{1/K, 2/K, \dots, (K-1)/K\}$ form a linear space. We denote this space by $\mathcal{S}_{q,K}$. Note that $\mathcal{S}_{q,K}$ has a finite dimension $q+K$. There are several ways to choose a basis in $\mathcal{S}_{q,K}$, below we construct the basis of normalized B -splines $\{N_j^{q,K}(x) : 1 \leq j \leq K+q\}$. Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_{2q+K+1})$ be a vector of knots defined in (D.2). First, we successively construct (unnormalized) B -splines $\{B_j^{q,K}(x) : 1 \leq j \leq K+q\}$ associated with knots a_1, \dots, a_{2q+K+1} . For any $j \in \{1, \dots, 2q+K\}$, let

$$B_j^{0,K}(x) = \begin{cases} 1/(a_{j+1} - a_j), & \text{if } a_j < a_{j+1} \text{ and } a_j \leq x < a_{j+1}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then for any $m \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, $j \in \{1, 2q+K-m\}$, we put

$$B_j^{m,K}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{(x-a_j)B_j^{m-1,K}(x) + (a_{j+m+1}-x)B_{j+1}^{m-1,K}(x)}{a_{j+m+1}-a_j}, & \text{if } a_j < a_{j+m+1}, a_j \leq x < a_{j+m+1}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{G.1})$$

Now, for $m \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, we define the normalized B -spline $N_j^{m,K}$ as

$$N_j^{m,K}(x) = (a_{j+m+1} - a_j)B_j^{m,K}(x), \quad 1 \leq j \leq 2q+K-m. \quad (\text{G.2})$$

We use the following properties of normalized B -splines (see [34, Section 4.3] for details).

Proposition 4. *The following holds.*

- For any $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $j \in \{1, \dots, q+K\}$, $\text{supp}(N_j^{q,K}) = [a_j, a_{j+q+1}]$ and $\|N_j^{q,K}\|_{L_\infty([0,1])} \leq 1$.
- For any $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $j \in \{1, \dots, q+K\}$, $B_j^{q,K}$ is a spline of degree q , it has continuous derivatives up to order $q-1$ and the $(q-1)$ -th derivative is Lipschitz. Moreover, for any $m \in \{1, \dots, q\}$,

$$\frac{dN_j^{m,K}(x+0)}{dx} = \frac{m}{a_{j+m} - a_j} \left(N_j^{m-1,K}(x) - N_{j+1}^{m-1,K}(x) \right), \quad 1 \leq j \leq 2q+K-m.$$

Corollary 2. *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,*

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq 2q+K-m} \|D^\ell N_j^{m,K}\|_{L_\infty([0,1])} \leq (2K)^\ell \frac{m!}{(m-\ell)!}.$$

Proof. Proposition 4 implies that, for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq j \leq 2q+K-m} \|D^\ell N_j^{m,K}\|_{L_\infty([0,1])} \\ &= \max_{1 \leq j \leq 2q+K-m} \frac{m}{a_{j+m} - a_j} \|D^{\ell-1} N_j^{m-1,K} - D^{\ell-1} N_{j+1}^{m-1,K}\|_{L_\infty([0,1])} \\ &\leq 2mK \max_{1 \leq j \leq 2q+K-m+1} \|D^{\ell-1} N_j^{m-1,K}\|_{L_\infty([0,1])}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the statement follows from the induction in ℓ together with $\|N_j^{q,K}\|_{L_\infty([0,1])} \leq 1$. \square

To study approximation properties of $\mathcal{S}_{q,K}$ with respect to the Hölder norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^k}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we follow the technique from [34, Sections 4.6 and 12.3] and introduce a dual basis for normalized

B-splines. A set of linear functionals $\{\lambda_1^{q,K}, \dots, \lambda_{q+K}^{q,K}\}$ on $L_\infty([0, 1])$ is called a dual basis if, for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, q+K\}$,

$$\lambda_i^{q,K} N_j^{q,K} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

An explicit expression for $\lambda_i^{q,K}$ can be found in [34, Eq.(4.89)] but it is not necessary for our purposes. Define a linear operator $\mathcal{Q}^{q,K} : L_\infty([0, 1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{q,K}$ by

$$\mathcal{Q}^{q,K} f = \sum_{j=1}^{q+K} (\lambda_j^{q,K} f) N_j^{q,K}.$$

The function $\mathcal{Q}^{q,K} f$ is called quasi-interpolant and it nicely approximates f provided that f is smooth enough. The approximation properties of $\mathcal{Q}^{q,K} f$ are studied below for the case of multivariate tensor-product splines.

G.2. Tensor-product splines

The main result of this section is Theorem 4 concerning approximation properties of multivariate splines. We start with auxiliary definitions. The tensor product

$$\mathcal{S}_d^{q,K} = (\mathcal{S}^{q,K})^{\otimes d} \equiv \text{span} \left\{ N_{j_1}^{q,K}(x_1) \cdots N_{j_d}^{q,K}(x_d) : j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, q+K\} \right\}$$

is called a space of tensor-product splines of degree q . Since q and K are fixed, we omit the upper indices in the notations $B_j^{q,K}, N_j^{q,K}$, $1 \leq j \leq q+K$, if there is no ambiguity. For any $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we denote $\{\lambda_{i,1}, \dots, \lambda_{i,q+K}\}$ the dual basis for $\{N_1(x_i), \dots, N_{q+K}(x_i)\}$ constructed in Appendix G.1. For any $j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, q+K\}$ and $f \in L_\infty([0, 1]^d)$, define

$$\mathcal{L}_{j_1, \dots, j_d} f = \lambda_{1,j_1} \lambda_{2,j_2} \cdots \lambda_{d,j_d} f.$$

It is easy to see that $\{\mathcal{L}_{j_1, \dots, j_d} : j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, q+K\}\}$ form a dual basis for $\{N_{j_1}(x_1) \cdots N_{j_d}(x_d)\}$. Now we formulate the approximation result from [34, Theorem 12.5].

Proposition 5. *Let $f \in L_\infty([0, 1]^d)$. Fix any $j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, q+K\}$ and let $\mathcal{L}_{j_1, \dots, j_d}$ be as defined above. Introduce*

$$A_{j_1, \dots, j_d} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^d [a_{j_i}, a_{j_i+q+1}].$$

Then

$$|\mathcal{L}_{j_1, \dots, j_d} f| \leq (2q+1)^d 9^{d(q-1)} \|f\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})}.$$

Similarly to $\mathcal{Q}^{q,K}$, for any $f \in L_\infty([0, 1]^d)$, define a multivariate quasi-interpolant

$$\mathcal{Q}_d^{q,K} f(x) = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_d=1}^{q+K} (\mathcal{L}_{j_1, \dots, j_d} f) N_{j_1}(x_1) \cdots N_{j_d}(x_d).$$

Similarly to N_j 's, we omit the upper indices q, K in the notation of \mathcal{Q}_d when they are clear from context. We are ready to formulate the main result of this section.

Theorem 4. Let $f \in \mathcal{H}^\beta([0, 1]^d, H^*)$ and fix a non-negative integer $\ell \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor$. Let the linear operator $\mathcal{Q}_d^{q,K} : L_\infty([0, 1]^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_d^{q,K}$ be as defined above. Then

$$\left\| f - \mathcal{Q}_d^{q,K} f \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^\ell([0, 1]^d)} \leq \frac{H^* \lfloor \beta \rfloor^{\beta-\ell} d^\beta}{(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - \ell)! K^{\beta-\ell}} + \frac{9^{d(\lfloor \beta \rfloor - 1)} (2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^{2d+\beta} H^* d^\beta}{K^{\beta-\ell}}.$$

Proof. Fix a multi-index $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $|\gamma| \leq \ell$. Then

$$\|D^\gamma f - D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d f\|_{L_\infty([0, 1]^d)} = \max_{j_1, \dots, j_d \in \{1, \dots, 2\lfloor \beta \rfloor + K + 1\}} \|D^\gamma f - D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d f\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})}.$$

Consider a polynomial of degree $q = \lfloor \beta \rfloor$

$$P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f(x) = \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor} \frac{D^\alpha f(a_{j_1, \dots, j_d})}{\alpha!} (x - a_{j_1, \dots, j_d})^\alpha,$$

where $a_{j_1, \dots, j_d} = (a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_d})$. Here we used conventional notations $\alpha! = \alpha_1! \alpha_2! \dots \alpha_d!$ and

$$(x - a_{j_1, \dots, j_d})^\alpha = (x_1 - a_{j_1})^{\alpha_1} (x_2 - a_{j_2})^{\alpha_2} \dots (x_d - a_{j_d})^{\alpha_d}.$$

Since P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f belongs to \mathcal{S}_d , we have $\mathcal{Q}_d P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f = P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f$. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^\gamma f - D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d f\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} &\leq \|D^\gamma (f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\ &\quad + \|D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d (f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})}. \end{aligned}$$

By Taylor's theorem and the definition of the Hölder class, the first term in the right-hand side does not exceed

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D^\gamma f - D^\gamma P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| = q - |\gamma|} \frac{q(x - a_{j_1, \dots, j_d})^\alpha}{\alpha!} \int_0^1 (1-s)^{q-1} (D^{\alpha+\gamma} f(sx + (1-s)a_{j_1, \dots, j_d}) - D^{\alpha+\gamma} f(a_{j_1, \dots, j_d})) ds \right\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| = q - |\gamma|} \frac{q(q/K)^{q-|\gamma|}}{\alpha!} \int_0^1 (1-s)^{q-1} H^* \|x - a_{j_1, \dots, j_d}\|^{\beta-q} ds \right\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\ &\leq \sum_{\alpha: |\alpha| = q - |\gamma|} \frac{(q/K)^{q-|\gamma|}}{\alpha!} H^* (q\sqrt{d}/K)^{\beta-q} \leq \frac{H^* (qd/K)^{\beta-|\gamma|}}{(q-|\gamma|)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d: |\alpha| = m} \frac{m!}{\alpha!} = d^m \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Consider $D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d (f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f)$. By the definition of \mathcal{Q}_d , we have

$$D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d (f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{q+K} \mathcal{L}_{i_1, \dots, i_d} (f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f) D^\gamma (N_{i_1}(x_1) \dots N_{i_d}(x_d)).$$

The triangle inequality and Proposition 5 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d(f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\
& \leq \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{q+K} |\mathcal{L}_{i_1, \dots, i_d}(f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f)| \|D^\gamma N_{i_1}(x_1) \dots N_{i_d}(x_d)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\
& \leq (2q+1)^d 9^{d(q-1)} \|f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{q+K} \|D^\gamma N_{i_1}(x_1) \dots N_{i_d}(x_d)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, by Taylor's theorem,

$$\|f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \leq \frac{H^*(qd/K)^\beta}{q!}.$$

By Proposition 4, for any $m \in \{1, \dots, q+K\}$, $\text{supp}(N_{i_m}) = [a_{i_m}, a_{i_m+q}]$. Hence, the intersection of $\text{supp}(N_{i_m})$ with $[a_{j_m}, a_{j_m+q}]$ has zero volume if $|i_m - j_m| > q$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{q+K} \|D^\gamma N_{i_1}(x_1) \dots N_{i_d}(x_d)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\
& = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{q+K} \|D^\gamma N_{i_1}(x_1) \dots N_{i_d}(x_d)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \prod_{m=1}^d \mathbb{1}(|i_m - j_m| \leq q).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Corollary 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d(f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} \\
& \leq \frac{(2q+1)^d 9^{d(q-1)} H^*(qd/K)^\beta}{q!} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{q+K} (2K)^{|\gamma|} \frac{q!}{\gamma!} \prod_{m=1}^d \mathbb{1}(|i_m - j_m| \leq q).
\end{aligned}$$

The sum in the right hand side contains at most $(2q)^d$ non-zero terms. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_d(f - P_{j_1, \dots, j_d}^f)\|_{L_\infty(A_{j_1, \dots, j_d})} & = \frac{(2q+1)^d 9^{d(q-1)} H^*(qd/K)^\beta (2q)^d (2K)^{|\gamma|}}{\gamma!} \\
& \leq \frac{9^{d(q-1)} (2q+1)^{2d+\beta} H^* d^\beta}{\gamma! K^{\beta-|\gamma|}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□