

Estimation of smooth functionals of covariance operators: jackknife bias reduction and bounds in terms of effective rank

Vladimir Koltchinskii*

*School of Mathematics
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332-0160
e-mail: vlad@math.gatech.edu*

June 7, 2022

Abstract: Let E be a separable Banach space and let $X, X_1, \dots, X_n, \dots$ be i.i.d. Gaussian random variables taking values in E with mean zero and unknown covariance operator $\Sigma : E^* \mapsto E$. The complexity of estimation of Σ based on observations X_1, \dots, X_n is naturally characterized by the so called effective rank of Σ : $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) := \frac{\mathbb{E}_\Sigma \|X\|^2}{\|\Sigma\|}$, where $\|\Sigma\|$ is the operator norm of Σ . Given a smooth real valued functional f defined on the space $L(E^*, E)$ of symmetric linear operators from E^* into E (equipped with the operator norm), our goal is to study the problem of estimation of $f(\Sigma)$ based on X_1, \dots, X_n . The estimators of $f(\Sigma)$ based on jackknife type bias reduction are considered and the dependence of their Orlicz norm error rates on effective rank $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$, the sample size n and the degree of Hölder smoothness s of functional f are studied. In particular, it is shown that, if $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, then the classical \sqrt{n} -rate is attainable and, if $s > \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, then asymptotic normality and asymptotic efficiency of the resulting estimators hold. Previously, the results of this type (for different estimators) were obtained only in the case of finite dimensional Euclidean space $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ and for covariance operators Σ whose spectrum is bounded away from zero (in which case, $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \asymp d$).

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62H12; secondary 62G20, 62H25, 60B20.

Keywords and phrases: Efficiency, Smooth functionals, Jackknife Bias Reduction, Concentration inequalities, Normal approximation.

*Supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-2113121

1. Introduction and main results

In this paper, we study a problem of estimation of the value $f(\Sigma)$ of a smooth real valued functional f based on i.i.d. mean zero Gaussian observations X_1, \dots, X_n with values in a separable Banach space and with unknown covariance operator Σ . The complexity of such estimation problems is naturally characterized by the effective rank $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$ of covariance operator Σ . Our goal is to develop estimators of $f(\Sigma)$ with an optimal dependence of the risk on the sample size n , effective rank $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$ and the degree of smoothness of functional f . Up to now, this problem has been studied only in the case of a finite dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d with the spectrum of the covariance Σ being bounded from above and bounded away from zero. In such a “nearly isotropic” case, the effective rank $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$ is of the same order as dimension d . Our goal is to study the problem in a dimension free framework with its complexity being characterized by $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$.

1.1. Estimation of covariance operators and effective rank

Let E be a separable Banach space with the dual space E^* . Given a bounded linear functional $u \in E^*$ and a vector $x \in E$, we will use the inner product notation $\langle x, u \rangle$ for the value of u at x (in the case when $E = \mathbb{H}$ is a Hilbert space, this becomes the actual inner product). Denote by $L(E^*, E)$ the space of all bounded linear operators $A : E^* \mapsto E$ equipped with the operator norm

$$\|A\| := \sup_{u \in E^*, \|u\| \leq 1} \|Au\|.$$

Let X be a Gaussian random variable in E with mean zero and covariance operator $\Sigma : E^* \mapsto E$,

$$\Sigma u := \mathbb{E}\langle X, u \rangle X, u \in E^*.$$

Given i.i.d. copies X_1, \dots, X_n of X , let $\hat{\Sigma} = \hat{\Sigma}_n : E^* \mapsto E$ be the sample covariance operator based on X_1, \dots, X_n :

$$\hat{\Sigma} u := n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j, u \rangle X_j, u \in E^*.$$

Recall that, for $x, y \in E$, the tensor product $x \otimes y$ could be viewed as a bounded operator from E^* to E , defined as follows: $(x \otimes y)u := x\langle y, u \rangle, u \in E^*$. Then $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}(X \otimes X)$ and $\hat{\Sigma} = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j \otimes X_j$.

The estimation error $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|$ of sample covariance operator $\hat{\Sigma}$ can be characterized in terms of operator norm $\|\Sigma\|$ and so called *effective rank* $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$ of covariance operator Σ , defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) := \frac{\mathbb{E}\|X\|^2}{\|\Sigma\|}.$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) = \frac{\mathbb{E} \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \langle X, u \rangle^2}{\sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \langle X, u \rangle^2} \geq 1.$$

Moreover, if $E = \mathbb{H}$ is a Hilbert space, we have

$$\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) = \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma)}{\|\Sigma\|} \leq \text{rank}(\Sigma) \leq \dim(\mathbb{H}).$$

The next results were proved in [11].

Theorem 1.1. *The following bound holds:*

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \asymp \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right).$$

Theorem 1.2. *For all $t \geq 1$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,*

$$\left| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| - \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right| \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \vee \frac{t}{n} \right).$$

In the above theorems and in what follows we write $A \lesssim B$ (for variables $A, B > 0$) if there exists a numerical constant $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$. The notation $A \gtrsim B$ is equivalent to $B \lesssim A$ and the notation $A \asymp B$ means that $A \lesssim B$ and $A \gtrsim B$. In some cases, it is convenient to allow the constants in the above relationships to depend on some parameters. In such cases, the signs $\lesssim, \gtrsim, \asymp$ will be provided with subscripts. Say, $A \lesssim_s B$ means that there exists $C_s > 0$ such that $A \leq C_s B$.

The bounds of these theorems show that, indeed, the size of $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|$ is characterized in terms of $\|\Sigma\|$ and effective rank $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$. In the case of finite dimensional Euclidean space $E = \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \leq d$, so, the bounds of the theorems imply well known bounds on $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|$ in terms of dimension d . Such dimension dependent bounds are sharp in the cases when covariance Σ is “nearly isotropic” in the sense that the spectrum $\sigma(\Sigma)$ of covariance Σ is bounded from above and bounded away from zero by positive numerical constants. In fact, in this case $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \asymp d$. In the “non isotropic” case, when the eigenvalues of covariance could be close to zero (in particular, in the infinite dimensional case), the dimension free description of covariance Σ in terms of its effective rank $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$ becomes necessary.

Throughout the paper, we use the generic norm notation $\|\cdot\|$ for a variety of different norms in different spaces. For instance, it is the norm of Banach space E , of its dual space E^* , the operator norm in the space $L(E^*, E)$, the operator norms in the spaces of multilinear forms in a Banach space, etc. In such cases, we do not provide the notation $\|\cdot\|$ with subscripts and its meaning should be clear from the context. Only if there is some ambiguity due to the fact that multiple norms are used on the same space, the subscripts will be used.

For instance, for operators acting in a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} , we will use the notation $\|\cdot\|_p$ for the Schatten p -norms for $p \geq 1$ with $\|\cdot\|_2$ being the Hilbert–Schmidt norm and $\|\cdot\|_1$ being the nuclear norm. Norms in function spaces and spaces of r.v. (such as the Hölder norms and Orlicz norms) will be also provided with subscripts.

1.2. Preliminaries: Orlicz spaces, smooth functionals, etc

Before stating the main results, we will introduce some notations used throughout the paper. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be a convex nondecreasing function with $\psi(0) = 0$. The Orlicz ψ -norm of a r.v. η is defined as

$$\|\eta\|_\psi = \inf \left\{ c \geq 0 : \mathbb{E} \psi \left(\frac{|\eta|}{c} \right) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Let $L_\psi(\mathbb{P})$ be the space of all r.v. on a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ with finite ψ -norm.

For $\psi(u) = u^p$, $u \geq 0$, $p \geq 1$, the ψ -norm coincides with the usual L_p -norm. The choice of $\psi(u) = \psi_\alpha(u)$, $u \geq 0$, $\alpha \geq 1$ yields the so called ψ_α -norms and various spaces of random variables with exponentially decaying tails, in particular, the space $L_{\psi_2}(\mathbb{P})$ of sub-gaussian r.v. and the space $L_{\psi_1}(\mathbb{P})$ of sub-exponential r.v. It is well known that, for $\alpha \geq 1$, the ψ_α -norm is equivalent to the following norm defined in terms of the L_p -norms:

$$\|\eta\|_{\psi_\alpha} \asymp \sup_{p \geq 1} p^{-1/\alpha} \mathbb{E}^{1/p} |\eta|^p. \quad (1.1)$$

Note that the right hand side also defines a norm of η for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and, despite the fact that in this case $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_\alpha}$ is not a norm (since ψ_α is not convex), the equivalence (1.1) still holds for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (with constants depending on α as α tends to 0). With a little abuse of notation, we will use the right hand side of (1.1) as the definition of ψ_α -norm for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (in fact, it will be convenient to use this definition for all $\alpha > 0$).

In what follows, we will measure the risk of estimators of $f(\Sigma)$ by the ψ -norms with properly chosen loss function ψ .

For an arbitrary set (space) S and a Banach space F , denote

$$\|g\|_{L_\infty} := \sup_{x \in S} \|g(x)\|.$$

Also, if F_1, F_2 are Banach spaces and $g : F_1 \mapsto F_2$, let

$$\|g\|_{\text{Lip}} := \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in F_1, x_1 \neq x_2} \frac{\|g(x_1) - g(x_2)\|}{\|x_1 - x_2\|}$$

and, for $\rho \in (0, 1]$, let

$$\|g\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} := \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in F_1, x_1 \neq x_2} \frac{\|g(x_1) - g(x_2)\|}{\|x_1 - x_2\|^\rho}.$$

We also denote

$$\text{Lip}(F_1, F_2) := \{g : F_1 \mapsto F_2 : \|g\|_{\text{Lip}} < \infty\} \text{ and } \text{Lip}_\rho(F_1, F_2) := \{g : F_1 \mapsto F_2 : \|g\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} < \infty\}.$$

Similarly, one can define spaces $\text{Lip}(U, F_2)$ and $\text{Lip}_\rho(U, F_2)$ and the corresponding norms $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Lip}} = \|\cdot\|_{\text{Lip}(U)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} = \|\cdot\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(U)}$ for an arbitrary subset $U \subset F_1$. If $F_1 = F$, $F_2 = \mathbb{R}$, we write $\text{Lip}(F) = \text{Lip}(F, \mathbb{R})$ and $\text{Lip}_\rho(F) = \text{Lip}_\rho(F, \mathbb{R})$.

For a k times Frèchet differentiable functional $f : F \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $f^{(k)}$ denotes its k -th Frèchet derivative (with $f^{(0)} = f$ and $f^{(1)} = f'$). Note that, for $x \in F$, $f^{(k)}(x)$ is a bounded symmetric k -linear form. For such a form $M[h_1, \dots, h_k]$, its operator norm is defined as

$$\|M\| := \sup_{\|h_1\|, \dots, \|h_k\| \leq 1} |M[h_1, \dots, h_k]|.$$

In particular, for $k = 1$, $f'(x)$ can be viewed as a bounded linear functional on F , so, $f'(x) \in F^*$ and we can write $f'(x)[h] = \langle h, f'(x) \rangle$, $h, x \in F$.

In what follows, the spaces of bounded symmetric k -linear forms are always equipped with the operator norm. For $s = k + \rho$, $k \geq 0, \rho \in (0, 1]$, the Hölder C^s -norm of k times Frèchet continuously differentiable functional f is defined by

$$\|f\|_{C^s} := \max_{0 \leq j \leq k} \sup_{x \in F} \|f^{(j)}(x)\| \vee \sup_{x, y \in F, x \neq y} \frac{\|f^{(k)}(x) - f^{(k)}(y)\|}{\|x - y\|^\rho}.$$

Similarly, one can define $C^s(U)$ -norms for k times Frèchet continuously differentiable functions $f : U \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ in an open subset $U \subset F$.

For a Frèchet differentiable functional $f : F \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, denote by

$$S_f(x; h) := f(x + h) - f(x) - \langle h, f'(x) \rangle, x, h \in F$$

the remainder of the first order Taylor expansion of f at point $x \in F$.

The following bounds on $S_f(x; h)$ will be used in what follows.

Proposition 1.1. *For a Frèchet continuously differentiable functional $f : F \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and for all $x, h, h' \in F$,*

$$|S_f(x, h)| \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|h\|^{1+\rho}$$

and

$$|S_f(x, h) - S_f(x, h')| \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} (\|h\|^\rho \vee \|h'\|^\rho) \|h - h'\|.$$

The same bounds hold if f is Frèchet continuously differentiable in a ball $B(x, \delta) := \{y : \|y - x\| < \delta\}$ and $\|h\|, \|h'\| < \delta$.

Similarly, for a k times Frèchet differentiable functional $f : F \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, denote by

$$S_f^{(k)}(x; h) := f(x + h) - \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{f^{(j)}(x)[h, \dots, h]}{j!}, x, h \in F$$

the remainder of the k -th order Taylor expansion of f .

Proposition 1.2. *For a k times Fréchet differentiable function $f : F \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and for all $x, h \in F$,*

$$|S_f^{(k)}(x, h)| \lesssim \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|h\|^{k+\rho}.$$

The same bound holds if f is k times Fréchet continuously differentiable in a ball $B(x, \delta)$ and $\|h\| < \delta$.

1.3. Main theorems

First we state a couple of results on estimation of $f(\Sigma)$ for a functional $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ of smoothness $s \in (0, 2]$. In this case, a simple plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$ suffices to achieve optimal error rates.

Theorem 1.3. *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$.*

(i) Suppose $f : L(E^, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the Hölder condition with exponent $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^\rho \left[\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^\rho + \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right)^\rho \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \right)^\rho + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^\rho \right]. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Suppose $f : L(E^, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz and, moreover, it is Fréchet continuously differentiable with the derivative f' satisfying the Hölder condition with exponent $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) + \frac{p}{n} \right) + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^{1+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

The following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 1.1. *(i) Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 (i),*

$$\left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{\psi_{1/\rho}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^\rho \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^\rho.$$

(ii) Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^{1+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

It is also possible to prove the following theorem that, in particular, implies normal approximation properties of plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$ with $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$. Let $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable functional with the first derivative f' satisfying the Hölder condition with exponent $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim_\rho \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left[\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\rho + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\rho)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\rho} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1+\rho} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

An immediate consequence is the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.4,*

$$\left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{\psi_{1/(1+\rho)}} \lesssim_\rho \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1+\rho}.$$

For functionals $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ of smoothness $s > 2$, the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$ of $f(\Sigma)$ becomes suboptimal due to its large bias and bias reduction is needed to construct estimators with optimal error rates. We will consider two estimators $T_f^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of $f(\Sigma)$ based on jackknife bias reduction method (see [6]). They are defined as follows. Let $k \geq 1$ and let $n/c \leq n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_k \leq n$ for some $c > 1$.

Define

$$T_f^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = T_{f,k}^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \sum_{j=1}^k C_j f(\hat{\Sigma}_{n_j}),$$

where

$$C_j := \prod_{i \neq j} \frac{n_j}{n_j - n_i}, j = 1, \dots, k. \quad (1.2)$$

It could be shown that $\sum_{j=1}^k C_j = 1$ (see [6]).

In the rest of the paper, the following assumption holds.

Assumption 1. Suppose that $\sum_{j=1}^k |C_j| \lesssim_k 1$.

Clearly, for Assumption 1 to hold, it is necessary that $n_{j+1} - n_j \asymp n, j = 1, \dots, k-1$. For instance, one could take $n_j := q^{j-k}n, j = 1, \dots, k$ for some $q > 1$.

Let now \mathcal{F}_{sym} denote the σ -algebra generated by random variables of the form $\psi(X_1 \otimes X_1, \dots, X_n \otimes X_n)$, where $\psi : L(E^*, E) \times \dots \times L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a symmetric function of n variables. Let

$$T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = T_{f,k}^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \mathbb{E} \left(T_{f,k}^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}} \right),$$

which could be easily written as a linear combination of U -statistics (see Section 2). It is well known that the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma}_n)$ of $f(\Sigma)$ has a large bias (despite the fact that $\hat{\Sigma}$ is an unbiased estimator of Σ). It turns out, however, that, for a smooth functional f with the choice (1.2) of weights C_j , the biases of estimators $f(\hat{\Sigma}_{n_j})$ of $f(\Sigma)$ almost cancel out resulting in a small bias of estimators $T_f^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. Of course, these estimators depend on the parameter k and on the choice of numbers n_1, \dots, n_k for which Assumption 1 holds. The choice of k in the main results stated below depends on the degree of smoothness of the functional f . To simplify the notations, we will simply write $T_f^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ suppressing their dependence on k and n_1, \dots, n_k .

The following results will be proved.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$. Let $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz and, moreover, for some $k \geq 2$, let it be k times Fréchet continuously differentiable with the k -th derivative $f^{(k)}$ satisfying the Hölder condition with exponent $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Then, for $i = 1, 2$ and for all $p \geq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) + \frac{p}{n} \right) + \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.5, for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ & \lesssim_s \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.1. Clearly, the results of Corollary 1.3 and Corollary 1.1 (ii) imply that the same bounds also hold for the ψ -norm error for an arbitrary loss function ψ dominated by ψ_1 in the sense that with some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ $\psi(u) \leq c_1 \psi_1(c_2 u)$, $u \geq 0$.

If $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$, the bound of Corollary 1.3 simplifies as follows:

$$\left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim_s \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}.$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s := k + \rho \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, then the first term of the bound is dominant and

$$\left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{\psi_1} = O(n^{-1/2})$$

yielding the classical parametric rates of convergence of estimators $T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, $i = 1, 2$ for sufficiently smooth functionals f .

The next theorem shows that if $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s = k + \rho > \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, then $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma)$ can be approximated by a sum of i.i.d. random variables with the remainder of the order $o(n^{-1/2})$, which suffices to establish the normal approximation of $\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))$ (yielding both asymptotic normality and asymptotic efficiency of estimator $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$).

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$ with $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$. Let $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a k times Fréchet continuously differentiable functional for some $k \geq 2$ with the first derivative f' satisfying the Hölder condition with exponent $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and the k -th derivative $f^{(k)}$ satisfying the Hölder condition with exponent $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho, \gamma} \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\gamma} \right) \\ & + \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1.4. *Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$ with $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$. If $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is k times continuously differentiable for some $k \geq 2$ with $\|f'\|_{C^1} < \infty$ and with the k -th derivative $f^{(k)}$ satisfying the Hölder condition with exponent $\rho \in (0, 1]$, then, for all $\beta \in [1/2, 1)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{\psi_\beta} \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho} \|f'\|_{C^1} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1/\beta}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1/\beta-1} + \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\langle f'(\Sigma), \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma \rangle = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j \otimes X_j, f'(\Sigma) \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle,$$

the bounds of Theorem 1.4, Corollary 1.2, Theorem 1.6 and Corollary 1.4 can be used to approximate the ‘‘Orcliz risk’’ of estimators $f(\hat{\Sigma})$ and $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ for losses ψ dominated by the sub-exponential loss ψ_1 (in particular, for the L_p -losses) as well as to develop normal approximation bounds for these estimators.

Let

$$\sigma_f^2(\Sigma) := \mathbb{E} \left(\langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right)^2.$$

It could be shown (see Lemma 4.1 below) that $\sigma_f(\Sigma) \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|$.

Corollary 1.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.4,*

$$\left| \sqrt{n} \left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_2} - \sigma_f(\Sigma) \right| \lesssim_\rho \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1+\rho}.$$

Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.6, the following bound holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sqrt{n} \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_2} - \sigma_f(\Sigma) \right| \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho, \gamma} \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma + \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the bound of the last corollary that, if $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s = k + \rho > \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, $k \geq 2$, $\rho \in (0, 1]$, then the normalized L_2 -risk

$$\sqrt{n} \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_2}$$

of estimator $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ converges to $\sigma_f(\Sigma)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, it is possible to show that, under the same conditions, $\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))$ converges in distribution to $N(0, \sigma_f^2(\Sigma))$. For $k = 1$, the same claims hold true for the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$.

To state the results on normal approximation, it will be convenient to use so called Wasserstein ψ -distances $W_\psi(\eta_1, \eta_2)$ between r.v. η_1, η_2 , or, more precisely, between their distributions. For a convex non-decreasing function $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\psi(0) = 0$, define

$$W_\psi(\eta_1, \eta_2) := \inf \left\{ \|\eta'_1 - \eta'_2\|_\psi : \eta'_1 \stackrel{d}{=} \eta_1, \eta'_2 \stackrel{d}{=} \eta_2 \right\}.$$

For $\psi(u) = u^p$, $u \geq 0$, $p \geq 1$, the Wasserstein ψ -distance becomes Wasserstein L_p -distance and it will be denoted $W_p(\eta_1, \eta_2)$. We can also use this definition for $\psi = \psi_\alpha$, $\alpha \geq 1$. Finally, it could be applied to the case of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ subject to a modification of the definition of the ψ_α -norms discussed above (see (1.1)).

The following corollary will be proved.

Corollary 1.6. (i) Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.4,

$$\begin{aligned} & W_2 \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}, Z \right) \\ & \lesssim_\rho \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2 \|f'(\Sigma)\|^2}{\sigma_f^2(\Sigma)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, under the assumptions of Corollary 1.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & W_{\psi_{1/(1+\rho)}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}, Z \right) \\ & \lesssim_\rho C \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.6,

$$\begin{aligned} W_2\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}, Z\right) &\lesssim_{k, \rho, \gamma} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2 \|f'(\Sigma)\|^2}{\sigma_f^2(\Sigma)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &+ \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^\gamma + \frac{\|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, under the assumptions of Corollary 1.4 for all $\beta \in [1/2, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\psi_\beta}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}, Z\right) &\lesssim_{k, \rho} C\left(\frac{\|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &+ \frac{\|f'\|_{C^1} \|\Sigma\|^{1/\beta}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^{1/\beta-1} + \frac{\|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

In both claims $C\left(\frac{\|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}\right) > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\frac{\|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}$.

Remark 1.2. Let

$$\mathcal{S}_f(A, B, r, \sigma_0) := \left\{ \|\Sigma\| \leq A, \|f'(\Sigma)\| \leq B, \mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \leq r, \sigma_f(\Sigma) \geq \sigma_0 \right\}$$

for some $A > 0, B > 0, r > 0, \sigma_0 > 0$. It immediately follows from Corollary 1.6 that if $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s = k + \rho > \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, $k \geq 2, \rho \in (0, 1]$, then, for all $\beta < 1$,

$$\sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_f(A, B, n^\alpha, \sigma_0)} W_{\psi_\beta}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}, Z\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This easily implies the asymptotic normality of estimator $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of $f(\Sigma)$ with \sqrt{n} -rate and limit variance $\sigma_f(\Sigma)$:

$$\sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_f(A, B, n^\alpha, \sigma_0)} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_\Sigma \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \leq x \right\} - \mathbb{P}\{Z \leq x\} \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and, moreover, for any loss function ψ dominated by ψ_β for some $\beta < 1$, we have

$$\sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_f(A, B, n^\alpha, \sigma_0)} \left\| \left\| \frac{\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \right\|_\psi - \|Z\|_\psi \right\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Similar results hold for the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$ when $k = 1$.

In principle, to estimate the value $f(\Sigma)$ of a functional f at unknown covariance Σ it should be enough for the functional to be smooth locally in a neighborhood of Σ rather than on the whole space $L(E^*, E)$. We will now state such local versions of the results discussed above. Note that if f is Lipschitz in

a neighborhood U of Σ , then, by McShane-Whitney extension theorem, it could be extended to the whole space with preservation of its Lipschitz constant (if f is, in addition, bounded in U by a constant, its Lipschitz extension could be chosen to be bounded by the same constant). Thus, without loss of generality, we will assume in what follows that f is Lipschitz in $L(E^*, E)$ (and, if needed, also bounded), but its higher order smoothness holds only locally.

We will start with a local version of Theorem 1.5.

Theorem 1.7. *Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$ with $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$. Let $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz and, for some $k \geq 2$, let it be k times Fréchet continuously differentiable in an open ball $U = B(\Sigma, \delta)$ of radius $\delta > 0$ with the k -th derivative satisfying the Hölder condition with exponent $\rho \in (0, 1]$ in this ball. Suppose also that $\delta \leq \|\Sigma\| \wedge 1$ and, for a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$, $\delta \geq C\|\Sigma\|\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}$. Then, for $i = 1, 2$ and for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{p}{n} \right) + \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(U)} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho} \\ & \quad + (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\|) \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $k = 1$, a similar bound holds for the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim_\rho \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{p}{n} \right) + \|f^{(1)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(U)} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

We will also prove the following local version of Theorem 1.6.

Theorem 1.8. *Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$ with $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$. Let f be a k times continuously differentiable functional in the ball $U = B(\Sigma, \delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$ and $k \geq 2$ with $\|f'\|_{C^{k-1+\rho}(U)} < \infty$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Suppose also that f is extended to a Lipschitz functional on $L(E^*, E)$ with preservation of its Lipschitz constant $\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} = \|f'\|_{L_\infty(U)}$. Finally, suppose that $\delta \leq \|\Sigma\| \wedge 1$ and, for a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$, $\delta \geq C\|\Sigma\|\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}$. Then, for all $p \geq 1$ and for all $\gamma \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho, \gamma} \|f'\|_{C^{k-1+\rho}(U)} \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\gamma} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, this implies that, for all $\beta \in [1/2, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{\psi_\beta} \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho, \beta} \|f'\|_{C^{k-1+\rho}(U)} \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1/\beta}}{\delta^{1/\beta-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1/\beta-1} + \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $a > 0$ and $r \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{S}(a, r)$ be the set of covariance operators $\Sigma : E^* \mapsto E$ with $\|\Sigma\| \leq a$ and $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \leq r$. The following result is an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.7.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $a > 0, r \geq 1$ and $\Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{S}(a, r)$. Suppose also that, for a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$,*

$$Ca\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} < \delta \leq a \wedge 1.$$

Let $U := B(\Sigma_0, 2\delta)$ and let $s = k + \rho$ for some $k \geq 2$ and $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Then, for $i = 1, 2$ and for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1} \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)} \\ & \lesssim_s \left(a \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \vee \frac{p}{n} \right) + a^s \left(\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \right)^s \right) \wedge 1. \end{aligned}$$

For $k = 1$, a similar bound holds for the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$.

For $p = 2$, the bound simplifies as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1} \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)} \\ & \lesssim_s \left(\frac{a}{\sqrt{n}} + a^s \left(\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \right)^s \right) \end{aligned}$$

(since both terms in the sum in the right hand side are bounded from above by 1, there is no need to take the minimum with 1).

In the case of separable Hilbert space $E = \mathbb{H}$, it is possible to show that the above bound for $p = 2$ is (nearly) minimax optimal locally around *spiked covariance operators* Σ_0 . A covariance operator Σ_0 will be called a *spiked covariance* of rank d if $\sigma(\Sigma) := \{\lambda, \mu, 0\}$ with $\lambda > \mu > 0$ and with eigenvalue λ being of multiplicity 1 and eigenvalue μ being of multiplicity $d - 1$.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{S}(a, r)$ be a spiked covariance operator of rank $[r]$ with nonzero eigenvalues $\lambda = \gamma_1 a$ and $\mu = \gamma_2 a$, where $0 < \gamma_2 < \gamma_1 < 1$ are numerical constants. Let $\kappa := \gamma_2 \wedge (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \wedge (1 - \gamma_1)$ and suppose that δ satisfies the condition*

$$c_1 \gamma_1 a \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} < \delta \leq c_2 \kappa a \wedge 1$$

with sufficiently large $c_1 > 0$ and sufficiently small $c_2 > 0$. Let $U := B(\Sigma_0, 2\delta)$ and let $s > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1} \inf_T \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a,r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \left\| T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)} \\ & \gtrsim \left(\gamma_1 \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}} \vee \gamma_1^{s/2} \gamma_2^{s/2} (a \wedge 1)^s \left(\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \right)^s \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is taken over all the estimators $T(X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

Finally, we will state another local minimax lower bound that along with the results of corollaries 1.5 and 1.6 imply the asymptotic efficiency of estimator $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of functional $f(\Sigma)$. A similar result has been already stated in [16] and its proof relies on van Trees inequality (see [13, 7] for similar arguments). As in the case of Theorem 1.9, the result will be stated in the case when $E = \mathbb{H}$ is a separable Hilbert space. In this case, it is easy to check that

$$\sigma_f^2(\Sigma) = 2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} f'(\Sigma) \Sigma^{1/2}\|_2^2.$$

Theorem 1.10. *Let $a > 1, r \geq 1$ and let Σ_0 be a covariance operator of rank $[r]$ with its non-zero eigenvalues belonging to an interval $[a^{-1} + \bar{\delta}, a - \bar{\delta}]$ for some $\bar{\delta} > 0$. Let $U := B(\Sigma_0, 2\bar{\delta})$ and suppose $f \in C^1(U)$. Let*

$$\omega_{f'}(\Sigma_0, \delta) := \sup_{\|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \|f'(\Sigma) - f'(\Sigma_0)\|, \delta \leq \bar{\delta}$$

be a local continuity modulus of f' at Σ_0 . For all $\beta > 2$, there exists a constant $D_\beta > 0$ such that, for all $\delta < \bar{\delta}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{T_n} \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a,r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \frac{\sqrt{n} \|T_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \\ & \geq 1 - D_\beta \left[\frac{a \omega_{f'}(\Sigma_0, \delta)}{\sigma_f(\Sigma_0)} + a^\beta \delta + \frac{a^2}{\delta^2 n} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is taken over all the estimators $T_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

Remark 1.3. This bound could be viewed as a non-asymptotic version of Hájek-LeCam local asymptotic minimax theorem. If $\sigma_f(\Sigma_0)$ is bounded away from zero and $\omega_{f'}(\Sigma_0, \delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, it implies that

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{T_n} \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a,r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}} \frac{\sqrt{n} \|T_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \geq 1.$$

It is easy to deduce from Corollary 1.5 that this asymptotic minimax lower bound is attained for estimator $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ (or, for $s \leq 2$, for the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$) in the class of covariances $\mathcal{S}(a, r)$ for a C^s -smooth functional f under the assumptions that $r \leq n^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s > \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$.

1.4. A brief review of related results

The problem of estimation of functionals of parameters of high-dimensional and infinite-dimensional statistical models has a long history going back to the 1970s. A very incomplete list of important references includes [19, 20, 4, 5, 1, 22, 2, 21, 23, 25]. One of the main difficulties in this problem is related to the fact that, in the case of a high-dimensional parameter θ and its reasonable estimator $\hat{\theta}$ (for instance, the maximum likelihood estimator), a naive plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\theta})$ of a non-linear functional $f(\theta)$ would typically have a large bias and, due to this, would fail to achieve optimal convergence rates. Thus, the development of bias reduction methods becomes a crucial ingredient of functional estimation. Motivated by this problem, several general approaches to bias reduction (jackknife, bootstrap and Taylor expansions methods) have been studied in recent paper [6] in the case of estimation of a smooth function of the parameter of binomial model and it was shown that, even in this simple case, the analysis of these approaches lead to non-trivial problems of approximation theory.

Estimation of functionals of covariance operators (for instance, in the case of normal models) is largely motivated by high-dimensional problems in multivariate statistical analysis. In particular, in principal component analysis, it is of importance to develop methods of estimation of linear forms of eigenvectors of unknown covariance, or of bilinear forms of its spectral projections, as well as some other functionals. Such problems have been studied in [10, 12] in a dimension free framework with the effective rank $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$ playing the role of complexity parameter (in the case of i.i.d. data in a Hilbert space \mathbb{H}). The bias reduction method developed in [10] for estimation of linear forms of eigenvectors of Σ was rather specialized and based on certain representations of the bias of bilinear forms of spectral projections of sample covariance. This method was developed to the full extent in [13] yielding asymptotically efficient estimators of linear forms of eigenvectors of Σ provided that $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) = o(n)$. The extension of this method to the case of estimation of bilinear forms of spectral projections of Σ (corresponding to multiple eigenvalues) has not been developed yet.

These difficulties motivated the study of more general bias reduction methods in the problem of estimation of functionals of the form $f(\Sigma) := \langle g(\Sigma), B \rangle$, where $g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function of real variable [7, 8]. It is known that, if B is a nuclear operator and function g belongs to the Besov space $B_{\infty,1}^s(\mathbb{R})$, then functional f defined on the space of bounded self-adjoint operators (equipped with an operator norm) is of Hölder smoothness s . Note that the bilinear form $\langle P_\lambda u, v \rangle$ of the spectral projection P_λ of operator Σ corresponding to its eigenvalue λ could be represented as $\langle g(\Sigma), B \rangle$ for a smooth function g supported in a small enough neighborhood of λ (that does not contain other eigenvalues of Σ). Moreover, by standard perturbation arguments, this representation also holds in an operator norm neighborhood of Σ . Thus, estimation of bilinear forms of spectral projections of Σ could be reduced to estimation of functionals of the form $\langle g(\Sigma), B \rangle$.

The bias reduction method studied in [7, 8, 15, 16] (called the *bootstrap chain*

bias reduction) goes back to the idea of iterated bootstrap bias reduction [3]. In the case of binomial model, it was also studied in [6] based on the ideas and results from classical approximation theory. To describe this approach in the case of functionals of covariance (the case of general parameter θ is similar), consider the following *Wishart operator*

$$(\mathcal{T}h)(\Sigma) := \mathbb{E}_\Sigma h(\hat{\Sigma}) = \int_{\mathcal{C}_+(\mathbb{H})} g(S)P(\Sigma, dS), h \in L_\infty(\mathcal{C}_+(\mathbb{H}))$$

acting in the space of bounded functions on the cone $\mathcal{C}_+(\mathbb{H})$ of covariance operators in \mathbb{H} , where

$$P(\Sigma, A) := \mathbb{P}_\Sigma\{\hat{\Sigma} \in A\}, A \subset \mathcal{C}_+(\mathbb{H})$$

is the distribution of the sample covariance operator $\hat{\Sigma}$ (clearly, $P(\Sigma, A)$ is a Markov kernel in the cone $\mathcal{C}_+(\mathbb{H})$). Let $(\mathcal{B}h)(\Sigma) := (\mathcal{T}h)(\Sigma) - h(\Sigma)$, $\Sigma \in \mathcal{C}_+(\mathbb{H})$. Since the bias of plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\Sigma})$ of $f(\Sigma)$ is equal to $(\mathcal{B}f)(\Sigma)$, the first order bias correction yields an estimator $f_1(\hat{\Sigma}) := f(\hat{\Sigma}) - (\mathcal{B}f)(\hat{\Sigma})$. Similarly, the bias of estimator $(\mathcal{B}f)(\hat{\Sigma})$ of $(\mathcal{B}f)(\Sigma)$ is equal to $(\mathcal{B}^2 f)(\Sigma)$, and the second order bias correction yields an estimator $f_2(\hat{\Sigma}) := f(\hat{\Sigma}) - (\mathcal{B}f)(\hat{\Sigma}) + (\mathcal{B}^2 f)(\hat{\Sigma})$. After k iterations, we get an estimator

$$f_k(\hat{\Sigma}) := \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j (\mathcal{B}^j f)(\hat{\Sigma}).$$

Another way to look at it is to observe that to find an estimator of $f(\Sigma)$ with a small bias, one has to solve approximately the operator equation $(\mathcal{T}h)(\Sigma) = f(\Sigma)$, $\Sigma \in \mathcal{C}_+(\mathbb{H})$ and to use $h(\hat{\Sigma})$ as an estimator. Since $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{B}$, the solution of the equation $\mathcal{T}h = f$ can be formally written as a Neumann series

$$h(\Sigma) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j (\mathcal{B}^j f)(\Sigma)$$

and the partial sums of this series

$$f_k(\Sigma) := \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j (\mathcal{B}^j f)(\Sigma)$$

provide approximate solutions of the equation.

It is easy to see that the bias of estimator $f_k(\hat{\Sigma})$ is given by the following formula:

$$\mathbb{E}_\Sigma f_k(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) = (-1)^k (\mathcal{B}^{k+1} f)(\Sigma),$$

so, to show that the bias of estimator $f_k(\hat{\Sigma})$ is sufficiently small when the functional f is sufficiently smooth, it is enough to control the size of $(\mathcal{B}^{k+1} f)(\Sigma)$ for

smooth f . This is based on representation of functions $\mathcal{B}^k f, k \geq 0$ in terms of so called *bootstrap chain*, which is a Markov chain $\{\hat{\Sigma}^{(k)} : k \geq 0\}$ with $\hat{\Sigma}^{(0)} = \Sigma$ and with transition probability kernel $P(\Sigma; A)$. This chain can be interpreted as an application of iterative parametric bootstrap to estimator $\hat{\Sigma}$: for $k = 0$, the chain starts at Σ ; for $k = 1$, its value $\hat{\Sigma}^{(1)} = \hat{\Sigma}$; for $k = 2$, its value $\hat{\Sigma}^{(2)}$ is a bootstrap estimator based on i.i.d. data $\hat{X}_1, \dots, \hat{X}_n$ resampled from $N(0; \hat{\Sigma})$ (conditionally on $\hat{\Sigma}$), etc. It is not hard to see that

$$(\mathcal{B}^k f)(\Sigma) = \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(j)}),$$

which is the expectation of the k -th order difference of the values of functional f along the trajectory of bootstrap chain. For a function $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, its k -th order difference at point $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with step h is

$$(\Delta_h^k f)(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} f(x + jh)$$

and, if f is k times continuously differentiable, $(\Delta_h^k f)(x) = O(h^k)$. In view of theorems 1.1, 1.2, under the assumption $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$, $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|$ is roughly of the order $\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}$, and this is also the size of the jumps of bootstrap chain $\{\hat{\Sigma}^{(k)} : k \geq 0\}$. By an analogy with the behavior of the k -th order differences of smooth functions in the real line, one could expect that, for a k times continuously differentiable functional f , one would have that

$$(\mathcal{B}^k f)(\Sigma) \lesssim \left(\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^k.$$

This would imply that estimator $f_k(\hat{\Sigma})$ does have a reduced bias when $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$ is small comparing with n and k is sufficiently large. The rigorous proof of this fact is, however, rather complicated and it required the development of a number of probabilistic and analytic tools. It was done in [7, 8] for functionals of the form $f(\Sigma) = \langle g(\Sigma), B \rangle$ and in [16] for general Hölder smooth functionals (in fact, in this paper the problem of estimation of functionals of unknown mean and covariance of normal model was studied). In both cases, it was done *only* in the case of covariances in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d and under the assumption that the spectrum of Σ belongs to the interval $[1/a, a]$ for some $a \geq 1$. Note that, in this case, $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \asymp d$, so, there is no need to use the effective rank of Σ as a complexity parameter. This assumption essentially means that the covariance is “almost” isotropic and the results similar to the ones stated in Section 1.3 were proved for estimator $f_k(\hat{\Sigma})$ with dimension d instead of $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$.

Although we conjecture that similar results hold for estimator $f_k(\hat{\Sigma})$ in the general dimension free case, we do not know how to prove this and the methods developed in [7, 8, 16] does not seem to suffice for this. However, as it was stated in Section 1.3 and will be proved later in the paper, such results do hold for

jackknife type estimators and their proofs are much simpler than for bootstrap chain estimators.

Some other results on bootstrap chain bias reduction and efficient estimation of functionals of unknown parameters for Gaussian shift models, more general random shift models, log-concave location models can be found in [15, 17, 14]. In [9], this method was studied in the case of general high-dimensional parametric models under the assumption that there exists an estimator of unknown parameter whose distribution could be approximated by Gaussian with sufficient accuracy. In [28], a version of Taylor expansions method of bias reduction was developed for estimation of functionals of the unknown mean with not necessarily i.i.d. and not necessarily Gaussian additive random noise.

2. Jackknife bias reduction

In this section, we summarize several facts (many of them known) concerning a jackknife bias reduction method in the problem of estimation of a smooth functional $f(\mathbb{E}Y)$ of unknown mean $\mathbb{E}Y$ of a random variable Y in a Banach space E based on i.i.d. observations Y_1, \dots, Y_n of Y .

The following simple proposition plays an important role in the analysis of jackknife bias reduction.

Lemma 2.1. *Let E be a Banach space and let $f : E \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be k times continuously differentiable for some $k \geq 2$ with $f^{(k)} \in \text{Lip}_\rho(E)$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Let $s := k + \rho$. Let Y, Y_1, \dots, Y_n be i.i.d. r.v. in E with distribution P and let $\bar{Y} = \bar{Y}_n := \frac{Y_1 + \dots + Y_n}{n}$. Suppose $\mathbb{E}\|Y\|^s < \infty$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}) - f(\mathbb{E}Y) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{\beta_{l,k}(P)}{n^l} + R,$$

where the coefficients $\beta_{l,k}(P)$ depend on P (but not on n) and

$$|R| \lesssim_s \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(E)} \mathbb{E}\|\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y\|^s.$$

PROOF. Let M be a bounded symmetric k -linear form on a Banach space E and let ξ, ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots be i.i.d. r.v. in E with $\mathbb{E}\xi = 0$, $\mathbb{E}\|\xi\|^k < \infty$. Let $\bar{\xi} := \frac{\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_n}{n}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}M[\bar{\xi}, \dots, \bar{\xi}] = n^{-k} \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq n} \mathbb{E}M[\xi_{i_1}, \dots, \xi_{i_k}].$$

Suppose there are m distinct indices $1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_m \leq n$ among i_1, \dots, i_k repeated with multiplicities k_1, \dots, k_m , where $1 \leq m \leq n$, $k_1, \dots, k_m \geq 1$, $k_1 + \dots + k_m = k$. Note that, if $k_j = 1$ for some $j = 1, \dots, m$, then $\mathbb{E}M[\xi_{i_1}, \dots, \xi_{i_k}] = 0$. Otherwise, we have

$$\mathbb{E}M[\xi_{i_1}, \dots, \xi_{i_k}] = \mathbb{E}M[\xi_1, \dots, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_m, \dots, \xi_m] =: b_{k_1, \dots, k_m}.$$

Denote

$$B_m := \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_m = k, k_j \geq 2, j=1, \dots, m} b_{k_1, \dots, k_m}.$$

Clearly, if $k_j \geq 2, j = 1, \dots, m$, then $m \leq k/2$. Since there are $\binom{n}{m}$ choices of l_1, \dots, l_m , we have

$$\mathbb{E}M[\bar{\xi}, \dots, \bar{\xi}] = \sum_{1 \leq m \leq k/2} \frac{\binom{n}{m}}{n^k} B_m.$$

Writing $m! \binom{n}{m} = \sum_{i=1}^m c_{m,i} n^i$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}M[\bar{\xi}, \dots, \bar{\xi}] = \sum_{1 \leq m \leq k/2} \frac{B_m}{m!} \sum_{i=1}^m c_{m,i} n^{-(k-i)} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k/2} d_{i,k} n^{-(k-i)},$$

where

$$d_{i,k} = d_{i,k}(M, \xi) := \sum_{i \leq m \leq k/2} c_{m,i} \frac{B_m}{m!}.$$

By the Taylor expansion, we have

$$f(x+h) = \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{f^{(j)}(x)[h, \dots, h]}{j!} + S_f^{(k)}(x; h)$$

with the following bound on the remainder (see Proposition 1.2):

$$|S_f^{(k)}(x; h)| \lesssim_s \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(E)} \|h\|^s.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}f'(\mathbb{E}Y)[\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y] = 0$, this implies that, for all $k \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}) - f(\mathbb{E}Y) = \sum_{j=2}^k \frac{\mathbb{E}f^{(j)}(\mathbb{E}Y)[\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y, \dots, \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y]}{j!} + \mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y)$$

with

$$|\mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y)| \lesssim_s \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(E)} \mathbb{E}\|\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y\|^s.$$

Let $\xi = Y - \mathbb{E}Y$, $\xi_j := Y_j - \mathbb{E}Y, j = 1, \dots, n$. Then $\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y = \bar{\xi}$ and, for all $k \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}) - f(\mathbb{E}Y) &= \sum_{j=2}^k \frac{\mathbb{E}f^{(j)}(\mathbb{E}Y)[\bar{\xi}, \dots, \bar{\xi}]}{j!} + \mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y) \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^k \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j/2} \tilde{d}_{i,j} n^{-(j-i)} + \mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{d}_{i,j} := d_{i,j}(f^{(j)}(\mathbb{E}Y), \xi)$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}) - f(\mathbb{E}Y) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{\beta_{l,k}(P)}{n^l} + \mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y),$$

where the coefficients

$$\beta_{l,k}(P) := \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}_{l,k}} \tilde{d}_{i,j}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{l,k} := \{(i,j) : 2 \leq j \leq k, 1 \leq i \leq j/2, j-i=l\}$$

depend on the distribution P of Y (but not on n) and

$$|\mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y)| \lesssim_s \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(E)} \mathbb{E}\|\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y\|^s.$$

□

As in Section 1, let $k \geq 1$ and $n/c \leq n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_k \leq n$ for some $c > 1$. Let

$$\hat{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) := \sum_{j=1}^k C_j f(\bar{Y}_{n_j}),$$

where $\{C_j : 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ are defined by (1.2) and Assumption 1 holds. With these definitions, it is known (see [6]) that the following proposition holds:

Proposition 2.1. *The coefficients $C_j, j = 1, \dots, k$ satisfy the following properties:*

- (i) $\sum_{j=1}^k C_j = 1$;
- (ii) $\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{C_j}{n_j^l} = 0$ for $l = 1, \dots, k-1$.

Under these conditions, Lemma 2.1 implies the following statement.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $f : E \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be k times continuously differentiable for some $k \geq 2$ with $f^{(k)} \in \text{Lip}_\rho(E)$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Let $s := k + \rho$. Then*

$$|\mathbb{E}\hat{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - f(\mathbb{E}Y)| \lesssim_s \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(E)} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mathbb{E}\|\bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y\|^s.$$

PROOF. Indeed, using Proposition 2.1 (i) and (ii), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\hat{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - f(\mathbb{E}Y) &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j (\mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}_{n_j}) - f(\mathbb{E}Y)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{\beta_{l,k}(P)}{n_j^l} + \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \\ &=: \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \beta_{l,k}(P) \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{C_j}{n_j^l} + R = R, \end{aligned}$$

and, by Assumption 1,

$$|R| \leq \sum_{j=1}^k |C_j| \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} |\mathbb{E} S_f^{(k)}(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y)| \lesssim_s \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(E)} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mathbb{E} \|\bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y\|^s.$$

□

Let \mathcal{F}_{sym} denote the σ -algebra generated by all symmetric functions $\psi(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ of r.v. Y_1, \dots, Y_n and define

$$\tilde{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) := \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}} \right).$$

It is easy to see that this estimator can be represented as a linear combination of U -statistics.

Recall that, if $h : E \times \dots \times E \mapsto F$ is a symmetric function of $m \leq n$ variables in a Banach space E with values in a Banach space F , then

$$U_n h = (U_n h)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) := \frac{1}{\binom{n}{m}} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_m \leq n} h(Y_{j_1}, \dots, Y_{j_m})$$

is the U -statistic of order m with kernel h . Then, for all $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_m \leq n$,

$$(U_n h)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) = \mathbb{E}(h(Y_{j_1}, \dots, Y_{j_m}) | \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}}).$$

We will need a couple of simple (and mostly known) facts. We give their proofs for completeness.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) := \bar{Y}_m$. Then, for all $m \leq n$,*

$$U_n \bar{Y}_m = \bar{Y}_n.$$

PROOF. Indeed,

$$U_n \bar{Y}_m = m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m U_n Y_j = \frac{m \bar{Y}_n}{m} = \bar{Y}_n.$$

□

Let $h : E \times \dots \times E \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a symmetric function.

Proposition 2.4. *For all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\|(U_n h)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E}h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m)\|_{L_p} \leq \|h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) - \mathbb{E}h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m)\|_{L_p}.$$

PROOF. By Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| (U_n h)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E}h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \right|^p &= \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E} \left(h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) - \mathbb{E}h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}} \right) \right|^p \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) - \mathbb{E}h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \right|^p \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left| h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) - \mathbb{E}h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \right|^p, \end{aligned}$$

implying the claim.

□

Proposition 2.5. For all $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| U_n f(\bar{Y}_m) - \mathbb{E} U_n f(\bar{Y}_m) - \langle \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y, f'(\mathbb{E} Y) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \leq \left\| S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) \right\|_{L_p}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Let $h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) := f(\bar{Y}_m)$ for a functional f differentiable at $\mathbb{E} Y$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) - \mathbb{E} h(Y_1, \dots, Y_m) \\ & = \langle \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y, f'(\mathbb{E} Y) \rangle + S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (U_n h)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E} (U_n h)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \\ & = \langle U_n \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y, f'(\mathbb{E} Y) \rangle + U_n S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) - \mathbb{E} U_n S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) \\ & = \langle \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y, f'(\mathbb{E} Y) \rangle + U_n S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) - \mathbb{E} U_n S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $p \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| U_n f(\bar{Y}_m) - \mathbb{E} U_n f(\bar{Y}_m) - \langle \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y, f'(\mathbb{E} Y) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \leq \left\| U_n S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) - \mathbb{E} U_n S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \leq \left\| S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\mathbb{E} Y; \bar{Y}_m - \mathbb{E} Y) \right\|_{L_p}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $h_j(Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_j}) := f(\bar{Y}_{n_j})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \mathbb{E}(h_j(Y_1, \dots, Y_{n_j}) | \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j (U_n h_j)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) = \sum_{j=1}^k C_j U_n f(\bar{Y}_{n_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}(U_n h_j)(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) = \mathbb{E} f(\bar{Y}_{n_j})$ and in view of Proposition 2.2, the following holds:

Proposition 2.6. Let $f : E \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be k times continuously differentiable for some $k \geq 2$ with $f^{(k)} \in \text{Lip}_\rho(E)$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and let $s = k + \rho$. Then

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \tilde{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - f(\mathbb{E} Y) \right| \lesssim_s \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(E)} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mathbb{E} \|\bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E} Y\|^s.$$

In view of Assumption 1, we easily get the next statements.

Proposition 2.7. *The following bounds hold for all $p \geq 1$*

$$\left\| \hat{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E} \hat{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f(\bar{Y}_{n_j}) - \mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}_{n_j})\|_{L_p}$$

and

$$\left\| \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E} \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f(\bar{Y}_{n_j}) - \mathbb{E}f(\bar{Y}_{n_j})\|_{L_p}$$

PROOF. The claims immediately follow from Assumption 1 and Proposition 2.4. \square

Proposition 2.8. *For all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E} \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \langle \bar{Y}_n - \mathbb{E}Y, f'(\mathbb{E}Y) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\| S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \right\|_{L_p}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j U_n f(\bar{Y}_{n_j}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j U_n \langle \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y, f'(\mathbb{E}Y) \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^k C_j U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \langle U_n \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y, f'(\mathbb{E}Y) \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^k C_j U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \langle \bar{Y}_n - \mathbb{E}Y, f'(\mathbb{E}Y) \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^k C_j U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \\ &= \langle \bar{Y}_n - \mathbb{E}Y, f'(\mathbb{E}Y) \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^k C_j U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.1 (i). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E} \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \\ &= \langle \bar{Y}_n - \mathbb{E}Y, f'(\mathbb{E}Y) \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \left(U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) - \mathbb{E} U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \mathbb{E}\check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) - \langle \bar{Y}_n - \mathbb{E}Y, f'(\mathbb{E}Y) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\
& \leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k C_j \left(U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) - \mathbb{E}U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \right) \right\|_{L_p} \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^k |C_j| \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\| U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) - \mathbb{E}U_n S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \right\|_{L_p} \\
& \lesssim \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\| S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) - \mathbb{E}S_f(\mathbb{E}Y; \bar{Y}_{n_j} - \mathbb{E}Y) \right\|_{L_p},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption 1 and Proposition 2.4. \square

3. Concentration of smooth functions of sample covariance operator

In this section, we derive several concentration bounds for functionals of sample covariance $\hat{\Sigma}$ playing a basic role in the proofs of the main results. In particular, we need the bounds on the L_p -norms $\|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{L_p}$ for all $p \geq 1$ that imply concentration with exponential tails of $f(\hat{\Sigma})$ around its expectation. We also need similar concentration bounds for the remainder of Taylor expansion $S_f(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)$ for a smooth functional f . Some concentration inequalities of this type have been previously obtained in [7, 16] in the case of sample covariances in Hilbert spaces. Here we extend these results to general Banach spaces and, in fact, we also simplify their proofs. Moreover, the inequalities we obtain easily imply concentration inequalities for $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|$ initially proved in [11] (also significantly simplifying their proofs).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n} + \frac{p}{n}} \right).$$

PROOF. It is well known that a centered Gaussian r.v. X in a separable Banach space can be represented by the following random series:

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} Z_j x_j,$$

where $\{Z_j : j \geq 1\}$ are i.i.d. standard normal r.v. and $\{x_j : j \geq 1\}$ are vectors in E such that the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} Z_j x_j$ converges in E a.s. and $\sum_{j \geq 1} \|x_j\|^2 < \infty$ (see, e.g., [18]).

Let $X^{(N)} := \sum_{j=1}^N Z_j x_j$. Denote by $\Sigma^{(N)}$ the covariance operator of $X^{(N)}$. Since $\|X - X^{(N)}\| \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ a.s., it easily follows from the Gaussian concentration that, for all $p \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E}\|X - X^{(N)}\|^p \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *The following statements hold:*

(i) *The sequence $\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|, N \geq 1$ is nondecreasing and $\|\Sigma^{(N)}\| \rightarrow \|\Sigma\|$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

(ii) *For all $p \geq 1$, the sequence $\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^p, N \geq 1$ is nondecreasing and*

$$\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^p \rightarrow \mathbb{E}\|X\|^p \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

(iii) *As a consequence,*

$$\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)}) \rightarrow \mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. Indeed,

$$\|\Sigma^{(N)}\| = \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \sum_{j=1}^N \langle x_j, u \rangle^2,$$

which is a nondecreasing sequence w.r.t. N . Moreover,

$$\|\Sigma^{(N)}\| - \|\Sigma\| \leq \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \langle x_j, u \rangle^2 \leq \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \|x_j\|^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^p &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{Z_{N+1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N Z_j x_j + Z_{N+1} x_{N+1} \right) \right\|^p \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}_{Z_{N+1}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N Z_j x_j + Z_{N+1} x_{N+1} \right\|^p = \mathbb{E}\|X^{(N+1)}\|^p \end{aligned}$$

implying that the sequence $\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^2, N \geq 1$ is nondecreasing. A similar argument shows that $\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^p \leq \mathbb{E}\|X\|^p, N \geq 1$. Since $\|X^{(N)}\|^p \rightarrow \|X\|^p$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ a.s. and, for all $p' > p$,

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^{p'} \leq \mathbb{E}\|X\|^{p'} < \infty,$$

we can conclude that $\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^p \rightarrow \mathbb{E}\|X\|^p$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

The last claim of the lemma easily follows from the definition of $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)$. \square

For $X_k, k \geq 1$, we have

$$X_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} Z_{j,k} x_j,$$

where $Z_{j,k}, j \geq 1, k = 1, \dots, n$ are i.i.d. standard normal r.v. and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} Z_{j,k} x_j$ converges in E a.s. for all $k = 1, \dots, n$. Let

$$X_k^{(N)} = \sum_{j=1}^N Z_{j,k} x_j, k = 1, \dots, n, N \geq 1.$$

Denote by $\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}$ the sample covariance based on $X_1^{(N)}, \dots, X_n^{(N)}$. Since the mapping $E \ni x \mapsto x \otimes x \in L(E^*, L)$ is continuous, we easily get that

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j^{(N)} \otimes X_j^{(N)} \rightarrow \hat{\Sigma} = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j \otimes X_j \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

in the space $L(E^*, E)$ (equipped with the operator norm). Note that, for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma}\|^p \leq \mathbb{E} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \|X_j\|^2 \right)^p \leq n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \|X_j\|^{2p} = \mathbb{E} \|X\|^{2p} < \infty$$

and, in view of Lemma 3.1 (ii), we also get

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^p \leq \sup_{N \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \|X^{(N)}\|^{2p} = \mathbb{E} \|X\|^{2p} < \infty.$$

Since we have $\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \hat{\Sigma}\|^p \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ a.s. and, for all $p' > p$,

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \hat{\Sigma}\|^{p'} \lesssim_{p'} \mathbb{E} \|X\|^{2p'} < \infty,$$

we can conclude that, for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \hat{\Sigma}\|^p \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since f is Lipschitz, this implies that

$$\mathbb{E} |f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}) - f(\hat{\Sigma})|^p \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$\left\| (f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}) - f(\hat{\Sigma})) - \mathbb{E}(f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}) - f(\hat{\Sigma})) \right\|_{L_p} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.1)$$

Thus, to obtain a bound on $\|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{L_p}$, it is now enough to bound $\|f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)})\|_{L_p}$ and pass to the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. To this end, recall

that $\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} = \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})$ depends on $\mathcal{Z} := (Z_{j,k})_{j=1,\dots,N;k=1,\dots,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$. Our main tool is the following well known form of Gaussian concentration inequalities.

For a locally Lipschitz function $g : \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, denote by

$$(Lg)(z) := \inf_{U \ni z} \sup_{z', z'' \in U} \frac{|f(z') - f(z'')|}{\|z - z'\|_{\ell_2}}$$

the local Lipschitz constant of g at point z (with the infimum taken over all neighborhoods U of point z). Note that this definition could be extended to local Lipschitz functions from a metric space into another metric space.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{Z} \sim N(0, I_m)$ be a standard normal r.v. in \mathbb{R}^m and let $g : \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\|g(\mathcal{Z}) - \mathbb{E}g(\mathcal{Z})\|_{L_p} \lesssim \sqrt{p} \|(Lg)(\mathcal{Z})\|_{L_p}.$$

We will apply the bound of Proposition 3.1 to $g(\mathcal{Z}) := f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}))$. For \mathcal{Z} and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = (\tilde{Z}_{j,k})_{j=1,\dots,N;k=1,\dots,n}$, $\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} = \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}^{(N)} := \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \tilde{\Sigma}^{(N)}\| &= \sup_{\|u\|, \|v\| \leq 1} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j^{(N)}, u \rangle \langle X_j^{(N)}, v \rangle - n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, u \rangle \langle \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, v \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|u\|, \|v\| \leq 1} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j^{(N)} - \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, u \rangle \langle X_j^{(N)}, v \rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \sup_{\|u\|, \|v\| \leq 1} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, u \rangle \langle X_j^{(N)} - \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, v \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j^{(N)} - \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, u \rangle^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \left[\sup_{\|v\| \leq 1} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j^{(N)}, v \rangle^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sup_{\|v\| \leq 1} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, v \rangle^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq (\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2} + \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2}) \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j^{(N)} - \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, u \rangle^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_j^{(N)} - \tilde{X}_j^{(N)}, u \rangle^2 &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^N (Z_{j,k} - \tilde{Z}_{j,k}) \langle x_k, u \rangle \right)^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^N (Z_{j,k} - \tilde{Z}_{j,k})^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \langle x_k, u \rangle^2 \\ &= (\Sigma^{(N)} u, u) \sum_{k=1}^N (Z_{j,k} - \tilde{Z}_{j,k})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \tilde{\Sigma}^{(N)}\| &\leq (\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2} + \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2}) \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^N (Z_{j,k} - \tilde{Z}_{j,k})^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq (\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2} + \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2}) \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathcal{Z} - \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}\|_{\ell_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The last inequality implies the following bound on the local Lipschitz constant of the mapping $\mathbb{R}^{N \times n} \ni \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})$:

$$(L\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)})(\mathcal{Z}) \leq \frac{2\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2}. \quad (3.3)$$

It immediately implies the bound on the local Lipschitz constant of function $\mathcal{Z} \mapsto f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}))$:

$$(Lf(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}))(\mathcal{Z}) \leq 2\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2}.$$

By Proposition 3.1, we get, that for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\|f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)})\|_{L_p} \lesssim \sqrt{p}\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2} \right\|_{L_p}. \quad (3.4)$$

Note also that

$$\left| \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2} - \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})\|^{1/2} \right| \leq \frac{\left| \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})\| \right|}{\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2} + \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})\|^{1/2}},$$

which together with (3.2) implies that $\mathcal{Z} \mapsto \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2}$ is a Lipschitz function with constant $\frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}}$. Again, by Proposition 3.1,

$$\left\| \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2} - \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2} \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \sqrt{p} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (3.5)$$

Combining (3.4) and (3.5) yields the bound

$$\|f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)})\|_{L_p} \lesssim \sqrt{p}\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2} + p\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|}{n}.$$

Note also that, by Lemma 3.1, $\|\Sigma^{(N)}\| \leq \|\Sigma\|$ and $\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|X\|^2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}\|^{1/2} &\leq \mathbb{E}^{1/2}\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}\| \leq \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}^{1/2}\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)}\| \\ &\leq \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} + \left(\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^2}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}\|X^{(N)}\|^2}{n}} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|\Sigma\|^{1/2} + C \left(\|\Sigma\|^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}\|X\|^2}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}\|X\|^2}{n}} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \|\Sigma\|^{1/2} \left(1 + C \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right) \lesssim \|\Sigma\|^{1/2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and we get the following bound:

$$\|f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)})\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}\|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n} + \frac{p}{n}} \right).$$

Passing to the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and using (3.1), we get

$$\|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}\|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n} + \frac{p}{n}} \right).$$

□

Theorem 3.1 immediately implies the following concentration bound.

Corollary 3.1. *For all $t \geq 1$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$*

$$|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})| \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}\|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n} + \frac{t}{n}} \right).$$

PROOF. Indeed, by Markov inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ |f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})| \geq e \|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{L_t} \right\} \leq \frac{\|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{L_t}^t}{e^t \|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{L_t}^t} = e^{-t},$$

implying the claim. □

The next corollary is also obvious.

Corollary 3.2. *The following bound holds:*

$$\|f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma})\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right).$$

Note also that the function $L(E^*; E) \ni B \mapsto \|B - \Sigma\|$ is Lipschitz with constant 1. Applying the above statements to this function, we get the following results initially proved in a more complicated way in [11] (see also theorems 1.1 and 1.2).

Proposition 3.2. *The following bounds hold:*

(i) for all $p \geq 1$

$$\left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| - \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n} + \frac{p}{n}} \right);$$

(ii)

$$\left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| - \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right);$$

(iii) for all $t \geq 1$,

$$\left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| - \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\| \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{t}{n} \right).$$

We will also need to obtain concentration bounds on the remainder of the first order Taylor expansion

$$S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) = f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) - \langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle$$

for a functional f with $\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} < \infty$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1]$.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that $f' \in \text{Lip}_\rho(L(E^*, E))$ and that $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E}S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\rho + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\rho)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\rho} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, it implies that

$$\left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E}S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_{\psi_{1/(1+\rho)}} \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\rho.$$

PROOF. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, it is enough to obtain the concentration bound for $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma)$ and then pass to the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. First note that, by the second bound of Proposition 1.1, the local Lipschitz constant of the mapping $H \mapsto S_f(\Sigma; H)$ is bounded from above as follows:

$$(LS_f(\Sigma; \cdot))(H) \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|H\|^\rho.$$

This implies the following bound on the local Lipschitz constant of $\mathcal{Z} \mapsto S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & (LS_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\cdot) - \Sigma))(\mathcal{Z}) \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma\|^\rho \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma\|^\rho + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma\|^{\rho+1/2} \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^\rho + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^\rho \\ & + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\rho+1/2} + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\rho+1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

By Proposition 3.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \sqrt{p} \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \left(\frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_p}^\rho + \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^\rho \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_p}^{\rho+1/2} + \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\rho+1/2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.2 (i),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_p}^\rho \leq \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_p}^\rho \\ & \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\| \right)^\rho + \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} - \mathbb{E} \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_p}^\rho \\ & \lesssim \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^\rho \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n} \right)^\rho + \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^\rho \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{p}{n} \right)^\rho. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Since $\rho + 1/2 < 2$, we have

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_p}^{\rho+1/2} \leq \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_{2p}}^{\rho+1/2},$$

and, similarly to (3.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L_p}^{\rho+1/2} \\ & \lesssim \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\rho+1/2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n} \right)^{\rho+1/2} + \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\rho+1/2} \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{p}{n} \right)^{\rho+1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \left(p^{1/2} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2+\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n} \right)^\rho \right. \\ & \left. + \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2+\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\rho)/2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee 1 \right)^\rho + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{\rho+1/2} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + p^{1/2} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1+\rho}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n} \right)^{\rho+1/2} \right. \\ & \left. + \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1+\rho} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{\rho/2+3/4} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma^{(N)})}{n}} \vee 1 \right)^{\rho+1/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\rho} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma \right\|^\rho + \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\rho+1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \left(p^{1/2} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^\rho + \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\rho)/2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right)^\rho + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{\rho+1/2} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + p^{1/2} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^{\rho+1/2} + \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{\rho/2+3/4} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right)^{\rho+1/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\rho} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$, the above bound simplifies as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \left(p^{1/2} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\rho \right. \\ & \left. + \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\rho)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{\rho+1/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{\rho/2+3/4} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\rho} \right) \right) \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\rho + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\rho)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\rho} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

□

The following corollary is obvious.

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose that $f' \in \text{Lip}_\rho$ and $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$. Then*

$$\left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \mathbb{E} f(\hat{\Sigma}) - \langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{\psi_{1/(1+\rho)}} \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\rho.$$

PROOF. It immediately follows from the fact that the right hand side of (3.8) is bounded from above by $\lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} p^{1+\rho} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\rho$.

□

4. Proofs of the main results

In this section, we provide the proofs of the main results stated in Section 1.3.

4.1. Upper risk bounds and normal approximation

We start with the proof of theorems 1.3 and 1.5.

PROOF. To prove the first bound of Theorem 1.3, note that, for $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and $p \geq 1$,

$$\left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \leq \|f\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \left\| \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right\|_{L_p} \leq \|f\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \left\| \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right\|_{L_p}^\rho.$$

Using Proposition 3.2 (i) and Theorem 1.1, we easily get

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \left[\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right) + \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n} + \frac{p}{n}} \right],$$

which implies

$$\left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^\rho \left[\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^\rho + \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right)^\rho \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \right)^\rho + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^\rho \right].$$

To prove the second bound, note that

$$\mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) = \mathbb{E}\langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle + \mathbb{E}S_f(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) = \mathbb{E}S_f(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma).$$

Using Proposition 1.1 (i) along with Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 3.2 (i) (for $p = 1 + \rho$), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma)| &\lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \\ &\lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^{1+\rho} + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right)^{1+\rho} \\ &\lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^{1+\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where we also used the fact that $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \geq 1$. It remains to combine the last bound with concentration bound of Theorem 3.1 to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

To prove Theorem 1.5, we will apply the results of Section 2 with the space $L(E^*, E)$ playing the role of E and $Y = X \otimes X$, $Y_j = X_j \otimes X_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}Y$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_n = \bar{Y}_n$. Also, $T_f^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \hat{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ and $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \check{T}_f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$. By Proposition 2.2, we get the following bounds on the bias of these estimators: for $i = 1, 2$,

$$|\mathbb{E}T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma)| \lesssim_{k,\rho} \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_{n_j} - \Sigma\|^{k+\rho}.$$

Using the bounds of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 3.2 (i), we get that, for all $j = 1, \dots, k$,

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{n_j} - \Sigma \right\|_{L_{k+\rho}} \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n_j}} + \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n_j} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n_j}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{k+\rho}{n_j} + \frac{k+\rho}{n_j}} \right).$$

Since $n/c \leq n_j \leq n$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{n_j} - \Sigma \right\|_{L_{k+\rho}} &\lesssim \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} + \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{k+\rho}{n} + \frac{k+\rho}{n}} \right) \\ &\lesssim_{k,\rho} \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$|\mathbb{E}T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma)| \lesssim_{k, \rho} \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee \frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \right)^{k+\rho}. \quad (4.2)$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.7, for all $p \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$,

$$\left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \mathbb{E}T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\| f(\hat{\Sigma}_{n_j}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}_{n_j}) \right\|_{L_p}$$

and, by Theorem 3.1 for $j = 1, \dots, k$,

$$\|f(\hat{\Sigma}_{n_j}) - \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}_{n_j})\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n_j}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_j}} + \frac{p}{n_j} \right).$$

Since $n/c \leq n_j \leq n, j = 1, \dots, k$, we get

$$\left\| T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \mathbb{E}T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\Sigma\| \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \vee 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{p}{n} \right). \quad (4.3)$$

Combining bounds (4.2) and (4.3) yields the first bound of Theorem 1.5. \square

Next we provide the proof of theorems 1.4, 1.6 and Corollary 1.4.

PROOF. Since

$$f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma) = \langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle + S_f(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E}S_f(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) + \mathbb{E}f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma),$$

it is enough to use bound on the bias (4.1) and the first concentration bound of Theorem 3.2 to complete the proof of Theorem 1.4.

It follows from Proposition 2.8 that, for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \mathbb{E}T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}_{n_j} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E}S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}_{n_j} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it remains to use the first bound of Theorem 3.2 to get that, for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \mathbb{E}T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - \langle \hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho, \gamma} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_j}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n_j}} \right)^\gamma + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n_j} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n_j} \right)^{1+\gamma} \right) \\ & \lesssim_{k, \rho, \gamma} \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\gamma} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we also use the condition that $n/c \leq n_j \leq n, j = 1, \dots, k$. Combining the last bound with bound (4.2) for $i = 2$ completes the proof of Theorem 1.6.

To deduce the bound of Corollary 1.4, it is enough to observe that, for all $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, $\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \leq 2\|f'\|_{C^1}$ and use the bound of Theorem 1.6 for $\gamma = \frac{1}{\beta} - 1$. \square

We turn now to the proof of Corollary 1.6.

PROOF. We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *The following bound holds:*

$$\left\| \langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|.$$

PROOF. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle &= \left\langle \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} Z_j x_j \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} Z_j x_j \right), f'(\Sigma) \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} Z_i Z_j \langle x_i \otimes x_j, f'(\Sigma) \rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} a_{ij} Z_i Z_j, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$a_{ij} := \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle x_i \otimes x_j, f'(\Sigma) \rangle + \langle x_j \otimes x_i, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right), \quad i, j \geq 1.$$

The symmetric matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j \geq 1}$ defines in a standard way an operator $A : \ell_2 \mapsto \ell_2$, which is bounded and self-adjoint. Its boundedness easily follows from the fact that it is Hilbert–Schmidt since

$$\|A\|_2^2 = \sum_{i,j \geq 1} a_{ij}^2 \leq \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \langle x_i \otimes x_j, f'(\Sigma) \rangle^2 \leq \|f'(\Sigma)\|^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|x_j\|^2 \right)^2 < \infty.$$

We will prove that, in fact, A is even a nuclear operator with $\|A\|_1 \leq \|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|$. To this end, note that, for a self-adjoint operator $B : \ell_2 \mapsto \ell_2$ with $\|B\| \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A, B \rangle &= \sum_{i,j \geq 1} a_{ij} b_{ij} = \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle x_i \otimes x_j, f'(\Sigma) \rangle + \langle x_j \otimes x_i, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right) b_{ij} \\ &= \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \geq 1} b_{ij} (x_i \otimes x_j + x_j \otimes x_i), f'(\Sigma) \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle A, B \rangle| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|f'(\Sigma)\| \left\| \sum_{i,j \geq 1} b_{ij} (x_i \otimes x_j + x_j \otimes x_i) \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \|f'(\Sigma)\| \sup_{\|u\|, \|v\| \leq 1} \left| \sum_{i,j \geq 1} b_{ij} \langle x_i, u \rangle \langle x_j, v \rangle + b_{ij} \langle x_j, u \rangle \langle x_i, v \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \|f'(\Sigma)\| \sup_{\|u\|, \|v\| \leq 1} \left| \sum_{i,j \geq 1} b_{ij} \langle x_i, u \rangle \langle x_j, v \rangle \right| \leq \|f'(\Sigma)\| \|B\| \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \sum_{j \geq 1} \langle x_j, u \rangle^2 \\
&\leq \|f'(\Sigma)\| \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} \langle \Sigma u, u \rangle \leq \|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

By the duality between the nuclear norm and the operator norm, the bound $\|A\|_1 \leq \|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|$, clearly, follows.

To prove the bound of the lemma, it is enough to consider the case when X is represented by a finite sum $X = \sum_{j=1}^N Z_j x_j$ and then pass to the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In this case,

$$\langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^N a_{ij} Z_i Z_j \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k g_k^2,$$

where λ_k are the eigenvalues of the matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^N$ and g_1, \dots, g_N are i.i.d. $N(0, 1)$ r.v. Therefore, we have

$$\left\| \langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle \right\|_{\psi_1} = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k g_k^2 \right\|_{\psi_1} \leq \sum_{k=1}^N |\lambda_k| \|g_k^2\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^N |\lambda_k| = \|A\|_1 \leq \|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|,$$

which allows to complete the proof. \square

We will also use the following normal approximation bounds proved in [24] (see Theorem 4.1 and equation (4.3); Theorem 2.1). Let $\eta, \eta_1, \eta_2, \dots$ be i.i.d. r.v. with $\mathbb{E}\eta = 0$, $\mathbb{E}\eta^2 = 1$ and let $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. Then, for all $r \in (1, 2]$,

$$W_r \left(\frac{\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n}{\sqrt{n}}, Z \right) \lesssim \frac{\mathbb{E}^{1/r} |\eta|^{r+2}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Moreover, if $\|\eta\|_{\psi_1} < \infty$, then

$$W_{\psi_1} \left(\frac{\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n}{\sqrt{n}}, Z \right) \lesssim \frac{C(\|\eta\|_{\psi_1})}{\sqrt{n}}$$

with some constant $C(\|\eta\|_{\psi_1}) < \infty$ depending only on $\|\eta\|_{\psi_1}$.

We will apply this bounds to r.v.

$$\eta := \frac{\langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle X \otimes X, f'(\Sigma) \rangle}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}.$$

By Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\|\eta\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}.$$

This also implies that

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/2} |\eta|^4 \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2 \|f'(\Sigma)\|^2}{\sigma_f^2(\Sigma)}.$$

Since

$$\langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j,$$

we get

$$W_2\left(\sqrt{n}\langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle, Z\right) \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2 \|f'(\Sigma)\|^2}{\sigma_f^2(\Sigma)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$W_{\psi_1}\left(\sqrt{n}\langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle, Z\right) \lesssim C \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (4.5)$$

Combining bound (4.4) with the bound of Theorem 1.6 for $p = 2$, we get, under the assumptions of this theorem, that

$$\begin{aligned} W_2\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}, Z\right) &\lesssim_{k, \rho, \gamma} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2 \|f'(\Sigma)\|^2}{\sigma_f^2(\Sigma)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &+ \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^\gamma + \frac{\|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^{k+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, combining bound (4.5) with bound of Corollary 1.4, we get under the assumptions of this corollary that, for all $\beta \in [1/2, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\psi_\beta}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)}, Z\right) &\lesssim_{k, \rho} C \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\| \|f'(\Sigma)\|}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &+ \frac{\|f'\|_{C^1} \|\Sigma\|^{1/\beta}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^{1/\beta-1} + \frac{\|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho}}{\sigma_f(\Sigma)} \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right)^{k+\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Claim (ii) of Corollary 1.6. The proof of Claim (i) is similar. \square

4.2. Local versions of upper bounds

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.7.

PROOF. Since functional $f : L(E^*, E) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz, we can still use the concentration bound of Theorem 3.1. However, since f is smooth only locally in the neighborhood $U = B(\Sigma, \delta)$, we have to modify the bounds on the bias based on propositions 2.2 and 2.6. To this end, it is enough to modify the bound on the remainder R in Lemma 2.1, which is based on global differentiability. This requires bounding $\mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) = \mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| < \delta) + \mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta).$$

The first term in the right hand side is still controlled using the bound on the remainder of Taylor expansion of Proposition 1.2:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| < \delta)| &\lesssim \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(U)} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \\ &\lesssim_{k,\rho} \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(U)} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where we used the fact that $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \leq n$ and bounds of Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 1.1.

To control the second term, note that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)| &\leq |f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma)| + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\|}{j!} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^j \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\|}{j!} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta)| \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta) + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\|}{j!} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^j I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^j I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta) \leq \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^{2j} \mathbb{P}^{1/2}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta\}. \quad (4.8)$$

Using the bound of Theorem 1.1 and bound (i) of Proposition 3.2, we easily get that, under the assumption $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \leq n$ for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{L_p} \leq \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| + \left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| - \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{L_p} \leq C\|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{p}{n} \right) \quad (4.9)$$

with some numerical constant $C > 0$. In particular, this implies that

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/2} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^{2j} \lesssim_j \|\Sigma\|^j \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^j. \quad (4.10)$$

If $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \leq \delta/2$ and $\delta \leq \|\Sigma\|$ (which hold under the assumptions of the theorem), we have that, for a small enough constant $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| - \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/2\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-cn\left(\frac{\delta}{\|\Sigma\|} \wedge \frac{\delta^2}{\|\Sigma\|^2}\right)\right\} \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{cn\delta^2}{\|\Sigma\|^2}\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where we used bound (iii) of Proposition 3.2 with

$$t := cn\left(\frac{\delta}{\|\Sigma\|} \wedge \frac{\delta^2}{\|\Sigma\|^2}\right).$$

It follows from (4.8), (4.10) and (4.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|^j I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta) &\lesssim_j \|\Sigma\|^j \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^j \exp\left\{-\frac{cn\delta^2}{2\|\Sigma\|^2}\right\} \\ &\lesssim_j \|\Sigma\|^j \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^j \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where we also use the condition that $\delta \gtrsim \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\sqrt{n}}$ and the fact that $e^{-x^2} \lesssim x^{-1}$ for $x \gtrsim 1$. Substituting (4.12) into bound (4.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E} S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \geq \delta)| \\ &\lesssim_k \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} + \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\| \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\|\Sigma\|^j \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^j}{j!} \\ &\lesssim_k \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\| \frac{\|\Sigma\|}{\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\exp\left\{\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right\} - 1 \right) \\ &\lesssim_k (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\|) \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the condition that $\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \lesssim \delta \leq 1$ and $e^x - 1 \lesssim x$, $0 \leq x \lesssim 1$. Recalling (4.6), we end up with the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E} S_f^{(k)}(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)| \\ &\lesssim_k \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(U)} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho} + (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\|) \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

It implies the bounds on the bias of estimators $T_f^{(1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n), T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ for $i = 1, 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} & |T_f^{(i)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma)| \\ & \lesssim_k \|f^{(k)}\|_{\text{Lip}_\rho(U)} \|\Sigma\|^{k+\rho} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{k+\rho} + (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \|f^{(j)}(\Sigma)\|) \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

The rest of the proof is the same as in the case of Theorem 1.5. \square

We now prove Theorem 1.8.

PROOF. To prove the theorem, we need to modify the concentration bounds of Theorem 3.2 in the case when f is smooth only in the neighborhood U . Namely, the following lemma will be proved.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose $\mathbf{r}(\Sigma) \lesssim n$ and $f \in \text{Lip}(L(E^*, E))$, $f' \in \text{Lip}_\gamma(U)$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $U = B(\Sigma, \delta)$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Suppose also that $\|\Sigma\| \geq \delta \geq C\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}$ for a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$. Then, for all $p \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \vee \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)}) \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\gamma/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, r.v. $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)$ will be approximated by $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma)$. We will assume that N is large enough so that $\|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\| < \delta$. We have to approximate r.v. $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma)$ further to be able to use the bounds on the remainder of Taylor expansion of Lemma 1.1. To this end, consider a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ such that $\varphi(y) = 1, y \leq 1$, $\varphi(y) = 0, y \geq 2$ and φ is Lipschitz with constant 1, and approximate r.v. $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma)$ by r.v. $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma) \varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right)$. Note that this r.v. coincides with $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma)$ when $\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma\| \leq \delta/4$ and it is equal to 0 when $\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma\| > \delta/2$. Using Lemma 1.1, it will be possible to control the local Lipschitz constant of the function

$$\mathcal{Z} \mapsto S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma) \varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right) =: g(\mathcal{Z}) \quad (4.14)$$

as we did for the function $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma)$ in the proof of Theorem 3.2. This will lead to concentration bounds for r.v. $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma) \varphi\left(\frac{2\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right)$ and, in the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$, to concentration bounds for r.v. $S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \varphi\left(\frac{2\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right)$.

Before doing this, we will obtain bounds on the approximation error

$$S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)\varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right) = S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)\left(1 - \varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Note that it is equal to 0 when $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \leq \delta/4$ and, otherwise, it is bounded by

$$|S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)| \leq |f(\hat{\Sigma}) - f(\Sigma)| + |\langle \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma, f'(\Sigma) \rangle| \leq 2\|f\|_{\text{Lip}(U)}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)\varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right) \right| \\ & \leq 2\|f\|_{\text{Lip}}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4). \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Next we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4) \right\|_{L_p} \leq \left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{L_{2p}} \left\| I(\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4) \right\|_{L_{2p}} \\ & = \left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{L_{2p}} \mathbb{P}^{1/2p}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

If $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \leq \delta/8$ and $\delta \leq \|\Sigma\|$ (which holds under the assumptions of the lemma), then, similarly to bound (4.11) for a small enough constant $c > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4\} \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{2cn\delta^2}{\|\Sigma\|^2}\right\},$$

Since, for all $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, $e^{-x} \lesssim x^{-\lambda/2}$, $x > 0$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}^{1/2p}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4\} \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{cn\delta^2}{p\|\Sigma\|^2}\right\} \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|^\lambda}{\delta^\lambda} \left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{\lambda/2}. \quad (4.17)$$

Also, it follows from (4.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{L_{2p}} \leq \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| + \left\| \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| - \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \right\|_{L_{2p}} \\ & \lesssim \|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} + \|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \|\Sigma\| \frac{p}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Using (4.17) with $\lambda = 1$, we get

$$\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \mathbb{P}^{1/2p}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4\} \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}},$$

and, using the same bound with $\lambda = \gamma$, we get

$$\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \mathbb{P}^{1/2p}\{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4\} \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{(1+\gamma)/2}$$

and

$$\|\Sigma\| \frac{p}{n} \mathbb{P}^{1/2p} \{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| > \delta/4\} \lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{1+\gamma/2}.$$

It now follows from (4.15), (4.16) and (4.18) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{1+\gamma/2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

We will now control the local Lipschitz constant of function $g(\mathcal{Z})$ defined by (4.14). Since $g(\mathcal{Z})$ is a continuous function and it is equal to 0 on the open set $\{\mathcal{Z} : \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma\| > \delta/2\}$, its local Lipschitz constant $(Lg)(\mathcal{Z})$ is equal to 0 on this set. Thus, it would be enough to control $(Lg)(\mathcal{Z})$ on the open set $\{\mathcal{Z} : \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma\| < \delta\}$. Since $\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} < \infty$, we can use on the above set Proposition 1.1 to show that, similarly to (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned} & (LS_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\cdot) - \Sigma))(\mathcal{Z}) \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^\gamma + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^\gamma \\ & + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\gamma+1/2} + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\gamma+1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

In addition, on the same set, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma) \right| & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1+\gamma} + \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Since φ is Lipschitz with constant 1, we can use bound (3.3) to get that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(L\varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\cdot) - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right) \right)(\mathcal{Z}) & \leq \frac{8}{\delta} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z})\|^{1/2} \\ & \leq \frac{8}{\delta} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} + \frac{8}{\delta} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Also, recall that φ is bounded by 1. Then, it follows from (4.20), (4.21) and

(4.22) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(Lg)(\mathcal{Z}) &\lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^\gamma \\
&+ \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^\gamma \\
&+ \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\gamma+1/2} \\
&+ \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\gamma+1/2} \\
&+ \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\gamma+1} \\
&+ \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\gamma+1}. \\
&+ \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\gamma+3/2} \\
&+ \frac{\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\gamma+1} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}. \quad (4.23)
\end{aligned}$$

Since we are assuming that $\|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\| < \delta$ and $\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma\| < \delta$, it follows that $\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)} - \Sigma^{(N)}\| < 2\delta$. Recall also that $\|\Sigma^{(N)}\| \leq \|\Sigma\|$. Therefore, the last four terms in the right hand side of bound (4.23) are dominated by the first four terms (up to constants), and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(Lg)(\mathcal{Z}) &\lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^\gamma \\
&+ \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^\gamma \\
&+ \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(N)}(\mathcal{Z}) - \Sigma^{(N)}\|^{\gamma+1/2} \\
&+ \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \frac{\|\Sigma^{(N)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma^{(N)} - \Sigma\|^{\gamma+1/2}. \quad (4.24)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this bound is similar to (3.6). Thus, we can repeat the concentration argument of Theorem 3.2 to get a bound similar to (3.8):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \varphi\left(\frac{4\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|}{\delta}\right) \right\|_{L_p} \\
&\lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{1+\gamma} \right). \quad (4.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining bounds (4.25) and (4.19) easily yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \left(\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\gamma} \right) \\ & + \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \left(\frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\gamma/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the assumption $\delta \gtrsim \|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\Sigma\|^2}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} &= \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1-\gamma}}{\delta^{1-\gamma}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^{1-\gamma} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Therefore, for $\delta \leq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) - \mathbb{E} S_f(\Sigma; \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_{L_p} \\ & \lesssim (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \vee \|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)}) \frac{\|\Sigma\|^{1+\gamma}}{\delta^\gamma} \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \right)^\gamma \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{(1+\gamma)/2} + \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1+\gamma/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.6. It utilizes concentration bound of Lemma 4.2, bound (4.13) on the bias of estimator $T_f^{(2)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ from the proof of Theorem 1.7 and bound (4.26). It also uses the fact that, for all $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, $\|f'\|_{\text{Lip}_\gamma(U)} \lesssim \|f'\|_{C^{k-1+\rho}(U)}$.

□

4.3. Minimax lower bounds: proof of Theorem 1.9

Let $L \subset \mathbb{H}$ be the linear span of eigenvectors of Σ_0 corresponding to the eigenvalues λ, μ and let P_L denote the orthogonal projection onto L . Clearly, $\dim(L) = d = [r]$. Let $u \in L$, $\|u\| = 1$ be a unit eigenvector of Σ_0 corresponding to its top eigenvalue λ (it is unique up to its sign). Then

$$\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_{u,\lambda,\mu} := \lambda(u \otimes u) + \mu(P_L - u \otimes u) = (\lambda - \mu)(u \otimes u) + \mu P_L.$$

Since $d = [r] \leq r$ and $\lambda \leq a$, we have $\Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{S}(a, r)$. Moreover, recall that $\lambda = \gamma_1 a, \mu = \gamma_2 a$ for $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, 1), \gamma_1 > \gamma_2$. If Σ is a covariance operator such $\text{Im}(\Sigma) = L$ and $\|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta$, where $\delta \leq \kappa a$ with $\kappa = (1 - \gamma_1) \wedge (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \wedge \gamma_2$,

then $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r)$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_T \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \mathbb{E}_\Sigma (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))^2 \\ & \geq \inf_T \sup_{\text{Im}(\Sigma) = L, \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \mathbb{E}_\Sigma (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Subspace L will be fixed throughout the proof. It will be also convenient to fix an orthonormal basis e_1, \dots, e_d of L and, since $L \ni x \mapsto (\langle x, e_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle x, e_d \rangle) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an isometry, to identify L with \mathbb{R}^d and its vectors with their coordinate representations.

We start with the following simple proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $c\gamma_1 \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}} < \delta \leq \kappa a \wedge 1$ for some sufficiently large constant $c > 0$. Then*

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1} \inf_T \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \|T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)} \gtrsim \gamma_1 \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

PROOF. Let $f(\Sigma) := \langle (\Sigma - \Sigma_0)u, u \rangle$. Clearly, this is a linear functional of Σ . It is a Lipschitz function with constant 1 and, since $\delta \leq 1$, $\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1$, where $U = B(\Sigma_0, \delta)$. Let $\Sigma_1 = \lambda_1(u \otimes u) + \mu(P_L - u \otimes u)$ with $\lambda_1 := \gamma_1 a + c\gamma_1 \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}}$. Note that, since $c\gamma_1 \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}} < \delta \leq \kappa a \wedge 1$, we have $\Sigma_1 \in B(\Sigma_0, \delta)$ and $\Sigma_1 \in \mathcal{S}(a, r)$. Note also that

$$|f(\Sigma_1) - f(\Sigma_0)| = c\gamma_1 \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

To bound from below the risk of an arbitrary estimator $T(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of $f(\Sigma)$, we will use “the two hypotheses” method (see [26], Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2). Using (4.27), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_T \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \mathbb{E}_\Sigma (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))^2 \\ & \geq \inf_T \left(\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_0} (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_0))^2 \vee \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_1} (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_1))^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

Clearly, to minimize the right hand side with respect to T , it is enough to consider the estimators $T(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ taking values in the interval $[f(\Sigma_0), f(\Sigma_1)]$.

For such an estimator, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_0} (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_0))^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_1} (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_1))^2} \right) \\
& \geq \left(\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_0} (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_0))^2 I \left(|T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_0)| \geq \frac{c\gamma_1 a}{2\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \\
& \quad \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_1} (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_1))^2} I \left(|T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_1)| > \frac{c\gamma_1 a}{2\sqrt{n}} \right) \\
& \geq \frac{c^2 \gamma_1^2 a^2}{4} \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_0} \left\{ |T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_0)| \geq \frac{c\gamma_1 a}{2\sqrt{n}} \right\} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma_1} \left\{ |T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_1)| > \frac{c\gamma_1 a}{2\sqrt{n}} \right\}} \right) \\
& = \frac{c^2 \gamma_1^2 a^2}{4} \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_0} \phi(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_1} (1 - \phi(X_1, \dots, X_n))} \right), \tag{4.29}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi(X_1, \dots, X_n) := I \left(|T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma_0)| \geq \frac{c\gamma_1 a}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

could be viewed as a test for the hypothesis $\Sigma = \Sigma_0$ against the alternative $\Sigma = \Sigma_1$.

Next, we will control the KL-divergence between Gaussian distributions $N(0, \Sigma_0)$ and $N(0, \Sigma_1)$:

$$K(N(0, \Sigma_0) \| N(0, \Sigma_1)) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_0) - d - \log \det(\Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_0) \right),$$

where it is assumed that Σ_0, Σ_1 are operators acting in space L (where they are nonsingular). We have

$$\Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_0 = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1} (u \otimes u) + (P_L - u \otimes u),$$

implying that $\text{tr}(\Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_0) - d = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1} - 1$ and $\det(\Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_0) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}$. Hence

$$K(N(0, \Sigma_0) \| N(0, \Sigma_1)) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1} - 1 - \log \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1}.$$

Since

$$\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1} - 1 = \frac{\gamma_1 a}{\gamma_1 a + c\gamma_1 \frac{a}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 = -\frac{\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}}{1 + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}},$$

we get

$$K(N(0, \Sigma_0) \| N(0, \Sigma_1)) = -\frac{\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}}{1 + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}} - \log \left(1 - \frac{\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}}{1 + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}} \right) \asymp \frac{c^2}{n},$$

provided that $\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} < 1/4$. This implies that

$$K(N(0, \Sigma_0)^{\otimes n} \| N(0, \Sigma_1)^{\otimes n}) = nK(N(0, \Sigma_0) \| N(0, \Sigma_1)) \asymp c^2.$$

Thus, if c^2 is small enough, then by [26], Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2(iii), we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_0} \phi(X_1, \dots, X_n) \bigvee \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_1} (1 - \phi(X_1, \dots, X_n)) \gtrsim 1.$$

Combining this with (4.28) and (4.29) we get that

$$\inf_T \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma} (T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma))^2 \gtrsim \frac{\gamma_1^2 a^2}{n},$$

which implies the claim. \square

The proof of the next proposition is much more involved.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $s > 0$. Suppose δ satisfies the condition*

$$c_1 \sqrt{\gamma_1 \gamma_2} a \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \leq \delta \leq c_2 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) a \wedge 1$$

for sufficiently large constant $c_1 > 0$ and sufficiently small constant $c_2 > 0$ and let $U = B(\Sigma_0, \delta)$. Then

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1} \inf_T \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a, r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \left\| T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma})} \gtrsim \gamma_1^{s/2} \gamma_2^{s/2} (a \wedge 1)^s \left(\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \right)^s.$$

PROOF. It will be enough to prove the bound for a sufficiently large r , say, $r \geq r_0$, where r_0 is a numerical constant. Indeed, then the bound also holds for $r \leq r_0$ with a constant depending on r_0 .

Recall that $d = [r]$. In what follows, we will use certain “well separated” finite sets of unit vectors $\theta_{\omega} \in L$ parametrized by vertices ω of binary cube $\{-1, 1\}^d$. Recall that $u \in L$ is a unit vector and $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_{u, \lambda, \mu}$. For $\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^d$, define

$$t_{\omega} := \varepsilon \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{d}} + \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} u$$

(recall that vectors are replaced by their coordinate representations). Then

$$\|t_{\omega}\|^2 = 1 + \frac{2\varepsilon\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}}{\sqrt{d}} \langle u, \omega \rangle. \quad (4.30)$$

Let

$$h(\omega, \omega') := \sum_{j=1}^d I(\omega_j \neq \omega'_j), \omega, \omega' \in \{-1, 1\}^d$$

be the Hamming distance in the binary cube $\{-1, 1\}^d$. We will use the following simple lemma (which is a modification of Varshamov-Gilbert bound).

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a subset $B \subset \{-1, 1\}^d$ such that*

- (i) $\text{card}(B) \geq \frac{e^{d/8}}{2}$;
- (ii) $\langle u, \omega \rangle < 2, \omega \in B$;
- (iii) $h(\omega, \omega') \geq d/4, \omega, \omega' \in B, \omega \neq \omega'$.

PROOF. Assuming that \mathbb{P} is a uniform probability distribution on the binary cube $\{-1, 1\}^d$, $\langle u, \omega \rangle$ is a subgaussian r.v. with parameter 1, so, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\langle u, \omega \rangle \geq t\} \leq e^{-t^2/2}.$$

Therefore,

$$2^{-d} \text{card}\{\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^d : |\langle u, \omega \rangle| \geq t\} \leq 2e^{-t^2/2}.$$

For $t = 2$, we have $2e^{-t^2/2} < 1/2$. This implies that

$$\text{card}\{\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^d : |\langle u, \omega \rangle| < 2\} > 2^{d-1}.$$

Note that the cardinality of any ball of radius m with respect to the Hamming distance in the d -dimensional binary cube is equal to

$$\binom{d}{\leq m} = \sum_{j=0}^m \binom{d}{j}.$$

Let $B \subset \{\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^d : |\langle u, \omega \rangle| < 2\}$ be an m -separated subset w.r.t. the Hamming distance of maximal cardinality. Then $\{\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^d : |\langle u, \omega \rangle| < 2\}$ is covered by the union of balls of radius m with centers in B , implying that $\text{card}(B) \binom{d}{\leq m} \geq 2^{d-1}$, or

$$\text{card}(B) \frac{\binom{d}{\leq m}}{2^d} \geq 1/2.$$

If $\nu \sim B(d, 1/2)$ denotes the binomial r.v. with parameters m and $1/2$, then the last inequality can be interpreted as

$$\text{card}(B) \mathbb{P}\{\nu \leq m\} \geq 1/2.$$

We will choose $m = d/4$. Then, by Hoeffding's inequality, $\mathbb{P}\{\nu \leq d/4\} \leq e^{-d/8}$. Thus, for the corresponding set B , we have $\text{card}(B) \geq \frac{e^{d/8}}{2}$. \square

Denote

$$\theta_\omega := \frac{t_\omega}{\|t_\omega\|}, \quad \omega \in B.$$

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq 1/8$. Then, for all $\omega, \omega' \in B$,*

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} (\sqrt{h(\omega, \omega')} - 4) \leq \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| \leq \frac{8\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \sqrt{h(\omega, \omega')}.$$

Moreover, if d is sufficiently large (namely, $d \geq 4 \times 8^2$), then, for all $\omega, \omega' \in B, \omega \neq \omega'$,

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{d}}\sqrt{h(\omega, \omega')} \leq \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| \leq \frac{8\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}}\sqrt{h(\omega, \omega')},$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{4} \leq \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| \leq 8\varepsilon, \quad \omega, \omega' \in B, \omega \neq \omega'.$$

PROOF. Note that, in view of (4.30) for all $\omega \in B$, we have

$$1 - \frac{4\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq \|t_\omega\|^2 \leq 1 + \frac{4\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}},$$

which also implies that

$$1 - \frac{4\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq \|t_\omega\| \leq 1 + \frac{4\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}}, \quad (4.31)$$

and, under the assumption that $\varepsilon/\sqrt{d} \leq 1/8$, we have $1/2 \leq \|t_\omega\| \leq 3/2$.

Since $t_\omega - t_{\omega'} = \varepsilon \frac{\omega - \omega'}{\sqrt{d}}$, we have

$$\|t_\omega - t_{\omega'}\| = \frac{2\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}}\sqrt{h(\omega, \omega')}. \quad (4.32)$$

Note also that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| &\leq \left\| \frac{t_\omega}{\|t_\omega\|} - \frac{t_{\omega'}}{\|t_{\omega'}\|} \right\| + \left\| \frac{t_{\omega'}}{\|t_\omega\|} - \frac{t_{\omega'}}{\|t_{\omega'}\|} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{\|t_\omega - t_{\omega'}\|}{\|t_\omega\|} + \|t_{\omega'}\| \left| \frac{1}{\|t_\omega\|} - \frac{1}{\|t_{\omega'}\|} \right| \leq \frac{2\|t_\omega - t_{\omega'}\|}{\|t_\omega\|} \leq 4\|t_\omega - t_{\omega'}\|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (4.31) that $|\|t_\omega\| - \|t_{\omega'}\|| \leq \frac{8\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}}$, and we have

$$\|t_\omega - t_{\omega'}\| \leq \|t_\omega\| \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| + \|\theta_{\omega'}\| |\|t_\omega\| - \|t_{\omega'}\|| \leq 2\|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| + \frac{8\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}}.$$

Thus, under the assumption $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq 1/8$, we get that for all $\omega, \omega' \in B$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\|t_\omega - t_{\omega'}\| - \frac{4\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| \leq 4\|t_\omega - t_{\omega'}\|.$$

Combining this with (4.32) yields the first inequality of the lemma. For the second inequality, note that, if $d \geq 4 \times 8^2$, then, in view of bound (iii) of Lemma 4.3, $\sqrt{h(\omega, \omega')} \geq 8$. □

We need the following simple lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $u_1, u_2 \in L$ with $\|u_1\| = 1, \|u_2\| = 1$ and let $\lambda > \mu > 0$. The following formula holds for the Kullback-Leibler distance between $N(0, \Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu})$ and $N(0, \Sigma_{u_2, \lambda, \mu})$:*

$$K(N(0, \Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu}) \| N(0, \Sigma_{u_2, \lambda, \mu})) = \frac{(\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1})}{2} \|u_1 \otimes u_1 - u_2 \otimes u_2\|_2^2.$$

PROOF. Indeed, taking into account that $\Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu}$ and $\Sigma_{u_2, \lambda, \mu}$ have the same spectrum and using well known formulas for the KL-distance between two multivariate normal distributions, we have

$$K(N(0, \Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu}) \| N(0, \Sigma_{u_2, \lambda, \mu})) = \text{tr}(\Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu}^{-1} (\Sigma_{u_2, \lambda, \mu} - \Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu})),$$

where $\Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu}^{-1}$ is the inverse of operator $\Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu} : L \mapsto L$. Let $P_1 = u_1 \otimes u_1$, $P_2 = u_2 \otimes u_2$, $P = P_L$. Note that $\Sigma_{u_2, \lambda, \mu} - \Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu} = (\lambda - \mu)(P_2 - P_1)$ and

$$\Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\lambda} P_1 + \frac{1}{\mu} (P - P_1) = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\mu} \right) P_1 + \frac{1}{\mu} P.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu}^{-1} (\Sigma_{u_2, \lambda, \mu} - \Sigma_{u_1, \lambda, \mu})) &= (\lambda - \mu) \text{tr} \left(\left(\left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\mu} \right) P_1 + \frac{1}{\mu} P \right) (P_2 - P_1) \right) \\ &= (\lambda - \mu) (\lambda^{-1} - \mu^{-1}) \text{tr}(P_1 P_2 - P_1^2) + (\lambda - \mu) \mu^{-1} \text{tr}(P(P_2 - P_1)) \\ &= (\lambda - \mu) (\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1}) (1 - \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle) = \frac{(\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1})}{2} \|P_1 - P_2\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

implying the claim. \square

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma_{\theta, \lambda, \mu})$, where $\lambda > \mu > 0$ are known numbers and $\theta \in L, \|\theta\| = 1$ is an unknown parameter to be estimated based on observations X_1, \dots, X_n . Further assume that $\theta \in \Theta_\varepsilon := \{\theta_\omega : \omega \in B\}$. The following fact and its proof are straightforward modifications of well known minimax bounds on the error rate for principal eigenvector in spiked covariance model.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that, for a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$,*

$$\varepsilon^2 \leq \frac{c}{(\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1})} \frac{d}{n}. \quad (4.33)$$

Then

$$\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \max_{\theta \in \Theta_\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \gtrsim \varepsilon^2.$$

PROOF. First note that, by Lemma 4.5 for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} K\left(N(0, \Sigma_{\theta, \lambda, \mu})^{\otimes n} \| N(0, \Sigma_{\theta', \lambda, \mu})^{\otimes n}\right) &= nK\left(N(0, \Sigma_{\theta, \lambda, \mu}) \| N(0, \Sigma_{\theta', \lambda, \mu})\right) \\ &= \frac{(\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1})}{2} n \|\theta \otimes \theta - \theta' \otimes \theta'\|_2^2 \\ &= (\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1}) n (1 - \langle \theta, \theta' \rangle^2). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the last bound of Lemma 4.4, for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta_\varepsilon$,

$$\langle \theta, \theta' \rangle = \frac{2 - \|\theta - \theta'\|_2^2}{2} \geq 1 - \frac{8^2 \varepsilon^2}{2},$$

implying that

$$1 - \langle \theta, \theta' \rangle^2 \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{8^2 \varepsilon^2}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{8^2 \varepsilon^2}{2} \left(2 - \frac{8^2 \varepsilon^2}{2}\right) \leq 8^2 \varepsilon^2.$$

Therefore, for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta_\varepsilon$,

$$K\left(N(0, \Sigma_{\theta, \lambda, \mu})^{\otimes n} \| N(0, \Sigma_{\theta', \lambda, \mu})^{\otimes n}\right) \leq 8^2 (\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1}) n \varepsilon^2.$$

Note also that, by Lemma 4.3 (i) under the assumptions $d \geq 4 \times 8^2$ and (4.33) with a sufficiently small constant c , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{10} \log \text{card}(\Theta_\varepsilon) &= \frac{1}{10} \log \text{card}(B) \geq \frac{1}{10} (d/8 - \log 2) \geq 8^2 (\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1}) n \varepsilon^2 \\ &\geq \max_{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta_\varepsilon} K\left(N(0, \Sigma_{\theta, \lambda, \mu})^{\otimes n} \| N(0, \Sigma_{\theta', \lambda, \mu})^{\otimes n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The claim now follows by an application of a standard Fano type inequality (see, e.g., [26], Theorem 2.5). \square

Lemma 4.7. *If $d \geq 8^2$ and $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq 1/8$, then, for all $\omega \in B$,*

$$\|\Sigma_{\theta_\omega, \lambda, \mu} - \Sigma_{u, \lambda, \mu}\| \leq 5\sqrt{2} |\lambda - \mu| \varepsilon.$$

PROOF. Note that $\|t_\omega - u\| \leq \varepsilon + |1 - \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}| \leq 2\varepsilon$ and, using bound (4.31), it is easy to get that, under the assumptions $d \geq 8^2$ and $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq 1/8$, for all $\omega \in B$,

$$\|\theta_\omega - u\| \leq \frac{\|t_\omega - u\|}{\|t_\omega\|} + \frac{|\|t_\omega\| - 1|}{\|t_\omega\|} \leq 4\varepsilon + \frac{8\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq 5\varepsilon.$$

In addition, for all $\omega \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_{\theta_\omega, \lambda, \mu} - \Sigma_{u, \lambda, \mu}\| &= |\lambda - \mu| \|\theta_\omega \otimes \theta_\omega - u \otimes u\| \leq |\lambda - \mu| \|\theta_\omega \otimes \theta_\omega - u \otimes u\|_2 \\ &= |\lambda - \mu| \sqrt{2 - 2\langle \theta_\omega, u \rangle^2} \leq |\lambda - \mu| \sqrt{4(1 - \langle \theta_\omega, u \rangle)} = \sqrt{2} |\lambda - \mu| \|\theta_\omega - u\| \\ &\leq 5\sqrt{2} |\lambda - \mu| \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Let $\Sigma_0 := \Sigma_{u,\lambda,\mu}$ and let $\delta < (\lambda - \mu)/2$. Then, for any covariance operator Σ such that $\|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta$, the top eigenvalue of $\lambda(\Sigma) = \|\Sigma\|$ of Σ is simple and $|\lambda(\Sigma) - \lambda| < \delta$. Moreover, if $\theta(\Sigma)$ is a unit eigenvector of Σ corresponding to $\lambda(\Sigma)$, then, by standard perturbation bounds (see, e.g., [10]), bound (2.7) of Lemma 1)

$$\|\theta(\Sigma) \otimes \theta(\Sigma) - u \otimes u\| \leq \frac{4\delta}{\lambda - \mu}. \quad (4.34)$$

Since eigenvector $\theta(\Sigma)$ is defined up to its sign, we will assume that $\langle \theta(\Sigma), u \rangle \geq 0$. We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\bar{\delta} := (\lambda - \mu)/8 \wedge 1$ and $U := B(\Sigma_0, 2\delta)$ with $\delta < \bar{\delta}/2$. Then, for all $s > 0$, the mapping $\Sigma \mapsto \theta(\Sigma)$ belongs to the Hölder space $C^s(U)$ with $\|\theta(\cdot)\|_{C^s(U)} \lesssim_s \bar{\delta}^{-s}$.*

PROOF. Let $g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a function supported in $(\lambda - \bar{\delta}, \lambda + \bar{\delta})$ such that $0 \leq g(x) \leq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}, g(x) = 1, x \in (\lambda - \bar{\delta}/2, \lambda + \bar{\delta}/2)$ and $\|g\|_{B_{\infty,1}^s} \lesssim_s \bar{\delta}^{-s}$ for all $s > 0$. For instance, one can take a C^∞ function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ with $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset [-1, 1]$ and such that $\psi(x) = 1, x \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ and set $g(x) := \psi(x/\bar{\delta}), x \in \mathbb{R}$ (for the proof of the bound on the Besov norms, see [27], Section 3.4.1). Note that $g(\Sigma) = \theta(\Sigma) \otimes \theta(\Sigma)$ and operator function $A \mapsto g(A)$ ¹ belongs to the Hölder space C^s with $\|g\|_{C^s} \lesssim_s \bar{\delta}^{-s}$ for all $s > 0$ (see [7], Section 2, Corollary 2). In addition, bound (4.34) implies that $g(U) \subset B(P, 1/2)$, where $P = u \otimes u$.

Consider now the following mapping $A \mapsto F(A)$ from the ball $B(P, 1/2)$ into \mathbb{H} :

$$F(A) := \frac{Au}{\sqrt{\langle Au, u \rangle}}.$$

Note that, for all $A \in B(P, 1/2)$, we have $\langle Au, u \rangle > 1/2$, so, the above mapping is well defined. Moreover, since $A \mapsto Au$ and $A \mapsto \langle Au, u \rangle$ are both linear mappings with operator norms bounded by 1 and $\langle Au, u \rangle > 1/2$ for $A \in B(P, 1/2)$, it is easy to check that the mapping $A \mapsto F(A)$ belongs to the Hölder space $C^s(B(P, 1/2))$ and $\|F\|_{C^s(B(P, 1/2))} \lesssim_s 1$. Finally, note that for any unit vector $v \in \mathbb{H}$ with $v \otimes v \in B(P, 1/2)$ and $\langle v, u \rangle \geq 0$, we have $F(v \otimes v) = v$. Therefore, $\theta(\Sigma) = F(g(\Sigma)), \Sigma \in B(\Sigma_0, 2\delta)$ and, using Faà di Bruno type calculus (see, e.g., [9], Section 3.1), it is easy to bound the Hölder norms of this superposition, yielding the bound $\|\theta(\cdot)\|_{C^s(U)} = \|F \circ g\|_{C^s(U)} \lesssim_s \bar{\delta}^{-s}$. □

Our next goal is to construct a set of functionals $f_k \in C^s(U), k = 1, \dots, d$, defined as $f_k(\Sigma) = h_k(\theta(\Sigma))$, where $h_k \in C^s(\mathbb{H})$. Each functional h_k will be a sum of “bumps” with disjoint supports around well separated vectors $\theta_\omega, \omega \in B$. Namely, let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ be a C^∞ function with support in $[-1, 1]$ and with

¹in the space of bounded self-adjoint operators in \mathbb{H} equipped with the operator norm

$\varphi(0) > 0$. Suppose that $\|\varphi\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim 1$. Let $\phi(u) := \varphi(\|u\|^2)$, $u \in \mathbb{H}$. Then $\|\phi\|_{C^s(\mathbb{H})} \lesssim 1$. Define

$$h_k(\theta) := \sum_{\omega \in B} \omega_k \varepsilon^s \phi\left(\frac{\theta - \theta_\omega}{c\varepsilon}\right), \theta \in \mathbb{H}, k = 1, \dots, d,$$

where $c \in (0, 1/16)$ is a small enough constant. The following facts are straightforward:

- (i) each function $\theta \mapsto \phi\left(\frac{\theta - \theta_\omega}{c\varepsilon}\right)$ is supported in a ball of radius $c\varepsilon$ centered at θ_ω .
- (ii) Functions $\phi\left(\frac{\theta - \theta_\omega}{c\varepsilon}\right)$, $\omega \in B$ have disjoint supports. Moreover, the supports of any two of those functions are separated by distance $\geq \varepsilon/8$.
- (iii) For all $\omega \in B$,

$$\left\| \varepsilon^s \phi\left(\frac{\cdot - \theta_\omega}{c\varepsilon}\right) \right\|_{C^s(\mathbb{H})} \lesssim 1.$$

The next proposition easily follows from the above properties.

Proposition 4.3. (i) For all $k = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\|h_k\|_{C^s(\mathbb{H})} \lesssim 1.$$

(ii) For all $k = 1, \dots, d$ and all $\omega \in B$,

$$h_k(\theta_\omega) = \omega_k \varepsilon^s \varphi(0).$$

The second claim of Proposition 4.3 means that the values of functionals $h_k, k = 1, \dots, d$ at the vectors $\theta_\omega, \omega \in B$ could be used to recover the vectors $\omega \in B$ and, hence, the vectors θ_ω themselves. This property plays a crucial role in our argument (its idea goes back to [22]).

As in the statement of the theorem, we fix $\lambda = \gamma_1 a$ and $\mu = \gamma_2 a$ for some numerical constants $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2 > 0$ and denote $\Sigma_\theta := \Sigma_{\theta, \lambda, \mu}$. Recall that $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_u$ and also recall the statement and the notations of Lemma 4.8. Define functionals

$$f_k(\Sigma) := \bar{\delta}^s h_k(\theta(\Sigma)), k = 1, \dots, d, \Sigma \in U = B(\Sigma_0, 2\delta).$$

Then $\|f_k\|_{C^s(U)} \lesssim 1$ and, moreover, by using $c'\varphi$ with a small enough $c' > 0$ instead of φ , we can achieve $\|f_k\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1$. Note also that $f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}) = \bar{\delta}^s h_k(\theta_\omega) = \varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^s \omega_k, k = 1, \dots, d$. The last relationship clearly means that the values $f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}), k = 1, \dots, d$ could be used to recover vectors $\omega \in B$ and θ_ω . Moreover, define the following distance

$$\tau(\omega, \omega') := \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d (f_k(\Sigma_\omega) - f_k(\Sigma_{\omega'}))^2 \right)^{1/2}, \omega, \omega' \in \{-1, 1\}^d.$$

Then

$$\tau(\omega, \omega') = \frac{\varphi(0)\bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^s}{\sqrt{d}} \sqrt{h(\omega, \omega')}, \quad \omega, \omega' \in \{-1, 1\}^d.$$

By the second bound of Lemma 4.4, we easily get the following statement:

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose $d \geq 4 \times 8^2$ and $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d}} \leq 1/8$. Then, for all $\omega, \omega' \in B$,*

$$\frac{1}{8} \varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^{s-1} \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\| \leq \tau(\omega, \omega') \leq 2 \varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^{s-1} \|\theta_\omega - \theta_{\omega'}\|.$$

Consider now arbitrary estimators $T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of functionals $f_k(\Sigma)$. For $k = 1, \dots, d$, define $\tilde{\omega}_k := \text{sign}(T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n))$, $\tilde{\omega} := (\tilde{\omega}_1, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_d)$ and

$$\tilde{T}_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^s \tilde{\omega}_k = f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_{\tilde{\omega}}}).$$

Then, for all $\omega \in B$ and $k = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} (\tilde{T}_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}))^2 \leq 4 \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} (T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}))^2. \quad (4.35)$$

Indeed, recall that $f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}) = \varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^s \omega_k$ and, without loss of generality, assume that $\omega_k = +1$. Then $\tilde{T}_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}) = 0$ when $T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) \geq 0$ and otherwise

$$|\tilde{T}_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega})| \leq 2|T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega})|,$$

which implies the claim.

Define also $\hat{\omega} := \arg\min_{\omega \in B} h(\tilde{\omega}, \omega)$ and $\hat{\theta} = \theta_{\hat{\omega}}$. By Lemma 4.9, for all $\omega \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_\omega\| &\leq \frac{8}{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^{s-1}} \tau(\hat{\omega}, \omega) = \frac{8}{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^{s-1}} \frac{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^s}{\sqrt{d}} \sqrt{h(\hat{\omega}, \omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^{s-1}} \frac{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^s}{\sqrt{d}} \sqrt{h(\tilde{\omega}, \omega) + h(\tilde{\omega}, \hat{\omega})} \leq \frac{8}{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^{s-1}} \frac{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^s}{\sqrt{d}} \sqrt{2h(\tilde{\omega}, \omega)} \\ &= \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{\varphi(0) \bar{\delta}^s \varepsilon^{s-1}} \tau(\tilde{\omega}, \omega). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_\omega} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_\omega\|^2 &\leq \frac{2 \times 8^2}{\varphi^2(0) \bar{\delta}^{2s} \varepsilon^{2(s-1)}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_\omega} \tau^2(\tilde{\omega}, \omega) = \frac{2 \times 8^2}{\varphi^2(0) \bar{\delta}^{2s} \varepsilon^{2(s-1)}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{\theta_\omega} (f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_{\tilde{\omega}}}) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}))^2 \\ &= \frac{2 \times 8^2}{\varphi^2(0) \bar{\delta}^{2s} \varepsilon^{2(s-1)}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} (\tilde{T}_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}))^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8^3}{\varphi^2(0) \bar{\delta}^{2s} \varepsilon^{2(s-1)}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} (T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used bound (4.35). This implies that

$$\max_{\omega \in B} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_\omega} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_\omega\|^2 \leq \frac{8^3}{\varphi^2(0)\bar{\delta}^{2s}\varepsilon^{2(s-1)}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \max_{\omega \in B} \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} \left(T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}) \right)^2.$$

Assuming that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \inf_T \max_{\omega \in B} \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} \left(T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}) \right)^2 < \tau^2,$$

one can find, for each $k = 1, \dots, d$, an estimator $T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ such that

$$\max_{\omega \in B} \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} \left(T_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}) \right)^2 < \tau^2,$$

which implies the existence of $\hat{\theta}$ such that

$$\max_{\omega \in B} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_\omega} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_\omega\|^2 \leq \frac{8^3 \tau^2}{\varphi^2(0)\bar{\delta}^{2s}\varepsilon^{2(s-1)}}.$$

Note that, for $\lambda = \gamma_1 a, \mu = \gamma_2 a$, $(\lambda - \mu)(\mu^{-1} - \lambda^{-1}) = (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(\gamma_2^{-1} - \gamma_1^{-1})$, so condition (4.33) of Lemma 4.6 becomes

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(\gamma_2^{-1} - \gamma_1^{-1})}} \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} := \varepsilon(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \quad (4.36)$$

with a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$. In view of Lemma 4.6, it follows that

$$\frac{\tau^2}{\varphi^2(0)\bar{\delta}^{2s}\varepsilon^{2(s-1)}} \gtrsim \varepsilon^2$$

for an arbitrary ε satisfying the condition (4.36). We set $\varepsilon := \varepsilon(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ and also observe that $\bar{\delta} = \frac{(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)a}{8} \wedge 1 \geq \frac{\gamma_1 - \gamma_2}{8}(a \wedge 1)$, which allows us to conclude that

$$\tau^2 \gtrsim \bar{\delta}^{2s} \varepsilon^{2s} \gtrsim \gamma_1^s \gamma_2^s (a \wedge 1)^{2s} \left(\frac{d}{n} \right)^s.$$

In other words,

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \inf_T \max_{\omega \in B} \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}} \left(T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_k(\Sigma_{\theta_\omega}) \right)^2 \gtrsim \gamma_1^s \gamma_2^s (a \wedge 1)^{2s} \left(\frac{d}{n} \right)^s.$$

Finally, by Lemma 4.7 for all $\omega \in B$, $\|\Sigma_{\theta_\omega} - \Sigma_0\| \leq 5\sqrt{2}(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)a\varepsilon$. For $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, we get $\|\Sigma_{\theta_\omega} - \Sigma_0\| < \delta$ provided that $\delta > 5\sqrt{2}c\sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2}a\sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}$. Taking also into account that $\|f_k\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1, k = 1, \dots, d$, we can conclude that

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1} \inf_T \sup_{\text{Im}(\Sigma) = L, \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \mathbb{E}_\Sigma \left(T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right)^2 \gtrsim \gamma_1^s \gamma_2^s (a \wedge 1)^{2s} \left(\frac{d}{n} \right)^s.$$

for a sufficiently small constant $c' > 0$. It remains to combine the last bound with (4.27) and to recall that $d = [r]$, to get

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{C^s(U)} \leq 1} \inf_T \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}(a,r), \|\Sigma - \Sigma_0\| < \delta} \left\| T(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(\Sigma) \right\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)} \gtrsim \gamma_1^{s/2} \gamma_2^{s/2} (a \wedge 1)^s \left(\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \right)^s.$$

□

The claim of Theorem 1.9 immediately follows by combining propositions 4.1 and 4.2.

References

- [1] P. Bickel and Y. Ritov. Estimating integrated square density derivatives: sharp best order of convergence estimates. *Sankhya*, 1988, 50, 381–393.
- [2] L. Birgé and P. Massart. Estimation of integral functionals of a density. *Annals of Statistics*, 1995, 23, 11–29.
- [3] P. Hall and M.A. Martin. On Bootstrap Resampling and Iteration. *Biometrika*, 1988, 75, 4, 661–671.
- [4] I. A. Ibragimov and R.Z. Khasminskii. *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1981.
- [5] I.A. Ibragimov, A.S. Nemirovski and R.Z. Khasminskii. Some problems of nonparametric estimation in Gaussian white noise. *Theory of Probab. and Appl.*, 1987, 31, 391–406.
- [6] J. Jiao and Y. Han. Bias correction with Jackknife, Bootstrap and Taylor Series. *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, 2020, 66, 7, 4392–4418.
- [7] V. Koltchinskii. Asymptotically Efficient Estimation of Smooth Functionals of Covariance Operators. *J. European Mathematical Society*, 2021, 23, 3, 765–843.
- [8] V. Koltchinskii. Asymptotic Efficiency in High-Dimensional Covariance Estimation. *Proc. ICM 2018*, Rio de Janeiro, 2018, vol. 3, 2891–2912.
- [9] V. Koltchinskii. Estimation of smooth functionals in high-dimensional models: bootstrap chains and Gaussian approximation. 2021. *arXiv:2011.03789*.
- [10] V. Koltchinskii and K. Lounici. Asymptotics and concentration bounds for bilinear forms of spectral projectors of sample covariance. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 2016, 52, 4, 1976–2013.
- [11] V. Koltchinskii and K. Lounici. Concentration inequalities and moment bounds for sample covariance operators. *Bernoulli*, 2017, 23, 1, 110–133.
- [12] V. Koltchinskii and K. Lounici. Normal approximation and concentration of spectral projectors of sample covariance. *Annals of Statistics*, 2017, 45, 1, 121–157.
- [13] V. Koltchinskii, M. Löffler and R. Nickl. Efficient Estimation of Linear Functionals of Principal Components. *Annals of Statistics*, 2020, 48, 1, 464–490.
- [14] V. Koltchinskii and M. Wahl. Functional estimation in log-concave location families. 2021. *arXiv:2108.00263*.

- [15] V. Koltchinskii and M. Zhilova. Efficient estimation of smooth functionals in Gaussian shift models. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré - Probab. et Statist.*, 2021, 57, 1, 351–386.
- [16] V. Koltchinskii and M. Zhilova. Estimation of Smooth Functionals in Normal Models: Bias Reduction and Asymptotic Efficiency, *Annals of Statistics*, 2021, 49, 5, 2577–2610.
- [17] V. Koltchinskii and M. Zhilova. Estimation of smooth functionals of location parameter in Gaussian and Poincaré random shift models. *Sankhya A*, 2021, 83, 569–596.
- [18] S. Kwapien and B. Szymanski. Some remarks on Gaussian measures in Banach spaces. *Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 1980, 1, 1, 59–65.
- [19] B. Levit. On the efficiency of a class of non-parametric estimates. *Theory of Prob. and applications*, 1975, 20(4), 723–740.
- [20] B. Levit. Asymptotically efficient estimation of nonlinear functionals. *Probl. Peredachi Inf. (Problems of Information Transmission)*, 1978, 14(3), 65–72.
- [21] O. Lepski, A. Nemirovski and V. Spokoiny. On estimation of the L_r norm of a regression function. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 1999, 113, 221–253.
- [22] A. Nemirovski. On necessary conditions for the efficient estimation of functionals of a nonparametric signal which is observed in white noise. *Theory of Probab. and Appl.*, 1990, 35, 94–103.
- [23] A. Nemirovski. *Topics in Non-parametric Statistics*. Ecole d’Ete de Probabilités de Saint-Flour. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, v. 1738, Springer, New York, 2000.
- [24] E. Rio. Upper bounds for minimal distances in the central limit theorem. *Ann. Inst. Henry Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 2009, 45, 3, 802–817.
- [25] J. Robins, L. Li, E. Tchetgen and A. van der Vaart. Higher order influence functions and minimax estimation of nonlinear functionals. *IMS Collections Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of David. A. Freedman*, 2008, vol. 2, 335–421.
- [26] A.B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer, 2009.
- [27] H. Triebel. *Theory of Function Spaces*, Springer, 1983.
- [28] F. Zhou, P. Li and C.-H. Zhang. High-Order Statistical Functional Expansion and Its Application To Some Nonsmooth Problems. 2021, *arXiv:2112.15591*.