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#### Abstract

We introduce a method to select a smoothing factor for kernel density estimation such that, for all densities in all dimensions, the $L_{1}$ error of the corresponding kernel estimate is not larger than three times the error of the estimate with the optimal smoothing factor plus a constant times $\sqrt{\log n / n}$, where $n$ is the sample size, and the constant depends only on the complexity of the kernel used in the estimate. The result is nonasymptotic, that is, the bound is valid for each $n$. The estimate uses ideas from the minimum distance estimation work of Yatracos. As the inequality is uniform with respect to all densities, the estimate is asymptotically minimax optimal (modulo a constant) over many function classes.


1. Introduction. We are given an i.i.d. sample $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$ drawn from an unknown density $f$ on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$. We consider the Akaike-Parzen-Rosenblatt density estimate

$$
f_{n h}(x)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_{h}\left(x-X_{i}\right),
$$

where $K: \mathbb{R}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a fixed kernel with $\int K=1, K_{h}(x)=\left(1 / h^{d}\right) K(x / h)$, and $h>0$ is the smoothing factor [Akaike (1954); Parzen (1962); Rosenblatt (1956)]. Many data-dependent choices for $h$ have been proposed in the literature. Most perform well for restricted classes of densities. An exception may be found in the recent work of Devroye and Lugosi (1996), where a datadependent smoothing factor $H$ is introduced for which

$$
\sup _{f} \limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n H}-f\right|}{\inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|} \leq 3,
$$

whenever the kernel $K$ is nonnegative, Lipschitz and of a compact support. The estimate of that paper requires various parameter choices which in turn are used to define the procedure for finding $H$. In this paper, a "cleaner" related estimate is proposed, and explicit nonasymptotic performance guarantees are provided that are uniform over all $f$.

[^0]2. The estimate. To define our estimate, we first introduce the class $\mathscr{R}_{k}$ of kernels of the form
$$
K^{\prime}(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{i} I_{A_{i}}(x),
$$
where $I_{A}$ denotes the indicator function of a set $A, k<\infty, \alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{k} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{k}$ are Borel sets in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ with the following property: the intersection of an infinite ray $\left\{x: x=t x_{0}, t \geq 0\right\}$, anchored at the origin, with any $A_{i}$ is an interval. This property is needed in the proof of Lemma 3 below. Examples of such $A_{i}$ 's include all convex sets and all star-shaped sets (a set $A$ is starshaped if $x \in A$ implies $\lambda x \in A$ for all $\lambda \in[0,1]$ ). The $A_{i}$ 's need not be disjoint. However, if the $A_{i}$ 's are disjoint rectangles, the sum looks a bit like a Riemann approximation of a function. Thus, kernels of the type given here are called Riemann kernels of parameter $k$. Denote the class of all such functions by $\mathscr{R}_{k}$. The most important examples include the uniform densities on ellipsoids, balls and hypercubes.

In our estimate, we first select $k$ and $K^{\prime} \in \mathscr{R}_{k}$ such that

$$
\int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right| \leq \frac{1}{n}
$$

Note that this is always possible if $K$ is Riemann integrable. The size $k$ as a function of $n$ will be discussed in Section 6.

A kernel estimate with kernel $K^{\prime}$ is piecewise constant and thus easy to work with in simulations.

The second and last choice is that of a parameter $m \leq n / 2$ that will be used to split the data set into a small test set of size $m$ and a large main sample of size $n-m$. Define the kernel estimates

$$
f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}(x)=\frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{i=1}^{n-m} K_{h}^{\prime}\left(x-X_{i}\right)
$$

for all $h>0$. Let $\mu_{m}$ be the empirical measure defined by the rest of the data points: $X_{n-m+1}, \ldots, X_{n}$, that is, for any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d}$,

$$
\mu_{m}(A)=\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=n-m+1}^{n} I_{A}\left(X_{i}\right)
$$

Let $H$ be that smoothing factor for which the quantity

$$
\sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\int_{A} f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}-\mu_{m}(A)\right|
$$

is minimal over $h \in(0, \infty)$, where $\mathscr{A}$ is a special (random) collection of sets to be defined below. If the minimum is not unique, we choose among the minimizing densities according to a prespecified rule; for example, we choose the smallest one. Observe that since $f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}$ is piecewise constant and $K^{\prime} \in \mathscr{R}_{k}$, a minimum always exists.

As $\mu_{m}(A)$ is close to $\int_{A} f$ for all $A$, one may expect that $\int_{A} f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}$ is close to $\int_{A} f$ as well if $\mathscr{A}$ is not too large. If $\mathscr{A}$ is the class of all Borel sets, the criterion to be minimized is equal to 2 for all $h$ and becomes useless. If $\mathscr{A}$ is too small, the closeness of $\int_{A} f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}$ to $\int_{A} f$ does not imply the closeness of $f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}$ to $f$. Thus, a compromise must be struck. Based on ideas from Yatracos (1985), for each $u, v>0$, we define the set $A_{u, v}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{u, v} & =\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: \sum_{i=1}^{n-m} K_{u}^{\prime}\left(x-X_{i}\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-m} K_{v}^{\prime}\left(x-X_{i}\right)\right\} \\
& =\left\{x: f_{n-m, u}^{\prime}(x) \geq f_{n-m, v}^{\prime}(x)\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We call the class of sets

$$
\mathscr{A}=\left\{A_{u, v}: u>0, v>0\right\}
$$

a Yatracos class. This class depends on $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n-m}$, and it becomes very rich, yet remains reasonably simple (even though it has an infinite number of members).

Finally, our estimate is

$$
f_{n} \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} f_{n-m, H} .
$$

Note that we have replaced $K^{\prime}$ by $K$ again. The kernel $K^{\prime}$ is no longer needed. We may also use $f_{n}=f_{n, H}$ and refer to Devroye and Lugosi (1996) for analysis of this situation. For a practical implementation and experimental comparison, we refer to Devroye (1997).
3. Main result. Let $K$ be a Riemann integrable kernel, and let $n$ be a positive integer. The kernel complexity of precision $1 / n$ of $K$ is defined by

$$
\kappa_{n}=\min \left\{k: \text { there exists a } K^{\prime} \in \mathscr{R}_{k} \text { such that } \int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right| \leq \frac{1}{n}\right\},
$$

that is, $\kappa_{n}$ is the smallest integer $k$ such that there exists a Riemann kernel with parameter $k$ whose $L_{1}$ distance from $K$ is at most $1 / n$. Clearly, if $K$ is Riemann integrable, then $\kappa_{n}<\infty$ for all $n$. In fact, it will be shown in Section 6 that for most kernels used in practice, $\kappa_{n}$ is usually of the order of $n^{\alpha}$ for some constant $\alpha$.

Theorem. Let $K$ be a bounded kernel, and $m \leq n / 2$. If $\kappa_{n}$ is the kernel complexity of $K$ of precision $1 / n$, then there exists a Riemann kernel $K^{\prime}$ of parameter $\kappa_{n}$ such that if $K^{\prime}$ is used in the estimate described in the previous section, then for all densities $f$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right| \leq & 3\left(1+\frac{2 m}{n-m}+8 \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\right) \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right| \\
& +4 \sqrt{\frac{\log \left(4 e^{8}\left(m^{2}+1\right)\left(1+2 \kappa_{n} m^{2}(n-m)\right)^{2}\right)}{2 m}}+\frac{4}{n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary 1. If we take $m=\lfloor n / 2\rfloor$, then

$$
\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right| \leq 43 \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|+c \sqrt{\frac{\log \left(n \kappa_{n}\right)}{n}},
$$

where $c$ is a universal constant, independent of $f$ and $K$.
Corollary 2. Take $m=\lfloor n / 64\rfloor$ and assume $n \geq 64$. Then simple computations show the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right| \leq & \frac{128}{21} \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right| \\
& +32 \sqrt{\frac{\log \left(128 e^{8}(n / 64)^{6} n^{2} \kappa_{n}^{2}\right)}{n}}+\frac{4}{n} \\
\leq & \frac{128}{21} \inf \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right| \\
& +32 \sqrt{\frac{22+8 \log (n / 64)+2 \log \kappa_{n}}{n}}+\frac{4}{n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary 3. If $m=o(n), m /\left(n^{4 / 5} \log n\right) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{\alpha}\right)$ for some finite $\alpha$, then

$$
\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right| \leq(3+o(1)) \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|+o\left(n^{-2 / 5}\right) .
$$

As $\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{2 / 5} \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|>0$ for any $f, K \geq 0$ and $d$ [see Devroye and Györfi (1985)], we have

$$
\sup _{f} \limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right|}{\inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|} \leq 3
$$

This universal asymptotic bound is shared with the related estimate of Devroye and Lugosi (1996).

Corollary 4. Let $s>0$ be even. If the kernel $K$ is bounded, symmetric and has finite nonzero sth moment (for even $s$ ) and zero ith moments for $0<i<s$, then regardless of the density and the choice of $h$,

$$
\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{s /(2 s+1)} \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|>0
$$

[Devroye (1988), page 1173]. For such higher-order kernels, let $m=o(n)$ such that $m /\left(n^{2 s /(2 s+1)} \log n\right) \rightarrow \infty$. Then if $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{\alpha}\right)$ for some finite $\alpha$,

$$
\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right| \leq(3+o(1)) \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|+o\left(n^{-s /(2 s+1)}\right)
$$

and therefore

$$
\sup _{f} \limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right|}{\inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|} \leq 3 .
$$

Thus, the theorem covers all kernels of finite order.

Computational notes. The user must pick $m, K$ and $K^{\prime}$. If $K$ itself is a Riemann kernel, then one should pick $K^{\prime} \equiv K$. As noted earlier, the piecewise constant nature of $K^{\prime}$ ensures that $f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}$ is piecewise constant and thus easy to manage without having to worry about numerical errors. When $K$ is not Riemann, the last section of this paper gives some guidance with respect to the choice of $K^{\prime}$. Note that the kernels $K$ and $K^{\prime}$ need not necessarily be positive. Finally, the corollaries of the previous section show that one should not take $m$ smaller than about $n^{4 / 5} \log n$.

The estimate requires that $\int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right| \leq 1 / n$. The value $1 / n$ is chosen such that the error resulting from this approximation stays small (less than $4 / n$ ). Since this value is much smaller than the other terms in the performance bound, one may be willing to use a less accurate approximation of $K$. For example, using a kernel $K^{\prime}$ with $\int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right|=u$ lets us replace $\kappa_{n}$ in the upper bound by $\kappa_{\lceil 1 / u\rceil}$. Clearly, one would not want to choose $u$ much larger than $m^{-1 / 2}$, since then the approximation error would dominate the error. Therefore, if $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{\alpha}\right)$ for some $\alpha$, as in most interesting cases, no more than a constant factor in the lower-order term is at stake.

## 4. Proof of the Theorem.

Lemma 1. For each $n, m$ and for all $f$,

$$
\int\left|f_{n}-f\right| \leq 3 \inf _{h} \int\left|f_{n-m, h}-f\right|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\int_{A} f-\mu_{m}(A)\right|+4 \int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right| .
$$

Proof of Lemma 1. Fix an $\varepsilon>0$, and let $\bar{f}$ be an estimate $f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}$ (based on the kernel $K^{\prime}$ ) such that, for all $h>0$,

$$
\int|\bar{f}-f| \leq \int\left|f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}-f\right|+\varepsilon .
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int\left|f_{n-m, H}^{\prime}-f\right| & \leq \int|\bar{f}-f|+\int\left|f_{n-m, H}^{\prime}-\bar{f}\right| \\
& =\int|\bar{f}-f|+2 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\int_{A} f_{n-m, H}^{\prime}-\int_{A} \bar{f}\right| \quad \text { (by Scheffés theorem) } \\
& \leq \int|\bar{f}-f|+2 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\int_{A} f_{n-m, H}^{\prime}-\mu_{m}(A)\right|+2 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} \bar{f}\right| \\
& \leq \int|\bar{f}-f|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} \bar{f}\right| \quad(\text { by the definition of } H) \\
& \leq \int|\bar{f}-f|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\int_{A} f-\int_{A} \bar{f}\right|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{I}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

(by the triangle inequality)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq 3 \int|\bar{f}-f|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right| \quad \text { (by Scheffé's theorem) } \\
& \leq 3 \inf _{h} \int\left|f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}-f\right|+\varepsilon+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

But since $\varepsilon$ is arbitrary, we have

$$
\int\left|f_{n-m, H}^{\prime}-f\right| \leq 3 \inf _{h} \int\left|f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}-f\right|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right|
$$

On the other hand, since, for each $h, \int\left|f_{n-m, h}-f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}\right| \leq \int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right|$, for the $L_{1}$ error of our estimate $f_{n}=f_{n-m, H}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int\left|f_{n}-f\right| & \leq \int\left|f_{n-m, H}^{\prime}-f\right|+\int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right| \\
& \leq 3 \inf _{h} \int\left|f_{n-m, h}^{\prime}-f\right|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right|+\int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

(by the argument above)

$$
\leq 3 \inf _{h} \int\left|f_{n-m, h}-f\right|+4 \sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right|+4 \int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right|
$$

which proves Lemma 1.
The first term on the right-hand side of the inequality of Lemma 1 may be bounded by the following result.

Lemma 2 [Devroye and Lugosi (1996)]. Let $K$ be a bounded kernel. If $m>$ 0 is a positive integer such that $2 m \leq n$, then

$$
1 \leq \frac{\inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n-m, h}-f\right|}{\inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n, h}-f\right|} \leq 1+\frac{2 m}{n-m}+8 \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n-m, h}-f\right| \leq \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n, h}-f\right|\left(1+\frac{2 m}{n-m}+8 \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\right)
$$

To obtain suitable upper bounds for $\sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\int_{A} f-\mu_{m}(A)\right|$, we use an inequality by Vapnik and Chervonenkis (1971) for uniform deviations of the empirical measure $\mu_{m}$ over the Yatracos class of sets $\mathscr{A}$.

Let $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ be fixed points. Define the shatter coefficient

$$
s(\mathscr{A}, m)=\sup _{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}}\left|\left\{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right\} \cap A: A \in \mathscr{A}\right|
$$

The purpose of the next lemma is to obtain a simple upper bound for $s(\mathscr{A}, m)$ if $K^{\prime}$ is a Riemann kernel. It is convenient to let the rank of $\mathscr{A}$ be $r(\mathscr{A})=n-m$, the size of the sample used in the definition of $\mathscr{A}$.

Lemma 3. Let $K^{\prime}=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{i} I_{A_{i}}$ be a Riemann kernel of parameter $k$. Then

$$
s(\mathscr{A}, m) \leq(m+1)(1+2 k m r(\mathscr{A}))^{2}
$$

Proof. Set $r=r(\mathscr{A})$. Define the vector

$$
z_{u}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r} K^{\prime}\left(\frac{y_{1}-X_{i}}{u}\right), \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{r} K^{\prime}\left(\frac{y_{m}-X_{i}}{u}\right)\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{m}
$$

As $u \uparrow \infty$, each component of $z_{u}$ changes every time $\left(y_{j}-X_{i}\right) / u$ enters or leaves a set $A_{l}, 1 \leq l \leq k$ for some $X_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq r$. Note that, for fixed $\left(y_{j}-X_{i}\right)$, the evolution is along an infinite ray anchored at the origin. By our assumption on the possible form of the sets $A_{l}$, the number of different values a component can take in its history (as $u \uparrow \infty$ ) is clearly bounded by $2 k r$. As there are $m$ components, the cardinality of the set of different values of $z_{u}$ is bounded as

$$
\left|\left\{z_{u}: u>0\right\}\right| \leq 1+2 k m r
$$

Thus,

$$
\left|\left\{\left(z_{u}, z_{v}\right): u, v>0\right\}\right| \leq(1+2 k m r)^{2} .
$$

Let $\mathscr{W}=\left\{\left(w, w^{\prime}\right):\left(w, w^{\prime}\right)=\left(z_{u}, z_{v}\right)\right.$ for some $\left.u, v>0\right\}$. For fixed $\left(w, w^{\prime}\right) \in \mathscr{W}$, let $U_{\left(w, w^{\prime}\right)}$ denote the collection of all $(u, v)$ such that $\left(z_{u}, z_{v}\right)=\left(w, w^{\prime}\right)$. For $(u, v) \in U_{\left(w, w^{\prime}\right)}$, we have

$$
y_{i} \in A_{u, v} \quad \text { if and only if } \quad w_{i} \geq\left(\frac{u}{v}\right)^{d} w_{i}^{\prime}
$$

where $w, w^{\prime}$ have components $w_{i}, w_{i}^{\prime}$, respectively, $1 \leq i \leq m$. Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\left\{\left\{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right\} \cap A_{u, v}:(u, v) \in U_{\left(w, w^{\prime}\right)}\right\}\right| \\
& \quad \leq\left|\left\{\left(I_{w_{1} \geq c w_{1}^{\prime}}, \ldots, I_{w_{m} \geq c w_{m}^{\prime}}\right): c \geq 0\right\}\right| \leq m+1
\end{aligned}
$$

But then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\left\{\left\{y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right\} \cap A_{u, v}:(u, v)>0\right\}\right| & \leq(m+1)\left|U_{\left(w, w^{\prime}\right)}\right| \\
& \leq(m+1)(1+2 k m r)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

A variant of the Vapnik-Chervonenkis inequality [Vapnik and Chervonenkis (1971); see Devroye (1982)] states that, for $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}\left\{\sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right|>\varepsilon \mid X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n-m}\right\} \\
& \quad \leq 4 e^{8} s\left(\mathscr{A}, m^{2}\right) e^{-2 m \varepsilon^{2}} \leq 4 e^{8}\left(m^{2}+1\right)\left(1+2 k m^{2} r(\mathscr{A})\right)^{2} e^{-2 m \varepsilon^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used Lemma 3. This implies by standard bounding that

$$
\mathbf{E}\left\{\sup _{A \in \mathscr{A}}\left|\mu_{m}(A)-\int_{A} f\right| \mid X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n-m}\right\} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log \left(4 e^{8} s\left(\mathscr{A}, m^{2}\right)\right)}{2 m}}
$$

[see Devroye, Györfi and Lugosi (1996), page 208]. As $r(\mathscr{A})=n-m$ and $s(\mathscr{A}, m)$ is uniformly bounded over all (random) collections $\mathscr{A}$, the proof of the theorem is complete.
5. Kernel complexity. In this section we obtain bounds for $\kappa_{n}$, the kernel complexity of precision $1 / n$ appearing in the theorem, for several examples of kernels. Note that the theorem has the form

$$
\mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right| \leq 3\left(1+\frac{2 m}{n-m}+8 \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\right) \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|+c \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{m}}
$$

for some constant $c$ which is independent of $f$, whenever $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{\alpha}\right)$ for some $\alpha<\infty$. Such kernels are polynomially Riemann approximable. All kernels that we have found in papers are in this class.

Uniform kernels. If $K(x)=I_{A}(x)$ for a star-shaped set $A$, then obviously $\kappa_{n}=1$ for all $n>1$.

IsOSCELES TRIANGULAR DENSITY. If $K(x)=(1-|x|)_{+}$, then elementary calculation shows that, for all $n, \kappa_{n} \leq n+1$.

Symmetric unimodal kernels. As a first main example, consider symmetric unimodal densities (i.e., $K \geq 0$ and $\int K=1$ ) on the real line. Let $\beta$ be the last positive value for which $\int_{\beta}^{\infty} K \leq 1 /(4 n)$. Partition $[0, \beta]$ and $[-\beta, 0]$ into $N=\lceil 4 n K(0) \beta\rceil$ equal intervals. On each interval, let $K^{\prime}$ be constant with value equal to the average of $K$ over that interval. Let $\gamma=\int_{\beta}^{\infty} K / K(\beta)$, and set $K^{\prime}(x)=K(\beta)$ on $[\beta, \beta+\gamma]$ and $[-\beta-\gamma,-\beta]$. Note that $\int K^{\prime}=1$, $\int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right| \leq 1 / n$ and that $K^{\prime}$ is Riemann with parameter $k=2 N+2 \leq$ $8 n K(0) \beta+10$. Thus, $\kappa_{n} \leq 8 n K(0) \beta+10$.

Example 1 (Bounded compact support densities). If $K(x) \leq a I_{[-b, b]}(x)$ and $K$ is symmetric, nonnegative and unimodal (such as the EpanechnikovBartlett kernel), then $\kappa_{n} \leq 8 n a b+10$.

Example 2 (The normal density). When $K(x)=(\sqrt{2 \pi})^{-1} e^{-x^{2} / 2}$, we have $K(0)=(\sqrt{2 \pi})^{-1}$. Since, for $\beta \geq 1$,

$$
\int_{\beta}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left(-x^{2} / 2\right) d x \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \frac{1}{\beta} \exp \left(-\beta^{2} / 2\right) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left(-\beta^{2} / 2\right)
$$

we may take $\beta=\sqrt{2 \log (4 n / \sqrt{2} \pi)}$. Thus, for all $n>1$,

$$
\kappa_{n} \leq \frac{8 n \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{\pi}}+10 .
$$

Example 3 (The Cauchy density). Take $K(x)=1 /\left(\pi\left(1+x^{2}\right)\right)$. Note that $K(0)=1 / \pi$, and that $\beta=\pi /(4 n)$ will do. Therefore,

$$
\kappa_{n} \leq \frac{32 n^{2}}{\pi^{2}}+10
$$

Example 4 (Densities with polynomial tails). Note that if $K$ is a symmetric unimodal density, and $|K(x)| \leq c /\left(1+|x|^{\gamma+1}\right)$ for some $c<\infty, \gamma>0$, then $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{1+1 / \gamma}\right)$. In fact, for most cases of interest, $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{\alpha}\right)$ for some finite constant $\alpha>0$. This remains so even for $d$ dimensions.

Kernels of bounded variation. If $K$ is symmetric and a difference of two monotone functions, that is, $K=K_{1}-K_{2}, K_{1} \downarrow 0, K_{2} \downarrow 0$ on [ $0, \infty$ ), then each $K_{1}, K_{2}$ may be approximated as above. Thus, in particular, if $K$ is of bounded variation, and $|K(x)| \leq c /\left(1+|x|^{\gamma+1}\right)$ for some $c<\infty, \gamma>0$, then we may approximate with $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{1+1 / \gamma}\right)$. Nearly every one-dimensional kernel falls in this class.

Product kernels. If $K=K_{1} \times \cdots \times K_{d}$ is a product of $d$ univariate kernels, and if we approximate $K_{i}$ with $K_{i}^{\prime}$ with parameter $\kappa_{n d}^{(i)}$ for all $i$ (where $\kappa_{n d}^{(i)}$ is the kernel complexity of $K_{i}$ of precision $n d$ ) and form $K^{\prime}=K_{1}^{\prime} \times \cdots \times K_{d}^{\prime}$, then $K^{\prime}$ is a weighted sum of indicators of product sets, and it is Riemann with parameter not exceeding $\prod_{i=1}^{d} \kappa_{n d}^{(i)}$. Furthermore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int\left|K-K^{\prime}\right| \leq & \int\left|K_{1} \times \cdots \times K_{d-1} \times K_{d}-K_{1} \times \cdots \times K_{d-1} \times K_{d}^{\prime}\right| \\
& +\cdots+\int\left|K_{1} \times K_{2}^{\prime} \cdots \times K_{d}^{\prime}-K_{1}^{\prime} \times K_{2}^{\prime} \cdots \times K_{d}^{\prime}\right| \\
\leq & d\left(\frac{1}{n d}\right) \\
= & \frac{1}{n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, it suffices to replace $\kappa_{n}$ throughout by $\prod_{i=1}^{d} \kappa_{n d}^{(i)}$, and only worry about univariate kernel approximations.

Kernels that are functions of $\|x\|$. Assume that $K(x)=M(\|x\|)$, where $M$ is a bounded nonnegative monotone decreasing function on $[0, \infty)$. Then we may approximate $M$ by a stepwise constant function $M^{\prime}$, and use the Riemann kernel $K^{\prime}(x)=M^{\prime}(\|x\|)$ in the estimate as an approximation of $K$. Clearly,

$$
\int\left|K(x)-K^{\prime}(x)\right| d x=\int_{0}^{\infty} c_{d} u^{d-1}\left|M(u)-M^{\prime}(u)\right| d u
$$

where $c_{d}$ is $d$ times the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$. We may define $M^{\prime}$ as follows. Let $\beta$ be the largest positive number for which $\int_{\beta}^{\infty} c_{d} u^{d-1} M(u) d u \leq$
$1 /(2 n)$. Partition $[0, \beta]$ into $N=\left\lceil 2 n c_{d} M(0) \beta^{d}\right\rceil$ equal intervals. On each interval, let $M^{\prime}$ be equal to the average of $M$ over that interval. Let $\gamma=$ $\int_{\beta}^{\infty} c_{d} u^{d-1} M(u) d u / M(\beta)$, and set $M^{\prime}(u)=M(\beta)$ on $u \in[\beta, \beta+\gamma]$ and let $M^{\prime}(u)=0$ for $u>\gamma$. Clearly, $\int K^{\prime}=1$, and $K^{\prime}$ is Riemann with parameter $k=N+1 \leq 2 n c_{d} K(0) \beta^{d}+2$. Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int\left|K(x)-K^{\prime}(x)\right| d x= & \int_{0}^{\beta} c_{d} u^{d-1}\left|M(u)-M^{\prime}(u)\right| d u \\
& +\int_{\beta}^{\infty} c_{d} u^{d-1}\left|M(u)-M^{\prime}(u)\right| d u \\
\leq & \frac{1}{2 n}+c_{d} \beta^{d-1} \int_{0}^{\beta}\left|M(u)-M^{\prime}(u)\right| d u \\
\leq & \frac{1}{2 n}+c_{d} \beta^{d-1} \frac{M(0) \beta}{N} \\
\leq & \frac{1}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus,

$$
\kappa_{n} \leq 2 n c_{d} M(0) \beta^{d}+2
$$

THE MULTIVARIATE STANDARD NORMAL KERNEL. We may apply the bound of the previous paragraph to the multivariate normal density. First note that it suffices to take $\beta=2 \sqrt{2 \log n}$. From this, we deduce that the kernel complexity is

$$
\kappa_{n}=O\left(n \log ^{d / 2} n\right)
$$

6. Minimax optimality and adaptation. In a minimax setting, a subclass $\mathscr{T}$ of densities of interest is given, and the minimax risk is commonly defined by

$$
R_{n}(\mathscr{T}) \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \inf _{f_{n}} \sup _{f \in \mathscr{F}} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n}-f\right|
$$

where the infimum is over all density estimates. For many smoothness classes it is known that, if $f_{n h}$ is the kernel estimate with an appropriate kernel $K$, then

$$
\sup _{f \in \mathscr{F}} \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right| \leq C R_{n}(\mathscr{F})
$$

for some universal constant $C>1$ [see, e.g., Devroye (1987)]. In fact, the proof of such a result usually reveals a formula for $h$ as a function of $f \in \mathscr{F}$. However, we do not know $f$, and so we are stuck. If we use the present datadependent bandwidth $H$, then with $m=o(n)$ and $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{\alpha}\right)$ for some finite $a$, we have

$$
\sup _{f \in \mathscr{F}} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n H}-f\right| \leq(3 C+o(1)) R_{n}(\mathscr{F})+O(\sqrt{\log n / m})
$$

In many cases, the last term is negligible. Thus, our results may be used for existence proofs of minimax optimal estimators; if one can find a formula $h=h(f, n)$ for the bandwidth that gives a certain rate, then that same rate will be achieved with $H$.

A more interesting problem occurs when we define $\mathscr{F}$ up to a parameter, such as the class of all Lipschitz densities on [0,1] with unknown Lipschitz constant $\alpha$. For fixed $\alpha$, the class is denoted by $\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}$. Assume that we know that, for each $\alpha$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{f \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha}} \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right| \leq C_{\alpha} R_{n}\left(\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}\right) . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $\alpha$ is not given beforehand, the challenge is to find a data-dependent $H$ such that

$$
\sup _{\alpha} \frac{\sup _{f \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha}} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n H}-f\right|}{R_{n}\left(\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}\right)} \leq C^{\prime}
$$

for some suitable constant $C^{\prime}$. In that case, we may say that $H$ adapts itself nicely to the union of the classes $\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}$. Such a point of view is not without merit. Assume that $H$ is picked by the method of this paper. Then, assuming that $m$ grows linearly with $n$, and that $\kappa_{n}=O\left(n^{a}\right)$ for some finite $a>0$, we see that there exist universal constants $D$ and $E$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup _{\alpha} \frac{\sup _{f \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha}} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n H}-f\right|}{R_{n}\left(\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}\right)} & \leq \sup _{\alpha} \frac{\sup _{f \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha}} D \inf _{h} \mathbf{E} \int\left|f_{n h}-f\right|+E \sqrt{(\log n) / n}}{R_{n}\left(\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}\right)} \\
& \leq \sup _{\alpha} \frac{D C_{\alpha} R_{n}\left(\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}\right)+E \sqrt{(\log n) / n}}{R_{n}\left(\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}\right)} \\
& =D \sup _{\alpha} C_{\alpha}+\frac{E \sqrt{(\log n) / n}}{\inf _{\alpha} R_{n}\left(\mathscr{F}_{\alpha}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the majority of the interesting cases, this is $D \sup _{\alpha} C_{\alpha}+o(1)$. Indeed, then, one may use $H$ and be assured of good adaptive capabilities whenever (1) holds and the constants $C_{\alpha}$ are uniformly bounded. Typically, (1) is easy to verify, so that one need not be concerned with the details of the random bandwidth $H$. Furthermore, the universal nature of the above result says something very powerful about the kernel estimate and about the bandwidths described in this paper.
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