

THE WEAK-FEATURE-IMPACT EFFECT ON THE NPMLE IN MONOTONE BINARY REGRESSION

BY DARIO KIEFFER^{1,a} AND ANGELIKA ROHDE^{1,b}

¹Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, ^adario.kieffer@stochastik.uni-freiburg.de; ^bangelika.rohde@stochastik.uni-freiburg.de

The nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator (NPMLE) in monotone binary regression models is studied when the impact of the features on the labels is weak. Here, weakness is colloquially understood as “close to flatness” of the feature-label relationship $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x)$. Statistical literature provides the analysis of the NPMLE for the two extremal cases: If there is a non-vanishing derivative of the regression function, then the NPMLE possesses a nonparametric rate of convergence with Chernoff-type limit distribution, and it converges at the parametric \sqrt{n} -rate if the underlying function is (locally) flat. To investigate the transition of the NPMLE between these two extremal cases, we introduce a novel mathematical scenario. New pointwise and L^1 -rates of convergence and corresponding limit distributions of the NPMLE are derived. They are shown to exhibit a sharp phase transition solely characterized by the level of feature impact.

1. Introduction. The goal of this article is to investigate the statistical behavior of the nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator (NPMLE) in the monotone binary regression model when the explanatory power of the features regarding the labels is weak. The motivation for studying this problem is two-fold.

- On the one hand, a weak feature-label relationship is a situation which occurs frequently in practical applications. Especially privacy preserving requirements may diminish the isolated effect of an explanatory variable X on the response variable Y considerably.
- On the other hand, purely motivated from statistical theory, we believe that the properties of the NPMLE in that regime are not fully understood. Actually, the literature provides the analysis for the two extremal cases: If there is a non-vanishing derivative, then the NPMLE possesses a nonparametric rate of convergence with Chernoff-type limit distribution (in the terminology of [Han and Kato \(2022\)](#)), and it converges at the parametric \sqrt{n} -rate if the underlying function is (locally) flat. The mathematical question raises how the transition from one to the other extremal case, i.e. the passage from the nonparametric to the parametric regime when the non-vanishing derivative is getting small in absolute value, actually looks like.

1.1. State of the art. As the problem of estimating a monotone function arises naturally in many real world tasks and also builds the foundation for multiple statistical models, it has been studied extensively over the last decades, with [Grenander \(1957\)](#) being the first to consider the NPMLE for monotone densities, lending it the name *Grenander estimator*. It was shown first in [Prakasa Rao \(1969\)](#) that this estimator is $n^{1/3}$ -consistent with respect to the pointwise distance and asymptotically Chernoff-distributed if the density’s first derivative does not vanish. This was then proven again in [Groeneboom \(1985\)](#) by a different technique utilizing inverse expressions based on the *switch relation*, which

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62G05; secondary 62G20.

Keywords and phrases: Nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation, binary regression model, weak feature impact, convergence rate, limiting distribution, phase transition.

then became the most important tool for deriving limits in nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation under several shape constraints. In that article, it was also the first time the L^1 -limiting behaviour was considered. A rigorous proof of the L^1 -limit then appeared in [Groeneboom, Hooghiemstra and Lopuhaä \(1999\)](#), proving that the expectation of the L^1 -distance converges with rate $n^{1/3}$ to zero and that the stabilized L^1 -distance itself fluctuates with rate $n^{1/6}$ around its expectation and is asymptotically normal. A generalization to the L^p -distance was given in [Kulikov and Lopuhaä \(2005\)](#). Meanwhile, similar results regarding the pointwise distance appeared in the context of isotonic regression and least squares estimation (LSE) in [Brunk \(1970\)](#) and for current status data in [Groeneboom and Wellner \(1992\)](#), utilizing the similarities between the NPMLE and the LSE. A unified study of various estimators, including the monotone NPMLE was introduced in [Kim and Pollard \(1990\)](#). The L^1 -limit for isotonic regression with fixed design was derived in [Durot \(2002\)](#) and was later generalized to the L^p -distance in [Durot \(2007\)](#) and to the random design setting in [Durot \(2008\)](#). Many more properties of the NPMLE under monotonicity constraints were derived during that time and beyond, for example the pointwise limiting behaviour for functions with vanishing derivative up to some order β were considered in [Wright \(1981\)](#), resulting in convergence rates $n^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}$ and for locally flat densities in [Carolan and Dykstra \(1999\)](#), obtaining the parametric \sqrt{n} -consistency. Non-asymptotic properties were investigated in [Birgé \(1989\)](#), minimax-optimality with adaptation to the underlying function was derived in [Cator \(2011\)](#), the limiting behaviour w.r.t. the uniform distance in [Durot, Kulikov and Lopuhaä \(2012\)](#), and the misspecified case in [Patilea \(2001\)](#) and [Jankowski \(2014\)](#), to mention just a few. More information can be found in the overview articles [Groeneboom and Jongbloed \(2018\)](#) and [Durot and Lopuhaä \(2018\)](#), as well as in the book [Groeneboom and Jongbloed \(2014\)](#). Recently, some new results were published, where we want to point out [Westling and Carone \(2020\)](#) who introduced a unified approach to study generalized Grenander estimators and obtained asymptotic results under weak assumptions in dependence of the modulus of continuity of the function to estimate. Pointwise estimation of n -dependent monotone functions with possibly changing shape were considered for the first time in the preprint [Mallick, Sarkar and Kuchibhotla \(2023\)](#), not reaching the parametric regime, however. Using a new localization technique in isotonic regression and an anti-concentration inequality for the supremum of a Brownian motion with a Lipschitz drift, [Han and Kato \(2022\)](#) derived Berry–Esseen bounds for Chernoff-type limit distributions. Recently, [Cattaneo, Jansson and Nagasawa \(2024\)](#) proposed a bootstrap adapting to the unknown order of the first non-zero derivative.

1.2. The weak-feature-impact scenario. In order to describe weakness of a feature-label relation, we have to clarify how it suitably translates into mathematical modeling. For conciseness of the representation, we restrict our attention to isotonic binary regression. Clearly, the extremal case of no impact corresponds to $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x)$ being constant, while a very steep increase from 0 to 1 or even the jump function $\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X) = \mathbb{1}\{X \geq c\}$ for some real number c is what one might consider as fully related. With this regard, a weak feature-label relation translates colloquially into $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x)$ being “almost flat”. As the distribution of the NPMLE is accessible essentially subject to asymptotics, weakness in the sense of “almost flatness” of a feature-label relationship has to be put into relation with the sample size to make its presence visible. For the remainder of the article, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ denote a probability space and consider the triangular array $(X_1, Y_1^n), \dots, (X_n, Y_n^n)$ of respective i.i.d. copies of a random vector $(X, Y^n): \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}$, related via

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{P}(Y^n = 1 | X) = \Phi_0(\delta_n X) =: \Phi_n(X)$$

for some isotonic function Φ_0 and a sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\delta_n \searrow 0$. We call the sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ the *level of feature impact*. Note that in case that Φ_0 is continuously differentiable, the derivative of (1) with respect to the feature variable satisfies

$$\Phi'_n(x) = \delta_n \Phi'_0(\delta_n x) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

If $\Phi'_0 > 0$, the level of feature impact characterizes the speed in which the derivative of the regression function $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y^n = 1 | X = x)$ approaches zero. Note that our theory could be developed likewise for a more general sequence of functions Φ_n with $\Phi'_n \longrightarrow 0$ pointwise, but characterization of the limiting behavior then results in bulky conditions on $(\Phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Instead, we find the results in terms of $(\delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ much easier to grasp. Besides, it can be viewed as generalization of logistic regression (where Φ_0 is the logistic function) with a one-dimensional explanatory variable. Here, the influence of the latter on the response is likewise disappearing if the corresponding parameter (regression coefficient) is tending to zero.

1.3. Overview of the results. Suppose for the moment that Φ_0 is continuously differentiable with $\Phi'_0 > 0$. Whereas the NPMLE is $n^{1/3}$ -consistent in the classical asymptotics, the rate of consistency in the weak-feature-impact scenario is proved to increase to

$$\sqrt{n} \wedge \left(\frac{n}{\delta_n} \right)^{1/3}$$

for pointwise and L^1 -distance. Note that $(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} \sim \sqrt{n}$ for $\delta_n \sim \sqrt{n}$. Our main finding is that corresponding to the new elbow in the rate, the distribution of the NPMLE exhibits a phase transition both locally (pointwise) and globally (in L^1) at the critical level of feature impact $\delta_n \sim n^{-1/2}$. Likewise, the underlying mathematical theory splits into separate chains of arguments, depending on whether $\delta_n \ll \sqrt{n}$, $\delta_n \sim \sqrt{n}$ and $\delta_n \gg \sqrt{n}$. To state our results, let $(Z(s))_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a standard two-sided Brownian motion on \mathbb{R} , let $(W(s))_{s \in [0,1]}$ be a standard Brownian motion on $[0, 1]$ and let

$$W^{*,\ell}(t) = \sup_{u < t} \inf_{v \geq t} \frac{W(v) - W(u)}{v - u}, \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

denote the left-derivative of its greatest convex minorant. With $\hat{\Phi}_n$ the NPMLE of Φ_n and P_X the marginal distribution of the features with continuous Lebesgue density p_X on its support $[-T, T]$ for some $T > 0$ and distribution function F_X , we are now in the position to present the two main Theorems of this article. Asymptotic results are understood as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

THEOREM (Pointwise limiting distribution). *Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable with non-vanishing derivative in a neighbourhood of zero, let x_0 be an interior point of the support of P_X and let p_X be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of x_0 .*

(i) *If $n\delta_n^2 \longrightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\left(\frac{n}{\delta_n} \right)^{1/3} (\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\frac{4\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))\Phi'_0(0)}{p_X(x_0)} \right)^{1/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(s) + s^2\}.$$

(ii) *If $n\delta_n^2 \longrightarrow 0$, then*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} W^{*,\ell}(F_X(x_0)).$$

Note that, as long as $n\delta_n^2 \longrightarrow \infty$ (*slow regime*), the limiting law is a scaled Chernoff distribution as in the classical setting for a fixed function. The proof is based on the switch relation and the inverse process, where the inverse process turns out to scale as $(n\delta_n^2)^{1/3}$. It

is insightful to contrast it with the convergence rate $(n/\delta_n)^{1/3}$ of the NPMLE, which mirrors the relation between Φ_n and $\Phi_n^{-1} = \delta_n^{-1} \Phi_0^{-1}$:

$$\left(\frac{n}{\delta_n}\right)^{1/3} = \frac{1}{\delta_n} (n\delta_n^2)^{1/3}.$$

As soon as $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow 0$ (*fast regime*), the level of feature impact does not affect the rate of convergence any longer and the limiting distribution changes to the distribution of the suitably scaled left-derivative of the greatest convex minorant of a Brownian motion, which corresponds to the limit in estimation of locally flat functions. As we will see in Section 4, however, a different limit actually occurs at the exact phase transition $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow c > 0$. In this section, we also study the more general situation, where Φ_0 is allowed to have vanishing derivatives up to some order β . In that case, the rates of convergence are different and the phase transition is correspondingly shifted to $\delta_n \sim n^{-1/2\beta}$.

The situation becomes more subtle and considerably more involved for the L^1 -distance. In the slow regime, we observe an effect of δ_n on both, the convergence rate of the L^1 -distance and the fluctuation around its stabilized expectation

$$\mu_n = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{n}{\delta_n} \right)^{1/3} \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt \right] = O(1).$$

Surprisingly, however, the way in which δ_n distorts the original rate in n is different: The fluctuation scales as $(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}$, whereas the expected L^1 -distance scales as the pointwise distance with $(n/\delta_n)^{1/3}$.

THEOREM (Limit distribution of the L^1 -error). *Assume that Φ_0 is differentiable with Hölder-continuous derivative in a neighbourhood of zero with $\Phi'_0(0) > 0$. Furthermore, let p_X be continuously differentiable (one-sided at the boundary points) on $[-T, T]$ with $p_X > 0$ on $[-T, T]$.*

(i) *If $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \left(\left(\frac{n}{\delta_n} \right)^{1/3} \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt - \mu_n \right) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $\sigma^2 > 0$ is specified in Section 5.

(ii) *If $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow 0$, then*

$$\sqrt{n} \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_X(x) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \max_{s \in [-T, T]} A(s).$$

Here, $(A(s))_{s \in [-T, T]}$ is a continuous Gaussian process, satisfying $A(-T) = -A(T)$, $\mathbb{E}[A(s)] = 0$ and

$$\text{Cov}(A(s), A(t)) = \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))(1 - 2|F_X(s) - F_X(t)|) \text{ for } s, t \in [-T, T].$$

Note that the fluctuation of the stabilized L^1 -distance around its expectation μ_n in the slow regime is getting slower, the faster δ_n goes to zero and collapses at the phase transition $\delta_n \sim n^{-1/2}$, where the limit distribution also changes. To the best of our knowledge, the limit in (ii) has not been discovered before.

1.4. Outline. The remaining parts of the article are organized as follows. In Section 3, we prove Hellinger consistency and deduce pointwise-, L^1 -, and uniform convergence on compact sets. These results do not require differentiability of Φ_0 and hold irrespective of the level of feature impact. In Section 4 and Section 5, we derive convergence rate and limiting distribution for the pointwise and the L^1 -distance, respectively. In Section 6, we collect some of the proofs of the main results. Some auxiliary proofs and results are given in the Appendices A, B and C.

2. Notation and preliminaries on the NPMLE. For the remainder of the article, we write P_X for the distribution of X under \mathbb{P} , denote the respective distribution function by F_X , write p_X for the continuous Lebesgue density if it exists and write F_n for the empirical distribution function of X_1, \dots, X_n , where we also define

$$F_n^{-1}: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad F_n^{-1}(a) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid F_n(x) \geq a\}.$$

Moreover, we write

$$\mathcal{F} := \{\Phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \Phi \text{ monotonically increasing}\}$$

for the set of monotonically increasing functions mapping \mathbb{R} into the unit interval. Note that both Φ_0 and Φ_n are contained in \mathcal{F} . Further, let

$$p_\Phi: \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad p_\Phi(x, y) := \Phi(x)^y (1 - \Phi(x))^{1-y}$$

denote the conditional density induced by our setting for arbitrary $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}$. The NPMLE for Φ_n is then defined by

$$\hat{\Phi}_n \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \prod_{i=1}^n p_\Phi(X_i, Y_i^n) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log p_\Phi(X_i, Y_i^n).$$

The fact that $\hat{\Phi}_n$ actually exists and is a.s. unique at the sample points can be proven similar as in (Part II Prop. 1.1 & Prop. 1.2, [Groeneboom and Wellner, 1992](#)), where existence and uniqueness of the maximum likelihood estimator is shown for the interval censoring problem. Note that it coincides here with the least-squares estimator (LSE). As usual in the literature, we agree on $\hat{\Phi}_n$ being right-continuous and piecewise constant with jump points being a subset of the sample points, i.e. for $X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}$ denoting the order statistic of X_1, \dots, X_n , we set

$$(2) \quad \hat{\Phi}_n|_{(-\infty, X_{(1)})} := 0, \quad \hat{\Phi}_n|_{[X_{(n)}, \infty)} := \hat{\Phi}_n(X_{(n)}), \quad \hat{\Phi}_n|_{[X_{(i)}, X_{(i+1)})} := \hat{\Phi}_n(X_{(i)})$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Although there is no closed-form expression for $\hat{\Phi}_n$, it is possible to characterize the classical NPMLE under shape constraints by its inverse process via the switch relation, originally introduced in [Groeneboom \(1983\)](#) for monotone densities. This provides the following characterization of $\hat{\Phi}_n$: Let $Y_{(1)}^n, \dots, Y_{(n)}^n$ be the corresponding ordering of labels according to $X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}$, i.e. if $X_{(i)} = X_j$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $Y_{(i)}^n = Y_j^n$. Further, let

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{Y}_n := \left\{ \left(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \leq i} Y_{(j)}^n \right) \mid i \in \{0, \dots, n\} \right\},$$

where $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \leq 0} Y_{(j)}^n := 0$ and let $G_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the greatest convex minorant of \mathcal{Y}_n . Then,

$$(4) \quad \hat{\Phi}_n(X_{(i)}) = \sup_{s < \frac{i}{n}} \inf_{t \geq \frac{i}{n}} \frac{G_n(t) - G_n(s)}{t - s},$$

is given by the left-hand derivative of G_n in the point i/n (see (Ch. 3.3, [Groeneboom and Jongbloed, 2014](#))). Based on this, we now obtain the *switch relation*, which states that the following process

$$(5) \quad U_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad U_n(a) := \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq x\}} - a F_n(x) \right\}$$

behaves like a generalized inverse to $\hat{\Phi}_n$, with argmin^+ denoting the sup of all points of minimum and \mathcal{X} denoting the (compact) support of P_X . We formulate the result for the weak-feature-impact scenario and refer to (Lemma 3.2, [Groeneboom and Jongbloed, 2014](#)) for a proof.

LEMMA 2.1 (Switch relation). *For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $a \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\hat{\Phi}_n(x) \geq a \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad U_n(a) \leq x \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

3. Consistency. As usual in the analysis of NPMLEs, Hellinger consistency is studied first due to its technical advantages compared to other distances with respect to the NPMLE (see, for example, [Van de Geer \(1993\)](#) for Hellinger consistency of certain NPMLEs). To introduce a distance function on \mathcal{F} , let us first introduce some notation regarding the Hellinger distance. For two probability measures Q_1, Q_2 on (Ω, \mathcal{A}) , let $h(Q_1, Q_2)$ denote the Hellinger distance of Q_1 and Q_2 . Denoting the counting measure on \mathbb{N} by ζ , we obtain for $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} h^2(\mathbb{P}_\Phi, \mathbb{P}_\Psi) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} (\sqrt{p_\Phi(x, y)} - \sqrt{p_\Psi(x, y)})^2 d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\sqrt{1 - \Phi(x)} - \sqrt{1 - \Psi(x)})^2 + (\sqrt{\Phi(x)} - \sqrt{\Psi(x)})^2 dP(x) \\ &=: d^2(\Psi, \Phi), \end{aligned}$$

which defines a distance function d on \mathcal{F} . Note that d itself is not the Hellinger distance but it is induced by the Hellinger metric, for which reason we will still refer to consistency in d as Hellinger consistency in the following. Apart from consistency itself, the key aspect of the following result is that Hellinger consistency of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ is actually independent of the chosen sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and is thus independent of the level of feature impact.

THEOREM 3.1 (Hellinger consistency). *We have*

$$d(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

As shown in Theorem [A.5](#), Hellinger consistency of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ is not only independent of δ_n , but even holds uniformly on \mathcal{F} in general, i.e. we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_\Phi(d(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the notation \mathbb{P}_Φ indicates that $\mathbb{P}_\Phi(Y = 1|X) = \Phi(X)$. Theorem [3.1](#) is an immediate consequence of this result. The proof of Theorem [A.5](#) given in Appendix [A](#) follows the idea of classical consistency proofs for MLEs, i.e. it is shown that the conditions of an argmax continuous mapping result are satisfied (see e.g. (Theorem 5.7, [van der Vaart, 1998](#))). However, to obtain consistency uniformly over \mathcal{F} , some additional work was necessary, which is why we decided to give a complete proof in Appendix [A](#).

As usual, Hellinger consistency implies $L^1(P_X)$ -consistency of $\hat{\Phi}_n$. Moreover, utilizing that the stochastic process $\hat{\Phi}_n(x) = \hat{\Phi}_n(\omega, x)$ can not only be seen as a random variable on Ω for fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, but also as a random variable on \mathbb{R} for fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, we deduce pointwise convergence by a two-stage subsequence argument. Finally, by utilizing our specific definition of Φ_n , a modification of the well-known fact that pointwise convergent sequences of distribution functions with a continuous limit converge uniformly, we also derive convergence uniformly on compacts in probability. Note that simply applying this result about distribution functions is not possible, as the limit of Φ_n is not a distribution function anymore. We summarize the findings in the following Theorem and give a detailed proof in Section [6](#).

THEOREM 3.2. *Assume that Φ_0 is continuous in a neighbourhood of zero and assume that P_X has a Lebesgue density with $p_X(x) > 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

- (i) $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_X(x) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$,
- (ii) $|\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)| \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$ for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,
- (iii) $\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$ for every $T > 0$.

As in Theorem 3.1, the consistency results in Theorem 3.2 do not depend on the choice of the sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, implying, as before, that consistency of the estimator is independent of the level of feature impact. This independence, however, changes when taking convergence rates and limiting distributions into account, as shown detailed in the next two sections.

4. Pointwise convergence rates and limiting distributions. In this section, we study the pointwise limiting behaviour of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ in detail, presenting convergence rates and limiting distributions of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ in dependence of δ_n . This will lead to an elbow in the convergence rate and a phase transition in the limiting distribution. We will see that this transition takes place exactly at $\delta_n = n^{-1/2}$ if Φ'_0 does not vanish in a neighbourhood of zero and that the transition point is shifted to $\delta_n = n^{-1/(2\beta)}$ if the β 'th derivative of Φ_0 for some $\beta \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ is the first non-vanishing derivative in a neighbourhood of zero. We will also investigate the limiting behaviour at the exact cut-off point. In particular, we observe that a lower feature impact (i.e. a faster rate of $\delta_n \searrow 0$) leads to a faster rate of convergence.

Before we state the result, let us introduce the following notations. For any interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and any continuous function $g: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let g^* denote its greatest convex minorant and let $g^{*,\ell}$ denote the left-hand derivative of g^* on the interior of I , i.e.

$$g^{*,\ell}(x) = \sup_{s < x} \inf_{t \geq x} \frac{g(t) - g(s)}{t - s}.$$

For more details on this, see (Ch. 3.3, [Groeneboom and Jongbloed, 2014](#)). For the remainder of this section, we will assume that P_X is supported on $\mathcal{X} = [-T, T]$ for some $T > 0$ and has a continuous and strictly positive Lebesgue density on $[-T, T]$.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, x_0 an interior point of \mathcal{X} and assume Φ_0 to be β -times continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of 0 with the β th derivative being the first non-vanishing derivative in 0.*

- (i) *Let $(Z(s))_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ denote a standard two-sided Brownian motion on \mathbb{R} , let*

$$f_\beta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f_\beta(s) := \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} Z(s) + \frac{\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0)}{p_X(x_0)^\beta (\beta + 1)!} s^{\beta+1}$$

and assume p_X to be β -times continuously differentiable on the interior of \mathcal{X} .

If $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\left(\frac{n}{\delta_n}\right)^{\beta/(2\beta+1)} (\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} f_\beta^{*,\ell}(0) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

- (ii) *Let $(W(s))_{s \in [0, 1]}$ denote a standard Brownian motion on $[0, 1]$, assume F_X to be invertible and assume X to have bounded moments up to order β .*

If $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} W^{*,\ell}(F_X(x_0)) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The limit in (i) (slow regime) appeared first in [Wright \(1981\)](#) and is the well-known limit of the NPMLE in binary regression under these general conditions on the derivative on the function to estimate. We want to point out, however, that the rate of consistency is getting faster here and changes from the classical rate $n^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}$ to

$$\left(\frac{n}{\delta_n}\right)^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}$$

according to the level of feature impact, and in consonance with Theorem 2.2 of [Mallick, Sarkar and Kuchibhotla \(2023\)](#). As soon as $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow 0$ (fast regime), the limiting distribution switches to the one derived in (Theorem 2.4 [Jankowski, 2014](#)). Note that this is quite insightful nonetheless, as neither the exact point of the phase transition, nor the number of phases and the effects of δ_n on the limiting distribution was known before.

Conceptually, we follow (Example 3.2.15, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) to prove statement (i) and the idea of (Theorem 2.4, [Jankowski, 2014](#)) for statement (ii). Some important adjustments, however, were necessary during the proof regarding the dependence on δ_n of the rates of the investigated empirical processes, the “limit” function Φ_n and the arising function classes, which are now n -dependent as well.

PROOF. First of all, for every $v \in \mathbb{R}$ and any sequence $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of real numbers, we know from the switch relation in Lemma 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(r_n(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) &= \mathbb{P}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) < \Phi_n(x_0) + r_n^{-1}v) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [-T, T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} - (\Phi_n(x_0) + r_n^{-1}v) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} \right\} > x_0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [-T, T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} - r_n^{-1} \frac{v}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} \right\} > x_0\right). \end{aligned}$$

We start with the proof of (ii). For this, let $r_n = \sqrt{n}$ and define

$$h_n: [-T, T] \times \{0, 1\} \times [-T, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad h_n(x, y, t) := (y - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq t\}},$$

as well as $H_n(t) := \mathbb{E}[h_n(X, Y^n, t)]$. Note that multiplying a function by a constant does not change the location of its minimum, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [-T, T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} - \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq s\}}] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq s\}}] - n^{-1/2} v \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} \right\} > x_0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [-T, T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s) - H_n(s)) + \sqrt{n} H_n(s) - \frac{v}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} \right\} > x_0\right). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing s with $F_X^{-1}(s)$ by a change of variable yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{F_X^{-1}(s) \in [-T, T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s)) - H_n(F_X^{-1}(s))) \right\} > x_0\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sqrt{n}H_n(F_X^{-1}(s)) - v \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} \Big\} > x_0 \Big) \\
& = \mathbb{P} \Big(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [0,1]}^+ \Big\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s)) - H_n(F_X^{-1}(s))) \\
& \quad + \sqrt{n}H_n(F_X^{-1}(s)) - v \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} \Big\} > F_X(x_0) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 6.4, we know that the sequence of processes inside the argmin^+ converges weakly in the space $\ell^\infty([0,1])$ to the process

$$(\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))}W(s) - vs)_{s \in [0,1]}$$

as long as $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow 0$ and from Proposition 6.5, we obtain convergence in distribution of the respective argmin 's as a consequence. Note that the argmin of this process has a continuous distribution function (see Stryhn (1996)) and so by summarizing the results, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) \\
& \rightarrow \mathbb{P} \Big(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [0,1]} \{ \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))}W(s) - vs \} > F_X(x_0) \Big) \\
& = \mathbb{P} \Big(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [0,1]} \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))} \Big\{ W(s) - \frac{v}{\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))}}s \Big\} > F_X(x_0) \Big) \\
& = \mathbb{P} \Big(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [0,1]} \Big\{ W(s) - \frac{v}{\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))}}s \Big\} > F_X(x_0) \Big) \\
& = \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))}W^{*,\ell}(F_X(x_0)) < v),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is a consequence of a general switch relation, formulated for left-hand derivatives of greatest convex minorants of continuous functions (Lemma 3.2, Groeneboom and Jongbloed, 2014). Statement (ii) now follows immediately.

Although the proof of (i) is conceptually similar to the proof of (ii), we need some additional modifications of the process inside the argmin^+ . First of all, let us introduce the following functions

$$\begin{aligned}
g: [-T, T] \times [-T, T] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & g(x, t) &:= \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq t\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq x_0\}}, \\
f_n: [-T, T] \times \{0, 1\} \times [-T, T] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & f_n(x, y, t) &:= (y - \Phi_n(x_0))g(x, t)
\end{aligned}$$

and let us set r_n to be $(n/\delta_n)^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}$. Note that addition of constants does not change the location of the minimum of a function, so by a change of variable where we replace s with $x_0 + s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(r_n(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) \\
& = \mathbb{P} \Big(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [-T, T]}^+ \Big\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq x_0\}}) \\
& \quad - r_n^{-1} \frac{v}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq x_0\}}) \Big\} > x_0 \Big) \\
& = \mathbb{P} \Big(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [-T, T]}^+ \Big\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s) - \frac{v}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, s) \Big\} > x_0 \Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{x_0+s \in [-T, T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0+s) - \frac{v}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0+s) \right\} > x_0\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [x_0-T, x_0+T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0+s) - \frac{v}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0+s) \right\} > 0\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Defining

$$E_n(t) := \mathbb{E}[f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, t)]$$

for $t \in [-T, T]$, we obtain from the previous calculations and by an addition of zero that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(r_n(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [x_0-T, x_0+T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0+s) - E_n(x_0+s)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + E_n(x_0+s) - \frac{v}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0+s) \right\} > 0\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For $a_n := (n\delta_n^{2\beta})^{-1/(2\beta+1)}$, by multiplication with $b_n := (n^{\beta+1}\delta_n^\beta)^{1/(2\beta+1)}$ inside the argmin and a replacement of s with $a_n s$ by a change of variable,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [x_0-T, x_0+T]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0+s) - E_n(x_0+s)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E_n(x_0+s) - \frac{v}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0+s) \right\} \\
&= a_n \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [a_n^{-1}(x_0-T), a_n^{-1}(x_0+T)]}^+ \left\{ \frac{b_n}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0+a_n s) - E_n(x_0+a_n s)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + b_n E_n(x_0+a_n s) - v \frac{b_n}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0+a_n s) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.1, we know that the process inside the argmin converges weakly for every $S > 0$ in the space $\ell^\infty([-S, S])$ to the process

$$\left(\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0)} Z(s) + \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) s^{\beta+1} - v p_X(x_0) s \right)_{s \in \mathbb{R}},$$

as long as $(n\delta_n^{2\beta}) \rightarrow \infty$. From Proposition 6.3, we then obtain convergence in distribution of the respective argmin's and by (Lemma A.2, Cattaneo, Jansson and Nagasawa, 2024), we know that the argmin of this process has a continuous distribution function. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(r_n(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0)} Z(s) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0)}{(\beta+1)!} s^{\beta+1} - v p_X(x_0) s \right\} > 0\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by replacing s by $s/p_X(x_0)$ in the argmin, we have

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1-\Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0)} Z(s) + \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) s^{\beta+1} - v p_X(x_0) s \right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_X(x_0)} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} Z(s) + \frac{\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0)}{p_X(x_0)^\beta (\beta + 1)!} s^{\beta+1} - vs \right\}.$$

So by a general switch relation as in (Lemma 3.2, [Groeneboom and Jongbloed, 2014](#)), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left(\frac{n}{\delta_n}\right)^{1/3} (\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v\right) \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}(f_\beta^{*,\ell}(0) < v)$$

for $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and statement (i) follows. \square

REMARK. For $\beta = 1$, i.e. $\Phi'_0(x) \neq 0$ for all x in a neighbourhood of zero, the proof of Theorem 4.1 reveals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(r_n(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} p_X(x_0) Z(s) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \Phi'_0(0) p_X(x_0) s^2 - v p_X(x_0) s \right\} > 0\right). \end{aligned}$$

By an application of Lemma C.4 and a replacement of s by $-s$ by a change of variable, this is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left(\frac{4\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))}{\Phi'_0(0)^2 p_X(x_0)}\right)^{1/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(s) + s^2\} + \frac{v}{\Phi'_0(0)} > 0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\Phi'_0(0) \left(\frac{4\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))}{\Phi'_0(0)^2 p_X(x_0)}\right)^{1/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(s) + s^2\} < -v\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(-\left(\frac{4\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))\Phi'_0(0)}{p_X(x_0)}\right)^{1/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(s) + s^2\} < v\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(-\left(\frac{4\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))\Phi'_0(0)}{p_X(x_0)}\right)^{1/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{-s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(-s) + (-s)^2\} < v\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\frac{4\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))\Phi'_0(0)}{p_X(x_0)}\right)^{1/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(s) + s^2\} < v\right). \end{aligned}$$

So for $\beta = 1$ we obtain convergence to the Chernoff distribution, as known from the classical theory. The rate, however, is $(n/\delta_n)^{1/3}$ and thus faster than the classical $n^{1/3}$ rate.

Until now, it remains unclear how the estimator behaves if $\delta_n = n^{-1/(2\beta)}$. Looking into the proof of Theorem 4.1 (i) shows us that the assumption $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \longrightarrow \infty$ is used multiple times, in particular during the proof of Lemma 6.1. In the proof of (ii), however, the assumption $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \longrightarrow 0$ is only used in Lemma 6.4 for the uniform convergence of \mathfrak{W}_n^2 to zero. Thus, the proof of (ii) yields a good starting point for investigating the limiting behaviour of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ under the assumption that $\delta_n = n^{-1/(2\beta)}$. The following Proposition summarizes this observation.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, x_0 an interior point of \mathcal{X} and assume Φ_0 to be β -times continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of 0 with the β th derivative being the first non-vanishing derivative in 0. Assume further F_X to be invertible with Hölder-continuous inverse F_X^{-1} to the exponent $\alpha > 1/2$. Let $(W(s))_{s \in [0,1]}$ denote a standard Brownian motion on $[0, 1]$, let $c > 0$ and let $g_{\beta,c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by*

$$g_{\beta,c}(s) := \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} W(s) + \sqrt{c} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) \mathbb{E}[(X - x_0)^\beta \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}}].$$

If $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \longrightarrow c$, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} g_{\beta,c}^{*,\ell}(F(x_0)) \quad \text{as } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. Using the notations introduced in the proof of (ii) of Theorem 4.1, we already know

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [0,1]}^+ \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s)) - H_n(F_X^{-1}(s))) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sqrt{n}H_n(F_X^{-1}(s)) - v \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} \right\} > F_X(x_0)\right). \end{aligned}$$

A modification of the proof of Lemma 6.4 shows that the process inside the argmin^+ converges weakly in the space $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ to the process

$$(\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))}W(s) + \sqrt{c}\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0)\mathbb{E}[(X - x_0)^\beta \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}}] - vs)_{s \in [0,1]}$$

as long as $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow c$. By an obvious adjustment of (Lemma A.2, Cattaneo, Jansson and Nagasawa, 2024), see also Cattaneo et al. (2025), to the process defined on a compact interval, we obtain from Hölder-continuity of F_X^{-1} and a Taylor expansion of the expectation in the previous expression, that the argmin of this process has a continuous distribution function. As in Proposition 6.5, we obtain convergence in distribution of the respective argmin 's and so by applying a general switch relation (Lemma 3.2, Groeneboom and Jongbloed, 2014),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Phi}_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)) < v) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{P}(\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [0,1]} \{g_{\beta,c}(s) - vs\} > F_X(x_0)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(g_{\beta,c}^{*,\ell}(F_X(x_0)) < v) \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. \square

5. L^1 -convergence rates and limiting distributions. In contrast to the local nature of the pointwise distance, the L^1 -distance measures the difference between $\hat{\Phi}_n$ and Φ_n globally. It is therefore not to be expected that the effects of the weak-feature-impact scenario on the pointwise limiting behaviour simply translate to the limiting behaviour of the L^1 -distance. Before we state the results, let us start with a slightly different characterization of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ than the one given in Section 2, leading to a different formulation of the switch relation which is better suited for working with the L^1 -distance than the one given in Lemma 2.1. Following (Durot, 2008, Section 4.1) and using the notation from Section 2, let $\Lambda_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the piecewise linear and continuous function that satisfies $(i/n, \Lambda_n(i/n)) \in \mathcal{Y}_n$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where \mathcal{Y}_n is defined in (3), and let $g_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the left-hand derivative of G_n , where G_n denotes the greatest convex minorant of \mathcal{Y}_n . Note that this implies

$$\hat{\Phi}_n(X_{(i)}) = g_n(i/n) = g_n \circ F_n(X_{(i)}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Defining $\tilde{U}_n(a) := \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in [0,1]}^+ \{\Lambda_n(t) - at\}$ for all $a \in [0, 1]$, note that $\tilde{U}_n(a)$ maps into the set $\{i/n \mid i = 0, \dots, n\}$ and we have

$$(6) \quad F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) = U_n(a),$$

where U_n denotes the generalized inverse to $\hat{\Phi}_n$, defined in (5). Note that this allows to interpret \tilde{U}_n as the generalized inverse to g_n . The following result now states the desired variation of the switch relation from Lemma 2.1.

LEMMA 5.1 (Switch relation). *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and every $a \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\hat{\Phi}_n(x) \geq a \iff F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) \leq x \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

PROOF. For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, note that $F_n^{-1} \circ F_n(x)$ is equal to the largest observation point that is still smaller than x . Consequently, $\hat{\Phi}_n(x) = \hat{\Phi}_n(F_n^{-1} \circ F_n(x))$ by definition of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ outside of the observation points and so we have

$$\hat{\Phi}_n(x) \geq a \iff \hat{\Phi}_n(F_n^{-1} \circ F_n(x)) \geq a.$$

From Lemma 2.1, we know that

$$\hat{\Phi}_n(F_n^{-1} \circ F_n(x)) \geq a \iff U_n(a) \leq F_n^{-1} \circ F_n(x)$$

\mathbb{P} -almost surely and because $F_n^{-1} \circ F_n$ is increasing, we obtain

$$U_n(a) \leq F_n^{-1} \circ F_n(x) \iff F_n^{-1} \circ F_n \circ U_n(a) \leq x.$$

The assertion then follows from (6). \square

For the remainder of this section, let $T > 0$ be arbitrary but fixed, assume that P_X has a Lebesgue density p_X and that the support of it is given by $\mathcal{X} = [-T, T]$. The following result gives a tail bound on the inverse process \tilde{U}_n and is a key ingredient for the proofs of the results stated in this section. Before we formulate the result, let us introduce $\lambda_n(a) := \Phi_n \circ F_X^{-1}(a)$ for $a \in [0, 1]$ and note that $\lambda_n^{-1}(u) = F_X \circ \Phi_n^{-1}(u)$ for $u \in [0, 1]$. Here, we assume Φ_n^{-1} to be defined on the whole unit interval and set $\Phi_n^{-1}(u) := T$ for $u > \Phi_n(T)$ and $\Phi_n^{-1}(u) := -T$ for $u < \Phi_n(-T)$ respectively. The proof follows (Theorem 1, Durot, 2007), but important modifications regarding the convergence rate of the inverse process as a result of the weak-feature-impact scenario were necessary. The following result yields an upper bound on the convergence rate of the pointwise distance $|\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)|$ in expectation for all $t \in (-T, T)$.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and F_X to be continuously differentiable on $[-T, T]$, let $\Phi'_0(0) > 0$, let p_X be bounded away from zero on $[-T, T]$ and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, there exists a constant $K > 0$ depending only on Φ_0 , F_X and the bounds on its derivatives, such that for all $t \in (-T, T)$ and n large enough,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)|] \leq K \max \{ (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}, (n(T-t))^{-1/2}, (n(T+t))^{-1/2} \}.$$

Note that although δ_n appears in the first part of the maximum, it does not play a role in the other two parts. In fact, comparing Proposition 5.2 to (Theorem 1, Durot, 2008) shows that these two parts actually remain identical to the classical setting. However, because $(n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} \geq n^{-1/2}$ as long as we have $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$, an application of Fubini's theorem to the previous result immediately shows that only the first part in the maximum affects the upper bound on the convergence rate of the expected $L^1([-T, T])$ -distance. While this result plays an important role in the proof of the asymptotic behaviour of the $L^1([-T, T])$ -distance itself, it is also interesting on its own, as it shows that in the weak-feature-impact scenario, there is actually a faster convergence of the expected $L^1([-T, T])$ -distance than in the classical setting. The following Corollary summarizes this result.

COROLLARY 5.3. *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 5.2, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt \right] = O((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}).$$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.2. Conceptually, the proof follows the idea of the proof of (Theorem 1, Durot, 2008). From a technical point of view, however, the n -dependence of Φ_n and its vanishing derivative required us to do some adjustments. In particular, it turned out

that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ is in fact a necessary assumption and we will see it being used multiple times throughout the proof. It actually is the main reason for us to include the proof, as it is not obvious a priori that this assumption is needed anyways.

For ease of notation, let $x_+ := \max\{x, 0\}$ denote the positive part of x for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $K > 0$ denote a constant which may change from line to line depending only on Φ'_0 in a neighbourhood of zero and on p_X and define

$$I_1(t) := \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t))_+] \quad \text{and} \quad I_2(t) := \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_n(t) - \hat{\Phi}_n(t))_+]$$

for $t \in [-T, T]$, implying that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)|] = I_1(t) + I_2(t).$$

From $|\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| \leq 1$, we obtain

$$I_1(t) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}(\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t) > x) dx$$

and from the fact that $\hat{\Phi}_n$ maps into $[0, 1]$, we observe

$$I_1(t) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}(\hat{\Phi}_n(t) > x + \Phi_n(t)) dx \leq \int_0^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq x + \Phi_n(t)) dx.$$

By the switch relation in Lemma 5.1, this implies

$$I_1(t) = \int_0^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) \leq t) dx.$$

Now note that for every $x > 0$ which satisfies $\Phi_n(t) + x < \Phi_n(T)$, a Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder of Φ_n^{-1} around $\Phi_n(t)$ yields for some $\nu_n \in (\Phi_n(t), \Phi_n(t) + x)$ that

$$\Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x) = t + \frac{1}{\Phi'_n(\Phi_n^{-1}(\nu_n))} x \geq t + K\delta_n^{-1}x$$

for n large enough. By an addition of zero, by using that $t - \Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x) < 0$ and by Lemma 6.6, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) - \Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t - \Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) - \Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x)| \geq \Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x) - t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) - \Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x)| \geq K\delta_n^{-1}x) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{x < K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x \geq K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}\}} K\delta_n n^{-1} x^{-3}. \end{aligned}$$

Because we assumed $x < \Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)$, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(t) &\leq K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3} + K(\delta_n/n) \int_{K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}}^{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)} x^{-3} dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) = O(\delta_n)$, but because $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, we can choose n large enough such that $K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3} < \Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)$ and so we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K(\delta_n/n) \int_{K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}}^{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)} x^{-3} dx &= K(\delta_n/n) (\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t))^{-2} - K(\delta_n/n) (\delta_n/n)^{-2/3} \\ &\leq K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3} \end{aligned}$$

and consequently,

$$I_1(t) \leq K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3} + \int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) dx.$$

To derive an upper bound for the remaining integral, note that for every $x \geq \Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)$, we have $\Phi_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(t) + x) = T$. So again by Lemma 6.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) &= \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) - T < t - T) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) - T| \geq T - t) \\ &\leq K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1}(T - t)^{-3} \end{aligned}$$

for $1 - \Phi_n(t) > x \geq \Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)$ and n large enough.

To finish the proof, we will consider the cases $T - t \geq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}$ and $T - t \leq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}$ separately.

• Let us start by assuming $T - t \geq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)}^{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)+(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}} K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1}(T - t)^{-3} dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)+(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)}^{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)+(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}} K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1}(T - t)^{-3} dx = K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}(n\delta_n^2)^{-1}(T - t)^{-3} \\ &\leq K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3} \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 6.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)+(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)+(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) - T| \geq T - t) dx \\ &\leq K \int_{\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)+(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} (n(T - t))^{-1}(\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) - x)^{-2} dx \\ &= K(n(T - t))^{-1} [(\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) - x)^{-1}]_{x=\Phi_n(T)-\Phi_n(t)+(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}}^{1-\Phi_n(t)} \\ &= K(n(T - t))^{-1} ((1 - \Phi_n(T))^{-1} + (n/\delta_n)^{1/3}) \\ &\leq K(\delta_n/n)^{2/3} + K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3} \\ &\leq K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have shown

$$I_1(t) \leq K(\delta_n/n)^{1/3}$$

for $T - t \geq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}$.

• Now assume $T - t \leq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}$. Then,

$$(n(T - t))^{-1/2} \geq (\delta_n/n)^{1/3}$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(t) &\leq K(n(T - t))^{-1/2} + \int_{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)}^{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) + (n(T - t))^{-1/2}} 1 dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) + (n(T - t))^{-1/2}}^{1 - \Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) dx. \end{aligned}$$

As before, we know from Lemma 6.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) + (n(T - t))^{-1/2}}^{1 - \Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(t) + x) < t) dx \\ &\leq K(n(T - t))^{-1} \left[(\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) - x)^{-1} \right]_{x=\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t) + (n(T - t))^{-1/2}}^{1 - \Phi_n(t)} \\ &= K(n(T - t))^{-1} ((1 - \Phi_n(T))^{-1} + (n(T - t))^{1/2}) \\ &\leq K(n(T - t))^{-1} + K(n(T - t))^{-1/2} \\ &\leq K(n(T - t))^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and so we have shown

$$I_1(t) \leq K(n(T - t))^{-1/2}$$

for $T - t \leq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}$.

Summarizing the results, we have

$$I_1(t) \leq K((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} + (n(T - t))^{-1/2})$$

and by similar arguments, we obtain

$$I_2(t) \leq K((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} + (n(T + t))^{-1/2}).$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)|] \leq K \max \{ (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}, (n(T - t))^{-1/2}, (n(T + t))^{-1/2} \},$$

for n large enough proves the assertion. \square

We will now derive the limiting distribution of the L^1 -distance, following [Durot \(2008\)](#) and [Durot \(2007\)](#). Their arguments needed careful modifications reflecting the n -dependence and vanishing derivative of Φ_n in our setting. As before, it turned out that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ is in fact a necessary assumption and we will see it being used multiple times throughout the proof. For ease of notations, let $X(a) := \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(s) + (s - a)^2\}$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\mathcal{C} := \int_0^\infty \operatorname{Cov}(|X(0)|, |X(a) - a|) da.$$

Further, let $\sigma_n^2(t) := \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(X))^2 | X = t]$ for $t \in [-T, T]$ and define

$$\mu_n := \mathbb{E}[|X(0)|] \int_{-T}^T (4\sigma_n^2(t) \Phi_0'(\delta_n t))^{1/3} p_X(t)^{-1/3} dt,$$

as well as

$$(7) \quad \sigma_n^2 := 8C \int_{-T}^T \frac{\sigma_n^2(t)}{p_X(t)} dt \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n^2.$$

As part of the proof, we also need

$$\Lambda^n(t) := \int_0^t \lambda_n(u) du \quad \text{and} \quad L_n(t) := \int_0^t \sigma_n^2 \circ F_X^{-1}(u) du$$

defined for $t \in [0, 1]$.

THEOREM 5.4. *Assume that Φ_0 is differentiable with Hölder-continuous derivative in a neighbourhood of zero with $\Phi'_0(0) > 0$. Furthermore, let p_X be continuously differentiable (one-sided at the boundary points) on $[-T, T]$ with $p_X > 0$ on $[-T, T]$ and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then,*

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \left((n/\delta_n)^{1/3} \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt - \mu_n \right) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

PROOF. For ease of notation, let us set

$$\mathcal{J}_n := \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt.$$

The first step of the proof is to show that \mathcal{J}_n can be written as the L^1 distance between \tilde{U}_n and λ_n^{-1} up to some sequence converging stochastically to zero with a rate faster than $n^{1/2}$. For this, note that by Corollary 6.10, there exist Brownian bridges B_n on $[0, 1]$, s.t.

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{n^{1/2}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

For $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$, let $i_n(a)$ denote the integer part of $(a - \lambda_n(0))(n\delta_n^2)^{1/3} / \log(n\delta_n^2)$, define $a_n := \lambda_n(0) + i_n(a)(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)$ and set

$$a_n^B := a - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{n^{1/2}(\lambda_n^{-1})'(a_n)}$$

Then, Lemma 6.11 combined with the previous results yields

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}),$$

which concludes the first step of the proof.

As the next step, we want to apply the function L_n to both \tilde{U}_n and λ_n^{-1} inside the integral. For this, let

$$U_n^L : [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)] \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad U_n^L(a) := L_n(\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B)) - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)),$$

define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n := \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da$$

and note that by Lemma 6.12, combined with the previous results,

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

It remains to show that $(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}((n/\delta_n)^{1/3}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n - \mu_n)$ is asymptotically normal. For this, define

$$L^n(t) := \int_0^t \sigma_n^2 \circ F_n^{-1}(u) du, \quad \psi_n(t) := \frac{L_n''(t)}{n^{1/2}L_n'(t)} B_n(t), \quad d_n(t) := \delta_n^{1/2} \frac{|\lambda_n'(t)|}{2L_n'(t)^2}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$ and set

$$W_t^n(u) := \frac{(n/\delta_n)^{1/6}}{(1 - \psi_n(t))^{1/2}} \left(W_n(L^n(t) + (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u(1 - \psi_n(t))) - W_n(L^n(t)) \right)$$

for $t \in (0, 1)$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$, where W_n is distributed as a standard two-sided Brownian motion under $\mathbb{P}^{|X}$. Note that W_t^n is therefore also distributed as a standard Brownian motion under $\mathbb{P}^{|X}$ for every $t \in (0, 1)$. In addition, define

$$\tilde{V}_n(t) := \operatorname{argmin}_{|u| \leq \delta_n^{-1} \log(n\delta_n^2)} \{W_t^n(u) + d_n(t)u^2\}.$$

It then follows from Lemma 6.13, that

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}((n/\delta_n)^{1/3}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n - \mu_n)$$

has the same asymptotic distribution as

$$(8) \quad (n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \left(\int_0^1 |\tilde{V}_n(t)| \frac{|\Phi_n' \circ F_X^{-1}(u)|}{(p_X \circ F_X^{-1}(u))^2 |L_n'(u)|} du - \mu_n \right)$$

and we know from Lemma 6.14 that (8) converges under $\mathbb{P}^{|X}$ to a normal distribution with mean zero and variance σ^2 .

In summary, we have shown with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{|X}$,

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}((n/\delta_n)^{1/3}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n - \mu_n) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. So by combining all the previous results,

$$\begin{aligned} (n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}((n/\delta_n)^{1/3}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n - \mu_n) &= (n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}((n/\delta_n)^{1/3}(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})) - \mu_n) \\ &= (n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}((n/\delta_n)^{1/3}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_n - \mu_n) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &\rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \end{aligned}$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$ unconditionally under \mathbb{P} . □

THEOREM 5.5. *Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and let $(A(s))_{s \in [-T, T]}$ be a continuous Gaussian process, satisfying $A(-T) = -A(T)$, $\mathbb{E}[A(s)] = 0$ and*

$$\operatorname{Cov}(A(s), A(t)) = \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))(1 - 2|F_X(s) - F_X(t)|) \text{ for } s, t \in [-T, T].$$

If $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\sqrt{n} \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_X(x) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \max_{s \in [-T, T]} A(s).$$

PROOF. For the empirical measure P_n with respect to X_1, \dots, X_n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_X(x) \\ &= \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| d(P_X - P_n)(x) + \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_n(x) \end{aligned}$$

and we also have by a standard bracketing argument for the function class $\mathcal{F}_n := \{\Phi - \Psi \mid \Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{F}, \|\Phi - \Psi\| \leq \delta_n K\}$ that

$$\int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| d(P_X - P_n)(x) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

A Taylor expansion of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ around 0 further shows for some ξ_i^n between 0 and X_i that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_n(x) - \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)| dP_n(x) \right| \\ & \leq \int_{-T}^T |\Phi_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)| dP_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\Phi_n(X_i) - \Phi_0(0)| = \delta_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Phi'_0(\delta_n \xi_i^n) |X_i|. \end{aligned}$$

Markov's inequality combined with the assumption that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow 0$ then yields

$$\int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_n(x) = \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)| dP_n(x) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$$

and in summary, we have

$$\int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_X(x) = \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)| dP_n(x) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

Let j_n denote the number of all the jumping points of $\hat{\Phi}_n$, let $T_1^n, \dots, T_{j_n}^n$ denote the jumping points of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ and set $T_0^n := X_{(1)}$, as well as $T_{j_n+1}^n := X_{(n)}$ and $T_{j_n+2}^n := T$. Then, from our characterization of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ between two jumping points (see Section 1), we know

$$\hat{\Phi}_n|_{(-\infty, T_0^n)} = 0, \quad \hat{\Phi}_n|_{[T_{j_n+1}^n, \infty)} = \hat{\Phi}_n(X_{(n)}), \quad \hat{\Phi}_n|_{[T_j^n, T_{j+1}^n)} = \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell \mathbb{1}_{\{T_j^n \leq X_\ell < T_{j+1}^n\}}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{T_j^n < X_\ell \leq T_{j+1}^n\}}}$$

for $j = 0, \dots, j_n$ and we also agree on $\hat{\Phi}_n(T_{j_n+2}^n) = \hat{\Phi}_n(X_{(n)})$ for notational convenience. Combining all this with the fact that $\hat{\Phi}_n$ is an increasing, right-continuous step function, as well as Lemma C.3, we know

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)| dP_n(x) \\ &= \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \left\{ \int_s^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)) dP_n(x) - \int_{-T}^s (\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)) dP_n(x) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \left\{ \int_{-T}^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{x > s\}} dP_n(x) - \int_{-T}^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq s\}} dP_n(x) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \left\{ \int_{-T}^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq s\}}) dP_n(x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_{-T}^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq s\}} dP_n(x) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \left\{ \int_{-T}^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq s\}}) dP_n(x) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{j_n+1} (\hat{\Phi}_n(T_{j+1}^n) - \Phi_0(0)) (F_n(T_{j+1}^n) - F_n(T_j^n)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{j+1}^n \leq s\}}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Now, by using the properties of $\hat{\Phi}_n$, we obtain for every $s \in [-T, T]$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{j_n+1} \hat{\Phi}_n(T_{j+1}^n) (F_n(T_{j+1}^n) - F_n(T_j^n)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{j+1}^n \leq s\}}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{j_n+1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n \mathbb{1}_{\{T_j^n \leq X_\ell < T_{j+1}^n\}} \frac{F_n(T_{j+1}^n) - F_n(T_j^n)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{T_j^n < X_\ell \leq T_{j+1}^n\}}} (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{j+1}^n \leq s\}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n \sum_{j=0}^{j_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_j^n \leq X_\ell < T_{j+1}^n\}} (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{j+1}^n \leq s\}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n \mathbb{1}_{\{T_0^n \leq X_\ell < s\}} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq s\}} + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell = s\}} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq s\}}) + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell = s\}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{j_n+1} \Phi_0(0) (F_n(T_{j+1}^n) - F_n(T_j^n)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{j+1}^n \leq s\}}) \\
&= \Phi_0(0) (1 - F_n(T_0^n)) - 2\Phi_0(0) (F_n(s) - F_n(T_0^n)) \\
&= \Phi_0(0) - 2\Phi_0(0)F_n(s) - \Phi_0(0)F_n(X_{(1)}) + 2\Phi_0(0)F_n(X_{(1)}) \\
&= \Phi_0(0)(1 - 2F_n(s)) + \frac{\Phi_0(0)}{n}
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\left| \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \left\{ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell = s\}} - \frac{\Phi_0(0)}{n} \right\} \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

Letting $A_n: [-T, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the piecewise linear process that satisfies

$$A_n(X_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq X_i\}})$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and noting that A_n attains its maximum at the observation points, we have by the previous results, that

$$\sqrt{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{\Phi}_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| dP_X(x)$$

has the same asymptotic distribution as

$$\sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq s\}}) \right\} = \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \{A_n(s)\} = \max_{s \in [-T, T]} \{A_n(s)\},$$

where we used continuity of A_n and the fact that the process inside the sup on the left side changes its value only at the observation points. The assertion now follows from continuous

mapping and (Addendum 1.5.8, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)), as long as $A_n \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} A$ in $\ell^\infty([-T, T])$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To prove this, let us first introduce for arbitrary $s \in [-T, T]$ the random index $i(s) \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ that satisfies $X_{i(s)} \leq s < X_{i(s)+1}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} A_n(s) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq X_{i(s)}\}}) \\ &\quad + (s - X_{i(s)})(A_n(X_{i(s)+1}) - A_n(X_{i(s)})) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq s\}}) \\ &\quad + 2 \frac{(s - X_{i(s)})}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq X_{i(s)}\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq X_{i(s)+1}\}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq s\}}) + 2 \frac{(s - X_{i(s)})}{\sqrt{n}} (Y_{i(s)+1}^n - \Phi_0(0)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq s\}}) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \end{aligned}$$

and so it suffices to show

$$\mathfrak{A}_n(s) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell^n - \Phi_0(0)) (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X_\ell \leq s\}}) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} A(s)$$

in $\ell^\infty([-T, T])$. Note that for this it suffices by (Theorem 1.5.4, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) and (Theorem 1.5.7, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) to show that $\mathfrak{A}_n(s)$ is asymptotically tight in \mathbb{R} for every $s \in [-T, T]$, that \mathfrak{A}_n as a stochastic process is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability and that for every finite subset $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subset [-T, T]$, the marginals $(\mathfrak{A}_n(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{A}_n(s_k))$ converge weakly to $(A(s_1), \dots, A(s_k))$.

We start with the weak convergence of the marginals, where we want to apply the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem. For this, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary, let $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subset [-T, T]$ denote an arbitrary finite subset of $[-T, T]$, let

$$f_n: [-T, T] \times \{0, 1\} \times [-T, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f_n(x, y, s) := (y - \Phi_0(0))(1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq s\}})$$

and note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{A}_n(s_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathfrak{A}_n(s_k) \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{pmatrix} f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s_1) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s_k) \end{pmatrix},$$

as well as that $\mathbb{E}[f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s)] = o(n^{-1/2})$. As a shorthand notation, let us introduce

$$V_i^n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{pmatrix} f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s_1) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s_k) \end{pmatrix}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note that $\|V_i^n\|^2 \leq k/n$ by definition of f_n and b_n and so we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|V_i^n\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\|V_i^n\| > \varepsilon\}}] \leq \frac{k}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\|V_i^n\|^2 > \varepsilon^2\}}] \leq \frac{k}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{k > n\varepsilon^2\}}] = k \mathbb{1}_{\{k > n\varepsilon^2\}} \rightarrow 0$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. For the sum of the covariance matrices of V_i , note that for $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Cov}(V_i^n) \right)_{j\ell} &= \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_0(0))^2 (1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq s_j\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq s_\ell\}})] + o(1) \\
&= \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))\mathbb{E}[1 - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq s_j\}} - 2\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq s_\ell\}} + 4\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] + o(1) \\
&= \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))(1 + 4F_X(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) - 2F_X(s_j) - 2F_X(s_\ell)) + o(1) \\
&= \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))(1 + 2F_X(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) - 2F_X(\max\{s_j, s_\ell\})) + o(1) \\
&= \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))(1 - 2|F_X(s_\ell) - F_X(s_j)|) + o(1) \\
&= \text{Cov}(A(s_j), A(s_\ell)) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

So by the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem, we have

$$(\mathfrak{A}_n(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{A}_n(s_k)) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} (\mathfrak{A}(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{A}(s_k))$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that this also implies asymptotic tightness of $\mathfrak{A}_n(s)$ for every $s \in [-T, T]$. To show that \mathfrak{A}_n is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ and define $\delta := \varepsilon^2 \eta^2$. Note that by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{A}_n(s) - \mathfrak{A}_n(t)| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{A}_n(s) - \mathfrak{A}_n(t)|\right].$$

Defining

$$h_{n,s,t}: [-T, T] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad h_{n,s,t}(x, y) := 2(y - \Phi_n(x_0))(\mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq t\}})$$

for $s, t \in [-T, T]$, setting $\mathcal{H}_{n,\delta} := \{h_{n,s,t} \mid s, t \in [-T, T], |s - t| < \delta\}$ and choosing $\varepsilon_n > 0$ and $M_n > 0$, s.t. $\mathbb{E}[h^2] < \varepsilon_n^2$ and $\|h\|_\infty \leq M_n$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}$, we have by (Theorem 2.14.17', [van der Vaart and Wellner, 2023](#))

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{A}_n(s) - \mathfrak{A}_n(t)|\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{h_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}} \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n h_n(X_i, Y_i^n) - \mathbb{E}[h_n(X_i, Y_i^n)]\right|\right] + o(1) \\
&\leq J_{\square}(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y^n})) \left(1 + \frac{J_{\square}(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y^n}))}{\varepsilon_n^2 n^{1/2}} M_n\right) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

For arbitrary $h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}$, there exists $s, t \in [-T, T]$, satisfying $|s - t| < \delta$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[h(X, Y^n)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[h_{n,s,t}(X, Y^n)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq t\}})^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\min\{s,t\} < X \leq \max\{s,t\}\}}] \\
&= F_X(\max\{s, t\}) - F_X(\min\{s, t\}) \\
&\leq \|p_X\|_\infty (\max\{s, t\} - \min\{s, t\}) \\
&= \|p_X\|_\infty |s - t| < \|p_X\|_\infty \delta
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|h\|_\infty = \|h_{n,s,t}\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

Thus, by choosing $\varepsilon_n = \sqrt{\delta}$ and $M_n = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{A}_n(s) - \mathfrak{A}_n(t)|\right] \\
&\leq J_{\square}(\delta^{1/2}, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y^n})) \left(1 + \frac{J_{\square}(\sqrt{\delta}, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y^n}))}{\delta n^{1/2}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By a standard bracketing argument, it follows that for some constant $K > 0$, which may change from line to line,

$$N_{[]}(\nu, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq N_{[]}(\nu^2, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^1(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq \frac{K}{\nu^2}.$$

Thus,

$$J_{[]}(\sqrt{\delta}, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq K \int_0^{\sqrt{\delta}} \log(K/\nu^2) d\nu \leq K\sqrt{\delta}$$

and we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t| < \delta} |\mathfrak{A}_n(s) - \mathfrak{A}_n(t)| \right] \leq K\sqrt{\delta}.$$

Finally, up to some constant,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|s-t| < \delta} |\mathfrak{A}_n(s) - \mathfrak{A}_n(t)| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t| < \delta} |\mathfrak{A}_n(s) - \mathfrak{A}_n(t)| \right] \leq \eta$$

by definition of δ and the assertion follows. \square

6. Proofs. In this section the essential proofs of the results contained in the article are collected.

6.1. *Consistency.* We start with the proof of Theorem 3.2, which concerns $L^1(P_X)$ -, pointwise and uniform consistency of $\hat{\Phi}_n$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2. Statement (i) follows immediately from Theorem 3.1 and Lemma B.1, while the proofs of statement (ii) and (iii) are connected in the sense that (ii) can be obtained as an interim result of the proof of (iii). However, (ii) is also an immediate consequence of (iii), which is why we only make a short remark at the stage of the proof where (ii) could be obtained, but continue with the proof of (iii) instead.

The idea of the proof of statement (iii) is to show for every subsequence of $D_n := \hat{\Phi}_n - \Phi_n$ that there exists a subsubsequence converging uniformly to 0 in probability w.r.t. \mathbb{P} . To make this precise, we start with an arbitrary subsequence of (D_n) , which we will denote by (D_n) again for ease of notation. Then, by (i) and the characterization of convergence in probability in terms of almost surely convergent subsequences, there exists a subsubsequence $(n_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ s.t.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(x) - \Phi_{n_j}(x)| dP(x) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{for } j \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Define

$$S_{\mathbb{P}} := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\omega, x) - \Phi_{n_j}(x)| dP_X(x) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ for } j \longrightarrow \infty \right\}$$

and consider for fixed $\omega \in S_{\mathbb{P}}$ an arbitrary subsequence of $D_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot)$, which we denote by $D_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot)$ again. Then, by an application of Markov's inequality w.r.t. P_X on \mathbb{R} , we obtain for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_X(|D_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot)| > \varepsilon) &= P_X(|\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot) - \Phi_{n_j}(\cdot)| > \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{P_X} [|\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot) - \Phi_{n_j}(\cdot)|] \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\omega, x) - \Phi_{n_j}(x)| dP_X(x) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } j \longrightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

by definition of $S_{\mathbb{P}}$. In different notation, this means

$$|D_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot)| = |\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot) - \Phi_{n_j}(\cdot)| \longrightarrow_{P_X} 0 \quad \text{for } j \longrightarrow \infty.$$

But then, again by a Borel-Cantelli argument, there exists another increasing sequence $(j_k^\omega)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, depending on ω , satisfying $j_k^\omega \longrightarrow \infty$ for $k \longrightarrow \infty$, s.t.

$$|D_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, \cdot)| = |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, \cdot) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\cdot)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad P_X\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{for } k \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Now, similar as before, we define

$$S_{P_X}(\omega) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, \cdot) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\cdot)| \longrightarrow 0 \text{ for } k \longrightarrow \infty\}.$$

Then, for arbitrary but fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus S_{P_X}(\omega)$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the fact that P_X has a Lebesgue density being positive on \mathbb{R} implies the existence of $x_1, x_2 \in S_{P_X}(\omega)$ with $x_1 < x_0 < x_2$. Moreover, from Lemma B.2, we know that there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$, s.t.

$$|\Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_2) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$$

for every $k > K$. By choosing $K \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, we also have

$$|\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_1) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \quad \text{and} \quad |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_2) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_2)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$$

for all $k > K$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |D_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_0)| &= |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_0) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_0)| \\ &\leq |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_0) - \hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_1)| + |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_1) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1)| + |\Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_0)| \\ &\leq |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_2) - \hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_1)| + |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_1) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1)| + |\Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_2)| \\ &< |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_2) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_2)| + |\Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_2) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1)| + |\Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x_1) - \hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x_1)| + \frac{2\varepsilon}{5} \\ &< \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that both $\hat{\Phi}_n$ and Φ_n are increasing in x . Thus, we have shown

$$|D_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x)| = |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } k \longrightarrow \infty$$

not only for $x \in S_{P_X}(\omega)$, but for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. By applying the subsequence argument at this point, statement (ii) could already be obtained. However, before we carry out the subsequence argument in detail in the next step, note that by Lemma B.3, we have for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |\hat{\Phi}_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(\omega, x) - \Phi_{n_{j_k^\omega}}(x)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } k \longrightarrow \infty.$$

But this means, that for any arbitrary subsequence of $D_{n_j}(\omega, \cdot)$, we found a subsubsequence converging to zero uniformly on compact intervals, implying by the subsequence argument that

$$\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\omega, x) - \Phi_{n_j}(x)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } j \longrightarrow \infty.$$

But because $\omega \in S_{\mathbb{P}}$ was arbitrary, we have actually shown by definition of $S_{\mathbb{P}}$, that

$$\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\cdot, x) - \Phi_{n_j}(x)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{for } j \longrightarrow \infty,$$

implying

$$\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |\hat{\Phi}_{n_j}(\cdot, x) - \Phi_{n_j}(x)| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad \text{for } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Applying the subsequence argument again, we conclude

$$\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |\hat{\Phi}_n(\cdot, x) - \Phi_n(x)| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and assertion (ii) and (iii) follow. \square

6.2. Pointwise limiting behaviour. In this section, we give necessary results for the proof of Theorem 4.1 (i) and (ii).

For the results related to the proof of (i), let us recall the following definitions. Let

$$\begin{aligned} g: [-T, T] \times [-T, T] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & g(x, t) &:= \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq t\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq x_0\}}, \\ f_n: [-T, T] \times \{0, 1\} \times [-T, T] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & f_n(x, y, t) &:= (y - \Phi_n(x_0))g(x, t) \end{aligned}$$

and define for every $t \in [-T, T]$,

$$E_n(t) := \mathbb{E}[f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, t)].$$

Furthermore, let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, let

$$r_n := \left(\frac{n}{\delta_n}\right)^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}, \quad a_n := (n\delta_n^{2\beta})^{-1/(2\beta+1)}, \quad b_n := (n^{\beta+1}\delta_n^\beta)^{1/(2\beta+1)}$$

and let $Z(s)$ denote a standard two-sided Brownian motion on \mathbb{R} . We also define the stochastic processes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) &:= \frac{b_n}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s) - E_n(x_0 + a_n s)), \\ \mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s) &:= b_n E_n(x_0 + a_n s), \\ \mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) &:= v \frac{b_n}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0 + a_n s), \\ \mathfrak{Z}^1(s) &:= \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0)}Z(s), \\ \mathfrak{Z}^2(s) &:= \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0)p_X(x_0)s^{\beta+1}, \\ \mathfrak{Z}^3(s) &:= vp_X(x_0)s \end{aligned}$$

and set

$$\mathfrak{Z}_n(s) := \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) + \mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s), \quad \mathfrak{Z}(s) := \mathfrak{Z}^1(s) + \mathfrak{Z}^2(s) - \mathfrak{Z}^3(s)$$

for $s \in [a_n^{-1}(x_0 - T), a_n^{-1}(x_0 + T)]$. Moreover, let

$$\hat{s}_n := \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [a_n^{-1}(x_0 - T), a_n^{-1}(x_0 + T)]}^+ \mathfrak{Z}_n(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{s} := \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{Z}(s)$$

denote the minimizers of $\mathfrak{Z}_n(s)$ and $\mathfrak{Z}(s)$ respectively.

LEMMA 6.1. *Let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, x_0 an interior point of \mathcal{X} and assume Φ_0 to be β -times continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of 0 with the β th derivative being the first non-vanishing derivative in 0. Assume further that p_X is β -times continuously differentiable on \mathcal{X} . Then, for every $S > 0$, the sequence of processes $\mathfrak{Z}_n(s)$ converges weakly in $\ell^\infty([-S, S])$ to the process $\mathfrak{Z}(s)$ as long as $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow \infty$.*

PROOF. We will start with the convergence of $\mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s)$. For this, let $S > 0$, define

$$I_n(t) := \int_{-\infty}^t (\Phi_n(x) - \Phi_n(x_0))p_X(x)dx - \int_{-\infty}^{x_0} (\Phi_n(x) - \Phi_n(x_0))p_X(x)dx$$

and note that we have $E_n(x_0 + a_ns) = I_n(x_0 + a_ns)$. A Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder of $I_n(t)$ around x_0 then yields the existence of $\xi_n(s)$ between x_0 and $x_0 + a_ns$, s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} E_n(x_0 + a_ns) &= I_n(x_0) + I'_n(x_0) + \sum_{k=2}^{\beta} \frac{1}{k!} I_n^{(k)}(x_0)(a_ns)^k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} I_n^{(\beta+1)}(\xi_n(s))(a_ns)^{\beta+1} \\ &= \sum_{k=2}^{\beta} \frac{(a_ns)^k}{k!} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{i} (\Phi_n - \Phi_n(x_0))^{(i)}(x_0) p_X^{(k-1-i)}(x_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{(a_ns)^{\beta+1}}{(\beta+1)!} \sum_{i=0}^{\beta} \binom{\beta}{i} (\Phi_n - \Phi_n(x_0))^{(i)}(\xi_n(s)) p_X^{(\beta-i)}(\xi_n(s)) \\ &= \frac{(a_ns)^{\beta+1}}{(\beta+1)!} (\Phi_n^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s))p_X(\xi_n(s)) + (\Phi_n(\xi_n(s)) - \Phi_n(x_0))p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s))), \end{aligned}$$

Multiplication with b_n and inserting the definition of both a_n and b_n yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{b_n}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_n^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s))p_X(\xi_n(s))(a_ns)^{\beta+1} &= \frac{a_nb_n\delta_n^\beta}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n\xi_n(s))p_X(\xi_n(s))s^{\beta+1} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n\xi_n(s))p_X(\xi_n(s))s^{\beta+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $a_n^{\beta+1}b_n\delta_n^\beta = 1$. For the second term, we obtain by a Taylor expansion of Φ_n around x_0 the existence of $\nu_n(s)$ between x_0 and $\xi_n(s)$, s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{b_n}{(\beta+1)!} (\Phi_n(\xi_n(s)) - \Phi_n(x_0))p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s))(a_ns)^{\beta+1} \\ &= \frac{\delta_n^{-\beta}}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_n^{(\beta)}(\nu_n(s))(\xi_n(s) - x_0)p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s))s^{\beta+1} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n\nu_n(s))(\xi_n(s) - x_0)p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s))s^{\beta+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous calculations, we have

$$\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s) - \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0)p_X(x_0)s^{\beta+1} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \xi_n(s)) p_X(\xi_n(s)) s^{\beta+1} - \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) s^{\beta+1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \nu_n(s)) (\xi_n(s) - x_0) p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s)) s^{\beta+1} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \xi_n(s)) p_X(\xi_n(s)) - \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) \right| |s|^{\beta+1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \nu_n(s)) (\xi_n(s) - x_0) p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s)) \right| |s|^{\beta+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first part, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \xi_n(s)) p_X(\xi_n(s)) - \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) \right| |s|^{\beta+1} \\
&\leq S^{\beta+1} \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \xi_n(s)) p_X(\xi_n(s)) - \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) \right| \\
&\leq S^{\beta+1} \sup_{s \in [x_0 - a_n S, x_0 + a_n S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n s) p_X(s) - \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) \right| \\
&= S^{\beta+1} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n s_n^*) p_X(s_n^*) - \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) \right|
\end{aligned}$$

where $s_n^* \in [x_0 - a_n S, x_0 + a_n S]$ denotes the maximizier of the function inside the sup. From the fact that $s_n^* \rightarrow x_0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ and continuity of $\Phi_0^{(\beta)}$ and p_X , we have

$$S^{\beta+1} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n s_n^*) p_X(s_n^*) - \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For the second part, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \nu_n(s)) (\xi_n(s) - x_0) p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s)) \right| |s|^{\beta+1} \\
&\leq S^{\beta+1} \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \nu_n(s)) (\xi_n(s) - x_0) p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s)) \right| \\
&\leq S^{\beta+1} \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \xi_n(s) - x_0 \right| \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \nu_n(s)) p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s)) \right| \\
&\leq S^{\beta+2} a_n \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} \left| \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n \nu_n(s)) p_X^{(\beta)}(\xi_n(s)) \right| \\
&\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s) \rightarrow \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) s^{\beta+1}$ in $\ell^\infty([-S, S])$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To show convergence of \mathfrak{Z}_n^3 , let us define

$$g_{n,s}: [-S, S] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad g_{n,s}(x) := v a_n^{-1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq x_0\}})$$

for every $s \in [-S, S]$, set $\mathcal{G}_n := \{g_{n,s} \mid s \in [-S, S]\}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and note that

$$\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_{n,s}(X_i).$$

A simple calculation now shows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)] &= v a_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}}] = v a_n^{-1} (F_X(x_0 + a_n s) - F_X(x_0)) \\
&\rightarrow v p_X(x_0) s \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}$$

for every $s \in [-S, S]$. Actually, we even have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathbb{E} [\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)] - vp_X(x_0)s| &= \left| va_n^{-1} (F_X(x_0 + a_n s_n^*) - F_X(x_0)) - vp_X(x_0)s_n^* \right| \\
&= |vs_n^*| \left| \frac{a_n^{-1}}{s_n^*} (F_X(x_0 + a_n s_n^*) - F_X(x_0)) - p_X(x_0) \right| \\
&\leq |vT| \left| \frac{a_n^{-1}}{s_n^*} (F_X(x_0 + a_n s_n^*) - F_X(x_0)) - p_X(x_0) \right| \\
&\longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \longrightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where $s_n^* \in [-S, S]$ denotes the maximizier of the function inside the sup. Note that we need $s_n^* \neq 0$ for the previous argument. However, the result remains true even if $s_n^* = 0$, because the function inside the sup vanishes in this case anyways. Now let us calculate the δ -bracketing number $N_{[]}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_n, L^1(P_X))$. For this, let $\delta > 0$, set $N(\delta) := \frac{2S}{\delta} 2vp_X(x_0)$ and define for $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor N(\delta) \rfloor$,

$$t_0 := -S, \quad s_i := s_{i-1} + \frac{\delta}{2vp_X(x_0)}, \quad s_{\lfloor N(\delta) \rfloor + 1} := S.$$

Note that $-S = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_{\lfloor N(\delta) \rfloor + 1} = S$ and $s_i - s_{i-1} \leq \frac{\delta}{2vp_X(x_0)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor N(\delta) \rfloor + 1$. Then, for every $s \in [-S, S]$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor N(\delta) \rfloor + 1\}$, s.t. $s_{i-1} \leq s \leq s_i$ and consequently, $g_{n, s_{i-1}}(x) \leq g_{n, s}(x) \leq g_{n, s_i}(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega} |g_{n, s_i}(x) - g_{n, s_{i-1}}(x)| dP_X(x) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} g_{n, s_i}(x) - vs_i p_X(x_0) + vs_{i-1} p_X(x_0) - g_{n, s_{i-1}}(x) dP_X(x) + v(s_i - s_{i-1}) p_X(x_0) \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathbb{E} [\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)] - vp_X(x_0)s| + \frac{\delta}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For n large enough, we know from previous calculations that

$$\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathbb{E} [\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)] - vp_X(x_0)s| < \frac{\delta}{4}$$

and thus, for n large enough, we have shown that $[g_{n, s_{i-1}}, g_{n, s_i}]_{i=1, \dots, \lfloor N(\delta) \rfloor + 1}$ define δ -brackets for \mathcal{G}_n with respect to $L^1(P_X)$. Consequently,

$$N_{[]}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_n, L^1(P_X)) \leq \lfloor N(\delta) \rfloor + 1 \leq 1 + \frac{2S}{\delta} 2vp_X(x_0).$$

Moreover, we have for every $s \in [-S, S]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(g_{n, s}(X)) &= v^2 a_n^{-2} (\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}})^2] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}}]^2) \\
&\leq v^2 a_n^{-2} (\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}})^2]) \\
&\leq 2v^2 a_n^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of \mathcal{G}_n , we have

$$\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) - \mathbb{E} [\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)]| = \sup_{g_n \in \mathcal{G}_n} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_n(X_i) - \mathbb{E} [g_n(X)] \right|$$

and from the fact that the δ -bracketing number $N_n(\delta)$ of \mathcal{G}_n is bounded by $1 + \frac{2S}{\delta} 2vp_X(x_0)$ for n large enough, we obtain from a typical Glivenko-Cantelli argument (see e.g. the proof of Lemma A.4) that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta = \varepsilon/2$, there exist functions $g_n^1, \dots, g_n^{N_n} \in \mathcal{G}_n$, s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)]| \geq \varepsilon\right) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_n^j(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[g_n^j(X)]\right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{\text{Var}(g_n^j(X))}{n} \leq N_n(\varepsilon/2) \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} \text{Var}(g_{n,s}(X)) \leq N_n(\varepsilon/2) \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} v^2 \frac{a_n^{-2}}{n} \\ &= N_n(\varepsilon/2) \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} v^2 \left(\frac{\delta_n^{4\beta}}{n^{2\beta-1}}\right)^{1/(2\beta+1)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \longrightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) - vp_X(x_0)s| \\ &\leq \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) - \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)]| + \sup_{s \in [-S, S]} |\mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)] - vp_X(x_0)s| \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and we have $\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} vp_X(x_0)s$ in $\ell^\infty([-S, S])$ for $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

To show weak convergence of $\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s)$ to $\mathfrak{Z}^1(s) := \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))}p_X(x_0)Z(s)$ in $\ell^\infty([-S, S])$, note that it suffices by (Theorem 1.5.4, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) and (Theorem 1.5.7, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) to show that $\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s)$ is asymptotically tight in \mathbb{R} for every $s \in [-S, S]$, that \mathfrak{Z}_n^1 as a stochastic process is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability and that for every finite subset $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subset [-S, S]$, the marginals $(\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s_k))$ converge weakly to $(\mathfrak{Z}^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{Z}^1(s_k))$.

We start with the weak convergence of the marginals, where we want to apply the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem. For this, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary, let $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subset [-S, S]$ denote an arbitrary finite subset of $[-S, S]$ and note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s_k) \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_n}{n} \begin{pmatrix} f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s_1) - \mathbb{E}[f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s_1)] \\ \vdots \\ f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s_k) - \mathbb{E}[f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s_k)] \end{pmatrix}.$$

As a shorthand notation, let us introduce

$$V_i^n := \frac{b_n}{n} \begin{pmatrix} f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s_1) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, s_k) \end{pmatrix}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note that $\|V_i^n\|^2 \leq k \frac{b_n^2}{n^2} = k(\frac{\delta_n}{n})^{2\beta/(2\beta+1)}$ by definition of f_n and b_n and so we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|V_i^n\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\|V_i^n\| > \varepsilon\}}] &\leq k \left(\frac{\delta_n}{n}\right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\|V_i^n\|^2 > \varepsilon^2\}}] \\ &\leq k \left(\frac{\delta_n}{n}\right)^{2\beta/(2\beta+1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{k > (n/\delta_n)^{2\beta/(2\beta+1)} \varepsilon^2\}}] \\ &= k a_n^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{k > (n/\delta_n)^{2\beta/(2\beta+1)} \varepsilon^2\}} \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$, where we used that $n/\delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. For the sum of the covariance matrices of V_i , note that for $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Cov}(V_i^n) \right)_{j\ell} = \frac{b_n^2}{n} (\mathbb{E}[f_n(X, Y^n, x_0 + a_n s_j) f_n(X, Y^n, x_0 + a_n s_\ell)] - E_n(x_0 + a_n s_j) E_n(x_0 + a_n s_\ell)).$$

Recall that for any $s \in [-S, S]$, $b_n E_n(x_0 + a_n s) = \mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s) \rightarrow \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!} \Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0) p_X(x_0) s^{\beta+1}$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, as shown previously. Thus,

$$\frac{b_n^2}{n} E_n(x_0 + a_n s_j) E_n(x_0 + a_n s_\ell) = \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s_j) \mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s_\ell) \rightarrow 0$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Further, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & f_n(X, Y^n, x_0 + a_n s_j) f_n(X, Y^n, x_0 + a_n s_\ell) \\ &= (Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 (\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s_j\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}}) (\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s_\ell\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}}) \\ &= (Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 (\mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 + a_n \max\{s_j, s_\ell\} < X \leq x_0\}}) \\ &= (Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 (\mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 - a_n \min\{-s_j, -s_\ell\} < X \leq x_0\}}) \end{aligned}$$

and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f_n(X, Y^n, x_0 + a_n s_j) f_n(X, Y^n, x_0 + a_n s_\ell)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 (\mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 - a_n \min\{-s_j, -s_\ell\} < X \leq x_0\}})] \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{s_j, s_\ell > 0\}} \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\{s_j, s_\ell < 0\}} \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 - a_n \min\{|s_j|, |s_\ell|\} < X \leq x_0\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

From now on, we will only consider the case $s_j, s_\ell > 0$, as the case $s_j, s_\ell < 0$ follows analogously. Note first that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(1 - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \Phi_n(X) + (\Phi_n(x_0))^2 (1 - \Phi_n(X))] \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_n(X) - 2\Phi_n(x_0)\Phi_n(X) + \Phi_n(x_0)^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_n(X)(1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0)) + \Phi_n(x_0)^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n(X)(1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] \\ &\quad + \Phi_n(x_0)^2 (F_X(x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) - F_X(x_0)) \end{aligned}$$

Now because $\frac{b_n^2}{n} = a_n^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{b_n^2}{n} \Phi_n(x_0)^2 (F_X(x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) - F_X(x_0)) \\ &= \Phi_n(x_0)^2 \min\{s_j, s_\ell\} a_n^{-1} \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}^{-1} (F_X(x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) - F_X(x_0)) \\ &\rightarrow \Phi_0(0)^2 \min\{s_j, s_\ell\} p_X(x_0) \end{aligned}$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Defining

$$J_n(t) := \int_{x_0}^t \Phi_n(x) p_X(x) dx,$$

we further have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{b_n^2}{n} \mathbb{E} [\Phi_n(X)(1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0))\mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 < X \leq x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}\}}] \\ &= a_n^{-1}(1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0))J_n(x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) \end{aligned}$$

and by a Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder of $J_n(t)$ around x_0 , we obtain for $\eta_n \in [x_0, x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}]$

$$\begin{aligned} & a_n^{-1}(1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0))J_n(x_0 + a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) \\ &= a_n^{-1}(1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0))(J_n(x_0) + J'_n(\eta_n)a_n \min\{s_j, s_\ell\}) \\ &= (1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0))J'_n(\eta_n) \min\{s_j, s_\ell\} \\ &= (1 - 2\Phi_n(x_0))\Phi_n(\eta_n)p_X(\eta_n) \min\{s_j, s_\ell\} \\ &\rightarrow (1 - 2\Phi_0(0))\Phi_0(0)p_X(x_0) \min\{s_j, s_\ell\} \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\eta_n \rightarrow x_0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, by combining the previous calculations, we have shown that for $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Cov}(V_i^n) \right)_{j\ell} \\ &\rightarrow ((1 - 2\Phi_0(0))\Phi_0(0)p_X(x_0) \min\{|s_j|, |s_\ell|\} + \Phi_0(0)^2 \min\{|s_j|, |s_\ell|\}p_X(x_0))\mathbb{1}_{\{s_j s_\ell > 0\}} \\ &= \Phi_0(0)(1 - 2\Phi_0(0) + \Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0) \min\{|s_j|, |s_\ell|\}\mathbb{1}_{\{s_j s_\ell > 0\}} \\ &= \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0) \min\{|s_j|, |s_\ell|\}\mathbb{1}_{\{s_j s_\ell > 0\}} \\ &= \text{Cov}(\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0)}Z(s_j), \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0)}Z(s_\ell)) \\ &= \text{Cov}(\mathfrak{Z}^1(s_j), \mathfrak{Z}^1(s_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

So by the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem, we have

$$(\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s_k)) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} (\mathfrak{Z}^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{Z}^1(s_k))$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that this also implies asymptotic tightness of $\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s)$ for every $s \in [-S, S]$. To show that \mathfrak{Z}_n^1 is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ and define $\delta := \varepsilon^2 \eta^2$. Note that by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(t)| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(t)|\right].$$

Defining

$$f_{n,s,t} : [-S, S] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f_{n,s,t}(x, y) := (y - \Phi_n(x_0))(\mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq x_0 + a_n t\}})$$

for $s, t \in [-S, S]$, setting $\mathcal{F}_{n,\delta} := \{f_{n,s,t} \mid s, t \in [-S, S], |s - t| < \delta\}$, and choosing $\varepsilon_n > 0$ and $M_n > 0$, s.t. $\mathbb{E}[f^2] < \varepsilon_n^2$ and $\|f\|_\infty \leq M_n$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$, we have by (Theorem 2.14.17', [van der Vaart and Wellner, 2023](#))

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(t)|\right] = b_n n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}} \left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_n(X_i, Y_i^n) - \mathbb{E}[f_n(X_i, Y_i^n)]\right|\right] \\ &\leq b_n n^{-1/2} J_{\square}(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y^n})) \left(1 + \frac{J_{\square}(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X, Y^n}))}{\varepsilon_n^2 n^{1/2}} M_n\right). \end{aligned}$$

For arbitrary $f \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$, there exists $s, t \in [-S, S]$, satisfying $|s - t| < \delta$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(X, Y^n)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[f_{n,s,t}(X, Y^n)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n t\}})^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{x_0 + a_n \min\{s,t\} < X \leq x_0 + a_n \max\{s,t\}\}}] \\ &= F_X(x_0 + a_n \max\{s, t\}) - F_X(x_0 + a_n \min\{s, t\}) \\ &= |F_X(x_0 + a_n s) - F_X(x_0 + a_n t)| \\ &\leq \|p_X\|_\infty a_n |s - t| < a_n \delta \|p_X\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|f\|_\infty = \|f_{n,s,t}\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

Thus, by choosing $\varepsilon_n = \sqrt{a_n \delta \|p_X\|_\infty}$ and $M_n = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(t)| \right] &\leq b_n n^{-1/2} J_{\square}(\sqrt{a_n \delta \|p_X\|_\infty}, \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(1 + \frac{J_{\square}(\sqrt{a_n \delta \|p_X\|_\infty}, \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n}))}{a_n \delta \|p_X\|_\infty \sqrt{n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

By a standard bracketing argument, it follows that for some constant $K > 0$, which may change from line to line,

$$N_{\square}(\nu, \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq N_{\square}(\nu^2, \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}, L^1(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq \frac{K}{\nu^2}.$$

Thus,

$$J_{\square}(\sqrt{a_n \delta \|p_X\|_\infty}, \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq K \int_0^{\sqrt{a_n \delta \|p_X\|_\infty}} \log(K/\nu^2) d\nu \leq K \sqrt{a_n \delta}$$

and we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(t)| \right] \leq K b_n n^{-1/2} \sqrt{a_n \delta} = K \sqrt{\delta}.$$

Finally, up to some constant,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(t)| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(t)| \right] \leq \eta$$

by definition of δ .

Summarizing the results, we have shown $\mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))p_X(x_0)}Z(s)$, as well as $\mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s) \rightarrow \frac{1}{(\beta+1)!}\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(0)p_X(x_0)s^{\beta+1}$ and $\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} vp_X(x_0)s$ in $\ell^\infty([-S, S])$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. The assertion now follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{Z}_n(s) = \mathfrak{Z}_n^1(s) + \mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s) - \mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)$ as well as that $\mathfrak{Z}_n^2(s)$ and $\mathfrak{Z}_n^3(s)$ converge to nonrandom functions. \square

LEMMA 6.2. *Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 6.1, the sequence of minimizers \hat{s}_n of $\mathfrak{Z}_n(s)$ is uniformly tight.*

PROOF. For ease of notation, we introduce for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the following sequence of stochastic processes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_n(s) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s) - E_n(x_0 + a_n s)) \\ &\quad + E_n(x_0 + a_n s) - v \frac{1}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0 + a_n s) \end{aligned}$$

and the following sequence of deterministic functions

$$\mathcal{M}^n(s) := E_n(x_0 + a_n s).$$

Note that

$$\hat{s}_n = \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in [a_n(x_0 - T), a_n(x_0 + T)]}^+ \mathcal{M}_n(s)$$

and that $s_n := \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{M}(s)$ satisfies $s_n = 0$, which follows from

$$\begin{aligned} E_n(x_0 + a_n s) &= \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_n(X) - \Phi_n(x_0))(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[|\Phi_n(X) - \Phi_n(x_0)| |\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}}|], \end{aligned}$$

where we used monotonicity of Φ_n . To show uniform tightness of \hat{s}_n , we use a slicing argument similar to the proof of (Theorem 3.2.5, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)). For this, note first that $\mathcal{M}_n(s_n) - \mathcal{M}_n(\hat{s}_n) \geq 0$ by the property of \hat{s}_n , as well as $\mathcal{M}_n(s_n) = 0$. Assume $s \geq 0$ for the moment and note that, as long as n is large enough, $\Phi_0^{(\beta)}$ is bounded away from zero in a neighbourhood of zero and p_X is bounded away from zero on its support. Thus, a Taylor expansion of Φ_n around x_0 reveals for some ξ_n between X and x_0 and some constant $C > 0$ which may change from line to line, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^n(s) &= \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_n(X) - \Phi_n(x_0))(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^{(\beta)}(\xi_n)(X - x_0)^\beta (\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}})] \\ &\geq C \delta_n^\beta \mathbb{E}[(X - x_0)^\beta (\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0 + a_n s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x_0\}})] \\ &= C \delta_n^\beta \int_0^{a_n s} x^\beta p_X(x_0 + x) dx \\ &\geq C \delta_n^\beta a_n^{\beta+1} s^{\beta+1} \end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments, the same result holds for $s \leq 0$. Now define slices

$$S_{j,n} := \{s \in \mathbb{R} \mid 2^{j-1} < a_n^{1/2} |s|^{\beta+1} \leq 2^j\}$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\hat{s}_n| > 2^K) &\leq \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in S_{j,n}} (\mathcal{M}_n(s_n) - \mathcal{M}_n(s)) \geq 0\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in S_{j,n}} (\mathcal{M}^n(s) - \mathcal{M}_n(s) - \mathcal{M}^n(s)) \geq 0\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in S_{j,n}} (\mathcal{M}^n(s) - \mathcal{M}_n(s)) \geq - \sup_{s \in S_{j,n}} (-\mathcal{M}^n(s))\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in S_{j,n}} (\mathcal{M}^n(s) - \mathcal{M}_n(s)) \geq \inf_{s \in S_{j,n}} \mathcal{M}^n(s)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathcal{M}^n(s) - \mathcal{M}_n(s)\|_{S_{j,n}} \geq \inf_{s \in S_{j,n}} \mathcal{M}^n(s)\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathcal{M}^n(s) - \mathcal{M}_n(s)\|_{S_{j,n}} \geq C\delta_n^\beta a_n^{\beta+1} a_n^{-1} 2^{2(j-1)}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{4}{C\delta_n^\beta a_n^\beta} \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{2j}} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{M}_n(s) - \mathcal{M}^n(s)\|_{S_{j,n}}]
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov's inequality in the last step.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{n,j}^1 &:= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s) - \mathbb{E}[f_n(X_i, Y_i^n, x_0 + a_n s)] \right\|_{S_{j,n}} \\
\mathcal{M}_{n,j}^2 &:= \left\| \frac{1}{nr_n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, x_0 + a_n s) \right\|_{S_{j,n}}
\end{aligned}$$

and note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{M}_n(s) - \mathcal{M}(s)\|_{S_{j,n}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}_{n,j}^1] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}_{n,j}^2].$$

As an immediate consequence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}_{n,j}^2] \leq r_n^{-1}.$$

And by applying a bracketing argument to $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}_{n,j}^1]$ similar as in Lemma 6.1, the assertion follows. \square

PROPOSITION 6.3. *Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 6.1, the sequence of minimizers \hat{s}_n of $\mathfrak{Z}_n(s)$ converges weakly to the minimizer \hat{s} of $\mathfrak{Z}(s)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

PROOF. From Lemma 6.1, we have for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ that $\mathfrak{Z}_n(s)$ converges weakly to $\mathfrak{Z}(s)$ in $\ell^\infty(K)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we have that the sample paths $s \mapsto \mathfrak{Z}(s)$ are continuous and that \hat{s} is unique and tight. From Lemma 6.2, we know that \hat{s}_n is uniformly tight and consequently, by (Theorem 3.2.2, van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996), we have $\hat{s}_n \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \hat{s}$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

The following results are necessary for the proof of part (ii) of Theorem 4.1. For this, we introduce the following notations. Let

$$h_n: [-T, T] \times \{0, 1\} \times [-T, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad h_n(x, y, t) := (y - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq t\}}$$

and define for every $t \in [-T, T]$,

$$H_n(t) := \mathbb{E}[h_n(X, Y^n, t)].$$

Further, let $(W(s))_{s \in [0, 1]}$ denote a standard Brownian motion on $[0, 1]$, define the stochastic processes

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s)) - H_n(F_X^{-1}(s))) \\
\mathfrak{W}_n^2(s) &:= \sqrt{n} H_n(F_X^{-1}(s)) \\
\mathfrak{W}_n^3(s) &:= v \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} \\
\mathfrak{W}^1(s) &:= \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} B(s) \\
\mathfrak{W}^2(s) &:= 0 \\
\mathfrak{W}^3(s) &:= vs
\end{aligned}$$

and set

$$\mathfrak{W}_n(s) := \mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) + \mathfrak{W}_n^2(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^3(s), \quad \mathfrak{W}_n(s) := \mathfrak{W}^1(s) + \mathfrak{W}^2(s) - \mathfrak{W}^3(s)$$

for $s \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, let us redefine $\hat{s}_n := \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}^+ \mathfrak{W}_n(s)$ and $\hat{s} := \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{W}(s)$ from the previous proofs to now denote the minimizers of $\mathfrak{W}_n(s)$ and $\mathfrak{W}(s)$ respectively.

LEMMA 6.4. *Let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, x_0 an interior point of \mathcal{X} and assume Φ_0 to be β -times continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of 0 with the β th derivative being the first non-vanishing derivative in 0. Assume further that X has bounded moments up to order β and that F_X is invertible. Then the sequence of processes $\mathfrak{W}_n(s)$ converges weakly in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ to the process $\mathfrak{W}(s)$, as long as $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

PROOF. We will start with the convergence of $\mathfrak{W}_n^2(s)$. Note that by assumption on Φ_n , a Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder of $\Phi_n(x)$ around x_0 of order β yields the existence of some ξ_n between x and x_0 , s.t.

$$n^{1/2}(\Phi_n(x) - \Phi_n(x_0)) = n^{1/2}\Phi_n^{(\beta)}(\xi_n)(x - x_0)^\beta = n^{1/2}\delta_n^\beta\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n\xi_n)(x - x_0)^\beta.$$

From $n\delta_n^{2\beta} \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s \in [0, 1]} |\mathfrak{W}_n^2(s)| &= \sup_{s \in [0, 1]} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[n^{1/2}(\Phi_n(X) - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} \right] \right| \\ &= \sup_{s \in [0, 1]} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[n^{1/2}\delta_n^\beta\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n\xi_n)(X - x_0)^\beta \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} \right] \right| \\ &\leq n^{1/2}\delta_n^\beta \mathbb{E} [|\Phi_0^{(\beta)}(\delta_n\xi_n)(X - x_0)^\beta|] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathfrak{W}_n^2(s) \rightarrow 0$ in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For convergence of $\mathfrak{W}_n^3(s)$, we know from the classical Glivenko-Cantelli result that $\mathfrak{W}_n^3(s) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} vF_X(F_X^{-1}(s)) = vs$ in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us now show weak convergence of $\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s)$ to $\mathfrak{W}^1(s) := \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))}W(s)$ in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$. For this, note that it suffices by (Theorem 1.5.4, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) and (Theorem 1.5.7, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)) to show that $\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s)$ is asymptotically tight in \mathbb{R} for every $s \in [0, 1]$, that \mathfrak{W}_n^1 as a stochastic process is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability and that for every finite subset $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subset [0, 1]$, the marginals $(\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{W}_n^1(s_k))$ converge weakly to $(\mathfrak{W}^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{W}^1(s_k))$.

We start with the weak convergence of the marginals, where we want to apply the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem. For this, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary, let $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subset [0, 1]$ denote an arbitrary finite subset of $[0, 1]$ and note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{W}_n^1(s_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathfrak{W}_n^1(s_k) \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{pmatrix} h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s_1)) - \mathbb{E}[h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s_1))] \\ \vdots \\ h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s_k)) - \mathbb{E}[h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s_k))] \end{pmatrix}.$$

As a shorthand notation, let us introduce

$$V_i^n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{pmatrix} h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s_1)) \\ \vdots \\ h_n(X_i, Y_i^n, F_X^{-1}(s_k)) \end{pmatrix}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note that $\|V_i^n\|^2 \leq k/n$ by definition of h_n and so we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\|V_i^n\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\|V_i^n\| > \varepsilon\}}] \leq \frac{k}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\|V_i^n\|^2 > \varepsilon^2\}}] \leq \frac{k}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{k > n\varepsilon^2\}}] = k \mathbb{1}_{\{k > n\varepsilon^2\}} \longrightarrow 0$$

for $n \longrightarrow \infty$. For the sum of the covariance matrices of V_i , note that for $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Cov}(V_i^n) \right)_{j\ell} &= \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s_j)\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s_\ell)\}}] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s_j)\}}] \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s_\ell)\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq \min\{F_X^{-1}(s_j), F_X^{-1}(s_\ell)\}\}}] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq \min\{F_X^{-1}(s_j), F_X^{-1}(s_\ell)\}\}}]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})\}}] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})\}}]^2. \end{aligned}$$

As seen before, the second part of the difference on the right side vanishes asymptotically. For the first part, note that by dominated convergence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[((1 - \Phi_n(x_0))^2 \Phi_n(X) + (\Phi_n(x_0))^2 (1 - \Phi_n(X))) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_n(X) - 2\Phi_n(x_0)\Phi_n(X) + \Phi_n(x_0)^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})\}}] \\ &\longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_0(0) - \Phi_0(0)^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})\}}] \end{aligned}$$

for $n \longrightarrow \infty$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Cov}(V_i^n) \right)_{j\ell} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_0(0) - \Phi_0(0)^2) \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})\}}] \\ &= \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0)) F_X(F_X^{-1}(\min\{s_j, s_\ell\})) \\ &= \Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0)) \min\{s_j, s_\ell\} \\ &= \text{Cov}(\sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} B(s_j), \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} B(s_\ell)) \\ &= \text{Cov}(\mathfrak{W}^1(s_j), \mathfrak{W}^1(s_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

So by the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem, we have

$$(\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{W}_n^1(s_k)) \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} (\mathfrak{W}^1(s_1), \dots, \mathfrak{W}^1(s_k))$$

for $n \longrightarrow \infty$. Note that this also implies asymptotic tightness of $\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s)$ for every $s \in [0, 1]$. To show that \mathfrak{W}_n^1 is asymptotically uniformly equicontinuous in probability, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ and define $\delta := \varepsilon^2 \eta^2$. Note that by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|s-t| < \delta} |\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^1(t)| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{|s-t| < \delta} |\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^1(t)|\right].$$

Defining

$$h_{n,s,t}: [0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad h_{n,s,t}(x, y) := (y - \Phi_n(x_0))(\mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq F_X^{-1}(t)\}})$$

for $s, t \in [0, 1]$, setting $\mathcal{H}_{n,\delta} := \{h_{n,s,t} \mid s, t \in [0, 1], |s - t| < \delta\}$ and choosing $\varepsilon_n > 0$ and $M_n > 0$, s.t. $\mathbb{E}[h^2] < \varepsilon_n^2$ and $\|h\|_\infty \leq M_n$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}$, we have by (Theorem 2.14.17', [van der Vaart and Wellner, 2023](#))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^1(t)| \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n h_n(X_i, Y_i^n) - \mathbb{E}[h_n(X_i, Y_i^n)] \right| \right] \\ &\leq J_{[]}(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \left(1 + \frac{J_{[]}(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n}))}{\varepsilon_n^2 n^{1/2}} M_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

For arbitrary $h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}$, there exists $s, t \in [0, 1]$, satisfying $|s - t| < \delta$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(X, Y^n)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[h_{n,s,t}(X, Y^n)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(s)\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq F_X^{-1}(t)\}})^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{F_X^{-1}(\min\{s,t\}) < X \leq F_X^{-1}(\max\{s,t\})\}}] \\ &= F_X(F_X^{-1}(\max\{s,t\})) - F_X(F_X^{-1}(\min\{s,t\})) \\ &= \max\{s, t\} - \min\{s, t\} = |s - t| < \delta \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|h\|_\infty = \|h_{n,s,t}\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

Thus, by choosing $\varepsilon_n = \sqrt{\delta}$ and $M_n = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^1(t)| \right] &\leq J_{[]}(\delta^{1/2}, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \left(1 + \frac{J_{[]}(\sqrt{\delta}, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n}))}{\delta n^{1/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By a standard bracketing argument, it follows that for some constant $K > 0$, which may change from line to line,

$$N_{[]}(\nu, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq N_{[]}(\nu^2, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^1(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq \frac{K}{\nu^2}.$$

Thus,

$$J_{[]}(\sqrt{\delta}, \mathcal{H}_{n,\delta}, L^2(\mathbb{P}^{X,Y^n})) \leq K \int_0^{\sqrt{\delta}} \log(K/\nu^2) d\nu \leq K\sqrt{\delta}$$

and we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^1(t)| \right] \leq K\sqrt{\delta}.$$

Finally, up to some constant,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^1(t)| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|s-t|<\delta} |\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^1(t)| \right] \leq \eta$$

by definition of δ .

Summarizing the results, we have $\mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \sqrt{\Phi_0(0)(1 - \Phi_0(0))} W(s)$, as well as $\mathfrak{W}_n^2(s) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ and $\mathfrak{W}_n^3(s) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} v s$ in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. The assertion now follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{W}_n(s) = \mathfrak{W}_n^1(s) + \mathfrak{W}_n^2(s) - \mathfrak{W}_n^3(s)$ as well as that $\mathfrak{W}_n^2(s)$ and $\mathfrak{W}_n^3(s)$ converge to nonrandom functions. \square

PROPOSITION 6.5. *Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 6.4, the sequence of minimizers \hat{s}_n of $\mathfrak{W}_n(s)$ converges weakly to the minimizer \hat{s} of $\mathfrak{W}(s)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

PROOF. From Lemma 6.4, we have that $\mathfrak{W}_n(s)$ converges weakly to $\mathfrak{W}(s)$ in $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we have that the sample paths $s \mapsto \mathfrak{W}(s)$ are continuous and that \hat{s} is unique and tight. Further, $\hat{s}_n \in [0, 1]$ is uniformly tight by definition and consequently, by (Theorem 3.2.2, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)), we have $\hat{s}_n \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \hat{s}$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

6.3. *Proof of L^1 -Convergence Rate and Limiting Distribution.* In this section, we give the necessary results for the proofs of Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 5.4, following mostly the ideas of [Durot \(2008\)](#) and [Durot \(2007\)](#). Compared to the results in there, the fact that the derivative of Φ_n converges to zero and thus, is not bounded away from zero uniformly in n required us to do some modifications. In particular, this means that we had to calculate many expressions explicitly, as they depend on n in our setting. Throughout this section, we will use the notations introduced in Section 5. We will start with some results about \tilde{U}_n and $F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n$, concerning their tail behaviour and their expectation. These results are used multiple times in the proofs of Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 5.4.

Note that in Section 5, we introduced $\lambda_n(a) := \Phi_n \circ F_X^{-1}(a)$ for $a \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda_n^{-1}(u) = F_X \circ \Phi_n^{-1}(u)$ for $u \in [0, 1]$, where we assumed Φ_n^{-1} to be defined on the whole unit interval and set $\Phi_n^{-1}(u) := T$ for $u > \Phi_n(T)$ and $\Phi_n^{-1}(u) := -T$ for $u < \Phi_n(-T)$ respectively.

LEMMA 6.6. *Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and F_X to be continuously differentiable on $[-T, T]$, let $\Phi'_0(0)$ and p_X be bounded away from zero and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for any $q \geq 2$, there exists a constant $K > 0$ depending only on the bounds on $\Phi'_0(0)$ and p_X , such that for every $a \in [0, 1]$, $x > 0$ and n large enough,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad \mathbb{P} \left(|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x \right) & \begin{cases} \leq 1 & x \in (0, (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}), \\ \leq K (n\delta_n^2 x^3)^{-q/2} & x \in [(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}, 1], \\ = 0 & x > 1 \end{cases} \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \mathbb{P} \left(|F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)) - \Phi_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x \right) & \begin{cases} \leq 1 & x \in (0, (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}), \\ \leq K (n\delta_n^2 x^3)^{-q/2} & x \in [(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}, 2T], \\ = 0 & x > 2T \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. The first and last inequalities in both cases are obviously true. So for the proof of (i), let us consider $x \in [(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}, 1]$ and let $K > 0$ denote a constant which may change from line to line. Define $M_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $M_n(t) := \Lambda_n(t) - \Lambda^n(t)$ and note that by definition of Λ_n , we have

$$\Lambda_n(u) = \Lambda_n \left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n} \right) + \left(u - \frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n} \right) \left(\Lambda_n \left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}{n} \right) - \Lambda_n \left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n} \right) \right),$$

where

$$\Lambda_n(i/n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^i Y_{(j)}^n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^i \varepsilon_{(j)}^n + \int_0^{i/n} \Phi_n(F_n^{-1}(u)) du, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Now fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and note that by definition of \tilde{U}_n ,

$$\{ |\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x \} \subseteq \left\{ \inf_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x} \Lambda_n(u) - au \leq \Lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - a\lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right\}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| > x) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x} \Lambda_n(u) - au \leq \Lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - a\lambda_n^{-1}(a)\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x} \Lambda_n(u) - \Lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) + a\lambda_n^{-1}(a) - au \leq 0\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x} \Lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - \Lambda_n(u) + au - a\lambda_n^{-1}(a) \geq 0\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x} M_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - M_n(u) + \Lambda^n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - \Lambda^n(u) + au - a\lambda_n^{-1}(a) \geq 0\right).
\end{aligned}$$

From a Taylor expansion of $\Lambda^n(u)$ around $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$ with Lagrange remainder, we obtain

$$\Lambda^n(u) = \Lambda^n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) + \lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_n'(\xi_n)(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2$$

for some ξ_n between u and $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$ and by assumption, we know that at least for n large enough,

$$\lambda_n'(t) = \delta_n \Phi_0'(\delta_n F_X^{-1}(t))(F_X^{-1})'(t) > \delta_n K.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda^n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - \Lambda^n(u) &= -\lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_n'(\xi_n)(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 \\
&\leq -\lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - K\delta_n(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now note that if $\lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \neq a$, then either

$$a < \lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n^{-1}(a) = F_X(-T) = 0,$$

or

$$a > \lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n^{-1}(a) = F_X(T) = 1.$$

Thus, $(a - \lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \leq 0$ for every a and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda^n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - \Lambda^n(u) + au - a\lambda_n^{-1}(a) \\
\leq -\lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - K\delta_n(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 + a(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \\
\leq -K\delta_n(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by a slicing argument, the union bound and Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x} M_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - M_n(u) - K\delta_n(u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 \geq 0\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \in [x2^k, x2^{k+1}]} M_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - M_n(u) \geq K\delta_n(x2^k)^2\right) \\
& \leq K(\delta_n x^2)^{-q} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-2kq} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \in [x2^k, x2^{k+1}]} |M_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - M_n(u)|^q\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Now we want to determine an upper bound for the expectation in the previous inequality. For $u \in [0, 1]$ and without loss of generality for $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_n(t+u) - \Lambda_n(u) &= \Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor}{n}\right) - \Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n}\right) \\ &\quad + \left(t+u - \frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor}{n}\right) \left(\Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor + 1}{n}\right) - \Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor}{n}\right)\right) \\ &\quad - \left(u - \frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n}\right) \left(\Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}{n}\right) - \Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

As an immediate consequence, we see

$$\left(t+u - \frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor}{n}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(u - \frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

By definition of Λ_n , we find

$$\Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor}{n}\right) - \Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor} \varepsilon_{(j)}^n + \int_{\lfloor nu \rfloor / n}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor / n} \Phi_n(F_n^{-1}(s)) ds$$

and in particular,

$$\Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor + 1}{n}\right) - \Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n} Y_{(\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor + 1)}^n$$

and

$$\Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}{n}\right) - \Lambda_n\left(\frac{\lfloor nu \rfloor}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n} Y_{(\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1)}^n.$$

Putting all of this together, we have by definition of Λ^n and the mean value theorem

$$\begin{aligned}|M_n(t+u) - M_n(u)| &= |\Lambda_n(t+u) - \Lambda_n(u) - (\Lambda^n(t+u) - \Lambda^n(u))| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor} \varepsilon_{(j)}^n + \int_{\lfloor nu \rfloor / n}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor / n} \Phi_n(F_n^{-1}(s)) ds - \int_u^{t+u} \lambda_n(s) ds \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n^2} (Y_{(\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor + 1)}^n + Y_{(\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1)}^n) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{j=\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor} \varepsilon_{(j)}^n \right| + \left| \int_u^{t+u} \Phi_n(F_n^{-1}(s)) - \Phi_n(F_X^{-1}(s)) ds \right| + \frac{2}{n} + \frac{2}{n^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{j=\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor} \varepsilon_{(j)}^n \right| + \delta_n t \sup_{s \in [-T, T]} |\Phi'_0(\delta_n s)| \sup_{v \in [0, 1]} |F_n^{-1}(v) - F_X^{-1}(v)| + \frac{4}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

For $x \geq 1/n$, we observe from the previous inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t \in [0, x]} |M_n(t+u) - M_n(u)| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sup_{t \in [0, x]} \left| \sum_{j=\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor} \varepsilon_{(j)}^n \right| + K \delta_n x \sup_{v \in [0, 1]} |F_n^{-1}(v) - F_X^{-1}(v)| + \frac{4}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

From [Dvoretzky, Kiefer and Wolfowitz \(1956\)](#), we know

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{v \in [0,1]} |F_n^{-1}(v) - F_X^{-1}(v)|^q \right] \leq K n^{-q/2}$$

and by using Doob's inequality together with (Theorem 3, [Rosenthal, 1973](#)) and arguing exactly as in ([Durot, 2008](#), p. 333), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,x]} \left| \sum_{j=\lfloor nu \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor n(t+u) \rfloor} \varepsilon_{(j)}^n \right|^q \right] \leq K (nx)^{q/2}.$$

Finally, this shows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,x]} |M_n(t+u) - M_n(u)|^q \right]^{1/q} \leq K \frac{x^{1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + K \frac{x\delta_n}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{4}{n}$$

and for n sufficiently large, we have $1/n \leq \delta_n/\sqrt{n} \leq 1/\sqrt{n}$ and thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,x]} |M_n(t+u) - M_n(u)|^q \right] \leq K \left(\frac{x}{n} \right)^{q/2}.$$

By using the same arguments, this also holds for $t \in [-1, 0]$ and so we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|u - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \in [x2^k, x2^{k+1}]} |M_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - M_n(u)|^q \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|\lambda_n^{-1}(a) - u| \leq x2^{k+1}} |M_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - u + u - M_n(u)|^q \right] \\ & \leq K \left(\frac{x2^{k+1}}{n} \right)^{q/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the previous results, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x) & \leq K (\delta_n x^2)^{-q} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-2kq} \left(\frac{x2^{k+1}}{n} \right)^{q/2} \\ & \leq K (n\delta_n^2 x^3)^{-q/2} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-3kq/2} \\ & \leq K (n\delta_n^2 x^3)^{-q/2} \end{aligned}$$

and statement (i) follows.

For the proof of statement (ii), let $x \in [(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}, 2T]$ and let again $K > 0$ denote a constant that may changes from line to line. Note further that a Taylor expansion with Lagrange remainder of F_X^{-1} around $\tilde{U}_n(a)$ yields

$$F_X^{-1}(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) = F_X^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)) + (F_X^{-1})'(\xi_n)(\lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \tilde{U}_n(a))$$

for some ξ_n between $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$ and $\tilde{U}_n(a)$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & |F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)) - F_X^{-1}(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))| \\ & \leq |F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)) - F_X^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a))| + |(F_X^{-1})'(\xi_n)(\lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \tilde{U}_n(a))| \\ & \leq \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_n^{-1}(u) - F_X^{-1}(u)| + \left| \frac{1}{p_X(F_X^{-1}(\xi_n))} (\lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \tilde{U}_n(a)) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_n^{-1}(u) - F_X^{-1}(u)| + \left(\inf_{t \in [-T, T]} p_X(t) \right)^{-1} |\lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \tilde{U}_n(a)| \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain from statement (i), Markov's inequality and [Dvoretzky, Kiefer and Wolfowitz \(1956\)](#)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)) - \Phi_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)) - F_X^{-1}(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))| \geq x) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_n^{-1}(u) - F_X^{-1}(u)| \geq x/2\right) + \mathbb{P}(|F_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a)) - \tilde{U}_n(a)| \geq Kx) \\
&\leq Kx^{-3q/2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_n^{-1}(u) - F_X^{-1}(u)|^{3q/2}\right] + K(n\delta_n^2 x^3)^{-q/2} \\
&\leq Kx^{-3q/2} (n^{-3q/4} + (n\delta_n^2)^{-q/2}) \\
&\leq K(n\delta_n^2 x^3)^{-q/2},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves statement (ii). \square

COROLLARY 6.7. *Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and F_X to be continuously differentiable on $[-T, T]$, let $\Phi'_0(0)$ and p_X be bounded away from zero and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for any $q \geq 2$ and any $r \in [1, 3q/2)$, there exists a constant $K > 0$ depending only on the bounds on $\Phi'_0(0)$ and p_X , such that for every $a \in [0, 1]$, $x > 0$ and n large enough,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)|^r\right] \leq K(n\delta_n^2)^{-r/3}$$

PROOF. Let $a \in [0, 1]$ be arbitrary. Then, by [Lemma 6.6](#)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)|^r\right] &= \int_0^\infty rx^{r-1} \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x) dx \\
&\leq \int_0^{K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}} rx^{r-1} dx + \int_{K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}}^1 Krx^{r-1} (n\delta_n^2 x^3)^{-q/2} dx
\end{aligned}$$

and this is bounded by $K(n\delta_n^2)^{-r/3}$ as long as $r - 1 - 3q/2 \leq -1$. But $r/3 \leq q/2$ holds by assumption on r and so the assertion follows. \square

The following result is a variation of [Lemma 6.6](#) for the case that $a \in [0, 1] \setminus \Phi_n([-T, T])$. The proof follows exactly the lines of ([Lemma 2](#), [Durot, 2008](#)) and is therefore omitted.

LEMMA 6.8. *There exists $K > 0$ depending only on Φ_0 and F_X such that for every $a \in [0, 1] \setminus \Phi_n([-T, T])$, $x > 0$ and n large enough,*

- (i) $\mathbb{P}^X(|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x) \leq K(nx)^{-1}(\Phi_n \circ \Phi_n^{-1}(a) - a)^{-2}$,
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - \Phi_n^{-1}(a)| \geq x) \leq K(nx)^{-1}(\Phi_n \circ \Phi_n^{-1}(a) - a)^{-2}$.

While the previous results are used multiple times throughout many of the proofs in [Section 5](#), the following results are the essential parts of the proof of [Theorem 5.4](#). The idea for the following result to replace $\hat{\Phi}_n$ and Φ_n by their inverse counterparts appeared first in [Groeneboom \(1985\)](#), was made rigorous in ([Corollary 2.1](#), [Groeneboom, Hooghiemstra and Lopuhaä, 1999](#)) and was later modified in ([Step 1](#), [Durot, 2007](#)).

LEMMA 6.9. Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and F_X to be continuously differentiable on $[-T, T]$, let $\Phi'_0(0) > 0$, let p_X be bounded away from zero on $[-T, T]$ and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then,

$$\int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt = \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} |F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - \Phi_n^{-1}(a)| da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

PROOF. Let

$$I_1 := \int_{-T}^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t))_+ dt, \quad I_2 := \int_{-T}^T (\Phi_n(t) - \hat{\Phi}_n(t))_+ dt$$

and define

$$J_1 := \int_{-T}^T \int_0^{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq \Phi_n(t) + u\}} du dt.$$

By Cavalieri's principle applied to I_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 - J_1 &= \int_{-T}^T \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq \Phi_n(t) + u\}} du dt - \int_{-T}^T \int_0^{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq \Phi_n(t) + u\}} du dt \\ &= \int_{-T}^T \int_{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)}^1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq \Phi_n(t) + u\}} du dt \\ &= \int_{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(T))}^T \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq \Phi_n(t) + u\}} du dt \end{aligned}$$

where we used the switch relation Lemma 5.1 in the last equality to obtain that $\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \leq \Phi_n(T)$ if and only if $t \leq F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(T))$. So we have $I_1 - J_1 \geq 0$. Again by Cavalieri's principle,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 - J_1 &\leq \int_{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(T))}^T \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq \Phi_n(t) + u\}} du dt \\ &= \int_{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(T))}^T (\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t))_+ dt \\ &\leq \int_{T - (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt \\ &\quad + 2T \mathbb{1}_{\{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(T)) \leq T - (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used without loss of generality that $n\delta_n^2 \geq 1$ for n large enough. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we know from Lemma 6.6, that again for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(T)) \leq T - (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)\}} \geq \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(\Phi_n(T)) - T| \geq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)) \leq K (n\delta_n^2 ((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2))^3)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by $K \log(n\delta_n^2)^{-3}$ and so we have

$$I_1 - J_1 \leq \int_{T - (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

By Markov's inequality, Fubini's theorem and Corollary 5.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n} \int_{T-(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt > \varepsilon\right) \\
& \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} \int_{T-(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)}^{T-(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)|\right] dt \\
& \quad + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} \int_{T-(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}}^T \mathbb{E}\left[|\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)|\right] dt \\
& \leq K \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} (\log(n\delta_n^2) - 1) + K \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} \int_{T-(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}}^T n^{-1/2} (T-t)^{-1/2} dt \\
& = \frac{K}{\varepsilon} \left(n^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1/3} (\log(n\delta_n^2) - 1) + 2(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which is equal to $\frac{K}{\varepsilon} (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} (1 + \log(n\delta_n^2))$ and so we have shown that

$$I_1 = J_1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

Note further that by the change of variable $a = \Phi_n(t) + u$, Fubini's theorem and the switch relation Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \int_{-T}^T \int_0^{\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(t)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq \Phi_n(t) + u\}} du dt \\
&= \int_{-T}^T \int_{\Phi_n(t)}^{\Phi_n(T)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq a\}} da dt \\
&= \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} \int_{-T}^T \mathbb{1}_{\{a \geq \Phi_n(t)\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq a\}} dt da \\
&= \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} \int_{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a)}^T \mathbb{1}_{\{\Phi_n^{-1}(a) \geq t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq a\}} dt da \\
&= \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} \int_{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a)}^{\Phi_n^{-1}(a)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{\Phi}_n(t) \geq a\}} dt da \\
&= \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} \int_{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a)}^{\Phi_n^{-1}(a)} \mathbb{1}_{\{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) \leq t\}} dt da \\
&= \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} (\Phi_n^{-1}(a) - F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a)) \mathbb{1}_{\{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) \leq \Phi_n^{-1}(a)\}} da
\end{aligned}$$

and so we have

$$I_1 = \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} (\Phi_n^{-1}(a) - F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a)) \mathbb{1}_{\{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) \leq \Phi_n^{-1}(a)\}} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

By similar arguments, we obtain

$$I_2 = \int_{\Phi_n(-T)}^{\Phi_n(T)} (F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - \Phi_n^{-1}(a)) \mathbb{1}_{\{F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) \geq \Phi_n^{-1}(a)\}} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$$

and the assertion follows. \square

COROLLARY 6.10. Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and F_X to be twice continuously differentiable on $[-T, T]$, let $\Phi'_0(0) > 0$, let p_X be bounded away from zero on $[-T, T]$ and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, there exist Brownian bridges B_n on $[0, 1]$, s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt \\ = \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Note first that $\Phi_n(T) = \Phi_n(F_X^{-1}(1)) = \lambda_n(1)$ and $\Phi_n(-T) = \Phi_n(F_X^{-1}(0)) = \lambda_n(0)$ and that by the KMT embedding (Komlós, Major and Tusnády, 1975, Theorem 3), there exist Brownian bridges B_n on $[0, 1]$ s.t.

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \left| F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(t) - t - \frac{B_n(t)}{\sqrt{n}} \right|^r \right]^{1/r} = O \left(\frac{\log(n)}{n} \right)$$

for $r \geq 1$. By Lemma 6.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} |F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - \Phi_n^{-1}(a)| da \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} |F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| da \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right| da. \end{aligned}$$

A Taylor expansion of F_X^{-1} around $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \lambda_n^{-1}(a) &= (F_X^{-1})'(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))(\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(F_X^{-1})''(\nu_n)(\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))}(\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(F_X^{-1})''(\nu_n)(\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some ν_n between $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$ and $\tilde{U}_n(a)$. But $(F_X^{-1})''$ is bounded by assumption and so we have from Corollary 6.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} (\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \right| \right] \\ \leq K \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)|^2 \right] \\ \leq K(n\delta_n^2)^{-2/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the fact that $|\lambda_n(1) - \lambda_n(0)| = O(\delta_n)$, an application of Markov's inequality and Fubini's theorem imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-T}^T |\hat{\Phi}_n(t) - \Phi_n(t)| dt \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left(\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right| da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that

$$\int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right| da = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

To prove this, observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right| da \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| F_n^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) - F_X^{-1} \circ \tilde{U}_n(a) + \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)))} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} - \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)))} \right| da \\ &\leq K\delta_n \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| F_n^{-1}(u) - F_X^{-1}(u) + \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(u))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_n^{-1}(u))} \right| \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} - \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)))}{p_X(F_n^{-1}(\tilde{U}_n(a)))} \right| da \\ &= K\delta_n \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| F_X^{-1}(u) - F_n^{-1}(u) - \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(u))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_n^{-1}(u))} \right| + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 6.6 together with a bound on the modulus of continuity of the Brownian bridge for the last equality. Subsequently, the crucial point is that monotonicity of F_X^{-1} reveals that the maximum in the previous equation is attained in the image of F_n . Thus, we can replace u with $F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u)$ inside the sup and a Taylor expansion of F_X^{-1} around u then yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| F_X^{-1}(u) - F_n^{-1}(u) - \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(u))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_n^{-1}(u))} \right| \\ &= \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| F_X^{-1}(F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u)) - F_n^{-1}(F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u)) - \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u)))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_n^{-1}(F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u)))} \right| \\ &= \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| F_X^{-1}(F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u)) - F_X^{-1}(u) - \frac{B_n(u)}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_X^{-1}(u))} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| (F_X^{-1})'(u)(F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u) - u) - \frac{B_n(u)}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_X^{-1}(u))} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + K \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |(F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u) - u)^2| \\
& \leq \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u) - u - \frac{B_n(u)}{\sqrt{n}}| \frac{1}{p_X(F_X^{-1}(u))} + K \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u) - u|^2 \\
& = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

by the KMT construction in (9) and the fact that $\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |F_n \circ F_X^{-1}(u) - u| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. \square

Let us recall some of the definitions introduced during the proof of Theorem 5.4 which we will use throughout the proofs of the subsequent results. For $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$, we introduced $i_n(a)$ to denote the integer part of $(a - \lambda_n(0))(n\delta_n^2)^{1/3}/\log(n\delta_n^2)$, we defined $a_n := \lambda_n(0) + i_n(a)(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}\log(n\delta_n^2)$ and set

$$a_n^B := a - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n^{-1})'(a_n)},$$

where B_n denotes the sequence of Brownian bridges introduced in Corollary 6.10.

LEMMA 6.11. *Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and F_X to be twice continuously differentiable on $[-T, T]$, let $\Phi'_0(0) > 0$, let p_X be bounded away from zero on $[-T, T]$ and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for the Brownian bridges B_n from Corollary 6.10, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} |\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}}| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\
& = \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} |\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. For $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $k_i^n := \lambda_n(0) + i(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}\log(n\delta_n^2)$ and

$$I_i^n := [k_i^n, \min\{k_{i+1}^n, \lambda_n(1)\}].$$

Note that $i_n(a) = i$ for every $a \in I_i^n$ and so in this case, we have

$$a_n = \lambda_n(0) + i(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3}\log(n\delta_n^2) = k_i^n$$

on I_i^n . Consequently, on I_i^n , a_n^B is just a translation of a by the constant

$$B_i^n := \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(k_i^n))}{\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n^{-1})'(k_i^n)}.$$

Let $I_i^{n,B} := I_i^n + B_i^n := \{x + B_i^n \mid x \in I_i^n\}$. Then, a change of variable inside the integral where a is replaced by a_n^B on each interval I_i^n together with an addition of zero yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} |\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}}| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\
& = \sum_{i \geq 0} \int_{I_i^n} |\tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}}| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\
& = \sum_{i \geq 0} \int_{I_i^{n,B}} |\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}}| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))} da
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i \geq 0} \int_{I_i^n} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))} da + R_n,$$

where

$$|R_n| \leq \sum_{i \geq 0} \int_{I_i^{n,B} \triangle I_i^n} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))} da$$

and $I_i^{n,B} \triangle I_i^n$ denotes the symmetric difference of $I_i^{n,B}$ and I_i^n . Note that by Corollary 6.7, which remains true for a replaced by a_n^B ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \geq 0} \int_{I_i^{n,B} \triangle I_i^n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))} \right] da \\ &= K \sum_{i \geq 0} \int_{I_i^{n,B} \triangle I_i^n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) \right| \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \right] da \\ &\leq K(\lambda_n(1) - \lambda_n(0)) \frac{(n\delta_n^2)^{1/3}}{\log(n\delta_n^2)} ((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} + n^{-1/2}) \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |B_n(u)| \\ &\leq K\delta_n \frac{1}{\log(n\delta_n^2)} n^{-1/2} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |B_n(u)| \\ &= o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

and so we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, we show that we can get rid of a_n^B in the Brownian bridge and the density p_X in the previous expression. By a Taylor expansion of $1/p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))$ around a , we find for some ν_n between a and a_n^B , that

$$\frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))} = \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} + \frac{p'_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(\nu_n))}{(p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(\nu_n))^2 \Phi'_0(\delta_n \Phi_n^{-1}(\nu_n)))} \frac{1}{\delta_n} (a_n^B - a).$$

Thus, by similar arguments as before,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \left(\frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a_n^B))} - \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right) \right] da \right| \\ &\leq K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \frac{\lambda_n(1) - \lambda_n(0)}{\delta_n} n^{-1/2} \\ &= o(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. - \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \right) \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} \right] da \right| \\
& \leq K \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \right] da \\
& = K n^{-1/2} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E} \left[|B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B))| \right] da \\
& \leq K n^{-1/2} \delta_n \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |B_n(t)| \right] \\
& = o(n^{-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

and so we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\
& = \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show that

$$\sqrt{n} \sup_{a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]} \left| \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n}} - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right| \longrightarrow 0$$

\mathbb{P} -almost surely. From a Taylor expansion of λ_n^{-1} around $a \in J_n$ we know that there exists $\nu_n = \nu_n(a, a_n^B)$ between a_n^B and a , s.t.

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n}} &= \lambda_n^{-1}(a) + (\lambda_n^{-1})'(\nu_n)(a_n^B - a) + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n}} \\
&= \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - (\lambda_n^{-1})'(\nu_n) \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n}(\lambda_n^{-1})'(a_n)} + \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n}} \\
&= \lambda_n^{-1}(a) + \left(1 - \frac{(\lambda_n^{-1})'(\nu_n)}{(\lambda_n^{-1})'(a_n)} \right) \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

But

$$\sup_{a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]} |\nu_n(a, a_n^B) - a_n| \leq \sup_{a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]} |a_n^B - a| \longrightarrow 0$$

\mathbb{P} -almost surely for $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and so we have by dominated convergence that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a_n^B) - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\
& = \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. \square

Recalling the definitions from Theorem 5.4, we defined

$$U_n^L: [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)] \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad U_n^L(a) := L_n(\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B)) - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)).$$

LEMMA 6.12. *Assume Φ_0 to be continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of zero and F_X to be continuously differentiable on $[-T, T]$, let $\Phi'_0(0)$ and p_X be bounded away from zero and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} |\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. It suffices to show that

$$\int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left(|\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| - \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \right) \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2}).$$

From a Taylor expansion of L_n around $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$, we obtain the existence of ν_n between $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$ and $\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B)$ such that

$$U_n^L(a) = L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))(\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) + \frac{1}{2}L''_n(\nu_n)(\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2.$$

By definition of $\sigma_n^2(t)$, we have

$$\sigma_n^2(t) = \mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(X))^2 | X = t] = \Phi_n(t)(1 - \Phi_n(t))$$

and consequently,

$$L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) = \Phi_n(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))(1 - \Phi_n(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))) \geq K \min\{\Phi_n(-T), 1 - \Phi_n(T)\} \geq K$$

for all $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$. Further,

$$L''_n(\nu_n) = (\sigma_n^2 \circ F_X^{-1})'(\nu_n) = \Phi'_n(F_X^{-1}(\nu_n)) \frac{1 - 2\Phi_n(F_X^{-1}(\nu_n))}{p_X(F_X^{-1}(\nu_n))} \leq \delta_n K.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right| - \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \leq \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \\ &= \left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) - (\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \frac{L''_n(\nu_n)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} (\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 \right| \\ &\leq \delta_n K (\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$ and so we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right| - \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \right] \leq \delta_n K \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a))^2 \right],$$

which is bounded by $K(n\delta_n^2)^{-2/3}\delta_n$ by Corollary 6.7. Thus, by Markov's inequality, Fubini's theorem and monotonicity, we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left(|\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)| - \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \right) \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da > \varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tilde{U}_n(a_n^B) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right| - \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \right] \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\ & \leq \frac{K}{\varepsilon} n^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1/3} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by $\frac{K}{\varepsilon}(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6}\delta_n$ and so the assertion follows. \square

Let us now recall the following definitions we made throughout the proof of Theorem 5.4

$$L^n(t) := \int_0^t \sigma_n^2 \circ F_n^{-1}(u) du, \quad \psi_n(t) := \frac{L_n''(t)}{\sqrt{n}L_n'(t)} B_n(t), \quad d_n(t) := \delta_n^{1/2} \frac{|\lambda_n'(t)|}{2L_n'(t)^2}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$ and let us also define

$$(10) \quad T_n := \delta_n^{-1} (n\delta_n^2)^{(1/3)(3q-5)}$$

for some $q \geq 12$ and let $\Omega_n \subseteq \Omega$ denote the set on which the following equalities hold almost surely:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |B_n(u)| \leq \log(n), \\ & \sup_{|u-v| \leq T_n(n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} \sqrt{\log(n)}} |B_n(u) - B_n(v)| \leq T_n^{1/2} (n/\delta_n)^{-1/6} \log(n), \\ & \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| F_X^{-1}(u) - F_n^{-1}(u) - \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(u))}{\sqrt{n}p_X(F_n^{-1}(u))} \right| \leq \frac{(\log(n))^2}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where B_n denotes the Brownian bridges from Corollary 6.10.

LEMMA 6.13. *Assume that Φ_0 is differentiable with Hölder-continuous derivative in a neighbourhood of zero with $\Phi_0'(0) > 0$. Furthermore, let p_X be continuously differentiable (one-sided at the boundary points) on $[-T, T]$ with $p_X > 0$ on $[-T, T]$ and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, there exists a \mathbb{P}^X -Brownian motion W_n , s.t.*

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \left((n/\delta_n)^{1/3} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da - \mu_n \right)$$

has the same asymptotic distribution with respect to \mathbb{P}^X , as

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \left(\int_0^1 |\tilde{V}_n(t)| \frac{|\Phi_n' \circ F_X^{-1}(t)|}{(p_X \circ F_X^{-1}(t))^2 |L_n'(t)|} dt - \mu_n \right),$$

where

$$\tilde{V}_n(t) := \operatorname{argmin}_{|u| \leq \delta_n^{-1} \log(n\delta_n^2)} \{W_t^n(u) + d_n(t)u^2\}$$

and

$$W_t^n(u) := \frac{(n/\delta_n)^{1/6}}{(1 - \psi_n(t))^{1/2}} \left(W_n(L^n(t) + (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u(1 - \psi_n(t))) - W_n(L^n(t)) \right)$$

for $t \in (0, 1)$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

PROOF. Note first that $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n) \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, so w.l.o.g. it suffices to prove the assertion on Ω_n . For every $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$, let

$$I_n(a) := [(n/\delta_n)^{1/3}(L_n(0) - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))), (n/\delta_n)^{1/3}(L_n(1) - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))].$$

By using elementary properties of the argmin, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (n/\delta_n)^{1/3}U_n^L(a) &= (n/\delta_n)^{1/3} \left(L_n \left(\operatorname{argmin}_{u \in [0,1]} \{ \Lambda_n(u) - a_n^B u \} \right) - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \right) \\ &= (n/\delta_n)^{1/3} \left(L_n \left(\operatorname{argmin}_{L_n^{-1}(v) \in [0,1]} \{ \Lambda_n(L_n^{-1}(v)) - a_n^B L_n^{-1}(v) \} \right) - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \right) \\ &= (n/\delta_n)^{1/3} \left(\operatorname{argmin}_{v \in [L_n(0), L_n(1)]} \{ (\Lambda_n \circ L_n^{-1} - a_n^B L_n^{-1})(v) \} - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \right) \\ &= (n/\delta_n)^{1/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{v + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) \in [L_n(0), L_n(1)]} \{ (\Lambda_n \circ L_n^{-1} - a_n^B L_n^{-1})(v + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) \} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in I_n(a)} \{ (\Lambda_n \circ L_n^{-1} - a_n^B L_n^{-1})((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}v + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) \} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in I_n(a)} \left\{ \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} (\Lambda_n \circ L_n^{-1} - a_n^B L_n^{-1})((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}v + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} (\Lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - a \lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} (a - a_n^B) \lambda_n^{-1}(a) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining further for $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$ and $u \in I_n(a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_n(a, u) &:= \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} (\Lambda_n \circ L_n^{-1} - a L_n^{-1})((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) \\ &\quad - \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} (\Lambda_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) - a \lambda_n^{-1}(a)), \\ R_n(a, u) &:= \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} \int_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^{L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))} \Phi_n \circ F_n^{-1}(x) - \Phi_n \circ F_X^{-1}(x) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} (a - a_n^B) (L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)), \\ \tilde{R}_n(a, u) &:= \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} \Lambda_n \circ L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) \\ &\quad - \frac{n^{2/3}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} \int_0^{L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))} \Phi_n \circ F_n^{-1}(x) dx \\ &\quad - W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u) - \frac{n^{1/6}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} W_n(L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))), \end{aligned}$$

we see for every $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$

$$(n/\delta_n)^{1/3}U_n^L(a) = \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in I_n(a)} \{ D_n(a, u) + W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u) + R_n(a, u) + \tilde{R}_n(a, u) \},$$

where the expressions in the argmin on the right side deviate only by a term which does not depend on u .

• Before we can show that both R_n and \tilde{R}_n are negligible for the location of the argmin, we need to localize first for technical reasons. So let

$$\hat{U}_n^L(a) := \operatorname{argmin}_{|u| \leq T_n} \{D_n(a, u) + W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u) + R_n(a, u) + \tilde{R}_n(a, u)\}$$

for $a \in [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)]$ and note that $[-T_n, T_n] \subseteq I_n(a)$ at least for n large enough with T_n defined in (10). This follows from the fact that

$$T_n = n^{\frac{1}{3(3q-5)}} \delta_n^{-\frac{(9q-17)}{(9q-15)}} = n^{\frac{1}{3(3q-5)}} \delta_n^{-\frac{1}{3(3q-5)}} \delta_n^{-\frac{(3q-6)}{(3q-5)}} = (n/\delta_n)^{\frac{1}{3(3q-5)}} \delta_n^{-\frac{(3q-6)}{(3q-5)}}$$

and

$$(n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} T_n = (n/\delta_n)^{-\frac{(3q-6)}{3(3q-5)}} \delta_n^{-\frac{(3q-6)}{(3q-5)}} = (n\delta_n^2)^{-\frac{(3q-6)}{3(3q-5)}}.$$

Note further that $(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a)$ can differ from $\hat{U}_n^L(a)$ only if $(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} |U_n^L(a)| > T_n$. But then, by a Taylor expansion of L_n around $\lambda_n^{-1}(a)$, monotonicity, Lemma 6.6 and by definition of T_n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left((n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a) \neq \hat{U}_n^L(a)\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|L_n(\tilde{U}_n(a_n^B)) - L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))| > T_n (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}\right) \\ &\leq K(\delta_n T_n)^{-3q/2} = K(n\delta_n^2)^{-\frac{q}{2(3q-5)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now by using this inequality, we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and n large enough, by Markov's inequality, Fubini's theorem, Hölder's inequality and Minkowski's inequality, that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left((n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \left| \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left(\left| \frac{(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| - \left| \frac{\hat{U}_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \right) \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \right| > \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \frac{(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{1}_{\{(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a) \neq \hat{U}_n^L(a)\}} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\left| \frac{(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| + \left| \frac{\hat{U}_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \right) \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \Big] \\ &\leq \frac{(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6}}{\varepsilon} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a) \neq \hat{U}_n^L(a)\}}]^{(r-1)/r} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right|^r \right]^{1/r} + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\hat{U}_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right|^r \right]^{1/r} \right) \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\ &\leq \frac{K}{\varepsilon} (n\delta_n^2)^{-\frac{q(r-1)}{2(3q-5)r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Corollary 6.7 and $\lambda_n(1) - \lambda_n(0) = O(\delta_n)$ in the last inequality. Choosing r sufficiently close to $3q/2$, this is bounded by $\frac{K}{\varepsilon} (n\delta_n^2)^{-\frac{q(3q-2)}{4(3q-5)}}$ and so it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{(n/\delta_n)^{1/3} U_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\ &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{\hat{U}_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}}((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6}). \end{aligned}$$

• Next, we want to show that R_n and \tilde{R}_n are actually negligible. In other words, we want to show that \hat{U}_n^L can be replaced in the previous integral by the following process, where $S_n := \delta_n^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)$,

$$\hat{V}_n : [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \hat{V}_n(a) := \operatorname{argmin}_{|u| \leq S_n} \{D_n(a, u) + W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u)\}.$$

For ease of notation, let us also introduce

$$\hat{V}_n^* : [\lambda_n(0), \lambda_n(1)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \hat{V}_n^*(a) := \operatorname{argmin}_{|u| \leq T_n} \{D_n(a, u) + W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u)\}.$$

Note that $\hat{V}_n^*(a)$ can differ from \hat{V}_n only if $|\hat{V}_n^*(a)| > S_n$ and it follows from (Proposition 1, [Durot, 2002](#)) together with the comments just before this Proposition, that there exists $K > 0$, s.t. for every (x, α) , satisfying

$$\alpha \in (0, S_n], \quad x > 0, \quad K\delta_n^3 S_n^2 \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha \log(2x\alpha)},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{U}_n^L(a) - \hat{V}_n(a)| > \alpha) &\leq \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{U}_n^L(a) - \hat{V}_n^*(a)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}) + \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n(a) - \hat{V}_n^*(a)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}^{|X|}\left(2 \sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |R_n(a, u) + \tilde{R}_n(a, u)| > x(\alpha/2)^{3/2}\right) \\ &\quad + K S_n x + \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n^*(a)| > S_n) + \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n^*(a)| > S_n) \\ &\leq K(x\alpha^{3/2})^{-q} \mathbb{E}^{|X|}\left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |R_n(a, u) + \tilde{R}_n(a, u)|^q\right] \\ &\quad + K S_n x + 2\mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n^*(a)| > S_n), \end{aligned}$$

where we also applied Markov's inequality in the last step. Before we derive an upper bound on the expectation involving R_n and \tilde{R}_n , let us consider the probability involving \hat{V}_n^* . Noting that $D_n(a, 0) = 0$ and that a Taylor expansion reveals $|D_n(a, u)| \geq \delta_n^{3/2} \kappa u^2$ for some $\kappa > 0$, we know from (Theorem 4, [Durot, 2002](#)), that

$$\mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n^*(a)| > S_n) \leq K \exp(-\kappa^2 \delta_n^3 S_n^3 / 2) \leq K \exp(-\kappa^2 \log(n\delta_n^2)^3 / 2).$$

Note further that $\mathbb{E}[(Y^n - \Phi_n(X))^q | X]$ is bounded and that $Y_i^n - \Phi_n(X_i)$ are independent under $\mathbb{P}^{|X|}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, it follows from [Sakhanenko \(1985\)](#) that there exist $\mathbb{P}^{|X|}$ -Brownian motions W_n and some constant $A > 0$, s.t.

$$\mathbb{E}^{|X|}\left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left|\Lambda_n(t) - \int_0^t \Phi_n \circ F_n^{-1}(u) du - \frac{W_n(L^n(t))}{\sqrt{n}}\right|^q\right] \leq A n^{1-q}.$$

Thus, by definition of \tilde{R}_n , by definition of Ω_n and by the modulus of continuity of the Brownian motion (Theorem 1.12, [Mörters and Peres, 2010](#)),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{|X|}\left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |\tilde{R}_n(a, u)|^q\right] \\ &\leq \frac{n^{2q/3}}{\delta_n^{q/6}} \mathbb{E}^{|X|}\left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left|\Lambda_n(t) - \int_0^t \Phi_n \circ F_n^{-1}(x) dx - \frac{W_n(L^n(t))}{\sqrt{n}}\right|^q\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}^{|X|}\left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} \left|\frac{n^{1/6}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} W_n(L^n(L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))))\right|^q\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{n^{1/6}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} W_n(L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) - (1 - \psi_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))^{1/2} W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u) \\
& - (1 - (1 - \psi_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))^{1/2}) W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u) \Big|^q \Big] \\
& \leq A \frac{n^{2q/3}}{\delta_n^{q/6}} n^{1-q} + \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} \left| \frac{n^{1/6}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} W_n(L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{n^{1/6}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} W_n(L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) + (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u(1 - \psi_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))) \right|^q \right] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |\psi_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u)|^q \right] \\
& \leq A \frac{n^{1-q/3}}{\delta_n^{q/6}} + \frac{n^{1/6}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |W_n(L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - W_n(L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)) + (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u(1 - \psi_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))) \right|^q \Big] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |W_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^n(u)|^q \right] \frac{K \log(n)^q}{n^{q/2}} \delta_n^q \\
& \leq K \frac{n^{1-q/3}}{\delta_n^{q/6}} + \frac{K \log(n)^q}{n^{q/2}} \delta_n^q + \frac{n^{1/6}}{\delta_n^{1/6}} \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u-v| \leq (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} T_n (\log(n)/n) \delta_n} |W_n(v) - W_n(u)|^q \right] \\
& \leq K \frac{n^{1-q/3}}{\delta_n^{q/6}} + \frac{K \log(n)^q}{n^{q/2}} \delta_n^q + T_n^{q/2} \frac{\log(n)^{q/2}}{n^{q/2}} \delta_n^q \\
& \leq K n^{1-q/3} \delta_n^{-q/6} + K n^{-q/3} \delta_n^q + K n^{-q/3} \delta_n^{q/2} \\
& \leq K n^{1-q/3} \delta_n^{-q/6}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |R_n(a, u)|^q \right] \\
& = \frac{n^{2q/3}}{\delta_n^{q/6}} \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} \left| \int_{\lambda_n^{-1}(a)}^{L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a)))} \Phi_n \circ F_X^{-1}(x) - \Phi_n \circ F_n^{-1}(x) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \Phi'_n(x) \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(x))}{\sqrt{n} p_X \circ F_n^{-1}(x)} + \Phi'_n(x) \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(x))}{\sqrt{n} p_X \circ F_n^{-1}(x)} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{B_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a_n))}{\sqrt{n} (\lambda_n^{-1})'(a_n)} dx \right|^q \right] \\
& \leq \frac{n^{2q/3}}{\delta_n^{q/6}} \sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |L_n^{-1}((n/\delta_n)^{-1/3}u + L_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))) - \lambda_n^{-1}(a)|^q \\
& \quad \cdot \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[K \delta_n^q \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |F_X^{-1}(t) - F_n^{-1}(t) - \frac{B_n(F_X \circ F_n^{-1}(t))}{\sqrt{n} p_X \circ F_n^{-1}(t)}| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + K \delta_n^q n^{-q/2} \sup_{|v-w| \leq (n/\delta_n)^{-1/3} T_n} |B_n(w) - B_n(v)|^q \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K n^{q/3} \delta_n^{q/6} \delta_n^q T_n^q (n^{-q} \log(n)^{2q} + n^{-q/2} (n/\delta_n)^{-q/6} T_n^{q/2} \log(n \delta_n^2)^{q/2}) \\
&\leq K n^{-q/3} \delta_n^q + K n^{-q/3} \delta_n^{q/6} \\
&\leq K n^{1-q/3} \delta_n^{-q/6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |R_n(a, u) + \tilde{R}_n(a, u)|^q \right] \leq K n^{1-q/3} \delta_n^{-q/6}$$

and we obtain again by (Theorem 4, [Durot, 2002](#)),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^{|X|} (|\hat{U}_n^L(a) - \hat{V}_n(a)| > \alpha) &\leq K (x \alpha^{3/2})^{-q} \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\sup_{|u| \leq T_n} |R_n(a, u) + \tilde{R}_n(a, u)|^q \right] \\
&\quad + K S_n x + 2 \mathbb{P}^{|X|} (|\hat{V}_n^*(a)| > S_n) \\
&\leq K (x \alpha^{3/2})^{-q} n^{1-q/3} \delta_n^{-q/6} + K S_n x
\end{aligned}$$

for every (x, α) , satisfying

$$\alpha \in (0, S_n], \quad x > 0, \quad K \delta_n^3 S_n^2 \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha \log(2x\alpha)}.$$

Now for any $\varepsilon > 0$, every $\alpha \in ((n \delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n \delta_n^2), (n \delta_n^2)^{-\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-1}]$ and

$$x_{\alpha, n} := S_n^{-1/(q+1)} \alpha^{-3q/(2(q+1))} n^{(3-q)/(3(q+1))} \delta_n^{-q/(6(q+1))}$$

we have $(x_{\alpha, n} \alpha^{3/2})^{-q} n^{1-q/3} \delta_n^{-q/6} \leq S_n x_{\alpha, n}$, $\alpha x_{\alpha, n} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ and so $(\alpha, x_{\alpha, n})$ does in fact satisfy

$$-\frac{1}{\alpha \log(2x_{\alpha, n} \alpha)} \geq K \delta_n^3 S_n^2.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}^{|X|} (|\hat{U}_n^L(a) - \hat{V}_n(a)| > \alpha) \leq K S_n x_{\alpha, n}.$$

By definition, $|\hat{U}_n^L(a) - \hat{V}_n(a)|$ is bounded by $2T_n$ and thus, using that $q > 12$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E}^{|X|} [|\hat{U}_n^L(a) - \hat{V}_n(a)|] da &= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \int_0^{2T_n} \mathbb{P}^{|X|} (|\hat{U}_n^L(a) - \hat{V}_n(a)| > \alpha) d\alpha da \\
&\leq K \delta_n ((n \delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n \delta_n^2) + K T_n S_n x_{(n \delta_n^2)^{-\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-1}} \\
&\quad + K \int_{(n \delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n \delta_n^2)}^{(n \delta_n^2)^{-\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-1}} S_n x_{\alpha, n} d\alpha) \\
&\leq K (n \delta_n^2)^{-1/6} / \log(n \delta_n^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{\hat{U}_n^L(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\
&= \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{\hat{V}_n(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}^{|X|}}((n \delta_n^2)^{-1/6}).
\end{aligned}$$

- As the last step, we want to approximate \hat{V}_n by $\tilde{V}_n \circ \lambda_n^{-1}$ in the previous integral. By a Taylor expansion, there exists $K > 0$, s.t. for all $|u| \leq S_n$

$$|D_n(a, u) - d_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))u^2| \leq K n^{-1/3} \delta_n^{-1/6} \delta_n^2 S_n^3.$$

By similar arguments as before, we have by (Proposition 1, [Durot, 2002](#)) and (Theorem 4, [Durot, 2002](#)), for every (x, α) , satisfying

$$\alpha \in (0, S_n], \quad x > 0, \quad K \delta_n^3 S_n^2 \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha \log(2x\alpha)},$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n(a) - \tilde{V}_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))| > \alpha) &\leq \mathbb{P}^{|X|}\left(2 \sup_{|u| \leq S_n} |D_n(a, u) - d_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))u^2| > x\alpha^{3/2}\right) \\ &\quad + K S_n x + \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n(a)| > S_n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}_{\{K n^{-1/3} \delta_n^{-1/6} \delta_n^2 S_n^3 > x\alpha^{3/2}\}} + K S_n x \\ &\quad + K \exp(-\kappa^2 \delta_n^3 S_n^3 / 2). \end{aligned}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, every $\alpha \in ((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n\delta_n^2), (n\delta_n^2)^{-\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-1}]$ and

$$x_{\alpha, n} := 2K \alpha^{-3/2} n^{-1/3} \delta_n^{-1/6} \delta_n^2 S_n^3,$$

we have $\alpha x_{\alpha, n} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ and so $(\alpha, x_{\alpha, n})$ satisfies

$$-\frac{1}{\alpha \log(2x_{\alpha, n}\alpha)} \geq K \delta_n^3 S_n^2$$

for n large enough. Thus, for n large enough, we have

$$\mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n(a) - \tilde{V}_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))| > \alpha) \leq K S_n x_{\alpha, n}$$

for every $\alpha \in ((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n\delta_n^2), (n\delta_n^2)^{-\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-1}]$. By definition, $|\hat{V}_n(a) - \tilde{V}_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))|$ is bounded by $2S_n$ and so we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{|X|}[|\hat{V}_n(a) - \tilde{V}_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))|] &= \int_0^{2S_n} \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(|\hat{V}_n(a) - \tilde{V}_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))| > \alpha) d\alpha \\ &\leq K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n\delta_n^2) + K S_n x_{(n\delta_n^2)^{-\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-1}} \\ &\quad + K \int_{(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n\delta_n^2)}^{(n\delta_n^2)^{-\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-1}} S_n x_{\alpha, n} d\alpha \\ &\leq K(n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n\delta_n^2) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \mathbb{E}^{|X|}[|\hat{V}_n(a) - \tilde{V}_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))|] da &\leq K(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \delta_n (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} \delta_n^{-1} / \log(n\delta_n^2) \\ &\leq K \frac{1}{\log(n\delta_n^2)} \end{aligned}$$

and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{\hat{V}_n(a)}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da \\ = \int_{\lambda_n(0)}^{\lambda_n(1)} \left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))}{L'_n(\lambda_n^{-1}(a))} \right| \frac{1}{p_X(\Phi_n^{-1}(a))} da + o_{\mathbb{P}^{|X|}}((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6}). \end{aligned}$$

A change of variable, where a is replaced by $\lambda_n(a)$, proves the assertion. \square

LEMMA 6.14. Assume that Φ_0 is differentiable with Hölder-continuous derivative in a neighbourhood of zero with $\Phi'_0(0) > 0$. Furthermore, let p_X be continuously differentiable (one-sided at the boundary points) on $[-T, T]$ with $p_X > 0$ on $[-T, T]$ and assume that $n\delta_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, with the definitions as in Lemma 6.13,

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \left(\int_0^1 |\tilde{V}_n(t)| \frac{|\Phi'_n \circ F_X^{-1}(t)|}{(p_X \circ F_X^{-1}(t))^2 |L'_n(t)|} dt - \mu_n \right)$$

converges to a normal distribution under $\mathbb{P}^{|X|}$ with mean zero and variance σ^2 defined in (7).

PROOF. As in the proof of Lemma 6.13, we can show the assertion w.l.o.g. on Ω_n , as $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n) \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, with Ω_n defined just before Lemma 6.13. Let

$$V_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad V_n(t) := \underset{u \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{W_t^n(u) + d_n(t)u^2\},$$

denote a variation of \tilde{V}_n where the argmin is now considered over the whole real line instead of $[-S_n, S_n]$, where $S_n := \delta_n^{-1} \log(n\delta_n^2)$. Further, define

$$\eta_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad \eta_n(t) := \frac{|\Phi'_n \circ F_X^{-1}(t)|}{(p_X \circ F_X^{-1}(t))^2}$$

and set

$$Y_n(t) := \left(\left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right| - \mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right| \right] \right) \eta_n(t)$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$. Note that $V_n(t)$ can differ from $\tilde{V}_n(t)$ only if $V_n(t) > S_n$ and so we have by (Theorem 4, Durot, 2002) that there exists $\kappa > 0$, s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(V_n(t) \neq \tilde{V}_n(t)) &\leq \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(V_n(t) > S_n) \leq 2 \exp(-\kappa^2 \delta_n^3 S_n^3 / 2) = 2 \exp(-\kappa^2 \log(n\delta_n^2)^3 / 2) \\ &\leq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} / \log(n\delta_n^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note further that under $\mathbb{P}^{|X|}$, both

$$\frac{\tilde{V}_n(t)}{(L'_n(t))^{4/3}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{V_n(t)}{(L'_n(t))^{4/3}}$$

have bounded moments of any order and that $\eta_n(t)$ is bounded. So we have by Hölder's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\int_0^1 \left(\left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right| - \left| \frac{V_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right| \right) \eta_n(t) dt \right] \leq \mathbb{P}^{|X|}(V_n(t) \neq \tilde{V}_n(t)) \leq (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6} / \log(n\delta_n^2).$$

Combining this with the fact that $d_n(t)^{2/3} V_n(t)$ is distributed as $X(0)$ for any t , we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{|X|} \left[\int_0^1 \left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right| \eta_n(t) dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[|X(0)|] \int_0^1 \delta_n^{-1/3} (L'_n(t))^{1/3} \left| \frac{2}{\lambda'_n(t)} \right|^{2/3} \eta_n(t) dt + o_{\mathbb{P}}((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6}) \\ &= \int_0^1 \delta_n^{-1/3} (4\sigma_n^2 \circ F_X^{-1}(t))^{1/3} \left(\frac{p_X \circ F_X^{-1}(t)}{|\Phi'_n \circ F_X^{-1}(t)|} \right)^{2/3} \frac{|\Phi'_n \circ F_X^{-1}(t)|}{(p_X \circ F_X^{-1}(t))^2} dt + o_{\mathbb{P}}((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6}) \\ &= \int_{-T}^T \delta_n^{-1/3} (4\sigma_n^2(t) \Phi'_n(t))^{1/3} p_X(t)^{-1/3} dt + o_{\mathbb{P}}((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6}) \\ &= \mu_n + o_{\mathbb{P}}((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/6}). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove that

$$(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \int_0^1 Y_n(t) dt \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{|X}$ for $n \longrightarrow \infty$. For this, let us introduce

$$v_n := \text{Var}^{|X} \left((n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \int_0^1 Y_n(t) dt \right) = (n\delta_n^2)^{1/3} \text{Var}^{|X} \left((n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \int_0^1 Y_n(t) dt \right)$$

and note that from Fubini's theorem and symmetry of the covariance matrix,

$$v_n = 2(n\delta_n^2)^{1/3} \int_0^1 \int_s^1 |\eta_n(s)\eta_n(t)| \text{Cov}^{|X} \left(\left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right|, \left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(s)}{L'_n(s)} \right| \right) dt ds.$$

Note further that W_n has independent increments, so for $\kappa_n := (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)^2$, we know by definition of Ω_n that $\tilde{V}_n(t)$ and $\tilde{V}_n(s)$ are independent for all $|t-s| \geq \kappa_n$ as long as n is large enough. Thus,

$$v_n = 2(n\delta_n^2)^{1/3} \int_0^1 \int_s^{\min\{1, s+\kappa_n\}} |\eta_n(s)|^2 \text{Cov}^{|X} \left(\left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right|, \left| \frac{\tilde{V}_n(s)}{L'_n(s)} \right| \right) dt ds + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Now let

$$\hat{V}_n(t) := \underset{u \in [-L'_n(t) \log(n), L'_n(t) \log(n)]}{\text{argmin}} \{ \hat{W}_t^n(u) + d_n(t)u^2 \},$$

where

$$\hat{W}_t^n(u) := n^{1/6} (W_n(L_n(t) + n^{-1/3}u) - W_n(L_n(t)))$$

and note that $\hat{W}_t^n(u)$ is a $\mathbb{P}^{|X}$ -standard Brownian motion. Then,

$$| \text{Cov}^{|X}(|\tilde{V}_n(t)|, |\tilde{V}_n(s)|) - \text{Cov}^{|X}(|\hat{V}_n(t)|, |\hat{V}_n(s)|) | \leq K \sup_{t \in [0,1]} (\mathbb{E}^{|X} [|\tilde{V}_n(t) - \hat{V}_n(t)|^r])^{1/r}$$

for arbitrary $r > 1$ and every (s, t) . By assumption and a similar argument as before, we can replace \tilde{V}_n by \hat{V}_n and obtain

$$v_n = 2(n\delta_n^2)^{1/3} \int_0^1 \int_0^{\min\{1, s+\kappa_n\}} |\eta_n(s)|^2 \text{Cov}^{|X} \left(\left| \frac{\hat{V}_n(t)}{L'_n(t)} \right|, \left| \frac{\hat{V}_n(s)}{L'_n(s)} \right| \right) dt ds + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Arguing as in (Step 5, [Durot, 2007](#)), we have

$$v_n = \sigma^2 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

To prove asymptotic normality of $(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \int_0^1 Y_n(t) dt$, we use Bernstein's method of big blocks and small blocks, as in (Step 6, [Durot, 2007](#)). For this, let $\eta_n := (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)^5$, $\eta'_n := (n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3} \log(n\delta_n^2)^2$ and let N_n denote the integer part of $(\eta_n + \eta'_n)^{-1}$. Further, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a_0^n := 0$, $a_{2N_n+1}^n := 1$ and for every $j \in \{0, \dots, N_n-1\}$, let $a_{2j+1}^n := a_{2j}^n + \eta_n$ and $a_{2j+2}^n := a_{2j+1}^n + \eta'_n$. Finally, let $\xi_j^n := (n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \int_{a_{2j}^n}^{a_{2j+1}^n} Y_n(t) dt$. Then, by definition of Y_n , we know that $\mathbb{E}^{|X} [Y_n(t)] = 0$ and so we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{|X} \left[\left(\sum_{j=0}^{N_n-1} \int_{a_{2j+1}^n}^{a_{2j+2}^n} Y_n(t) dt \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{i,j} \int_{a_{2j+1}^n}^{a_{2j+2}^n} \int_{a_{2i+1}^n}^{a_{2i+2}^n} \text{Cov}^{|X} (Y_n(t), Y_n(s)) dt ds.$$

From independence we know that the terms with $i \neq j$ are equal to zero for large enough n , so the above expectation is of order $o((n\delta_n^2)^{-1/3})$. Consequently, $(n\delta_n^2)^{1/6} \int_0^1 Y_n(t) dt$ converges

to the same limit as $\sum_j \xi_j^n$ and as seen before, $\text{Var}^{IX}(\sum_j \xi_j^n)$ converges to σ^2 for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Further, we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$ by both Hölder's and Markov's inequality, that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N_n} \mathbb{E}[(\xi_j^n)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\xi_j^n| > \varepsilon\}}] \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_j^n|^3] \varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow 0$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. By the Lindeberg-Feller CLT, this shows that $\sum_j \xi_j^n$ converges to a centered normal distribution with variance σ^2 and the assertion follows. \square

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF HELLINGER CONSISTENCY

In this section, we give the proof that $\hat{\Phi}_n$ is Hellinger consistent. Before we start with the actual proof, let us introduce for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the functions

$$f_{\Psi, \Phi}: \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) := \frac{p_{\Psi}(x, y) + p_{\Phi}(x, y)}{2p_{\Phi}(x, y)},$$

$$m_{\Psi, \Phi}: \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad m_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) := \log(f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y)),$$

as well as the random variables

$$M_n(\Psi, \Phi) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_{\Psi, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i^n)$$

and their expectations

$$M(\Psi, \Phi) := \mathbb{E}_{\Phi}[m_{\Psi, \Phi}(X, Y)].$$

Note that Φ is identifiable by definition and that $M_n(\Phi, \Phi) = M^n(\Phi, \Phi) = 0$ by definition of $m_{\Psi, \Phi}$. The following Lemma guarantees that $M_n(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \geq M_n(\Phi, \Phi)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which is a weaker statement than $\hat{\Phi}_n$ nearly maximizing M_n , but still suffices for the consistency proof.

LEMMA A.1. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $M_n(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \geq 0$.*

PROOF. By concavity of the logarithm and the definition of $\hat{\Phi}_n$ as the maximizer of the log-likelihood, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_n(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left(\frac{p_{\hat{\Phi}_n}(X_i, Y_i^n) + p_{\Phi}(X_i, Y_i^n)}{2p_{\Phi}(X_i, Y_i^n)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{p_{\hat{\Phi}_n}(X_i, Y_i^n)}{p_{\Phi}(X_i, Y_i^n)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(p_{\hat{\Phi}_n}(X_i, Y_i^n)) - \log(p_{\Phi}(X_i, Y_i^n)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(p_{\Phi}(X_i, Y_i^n)) - \log(p_{\Phi}(X_i, Y_i^n)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following Lemma guarantees that Φ is a well-separated point of maximum of $M(\cdot, \Phi)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

LEMMA A.2. *For every $\Psi, \Phi \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $M(\Psi, \Phi) \leq -d^2(\Psi, \Phi)/8$. In particular, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sup_{\Psi: d(\Psi, \Phi) \geq \varepsilon} M(\Psi, \Phi) \leq -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}.$$

PROOF. By some basic calculations and Lemma C.2 (ii), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M(\Psi, \Phi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}} m_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) d\mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X, Y)}(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0, 1\}} m_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0, 1\}} \log \left(\frac{p_{\Psi}(x, y) + p_{\Phi}(x, y)}{2p_{\Phi}(x, y)} \right) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p_{\Psi}(x,y) + p_{\Phi}(x,y)}{2p_{\Phi}(x,y)}} - 1 \right) p_{\Phi}(x,y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} 2 \int_{\{0,1\}} \sqrt{\frac{p_{\Psi}(x,y) + p_{\Phi}(x,y)}{2p_{\Phi}(x,y)}} p_{\Phi}(x,y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) - 2 \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{p_{\Psi}(x,y) + p_{\Phi}(x,y)}{2}} - \sqrt{p_{\Phi}(x,y)} \right)^2 d\zeta(y) dP(x)
\end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma C.1, we have

$$\left(\sqrt{\frac{p_{\Psi}(x,y) + p_{\Phi}(x,y)}{2}} - \sqrt{p_{\Phi}(x,y)} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{16} (\sqrt{p_{\Psi}(x,y)} - \sqrt{p_{\Phi}(x,y)})^2.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
M(\Psi, \Phi) &\leq -\frac{1}{16} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} (\sqrt{p_{\Psi}(x,y)} - \sqrt{p_{\Phi}(x,y)})^2 d\zeta(y) dP(x) = -\frac{1}{8} h^2(p_{\Psi}, p_{\Phi}) \\
&= -\frac{1}{8} d^2(\Psi, \Phi).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $d(\Psi, \Phi) \geq \varepsilon$, we have $M(\Psi, \Phi) \leq -\varepsilon^2/8$ and the assertion follows. \square

Note that the previous result implies $\Phi \in \arg\max_{\Psi \in \mathcal{F}} M(\Psi, \Phi)$. Moreover, we obtain that $M(\Psi, \Phi) = 0$ if and only if $\Psi = \Phi$. Before we proceed with the proof that the difference between M_n and M converges uniformly in probability over \mathcal{F} , we need an upper bound on the bracketing numbers of the set of functions $m_{\Psi, \Phi}$, uniformly in Φ .

PROPOSITION A.3. *Let $\mathcal{G}_{\Phi} := \{m_{\Psi, \Phi} \mid \Psi \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$, s.t. for all $\delta > 0$,*

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} N_{[]}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_{\Phi}, L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X,Y)})) \leq N_{[]}(\delta/2, \mathcal{F}, L^1(P)) \leq C^{1/\delta}.$$

PROOF. The second inequality is an immediate consequence of (Theorem 2.7.5, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)), where the constructed brackets in particular belong to \mathcal{F} . For arbitrary $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$, let $[\Psi_L, \Psi^U]$ denote a corresponding δ -bracket for Ψ , where $\Psi_L, \Psi^U \in \mathcal{F}$. Now let

$$\begin{aligned}
p_L: \mathbb{R} \times \{0,1\} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & p_L(x,y) &:= \Psi_L(x)^y (1 - \Psi^U(x))^{1-y}, \\
p^U: \mathbb{R} \times \{0,1\} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & p^U(x,y) &:= \Psi^U(x)^y (1 - \Psi_L(x))^{1-y}
\end{aligned}$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{\Phi, L}: \mathbb{R} \times \{0,1\} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & f_{\Phi, L}(x,y) &:= \frac{p_L(x,y) + p_{\Phi}(x,y)}{2p_{\Phi}(x,y)}, \\
f_{\Phi}^U: \mathbb{R} \times \{0,1\} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & f_{\Phi}^U(x,y) &:= \frac{p^U(x,y) + p_{\Phi}(x,y)}{2p_{\Phi}(x,y)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f_{\Phi, L}(x, 0) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1 - \Psi^U(x)}{2(1 - \Phi(x))} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1 - \Psi(x)}{2(1 - \Phi(x))} = f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, 0),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{\Phi,L}(x,1) &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\Psi_L(x)}{2\Phi(x)} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\Psi(x)}{2\Phi(x)} = f_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,1), \\
f_{\Phi}^U(x,0) &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1 - \Psi_L(x)}{2(1 - \Phi(x))} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1 - \Psi(x)}{2(1 - \Phi(x))} = f_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,0), \\
f_{\Phi}^U(x,1) &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\Phi^U(x)}{2\Phi(x)} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\Psi(x)}{2\Phi(x)} = f_{\Psi,\Phi}(x,1),
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. for every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$f_{\Phi,L}(x, y) \leq f_{\Psi,\Phi}(x, y) \leq f_{\Phi}^U(x, y).$$

Defining

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{\Phi,L} : \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & m_{\Phi,L}(x, y) &:= \log(f_{\Phi,L}(x, y)) \\
m_{\Phi}^U : \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & m_{\Phi}^U(x, y) &:= \log(f_{\Phi}^U(x, y)),
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$m_{\Phi,L}(x, y) \leq m_{\Psi,\Phi}(x, y) \leq m_{\Phi}^U(x, y)$$

by definition of $m_{\Psi,\Phi}$. Moreover, from Lemma C.2 (i), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|m_{\Phi}^U - m_{\Phi,L}\|_{1, \mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X,Y)}} &= \left\| \log\left(\frac{p^U + p_{\Phi}}{2p_{\Phi}}\right) - \log\left(\frac{p_L + p_{\Phi}}{2p_{\Phi}}\right) \right\|_{1, \mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X,Y)}} \\
&= \left\| \log\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{p^U}{2p_{\Phi}}\right) - \log\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{p_L}{2p_{\Phi}}\right) \right\|_{1, \mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X,Y)}} \\
&\leq 2 \left\| \frac{p^U}{2p_{\Phi}} - \frac{p_L}{2p_{\Phi}} \right\|_{1, \mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X,Y)}} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \{0,1\}} \left| \frac{p^U(x, y) - p_L(x, y)}{p_{\Phi}(x, y)} \right| d\mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X,Y)}(x, y) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left| \frac{p^U(x, y) - p_L(x, y)}{p_{\Phi}(x, y)} \right| p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} |p^U(x, y) - p_L(x, y)| \mathbf{1}_{\{p_{\Phi}(x, y) > 0\}} d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Phi^U(x) - \Phi_L(x)| + |1 - \Phi^U(x) - (1 - \Phi_L(x))| dP(x) \\
&= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Phi^U(x) - \Phi_L(x)| dP(x) \\
&= 2 \|\Phi^U - \Phi_L\|_{1,P} \\
&\leq 2\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $[m_{\Phi,L}, m_{\Phi}^U]$ is a 2δ -bracket enclosing $m_{\Psi,\Phi} \in \mathcal{G}_{\Phi}$, where both, $m_{\Phi,L}$ and m_{Φ}^U , are contained in \mathcal{G}_{Φ} by construction. Consequently,

$$N_{[]}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_{\Phi}, L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\Phi}^{(X,Y)})) \leq N_{[]}(\delta/2, \mathcal{F}, L^1(P)).$$

□

Uniformly in Φ , the next Lemma states uniform convergence in probability of the difference $M_n(\cdot, \Phi) - M(\cdot, \Phi)$ over \mathcal{F} , which will later allow us to derive convergence of the approximate maximizers of $M_n(\cdot, \Phi)$ and $M(\cdot, \Phi)$. The proof makes use of Proposition A.3 and is based on a classical Glivenko-Cantelli argument (compare with (Lemma 3.1, [van de Geer, 2010](#))), which we had to modify for our setting to take into account the Φ -dependent function classes.

LEMMA A.4. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_\Phi \left(\sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{F}} |M_n(\Psi, \Phi) - M(\Psi, \Phi)| > \varepsilon \right) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. First of all, note that for \mathcal{G}_Φ defined as in Proposition A.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{F}} |M_n(\Psi, \Phi) - M(\Psi, \Phi)| &= \sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_{\Psi, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[m_{\Psi, \Phi}(X, Y^n)] \right| \\ &= \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_\Phi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma A.3, we know that there exists a positive constant C , independent of Φ , s.t.

$$N_{[]}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_\Phi, L^1(\mathbb{P}_\Phi^{(X, Y)})) \leq C^{2/\delta}$$

for all $\delta > 0$ and all $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}$. In other words, for every $\delta > 0$, there exists a δ -bracketing set $\{[g_j^{L, \Phi}, g_j^{U, \Phi}]\}_{j=1, \dots, N(\delta)}$ for \mathcal{G}_Φ with respect to $\mathbb{P}_\Phi^{(X, Y)}$, satisfying $N(\delta) \leq C^{2/\delta}$ and $g_j^{L, \Phi}, g_j^{U, \Phi} \in \mathcal{G}_\Phi$ for $j = 1, \dots, N(\delta)$, for every $\Phi \in \mathcal{F}$. More specifically, this means that

$$\|g_j^{U, \Phi} - g_j^{L, \Phi}\|_{1, \mathbb{P}_\Phi^{(X, Y)}} \leq \delta$$

for $j = 1, \dots, N(\delta)$ and that for every $g \in \mathcal{G}_\Phi$, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, N(\delta)\}$, such that

$$g_j^{L, \Phi} \leq g \leq g_j^{U, \Phi}.$$

Thus, for every $g \in \mathcal{G}_\Phi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] + \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] + \mathbb{E}_\Phi[|g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y) - g(X, Y)|] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] + \|g_j^{U, \Phi} - g\|_{1, \mathbb{P}_\Phi^{(X, Y)}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{L, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{L, \Phi}(X, Y)] - \delta,$$

leading to the following two inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] + \delta, \\ -\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)]\right) &\leq -\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{L, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{L, \Phi}(X, Y)]\right) + \delta, \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right| &\leq \max \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] \right|, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{L, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{L, \Phi}(X, Y)] \right| \right\} + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Defining $\mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta} := \{g_j^{L, \Phi} \mid j = 1, \dots, N(\delta)\} \cup \{g_j^{U, \Phi} \mid j = 1, \dots, N(\delta)\}$, we know from Proposition A.3, that $\mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_\Phi$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_\Phi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right| &\leq \max_{j=1, \dots, N(\delta)} \max \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{U, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{U, \Phi}(X, Y)] \right|, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_j^{L, \Phi}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g_j^{L, \Phi}(X, Y)] \right| \right\} + \delta \\ &= \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right| + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Now for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, we have $N_n \leq C^{2/\delta} = C^{4/\varepsilon}$ and we obtain from an application of Chebyshev's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\Phi, \delta}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta}} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi[g(X, Y)] \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta}} \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{\text{Var}_\Phi(g(X, Y))}{n} \\ &\leq C^{4/\varepsilon} \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{1}{n} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}'_{\Phi, \delta}} \text{Var}_\Phi(g(X, Y)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C^{4/\varepsilon} \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{1}{n} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\Phi, \delta}} \text{Var}_{\Phi}(g(X, Y)).$$

Assuming the variance is uniformly bounded in Φ , the assertion follows immediately. To this aim, note first that for arbitrary $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\Phi}(m_{\Psi, \Phi}(X, Y)) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\Phi}[m_{\Psi, \Phi}(X, Y)^2] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \log(f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y))^2 p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \log(f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y))^2 p_{\Phi}(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{\{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) \geq 1\}} d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \log(f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y))^2 p_{\Phi}(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{\{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) < 1\}} d\zeta(y) dP(x). \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma C.2 (ii), as well as using the fact that $0 \leq p_{\Psi} \leq 1$ for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \log(f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y))^2 p_{\Phi}(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{\{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) \geq 1\}} d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq 4 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} (\sqrt{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y)} - 1)^2 p_{\Phi}(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{\{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) \geq 1\}} d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq 4 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} (f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) - 2\sqrt{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y)} + 1) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq 4 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} (f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) + 1) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &= 4 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left(\frac{p_{\Psi}(x, y) + p_{\Phi}(x, y)}{2} + p_{\Phi}(x, y) \right) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq 4 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} 2 d\zeta(y) dP(x). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we obtain from an application of Lemma C.2 (iii), that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \log(f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y))^2 p_{\Phi}(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{\{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) < 1\}} d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y)} \right)^2 p_{\Phi}(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{\{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y) < 1\}} d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y)} + \frac{1}{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y)^2} \right) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{f_{\Psi, \Phi}(x, y)^2} \right) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left(1 + 4 \frac{p_{\Phi}(x, y)^2}{(p_{\Psi}(x, y) + p_{\Phi}(x, y))^2} \right) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} \left(1 + 4 \frac{p_{\Phi}(x, y)^2}{p_{\Phi}(x, y)^2} \right) p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x) \\ &= 5 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\{0,1\}} p_{\Phi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $p_\Psi(x, y) + p_\Phi(x, y) \geq p_\Phi(x, y)$. Combining these results, we have shown that indeed $\text{Var}_\Phi(m_{\Psi, \Phi}(X, Y)) \leq 16 + 5 = 21$. \square

Based on Lemma A.1, A.2 and A.4, we can now prove the following Theorem, following the idea of the proof of (Theorem 5.7, van der Vaart, 1998). Note that Theorem 3.1 immediately follows from this Theorem as well.

THEOREM A.5. *Let \mathbb{P}_Φ indicate that $\mathbb{P}_\Phi(Y = 1|X) = \Phi(X)$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_\Phi(d(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) > \varepsilon) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. By Lemma A.2, we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$ that $M(\Psi, \Phi) \leq -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}$ for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$ with $d(\Psi, \Phi) \geq \varepsilon$. Thus,

$$\{d(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \left\{M(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \leq -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}\right\} = \left\{-M(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}\right\}.$$

From Lemma A.1, we obtain

$$-M(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \leq M_n(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) - M(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \leq \sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{F}} |M(\Psi, \Phi) - M_n(\Psi, \Phi)|.$$

Consequently,

$$\left\{-M(\hat{\Phi}_n) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}\right\} \subseteq \left\{\sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{F}} |M_n(\Psi, \Phi) - M(\Psi, \Phi)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}\right\}$$

and by Lemma A.4, we have for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_\Phi(d(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Phi) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_\Phi\left(\sup_{\Psi \in \mathcal{F}} |M_n(\Psi, \Phi) - M(\Psi, \Phi)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}\right) \longrightarrow 0,$$

for $n \longrightarrow \infty$. \square

APPENDIX B: PROOF OF $L^1(P_X)$ - AND UNIFORM CONSISTENCY

In this section, we give the necessary technical results for proving $L^1(P_X)$ - and uniform convergence of the difference between the estimator $\hat{\Phi}_n$ and the true function Φ_n . We start with the following result, relating the L^1 -distance to the Hellinger distance, which we formulate here to fit in our setting.

LEMMA B.1. *For every $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{F}$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Phi(x) - \Psi(x)| dP_X(x) \leq \sqrt{2} d(\Phi, \Psi)$$

PROOF. For $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Phi(x) - \Psi(x)| dP_X(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Phi(x) - \Psi(x)| + |\Phi(x) - \Psi(x)| dP_X(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |1 - \Phi(x) - (1 - \Psi(x))| + |\Phi(x) - \Psi(x)| dP_X(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_\Phi(x, 0) - p_\Psi(x, 0)| + |p_\Phi(x, 1) - p_\Psi(x, 1)| dP_X(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_\Phi(x, y) - p_\Psi(x, y)| d\zeta(y) dP_X(x). \end{aligned}$$

By (Lemma 2.1, [Tsybakov, 2009](#)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |p_{\Phi}(x, y) - p_{\Psi}(x, y)| d\zeta(y) dP_X(x) &= \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \int_A p_{\Phi}(x, y) - p_{\Psi}(x, y) d\zeta(y) dP_X(x) \right| \\ &= V(p_{\Phi}, p_{\Psi}), \end{aligned}$$

where V denotes the total variation distance. From (Lemma 2.3, [Tsybakov, 2009](#)), we obtain that

$$V(p_{\Phi}, p_{\Psi}) \leq \sqrt{2}h(p_{\Phi}, p_{\Psi}) = \sqrt{2}d(\Phi, \Psi)$$

and the assertion follows. \square

The following result is a consequence of continuity of Φ_0 and implies pointwise convergence of Φ_n to a constant.

LEMMA B.2. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, s.t.*

$$|\Phi_n(y) - \Phi_n(x)| < \varepsilon$$

for all $n > N$.

PROOF. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, we know from continuity of Φ_0 that there exists $\delta > 0$, s.t.

$$|\Phi_0(z) - \Phi_0(0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{for all } |z| < \delta.$$

Now for arbitrary $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. both, $|\delta_n y| < \delta$ and $|\delta_n x| < \delta$ for all $n > N$. Then,

$$|\Phi_n(y) - \Phi_n(x)| = |\Phi_0(\delta_n y) - \Phi_0(\delta_n x)| \leq |\Phi_0(\delta_n y) - \Phi_0(0)| + |\Phi_0(0) - \Phi_0(\delta_n x)| < \varepsilon$$

and the assertion follows. \square

The following result is inspired by the well-known fact that sequences of pointwise convergent distribution functions with continuous limit converge uniformly as well. Exploiting the properties of distribution functions, it is possible to get this uniform convergence on the whole real line. However, because we compare two sequences of distribution functions with each other, where the pointwise limit of Φ_n is not a distribution function anymore, we can only obtain uniform convergence on compact intervals. Moreover, we had to make some necessary adjustments to the classical proof to work in our setting.

LEMMA B.3. *Let $G_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a distribution function and assume for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ that*

$$|G_n(x_0) - \Phi_n(x_0)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Then, for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |G_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF. Let $T > 0$ and consider the interval $[-T, T]$. Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$, we know from Lemma B.2 that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, s.t.

$$|\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(-T)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$$

for all $n > N$. By assumption, we can choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough, s.t.

$$|G_n(-T) - \Phi_n(-T)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \quad \text{and} \quad |G_n(T) - \Phi_n(T)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$$

also holds for all $n > N$. But this means

$$\Phi_n(-T) - \frac{\varepsilon}{5} < G_n(-T) \leq G_n(x) \leq G_n(T) < \Phi_n(T) + \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$$

for all $n > N$, where we used monotonicity of G_n . Note that this implies

$$|G_n(x) - G_n(-T)| < \Phi_n(T) + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} - (\Phi_n(-T) - \varepsilon/5) = \Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(-T) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{5} < \frac{3\varepsilon}{5}.$$

Combining the previous results, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |G_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| &\leq |G_n(x) - G_n(-T)| + |G_n(-T) - \Phi_n(-T)| + |\Phi_n(-T) - \Phi_n(x)| \\ &< |G_n(x) - G_n(-T)| + \frac{\varepsilon}{5} + |\Phi_n(T) - \Phi_n(-T)| \\ &< \frac{3\varepsilon}{5} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{5} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $n > N$ and for every $x \in [-T, T]$,

$$|G_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| < \varepsilon,$$

or in other words,

$$\sup_{x \in [-T, T]} |G_n(x) - \Phi_n(x)| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

□

APPENDIX C: AUXILIARY RESULTS

In this section, we summarize some technical and auxiliary results which are needed in the proofs of the other sections.

LEMMA C.1. *For $a, b \geq 0$, we have*

$$\frac{\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} - \sqrt{b}} = 2 \frac{\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} + \sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} + \sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}} \leq 2.$$

Moreover, we have

$$|\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b}|^2 \leq 16 \left| \sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} - \sqrt{b} \right|^2.$$

PROOF. We follow the idea of (Lemma 4.2, [van de Geer, 2010](#)). The first statement follows from

$$(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b})(\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}) = a - b,$$

and

$$2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} + \sqrt{b} \right) \left(\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} - \sqrt{b} \right) = 2 \left(\frac{a+b}{2} - b \right) = a + b - 2b = a - b.$$

For the second statement, note that

$$\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{b}{2}} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} + \sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{a} + 2\sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}} \leq 2 \frac{\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}} = 2.$$

By a combination of the first two statements, we obtain

$$|\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b}| = 2 \left| \sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} - \sqrt{b} \right| \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} + \sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}} \right) \leq 4 \left| \sqrt{\frac{a+b}{2}} - \sqrt{b} \right|$$

and the third statement follows from taking the square on both sides. \square

LEMMA C.2. For $a, b \in [0, \infty)$, we have

- (i) $|\log(1/2 + b) - \log(1/2 + a)| \leq 2|b - a|$,
- (ii) For $a \geq 1$, we have $\log(a) \leq 2(\sqrt{a} - 1)$ and $\log(a)^2 \leq 4(\sqrt{a} - 1)^2$,
- (iii) For $a \leq 1$, we have $\log(a)^2 \leq (1 - \frac{1}{a})^2$.

PROOF. (i) Without loss of generality, we assume $a \leq b$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\log(1/2 + b) - \log(1/2 + a)| &= \log\left(\frac{1/2 + b}{1/2 + a}\right) = \log\left(1 + \left(\frac{1/2 + b}{1/2 + a} - 1\right)\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1/2 + b}{1/2 + a} - 1 = \frac{1}{1/2 + a}(1/2 + b - (1/2 + a)) = \frac{1}{1 + 2a}2(b - a) \\ &\leq 2|b - a|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\log(1 + x) \leq x$ for $x \in [0, \infty)$.

- (ii) Let $g: [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g(a) := \log(a) - 2(\sqrt{a} - 1)$. Then, $g(1) = 0$ and

$$g'(a) = \frac{1}{a} - 2 \frac{1}{2\sqrt{a}} = \frac{1 - \sqrt{a}}{a} \leq 0.$$

Thus, $g(a) \leq 0$ for all $a \in [1, \infty)$, implying

$$\log(a) \leq 2(\sqrt{a} - 1).$$

The second assertion follows from the fact that $\log(a) \geq 0$ and $2(\sqrt{a} - 1) \geq 0$ for all $a \geq 1$.

- (iii) Let $g: (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g(a) := \log(a) - 1 + \frac{1}{a}$. Then, $g(1) = 0$ and

$$g'(a) = \frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{a^2} = \frac{a - 1}{a^2} \leq 0.$$

Thus, $g(a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in (0, 1]$, implying

$$\log(a) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{a}.$$

The assertion now follows from the fact that $\log(a) \leq 0$ and $2(\sqrt{a} - 1) \leq 0$ for all $a \leq 1$. \square

LEMMA C.3. *Let $G: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and assume there exists $T \in \mathbb{R}$, s.t. $G|_{(-\infty, T)} < 0$ and $G|_{[T, \infty)} \geq 0$. Then, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\int_s^\infty G(x)dx - \int_{-\infty}^s G(x)dx \leq \int_T^\infty G(x)dx - \int_{-\infty}^T G(x)dx.$$

In particular,

$$\max_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \int_s^\infty G(x)dx - \int_{-\infty}^s G(x)dx \right\} = \int_T^\infty G(x)dx - \int_{-\infty}^T G(x)dx.$$

PROOF. Consider $s \geq T$, then

$$\int_T^\infty G(x)dx - \int_s^\infty G(x)dx + \int_{-\infty}^s G(x)dx - \int_{-\infty}^T G(x)dx = \int_T^s G(x)dx + \int_T^s G(x)dx$$

which is greater than or equal to zero. The case $s < T$ follows similarly. \square

The following result is stated as an exercise in (Problem 3.2.5, [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)). For completeness, we decided to give the proof as well.

LEMMA C.4. *Let $(Z(s))_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a standard (two-sided) Brownian motion and let $a, b \in (0, \infty)$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,*

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{aZ(s) + bs^2 - cs\} =_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{2/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{Z(s) + s^2\} + \frac{c}{2b}$$

PROOF. By replacing s with $h(s) := (a/b)^{2/3}s + c/2b$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{aZ(s) + bs^2 - cs\} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{h(s) \in \mathbb{R}} \{aZ(h(s)) + bh(s)^2 - ch(s)\} \\ &= \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{2/3} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{aZ(h(s)) + bh(s)^2 - ch(s)\} + \frac{c}{2b} \end{aligned}$$

Using the properties of Brownian motion, we have

$$aZ(h(s)) =_{\mathcal{L}} a \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{1/3} Z(s) + aZ\left(\frac{c}{2b}\right) =_{\mathcal{L}} \frac{a^{4/3}}{b^{1/3}} Z(s) + aZ\left(\frac{c}{2b}\right)$$

and simple calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned} bh(s)^2 - ch(s) &= b \left(\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{4/3} s^2 + \frac{c}{b} \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{2/3} s + \frac{c^2}{4b^2} \right) - c \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{2/3} s - \frac{c^2}{2b} \\ &= \frac{a^{4/3}}{b^{1/3}} s^2 + c \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{2/3} s + \frac{c^2}{4b} - c \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{2/3} s - \frac{c^2}{2b} \\ &= \frac{a^{4/3}}{b^{1/3}} s^2 + \frac{c^2}{4b} - \frac{c^2}{2b}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these results, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{aZ(h(s)) + bh(s)^2 - ch(s)\} \\ =_{\mathcal{L}} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{a^{4/3}}{b^{1/3}} Z(s) + aZ\left(\frac{c}{2b}\right) + \frac{a^{4/3}}{b^{1/3}} s^2 + \frac{c^2}{4b} - \frac{c^2}{2b} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&=_{\mathcal{L}} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{a^{4/3}}{b^{1/3}} Z(s) + \frac{a^{4/3}}{b^{1/3}} s^2 \right\} \\
&=_{\mathcal{L}} \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{ Z(s) + s^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. \square

Funding. This work has been supported by the Research Unit 5381, DFG-grant RO3766/8-1.

REFERENCES

- BIRGÉ, L. (1989). The Grenander estimator: A nonasymptotic approach. *Ann. Stat.* **17** 1532–1549. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176347380>
- BRUNK, H. D. (1970). Estimation of isotonic regression. In *Nonparametric Techniques in Statistical Inference (Proc. Sympos., Indiana Univ., Bloomington, Ind., 1969)* 177–197. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- CAROLAN, C. and DYKSTRA, R. (1999). Asymptotic behavior of the Grenander estimator at density flat regions. *Can. J. Stat.* **27** 557–566. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3316111>
- CATOR, E. (2011). Adaptivity and optimality of the monotone least-squares estimator. *Bernoulli* **17** 714–735. <https://doi.org/10.3150/10-BEJ289>
- CATTANEO, M. D., JANSSON, M. and NAGASAWA, K. (2024). Bootstrap-assisted inference for generalized Grenander-type estimators. *Ann. Stat.* **52** 1509–1533. <https://doi.org/10.1214/24-AOS2402>
- CATTANEO, M. D., COX, G. F., JANSSON, M. and NAGASAWA, K. (2025). Continuity of the Distribution Function of the argmax of a Gaussian Process. *arXiv: 2501.13265*.
- DUROT, C. (2002). Sharp asymptotics for isotonic regression. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **122** 222–240. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004400100171>
- DUROT, C. (2007). On the \mathbb{L}_p -error of monotonicity constrained estimators. *Ann. Stat.* **35** 1080–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1214/009053606000001497>
- DUROT, C. (2008). Monotone nonparametric regression with random design. *Math. Methods Stat.* **17** 327–341. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S1066530708040042>
- DUROT, C., KULIKOV, V. N. and LOPUHAÄ, H. P. (2012). The limit distribution of the L_∞ -error of Grenander-type estimators. *Ann. Stat.* **40** 1578–1608. <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1015>
- DUROT, C. and LOPUHAÄ, H. P. (2018). Limit theory in monotone function estimation. *Stat. Sci.* **33** 547–567. <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-STS664>
- DVORETZKY, A., KIEFER, J. and WOLFOWITZ, J. (1956). Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **27** 642–669. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728174>
- GRENANDER, U. (1957). On the theory of mortality measurement. II. *Skand. Aktuarietidskr.* **1956** 125–153.
- GROENEBOOM, P. (1983). The concave majorant of Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.* **11** 1016–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176993450>
- GROENEBOOM, P. (1985). Estimating a monotone density. In *Proceedings of the Berkeley conference in honor of Jerzy Neyman and Jack Kiefer, held in Berkeley, California, June 20 – July 1, 1983. Volume II* 539–555. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Advanced Books and Software; Hayward, Calif.: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- GROENEBOOM, P., HOOGHIEMSTRA, G. and LOPUHAÄ, H. P. (1999). Asymptotic normality of the L_1 error of the Grenander estimator. *Ann. Stat.* **27** 1316–1347. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1017938928>
- GROENEBOOM, P. and JONGBLOED, G. (2014). *Nonparametric estimation under shape constraints. Estimators, algorithms and asymptotics.* *Camb. Ser. Stat. Probab. Math.* **38**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139020893>
- GROENEBOOM, P. and JONGBLOED, G. (2018). Some developments in the theory of shape constrained inference. *Stat. Sci.* **33** 473–492. <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-STS657>
- GROENEBOOM, P. and WELLNER, J. A. (1992). *Information bounds and nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation.* *DMV Semin.* **19**. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag.
- HAN, Q. and KATO, K. (2022). Berry-Esseen bounds for Chernoff-type nonstandard asymptotics in isotonic regression. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **32** 1459–1498. <https://doi.org/10.1214/21-AAP1716>
- JANKOWSKI, H. (2014). Convergence of linear functionals of the Grenander estimator under misspecification. *Ann. Stat.* **42** 625–653. <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-AOS1196>

- KIM, J. and POLLARD, D. (1990). Cube root asymptotics. *Ann. Stat.* **18** 191–219. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176347498>
- KOMLÓS, J., MAJOR, P. and TUSNÁDY, G. (1975). An approximation of partial sums of independent RV's, and the sample DF. *I. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verw. Geb.* **32** 111–131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00533093>
- KULIKOV, V. N. and LOPUHAÄ, H. P. (2005). Asymptotic normality of the L_k -error of the Grenander estimator. *Ann. Stat.* **33** 2228–2255. <https://doi.org/10.1214/009053605000000462>
- MALLICK, S., SARKAR, S. and KUCHIBHOTLA, A. K. (2023). New Asymptotic Limit Theory and Inference for Monotone Regression. *arXiv: 2310.20058*.
- MÖRTERS, P. and PERES, Y. (2010). *Brownian motion. With an appendix by Oded Schramm and Wendelin Werner.* *Camb. Ser. Stat. Probab. Math.* **30**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511750489>
- PATILEA, V. (2001). Convex models, MLE and misspecification. *Ann. Stat.* **29** 94–123. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/996986503>
- PRAKASA RAO, B. L. S. (1969). Estimation of a unimodal density. *Sankhyā, Ser. A* **31** 23–36.
- ROSENTHAL, H. P. (1973). On Subspaces of L_p . *Annals of Mathematics* **97** 344–373.
- SAKHANENKO, A. I. (1985). Estimates in the invariance principle.
- STRYHN, H. (1996). The location of the maximum and asymmetric two-sided Brownian motion with triangular drift. *Stat. Probab. Lett.* **29** 279–284. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-7152\(95\)00183-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-7152(95)00183-2)
- TSYBAKOV, A. B. (2009). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation.* *Springer Ser. Stat.* New York, NY: Springer.
- VAN DE GEER, S. (1993). Hellinger-consistency of certain nonparametric maximum likelihood estimators. *Ann. Stat.* **21** 14–44. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176349013>
- VAN DE GEER, S. A. (2010). *Empirical processes in M-estimation.*, reprint of the 2000 hardback ed. ed. *Camb. Ser. Stat. Probab. Math.* **6**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics.* *Camb. Ser. Stat. Probab. Math.* **3**. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511802256>
- VAN DER VAART, A. and WELLNER, J. A. (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes. With applications to statistics.* *Springer Ser. Stat.* New York, NY: Springer.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. and WELLNER, J. A. (2023). *Weak convergence and empirical processes. With applications to statistics*, 2nd expanded edition ed. *Springer Ser. Stat.* Cham: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29040-4>
- WESTLING, T. and CARONE, M. (2020). A unified study of nonparametric inference for monotone functions. *Ann. Stat.* **48** 1001–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-AOS1835>
- WRIGHT, F. T. (1981). The Asymptotic Behavior of Monotone Regression Estimates. *The Annals of Statistics* **9** 443–448.