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In this lecture, we provide further methods to derive a lower bound for the minimax risk. First, we will continue our previous discussion on constructing alternatives via tight packings. Then, we will introduce the Varshamov-Gilbert lemma, which is another method to construct well-separated alternatives. We also briefly mention other methods for lower bounds. Finally, we will discuss nonprarametric regression.

## 1 Method 1: Constructing alternatives via tight packings (continued)

In the previous lecture, we have learned $\varepsilon$-packing numbers. We will see $\varepsilon$-covering numbers that behave in the equivalent order to packing numbers as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Definition 1. (Covering number, metric entropy)

- An $\varepsilon$-covering of set $\mathcal{X}$ with respect to a metric $\rho$ is a set $\left\{x_{1}, \cdots, x_{N}\right\}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists some $x_{i} \in\left\{x_{1}, \cdots, x_{N}\right\}$ s.t. $\rho\left(x, x_{i}\right) \leq \varepsilon$.
- The $\varepsilon$-covering number $N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{X}, \rho)$ is the size of the smallest covering.
- The metric entropy is $\log (N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{X}, \rho))$.

We have the following lemma that relates covering numbers and packing numbers.
Lemma 1. A covering number $N(\cdot, \mathcal{X}, \rho)$ and a packing number $M(\cdot, \mathcal{X}, \rho)$ satisfy

$$
M(2 \varepsilon, \mathcal{X}, \rho) \leq N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{X}, \rho) \leq M(\varepsilon, \mathcal{X}, \rho)
$$

Remark This lemma is useful since we can apply prior work on bounding the metric entropy $\log (N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{X}, \rho))$.

## 2 Method 2: Varshamov-Gilbert Lemma

To get a lower bound for the minimax risk, it is often convenient to consider alternatives indexed with a hypercube:

$$
\left\{P_{\omega} ; \omega=\left(\omega_{1}, \ldots, \omega_{d}\right) \in\{0,1\}^{d}\right\}
$$

Example 1. (Normal mean estimation in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ ) Consider a hypercube:

$$
\left\{N\left(\delta \omega, \sigma^{2} I\right) ; \omega \in\{0,1\}^{d}\right\}
$$



Figure 1: A hypercube that we will use to generate our alternatives by removing a few vertices from the cube.

For these alternatives, we can calculate the following values:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min _{\omega \neq \omega^{\prime}} \rho\left(\theta\left(P_{\omega}\right), \theta\left(P_{\omega^{\prime}}\right)\right) & =\min _{\omega \neq \omega^{\prime}}\left\|\delta \omega-\delta \omega^{\prime}\right\|_{2} \\
& =\delta, \quad\left(\omega \text { and } \omega^{\prime} \text { differ on only one coordinate }\right) \\
\max _{\omega, \omega^{\prime}} \mathrm{KL}\left(P_{\omega}, P_{\omega^{\prime}}\right) & =\frac{\max _{\omega, \omega^{\prime}}\left\|\delta \omega-\delta \omega^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}} \\
& =\frac{d \delta^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}} \cdot \quad\left(\omega \text { and } \omega^{\prime} \text { differ on all coordinates }\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The problem here is the Kullback-Leibler divergence could be large relative to the minimum distance, thus, we cannot simply apply the local Fano's method.

This example motivates us to introduce Varshamov-Gilbert Lemma. The Varshamov-Gilbert lemma states that we can find a large subset of $\{0,1\}^{d}$ such that the minimum distance between any two points in the subset is also large. Before stating the lemma, we define the Hamming distance.

Definition 2. (Hamming distance) The hamming distance between two binary vectors $\omega, \omega^{\prime}$ is $H\left(\omega, \omega^{\prime}\right)=$ $\sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{1}\left\{\omega_{j} \neq \omega_{j}^{\prime}\right\}$ for $\omega, \omega^{\prime} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$. It counts the number of coordinate where $\omega_{j}$ and $\omega_{j}^{\prime}$ differ.

Lemma 2. (Varshamov-Gilbert) Let $m \geq 8$. Then there exists $\Omega_{m} \subseteq\{0,1\}^{m}$ such that the followings are true: (i) $\left|\Omega_{m}\right| \geq 2^{m / 8}$. (ii) $\forall \omega, \omega^{\prime} \in \Omega_{m}, H\left(\omega, \omega^{\prime}\right) \geq m / 8$. We will call $\Omega_{m}$ the Varshamov-Gilbert pruned hypercube of $\{0,1\}^{m}$.

We will revisit the normal mean estimation example to illustrate an application of the Varshamov-Gilbert lemma.
Example 2. (Normal mean estimation in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ ) Let an i.i.d. data $S=\left\{x_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}\right\} \sim P^{n}$ where $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}=\left\{N(\mu, \Sigma) ; \mu \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, \Sigma \preceq \sigma^{2} I\right\}$. Consider $\Phi \circ \rho\left(\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}\right)=\left\|\theta_{1}-\theta_{2}\right\|_{2}^{2}$. Let $\Omega_{d}$ be the Varshamov-Gilbert pruned hypercube of $\{0,1\}^{d}$. Define

$$
\mathcal{P}^{\prime}=\left\{N\left(\sqrt{\frac{8}{d}} \delta \omega, \sigma^{2} I\right) ; \omega \in \Omega_{d}\right\}
$$

For these alternatives, we have the following bound:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min _{P_{\omega} \neq P_{\omega^{\prime}}, P_{\omega}, P_{\omega^{\prime}} \in \mathcal{P}^{\prime}} \rho\left(\theta\left(P_{\omega}\right), \theta\left(P_{\omega^{\prime}}\right)\right) & =\min _{\omega \neq \omega^{\prime}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{d}\left(\sqrt{\frac{8}{d}} \delta \omega_{j}-\sqrt{\frac{8}{d}} \delta \omega_{j}^{\prime}\right)^{2}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{8}{d}} \delta \min _{\omega \neq \omega^{\prime}} \sqrt{H\left(\omega, \omega^{\prime}\right)} \\
& \geq \sqrt{\frac{8}{d}} \delta \sqrt{\frac{d}{8}}=\delta
\end{aligned}
$$

where the inequality follows from the property (ii) of the Varshamov-Gilbert pruned hypercube. Since the maximum $\ell_{2}$-distance over a hypercube is the length of a diagonal, we also have

$$
\max _{P_{\omega}, P_{\omega^{\prime}} \in \mathcal{P}^{\prime}} \operatorname{KL}\left(P_{\omega}, P_{\omega^{\prime}}\right)=\frac{\left(\sqrt{d} \times\left(\sqrt{\frac{8}{d}} \delta\right)\right)^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}=\frac{4 \delta^{2}}{\sigma^{2}}
$$

Choose $\delta=\sigma \sqrt{\frac{d \log (2)}{128 n}}$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max _{P_{\omega}, P_{\omega^{\prime}} \in \mathcal{P}^{\prime}} \mathrm{KL}\left(P_{\omega}, P_{\omega^{\prime}}\right) & =\frac{4 \delta^{2}}{\sigma^{2}}=\frac{d \log (2)}{32 n} \\
& =\frac{\log \left(2^{d / 8}\right)}{4 n} \\
& \leq \frac{\log \left(\left|\mathcal{P}^{\prime}\right|\right)}{4 n}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the inequality follows from the property (i) of the Varshamov-Gilbert pruned hypercube: $\left|\mathcal{P}^{\prime}\right|=\left|\Omega_{d}\right| \geq$ $2^{d / 8}$. Therefore, by the local Fano's method (here we also require $d \geq 32$ ),

$$
R_{n}^{*} \geq \frac{1}{2} \Phi\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right)=\frac{\log (2)}{1024} \cdot \frac{d \sigma^{2}}{n}
$$

## 3 Other methods for lower bounds

Theorem 3. Informal theorem (Ch 2, Tsyhakov)
Let $\mathrm{S}=\left\{\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{y}_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)\right\} \sim P \in \mathcal{P},\left\{P_{0}, \ldots, P_{N}\right\} \subseteq P$, and $\delta=\max _{j \neq k} \Phi \circ \rho\left(\theta\left(P_{j}\right), \theta\left(P_{k}\right)\right)$. Then if

$$
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} K L\left(P_{j}, P_{0}\right) \leq C_{1} \log (N)
$$

we can say that

$$
R_{n}^{*} \geq C_{2} \Phi\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right)
$$

Roughly, this informal theorem says that if the average KL distance between $P_{j} \forall j$ and some "central" distribution $P_{0}$ is small enough we get a the lower bound of on the minimax risk seen above.

A related method, Assouad's method, can be found in chapter 9 of John Duchi's "Lecture Notes on Information Theory." This method applies when there is additional structure in the problem.

## 4 Nonparametric regression

The model: Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the class of bounded Lipschitz functions in $[0,1]$. That is

$$
\mathcal{F}=\left\{f:[0,1] \rightarrow[0, B] ;\left|f\left(x_{1}\right)-f\left(x_{2}\right)\right| \leq L\left|x_{1}, x_{2}\right|\right\}
$$

where $L$ is the Lipschitz constant.
We observe some $\mathrm{S}=\left\{\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{y}_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)\right\}$ drawn i.i.d. from $P_{x y}=\mathcal{P}$ where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}=\left\{P_{x y} ;\right. & 0<\alpha_{0} \leq p(x) \leq \alpha_{1}<\infty \\
& \text { the regression function } f(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[Y \mid X=x] \in \mathcal{F} \\
& \left.\operatorname{Var}(Y \mid X=x) \leq \sigma^{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We wish to estimate the regression function via the following loss

$$
\ell\left(P_{x y}, y\right)=\int(f(x)-g(x))^{2} p(x) d x
$$

where $f$ is the regression function and $g:[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The risk of $\hat{f}$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(P_{x y}, \hat{f}\right) & =\mathbb{E}_{S}\left[\ell\left(P_{x y}, \hat{f}\right)\right] \\
& =\mathbb{E}_{S}\left[\int(f(x)-\hat{f}(x))^{2} p(x) d x\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

and the minimax risk of $\hat{f}$ is

$$
R_{n}^{*}=\inf _{\hat{f}} \sup _{P_{x y} \in \mathcal{P}} R\left(P_{x y}, \hat{f}\right) .
$$

We want to show that the minimax risk is $\Theta\left(n^{-\frac{2}{3}}\right)$. We will do this in two steps:

1. Establish a lower bound with Fano's method
2. Get and upper bound using Nadaraya-Watson Estimation

### 4.1 Lower Bound

To begin it should be noted that we have a problem where the loss does cannot be written as $\ell=\Phi \circ \rho$. To circumvent this, denote $\mathcal{P}^{\prime \prime}=\left\{P_{x y} \in \mathcal{P} ; p(x)=1\right\} .{ }^{1}$ Then

$$
R_{n}^{*}=\inf _{\hat{f}} \sup _{P_{x y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\prime}} \mathbb{E}_{S}[\underbrace{\int(f(x)-\hat{f}(x))^{2} p(x) d x}_{\Phi \circ \rho}]
$$

where $\Phi \circ \rho\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)=\left\|f_{1}-f_{2}\right\|_{2}^{2}$.
Now we proceed with proving the lower bound via the following three steps:

[^0]1. Constructing the alternatives
2. Lower bounding $\rho$
3. Upper bounding KL

### 4.1.1 Constructing the alternatives



Figure 2: $\Psi(x)$
Let

$$
\Psi(x)= \begin{cases}x+\frac{1}{2} & \text { if } x \in[-1 / 2,0] \\ -x+\frac{1}{2} & \text { if } x \in[0,1 / 2] \\ 0 & \text { o.w. }\end{cases}
$$

where $\Psi$ is $1-$ Lipschitz and $\int \Psi^{2}(x) d x=\frac{1}{12}<\infty$.
Now let $h>0$ (we will choose it more precisely later), and let $m=\frac{1}{h}$. Define $\mathcal{F}^{\prime}$

$$
\mathcal{F}^{\prime}=\left\{f_{w} ; f_{w}(\cdot)=\sum_{j=1}^{m} w_{j} \phi_{j}(\cdot), w \in \Omega_{m}\right\}
$$

where $\Omega_{m}$ is the Vashamov-Gilbert pruned subset of $\{0,1\}^{d}$. And $\phi_{j}$ as

$$
\phi_{j}(x)=\operatorname{Lh} \Psi\left(\frac{(x-(j-1 / 2) h)}{h}\right)
$$



Figure 3: Depiction of $\phi_{j}$ and $w$ when $w=\{0,0,1,0,1\}$.
Now we need to check that $\mathcal{F}^{\prime} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ (to show that $f_{w}$ is $L$-Lipschitz). To do this, it is sufficient to check within one of the "bumps." By the chain rule,

$$
\left|\phi_{j}^{\prime}\right|=\left|L h \Psi^{\prime}\left(\frac{(x-(j-1 / 2) h)}{h}\right) \frac{1}{h}\right|=L
$$

Finally we define our set of alternatives $\mathcal{P}^{\prime}$ as follows.

$$
\mathcal{P}^{\prime}=\left\{\mathcal{P} ; p(x) \text { is uniform, } \quad f(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[Y \mid X=x] \in \mathcal{F}^{\prime}, \quad Y \mid X=x \sim \mathcal{N}\left(f(x), \sigma^{2}\right)\right\}
$$

We see that $\mathcal{P}^{\prime} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\prime \prime} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ where


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ We choose $p(x)=1$ here for simplicity, but any uniform pdf will work.

