

# Goodness-of-fit testing from observations with multiplicative measurement error

Jan Johannes <sup>a</sup> and Bianca Neubert <sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Institut für Mathematik (IMa), Interdisciplinary Center for Scientific Computing (IWR),  
Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Germany; \*neubert@math.uni-heidelberg.de

Given observations from a positive random variable contaminated by multiplicative measurement error, we consider a nonparametric goodness-of-fit testing task for its unknown density in a non-asymptotic framework. We propose a testing procedure based on estimating a quadratic functional of the Mellin transform of the unknown density and the null. We derive non-asymptotic testing radii and testing rates over Mellin–Sobolev spaces, which naturally characterize regularity and ill-posedness in this model. By employing a multiple testing procedure with Bonferroni correction, we obtain data-driven procedures and analyze their performance. Compared with the non-adaptive tests, their testing radii deteriorate by at most a logarithmic factor. We illustrate the testing procedures with a simulation study using various choices of densities.

*Keywords:* Non-asymptotic radius of testing, Density function, Survival function, Mellin-transform, Bonferroni aggregation

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classifications:* Primary 62G10; secondary 62C20.

## 1 Introduction

In this work, we consider nonparametric data-driven goodness-of-fit hypothesis testing for the density of a strictly positive random variable  $X$  in a multiplicative measurement error model. More precisely, let  $X$  and  $U$  be strictly positive independent random variables admitting, respectively, an unknown density  $f$  and a known density  $\varphi$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda_+$  on the positive real line  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . We have access to an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) sample of size  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  from  $Y = XU$  admitting a density  $g$  given for  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$  by

$$g(y) = (f * \varphi)(y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(x)\varphi(y/x)x^{-1}d\lambda_+(x). \quad (1.1)$$

For a prescribed density  $f_o$  we propose a data-driven testing procedure based only on observations of  $Y$  for the goodness-fit testing task

$$H_0: f = f_o \quad \text{against} \quad H_1: f \neq f_o,$$

which naturally leads to a statistical inverse problem called multiplicative deconvolution. Vardi (1989) and Vardi and Zhang (1992) introduce and thoroughly investigate multiplicative censoring, which corresponds to the specific multiplicative deconvolution model where the multiplicative error  $U$  is uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]$ . As explained and motivated in van Es et al. (2000), multiplicative censoring represents a common challenge in survival analysis.

There is a substantial body of work on estimation of the unknown density  $f$ . Under multiplicative censoring, for example, Andersen and Hansen (2001) employ series expansion methods; Brunel et al. (2016) propose a kernel estimator; Comte and Dion (2016) develop a projection estimator based on the Laguerre basis; and Belomestny et al. (2016) study the case of a Beta-distributed error. All of these approaches fall within the broader framework of the multiplicative measurement error model. Nonparametric density estimation in this setting has been investigated by Brenner Miguel et al. (2021), who assume a known error density and apply spectral cut-off regularization, and by Brenner Miguel et al. (2024), who address the case of an unknown error density. Further contributions include Brenner Miguel et al. (2023), who consider estimation of a linear functional of the unknown density  $f$ , and Belomestny and Goldenshluger (2020), who analyze pointwise density estimation. Pointwise estimation of the cumulative distribution function, as studied in Belomestny et al. (2024), also covers scenarios where absolute continuity does not hold. The estimation of a quadratic functional of the unknown density has been studied in Comte et al. (2025). The central tool for analysing multiplicative deconvolution is the multiplication theorem. For a density  $g = f * \varphi$  and the corresponding Mellin transformations  $\mathcal{M}_c[g], \mathcal{M}_c[f], \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]$  (defined below) the theorem states that  $\mathcal{M}_c[g] = \mathcal{M}_c[f]\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]$ . This property is exploited in Belomestny and Goldenshluger (2020) to construct a kernel density estimator of  $f$  while Brenner Miguel et al. (2023) and Comte et al. (2025) employ it to develop a plug-in estimator.

We now turn to the testing task. Asymptotic rates of testing for nonparametric alternatives is introduced in the series of papers by Ingster (1993a,b,c). For a fixed sample size, a nonasymptotic radius of testing has been studied by Baraud (2002), Laurent et al. (2012), Collier et al. (2017) and Marteau and Sapatinas (2017) amongst others. Its connection to the asymptotic approach is studied in Marteau and Sapatinas (2015). The link between quadratic functional estimation and testing is amongst others explored in Collier et al. (2017), Kroll (2019) and Schluttenhofer and Johannes (2020a,b). Estimation of quadratic functionals of densities have extensively been treated in the literature by Laurent and Massart (2000), Laurent (2005) and Butucea and Meziani (2011), to name but a few. In particular we refer to Butucea (2007), Schluttenhofer and Johannes (2020b) and Comte et al. (2025) for measurement models with additive real, circular and multiplicative errors, respectively. Goodness-of-fit testing for additive real measurement error models has been studied for example by Butucea (2007) while Schluttenhofer and Johannes (2020a) consider circular errors. In this paper, we study the multiplicative case. We propose a test statistic by replacing the unknown Mellin transform with its empirical counterpart, borrowing ideas from Comte et al. (2025). More precisely, to distinguish between the null hypothesis and the alternative, we consider a weighted  $\mathbb{L}^2$ -distance between the Mellin transforms of  $f$  and  $f_0$  allowing to study goodness-of-fit hypotheses on the density  $f$ , its derivatives or the associated survival function. Considering this general framework, we derive upper bounds for the radius of testing.

The accuracy of the proposed test statistic relies crucially on an optimal choice of a tuning parameter which is unknown in practice. In the literature, data-driven testing strategies have been studied in both asymptotic and non-asymptotic frameworks (e.g., Spokoiny (1996), Baraud et al. (2003), and Fromont and Laurent (2006)). In particular, we refer to Butucea et al. (2009) and Butucea (2007) for additive real measurement error models, and to Schluttenhofer and Johannes (2020a) for the circular case. Our aim is to derive in a multiplicative measurement error model upper bounds for the radius of testing of a fully data-driven procedure using a Bonferroni approach.

The paper is organized as follows. We first review the Mellin transform, present, the testing task, and propose the test statistic in Section 2. In Section 3, we derive bounds for the quantiles

of the proposed test statistic. In Section 4, we establish upper bounds for the radius of testing. In Section 5, we propose a data-driven testing procedure based on the max-test and also provide upper bounds for its radius of testing. Finally, in Section 6, we illustrate the theoretical results with a small simulation study.

## 2 Methodology

Before stating the testing task and defining a test statistic, we introduce the Mellin transform and recall the multiplicative deconvolution problem.

**Mellin transform** Consider on the Borel-measurable space  $(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{B}_+)$  the restriction  $\lambda_+$  of the Lebesgue-measure  $\lambda$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  denote by  $x^c \lambda_+$  the  $\sigma$ -finite measure with Lebesgue-density  $x^c$  given by  $x \mapsto x^c$ . Introduce for  $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$  the set  $\mathbb{L}^s(x^c) := \mathbb{L}_+^s(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{B}_+, x^c \lambda_+)$  of all complex-valued  $\mathbb{L}_+^s(x^c)$ -integrable functions. Analogously, denote by  $\mathbb{L}^2 := \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}, \lambda)$  the set of all complex-valued square-Lebesgue-integrable functions. Then, the Mellin transform is the operator  $\mathcal{M}_c \in \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1}), \mathbb{L}^2)$  satisfying for  $g \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{c-1}) \cap \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathcal{M}_c[g](t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} x^{c-1+2\pi it} g(x) \lambda_+(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} x^{2\pi it} g(x) (x^{c-1} \lambda_+)(x).$$

Moreover, it fulfils  $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})} = \langle \mathcal{M}_c[h_1], \mathcal{M}_c[h_2] \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2}$  for all  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{M}_c$  is unitary, and, in particular, the *Plancherel equality* holds, that is,

$$\|h_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})}^2 = \|\mathcal{M}_c[h_1]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2. \quad (2.1)$$

The adjoint  $\mathcal{M}_c^\dagger \in \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{L}^2, \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1}))$  of the Mellin transform satisfies for  $G \in \mathbb{L}^1 \cap \mathbb{L}^2$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\mathcal{M}_c^\dagger[G](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^{-c-2\pi it} G(t) d\lambda(t).$$

In analogy to the additive convolution theorem, see Meister (2009), there is a *multiplicative convolution theorem*. It states that for  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{c-1})$

$$\mathcal{M}_c[h_1 * h_2] = \mathcal{M}_c[h_1] \cdot \mathcal{M}_c[h_2] \quad (2.2)$$

where  $*$  denotes the multiplicative convolution defined in eq. (1.1). We refer to Brenner Miguel (2023) for a detailed discussion of the Mellin transform.

**Multiplicative deconvolution** In the multiplicative measurement error model, we are interested in an unknown density  $f: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  of a positive random variable  $X$  given independent and identically distributed copies  $(Y_j)_{j \in [n]}$  of

$$Y = XU \quad (2.3)$$

where  $X$  and  $U$  are independent of each other and  $U$  has a known density  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . In this setting the density  $g: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  of  $Y$  is given by  $g = f * \varphi$ . Making use of the multiplicative convolution theorem eq. (2.2) it holds that  $\mathcal{M}_c[g] = \mathcal{M}_c[f] \cdot \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]$ .

**Goodness-of-fit testing task** Throughout this paper, we assume that the random variables admit densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and that the corresponding Mellin transforms exist. These assumptions are summarized in the following set of functions:

$$\mathcal{D} := \{h \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{c-1}) \cap \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1}) : h \text{ Lebesgue density on } \mathbb{R}_+\}.$$

Here and subsequently, the quantities of the following assumption are fixed and assumed to be known.

**Assumption A1.** Consider the multiplicative measurement error model, an arbitrary measurable symmetric density function  $w: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . In addition, let  $f_o, \varphi \in \mathcal{D}$ .

Under **Assumption A1** we are interested in the goodness-of-fit testing task

$$H_0: f = f_o \quad \text{against} \quad H_1: f \neq f_o. \quad (2.4)$$

The performance of a test is measured by how well it is able to distinguish between the null hypothesis and elements that are in some sense separated from the null. For this, first define for an arbitrary measurable and symmetric density function  $u: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the class

$$\mathcal{F}^u := \{h \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1}) \cap \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{c-1}) : \mathcal{M}_c[h] \in \mathbb{L}^2(u^2)\}.$$

Now, we consider the following norm to measure the separation of densities. Under **Assumption A1**, we define for  $h \in \mathcal{F}^w$  analogously to Comte et al. (2025) the quadratic functional

$$q^2(h) := \|\mathcal{M}_c[h]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{M}_c[h](t)|^2 w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \quad (2.5)$$

We define an *energy set* for the separation radius  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$  as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho} := \{h \in \mathcal{F}^w : q^2(h) \geq \rho^2\}$$

and write shortly

$$\mathcal{D} \cap (f_o + \mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho}) := \{h \in \mathcal{D} : h - f_o \in \mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho}\}.$$

Consequently, under **Assumption A1** the testing task can be written as

$$H_0: f = f_o \quad \text{against} \quad H_1: f \in \mathcal{D} \cap (f_o + \mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho}).$$

**Illustration 2.1.** Different choices of the function  $w$  allows us to cover the following possible goodness-of-fit testing tasks.

(i) If  $w = 1$ , we get using the Plancherel type identity eq. (2.1) that

$$q^2(f) = \|\mathcal{M}_c[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 = \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |f(x)|^2 x^{2c-1} dx$$

and  $q^2(f) = \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2}^2$  in the special case of  $c = \frac{1}{2}$ . Consequently, we cover the testing task

$$H_0: f = f_o \quad \text{against} \quad H_1: f \in \mathcal{D}, \|f - f_o\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2}^2 \geq \rho.$$

- (ii) If  $w^2(t) = \frac{1}{(c-1)^2 + 4\pi^2 t^2}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we consider the quadratic functional evaluated at the survival function  $S$  of  $X$ , i.e.

$$q^2(f) = \|S\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |S(x)|^2 x^{2c-1} dx.$$

and  $q^2(f) = \|S\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2}^2$  in the special case of  $c = \frac{1}{2}$ . For more details see Brenner Miguel and Phandoidaen (2022). Consequently, we cover the testing task

$$H_0: S = S_o \quad \text{against} \quad H_1: f \in \mathcal{D}, \|S - S_o\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2}^2 \geq \rho.$$

- (iii) Let  $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , i.e. smooth with compact support in  $\mathbb{R}_+$  such that for any  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$  the derivatives  $D^\beta[f] := \frac{d^\beta}{dx^\beta} f$  exist. If  $w^2(t) = \prod_{j=1}^\beta ((c + \beta - j)^2 + 4\pi^2 t^2)$  for  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$  then we have that

$$q^2(f) = \|D^\beta[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2(c+\beta)-1})}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |D^\beta[f](t)|^2 x^{2(c+\beta)-1} dx,$$

see Proposition 2.3.11, Brenner Miguel (2023), and  $q^2(f) = \|D^\beta[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2}^2$  in the special case  $c = \frac{1}{2} - \beta$ . Consequently, we cover the testing task

$$H_0: D^\beta[f] = D^\beta[f_o] \quad \text{against} \quad H_1: f \in \mathcal{D}, \|D^\beta[f] - D^\beta[f_o]\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2}^2 \geq \rho.$$

Further, we assume some kind of regularity for the densities under the alternative. Analogously to the quadratic functional estimation in Comte et al. (2025) consider the following assumption.

**Assumption A2.** (i) Let  $s: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$  be a symmetric, non-decreasing regularity function such that  $s(t) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $|t| \rightarrow \infty$ .

- (ii) Assume that the symmetric function  $w/s$  is non-increasing such that  $w(t)/s(t) = o(1)$  as  $|t| \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then, for  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$  define

$$\mathcal{F}^{s|R} := \left\{ h \in \mathcal{F}^s : \|s \mathcal{M}_c[h]\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2}^2 \leq R^2 \right\} \quad (2.6)$$

and write shortly

$$\mathcal{D} \cap (f_o + \mathcal{F}^{s|R} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho}) := \{h \in \mathcal{D} : h - f_o \in \mathcal{F}^{s|R} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho}\}.$$

Consequently, under **Assumptions A1 and A2** we analyse the testing task

$$H_0: f = f_o \quad \text{against} \quad H_1: f \in \mathcal{D} \cap (f_o + \mathcal{F}^{s|R} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho}). \quad (2.7)$$

Roughly speaking, in minimax testing one searches for the smallest  $\rho$  such that eq. (2.7) is still testable with small error probabilities. We measure the accuracy of a test  $\Delta: \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  by its maximal risk defined as the sum of the type I error probability and the maximal type II error probability over the  $\rho$ -separated alternative

$$\mathcal{R}(\Delta | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}^{s|R}, \rho^2) = \mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f_o}^n(\Delta = 1) + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D} \cap (f_o + \mathcal{F}^{s|R} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\geq \rho})} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(\Delta = 0).$$

A widely used approach consists in deriving a test statistic  $\hat{q}^2$  which estimates  $q^2(f - f_o)$  and forming a test given by

$$\Delta := \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{q}^2 \geq \tau\}}$$

for some suitable value  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . In this paper, the test statistic is inspired by the estimator proposed in Comte et al. (2025). Before proposing an estimator of  $q^2(f - f_o)$ , we introduce some notations and an additional assumption. For brevity, we write for  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\psi(x, t) := x^{c-1+2\pi it} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(x, t) := \psi(x, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi(Y, t)],$$

where evidently  $\mathbb{E}_g[\psi(Y, t)] = \mathcal{M}_c[g](t)$  and  $\Psi(Y, t)$  is centred.

**Assumption A3.**  $\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t) \neq 0$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi] \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(w)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

We first see that under **Assumptions A1 and A3** it holds that for any  $f \in \mathcal{D}$

$$\begin{aligned} q_k^2(f - f_o) &= \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}(\mathcal{M}_c[f] - \mathcal{M}_c[f_o])\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 \\ &= \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 - 2\langle \mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[f], \mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[f_o] \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[f_o]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and with the convolution theorem (c.f. eq. (2.2)) we get

$$\begin{aligned} q_k^2(f - f_o) &= \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[g]/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 \\ &\quad - 2\langle \mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[g]/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi], \mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi] \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Since  $f_o$  and  $\varphi$  are known, the third term of eq. (2.8) is known as well. For the second term, we introduce the following estimator:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}_k &:= \langle \mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\psi(Y_j, \cdot)/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi], \mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi] \rangle_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]}(t) |\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^{-2} \psi(Y_j, t) \overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g_o](t)} w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \end{aligned}$$

The first term of eq. (2.8) we estimate by

$$\hat{T}_k := \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{\substack{j \neq l \\ j, l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}} \int_{-k}^k \frac{\psi(Y_j, t) \psi(Y_l, -t)}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \tag{2.9}$$

Due to the independence of  $(Y_j)_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} q_k^2(f) &:= \mathbb{E}_g^n[\hat{T}_k] = \int_{-k}^k \frac{\mathbb{E}_g[\psi(Y_1, t)] \mathbb{E}_g[\psi(Y_2, -t)]}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \\ &= \int_{-k}^k |\mathcal{M}_c[f](t)|^2 w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, combining all three terms, the test statistic defined by

$$\hat{q}_k^2 := \hat{T}_k - 2\hat{S}_k + q_k^2(f_o). \tag{2.10}$$

gives an unbiased estimator of  $q_k^2(f - f_o)$ . Next, we derive bounds for the quantiles of the proposed test statistic, which are subsequently used to establish upper bounds of the radius of testing.

### 3 Bounds for the quantiles of the test statistic

In this section, we derive bounds for the quantiles of the test statistic  $\hat{q}_k^2$  defined in eq. (2.10). To define the critical value  $\tau_k(\alpha)$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  of  $\hat{q}_k^2$ , we first introduce some notation. We set  $L_\alpha := 1 - \log \alpha \geq 1$  and define for  $k \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\mathbf{v}_k := \int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^4} w^4(t) d\lambda(t), \quad (3.1)$$

$$\mathbf{m}_k := \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^4. \quad (3.2)$$

Due to [Assumption A3](#) both terms are well-defined and finite. More precisely, due to the assumption  $\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi] \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(w)$  we have that  $\mathbf{m}_k$  is finite. It immediately follows that for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  it holds  $\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi] \in \mathbb{L}^{2p}(w^{2p})$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{R}_+$  since

$$\int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^{2p}} w^{2p}(t) d\lambda(t) \leq \mathbf{m}_k^{p/2}(2k).$$

To show bounds for the quantiles of the test statistic we need additional moment assumptions.

**Assumption A4.** Let  $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1}) \cap \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$  and  $f_o \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$ .

It follows immediately from [Assumption A4](#) that  $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2(c-1)})$ . For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  use the notation  $x \vee y := \max\{x, y\}$  and  $x \wedge y := \min\{x, y\}$ . Then, we write

$$C_\varphi := \|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} / \|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2(c-1)})} \vee 1, \quad (3.3)$$

which is finite under [Assumptions A3 and A4](#). If  $h \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2(c-1)})$ , then due to [Lemma A.3](#) it holds under [Assumption A4](#) that  $h * \varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2(c-1)})$  and we denote

$$v_{h|\varphi} := \|h * \varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2(c-1)})} \vee 1.$$

Analogously, if in addition  $h \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$ , then  $h * \varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$  due to [Lemma A.3](#) and we write

$$\bar{v}_{h|\varphi} := \|h * \varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})} \vee 1. \quad (3.4)$$

Note that under [Assumption A4](#), the constants  $v_{f_o|\varphi}$  and  $\bar{v}_{f_o|\varphi}$  are finite. Finally, the critical value is given for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  as

$$\tau_k(\alpha) := \left( 18C_\varphi \bar{v}_{f_o|\varphi} + 69493 \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \frac{L_{\alpha/2}}{\alpha} \right) L_{\alpha/2}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} + 52v_{f_o|\varphi} C_\varphi L_{\alpha/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n}. \quad (3.5)$$

The key element to analyse the behaviour of the test statistic  $\hat{q}_k^2$  is the following decomposition:

$$\hat{q}_k^2 = U_k + 2W_k + q_k^2(f - f_o) \quad (3.6)$$

with the canonical U-statistic

$$U_k := \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{\substack{j_1 \neq j_2 \\ j_1, j_2 \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}} \int_{-k}^k \frac{\Psi(Y_{j_1}, t) \bar{\Psi}(Y_{j_2}, t)}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \quad (3.7)$$

and the centred linear statistic

$$W_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} \int_{-k}^k \frac{\Psi(Y_j, t)(\overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g]}(t) - \overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]}(t))}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \quad (3.8)$$

For the two following propositions, we apply results for the U-statistic and linear statistic, which are more technical and can be found in Section B. We first give a bound under the null hypothesis.

**Proposition 3.1** (*Bound for the quantiles of  $\hat{q}_k^2$  under the null hypothesis*). *Let Assumptions A1, A3 and A4 be satisfied and let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider the estimator  $\hat{q}_k^2$  and the threshold  $\tau_k(\alpha)$  defined in eq. (2.10) and eq. (3.5), respectively. Under the null hypothesis we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f_o}^n(\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau_k(\alpha)) \leq \alpha.$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* If  $f = f_o$  and, hence  $g = g_o$  and  $\mathcal{M}_c[g] = \mathcal{M}_c[g_o]$ , the decomposition eq. (3.6) simplifies to  $\hat{q}_k^2 = U_k$ . Due to Assumption A4, we have that  $f_o, \varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$  and the assumptions of Lemma B.4 given in Section B are satisfied for  $p = 2$ . Moreover, with  $\gamma = \alpha$  and using the notations in eq. (3.1) and eq. (3.2), we have that  $\tau^{U_k}(\gamma) = \tau_k(\alpha)$ . Thus, we immediately obtain the result from Lemma B.4.  $\square$

Let us continue with the bound of the quantiles of the test statistic under the alternative.

**Proposition 3.2** (*Bound for the quantiles of  $\hat{q}_k^2$  under the alternative*). *Let Assumptions A1, A3 and A4 be satisfied and let  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider the estimator  $\hat{q}_k^2$  defined in eq. (2.10). Under the alternative, if  $f \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$  satisfies for an arbitrary critical value  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$  the separation condition*

$$q_k^2(f - f_o) \geq 2\tau + 2 \left( 18C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + 138986 \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) L_{\beta/4}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{v_k}}{n} + 112C_{\varphi} v_{f|\varphi} \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{m_k}}{n}, \quad (3.9)$$

then, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(\hat{q}_k^2 < \tau) \leq \beta.$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.2.* Keeping the decomposition eq. (3.6) in mind, we control the deviations of the U-statistic  $U_k$  and the linear statistic  $W_k$  separately, applying Lemma B.4 and Lemma B.5, respectively. The assumptions of Lemma B.4 are satisfied with  $p = 2$ . Therefore, making use of  $\gamma = \beta/2$  and the notations of eq. (3.1) and eq. (3.2) we get for the quantile  $\tau^{U_k}(\beta/2)$  that

$$\tau^{U_k}(\beta/2) = \left( 18\bar{v}_{f|\varphi} C_{\varphi} + 138986 \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) L_{\beta/4}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{v_k}}{n} + 52C_{\varphi} v_{f|\varphi} L_{\beta/4} \frac{\sqrt{m_k}}{n}.$$

The event  $\Omega_U := \{U_k \leq -\tau^{U_k}(\beta/2)\}$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(\Omega_U) = \mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(-U_k \geq \tau^{U_k}(\beta/2)) \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \quad (3.10)$$



due to **Lemma B.4** and the usual symmetry argument. The assumptions of **Lemma B.5** are satisfied and with  $\gamma = \beta/2$  a quantile-bound of the linear statistic  $W_k$  is given by

$$\tau^{W_k}(\beta/2) = 2 \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k} C_\varphi \mathbf{v}_{f|\varphi}}{n \beta} + \frac{1}{4} q_k^2(f - f_o).$$

Define the event  $\Omega_W := \{W_k < -\tau^{W_k}(\beta/2)\}$ . Due to **Lemma B.5** we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(\Omega_W) = \mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(W_k < -\tau^{W_k}(\beta/2)) \leq \frac{\beta}{2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Further, using  $L_{\beta/4}, \frac{1}{\beta} \geq 1$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau^{U_k}(\beta/2) + 2\tau^{W_k}(\beta/2) \\ &= \left( 18\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi + 138986 \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) L_{\beta/4}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} + 52C_\varphi \mathbf{v}_{f|\varphi} L_{\beta/4} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n} + 4 \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k} C_\varphi \mathbf{v}_{f|\varphi}}{n \beta} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} q_k^2(f - f_o) \\ &\leq \left( 18\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi + 138986 \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) L_{\beta/4}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} + 56C_\varphi \mathbf{v}_{f|\varphi} \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n} + \frac{1}{2} q_k^2(f - f_o). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Reformulating the separation condition given in eq. (3.9), yields that

$$\begin{aligned} q_k^2(f - f_o) &\geq \tau + \left( 18C_\varphi \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{f|\varphi} + 138986 \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) L_{\beta/4}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} + 56C_\varphi \mathbf{v}_{f|\varphi} \frac{L_{\beta/4}}{\beta} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} q_k^2(f - f_o). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging eq. (3.12) into the last inequality, it follows that

$$q_k^2(f - f_o) \geq \tau + \tau^{U_k}(\beta/2) + 2\tau^{W_k}(\beta/2). \quad (3.13)$$

Thus, combining eqs. (3.10), (3.11) and (3.13) the decomposition given in eq. (3.6) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(\hat{q}_k^2 < \tau) &= \mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(\{\hat{q}_k^2 < \tau\} \cap \Omega_U) + \mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(\{\hat{q}_k^2 < \tau\} \cap \Omega_U^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(\Omega_U) + \mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(2W_k < \tau + \tau^{U_k}(\beta/2) - \hat{q}_k^2) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{2} + \mathbb{P}_{f,\varphi}^n(2W_k < -2\tau^{W_k}(\beta/2)) \\ &\leq \beta \end{aligned}$$

which shows the claim and completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4 Upper bound for the radius of testing

For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we use the test statistic  $\hat{q}_k^2$  defined in eq. (2.10) and the critical value  $\tau_k(\alpha)$  given in eq. (3.5) to define the test

$$\Delta_{k,\alpha} := \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau_k(\alpha)\}}. \quad (4.1)$$

From **Proposition 3.1** follows immediately that the test  $\Delta_{k,\alpha}$  is a level- $\alpha$ -test for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . To analyse its power over the alternative, we consider the regularity class  $\mathcal{F}^{s|R}$  defined in eq. (2.6) with regularity parameter  $s$  satisfying **Assumption A2** and  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . **Proposition 3.2** allows to characterize elements in  $\mathcal{F}^{s|R}$  for which  $\Delta_{k,\alpha}$  is powerful. Exploiting these results, we derive in this section an upper bound for the radius of testing of  $\Delta_{k,\alpha}$  in terms of  $\mathbf{v}_k$  and  $\mathbf{m}_k$  defined in eqs. (3.1) and (3.2), respectively, and the regularity parameter  $s$ . That is, define

$$\rho_{k,s}^2 := \rho_{k,s}^2(n) := \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} \vee \frac{1}{n} (\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}).$$

For the result on the upper bound of the radius of testing, we need that the additional moment assumption for the hypothesis (**Assumption A4**) also holds uniformly for the elements of the alternative. More precisely, we introduce for  $v \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $v \geq 1$  the set

$$\mathcal{D}^v := \{h \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)}) : \bar{v}_{h|\varphi} \leq v\}.$$

The constant  $\bar{v}_{h|\varphi}$  is defined in eq. (3.4) and finite for  $h \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$ . The following result gives a bound on the maximal risk of the proposed test.

**Proposition 4.1** (*Upper bound for the radius of testing of  $\Delta_{k,\gamma/2}$* ). *Under Assumptions A1 to A4, for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $d \in \mathbb{R}_+$  define*

$$A_\gamma^2 := R^2 + 140 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_\varphi \bar{v}_{f_o|\varphi} + 260 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_\varphi v + 833934 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{3/2}}{\gamma} d \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\eta_k^2 := \eta_k^2(n) := 1 \vee \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{dn}.$$

For all  $A \geq A_\gamma$  and  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq 2$  we have

$$\mathcal{R}(\Delta_{k,\gamma/2} | \mathcal{D}^v, \mathcal{F}^{s|R}, A^2 \rho_{k,s}^2 \cdot \eta_k^2) \leq \gamma.$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* The result follows from **Proposition 3.1** and **Proposition 3.2** with  $\alpha = \beta = \gamma/2$ ,  $\tau = \tau_k(\alpha)$ , and the definition of the maximal risk

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\Delta_{k,\gamma/2} | \mathcal{D}^v, \mathcal{F}^{s|R}, A^2 \rho_{k,s}^2 \cdot \eta_k^2) &= \mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f_o}^n(\Delta_{k,\gamma/2} = 1) \\ &\quad + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}^v \cap (f_o + \mathcal{F}^{s|R} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\geq A^2 \rho_{k,s}^2 \cdot \eta_k^2})} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(\Delta_{k,\gamma/2} = 0) \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{2} = \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Since **Assumptions A1, A3 and A4** are satisfied, we can apply **Proposition 3.1**. To conclude the proof, we need to check the assumptions of **Proposition 3.2**, that is, to verify eq. (3.9) for elements in the alternative  $f \in \mathcal{D}^v \cap (f_o + \mathcal{F}^{s|R} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\geq A^2 \rho_{k,s}^2 \cdot \eta_k^2})$ . More precisely, under **Assumptions A1 to A4** it remains to show

$$\begin{aligned} q_k^2(f - f_o) &\geq 2\tau_k(\gamma/2) + 2 \left( 18C_\varphi \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + 2 \cdot 138986 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) L_{\gamma/8}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} \\ &\quad + 2 \cdot 112C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Indeed, with [Assumption A2](#) and  $f - f_o \in \mathcal{F}^{s|R}$ , we bound the bias under the alternative. More precisely, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
q_k^2(f - f_o) - q_k^2(f - f_o) &= \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]^c}(\mathcal{M}_c[f] - \mathcal{M}_c[f_o])\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 \\
&= \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]^c}(\mathcal{M}_c[f] - \mathcal{M}_c[f_o])s/s\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 \\
&\leq \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]^c}/s\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2 \|s(\mathcal{M}_c[f] - \mathcal{M}_c[f_o])\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} R^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Consequently, we have for  $f - f_o \in \mathcal{F}^{s|R} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\geq A^2 \rho_{k,s}^2, \eta_k^2}$  that

$$q_k^2(f - f_o) \geq q_k^2(f - f_o) - \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} R^2 \geq A^2 \rho_{k,s}^2 \cdot \eta_k^2 - \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} R^2. \tag{4.5}$$

Let us upper bound the critical value  $\tau_k(\gamma/2)$ . Since  $L_\gamma = 1 - \log \gamma \geq 1$  for all  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $L_\gamma$  is increasing in  $\gamma$ , we also have that  $L_{\gamma/4}, L_{\gamma/4}^{1/2} \leq L_{\gamma/8}$ . Thus, it follows

$$L_{\gamma/4} L_{\gamma/4}^{1/2} \leq L_{\gamma/8}^{3/2}.$$

Additionally, because  $C_{\varphi} v_{f|\varphi} \leq C_{\varphi}^2 \bar{v}_{f|\varphi}$  we obtain for the critical value

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_k(\gamma/2) &= \left( 18C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + 138986 \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \frac{L_{\gamma/4}}{\gamma} \right) L_{\gamma/4}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} + 52v_{f|\varphi} C_{\varphi} L_{\gamma/4} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n} \\
&\leq \left( 18 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + 138986 \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{3/2}}{\gamma} \right) \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} + 52v_{f|\varphi} C_{\varphi} \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n} \\
&\leq \left( 70\bar{v}_{f|\varphi} C_{\varphi} \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} + 138986 \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{3/2}}{\gamma} \right) \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} \vee \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Using  $A \geq A_\gamma$  for  $A_\gamma$  defined in eq. (4.2) and  $d \eta_k^2 \geq \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n}$ , we get for eq. (4.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
q_k^2(f - f_o) &\geq \left( R^2 + 140 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + 260 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_{\varphi} v + 833934 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{3/2}}{\gamma} \eta_k^2 d \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left( \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} \vee \frac{1}{n} (\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}) \right) - \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} R^2 \\
&\geq \left( (2 \cdot 70) \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + (2 \cdot 18 + 2 \cdot 112) \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + (2 + 4) 138986 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{3/2}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{1}{n} (\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the calculation with the bound derived in eq. (4.6) for the critical value  $\tau_k(\gamma/2)$ , we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
q_k^2(f - f_o) &\geq 2\tau_k(\gamma/2) + 2 \left( 18C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + 2 \cdot 138986 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \right) L_{\gamma/8}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} \\
&\quad + 2 \cdot 112C_{\varphi} v_{f|\varphi} \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the separation condition given in eq. (4.3) and completes the proof.  $\square$

Let us introduce a dimension parameter that realizes an optimal bias-variance trade-off and the corresponding radius:

$$k_s^* := k_s^*(n) := \arg \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \rho_{k,s}^2(n) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{*,s}^2 := \rho_{*,s}^2(n) = \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \rho_{k,s}^2(n). \quad (4.7)$$

The next result follows immediately from [Proposition 4.1](#) and, hence, we omit the proof.

**Corollary 4.2.** *Under the assumptions of [Proposition 4.1](#) let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $A_\gamma$  as in eq. (4.2). For all  $A \geq A_\gamma$  and  $n \geq 2$  we have*

$$\mathcal{R}(\Delta_{k_s^*, \gamma/2} | \mathcal{D}^v, \mathcal{F}^{s|R}, A^2 \rho_{*,s}^2 \cdot \eta_{k_s^*}^2) \leq \gamma.$$

We note that [Corollary 4.2](#) derives  $\rho_{*,s}^2 \cdot \eta_{k_s^*}^2$  as an upper bound of the separation radius for any finite sample size  $n \geq 2$ . Typically,  $\eta_{k_s^*}^2$  is a deterioration which is asymptotically negligible. To be more precise, we study the asymptotic behaviour of this upper bound as the sample tends to infinity by determining the order of

$$\rho_{*,s}^2(n) = \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} \vee \frac{1}{n} (\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}) \right).$$

Following [Comte et al. \(2025\)](#), we consider different choices of regularity function  $s$ , the density function  $w^2$  and the order of the Mellin transform of the error density, which determine the order of  $\mathbf{v}_k$  and  $\mathbf{m}_k$ .

For two real-valued functions  $h_1, h_2: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we write  $h_1(t) \sim h_2(t)$  if there exist constants  $C, \tilde{C}$  such that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  we have  $h_1(t) \leq C h_2(t)$  and  $h_2(t) \leq \tilde{C} h_1(t)$ . We then call  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  of the same order. The class  $\mathcal{F}^{s|R}$  defined in eq. (2.6) covers the usual assumptions on the regularity of the unknown density  $f$ , i.e., ordinary and super smooth densities. More precisely, in the *ordinary smooth case* the regularity function  $s$  is of polynomial order, i.e.,  $s(t) \sim (1 + t^2)^{s/2}$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{F}^{s|R}$  corresponds to the Mellin-Sobolev space, see Definition 2.3.9 in [Brenner Miguel \(2023\)](#). In the *super smooth case*,  $s$  is assumed to be exponentially increasing, i.e.,  $s(t) \sim \exp(|t|^s)$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

Recall that the quadratic functional  $q^2(h)$  is finite for all elements  $h$  in the nonparametric class of functions  $\mathcal{F}^{s|R}$  if  $w/s$  is bounded ([Assumption A2](#) (ii)). Convergence of  $w/s$  against zero as  $|t| \rightarrow \infty$  gives the rate for the bias term. Furthermore, we restrict ourselves to the case that  $w^2(t) \sim (1 + t^2)^a$  for  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . This includes the examples given in [Illustration 2.1](#) with the following choices of  $a$ .

- (i) In the case  $a = 0$  we have  $w(t) = 1$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Recall that in this case  $q^2(f)$  equals a (weighted)  $\mathbb{L}_+^2$ -norm of the density  $f$  itself.
- (ii) The case  $a = -1$  covers quadratic functional estimation of the survival function  $S_f$  of  $X$ , more precisely, we have  $w^2(t) = \frac{1}{(c-1)^2 + 4\pi t^2}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (iii) The case  $a = \beta \in \mathbb{N}$  covers quadratic functionals of derivatives  $D^\beta[f]$  of the density  $f$ .

Note that, only in case of ordinary smoothness of the unknown density  $f$ , [Assumption A2](#) (ii) imposes the additional condition  $s > a$  on the parameters.

We consider in the following two cases for the behaviour of the Mellin transform of the error density  $\varphi$ . We either assume for some decay parameter  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+$  its *ordinary smoothness*, i.e.,  $|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)| \sim (1 + t^2)^{-\sigma/2}$ ; or its *super smoothness*, i.e.,  $|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)| \sim \exp(-|t|^\sigma)$ . Under these configurations standard calculations allow to derive the corresponding rates given in Table 1.

For the case that both densities are ordinary smooth (first line), we assume that  $\sigma + a > -\frac{1}{4}$ . Let us remark that in the case of  $\sigma + a = -\frac{1}{4}$  the term  $\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k} = \sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}$  is of order  $\sqrt{\log k}$  and the corresponding rate of testing is of order  $\sqrt{\log n}/n$ . If the density function  $w$  is even of smaller order, i.e.,  $\sigma + a < -\frac{1}{4}$ , it holds that  $\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k} \sim 1$  and we achieve a parametric rate  $n^{-1}$ . If the unknown density function is ordinary smooth and the error density is super smooth (second line in Table 1), then, the optimal parameter  $k_s^*$  does not depend on the regularity parameter  $s$ . Hence, in this case the test  $\Delta_{k_s^*}$  is automatically adaptive. We shall emphasize that in all three examples the factor

$$\eta_{k_s^*}^2 = 1 \vee \frac{\sqrt{2k_s^*}}{dn}$$

is of order one and, thus, the order of the radius of testing is indeed equal to the order of  $\rho_{*,s}^2(n)$ .

$s(t)$	$ \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t) $	$k_s^*$	$\rho_{*,s}^2(n)$
$(1+t^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}$	$(1+t^2)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$	$n^{\frac{2}{4s+4\sigma+1}}$	$n^{-\frac{4(s-a)}{4s+4\sigma+1}}$
$(1+t^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}$	$\exp(- t ^\sigma)$	$(\log n)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}$	$(\log n)^{-\frac{2(s-a)}{\sigma}}$
$\exp( t ^s)$	$(1+t^2)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$	$(\log n)^{\frac{1}{s}}$	$\frac{1}{n}(\log n)^{\frac{2(\sigma+a)+1/2}{s}}$

Table 1: Order of the radius of testing for  $w^2(t) \sim (1+t^2)^a$ .

## 5 Testing radius of a max-test

The performance of the test  $\Delta_{k,\gamma/2}$  in [Proposition 4.1](#) relies on the choice of the dimension parameter  $k$  and its optimal selection in turn depends generally on the alternative class  $\mathcal{F}^{s|R}$ , see Table 1. A testing procedure is called adaptive, i.e., assumption-free, if it performs optimally for a wide range of alternatives. In this section, we therefore propose a data-driven testing procedure by aggregating the tests derived in the last section over various dimension parameters  $k$  and discuss assumptions under which it performs (nearly) adaptive. In Section 5.1, we first introduce the testing procedure and then derive in Section 5.2 an upper bound for its radius of testing.

### 5.1 Data-driven procedure via Bonferroni aggregation

We first recapitulate the main ideas of the Bonferroni aggregation. Let  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  be a finite collection of dimension parameters. Recall that by [Proposition 3.1](#) for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  each test in the following family

$$(\Delta_{k,\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|})_{k \in \mathcal{K}} := (\mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau_k(\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|)\}})_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$$

has level  $\alpha/|\mathcal{K}| \in (0, 1)$ . We consider the max-test

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha} := \mathbb{1}_{\{\zeta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha} > 0\}} \quad \text{with} \quad \zeta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha} = \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \Delta_{k,\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|} \quad (5.1)$$

i.e. the test rejects the null hypothesis as soon as one of the tests in the collection does. Under the null hypothesis, we bound the type I error probability of the max-test by the sum of the error probabilities of the individual tests

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f_0}^n(\Delta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha} = 1) = \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f_0}^n(\zeta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha} > 0) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f_0}^n(\Delta_{k,\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|} = 1) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{\alpha}{|\mathcal{K}|} = \alpha. \quad (5.2)$$

Hence,  $\Delta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha}$  is a level- $\alpha$ -test. Under the alternative the type II error probability is bounded by the minimum of the error probabilities of the individual tests, i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(\Delta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha} = 0) = \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(\zeta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha} \leq 0) \leq \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(\Delta_{k,\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|} = 0). \quad (5.3)$$

Therefore,  $\Delta_{\mathcal{K},\alpha}$  has the maximal power achievable by a test in the collection. The bounds eq. (5.2) and eq. (5.3) have opposing effects on the choice of the collection  $\mathcal{K}$ . On the one hand, it should be as small as possible to keep the type I error probability small. On the other hand, it must be large enough to approximate an optimal dimension parameter for a wide range of alternative classes that we want to adapt to. In this work we consider a classical Bonferroni choice of an error level  $\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|$ . For other aggregation choices, e.g. Monte Carlo quantile and Monte Carlo threshold method, we refer to Baraud et al. (2003) and Fromont and Laurent (2006). Although the Bonferroni choice is a more conservative method, its optimality is often shown, which is then also shared with the other methods.

Applying the Bonferroni choice to the level  $\alpha/|\mathcal{K}| \in (0, 1)$ , the critical value in eq. (3.5) writes

$$\tau_k(\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|) := \left( 18C_\varphi \bar{v}_{f_o|\varphi} + 69493 \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n} \frac{L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|} |\mathcal{K}|}{\alpha} \right) L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{v_k}}{n} + 52v_{f_o|\varphi} C_\varphi L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|} \frac{\sqrt{m_k}}{n}.$$

We observe that the critical value and hence the separation condition eq. (3.9) in **Proposition 3.2** increases at least by a factor  $|\mathcal{K}|$  leading possibly to a deterioration of the radius of testing by this factor. This is known to be suboptimal. To find a sharper bound on the critical value, we impose in this section a stronger moment condition under the null hypothesis. That is, instead of **Assumption A4**, we assume in the results of this section the following.

**Assumption A5.** For  $p \geq 2$  let  $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1}) \cap \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})$  and  $f_o \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})$ .

We shall emphasize that the parameter  $p$  given in **Assumption A5** is known under the null hypothesis since the error density is known. However, under **Assumption A5**, it follows that  $f_o * \varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})$  by **Lemma A.3** and we write shortly,

$$v_{f_o|\varphi}(p) := \|f_o * \varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})} \vee 1.$$

Finally, for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  we introduce an updated critical value

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{k|\alpha} := & \left( 18C_\varphi v_{f_o|\varphi}(p) + 69493 \frac{\sqrt{2k} |\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)} L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|}^2}{n \alpha} \right) L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{v_k}}{n} \\ & + 52v_{f_o|\varphi} C_\varphi L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|} \frac{\sqrt{m_k}}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Below we generalize **Proposition 3.1** to the updated critical value and, therewith, we show that each test in the following family

$$(\Delta_{k|\alpha})_{k \in \mathcal{K}} := (\mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau_{k|\alpha}\}})_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$$

has level  $\alpha/|\mathcal{K}| \in (0, 1)$ . Afterwards, we consider the updated max-test

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{K}|\alpha} := \mathbb{1}_{\{\zeta_{\mathcal{K}|\alpha} > 0\}} \quad \text{with} \quad \zeta_{\mathcal{K}|\alpha} = \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \Delta_{k|\alpha} \quad (5.5)$$

and derive an upper bound of its radius of testing.

**Proposition 5.1** (*Bound for the quantiles of  $\hat{q}_k^2$  under the null hypothesis*). *Let Assumptions A1, A3 and A5 be satisfied and let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  be finite. Consider the estimator  $\hat{q}_k^2$  and the threshold  $\tau_{k|\alpha}$  defined in eq. (2.10) and eq. (5.4), respectively. Under the null hypothesis we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f_0}^n(\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau_{k|\alpha}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{|\mathcal{K}|}.$$

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* The proof follows along the same lines as the proof of Proposition 3.1. If  $f = f_0$  and, hence  $g = g_0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_c[g] = \mathcal{M}_c[g_0]$ , the decomposition eq. (3.6) simplifies to  $\hat{q}_k^2 = U_k$ . Due to Assumption A5, we have that  $f_0, \varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})$  and the assumptions of Lemma B.4 are satisfied. We intend to apply Lemma B.4 with  $\gamma = \alpha/|\mathcal{K}|$ . Moreover, using the notations in eq. (3.1) and eq. (3.2) and the fact that for  $p \geq 2$  it holds that  $\alpha^{-1/(p-1)} \leq \alpha^{-1}$  and  $L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|}^{2-1/(p-1)} \leq L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|}^2$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{U_k}(\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|) &= \left( 18v_{f_0|\varphi}(p)C_\varphi + 69493 \frac{\sqrt{2k}|\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)}}{n\alpha^{1/(p-1)}} L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|}^{2-1/(p-1)} \right) \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}}{n} L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + 52C_\varphi v_{f_0|\varphi} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}}{n} L_{\alpha/2|\mathcal{K}|} \leq \tau_{k|\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain immediately from Lemma B.4 that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f_0}^n(\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau_{k|\alpha}) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f_0}^n(\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau^{U_k}(\alpha/|\mathcal{K}|)) \leq \frac{\alpha}{|\mathcal{K}|}.$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

In summary, due to Proposition 5.1 and eq. (5.2), for any finite collection  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{N}$  and any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  the max-test given in eq. (5.5) is of level  $\alpha$ . In the next section, we derive an upper bound for its radius of testing.

## 5.2 Testing radius of the max-test

Denote by  $\mathcal{S}$  the set of regularity functions satisfying Assumption A2. The set  $\mathcal{S}$  characterizes the collection of alternatives  $\{\mathcal{F}^{s|R} : s \in \mathcal{S}\}$  for which we analyse the power of the testing procedure simultaneously. The max-test only aggregates over a finite set  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ . We define the minimal achievable radius of testing for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  over the set  $\mathcal{K}$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$  as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(x) := \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \rho_{k,s}^2(x) \quad \text{with} \quad \rho_{k,s}^2(x) := \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} \vee \frac{1}{x} (\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}).$$

Since  $\rho_{*,s}^2 = \rho_{k_s^*,s}^2(n)$  is defined in eq. (4.7) as the minimum taken over  $\mathbb{N}$  instead of  $\mathcal{K}$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we always have  $\rho_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n) \geq \rho_{\mathbb{N},s}^2(n) = \rho_{*,s}^2$  and evidently  $\rho_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n) = \rho_{\mathbb{N},s}^2(n)$  whenever  $k_s^* \in \mathcal{K}$ . Let us introduce the factor  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}} := (1 + \log |\mathcal{K}|)^{-1/2} \in (0, 1)$ . For each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $k \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$\begin{aligned} r_{k,s}^2 &:= r_{k,s}^2(n) := \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} \vee \frac{1}{n} (\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \vee \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-2} \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}) \\ k_{\mathcal{K},s} &:= k_{\mathcal{K},s}(n) := \arg \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} r_{k,s}^2(n) \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

$$r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 := r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n) := \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} r_{k,s}^2(n). \tag{5.7}$$



Evidently, since  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}} \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$\rho_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(\delta_{\mathcal{K}}n) \leq r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^2n).$$

Provided that the collection  $\mathcal{K}$  is chosen such that  $\rho_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(\delta_{\mathcal{K}}n) \asymp \rho_{\mathbb{N},s}^2(\delta_{\mathcal{K}})$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^2n) \asymp \rho_{\mathbb{N},s}^2(\delta_{\mathcal{K}}n)$  in the best case the effective sample size is  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}}n$  and in the worst case  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^2n$ . Consequently,  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}}$  is also called adaptive factor.

In the next proposition we show for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , by applying **Propositions** 3.2 and 5.1 with  $\alpha = \beta = \gamma/2$ , that both the type I and maximal type II error probability of the updated max-test  $\Delta_{\mathcal{K}|\gamma/2}$  are bounded by  $\gamma/2$  and thus their sum is bounded by  $\gamma$ .

**Proposition 5.2** (*Uniform radius of testing over regularity class  $\mathcal{S}$* ). *Let Assumptions A1, A3 and A5 be satisfied. For  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $d \in \mathbb{R}, d \geq 1$  define*

$$A_{\gamma}^2 := R^2 + 140 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_{\varphi} v_{f_0|\varphi}(p) + 260 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_{\varphi} v + 833934 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{5/2}}{\gamma} d.$$

For  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  finite and  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $k_{\mathcal{K},s} \in \mathcal{K}$  as defined in eq. (5.6) set

$$\eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 := \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n) := 1 \vee \frac{\sqrt{2k_{\mathcal{K},s}} |\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)}}{d n \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^4}. \quad (5.8)$$

Then,  $r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2$  as given in eq. (5.7) satisfies for all  $A \geq A_{\gamma}$  that

$$\mathcal{R}(\Delta_{\mathcal{K}|\gamma/2} | \mathcal{D}^v, \mathcal{F}^{s|R}, A^2 r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2) \leq \gamma.$$

*Proof of Proposition 5.2.* Under the null hypothesis the claim follows for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  from eq. (5.2) together with **Proposition** 5.1 and  $\alpha = \gamma/2$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f_0}^n(\Delta_{\mathcal{K}|\gamma/2} = 1) = \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f_0}^n(\hat{q}_k^2 \geq \tau_{k|\gamma/2}) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2|\mathcal{K}|}$$

for all  $k \in \mathcal{K}$ , and  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{\gamma}{2|\mathcal{K}|} = \gamma/2$ . Thus, it holds

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f_0}^n(\Delta_{\mathcal{K}|\gamma/2} = 1) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

If  $f \in \mathcal{D}^v$  satisfies the separation condition eq. (3.9) for  $\tau = \tau_{k^\circ|\gamma/2}$  for some  $k^\circ \in \mathcal{K}$ , then, the assumptions of **Proposition** 3.2 are fulfilled with  $\beta = \gamma/2$  and it holds with eq. (5.3) that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(\Delta_{\mathcal{K}|\gamma/2} = 0) \leq \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(\Delta_{k|\gamma/2} = 0) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(\Delta_{k^\circ|\gamma/2} = 0) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

Consequently, the claim of the proposition follows, if for every element of the alternative, that is,  $f \in \mathcal{D}^v$  with  $f - f_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{s|R}$  and  $q^2(f - f_0) \geq A^2 r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2$  for some  $A^2 \geq A_{\gamma}^2$ , the separation condition eq. (3.9) is satisfied for  $\tau = \tau_{k^\circ|\gamma/2}$  and  $k^\circ := k_{\mathcal{K},s} \in \mathcal{K}$  as defined in eq. (5.6). Then, rewriting the separation condition eq. (3.9), it remains to show that

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k^\circ}^2(f - f_0) &\geq 2\tau_{k^\circ|\gamma/2} + 2 \left( 18C_{\varphi} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} + 2 \cdot 138986 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{2k^\circ}}{n} \right) L_{\gamma/8}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_{k^\circ}}}{n} \\ &\quad + 2 \cdot 112C_{\varphi} v_{f|\varphi} \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_{k^\circ}}}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$



Since  $f - f_o \in \mathcal{F}^{s|R}$ , we have analogously to eq. (4.4)

$$q^2(f - f_o) - q_{k^\circ}^2(f - f_o) \leq \frac{w^2(k^\circ)}{s^2(k^\circ)} R^2$$

and, thus, exploiting  $q^2(f - f_o) \geq A_\gamma^2 r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2$  we get

$$q_{k^\circ}^2(f - f_o) \geq q^2(f - f_o) - \frac{w^2(k^\circ)}{s^2(k^\circ)} R^2 \geq A_\gamma^2 r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 - \frac{w^2(k^\circ)}{s^2(k^\circ)} R^2. \quad (5.10)$$

Using  $L_{\gamma/4} \geq 1$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\gamma/(4|\mathcal{K}|)} &= 1 - \log(\gamma/(4|\mathcal{K}|)) = 1 - \log(\gamma/4) + \log(|\mathcal{K}|) \\ &\leq (1 - \log(\gamma/4))(1 + \log(|\mathcal{K}|)) = L_{\gamma/4} \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, due to  $p \geq 2$  it holds  $2^{1/(p-1)} \leq 2$ ,

$$\frac{L_{\gamma/4}^2 L_{\gamma/4}^{1/2}}{\gamma^{1/(p-1)}} \leq \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{5/2}}{\gamma}.$$

Also, we have  $v_{f_o|\varphi} \leq v_{f_o|\varphi}(p)$ . Thus, we obtain for the critical value

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{k^\circ|\gamma/2} &= \left( 18C_\varphi v_{f_o|\varphi}(p) + 2 \cdot 69493 \frac{\sqrt{2k^\circ} |\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)} L_{\gamma/4}^2}{n \gamma} \right) L_{\gamma/4}^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{v_{k^\circ}}}{n} \\ &\quad + 52v_{f_o|\varphi} C_\varphi L_{\gamma/4} \frac{\sqrt{m_{k^\circ}}}{n} \\ &\leq \left( 18 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_\varphi v_{f_o|\varphi}(p) + 138986 \frac{\sqrt{2k^\circ} |\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)} L_{\gamma/8}^{5/2}}{n \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^4 \gamma} \right) \frac{\sqrt{v_{k^\circ}}}{\delta_{\mathcal{K}} n} \\ &\quad + 52v_{f_o|\varphi} C_\varphi \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{m_{k^\circ}}}{n \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^2} \\ &\leq \left( 70 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_\varphi v_{f_o|\varphi}(p) + 138986 \frac{\sqrt{2k^\circ} |\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)} L_{\gamma/8}^{5/2}}{n \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^4 \gamma} \right) \frac{\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1} \sqrt{v_{k^\circ}} \vee \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-2} \sqrt{m_{k^\circ}}}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Inserting in eq. (5.10) the definition of  $A_\gamma$  and using that  $r_{\mathcal{K},s} = r_{k^\circ,s}$  and  $\eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 \geq 1$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k^\circ}^2(f - f_o) &\geq (R^2 + 140 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_\varphi v_{f_o|\varphi}(p) + 260 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_\varphi v + 833934 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{5/2}}{\gamma} d \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2) \\ &\quad \cdot \left( \frac{w^2(k^\circ)}{s^2(k^\circ)} \vee \frac{1}{n} (\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1} \sqrt{v_{k^\circ}} \vee \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-2} \sqrt{m_{k^\circ}}) \right) - \frac{w^2(k^\circ)}{s^2(k^\circ)} R^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $v \geq \bar{v}_{f|\varphi}$  for  $f \in \mathcal{D}^v$  and  $\frac{\sqrt{2k^\circ} |\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)}}{\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^4 n} \leq d \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2$  it follows

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k^\circ}^2(f - f_o) &\geq \left( (2 \cdot 70) \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} C_\varphi v_{f_o|\varphi}(p) + (2 \cdot 18 + 2 \cdot 112) \frac{L_{\gamma/8}}{\gamma} \bar{v}_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2 + 4) 138986 \frac{L_{\gamma/8}^{5/2}}{\gamma} \frac{\sqrt{2k^\circ} |\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)}}{\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^4 n} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{n} (\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1} \sqrt{v_{k^\circ}} \vee \delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-2} \sqrt{m_{k^\circ}}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the lower bound of the quantile  $\tau_{k^\circ|\gamma/2}$  derived in eq. (5.11),  $\frac{|\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)}}{\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^4} \geq 1$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}} \in (0, 1)$  we obtain eq. (5.9) and this completes the proof.  $\square$

Let us remark that **Proposition 5.2** yields  $r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2 \cdot \eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2$  as an upper bound for the radius of testing for any finite sample size  $n \geq 2$ . Similarly, to **Corollary 4.2** the term  $\eta_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n)$  is a deterioration which is typically asymptotically negligible as  $n$  tends to infinity for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Before establishing in which cases this is fulfilled, we first discuss the rate  $r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n)$  and the impact of its deviations from  $\rho_{*,s}^2(n)$  as well as choices for the collection  $\mathcal{K}$ .

**Naive choice of  $\mathcal{K}$**  For  $r_{\mathcal{K},s}^2(n)$ , we minimize over the collection  $\mathcal{K}$  instead of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Ideally,  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is chosen such that its elements approximate the optimal parameter  $k_s^*$  given in eq. (4.7) sufficiently well for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . For the examples considered in Section 4, we have that  $k_s^* \leq n^2$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough, refer to Table 1. Hence, a naive choice is  $\mathcal{K}_o := \llbracket n^2 \rrbracket$  with  $|\mathcal{K}_o| = n^2$ , which yields a factor  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}_o}^{-1} = (1 + \log |\mathcal{K}_o|)^{1/2}$  of order  $(\log n)^{1/2}$ . Denote here  $k_o := k_{\mathcal{K}_o,s}(n)$  and

$$V_{\mathcal{K}_o,s}(n) := \frac{1}{n} \left( \delta_{\mathcal{K}_o}^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbf{v}_{k_o}} \vee \delta_{\mathcal{K}_o}^{-2} \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_{k_o}} \right).$$

The resulting rates for the examples presented in Section 4 are given in Table 2. Further assume from now on that  $\sigma + a > -\frac{1}{4}$  for the (o.s.-o.s.) case (first line). Note that in the example of both densities to be ordinarily smooth (first line) and the case of super smoothness of  $s$  and ordinary smoothness of the error density (third line), the rate worsens by a logarithmic factor, while the case of an ordinary smooth regularity  $s$  and super smoothness of the error density (second line), the rate stays the same as in the non-adaptive case, see Table 1. Consequently, we will not consider this case any further in this section. In the fourth column  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$  is some constant depending on  $a$  and  $\sigma$ . However, the exponential term dominates.

$s(t)$	$ \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t) $	$\frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)}$	$V_{\mathcal{K}_o,s}(n)$	$k_o = k_{\mathcal{K}_o,s}(n)$	$r_{\mathcal{K}_o,s}^2(n)$
$(1+t^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}$	$(1+t^2)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$	$k^{-2(s-a)}$	$\frac{\log n}{n} k_o^{2(\sigma+a)+\frac{1}{2}}$	$\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)^{\frac{2}{4s+4\sigma+1}}$	$\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)^{\frac{-4(s-a)}{4s+4\sigma+1}}$
$(1+t^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}$	$\exp(- t ^\sigma)$	$k^{-2(s-a)}$	$\frac{n}{\log n} k_o^\kappa \exp(2k_o^\sigma)$	$(\log n)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}$	$(\log n)^{-\frac{2(s-a)}{\sigma}}$
$\exp( t ^s)$	$(1+t^2)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$	$\exp(2k^s)$	$\frac{n}{\log n} k_o^{2(\sigma+a)+\frac{1}{2}}$	$(\log n)^{\frac{1}{s}}$	$\frac{\log(n)}{n} (\log n)^{\frac{2(\sigma+a)+1/2}{s}}$

Table 2: Order of the radius of testing for  $w^2(t) \sim (1+t^2)^a$ .

**Optimized choice of  $\mathcal{K}$**  In most cases, a finer grid than  $\mathcal{K} = \llbracket n^2 \rrbracket$  approximates the minimization over  $\mathbb{N}$  well enough. More precisely, we consider a minimization over a geometric grid

$$\mathcal{K}_g := \{1\} \cup \{2^j, j \in \llbracket \log(n^2) \rrbracket\}.$$

Choosing  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_g$  results in an adaptive factor  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}_g}^{-1}$  of order  $(\log \log n)^{1/2}$ . Denote

$$r_{\mathcal{K}_g,1}^2(n) := \arg \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}_g} \left( \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} \vee \frac{1}{n} \delta_{\mathcal{K}_g}^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k} \right),$$

$$r_{\mathcal{K}_g,2}^2(n) := \arg \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}_g} \left( \frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)} \vee \frac{1}{n} \delta_{\mathcal{K}_g}^{-2} \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k} \right).$$

Then, it holds that  $r_{\mathcal{K}_g, s}^2(n) = r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 1}^2(n) \vee r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 2}^2(n)$ , by Lemma A.2.1 in Schluttenhofer (2020), since  $\frac{w^2(k)}{s^2(k)}$  is by [Assumption A2](#) non-increasing and both  $\frac{1}{n}\delta_{\mathcal{K}_g}^{-1}\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_k}$  and  $\frac{1}{n}\delta_{\mathcal{K}_g}^{-2}\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_k}$  are non-decreasing in  $k$ . Table 3 gives for  $\mathcal{K}_g$  the order of both  $r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 1}^2(n)$  and  $r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 2}^2(n)$ , for the case that the Mellin transform of the error density is ordinarily smooth and the density  $f$  ordinarily smooth (first line) or super smooth (second line).

$s(t)$	$ \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t) $	$r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 1}^2(n)$	$r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 2}^2(n)$
$(1+t^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}$	$(1+t^2)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$	$\left(\frac{n}{(\log \log n)^{1/2}}\right)^{-\frac{4(s-a)}{4s+4\sigma+1}}$	$\left(\frac{n}{\log \log n}\right)^{-\frac{4(s-a)}{4s+4\sigma}}$
$\exp( t ^s)$	$(1+t^2)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$	$\frac{(\log \log n)^{1/2}}{n}(\log n)^{\frac{2(\sigma+a)+1/2}{s}}$	$\frac{\log \log n}{n}(\log n)^{\frac{2(\sigma+a)}{s}}$

Table 3: Order of the radius of testing  $w^2(t) \sim (1+t^2)^a$ .

Note, that  $r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 2}^2(n)$  is asymptotically negligible compared with  $r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 1}^2(n)$ . Hence, the upper bound in [Proposition 5.2](#) asymptotically reduces to  $r_{\mathcal{K}_g, 1}^2(n)$  for both the first and the third line. If the unknown density is super smooth and the error density is ordinary smooth, the smaller geometric collection

$$\mathcal{K}_m = \{1\} \cup \{2^j, j \in \llbracket m^{-1} \log \log n \rrbracket\},$$

for  $m > 0$  is still sufficient. Then, the adaptive factor becomes of order  $(\log \log \log n)^{1/2}$ . The corresponding rates are given in Table 4. Again, the term  $r_{\mathcal{K}_m, 2}^2(n)$  is asymptotically negligible compared with  $r_{\mathcal{K}_m, 1}^2(n)$  and the upper bound in [Proposition 5.2](#) asymptotically reduces to  $r_{\mathcal{K}_m, 1}^2(n)$ .

$s(t)$	$ \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t) $	$r_{\mathcal{K}_m, 1}^2(n)$	$r_{\mathcal{K}_m, 2}^2(n)$
$\exp( t ^s)$	$(1+t^2)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$	$\frac{(\log \log \log n)^{1/2}}{n}(\log n)^{\frac{2(\sigma+a)+1/2}{s}}$	$\frac{\log \log \log n}{n}(\log n)^{\frac{2(\sigma+a)}{s}}$

Table 4: Order of the radius of testing  $w^2(t) \sim (1+t^2)^a$ .

For more details on the derivation of the rates in Tables 3 and 4, we refer to the calculations of Illustration 4.3.6. in Schluttenhofer (2020), where analogous rates are calculated for a circular convolution model.

**Order of factor  $\eta_{\mathcal{K}|n}^2$**  Let us discuss under which assumptions the factor  $\eta_{\mathcal{K}|n}^2$  is of order one for the given examples such that  $r_{\mathcal{K}, s}^2(n)$  describes indeed the order of the radius of testing. First note that in all discussed collections it holds  $|\mathcal{K}| \leq n^2$  and thus  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-4} \leq (\log n)^2$ . Let us start with the case that the Mellin transform of the error density is ordinarily smooth and the density  $f$  super smooth (second line of Table 2). In this case, it holds that

$$\frac{\sqrt{2k_{\mathcal{K}, s}(n)}|\mathcal{K}|^{1/(p-1)}}{dn\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^4} \lesssim \frac{n^{\frac{1}{4s+4\sigma+1}}n^{\frac{2}{(p-1)}}}{n(\log n)^{-2}}.$$

This is of order less or equal to one whenever

$$\frac{2}{p-1} - 1 + \frac{1}{4s+4\sigma+1} < 0.$$

For example, if  $\frac{1}{4} < \sigma + s$  and  $p \geq 5$ , this is satisfied. Consequently, if the regularity parameters  $\sigma$  and  $s$  are sufficiently large and the moment condition [Assumption A5](#) is satisfied for  $\varphi$  and  $f_o$ , then the parameter  $\eta_{\mathcal{K}|n}^2$  is of order one. For the other two examples, line one and three of Table 2, we have that  $\sqrt{k_{\mathcal{K},s}(n)}$  is of logarithmic order in  $n$ , and, consequently,  $p \geq 5$  is sufficient for  $\eta_{\mathcal{K}|n}^2 \sim 1$  to hold, as well. That is, the radius of testing is of order as given in Tables 2 to 4, depending on the choice of  $\mathcal{K}$ .

## 6 Simulation study

In this section, we illustrate the behaviour of the test  $\Delta_{k,\alpha}$  presented in eq. (4.1) and the data-driven max-test  $\Delta_{\mathcal{K}|\alpha}$  defined in eq. (5.5).

To do so we consider as null hypothesis the case of an super-smooth null hypothesis density and ordinarily smooth error density  $\varphi$ . Specifically, we set the null hypothesis to be log-normally distributed with parameters  $\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 1$ , i.e., for  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$f_o(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi x^2}} \exp(-\log(x)^2/2)$$

and  $U$  being Pareto-distributed, i.e.

$$\varphi(x) = \mathbb{1}_{(1,\infty)}(x)x^{-2}.$$

For the random variable  $X$  we look both at the case that the null hypothesis is satisfied, i.e.,  $f = f_o$ , and, at the case where the density of  $X$  belongs to the alternative. More precisely, we consider for  $X$  the two cases

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &= f_o(x), \\ f_2(x) &= 2x\mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $c = 0.5$ , the corresponding Mellin-transforms are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}[f_1](t) &= 2/(1.5 + 2\pi it), \\ \mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}[f_2](t) &= \exp((-0.5 + 2\pi it)^2/2), \\ \mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}[\varphi](t) &= (1.5 - 2\pi it)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We refer again to Brenner Miguel (2023) for more details on Mellin transforms. Let  $w(t) = 1$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . The separation of the density to the null hypothesis is obviously zero for  $f_1$ , that is  $q^2(f_1 - f_o) = 0$ . For the second density  $f_2$  we have  $q^2(f_2 - f_o) = 0.5$ .


Below, we show the results of our simulation study in Figure 1 for the first example,  $f = f_1$ , and in Figure 2 for second example,  $f = f_2$ . The boxplots of the values of the test statistic  $\hat{q}_k^2$  are depicted over 50 iterations for  $k \in \{0.5, 0.6, \dots, 1.4\}$  and  $n \in \{100, 500\}$ . The examples were chosen such that the densities and their Mellin transforms have a simple representation. However, the bias is for  $k \leq 1.4$  already too small to see variation in the estimates. Minimizing over a subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ , we would always choose  $k = 1$  for the given sample sizes. Only immensely higher sample sizes would lead to a different output. Thus, we rescaled the set of dimension parameters on the interval  $[0.5, 1.4]$ .

In both Figures 1 and 2, the triangles indicate different estimates for  $\alpha$ -quantiles for  $\alpha = 0.1$ . The dark blue triangle indicates the quantile  $\tau_k(0.1)$  proposed in eq. (4.1) and the light blue one the corresponding quantile  $\tau_{k|0.1}$  for the max-test defined in eq. (5.4) for  $\mathcal{K} = \{0.5, 0.6, \dots, 1.4\}$ .


Note that since  $L_{\gamma/(4|\mathcal{K}|)} \leq L_{\gamma/4}\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-2}$  (see proof of [Proposition 5.2](#)), these theoretical quantiles differ by  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1} = (1 + \log(10))^{1/2} \approx 1.82$  up to constants. In dark brown, the empirical 0.1-quantiles under the null hypothesis are indicated. The light brown triangles give the empirical quantiles multiplied by the factor  $\delta_{\mathcal{K}}^{-1}$  to give an empirical quantile for the max-test. The numbers in brackets in the legend give the rejection rate of the corresponding max-tests for each example.

As already mentioned,  $n = \{100, 500\}$  are relatively small sample sizes and the bias is relatively small compared to the variance. Consequently, we decide to use a value equal to 0.6 for the constants of both  $\tau_k(0.1)$  and  $\tau_{k|0.1}$ . The effect of this can be seen in the boundaries of the interval considered for parameter  $k$ : Under the null hypothesis in Figure 1 we note that the test does not adhere to the significance level of 0.1 at the boundaries. Choosing the theoretical constants instead, the test would always reject for these examples.

However, close to  $k = 1$  the theoretical quantiles appear to match the empirical quantiles. Looking at the alternative in Figure 2, the separation appears to be large enough such that the test has high power already for a sample size of  $n = 500$ .




(a) Example 1,  $n = 100$




(b) Example 1,  $n = 500$

Figure 1: The boxplots represent the values of  $\hat{q}_k^2$  for  $f = f_1$  over 50 iterations. The horizontal lines indicate  $q^2 = 0$ . The triangles indicate different estimates for 0.1-quantiles. The numbers given in the legend indicate the rejection rate of the corresponding test.



(a) Example 2,  $n = 100$



(b) Example 2,  $n = 500$

Figure 2: The boxplots represent the values of  $\hat{q}_k^2$  for  $f = f_2$  over 50 iterations. The horizontal lines indicate  $q^2 = 0.5$ . The triangles indicate different estimates for 0.1-quantiles. The numbers given in the legend indicate the rejection rate of the corresponding test.

**Acknowledgments** This work is funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy EXC-2181/1-39090098 (the Heidelberg STRUCTURES Cluster of Excellence).

**Disclosure statement** The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

## References

- Andersen, K. E. and Hansen, M. B. (2001), “Multiplicative censoring: density estimation by a series expansion approach,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 98, 137–155.
- Baraud, Y. (2002), “Non-asymptotic minimax rates of testing in signal detection,” *Bernoulli*, 8, 577–606.
- Baraud, Y., Huet, S., and Laurent, B. (2003), “Adaptive tests of linear hypotheses by model selection,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 31.
- Belomestny, D., Comte, F., and Genon-Catalot, V. (2016), “Nonparametric Laguerre estimation in the multiplicative censoring model,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10, 3114 – 3152.

- Belomestny, D. and Goldenshluger, A. (2020), “Nonparametric density estimation from observations with multiplicative measurement errors,” *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 56, 36 – 67.
- Belomestny, D., Morozova, E., and Panov, V. (2024), “Statistical inference for scale mixture models via Mellin transform approach,” *Statistics*, 58, 209–229.
- Brenner Miguel, S. (2023), *The Mellin transform in nonparametric statistics*, Heidelberg: Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg.
- Brenner Miguel, S., Comte, F., and Johannes, J. (2021), “Spectral cut-off regularisation for density estimation under multiplicative measurement errors,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15, 3551 – 3573.
- (2023), “Linear functional estimation under multiplicative measurement error,” *Bernoulli*, 29, 2247 – 2271.
- Brenner Miguel, S., Johannes, J., and Siebel, M. (2024), “Multiplicative deconvolution under unknown error distribution,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 18, 4795–4850.
- Brenner Miguel, S. and Phandoidaen, N. (2022), “Multiplicative deconvolution in survival analysis under dependency,” *Statistics*, 56, 297–328.
- Brunel, E., Comte, F., and Genon-Catalot, V. (2016), “Nonparametric density and survival function estimation in the multiplicative censoring model,” *Test*, 25, 570–590.
- Butucea, C. (2007), “Goodness-of-fit testing and quadratic functional estimation from indirect observations,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 35, 1907 – 1930.
- Butucea, C., Matias, C., and Pouet, C. (2009), “Adaptive goodness-of-fit testing from indirect observations,” *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 45, 352–372.
- Butucea, C. and Meziani, K. (2011), “Quadratic functional estimation in inverse problems,” *Statistical Methodology*, 8, 31–41, advances in Data Mining and Statistical Learning.
- Collier, O., Comminges, L., and Tsybakov, A. B. (2017), “Minimax estimation of linear and quadratic functionals on sparsity classes,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 45.
- Comte, F. and Dion, C. (2016), “Nonparametric estimation in a multiplicative censoring model with symmetric noise,” *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 28, 768–801.
- Comte, F., Johannes, J., and Neubert, B. (2025), “Quadratic functional estimation from observations with multiplicative measurement error,” *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*.
- Fromont, M. and Laurent, B. (2006), “Adaptive goodness-of-fit tests in a density model,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 34.
- Giné, E. and Nickl, R. (2016), *Mathematical foundations of infinite-dimensional statistical models*, Cambridge series in statistical and probabilistic mathematics, New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Ingster, Y. I. (1993a), “Asymptotically minimax hypothesis testing for nonparametric alternatives. I,” *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 2, 85–114.
- (1993b), “Asymptotically minimax hypothesis testing for nonparametric alternatives. II,” *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 2, 171–189.
- (1993c), “Asymptotically minimax hypothesis testing for nonparametric alternatives. III,” *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 2, 249–268.
- Kroll, M. (2019), “Rate optimal estimation of quadratic functionals in inverse problems with partially unknown operator and application to testing problems,” *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 23, 524–551.
- Laurent, B. (2005), “Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional of a density by model selection,” *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 9, 1–18.
- Laurent, B., Loubes, J.-M., and Marteau, C. (2012), “Non asymptotic minimax rates of testing in signal detection with heterogeneous variances,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6.
- Laurent, B. and Massart, P. (2000), “Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 28, 1302 – 1338.
- Lee, A. J. (1990), “U-Statistics: Theory and Practice,” New York: CRC Press.
- Marteau, C. and Sapatinas, T. (2015), “A unified treatment for non-asymptotic and asymptotic approaches to minimax signal detection,” *Statistics Surveys*, 9, 253–297.
- (2017), “Minimax goodness-of-fit testing in ill-posed inverse problems with partially unknown operators,” *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 53.
- Meister, A. (2009), *Deconvolution Problems in Nonparametric Statistics*, Berlin: Springer.
- Schluttenhofer, S. (2020), *Adaptive minimax testing for inverse problems*, Heidelberg: Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg.
- Schluttenhofer, S. and Johannes, J. (2020a), “Adaptive minimax testing for circular convolution,” *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 29, 106–133.
- (2020b), “Minimax testing and quadratic functional estimation for circular convolution,” Discussion paper.
- Spokoiny, V. G. (1996), “Adaptive hypothesis testing using wavelets,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 24.
- van Es, B., Klaassen, C. A., and Oudshoorn, K. (2000), “Survival analysis under cross-sectional sampling: length bias and multiplicative censoring,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 91, 295–312, perspectives in modern statistical inference: parametric semiparametrics, nonparametrics.
- Vardi, Y. (1989), “Multiplicative Censoring, Renewal Processes, Deconvolution and Decreasing Density: Nonparametric Estimation,” *Biometrika*, 76, 751–761.
- Vardi, Y. and Zhang, C.-H. (1992), “Large Sample Study of Empirical Distributions in a Random-Multiplicative Censoring Model,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 20, 1022 – 1039.



## Appendix

### A Auxiliary results

In this section, we collect results from the literature used in the proofs of this work. We start by reviewing some properties of U-statistics. These results hold for random variables on any measurable space, in particular for  $(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{B}_+)$ .

For  $(X_j)_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  independent and identically distributed random variables in  $(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{B}_+)$  and symmetric kernel  $h: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , a U-statistic is a sum of the form

$$U_n = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{\substack{j_1 \neq j_2 \\ j_1, j_2 \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}} h(X_{j_1}, X_{j_2}).$$

The U-statistic is called canonical if for all  $i, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$  and all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\mathbb{E}[h(X_i, y)] = \mathbb{E}[h(x, X_j)] = 0.$$

The next assertion, a concentration inequality for canonical U-statistics, provides our key argument in order to control the deviation of the test statistics. It is a reformulation of Theorem 3.4.8 in Giné and Nickl (2016). We use the notation  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{L}_{+,2}^\infty}$  to indicate the essential supremum for functions on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ .

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $U_n$  be a canonical U-statistic for  $(X_j)_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}$ ,  $n \geq 2$  i.i.d.  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -valued random variables and kernel  $h: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded and symmetric. Let*

$$\begin{aligned} A &\geq \|h\|_{\mathbb{L}_{+,2}^\infty} \\ B^2 &\geq \|\mathbb{E}[h^2(X_1, \cdot)]\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty} \\ C^2 &\geq \mathbb{E}[h^2(X_1, X_2)] \\ D &\geq \sup\{\mathbb{E}[h(X_1, X_2)\xi(X_1)\zeta(X_2)] : \mathbb{E}[\xi^2(X_1)] \leq 1, \mathbb{E}[\zeta^2(X_2)] \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for all  $x \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(U_n \geq 8\frac{C}{n}x^{1/2} + 13\frac{D}{n}x + 261\frac{B}{n^{3/2}}x^{\frac{3}{2}} + 343\frac{A}{n^2}x^2\right) \leq \exp(1-x).$$

We bound the variance of an U-statistic by the following adaption of Theorem 3, Chapter 1, in Lee (1990).

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $U_n$  be a U-statistic for  $(X_j)_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}$ ,  $n \geq 2$  i.i.d.  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -valued random variables. Then*

$$\text{Var}(U_n) \leq \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \mathbb{E}^2[|h(X_1, X_2)|^2].$$

Now, we turn to norm inequalities for multiplicative convolution. The next result can be found in Comte et al. (2025).

**Lemma A.3.** (i) *Let  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})$  for  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $h_1 * h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})$  with  $\|h_1 * h_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})} \leq \|h_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})} \|h_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})}$ . If  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are probability densities, equality holds.*

- (ii) Let  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{c-1})$  and  $h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})$  for  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $h_1 * h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})$  with  $\|h_1 * h_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})} \leq \|h_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{c-1})} \|h_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})}$ .
- (iii) Let  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})$  and  $h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})$  for  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $h_1 * h_2 \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})$  with  $\|h_1 * h_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \leq \|h_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \|h_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})}$ .
- (iv) If  $f \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})$  and  $\varphi \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1}) \cap \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})$  are probability densities and  $g := f * \varphi$ , then we have

$$\|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \leq \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})} \|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} = \frac{\|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})}}{\|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})}} \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2c-2})}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Next, we recall properties of the Mellin transform, which we use in the sequel without further reference. See Comte et al. (2025) for the proof of the following result.

**Lemma A.4.** (i) It holds for any  $h \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{c-1}) \cap \mathbb{L}_+^2(x^{2c-1})$  that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}_c[h]}(t) = \mathcal{M}_c[h](-t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$$

and, analogously, for  $H \in \mathbb{L}^1 \cap \mathbb{L}^2$  it holds that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}_c^\dagger[H]}(x) = \mathcal{M}_c^\dagger[H(-\cdot)](x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

- (ii) Let  $g \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})$ , then it holds for  $\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}h \in \mathbb{L}^2$  that

$$\mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k Y^{c-1+2\pi it} h(t) dt \right|^2 \right] \leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}h\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2$$

- (iii) For  $g \in \mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})$  and  $h \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(g)$  we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{E}_g [Y^{c-1+2\pi it} h(Y)] \right|^2 dt \leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \mathbb{E}_g [h^2(Y)].$$

## B Proofs for Section 3

The key element to analyse the behaviour of the test statistic  $\hat{q}_k^2$  defined in eq. (2.10) is the decomposition eq. (3.6). It holds

$$\hat{q}_k^2 = U_k + 2W_k + q_k^2(f - f_o)$$

with the canonical U-statistic

$$U_k := \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{\substack{j_1 \neq j_2 \\ j_1, j_2 \in \llbracket n \rrbracket}} h_k(Y_{j_1}, Y_{j_2}) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$h_k(x, y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} |\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]|^{-2} \Psi(x, \cdot) \overline{\Psi}(y, \cdot) w^2 d\lambda \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and the centred linear statistic

$$W_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} \int_{-k}^k \frac{\Psi(Y_j, t) (\overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g]}(t) - \overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]}(t))}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Due to this decomposition, in Section B.1, we first collect auxiliary results for the U-statistic  $U_k$ . In Section B.2, we continue with results on the linear statistic  $W_k$ .

## B.1 *U-statistic results*

In order to obtain bounds of the quantiles of  $U_k$  given in eq. (B.1), we apply the concentration inequality for canonical U-statistics given in [Proposition A.1](#). Note that for  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$  the term  $|x^{c-1+2\pi it}| = x^{c-1}$  and, hence, the kernel  $h_k$  given in eq. (B.2) are in general not bounded. Therefore, we decompose  $h_k$  in a bounded and a remaining unbounded part. More precisely, given  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  specified later, we denote for  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\psi_k^b(y, t) := \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(y^{c-1})y^{c-1+2\pi it} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_k^u(y, t) := \mathbb{1}_{(\delta, \infty)}(y^{c-1})y^{c-1+2\pi it}.$$

Define the bounded part of kernel  $h_k$  as

$$h_k^b(x, y) := \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])(\psi_k^b(x, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Then,  $h_k^b$  is indeed bounded as can be seen in the proof of [Lemma B.1](#). Analogously, define

$$\begin{aligned} h_k^u(x, y) := & \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y_1, t)])(\psi_k^u(x, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y_1, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \\ & + \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y_1, t)])(\psi_k^b(x, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \\ & + \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])(\psi_k^u(x, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y_1, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

The kernels  $h_k^b$  and  $h_k^u$  are also symmetric and real-valued and we have  $h_k = h_k^b + h_k^u$ . Denote by  $U_k^b$  and  $U_k^u$  the corresponding canonical U-statistics, respectively, where  $U_k = U_k^b + U_k^u$  evidently. We first derive a quantile-bound for the bounded part  $U_k^b$  in [Lemma B.2](#) using [Proposition A.1](#) and, subsequently, a quantile-bound for the unbounded part  $U_k^u$  in [Lemma B.3](#). Both results are combined to derive a bound for the quantile of  $U_k$  in [Lemma B.4](#). We make use of the quantile-bounds of  $U_k$  both under the null and the alternative. However, only under the null we impose eventually a stronger moment condition, that is,  $f_o \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})$  for some  $p \geq 2$ , while under the alternative  $f \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{4(c-1)})$  is sufficient. Therefore, we derive the following quantile-bounds of  $U_k$  assuming  $g := \varphi * f$  with  $\varphi, f \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})$  for some  $p \geq 2$ . We introduce the following notation

$$v_{f|\varphi}(p) = (\|f * \varphi\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})} \vee 1).$$

Note that  $v_{f|\varphi} = v_{f|\varphi}(1)$ . For the bounded U-statistic, the following lemma gives the constants for applying [Proposition A.1](#). It was shown in Comte et al. (2025) and we state the proof here for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma B.1 (Constants for the bounded U-statistic).** *Let the assumptions of [Lemma B.4](#) be satisfied. The kernel  $h_k^b$  introduced in eq. (B.4) with  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  is real-valued, bounded, symmetric and satisfies for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$  that  $\mathbb{E}_g[h_k^b(Y, y)] = 0$ . Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= 4\delta^2 \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2, \\ B^2 &:= 4C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \delta^2 \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^4, \\ C^2 &:= C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}^2 \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^4, \\ D &:= 4C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

*satisfy the conditions of the U-statistic concentration inequality given in [Proposition A.1](#).*

*Proof of Lemma B.1.* We compute the quantities  $A, B, C$  and  $D$  verifying the four inequalities of Proposition A.1. Consider  $A$ . Since  $|\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]| \leq 2\delta$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$  we have

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+} |h_k^b(x, y)| \leq 4\delta^2 \int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) = A.$$

Consider  $B$ . Using that the U-statistic is canonical and Lemma A.4 (iii) we get for  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_g[|h_k^b(y, Y_1)|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \psi_k^b(Y_1, -t) \frac{(\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(Y_1^{c-1}) \left| \int_{-k}^k Y_1^{c-1-2\pi it} \frac{(\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k Y_1^{c-1-2\pi it} \frac{(\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \int_{-k}^k \frac{|\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]|^2}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^4} w^4(t) d\lambda(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Consequently,  $|\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]| \leq 2\delta$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$  implies

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E}_g[|h_k^b(y, Y_1)|^2] \leq C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} 4\delta^2 \int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^4} w^4(t) d\lambda(t) = B^2.$$

Consider  $C$ . Keep in mind that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_g[|\psi_k^b(Y_1, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}_g[|\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g[\mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(Y_1^{c-1}) |Y_1^{c-1+2\pi it}|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_g[Y_1^{2c-2}] \leq v_{f|\varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

Using additionally the calculations of eq. (B.6) for  $B$ , it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_g^2[|h_k^b(Y_1, Y_2)|^2] &\leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \int_{-k}^k \mathbb{E}_g[|\psi_k^b(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]|^2] \frac{w^4(t)}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^4} d\lambda(t) \\ &\leq C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}^2 \int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^4} w^4(t) d\lambda(t) = C^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider  $D$ .  $D = C$  satisfies the condition, but we find a sharper bound. For this, we first see that for all  $\xi \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(g)$  due to Lemma A.4 (iii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{E}_g[\xi(Y_1) \psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]|^2 d\lambda(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{E}_g[Y_1^{c-1+2\pi it} \xi(Y_1) \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(Y_1^{c-1})]|^2 d\lambda(t) \\ &\leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \mathbb{E}_g[|\xi(Y_1)|^2 \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(Y_1^{c-1})] \\ &\leq C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \mathbb{E}_g[|\xi(Y_1)|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Lemma A.4 (iii) we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{E}_g[Y_1^{c-1+2\pi it} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(Y_1^{c-1})]|^2 d\lambda(t) \leq C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi},$$

which in turn implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{E}_g [\xi(Y_1) \mathbb{E}_g [\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]]|^2 d\lambda(t) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_g [|\xi(Y_1)|^2] |\mathbb{E}_g [\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)]|^2 d\lambda(t) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g [|\xi(Y_1)|^2] \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{E}_g [Y_1^{c-1+2\pi it} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta]}(Y_1^{c-1})]|^2 d\lambda(t) \leq \mathbb{E}_g [|\xi(Y_1)|^2] C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last bounds it follows

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{E}_g [\xi(Y_1) (\psi_k^b(Y_1, t) - \mathbb{E}_g [\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])]|^2 d\lambda(t) \leq 4C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \mathbb{E}_g [|\xi(Y_1)|^2].$$

Consequently, for all  $\xi, \zeta \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(g)$  with  $\mathbb{E}_g [|\xi(Y_1)|^2] \leq 1$  and  $\mathbb{E}_g [|\zeta(Y_1)|^2] \leq 1$  it follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} h_k^b(x, y) \xi(x) \zeta(y) \mathbb{P}_g(dx) \mathbb{P}_g(dy) \\ &= \int_{-k}^k \frac{\mathbb{E}_g [\xi(Y_1) (\psi_k^b(Y_1, t) - \mathbb{E}_g [\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])] \mathbb{E}_g [\zeta(Y_2) (\psi_k^b(Y_2, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g [\psi_k^b(Y_2, -t)])]}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{\xi \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(g), \\ \mathbb{E}_g [|\xi(Y_1)|^2] \leq 1}} \left\{ \int_{-k}^k \frac{|\mathbb{E}_g [\xi(Y_1) (\psi_k^b(Y_1, t) - \mathbb{E}_g [\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])]|^2}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right\} \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2 \sup_{\substack{\xi \in \mathbb{L}_+^2(g), \\ \mathbb{E}_g [|\xi(Y_1)|^2] \leq 1}} \left\{ \int_{-k}^k |\mathbb{E}_g [\xi(Y_1) (\psi_k^b(Y_1, t) - \mathbb{E}_g [\psi_k^b(Y_1, t)])]|^2 d\lambda(t) \right\} \\ &\leq 4C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2 = D. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

With this result we show the following lemma for the bounded part of the U-statistic eq. (3.7).

**Lemma B.2 (Quantile of the bounded U-statistic).** *Let the assumptions of Lemma B.4 be satisfied. Consider for each  $n \geq 2$  and any  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  the canonical U-statistic  $U_k^b$ . For  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k^b(\gamma) &:= \left( 9C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} + 69493 \frac{\delta^2}{n} \sqrt{2k} L_\gamma^2 \right) L_\gamma^{1/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n} \\ &\quad + 52C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} L_\gamma \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n} \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n (U_k^b \geq \tau_k^b(\gamma)) \leq \gamma.$$

*Proof of Lemma B.2.* We intend to apply the exponential inequality for canonical U-statistics given in Proposition A.1 using quantities  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ , and  $D$  which verify the four required inequalities. Precisely, for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $x = L_\gamma = 1 - \log \gamma$  due to Proposition A.1 we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n \left( U_k \geq 8 \frac{C}{n} L_\gamma^{1/2} + 13 \frac{D}{n} L_\gamma + 261 \frac{B}{n^{3/2}} L_\gamma^{3/2} + 343 \frac{A}{n^2} L_\gamma^2 \right) \leq \exp(1 - L_\gamma) = \gamma.$$

Exploiting [Lemma B.2](#) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & 8\frac{C}{n}L_\gamma^{1/2} + 13\frac{D}{n}L_\gamma + 261\frac{B}{n^{3/2}}L_\gamma^{3/2} + 343\frac{A}{n^2}L_\gamma^2 \\ &= 8\frac{C_\varphi^{1/2}v_{f|\varphi}\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n}L_\gamma^{1/2} + 52\frac{C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n}L_\gamma \\ &+ 522\frac{C_\varphi^{1/2}v_{f|\varphi}^{1/2}\delta\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n^{3/2}}L_\gamma^{3/2} + 1372\frac{\delta^2\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2}{n^2}L_\gamma^2 \end{aligned}$$

which together with  $\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^4 \leq (2k)\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^4$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} & 8\frac{C}{n}L_\gamma^{1/2} + 13\frac{D}{n}L_\gamma + 261\frac{B}{n^{3/2}}L_\gamma^{3/2} + 343\frac{A}{n^2}L_\gamma^2 \\ & \leq 52\frac{C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n}L_\gamma + \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n}L_\gamma^{1/2} \\ & \quad \cdot \left( 8C_\varphi^{1/2}v_{f|\varphi} + 522\frac{C_\varphi^{1/2}v_{f|\varphi}^{1/2}\delta}{n^{1/2}}L_\gamma + 1372\frac{\delta^2\sqrt{2k}}{n}L_\gamma^{3/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$  for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have that

$$522\frac{C_\varphi^{1/2}v_{f|\varphi}^{1/2}\delta}{n^{1/2}}L_\gamma \leq C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} + (522/2)^2\frac{\delta^2 L_\gamma^2}{n}$$

and, thus, since  $\sqrt{2k}, L_\gamma \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & 8\frac{C}{n}L_\gamma^{1/2} + 13\frac{D}{n}L_\gamma + 261\frac{B}{n^{3/2}}L_\gamma^{3/2} + 343\frac{A}{n^2}L_\gamma^2 \\ & \leq 52\frac{C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n}L_\gamma + \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n}L_\gamma^{1/2} \\ & \quad \cdot \left( 9C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} + ((522/2)^2 + 1372)\frac{\delta^2\sqrt{2k}}{n}L_\gamma^2 \right) = \tau_k^b(\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

with  $(522/2)^2 + 1372 = 69493$  due to [Proposition A.1](#) follows

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(U_k^b \geq \tau_k^b(\gamma)) \leq \gamma$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Further, we give a quantile-bound of the unbounded part  $U_k^u$  of the U-statistic given in eq. (3.7).

**Lemma B.3** (*Quantile of the unbounded U-statistic*). *Let the assumptions of [Lemma B.4](#) be satisfied. Consider for each  $n \geq 2$  and  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  the canonical U-statistic  $U_k^u$ . For  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  setting*

$$\tau_k^u(\gamma) := \frac{\delta^{(1-p)}}{\gamma^{1/2}} 6C_\varphi^{1/2}v_{f|\varphi}^{1/2}(v_{f|\varphi}(p))^{1/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(U_k^u \geq \tau_k^u(\gamma)) \leq \gamma.$$

*Proof of Lemma B.3.* We start the proof with the observation that the symmetric and real-valued kernel  $h_k^u$  given in eq. (B.5) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_g^2[|h_k^u(Y_1, Y_2)|^2] \\ & \leq 3\mathbb{E}_g^2 \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(Y_2, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)])(\psi_k^u(Y_1, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 3\mathbb{E}_g^2 \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(Y_2, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)])(\psi_k^b(Y_2, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 3\mathbb{E}_g^2 \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^b(Y_2, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y, t)])(\psi_k^u(Y_1, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Note that the second and the third summand are the same due to symmetry of the integrals. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_g^2[|h_k^u(Y_1, Y_2)|^2] \\ & \leq 3\mathbb{E}_g^2 \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(Y_2, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)])(\psi_k^u(Y_1, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 6\mathbb{E}_g^2 \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(Y_2, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)])(\psi_k^b(Y_1, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

Consider the first summand. Due to the independence of  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  we first consider the expectation with respect to  $Y_2$  for fixed  $Y_1 = y \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . We have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(Y_2, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)])(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{\psi_k^u(Y_2, t)(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(\delta, \infty)}(Y_2^{c-1}) \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{Y_2^{c-1+2\pi it}(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{Y_2^{c-1+2\pi it}(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.4 (ii) with  $h(t) := \frac{(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t)$ , it follows for  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{Y_2^{c-1+2\pi it}(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \|\mathbf{1}_{[-k, k]} \frac{(\psi_k^u(y, \cdot) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, \cdot)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]|^2}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the second summand of eq. (B.7) we get for  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{(\psi_k^u(y, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)])(\psi_k^b(Y_2, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^b(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_g^2 \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{\psi_k^b(Y_2, t)(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \mathbf{1}_{[0, \delta]}(Y_2^{c-1}) \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{Y_2^{c-1+2\pi it}(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{Y_2^{c-1+2\pi it}(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Using again [Lemma A.4 \(ii\)](#) with  $h(t) := \frac{(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t)$ , it follows for  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{Y_2^{c-1+2\pi it}(\psi_k^u(y, -t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, -t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\
& \leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \|\mathbf{1}_{[-k, k]} \frac{(\psi_k^u(y, \cdot) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, \cdot)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]|^2}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^4)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last upper bounds and eq. (B.7), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_g^2[|h_k^u(Y_1, Y_2)|^2] \leq 9\|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \|\mathbf{1}_{[-k, k]} \frac{(\psi_k^u(Y_1, \cdot) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, \cdot)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]|^2}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^4)}^2 \right]. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Further, we have that  $\|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \leq v_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi$  and for  $p \geq 2$  it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_g[\|\mathbf{1}_{(\delta, \infty)}(Y_1^{c-1}) Y_1^{c-1+2\pi it}\|^2] \leq \delta^{2(1-p)} v_{f|\varphi}(p)$$

which in turn implies

$$\mathbb{E}_g[|\psi_k^u(Y_1, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)]|^2] \leq \delta^{2(1-p)} v_{f|\varphi}(p).$$

Combining these estimates with eq. (B.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_g^2[|h_k^u(Y_1, Y_2)|^2] & \leq 9v_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi \int_{-k}^k \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \frac{(\psi_k^u(Y_1, t) - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi_k^u(Y, t)])}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} \right|^2 \right] w^4(t) d\lambda(t) \\
& \leq 9v_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi \delta^{2(1-p)} v_{f|\varphi}(p) \|\mathbf{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying [Lemma A.2](#) we immediately obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_g^n[|U_k^u|^2] & = \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \mathbb{E}_g^2[|h_k^u(Y_1, Y_2)|^2] \leq \frac{36}{n^2} v_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi \delta^{2(1-p)} v_{f|\varphi}(p) \|\mathbf{1}_{[-k, k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^4 \\
& = \gamma |\tau_k^u(\gamma)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by applying Markov's inequality the result follows, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(U_k^u \geq \tau_k^u(\gamma)) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_g^n[|U_k^u|^2]}{|\tau_k^u(\gamma)|^2} \leq \gamma,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$



**Lemma B.4 (Quantile of the U-statistic).** *Let Assumptions A1, A3 and A5 be satisfied. Consider for each  $n \geq 2$  the canonical U-statistic  $U_k$  defined in eq. (B.1). For any  $f \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2p(c-1)})$  with  $p \geq 2$  and setting*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{U_k}(\gamma) := & \left( 18v_{f|\varphi}(p)C_\varphi + 69493 \frac{\sqrt{2k}}{n\gamma^{1/(p-1)}} L_{\gamma/2}^{2-1/(p-1)} \right) \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n} L_{\gamma/2}^{1/2} \\ & + 52C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n} L_{\gamma/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(U_k \geq \tau^{U_k}(\gamma)) \leq \gamma.$$

*Proof of Lemma B.4.* We start the proof by decomposing the U-statistic  $U_k = U_k^b + U_k^u$  with kernels given in eq. (B.4) and eq. (B.5) using the threshold

$$\delta^2 = L_{\gamma/2}^{1/(1-p)} \gamma^{1/(1-p)} > 0. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

We show below that the critical values  $\tau^{U_k}(\gamma)$  given in eq. (B.9),  $\tau_k^b(\gamma)$  and  $\tau_k^u(\gamma)$  defined in Lemmata B.2 and B.3, respectively, satisfy

$$\tau^{U_k}(\gamma) \geq \tau_k^b(\gamma/2) + \tau_k^u(\gamma/2). \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Consequently, from Lemmata B.2 and B.3 we immediately obtain the result, that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(U_k \geq \tau^{U_k}(\gamma)) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(U_k^b \geq \tau_k^b(\gamma/2)) + \mathbb{P}_{\varphi,f}^n(U_k^u \geq \tau_k^u(\gamma/2)) \leq \gamma/2 + \gamma/2 = \gamma.$$

It remains to show eq. (B.11). We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k^b(\gamma/2) + \tau_k^u(\gamma/2) = & \left( 9C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} + 69493 \frac{\delta^2}{n} \sqrt{2k} L_{\gamma/2}^2 \right) L_{\gamma/2}^{1/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n} \\ & + 52C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} L_{\gamma/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n} \\ & + \sqrt{2} \frac{\delta^{(1-p)}}{\gamma^{1/2}} 6C_\varphi^{1/2} v_{f|\varphi}^{1/2} (v_{f|\varphi}(p))^{1/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $v_{f|\varphi}, v_{f|\varphi}^2 \leq v_{f|\varphi}(p)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k^b(\gamma/2) + \tau_k^u(\gamma/2) \leq & \left( 9C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}(p) + 69493 \frac{\delta^2}{n} \sqrt{2k} L_{\gamma/2}^2 + L_{\gamma/2}^{-1/2} 9 \frac{\delta^{(1-p)}}{\gamma^{1/2}} C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}(p) \right) \\ & \cdot L_{\gamma/2}^{1/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n} \\ & + 52C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} L_{\gamma/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

With the choice of  $\delta$  given in eq. (B.10), it holds  $\delta^{1-p} = L_{\gamma/2}^{1/2} \gamma^{1/2}$  and it follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau_k^b(\gamma/2) + \tau_k^u(\gamma/2) \\ & \leq \left( 18C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi}(p) + 69493 \gamma^{-1/(p-1)} \frac{L_{\gamma/2}^{2-1/(p-1)}}{n} \sqrt{2k} \right) L_{\gamma/2}^{1/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(w^4)}^2}{n} \\ & \quad + 52C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} L_{\gamma/2} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]}/\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{n} \\ & = \tau^{U_k}(\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

which shows eq. (B.11) and completes the proof.  $\square$

## B.2 Linear statistic result

Consider the centred linear statistic  $W_k$  defined in eq. (B.3) admitting as kernel the real-valued function for  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$h_k(y) := \int_{-k}^k |\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^{-2} \Psi(y, t) (\overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g]}(t) - \overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]}(t)) w^2(t) d\lambda(t).$$

Using Markov's inequality, we show the following result for its quantile-bound.

**Lemma B.5 (Quantile of the linear statistic).** *Let Assumptions A1, A3 and A5 be satisfied. Further, assume that  $f \in \mathbb{L}_+^1(x^{2(c-1)})$ . Consider for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the linear statistic  $W_k$  defined in eq. (B.3). For  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  setting*

$$\tau^{W_k}(\gamma) := \frac{1}{4} \|(\mathcal{M}_c[g] - \mathcal{M}_c[g_o]) \mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 + \frac{C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2}{\gamma n}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(W_k \geq \tau^{W_k}(\gamma)) \leq \gamma.$$

*Proof of Lemma B.5.* By exploiting that the observations  $(Y_j)_{j \in [n]}$  are i.i.d. we get that

$$\begin{aligned} n\mathbb{E}_g^n[|W_k|^2] &= \mathbb{E}_g[|h_k(Y_1)|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} \Psi(Y_1, t) (\overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g]}(t) - \overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]}(t)) w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} Y_1^{c-1+2\pi i t} (\overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g]}(t) - \overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]}(t)) w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

With Lemma A.4 (ii) and  $\|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_+^\infty(x^{2c-1})} \leq v_{f|\varphi} C_\varphi$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_g \left[ \left| \int_{-k}^k \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_c[\varphi](t)|^2} Y_1^{c-1+2\pi i t} (\overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g]}(t) - \overline{\mathcal{M}_c[g_o]}(t)) w^2(t) d\lambda(t) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \|(\mathcal{M}_c[g] - \mathcal{M}_c[g_o]) \mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^4)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Exploiting  $ab \leq a^2/4 + b^2$  for  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma^{-1/2} (C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi})^{1/2} \|(\mathcal{M}_c[g] - \mathcal{M}_c[g_o]) \mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^4)} n^{-1/2} \\ &\leq \gamma^{-1/2} (C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi})^{1/2} \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)} \|(\mathcal{M}_c[g] - \mathcal{M}_c[g_o]) \mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)} n^{-1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|(\mathcal{M}_c[g] - \mathcal{M}_c[g_o]) \mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(w^2)}^2 + \gamma^{-1} n^{-1} C_\varphi v_{f|\varphi} \|\mathbb{1}_{[-k,k]} / \mathcal{M}_c[\varphi]\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(w)}^2 \\ &= \tau^{W_k}(\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

and, consequently,

$$n\mathbb{E}_g^n[|W_k|^2] \leq n\gamma |\tau^{W_k}(\gamma)|^2.$$

Finally, by applying Markov's inequality follows immediately the result, that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\varphi, f}^n(W_k \geq \tau^{W_k}(\gamma)) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_g^n[|W_k|^2]}{|\tau^{W_k}(\gamma)|^2} \leq \gamma$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$