

STRONG CONVERGENCE OF KERNEL ESTIMATES OF NONPARAMETRIC REGRESSION FUNCTIONS

ZHAO LINCHENG(赵林城)* FANG ZHAOBEN(方兆本)*

Abstract

Let $(X, Y), (X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ be i. i. d. random vectors taking values in $R_d \times R$ with $E(|Y|) < \infty$. To estimate the regression function $m(x) = E(Y|X=x)$, we use the kernel estimate $m_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_i - x}{h_n}\right) Y_i / \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_j - x}{h_n}\right)$, where $K(x)$ is a kernel function and h_n a window width. In this paper, we establish the strong consistency of $m_n(x)$ when $E(|Y|^p) < \infty$ for some $p > 1$ or $E\{\exp(t|Y|^\lambda)\} < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and $t > 0$. It is remarkable that other conditions imposed here are independent of the distribution of (X, Y) .

§ 1. Introduction

Let $(X, Y), (X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ be independent identically distributed $R^d \times R$ valued random vectors with $E|Y| < \infty$. The regression function

$$m(x) = E(Y|X=x)$$

is estimated by

$$m_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}(x) Y_i, \quad (1)$$

where $W_{ni}(x)$ is a Borel measurable function of x and X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n . The so-called kernel estimate can be obtained by putting

$$W_{ni}(x) = K\left(\frac{X_i - x}{h}\right) / \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_j - x}{h}\right), \quad (2)$$

where $K(x)$ is a given kernel density on R^d and $h = h_n$ is a positive number depending upon n only; for definition, we treat $0/0$ in (2) as 0.

The fundamental problem of large-sample nonparametric regression theory is to find the conditions under which $m_n(x)$ is a strong consistent estimate of $m(x)$. The first general result in this direction belongs to Devroye (1981[1]). He proved the strong consistency of $m_n(x)$ under a series of restrictions including the crucial one that Y is bounded. Recently we succeeded in getting rid of this excessively

stringent condition, and establish the strong consistency of $m_n(x)$ under more natural and reasonable conditions.

In this paper, either the ordinary Euclidean norm or the maximum component norm $\|x\| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x^{(i)}|$ can be taken as the norm of $x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(d)})$. Such as in [1], the kernel $K(x)$ satisfies

(i) there exist positive numbers, $r, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2$ such that

$$\tilde{c}_1 I(\|x\| \leq r) \leq K(x) \leq \tilde{c}_2 I(\|x\| \leq r), \quad (3)$$

where $I(A)$ is the indicator function of set A . We establish the following

Theorem 1. Suppose that $E|Y|^p < \infty$ for some $p > 1$, kernel K satisfies condition (3), $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{p}, 1)$ is a constant, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n = 0$, and $\inf_n \{h_n^d / n^{\alpha-1}\} > 0$. Then we have

$$m_n(X) \rightarrow m(X) \quad \text{a. s. as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4)$$

Theorem 2. Suppose that $E\{\exp(t|Y|^\lambda)\} < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and $t > 0$, kernel K satisfies condition (3), $\alpha > \frac{1}{\lambda}$ is a constant, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n = 0$, and $\inf_n \{nh_n^d / (\log n)^{1+\alpha}\} > 0$, then (4) is true.

It is remarkable that the conditions of these theorems impose no specific restrictions on the distribution μ of X .

§ 2. Proof of the Theorems

For simplicity, we use the following symbols in this paper:

$c > 0$ denotes a constant;

$c(x) > 0$ denotes a constant depending upon x ;

$c(x, \Delta) > 0$ denotes a constant depending upon x and Δ , where $\Delta = (X_1, X_2, \dots)$.

(These constants can be assumed to be different values in their appearance, even within the same expression.)

μ denotes the distribution of X ; F denotes the support of μ ;

S_ρ —the closed sphere of radius ρ centered at x .

Lemma 1. Suppose that $\int |f(x)|^p \mu(dx) < \infty$ for some $p > 0$, then

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \int_{S_\rho} |f(u) - f(x)|^p \mu(du) / \mu(S_\rho) = 0, \quad \text{for a. e. } x(\mu). \quad (5)$$

We emphasize that (5) is true for both the norms mentioned earlier. Refer to [2], p. 191, example 20.

Lemma 2. Let $h = h_n$ be a sequence of positive numbers with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h = 0$. For all $c > 0$, there exists a nonnegative function g with $g(x) < \infty$ such that

$$h^d / \mu(S_{ch}) \rightarrow g(x) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{a. e. } x(\mu). \quad (6)$$

Refer to the proof of [1], Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 3.^[3] Let r. v. $Y \sim B(n, p)$, $0 < p < 1$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$P\left(\frac{Y}{n} - p \leq -\varepsilon\right) \leq \exp(-n\varepsilon^2/(2p + \varepsilon)). \quad (7)$$

There exists a similar result for $P\left(\frac{Y}{n} - p \geq \varepsilon\right)$.

Proof of the Theorems. In the following we shall make repeatedly use of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. On each special occasion of its use, there is an exceptive set on which the related formula may not be true, these exceptive sets sum up to a μ -null set. For simplicity of writing we suppose that this set is empty, this can be done without loss of generality. Take $x \in F$. Put $A_i = \{\|X_i - x\| \leq rh\}$,

$$N = \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j), \quad p_n = \mu(S_{rh}).$$

By (3)

$$J_n(x) \triangleq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}(x)(m(X_i) - m(x)) \right| \leq \tilde{c}_2 / \tilde{c}_1 \cdot N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |m(X_i) - m(x)| I(A_i). \quad (8)$$

Write $g(u) = |m(u) - m(x)|$. Let

$$U_n(x) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i) |m(X_i) - m(x)| = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i) g(X_i), \quad (9)$$

$$\tilde{E}U_n(x) = E\{U_n(x) | I(A_1), \dots, I(A_n)\}. \quad (10)$$

Using lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}U_n(x) &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i) \int_{S_{rh}} |m(u) - m(x)| \mu(du) / \mu(S_{rh}) \\ &= \int_{S_{rh}} |m(u) - m(x)| \mu(du) / \mu(S_{rh}) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We proceed to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n(x) = 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (12)$$

Write $g_j = g(X_j)$, $\log_2 n = \log \log n$, and take $d_n = \log n \log_2 n$, $c_j = j^{1/p}$ (in Theorem. 1) or $2(1/t \log j)^{1/\lambda}$ (in Theorem. 2).

Let

$$\left. \begin{aligned} g'_j &= g_j I(g_j > c_j), \quad U'_n = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) g'_j, \\ g''_{nj} &= g_j I(N^{-1} I(A_j) g_j \leq d_n^{-1}), \quad U''_n = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) g''_{nj}, \\ g'''_{nj} &= g_j - g'_j - g''_{nj}, \quad U'''_n = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) g'''_{nj}. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (13)$$

Since $|y|^p$ is a convex function of y for $p > 1$, and for fixed $t > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, $\exp(ty^\lambda) I(y > a)$ is a convex function of $y \in (a, +\infty)$ for sufficiently large a , from the Jensen's inequality it is easy to see that $E|g(X_1)|^p < \infty$ or $E\{\exp(t|g(X_1)|^\lambda)\} < \infty$ according to the conditions of Theorem 1 or Theorem 2

$$\sum_j P(g_j > c_j) < \infty,$$

respectively. Hence

and by Borel-Cantelli's lemma, we have

$$P(g_j > c_j, \text{ i. o. }) = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g_j^2 I(g_j > c_j) < \infty \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (14)$$

By lemma 2, we have

$$np_n = n\mu(S_{rn}) \geq c(x) \cdot n^\alpha, \quad \forall n, \quad (15)$$

in the case of Theorem 1, and

$$np_n \geq c(x) (\log n)^{1+\alpha}, \quad \forall n, \quad (15')$$

in the case of Theorem 2. Therefore for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $\frac{1}{n\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1}{2} p_n$ for sufficiently large n . By Hoeffding's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(N^{-1} > \varepsilon) &= P(N < 1/\varepsilon) = P\left(\frac{N}{n} - p_n < \frac{1}{n\varepsilon} - p_n\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\frac{N}{n} - p_n < -\frac{1}{2} p_n\right) \leq \exp\left\{-n\left(\frac{1}{2} p_n\right)^2 / \left(2p_n + \frac{1}{2} p_n\right)\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\{-np_n/10\} \end{aligned}$$

when n is large enough. Hence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(N^{-1} > \varepsilon) < \infty.$$

By Borel-Cantelli's lemma, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} = 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (16)$$

From Schwarz's inequality, noticing (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (U'_n)^2 &\leq N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i) \sum_{j=1}^n g_j^2 I(g_j > c_j) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} I(N > 0) \sum_{j=1}^n g_j^2 I(g_j > c_j) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Now, we proceed to prove

$$U''_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (18)$$

Let $\tilde{E}(\cdot) = E(\cdot | I(A_1), \dots, I(A_n))$, $Z_j = d_n I(A_j) N^{-1} [g''_{nj} - E(g''_{nj} | A_j)]$, then $\tilde{E}Z_j = 0$, $Z_j \leq 1$, $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Suppose that $E|Y|^p < \infty$, or $E\{\exp(t|Y|^b)\} < \infty$, one can take $b < p$, $1 < b \leq 2$, since $e^z \leq 1 + z + |z|^b$ when $z \leq 1$, we have

$$\tilde{E}\{\exp(Z_j)\} \leq 1 + \tilde{E}|Z_j|^b \leq \exp(\tilde{E}|Z_j|^b).$$

When $I(A_1), \dots, I(A_n)$ are given, Z_1, \dots, Z_n are iid, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}\{\exp[d_n(U''_n - \tilde{E}U''_n)]\} &\leq \exp\left\{d_n^b N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) \tilde{E}|g''_{nj} - \tilde{E}g''_{nj}|^b\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{d_n^b N^{-b} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) \tilde{E}g^b(X_j)\right\} = \exp\left\{d_n^b N^{-(b-1)} I(N > 0) \int_{S_{rn}} g^b(v) \mu(dv) / \mu(S_{rn})\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\{d_n^b N^{-(b-1)} I(N > 0) g^{b*}(x)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we have written

$$\varphi^*(x) = \sup_{\rho > 0} \int_{S_\rho} \varphi(u) \mu(du) / \mu(S_\rho)$$

for any μ -integrable function $\varphi(x)$. Note that by Lemma 1 and the choice of x , we have $g^{b^*}(x) < \infty$. By (15) or (15') and $d_n = \log n \log_2 n$, we know that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$d_n^b \left(\frac{2}{np_n} \right)^{b-1} g^{b^*}(x) < \frac{1}{2} d_n \varepsilon$$

for $n \geq n_0$. So, by Hoeffding's inequality and Markov's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(U_n'' - \tilde{E}U_n'' \geq \varepsilon) &\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + P\left(U_n'' - \tilde{E}U_n'' \geq \varepsilon, N \geq \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\frac{N}{n} - p_n < -\frac{1}{2} p_n\right) + e^{-d_n \varepsilon} \int_{N \geq \frac{1}{2} np_n} \tilde{E}\{\exp[d_n(U_n'' - \tilde{E}U_n'')]\} dP \\ &\leq \exp(-np_n/10) + \exp(-d_n \varepsilon) \cdot \exp\{d_n^b (2/np_n)^{b-1} g^{b^*}(x)\} \\ &\leq \exp(-np_n/10) + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} d_n \varepsilon\right). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

By (15') and by the choice of d_n , we get

$$\sum_n P(U_n'' - \tilde{E}U_n'' \geq \varepsilon) < \infty, \text{ for any } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (21)$$

By Borel-Cantelli's lemma

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (U_n'' - \tilde{E}U_n'') \leq 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (22)$$

Recalling (11), we see that $\tilde{E}U_n'' \rightarrow 0$ a. s., thus,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n'' \leq 0 \quad \text{a. s.,}$$

therefore, (18) is true.

Now we come to prove: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n''' = 0$ a. s. Putting

$$D_n = \{j: 1 \leq j \leq n, I(A_j) \cdot N^{-1} > d_n^{-1}\}, \quad (23)$$

we have

$$N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) g_{nj}''' \leq \sum_{j \in D_n} N^{-1} I(A_j) c_j \leq N^{-1} c_n \#(D_n).$$

Hence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, in order to get $U_n''' \geq \varepsilon$, we must have

$$\#(D_n) \geq \varepsilon N c_n^{-1}. \quad (24)$$

Take a positive integer $k > \frac{1}{p\alpha - 1}$ in the case of Theorem 1, and $k=1$ in another case, by $c_n = n^{1/p}$ (in Theorem 1) or $c_n = 2 \cdot (t^{-1} \log n)^{1/\lambda}$ (in Theorem 2), recalling (15) or (15'), we know that there exists $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$N \geq \frac{1}{2} np_n, U_n''' \geq \varepsilon \Rightarrow \#(D_n) \geq \varepsilon \frac{1}{2} np_n c_n^{-1} \geq k \quad (25)$$

for $n \geq n_0$, and that

$$N \geq \frac{1}{2} np_n, j \in D_n \Rightarrow g_j > \frac{np_n}{2d_n}. \quad (26)$$

Hence, when $n \geq n_0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
P(U_n''' \geq \varepsilon) &\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + P\left(N \geq \frac{1}{2} np_n, U_n''' \geq \varepsilon\right) \\
&\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + P\left(\#\left\{j: j \leq n, g_j > \frac{np_n}{2d_n}\right\} > k\right).
\end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In the case of Theorem 1, since g_1, \dots, g_n are iid and $np_n \geq c(x)n^\alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(U_n''' \geq \varepsilon) &\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + \left\{\sum_{j=1}^n P\left(g_j > \frac{np_n}{2d_n}\right)\right\}^k \\
&\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + \left\{n\left(\frac{2d_n}{np_n}\right)^p E|g_1|^p\right\}^k \\
&\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + \{n d_n^p n^{-p\alpha} c(x)\}^k \\
&\leq \exp(-np_n/10) + c(x) d_n^{p/2} n^{-(p\alpha-1)/2}, \quad n \geq n_0.
\end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In the case of Theorem 2, from (15'), there exists $n'_0 = n'_0(x)$ such that

$$t \left| \frac{np_n}{2d_n} \right|^\lambda \geq 3 \log n \text{ for } n \geq n'_0.$$

Choosing $k=1$ in (27), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
P(U_n''' \geq \varepsilon) &\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + nP\left(g_1 > \frac{np_n}{2d_n}\right) \\
&\leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + n \cdot \exp\left(-t \left| \frac{np_n}{2d_n} \right|^\lambda\right) E[\exp(t|g_1|^\lambda)] \\
&\leq \exp(-np_n/10) + c(x)n \exp(-3 \log n) \\
&\leq \exp(-np_n/10) + c(x)n^{-2}, \quad n \geq n'_0.
\end{aligned} \quad (28')$$

From (28) or (28'), we get

$$\sum_n P(U_n''' \geq \varepsilon) < \infty, \text{ for any } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (29)$$

By Borel-Cantelli's lemma and $U_n''' \geq 0$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n''' = 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (30)$$

From (17), (18), (30) and $U_n(x) = U'_n + U''_n + U'''_n$, we know that (12) is true.

In the following we prove that

$$T_n(x) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^n W_{nj}(x) (Y_j - m(X_j)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (31)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $W_{nj}(x) = K((X_j - x)/h) / \sum_{i=1}^n K((X_i - x)/h)$ has been defined in (2).

Write $e_j = Y_j - m(X_j)$, take c_j, d_n as above, and let

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
e'_j &= e_j I(e_j > c_j), \quad T'_n = \sum_{j=1}^n W_{nj} e'_j, \\
e''_{nj} &= e_j I(W_{nj} e_j \leq d_n^{-1}), \quad T''_n = \sum_{j=1}^n W_{nj} e''_{nj}, \\
e'''_{nj} &= e_j - e'_j - e''_{nj}, \quad T'''_n = \sum_{j=1}^n W_{nj} e'''_{nj}.
\end{aligned} \right\} \quad (32)$$

Similarly, we get

$$\sum_j P(e_j > c_j) \leq \sum_j P\left(|Y_j| < \frac{1}{2} c_j\right) + \sum_j P\left(|m(X_j)| > \frac{1}{2} c_j\right) < \infty,$$

$$P(e_j > c_j, \text{ i. o. }) = 0,$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j^2 I(e_j > c_j) < \infty \quad \text{a. s.}$$

By Schwarz's inequality and (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (T'_n)^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n W_{nj}^2(x) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j^2 I(e_j > c_j) \\ &\leq (\tilde{c}_2/\tilde{c}_1)^2 N^{-1} I(N > 0) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j^2 I(e_j > c_j) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Writing $Z_j = d_n W_{nj} e''_{nj}$, we have $Z_j \leq 1$. When $\Delta = (X_1, X_2, \dots)$ is given, Z_1, \dots, Z_n are conditionally independent, and $E(Z_j | X_j) \leq 0$.

Assume that $1 < b \leq 2$, write $g_b(X_j) = E(|Y_j|^b | X_j)$, then we have as before

$$\begin{aligned} E(e^{Z_j} | X_j) &\leq 1 + E(|Z_j|^b | X_j) \leq \exp\{E(|Z_j|^b | X_j)\}, \\ E\{\exp(d_n T'_n) | \Delta\} &\leq \exp\left\{cd_n^b \sum_{j=1}^n W_{nj}^b g_b(X_j)\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{cd_n^b N^{-b} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) g_b(X_j)\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Suppose $p > 1$, by $\alpha > p^{-1}$, one can take $b > 1$ sufficiently close to 1 such that $q = p/b > 1$ and $\alpha > 1/q$. Suppose $\lambda > 0$, by $\alpha > \frac{1}{\lambda}$, one can take $b > 1$ sufficiently close to 1 such that the inequality $\alpha > 1/\nu$ is valid for $\nu = \lambda/b$. In this case, $E|g_b(X_j)|^q \leq E|Y_j|^q < \infty$, and $1/q < \alpha \leq 1$ for the occasion of Theorem 1. For the case of Theorem 2, we have $E\{\exp(t|g_b(X_j)|^\nu)\} < \infty$, and $\alpha > 1/\nu$. Therefore, from the proof of (12), we obtain

$$N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) g_b(X_j) \rightarrow g_b(x) \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (35)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Writing $\mu^\infty = \mu \times \mu \times \dots$, we have

$$cN^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n I(A_j) g_b(X_j) \leq c(x, \Delta) \quad \text{a. e. } \Delta(\mu^\infty). \quad (36)$$

Just as before, from Hoeffding's inequality

$$\sum_n P\left(N \leq \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) < \infty.$$

By Borel-Cantelli's lemma

$$P\left(N \leq \frac{1}{2} np_n, \text{ i. o. }\right) = 0. \quad (37)$$

Hence, when n is sufficiently large

$$N > \frac{1}{2} np_n, \quad \text{a. e. } \Delta(\mu^\infty). \quad (38)$$

From (34), recalling $np_n \geq c(x)(\log n)^{1+\alpha}$, $d_n = \log n \log_2 n$, for a. e. $\Delta(\mu^\infty)$ and given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(x, \Delta)$ such that

$$P(T_n''' \geq \varepsilon | \Delta) \leq e^{-d_n \varepsilon} E\{\exp(d_n T_n''') | \Delta\} \leq e^{-d_n \varepsilon} \exp\{d_n^b N^{-(b-1)} I(N > 0) c(x, \Delta)\} \\ \leq e^{-d_n \varepsilon} \exp\left\{d_n^b \left(\frac{2}{np_n}\right)^{b-1} c(x, \Delta)\right\} \leq e^{-d_n \varepsilon} e^{d_n^b/2} = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} d_n \varepsilon\right) \quad (39)$$

for $n \geq n_0$. Here, we get the second inequality by (36). By (38) we get the third one. From (39), we have

$$\sum_n P(T_n''' \geq \varepsilon | \Delta) < \infty, \text{ for any } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (40)$$

Hence, by Borel-Cantelli's lemma, we have

$$P(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n''' > 0 | \Delta) = 0, \text{ for a.e. } \Delta(\mu^\infty). \quad (41)$$

By Fubini's theorem, we have

$$P(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n''' > 0) = 0, \quad (42)$$

i. e.,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n''' \leq 0 \quad \text{a. s.}, \quad (43)$$

For the proof of $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n''' \leq 0$ a. s., write

$$D_n = \{j: 1 \leq j \leq n, W_{nj} e_j > d_n^{-1}\}. \quad (44)$$

Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n W_{nj} e_{nj}''' \leq \sum_{j \in D_n} (\tilde{c}_2 / \tilde{c}_1) N^{-1} I(A_j) c_j \leq (\tilde{c}_2 / \tilde{c}_1) N^{-1} c_n \#(D_n).$$

Therefore, in order to get $T_n''' \geq \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we must have

$$\#(D_n) \geq \tilde{c}_1 \tilde{c}_2^{-1} \varepsilon N c_n^{-1}. \quad (45)$$

Taking a positive integer $k > \frac{1}{p\alpha - 1}$, just as before, there exists $n_0 = n_0(x)$ such that

$$N \geq \frac{1}{2} np_n, \quad T_n''' \geq \varepsilon \Rightarrow \#(D_n) \geq k \quad (46)$$

for $n \geq n_0$, and

$$N \geq \frac{1}{2} np_n, \quad j \in D_n \Rightarrow e_j > \tilde{c}_1 np_n / (2d_n \tilde{c}_2) \triangleq c np_n / d_n. \quad (47)$$

Hence, when $n \geq n_0$, we have

$$P(T_n''' \geq \varepsilon) \leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + P\left(N > \frac{1}{2} np_n, T_n''' \geq \varepsilon\right) \\ \leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + P(\#\{j: j \leq n, e_j > c np_n / d_n\} > k). \quad (48)$$

In the case of Theorem 1, since e_1, \dots, e_n are iid, and $np_n \geq c(x)n^\alpha$, we have

$$P(T_n''' \geq \varepsilon) \leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + \left\{\sum_{j=1}^n P(e_j > c np_n / d_n)\right\}^k \\ \leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + \{n(d_n / (c np_n))^p E|e_1|^p\}^k \\ \leq P\left(N < \frac{1}{2} np_n\right) + \left\{n d_n^p n^{-p\alpha} c(x)\right\}^k \\ \leq \exp(-np_n/10) + c(x) d_n^{p/k} n^{-(p\alpha-1)/k}, \quad n \geq n_0. \quad (49)$$

In the case of Theorem 2, take $k=1$ in (48). Similar to the proof of (28), there exists $n' = n'_0(x)$ such that

$$P(T_n''' \geq \varepsilon) \leq \exp(-np_n/10) + c(x)n^{-2} \quad (49')$$

for $n > n'_0$. From (49) and (49'), we get

$$\sum_n P(T_n''' \geq \varepsilon) < \infty \text{ for any } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (50)$$

Hence, by Borel-Cantelli's lemma, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n''' \leq 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (51)$$

From (33), (43), (51) and $T_n(x) = T_n' + T_n'' + T_n'''$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{a. s.,} \quad (52)$$

Replacing e_j by $-e_j$, (52) implies

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{a. s..} \quad (53)$$

From (52) and (53), we get (31).

Finally by (8), (9), (12) and (31), noticing

$$\begin{aligned} |m_n(x) - m(x)| &\leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}(x) (m(X_i) - m(x)) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}(x) (Y_i - m(X_i)) \right| \\ &= J_n(x) + |T_n(x)|, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

for $x \in F$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |m_n(x) - m(x)| = 0 \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (55)$$

Since F is the support of μ , we have $\mu(F) = 1$. By Fubini's theorem, we get (4).

This completes the proof of Theorem 1 and 2.

References

- [1] Devroye, L., On the Almost Everywhere Convergence of Nonparametric Regression Function Estimates, *Ann. Statist.*, **9** (1981), 1310—1319.
- [2] Wheeden, R. L. & Zygmund, A., Measure and Integral, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1977.
- [3] Hoeffding, W., Probability Inequalities for sums of Bounded Random Variables, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **58** (1963), 13—30.

