

# Finite samples inference and critical dimension for stochastically linear models

Vladimir Spokoiny\*

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

January 19, 2022

## Abstract

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

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

---

\*Financial support by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the Collaborative Research Center 1294 “Data assimilation” is gratefully acknowledged. The research was supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant No. 18-11-00132.

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

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Classical asymptotic theory . . . . .	4
1.2	Challenges and goals . . . . .	5
1.2.1	Model misspecification . . . . .	5
1.2.2	I.i.d. of independent samples, effective sample size . . . . .	6
1.2.3	Effective parameter dimension . . . . .	6
1.2.4	Bias-variance trade-off . . . . .	6
1.3	Setup. Main steps of study . . . . .	7
1.3.1	Stochastically linear smooth models . . . . .	7
1.3.2	Concentration of the pMLE . . . . .	7
1.3.3	Fisher and Wilks expansions . . . . .	8
1.3.4	Concentration of the posterior . . . . .	8
1.3.5	Gaussian approximation of the posterior . . . . .	9
<b>2</b>	<b>Properties of the pMLE <math>\tilde{v}_G</math></b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Concentration of the pMLE $\tilde{v}_G$ . . . . .	11
2.2	A bound in the $\ell_2$ -norm . . . . .	13
2.3	The case when $\ \cdot\ _o$ is a sup-norm . . . . .	14
2.4	Fisher and Wilks expansions . . . . .	15
2.5	Bias, loss and risk of the pMLE . . . . .	17
<b>3</b>	<b>Gaussian approximation of the posterior</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1	Concentration of the posterior . . . . .	22
3.2	Accuracy of Gaussian approximation . . . . .	24
3.2.1	Univariate case . . . . .	26
3.2.2	Additive log-likelihood . . . . .	27
3.3	Critical dimension . . . . .	28
<b>4</b>	<b>Anisotropic logistic regression</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1	Setup and main results . . . . .	29
4.2	Regular balanced case . . . . .	36
4.3	Truncation and smooth priors . . . . .	36

<b>A</b>	<b>Laplace approximation in high dimensions</b>	<b>39</b>
A.1	Error of Laplace approximation . . . . .	39
A.2	Local approximation. Univariate case . . . . .	41
A.3	Local approximation. Multivariate case . . . . .	44
A.4	Tail integrals . . . . .	50
A.5	Modulus of continuity of the Hessian $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$ . . . . .	52
<b>B</b>	<b>Deviation bounds for quadratic forms</b>	<b>53</b>
B.1	Moments of a Gaussian quadratic form . . . . .	53
B.2	Deviation bounds for Gaussian quadratic forms . . . . .	56
B.3	Deviation bounds for non-Gaussian quadratic forms . . . . .	59
B.4	Weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s: univariate case . . . . .	65
B.5	Deviation bounds for weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s in a $\ell_2$ -norm . . . . .	66

## 1 Introduction

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

Our starting point is a parametric assumption about the distribution of the data  $\mathbf{Y}$ :  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{P}$  and the data distribution  $\mathcal{P}$  belongs a given parametric family  $(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y})$  dominated by a sigma-finite measure  $\mu_0$ . As in the case of linear modeling, we accept that this assumption is an idealization of reality and the true distribution  $\mathcal{P}$  is not an element of  $(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}})$ . However, a parametric assumption, even being wrong, may appear to be very useful, because it yields the method of estimation. Namely, the MLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$  is defined by maximizing the log-likelihood function  $L(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) = \log \frac{d\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}}{d\mu_0}(\mathbf{Y})$  over the parameter set  $\mathcal{Y}$ :

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

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

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

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

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

for a symmetric  $p \times p$  positive definite matrix  $G$ .

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

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

In particular, the posterior mode defined as the point of maximum of the posterior density coincides with the penalized MLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  for the penalty  $\text{pen}_G(\mathbf{v}) = -\log \pi_G(\mathbf{v})$ . The sub-index  $G$  relies to the Gaussian prior with parameters  $\mathcal{N}(0, G^2)$ .

The use of the penalty and the prior centered at zero is only for notational convenience. Everything below can be extended to the case of an arbitrary center  $\mathbf{v}_0$ .

### 1.1 Classical asymptotic theory

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

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

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

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

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

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

where  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$  is a standard Gaussian vector in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  and  $\chi_p^2$  is a chi-squared distribution with  $p$  degrees of freedom. These results are fundamental and build the basis for the

most statistical applications like analysis of variance, canonical and correlation analysis, uncertainty quantification and hypothesis testing etc. We refer to [van der Vaart \(1998\)](#) for a comprehensive discussion and an historical overview of the related results including the general LAN theory by L. Le Cam.

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

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

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

## 1.2 Challenges and goals

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

### 1.2.1 Model misspecification

First, the model can be misspecified and the underlying data generating measure  $\mathbb{P}$  is not an element of the family  $(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y})$ . This means that the used log-likelihood function is not necessarily a true log-likelihood. In particular, the condition  $\mathbb{E} \exp L(\mathbf{v}) = 1$  does not hold true. This issue also requires to redefine the target of estimation  $\mathbf{v}^*$  as the maximizer of the expected log-likelihood:

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

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

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

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

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

We also write

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

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

Another important issue is a possibility to relax the assumption of an i.i.d. of independent sample. Below we operate with the general likelihood, its structure does not need to be specified. Effectively we can even proceed with just one observation. However, in the case of an independent sample  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the function  $L(\mathbf{v})$  is of additive structure; see (4.1) below for the GLM case. The same applies to the information matrix  $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ ; see (4.2). Moreover, if the  $Y_i$ 's are i.i.d. then  $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})$  is proportional to  $n$ . Therefore, we use the value  $n = \|\mathbb{F}^{-1}\|^{-1}$  as a proxy for the “sample size”. It can be called the *effective sample size*.

### 1.2.3 Effective parameter dimension

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

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

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

### 1.2.4 Bias-variance trade-off

Introducing a quadratic penalty  $\|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$  or, equivalently, a Gaussian prior  $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$  allow to consider in a unified way the classical parametric situation with  $p$  fixed and  $n$  large and the nonparametric situation with  $p$  large or infinite. The link is given by the value  $\mathfrak{p}_G$  which smoothly decreases as  $G^2$  increases. From the other side, an increase

of the penalty yields an increase of the bias measured by the difference  $\boldsymbol{v}_G^* - \boldsymbol{v}^*$  in some norm. For most of tasks in nonparametric statistics such as minimax risk estimation or model selection, etc, one has to balance the variance term  $\mathfrak{p}_G$  and the squared bias yielding the optimal rate of estimation.

### 1.3 Setup. Main steps of study

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

#### 1.3.1 Stochastically linear smooth models

Below we limit ourselves to a special class of *stochastically linear smooth* (SLS) statistical models. The major condition on this class is that the stochastic component  $\zeta(\boldsymbol{v}) = L(\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\boldsymbol{v})$  of the log-likelihood  $L(\boldsymbol{v})$  is linear in parameter  $\boldsymbol{v}$ . We also assume that the expected log-likelihood is a smooth function of the parameter  $\boldsymbol{v}$ . This class includes popular Generalized Linear Models but it is much larger. In particular, by an extending the parameter space, one can consider many nonlinear models including nonlinear regression or nonlinear inverse problems as a special case of SLS; see [Spokoiny \(2019\)](#). We also focus on the case of a quadratic penalization  $\text{pen}_G(\boldsymbol{v}) = \|G\boldsymbol{v}\|^2/2$  or a Gaussian prior  $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$ . This would not affect the SLS assumption. The SLS assumption helps to avoid heavy tools of empirical process theory which is typically used in the analysis of pMLE  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G$  or the posterior  $\boldsymbol{v} \mid \boldsymbol{Y}$ ; see e.g. [van der Vaart \(1998\)](#), [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#), [Ginè and Nickl \(2015\)](#). We only need some accurate deviation bounds for quadratic forms of the errors; see Section B in the appendix.

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

#### 1.3.2 Concentration of the pMLE

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

$$\mathbb{P}(\|D_G(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_G - \boldsymbol{v}_G^*)\| > \mathfrak{r}_G + \sqrt{2\mathfrak{x}}) \leq 3e^{-\mathfrak{x}},$$

where  $\mathfrak{r}_G^2 \asymp \mathfrak{p}_G$ . The result becomes sensible provided that  $\mathfrak{p}_G \ll n$ .

### 1.3.3 Fisher and Wilks expansions

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

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{F}_G^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - \boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2 &\lesssim \omega_{3,G} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2, \\ \left| L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2 \right| &\lesssim \omega_{3,G} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = \mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2} \nabla L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ . The accuracy of approximation is controlled by the value  $\omega_{3,G}$  and the presented results require  $\omega_{3,G} \ll 1$ . In typical examples  $\omega_{3,G} \asymp \mathfrak{p}_G/n$  and again we come to the condition  $\mathfrak{p}_G \ll n$ . The first result in (1.4) about the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  will be referred to as *the Fisher expansion*, while the second one about  $L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$  is called *the Wilks expansion*. These two expansions provide a finite sample analog of the asymptotic statements (1.1) and are informative even in the classical parametric situation. In fact, under standard assumptions, the normalized score vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G$  is asymptotically normal  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_G)$  with  $\Sigma_G = \mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2} V^2 \mathbb{F}_G^{-1/2}$  and  $V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla L(\mathbf{v}))$ . Stochastic linearity implies that the matrix  $V^2$  does not depend on the point  $\mathbf{v}$ . If the model is correctly specified, then  $\Sigma_G$  approaches the identity as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and we obtain the classical results (1.1). Note that the use of stochastic linearity allows to obtain much more accurate bounds than in Spokoiny (2012). It is also a significant improvement of Spokoiny and Panov (2019) where the condition  $\mathfrak{p}_G^3 \ll n$  was assumed; see Section 2.4 below for details.

### 1.3.4 Concentration of the posterior

The study of the posterior  $\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{Y}$  also starts with a concentration result that claims that the dominating part of the posterior distribution is located in a vicinity  $\mathcal{W}$  of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ . The set  $\mathcal{W}$  has to be slightly larger than  $\mathcal{W}_G$ . A great advantage of stochastic linearity is that it allows to replace the log-likelihood  $L_G(\mathbf{v})$  in the Bayes formula with the expected log-likelihood  $\mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ . Further one can use quadratic approximation of  $\mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$  within the vicinity  $\mathcal{W}$  and concavity of  $\mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$  outside of  $\mathcal{W}$ .

It appears that the concentration result for the posterior is much more involved than the concentration result for pMLE. However, the required conditions are very similar. In particular, we still need the relation  $\mathfrak{p}_G \ll n$ .



### 1.3.5 Gaussian approximation of the posterior

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

We can summarize as follows: all the classical statistical results established for linear models as well as all classical asymptotic results can be extended to SLM's. For the majority of the results, it is sufficient to ensure the relation  $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_G = \text{tr}(\mathbf{F}_G^{-1}\mathbf{F})$  is the *effective dimension* of the problem. For Gaussian approximation of the posterior, we need a stronger condition  $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n^{1/3}$ .

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some important properties of the penalized MLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  including concentration, Fisher and Wilks expansion, bias and risk. Section 3 describes the properties of the posterior  $\mathbf{v}_G | \mathbf{Y}$ . The main result describes the accuracy of Gaussian approximation of this posterior. Section 4 specifies the result to the case of logit regression. The appendix collects some very useful facts about Laplace approximation for the integral  $\int e^{f(\mathbf{v})} d\mathbf{v}$  for a smooth concave function  $f$  as well as some deviation bounds for Gaussian and non-Gaussian quadratic forms.

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

This section presents general results about concentration and expansion of the pMLE. We assume to be given a pseudo log-likelihood random function  $L(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $p \leq \infty$ . Given a quadratic penalty  $\|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$ , define

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

Consider the penalized MLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  and its population counterpart  $\mathbf{v}_G^*$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\text{argmax}} L_G(\mathbf{v}),$$

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

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

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

Below we make use of the concentration properties of the stochastic vector  $\nabla\zeta$ .

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

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

Examples of choosing the norm  $\|\cdot\|_o$  are given in Section 2.2. Further we will need some smoothness conditions on the function  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ .

( $\mathcal{L}$ ) *The function  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$  is four times Gateaux differentiable in  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$ , where  $\mathcal{Y}^\circ$  is a local subset in  $\mathcal{Y}$ .*

This condition enables us to apply the Taylor approximation of Proposition A.5 or Proposition A.8 and to quantify the error of the Taylor expansion of  $f(\mathbf{v})$  in a local vicinity of  $\mathbf{v}_G^*$ . A precise formulation is given in each result separately. The class of models satisfying the conditions ( $\zeta$ ), ( $\nabla\zeta$ )<sub>o</sub>, and ( $\mathcal{L}$ ) will be referred to as *stochastically linear smooth* (SLS).

All the results can be substantially simplified if the deterministic part  $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$  of the log-likelihood is a concave or semi-concave function. For concentration of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  we assume concavity of  $\mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ .

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

An important intermediate result about posterior concentration from Proposition 3.2 heavily relies on a stronger condition of semi-concavity of  $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ ; see condition ( $\mathcal{C}_T$ ) below for details.

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

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

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

and write  $D_G^2 = D_G^2(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ ,  $\tilde{D}_G^2 = D_G^2(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ .

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

Let  $\|\cdot\|_\circ$  be the norm from condition  $(\nabla\zeta)_\circ$  describing the concentration set of  $\nabla\zeta$ . Let also  $\|\cdot\|_*$  be the corresponding dual norm:

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

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

$$\mathcal{W}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{u}: \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G \|\mathbf{u}\|_*\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Examples of choosing the norm  $\|\cdot\|_\circ$  and the corresponding sets  $\mathcal{W}_G$  are given in Section 2.2. The result of this section states the concentration properties of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  in the local vicinity  $\mathcal{A}_G$  of  $\mathbf{v}_G^*$  of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathcal{W}_G = \{\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_G^* + \mathbf{u}: \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{W}_G\} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^\circ. \quad (2.2)$$

Introduce  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{E}L(\mathbf{v})$  and  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}) = f(\mathbf{v}) - \|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$  so that  $\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = 0$ ,  $\nabla^2 f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = -D_G^2$ , and  $f^{(k)}(\mathbf{v}) \equiv f_G^{(k)}(\mathbf{v})$  for  $k \geq 3$  yielding

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u}) \right|_{t=0} = -\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

The local regularity of  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$  within  $\mathcal{A}_G$  from (2.2) will be measured by

$$\alpha_{3,G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{W}_G} \frac{2|\langle f^{(3)}(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle|}{\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}. \quad (2.3)$$

Obviously

$$f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \leq \frac{\alpha_{3,G}}{3} \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad (2.4)$$

$$|\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle| \leq \alpha_{3,G} \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2. \quad (2.5)$$

Define also

$$\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) = f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle,$$

$$\omega_{3,G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{W}_G} \frac{2|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})|}{\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

By (2.4) it holds  $\omega_{3,G} \leq \alpha_{3,G}/3$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** Suppose  $(\zeta)$ ,  $(\nabla\zeta)_\circ$ ,  $(\mathcal{L})$ , and  $(\mathcal{C}_G)$ . Let also  $\nu$  from (2.1) fulfill

$$1 - \nu - \alpha_{3,G} \geq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Then on a set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - \mathbf{C}_0 e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ , it holds  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$ , that is,

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

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

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

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* Below we restrict ourselves to the random set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  and assume that  $\|\nabla\zeta\|_\circ \leq \mathbf{r}_G$ . Then on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  for any  $\mathbf{u}$

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

Moreover, if  $\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{W}_G$ , then by definition (2.1) it holds  $\mathbf{r}_G \|\mathbf{u}\|_* \leq \nu \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2$ . Therefore,

$$|\langle \nabla\zeta, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \nu \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{W}_G. \quad (2.9)$$

Let  $\mathbf{v}$  be a point on the boundary of the set  $\mathcal{A}_G$  from (2.2). We also write  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*$ . The idea is to show that the derivative  $\frac{d}{dt} L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u}) < 0$  is negative for  $t > 1$ . This would imply that all the extreme points of  $L_G(\mathbf{v})$  are within  $\mathcal{A}_G$ . We use the decomposition

$$L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u}) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = \langle \nabla\zeta, \mathbf{u} \rangle t + \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*).$$

With  $h(t) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u})$ , it holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u}) = \langle \nabla\zeta, \mathbf{u} \rangle + h'(t). \quad (2.10)$$

By definition of  $\mathbf{v}_G^*$ , it also holds  $h'(0) = 0$ . The identity  $\nabla^2 L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = -D_G^2$  yields  $h''(0) = -\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2$ . The bound (2.5) implies for  $|t| \leq 1$

$$|h'(t) - th''(0)| = |h'(t) - h'(0) - th''(0)| \leq t^2 |h''(0)| \alpha_{3,G}.$$

For  $t = 1$ , we obtain by (2.7)

$$h'(1) \leq h''(0) - h''(0)\alpha_{3,G} = -|h''(0)|(1 - \alpha_{3,G}) < 0.$$

Moreover, concavity of  $h(t)$  and  $h'(0) = 0$  imply that  $h'(t)$  decreases in  $t$  for  $t > 1$ . Further, summing up the above derivation yields on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  in view of (2.9)

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u}) \right|_{t=1} \leq -\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 (1 - \nu - \alpha_{3,G}) < 0.$$

As  $\frac{d}{dt} L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* + t\mathbf{u})$  decreases with  $t \geq 1$  together with  $h'(t)$  due to (2.10), the same applies to all such  $t$ . This implies the assertion.  $\square$

## 2.2 A bound in the $\ell_2$ -norm

The results about pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  strongly rely on the condition  $(\nabla\zeta)_\circ$  describing the concentration set of  $\nabla\zeta$  using the norm  $\|\cdot\|_\circ$  and its dual  $\|\cdot\|_*$ . Now we present the leading example when both  $\|\cdot\|_\circ$  and its dual  $\|\cdot\|_*$  are some  $\ell_2$ -norms. More specifically, we consider the classical case when the gradient  $\nabla\zeta$  exhibits sub-Gaussian behavior, see (B.18) of Theorem B.10. Condition  $(\nabla\zeta)_\circ$  will be replaced by

$(\nabla\zeta)$  Let  $V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla\zeta)$ . For any  $\mathbf{x} > 0$ , it holds

$$\mathbb{P}(\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| \geq \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \quad (2.11)$$

with

$$\mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\text{tr}(D_G^{-2}V^2)} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}.$$

**Proposition 2.2.** Assume  $(\zeta)$ ,  $(\mathcal{C}_G)$ , and  $(\nabla\zeta)$ . Let also  $\alpha_{3,G}$  from (2.3) satisfy (2.7). Then it holds on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbf{r}_G = \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})$

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

Equivalently  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^* \in \mathcal{W}_G$  with

$$\mathcal{W}_G = \{\mathbf{u}: \|D_G \mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G\}. \quad (2.12)$$

*Proof.* We apply Proposition 2.1 with  $\mathbf{H} = D_G$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\circ = \|D_G^{-1}\mathbf{u}\|$ , and  $\mathbf{r}_\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{r}_G = \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})$ . It holds

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

leading to the set  $\mathcal{W}_G$  with the elliptic shape

$$\mathcal{W}_G = \{\mathbf{u}: \nu \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{r}_G \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|\} = \{\mathbf{u}: \|D_G \mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_G\}$$

as in (2.12).  $\square$

### 2.3 The case when $\|\cdot\|_{\circ}$ is a sup-norm

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

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

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

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

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

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

Suppose now that there exists a diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{H}^2$  such that  $D_G^2 \geq \mathbf{H}^2$ . Consider the set  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{H}}$  from (2.8). This set  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{H}}$  can be described explicitly. Indeed, with  $a_j = (2\nu)^{-1}z_j(\mathbf{x}_j)/\mathbb{F}_j$

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

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

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

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

## 2.4 Fisher and Wilks expansions

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

**Proposition 2.3.** *Under the conditions of Proposition 2.1 or Proposition 2.2, it holds on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\omega_{3,G} \leq 1/3$  from (2.6)*

$$-\omega_{3,G} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 \leq 2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 \leq \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2, \quad (2.13)$$

and for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$

$$\left| 2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v})\|^2 \right| \leq \omega_{3,G} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v})\|^2. \quad (2.14)$$

Also

$$\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 \leq \frac{3\omega_{3,G}}{(1 - \omega_{3,G})^2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2. \quad (2.15)$$

$$\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|. \quad (2.16)$$

The random matrix  $\tilde{D}_G^2 = \mathbb{F}_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$  fulfills on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_G^{-1} \tilde{D}_G^2 D_G - I_p\| &\leq \alpha_{3,G}, \\ \|D_G \tilde{D}_G^{-2} D_G - I_p\| &\leq \frac{\alpha_{3,G}}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$\alpha_{3,G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}_G} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{2|\langle \nabla^3 \mathbb{E} L_G(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} \rangle|}{\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2}. \quad (2.18)$$

**Remark 2.2.** The bidirectional definition (2.18) of  $\alpha_{3,G}$  is, of course, stronger than the directional definition (2.3). However, in typical examples these quantities are similar. We therefore, use the same notation without any risk of confusion.

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.1, on the random set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  of dominating probability, the estimate  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  belongs to the set  $\mathcal{A}_G$  yielding  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^* \in \mathcal{W}_G$ . By definition of  $\mathbf{v}_G^* =$

$\operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ , it holds  $\nabla \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = 0$ . Furthermore,  $\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = -D_G^2$ . By (2.6), for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}) + \frac{1}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2 \right| \leq \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2. \quad (2.19)$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} L_G(\mathbf{v}) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 &= \langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*, \nabla \zeta \rangle + \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 + \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) + \frac{1}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

As  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$  and it maximizes  $L_G(\mathbf{v})$ , we derive by (2.19)

$$\begin{aligned} L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 &= \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \left\{ L_G(\mathbf{v}) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 + \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\max_{\mathbf{u}} \{ \tau \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \} = \frac{\tau}{1-\tau} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2$  for any  $\tau \in [0, 1]$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , it follows

$$L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 \leq \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2(1 - \omega_{3,G})} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2.$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 &\geq \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 - \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2 \right\} \\ &= -\frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2(1 + \omega_{3,G})} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

These bounds imply (2.13).

Now we derive similarly to (2.20) that for  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$

$$L_G(\mathbf{v}) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) \leq \langle \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*, \nabla \zeta \rangle - \frac{1 - \omega_{3,G}}{2} \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2.$$

A particular choice  $\mathbf{v} = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  yields

$$L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) \leq \langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*, \nabla \zeta \rangle - \frac{1 - \omega_{3,G}}{2} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2.$$

Combining with (2.21) allows to bound

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*, \nabla \zeta \rangle - \frac{1 - \omega_{3,G}}{2} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2 \geq -\frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2(1 + \omega_{3,G})} \|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\|^2.$$



Further, for  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta$ ,  $\mathbf{u} = D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)$ , and  $\tau = \omega_{3,G} \in [0, 1/3]$ , the inequality

$$2\langle \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle - (1 - \tau)\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \geq -\frac{\tau}{1 + \tau}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2$$

implies

$$\left\| \mathbf{u} - \frac{1}{1 - \tau}\boldsymbol{\xi} \right\|^2 \leq \frac{2\tau}{(1 + \tau)(1 - \tau)^2}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2$$

yielding for  $\tau \leq 1/3$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\xi}\| &\leq \left( \tau + \sqrt{\frac{2\tau}{1 + \tau}} \right) \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1 - \tau} \leq \frac{\sqrt{3\tau}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1 - \tau}, \\ \|\mathbf{u}\| &\leq \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{2\tau}{1 + \tau}} \right) \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1 - \tau} \leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\tau}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}{1 - \tau}, \end{aligned}$$

and (2.15), (2.16) follow.

Now we prove (2.14). We use that  $\nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) = 0$ . This enables us to write

$$L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}) = L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v} \rangle$$

Now linearity of the stochastic term of  $L_G(\mathbf{v})$  yields for any particular value  $\mathbf{v}^\circ$  of  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$

$$\begin{aligned} L_G(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla L_G(\mathbf{v}^\circ), \mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v} \rangle &= f_G(\mathbf{v}^\circ) - f_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^\circ), \mathbf{v}^\circ - \mathbf{v} \rangle \\ &= -f_G(\mathbf{v}^\circ; \mathbf{u}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^\circ$ . Smoothness condition (2.6) with  $\omega_{3,G} \leq 1/3$  implies the result.

The statements (2.17) follows from (A.34) and (A.35) with  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ .  $\square$

## 2.5 Bias, loss and risk of the pMLE

The previous results refer to  $\mathbf{v}_G^*$  as ‘‘target’’. However, this quantity depends on penalization which introduces some bias. This section studies the impact of the bias on the inference under the so called ‘‘small bias’’ condition. Usually the target of estimation  $\mathbf{v}^*$  is defined as the maximizer of the expected log-likelihood:  $\mathbf{v}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ . However, this definition assumes that the underlying truth is ‘‘in the model’’. Our results below in this section apply to any fixed  $\mathbf{v}^*$ . We only use that  $\mathbf{v}^*$  is not too far away from  $\mathbf{v}_G^*$  and our smoothness condition  $(\mathcal{L})$  in terms of the quantities  $\omega_{3,G}$  and  $\alpha_{3,G}$  is valid at this point. We present a natural definition of the bias in terms of the gradient  $\nabla \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$  and relates this definition to the commonly used difference  $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*$ .

Due to Proposition 2.1 or 2.2, the penalized MLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  is in fact an estimator of the vector  $\mathbf{v}_G^*$ . In particular,

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

with a high probability, where  $\mathbf{r}_G = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}$  bounds the norm  $\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\|$  and  $\mathbf{p}_G = \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}V^2)$  corresponds to the effective parameter dimension while  $V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla\zeta)$ . This section discusses whether one can use  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  for estimating the underlying truth  $\mathbf{v}^*$ . The answer is positive under the so called ‘‘small bias’’ condition. To state the result, define with  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_G &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) \in \mathbb{R}^p, \\ \mathbf{a}_G &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_G^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G. \end{aligned}$$

We will see that  $\|\mathbf{a}_G\|$  quantifies the bias induced by penalization. The mentioned small bias condition means that  $\|\mathbf{a}_G\| \ll \mathbf{p}_G^{1/2}$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\alpha_{3,G} \leq 1/2$ . For any  $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$ , it holds with  $\mathbf{a}_G = D_G^{-1} \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$*

$$\|D_G(\mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*) - \mathbf{a}_G\| \leq \alpha_{3,G} \|\mathbf{a}_G\|. \quad (2.22)$$

If  $\mathbf{v}^* = \text{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ , then

$$\mathbf{A}_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = -G^2 \mathbf{v}^*.$$

Moreover, for any linear mapping  $Q$ , the bias  $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*$  fulfills with  $\mathbf{a}_{Q|G} = QD_G^{-2} \mathbf{A}_G$

$$\|Q \mathbf{b}_G\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}} \|\mathbf{a}_{Q|G}\|. \quad (2.23)$$

*Proof.* We use  $\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = 0$ . Then

$$\nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = \mathbf{A}_G,$$

and hence, for any  $\mathbf{u}$

$$\langle \mathbf{A}_G, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*), \mathbf{u} \rangle.$$

The bound (2.5) implies in view of  $\nabla^2 f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) = -D_G^2$  for  $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*$

$$|\langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) - \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle D_G^2 \mathbf{b}_G, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \alpha_{3,G} \|D_G \mathbf{b}_G\| \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|,$$

yielding

$$|\langle \mathbf{A}_G - D_G^2 \mathbf{b}_G, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \alpha_{3,G} \|D_G \mathbf{b}_G\| \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|.$$

Taking the supremum over all  $\mathbf{u}$  with  $\|D_G \mathbf{u}\| = 1$  results in

$$\|D_G^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G + D_G \mathbf{b}_G\| \leq \alpha_{3,G} \|D_G \mathbf{b}_G\|$$

and (2.22) follows. The proof of (2.23) is similar. Finally, if  $\mathbf{v}^*$  maximizes  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ , then  $\mathbf{A}_G = \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = \nabla f(\mathbf{v}^*) - G^2 \mathbf{v}^* = -G^2 \mathbf{v}^*$ .  $\square$

Now we show how the Fisher expansion (2.15) enables us to establish sharp finite sample bounds for the loss and risk of the estimator  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.1. Let  $\mathbf{v}^* \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$ . Then on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ , it holds with  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta$  and  $\mathbf{a}_G = D_G^{-1} \mathbf{A}_G = D_G^{-1} \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}^*) = -D_G^{-1} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\| &\leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}} \|\mathbf{a}_G\| \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \mathbf{r}_G + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}} \|\mathbf{a}_G\|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

where

$$\mathbf{r}_G = \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}, \quad \mathbf{p}_G = \text{tr}(D_G^{-1} V^2 D_G^{-1}).$$

*Proof.* Define for  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta$  the random set

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| \leq \mathbf{r}_G\}.$$

Then  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ ; see Corollary B.11. It follows from (2.15) of Proposition 2.3 and  $3\omega_{3,G} \leq \alpha_{3,G}$  that on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}_G^*$

$$\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*) - \boldsymbol{\xi}_G + D_G \mathbf{b}_G\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|. \quad (2.25)$$

This and the bound (2.23) imply the first inequality in (2.24). As  $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| \leq \mathbf{r}_G$  on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ , the second bound (2.24) follows as well.  $\square$

Now we state the results about the mean and risk of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ . To avoid technical burden, we exclude a pathologic event  $\{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| > \mathbf{r}_G(\mathbf{x})\}$  having an exponentially small probability for some large  $\mathbf{x}$ ; see condition (2.11) of Proposition 2.2.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Assume the conditions of Proposition 2.2. Then for a set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-x}$ , it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}\{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*) \mathbb{I}(\Omega(\mathbf{x}))}\| &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}} \|\mathbf{a}_G\| + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\| + \mathbf{C}_1 e^{-x} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}} \|\mathbf{a}_G\| + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_G} + \mathbf{C}_1 e^{-x}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\{\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \mathbb{I}(\Omega(\mathbf{x}))\} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}}\right)^2 \mathbf{p}_G + \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{a}_G\|}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}} + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}} \mathbf{p}_G}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} + \mathbf{C}_1 e^{-x}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

**Remark 2.3.** If  $\alpha_{3,G}$  and hence,  $\omega_{3,G}$  are small then (2.27) yields the classical bias-variance decomposition

$$\mathbb{E}\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2 \leq (\mathbf{p}_G + \|\mathbf{a}_G\|^2) \{1 + o(1)\}. \quad (2.28)$$

Moreover, under the small bias condition  $\|\mathbf{a}_G\|^2 \ll \mathbf{p}_G$ , the impact of the bias induced by penalization is negligible. The relation  $\|\mathbf{a}_G\|^2 \asymp \mathbf{p}_G$  is usually referred to as ‘‘bias-variance trade-off’’.

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

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

For the first term we apply (2.25). To show (2.26), we also have to bound the tail moments of  $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|$ :

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{x}}(D_G\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}\{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\}\{D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\}^\top \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_G \boldsymbol{\xi}_G^\top) = \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}}\right)^2 B_G. \end{aligned}$$

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

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

and (2.27) follows.  $\square$

Finally we state the Wilks expansion for the quantity  $2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}^*)$  and specify it under the small bias condition  $\|\mathbf{a}_G\| \ll \mathbf{r}_G$ .

**Proposition 2.7.** *It holds under the conditions of Proposition 2.2 on the set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sqrt{2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}^*)} - \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta + D_G\mathbf{b}_G\| \right| &\leq 2\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| + \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2}\|D_G\mathbf{b}_G\|. \\ \left| \sqrt{2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}^*)} - \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| \right| &\leq 2\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| + \frac{1 + \omega_{3,G}/2}{1 - \alpha_{3,G}}\|\mathbf{a}_G\|. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By (2.14) of Proposition 2.3

$$2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}^*) \leq (1 + \omega_{3,G})\|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}^*)\|^2.$$

Moreover, (2.15) ensures that

$$\sqrt{2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}^*)} \leq \sqrt{1 + \omega_{3,G}} \left( \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta + D_G\mathbf{b}_G\| + \frac{\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}} \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| \right)$$

yielding

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{2L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - 2L_G(\mathbf{v}^*)} - \|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta + D_G\mathbf{b}_G\| \\ &\leq \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2}\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta + D_G\mathbf{b}_G\| + \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{3,G}(1 + \omega_{3,G})}}{1 - \omega_{3,G}}\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{3\omega_{3,G}}\|D_G^{-1}\nabla\zeta\| + \frac{\omega_{3,G}}{2}\|D_G\mathbf{b}_G\|. \end{aligned}$$

The inverse inequality can be proved in a similar way. The second statement follows from the first one and (2.22).  $\square$

### 3 Gaussian approximation of the posterior

Now we study the properties of the posterior  $\mathbf{v}_G \mid \mathbf{Y}$ . The study includes two major steps: posterior concentration and a Gaussian approximation of the posterior distribution.

### 3.1 Concentration of the posterior

We start by presenting a general bound on posterior concentration. Then we specify the conditions and the result to the case when the expected log-likelihood is a concave function.

We make use of the result of Proposition 2.1 about concentration of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  on a local set  $\mathcal{A}_G$  from (2.2). This set can be represented as  $\mathcal{A}_G = \mathcal{W}_G + \mathbf{v}_G^*$ , where  $\mathcal{W}_G$  is from (2.1). Now we aim at describing a concentration set of the posterior in the form  $\tilde{D}_G^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{U}} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  for  $\tilde{D}_G = D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ , and for a special choice of sets  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ . Namely, we need that a standard Gaussian measure concentrates on any such  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})$ . For this we take  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{u}: \|T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v})\}$  with some trace operator  $T(\mathbf{v})$ , a proper  $\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v})$ , and some fixed  $\nu$ , e.g.  $\nu = 2/3$ . A standard choice is  $T(\mathbf{v}) = D(\mathbf{v})D_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})$  provided that  $\|D^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\|$  is a small number. If  $D(\mathbf{v})$  is not well posed, one should take  $T$  slightly larger, e.g.  $T(\mathbf{v}) = D_T(\mathbf{v})D_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})$  for  $D_T^2(\mathbf{v}) = D^2(\mathbf{v}) + G_0^2$ , where  $G_0^2$  is a minimal penalization ensuring the desired properties “ $\|D_T^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\|$  small”. Define the value

$$\tilde{\rho} = \frac{\int \mathbb{1}(\tilde{D}_G \mathbf{u} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}) \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u})\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \mathbb{1}(\tilde{D}_G \mathbf{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}) \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u})\} d\mathbf{u}}. \quad (3.1)$$

This value  $\tilde{\rho}$  bounds from above the posterior probability of the set  $\tilde{D}_G(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{D}_G(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq \tilde{\rho}.$$

In the next result,  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$  and  $f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) = f_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Suppose (C) and let  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$  on a set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - C_0 e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ . Let also for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ , a trace operator  $T(\mathbf{v}) \leq I_p$  and the radius  $\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v})$  be fixed. Define  $D_T^2(\mathbf{v}) = \{T(\mathbf{v})D_G(\mathbf{v})\}^\top T(\mathbf{v})D_G(\mathbf{v})$  and let*

$$\omega_3(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\|D_T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v})} \frac{2|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})|}{\|D_T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2} \leq 1 - \nu; \quad (3.2)$$

cf. (2.6) and (2.7). Suppose that for a standard normal  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \mathbb{P}(\gamma \notin \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})) = \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \mathbb{P}(\|T(\mathbf{v})\gamma\| > \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v})) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}} \quad (3.3)$$

and for some constant  $C_2$  and any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ , it holds with  $\mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}\{T^\top(\mathbf{v})T(\mathbf{v})\}$

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\left\{f_G(\mathbf{v}; D_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\gamma) + \frac{\|\gamma\|^2}{2}\right\} \mathbb{1}(\gamma \notin \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})) \leq C_2 e^{-\mathbf{x} - \omega_3(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v})/2}. \quad (3.4)$$

Then on the set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ , the value  $\tilde{\rho}$  from (3.1) satisfies

$$\tilde{\rho} \leq \frac{\mathbf{C}_2 e^{-\mathbf{x}}}{1 - e^{-\mathbf{x}}}. \quad (3.5)$$

*Proof.* We start by establishing another more useful representation for  $\tilde{\rho}$ . With  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{u}: \|T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v})\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$ , the use of  $\nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) = 0$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho} &= \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\tilde{D}_G \mathbf{u} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}) \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \mathbb{I}(\tilde{D}_G \mathbf{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}) \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)\} d\mathbf{u}} \\ &= \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\tilde{D}_G \mathbf{u} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}) \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \mathbb{I}(\tilde{D}_G \mathbf{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}) \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we study this expression for any possible value  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \mathbf{v}$  from the concentration set  $\mathcal{A}_G$  of  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$ . Consider  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ . As the stochastic term of  $L(\mathbf{v})$  and thus, of  $L_G(\mathbf{v})$  is linear in  $\mathbf{v}$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} L_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\mathbf{v}) - \langle \nabla L_G(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ = f_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) - f_G(\mathbf{u}) - \langle \nabla f_G(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} \rangle = f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, it suffices to bound uniformly in  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$  the ratio

$$\rho(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(D_G(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})) e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \mathbb{I}(D_G(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})) e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}. \quad (3.7)$$

Let us fix  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$  and bound separately the nominator and denominator of  $\rho(\mathbf{v})$ . We write  $D_G = D_G(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})$  and use that  $\{D_G \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}\} = \{\|D_T \mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_T\}$ . The bound (A.17) of Proposition A.5 yields

$$\int \mathbb{I}(D_G \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}) e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \geq e^{-\omega_{3PT}/2} \int \mathbb{I}(D_G \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}) e^{-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}.$$

Now we bound the integral of  $\exp\{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})\}$  on the exterior of  $D_G^{-1}\mathcal{U} = \{\mathbf{u}: D_G \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}\}$ . Change of variables and (3.4) help to derive

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(D_G \mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) \exp\{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp(-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2) d\mathbf{u}} &= \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) \exp\{f_G(\mathbf{v}, D_G^{-1}\mathbf{u})\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}) \exp(-\|\mathbf{u}\|^2/2) d\mathbf{u}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{f_G(\mathbf{v}, D_G^{-1}\gamma) + \frac{1}{2}\|\gamma\|^2\right\} \mathbb{I}(\gamma \notin \mathcal{U}) \leq \mathbf{C}_2 e^{-\mathbf{x} - \omega_{3PT}/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these bounds together yields in view of (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(v) &\leq e^{\omega_3 \mathfrak{p}_T/2} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(D_G \mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) \exp\{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \mathbb{I}(D_G \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}) \exp(-\|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2/2) d\mathbf{u}} \\ &= e^{\omega_3 \mathfrak{p}_T/2} \frac{\mathbb{E} \exp\{f_G(\mathbf{v}, D_G^{-1} \gamma) + \|\gamma\|^2/2\} \mathbb{I}(\gamma \notin \mathcal{U})}{\mathbb{P}(\gamma \in \mathcal{U})} \leq \mathfrak{C}_2 \frac{e^{-x}}{1 - e^{-x}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

and (3.5) follows.  $\square$

**The case of  $\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$  semi-concave.** Checking (3.4) of Proposition 3.1 can be tricky. It involves the function  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$  and the sets  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{u}: \|T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathfrak{r}_T(\mathbf{v})\}$  for given trace operators  $T(\mathbf{v})$ . Here we present a simple sufficient condition in terms of a bound on the radius  $\mathfrak{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) = \text{tr}\{T^\top(\mathbf{v})T(\mathbf{v})\}$  provided that  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$  is semi-concave.

( $\mathfrak{C}_T$ ) For any  $\mathbf{v}$ , the function  $2\mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) + \|D(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|D_T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2$  is concave in  $\mathbf{u}$ , where  $D_T^2(\mathbf{v}) = \{T(\mathbf{v})D_G(\mathbf{v})\}^\top T(\mathbf{v})D_G(\mathbf{v})$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** Suppose ( $\zeta$ ) and let  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$  on a set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - \mathfrak{C}_0 e^{-x}$ . Let the operator  $T(\mathbf{v})$  be fixed to ensure ( $\mathfrak{C}_T$ ). Let also (3.2) hold with

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

Then for the function  $f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ , conditions (3.3) and (3.4) are fulfilled with  $\mathfrak{C}_2 = 4$  and the statement (3.5) continues to apply.

*Proof.* For any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}^\circ$ , conditions (3.3) and (3.4) can be checked by Proposition A.9 with  $x = \mathbf{v}$  and  $f(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u})$ . This reduces the statement to Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

### 3.2 Accuracy of Gaussian approximation

We are now prepared to state our main result about a Gaussian approximation of the posterior. Everywhere we assume that  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  concentrates on the set  $\mathcal{A}_G$  and for each  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ , an operator  $T(\mathbf{v})$  and a radius  $\mathfrak{r}_T(\mathbf{v})$  are fixed to ensure (3.3) and (3.4). The latter follows from Proposition 3.2 under ( $\mathfrak{C}_T$ ). Given a Gaussian prior  $\mathcal{N}(0, G^{-2})$ , the corresponding posterior will be denoted as  $\mathbf{v}_G \mid \mathbf{Y}$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** Assume the conditions of Proposition 3.1 or 3.2. Furthermore, let

$$\diamond_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \omega_3(\mathbf{v}) \mathfrak{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) \leq 2/3; \quad (3.9)$$



cf. (3.2). Then for any Borel set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ , one can bound on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\diamond = \diamond_2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \diamond - e^{-x}} \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \gamma \in A) + \frac{\diamond + \mathbf{C}_2 e^{-x}}{1 - \diamond - e^{-x}}, \\ \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) &\geq \frac{1}{1 + \diamond + \mathbf{C}_2 e^{-x}} \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \gamma \in A) - \frac{\diamond + e^{-x}}{1 + \diamond + \mathbf{C}_2 e^{-x}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Here  $\mathbb{P}'$  means a standard Gaussian distribution of  $\gamma$  given  $\mathbf{Y}$ . Furthermore, let for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ , there exist a nonnegative homogeneous function  $\tau_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$  such that  $\tau_3(\mathbf{v}, t\mathbf{u}) = |t|^3 \tau_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$  for any  $t$  and

$$|\delta_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{1}{6} \tau_3(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}), \quad D_G(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}). \quad (3.11)$$

Define for a Gaussian element  $\gamma_G(\mathbf{v}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v}))$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$

$$\diamond_3(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{4\{1 - \omega_3(\mathbf{v})\}^{3/2}} \mathbb{E} \tau_3(\mathbf{v}, \gamma_G(\mathbf{v})), \quad \diamond_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \diamond_3(\mathbf{v}).$$

Then the result (3.10) applies with  $\diamond = \diamond_3$ .

Finally, let for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ , there exist a positive function  $\tau_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$  such that  $\tau_4(\mathbf{v}, t\mathbf{u}) = t^4 \tau_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$  and

$$|\delta_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{1}{24} \tau_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) \leq 1, \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in D_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}), \quad (3.12)$$

with  $\delta_4(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$  from (A.13). Define for a Gaussian element  $\gamma_G(\mathbf{v}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v}))$

$$\begin{aligned} \diamond_4(\mathbf{v}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{16\{1 - \omega_3(\mathbf{v})\}^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{v}), \gamma_G^{\otimes 3}(\mathbf{v}) \rangle^2 + 2\mathbb{E} \tau_4(\mathbf{v}, \gamma_G) \right\}, \\ \diamond_4 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \diamond_4(\mathbf{v}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Then (3.10) applies with  $\diamond = \diamond_4$  uniformly over the class  $\mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)$  of centrally symmetric Borel sets  $A$ .

We also present a simple corollary with an explicit error of Gaussian approximation.

**Corollary 3.4.** *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 3.3 to be fulfilled. It holds on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \gamma \in A) \right| &\leq 4(\diamond_3 + e^{-x}), \\ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'(\tilde{D}_G^{-1} \gamma \in A) \right| &\leq 4(\diamond_4 + e^{-x}). \end{aligned}$$

### Proof of Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.4

Similarly to the proof of Proposition 2.1, we restrict ourselves to the situation when  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G$ . Then we fix any possible value  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$  of  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  and use (C) and  $\nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) = 0$  to represent the posterior probability of a set  $A$  in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}) &= \frac{\int_A \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u})\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u})\} d\mathbf{u}} \\ &= \frac{\int_A \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp\{L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G + \mathbf{u}) - L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - \langle \nabla L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\int_A e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}, \end{aligned}$$

cf. (3.6). Proposition 3.1 claims that given  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \mathbf{v}$ , the centered posterior  $\mathbf{v}_G - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \mid \mathbf{Y}$  concentrates on the set  $\{\mathbf{u}: D_G(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v})\}$ . Moreover, the value  $\rho(\mathbf{v})$  from (3.7) satisfies (3.8). We now apply Proposition A.1 with  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L_G(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $g(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \in A)$ , and  $\mathbf{H}^2 = D_G^2(\mathbf{v})$ . The quantity  $\diamond$  from (A.3) can be bounded  $\diamond \leq \diamond_2$  as in (A.19) of Proposition A.5. Similarly, under (3.11), it follows from (A.25) of Proposition A.7 that  $\diamond \leq \diamond_3$  while (A.27) of Proposition A.8 states  $\diamond \leq \diamond_4$  under (3.12). Moreover, (3.3) and (3.4) imply (A.2) with  $\rho_\gamma = e^{-\mathbf{x}}$  and  $\rho = \mathbf{C}_2 e^{-\mathbf{x}}$ , and (3.10) follows from (A.5). Corollary 3.4 follows from Corollary A.2.

#### 3.2.1 Univariate case

Let  $p = 1$ . This is a special case of Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, however, we present an independent derivation. For any  $v$ , define  $T(v) \equiv 1$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(v) = \mathcal{U} = [-\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}]$  for  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}$ . Below we assume that the value  $\omega_3$  satisfies  $\mathbf{x}\omega_3 \leq 1$ . It holds

$$\mathbb{P}(\gamma \notin \mathcal{U}) \leq \mathbb{P}(|\gamma| > \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \exp\left\{-\frac{1-\omega_3}{2}\mathbf{r}|\gamma| + \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2\right\} \mathbb{I}(|\gamma| > \mathbf{r}) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbf{r}}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)\mathbf{r}u}{2}\right) du \leq \frac{4}{\mathbf{r}\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\mathbf{r}^2(1-\omega_3)/2} \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}} \frac{4e^{\omega_3\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{r}\sqrt{2\pi}} \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}} \end{aligned}$$

for  $\mathbf{r} = \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}} \geq 2.17$ . So, (3.4) holds for  $\mathbf{C}_2 = 2$ . Moreover, as  $\mathbf{p}_T(v) \equiv 1$ , (3.9) holds as well and the statements of Theorem 3.3 can be applied.

### 3.2.2 Additive log-likelihood

Here we discuss a special case of the general result when the log-likelihood function  $L(\mathbf{v})$  is of additive structure:

$$L(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{\alpha} L_{\alpha}(v_{\alpha}).$$

For the prior of product structure with a diagonal matrix  $G^2 = \text{diag}(g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2)$ , this yields a posterior with independent components. This suggests to pick the local set  $\mathcal{U}$  as a rectangle:

$$\mathcal{U} = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} [-\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}, \mathbf{r}_{\alpha}].$$

We do not suppose that  $G^2$  is diagonal, however, it holds  $G^2 \geq G_0^2 = \text{diag}(g_1^2, \dots, g_p^2)$ . Let  $\pi$  be a prior on  $\mathfrak{A}$ , that is,  $\pi(\alpha) > 0$  and  $\sum_{\alpha} \pi_{\alpha} = 1$ . Define  $\mathbf{r}_{\alpha} = \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}} = \sqrt{2\mathbf{x} - 2\log \pi_{\alpha}}$  and check the conditions in (3.3) and (3.4). Clearly

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\gamma} \notin \mathcal{U}) \leq \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} \mathbb{P}(|\gamma_{\alpha}| > \mathbf{r}_{\alpha}) \leq \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} e^{-\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}^2/2} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} e^{-\mathbf{x}} \pi_{\alpha} = e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

Now we check (3.4). We use that

$$f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) = f(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) - \|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 \leq f(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) - \|\mathbf{G}_0\mathbf{u}\|^2/2.$$

This reduces the bound to the case of a diagonal matrix  $G^2 = G_0^2$ . Now,

$$f_G(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} f_{\alpha}(v_{\alpha}, u_{\alpha})$$

and the product structure of the local set  $\mathcal{U}$  yields by Example 3.2.1

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{f_G(\mathbf{v}, D_G^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2\right\} \mathbb{I}(\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{U}) \\ &= \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{f_{\alpha}(v_{\alpha}, D_{\alpha, G}^{-1}u_{\alpha}) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\alpha}^2\right\} \mathbb{I}(\gamma_{\alpha} \leq |\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}|) \geq \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} (1 - 2e^{-\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}}). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to check that  $\sum_{\alpha} e^{-\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}} = e^{-\mathbf{x}}$  and  $2e^{-\mathbf{x}} \leq 1/2$  implies

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} (1 - \mathbf{C}_2 e^{-\mathbf{x}_{\alpha}}) \geq 1 - 4e^{-\mathbf{x}}$$

yielding (3.4) with  $\mathbf{C}_2 = 4$ .

### 3.3 Critical dimension

This section discusses the important question of the critical parameter dimension still ensuring the validity of the presented results. A very important feature of our results is their dimension free and coordinate free form. The true parametric dimension  $p$  can be very large or even infinite, it does not show up in the error terms. Neither we use any spectral decomposition or sequence space structure, in particular, we do not require that the Fisher information matrix  $\mathbb{F}$  and the penalty matrix  $G^2$  are diagonal or can be diagonalized simultaneously. An important issue is the notion of a *sample size*. We operate with the log-likelihood function  $L(\mathbf{v})$ , its structure is not specified. However, in the case of an independent sample  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the function  $L(\mathbf{v})$  is of additive structure; see (4.1) below. The same applies to the information matrix  $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{v}) = -\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ ; see (4.2). Moreover, if the  $Y_i$ 's are i.i.d. then  $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})$  is proportional to  $n$ . Below we use the value  $\|\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\|$  as analog of the inverse sample size. Our results well applied as long as this value is sufficiently small. Below we quantify all these qualitative statements in the so called “regular” case with  $\|\mathbb{F}^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\| \lesssim n^{-1}$ .

For the concentration result of Proposition 2.1 the most critical condition is given by (2.7). Essentially it says that the values  $\omega_{3,G}$  and  $\alpha_{3,G}$  are significantly smaller than 1. We focus on the setup of Section 2.2 with the local set  $\mathcal{W}_G$  from (2.12). Under rather general regularity conditions one can bound  $\alpha_{3,G} \leq \mathbf{Cr}_G \|D_G^{-1}\|$ . As  $\|D_G^{-2}\| \leq \|\mathbb{F}^{-1}\| \leq 1/n$ , condition (2.7) means  $\mathbf{r}_G^2 \ll n$ . Moreover, the definition (2.11) of  $\mathbf{r}_G$  yields that  $\mathbf{r}_G^2 \asymp \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}V^2) \asymp \mathbf{p}_G$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_G$  is the effective dimension of the problem; cf. Spokoiny and Panov (2019). We conclude that the main properties of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  including concentration and Fisher and Wilks expansions are valid under the condition  $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n$  meaning sufficiently many observations per parameter.

Further, posterior concentration in Proposition 3.2 only requires  $\omega_3(\mathbf{v}) \ll 1$  for all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ . As above, in regular situation one can bound  $\omega_3(\mathbf{v}) \asymp \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v})/n}$  yielding the condition  $\mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) \ll n$  on the critical dimension which is essentially the same as the condition  $\mathbf{p}_G \ll n$  for the pMLE. Now we turn to the result of Theorem 3.3 describing the whole posterior distribution. The major condition (3.9) can cause serious problems in applications because of the multiplicative factor  $\mathbf{p}_T$ . Indeed, with  $\omega_3 \asymp \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_T/n}$  we obtain  $\omega_3 \mathbf{p}_T \asymp \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_T^3/n}$  and (3.9) forces  $\mathbf{p}_T^3 \ll n$  instead of  $\mathbf{p}_T \ll n$ . In some cases, e.g. for additive structure of the log-likelihood, it can be relaxed. However, it seems that the  $\mathbf{p}_T^3 \ll n$  condition is intrinsic to the problem and cannot be relaxed in general situation.

## 4 Anisotropic logistic regression

This section specifies the general results to a popular logistic regression model. It is widely used e.g. in binary classification in machine learning for binary classification or in binary response model in econometrics. The results presented here can be viewed as extension of [Spokoiny and Panov \(2019\)](#) to the case of non-regular models. Such an extension is very important for practical applications where the underlying probability of success can be very close to zero or one. Most of existing theoretical studies fail in such cases and the analysis becomes very involved. Moreover, another type of limiting behavior of the posterior may happen; see e.g. [Bochkina and Green \(2014\)](#) for some examples of model with non-Gaussian posterior approximation in non-regular regression. Our results indicate that the use of a sufficiently strong Gaussian prior on the canonical parameter vector allows to eliminate such cases and to establish a uniform Gaussian approximation of the posterior.

### 4.1 Setup and main results

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

$$L(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i \langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \phi(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle) \right\} \quad (4.1)$$

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

A penalized MLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  is defined by maximization of the penalized log-likelihood  $L_G(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$  for the quadratic penalty  $\|G\mathbf{v}\|^2/2$ :  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} L_G(\mathbf{v})$ . The penalized Fisher information matrix  $\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v})$  at  $\mathbf{v}$  is given by

$$\mathbb{F}_G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi''(\langle \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i \boldsymbol{\Psi}_i^\top + G^2. \quad (4.2)$$

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

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

density is given by

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

Inference for the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  and for the posterior density is well studied in regular situations when the true parameter  $\mathbf{v}^*$  belongs to a bounded set  $\mathcal{Y}$ ; see e.g. [Spokoiny \(2017\)](#); [Spokoiny and Panov \(2019\)](#). However, this does not apply to an irregular case when  $\mathcal{Y}$  can be unbounded. The approach of this paper allows to treat in a unified way regular, irregular, and mixed cases under the condition of sufficient information for each parameters in terms of the minimal eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{F}_G = \mathbf{F}_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ .

Let  $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i) \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle$  be the stochastic component of  $L(\mathbf{v})$ , and

$$\nabla \zeta = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i) \Psi_i, \quad V^2 = \text{Var}(\nabla \zeta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) \Psi_i \Psi_i$$

be its gradient and its covariance. Note that under correct GLM specification  $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i^*)$  with  $\theta_i^* = e^{\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v}^* \rangle} / (1 + e^{\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v}^* \rangle})$  for the true parameter  $\mathbf{v}^*$ , it follows  $V^2 = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}^*)$ . With  $\mathbf{x} > 0$ , define

$$\mathbf{p}_{V|G}(\mathbf{v}) = \text{tr}\{D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v}) V^2\}, \quad \mathbf{r}_{V|G} = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_{V|G}(\mathbf{v})} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}. \quad (4.3)$$

As usual, we write  $D_G = D_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$  and  $\mathbf{p}_{V|G} = \mathbf{p}_{V|G}(\mathbf{v}_G^*)$ . The norm of the vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_G = D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta$  can be bounded with large probability by  $\mathbf{r}_{V|G}$ ; see [Lemma B.15](#).

We need one more condition on regularity of the design  $\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_n$ . For any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}$  and any vector  $\mathbf{u}$ , the definition (4.2) implies

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

Design regularity usually treated in the sense that each summand  $\phi''(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle) \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2$  is  $n$  times smaller in order that the whole sum. Our condition requires a similar relation with  $n$  replaced by  $\mathbf{r}_{V|G}^2$  from (4.3). We also need a bound on the fourth moments of the design distribution.

( $\Psi_G$ ) (i) For all  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\max_{i \leq n} |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{3\mathbf{r}_{V|G}} \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|. \quad (4.4)$$

(ii) There exists  $\mathbf{C}_\Psi$  such that for all  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  with  $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^4 \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v}_G^* \rangle) \leq \mathbf{C}_\Psi^2 \|D_G \mathbf{u}\|^2.$$

If  $\|D_G \mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}_{V|G}$  then (4.4) of condition  $(\Psi_G)$  particularly yields  $|\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq 1/3$  for all  $i \leq n$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $Y_i$  be independent Bernoulli,  $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i^*)$ . Consider GLM (4.1). Given  $G^2$ , assume  $(\Psi_G)$ . Let also with  $\nu = 2/3$  and  $\mathbf{r}_{V|G}$  from (4.3)*

$$\nu^{-1} \sqrt{e} \mathbf{C}_\Psi \mathbf{r}_{V|G} \|D_G^{-1}\| \leq 1/3. \quad (4.5)$$

Then on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ , the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  satisfies

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

Moreover, it holds on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\omega_G = \sqrt{e} \mathbf{C}_\Psi \mathbf{r}_{V|G} \|D_G^{-1}\| \leq 2/9$

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*) - \boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2 &\leq \frac{3\omega_G}{(1 - \omega_G)^2} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2, \\ \left| L_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) - L_G(\mathbf{v}_G^*) - \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2 \right| &\leq \frac{\omega_G}{2(1 - \omega_G)} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_G\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 4.1.** It is remarkable that the results about the properties of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  only assume the basic condition (4.5) and some design regularity. Moreover, if  $\lambda_G = \max_i \|D_G^{-1} \Psi_i\| \asymp \|D_G^{-1}\|$ , then our conditions only require  $\mathbf{p}_{V|G} \|D_G^{-2}\|$  being small.

*Proof.* We apply the generic results of Proposition 2.1. The stochastic component  $\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = L(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$  is obviously linear in  $\mathbf{v}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \zeta &= \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i) \Psi_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \Psi_i. \\ V^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\varepsilon_i) \Psi_i \Psi_i^\top = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) \Psi_i \Psi_i^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be such that  $1/\lambda_G \geq \mathbf{x}^{1/2}/2 + (\mathbf{x} \mathbf{p}_{V|G}/4)^{1/4}$  with  $\mathbf{p}_{V|G} = \text{tr}(D_G^{-2} V^2)$  and  $\lambda_G = \max_i \|D_G^{-1} \Psi_i\|$ . By Lemma B.15, on a set  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega(\mathbf{x})) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}$

$$\|D_G^{-1} \nabla \zeta\| \leq \mathbf{r}_{V|G} = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_{V|G}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}.$$

Now we aim to check that  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G - \mathbf{v}_G^*$  concentrates on the set

$$\mathcal{W}_G = \{\mathbf{u}: \|D_G \mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_{V|G}\}$$

for  $\nu = 2/3$ . By (4.4), it holds with  $\nu = 2/3$

$$\max_{i \leq n} \sup_{\|D_G \mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_{V|G}} |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{\nu \mathbf{r}_{V|G}} \|D_G \mathbf{u}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.6)$$

Next we check a similar statement for  $\phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \rangle)$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *It holds for  $\phi(v) = \log(1 + e^v)$*

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

Moreover, for any  $b > 0$ , any  $v^\circ \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $k = 2, 3, 4, 5$

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

*Proof.* It holds

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(v) &= \frac{e^v}{1 + e^v}, \\ \phi''(v) &= \frac{e^v}{(1 + e^v)^2}, \\ \phi'''(v) &= \frac{e^v}{(1 + e^v)^2} - \frac{2e^{2v}}{(1 + e^v)^3}, \\ \phi^{(4)}(v) &= \frac{e^v}{(1 + e^v)^2} - \frac{6e^{2v}}{(1 + e^v)^3} + \frac{6e^{3v}}{(1 + e^v)^4}, \\ \phi^{(5)}(v) &= \frac{e^v}{(1 + e^v)^2} - \frac{14e^{2v}}{(1 + e^v)^3} + \frac{36e^{3v}}{(1 + e^v)^4} - \frac{24e^{4v}}{(1 + e^v)^5}. \end{aligned}$$

It is worth straightforward to see that  $|\phi^{(k)}(v)| \leq \phi''(v)$  for  $k = 3, 4, 5$ . Further, suppose that  $v^\circ < 0$ . As the function  $\phi''(v)$  is monotonously increasing in  $v < 0$ , it holds

$$\sup_{|v - v^\circ| \leq b} \frac{\phi''(v)}{\phi''(v^\circ)} = \frac{\phi''(v^\circ + b)}{\phi''(v^\circ)} \leq e^b \quad (4.7)$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

Putting together (4.6) and (4.7) yields for each  $i \leq n$  and  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_G^*$

$$\sup_{\|D_G \mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_{V|G}} \frac{\phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} \rangle)}{\phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle)} \leq e^{1/2}. \quad (4.8)$$



As the next step we evaluate the value  $\alpha_{3,G}$  from (2.3). Let  $f(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}L(\mathbf{v})$ . For any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$  and any  $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $k \geq 2$ ,

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

and, in particular,

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

To simplify the notation, we define  $w_i = \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle)$ . With  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_G^*$ , for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{U}$ , we derive by (ii) of  $(\Psi_G)$ , Lemma 4.2 and (4.8) for  $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle| \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w} \rangle) \\ &\leq \sqrt{e} \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle| \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 w_i \leq \sqrt{e} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 w_i \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^4 w_i \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{e} \mathfrak{C}_\Psi \|D\mathbf{w}\| \|D_G\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{u}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

For any fixed  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}$  with  $\|D_G\mathbf{w}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathfrak{r}_{V|G}$ , this bound and condition (4.5) yield

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|\langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle|}{\|D_G\mathbf{u}\|^2} \leq \frac{\nu^{-1} \sqrt{e} \mathfrak{C}_\Psi \mathfrak{r}_{V|G} \|\mathbf{u}\|}{\|D_G\mathbf{u}\|} \leq 1/3 \quad (4.10)$$

yielding  $\alpha_{3,G} \leq 2/3$  and  $\omega_{3,G} \leq 2/9$ ; see (2.4). This helps to check the condition (2.7) with  $\nu = 2/3$  and to state the desired concentration property of  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  from Proposition 2.1 as well as the Fisher and Wilks expansions of Proposition 2.3.  $\square$

Now we state the main result about Gaussian approximation of the posterior distribution. We already know that  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G \in \mathcal{A}_G = \{\mathbf{v}: \|D_G(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_G^*)\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathfrak{r}_{V|G}\}$  on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$ . Our result involves an operator  $D_T(\mathbf{v})$  depending on  $\mathbf{v}$  and satisfying  $D(\mathbf{v}) \leq D_T(\mathbf{v}) \leq D_G(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}\{D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v}) D_T^2(\mathbf{v})\} \leq \mathfrak{C}$ . The main requirement to  $D_T(\mathbf{v})$  is that  $\|D_T^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\|$  is a small number uniformly over  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ . In a regular situation, when the latter holds for  $D(\mathbf{v})$ , one can take  $D_T(\mathbf{v}) \equiv D(\mathbf{v})$ . The condition  $(\Psi_G)$  should be slightly adjusted to the situation at hand.

$(\Psi_T)$  For all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$  and  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\max_{i \leq n} |\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{3\mathfrak{r}_{V|G}(\mathbf{v})} \|D_T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|.$$

There exists  $\mathbf{C}_\Psi$  such that for all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$  and any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  with  $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^4 \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle) \leq \mathbf{C}_\Psi^2 \|D_T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2.$$

**Theorem 4.3.** *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 4.1 and  $(\Psi_T)$ . Given  $\mathbf{x}$ , define for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$*

$$\mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) = \text{tr}\{D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})D_T^2(\mathbf{v})\}, \quad \mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v}) = 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v})} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}.$$

Let with  $\nu = 2/3$

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \nu^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{C}_\Psi \mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v}) \|D_T^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\| \leq \frac{1}{3}. \quad (4.11)$$

Then it holds on  $\Omega(\mathbf{x})$  with  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_G = \mathbf{F}_G(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_G^{1/2}(\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) - \mathbb{P}(\gamma \in A) \right| &\leq \mathbf{C}_3 (\diamond_3 + e^{-\mathbf{x}}), \\ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbb{R}^p)} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_G^{1/2}(\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G) \in A \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) - \mathbb{P}(\gamma \in A) \right| &\leq \mathbf{C}_4 (\diamond_3^2 + e^{-\mathbf{x}}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where  $\gamma$  is standard Gaussian in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_3, \mathbf{C}_4$  are some absolute constants, and

$$\diamond_3 \leq \mathbf{C}_\Psi \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G} \mathbf{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \sqrt{\text{tr} D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})}.$$

**Remark 4.2.** Condition (4.11) is stronger than (4.5) because of the additional factor  $\mathbf{p}_T(\mathbf{v})$  and of using  $\|D_T^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\|$  in place of  $\|D_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\|$ .

*Proof.* We apply the generic result of Theorem 3.3. By Theorem 4.1, the estimate  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  with high probability belongs to the set  $\mathcal{A}_G$ . We now fix the sets  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{v}) = \{\mathbf{u}: \|T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v})\}$  using the operators  $T(\mathbf{v}) = D_T(\mathbf{v})D_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})$ , and apply the general result of Theorem 3.3. Similarly to (4.10), we derive for any fixed  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}$  with  $\|D_T\mathbf{w}\| \leq \nu^{-1}\mathbf{r}_T$ , by condition (4.11)

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{|\langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{v} + t\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle|}{\|D_T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|^2} \leq \frac{\nu^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{C}_\Psi \mathbf{r}_T(\mathbf{v}) \|\mathbf{u}\|}{\|D_T(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}\|} \leq 1/3$$

yielding  $\alpha_3(\mathbf{v}) \leq 2/3$  and  $\omega_3(\mathbf{v}) \leq 2/9$ . This implies condition (3.2) of Proposition 3.1. The use of (4.11) also implies condition (3.9) of Theorem 3.3. Further we have to evaluate the values  $\diamond_k(\mathbf{v})$  for  $k \geq 3$  from Theorem 3.3. Similarly to (4.9)

$$|\delta_4(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{e}}}{24} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle^4 w_i$$

with  $w_i = \phi^{(2)}(\langle \Psi_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle)$  and the use of  $(\Psi_T)$  helps to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \gamma_G \rangle^4 w_i &\leq \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \mathbb{E}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2 \|\gamma_G\|^2) \\ &= \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \mathbb{E}\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2 \mathbb{E}\|\gamma_G\|^2 + \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \mathbb{E}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2)(\|\gamma_G\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\gamma_G\|^2) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \mathbb{E}\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2 \mathbb{E}\|\gamma_G\|^2 + \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \sqrt{\text{Var}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2) \text{Var}(\|\gamma_G\|^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

The same arguments help to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \Psi_i, \gamma_G \rangle^3 w_i \right)^2 &\leq \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \mathbb{E}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^4 \|\gamma_G\|^2) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \mathbb{E}\|D_T \gamma_G\|^4 \mathbb{E}\|\gamma_G\|^2 + \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \sqrt{\text{Var}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^4) \text{Var}(\|\gamma_G\|^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Now observe that  $\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2 = \langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle$  with  $\gamma$  standard normal and  $B = D_G^{-1} D_T^2 D_G^{-1} \leq I_p$ ,  $\text{tr} B = \mathfrak{p}_T$ . Lemma B.1 implies  $\mathbb{E}\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2 = \mathfrak{p}_T$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2) &\leq 2\mathfrak{p}_T, \\ \text{Var} \|D_T \gamma_G\|^4 &\leq 8\mathfrak{p}_T^3 + 40\mathfrak{p}_T^2 + 48\mathfrak{p}_T. \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\gamma_G\|^2 &= \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}), \\ \text{Var}(\|\gamma_G\|^2) &= 2 \text{tr}(D_G^{-4}) \leq 2\|D_G^{-2}\| \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}) \leq 2 \text{tr}^2(D_G^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

We derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^2 \|\gamma_G\|^2) &\leq \mathfrak{p}_T \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}) + 2\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}_T \text{tr}(D_G^{-4})} \leq 2\mathfrak{p}_T \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}), \\ \mathbb{E}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^4 \|\gamma_G\|^2) &\leq (\mathfrak{p}_T^2 + 2\mathfrak{p}_T) \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}) + \sqrt{\text{Var}(\|D_T \gamma_G\|^4) \text{Var}(\|\gamma_G\|^2)} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{C}_4 \mathfrak{p}_T^2 \text{tr}(D_G^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

This yields by (3.13), (4.13), and (4.14)

$$\diamond_4(\mathbf{v}) \lesssim \mathfrak{C}_\Psi^2 \mathfrak{p}_T^2(\mathbf{v}) \text{tr} D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v}).$$

Also (4.14) implies

$$\diamond_3(\mathbf{v}) \lesssim \sqrt{\diamond_4(\mathbf{v})} \lesssim \mathfrak{C}_\Psi \mathfrak{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) \sqrt{\text{tr} D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})}.$$

Finally we apply the general results of Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.4.  $\square$

## 4.2 Regular balanced case

Here we specify the results to the case of a regular design when all the eigenvalues of the matrix information  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v}) = D^2(\mathbf{v})$  for all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$  are of order  $n$ . In addition we assume that the penalty  $G^2$  is balanced with  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\|\mathbf{F}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\| \asymp n^{-1}$  as well. Then condition (4.5) of Theorem 4.1 requires  $r_{V|G}^2 \ll n$ . In view of  $r_{V|G}^2 \approx \text{tr}(V^2 D_G^{-2}) = \mathfrak{p}_G$ , all the presented properties of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  are valid as long as  $\mathfrak{p}_G \ll n$ . Under the same condition we can state posterior concentration of Proposition 3.2. Gaussian approximation of the posterior from Theorem 4.3 requires stronger conditions (4.11). We can use  $D_T(\mathbf{v}) = D(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\mathbf{r}_T = \mathbf{r}_G$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}_T(\mathbf{v}) = \mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v})$ . Design regularity  $\|D^{-2}(\mathbf{v})\| \asymp n^{-1}$  yields

$$\text{tr } D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v}) \asymp n^{-1} \text{tr}\{D^2(\mathbf{v})D_G^{-2}(\mathbf{v})\} = n^{-1}\mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v}).$$

Therefore,  $\diamond_3(\mathbf{v}) \asymp \mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v})\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v})/n}$ ,  $\diamond_4(\mathbf{v}) \asymp \mathfrak{p}_G^3(\mathbf{v})/n$ , and the results of Theorem 4.3 are meaningful if  $\mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \ll n^{1/3}$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_G$ . We conclude that the majority of our results are applicable under rather mild and intuitive condition  $\mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \ll n$  meaning sufficiently many observations per one effective parameter. The only one final result about Gaussian approximation of the posterior requires much more restrictive condition  $\mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \ll n^{1/3}$ .

## 4.3 Truncation and smooth priors

In this section we consider two non-trivial examples of Gaussian priors: truncation and smooth priors. To make the presentation clear, we impose some assumptions on the considered setup. Most of them are non-restrictive and can be extended to more general situations. We assume to be given a growing sequence of nested linear approximation subspaces  $\mathbb{W}_1 \subset \mathbb{W}_2 \dots$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  of dimension  $\dim(\mathbb{W}_m) = m$ . Below  $\Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m}$  is the projector on  $\mathbb{W}_m$  and  $\mathbb{W}_m^c$  is the orthogonal complement of  $\mathbb{W}_m$ . A *smooth prior* is described by a self-adjoint operator  $G$  such that  $\|G\mathbf{u}\|/\|\mathbf{u}\|$  becomes large for  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{W}_m^c$  and  $m$  large. One can write this condition in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \|G\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq g_m^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, & \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{W}_m, \\ \|G\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\geq g_m^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, & \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{W}_m^c. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Often one assumes that  $\mathbb{W}_m$  is spanned by the eigenvectors of  $G^2$  corresponding to its smallest eigenvalues  $g_1^2 \leq g_2^2 \leq \dots \leq g_m^2$ . We only need (4.15). Further we assume that  $g_j^2$  grow polynomially yielding for some  $\mathfrak{C}_{1,g}, \mathfrak{C}_{2,g}$  and each  $J$

$$\mathfrak{C}_{1,g} \leq \frac{1}{Jg_J^{-2}} \sum_{j \geq J} g_j^{-2} \leq \mathfrak{C}_{2,g}. \tag{4.16}$$

A typical example is given by  $G^2 = \text{diag}(g_j^2)$  with  $g_j^2 = w^{-1}j^{2s}$  for  $s > 1/2$  and some window parameter  $w$ . Below we refer to this case as  $(s, w)$ -smooth prior.

A  $m$ -truncation prior assumes that the prior distribution is restricted to  $\mathbb{W}_m$ . This formally corresponds to a covariance operator  $G_m^{-2}$  with  $G_m^{-2}(I - \Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m}) = 0$ . Equivalently, we set  $g_{m+1} = g_{m+2} = \dots = \infty$  in (4.15).

To evaluate the effective dimension, we assume that the matrices  $\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})$  and  $V^2$  satisfy for each  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ$ ,  $m \geq 1$ , and any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{W}_m$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq \langle \mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq \mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \\ \mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq \langle V^2\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq \mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} n \|\mathbf{u}\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

This condition is standard for regular regression models. First we evaluate the effective dimension of the problem.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Assume (4.15), (4.16), and (4.17). (1) For a  $m$ -truncation prior, suppose that  $g_m^2 \leq n$ . (2) For a smooth prior, define  $m$  by  $g_m^2 \approx n$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{C}_3 m \leq \mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \leq \mathbf{C}_4 m, \quad \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{Y}^\circ, \tag{4.18}$$

where  $\mathbf{C}_3$  and  $\mathbf{C}_4$  only depend on  $\mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}}, \mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ , and  $\mathbf{C}_{1,g}, \mathbf{C}_{2,g}$ .

(3) For a  $(s, w)$ -smooth prior, the effective dimension is given by  $\mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \asymp (nw)^{1/(2s)}$ .

Here and below “ $a \asymp b$ ” means  $a \leq \mathbf{C}b$  and  $b \leq \mathbf{C}a$  with an absolute constant  $\mathbf{C}$ .

**Remark 4.3.** Later we will see that under (4.17), a  $(s, w)$ -smooth prior yields nearly the same behavior of the pMLE  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_G$  and the posterior as  $m$ -truncation prior with  $m \asymp (wn)^{1/(2s)}$ .

*Proof.* The condition  $G_m^{-2}(I - \Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m}) = 0$  effectively means that the prior is limited to the subspace  $\mathbb{W}_m$  and moreover,  $\|V^2 \mathbb{F}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{v})\| \leq 1$ . This implies  $\mathfrak{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \leq \dim(\mathbb{W}_m) = m$ . Next we show the statement (4.18). For  $m \geq 1$ , by (4.17) and (4.15)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}[V^2\{\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2\}^{-1}\Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m}] &\leq (\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}}/\mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}}) \text{tr} \Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m} = (\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}}/\mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}})m, \\ \text{tr}[V^2\{\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2\}^{-1}\Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m}] &\geq \mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}} \frac{n}{\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}}n + g_m} \text{tr} \Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m} = \frac{m \mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}} n}{\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}}n + g_m^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\text{tr}[V^2\{\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2\}^{-1}(I - \Pi_{\mathbb{W}_m})] \leq \sum_{j \geq m} \frac{\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} n}{\mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}} n + g_j^2}.$$

Further, by (4.16)

$$\sum_{j \geq m} \frac{\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} n}{\mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}} n + g_j^2} \leq \mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} n \sum_{j \geq m} \frac{1}{g_j^2} \leq \frac{\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} n \mathbf{C}_{2,g} m}{g_m^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$m \frac{\mathbf{C}_{1,\mathbb{F}} n}{\mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} n + g_m^2} \leq \text{tr}[V^2\{\mathbb{F}(\mathbf{v}) + G^2\}^{-1}] \leq m \frac{1 + \mathbf{C}_{2,\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{C}_{2,g} n}{g_m^2}.$$

If  $m$  be such that  $g_m^2 \asymp n$ , then  $\mathbf{p}_G(\mathbf{v}) \asymp m$ .  $\square$

The next result explains how the prior can be linked to “smoothness” of the unknown vector  $\mathbf{v}^*$ . Suppose that the unknown vector  $\mathbf{v}^*$  belongs to a Sobolev ball  $\mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)$ :

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

By Lemma 2.4, the bias  $\mathbf{b}_G = \mathbf{v}_G^* - \mathbf{v}^*$  can be bounded as  $\|\mathbf{b}_G\| \approx \|D_G^{-2} G^2 \mathbf{v}^*\|$ . Due to (2.28) with  $Q = I_p$ , the bias-variance trade-off means  $\|\mathbf{b}_G\|^2 \asymp \mathbf{p}_{Q|G} = \text{tr}(D_G^{-2} \mathbf{H}^2 D_G^{-2})$ .

Under a proper choice  $m = m^* = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$  or  $(w n)^{1/(2s)} = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)} = m^*$  of the prior parameters one can derive finite sample versions of the standard nonparametric *rate optimal* results about concentration of the pMLE and posterior contraction; cf Castillo and Nickl (2014), Castillo and Rousseau (2015). We use that  $\tilde{D}_G^2 \geq n \mathbf{C}_\psi^2 I_p$  and  $n^{-1} z_G^2 \asymp n^{-1} m^* \asymp w_0^{1/(2s_0+1)} n^{-2s_0/(2s_0+1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $s_0 > 0$ . The error term in (4.12) is of order  $n^{(2-2s_0)/(2s_0+1)}$  and it tends to zero only as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  only if  $s_0 > 1$ .

**Theorem 4.5.** *Assume conditions of Theorem 4.3. Define  $m^* = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)}$ . For the  $m$ -truncation prior with  $m = m^*$  or for the  $(s, w)$ -smooth prior with  $(w n)^{1/(2s)} = (w_0 n)^{1/(2s_0+1)} = m^*$ , it holds on the same set  $\Omega_n$*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{B}(s_0, w_0)} \mathbb{P} \left( \|\mathbf{v}_G - \mathbf{v}^*\|^2 > \mathbf{C} w_0^{1/(2s_0+1)} n^{-2s_0/(2s_0+1)} \mid \mathbf{X} \right) \leq n^{-1},$$

for  $n$  sufficiently large.

## A Laplace approximation in high dimensions

Here we collect some useful bounds for accuracy of Gaussian approximation of a log-smooth density. More precisely, let  $f(\mathbf{x})$  be a smooth function in a high-dimensional Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^p$  defining a distribution with the density  $\mathbf{C}e^{f(\mathbf{x})}$ , where  $\mathbf{C}$  is a normalizing constant. Below we assume that  $f(\cdot)$  is three or even four time differentiable and concave at a fixed central point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  with  $\mathbf{D}^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$  strictly positive semidefinite. Given a function  $g(\cdot)$ , we consider the ratio of two integrals

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

where the integral sign  $\int$  without limits means the integral over the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . We aim at establishing a Gaussian approximation  $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{D}^{-2})$  for  $\mathcal{I}(g)$ :

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

### A.1 Error of Laplace approximation

Obviously

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

Moreover, if  $\mathbf{x} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{v})$ , then  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  and

$$\mathcal{I}(g) = \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}. \tag{A.1}$$

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

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

Implicitly we assume that the negative Hessian  $\mathbf{D}^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$  is sufficiently large in the sense that the Gaussian measure  $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{D}^{-2})$  concentrates on a local set  $\mathcal{U}$ . This allows to use a local Taylor expansion for  $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \approx -\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$  in  $\mathbf{u}$  on  $\mathcal{U}$ . The main technical step is to bound the error of approximation

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

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

$$\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})-f(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}, \quad \rho_{\mathbb{D}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

are sufficiently small then one can bound the difference  $|\mathcal{I}(g) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{D}}(g)|$  in terms of  $\diamond, \rho$  and  $\rho_{\mathbb{D}}$ . The next result makes this claim rigorous.

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

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})-f(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})-f(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond_g, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then with  $\rho$  and  $\rho_{\mathbb{D}}$  from (A.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \rho_{\mathbb{D}} - \diamond} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} + \frac{\rho + \diamond_g}{1 - \rho_{\mathbb{D}} - \diamond}, \\ \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}} &\geq \frac{1}{1 + \rho + \diamond} \frac{\int g(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} - \frac{\rho_{\mathbb{D}} + \diamond_g}{1 + \rho + \diamond}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

*Proof.* It follows from (A.3)

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

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

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



Putting together all these bounds yields (A.5).  $\square$

The next corollary is straightforward.

**Corollary A.2.** *Assume (A.2) with  $\rho_D \leq \rho$  and (A.3), (A.4) with  $\diamond_g \leq \diamond$  and  $\diamond + \rho \leq 1/2$  for a function  $g(\mathbf{u})$  with  $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$ . Then*

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

## A.2 Local approximation. Univariate case

In what follows we present some bounds for the error  $\diamond$  of local approximation from (A.3) and for the tail moments  $\rho_g$ . Our results are explicit, non-asymptotic, coordinate and dimension free. First we discuss the univariate case, then extend the results to the multivariate case.

We start with the univariate case. Define  $f(x; u) = f(x + u) - f(x) - f'(x)u$ ,

$$\delta_3(x, u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(x + u) - f(x) - f'(x)u - f''(x)\frac{u^2}{2}.$$

**Proposition A.3.** *Let a function  $f(u)$  be two times continuously differentiable and satisfy  $f''(x) = -D^2 < 0$ . If for some  $z > 0$*

$$\sup_{|u| \leq z} \frac{1}{D^2 u^2 / 2} |\delta_3(x, u)| \leq \omega_3 \leq 1/3, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

then for any function  $g(u)$  with  $|g(u)| \leq 1$

$$\frac{|\int_{-z}^z e^{f(x;u)} g(u) du - \int_{-z}^z e^{-D^2 u^2 / 2} g(u) du|}{\int e^{-D^2 u^2 / 2} du} \leq \diamond_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\omega_3}{2(1 - \omega_3)}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Moreover, if, in addition to (A.6), for some  $\bar{f}^{(3)} = \bar{f}^{(3)}(x)$

$$|\delta_3(x, u)| \leq \frac{1}{6} |\bar{f}^{(3)}| u^3, \quad |u| \leq z, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

then

$$\frac{|\int_{-z}^z e^{f(x;u)} g(u) du - \int_{-z}^z e^{-D^2 u^2 / 2} g(u) du|}{\int e^{-D^2 u^2 / 2} du} \leq \diamond_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{0.7 |\bar{f}^{(3)}|}{D^3}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

*Proof.* By (A.6) and  $\omega_3 \leq 1/3$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathbb{D}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \int_{-z}^z e^{f(x;u)} g(u) du - \int_{-z}^z e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} g(u) du \right| \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{D}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \int_{-z}^z e^{-(1-\omega_3)\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} du - \int_{-z}^z e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} du \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \int e^{-(1-\omega_3)u^2/2} du - \int e^{-u^2/2} du \right| \leq (1-\omega_3)^{-1/2} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

We now use that  $(1-\omega_3)^{-1/2} - 1 \leq 0.5\omega_3/(1-\omega_3)$  for  $\omega_3 < 1$ , and the result (A.7) follows.

Now we show (A.9). It holds

$$\int_{-z}^z e^{f(x;u)} g(u) du = \int_{-z}^z e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2 + \delta_3(x,u)} g(u) du.$$

Define for  $t \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \int_{-z}^z e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2 + t\delta_3(x,u)} g(u) du.$$

Then for  $t \in [0, 1]$  by (A.6) and (A.8)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}'(t)| &= \left| \int_{-z}^z \delta_3(x,u) e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2 + t\delta_3(x,u)} g(u) du \right| \leq \int_{-z}^z |\delta_3(x,u)| e^{-(1-\omega_3)\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{6} \int_{-z}^z |\bar{f}^{(3)}| u^3 e^{-(1-\omega_3)\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} du \leq \frac{|\bar{f}^{(3)}| \mathbb{D}^{-4}}{6(1-\omega_3)^2} \int |u|^3 e^{-u^2/2} du = \frac{2|\bar{f}^{(3)}| \mathbb{D}^{-4}}{3(1-\omega_3)^2} \end{aligned}$$

and it holds

$$|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{R}'(t)| \leq \frac{2|\bar{f}^{(3)}| \mathbb{D}^{-4}}{3(1-\omega_3)^2}$$

yielding for  $\omega_3 \leq 1/3$

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)|}{\int e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} du} \leq \frac{2|\bar{f}^{(3)}| \mathbb{D}^{-4}}{3(1-\omega_3)^2 \sqrt{2\pi} \mathbb{D}^{-1}} \leq \frac{0.27|\bar{f}^{(3)}|}{(1-\omega_3)^2 \mathbb{D}^3}$$

and (A.9) follows.  $\square$

Now we present some results based on a higher order Taylor approximation. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_4(x, u) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(x+u) - f(x) - f'(x)u + \frac{\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2} - \frac{f^{(3)}(x)u^3}{6} \\ &= f(x, u) + \frac{\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2} - \frac{f^{(3)}(x)u^3}{6}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

With  $\delta_3(x, u) = f(x, u) + \mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2$ , it obviously holds

$$\delta_3(x, u) = \delta_4(x, u) + f^{(3)}(x)u^3/6.$$

**Proposition A.4.** *Let  $f(u)$  be three times continuously differentiable and satisfy (A.6). Define  $\varkappa_3 = f^{(3)}(x)/\mathbb{D}^2$ . If  $\delta_4(x, u)$  from (A.10) satisfies*

$$\sup_{|u| \leq z} \frac{24}{\mathbb{D}^2 u^4} |\delta_4(x, u)| \leq \varkappa_4 \quad (\text{A.11})$$

then for any function  $g(u)$  with  $|g(u)| \leq 1$  and  $g(u) = g(-u)$

$$\frac{|\int_{-z}^z e^{f(x;u)} g(u) du - \int_{-z}^z e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} g(u) du|}{\int e^{-\mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2} du} \leq \diamond_4. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

with

$$\diamond_4 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \frac{5\varkappa_3^2}{12(1-\omega_3)^{7/2}} + \frac{\varkappa_4}{4(1-\omega_3)^{5/2}} \right\} \mathbb{D}^{-2}.$$

*Proof.* We write  $\delta_3(u)$  in place of  $\delta_3(x, u)$  and  $f^{(3)}$  in place of  $f^{(3)}(x)$ . It holds

$$\int_{-z}^z e^{f(x;u)} g(u) du = \int_{-z}^z \exp\left\{-\frac{\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2} + \delta_3(u)\right\} g(u) du.$$

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

$$\mathcal{R}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{-z}^z \exp\left\{-\frac{\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2} + t\delta_3(u)\right\} g(u) du.$$

Symmetry  $g(u) = g(-u)$  implies that

$$\mathcal{R}'(0) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-z}^z \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2}\right) \{\delta_3(u) + \delta_3(-u)\} g(u) du = \int_{-z}^z \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2}\right) \delta_4(u) g(u) du.$$

Moreover, as  $|\delta_3(u)| \leq \omega_3 \mathbb{D}^2 u^2/2$ , it holds for  $t \in [0, 1]$

$$|\mathcal{R}''(t)| = \left| \int_{-z}^z \delta_3^2(u) \exp\left\{-\frac{\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2} + t\delta_3(u)\right\} g(u) du \right| \leq \int_{-z}^z \delta_3^2(u) \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2}\right) du.$$

As  $\delta_3(u) = f^{(3)}u^3/6 + \delta_4(u)$  and  $|\delta_4(u)| \leq 1$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}''(t)| &\leq 2 \int_{-z}^z \{\delta_4^2(u) + |f^{(3)}u^3/6|^2\} \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2}\right) du \\ &\leq 2 \int_{-z}^z \{|\delta_4(u)| + |f^{(3)}|^2 u^6/36\} \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)\mathbb{D}^2 u^2}{2}\right) du. \end{aligned}$$

The use of  $|f^{(3)}| = \varkappa_3 D^2$  and (A.11) yields in view of  $\omega_3 \leq 1/3$  and  $|\delta_4(u)| \leq \varkappa_4 D^2 u^4$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq |\mathcal{R}'(0)| + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{t \leq 1} |\mathcal{R}''(t)| \\
&\leq 2 \int_{-z}^z |\delta_4(u)| \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)D^2 u^2}{2}\right) du + \frac{\varkappa_3^2 D^4}{36} \int_{-z}^z u^6 \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)D^2 u^2}{2}\right) du \\
&\leq \frac{\varkappa_4 D^2}{12} \int_{-z}^z u^4 \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)D^2 u^2}{2}\right) du + \frac{\varkappa_3^2 D^4}{36} \int_{-z}^z u^6 \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\omega_3)D^2 u^2}{2}\right) du \\
&\leq \frac{\varkappa_4 (1-\omega_3)^{-5/2}}{12 D^3} \int u^4 \exp\left(-\frac{D^2 u^2}{2}\right) du + \frac{\varkappa_3^2 (1-\omega_3)^{-7/2}}{36 D^3} \int u^6 \exp\left(-\frac{D^2 u^2}{2}\right) du \\
&= \frac{3\sqrt{2\pi} \varkappa_4 (1-\omega_3)^{-5/2}}{12 D^3} + \frac{15\sqrt{2\pi} \varkappa_3^2 (1-\omega_3)^{-7/2}}{36 D^3}
\end{aligned}$$

yielding (A.12) in view of  $\int e^{-D^2 u^2/2} du = \sqrt{2\pi} D^{-1}$  and  $\varkappa_3 \leq 1/3$ .  $\square$

**Remark A.1.** Suppose that  $f(\cdot)$  is three times continuously differentiable and  $|f^{(3)}(x+u)| \leq \tau_3 D^2$  for  $|u| \leq z$ . Then the expansion (A.6) applies with  $\omega_3 \leq \tau_3 z/3$ . The use of  $z = \mathbf{x}/D$  yields

$$\omega_3 \leq \tau_3 z/3 \leq \mathbf{C} \tau_3 \mathbf{x} D^{-1}.$$

Similarly, if  $f(\cdot)$  is four times continuously differentiable and  $|f^{(4)}(u)| \leq \varkappa_4 D^2$  for  $|u| \leq z$ , then (A.11) holds as well. One can see that the use of a higher order approximation of  $f$  allows to improve the accuracy of approximation from  $D^{-1}$  as in (A.9) of Proposition A.3 to  $D^{-2}$  as in (A.12) of Proposition A.4.

### A.3 Local approximation. Multivariate case

Now we extend the result to a multivariate function  $f$ . We present two results. One is based on the Taylor expansion of the second order and can be used for bounding the total variation distance. The second result is finer and uses the fourth order expansion. It allows to improve the error term of Gaussian approximation over the class of centrally symmetric sets. Let  $p \leq \infty$  and let  $f(\cdot)$  be a three times continuously differentiable function on  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . We fix a reference point  $\mathbf{x}$  and local region around  $\mathbf{x}$  given by the local star-shaped set  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ . Suppose that  $-\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$  is positive semidefinite matrix and denote  $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) = -D^2$ . Define for each  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle.$$

Also consider the second order Taylor approximation  $f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) \approx f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle$  and similarly the third order expansion and introduce the remainders

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &= f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle, \\ \delta_4(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &= f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle - \frac{1}{6} \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

The use of the Taylor formula allows to bound

$$|\delta_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{1}{k!} |\langle \nabla^k f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes k} \rangle|, \quad k \geq 3. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

It is worth noting that adding a quadratic penalty  $-\|G\mathbf{u}\|^2/2$  to  $f$  does not affect the remainders  $\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  and  $\delta_4(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ . Indeed, with  $f_G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) = f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - \|G(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u})\|^2/2$ , it holds

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

and the values  $\delta_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  do not change after adding the quadratic term,  $k \geq 3$ .

The next result involves another matrix  $D_0^2 \leq D^2$ . This corresponds to the situation when  $f(\mathbf{x})$  contains a significant quadratic component, e.g.  $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_0(\mathbf{x}) - \|G\mathbf{x}\|^2/2$ . Then  $D_0^2 = -\nabla^2 f_0(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $D^2 = D_0^2 + G^2$ , but the quadratic term  $\|G\mathbf{x}\|^2/2$  has no impact in the error  $\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ .

**Proposition A.5.** *Suppose that the set  $\mathcal{U}$  is star-shaped and such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(D^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma} \notin \mathcal{U}) \leq e^{-x} \leq 1/4, \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Let also an operator  $D_0^2 \leq D^2$  be fixed such that

$$\omega_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}} \frac{1}{\|D_0\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} |\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{1}{3}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Then

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \geq e^{-\omega_3 p_0/2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|D\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

with

$$p_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}(D_0^2 D^{-2}).$$

If, in addition,

$$\omega_3 p_0 \leq 2/3, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

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

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond_2 = \frac{0.75 \omega_3 \mathbf{p}_0}{1 - \omega_3}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

*Proof.* First we show that

$$\det(\mathbf{I} + \omega_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1}) \leq \exp(\omega_3 \mathbf{p}_0), \quad (\text{A.20})$$

$$\det(\mathbf{I} - \omega_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1})^{-1/2} \leq \exp\{3/2 \log(3/2) \omega_3 \mathbf{p}_0\} \leq 3/2. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Indeed, without loss of generality assume that  $\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1}$  is diagonal with eigenvalues  $\lambda_j \in [0, 1]$ . As  $-\log(1-x) \leq 3 \log(3/2)$  for  $x \in [0, 1/3]$ , it holds by (A.16) and (A.18)

$$\begin{aligned} \log \det(\mathbf{I} - \omega_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1})^{-1} &= - \sum_{j=1}^p \log(1 - \omega_3 \lambda_j) \leq 3 \log(3/2) \sum_{j=1}^p \omega_3 \lambda_j \\ &= 3 \log(3/2) \omega_3 \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1}) = 3 \log(3/2) \omega_3 \mathbf{p}_0 \leq 2 \log(3/2). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (A.20) is similar using  $\log(1+x) \leq x$  for  $x \geq 0$ .

Now we check (A.17). By definition (A.13),  $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) = -\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ . Therefore, by (A.16)

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} = \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} \geq \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}.$$

As  $\mathcal{U}$  is star-shaped, change of variable  $(\mathbf{I} + \omega_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1})^{1/2} \mathbf{u}$  to  $\mathbf{w}$  yields by (A.20)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} &\geq \det(\mathbf{I} + \omega_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1})^{-1/2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w} \\ &\geq e^{-\omega_3 \mathbf{p}_0/2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w}, \end{aligned}$$

and (A.17) follows.

Now we suppose (A.18) to be fulfilled. Define for  $t \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + t\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Then for  $t \in [0, 1]$  by (A.16)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}'(t)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + t\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| e^{-(\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2)/2} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we make change of variable  $\Gamma \mathbf{u}$  to  $\mathbf{w}$  with  $\Gamma^2 = \mathbf{I} - \omega_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1}$ . By (A.21)  $\det \Gamma^{-1} \leq 3/2$  and also  $\|\Gamma^{-1}\| \leq (1 - \omega_3)^{-1/2}$ . By (A.16)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{R}'(t)| \leq \frac{\omega_3}{2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2 e^{-(\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2)/2} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{3\omega_3}{4} \int \|\mathbf{D}_0 \Gamma^{-1} \mathbf{w}\|^2 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w} \leq \frac{3\omega_3}{4(1 - \omega_3)} \int \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{w}\|^2 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of  $\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-2})$  for a standard normal  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ , we derive

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)|}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{3\omega_3}{4(1 - \omega_3)} \frac{\int \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{w}\|^2 e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w}} \leq \frac{3\omega_3 p_0}{4(1 - \omega_3)}$$

and the bound (A.19) follows.  $\square$

The result can be extended to the case with a homogeneous function  $g(\mathbf{u})$ , e.g.  $g(\mathbf{u}) = \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^k$ .

**Proposition A.6.** *Suppose the conditions of Proposition A.5 including (A.18). Let*

$$|\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{1}{6} \tau_3(\mathbf{u}) \quad (\text{A.23})$$

for a 3-homogeneous function  $\tau_3(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $\tau_3(t\mathbf{u}) = |t|^3 \tau_3(\mathbf{u})$ . Then for  $k \geq 0$  and any  $k$ -homogeneous function  $g(\cdot)$  with  $g(t\mathbf{u}) = t^k g(\mathbf{u})$

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \{g(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}}) \tau_3(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}})\}}{4(1 - \omega_3)^{(k+3)/2}}, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{D}^{-2})$  is a Gaussian element in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ .

*Proof.* Similarly to the proof of Proposition A.5, under (A.23) for  $\mathcal{R}(t)$  from (A.22)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq \frac{\det(\Gamma^{-1})}{6} \int \tau_3(\Gamma^{-1} \mathbf{w}) g(\Gamma^{-1} \mathbf{w}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4(1 - \omega_3)^{(k+3)/2}} \int \tau_3(\mathbf{w}) g(\mathbf{w}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w} \end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)|}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{1}{4(1 - \omega_3)^{(k+3)/2}} \frac{\int \tau_3(\mathbf{w}) g(\mathbf{w}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{w}}.$$

This yields (A.24).  $\square$

Important special cases correspond to  $k = 0$  and  $k = 1$ .

**Proposition A.7.** *Suppose the conditions of Proposition A.5 including (A.18). If  $|\delta_3(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \tau_3(\mathbf{u})/6$  for a 3-homogeneous function  $\tau_3(\mathbf{u})$  of  $\mathbf{u}$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\tau_3(\mathbf{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{4(1-\omega_3)^{3/2}}, \\ \left\| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} Q\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} Q\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right\| &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\{\|Q\mathbf{u}\| \tau_3(\mathbf{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma})\}}{4(1-\omega_3)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Now we state a sharper result based on the fourth order Taylor expansion of  $f(\mathbf{x})$ .

**Proposition A.8.** *Suppose that some star-shaped set  $\mathcal{U}$  and an operator  $\mathbf{D}_0^2 \leq \mathbf{D}^2$  are fixed such that (A.15), (A.16), and (A.18) are fulfilled with  $\omega_3 \leq 1/3$ . Let also*

$$|\delta_4(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \frac{1}{24}\tau_4(\mathbf{u}) \leq 1, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (\text{A.26})$$

for some homogeneous function  $\tau_4(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $\tau_4(t\mathbf{u}) = t^4\tau_4(\mathbf{u})$ . Then for any function  $g(\mathbf{u})$  with  $|g(\mathbf{u})| \leq 1$  and  $g(\mathbf{u}) = g(-\mathbf{u})$

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u})} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \right| \leq \diamond_4, \quad (\text{A.27})$$

where for a Gaussian element  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{D}^{-2})$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$

$$\diamond_4 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{16(1-\omega_3)^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\tau_4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}}) \right\}.$$

If the function  $g(\cdot)$  is not bounded by one but it is symmetric and  $2m$ -homogeneous, i.e.  $g(t\mathbf{u}) = t^{2m}g(\mathbf{u})$ , then (A.27) still applies with

$$\diamond_4 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{16(1-\omega_3)^{2+m}} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \langle \nabla^3 f(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 g(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}}) + 2\tau_4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}}) g(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathbf{D}}) \right\}. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

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

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

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

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



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

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}'(0) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) \{\delta_3(\mathbf{u}) + \delta_3(-\mathbf{u})\} g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) \bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u}) g(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}\end{aligned}\tag{A.29}$$

with  $\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u}) = \{\delta_4(\mathbf{u}) + \delta_4(-\mathbf{u})\}/2$ . Moreover, as  $|\delta_3(\mathbf{u})| \leq \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2/2$ , it holds for  $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{R}''(t)| &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta_3^2(\mathbf{u}) \exp\left\{-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2} + t\delta_3(\mathbf{u})\right\} |g(\mathbf{u})| d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{U}} \delta_3^2(\mathbf{u}) \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u}.\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{R}''(t)| &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{U}} \{\bar{\delta}_4^2(\mathbf{u}) + |\langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle/6|^2\} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{U}} \{|\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u})| + \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2/36\} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u}.\end{aligned}$$

This and (A.29) yield

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)| &\leq |\mathcal{R}'(0)| + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{R}''(t)| \leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{U}} |\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u})| \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{36} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u}.\end{aligned}$$

Change of variable  $(\mathbf{I} - \omega_3 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1})^{1/2} \mathbf{u}$  to  $\mathbf{w}$  yields by (A.21) in view of  $\omega_3 \leq 1/3$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{36} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{3/2}{36(1 - \omega_3)^3} \int \langle f^{(3)}, \mathbf{w}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{w}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly by (A.26)

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{U}} |\bar{\delta}_4(\mathbf{u})| \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \omega_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \frac{3/2}{24(1 - \omega_3)^2} \int \tau_4(\mathbf{w}) \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{w}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{w}.\end{aligned}$$

The use of  $\omega_3 \leq 1/3$  implies that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}(1) - \mathcal{R}(0)|}{\int_{\mathcal{U}} e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq \frac{3/2}{24(1 - \omega_3)^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \langle f^{(3)}, \gamma_{\mathbf{D}}^{\otimes 3} \rangle^2 + 2\mathbb{E} \tau_4(\gamma_{\mathbf{D}}) \right\} \leq \diamond_4$$

and (A.27) follows. The proof of (A.28) is similar.  $\square$

#### A.4 Tail integrals

Here we evaluate  $\rho$  from (A.2) which bounds the integral of  $e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})}$  over the complement of the local set  $\mathcal{U}$  of a special form  $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathbf{u}: \|T\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{r}_T\}$  for a given trace operator  $T$  and some radius  $\mathbf{r}_T$ . We assume that  $f$  is strongly concave and moreover,  $T$  is taken to ensure that

$$f_T(\mathbf{u}) = f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{u}) + \|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 - \|T\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 \quad (\text{A.30})$$

is concave. One example to keep in mind is  $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_0(\mathbf{x}) - \|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}\|^2/2$  with  $\mathbf{D}_0^2 = -\nabla^2 f_0(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\mathbf{D}^2 = \mathbf{D}_0^2 + \mathbf{G}^2$ , and  $\|T\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{D}_0\mathbf{u}\|^2$  yielding  $T^\top T = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_0^2 \mathbf{D}^{-1}$ .

**Proposition A.9.** *Let  $T$  be a sub-projector in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  such that  $f_T$  from (A.30) is concave. Given  $\nu < 1$ , define*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &= \{\mathbf{u}: \|T\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\| \leq \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_T\}, \\ \mathbf{r}_T &= 2\sqrt{\mathbf{p}_T} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}, \quad \mathbf{p}_T = \text{tr}(T^\top T). \end{aligned}$$

Let also (A.16) hold with  $\mathbf{D}_0 \leq T\mathbf{D}$  and

$$\omega_3 \leq 1 - \nu.$$

Then

$$\frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{f(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{u})} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq 4e^{-\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_T/2}, \quad (\text{A.31})$$

$$\frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}}{\int e^{-\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}\|^2/2} d\mathbf{u}} \leq e^{-\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_T/2}. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

*Proof.* Change of variables  $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$  reduces the proof to the case with  $\mathbf{D}^2 = \mathbf{I}$ . Then (A.16) is fulfilled with  $\mathbf{D}_0^2 \leq T^\top T$ . Let  $\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}$ , that is,  $\|T\mathbf{u}\| > \mathbf{r}$  with  $\mathbf{r} = \nu^{-1} \mathbf{r}_T$ . Define  $\mathbf{u}^\circ = \mathbf{r} \|T\mathbf{u}\|^{-1} \mathbf{u}$  yielding  $\|T\mathbf{u}^\circ\| = \mathbf{r}$ . We also write  $\mathbf{u} = (1 + \tau)\mathbf{u}^\circ$  for  $\tau > 0$ . By (A.16) and  $\nabla^2 f_T(0) = -T^\top T$

$$\begin{aligned} f_T(\mathbf{u}^\circ) - f_T(0) - \langle \nabla f_T(0), \mathbf{u}^\circ \rangle &\leq -(1 - \omega_3) \|T\mathbf{u}^\circ\|^2/2, \\ \langle \nabla f_T(\mathbf{u}^\circ) - \nabla f_T(0), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^\circ \rangle &\leq -(1 - \omega_3) \langle T^\top T \mathbf{u}^\circ, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^\circ \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

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

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

yielding by (A.33) in view of  $\langle T\mathbf{u}^\circ, T\mathbf{u} \rangle = \|T\mathbf{u}^\circ\| \|T\mathbf{u}\|$

$$\begin{aligned} & f_T(\mathbf{u}) - f_T(0) - \langle \nabla f_T(0), \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ &= f_T(\mathbf{u}) - f_T(\mathbf{u}^\circ) - \langle \nabla f_T(\mathbf{u}^\circ), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^\circ \rangle \\ &\quad + f_T(\mathbf{u}^\circ) - f_T(0) - \langle \nabla f_T(0), \mathbf{u}^\circ \rangle + \langle \nabla f_T(\mathbf{u}^\circ) - \nabla f_T(0), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^\circ \rangle \\ &\leq (1 - \omega_3)\|T\mathbf{u}^\circ\|^2/2 - (1 - \omega_3)\langle T\mathbf{u}^\circ, T\mathbf{u} \rangle \leq -(1 - \omega_3)\|T\mathbf{u}^\circ\| \|T\mathbf{u}\|/2. \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} & f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - f(0) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle \\ &= f_T(\mathbf{u}) - f_T(0) - \langle \nabla f_T(0), \mathbf{u} \rangle - \|\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \|T\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 \\ &\leq -(1 - \omega_3)\mathbf{r}\|T\mathbf{u}\|/2 - \|\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \|T\mathbf{u}\|^2/2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields by  $\mathbf{r}_T = \nu \mathbf{r} \leq (1 - \omega_3)\mathbf{r}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{U}) \exp\{f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u} \rangle\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp(-\|\mathbf{u}\|^2/2) d\mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(\|T\mathbf{u}\| > \mathbf{r}) \exp\{-(1 - \omega_3)\mathbf{r}\|T\mathbf{u}\|/2 - \|\mathbf{u}\|^2/2 + \|T\mathbf{u}\|^2/2\} d\mathbf{u}}{\int \exp(-\|\mathbf{u}\|^2/2) d\mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{-\frac{\mathbf{r}_T}{2}\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| + \frac{1}{2}\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2\right\} \mathbb{I}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > \mathbf{r}_T) \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\mathcal{R}_T(\mathbf{r}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E} \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbf{r}}{2}\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| + \frac{1}{2}\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2\right) \mathbb{I}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| > \mathbf{r}).$$

Integration by parts allows to represent the last integral as

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

By Theorem B.4, for any  $z \geq \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_T}$

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

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

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

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

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

This completes the proof of the result (A.31). The second statement (A.32) is about Gaussian probability  $\mathbb{P}(\|T\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \geq \mathbf{r}_T)$  for a standard normal element  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ , and we derive

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

and (A.32) follows.  $\square$

### A.5 Modulus of continuity of the Hessian $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$

Now we study the modulus of continuity of the Hessian  $f''(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$  for a concave function  $f(\mathbf{x})$ . For  $\mathbf{x}$  fixed, we write  $\mathbf{D}^2 = -f''(\mathbf{x})$ . Obviously for  $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$

$$\left| \langle f''(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}) - f''(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \right| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left| \langle f^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} \rangle \right|;$$

cf. (A.14).

**Lemma A.10.** *Suppose that for some  $\alpha_3$*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{U}} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2} \left| \langle f^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} \rangle \right| \leq \alpha_3; \quad (\text{A.34})$$

cf. (A.16). Then for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{U}$

$$\left| \langle f''(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}) - f''(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{u}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \right| \leq \alpha_3 \|\mathbf{D}_0 \mathbf{u}\|^2. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

Moreover, with  $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{w}}^2 = -\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w})$

$$\|\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{w}}^{-2} - \mathbf{D}^{-2})\mathbf{D}\| \leq \frac{\alpha_3}{1 - \alpha_3}, \quad \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{w}}^{-2} \mathbf{D}\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_3}.$$

*Proof.* The bound (A.35) follows from the definition (A.34). This also yields by  $D_0^2 \leq D^2$

$$\|D^{-1}D_w^2D^{-1} - I\| \leq \alpha_3, \quad \|D^{-1}D_w^2D^{-1}\| \leq 1 + \alpha_3, \quad \|D D_w^{-2}D\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_3}.$$

Moreover,

$$\|D(D_w^{-2} - D^{-2})D\| = \|D D_w^{-2}D D^{-1}(D_w^2 - D^2)D^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\alpha_3}{1 - \alpha_3}.$$

as required.  $\square$

## B Deviation bounds for quadratic forms

This section collects some bounds for Gaussian and non-Gaussian quadratic forms.

### B.1 Moments of a Gaussian quadratic form

Let  $\gamma$  be standard normal in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  for  $p \leq \infty$ . Given a self-adjoint trace operator  $B$ , consider a quadratic form  $\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle$ .

**Lemma B.1.** *It holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle &= \text{tr } B, \\ \text{Var}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle &= 2 \text{tr } B^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \text{tr } B)^2 &= 2 \text{tr } B^2, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \text{tr } B)^3 &= 8 \text{tr } B^3, \\ \mathbb{E}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \text{tr } B)^4 &= 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 12(\text{tr } B^2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 &= (\text{tr } B)^2 + 2 \text{tr } B^2, \\ \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^3 &= (\text{tr } B)^3 + 6 \text{tr } B \text{tr } B^2 + 8 \text{tr } B^3, \\ \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^4 &= (\text{tr } B)^4 + 12(\text{tr } B)^2 \text{tr } B^2 + 32(\text{tr } B) \text{tr } B^3 + 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 12(\text{tr } B^2)^2, \\ \text{Var}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 &= 8(\text{tr } B)^2 \text{tr } B^2 + 32(\text{tr } B) \text{tr } B^3 + 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 8(\text{tr } B^2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if  $B \leq I_p$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \text{tr } B$ , then  $\text{tr } B^m \leq \mathbf{p}$  for  $m \geq 1$  and

$$\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 \leq \mathbf{p}^2 + 2\mathbf{p},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^3 \leq \mathbf{p}^3 + 6\mathbf{p}^2 + 8\mathbf{p},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^4 = \mathbf{p}^4 + 12\mathbf{p}^3 + 44\mathbf{p}^2 + 48\mathbf{p},$$

$$\text{Var}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 = 8\mathbf{p}^3 + 40\mathbf{p}^2 + 48\mathbf{p}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\chi = \gamma^2 - 1$  for  $\gamma$  standard normal. Then  $\mathbb{E}\chi = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\chi^2 = 2$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\chi^3 = 8$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\chi^4 = 60$ . Without loss of generality assume  $B$  diagonal:  $B = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)$ . Then

$$\xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \text{tr } B = \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j (\gamma_j^2 - 1),$$

where  $\gamma_j$  are i.i.d. standard normal. This easily yields

$$\mathbb{E}\xi^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j^2 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_j^2 - 1)^2 = \mathbb{E}\chi^2 \text{tr } B^2 = 2 \text{tr } B^2,$$

$$\mathbb{E}\xi^3 = \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j^3 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_j^2 - 1)^3 = \mathbb{E}\chi^3 \text{tr } B^3 = 8 \text{tr } B^3,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\xi^4 &= \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j^4 (\gamma_j^2 - 1)^4 + \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_i^2 \lambda_j^2 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_i^2 - 1)^2 \mathbb{E}(\gamma_j^2 - 1)^2 \\ &= (\mathbb{E}\chi^4 - 3(\mathbb{E}\chi^2)^2) \text{tr } B^4 + 3(\mathbb{E}\chi^2 \text{tr } B^2)^2 = 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 12(\text{tr } B^2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

ensuring

$$\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 = (\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle)^2 + \mathbb{E}\xi^2 = (\text{tr } B)^2 + 2 \text{tr } B^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^3 &= \mathbb{E}(\xi + \text{tr } B)^3 = (\text{tr } B)^3 + \mathbb{E}\xi^3 + 3 \text{tr } B \mathbb{E}\xi^2 \\ &= (\text{tr } B)^3 + 6 \text{tr } B \text{tr } B^2 + 8 \text{tr } B^3, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle^2 &= \mathbb{E}(\xi + \text{tr } B)^4 - (\mathbb{E}\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle)^2 \\ &= (\text{tr } B)^4 + 6(\text{tr } B)^2 \mathbb{E}\xi^2 + 4 \text{tr } B \mathbb{E}\xi^3 + \mathbb{E}\xi^4 - ((\text{tr } B)^2 + 2 \text{tr } B^2)^2 \\ &= 8(\text{tr } B)^2 \text{tr } B^2 + 32(\text{tr } B) \text{tr } B^3 + 48 \text{tr } B^4 + 8(\text{tr } B^2)^2 \end{aligned}$$

This implies the results of the lemma.  $\square$

Now we compute the exponential moments of centered and non-centered quadratic forms.

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $\|B\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ . Then for any  $\mu \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \mathfrak{p})\right\} = \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2}.$$

Moreover, with  $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr } B$  and  $\mathfrak{v}^2 = \text{tr } B^2$

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \mathfrak{p})\right\} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \mathfrak{v}^2}{4(1 - \mu)}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

If  $B$  is positive semidefinite,  $\lambda_j \geq 0$ , then

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{-\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \mathfrak{p})\right\} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \mathfrak{v}^2}{4}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda_j$  be the eigenvalues of  $B$ ,  $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$ . By an orthogonal transform, one can reduce the statement to the case of a diagonal matrix  $B = \text{diag}(\lambda_j)$ . Then  $\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j \varepsilon_j^2$  and by independence of the  $\varepsilon_j$ 's

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mu}{2} \langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle \right\} = \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{\mu}{2} \lambda_j \varepsilon_j^2\right) = \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \mu \lambda_j}} = \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2}.$$

Below we use the simple bound:

$$\begin{aligned} -\log(1 - u) - u &= \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{u^k}{k} \leq \frac{u^2}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u^k = \frac{u^2}{2(1 - u)}, \quad u \in (0, 1), \\ -\log(1 - u) + u &= \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{u^k}{k} \leq \frac{u^2}{2}, \quad u \in (-1, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Now it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mu}{2} (\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle - \mathfrak{p}) \right\} &= \log \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2} - \frac{\mu \mathfrak{p}}{2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \{\log(1 - \mu \lambda_j) + \mu \lambda_j\} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\mu^2 \lambda_j^2}{4(1 - \mu)} = \frac{\mu^2 \mathfrak{v}^2}{4(1 - \mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

The last statement can be proved similarly.  $\square$

Now we consider the case of a non-centered quadratic form  $\langle B\gamma, \gamma \rangle/2 + \langle \mathbf{A}, \gamma \rangle$  for a fixed vector  $\mathbf{A}$ .

**Lemma B.3.** *Let  $\lambda_{\max}(B) < 1$ . Then for any  $\mathbf{A}$*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle\right\} = \exp\left\{\frac{\|(I - B)^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\|^2}{2}\right\} \det(I - B)^{-1/2}.$$

Moreover, for any  $\mu \in (0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle - \mathfrak{p}) + \langle \mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle\right\} \\ &= \frac{\|(I - \mu B)^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\|^2}{2} + \log \det(I - \mu B)^{-1/2} - \mu\mathfrak{p} \\ &\leq \frac{\|(I - \mu B)^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\|^2}{2} + \frac{\mu^2\mathfrak{v}^2}{4(1 - \mu)}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

*Proof.* Denote  $\mathbf{a} = (I - B)^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}$ . It holds by change of variables  $(I - B)^{1/2}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$  for  $\mathfrak{C}_p = (2\pi)^{-p/2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\langle B\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\rangle\right\} &= \mathfrak{C}_p \int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\langle (I - B)\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{x}\rangle\right\} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \mathfrak{C}_p \det(I - B)^{-1/2} \int \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u}\rangle\right\} d\mathbf{u} = \det(I - B)^{-1/2} e^{\|\mathbf{a}\|^2/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality (B.2) follows by (B.1).  $\square$

## B.2 Deviation bounds for Gaussian quadratic forms

The next result explains the concentration effect of  $\langle B\xi, \xi\rangle$  for a centered Gaussian vector  $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{V}^2)$  and a symmetric trace operator  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $p \leq \infty$ . We use a version from [Laurent and Massart \(2000\)](#). For completeness, we present a simple proof of the upper bound.

**Theorem B.4.** *Let  $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{V}^2)$  be a Gaussian element in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  and  $B$  be symmetric such that  $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$  is a trace operator in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . Then with  $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr}(W)$ ,  $\mathfrak{v}^2 = \text{tr}(W^2)$ , and  $\lambda = \|W\|$ , it holds for each  $\mathfrak{x} \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle B\xi, \xi\rangle - \mathfrak{p} > 2\mathfrak{v}\sqrt{\mathfrak{x}} + 2\lambda\mathfrak{x}\right) \leq e^{-\mathfrak{x}}.$$

It also implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\langle B\xi, \xi\rangle - \mathfrak{p}| > z_2(W, \mathfrak{x})\right) \leq 2e^{-\mathfrak{x}}, \tag{B.3}$$

with

$$z_2(W, \mathfrak{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\mathfrak{v}\sqrt{\mathfrak{x}} + 2\lambda\mathfrak{x}. \tag{B.4}$$



*Proof.* W.l.o.g. assume that  $\lambda = \|W\| = 1$ . We use the identity  $\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle = \langle W\gamma, \gamma \rangle$  with  $\gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$ . We apply the exponential Chebyshev inequality: with  $\mu > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle W\gamma, \gamma \rangle > z^2\right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\mu\langle W\gamma, \gamma \rangle/2 - \mu z^2/2\right).$$

Given  $x > 0$ , fix  $\mu < 1$  by the equation

$$\frac{\mu}{1-\mu} = \frac{2\sqrt{x}}{v} \quad \text{or} \quad \mu^{-1} = 1 + \frac{v}{2\sqrt{x}}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Let  $\lambda_j$  be the eigenvalues of  $W$ ,  $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$ . It holds with  $p = \text{tr } W$  in view of (B.1)

$$\log \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\mu}{2}(\langle W\gamma, \gamma \rangle - p)\right\} \leq \frac{\mu^2 v^2}{4(1-\mu)}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

It remains to check that the choice  $\mu$  by (B.5) and  $z = z(W, x)$  yields

$$\frac{\mu^2 v^2}{4(1-\mu)} - \frac{\mu(z^2 - p)}{2} = \frac{\mu^2 v^2}{4(1-\mu)} - \mu(v\sqrt{x} + x) = \mu\left(\frac{v\sqrt{x}}{2} - v\sqrt{x} - x\right) = -x \quad (\text{B.7})$$

as required. The last statement (B.3) is obtained by applying this inequality twice to  $W$  and  $-W$ .  $\square$

**Corollary B.5.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem B.4. Then for  $z > v$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - p| \geq z\right) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{z^2}{(v + \sqrt{v^2 + 2\lambda z})^2}\right\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{4v^2 + 4\lambda z}\right). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

*Proof.* Given  $z$ , define  $x$  by  $2v\sqrt{x} + 2\lambda x = z$  or  $2\lambda\sqrt{x} = \sqrt{v^2 + 2\lambda z} - v$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - p \geq z\right) \leq e^{-x} = \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{v^2 + 2\lambda z} - v)^2}{4\lambda^2}\right\} = \exp\left\{-\frac{z^2}{(v + \sqrt{v^2 + 2\lambda z})^2}\right\}.$$

This yields (B.8) by direct calculus.  $\square$

Of course, bound (B.8) is sensible only if  $z \gg v$ .

**Corollary B.6.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem B.4. If also  $B \geq 0$ , then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - p \geq 2v\sqrt{x} + 2\lambda x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|B^{1/2}\xi\| \geq \sqrt{p} + \sqrt{2\lambda x}\right) \leq e^{-x} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - p < -2v\sqrt{x}\right) \leq e^{-x}.$$

*Proof.* The definition implies  $v^2 \leq p\lambda$ . One can use a sub-optimal choice of the value  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \{1 + 2\sqrt{\lambda p/\mathbf{x}}\}^{-1}$  yielding the statement of the corollary.  $\square$

As a special case, we present a bound for the chi-squared distribution corresponding to  $B = \mathcal{V}^2 = I_p$ ,  $p < \infty$ . Then  $\text{tr}(W) = p$ ,  $\text{tr}(W^2) = p$  and  $\lambda(W) = 1$ .

**Corollary B.7.** *Let  $\gamma$  be a standard normal vector in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . Then for any  $\mathbf{x} > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\gamma\|^2 \geq p + 2\sqrt{p\mathbf{x}} + 2\mathbf{x}) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}},$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\gamma\| \geq \sqrt{p} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}},$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\gamma\|^2 \leq p - 2\sqrt{p\mathbf{x}}) \leq e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

The bound of Theorem B.4 can be represented as a usual deviation bound.

**Theorem B.8.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem B.4 with  $B \geq 0$ . Then for  $z > \sqrt{p} + 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{p})^2}{2\lambda}\right\}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle^{1/2} \mathbb{I}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2)\} \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{p})^2}{2\lambda}\right\},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \mathbb{I}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2)\} \leq \frac{2z}{z - \sqrt{p}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{p})^2}{2\lambda}\right\}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

*Proof.* Bound (B.10) follows from (B.9). It obviously suffices to check the bound for the excess risk for  $\lambda = 1$ . It follows with  $\eta = \|B^{1/2}\xi\|$  for  $z \geq \sqrt{p} + 1$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\eta \mathbb{I}(\eta > z)\} = \int_z^\infty \mathbb{P}(\eta \geq z) dz \leq \int_z^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{(x - \sqrt{p})^2}{2}\right\} dx \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{(z - \sqrt{p})^2}{2}\right\}.$$

Similarly

$$\mathbb{E}\{\eta^2 \mathbb{I}(\eta^2 > z^2)\} = \int_{z^2}^\infty \mathbb{P}(\eta^2 \geq \mathfrak{z}) d\mathfrak{z} \leq \int_{z^2}^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{\mathfrak{z}} - \sqrt{p})^2}{2}\right\} d\mathfrak{z}.$$

By change of variables  $\sqrt{\mathfrak{z}} - \sqrt{p} = u$  for  $z > \sqrt{p} + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{z^2}^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{\mathfrak{z}} - \sqrt{p})^2}{2}\right\} d\mathfrak{z} &\leq 2 \int_{z - \sqrt{p}}^\infty (u + \sqrt{p}) \exp\{-u^2/2\} du \\ &\leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{p}}{z - \sqrt{p}}\right) \exp\{-(z - \sqrt{p})^2/2\} = \frac{2z}{z - \sqrt{p}} \exp\{-(z - \sqrt{p})^2/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

### B.3 Deviation bounds for non-Gaussian quadratic forms

This section collects some probability bounds for non-Gaussian quadratic forms starting from the subgaussian case. Then we extend the result to the case of exponential tails. Let  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  be a random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $p \leq \infty$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0$ . We suppose that there exists an operator  $\mathcal{V}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  such that

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle) \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

In the Gaussian case, one obviously takes  $\mathcal{V}^2 = \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ . In general,  $\mathcal{V}^2 \geq \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ . We consider a quadratic form  $\langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  satisfies (B.12) and  $B$  is a given symmetric non-negative operator in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  such that  $B \leq \mathcal{V}^{-2}$  and  $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$  is a trace operator:

$$p = \text{tr}(W) < \infty.$$

Denote also

$$v^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{tr}(W^2).$$

We show that under these conditions, the quadratic form  $\langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle$  follows the same deviation bound  $\mathbb{P}(\langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle \geq z^2(W, \mathbf{x})) \leq e^{-x}$  with  $z^2(W, \mathbf{x})$  from (B.4) as in the Gaussian case.

**Theorem B.9.** *Suppose (B.12). Let  $p = \text{tr} W < \infty$  for  $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle > z^2(W, \mathbf{x})) \leq e^{-x}.$$

*The bounds (B.10) through (B.11) of Theorem B.8 continue to apply as well.*

*Proof.* For any  $\mu < 1$ , we use the identity

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) = \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} \exp(\mu^{1/2} \langle \mathcal{V}B^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle)$$

Application of Fubini's theorem and (B.12) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\mu^2 \text{tr} W^2}{4(1-\mu)} + \frac{\mu \text{tr} W}{2}\right).$$

Further we proceed as in the Gaussian case. □

Now we turn to the main case of light exponential tails of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ . Namely, we suppose that  $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0$  and for some fixed  $g > 0$

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle) \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq g, \quad (\text{B.13})$$

for some self-adjoint operator  $\mathcal{V}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $\mathcal{V} \geq I_p$ . In fact, it suffices to assume that

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathfrak{g}} \mathbb{E} \exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle) \leq \mathfrak{C}.$$

Then one can use the fact that existence of the exponential moment  $\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda_0 \boldsymbol{\xi}}$  for a centered random variable  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  and some fixed  $\lambda_0$  implies that the moment generating function  $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \mathbb{E}e^{\lambda \boldsymbol{\xi}}$  is analytic in  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$  with  $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(0) = f'_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(0) = 0$  and hence, it can be well majorated by a quadratic function in a smaller interval  $[0, \lambda_1]$  for  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$ ; see Golubev and Spokoiny (2009).

Remind the notation  $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$ . By normalization, one can easily reduce the study to the case  $\|W\| = 1$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr}(W)$ ,  $\mathfrak{v}^2 = \text{tr}(W^2)$ , and  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  be defined by  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + \frac{\mathfrak{v}}{2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}})^{-1}$ ; see (B.5). Obviously  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  grows with  $\mathbf{x}$ . Define the value  $\mathbf{x}_c$  as the root of the equation

$$\frac{\mathfrak{g} - \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}\mu(\mathbf{x})}}{\mu(\mathbf{x})} = z(W, \mathbf{x}) + 1. \quad (\text{B.14})$$

The left hand-side here decreases with  $\mathbf{x}$ , while the right hand-side is increasing in  $\mathbf{x}$  to infinity. Therefore, the solution exists and unique. Also denote  $\mu_c = \mu(\mathbf{x}_c)$  and

$$\mathfrak{g}_c = \mathfrak{g} - \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}\mu_c}, \quad (\text{B.15})$$

so that

$$\mathfrak{g}_c/\mu_c = z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1.$$

**Theorem B.10.** *Let (B.13) hold and let  $B$  be such that  $W = \mathcal{V}B\mathcal{V}$  satisfies  $\|W\| = 1$  and  $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tr}(W) < \infty$ . Define  $\mathbf{x}_c$  by (B.14) and  $\mathfrak{g}_c$  by (B.15), and suppose  $\mathfrak{g}_c \geq 1$ . Then for any  $\mathbf{x} > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle \geq z_c^2(W, \mathbf{x})) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}} + e^{-\mathbf{x}_c} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{x}_c) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}, \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where  $z_c(W, \mathbf{x})$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} z_c(W, \mathbf{x}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \sqrt{\mathfrak{p} + 2\mathfrak{v}\mathbf{x}^{1/2} + 2\mathbf{x}}, & \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c, \\ \mathfrak{g}_c/\mu_c + 2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c)/\mathfrak{g}_c, & \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c, \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}, & \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c, \\ \mathfrak{g}_c/\mu_c + 2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c)/\mathfrak{g}_c, & \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if, given  $\mathbf{x}$ , it holds

$$\mathbf{g} \geq \mathbf{x}^{1/2}/2 + (\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}/4)^{1/4}, \quad (\text{B.17})$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|B^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \geq \sqrt{\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \quad (\text{B.18})$$

**Remark B.1.** Depending on the value  $\mathbf{x}$ , we have two types of tail behavior of the quadratic form  $\langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle$ . For  $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c$ , we have essentially the same deviation bounds as in the Gaussian case with the extra-factor two in the deviation probability. For  $\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c$ , we switch to the special regime driven by the exponential moment condition (B.13). Usually  $\mathbf{g}^2$  is a large number (of order  $n$  in the i.i.d. setup) yielding  $\mathbf{x}_c$  also large, and the second term in (B.16) can be simply ignored. The function  $z_c(W, \mathbf{x})$  is discontinuous at the point  $\mathbf{x}_c$ . Indeed,  $z_c(W, \mathbf{x}) = z(W, \mathbf{x})$  for  $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{x}_c$ , while by (B.14), it holds  $\mathbf{g}_c/\mu_c = z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1$ . However, the jump at  $\mathbf{x}_c$  is at most one.

As a corollary, we state the result for the norm of  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  corresponding to the case  $\mathcal{V}^{-2} = B = I_p$  and  $p < \infty$ . Then

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{v}^2 = p.$$

**Corollary B.11.** Let (B.13) hold with  $\mathcal{V} = I_p$ . Then for each  $\mathbf{x} > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \geq z_c(p, \mathbf{x})) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}} + e^{-\mathbf{x}_c} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{x}_c),$$

where  $z_c(p, \mathbf{x})$  is defined by

$$z_c(p, \mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} (p + 2\sqrt{p\mathbf{x}} + 2\mathbf{x})^{1/2}, & \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c, \\ \mathbf{g}_c/\mu_c + 2\mathbf{g}_c^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c), & \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c. \end{cases}$$

If  $\mathbf{g} \geq \mathbf{x}^{1/2}/2 + (\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}/4)^{1/4}$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \geq z(p, \mathbf{x})) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}}.$$

*Proof of Theorem B.10.* First we consider the most interesting case  $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c$ . We expect to get Gaussian type deviation bounds for such  $\mathbf{x}$ . The main tool of the proof is the following lemma.

**Lemma B.12.** Let  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mathfrak{z}(\mu) = \mathbf{g}/\mu - \sqrt{\mathbf{p}/\mu} > 0$ . Then (B.13) implies

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) \mathbb{I}(\|\mathcal{V}B\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu)) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{\mu^2 \mathbf{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)} + \frac{\mu \mathbf{p}}{2}\right). \quad (\text{B.19})$$

*Proof.* Let us fix for a moment some  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $\mu < 1$  and define

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathcal{V}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad \Sigma = \mu W = \mu \mathcal{V} B \mathcal{V}.$$

Consider the Gaussian measure  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma} = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{a}, \Sigma^{-1})$ , and let  $\mathbf{U} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma^{-1})$ . By the Girsanov formula

$$\log \frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma}}{d\mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}}(\mathbf{u}) = \langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle$$

and for any set  $A \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma}(A) = \mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}(A - \mathbf{a}) = \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \left[ \exp \left\{ \langle \Sigma \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{a} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle \right\} \mathbb{I}(A) \right].$$

Now we select  $A = \{\mathbf{u}: \|\Sigma \mathbf{u}\| \leq \mathbf{g}\}$ . Under  $\mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}$ , one can represent  $\Sigma \mathbf{U} = \Sigma^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mu^{1/2} \mathcal{V} B^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$  with a standard Gaussian  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{0, \Sigma}(A - \mathbf{a}) &= \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} (\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{a})\| \leq \mathbf{g}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} (\|\Sigma^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq \mathbf{g} - \|\Sigma \mathbf{a}\|). \end{aligned}$$

We now use that  $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} (\|\Sigma^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 \leq \text{tr}(\Sigma)) \geq 1/2$  with  $\text{tr}(\Sigma) = \mu \text{tr}(W) = \mu \mathfrak{p}$ . Therefore, the condition  $\|\Sigma \mathbf{a}\| + \sqrt{\mu \mathfrak{p}} \leq \mathbf{g}$  implies in view of  $\langle \Sigma \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle = \mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle$

$$1/2 \leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{a}, \Sigma}(A) = \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \left[ \exp \left\{ \langle \Sigma \mathbf{U}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle - \mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2 \right\} \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathbf{U}\| \leq \mathbf{g}) \right]$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp(\mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \mathbf{g} - \sqrt{\mu \mathfrak{p}}) \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \left[ \exp \left\{ \langle \Sigma \mathbf{U}, \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle \right\} \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathbf{U}\| \leq \mathbf{g}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now take the expectation of the each side of this equation w.r.t.  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ , change the integration order, and use (B.13) yielding

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu \langle B \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle / 2) \mathbb{I}(\|\Sigma \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \mathbf{g} - \sqrt{\mu \mathfrak{p}}) \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{0, \Sigma} \exp(\|\Sigma \mathbf{U}\|^2 / 2) \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} \exp(\mu \|W^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}\|^2 / 2) = 2 \det(\mathbf{I} - \mu W)^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We also use that for any  $\mu > 0$

$$\log \det(\mathbf{I} - \mu W)^{-1/2} - \frac{\mu \text{tr} W}{2} \leq \frac{\mu^2 \text{tr} W^2}{4(1 - \mu)};$$

see (B.6), and the first statement follows in view of  $\Sigma \mathcal{V}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mu \mathcal{V} B \boldsymbol{\xi}$ .  $\square$

The use of  $\mu = \mu_{\mathbf{x}}$  from (B.5) in (B.19) yields similarly to the proof of Theorem B.4

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle > z^2(W, \mathbf{x}), \|\mathcal{V}B\xi\| \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}})\right) \leq 2e^{-x}. \quad (\text{B.20})$$

It remains to consider the probability of large deviation  $\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{V}B\xi\| > \mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}}))$ .

**Lemma B.13.** *For any  $\mathbf{x}_c > 0$  such that  $z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1 \leq \mathfrak{g}_c/\mu_c$ , it holds with  $\mu_c = \{1 + \mathfrak{v}/(2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}_c})\}^{-1}$  and  $z_c = \mathfrak{z}(\mu_c) = \mathfrak{g}/\mu_c - \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}/\mu_c}$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{V}B\xi\| > z_c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle > z_c^2) \leq e^{-x_c}.$$

*Proof.* Define

$$\Phi(\mu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\mu^2 \mathfrak{v}^2}{4(1-\mu)} + \frac{\mu \mathfrak{p}}{2}.$$

It follows due to (B.5) and (B.7) for any  $\mu \leq \mu_c$

$$\Phi(\mu) \leq \Phi(\mu_c) \leq \frac{\mu_c z_c^2(W, \mathbf{x}_c)}{2} - \mathbf{x}_c,$$

where the right hand-side does not depend on  $\mu$ . Denote  $\eta^2 = \langle B\xi, \xi \rangle$  and use that  $\|\mathcal{V}B\xi\| \leq \|B^{1/2}\xi\| = \eta$ . Then by (B.19)

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu\eta^2/2) \mathbb{I}(\eta \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu)) \leq 2 \exp \Phi(\mu) \leq 2 \exp \Phi(\mu_c). \quad (\text{B.21})$$

Define the inverse function  $\mu(\mathfrak{z}) = \mathfrak{z}^{-1}(\mu)$ . For any  $\mathfrak{z} \geq z_c$ , it follows from (B.21) with  $\mu = \mu(\mathfrak{z})$

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\{\mu(\mathfrak{z})(\mathfrak{z} - 1)^2/2\} \mathbb{I}(\mathfrak{z} - 1 \leq \eta \leq \mathfrak{z}) \leq 2 \exp \Phi(\mu_c)$$

yielding

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{z} - 1 \leq \eta \leq \mathfrak{z}) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\mu(\mathfrak{z})(\mathfrak{z} - 1)^2/2 + \Phi(\mu_c)\right)$$

and hence,

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta > \mathfrak{z}) \leq 2 \int_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\infty} \exp\{-\mu(z)(z - 1)^2/2 + \Phi(\mu_c)\} dz.$$

Further,  $\mu \mathfrak{z}(\mu) = \mathfrak{g} - \sqrt{\mathfrak{p}\mu}$  and

$$\mathfrak{g}_c = \mu_c z_c \leq \mu \mathfrak{z}(\mu) \leq \mathfrak{g}, \quad \mu \leq \mu_c.$$

This implies the same bound for the inverse function:

$$\mathfrak{g}_c \leq \mathfrak{z} \mu(\mathfrak{z}) \leq \mathfrak{g}, \quad \mathfrak{z} \geq z_c,$$

and for  $\mathfrak{z} \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta > \mathfrak{z}) &\leq 2 \int_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\infty} \exp\{-\mu(z)(z^2/2 - z) + \Phi(\mu_c)\} dz \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\infty} \exp\{-\mathfrak{g}_c(z/2 - 1) + \Phi(\mu_c)\} dz \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\mathfrak{g}_c} \exp\{-\mathfrak{g}_c(\mathfrak{z}/2 - 1) + \Phi(\mu_c)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

Conditions  $\mathfrak{g}_c z_c = \mu_c^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_c^2 \geq \mu_c \{z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1\}^2$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_c \geq 1$  ensure that  $\mathbb{P}(\eta > z_c) \leq e^{-x_c}$ .  $\square$

Remind that  $\mathbf{x}_c$  is the largest  $\mathbf{x}$ -value ensuring the condition  $\mathfrak{g}_c \geq z(W, \mathbf{x}_c) + 1$ . We also use that for  $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}_c$ , it holds  $\mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}}) \geq \mathfrak{z}(\mu_c) = z_c$ . Therefore, by (B.20) and Lemma B.13

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2(W, \mathbf{x})) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z^2(W, \mathbf{x}), \|\mathcal{V}B\xi\| \leq \mathfrak{z}(\mu_{\mathbf{x}})) + \mathbb{P}(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle \geq z_c^2) \\ &\leq 2e^{-x} + e^{-x_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we consider  $\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{x}_c$ . Applying (B.22) yields by  $\mathfrak{z} \geq z_c$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta > \mathfrak{z}) &\leq \frac{2}{\mu_c z_c} \exp\{-\mu_c z_c^2/2 + \mathfrak{g} + \mu_c z^2(W, \mathbf{x}_c)/2 - \mathbf{x}_c\} \exp\{-\mu_c z_c(\mathfrak{z} - z_c)/2\} \\ &\leq e^{-x_c} \exp\{-\mathfrak{g}_c(\mathfrak{z} - z_c)/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

The choice  $\mathfrak{z}$  by

$$\mathfrak{g}_c(\mathfrak{z} - z_c)/2 = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c$$

ensures the desired bound.

Now, for a prescribed  $\mathbf{x}$ , we evaluate the minimal value  $\mathfrak{g}$  ensuring the bound (B.16) with  $\mathbf{x}_c \geq \mathbf{x}$ . For simplicity we apply the sub-optimal choice  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + 2\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}/\mathbf{x}})^{-1}$ ; see Remark B.6. Then for any  $\mathbf{x} \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathbf{x}) \{z(W, \mathbf{x}) + 1\} &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}}} \left( \sqrt{\mathfrak{p} + 2(\mathbf{x}\mathfrak{p})^{1/2} + 2\mathbf{x} + 1} \right), \\ \mathfrak{p} \mu(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} \mathfrak{p}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + 2\sqrt{\mathfrak{p}}}. \end{aligned}$$



It is now straightforward to check that

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) \{z(W, \mathbf{x}) + 1\} + \sqrt{\mathbf{p} \mu(\mathbf{x})} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}/2 + (\mathbf{x} \mathbf{p}/4)^{1/4}.$$

Therefore, if (B.17) holds for the given  $\mathbf{x}$ , then (B.14) is fulfilled with  $\mathbf{x}_c \geq \mathbf{x}$  yielding (B.18).  $\square$

#### B.4 Weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s: univariate case

Let  $Y_i$  be independent Bernoulli( $\theta_i^*$ ) and  $w_i \in [0, 1]$ . First we state a deviation bound for a centered sum on non i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables.

**Lemma B.14.** *Let  $Y_i$  be independent Bernoulli( $\theta_i^*$ ) and  $w_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define*

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i w_i, \\ V^2 &= \text{Var}(S) = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) w_i^2, \\ w^* &= \max_i |w_i|. \end{aligned}$$

Then it holds

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{\lambda(S - \mathbb{E}S)}{V}\right\} \leq \lambda^2, \quad \lambda \leq \log(2)V/w^*. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Furthermore, suppose that given  $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ ,

$$V \geq \frac{3}{2} \mathbf{x}^{1/2} w^*. \quad (\text{B.24})$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(V^{-1}|S - \mathbb{E}S| \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 2e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Without (B.24), the bound (B.25) applies with  $V$  replaced by  $V_{\mathbf{x}} = V \vee (3\mathbf{x}^{1/2}w^*/2)$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume  $w^* = 1$ , otherwise just rescale all the weights by the factor  $1/w^*$ . We use that

$$f(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{u(S - \mathbb{E}S)\right\} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \log(\theta_i^* e^{uw_i} + 1 - \theta_i^*) - uw_i \theta_i^* \right].$$

This is an analytic function of  $u$  for  $|u| \leq \log 2$  satisfying  $f(0) = 0$ ,  $f'(0) = 0$ , and, with  $v_i^* = \log \theta_i^* - \log(1 - \theta_i^*)$ ,

$$f''(u) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{w_i^2 \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) e^{uw_i}}{(\theta_i^* e^{uw_i} + 1 - \theta_i^*)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{w_i^2 e^{v_i^* + uw_i}}{(e^{v_i^* + uw_i} + 1)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i(u) \{1 - \theta_i(u)\} w_i^2$$

for  $\theta_i(u) = e^{v_i^* + uw_i} / (e^{v_i^* + uw_i} + 1)$ . Clearly  $\theta_i(u)$  and thus,  $\theta_i(u) \{1 - \theta_i(u)\}$  monotonously increases with  $u$  and it holds for  $\theta_i^* = \theta_i(0)$

$$\theta_i(u) \{1 - \theta_i(u)\} \leq e^{|u|} \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*) \leq 2 \theta_i^* (1 - \theta_i^*), \quad |u| \leq \log 2.$$

This yields

$$f(u) \leq V^2 u^2 \quad |u| \leq \log 2.$$

As  $\mathbf{x} \leq 4V^2/9$ , the value  $\lambda = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}$  fulfills  $\lambda/V = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}}/V \leq \log 2 \leq 2^{-1/2}$ . Now by the exponential Chebyshev inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(V^{-1}(S - \mathbb{E}S) \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{x}}\right) &\leq \exp\{-2\lambda\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + f(\lambda/V)\} \\ &\leq \exp(-2\lambda\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} + \lambda^2) = e^{-\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly one can bound  $\mathbb{E}S - S$ . □

## B.5 Deviation bounds for weighted sums of Bernoulli r.v.'s in a $\ell_2$ -norm

Now we present a bound for the norm of the normalized vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{\Psi}(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$  is a linear mapping  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ . Let

$$V^2 = \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}Y) = \boldsymbol{\Psi} \text{Var}(Y) \boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top.$$

We aim at bounding the norm  $\|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}\|$ , where an operator  $\mathbf{H}$  satisfies  $\mathbf{H}^2 \geq V^2$ .

**Lemma B.15.** *Let  $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i^*)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and let  $(w_{i,\alpha})$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$ , be a collection of weighting schemes. Consider  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{\Psi}(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)$ , and let  $\mathbf{H}^2 \geq \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ . Define*

$$w^* = \max_i \|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_i\|.$$

Then with  $\mathbf{p} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}^{-2}V^2)$ , it holds

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \geq \sqrt{\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{2\mathbf{x}}) \leq 3e^{-\mathbf{x}},$$

provided that

$$1/w^* \geq \sqrt{x}/2 + (px/4)^{1/4}. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

*Proof.* We apply the general result of Theorem B.10 under conditions (B.13) and (B.17). For any vector  $\mathbf{u}$ , consider the scalar product  $\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{Y}), \mathbf{u} \rangle$ . It is obviously a weighted centered sum of the Bernoulli r.v.'s  $Y_i - \theta_i^*$  with

$$\text{Var}\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|^2.$$

One can write with  $\varepsilon_i = Y_i - \theta_i^*$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_i)$

$$\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1}\mathbf{u} \rangle.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it holds

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-1}\mathbf{u}\|_\infty = \max_i |(\mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_i)^\top \mathbf{u}| \leq w^* \|\mathbf{u}\|.$$

The bound (B.23) of Lemma B.14 on the exponential moments of  $\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle$  implies

$$\log \mathbb{E} \exp\{\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{u} \rangle\} \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \log(2)/w^*.$$

Therefore, (B.13) is fulfilled with  $\mathcal{V}^2 = 2\mathbf{H}^2$  and  $\mathbf{g} = \sqrt{2} \log(2)/w^*$ , and (B.17) follows from (B.26). The deviation bound (B.18) of Theorem B.10 yields the assertion.  $\square$

## References

- Bochkina, N. A. and Green, P. J. (2014). The Bernstein–von Mises theorem and nonregular models. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(5):1850–1878.
- Castillo, I. and Nickl, R. (2014). On the Bernstein – von Mises phenomenon for nonparametric Bayes procedures. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(5):1941–1969.
- Castillo, I. and Rousseau, J. (2015). A Bernstein–von Mises theorem for smooth functionals in semiparametric models. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(6):2353–2383.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference*, volume 44 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Ginè, E. and Nickl, R. (2015). *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- Golubev, Y. and Spokoiny, V. (2009). Exponential bounds for minimum contrast estimators. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 3:712–746.
- Laurent, B. and Massart, P. (2000). Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Ann. Statist.*, 28(5):1302–1338.
- Spokoiny, V. (2012). Parametric estimation. Finite sample theory. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(6):2877–2909. arXiv:1111.3029.
- Spokoiny, V. (2017). Penalized maximum likelihood estimation and effective dimension. *AIHP*, 53(1):389–429. arXiv:1205.0498.
- Spokoiny, V. (2019). Bayesian inference for nonlinear inverse problems. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.12694>.
- Spokoiny, V. and Panov, M. (2019). Accuracy of Gaussian approximation for high-dimensional posterior distributions. arXiv:1910.06028.
- van der Vaart, A. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.