

# Uniform convergence rates and automatic variable selection in nonparametric regression with functional and categorical covariates

Leonie Selk\*

October 3, 2022

## Abstract

In Selk and Gertheiss (2022) a nonparametric prediction method for models with multiple functional and categorical covariates is introduced. The dependent variable can be categorical (binary or multi-class) or continuous, thus both classification and regression problems are considered. In the paper at hand the asymptotic properties of this method are developed. A uniform rate of convergence for the regression / classification estimator is given. Further it is shown that, asymptotically, a data-driven least squares cross-validation method can automatically remove irrelevant, noise variables.

**Keywords:** nonparametric regression, uniform rate of convergence, cross-validation, variable selection, multivariate functional and categorical predictors

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 62G08, 62G20, 62H12

## 1 Introduction

This paper deals with nonparametric prediction and estimation with multiple predictors that admits a mix of functional and categorical ones. The method considered was introduced in Selk and Gertheiss (2022). It is an expansion of the well-known Nadaraya-Watson estimator

$$\hat{m}(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i K((X_i - x)/h_n)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K((X_i - x)/h_n)},$$

with some kernel  $K(\cdot)$  and bandwidth  $h_n \searrow 0$  (for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ), that was introduced by Nadaraya (1964) and Watson (1964) as a nonparametric estimator for the regression function in a model  $Y_i = m(X_i) + \varepsilon_i$  with continuous observations  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ . In the classification case with categorical response  $Y$  this estimator can be adapted to estimate the posterior probability  $P_g(x) = P(Y = g|x)$  as

$$\hat{P}_g(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n I\{Y_i = g\} K((X_i - x)/h_n)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K((X_i - x)/h_n)},$$

---

\*Helmut-Schmidt-University, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Hamburg, Germany, corresponding author: leonie.selk@hsu-hh.de

see for instance Hastie et al. (2009). The method introduced in Selk and Gertheiss (2022) extends these estimators to handle multiple functional and categorical predictors, see Section 2. In the paper at hand uniform convergence rates for the regression and classification estimators are given. Besides estimation of the regression function, variable selection is of interest, thus separating relevant predictors from noise variables. This is done with weights (counterpart to bandwidth) that are determined for each covariate in a data-driven way. The size of the weights then indicates the relevance of the corresponding covariate. In the paper at hand it is shown that in fact, asymptotically, the weights for noise variables vanish whereas those for relevant predictors tend to infinity.

Uniform convergence rates in similar settings can be found e.g. in Li and Ouyang (2005), Ferraty et al. (2010) or Bouzebda and Nemouchi (2020). A model with multiple continuous and categorical covariates is considered in Li and Ouyang (2005). The authors prove a uniform rate of convergence for a Nadaraya-Watson type regression estimator similar to the one considered in the paper at hand. Functional covariates are considered in Ferraty et al. (2010). For a regression model with a single functional covariate uniform convergence of a kernel regression estimator is shown. A similar result is given in Bouzebda and Nemouchi (2020) who deal with conditional U-statistics.

Asymptotic results for weights / bandwidths determined by cross-validation in similar settings can e.g. be found in Hall et al. (2007) or Ouyang et al. (2009). Hall et al. (2007) prove for a regression model with continuous and categorical covariates that irrelevant predictors are smoothed out by cross-validated bandwidth. In Ouyang et al. (2009) a regression model with only categorical covariates is considered. This case has to be handled separately and cannot be treated as a special case of a model with mixed covariates, since the convergence rates for the smoothing parameters are different from the results in Hall et al. (2007) and in the paper at hand.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the estimation method and the determination of the weights is explained. Further, assumptions needed for the theoretical results are stated. Section 3 gives the asymptotic results, in detail the consistency and uniform convergence rates for the regression and classification estimators, and convergence statements for the data-driven weights. In Section 4 some finite sample simulation results are presented. Section 5 sums up the proofs and Section 6 concludes with a short discussion.

## 2 Model

Let  $(\mathbf{X}_1, Y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{X}_n, Y_n)$  be iid observations, with  $p$ -dimensional covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i = X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip}$  that contain functional and categorical values, and continuous or categorical scalar response  $Y_i$ . The aim is to predict  $Y$  given some new observation  $\mathbf{x}$ . In the regression case

$$Y_i = m(\mathbf{X}_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \varepsilon_i \text{ iid, bounded second moments} \quad (1)$$

this means the estimation of the regression function  $m(\mathbf{x})$  and in the classification case

$$Y_i \in \{1, \dots, G\} \quad (2)$$

the estimation of the posterior probability  $P_g(\mathbf{x}) = P(Y = g|\mathbf{x})$ . The estimator introduced by Selk and Gertheiss (2022) for this target is

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i K(\omega_1 d_1(X_{i1}, x_1) + \dots + \omega_p d_p(X_{ip}, x_p))}{\sum_{i=1}^n K(\omega_1 d_1(X_{i1}, x_1) + \dots + \omega_p d_p(X_{ip}, x_p))},$$

in the regression case, and the same with  $Y_i$  replaced by  $I\{Y_i = g\}$  in the classification case, for some kernel function  $K$  and weights  $\omega_j$  that are determined in a data-driven way. The distance measures  $d_1(\cdot, \cdot), \dots, d_p(\cdot, \cdot)$  may be very different, according to the type of the covariates. With categorical predictors  $X_{il}, x_l \in \{1, \dots, G_l\}$ , for example, one may use

$$d_l(X_{il}, x_l) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } X_{il} = x_l, \\ 1 & \text{if } X_{il} \neq x_l, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

or for functional  $X_{ij}, x_j \in L^2$ , for instance,

$$d_j(X_{ij}, x_j) = \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{D}_j} (X_{ij}(t) - x_j(t))^2 dt}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_j$  is the domain of the functions  $X_{ij}, x_j$ .

**Remark 2.1** *The distance measures in (3) and (4) are just examples for possible (semi-) metrics that can be applied. If the categorical covariates are ordinal e.g. the metric  $d_l(X_{il}, x_l) = |X_{il} - x_l|$  would be suitable. For functional variables next to metrics like the  $L^2$  one in (4) it is also possible to use semi-metrics, see Chapter 3 in Ferraty and Vieu (2006) or Section 2.3 in Selk and Gertheiss (2022).*

In the paper at hand it is assumed that  $X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip_{\text{fun}}}$  are functional observations,  $X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+1)}, \dots, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}})}$  are categorical observations where  $p = p_{\text{fun}} + p_{\text{cat}}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists 0 < q_{\text{fun}} \leq p_{\text{fun}}, 0 \leq q_{\text{cat}} \leq p_{\text{cat}} : \\ &X_{i1}, \dots, X_{iq_{\text{fun}}}, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+1)}, \dots, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+q_{\text{cat}})} \text{ are relevant predictors} \\ &X_{i(q_{\text{fun}}+1)}, \dots, X_{ip_{\text{fun}}}, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+q_{\text{cat}}+1)}, \dots, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}})} \text{ are noise.} \end{aligned}$$

Thus both types of covariates may contain relevant predictors and noise but there has to be at least one relevant functional predictor. Further it is assumed that the kernel has a product form

$$K_{\omega}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') := \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(x_j, x'_j)) \cdot \prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(x_j, x'_j)}$$

for kernel functions  $K_j$  and  $k_j > 1$ , see Assumption (A3). This is a typical form of a multivariate Nadaraya-Watson estimator, compare e.g. Härdle and Müller (2000) for continuous covariates, the seminal paper of Aitchison and Aitken (1976) for categorical ones, or Li and Ouyang (2005) for mixed continuous and categorical covariates. Note further that  $K(\omega_1 d_1(X_{i1}, x_1) + \dots + \omega_p d_p(X_{ip}, x_p)) = \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K(\omega_j d_j(x_j, x'_j)) \cdot \prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (e^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(x_j, x'_j)}$  if  $K$  is the Picard-kernel  $K(u) = \exp(-u)I\{u \geq 0\}$ .

The performance of the estimators

$$\hat{m}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{i=1}^n K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{x})} \quad (5)$$

and

$$\hat{P}_g(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n I\{Y_i = g\} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{i=1}^n K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{x})} \quad (6)$$

depends heavily on the weights  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p$ , see Theorem 3.1. A popular way to determine those weights, or their counterpart the bandwidths, is by cross-validation. With

$$\hat{m}_{(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i) = \frac{\sum_{s \neq i} Y_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)},$$

$$\hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i) = \frac{\sum_{s \neq i} I\{Y_s = g\} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)}.$$

being the leave-one-out estimates one may estimate  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p$  by minimizing

$$Q(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{m}_{(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i), \quad (7)$$

respectively

$$Q(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (I\{Y_i = g\} - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i), \quad (8)$$

where  $v(\mathbf{x}) = I\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}\}$  for some suitable subset  $\mathcal{S}$ , see Remark 2.5 and Assumption (A7). The minimizing weights are denoted by  $\hat{\omega}_1, \dots, \hat{\omega}_p$ . Corollary 3.1 states that with this data-driven weights the noise variables vanish asymptotically from the estimators defined in (5) and (6). On the one hand this is interesting in the sense of variable selection. On the other hand the simulations in Selk and Gertheiss (2022) show that downgrading the irrelevant covariates leads to an improvement of the estimation performance, see also Section 4.

Before stating the assumptions needed to prove Theorem 3.1 and 3.2 let's introduce some notation:

- Let  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i := X_{i1}, \dots, X_{iq_{\text{fun}}}, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+1)}, \dots, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+q_{\text{cat}})}$  denote the relevant predictors and  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i = \mathbf{X}_i \setminus \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i$  the noise variables.
- Let  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{fun}}$  denote the functional elements of  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{cat}}$  the categorical ones. All functional covariates take values in semi-metric spaces  $\mathcal{F}_j$  and each categorical covariate  $X_{ij}$  takes values in  $\{1, \dots, \tilde{G}_j\}$ . For the functional covariates suitable subsets  $\mathcal{S}_j$  of  $\mathcal{F}_j$  are considered, see Remark 2.5 and Assumption (A7).
- The indices are combined as follows
 
$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{fun}} &= \{1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}}\}, & J_{\text{cat}} &= \{p_{\text{fun}} + 1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}} + p_{\text{cat}}\}, \\ \bar{J}_{\text{fun}} &= \{1, \dots, q_{\text{fun}}\}, & \bar{J}_{\text{cat}} &= \{p_{\text{fun}} + 1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}} + q_{\text{cat}}\}, & \bar{J} &= \bar{J}_{\text{fun}} \cup \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}, \\ \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}} &= \{q_{\text{fun}} + 1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}}\}, & \tilde{J}_{\text{cat}} &= \{p_{\text{fun}} + q_{\text{cat}} + 1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}} + p_{\text{cat}}\}, & \tilde{J} &= \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}} \cup \tilde{J}_{\text{cat}}. \end{aligned}$$

- For the distance measures set  $d_{\text{fun}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} (d_j(x_j, x'_j))$  and  $d_{\text{cat}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \max_{j \in J_{\text{cat}}} (d_j(x_j, x'_j))$ . The categorical distance measures are standardized such that  $d_j(x_j, x'_j) \geq 1$  if  $d_j(x_j, x'_j) \neq 0$ .

Throughout the paper  $C$  and  $C'$  denote positive constants whose values can change from line to line.

In both the regression case (1) and the classification case (2) it is assumed that:

- (A0) As already stated there has to be at least one functional relevant covariate, i. e.  $q_{\text{fun}} > 0$ . Further the categorical covariates are distributed such that  $P(\max_{j \in J_{\text{cat}}} d_j(X_j, x_j) = 0 | \mathbf{X}_{\text{fun}}) \geq C_{\text{cat}}$  for some  $C_{\text{cat}} > 0$ , almost surely, uniformly in  $(x_j)_{j \in J_{\text{cat}}}$  with  $x_j \in \{1, \dots, G_j\}$ .

- (A1)  $(\bar{\mathbf{X}}, Y)$  is independent of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ .

- (A2) The regression function is Lipschitz with some constant  $L < \infty$

$$|m(\mathbf{x}) - m(\mathbf{x}')| \leq L(d_{\text{fun}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')^\beta + d_{\text{cat}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')).$$

The same holds for the posterior probability  $P_g(\mathbf{x}) = P(Y = g | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$ .

- (A3) The kernel is defined as  $K_\omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(x_j, x'_j)) \cdot \prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(x_j, x'_j)}$  where the kernel functions  $K_j$  have bounded support  $[0, 1]$  and  $k_j > 1$ . Further there exist constants  $0 < C, C' < \infty$  such that  $C \leq K_j(u) \leq C'$  for all  $u \in [0, 1]$ . Also the following Lipschitz condition applies:  $|\prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(u_j) - \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(u'_j)| \leq L_K \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} |u_j - u'_j|$  for some  $L_K < \infty$  and all  $u_j, u'_j \in [0, 1]$ . Additionally it is assumed that all  $K_j$  have a unique maximum in zero.

- (A4) There exist monotone bounded function  $\phi$  and  $\varphi \leq 1$  and constants  $0 < C, C' < \infty$  such that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and all  $x_j \in \mathcal{S}_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}}$ , it holds  $C\phi(\epsilon) \leq P(\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} (d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq \epsilon) \leq C'\phi(\epsilon)$  and  $C\varphi(\epsilon) \leq P(\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} (d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq \epsilon) \leq C'\varphi(\epsilon)$ . Further for every functional covariate  $X_j$  there exists a function  $\phi_j$  with  $C\phi_j(\epsilon) \leq P(d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq \epsilon) \leq C'\phi_j(\epsilon)$  that is Lipschitz.

Before proceeding with assumptions (A5)-(A7) note the following remarks.

**Remark 2.2** *The probability that is bounded by the functions  $\phi, \varphi, \phi_j$  in assumption (A4) is called the small ball probability and is known to play an important role for asymptotic results in nonparametric statistics for functional variables, compare Ferraty and Vieu (2006). It is easy to see that the choice of the distance measures  $d_j$  directly influences the small ball probability. Chapter 13 in Ferraty and Vieu (2006) is dedicated to this issue. For a suitable choice of distance measures it is possible to get  $\phi_j(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon$ , see Section 13.3.3 in the aforementioned book. Thus for the multivariate setting this means  $\phi(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon^{q_{\text{fun}}}$  for a suitable dependence structure between the covariates.*

**Remark 2.3**  $K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)$  is zero if  $d_{\text{fun}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) = \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} (d_j(X_{sj}, X_{ij})) > 1/\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} (\omega_j)$ .

**Remark 2.4** *Uniformly in  $x_j \in \mathcal{S}_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}}$ ,  $x_j \in \{1, \dots, \tilde{G}_j\}$ ,  $j = p_{\text{fun}}+1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}$  it holds for some constants  $C, C' < \infty$*

$$\begin{aligned} E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x})] &= E\left[\prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \cdot \prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(X_j, x_j)}\right] \\ &\leq E\left[\prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j))\right] \\ &\leq CE[I\{\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}\}] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E[I\{\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}\}] &= P(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \\ &= P(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}) \cdot P(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}) \\ &= P(\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq 1) \cdot P(\max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq 1) \\ &\leq P(\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j) \max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq 1) \cdot 1 \\ &\leq C' \phi((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j))^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Further for some constants  $C, C' > 0$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned} E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x})] &= E\left[\prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \cdot \prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(X_j, x_j)}\right] \\ &= E\left[\prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \cdot E\left[\prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(X_j, x_j)} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{fun}}\right]\right] \\ &\geq CE[I\{\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}\}]C_{\text{cat}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &E[I\{\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}\}] \\ &= P(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \\ &= P(\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq 1) \cdot P(\max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq 1) \\ &\geq P(\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j) \max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq 1) \cdot P(\max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j) \max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(d_j(X_j, x_j)) \leq 1) \\ &\geq C \phi((\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j))^{-1}) \varphi((\max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j))^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of readability set  $\phi_1 := \phi((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j))^{-1})$  and  $\phi_2 := \phi((\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j))^{-1}) \varphi((\max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}}(\omega_j))^{-1})$  and note that  $\phi_2 \leq \phi_1$ .

Now let's state two more assumptions (A5), (A6), followed by a further remark and the last assumption (A7).

**(A5)** The weights  $\omega_j$  may not go too fast to zero or to infinity. In detail the following has to be fulfilled:  $\tilde{\phi} := \frac{\phi_2^2}{\phi_1}$  tends to zero with growing sample size  $n$  -

this holds if  $\phi((\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-1})$  tends to zero - but  $\tilde{\phi} n^{\frac{1}{3}} \log(n)^{-1}$  tends to infinity. Further  $\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j = O(\sqrt{n/\log(n)})$ . The term  $\zeta(\bar{\omega}) := ((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^2)$  has to fulfill  $\zeta(\bar{\omega})^{-1} = o(n)$  and  $\zeta(\bar{\omega}) = o(\sqrt{n\tilde{\phi}\phi_2^2/\log(n)})$ .

(A6) For the moments of the response variable  $Y$  it holds  $\forall l \geq 1 \exists C_l < \infty$  such that  $E[|Y|^l] \leq C_l$ .

**Remark 2.5** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be some semi-metric space and  $\mathcal{S}$  some subset. A finite set of points  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  is called an  $\epsilon$ -net for  $\mathcal{S}$  with some  $\epsilon > 0$  if  $\mathcal{S}$  is covered by the open balls with radius  $\epsilon$  and center points  $x_1, \dots, x_N$ . The minimal number of open balls with radius  $\epsilon$  necessary to cover  $\mathcal{S}$  is called the covering number of  $\mathcal{S}$  and denoted by  $N_{\mathcal{S}}(\epsilon)$ .

In the setting at hand for every functional covariate a subset  $\mathcal{S}_j$  of  $\mathcal{F}_j$  is considered and covered by an  $\epsilon$ -net  $\mathcal{D}_j^\epsilon$  with  $|\mathcal{D}_j^\epsilon| = N_{\mathcal{S}_j}(\epsilon)$ . These nets are combined to  $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon = (\times_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \mathcal{D}_j^\epsilon) \times (\times_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} \{1, \dots, \tilde{G}_j\})$ , see the proof of Lemma 5.1. The combined covering number  $N(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$  is then a product of the univariate covering numbers  $N(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon) = \prod_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} N_{\mathcal{S}_j}(\epsilon) \prod_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} \tilde{G}_j$ . The Kolmogorov entropy  $\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon) := \log(N(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon))$  is thus a sum of the univariate entropies. In Ferraty et al. (2010) several examples are given on the size of the entropy for subsets of functional spaces. It is clear that the size of the entropy depends heavily on the choice of the semi-metric - the distance measures  $d_j$  in the setting at hand. Example 4 in Ferraty et al. (2010) is thus especially interesting since it allows to construct, in any case, a semi-metric with reasonably "small" entropy.

(A7) The Kolmogorov entropy of  $\mathcal{S} := (\times_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \mathcal{S}_j) \times (\times_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} \{1, \dots, \tilde{G}_j\})$  fulfills  $\psi\left(\mathcal{D}_{\frac{\log(n)}{n}}\right) = O(\log(n))$ .

The assumptions are very similar to those stated in Hall et al. (2007) and Ferraty et al. (2010), extended to the functional and / or multivariate case. (A2), (A3) and (A6) are typical for nonparametric settings and (A4) is a standard approach in dealing with functional data. (A7) is not necessarily needed and could be replaced by some weaker condition on the convergence rate of the entropy when assumption (A5) is adapted accordingly. Nevertheless it is stated like this for the sake of readability. Assumption (A1) might appear restrictive but it is needed for the proof technique used and stated in the same way in Hall et al. (2007).

### 3 Asymptotic results

Theorem 3.1 states that the regression and classification estimators  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{P}_g$  are consistent with suitable weights  $\omega$  and gives uniform convergence rates.

**Theorem 3.1** Under assumptions (A0), (A2)–(A7) it holds

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{s=1}^n K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right| = O\left( \left( \min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \right)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}) \right) + O_P\left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}} \right)$$

as well as for all  $g = 1, \dots, G$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\sum_{s=1}^n I\{Y_s = g\} K_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{s=1}^n K_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right| \\ &= O\left( \left( \min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \right)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}) \right) + O_P\left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\tilde{\phi} = \frac{\phi_2^2}{\phi_1}$ .

The proof is given in Section 5. The result is comparable to those of Li and Ouyang (2005) and Ferraty et al. (2010) who give uniform convergence rates for a model with multiple continuous and categorical covariates and with a single functional covariate respectively.

Theorem 3.2 gives an asymptotic expansion of  $Q$ . With that the asymptotic behavior of  $Q$ 's minimizing weights can be deduced, see Corollary 3.1.

**Theorem 3.2** *Under assumptions (A0)–(A7) with  $\tilde{\phi} = \frac{\phi_2^2}{\phi_1}$  and  $\zeta(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) = ((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}))^2$  it holds*

$$(i) \quad Q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = A_m(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + B(\boldsymbol{\omega}) + o_P(\zeta(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + (n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) + R$$

and uniformly in  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$

$$(ii) \quad Q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = A_m(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + o_P(1) + R$$

where  $A_m(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) := \frac{n-2}{n-1} E\left[ \left( \frac{E[m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] = O(\zeta(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}))$ ,  $B(\boldsymbol{\omega}) := \frac{E[\varepsilon_1^2]}{n-1} E\left[ \frac{E[(K_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2 | \mathbf{X}_2]}{(E[K_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2])^2} v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] = O((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1})$  and  $R = O_P(1)$  is some term that does not depend on  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ . Accordingly in the classification case

$$(iii) \quad Q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = A_P(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + B(\boldsymbol{\omega}) + o_P(\zeta(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + (n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) + R'$$

and uniformly in  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$

$$(iv) \quad Q(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = A_P(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + o_P(1) + R'$$

where  $A_P(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) := \frac{n-2}{n-1} \sum_{g=1}^G E\left[ \left( \frac{E[P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] = O(\zeta(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}))$  and  $R' = O_P(1)$  is again some term that does not depend on  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ .

The proof is given in Section 5. The result is comparable to that of Hall et al. (2007) who give a similar stochastic expansion for  $Q$  in a model with multiple continuous and categorical covariates.

Corollary 3.1 is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.2. It states that the weights for relevant predictors converge to infinity whereas the weights for the noise variables vanish asymptotically.



**Corollary 3.1** Assume that  $A_m$  (resp.  $A_P$ ) from Theorem 3.2 as a function of  $(\omega_j)_{j \in \bar{J}}$  goes to zero if and only if all  $\omega_j$  for  $j \in \bar{J}$  go to infinity. Then in both the regression and the classification case the minimizer  $(\hat{\omega}_1, \dots, \hat{\omega}_p)$  of  $Q(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p)$  fulfill

- $\hat{\omega}_j \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{P} \infty$  for all  $j \in \bar{J}$  by Theorem 3.2 (ii) (resp. (iv)).
- $\hat{\omega}_j \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{P} 0$  for all  $j \in \tilde{J}$  by Theorem 3.2 (i) (resp. (iii)) and Lemma 5.5.

Minimizing  $Q(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p)$  is a tradeoff between  $\zeta(\bar{\omega})$  and  $(n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}$  where the first one goes faster to zero the faster  $\bar{\omega}$  goes to infinity and the latter one goes slower to zero the faster  $\bar{\omega}$  goes to infinity. The rate of  $(\hat{\omega}_j)_{j \in \bar{J}}$  as well as the rate in Theorem 3.1 depend on the small ball probability  $\phi$  which depends on the choice of the (semi-)metric  $d_{\text{fun}}$ , see Remark 2.2. With  $\phi(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon^{q_{\text{fun}}}$  it holds

- $\hat{\omega}_j \sim n^{\frac{1}{q_{\text{fun}}+2\beta}}$  for all  $j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}$ .
- $\hat{\omega}_j \sim \frac{\beta}{q_{\text{fun}}+2\beta} \log(n)$  for all  $j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}$ .
- The convergence rate for the regression / classification estimator in Theorem 3.1 with weights  $(\hat{\omega}_1, \dots, \hat{\omega}_p)$  is  $O(n^{-\frac{\beta}{q_{\text{fun}}+2\beta}} \sqrt{\log(n)})$ .

The assumption on  $A_m$  (resp.  $A_P$ ) is stated in a very similar way in Hall et al. (2007).

## 4 Finite sample performance

The performance of the estimators defined in (5) and (6) on simulated and real world data is extensively studied in Selk and Gertheiss (2022). Here, only a small overview shall be given to illustrate the influence of a growing sample size and of downgrading irrelevant covariates.

Data is generated according to the following regression model, compare to Selk and Gertheiss (2022) Section 3. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , functional covariates  $X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip_{\text{fun}}}$  are generated according to

$$\tilde{X}_{ij}(t) = \sum_{l=1}^5 \left( B_{ij,l} \sin \left( \frac{t}{T} (5 - B_{ij,l}) 2\pi \right) - M_{ij,l} \right),$$

where  $B_{ij,l} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 5]$  and  $M_{ij,l} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 2\pi]$  for  $l = 1, \dots, 5$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and  $T = 300$ .  $\mathcal{U}$  stands for the (continuous) uniform distribution. Then,  $X_{ij}(t)$  is calculated from  $\tilde{X}_{ij}(t)$  by scaling it in direction  $i$  and then dividing each value by 10. The categorical covariates are generated as  $X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+1)}, \dots, X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}})} \sim B(0.5)$ , such that  $p_{\text{fun}} + p_{\text{cat}} = p$ . The regression is then build as an extended functional linear model

$$Y_i = 5 \sum_{j=1}^{q_{\text{fun}}} \int X_{ij}(t) \gamma_{3, \frac{1}{3}}(t/10) dt + 2(X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+1)} + \dots + X_{i(p_{\text{fun}}+q_{\text{cat}})}) + \varepsilon_i$$

for some  $q_{\text{fun}} \leq p_{\text{fun}}$  and  $q_{\text{cat}} \leq p_{\text{cat}}$ , where the coefficient function  $\gamma_{a,b}(t) = b^a / \Gamma(a) t^{a-1} e^{-bt} I\{t > 0\}$  is the density of the Gamma distribution. The errors  $\varepsilon_i$  are iid standard normal. Results are shown for ‘minimal’ and ‘sparse’ cases. where  $q_{\text{fun}} = q_{\text{cat}} = 1$ ,  $p_{\text{fun}} = p_{\text{cat}} = 2$




Figure 1: Prediction results in the minimal (left) and sparse (right) case with no restriction ('data driven weights'), restriction (i, 'equal weights') and (ii, 'oracle'), respectively.

in the minimal and  $q_{\text{fun}} = q_{\text{cat}} = 2$ ,  $p_{\text{fun}} = p_{\text{cat}} = 8$  in the sparse case. For all generated data sets a one-sided Picard kernel  $K(u) = e^{-u}I\{u \geq 0\}$  is used and the results shown are based on 500 replications each.

Additionally to the method explained in Section 2 the minimizer of  $Q$  is determined under the restrictions

(i)  $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \dots = \omega_p$ ,

(ii)  $\omega_j = 0$  for all covariates with no influence on the response.

Thus under restriction (ii), which is also called 'oracle', the minimizing weights are only determined for the relevant covariates, whereas restriction (i) leads to a single minimizing weight and can be interpreted as determination of a suitable overall/global bandwidth. A comparison of the results under both restrictions also shows the difference in estimation performance with and without the irrelevant covariates included in the estimator.

Figure 1 displays the estimation results for different sample sizes  $n = 100, 500, 1000$ . It can be seen that the performance increases with growing sample size and that the results are better when the irrelevant variables are excluded from the estimator, where the data-driven weights achieve results comparable to the oracle case. In Figure 2 the estimated weights are presented for different sample sizes  $n = 100, 500, 1000$ . The effect that (only) the weights for the noise variables vanish with growing sample size can clearly be seen.




Figure 2: Normed minimizing weights  $\frac{\hat{\omega}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^p \hat{\omega}_k}$  in the minimal and sparse case, respectively.

## 5 Proofs

**Proof of Theorem 3.1:** Consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{s=1}^n K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \\
&= \frac{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - \frac{E[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})]}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right) \\
&+ \frac{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} \left( \frac{E[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})]}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right) \\
&+ \frac{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} \left( 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right) m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the classification case the same holds with  $Y_s$  replaced by  $I\{Y_s = g\}$  and  $m(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$  replaced by  $P_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ . Now the assertion can be deduced from the following Lemmata 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. Note that  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} |m(\bar{\mathbf{x}})| < \infty$  and that Lemma 5.1 implies  $\frac{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} = O_P(1)$  uniformly in  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ .

**Lemma 5.1** *Under assumptions (A3), (A4), (A5) and (A7) it holds*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - 1 \right| = O_P \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n \tilde{\phi}}} \right)$$

with  $\tilde{\phi} = \frac{\phi_2^2}{\phi_1}$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.1:** Following the proof of Lemma 8 in Ferraty et al. (2010) set  $\epsilon = \frac{\log(n)}{n}$  and let  $\mathcal{D}_j^\epsilon$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p_{\text{fun}}$  be minimal  $\epsilon$ -nets for  $\mathcal{S}_j$ , as defined in Ferraty et al. (2010) and Remark 2.5, and  $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon = (\times_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \mathcal{D}_j^\epsilon) \times (\times_{j \in J_{\text{cat}}} \{1, \dots, \tilde{G}_j\})$ . For all  $\mathbf{x}$  set  $\mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{D}_\epsilon} d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ . With  $\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$  the Kolmogorov entropy is denoted and with  $N(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$  the covering number, see Remark 2.5. Then consider the decomposition

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - 1 \right| \leq \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})})|}_{F_1} + \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})}) - 1|}_{F_2}$$

where  $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}$ . For some constant  $C < \infty$  it holds with Remark 2.4

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &\leq \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n |K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}) - K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})})| \\ &= \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \left| \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j)) - \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j})) \right| \cdot \prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(X_{sj}, x_j)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \left| \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j)) - \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j})) \right| \\ &= \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \left| \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j)) - \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j})) \right| \\ &\quad \cdot I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \vee (\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the decomposition

$$F_1 \leq C' \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} (F_{11} + F_{12} + F_{13})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F_{11} &= \frac{1}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \left| \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j)) - \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j})) \right| \\ &\quad \cdot I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}})\} \end{aligned}$$

$$F_{12} = \frac{1}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\}$$

$$F_{13} = \frac{1}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) > 1)\}.$$

By the Lipschitz assumption on  $K$  in (A3) it holds for some constants  $C, C' < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} F_{11} &\leq \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} |\omega_j (d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) - d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}))| \\ &\quad \cdot I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}})\} \\ &\leq \frac{C' \epsilon \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \left| I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}})\} \right| \end{aligned}$$

and thus with a Bernstein inequality (e. g. Corrolary A.9 in Ferraty and Vieu (2006)) for all  $\eta > 0$  and some constants  $0 < C, C' < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(|F_{11} - E[F_{11}]| > \eta \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\eta^2 \frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}{2C\left(\frac{\epsilon^2 \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j^2 \phi_1}{\phi_2^2} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}} \frac{\epsilon \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j}{\phi_2}\right)}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-C'\eta^2 \log(n)) \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

since  $\phi_2^{-1} \leq \tilde{\phi}^{-1}$  and  $\epsilon \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \leq 1$  for  $n$  large enough. Combine this result with  $E[F_{11}] = O\left(\frac{\epsilon \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \phi_1}{\phi_2}\right)$  to get

$$F_{11} = O\left(\frac{\epsilon \max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \phi_1}{\phi_2}\right) + O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right)$$

with  $\max_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \phi_1 = O\left(\sqrt{n\tilde{\phi}/\log(n)}\right)$ . For  $F_{12}$  it holds with

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\}\right] \\ &= P\left((\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \cap (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \wedge \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} P(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \cap \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} P(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \cap \omega_j (d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) + \epsilon) > 1) \\ &= \sum_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \left(P(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1) - P(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 - \omega_j \epsilon)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} C(\phi_j(\omega_j^{-1}) - \phi_j(\omega_j^{-1} - \epsilon)) \\ &= O(\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\eta > 0$  and some constants  $0 < C, C' < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(|F_{12} - E[F_{12}]| > \eta \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\eta^2 \frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}{2C\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\phi_2^2} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}} \frac{1}{\phi_2}\right)}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-C'\eta^2 \log(n)) \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\frac{\epsilon}{\phi_1} \leq 1$  for  $n$  large enough and thus

$$F_{12} = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right).$$

With the same arguments one gets  $F_{13} = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right)$ .

Considering  $F_2$  for all  $\eta > 0$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(F_2 > \eta\sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) &= P\left(\max_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{D}_\epsilon} |\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}') - 1| > \eta\sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) \\ &\leq N(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon) \max_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{D}_\epsilon} P\left(|\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}') - 1| > \eta\sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Further  $\frac{K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}')}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}')]}$  =  $O(\phi_2^{-1}) = O\left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_2^2}\right)$ ,  $E\left[\frac{K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}')}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}')]}\right] = 1$  and  $\text{Var}\left(\frac{K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}')}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}')]}\right) = O\left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_2^2}\right) + O(1) = O\left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_2^2}\right)$  for all  $s = 1, \dots, n$  and  $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{D}_\epsilon$  by Remark 2.4 and thus with a Bernstein inequality as before for some constants  $0 < C, C' < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(|\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}') - 1| > \eta\sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) &= P\left(\frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{s=1}^n \left( \frac{K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}')}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}')]}\right) - 1 \right| > \eta\sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\eta^2 \frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}{2C\left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_2^2} + \sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}} \frac{\phi_1}{\phi_2^2}}\right)}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-C'\eta^2\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(F_2 > \eta\sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) &\leq 2N(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon) \exp(-C'\eta^2\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)) \\ &= 2 \exp((1 - C'\eta^2)\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof since  $\eta$  can be chosen such that  $C'\eta^2 > 1$ . □

**Lemma 5.2** *Under assumptions (A0), (A2), (A3) and (A4) it holds*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right| = O\left(\left(\min_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j\right)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in J_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})\right)$$

as well as

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n I\{Y_s = g\} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right| = O\left(\left(\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j\right)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})\right)$$

for all  $g = 1, \dots, G$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.2:** It holds

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})\right]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right| &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})(Y_1 - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})|m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}})]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \end{aligned}$$

since the errors are centered and independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ . For the classification case similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n I\{Y_s = g\} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \bar{\mathbf{x}})\right]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right| \\
&= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E\left[E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}) (I\{Y_1 = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_1]\right]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| \\
&= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}) (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}) | P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}})]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Further by the Lipschitz assumption on  $m$  (same for  $P_g$ ) and Remark 2.3 one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}) | m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) - m(\mathbf{x})]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} &\leq L \left( \left( \min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \right)^{-\beta} + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}) d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{x}})]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right) \\
&= O \left( \left( \min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \right)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since if  $d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \neq 0$  there exists some  $j_1 \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}$  with  $d_{j_1}(X_{1j_1}, x_{j_1}) \geq 1$  and thus  $k_{j_1}^{-\omega_{j_1} d_{j_1}(X_{1j_1}, x_{j_1})} \leq \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})$ . Further note that  $E[k_{j_1}^{\omega_{j_1} d_{j_1}(X_{1j_1}, x_{j_1})} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}) d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{x}})] \leq \max d_{\text{cat}} E[\prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{1j}, x_j))]$  with  $\max d_{\text{cat}}$  being the maximum value that  $d_{\text{cat}}$  can take, and that

$$\begin{aligned}
E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x})] &= EE[[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{X}_{\text{fun}}]] \\
&= E \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \cdot E \left[ \prod_{j=p_{\text{fun}}+1}^{p_{\text{fun}}+p_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j})^{d_j(X_j, x_j)} | \mathbf{X}_{\text{fun}} \right] \right] \\
&\geq E \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \cdot P(d_{\text{cat}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x}) = 0 | \mathbf{X}_{\text{fun}}) \right] \\
&\geq E \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_j, x_j)) \right] \cdot C_{\text{cat}}
\end{aligned}$$

with assumption (A0). The same holds with  $m$  replaced by  $P_g$ . □

**Lemma 5.3** *Under assumptions (A3), (A4), (A5) and (A6) it holds*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Z_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - \frac{E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Z_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| = O_P \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n \tilde{\phi}}} \right)$$

for  $Z = Y$  or  $Z = I\{Y = g\}$  and all  $g = 1, \dots, G$  respectively with  $\tilde{\phi} = \frac{\phi_2^2}{\phi_1}$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.3:** The proof follows along the same lines as the proof of Lemma 5.1, compare to Ferraty et al. (2010) Lemma 11. First consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Z_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} - \frac{E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Z_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| \\
&\leq \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} |\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{h}(\mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})})|}_{H_1} + \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} |\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})}) - E[\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})})]|}_{H_2} + \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} |E[\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})})] - E[\hat{h}(\mathbf{x})]|}_{H_3}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n Y_s K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}$  or  $\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n I\{Y_s = g\} K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}$  respectively. For some constant  $C < \infty$  it holds with Remark 2.4

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1 &\leq \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n |Z_s| |K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}) - K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x}_{k(\mathbf{x})})| \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n |Z_s| \left| \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j)) - \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j})) \right| \\
&= \frac{C}{\phi_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n |Z_s| \left| \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j)) - \prod_{j=1}^{p_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j})) \right| \\
&\quad \cdot I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \vee (\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}})\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the classification case ( $Z = I\{Y = g\}$ ) the rates for  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  follow with exactly the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 5.1. For the regression case the arguments are very similar. Since  $Y$  is not bounded a Bernstein inequality for unbounded random variables has to be used, e. g. Corrolary A.8 in Ferraty and Vieu (2006). Let's exemplarily have a look on  $H_{12}$  (defined analogously to  $F_{12}$ ). Since  $Y = m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}) + \varepsilon$  where  $m(\bar{\mathbf{X}})$  can be bounded and  $\varepsilon$  is independent of  $\mathbf{X}$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[|Y_s| I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\}] \\
&\leq E[|m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)| + |\varepsilon_s|] I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\} \\
&\leq E[|m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{x}})| + |m(\bar{\mathbf{x}})| + |\varepsilon_s|] \\
&\quad \cdot I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\} \\
&\leq (O((\min_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta}) + O(1) + E[|\varepsilon_s|]) \\
&\quad \cdot P\left((\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \cap (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\right) \\
&= O(1) \cdot O(\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly  $E[\phi_2^{-l} |Y_s|^l I\{(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j) \leq 1 \forall j \in J_{\text{fun}}) \wedge (\exists j \in J_{\text{fun}} : \omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_{k(\mathbf{x})j}) > 1)\}] = O(\epsilon \phi_2^{-1}) \cdot O(\phi_2^{-(l-1)}) = O(\phi_2^{-(l-1)})$  by Assumptions (A5) and (A6). Further with Corrolary A.8 in Ferraty and Vieu (2006) for some constants  $0 < C, C' < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(|H_{12} - E[H_{12}]| > \eta \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n \tilde{\phi}}}\right) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n \eta^2 \frac{\log(n)}{n \tilde{\phi}}}{2 \frac{C}{\phi_2}}\right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp(-C' \eta^2 \log(n)) \\
&= o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Considering  $H_2$  for all  $\eta > 0$  it holds with a Bernstein inequality as before for some constants  $0 < C, C' < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(|\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}') - E[\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}')]| > \eta \sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n \tilde{\phi}}}\right) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n \eta^2 \frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n \tilde{\phi}}}{2 C \tilde{\phi}^{-1}}\right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp(-C' \eta^2 \psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon))
\end{aligned}$$



since  $E\left[\left(\frac{|Y_s|K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}\right)^l\right] = O(\phi_2^{-l}\phi_1) = O(\phi_1^{-(l-2)}\phi_2^{l-2})O\left(\left(\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_2}\right)^{l-1}\right) = O(\tilde{\phi}^{-(l-1)})$ . Further

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(H_2 > \eta\sqrt{\frac{\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) &\leq 2N(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)\exp(-C'\eta^2\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)) \\ &= 2\exp((1-C'\eta^2)\psi(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)) \end{aligned}$$

where the same arguments are used as in the proof of Lemma 5.1 for  $F_2$  and  $\eta$  can be chosen such that  $C'\eta > 1$ .

$H_3$  can be treated analogously to  $H_1$  and it holds  $H_3 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right)$  which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.2:** The function  $Q$  can be decomposed in

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) + \varepsilon_i - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i) \end{aligned}$$

and in the classification case accordingly

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (I\{Y_i = g\} - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i) + I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i)) (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 v(\mathbf{X}_i). \end{aligned}$$

The last term does not depend on  $\omega$  in both cases. In Lemma 5.4 it is shown that

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i)) = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega}) + (n\tilde{\phi})^{-1})$$

and

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i)) = o_P(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } \boldsymbol{\omega}$$

as well as

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i) (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))) = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\boldsymbol{\omega}}) + (n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}),$$

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i) (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))) = o_P(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } \boldsymbol{\omega}.$$

Thus it remains to examine the first term of the decomposition of  $Q$ . This is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) (\hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} + \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si} \right)^2} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si} \right)^2} \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si} \right) \left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si} \right)}{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si} \right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

with  $K_{si} := K_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)$ . Accordingly

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (\hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si} \right)^2} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si} \right)^2} \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si} \right) \left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) \right)}{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si} \right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In Lemma 5.5 it is shown that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si} \right)^2} \\ &= \frac{C}{n-1} E \left[ \frac{E[(K_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2 | \mathbf{X}_2]}{\left( E[K_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2] \right)^2} v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) = o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\
&= \frac{C}{n-1} E \left[ \frac{E[(K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2 | \mathbf{X}_2]}{\left(E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2]\right)^2} v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

respectively, and in Lemma 5.6 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})), \\
& \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = o_P(1) \text{ uniformly in } \omega,
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\
&= o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\
&= o_P(1) \text{ uniformly in } \omega.
\end{aligned}$$

For the remaining term it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

In Lemma 5.7 it is shown that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})),$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = o_P(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } \omega,$$

and accordingly

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})),$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = o_P(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } \omega.$$

Finally Lemma 5.8 yields for the remaining term

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}$$

$$= \frac{n-2}{n-1} E \left[ \left( \frac{E[m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})),$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}$$

$$= \frac{n-2}{n-1} E \left[ \left( \frac{E[m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + o_P(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } \omega$$

as well as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}$$

$$= \frac{n-2}{n-1} \sum_{g=1}^G E \left[ \left( \frac{E[P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})),$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}$$

$$= \frac{n-2}{n-1} \sum_{g=1}^G E \left[ \left( \frac{E[P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + o_P(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } \omega.$$

**Lemma 5.4** Under assumptions (A0), (A2)–(A7) it holds

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i)) = O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}) + o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega}) + (n\tilde{\phi})^{-1})$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{P}_{g(-i)}(\mathbf{X}_i) (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))) &= O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}) + o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) \\ &= o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega}) + (n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\zeta(\bar{\omega}) = ((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}))^2$  and  $\tilde{\phi} = \frac{\phi_2^2}{\phi_1}$ . Note that also  $O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}) + o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) = o_P(1)$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.4:** It holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \hat{m}_{-i}(\mathbf{X}_i)) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \left( m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} Y_s K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - Y_s) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} - \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where both terms in the last line are centered

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right] &= 0, \\ E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

since errors and observations are independent. In the classification case both terms are

centered as well

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right] \\
&= E \left[ E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \middle| \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \right] \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (E[I\{Y_i = g\} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i] - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) E \left[ v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \middle| \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \right] \right] \\
&= 0, \\
& E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right] \\
&= E \left[ E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (I\{Y_i = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \middle| \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \right] \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G (E[I\{Y_i = g\} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i] - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) E \left[ v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \middle| \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \right] \right] \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

since  $E[I\{Y_i = g\} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i] = P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)$  by definition and the observations are independent. To get the rate of convergence consider the variance

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[ \left( \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{4}{n^2} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{i_2=1}^n E \left[ \varepsilon_{i_1} \varepsilon_{i_2} v(\mathbf{X}_{i_1}) v(\mathbf{X}_{i_2}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_1} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si_1}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_1} K_{si_1}} \right) \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_2} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si_2}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_2} K_{si_2}} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{4}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E[\varepsilon_i^2] E \left[ (v(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{4L^2}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E[\varepsilon_i^2] E \left[ (v(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (d_{\text{fun}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)^\beta + d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{4L^2}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E[\varepsilon_i^2] E \left[ (v(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 \left( \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} ((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{4L^2}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E[\varepsilon_i^2] E \left[ (v(\mathbf{X}_i))^2 \left( \left( \min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j \right)^{-\beta} + \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= O \left( (n \min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j^{2\beta})^{-1} + (n \min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j^\beta)^{-1} \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}) + n^{-1} (\max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}))^2 \right) \\
&= O(n^{-1} \zeta(\bar{\omega}))
\end{aligned}$$

with the same arguments as used in the proof of Lemma 5.2 and by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
& v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \prod_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, X_{ij}))}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} \\
& \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \prod_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j))}{E[\prod_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{1j}, x_j))]} \right| \cdot \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} \right| \\
& \quad \cdot \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{E[\prod_{j \in J_{\text{fun}}} K_j(\omega_j d_j(X_{1j}, x_j))]}{E[K_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \\
& = O_P(1) \cdot O_P(1) \cdot O(1)
\end{aligned}$$

which follows with Lemma 5.1. With the Chebychev inequality  $\forall \eta > 0$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\left|\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}}\right| > \eta n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{n}{\eta^2 \zeta(\bar{\omega})} O\left(\frac{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}{n}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and thus  $\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)) K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} = O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})})$ .

Further  $\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}} = o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1})$  since

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\left(\frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{u \neq i} \frac{\varepsilon_i \varepsilon_u K_{ui}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}}\right)^2\right] \\
& = \frac{4}{n^2(n-1)^2} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{i_2=1}^n \sum_{u_1 \neq i_1} \sum_{u_2 \neq i_2} E[\varepsilon_{i_1} \varepsilon_{i_2} \varepsilon_{u_1} \varepsilon_{u_2}] E\left[\frac{K_{u_1 i_1}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_1} K_{si_1}} \frac{K_{u_2 i_2}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_2} K_{si_2}}\right] \\
& = \frac{8}{n^2(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{u \neq i} E[\varepsilon_i^2] E[\varepsilon_u^2] E\left[\left(\frac{K_{ui}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}}\right)^2\right] \\
& = O(n^{-2}) \cdot O\left(E\left[\left(\frac{K_{1i}}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}}\right)^2\right]\right) \\
& = O(n^{-2} \tilde{\phi}^{-1}) = O((n\tilde{\phi})^{-2} \tilde{\phi}).
\end{aligned}$$

In the classification case similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\left(\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{g=1}^G(I\{Y_i=g\}-P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))\frac{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}(P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)-P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}K_{si}}\right)^2\right] \\
&= \frac{4}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{g_1=1}^G\sum_{g_2=1}^G E\left[(I\{Y_i=g_1\}-P_{g_1}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(I\{Y_i=g_2\}-P_{g_2}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))\right. \\
&\quad \left.\cdot\frac{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}(P_{g_1}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)-P_{g_1}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}K_{si}}\cdot\frac{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}(P_{g_2}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)-P_{g_2}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}K_{si}}\right] \\
&+ \frac{4}{n^2}\sum_{i_1=1}^n\sum_{g_1=1}^G\sum_{i_2\neq i_1}^n\sum_{g_2=1}^G E\left[E\left[(I\{Y_{i_1}=g_1\}-P_{g_1}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_1}))(I\{Y_{i_2}=g_2\}-P_{g_2}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_2}))\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.\cdot\frac{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i_1}(P_{g_1}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_1})-P_{g_1}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))K_{si_1}}{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i_1}K_{si_1}}\cdot\frac{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i_2}(P_{g_2}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_2})-P_{g_2}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))K_{si_2}}{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i_2}K_{si_2}}\middle|\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_1}\right]\right] \\
&= O((n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})})^2)+0
\end{aligned}$$

with the same arguments as for the regression case, just as  $E\left[\left(\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{g=1}^G(I\{Y_i=g\}-P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))v(\mathbf{X}_i)\frac{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}(I\{Y_s=g\}-P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))K_{si}}{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}K_{si}}\right)^2\right]=O(n^{-2}\tilde{\phi}^{-1})$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5** *Under assumptions (A1), (A3), (A4), (A5), (A6) and (A7) it holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}\varepsilon_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\
&= \frac{E[\varepsilon_1^2]}{n-1}E\left[\frac{E[(K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2|\mathbf{X}_2]}{\left(E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)|\mathbf{X}_2]\right)^2}v(\mathbf{X}_2)\right]+o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) \\
&= o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

and analogously for the classification case

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{g=1}^G\frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}(I\{Y_s=g\}-P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{s\neq i}K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\
&= \frac{E[\varepsilon_1^2]}{n-1}E\left[\frac{E[(K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2|\mathbf{X}_2]}{\left(E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)|\mathbf{X}_2]\right)^2}v(\mathbf{X}_2)\right]+o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}) \\
&= o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the  $o_P$  terms are uniformly in  $\omega$  and  $\tilde{\phi}=\frac{\phi_2^2}{\phi_1}$ .

Further the term  $E\left[v(\mathbf{X}_2)E[(K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2|\mathbf{X}_2]/\left(E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)|\mathbf{X}_2]\right)^2\right]$  is minimized by  $\omega_j=0$  for all  $j\in\tilde{J}$ .



**Proof of Lemma 5.5:** Initially the denominator is replaced, where

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_i) | \mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2} \cdot \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_i) | \mathbf{X}_i]^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_i) | \mathbf{X}_i]^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_i) | \mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\
& \quad + O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{(\log(n))^3}{n\tilde{\phi}^3}}\right) O_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

since with Theorem 3.1

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right)^2} &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})} - 0\right)^2 \\
&= O_P\left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right)^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and with Lemma 5.1 for some  $0 < C < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{(E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})])^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right)^2}{(E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})])^2} \right| \\
&= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})] - \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \cdot \frac{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})]}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})}{E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{x})]} \right| \cdot \frac{C}{\phi_2} \\
&= O_P\left(\phi_2^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the classification case

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\mathbf{X}_s)) K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{x})\right)^2} = O_P\left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right)^2\right)$$

which can be deduced with the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Further

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}\right)^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s^2 \frac{K_{si}^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{s_2 \neq s_1, s_2 \neq i} \varepsilon_{s_1} \varepsilon_{s_2} \frac{K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \quad (10)$$

where we first have a look on the second part (10) which is centered

$$E\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{s_2 \neq s_1, s_2 \neq i} \varepsilon_{s_1} \varepsilon_{s_2} \frac{K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i)\right] = 0.$$

To get the rate of convergence consider the variance

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1, \\ s_2 \neq i}} \varepsilon_{s_1} \varepsilon_{s_2} \frac{K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i)\right)^2\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{1}{n^2(n-1)^4} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i_1} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1, \\ s_2 \neq i_1}} \sum_{i_2=1}^n \sum_{s_3 \neq i_2} \sum_{\substack{s_4 \neq s_3, \\ s_4 \neq i_2}} \varepsilon_{s_1} \varepsilon_{s_2} \varepsilon_{s_3} \varepsilon_{s_4} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \cdot \frac{K_{s_1 i_1} K_{s_2 i_1}}{E[K_{1i_1}|\mathbf{X}_{i_1}]^2} \frac{K_{s_3 i_2} K_{s_4 i_2}}{E[K_{1i_2}|\mathbf{X}_{i_2}]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_{i_1}) v(\mathbf{X}_{i_2})\right] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{n^2(n-1)^4} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i_1} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1, \\ s_2 \neq i_1}} \sum_{i_2=1}^n E[\varepsilon_{s_1}^2] E[\varepsilon_{s_2}^2] E\left[\frac{K_{s_1 i_1} K_{s_2 i_1}}{E[K_{1i_1}|\mathbf{X}_{i_1}]^2} \frac{K_{s_1 i_2} K_{s_2 i_2}}{E[K_{1i_2}|\mathbf{X}_{i_2}]^2}\right] \\ &= \frac{2}{n^2(n-1)^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1, \\ s_2 \neq i}} E[\varepsilon_{s_1}^2] E[\varepsilon_{s_2}^2] E\left[\frac{K_{s_1 i}^2 K_{s_2 i}^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^4}\right] \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{n^2(n-1)^4} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i_1} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1, \\ s_2 \neq i_1}} \sum_{i_2 \neq i_1} E[\varepsilon_{s_1}^2] E[\varepsilon_{s_2}^2] E\left[\frac{K_{s_1 i_1} K_{s_2 i_1}}{E[K_{1i_1}|\mathbf{X}_{i_1}]^2} \frac{K_{s_1 i_2} K_{s_2 i_2}}{E[K_{1i_2}|\mathbf{X}_{i_2}]^2}\right] \\ &= O(n^{-3} \phi_1^2 \phi_2^{-4}) + O(n^{-2}) \\ &= O((n\tilde{\phi})^{-2} (n^{-1} + \tilde{\phi}^2)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus with the Chebychev inequality it holds  $\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1, \\ s_2 \neq i}} \varepsilon_{s_1} \varepsilon_{s_2} \frac{K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} = o_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-1})$ . The same holds for the classification case which can be deduced with similar arguments as used in the proof of Lemma 5.4.

For the first part of the sum, (9), it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s^2 \frac{K_{si}^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} E[\varepsilon_s^2] E\left[\left[\frac{K_{si}^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \middle| \mathbf{X}_i\right]\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n-1} E[\varepsilon_1^2] E\left[\frac{E[K_{12}^2|\mathbf{X}_2]}{E[K_{12}|\mathbf{X}_2]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_2)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

and analogously for the classification case. The remaining part is of smaller order. To see this set  $\xi_{si} = \varepsilon_s^2 \frac{K_{si}^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} v(\mathbf{X}_i)$  and get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s^2 \frac{K_{si}^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2}\right) \\
&= E\left[\left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} \xi_{si} - E\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} \xi_{si}\right]\right)^2\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2(n-1)^4} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i_1}^n \sum_{i_2=1}^n \sum_{s_2 \neq i_2}^n E[(\xi_{s_1 i_1} - E[\xi_{s_1 i_1}])(\xi_{s_2 i_2} - E[\xi_{s_2 i_2}])] \\
&= O(n^{-3} \phi_1 \phi_2^{-4})
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\xi_{s_1 i_1}$  and  $\xi_{s_2 i_2}$  are independent if  $s_2 \neq s_1$ ,  $s_2 \neq i_1$ ,  $i_2 \neq s_1$ ,  $i_2 \neq i_1$ . Thus with the Chebychev inequality for all  $\eta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} \xi_{si} - E\left[\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \neq i} \xi_{si}\right]\right| > \eta(n\tilde{\phi})^{-1}\right) \\
&= O(n^{-3} \phi_1 \phi_2^{-4} \cdot n^2 \tilde{\phi}^2) \\
&= O(n^{-1} \phi_1^{-1}) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

At last consider the term  $E\left[v(\mathbf{X}_2) E[(K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2 | \mathbf{X}_2] / \left(E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2]\right)^2\right]$ . It holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\frac{E[(K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2))^2 | \mathbf{X}_2]}{\left(E[K_\omega(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) | \mathbf{X}_2]\right)^2} v(\mathbf{X}_2)\right] \\
&= E\left[\frac{E[(\bar{K}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2))^2 | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{\left(E[\bar{K}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]\right)^2} \frac{E[(\tilde{K}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2))^2 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{\left(E[\tilde{K}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2]\right)^2} v(\mathbf{X}_2)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  are independent by Assumption (A1). Now note that

$$0 \leq \text{Var}(\tilde{K}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2) = E[(\tilde{K}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2))^2 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2] - \left(E[\tilde{K}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2]\right)^2.$$

If  $\omega_j = 0$  for all  $j \in \tilde{J}$  it holds that  $\tilde{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is constant and thus  $\text{Var}(\tilde{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2) = 0$  which implies  $E[(\tilde{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2))^2|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2]/(E[\tilde{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2])^2 = 1$ , so the minimum is achieved. Otherwise, if at least for one  $j \in \tilde{J}$  the weight  $\omega_j$  differs from zero  $\text{Var}(\tilde{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s, \cdot)) > 0$  by Assumption (A3) that  $K_j$  is not constant and  $k_j > 1$  for all  $j$ . Thus the minimum of  $E[(\tilde{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2))^2|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2]/(E[\tilde{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2)|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_2])^2$  is achieved if and only if  $\omega_j = 0 \forall j \in \tilde{J}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6** *Under assumptions (A0), (A2)–(A7) it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} &= O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}) \\ &= o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})), \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (I\{Y_s = g\} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\ = O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}) = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega})), \end{aligned}$$

with  $\zeta(\bar{\omega}) = ((\min_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \tilde{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}))^2$ . Note that also  $O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})}) = o_P(1)$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.6** The considered term is centered

$$E\left[\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}\right] = 0$$

since the errors are independent of the observations and have mean zero. The same holds in the classification case with  $E[I\{Y_s = g\}|\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s] = P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)$ , compare to the proof of Lemma 5.4. The size of the squared expectation can be derived with

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[\left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2}\right)^2\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{4}{n^2(n-1)^2} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{i_2=1}^n \sum_{s_2 \neq i_1} \sum_{s_4 \neq i_2} \frac{\varepsilon_{s_2} \varepsilon_{s_4} K_{s_2 i_1} K_{s_4 i_2}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_1} K_{s i_1}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_2} K_{s i_2}\right)}\right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i_1} \sum_{s_3 \neq i_2} v(\mathbf{X}_{i_1}) v(\mathbf{X}_{i_2}) \frac{(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_1}))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_3}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i_2})) K_{s_1 i_1} K_{s_3 i_2}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_1} K_{s i_1}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i_2} K_{s i_2}\right)}\right] \\ &= O(n^{-1}) \cdot O(\zeta(\bar{\omega})) \end{aligned}$$

with the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 5.4. Thus with the Chebychev inequality  $\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \varepsilon_s K_{si}\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = O_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\zeta(\bar{\omega})})$ . The same holds in the classification case.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7** Under assumptions (A0), (A2), (A3), (A4), (A5) and (A7) it holds

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = O_P(n^{-1} \tilde{\phi}^{-1} \zeta(\bar{\omega})) = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega}))$$

and accordingly

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} = O_P(n^{-1} \tilde{\phi}^{-1} \zeta(\bar{\omega})) = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega}))$$

with  $\zeta(\bar{\omega}) = ((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}))^2$ . Note that also  $O_P(n^{-1} \tilde{\phi}^{-1} \zeta(\bar{\omega})) = o_P(1)$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.7:** For this term one can directly deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\ & \leq \frac{L^2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)} \sum_{s \neq i} (d_{\text{fun}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s)^\beta + d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\ & \leq \frac{L^2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)} \sum_{s \neq i} ((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + d_{\text{cat}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s))^2 K_{si}^2}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\ & = O_P(n^{-1} \zeta(\bar{\omega}) \phi_1 \phi_2^{-2}) \end{aligned}$$

with the same arguments as in the derivation of the squared estimation in the proof of Lemma 5.4 and by noting that  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} \prod_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} K_j^2(\omega_j d_j(X_{sj}, x_j))}{E[\prod_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} K_j^2(\omega_j d_j(X_{1j}, x_j))]} \right| = O_P(1)$  which follows with the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 5.1.

In the classification case one gets the same result since the same Lipschitz condition applies.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.8** Under assumptions (A0), (A1), (A2), (A3), (A4), (A5) and (A7) it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\ & = \frac{n-2}{n-1} E \left[ \left( \frac{E[m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + O_P \left( \zeta(\bar{\omega}) \phi_2^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n \tilde{\phi}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{si}\right)^2} \\ & = \frac{n-2}{n-1} \sum_{g=1}^G E \left[ \left( \frac{E[P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1) \bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - P_g(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2) \right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2) \right] + O_P \left( \zeta(\bar{\omega}) \phi_2^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n \tilde{\phi}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\zeta(\bar{\omega}) = ((\min_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{fun}}} \omega_j)^{-\beta} + \max_{j \in \bar{J}_{\text{cat}}} (k_j^{-\omega_j}))^2$ . Note that  $O_P\left(\zeta(\bar{\omega})\phi_2^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) = o_P(\zeta(\bar{\omega}))$  and also  $O_P\left(\zeta(\bar{\omega})\phi_2^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right) = o_P(1)$ .

Further  $E\left[\left(\frac{E[m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1)\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2)|\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]}{E[\bar{K}_{\bar{\omega}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{X}}_2)|\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_2)\right)^2 v(\mathbf{X}_2)\right] = O(\zeta(\bar{\omega}))$  and the same with  $m$  replaced by  $P_g$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.8:** First the denominator is replaced

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{s i}\right)^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{s i}\right)^2} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{s \neq i} K_{s i}\right)^2}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i]^2} \\
&+ O_P\left(\zeta(\bar{\omega})\phi_2^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n\tilde{\phi}}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

with Lemma 5.1 (compare to the proof of Lemma 5.5) and the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.7. The same holds in the classification case. The expectation of the remaining term leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{(E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i])^2}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E\left[v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} E\left[(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i} | \mathbf{X}_i\right]}{(E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i])^2}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E\left[\frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \neq i \\ s_2 \neq i}} \sum_{s_2 \neq s_1} v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{E\left[(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} | \mathbf{X}_i\right] E\left[(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_2 i} | \mathbf{X}_i\right]}{(E[K_{1i}|\mathbf{X}_i])^2}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{n-2}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} E \left[ v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( E \left[ (m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) \bar{K}_{si} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \right] \right)^2 \left( E[\tilde{K}_{si} | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i] \right)^2}{\left( E[\bar{K}_{1i} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i] \right)^2 \left( E[\tilde{K}_{1i} | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i] \right)^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} E \left[ v(\mathbf{X}_i) \frac{\left( E \left[ m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) \bar{K}_{si} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \right] - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) E[\bar{K}_{si} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i] \right)^2}{\left( E[\bar{K}_{1i} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i] \right)^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{n-2}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s \neq i} E \left[ v(\mathbf{X}_i) \left( \frac{E \left[ m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) \bar{K}_{si} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \right]}{E[\bar{K}_{1i} | \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i]} - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) \right)^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

and thus the asserted non-zero term. Further note that  $E \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} \frac{v(\mathbf{X}_i)(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{(E[K_{1i} | \mathbf{X}_i])^2} \right] = O(\zeta(\bar{\omega}))$  with the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.6. The remaining part is of the asserted order. To see this set  $\xi_{sli} := \frac{v(\mathbf{X}_i)(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_l) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{si} K_{li}}{(E[K_{1i} | \mathbf{X}_i])^2}$  and get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} \frac{v(\mathbf{X}_i)(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_1}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i))(m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{s_2}) - m(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i)) K_{s_1 i} K_{s_2 i}}{(E[K_{1i} | \mathbf{X}_i])^2} \right) \\
&= E \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} \xi_{s_1 s_2 i} - E \left[ \frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} \xi_{s_1 s_2 i} \right] \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2(n-1)^4} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i_1} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i_1}} \sum_{i_2=1}^n \sum_{s_3 \neq i_2} \sum_{\substack{s_4 \neq s_3 \\ s_4 \neq i_2}} E \left[ (\xi_{s_1 s_2 i_1} - E[\xi_{s_1 s_2 i_1}]) (\xi_{s_3 s_4 i_2} - E[\xi_{s_3 s_4 i_2}]) \right] \\
&= O(n^{-1}(\zeta(\bar{\omega}))^2 \phi_1 \phi_2^{-4})
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\xi_{s_1 s_2 i_1}$  and  $\xi_{s_3 s_4 i_2}$  are independent if all indices are different. Thus with the Chebychev inequality it holds  $\frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} \xi_{s_1 s_2 i} - E \left[ \frac{1}{n(n-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_1 \neq i} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \neq s_1 \\ s_2 \neq i}} \xi_{s_1 s_2 i} \right] = O_P((n\tilde{\phi})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta(\bar{\omega}) \phi_2^{-1})$ . The same holds with  $m$  replaced by  $P_g$ .  $\square$

## 6 Concluding remarks

The paper revisits the nonparametric method for classification and regression estimation, where the covariates may be functional and categorical, of Selk and Gertheiss (2022). It gives a thorough theoretical analysis of the asymptotic properties of their method. Both the consistency of the regression and classification estimators as well as the asymptotic behavior of the weights are deduced.

The results of Hall et al. (2007) are extended to functional combined with categorical covariates. It would also be possible to include continuous variables as well with very similar arguments. At the same time the results of Ferraty et al. (2010) are extended from a single to multiple functional covariates. Further extension is given by including the classification case.

## References

- Aitchison, J. and Aitken, C. G. G. (1976). Multivariate binary discrimination by the kernel method. *Biometrika*, 63:413–420.
- Bouzebda, S. and Nemouchi, B. (2020). Uniform consistency and uniform in bandwidth consistency for nonparametric regression estimates and conditional u-statistics involving functional data. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 32(2):452–509.
- Ferraty, F., Laksaci, A., Tadj, A., and Vieu, P. (2010). Rate of uniform consistency for nonparametric estimates with functional variables. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 140:335–352.
- Ferraty, F. and Vieu, P. (2006). *Nonparametric Functional Data Analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York.
- Hall, P., Li, Q., and Racine, J. S. (2007). Nonparametric estimation of regression functions in the presence of irrelevant regressors. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(4):784–789.
- Härdle, W. and Müller, M. (2000). Multivariate and semiparametric kernel regression. In Schimek, M. G., editor, *Smoothing and Regression: Approaches, Computation, and Application*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, chapter 12. Wiley.
- Hastie, T., Tibshiranie, R., and Friedman, J. (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning—Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2nd edition.
- Li, Q. and Ouyang, D. (2005). Uniform convergence rate of kernel estimation with mixed categorical and continuous data. *Economics Letters*, 86:291–296.
- Nadaraya, E. A. (1964). On non-parametric estimates of density functions and regression curves. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 10:186–190.
- Ouyang, D., Li, Q., and Racine, J. S. (2009). Nonparametric estimation of regression functions with discrete regressors. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(4):784–789.
- Selk, L. and Gertheiss, J. (2022). Nonparametric regression and classification with functional, categorical, and mixed covariates. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*.
- Watson, G. S. (1964). Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhya Series A*, 26:359–372.