

TESSELLATION LOCALIZED TRANSFER LEARNING FOR NONPARAMETRIC REGRESSION

HÉLÈNE HALCONRUY^{1,2}, BENJAMIN BOBBIA³, AND PAUL LEJAMTEL⁴

ABSTRACT. Transfer learning aims to improve performance on a target task by leveraging information from related source tasks. We propose a nonparametric regression transfer learning framework that explicitly models heterogeneity in the source-target relationship. Our approach relies on a local transfer assumption: the covariate space is partitioned into finitely many cells such that, within each cell, the target regression function can be expressed as a low-complexity transformation of the source regression function. This localized structure enables effective transfer where similarity is present while limiting negative transfer elsewhere. We introduce estimators that jointly learn the local transfer functions and the target regression, together with fully data-driven procedures that adapt to unknown partition structure and transfer strength. We establish sharp minimax rates for target regression estimation, showing that local transfer can mitigate the curse of dimensionality by exploiting reduced functional complexity. Our theoretical guarantees take the form of oracle inequalities that decompose excess risk into estimation and approximation terms, ensuring robustness to model misspecification. Numerical experiments illustrate the benefits of the proposed approach.

1. INTRODUCTION

Transfer learning (TL) traces its origins to educational psychology, where learning is understood as the generalization of prior experience to new but related situations. As articulated by C. H. Judd, transfer is feasible only when a meaningful similarity or structural connection exists between learning activities. A classical illustration is that musical training on the violin facilitates subsequent learning of the piano, owing to shared underlying concepts and skills. This principle was later formalized in the machine learning literature (see, e.g., the surveys [34, 51, 50]), where transfer learning is understood as the improvement of performance on a target task through the exploitation of knowledge acquired from a *sufficiently similar* source task.

SAMOVAR, Télécom SudParis, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 91120 Palaiseau, France.

Modal'X, Université Paris Nanterre, 92000 Nanterre, France.

DISC, Fédération Enac ISAE-SUPAERO, université de Toulouse, 31055 Toulouse, France.

ESILV, Pôle Léonard de Vinci, 92400 Courbevoie, France.

This paradigm is particularly compelling in settings where the acquisition of target observations is rare, costly, or otherwise constrained, while data drawn from related environments are available. In such situations, transfer learning provides a natural mechanism to compensate for data scarcity by leveraging structural similarities across datasets. Its range of applications is broad, spanning classical machine learning areas such as computer vision [12, 49] and natural language processing [38, 7], including tasks like sentiment analysis [28]. It has also been widely adopted in recommender systems [34, 30] and fraud detection [19], and has more recently attracted increasing attention within the statistics community. In this latter context, transfer learning has been successfully applied to problems including non-parametric classification [6, 37, 3], large-scale Gaussian graphical models [24] and contextual multi-armed bandits. At the same time, these developments have highlighted the inherent risk of *negative transfer*, motivating robust approaches that explicitly account for unreliable or heterogeneous sources, such as the framework proposed by Fan *et al.* [11].

In this work, we propose a regression transfer learning framework that explicitly accounts for heterogeneity in the relationship between the source and target distributions. Our approach is inspired by the local viewpoint advocated by Reeve *et al.* and is based on the key assumption that the feature space \mathbb{R}^d can be partitioned into finitely many cells \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* such that, within each cell, the target regression function $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ is well approximated by a simple transformation of the source regression function $f_{\mathcal{S}}$. More precisely, for each cell \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , there exists a *local transfer function* $g_\ell: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying $f_{\mathcal{T}} = g_\ell \circ f_{\mathcal{S}}$ on \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* . This formulation allows similarity between source and target to vary across the covariate space, enabling effective transfer where it is informative while avoiding negative transfer elsewhere.

Within this framework, we establish minimax rates of convergence for the estimation of the target regression function, showing that local transfer can mitigate the curse of dimensionality by exploiting the low-complexity structure induced by the transfer functions. We further propose adaptive, fully data-driven procedures that achieve these rates without prior knowledge of the oracle tessellation or the strength of transfer. In particular, our method simultaneously estimates the local transfer functions and the target regression, yielding sharp risk bounds that reflect both the quality and the spatial extent of transferability. Importantly, our theoretical guarantees take the form of oracle inequalities that decompose the excess risk into an estimation term and an approximation (bias) term. This structure ensures robustness to misspecification: when the transfer assumption is only approximately satisfied, or when the true partition of the covariate space lies outside the considered tessellation class, the performance of our estimator deteriorates smoothly through an explicit bias term measuring the departure from the ideal transfer structure, rather than reverting abruptly to a non-transfer baseline.

1.1. Related work. A rapidly growing body of work studies transfer learning in regression, with the common goal of exploiting structural similarities between source and target models to improve estimation accuracy, while mitigating the risk of negative transfer, that is, the deterioration of target performance caused by incorporating misleading or mismatched source information.

Linear and parametric regression. Early work focused on linear regression, where transfer is naturally expressed through proximity between regression coefficients or fitted responses. In the data-enriched framework of Chen, Owen and Shi [5], a small target sample is complemented by a larger, potentially biased auxiliary dataset, with theoretical guarantees quantifying the resulting bias-variance trade-off. Related parametric approaches include robust modeling under population shifts [1] and the formal assessment of *transfer gain*, as studied by Obst *et al.* [33]. Semi-supervised extensions, in which unlabeled target covariates are abundant while labeled responses are scarce, have also been considered in parametric settings [18].

High-dimensional transfer in regression. In high-dimensional regimes, transfer learning requires carefully balancing information sharing against task heterogeneity. Li, Cai and Hongzhe [23] develop a minimax theory for high-dimensional linear regression with multiple sources, demonstrating that optimal rates can be achieved when the target model is sufficiently close to a subset of auxiliary models. Extensions address more complex forms of mismatch, including partially overlapping feature spaces [4] and overparameterized regimes exhibiting benign overfitting [16]. From an algorithmic perspective, Wang *et al.* propose a multi-environment approximate message passing framework for analyzing Lasso-based transfer estimators [48], while Moon establishes minimax-optimal rates for transfer in high-dimensional additive regression [31].

Nonparametric and semiparametric regression. In nonparametric settings, similarity between source and target is encoded at the level of regression functions rather than parameters, leading to more flexible - but also more delicate - transfer mechanisms. Among these works, the framework of Cai and Pu [2] is the closest to our setting. They introduce an explicit *transfer condition*, requiring the target regression function to lie close, in \mathbb{L}^2 , to a low-complexity combination of source functions, and propose adaptive procedures that exploit informative sources while reverting to target-only rates when the condition fails. Related contributions include kernel-based transfer learning [47], smoothness-adaptive hypothesis transfer [25], robust methods for concept shifts and misspecification [26], source-function weighting strategies [27], and representation transfer in semiparametric regression with an emphasis on valid inference [15].

1.2. Organization of the paper. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the statistical framework, formalizes

the local transfer learning assumption, and defines the class of admissible tessellations and transfer functions. This section also presents the proposed estimation procedure, including the construction of the local transfer estimators and their data-driven selection. The main theoretical results are stated in Section 3. We establish minimax convergence rates - both upper bounds (Theorem 1) and lower bounds (Theorem 4) - as well as oracle inequalities under both well-specified and misspecified transfer scenarios. In addition, we study the estimation error of the transfer function in an oracle setting (Theorem 5). Illustrative examples are provided in Section 4, and concluding remarks are given in Section 5. Proofs of the main results are deferred to Appendices B, C, and D, while additional technical arguments and auxiliary results are collected in the Appendices A and E.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND ALGORITHM

This section introduces the statistical framework and the estimation procedure underlying our local transfer learning approach.

2.1. Setting. Let $d \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Consider two datasets of differing sizes and qualities. The first dataset, called the *source sample*, contains a large number n_S of low-quality data points. The second dataset, referred to as the *target sample*, consists of high-quality data but is smaller in size, with n_T data points.

Let \mathcal{D}_S denote the source sample, comprising input/output pairs $((X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathcal{S})$, and let \mathcal{D}_T denote the target sample, with pairs $((X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathcal{T})$.

For all $i \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$, the inputs satisfy $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the outputs $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The data follow the regression models

$$(1) \quad Y_i = f_S(X_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{S},$$

and

$$(2) \quad Y_i = f_T(X_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{T},$$

where the noise terms ε_i satisfy $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i|X_i] = 0$ and $\text{Var}[\varepsilon_i|X_i] \leq \sigma^2$.

The goal is to estimate the function f_T using both the target sample and the source sample, and more specifically by leveraging an estimate of f_S . As mentioned in the introduction, transferring information from the source to the target requires a *transferability condition*. Our main assumption on the relationship between f_T and f_S is that the feature space $[0, 1]^d$ can be partitioned into finitely many cells \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , such that on each cell f_T is obtained by transforming f_S via a function g_ℓ^* . More specifically, we have the main structural assumption:

Assumption 1. *There exists a partition of $[0, 1]^d$ into cells $H^* = \{\mathcal{A}_\ell^*, \ell \in [L^*]\}$ s.t. for all $\ell \in [L^*]$ there exists a function $g_\ell^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(3) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*, f_T(x) = g_\ell^*(f_S(x)).$$

Let $g : (x, y) \in [0, 1]^d \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \sum_{\ell \in [L^*]} g_\ell^*(y) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\ell^*}(x)$ be the transfer function.

Remark 1 (Interpretation of the transfer hypothesis). The tessellation should be understood as *an idealized representation of heterogeneous similarity*, not as a literal partition known to the practitioner. The transfer hypothesis formalizes the existence of regions in the covariate space where the target regression function admits a simple relationship with its source counterpart, while allowing this relationship to fail outside these regions. In particular, it does not require global similarity between the source and target distributions, nor does it assume that the partition is uniquely defined or identifiable. Its role is *purely statistical*: it specifies a structural condition under which information transfer is possible and quantifies, through oracle inequalities, how deviations from this idealized structure affect the achievable risk. The proposed procedures are fully data-driven and are designed to adapt to such latent structure without requiring explicit knowledge of the tessellation.

Well-specified and misspecified models. The transfer learning model is said to be *well-specified* if there exists a tessellation $H^* = \{\mathcal{A}_\ell^* : \ell \in [L^*]\}$ such that Assumption 1 holds on each cell. In this case, the source-target relationship is correctly captured by a cellwise transfer function, with no systematic model error. By contrast, the model is *misspecified* if no admissible tessellation satisfies Assumption 1 exactly, leading to an irreducible bias due to approximation error. Our analysis quantifies this effect through oracle inequalities balancing estimation and approximation errors.

2.2. Algorithm. As the target tessellation on which Assumption 1 holds is unknown, we select a partition from a suitable class of *admissible tessellations*, defined below. To this end, the target sample is split into two independent subsamples of equal size $|\mathcal{T}_2| \simeq |\mathcal{T}_1| = \lfloor n_{\mathcal{T}}/2 \rfloor$. The first subsample, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_1} = \{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathcal{T}_1\}$, plays the role of a training sample and is used to estimate the cellwise transfer functions associated with each candidate tessellation. The second subsample, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_2} = \{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathcal{T}_2\}$, is reserved for model selection and is used exclusively to choose the tessellation via empirical risk minimization.

We fix an integer $L_{\max} > 0$, which represents the maximal number of cells allowed in the procedure. In the well-specified case, we assume that $L^* \leq L_{\max}$; otherwise, L_{\max} simply acts as a complexity cap on the admissible tessellations.

Definition 1 (Admissible tessellation class). Let $h > 0$ be the bandwidth used in the local transfer estimation. Let \mathcal{H} be a collection of tessellations $H = (\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell})_{\ell \in [L_H]}$, where each $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$ is a cell and $L_H \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the number of cells. We say that a tessellation H is *admissible* if it satisfies the following conditions:

(i) **Minimum cell mass:** for all $\ell \in [L_H]$,

$$|\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}| \geq \mathbf{c}_{\text{mass}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d,$$

where $\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell} := \{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : X_i \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}$.
(ii) **Locality radius:** for all $\ell \in [L_H]$,

$$\text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) \leq \mathfrak{r}_{\text{rad}} h.$$

(iii) **Regular shape:** For each cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, there exist a point $x_{H,\ell} \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$ and a constant $\mathfrak{r}_{\text{loc}} > 0$ such that

$$\text{B}_d(x_{H,\ell}, \mathfrak{r}_{\text{loc}} h) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}.$$

The point $x_{H,\ell}$ is referred to as the representative point of the cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$. Since the cells need not admit a natural geometric center, we simply assume - without loss of generality - that $x_{H,\ell}$ plays the role of a center for $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$.

The essence of our transfer procedure (TL)² lies in combining a global source estimator with *locally adapted transfer functions* whose spatial organization is learned from the data (see Algorithm 1). Our main assumption is that the relationship between the source and target regression functions can be described by *locally affine transformations* of the source estimator \hat{f}_S (Step 1), with parameters that may vary across the covariate space. To capture this spatial heterogeneity, the covariate space is partitioned using an admissible tessellation H . On each cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, a local transfer function $\hat{g}_{H,\ell}$ is estimated (Step 2) using a first subsample of target data. This function aligns the source estimator with the target responses in a neighborhood of the cell center, leveraging both spatial proximity and similarity in source predictions, and yields a transfer estimator \hat{f}_T^H (Step 3).

In a second stage (see Algorithm 2), model complexity is controlled by clustering (Step 1) similar cellwise transfer behaviors and selecting, among tessellations H of the resulting size, the one minimizing a target empirical risk (Step 2). This step balances bias and variance by adapting the granularity of localization to the data, i.e., the size of the local neighborhoods (or bandwidth) used for estimation.

Overall, the method jointly adapts the *local transfer corrections* and the *spatial tessellation*, interpolating between global transfer learning and fully local estimation.

Remark 2 ((TL)²). The notation (TL)² naturally conveys the idea of two layers of *localization* and *transfer*. The first “localize-transfer” step is implemented in Algorithm 1, where source information is locally transferred to the target by estimating cellwise affine corrections on a fixed tessellation. Algorithm 2 performs a second localization, this time at the level of the transfer structure itself, by selecting a tessellation whose cells correspond to homogeneous transfer behaviors. No new transfer functions are learned at this stage; rather, the previously estimated cellwise transfer functions are selected and applied according to the chosen tessellation to produce the final estimator.

Algorithm 1: Transfer Learning estimation on an admissible tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$

Data: Source sample \mathcal{D}_S , target training sample \mathcal{D}_{T_1} , fixed tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$ with cells $\{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}_{\ell \in [L_H]}$ and centers $\{x_{H,\ell}\}_{\ell \in [L_H]}$.

Result: Transfer estimator on H : \hat{f}_T^H .

1 **Step 1: Source Nadaraya-Watson estimator**

2 Define

$$\hat{f}_S(x) = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} K_{h_S}(X_i - x) Y_i}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} K_{h_S}(X_i - x)}, \quad h_S = n_S^{-\frac{1}{2d+\beta_S}}.$$

3 **Step 2: Local transfer estimation on each cell**

4 **for** $\ell = 1, \dots, L_H$ **do**

5 Estimate $(\hat{a}_{H,\ell}, \hat{b}_{H,\ell})$ by solving

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{a}_{H,\ell}, \hat{b}_{H,\ell}) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{a,b \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} (Y_i - a(\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell})) - b)^2 \\ \times K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{H,\ell}\|) K_{z,h}(|\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell})|). \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell} = \{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : X_i \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}$.

6 Define the cell-wise transfer function

$$\hat{g}_{H,\ell}(y, y_\ell) = \hat{a}_{H,\ell}(y - y_\ell) + \hat{b}_{H,\ell}.$$

7 **Step 3: Transfer estimator on H**

8 Let $\ell_H(x)$ be the index of the cell of H containing x . Define the transfer estimator on the tessellation H :

$$\hat{f}_T^H(x) = \hat{g}_{H,\ell_H(x)}(\hat{f}_S(x), \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell_H(x)})).$$

3. RISK BOUNDS FOR THE TRANSFER ESTIMATORS

3.1. Assumptions. In this section, we introduce a set of assumptions that we will need to establish some or all of the following results: upper and lower bounds for the transfer estimator, and an upper bound for the transfer functions g_ℓ .

In order to obtain convergence rates, we need to refine the transferrability condition (1). More precisely, we need a *local linear transfer regularity* condition:

Assumption 2. *There exist functions $a^*, b^* : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, constants $\mathfrak{l}_{\text{loc}} > 0$, $\beta_{\text{loc}} \in [0, 1]$, such that for all $x, x' \in [0, 1]^d$,*

$$(4) \quad |f_T(x) - (a^*(x')(f_S(x) - f_S(x')) + b^*(x'))| \leq \mathfrak{l}_{\text{loc}} \|x - x'\|^{1+\beta_{\text{loc}}}.$$

Algorithm 2: Tessellation-Localized Transfer Learning (TL)²

Data: Target validation sample $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}_2}$, cellwise transfer function $\widehat{g}_{H,\ell}$ for each candidate tessellation $H = \{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}_{\ell \in [L_H]} \in \mathcal{H}$ and each $\ell \in [L_H]$.

Result: Transfer estimator $\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{TL}}$

1 **Step 1: Select best tessellation**

2 Choose

$$\widehat{H} \in \underset{H \in \mathcal{H}_L, L \in [L_{\max}]}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_2|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[(Y_i - \widehat{g}_{H,\ell}(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(X_i), \widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{H,\ell})))^2 \right].$$

3 **Step 2: Final transfer estimator**

4 Let $\ell_{\widehat{H}}(x)$ be the cell of \widehat{H} containing x . Define the transfer estimator:

$$\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{TL}}(x) = \widehat{g}_{\widehat{H}, \ell_{\widehat{H}}(x)}(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x), \widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{\widehat{H}, \ell_{\widehat{H}}(x)})).$$

Remark 3 (Assumption 1 vs Assumption 2). Assumption 1 is *purely structural*: on each cell \mathcal{A}_{ℓ}^* , the relationship between $f_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ is exact and one-dimensional, namely $f_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = g_{\ell}^*(f_{\mathcal{S}}(x))$. No smoothness is required; the only restriction is that $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ depends on x solely through $f_{\mathcal{S}}(x)$ within each cell. In contrast, Assumption 2 is a *local regularity* condition: near any x' , $f_{\mathcal{T}}(x)$ is well approximated by an affine function of $f_{\mathcal{S}}(x)$ with a Hölder remainder $\|x - x'\|^{1+\beta_{\text{loc}}}$. It imposes no global rule such as $f_{\mathcal{T}} = g(f_{\mathcal{S}})$, but requires smoothness in x . Thus, Assumption 1 gives a *piecewise global* structure, while Assumption 2 yields a *globally defined, locally smooth* coupling between $f_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $f_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Moreover, if one augments Assumption 1 with additional regularity that is for instance assuming that on each cell \mathcal{A}_{ℓ}^* ,

$$f_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = g_{\ell}^*(f_{\mathcal{S}}(x)),$$

where $g_{\ell}^* \in \mathcal{C}^{1+\beta_{\ell}}$, $f_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{C}^1$, $\nabla f_{\mathcal{S}}$ is non-degenerate, then a Taylor expansion of g_{ℓ}^* at $f_{\mathcal{S}}(x')$, combined with the smoothness of $f_{\mathcal{S}}$, yields for x near x' ,

$$f_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = g'_{\ell}(f_{\mathcal{S}}(x'))(f_{\mathcal{S}}(x) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x')) + \left[g_{\ell}(f_{\mathcal{S}}(x')) - g'_{\ell}(f_{\mathcal{S}}(x'))f_{\mathcal{S}}(x') \right],$$

with a remainder of order $\|x - x'\|^{1+\beta_{\ell}}$, i.e. $\beta_{\text{loc}} = \beta_{\ell}$. Thus, under such regularity, Assumption 1 implies a local behavior of the form described in Assumption 2 within each cell.

The following Assumptions 3, 4, and 5 are standard in nonparametric regression and are adapted here to a setting involving two regression problems: a source problem (1) and a target problem (2).

Assumption 3 (Design). We impose the following two conditions on the sampling distributions:

3.1 Target design. The target design points X_i ($i \in \mathcal{T}$) are i.i.d. on \mathbb{R}^d with density $p_{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfying $p_{\mathcal{T}} \in [p_{\mathcal{T}}^{\min}, p_{\mathcal{T}}^{\max}]$ where $p_{\mathcal{T}}^{\max} \geq p_{\mathcal{T}}^{\min} > 0$.

3.2 Source design. The source design points X_i ($i \in \mathcal{S}$) are i.i.d. on \mathbb{R}^d with density $p_{\mathcal{S}}$ satisfying $p_{\mathcal{S}} \in [p_{\mathcal{S}}^{\min}, p_{\mathcal{S}}^{\max}]$ where $p_{\mathcal{S}}^{\max} \geq p_{\mathcal{S}}^{\min} > 0$.

Assumption 4. We make the following assumptions on the regularity of the source and target functions:

4.1 Source function regularity. $f_{\mathcal{S}} \in \text{Höl}(\beta_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathfrak{l}_{\mathcal{S}}; [0, 1]^d)$.

4.2 Target function regularity. $f_{\mathcal{T}} \in \text{Höl}(\beta_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathfrak{l}_{\mathcal{T}}; [0, 1]^d)$.

Assumption 5. For any $i \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$, the random variable ε_i is sub-exponential, i.e.

$$\|\varepsilon_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{S}} \quad (i \in \mathcal{S}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\varepsilon_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{T}} \quad (i \in \mathcal{T}),$$

for some constants $\sigma_{\mathcal{S}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{T}} > 0$, where $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_1}$ is the Orlicz ψ_1 -norm (see Definition 2).

Assumption 6 (Kernels). The kernels $K : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $K_x : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $K_z : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ are bounded, nonnegative, and compactly supported on $[0, 1]$. Moreover, they are symmetric and satisfy

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} K(u) du = 1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_x(u) du = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_z(u) du = 1.$$

Moreover, K_z is Lipschitz on \mathbb{R} with constant \mathfrak{l}_{K_z} has a finite second moment:

$$0 < \mu_2(K_z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 K_z(u) du < \infty.$$

To support our minimax bound, let us introduce the function class:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(H^*, \beta_{\mathcal{S}}, \beta_{\mathcal{T}}, \beta_{\text{loc}}) = & \left\{ (f_{\mathcal{S}}, f_{\mathcal{T}}) : f_{\mathcal{S}} \in \text{Höl}(\beta_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathfrak{l}_{\mathcal{S}}, [0, 1]^d), \right. \\ & \left. f_{\mathcal{T}} \in \text{Höl}(\beta_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathfrak{l}_{\mathcal{T}}, [0, 1]^d), (2) \text{ holds}, (4) \text{ holds with exponent } \beta_{\text{loc}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The class $\mathcal{F}(H^*, \beta_{\mathcal{S}}, \beta_{\mathcal{T}}, \beta_{\text{loc}})$ corresponds to a *well-specified* transfer learning model associated with the oracle tessellation H^* . Indeed, for any $(f_{\mathcal{S}}, f_{\mathcal{T}})$ in this class, the local transfer relationship encoded in Assumption (2) holds exactly on each cell of H^* , with transfer regularity β_{loc} .

In the following sections, we measure performance using the regression risk

$$\mathcal{R}(g) := \mathbb{E} [(Y - g(X))^2],$$

for measurable functions $g : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Under the regression model $Y = f_{\mathcal{T}}(X) + \varepsilon$ with $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon|X] = 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{R}(g) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}}) = \|g - f_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2,$$

so that excess risk coincides with squared $\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)$ error.

3.2. Upper bound.

3.2.1. Mean-squared error of the transfer estimator on a fixed tessellation.

The aim of this section is to study the mean squared error bound of the transfer estimator $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H$ constructed on a fixed admissible tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$ by Algorithm (1).

To decompose and interpret the error bound, we introduce auxiliary functions. Fix a tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$. The *population cellwise transfer linearization* is defined by

$$(5) \quad g_{f_S}^H : x \in [0, 1]^d \mapsto a_{H, \ell_H(x)}^* (f_S(x) - f_S(x_{\ell_H(x)})) + b_{H, \ell_H(x)}^*,$$

where $\ell_H(x)$ denotes the index of the cell of H containing x . The function $g_{f_S}^H$ provides a cellwise linear approximation of the transfer relation $g^* \circ f_S = f_{\mathcal{T}}$ on the tessellation H . In general, $g_{f_S}^H$ need not coincide with the optimal transfer representation unless Assumption 1 holds for H .

We further define the *source oracle* as

$$(6) \quad \bar{g}_{\theta}^H : x \in [0, 1]^d \mapsto \bar{a}_{H, \ell_H(x)} (f_S(x) - f_S(x_{\ell_H(x)})) + \bar{b}_{H, \ell_H(x)},$$

where $\bar{\theta}_{H, \ell} = (\bar{a}_{H, \ell}, \bar{b}_{H, \ell})$ denotes the cellwise least-squares estimator computed from the target sample \mathcal{T}_1 , while retaining access to the *true* source function f_S . The difference $g_{f_S}^H - \bar{g}_{\theta}^H$ thus isolates the statistical error due to the estimation of the transfer coefficients. The transfer estimator $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H$ on the tessellation H additionally replaces f_S with its nonparametric estimator \hat{f}_S .

For any fixed tessellation H , the following deterministic decomposition holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}}) &= \|f_{\mathcal{T}} - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \\ &\leq 2\|f_{\mathcal{T}} - g_{f_S}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 + 2\|g_{f_S}^H - \bar{g}_{\theta}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \\ (7) \quad &\quad + 2\|\bar{g}_{\theta}^H - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \\ &=: 2\text{Approx}(H) + 2\text{Fit}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H) + 2\text{Plug}_S(H). \end{aligned}$$

We have the following interpretation: the term $\text{Approx}(H)$ quantifies the *transfer bias* induced by approximating the target regression function $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ with a piecewise linear transfer model on H . The quantity $\text{Fit}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H)$ captures the estimation error arising from replacing the population transfer parameters $(a_{H, \ell}^*, b_{H, \ell}^*)$ with their empirical counterparts estimated from the target sample \mathcal{T}_1 . Finally, $\text{Plug}_S(H)$ measures the additional error incurred by substituting the unknown source function f_S with its nonparametric estimator \hat{f}_S within the transfer model.

Beyond requiring the tessellations to be admissible, we also need the corresponding partition of $[0, 1]^d$ to satisfy certain regularity conditions and to ensure an appropriate distribution of the target data within the cells.

Assumption 7 (Local design regularity on each cell). *We impose the following local regularity condition on the design.*

7.1 . On admissible tessellations. *For any admissible tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$, there exist constants $0 < \lambda_{H,\min} \leq \lambda_{H,\max} < \infty$ such that for all $\ell \in [L_H]$,*

$$(8) \quad \lambda_{H,\min} I_2 \preceq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}|} (\Psi_{H,\ell})^\top \Psi_{H,\ell} \preceq \lambda_{H,\max} I_2,$$

where $\Psi_{H,\ell}$ is the $n_{H,\ell} \times 2$ design matrix with rows $\phi_\ell^H(X_i)^\top$, $i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}$, and

$$(9) \quad \phi_\ell^H(x) = (1, f_S(x) - f_S(x_{H,\ell}))^\top,$$

with $\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell} := \{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : X_i \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}$.

7.2 . On the target tessellation. *There exist constants $0 < \lambda_{\min}^* \leq \lambda_{\max}^* < \infty$ such that for all $\ell \in [L^*]$,*

$$(10) \quad \lambda_{\min}^* I_2 \preceq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_1^{*,\ell}|} (\Psi_\ell^*)^\top \Psi_\ell^* \preceq \lambda_{\max}^* I_2,$$

where Ψ_ℓ^* is the $n_\ell \times 2$ design matrix with rows $\phi_\ell^*(X_i)^\top$ ($i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{*,\ell}$), and

$$(11) \quad \phi_\ell^*(x) = (1, f_S(x) - f_S(x_{\ell^*}))^\top,$$

with $\mathcal{T}_1^{*,\ell} := \{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : X_i \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*\}$.

For any $\ell \in [L_H]$, define

$$(12) \quad n_{H,\ell} := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{H,\ell} := \mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}).$$

Assumption 8 (Cellwise lower-mass condition). *For all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and all $H \in \mathcal{H}$,*

$$(13) \quad n_{\mathcal{T}_1} \min_{\ell \in [L_H]} p_{H,\ell} \geq 8 \log \left(\frac{L_H}{\delta} \right).$$

Remark 4 (On Assumption 7.2). Assuming local Gram invertibility uniformly over all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ simply means that \mathcal{H} is restricted to a class of *admissible* tessellations whose cells are regular enough for local linear estimation. This type of condition is standard in the theory of tessellation-based estimators: see, for example, Györfi et al. ([14], Chapter 12), Scornet et al. [39], and Wager and Athey [45], where the analysis excludes degenerate cells to ensure identifiability of local fits. Our assumption avoids stronger geometric or density conditions on the function f_S and isolates precisely the regularity needed for the local estimator to be well-posed.

To express the approximation and estimation bounds purely in terms of the number of cells L_H , we impose the following mild regularity condition on the geometry of the tessellations, which rules out highly irregular partitions with a few large cells and many tiny ones.

Assumption 9 (Quasi-uniform mesh condition). *9.1 . On admissible tessellations.* There exists a constant $\mathfrak{c}_\Delta > 0$ such that for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\Delta_{\max}(H) := \max_{\ell \in [L_H]} \Delta_{H,\ell} \leq \mathfrak{c}_\Delta L_H^{-1/d},$$

where $\Delta_{H,\ell} := \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell})$.

9.2 . On the target tessellation. There exist constants $0 < \mathfrak{c}_{\min}^* \leq \mathfrak{c}_{\max}^* < \infty$ such that

$$(14) \quad \mathfrak{c}_{\min}^*(L^*)^{-1/d} \leq \Delta_{\min}(H^*) \leq \Delta_{\max}(H^*) \leq \mathfrak{c}_{\max}^*(L^*)^{-1/d},$$

where $\Delta_{\min}(H^*) = \min_{\ell \in [L^*]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*)$ and $\Delta_{\max}(H^*) = \max_{\ell \in [L^*]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*)$.

Theorem 1. Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ be an admissible tessellation. Suppose that Assumptions 2, 3, 4, 5 7 and 9.1 hold.

Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \gtrsim \log(1/\delta)$, the transfer estimator $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H$ associated with the tessellation H satisfies, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}}) \lesssim L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d} + \frac{L_H}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \\ + L_H^{-2\beta_g\beta_S/d} + \log\left(\frac{L_H}{\delta}\right) \left(1 + \log\left(\frac{L_H}{\delta}\right)\right) n_S^{-\frac{2\beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}}.$$

Remark 5 (Interpretation of the error decomposition). The bound (15) reveals four distinct contributions to the excess risk of the transfer estimator. The first term, $L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d}$, corresponds to the approximation error incurred by representing the target regression function with a piecewise linear transfer model on a quasi-uniform tessellation of size L_H . This term is governed by the local transfer smoothness exponent β_{loc} appearing in Assumption 2. The second term, $L_H/n_{\mathcal{T}_1}$, up to logarithmic factors, reflects the aggregate parametric estimation error arising from the estimation of the $2L_H$ cellwise transfer coefficients based on the $n_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ target observations. The third term, $L_H^{-2\beta_g\beta_S/d}$, captures an additional approximation bias induced by composing the cellwise linear transfer model with a nonparametric estimate of the source regression function. This term depends jointly on the transfer smoothness exponent β_g and the source smoothness exponent β_S . Finally, the last term corresponds to the plug-in error induced by estimating the source regression function f_S from n_S observations. Up to logarithmic factors, it matches the classical minimax rate for estimating a β_S -Hölder regression function in dimension d .

Remark 6 (Smooth transfer-source regime). Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, assume in addition that

$$\beta_g \beta_S \geq 1 + \beta_{\text{loc}}.$$

Then, under the quasi-uniformity assumption on H , we have

$$\sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} p_{H,\ell} \Delta_{H,\ell}^{2\beta_g\beta_S} \lesssim \Delta_{\max}(H)^{2\beta_g\beta_S} \lesssim L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d}.$$

Consequently, the additional approximation term $L_H^{-2\beta_g\beta_S/d}$ in (15) is dominated by the transfer bias term $L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d}$ and can be absorbed into it. In this regime, the excess risk bound simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}}) &\lesssim L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d} + \frac{L_H}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \\ &\quad + \log\left(\frac{L_H}{\delta}\right) \left(1 + \log\left(\frac{L_H}{\delta}\right)\right) n_S^{-\frac{2\beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the remainder of this section, we focus on the smooth transfer-source regime and assume that

$$\beta_g\beta_S \geq 1 + \beta_{\text{loc}}.$$

Consider the additional assumption:

Assumption 10 (Effective sample size and plug-in regime). *For any fixed admissible tessellation H and cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, define the effective sample size count*

$$N_{H,\ell} = \#\left\{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : \|X_i - x_{H,\ell}\| \leq h, |\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell})| \leq \bar{h}\right\}.$$

Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. There exist constants $\mathfrak{c}_1^{\text{ess}}, \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} > 0$ such that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following event holds:

$$(16) \quad \frac{1}{\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \leq \sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} N_{H,\ell} \leq \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}.$$

We define the event

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{ess}} = \left\{ \forall H \in \mathcal{H}, \forall \ell \in [L_H] : \frac{1}{\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \leq N_{H,\ell} \leq \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \right\}.$$

In particular, the effective sample size of the local weighted estimator within each cell is of order $n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}$, uniformly over (H, ℓ) . We further assume the plug-in regime

$$(18) \quad n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \geq \mathfrak{c}_1^{\text{ess}} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right).$$

Remark 7. In classical local polynomial regression [10], uniform covering and design-conditioning assumptions are typically used to control the number of observations falling into local neighborhoods. In the present transfer-learning setting, these conditions are replaced by the effective sample size requirement in Assumption 10, together with the cellwise local-design conditions in Assumptions 7.1 and 7.2. The effective sample size condition directly controls joint localization counts of the form

$$(19) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \|X_i - x_{H,\ell}\| \leq h, |\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell})| \leq \bar{h} \right\}},$$

that is, the number of target observations falling in a joint $(x, \hat{f}_S(x))$ -window around $(x_{H,\ell}, \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell}))$. Such counts naturally arise in the local transfer estimation step and are controlled uniformly over all admissible tessellations and cells under Assumption 10.

Under this additional assumption, we obtain the following corollary, which yields a simplified rate in an effective sample size regime.

Corollary 1. *Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ be an admissible tessellation. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Assume moreover that Assumption 10 holds at level δ . Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$(20) \quad \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}}) \lesssim L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d} + \frac{L_H}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} + n_S^{-\frac{2\beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}}.$$

Proof. Under Assumption 10, the effective sample size in each cellwise local regression is of order $n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^{d\bar{h}}$ uniformly over (H, ℓ) , and the plug-in regime ensures $n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^{d\bar{h}} \gtrsim \log(1/\delta)$. The logarithmic factors in Theorem 1 can therefore be absorbed into the implicit constant, yielding (20). \square

Independently, Theorem 1 also implies an expectation bound on a fixed tessellation.

Corollary 2. *Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ be an admissible tessellation. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Then*

$$(21) \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}})] \lesssim L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d} + \frac{L_H}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} + (1 + \log(L_H))^2 n_S^{-\frac{2\beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}}.$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 1 with $\delta = e^{-t}$ and integrate the resulting sub-exponential tail bound in t . Expanding $\log(L_H/\delta)$ yields a factor of order $(1 + \log(L_H))^2$ after integration, which gives (21). \square

The next corollary specializes Theorem 1 to the well-specified oracle regime, where the true tessellation is known and the effective sample size condition is satisfied via plug-in tuning.

Corollary 3 (Oracle rate under a well-specified model). *Assume moreover that Assumptions 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9.1 hold, as well as the plug-in condition (18). Then the transfer estimator $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{TL}} = \hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{H^*}$ associated with the oracle tessellation H^* satisfies the following bound in expectation:*

$$(22) \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{TL}}) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}})] \lesssim (L^*)^{-\frac{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}{d}} + \frac{L^*}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} + \log(L^*)(1 + \log(L^*)) n_S^{-\frac{2\beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}}.$$

3.2.2. Empirical risk minimization and risk bound for the transfer estimator. We now analyze the additional error induced by the data-driven selection of an admissible tessellation. The results of the previous section provide risk bounds for the transfer estimator associated with a *fixed* tessellation. In practice, however, the tessellation must be selected from a finite collection \mathcal{H} using an independent validation sample. This model selection step introduces an extra estimation error, which we quantify below.

For any $H \in \mathcal{H}$, let $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H$ denote the transfer estimator constructed on the tessellation H , and define its population risk by

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{R}(H) := \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H) = \mathbb{E}[(Y - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H(X))^2].$$

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H)$ denote the corresponding empirical risk computed on the validation sample \mathcal{T}_2 . The selected tessellation is defined via the empirical risk minimization rule

$$(24) \quad \widehat{H} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H).$$

Oracle inequality in expectation. We first establish an oracle inequality for this empirical selection procedure in expectation. This result relies only on finite-moment assumptions and is therefore compatible with sub-exponential noise.

Proposition 1. *Let $H^{\text{or}} \in \arg \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H)$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] < \infty$ and that the validation sample \mathcal{T}_2 is independent of the data used to construct the estimators $\{\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Then there exists a universal constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that*

$$(25) \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(\widehat{H})] \leq \mathcal{R}(H^{\text{or}}) + \mathfrak{c}(\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{n_{\mathcal{T}_2}}},$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\max} := \max_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H)$.

Proof. The proof is postponed to Appendix B.2.1. \square

We now combine the above oracle inequality with the fixed-tessellation risk bounds (Theorem 1) derived previously to obtain a bound for the selected transfer estimator.

Theorem 2 (Oracle inequality for the transfer estimator). *Assume that the class \mathcal{H} of admissible tessellations is finite. Suppose that Assumptions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 hold. Then there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that*

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{TL}}) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}})] &\leq \mathfrak{c} \inf_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d} + \frac{L_H}{n_{\mathcal{T}}} + n_{\mathcal{S}}^{-\frac{2\beta_{\mathcal{S}}}{2\beta_{\mathcal{S}}+d}} \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathfrak{c}(\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{n_{\mathcal{T}}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{TL}} := \widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\widehat{H}}$ denotes the transfer estimator associated with the selected tessellation \widehat{H} .

The bound (26) is an oracle inequality showing that the selected transfer estimator achieves, up to a model-selection penalty, the same performance as the best estimator associated with a tessellation in \mathcal{H} .

High-probability selection via median-of-means. While the expectation bound above is sufficient for our purposes, a high-probability oracle inequality can be obtained under the same moment assumptions by replacing the empirical risk $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H)$ with a median-of-means (MoM) version. To this end, partition the validation sample \mathcal{T}_2 into B disjoint blocks of equal size.

For any $H \in \mathcal{H}$, let $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H)$ denote the median of the blockwise empirical means of the squared validation loss

$$\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y) := (Y - \widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H(X))^2.$$

The selected tessellation is then defined by

$$(27) \quad \widehat{H}_{\text{MoM}} \in \underset{H \in \mathcal{H}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H).$$

The following proposition provides a high-probability oracle inequality for the MoM-based selection step.

Proposition 2 (High-probability oracle inequality for tessellation selection). *Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] < \infty$. There exist universal constants $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c}' > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and any integer B satisfying*

$$(28) \quad B \geq \mathfrak{c} \log\left(\frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{\delta}\right),$$

the selected tessellation \widehat{H}_{MoM} satisfies, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{R}(\widehat{H}_{\text{MoM}}) \leq \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H) + \mathfrak{c}'(\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{\log(|\mathcal{H}|/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}_2}}},$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\max} := \max_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H)$.

Proof. The proof is postponed to Appendix B.2.2. \square

We finally combine Proposition 2 with the high-probability fixed-tessellation bounds (Theorem 1) established earlier.

Theorem 3 (High-probability risk bound for the selected transfer estimator). *Assume that the class \mathcal{H} of admissible tessellations is finite. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Assume moreover that Assumption 10 holds at level $\delta/(2|\mathcal{H}|)$ and that $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] < \infty$. Let \widehat{H}_{MoM} be defined as above with an integer B satisfying*

$$(30) \quad B \geq \mathfrak{c} \log\left(\frac{2|\mathcal{H}|}{\delta}\right).$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\widehat{H}_{\text{MoM}}}) - \mathcal{R}(f_{\mathcal{T}}) &\lesssim \inf_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d} + \frac{L_H}{n_{\mathcal{T}}} + n_{\mathcal{S}}^{-\frac{2\beta_{\mathcal{S}}}{2\beta_{\mathcal{S}}+d}} \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathfrak{c}''(\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\mathcal{H}|/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}}}}, \end{aligned}$$

for some universal constant $\mathfrak{c}'' > 0$.

The bound (31) is a high-probability oracle inequality showing that the selected transfer estimator achieves, up to a model-selection penalty, the same performance as the best estimator associated with a tessellation in \mathcal{H} .

3.3. Lower bound. In this section, we establish a minimax lower bound for transfer learning under an oracle tessellation. Specifically, we assume that the true tessellation $H^\star = \{\mathcal{A}_\ell^\star : \ell \in [L^\star]\}$ for which Assumption 1 holds is known, and we characterize the fundamental limits of estimation in this idealized setting. Moreover, since centered Gaussian noise $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is sub-Gaussian and hence sub-exponential, it suffices to prove the minimax lower bound under the Gaussian noise submodel. Any lower bound obtained under this restriction applies *a fortiori* to the full sub-exponential noise model.

Assumption 11 (Balanced cell allocation). *For any $\ell \in [L^\star]$, let $p_\ell^\star := \mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^\star)$. There exist constants $0 < \mathfrak{a} \leq \mathfrak{b} < \infty$ such that*

$$(32) \quad \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{L^\star} \leq p_\ell^\star \leq \frac{\mathfrak{b}}{L^\star}.$$

Theorem 4. *Assume that the source and target regression functions satisfy Assumption 4 with $\beta_S = \beta_T = \beta$. Assume further that the oracle tessellation $H^\star = \{\mathcal{A}_\ell^\star : \ell \in [L^\star]\}$ and the associated set of representative points $\{x_{H^\star, \ell} : \ell \in [L^\star]\}$ are known, and that Assumptions 1, 7.2, and 11 hold. Suppose moreover that Assumption 2 holds with $\|a^\star\|_\infty \leq A_{\max}$ and $\|b^\star\|_\infty \leq B_{\max}$ for some $A_{\max}, B_{\max} > 0$.*

Then there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$, depending only on $d, \beta, \sigma, A_{\max}, B_{\max}$ and the constants appearing in Assumptions 3, 7.2, and 11, such that

$$\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{(f_S, f_T) \in \mathcal{F}(H^\star, \beta, \beta, \beta_{\text{loc}})} \left[\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) - \mathcal{R}(f_T) \right] \geq \mathfrak{c} \left[\frac{\sigma^2 L^\star}{n_T} + (\Delta_{\min}(H^\star))^{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})} + n_S^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}} \right].$$

In particular, the same lower bound applies to the transfer estimator \hat{f}_T^{TL} defined in Algorithm 2:

$$\sup_{(f_S, f_T) \in \mathcal{F}(H^\star, \beta, \beta, \beta_{\text{loc}})} \left[\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_T^{\text{TL}}) - \mathcal{R}(f_T) \right] \geq \mathfrak{c} \left[\frac{\sigma^2 L^\star}{n_T} + (\Delta_{\min}(H^\star))^{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})} + n_S^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}} \right].$$

As an immediate consequence, we obtain the following specialization for quasi-uniform tessellations.

Corollary 4. *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 4 and Assumption 9.2 hold. Then, there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that*

$$(33) \quad \inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{(f_S, f_T) \in \mathcal{F}(H^\star, \beta, \beta, \beta_{\text{loc}})} (\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) - \mathcal{R}(f_T)) \geq \mathfrak{c} \left[\frac{\sigma^2 L^\star}{n_T} + (L^\star)^{-\frac{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}{d}} + n_S^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}} \right].$$

Combining Corollary 3 with Corollary 4, we conclude that the proposed transfer learning estimator is minimax rate-optimal over $\mathcal{F}(H^\star, \beta, \beta, \beta_{\text{loc}})$,

up to logarithmic factors and the standard sample-splitting convention $n_{\mathcal{T}_1} = cn_{\mathcal{T}}$. In particular, no estimator can uniformly improve upon the rates achieved by $\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{TL}}$ on this class.

Remark 8 (On the role of the dimension). For a fixed tessellation H^* , the target-side contribution $\sigma^2 L^*/n_{\mathcal{T}} + (\Delta_{\min}(H^*))^{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}$ is parametric in the target sample size $n_{\mathcal{T}}$. In this sense, transfer learning removes the curse of dimensionality on the target side when the tessellation is fixed. If one further assumes a regular tessellation with $\Delta_{\min}(H^*)$ of order $(L^*)^{-1/d}$ and allows L^* to grow with $n_{\mathcal{T}}$, balancing the terms $L^*/n_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $(\Delta_{\min}(H^*))^{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}$ yields the rate

$$(34) \quad n_{\mathcal{T}}^{-\frac{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})+d}},$$

which again exhibits an explicit dependence on the ambient dimension d . Such a dependence is unavoidable in fully d -dimensional nonparametric settings, unless additional structural assumptions are imposed to reduce the intrinsic dimension. Examples include manifold regularity [41], sparsity [36], or more general forms of effective dimension reduction [14], all of which mitigate the curse of dimensionality by lowering the effective complexity of the regression problem.

3.4. Estimation of the transfer function under an oracle tessellation. In this section, we study the estimation error of the transfer function in an oracle setting where the true tessellation $H^* = \{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^* : \ell \in [L^*]\}$ satisfying Assumption 1 is assumed to be known. This assumption allows us to focus exclusively on the statistical complexity of estimating the transfer map, abstracting away from the additional error induced by tessellation selection. The transfer function admits the cellwise representation

$$(35) \quad g(x, y) := \sum_{\ell \in [L^*]} g_{\ell}^*(y) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^*}(x).$$

Accordingly, for each $\ell \in [L^*]$ we consider the regression model

$$(36) \quad Y_i = g_{\ell}^*(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(X_i)) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{T}_1,$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i | X_i] = 0$ and the noise on the target sample satisfies Assumption 5, namely $|\varepsilon_i| \psi_1 \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$. Using the estimated source score $\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}$, we define the estimator

$$(37) \quad \widehat{g}_{\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}}(x, y) := \sum_{\ell \in [L^*]} \widehat{g}_{\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}, \ell}(y) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^*}(x), \quad \widehat{g}_{\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}, \ell}(y) := \widehat{a}_{\ell}[y - \widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{\ell^*})] + \widehat{b}_{\ell},$$

where $(\widehat{a}_\ell, \widehat{b}_\ell)$ is obtained by local least squares around the representative point x_{ℓ^*} of the cell \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , namely

$$(38) \quad (\widehat{b}_\ell, \widehat{a}_\ell) \in \underset{b, a \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \left[Y_i - a(\widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}(X_i) - \widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}(x_{\ell^*})) - b \right]^2 \right. \\ \left. \times K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{\ell^*}\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|\widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}(X_i) - \widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}(x_{\ell^*})|) \right\}.$$

Here, $K_x : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $K_z : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ are bounded kernels supported on $[0, 1]$ and satisfying Assumption 6. The bandwidths $h > 0$ and $\bar{h} > 0$ define the rescaled kernels $K_{x,h} = h^{-d}K_x(\cdot/h)$ and $K_{z,\bar{h}} = \bar{h}^{-1}K_z(\cdot/\bar{h})$.

Assumption 12. For all $\ell \in [L^*]$, $g_\ell^* \in \text{H\"ol}(\beta_g, \mathfrak{l}_g; \mathbb{R})$, where $\beta_g > 1$ and $\mathfrak{l}_g > 0$.

Throughout this section, we assume that Assumptions 3.2, 4.1, 5, and 6 hold. In particular, these assumptions ensure uniform control of the source estimator $\widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}$ in sup-norm. Specifically, for any $\delta_\mathcal{S} \in (0, 1)$, there exist constants $\mathfrak{c}'_\mathcal{S}, \mathfrak{c}_\mathcal{S} > 0$ and an event $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{S}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{S}) \geq 1 - \delta_\mathcal{S}$ on which

$$(39) \quad \epsilon_\mathcal{S} := \|\widehat{f}_\mathcal{S} - f_\mathcal{S}\|_\infty \leq \mathfrak{c}'_\mathcal{S} \left(\frac{\log(\mathfrak{c}_\mathcal{S}/\delta_\mathcal{S})}{n_\mathcal{S}} \right)^{\frac{\beta_\mathcal{S}}{2\beta_\mathcal{S}+d}}.$$

Theorem 5. Let X be a target covariate with distribution $\mu_\mathcal{T}$ (density $p_\mathcal{T}$), independent of the source sample $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$. Suppose Assumptions 3.2, 4.1, 5, and 6 hold. Assume moreover that Assumptions 7.2, 10, and 6 hold on each cell $\ell \in [L^*]$ for the local estimators (38), and define for $x \in [0, 1]^d$, $y_{\ell(x)} := \widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}(x_{\ell^*(x)})$ where $\ell^*(x)$ is the unique index such that $x \in \mathcal{A}_{\ell(x)}^*$. Fix $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the localization event

$$(40) \quad \mathcal{E}_y := \left\{ |y - y_{\ell(X)}| \leq \bar{h} \right\}.$$

Then, on the event $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{ess}} \cap \mathcal{E}_y$, where \mathcal{E}_{ess} is defined by (17), we have

$$(41) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(\widehat{g}_{\widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}}(X, y) - g(X, y))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S} \right] \\ \lesssim \mathfrak{l}_g^2 \left(\frac{\log(\mathfrak{c}_\mathcal{S}/\delta_\mathcal{S})}{n_\mathcal{S}} \right)^{\frac{2\beta_g\beta_\mathcal{S}}{2\beta_\mathcal{S}+d}} + \mathfrak{l}_g^2 \bar{h}^{2\beta_g} + \frac{\sigma_\mathcal{T}^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}},$$

where the implicit constant depends only on $\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}}$, λ_0 , and the kernel envelopes $\|K_x\|_\infty, \|K_z\|_\infty$. In particular, with the choice $\bar{h} = (n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d)^{-1/(2\beta_g+1)}$, the bound (41) yields, on $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{ess}} \cap \mathcal{E}_y$,

$$(42) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(\widehat{g}_{\widehat{f}_\mathcal{S}}(X, y) - g(X, y))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S} \right] \lesssim \left(\frac{\log(\mathfrak{c}_\mathcal{S}/\delta_\mathcal{S})}{n_\mathcal{S}} \right)^{\frac{2\beta_g\beta_\mathcal{S}}{2\beta_\mathcal{S}+d}} + (n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d)^{-\frac{2\beta_g}{2\beta_g+1}}.$$

Moreover, if $\sup_{\ell \in [L^*]} |y - y_\ell| \leq \bar{h}$, then \mathcal{E}_y holds automatically and the same bound is valid (on $\mathcal{E}_S \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{ess}}$).

Proof. The proof is postponed to Appendix D.1.2. □

Connection with the global excess-risk bound. Theorem 5 controls the pointwise-in- y estimation error of the transfer function, averaged over the target covariate X . In the subsequent analysis, this bound is integrated over the random argument $y = \hat{f}_S(X)$ and combined with the approximation and parametric estimation errors arising from the tessellation structure. This decomposition yields the source plug-in term appearing in the global excess-risk bounds for the transfer estimator, as stated in Theorems 1 and 2.

4. EXPERIMENTS AND APPLICATION

In this section, we present numerical experiments designed to illustrate both the performance and the limitations of the proposed transfer learning approach. Throughout the numerical study, performance is assessed in terms of the error reduction

$$E_{\text{red}} := \frac{\text{MSE}_{\text{NW}} - \text{MSE}_{(\text{TL})^2}}{\text{MSE}_{\text{NW}}},$$

where MSE_{NW} and $\text{MSE}_{(\text{TL})^2}$ denote respectively the mean squared error of the Nadaraya-Watson estimator of $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ computed on the full target sample \mathcal{T} (i.e., without transfer), and that of the proposed $(\text{TL})^2$ estimator defined in Algorithm (2). In practice, values of E_{red} close to 1 indicate a highly effective transfer, while negative values correspond to negative transfer, meaning that incorporating source information deteriorates the estimation accuracy.

The first step of the procedure consists in specifying the collection \mathcal{H} of admissible tessellations. In this section, we focus on the special case of axis-aligned square tessellations. More precisely, letting d denote the dimension of the regressors, each cell of the partition is of the form

$$\prod_{i=1}^d \left] \frac{k_i}{n_T}, \frac{k_i + 1}{n_T} \right], \quad 0 \leq k_1, \dots, k_d \leq n_T - 1.$$

As a consequence, the maximal number of cells is fixed and given by $L_{\text{max}} = n_T^d$.

Remark 9. The transfer estimation procedures described in Algorithms 1 and 2 require solving an optimization problem over a finite but potentially large collection of partitions of $[0, 1]^d$. A direct exploration of this set may therefore be computationally demanding. In the present numerical study, we rely on a simulated annealing algorithm [17] to perform this optimization. We emphasize that this choice is purely algorithmic: the optimization strategy is independent of the proposed transfer methodology, and alternative optimization methods could equally well be employed.

Along these section all kernels considered are gaussian, namely K , K_x and K_z are all taken as $x \mapsto \sqrt{2\pi}^{-1} e^{-\|x\|_2^2/2}$ where x stand for the appropriate argument. Moreover, the bandwidths h and \bar{h} are chosen of order $n^{-1/3}$. Since the purpose of this section is to assess the intrinsic properties of the transfer learning procedure, the influence of tuning parameter selection is not investigated. It is nevertheless worth noting that this choice does not coincide with the classical bandwidth that is optimal in terms of mean squared error. This departure is deliberate and more consistent with the philosophy of transfer learning, whose primary goal is often variance reduction rather than pointwise optimality: transfer learning is often variance reduction, whereas bandwidths optimized for mean squared error may lead to an undesirable increase in variance due to the well-known bias/variance trade-off.

The results presented in this section are based on 100 monte-carlo simulations, namely 100 replications for simulated data and 100 random subsampling for application. The displays present the median of those 100 empirical results. The choice of the median rather the average is due to the fact that, for simulated data, the transferred estimator may leads to a severe increase of MSE, driving the average over simulations. This phenomenon seems not due to the transfer learning methodology but to the optimization method (e.g simulated annealing). We made this assumptions since when only a little number of admissible tessellations is consider, so the best partition can be explicitly found, the phenomenon of severe error is never observed.

4.1. Empirical results. To illustrate the performance of the proposed transfer learning method and its behavior as the dimension increases, we consider two synthetic regression targets defined on $[0, 1]^d$ with values in \mathbb{R} , for varying dimensions $d \geq 1$. In both experiments, the same source regression function is used, namely $f_S : x \in [0, 1]^d \mapsto \|x\|_2^2$. Moreover, target and source covariates (respectively $X_{\mathcal{T}}$ and X_S) are both simulated according to i.i.d uniform distribution on $[0, 1]^d$ and source output are simulated for all $i \in \mathcal{S}$ as $Y_i = f_S(X_i) + \varepsilon_i$ with $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$. Whereas the target output is simulated for $i \in \mathcal{T}$ as $Y_i = f_k(X_i) + \varepsilon_i$ with $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$ while f_k stand for one of the follonwig target regression functions.

Target 1:

$$f_1(x) := \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}\}}(\sin(\|x\|_2)) + \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 < \frac{1}{2}\}}(e^{\|x\|_2}), \quad x \in [0, 1]^d.$$

Target 2:

$$f_2(x) := \mathbf{1}_{\{\|x\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\}}(\sin(\|x\|_2)) + \mathbf{1}_{\{\|x\|_2 < \frac{1}{2}\}}(e^{\|x\|_2}), \quad x \in [0, 1]^d.$$

In all simulations, the target sample size is fixed to $n_{\mathcal{T}} = 20$. As a consequence, admissible partitions can only split the domain at points of the form $k/20$ with $k \in \{1, \dots, 20\}$. This setting is favorable for the estimation of f_1 , since its discontinuity can be exactly captured by an admissible tessellation.

In contrast, the discontinuity of f_2 lies on a sphere of radius $1/2$, which cannot be perfectly approximated by axis-aligned partitions, leading to an intrinsic model misspecification.

To further investigate the robustness of the method to model misspecification, we also consider the estimation of f_1 using partitions split at points $k/19$, $k = \{1, \dots, 19\}$. This configuration is referred to as Target 1 (wrong split) in Figure 1. In this case, misspecification arises from the fact that the optimal partition H^* appearing in Assumption (1) does not belong to the class of admissible tessellations explored by the algorithm. Figure 1 reports




FIGURE 1. Error reduction for the estimation of f_1 and f_2 as a function of the regressor dimension d .

the error reduction as a function of the dimension d . In these experiments, the source sample size is set to $n_S = 100 \times d$.

As long as the model is well-specified, a substantial error reduction is observed. Nevertheless, the qualitative behavior of the three curves remains similar, with a monotone decrease as the dimension increases. This phenomenon highlights the impact of the quality of the source estimator. For instance, in dimension $d = 12$, only 1200 source observations are available, which may lead to a poor estimation of the source function due to the curse of dimensionality. As a result, for Target 2 the error reduction becomes negative, meaning that transfer increases the estimation error (by approximately 26% in this case).

This issue can be mitigated by improving the estimation of the source function. In particular, Table 1 shows that increasing the source sample size for $d = 12$ restores a positive and increasing error reduction for Target 2.

TABLE 1. Error reduction for Target 2 as the source sample size increases, with $d = 12$.

| | | | |
|------------------|------|------|------|
| n_S | 2000 | 4000 | 6000 |
| E_{red} | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.26 |

Remark 10. These simulations illustrate the respective roles of the different terms appearing in the error decomposition given in Equation (7). More specifically, the decreasing behavior of the curves in Figure 1, as well as the results reported in Table 1, highlight the impact of the term $\text{Plug}_S(H)$ and underline the importance of accurately estimating the source function in order to achieve positive transfer.

On the other hand, the relative positions of the curves in Figure 1 reflect the influence of the approximation error $\text{Approx}(H)$ and the fitting term $\text{Fit}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H)$, emphasizing the necessity of identifying a tessellation for which the transfer function is sufficiently smooth to allow for an accurate local linear estimation.

4.2. Application. In this section the performances of $(\text{TL})^2$ are evaluated on two datasets. The first dataset is a famous toy model *Abalone* available on the UCI database.

Toy dataset : Abalone [32]. In this experiment, we consider a real-data regression problem in which the goal is to predict the age of abalones from a set of physical measurements. More precisely, the regression task maps \mathbb{R}^7 to \mathbb{R} , where the response variable is the abalone’s age and the covariates consist of its length, diameter, height, and the weights of its various organs. The target task corresponds to the estimation of the age of female abalones ($n_{\mathcal{T}} = 1307$), while observations from male abalones ($n_S = 1528$) are used as source data for transfer learning. For any experiments the source sample is entirely used whereas the target sample is chosen among 600 female subsampled in the 1307 available and the RMS is computed on the 707 remaining female. Figure 2 shows the error reduction achieved by the proposed transfer learning method as the number of target observations increases. As expected, the benefit of transfer is most pronounced when the target sample size is small. In particular, when fewer than 100 target observations are available, the method yields an error reduction of approximately 26%. As the number of target samples increases, the performance of the classical Nadaraya-Watson estimator improves, thereby reducing the marginal gain brought by transfer. The error reduction then gradually decreases and stabilizes around 8%. Notably, even when the full dataset is used (corresponding to approximately 1300 target observations), transfer learning still provides a modest but positive improvement. From a target-to-source sample size ratio of approximately 0.3 onward, this gain remains essentially constant, indicating that the proposed method continues to exploit source information effectively even in data-rich target regimes.




FIGURE 2. Error reduction for the estimation of female abalone age as a function of the target sample size.

5. CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS

In this work, we introduced a regression transfer learning framework that explicitly accounts for heterogeneity in the relationship between source and target distributions. By modeling transfer locally through an oracle tessellation and cellwise transfer functions, we showed that meaningful gains can be achieved even when global similarity assumptions fail. Our analysis establishes minimax-optimal rates of convergence and oracle inequalities that disentangle estimation and approximation errors, thereby clarifying when and how transfer learning can mitigate the curse of dimensionality. Beyond the well-specified regime, our results demonstrate that local transfer yields stable and interpretable performance under mild forms of misspecification, providing a principled safeguard against negative transfer.

Despite its flexibility, the proposed framework relies on structural assumptions that may not be appropriate in all applications. In particular, the existence of a finite tessellation supporting simple local transfer relationships may be restrictive in settings where similarity between source and target varies continuously or lacks spatial coherence. Moreover, while our adaptive procedure alleviates the need to know the oracle partition, its computational cost may grow with the richness of the tessellation class, potentially limiting scalability in very high-dimensional problems. Finally, our analysis focuses on regression with bounded responses; extending the results to more general loss functions or heavy-tailed noise distributions would require additional technical developments.

Several directions for future work naturally emerge from this study. First, relaxing the piecewise-constant tessellation structure toward smoothly varying or hierarchical partitions could further enhance flexibility while preserving interpretability. Second, extending the framework to settings with multiple heterogeneous sources, or to sequential and online transfer scenarios, would broaden its applicability. From a theoretical standpoint, an important direction is to characterize negative transfer more precisely by identifying distinct regimes of transferability. Such regimes may depend on the relative sizes of the target and source samples, for instance through the ratio n_T/n_S , as well as on structural properties of the local transfer functions, such as their regularity or degree of nonlinearity. A finer understanding of these interactions could lead to sharp phase transitions delineating when transfer is beneficial, neutral, or detrimental, and to refined oracle bounds that explicitly quantify these effects.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Benjamin Bobbia and Hélène Halconrui acknowledge the support of the French National Research Agency (ANR) under grant ANR-24-CE40-3341 (project DECATTLON).

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bouveyron and J. Jacques. Adaptive linear models for regression: improving prediction when population has changed. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 31(14):2237–2247, 2010.
- [2] T. Cai and H. Pu. Transfer learning for nonparametric regression: Non-asymptotic minimax analysis and adaptive procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12272*, 2024.
- [3] T Tony Cai and Hongji Wei. Transfer learning for nonparametric classification. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(1):100–128, 2021.
- [4] Jae Ho Chang, Massimiliano Russo, and Subhadeep Paul. Heterogeneous transfer learning for high dimensional regression with feature mismatch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.18081*, 2024.
- [5] Aiyu Chen and Minghui Shi. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9:1078–1112, 2015.
- [6] Corinna Cortes and Mehryar Mohri. Domain adaptation and sample bias correction theory and algorithm for regression. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 519:103–126, 2014.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, pages 4171–4186, 2019.

- [8] Ronald A DeVore and George G Lorentz. *Constructive approximation*, volume 303. Springer Science & Business Media, 1993.
- [9] Uwe Einmahl and David M Mason. Uniform in bandwidth consistency of kernel-type function estimators. 2005.
- [10] Jianqing Fan. *Local polynomial modelling and its applications: monographs on statistics and applied probability 66*. Routledge, 2018.
- [11] Jianqing Fan, Cheng Gao, and Jason M Klusowski. Robust transfer learning with unreliable source data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 53(4):1728–1752, 2025.
- [12] Yaroslav Ganin, Evgeniya Ustinova, Hana Ajakan, Pascal Germain, Hugo Larochelle, François Laviolette, Mario March, and Victor Lempitsky. Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *Journal of machine learning research*, 17(59):1–35, 2016.
- [13] Evarist Giné and Armelle Guillaou. Rates of strong uniform consistency for multivariate kernel density estimators. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, volume 38, pages 907–921. Elsevier, 2002.
- [14] László Györfi, Michael Kohler, Adam Krzyżak, and Harro Walk. *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer, 2002.
- [15] Baihua He, Huihang Liu, Xinyu Zhang, and Jian Huang. Representation transfer learning for semiparametric regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13197*, 2024.
- [16] Yeichan Kim, Ilmun Kim, and Seyoung Park. Transfer learning for benign overfitting in high-dimensional linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.15337*, 2025.
- [17] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220(4598):671–680, 1983.
- [18] Peng Lai, Zhou Wang, and Zitong Wang. Robust estimation of the parametric regression model under semi-supervised transfer learning. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, pages 1–18, 2025.
- [19] Bertrand LeBichot, Theo Verhelst, Yann-Ael Le Borgne, Liyun He-Guelton, Frederic Oble, and Gianluca Bontempi. Transfer learning strategies for credit card fraud detection. *IEEE access*, 9:114754–114766, 2021.
- [20] Lucien LeCam. Convergence of estimates under dimensionality restrictions. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 38–53, 1973.
- [21] Guillaume Lecué and Matthieu Lerasle. Robust machine learning by median-of-means: theory and practice. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2020.
- [22] Erich Leo Lehmann and George Casella. *Theory of point estimation*. Springer, 1998.
- [23] S. Li, T. Cai, and H. Li. Transfer learning for high-dimensional linear regression: Prediction, estimation and minimax optimality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(1):149–173, 2022.

- [24] Sai Li, T Tony Cai, and Hongzhe Li. Transfer learning in large-scale gaussian graphical models with false discovery rate control. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(543):2171–2183, 2023.
- [25] Haotian Lin and Matthew Reimherr. Smoothness adaptive hypothesis transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14966*, 2024.
- [26] Haotian Lin and Matthew Reimherr. Model-robust and adaptive-optimal transfer learning for tackling concept shifts in nonparametric regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.10870*, 2025.
- [27] Lu Lin and Weiyu Li. Source-function weighted-transfer learning for nonparametric regression with seemingly similar sources. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11222*, 2023.
- [28] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [29] Gabor Lugosi and Shahar Mendelson. Risk minimization by median-of-means tournaments. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 22(3):925–965, 2019.
- [30] Tong Man, Huawei Shen, Xiaolong Jin, and Xueqi Cheng. Cross-domain recommendation: An embedding and mapping approach. In *Ijcai*, volume 17, pages 2464–2470, 2017.
- [31] Seung Hyun Moon. Minimax optimal transfer learning for high-dimensional additive regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.06308*, 2025.
- [32] Warwick Nash, Tracy Sellers, Simon Talbot, Andrew Cawthorn, and Wes Ford. Abalone. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1994. University of California, Irvine.
- [33] D. Obst, B. Ghattas, and *et al.* Cugliari. Improved linear regression prediction by transfer learning. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 2022.
- [34] Sinno Jialin Pan and Qiang Yang. A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 22(10):1345–1359, 2009.
- [35] Allan Pinkus. *N-widths in Approximation Theory*, volume 7. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [36] Garvesh Raskutti, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Minimax-optimal rates for sparse additive models over kernel classes via convex programming. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):389–427, 2012.
- [37] H. Reeve, T. Cannings, and R. Samworth. Adaptive transfer learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(6):3618–3649, 2021.
- [38] Sebastian Ruder, Matthew E Peters, Swabha Swayamdipta, and Thomas Wolf. Transfer learning in natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Tutorials*, pages 15–18, 2019.

- [39] Erwan Scornet, Gérard Biau, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Consistency of random forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1716–1741, 2015.
- [40] Charles J Stone. Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression. *The annals of statistics*, pages 1040–1053, 1982.
- [41] Joshua B Tenenbaum, Vin de Silva, and John C Langford. A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction. *science*, 290(5500):2319–2323, 2000.
- [42] Alexandre B Tsybakov. Nonparametric estimators. In *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*, pages 1–76. Springer, 2008.
- [43] Harry L Van Trees. *Detection, estimation, and modulation theory, part I: detection, estimation, and linear modulation theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [44] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [45] Stefan Wager and Susan Athey. Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1228–1242, 2018.
- [46] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [47] Chao Wang, Caixing Wang, Xin He, and Xingdong Feng. Minimax optimal transfer learning for kernel-based nonparametric regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13966*, 2023.
- [48] Longlin Wang, Yanke Song, Kuanhao Jiang, and Pragya Sur. Glamp: An approximate message passing framework for transfer learning with applications to lasso-based estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22594*, 2025.
- [49] Mei Wang and Weihong Deng. Deep visual domain adaptation: A survey. *Neurocomputing*, 312:135–153, 2018.
- [50] Zhengyu Zhu, Yibo Yan, Gefei Li, and Riquan Zhang. Recent developments on statistical transfer learning. *International Statistical Review*, 2025.
- [51] F. Zhuang, Z. Qi, K. Duan, and *et al.* A comprehensive survey on transfer learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 2020.

This page provides a summary of the notation used throughout the appendix.

| Symbol | Description |
|---|---|
| rule | |
| General mathematical notation | |
| $[n]$ | The set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. |
| $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ | The indicator function. |
| I_d | Identity matrix of size $d \times d$ |
| $a \lesssim b$ | $\exists c > 0$ such that $a \leq cb$ |
| $A \preceq B$ | $B - A$ is positive semidefinite (A, B matrices) |
| $c > 0$ | Universal constant |
| Source and target | |
| \mathcal{D}_S | Source dataset: $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathcal{S}\}$ |
| \mathcal{D}_T | Target dataset: $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathcal{T}\}$ |
| $\mathcal{T}_1 \subset \mathcal{T}$ | Target training sample |
| $\mathcal{T}_2 \subset \mathcal{T}$ | Target validation sample |
| Tessellation and cells | |
| \mathcal{H} | Set of tessellations. |
| $H = (\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell})_{\ell \in [L_H]}$ | Tessellation. |
| L_{\max} | maximum number of admissible cells |
| $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$ | Cell with index ℓ in tessellation H . |
| $\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}$ | $\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell} = \{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : X_i \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}$ |
| $\Delta_{H,\ell} = \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell})$ | |
| Estimators | |
| $\widehat{f}_T^{\text{TL}}$ | Final transfer estimator of f_T |
| \widehat{f}_T^H | Transfer estimator of f_T on tessellation \mathcal{H} |
| \widehat{f}_S | Nadarya-Watson estimator of f_S |
| $\widehat{g}_{H,\ell}$ | Local transfer function estimator on $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$ |

APPENDIX A. USEFUL PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In this section, we fix a cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$ of an admissible tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$ (see Definition 1), with representative point (center) $x_{H,\ell}$. We work on the target subsample \mathcal{T}_1 and consider, on each cell $\ell \in [L_H]$, the oracle-score and plug-in-score models

$$(43) \quad Y_i = g_\ell \circ f_S(X_i) + \varepsilon_i \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i = g_\ell \circ \widehat{f}_S(X_i) + \bar{\varepsilon}_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell},$$

where the noise terms satisfy $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i | X_i] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\varepsilon}_i | X_i] = 0$, and are conditionally sub-Gaussian with proxy variance σ_T^2 .

For a fixed cell ℓ , we write $m_{H,\ell}(u) := g_\ell(f_S(u))$ for the corresponding regression function on $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$. We assume that $m_{H,\ell}$ admits a local linear

expansion at the representative point $x_{H,\ell}$: there exist $\theta_{H,\ell}^* \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and a remainder $r_{H,\ell}(\cdot) := r_{H,\ell}(\cdot; x_{H,\ell})$ such that, for all $u \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$,

$$(44) \quad m_{H,\ell}(u) = (\theta_{H,\ell}^*)^\top \phi_{H,\ell}(u) + r_{H,\ell}(u),$$

where the feature map is defined by

$$(45) \quad \phi_{H,\ell} : u \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell} \mapsto (1, f_S(u) - f_S(x_{H,\ell}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

We define the cell index set and its cardinality by

$$\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell} := \{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : X_i \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\} \quad \text{and} \quad n_{H,\ell} := |\mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}|.$$

We consider the following weighted least-squares estimators on the cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$:

$$(46) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\bar{b}_{H,\ell}, \bar{a}_{H,\ell}) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{b,a \in \mathbb{R}} & \left\{ \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \left[Y_i - a(f_S(X_i) - f_S(x_{H,\ell})) - b \right]^2 \right. \\ & \left. \times K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{H,\ell}\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|f_S(X_i) - f_S(x_{H,\ell})|) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\hat{b}_{H,\ell}, \hat{a}_{H,\ell}) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{b,a \in \mathbb{R}} & \left\{ \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \left[Y_i - a(\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell})) - b \right]^2 \right. \\ & \left. \times K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{H,\ell}\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{H,\ell})|) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For the oracle estimator, introduce the weights: for all $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$, $\ell \in [L_H]$,

$$w_{i,\ell} := K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{H,\ell}\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|f_S(X_i) - f_S(x_{H,\ell})|),$$

and the (unnormalized) weighted design matrices and vectors

$$\Psi_{H,\ell} := (\phi_{H,\ell}(X_i)^\top)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \quad \text{and} \quad W_{H,\ell} := \operatorname{diag}(w_{i,\ell})_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}.$$

Define the weighted Gram matrix and score vector

$$G_{H,\ell} := \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \Psi_{H,\ell}, \quad \text{and} \quad s_{H,\ell} := \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} Y,$$

so that, whenever $G_{H,\ell}$ is invertible,

$$(48) \quad \bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = G_{H,\ell}^{-1} s_{H,\ell}.$$

A.1. A weighted least-squares tail bound. We state a cellwise concentration bound for the oracle weighted estimator $\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell}$, uniformly over $\ell \in [L_H]$.

Lemma 1. *Suppose Assumption 7.1 holds. Assume moreover that Assumption 5 holds. Suppose that for the fixed tessellation H and bandwidths (h, \bar{h}) , the weighted Gram matrices satisfy, for all $\ell \in [L_H]$,*

$$(49) \quad \lambda_{H,\min} I_2 \preceq G_{H,\ell} \preceq \lambda_{H,\max} I_2.$$

Then there exists a universal constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$(50) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\exists \ell \in [L_H] : \|\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \theta_{H,\ell}^*\|_2^2 > \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2}{\lambda_{H,\min}} \frac{\log(2L_H/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} + \frac{B_{H,\ell}^2}{\lambda_{H,\min}^2} \right)\right) \leq \delta,$$

where

$$(51) \quad B_{H,\ell} := \left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} r_{H,\ell} \right\|_2, \quad r_{H,\ell} := (r_{H,\ell}(X_i))_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}.$$

In particular, if $|r_{H,\ell}(u)| \leq r_{\max,H,\ell}$ for all $u \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$ and $\|\phi_{H,\ell}(u)\|_2 \leq \phi_{\max,H,\ell}$ for all $u \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, then

$$(52) \quad B_{H,\ell} \leq \phi_{\max,H,\ell} r_{\max,H,\ell}.$$

Proof. Fix $\ell \in [L_H]$ and condition on the design $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}$. Using the local linear decomposition (44), for all $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$ we may write

$$Y_i = (\theta_{H,\ell}^*)^\top \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i) + r_{H,\ell}(X_i) + \varepsilon_i.$$

Recalling the definitions of $G_{H,\ell}$ and $s_{H,\ell}$, this yields

$$s_{H,\ell} - G_{H,\ell} \theta_{H,\ell}^* = \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \varepsilon + \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} r_{H,\ell}.$$

On the event that $G_{H,\ell}$ is invertible,

$$\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \theta_{H,\ell}^* = G_{H,\ell}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \varepsilon + \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} r_{H,\ell} \right).$$

Using the weighted design condition (49), we obtain

$$(53) \quad \|\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \theta_{H,\ell}^*\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{H,\min}} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \varepsilon \right\|_2 + B_{H,\ell} \right).$$

Let $v \in \mathbb{S}^1$ (the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^2) be fixed. Then

$$v^\top \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \varepsilon = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell} (v^\top \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i)) \varepsilon_i.$$

By Assumption 5, the variables $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}$ are independent, centered, and sub-exponential with $\|\varepsilon_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$. Moreover, by boundedness of the kernels and of $\phi_{H,\ell}$ on $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c}_0 > 0$ such that

$$|w_{i,\ell} v^\top \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i)| \leq \mathfrak{c}_0 \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{T}_1.$$

Hence, the summands $w_{i,\ell}(v^\top \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i))\varepsilon_i$ are independent, centered, sub-exponential random variables with ψ_1 -norm bounded by $\mathfrak{c}_0\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Applying Bernstein's inequality for weighted sums of sub-exponential random variables (see Proposition 5), there exists a universal constant $\mathfrak{c}_1 > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|v^\top \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \varepsilon\right| \geq \mathfrak{c}_1 \sigma_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\sqrt{t \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell}^2 (v^\top \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i))^2} + t\right)\right) \leq 2e^{-t}.$$

Since

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell}^2 (v^\top \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i))^2 \leq \|W_{H,\ell}\|_{\text{op}} v^\top \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \Psi_{H,\ell} v \leq \|W_{H,\ell}\|_{\text{op}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} \lambda_{H,\max},$$

and $\|W_{H,\ell}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty$, we conclude that there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c}_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \varepsilon\right\|_2^2 \geq \mathfrak{c}_2 \sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2 t n_{\mathcal{T}_1} \lambda_{H,\max}\right) \leq 2e^{-t},$$

where we used a standard 1/2-net argument on \mathbb{S}^1 (see [46, Section 5.2.2]). This yields

$$(54) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \Psi_{H,\ell}^\top W_{H,\ell} \varepsilon\right\|_2^2 \geq \mathfrak{c}_3 \frac{\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2 t}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}}\right) \leq 2e^{-t},$$

for a universal constant $\mathfrak{c}_3 > 0$.

Combining (53) and (54), we obtain that with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-t}$,

$$\|\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \theta_{H,\ell}^*\|_2^2 \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2}{\lambda_{H,\min}} \frac{t}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} + \frac{B_{H,\ell}^2}{\lambda_{H,\min}^2} \right),$$

for a universal constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$. Taking $t = \log(2L_H/\delta)$ and applying a union bound over $\ell \in [L_H]$ yields (50). Finally, if $|r_{H,\ell}(u)| \leq r_{\max,H,\ell}$ and $\|\phi_{H,\ell}(u)\|_2 \leq \phi_{\max,H,\ell}$ for all $u \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, then (52) follows directly from Cauchy-Schwarz. \square

A.2. A perturbation bound: oracle vs. plug-in. The second objective of this section is to compare the estimators $\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\bar{b}_{H,\ell}, \bar{a}_{H,\ell})$ and $\hat{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\hat{b}_{H,\ell}, \hat{a}_{H,\ell})$ obtained by replacing the oracle score

$$(55) \quad Z_{i,\ell} := f_{\mathcal{S}}(X_i) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{H,\ell})$$

by the plug-in score

$$(56) \quad \hat{Z}_{i,\ell} := \hat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(X_i) - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{H,\ell}).$$

Lemma 2 (Oracle vs. plug-in local estimator). *Suppose Assumptions 7.1, 10, and 6 hold. Assume moreover that $\epsilon_{\mathcal{S}} := \|\hat{f}_{\mathcal{S}} - f_{\mathcal{S}}\|_\infty$ satisfies*

$$(57) \quad \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}/\bar{h} \leq \mathfrak{c}_0$$

for a sufficiently small universal constant $\mathfrak{c}_0 > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$(58) \quad \|\widehat{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \bar{\theta}_{H,\ell}\|_2 \leq \mathfrak{c} \left[\frac{\epsilon_S}{\bar{h}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}}} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}} \right],$$

where $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ depends only on kernel envelopes and Lipschitz constants, $\lambda_{H,\min}$, $\lambda_{H,\max}$, and admissible-partition constants.

Proof. Fix a cell ℓ and write $x_\ell := x_{H,\ell}$ for brevity. For all $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$, define the feature vectors $\phi_i = (1, Z_{i,\ell}/\bar{h})^\top$, $\widehat{\phi}_i = (1, \widehat{Z}_{i,\ell}/\bar{h})^\top$, and weights

$$w_i = K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_\ell\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|Z_{i,\ell}|), \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{w}_i = K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_\ell\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|\widehat{Z}_{i,\ell}|).$$

Let $S = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_i$ and $\widehat{S} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \widehat{w}_i$, and define

$$M = S^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_i \phi_i \phi_i^\top, \quad \widehat{M} = \widehat{S}^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \widehat{w}_i \widehat{\phi}_i \widehat{\phi}_i^\top,$$

and

$$m = S^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_i \phi_i Y_i, \quad \widehat{m} = \widehat{S}^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \widehat{w}_i \widehat{\phi}_i Y_i.$$

Then $\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = M^{-1}m$ and $\widehat{\theta}_{H,\ell} = \widehat{M}^{-1}\widehat{m}$.

Step 1: Effective sample size and normalization. By Assumption 10, with probability at least $1 - \delta/4$,

$$(59) \quad \frac{1}{\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \leq \widehat{S} \leq \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}.$$

On the event (59) and under (57), the Lipschitz property of K_z yields $|w_i - \widehat{w}_i| \lesssim \epsilon_S/\bar{h}$ uniformly in i , and hence $|S - \widehat{S}| \lesssim (\epsilon_S/\bar{h})\widehat{S}$. In particular, for \mathfrak{c}_0 small enough, (59) implies the same bounds for S up to a change of constants:

$$(60) \quad \frac{1}{2\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \leq S \leq 2\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}.$$

Step 2: Control of $\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}}$. Write $A = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_i \phi_i \phi_i^\top$ and $\widehat{A} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \widehat{w}_i \widehat{\phi}_i \widehat{\phi}_i^\top$, so that $M = A/S$ and $\widehat{M} = \widehat{A}/\widehat{S}$. Decomposing,

$$(61) \quad M - \widehat{M} = \frac{A - \widehat{A}}{S} + \widehat{A} \left(\frac{1}{S} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}} \right).$$

On the support of $K_{z,\bar{h}}$, we have $|Z_{i,\ell}| \lesssim \bar{h}$, hence $\|\phi_i\|_2 \lesssim 1$. Similarly, $\|\widehat{\phi}_i\|_2 \lesssim 1$ on the support of \widehat{w}_i . Moreover, under (57) and Lipschitzness of K_z ,

$$\|\phi_i \phi_i^\top - \widehat{\phi}_i \widehat{\phi}_i^\top\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{|Z_{i,\ell} - \widehat{Z}_{i,\ell}|}{\bar{h}} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_S}{\bar{h}}, \quad |w_i - \widehat{w}_i| \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_S}{\bar{h}}.$$

Hence $\|A - \widehat{A}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim (\epsilon_S/\bar{h})\widehat{S}$. Dividing by S and using (60) gives

$$(62) \quad \frac{\|A - \widehat{A}\|_{\text{op}}}{S} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_S}{\bar{h}}.$$

Similarly, since $\|\widehat{A}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \widehat{S}$ and $|\frac{1}{S} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}}| \lesssim |S - \widehat{S}|/S^2$, we obtain

$$(63) \quad \left\| \widehat{A} \left(\frac{1}{S} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}} \right) \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{|S - \widehat{S}|}{S} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_S}{\bar{h}}.$$

Combining (61)–(63) yields

$$(64) \quad \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_S}{\bar{h}}.$$

Step 3: Concentration terms (from Y_i). To incorporate the randomness of (Y_i) , we work on the event where weighted sub-exponential concentration holds for the sums defining m and \widehat{m} . Under Assumption 5 and the effective sample size $n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}$, Bernstein's inequality for weighted sums of sub-exponential variables yields that, with probability at least $1 - \delta/4$,

$$(65) \quad \|m - \mathbb{E}[m|\{X_i\}]\|_2 + \|\widehat{m} - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}|\{X_i\}]\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}}} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}}.$$

Moreover, the deterministic perturbation bounds above imply $\|\mathbb{E}[m|\{X_i\}] - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}|\{X_i\}]\|_2 \lesssim \epsilon_S/\bar{h}$.

Final step: comparing $\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_{H,\ell}$. Using

$$\widehat{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\widehat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1})m + \widehat{M}^{-1}(\widehat{m} - m),$$

Assumption 7.1 and Weyl's inequality yield that \widehat{M} is invertible and $\|\widehat{M}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim 1/\lambda_{H,\min}$ on the event where $\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}}$ is sufficiently small (which holds under (57)). Moreover,

$$\|\widehat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|M^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}} \|\widehat{M}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}}.$$

Combining (64) and (65) and taking a union bound over the underlying events yields (58). \square

A.3. A high-probability control of the oracle slopes. The following lemma provides a high-probability control of the oracle slopes.

Lemma 3. *Assume Assumptions 3.1, 5, 7.2, and 10 hold. Then there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c}_a > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the event*

$$(66) \quad \mathcal{E}_{a,H,\delta} := \left\{ \max_{\ell \in [L_H]} |\bar{a}_{H,\ell}|^2 \leq \mathfrak{c}_a \log \left(\frac{L_H}{\delta} \right) \right\}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{a,H,\delta}) \geq 1 - \delta$.

Proof. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Recall that for a fixed tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and a cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, the cellwise transfer coefficients $\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\bar{b}_{H,\ell}, \bar{a}_{H,\ell})^\top$ are defined as the solution of a weighted least-squares problem based on the target subsample \mathcal{T}_1 . They admit the closed-form representation

$$\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = M_{H,\ell}^{-1} m_{H,\ell},$$

where the Gram matrix $M_{H,\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and the vector $m_{H,\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are given by

$$M_{H,\ell} := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell} \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i) \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i)^\top \quad \text{and} \quad m_{H,\ell} := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell} \phi_{H,\ell}(X_i) Y_i,$$

with $\phi_{H,\ell}(x) = (1, z_{H,\ell}(x))^\top$, $z_{H,\ell}(x) := f_{\mathcal{S}}(x) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{H,\ell})$, and normalized weights

$$\alpha_{i,\ell} := \frac{w_{i,\ell}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} w_{j,\ell}}, \quad w_{i,\ell} = K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{H,\ell}\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|f_{\mathcal{S}}(X_i) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{H,\ell})|).$$

By construction, $\alpha_{i,\ell} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell} = 1$.

Define the conditioning event

$$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\ell} := \{\lambda_{\min}(M_{H,\ell}) \geq \lambda_0\}.$$

By Assumptions 7.2 and 10, we may choose λ_0 (and the implicit constants in the effective sample size regime) so that

$$(67) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{\ell \in [L_H]} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\ell}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

On $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\ell}$, we have $\|M_{H,\ell}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \lambda_0^{-1}$ and hence

$$(68) \quad |\bar{a}_{H,\ell}| \leq \|\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell}\|_2 \leq \|M_{H,\ell}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|m_{H,\ell}\|_2 \leq \lambda_0^{-1} \|m_{H,\ell}\|_2.$$

Moreover, using $\|\phi_{H,\ell}(X_i)\|_2 \leq \mathbf{c}_\phi$ on each cell, we obtain

$$(69) \quad \|m_{H,\ell}\|_2 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell} \|\phi_{H,\ell}(X_i)\|_2 |Y_i| \leq \mathbf{c}_\phi \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell} |Y_i|.$$

Consider the event

$$\mathcal{A}^{\text{ess}} := \left\{ \max_{\ell \in [L_H]} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell}^2 \leq \frac{\mathbf{c}_{\text{ess}}^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}} \right\}.$$

By Assumption 10 and boundedness of the kernels, this event satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{ess}}) \geq 1 - \delta/2$. Conditionally on the weights $(\alpha_{i,\ell})_i$ and the design, the variables $(Y_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}}$ are independent and, by Assumption 5, sub-exponential with uniformly bounded ψ_1 -norm. Bernstein's inequality for weighted sums of sub-exponential variables yields that there exists a constant $\mathbf{c} > 0$ such that, for

every $\ell \in [L_H]$,

$$(70) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell} |Y_i| \geq \mathfrak{c} \left(1 + \sqrt{\log(L_H/\delta)} \right) \mid (\alpha_{i,\ell})_i \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2L_H},$$

on the event \mathcal{A}^{ess} . Taking a union bound over $\ell \in [L_H]$ yields that, on \mathcal{A}^{ess} , with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$,

$$(71) \quad \max_{\ell \in [L_H]} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{H,\ell}} \alpha_{i,\ell} |Y_i| \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(1 + \sqrt{\log(L_H/\delta)} \right).$$

Intersecting (71) with (67), and using (68)–(69), yields (66). \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 1 (UPPER BOUND)

The proof is divided into two parts. The first part (Appendix B.1) controls the contribution to the mean squared error from a data-dependent non-parametric estimator calibrated using a fixed decision tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$. The second part (Appendix B.2) analyzes the additional error introduced by selecting the decision tessellation through empirical risk minimization.

B.1. Risk on a fixed tessellation: proof of Theorem (1). Fix a partition $H \in \mathcal{H}$. To analyze the risk, we introduce several auxiliary functions related to the composition $g^* \circ f_{\mathcal{S}} = f_{\mathcal{T}}$, where the transfer function g^* is defined in Assumption 1. For any $\ell \in [L_H]$, define the centered source regressor

$$z_{H,\ell} : x \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell} \mapsto f_{\mathcal{S}}(x) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{\ell}).$$

Let $\ell_H : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow [L_H]$ denote the index of the cell containing x , i.e.

$$\ell_H(x) = \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} \ell \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}\}}.$$

Transfer linearization $g_{f_{\mathcal{S}}}^H$. For each cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$, define the population cellwise least-squares coefficients

$$(a_{H,\ell}^*, b_{H,\ell}^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{a,b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[(Y - az_{H,\ell}(X) - b)^2 \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}].$$

These quantities are deterministic functionals of the joint distribution of (X, Y) , conditionally on the tessellation H . Define the piecewise-linear function

$$\begin{aligned} g_{f_{\mathcal{S}}}^H(x) &= a_{H,\ell_H(x)}^* (f_{\mathcal{S}}(x) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{\ell_H(x)})) + b_{H,\ell_H(x)}^* \\ &= a_{H,\ell_H(x)}^* z_{H,\ell_H(x)}(x) + b_{H,\ell_H(x)}^*. \end{aligned}$$

For each $\ell \in [L_H]$, $(a_{H,\ell}^*, b_{H,\ell}^*)$ is the $\mathbb{L}^2(p_{X|\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}})$ -projection of $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ onto $\operatorname{span}(1, z_{H,\ell})$. Globally, $g_{f_{\mathcal{S}}}^H$ is the $\mathbb{L}^2(p_X)$ -projection of $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ onto the piecewise-linear function class

$$\mathcal{V}_H = \left\{ x \mapsto a_{\ell} z_{H,\ell}(x) + b_{\ell}, \ x \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}, \ a_{\ell}, b_{\ell} \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Source oracle g_θ^H . Let $\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\bar{a}_{H,\ell}, \bar{b}_{H,\ell})$ be the cellwise estimator computed from \mathcal{T}_1 . Define

$$g_\theta^H(x) = \bar{a}_{H,\ell_H(x)}(f_S(x) - f_S(x_{\ell_H(x)})) + \bar{b}_{H,\ell_H(x)}.$$

We have the decomposition

$$\|f_{\mathcal{T}} - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \leq 2\|f_{\mathcal{T}} - g_\theta^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 + 2\|g_\theta^H - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2.$$

Since $g_{f_S}^H$ is the $\mathbb{L}^2(p_X)$ -projection of $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ onto \mathcal{V}_H , Pythagoras' theorem yields

$$\|f_{\mathcal{T}} - g_\theta^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 = \|f_{\mathcal{T}} - g_{f_S}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 + \|g_{f_S}^H - g_\theta^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2.$$

Hence

$$\|f_{\mathcal{T}} - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \leq 2\text{Approx}(H) + 2\text{Fit}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H) + 2\text{Plug}_S(H).$$

Control of Approx(H) This corresponds to the *transfer bias*, i.e. the error induced by approximating $f_{\mathcal{T}} = g^* \circ f_S$ by the transfer linearization function $g_{f_S}^H$.

For any partition $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and cell $\ell \in [L_H]$, define $\Delta_{H,\ell} := \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell})$ and $\Delta_{\max}(H) := \max_{\ell \in [L_H]} \Delta_{H,\ell}$. Even if it means replacing $\Delta_{H,\ell}$ by $\min(\Delta_{H,\ell}, r_0)$, we assume that $\Delta_{H,\ell} \leq r_0$ for any $\ell \in [L_H]$ and any $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Assume furthermore that for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$, $\Delta_{\max}(H) \lesssim L_H^{-1/d}$. Let us now fix a partition H and a cell $\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$ with $\ell \in [L_H]$. Then, according to Assumption (1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{a,b} \mathbb{E} \left[(Y - a(f_S(X) - f_S(x_\ell)) - b)^2 \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[(Y - a^*(x_\ell)(f_S(X) - f_S(x_\ell)) - b^*(x_\ell))^2 \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell} \right] \lesssim (\Delta_{H,\ell})^{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}. \end{aligned}$$

The global approximation error for a tessellation $H \in \mathcal{H}$ therefore satisfies

$$\text{Approx}(H) := \|f_{\mathcal{T}} - g_{f_S}^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \leq \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} \mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) (\Delta_{H,\ell})^{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}.$$

It follows from Assumption 3.1 that

$$p_T^{\min}(\Delta_{H,\ell})^d \leq \mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) = \int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} p_X(x) dx \leq p_T^{\max}(\Delta_{H,\ell})^d,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Approx}(H) & \leq p_T^{\max} \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} (\Delta_{H,\ell})^{d+2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})} \\ & \leq p_T^{\max} L_H \Delta_{\max}(H)^{d+2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})} \leq p_T^{\max} L_H^{-2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})/d}. \end{aligned}$$

Control of Fit $_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H)$. We work conditionally on the partition H .

Applying Lemma 1 with confidence level $\delta > 0$, there exists an event \mathcal{O}_δ with $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_\delta) \geq 1 - \delta$ such that, simultaneously for all $\ell \in [L_H]$,

$$(72) \quad \|\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \theta_{H,\ell}^*\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{\log(L_H/\delta)}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} + \Delta_{H,\ell}^{2\beta_g\beta_S}.$$

The empirical fit term is

$$\text{Fit}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H) = \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} p_{H,\ell} \mathbb{E} [\langle \phi_{H,\ell}(X), \bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \theta_{H,\ell}^* \rangle^2 \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}].$$

Using the uniform bound $\|\phi_{H,\ell}(X)\|_2 \leq M$, on the event \mathcal{O}_δ ,

$$\text{Fit}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H) \leq M^2 \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} p_{H,\ell} \|\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \theta_{H,\ell}^*\|_2^2.$$

Plugging (72), we obtain that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\text{Fit}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(H) \lesssim \frac{L_H}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \log \left(\frac{L_H}{\delta} \right) + \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} p_{H,\ell} \Delta_{H,\ell}^{2\beta_g\beta_S}.$$

Under the quasi-uniformity assumption $\Delta_{H,\ell} \leq CL_H^{-1/d}$ and using $\sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} p_{H,\ell} = 1$, this further yields

$$\sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} p_{H,\ell} \Delta_{H,\ell}^{2\beta_g\beta_S} \leq \Delta_{\max}(H)^{2\beta_g\beta_S} \lesssim L_H^{-2\beta_g\beta_S/d}.$$

Control of $\text{Plug}_S(H)$. For a fixed $H \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Plug}_S(H) &= \|\hat{f}_T^H - g_\theta^H\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} \int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} \left(\bar{a}_{H,\ell} \Delta f_{S,\ell}(x) + \bar{b}_{H,\ell} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \hat{a}_{H,\ell} \Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell}(x) - \hat{b}_{H,\ell} \right)^2 d\mu_X(x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta f_{S,\ell}(x) := f_S(x) - f_S(x_\ell) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell}(x) := \hat{f}_S(x) - \hat{f}_S(x_\ell).$$

For any $\ell \in [L_H]$ and $x \in \mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{a}_{H,\ell} \Delta f_{S,\ell}(x) + \bar{b}_{H,\ell} - \hat{a}_{H,\ell} \Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell}(x) - \hat{b}_{H,\ell} \\ &= (\bar{a}_{H,\ell} - \hat{a}_{H,\ell}) \Delta f_{S,\ell}(x) + (\bar{b}_{H,\ell} - \hat{b}_{H,\ell}) + \bar{a}_{H,\ell} (\Delta f_{S,\ell}(x) - \Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell}(x)) \\ &\quad + (\bar{a}_{H,\ell} - \hat{a}_{H,\ell}) (\Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell}(x) - \Delta f_{S,\ell}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(73) \quad \text{Plug}_S(H) \leq 4 \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} (I_{1,\ell} + I_{2,\ell} + I_{3,\ell} + I_{4,\ell}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{1,\ell} &:= \int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} (\bar{a}_{H,\ell} - \hat{a}_{H,\ell})^2 (\Delta f_{S,\ell}(x))^2 d\mu_X(x), \\
I_{2,\ell} &:= \int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} (\bar{b}_{H,\ell} - \hat{b}_{H,\ell})^2 d\mu_X(x) = \mu_X(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) (\bar{b}_{H,\ell} - \hat{b}_{H,\ell})^2, \\
I_{3,\ell} &:= \int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} \bar{a}_{H,\ell}^2 (\Delta f_{S,\ell}(x) - \Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell}(x))^2 d\mu_X(x), \\
I_{4,\ell} &:= \int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} (\bar{a}_{H,\ell} - \hat{a}_{H,\ell})^2 (\Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell}(x) - \Delta f_{S,\ell}(x))^2 d\mu_X(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 1: Control of $I_{1,\ell}$ and $I_{2,\ell}$. Define the event

$$(74) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\delta/3} := \left\{ \max_{\ell \in [L_H]} \|\hat{\theta}_{H,\ell} - \bar{\theta}_{H,\ell}\|_2 \leq \eta_{\delta/3} \right\},$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\hat{b}_{H,\ell}, \hat{a}_{H,\ell})$ and $\bar{\theta}_{H,\ell} = (\bar{b}_{H,\ell}, \bar{a}_{H,\ell})$. Since f_S is β_S -Hölder and $\text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) \leq \Delta_{H,\ell}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} (\Delta f_{S,\ell}(x))^2 d\mu_X(x) \lesssim \Delta_{H,\ell}^{2\beta_S} \mu_X(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}).$$

Therefore, on $\mathcal{E}_{\delta/3}$,

$$(75) \quad \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} I_{2,\ell} \leq \eta_{\delta/3}^2 \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} \mu_X(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) = \eta_{\delta/3}^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} I_{1,\ell} &\lesssim \eta_{\delta/3}^2 \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} \Delta_{H,\ell}^{2\beta_S} \mu_X(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) \\
(76) \quad &\leq \eta_{\delta/3}^2 \Delta_{\max}(H)^{2\beta_S} \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} \mu_X(\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}) \lesssim \eta_{\delta/3}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the quasi-uniform mesh assumption $\Delta_{H,\ell} \lesssim L_H^{-1/d}$.

Step 2: Control of $I_{3,\ell}$. Introduce a source event $\mathcal{S}_{\delta/3}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_{\delta/3}) \geq 1 - \delta/3$ and on which

$$\|\hat{f}_S - f_S\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mu_X)}^2 \lesssim h_x^{2\beta_S} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n_S h_x^d}$$

and

$$\max_{\ell \in [L_H]} |\hat{f}_S(x_\ell) - f_S(x_\ell)|^2 \lesssim h_x^{2\beta_S} + \frac{\log(L_H/\delta)}{n_S h_x^d}.$$

Then, for any $\ell \in [L_H]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} I_{3,\ell} &\leq \left(\max_{\ell \in [L_H]} \bar{a}_{H,\ell}^2 \right) \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} \int_{\mathcal{A}_{H,\ell}} (\Delta f_{S,\ell} - \Delta \hat{f}_{S,\ell})^2 d\mu_X \\
(77) \quad &\lesssim \log\left(\frac{L_H}{\delta}\right) \left(h_x^{2\beta_S} + \frac{\log(L_H/\delta)}{n_S h_x^d} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Control of $I_{4,\ell}$. On $\mathcal{E}_{\delta/3} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\delta/3}$,

$$(78) \quad \sum_{\ell \in [L_H]} I_{4,\ell} \lesssim \eta_{\delta/3}^2 \left(h_x^{2\beta_S} + \frac{\log(L_H/\delta)}{n_S h_x^d} \right).$$

Step 4: Conclusion. Let

$$\mathcal{G}_\delta := \mathcal{E}_{\delta/3} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\delta/3} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\delta/3}.$$

By a union bound, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_\delta) \geq 1 - \delta$. Combining (73), (75), (76), (77), and (78), we obtain that on \mathcal{G}_δ ,

$$\text{Plug}_\mathcal{S}(H) \lesssim \eta_{\delta/3}^2 + \log\left(\frac{L_H}{\delta}\right) \left(h_x^{2\beta_S} + \frac{\log(L_H/\delta)}{n_S h_x^d} \right).$$

Using $\eta_{\delta/3}^2 \lesssim L_H \log(1/\delta)/n_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ and choosing $h_x = n_S^{-1/(2\beta_S+d)}$ concludes the proof of the bound on $\text{Plug}_\mathcal{S}(H)$.

B.2. Empirical risk minimization.

B.2.1. Proof of Proposition 1. For any $H \in \mathcal{H}$, define the *population* and *empirical* risks by

$$\mathcal{R}(H) := \mathbb{E}[(Y - \hat{f}_\mathcal{T}^H(X))^2] \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) := \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_2}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_2} (Y_i - \hat{f}_\mathcal{T}^H(X_i))^2,$$

where \mathcal{T}_2 denotes the validation sample and

$$\hat{f}_\mathcal{T}^H(x) = \hat{a}_{H,\ell_H(x)}(\hat{f}_\mathcal{S}(x) - \hat{f}_\mathcal{S}(x_{H,\ell_H(x)})) + \hat{b}_{H,\ell_H(x)}.$$

We select the tessellation according to the empirical risk minimization rule

$$\widehat{H} \in \arg \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H).$$

To lighten the notation, define

$$\hat{\mu}_H(x) := \hat{a}_{H,\ell_H(x)}(\hat{f}_\mathcal{S}(x) - \hat{f}_\mathcal{S}(x_{H,\ell_H(x)})) + \hat{b}_{H,\ell_H(x)},$$

and the validation loss

$$\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y) := (Y - \hat{\mu}_H(X))^2.$$

With the model $Y = f_\mathcal{T}(X) + \varepsilon$, we may write

$$\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y) = (\varepsilon - \Delta_H(X))^2, \quad \Delta_H(X) := \hat{\mu}_H(X) - f_\mathcal{T}(X).$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{R}(H) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^2] + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_H(X)^2],$$

since $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon|X] = 0$.

Under Assumption 5, the noise ε is sub-exponential, and we assume in addition that $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] < \infty$. Using $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_H(X)^2] \leq \mathcal{R}(H) \leq \mathcal{R}_{\max}$, where

$$\mathcal{R}_{\max} := \max_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H),$$

we obtain uniformly over $H \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y)^2] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] + \mathcal{R}_{\max}^2 < \infty.$$

Conditionally on $(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{S})$, the variables $\{\mathcal{L}_H(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{T}_2}$ are i.i.d. with mean $\mathcal{R}(H)$. By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \mid \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{S} \right] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H))^2 \mid \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{S} \right]} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y) \mid \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{S})}{n_{\mathcal{T}_2}}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y)^2 \mid \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{S}]}{n_{\mathcal{T}_2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and using that for $U_H = \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} U_H \right] \leq \left(\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}[U_H^2] \right)^{1/2},$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \right] \lesssim (\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{n_{\mathcal{T}_2}}}.$$

Let $H^{\text{or}} \in \arg \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H)$. By the definition of \widehat{H} and the previous bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(\widehat{H})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\widehat{H})] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H^{\text{or}})] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}(H^{\text{or}}) + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(79) \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(\widehat{H})] \leq \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H) + \mathfrak{c}(\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{\log |\mathcal{H}|}{n_{\mathcal{T}_2}}},$$

for some universal constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$.

B.2.2. Proof of Proposition 2. We work conditionally on the training samples $(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{S})$, so that the validation observations $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{T}_2}$ are i.i.d. and independent of $\{\widehat{\mu}_H : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$. For brevity, write

$$\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y) := (Y - \widehat{\mu}_H(X))^2, \quad \mathcal{R}(H) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y)].$$

Step 1: Moment bound. Recall that $Y = f_{\mathcal{T}}(X) + \varepsilon$ and $\Delta_H(X) := \widehat{\mu}_H(X) - f_{\mathcal{T}}(X)$, so that

$$\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y) = (\varepsilon - \Delta_H(X))^2.$$

Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon|X] = 0$,

$$\mathcal{R}(H) = \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^2] + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_H(X)^2] \leq \mathcal{R}_{\max}.$$

Assume $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] < \infty$. Then, using $(u - v)^4 \leq 8(u^4 + v^4)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_H(X)^4] \leq (\mathbb{E}[\Delta_H(X)^2])^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(\varepsilon - \Delta_H(X))^4] \leq 8\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] + 8\mathbb{E}[\Delta_H(X)^4] \\ &\leq 8\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] + 8\mathcal{R}_{\max}^2 \lesssim (\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max})^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon^4] \lesssim \sigma^4$ under sub-exponential tails (up to a constant depending only on the sub-exponential proxy). Consequently, for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y)^2] \lesssim (\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max})^2.$$

Step 2: Median-of-means deviation for a fixed H . Partition \mathcal{T}_2 into B disjoint blocks $\{\mathcal{B}_b\}_{b=1}^B$ of equal size $m := \lfloor n\mathcal{T}_2/B \rfloor$. For each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and block $b \in [B]$, define the block empirical risk

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_b(H) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}_b} \mathcal{L}_H(X_i, Y_i),$$

and define the median-of-means risk [21, 29]

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) := \text{median}(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_1(H), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_B(H)).$$

Fix $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $t > 0$. By Chebyshev's inequality and the variance bound above, for each block b ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_b(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| > t) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_H(X, Y))}{mt^2} \lesssim \frac{(\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max})^2}{mt^2}.$$

Choose

$$t = \mathbf{c}_0(\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{B}{n\mathcal{T}_2}},$$

with $\mathbf{c}_0 > 0$ large enough so that the right-hand side is at most $1/8$. Then, for each b , the indicator $\mathbf{1}_{\{|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_b(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| > t\}}$ is Bernoulli with mean at most $1/8$. Hence, by a Chernoff bound,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\#\{b \in [B] : |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_b(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| > t\} \geq B/2\right) \leq 2\exp(-\mathbf{c}_1 B),$$

for a universal constant $\mathbf{c}_1 > 0$. But the event inside the probability is exactly $\{|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| > t\}$, since the median is bad only if at least half the blocks are bad. Therefore,

$$(80) \quad \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| > t) \leq 2\exp(-\mathbf{c}_1 B).$$

Step 3: Uniform control over \mathcal{H} and oracle inequality. Applying a union bound over $H \in \mathcal{H}$ in (80) yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| > t\right) \leq 2|\mathcal{H}|\exp(-\mathbf{c}_1 B).$$

Choose B such that $2|\mathcal{H}|\exp(-\mathbf{c}_1 B) \leq \delta$, i.e.

$$B \gtrsim \log(|\mathcal{H}|/\delta).$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have simultaneously for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \leq t \lesssim (\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{B}{n\tau_2}} \lesssim (\sigma^2 + \mathcal{R}_{\max}) \sqrt{\frac{\log(|\mathcal{H}|/\delta)}{n\tau_2}}.$$

Let $H^{\text{or}} \in \arg \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(H)$ and recall that $\widehat{H}_{\text{MoM}} \in \arg \min_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H)$. On the above event,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{H}_{\text{MoM}}) &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(\widehat{H}_{\text{MoM}}) + \sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \\ &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H^{\text{or}}) + \sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)| \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}(H^{\text{or}}) + 2 \sup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{MoM}}(H) - \mathcal{R}(H)|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with the uniform deviation bound gives the result.

APPENDIX C. PROOF OF THEOREM 4 (LOWER BOUND)

For the minimax lower bound, we assume that $f_S, f_T \in \text{Höl}(\beta, \mathfrak{l}; [0, 1]^d)$ and that the estimator is given *oracle access* to the true partition $H^* = \{\mathcal{A}_\ell^*\}_{\ell \in [L^*]}$ of $[0, 1]^d$. Moreover, since centered Gaussian noise $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is sub-Gaussian and hence sub-exponential, it suffices to prove the minimax lower bound under the Gaussian noise submodel. Any lower bound obtained under this restriction applies *a fortiori* to the full sub-exponential noise model. We consider a smaller model by refining Assumption 2 by the following one:

Assumption 13 (Structured per-leaf transfer model). *Let $H^* = \{\mathcal{A}_\ell^*\}_{\ell \in [L^*]}$ be the true partition. For each leaf \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* there exist parameters $a_\ell^*, b_\ell^* \in \mathbb{R}$, and a remainder function $R_\ell : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*$,*

$$f_T(x) = a_\ell^* (f_S(x) - f_S(x_\ell^*)) + b_\ell^* + R_\ell(x),$$

where $x_\ell^ \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*$ is a fixed anchor point (the center of the leaf \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* for instance). Moreover, the remainder satisfies the Hölder bound*

$$|R_\ell(x) - R_\ell(x')| \leq \mathbf{c}_{\text{rem}} \|x - x'\|^{1+\beta_{\text{loc}}} \quad \text{for all } x, x' \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*,$$

and the parameters obey the uniform bounds

$$|a_\ell^*| \leq \mathbf{a}_{\max}^* \quad \text{and} \quad |b_\ell^*| \leq \mathbf{b}_{\max}^* \quad \text{for all } \ell \in [L^*],$$

for some $\mathbf{a}_{\max}^, \mathbf{b}_{\max}^* > 0$.*

Remark 11. Assumption 13 defines a *smaller* and more structured model than the local transfer condition in Assumption 2. In this class, the target function is genuinely “simpler given the source”: on each leaf, f_T is parametric in the coefficients (a_ℓ^*, b_ℓ^*) , up to a controlled Hölder remainder. As a consequence, the minimax lower bound over this structured class features a

parametric term of order $L^*/n_{\mathcal{T}}$ (plus approximation and source-estimation terms), showing that the transfer estimator achieves a strictly faster rate than the classical nonparametric rate based on $n_{\mathcal{T}}$ alone.

This assumption only makes the estimation task strictly easier, since the original estimator must in general select \widehat{H} from data. Therefore any lower bound obtained under this favorable scenario applies *a fortiori* to the original transfer estimator \widehat{f}_{TL} . Let

$$\Delta_{\min}(H^*) = \min_{\ell \in [L^*]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{\max}(H^*) = \max_{\ell \in [L^*]} \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_{\ell}^*).$$

Under this oracle model, the minimax risk necessarily contains three independent contributions:

- A parametric cost $\sigma^2 L^*/n_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ for estimating per-cell transfer coefficients (a_{ℓ}, b_{ℓ}) from \mathcal{T}_1 data (see Subsection C.1);
- An approximation term of order $(r^*)^{2(1+\beta_{\text{loc}})}$ induced by the best possible piecewise-linear model on a partition of diameter r^* (see Subsection C.2);
- A source-side nonparametric term $n_{\mathcal{S}}^{-2\beta/(2\beta+d)}$ due to the intrinsic difficulty of estimating $f_{\mathcal{S}}$ from the source sample (see Subsection C.3).

C.1. Per-cell transfer error. In this part, we assume that an oracle gives the true partition $H^* \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e. the set of cells $\{\mathcal{A}_1^*, \dots, \mathcal{A}_{L^*}^*\}$, and the true source function $f_{\mathcal{S}}$. Once the partition is known, target data falling in leaf \mathcal{A}_{ℓ}^* satisfy the local linear transfer model: for all $i \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$(81) \quad Y_i = a_{\ell}(f_{\mathcal{S}}(X_i) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{\ell}^*)) + b_{\ell} + \varepsilon_i, \quad \varepsilon_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2).$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell} = \{i \in \mathcal{T}_1 : X_i \in \mathcal{A}_{\ell}^*\}$. For all $\ell \in [L^*]$, define the design matrix $\Psi_{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell}| \times 2}$ with rows $(Z_{\ell}^i, 1)$ for $i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell}$, where $Z_{\ell}^i = f_{\mathcal{S}}(X_i) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{\ell}^*)$. On each leaf \mathcal{A}_{ℓ}^* , we can rewrite (81) in the following matrix form

$$Y_{\ell} = \Psi_{\ell} \theta_{\ell} + \varepsilon_{\ell},$$

where $Y_{\ell} := \{Y_i, i \in \mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell}\}$ and $\varepsilon_{\ell} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{|\mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell}|})$. By the Cramér-Rao and Van Trees information bounds for Gaussian linear models [22, 43], any estimator $\widehat{\theta}_{\ell}$ must satisfy

$$\inf_{\theta_{\ell}} \sup_{\theta_{\ell}} \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\theta}_{\ell} - \theta_{\ell}\|_2^2 \geq \sigma^2 \text{Tr}((\Psi_{\ell}^{\top} \Psi_{\ell})^{-1}).$$

This lower bound coincides with the classical minimax rate in the Gaussian normal-means model [42]. Under Assumption ??, we have

$$\text{Tr}((\Psi_{\ell}^{\top} \Psi_{\ell})^{-1}) \geq c \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell}|}.$$

Moreover, the integrated target prediction risk on leaf \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* ,

$$R_\ell := \int_{\mathcal{A}_\ell^*} \mathbb{E} \left[(\widehat{f}_\mathcal{T}(x) - f_\mathcal{T}(x))^2 \right] d\mu(x),$$

satisfies

$$R_\ell \geq \mathfrak{c} \mu(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*) \mathbb{E} [\|\widehat{\theta}_\ell - \theta_\ell\|_2^2],$$

so that $R_\ell \geq \mathfrak{c} \mu(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*) \sigma^2 / |\mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell}|$. Noting that $\mu(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*) \geq \mathfrak{c} / L^*$ and that, by Assumption 11, $|\mathcal{T}_1^{\star, \ell}| \geq \mathfrak{c} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} / L^*$ with high probability, we then have

$$(82) \quad \mathbb{E} [\|\widehat{f}_\mathcal{T} - f_\mathcal{T}\|_{L_\mu^2}^2] = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L^*} R_\ell \geq \mathfrak{c} L^* \cdot \frac{1}{L^*} \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} / L^*} = \frac{\sigma^2 L^*}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}}.$$

C.2. Piecewise linear approximation error. In this part, we assume that an oracle gives the true partition $H^* \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e. the set of cells $\{\mathcal{A}_1^*, \dots, \mathcal{A}_{L^*}^*\}$, and that the true target function $f_\mathcal{T}$ is linked to $f_\mathcal{S}$ via the structured cell-wise Assumption 13. We are looking for the error made by approximating $f_\mathcal{T}$ by an element of the class

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{lin}}(f_\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^*) = \bigoplus_{\ell=1}^{L^*} \mathcal{F}_\ell,$$

where for any $\ell \in [L^*]$,

$$\mathcal{F}_\ell := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^* \mapsto a_\ell(f_\mathcal{S}(x) - f_\mathcal{S}(x_\ell^*)) + b_\ell, (a_\ell, b_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \right\}$$

is a 2-dimensional affine space of functions.

Fix a cell \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* and set $r_\ell := \text{diam}(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*)$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\ell^{\text{Hö}1}$ denote the unit ball $\text{Hö}(1 + \beta_{\text{loc}}, 1; \mathcal{A}_\ell^*)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{B}_\ell^{\text{Hö}1}} := \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*)} + [g]_{\mathcal{B}_\ell^{\text{Hö}1}},$$

where we define the Hölder semi-norm

$$[g]_{\mathcal{B}_\ell^{\text{Hö}1}} := \sup_{\substack{x, y \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^* \\ x \neq y}} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|}{|x - y|^{1 + \beta_{\text{loc}}}}.$$

By Theorem 9 and a scaling argument on \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , the 2-width of $\mathcal{B}_\ell^{\text{Hö}1}$ satisfies

$$d_2(\mathcal{B}_\ell^{\text{Hö}1}, \mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*)) \geq \mathfrak{c} r_\ell^{1 + \beta_{\text{loc}} + d/2}.$$

In particular, as \mathcal{F}_ℓ is a 2-dimensional (affine) subspace of functions on \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , we have

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{B}_\ell^{\text{Hö}1}} \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_\ell} \|g - \phi\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*)} \geq \mathfrak{c} r_\ell^{1 + \beta_{\text{loc}} + d/2}.$$

Summing the cellwise \mathbb{L}^2 -lower bounds over the disjoint cells yields

$$\inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{lin}}(f_\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^*)} \|g - \phi\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \geq \mathfrak{c} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L^*} r_\ell^{2(1 + \beta_{\text{loc}}) + d},$$

using that $\sum_\ell |\mathcal{A}_\ell^*| = 1$.

C.3. Source function estimation lower bound. In this part, we assume that an oracle gives the true partition $H^* \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e. the set of cells $\{\mathcal{A}_1^*, \dots, \mathcal{A}_{L^*}^*\}$, the exact leaf ℓ each point x belongs to, the correct transfer coefficients (a_ℓ, b_ℓ) , so that $f_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = a_\ell f_{\mathcal{S}}(x) + b_\ell$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$, and (iii) the entire transfer structure (the partition and all parameters). The intrinsic nonparametric difficulty of estimating $f_{\mathcal{S}}$ remains and enters the minimax lower bound for estimating $f_{\mathcal{T}}$.

As mentioned above, the true partition $\{\mathcal{A}_1^*, \dots, \mathcal{A}_{L^*}^*\}$ is assumed to be known as well as the coefficients (a_ℓ^*, b_ℓ^*) such that

$$f_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = a_\ell^* f_{\mathcal{S}}(x) + b_\ell^*, \quad x \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*.$$

Link between $f_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $f_{\mathcal{T}}$ estimation Fix a leaf \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* and a point x_0 in the interior of \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* . For any estimator $\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}$, define its pointwise risk at x_0 by

$$\mathcal{R}_{x_0}(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}; f_{\mathcal{S}}) = \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathcal{S}}}[(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0) - f_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0))^2],$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathcal{S}}}$ denotes the expectation taken over the joint law of the source data under $f_{\mathcal{S}}$. For $a_\ell^* \neq 0$, define

$$\widetilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_0) = \frac{\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0) - b_\ell^*}{a_\ell^*},$$

so that $\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0) - f_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0) = a_\ell^*(\widetilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_0) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_0))$. Then,

$$(83) \quad \mathcal{R}_{x_0}(\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{T}}; f_{\mathcal{S}}) = (a_\ell^*)^2 \mathbb{E}_{f_{\mathcal{S}}}[(\widetilde{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_0) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_0))^2].$$

Thus any lower bound for estimating $f_{\mathcal{S}}(x_0)$ yields the same (up to factor $(a_\ell^*)^2$) for estimating $f_{\mathcal{T}}(x_0)$.

Le Cam's method Choose a smooth function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ supported in $[-1, 1]^d$, with $\varphi(0) = 1$. For a bandwidth $h > 0$, let

$$\varphi_h(x) = \varphi\left(\frac{x - x_0}{h}\right), \quad \delta_h = Lh^\beta,$$

with $L > 0$ small so that $\delta_h \varphi_h \in \text{Höl}(\beta, \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{S}})$. Since x_0 lies in the interior of the leaf \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , take h small so that $\text{supp}(\varphi_h) \subset \mathcal{A}_\ell^*$. Define $f_0 \equiv 0$ and $f_1 = \delta_h \varphi_h$. Note that $f_0, f_1 \in \text{Höl}(\beta, \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $f_1(x_0) - f_0(x_0) = \delta_h$. Let P_j denote the law of the data when $f_{\mathcal{S}} = f_j$ for $j \in \{0, 1\}$. Conditional on the source design $X^{\mathcal{S}} = \{X_i, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$,

$$\text{KL}(P_1 \| P_0 | X^{\mathcal{S}}) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (f_1(X_i) - f_0(X_i))^2 = \frac{\delta_h^2}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \varphi_h(X_i)^2.$$

Taking expectation over the design and using Assumption 3.2,

$$\text{KL}(P_1 \| P_0) \leq c_{\mathcal{S}} \delta_h^2 h^d.$$

In particular, $\text{KL}(P_1 \| P_0) \leq c_{\mathcal{S}} h^{2\beta+d}$. Choose $h = n_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1/(2\beta+d)}$ so that $\text{KL}(P_1 \| P_0) \leq \mathfrak{c}$ for some constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$. For any estimator $\widehat{f}_{\mathcal{S}}(x_0)$ of

$f_S(x_0)$, Le Cam's inequality (see [20] or [42], Theorem 2.2) yields

$$\sup_{j \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_{P_j} [(\widehat{f}_S(x_0) - f_j(x_0))^2] \geq \mathfrak{c} \delta_h^2.$$

Hence

$$\inf_{\widehat{f}_S} \sup_{f_S \in \text{Hö}(\beta, \mathfrak{l}_S; [0,1]^d)} \mathbb{E}_{f_S} [(\widehat{f}_S(x_0) - f_S(x_0))^2] \geq \mathfrak{c} h^{2\beta} = \mathfrak{c} n_S^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}}.$$

Transfer to f_T Follows from (83) that

$$\inf_{\widehat{f}_T} \sup_{f_S \in \text{Hö}(\beta, \mathfrak{l}_S; [0,1]^d)} \mathcal{R}_{x_0}(\widehat{f}_T; f_S) = (a_\ell^*)^2 \inf_{\widehat{f}_S} \sup_{f_S \in \text{Hö}(\beta, \mathfrak{l}_S; [0,1]^d)} \mathbb{E}_{f_S} [(\widehat{f}_S(x_0) - f_S(x_0))^2],$$

which entails

$$\inf_{\widehat{f}_T} \sup_{f_S \in \text{Hö}(\beta, \mathfrak{l}_S; [0,1]^d)} \mathcal{R}_{x_0}(\widehat{f}_T; f_S) \geq \mathfrak{c} (a_\ell^*)^2 n_S^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}}.$$

APPENDIX D. PROOF OF THEOREM 5 (RISK OF THE TRANSFER FUNCTION ESTIMATOR)

Assume that the target tessellation $(\mathcal{A}_\ell^*)_{\ell \in [L^*]}$ on which Assumption 1 holds is known. In this section, we study the estimation of the cellwise transfer functions $(g_\ell^*)_{\ell \in [L^*]}$.

D.1. Local polynomial estimators.

D.1.1. Setup and local linear estimators. **We work conditionally on the source sample \mathcal{D}_S . Since the source estimator \widehat{f}_S depends only on \mathcal{D}_S and is independent of the target sample \mathcal{D}_T , it can be treated as deterministic in the target-side analysis.** For each $\ell \in [L^*]$, consider the regression model

$$Y_i = g_\ell^*(\widehat{f}_S(X_i)) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{T}_1,$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i | X_i] = 0$ and Assumption 5 holds on the target sample, i.e. $\|\varepsilon_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq \sigma_T$ for all $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$.

Assume that the functions g_ℓ^* satisfy Assumption 12. In particular, for any $\ell \in [L^*]$ and any u in a neighborhood of $\widehat{f}_S(x)$, we have the first-order Taylor expansion

$$g_\ell^*(u) = g_\ell^*(\widehat{f}_S(x)) + (g_\ell^*)'(\widehat{f}_S(x)) (u - \widehat{f}_S(x)) + R_{\ell,x}(u),$$

with remainder bounded by

$$(84) \quad |R_{\ell,x}(u)| \leq \mathfrak{l}_g |u - \widehat{f}_S(x)|^{\beta_g}.$$

Let $K_x : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $K_z : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be bounded kernels supported on $[0, 1]$ satisfying Assumption 6, and let $h > 0$ and $\bar{h} > 0$ be bandwidths. For

each cell \mathcal{A}_ℓ^\star , with reference point x_{ℓ^\star} , define the *cellwise local least-squares estimator*

$$(85) \quad (\hat{b}_\ell, \hat{a}_\ell) \in \underset{b, a \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \left[Y_i - a(\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})) - b \right]^2 \right. \\ \left. \times K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{\ell^\star}\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})|) \right\},$$

where $K_{x,h} = h^{-d} K_x(\cdot/h)$ and $K_{z,\bar{h}} = \bar{h}^{-1} K_z(\cdot/\bar{h})$. Write $\psi(t) = (1, t)^\top$ and define, for $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$,

$$\phi_{i,\ell} = \psi\left(\frac{\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})}{\bar{h}}\right)$$

and

$$w_{i,\ell} = K_{x,h}(\|X_i - x_{\ell^\star}\|) K_{z,\bar{h}}(|\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})|).$$

Let $S_\ell = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell}$. Then, letting

$$M_\ell = \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell} \phi_{i,\ell} \phi_{i,\ell}^\top \quad \text{and} \quad m_\ell = \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell} \phi_{i,\ell} Y_i,$$

we can write

$$\hat{\theta}_\ell = M_\ell^{-1} m_\ell, \quad \hat{b}_\ell = e_1^\top \hat{\theta}_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{a}_\ell = e_2^\top \hat{\theta}_\ell.$$

The associated predictor on \mathcal{A}_ℓ^\star is

$$\hat{f}_\ell(x') = \hat{b}_\ell + \hat{a}_\ell(\hat{f}_S(x') - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})).$$

For clarity, define for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$S_{k,\ell} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell} (\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star}))^k \quad \text{and} \quad T_{k,\ell} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} w_{i,\ell} (\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star}))^k Y_i.$$

Then we have

$$\hat{b}_\ell = \frac{S_{2,\ell} T_{0,\ell} - S_{1,\ell} T_{1,\ell}}{S_{2,\ell} S_{0,\ell} - S_{1,\ell}^2} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} W_{i,\ell} Y_i \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{a}_\ell = \frac{S_{0,\ell} T_{1,\ell} - S_{1,\ell} T_{0,\ell}}{S_{2,\ell} S_{0,\ell} - S_{1,\ell}^2} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} Y_i,$$

where

$$\varpi_{i,\ell} = w_{i,\ell} [S_{2,\ell} - g(\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})) S_{1,\ell}],$$

as well as

$$\kappa_{i,\ell} = w_{i,\ell} [(\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})) S_{0,\ell} - S_{1,\ell}],$$

and the normalized weights are

$$W_{i,\ell} = \frac{\varpi_{i,\ell}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}_1} \varpi_{j,\ell}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{W}_{i,\ell} = \frac{\kappa_{i,\ell}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}_1} \varpi_{j,\ell}}.$$

They satisfy

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \kappa_{i,\ell} (\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^\star})) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \varpi_{i,\ell}.$$

Lemma 4 (Polynomial reproduction). *Let $p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be linear: $p(y) = a_p(y - \widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})) + b_p$. Then*

$$(86) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} W_{i,\ell} p(\widehat{f}_S(X_i)) = p(\widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})) = b_p,$$

and

$$(87) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \overline{W}_{i,\ell} p(\widehat{f}_S(X_i)) = p'(\widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})) = a_p.$$

Proof. Since p is linear, (b_p, a_p) minimizes the objective in (85). The identities (86)–(87) then follow from the closed-form expressions (D.1.1). \square

Lemma 5. *Consider the estimator (85). Suppose Assumptions 6, 7 and 10 hold. Then, for any cell \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , the following statements hold:*

- (i) *For any $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$, if $\|X_i - x_{\ell^*}\| > h$ or $|\widehat{f}_S(X_i) - \widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})| > \bar{h}$, then $W_{i,\ell} = 0$ and $\overline{W}_{i,\ell} = 0$.*
- (ii) *On the event in Assumption 10,*

$$(88) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |W_{i,\ell}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty}{\lambda_0},$$

and

$$(89) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |\overline{W}_{i,\ell}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty}{\bar{h} \lambda_0}.$$

- (iii) *On the same event,*

$$(90) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |W_{i,\ell}|^2 \leq \frac{2 \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty^2 \|K_z\|_\infty^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \lambda_0^2},$$

and

$$(91) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |\overline{W}_{i,\ell}|^2 \leq \frac{2 \mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty^2 \|K_z\|_\infty^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}^3 \lambda_0^2}.$$

Proof. We only treat the bound for $W_{i,\ell}$; the case of $\overline{W}_{i,\ell}$ is identical up to the additional factor \bar{h}^{-1} . By (D.1.1)–(D.1.1) and Assumption 6,

$$\begin{aligned} |W_{i,\ell}| &\leq \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}} \|\widehat{M}_\ell^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \left\| \psi \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_S(X_i) - \widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})}{\bar{h}} \right) \right\|_2 \|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\|X_i - x_{\ell^*}\| \leq h, |\widehat{f}_S(X_i) - \widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})| \leq \bar{h}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

On $\{|\widehat{f}_S(X_i) - \widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})| \leq \bar{h}\}$ we have $\|\psi(\cdot)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2}$. Moreover, by Assumption 7, $\|\widehat{M}_\ell^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \lambda_0^{-1}$. Hence

$$(92) \quad |W_{i,\ell}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}} \frac{\|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty}{\lambda_0} \mathbf{1}_{\{\|X_i - x_{\ell^*}\| \leq h, |\widehat{f}_S(X_i) - \widehat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})| \leq \bar{h}\}}.$$

Statement (i) follows immediately.

Summing (92) over $i \in \mathcal{T}_1$ yields

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |W_{i,\ell}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}} \frac{\|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty}{\lambda_0} N_\ell,$$

where

$$N_\ell := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\|X_i - x_{\ell^*}\| \leq h, |\hat{f}_S(X_i) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})| \leq \bar{h}\}}.$$

By Assumption 10, on the event of that assumption, $N_\ell \leq \mathbf{c}_2^{\text{ess}} n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}$, which gives (88). The bound (89) follows similarly.

For (iii), combining (92) with (88) yields

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |W_{i,\ell}|^2 \leq \left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |W_{i,\ell}| \right) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |W_{i,\ell}| \leq \frac{2\mathbf{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty^2 \|K_z\|_\infty^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h} \lambda_0^2},$$

which is (90). The bound (91) is analogous. \square

Proposition 3 (Risk bounds for \hat{a}_ℓ and \hat{b}_ℓ). *Suppose Assumptions 6, 7.2 and 10. Work conditionally on the source sample \mathcal{D}_S , so that \hat{f}_S is deterministic. Fix $\ell \in [L^*]$ and let x_{ℓ^*} be the reference point of the cell \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* . Then, on the event in Assumption 10, for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*$ such that $|\hat{f}_S(x) - \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})| \leq \bar{h}$, we have*

$$(93) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{a}_\ell - (g_\ell^*)'(\hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] \leq \frac{2\mathbf{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty^2 \|K_z\|_\infty^2}{\lambda_0^2} \left[\frac{4\mathfrak{l}_g^2 \|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g}}{\bar{h}^2} + 4\mathfrak{l}_g^2 \bar{h}^{2(\beta_g-1)} + \frac{\sigma_T^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}^3} \right].$$

Moreover, on the same event,

$$(94) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{b}_\ell - g_\ell^*(\hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] \leq \frac{2\mathbf{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty^2 \|K_z\|_\infty^2}{\lambda_0^2} \left[4\mathfrak{l}_g^2 \left(\|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g} + \bar{h}^{2\beta_g} \right) + \frac{\sigma_T^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}} \right].$$

Proof. We prove (93); the bound for \hat{b}_ℓ follows by the same argument and is omitted.

Fix $\ell \in [L^*]$ and abbreviate $x_\ell := x_{\ell^*}$ and $y_\ell := \hat{f}_S(x_\ell)$. Let $x \in \mathcal{A}_\ell^*$ satisfy $|\hat{f}_S(x) - y_\ell| \leq \bar{h}$. Recall that $\hat{a}_\ell = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} Y_i$, where the weights $(\bar{W}_{i,\ell})_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}$ are defined in (D.1.1) with $z = \hat{f}_S$. Decompose

$$(95) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{a}_\ell - (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] = \text{Var}(\hat{a}_\ell \mid \mathcal{D}_S) + \left(\mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_\ell \mid \mathcal{D}_S] - (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell) \right)^2.$$

Bias. Conditionally on \mathcal{D}_S and the target design $(X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i, \mathcal{D}_S] = g_\ell^*(f_S(X_i))$ on \mathcal{A}_ℓ^* , hence

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_\ell | (X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}, \mathcal{D}_S] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} g_\ell^*(f_S(X_i)).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_\ell | \mathcal{D}_S] - (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} \left(g_\ell^*(f_S(X_i)) - g_\ell^*(\hat{f}_S(X_i)) \right) \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} g_\ell^*(\hat{f}_S(X_i)) \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] - (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell) \\ &=: \text{bias}_1 + \text{bias}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_\ell^* \in \text{H\"ol}(\beta_g, \mathfrak{l}_g)$ and $\|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty < \infty$,

$$|\text{bias}_1| \leq \mathfrak{l}_g \|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{\beta_g} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |\bar{W}_{i,\ell}| \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right].$$

On the event in Assumption 10, Lemma 5 gives

$$(96) \quad |\text{bias}_1| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \mathfrak{l}_g \|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty}{\lambda_0 \bar{h}} \|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{\beta_g}.$$

To control bias_2 , define the linear polynomial

$$p(u) = g_\ell^*(y_\ell) + (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell)(u - y_\ell).$$

Write $g_\ell^*(u) = p(u) + R_\ell(u)$, where by (84), $|R_\ell(u)| \leq \mathfrak{l}_g |u - y_\ell|^{\beta_g}$. By Lemma 4, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} p(\hat{f}_S(X_i)) = (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell).$$

Hence,

$$\text{bias}_2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} R_\ell(\hat{f}_S(X_i)) \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right].$$

On the support of $\bar{W}_{i,\ell}$ we have $|\hat{f}_S(X_i) - y_\ell| \leq \bar{h}$, so $|R_\ell(\hat{f}_S(X_i))| \leq \mathfrak{l}_g \bar{h}^{\beta_g}$. Using again Lemma 5 on the \mathcal{E}_{ess} (defined by (17)),

$$(97) \quad |\text{bias}_2| \leq \mathfrak{l}_g \bar{h}^{\beta_g} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} |\bar{W}_{i,\ell}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \mathfrak{l}_g \|K_x\|_\infty \|K_z\|_\infty}{\lambda_0} \bar{h}^{\beta_g - 1}.$$

Combining (96)–(97) and using $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ yields, on the event \mathcal{E}_{ess} (defined by (17)),

$$(98) \quad \left(\mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_\ell | \mathcal{D}_S] - (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell) \right)^2 \leq \frac{4\mathfrak{c}_2^{\text{ess}} \|K_x\|_\infty^2 \|K_z\|_\infty^2}{\lambda_0^2} \left[\frac{4\mathfrak{l}_g^2 \|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g}}{\bar{h}^2} + 4\mathfrak{l}_g^2 \bar{h}^{2(\beta_g - 1)} \right].$$

Variance. Conditionally on $(X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}$ and \mathcal{D}_S , the weights $(\bar{W}_{i,\ell})_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}$ are deterministic and

$$\hat{a}_\ell - \mathbb{E}[\hat{a}_\ell | (X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}, \mathcal{D}_S] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell} \varepsilon_i.$$

By Assumption 5, $\|\varepsilon_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$, hence $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i^2] \lesssim \sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2$ uniformly in i . Therefore,

$$\text{Var}(\hat{a}_\ell | (X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1}, \mathcal{D}_S) \leq \left(\sup_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i^2] \right) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell}^2 \lesssim \sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1} \bar{W}_{i,\ell}^2.$$

Taking expectation over the target design and using Lemma 5 on the event \mathcal{E}_{ess} (defined by (17)) gives

$$(99) \quad \text{Var}(\hat{a}_\ell | \mathcal{D}_S) \leq \frac{2c_2^{\text{ess}} \sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2 \|K_x\|_\infty^2 \|K_z\|_\infty^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}^3 \lambda_0^2}.$$

Conclusion. Plugging (98) and (99) into (95) yields (93). \square

D.1.2. Proof of Theorem 5. Again, we work conditionally on the source sample \mathcal{D}_S , so that \hat{f}_S is fixed. Let $\ell = \ell^*(X)$ and write $y_\ell := \hat{f}_S(x_{\ell^*})$, so that $g(X, y) = g_\ell^*(y)$ and $\hat{g}_{\hat{f}_S}(X, y) = \hat{g}_{\hat{f}_S, \ell}(y)$. Recall that

$$\hat{g}_{\hat{f}_S, \ell}(y) = \hat{a}_\ell(y - y_\ell) + \hat{b}_\ell \quad \text{with} \quad a_\ell^* = (g_\ell^*)'(y_\ell) \text{ and } b_\ell^* = g_\ell^*(y_\ell).$$

On the event \mathcal{E}_y we have $|y - y_\ell| \leq \bar{h}$. Then,

$$(100) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{g}_{\hat{f}_S, \ell}(y) - g_\ell^*(y))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] &\leq 3\bar{h}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{a}_\ell - a_\ell^*)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] + 3 \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{b}_\ell - b_\ell^*)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] \\ &\quad + 3 \left(g_\ell^*(y) - (a_\ell^*(y - y_\ell) + b_\ell^*) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the Taylor remainder bound (84) (with expansion point y_ℓ), on \mathcal{E}_y ,

$$(101) \quad \left(g_\ell^*(y) - (a_\ell^*(y - y_\ell) + b_\ell^*) \right)^2 \leq \mathfrak{l}_g^2 |y - y_\ell|^{2\beta_g} \leq \mathfrak{l}_g^2 \bar{h}^{2\beta_g}.$$

On the event \mathcal{E}_{ess} (17), Proposition 3 yields

$$(102) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{a}_\ell - a_\ell^*)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] \lesssim \frac{\mathfrak{l}_g^2 \|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g}}{\bar{h}^2} + \mathfrak{l}_g^2 \bar{h}^{2(\beta_g-1)} + \frac{\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}^3},$$

and

$$(103) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{b}_\ell - b_\ell^*)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] \lesssim \mathfrak{l}_g^2 \left(\|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g} + \bar{h}^{2\beta_g} \right) + \frac{\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}}.$$

Substituting (102)–(103) and (101) into (100), and simplifying, gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{g}_{\hat{f}_S, \ell}(y) - g_\ell^*(y))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_S \right] \lesssim \mathfrak{l}_g^2 \|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g} + \mathfrak{l}_g^2 \bar{h}^{2\beta_g} + \frac{\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}^2}{n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h}},$$

on $\mathcal{E}_{\text{ess}} \cap \mathcal{E}_y$. Finally, on \mathcal{E}_S we have the sup-norm control (39) (see Appendix E.1 for details), hence

$$\|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g} \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{\log(c_S/\delta_S)}{n_S} \right)^{\frac{2\beta_g\beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}},$$

which yields (41).

The optimized choice $\bar{h} = (n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d)^{-1/(2\beta_g+1)}$ balances $\bar{h}^{2\beta_g}$ and $(n_{\mathcal{T}_1} h^d \bar{h})^{-1}$ and gives (42).

APPENDIX E. TECHNICAL RESULTS

E.1. Nadarya-Watson estimator. We briefly recall classical consistency and deviation results for the Nadaraya-Watson (NW) estimator, which will be used to control the estimation error of the source regression function. Setting. Let $(X_i, Y_i)_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ be i.i.d. observations from the regression model

$$Y_i = f_S(X_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i | X_i] = 0,$$

where $X_i \in [0, 1]^d$ has density p_S satisfying Assumption 3.2. We assume that the noise variables $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ are independent and sub-exponential, i.e., there exist constants $(\sigma_S, b) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \varepsilon_i)] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\sigma_S^2 \lambda^2}{2}\right),$$

for all $|\lambda| < 1/b$. Let K be a bounded, Lipschitz, compactly supported kernel satisfying $\int K = 1$, and let $h_S > 0$ denote a bandwidth. The Nadaraya-Watson estimator of f_S is defined as

$$\hat{f}_S(x) = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} K_{h_S}(x - X_i) Y_i}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} K_{h_S}(x - X_i)}, \quad K_{h_S}(u) := h_S^{-d} K(u/h_S).$$

Smoothness assumption. We assume throughout that the source regression function belongs to a Hölder class $\text{Höl}(\beta_S, \mathfrak{l}_S)$, for some smoothness parameter $\beta_S > 0$ and radius $\mathfrak{l}_S > 0$.

Uniform risk bounds. Under the above assumptions, the bias-variance trade-off of the NW estimator is well understood. In particular, classical results due to Stone [40], and later refinements by Györfi et al. [14] and Tsybakov [42], yield the following uniform mean-squared error bound: there exist constants $\mathfrak{c}_1, \mathfrak{c}_2 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in [0, 1]^d} \mathbb{E}[|\hat{f}_S(x) - f_S(x)|^2] \leq \mathfrak{c}_1 h_S^{2\beta_S} + \frac{\mathfrak{c}_2}{n_S h_S^d}.$$

Uniform deviation bounds under sub-exponential noise. High-probability sup-norm bounds can still be obtained when the noise is sub-exponential, at the price of larger constants. Using Bernstein-type inequalities for kernel regression with unbounded noise (see, e.g., Giné and Guillou [13], Einmahl

and Mason [9], and the discussion in Tsybakov [42]), there exist constants $c_S, \mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that, for any $\delta_S \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta_S$,

$$\|\hat{f}_S - f_S\|_\infty \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(h_S^{\beta_S} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(c_S/\delta_S)}{n_S h_S^d}} \right).$$

Choosing the bandwidth optimally as

$$h_S = \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{\log(c_S/\delta_S)}{n_S} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta_S+d}},$$

and assuming that $n_S h_S^d / \log n_S \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the uniform rate

$$\|\hat{f}_S - f_S\|_\infty \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{\log(c_S/\delta_S)}{n_S} \right)^{\frac{\beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}}.$$

Finally, this bound directly implies a control on higher-order powers of the sup-norm error. In particular, for any $\beta_g > 0$, with the same probability,

$$\|f_S - \hat{f}_S\|_\infty^{2\beta_g} \leq \mathfrak{c} \left(\frac{\log(c_S/\delta_S)}{n_S} \right)^{\frac{2\beta_g \beta_S}{2\beta_S+d}}.$$

Such bounds will play a key role in controlling the additional error induced by the estimation of the source regression function when composed with a β_g -Hölder transfer function.

E.2. Deviation and concentration inequalities.

Theorem 6 (Chernoff's bound for Bernoulli random variables). *Let $(Z_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with parameter $p \in (0, 1)$. For any $\rho \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \leq \rho np \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{(1-\rho)^2}{2} np \right).$$

Theorem 7 (Bernstein inequality, bounded summands). *Let $(Z_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be independent, centered random variables with $|Z_i| \leq M$ almost surely, and set $v := \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(Z_i)$. Then, for any $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right| > t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2(v + \frac{M}{3} t)} \right) = 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2v + \frac{2}{3} Mt} \right).$$

Equivalently, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right| \leq \sqrt{2v \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)} + \frac{M}{3} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right).$$

Theorem 8. [Matrix Bernstein inequality] Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be independent, random, self-adjoint matrices of dimension $d \times d$ such that $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$ and there exists $R > 0$ such that $\|X_i\|_{\text{op}} \leq R$ almost surely. Define the matrix variance parameter

$$\sigma^2 := \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] \right\|_{\text{op}}.$$

Then, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right\|_{\text{op}} \geq t \right) \leq 2d \exp \left(\frac{-t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + Rt/3} \right).$$

As a corollary, there exists a constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right\|_{\text{op}} \right] \leq C \max \{ \sqrt{\sigma^2 \log d}, R \log d \}$$

Bernstein inequality for sub-exponential random variables. Recall the definition of Orlicz norms.

Definition 2. The Orlicz ψ_1 -norm of a real-valued random variable X is defined by:

$$\|X\|_{\psi_1} = \inf \left\{ C > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{|X|}{C} \right) \right] \leq 2 \right\}.$$

A random variable is called sub-exponential if $\|X\|_{\psi_1} < \infty$.

The Orlicz ψ_2 -norm of a real-valued random variable X is defined by:

$$\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \inf \left\{ C > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{|X|^2}{C^2} \right) \right] \leq 2 \right\}.$$

A random variable is called sub-Gaussian if $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$.

The following examples can be found in [44], Section 2.5.

Example 1. (1) Any random variable $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is sub-gaussian with $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq C\sigma$, for some $C > 0$.

(2) Any bounded random variable X is sub-Gaussian with $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq C\|X\|_{\infty}$, for some $C > 0$.

Let us prove the useful lemma:

Lemma 6. Let X be a sub-Gaussian random variable such that $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \sigma$. Then, the random variable $X^2 - \mathbb{E}[X^2]$ is sub-exponential, and

$$\|X^2 - \mathbb{E}[X^2]\|_{\psi_1} \leq 4\sigma^2.$$

Proof. Assume that $\|X\|_{\psi_2} < \sigma$, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\exp(X^2/\sigma^2)] \leq 2$. Using the standard inequality $e^u \geq 1 + u$, we get

$$2 \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{X^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \right] \geq 1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}{\sigma^2},$$

so that $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \leq \sigma^2$. Moreover, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{X^2}{4\sigma^2}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\exp\left(\frac{X^2}{\sigma^2}\right)\right)^{1/4}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\exp\left(\frac{X^2}{\sigma^2}\right)\right)\right]^{1/4} \leq 2^{1/4}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{|X^2 - \mathbb{E}[X^2]|}{4\sigma^2}\right)\right] &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}{4\sigma^2}\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{X^2}{4\sigma^2}\right)\right] \\ &\leq e^{1/4} \cdot 2^{1/4} \leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the result. \square

We recall:

Proposition 4 ([44], Proposition 2.5.2). *Let X be a random variable. Then the following properties are equivalent; the parameters $K_i > 0$ appearing in these properties differ from each other by at most an absolute constant factor.*

- (1) For all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/K_1^2)$.
- (2) For all $p \geq 1$, $\|X\|_p = (\mathbb{E}|X|^p)^{1/p} \leq K_2 \sqrt{p}$.
- (3) For all λ such that $|\lambda| \leq K_1$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda^2 X^2)] \leq \exp(K_3^2 \lambda^2)$.
- (4) We have $\mathbb{E}[\exp(X^2/K_4^2)] \leq 2$.
- (5) Moreover, if $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ then properties (i)–(iv) are also equivalent to the following property: For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda X)] \leq \exp(K_5^2 \lambda^2)$.

Lemma 7 (Bernstein inequalities for sub-exponential/Gaussian random variables). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be independent, mean-zero, random variables.*

- Assume the X_i are sub-exponential such that $\|X_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq K$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then, there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,

$$(104) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-c \min\left(\frac{t^2}{nK^2}, \frac{t}{K}\right)\right).$$

Equivalently, with probability $1 - \delta$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$(105) \quad \left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right| \leq CK \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{\log(2/\delta)}{n}\right).$$

- Assume the X_i are sub-Gaussian such that $\|X_i\|_{\psi_2} \leq K$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then, there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,

$$(106) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-c \frac{t^2}{nK^2}\right).$$

Proposition 5 (Bernstein inequality for weighted sums of sub-exponential variables). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be independent sub-exponential random variables satisfying $\|X_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq K$ for all i , and let $(\alpha_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be deterministic weights. Then there exists a universal constant $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ such that, for all*

$\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i |X_i| \geq cK \left(\sqrt{\log(1/\delta) \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2} + \log(1/\delta) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\alpha_i| \right) \right) \leq \delta.$$

E.3. Approximation results.

Definition 3. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The Kolmogorov n -width of a subset $K \subset L^\infty(A)$ is defined by

$$(107) \quad d_n(K, L^\infty) := \inf_{\substack{V \subset L^\infty(A) \\ \dim V = n}} \sup_{g \in K} \inf_{\phi \in V} \|g - \phi\|_{L^\infty(A)}.$$

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz (whose boundary can be described locally by graphs of Lipschitz functions) domain, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and

$$\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(A) := \{f \in \text{H\"ol}(s; A) : \|f\|_{\text{H\"ol}(s; A)} \leq 1\}$$

be the unit Hölder ball of smoothness $s > 0$ (Hölder-Zygmund class). The Kolmogorov k -width in $L^p(A)$ is

$$d_k(\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(A), L^p(A)) := \inf_{\substack{V \subset L^p(A) \\ \dim V = k}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(A)} \inf_{g \in V} \|f - g\|_{L^p(A)}.$$

The following result can be found in ([35], Chapter 7) or ([8], Chapter 9).

Theorem 9 (Kolmogorov k -widths of Hölder balls in L^p). *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz (i.e. whose boundary can be described locally by graphs of Lipschitz functions) domain, let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and let $s > 0$. Then there exist constants $c, c' > 0$ depending only on s, d, p , and A such that*

$$ck^{-s/d} \leq d_k(\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(A), L^p(A)) \leq c'k^{-s/d}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

In particular, the optimal n -dimensional approximation rate of s -Hölder functions in $L^p(A)$ is $n^{-s/d}$.

Corollary 5 (Scaling to a ball of radius r). *Let $Q = \mathcal{B}_d(x_0, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at x_0 , let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and let*

$$\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(Q) := \{f \in \text{H\"ol}(s; Q) : \|f\|_{\text{H\"ol}(s; Q)} \leq 1\}.$$

Then there exist constants $c, c' > 0$ depending only on s, d, p such that, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$ck^{-s/d}r^{s+d/p} \leq d_k(\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(Q), L^p(Q)) \leq c'k^{-s/d}r^{s+d/p}.$$

In particular, for $k = 2$ and $p = 2$,

$$d_k(\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(Q), L^2(Q)) = cr^{s+d/2}.$$

Proof (sketch). Let $B_0 := \mathcal{B}_d(0, 1)$ and $Q := \mathcal{B}_d(x_0, r)$. Let $S_r : \mathbb{R}^Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{B_0}$ be the function such that $f(y) := f(x_0 + ry)$, which maps functions on Q to functions on B_0 . Then $\|S_r f\|_{L^p(B_0)} = r^{d/p} \|f\|_{L^p(Q)}$, and the $\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}$ seminorm scales by r^s , so S_r maps $\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(Q)$ onto a set equivalent (up to constants independent of r) to $\mathcal{B}_s^{\text{H\"ol}}(B_0)$. Applying the L^p width result on B_0 and rescaling yields the claim. \square