HAL
open science

Variable selection through CART

Marie Sauvé, Christine Tuleau-Malot

To cite this version:

Marie Sauvé, Christine Tuleau-Malot. Variable selection through CART. ESAIM: Probability and Statistics, 2014, 18, pp.770-798. 10.1051/ps/2014006 . hal-00551375v1

HAL Id: hal-00551375

https://hal.science/hal-00551375v1

Submitted on 3 Jan 2011 (v1), last revised 9 Mar 2016 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Variable selection through CART☆

Marie SAUVE, Christine TULEAU-MALOT*,[a]

[a] *Laboratoire Jean-Alexandre Dieudonné, CNRS UMR 6621,*
Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis,
Parc Valrose, 06108 Nice Cedex 2, France.

Abstract

This paper deals with variable selection in the regression and binary classification frameworks. It proposes an automatic and exhaustive procedure which relies on the use of the CART algorithm and on model selection via penalization. This work, of theoretical nature, aims at determining adequate penalties, i.e. penalties which allow to get oracle type inequalities justifying the performance of the proposed procedure. Since the exhaustive procedure can not be executed when the number of variables is too big, a more practical procedure is also proposed and still theoretically validated. A simulation study completes the theoretical results.

Key words: binary classification, CART, model selection, penalization, regression, variable selection
2000 MSC: 62G05, 62G07, 62G20

1. Introduction

This paper deals with variable selection in nonlinear regression and classification using CART estimation and model selection approach. Our aim is to propose a theoretical variable selection procedure for nonlinear models and to consider some practical approaches.

Variable selection is a very important topic since we have to consider problems where the number of variables is very large while the number of variables that are really explanatory can be much smaller. This is the reason why we are interesting in their importance. The variable importance is a notion which allows the quantification of the ability of a variable to explain the studied phenomena. The formula, for the computation, depends on the considered model. In the literature, there are many variable selection procedures which combine primarily a concept of variable importance and model estimation. If we refer to the work of Kohavi and John ([17]) or Guyon and Elisseff ([14]), these methods are “filter”, “wrapper” or “embedded” methods. To summarize, (i) filter method is a pre-processing step which does not depend on the learning algorithm, (ii) in the wrapper method the learning model is used to induce the final model but also to search the optimal feature subset, and (iii) for embedded methods the features selection and the learning part can not be separated.
Let us mention some of those methods, in the regression and/or the classification framework.

☆The authors acknowledge the support of the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR), under grant ATLAS (JCJC06_137446) ”From Applications to Theory in Learning and Adaptive Statistics”.
*Corresponding author. Tel.: (+33) 04 92 07 60 20; Fax: (+33) 04 93 51 79 74.
Email address: `malot@unice.fr` (Christine TULEAU-MALOT)

1.1. General framework and State of the Art

Let us consider a linear regression model $Y = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j X^j + \varepsilon = X\beta + \varepsilon$ where ε is an unobservable noise, Y the response and $X = (X^1, \ldots, X^p)$ a vector of p explanatory variables. Let $\{(X_i, Y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}\}$ be a sample, i.e. n independent copies of the pair of random variables (X, Y).

The well-known Ordinary Least Square (OLS) estimator provides an useful way to estimate the vector β but it suffers from a main drawback: it is not adapted to variable selection since, when p is large, many components of β are non zero. However, if OLS is not a convenient method to perform variable selection, the least squares criterion often appears in model selection. For example, Ridge Regression and Lasso (wrapper methods) are penalized versions of OLS. Ridge Regression (see Hastie [16]) involves a L_2 penalization which produces the shrinkage of β but does not force any coefficients of β to be zero. So, Ridge Regression is better than OLS, but it is not a variable selection method unlike Lasso. Lasso (see Tibshirani [28]) uses the least squares criterion penalized by a L_1 penalty term. By this way, Lasso shrinks some coefficients and puts the others to zero. Thus, this last method performs variable selection but computationally, its implementation needs quadratic programming techniques.

Penalization is not the only way to perform variable or model selection. For example, we can cite the Subset Selection (see Hastie [16]) which provides, for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, the best subset of size k, i.e. the subset of size k which gives smallest residual sum of squares. Then, by cross validation, the final subset is selected. This wrapper method is exhaustive: it is consequently difficult to use it in practice when p is large. Often, Forward or Backward Stepwise Selection (see Hastie [16]) are preferred since they are computationally efficient methods. But, they may eliminate useful predictors. Since they are not exhaustive methods they may not reach the global optimal model. In the regression framework, there exists an efficient algorithm developped by Furnival and Wilson ([8]) which achieves the optimal model, for a small number of explanatory variables, without exploring all the models.

More recently, the most promising method seems to be the method called Least Angle Regression (LARS) due to Efron *et al.* ([7]). Let $\mu = x\beta$ where $x = (X_1^T, \ldots, X_n^T)$. LARS builds an estimate of μ by successive steps. It proceeds by adding, at each step, one covariate to the model, as Forward Selection. At the begining, $\mu = \mu_0 = 0$. At the first step, LARS finds the predictor X^{j_1} most correlated with the response Y and increases μ_0 in the direction of X^{j_1} until another predictor X^{j_2} has a larger correlation with the current residuals. Then, μ_0 is replaced by μ_1. This step corresponds to the first step of Forward Selection. But, unlike Forward Selection, LARS is based on an equiangulary strategy. For example, at the second step, LARS proceeds equiangulary between X^{j_1} and X^{j_2} until another explanatory variable enters. This method is computationally efficient and gives good results in practice. However, a complete theoretical elucidation needs further investigation.
For linear regression, some works are also based on variable importance assessment; the aim is to produce a relative importance of regressor variables. Grömping ([13]) proposes a study of some estimators of relative importance based on variance decomposition.

In the context of nonlinear models, Sobol ([27]) proposes an extension of the notion of relative importance via the Sobol sensitivity indices, indices which take part to the sensitivity analysis (cf. Saltelli *et al.* [25]). The idea of variable importance is not so recent since it can be found in the book about Classification And Regression Trees of Breiman *et al.* ([5]) who introduce the variable importance as the decrease of node impurity measures, or in the studies about Random Forests by Breiman *et al.* ([3], [4]) where the

variable importance is more a permutation importance index. Thanks to this notion, the variables can be ordered and we can easily deduce some filter or wrapper methods to select some of them. But, there exists also some embedded purposes based on those notions or some others. Thus, Dìaz-Uriarte and Alvarez de Andrés ([6]) propose the following recursive strategy. They compute the Random Forests variable importance and they delete the 20% of variables having the smallest importance: with the remaining variables, they construct a new forest and repeat the procedure. At the end, they compare all the forest models and conserve the one having the smallest Out Of Bag error rate. Poggi and Tuleau ([23]) develop a method based on CART and on a stepwise ascending strategy combined with an elimination step while Genuer *et al.* ([9]) propose a procedure based on Random Forest combined with elimination, ranking and variable selection steps. Guyon *et al.* ([15]) propose a method of selection, called SVM-RFE, utilizing Support Vector Machine methods based on Recursive Feature Elimination. Recently, this approach has been modified by Ben Ishak *et al.* ([12]) using a stepwise strategy.

1.2. Main goals

In this paper, the purpose is to propose, for regression and classification frameworks, a variable selection procedure, based on CART, which is adaptative and theoretically validated. This second point is very important and establishes a real difference with existing works since actually most of the practical method for both frameworks are not validated because of the use of Random Forest or arbitrary thresholds on the variable importance. The method consists in applying the CART algorithm to each possible subset of variables and then considering model selection via penalization (cf. Birgé and Massart [2]), to select the set which minimizes a penalized criterion. In the regression and classification frameworks, we determine via oracle bounds, the expressions of this penalized criterion.

More precisely, let $\mathcal{L} = \{(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)\}$ be a sample, i.e. independent copies of a pair (X, Y), where X takes its values in $\mathcal{X}$, for example $\mathbb{R}^p$, with distribution μ and Y belongs to $\mathcal{Y}$ ($\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ in the regression framework and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0; 1\}$ in the classification one). Let s be the regression function or the Bayes classifier according to the considered framework. We write $X = (X^1, \ldots, X^p)$ where the p variables X^j, with $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p\}$, are the explanatory variables. We denote by Λ the set of the p explanatory variables, i.e. $\Lambda = \{X^1, X^2, \ldots, X^p\}$. The explained variable Y is called the response. When we deal with variable selection, there exists two different objectives (cf. Genuer *et al.* [9]): the first one consists in determining all the important variables highly related to the response Y whereas the second one is to find the smallest subset of variables to provide a good prediction of Y. Our purpose here is to find a subset M of Λ, as small as possible, such that the variables in M enable to predict the response Y.

To achieve this objective, we split the sample $\mathcal{L}$ in three subsamples $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}_3$ of size n_1, n_2 and n_3 respectively. In the following, we consider two cases: the first one is "$\mathcal{L}_1$ independent of $\mathcal{L}_2$" and the second corresponds to "$\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}_2$". Then we apply the CART algorithm to all the subsets of Λ (an overview of CART is given later and for more details, the reader can refer to Breiman *et al.* [5]). More precisely, for any $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$, we build the maximal tree by the CART growing procedure using the subsample $\mathcal{L}_1$. This tree, denoted $T_{max}^{(M)}$, is constructed thanks to the class of admissible splits $\mathcal{S}p_M$ which involves only the variables of M. For any $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ and any $T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}$, we consider the space $S_{M,T}$ of $\mathbb{L}^2_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mu)$ composed by all the piecewise constant functions with values in $\mathcal{Y}$ and defined on the partition $\tilde{T}$ associated with the leaves of T. At this stage, we have the collection of models

$$\{S_{M,T}, \quad M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \text{ and } T \preceq T_{max}^{M}\}$$

which depends only on $\mathcal{L}_1$. Then, for any (M, T), we denote $\hat{s}_{M,T}$ the $\mathcal{L}_2$ empirical risk minimizer on $S_{M,T}$.

$$\hat{s}_{M,T} = \underset{u \in S_{M,T}}{argmin}\, \gamma_{n_2}(u) \text{ with } \gamma_{n_2}(u) = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{(X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2} (Y_i - u(X_i))^2 .$$

Finally, we select $(\widehat{M,T})$ by minimizing the penalized contrast:

$$(\widehat{M,T}) = \underset{(M,T)}{argmin} \{\gamma_{n_2}(\hat{s}_{M,T}) + pen(M,T)\}$$

and we denote the corresponding estimator $\tilde{s} = \hat{s}_{\widehat{M,T}}$.

Our purpose is to determine the penalty function *pen* such that the model $(\widehat{M,T})$ is close to the optimal one. This means that the model selection procedure should satisfy an oracle inequality i.e.:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[l(s,\tilde{s})\,|\mathcal{L}_1\right] \leq C \inf_{(M,T)} \left\{\mathbb{E}\left[l(s,\hat{s}_{M,T})\,|\mathcal{L}_1\right]\right\}, \qquad C \text{ close to } 1$$

where l denotes the loss function and s the optimal predictor. The main results of this paper give adequate penalties defined up to two multiplicative constants α and β. Thus we have a family of estimators $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)$ among which the final estimator is chosen using the test sample $\mathcal{L}_3$. This third sub-sample is admittedly introduce for practice but we consider it also in the theoretical part since we obtain some results on it.

The described procedure is, of course, a theoretical one since, when p is too large, it may be impossible, in practice, to take into account all the 2^p sets of variables. A solution consists of determining, at first, few data-driven subsets of variables which are adapted to perform variable selection and then applying our procedure to those subsets. As this family of subsets, denoted $\mathcal{P}^*$, is constructed thanks to the data, the theoretical penalty, determined when the procedure involves the 2^p sets, is still adapted for the procedure restricted to $\mathcal{P}^*$ since this subset is not deterministic.

The paper is organized as follows. After this introduction, the Section 2 recalls the different steps of the CART algorithm and defines some notations. The Sections 4 and 3 present the results obtained in the regression and classification frameworks. In both sections, the results have the same spirit, however since the frameworks differ, the assumptions and the penalty functions are different. This is the reason why, for clarity, we divide our results. In the Section 5, we apply our procedure to a simulated example and we compare the results of the procedure when, on the one hand, we consider all sets of variables and, on the other hand, we take into account only a subset determined thanks to the Variable Importance defined by Breiman *et al.* ([5]). Sections 6 and 7 collect lemmas and proofs.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Overview of CART and variable selection

In the regression and classification frameworks and thanks to a training set, CART splits recursively the observations space $\mathcal{X}$ and defines a piecewise constant function on this partition which is called a predictor or a classifier according to the case. CART proceeds in three steps: the construction of a maximal tree, the construction of nested models by pruning and a final model selection. In the following, we give a brief summary; for details, readers may refer to the seminal book of Breiman *et al.* ([5]) or to Gey's vulgarization articles ([11], [10]).

The first step consists of the construction of a nested sequence of partitions of $\mathcal{X}$ using binary splits. A useful representation of this construction is a tree composed of nonterminal and terminal nodes. To each nonterminal node is associated a binary split which is just a question of the form $(\mathbf{X^j} \leq \mathbf{c_j})$ for numerical variables or $(\mathbf{X^j} \in \mathbf{S_j})$ for qualitative ones. Such split involves only one original explanatory variable and is determined by maximizing a quality criterion derived from impurity function. For instance, in the regression framework the criterion for a node $\mathbf{t}$ is the decrease of $\mathbf{R(t)}$ where $\mathbf{R(t)} = \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{n}} \sum_{\mathbf{X_i} \in \mathbf{t}} (\mathbf{Y_i} - \overline{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{t}))^2$ with $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{t})$ the arithmetical mean of $\mathbf{Y}$ over $\mathbf{t}$. This is just the estimate of the error. In the classification framework, the criterion is the decrease in impurity which is often the Gini index $\mathbf{i(t)} = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}} \mathbf{p(i|t)p(j|t)}$ with $\mathbf{p(i|t)}$ the posterior probability of the class $\mathbf{i}$ in $\mathbf{t}$. In this case, the criterion is less intuitive but the estimate of the misclassification rate has too many drawbacks to be used. The tree associated to the finest partition, that is to say the one with one observation or observations with the same response by element, is the maximal tree. This tree is too complex and too faithful with the training sample. This is the reason of the next step. The principle of the pruning step is to extract, from the maximal tree a sequence of nested subtrees which minimize a penalized criterion. This penalized criterion, proposed by Breiman *et al.* ([5]) realizes a trade-off between the goodness of fit and the complexity of the tree (or model) measured by the number of leaves. At last, via a test sample or cross validation, a subtree is selected among the preceding sequence.

CART is an algorithm which builds a binary decision tree. A first idea is to perform variable selection by retaining the variables appearing in the tree. This has many drawbacks since on the one hand, the number of selected variables may be too large, and on the other hand, some really important variables could be hidden by the selected ones.
A second approach is based on the Variable Importance (VI) introduced by Breiman *et al.* ([5]). This criterion, calculated with respect to a given tree (typically coming from the procedure CART), quantifies the contribution of each variable by awarding it a note between 0 and 100. The variable selection consists of keeping the variables whose notes are greater than an arbitrary threshold. But, there is, at present, no way to automatically determine the threshold and such a method does not allow to suppress highly dependent influent variables.
In this paper, we propose another approach which consists of applying CART to each subset of variables and choosing the set which minimizes an adequate penalized criterion.

2.2. The context

The paper deals with two frameworks: the regression and the binary classification. In both cases, we denote

$$s = \underset{u:\mathbb{R}^p \to \mathcal{Y}}{argmin}\, \mathbb{E}\left[\gamma(u,(X,Y))\right] \text{ with } \gamma(u,(x,y)) = (y - u(x))^2. \tag{2.1}$$

The quantity s represents the best predictor according to the quadratic contrast γ. Since the distribution P is unknown, s is unknown too. Thus, in the regression and classification frameworks, we use $(X_1, Y_1), ..., (X_n, Y_n)$, independent copies of (X, Y), to construct an estimator of s. The quality of this one is measured by the loss function l defined by:

$$l(s,u) = \mathbb{E}[\gamma(u,.)] - \mathbb{E}[\gamma(s,.)]. \tag{2.2}$$

In the regression case, the expression of s defined in (2.1) is

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad s(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x],$$

and the loss function l given by (2.2) is the $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^p, \mu)$-norm, denoted $\|.\|_\mu$.
In this context, each (X_i, Y_i) satisfies

$$Y_i = s(X_i) + \varepsilon_i$$

where $(\varepsilon_1, ..., \varepsilon_n)$ is a sample such that $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i | X_i] = 0$. In the following, we assume that the variables ε_i have exponential moments around 0 conditionally to X_i. As explained in ([26]), this assumption can be expressed by the existence of two constants $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\text{for any } \lambda \in (-1/\rho, 1/\rho), \ \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda \varepsilon_i} \middle| X_i\right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \lambda^2}{2\,(1 - \rho|\lambda|)}. \tag{2.3}$$

σ^2 is necessarily greater than $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_i^2)$ and can be chosen as close to $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_i^2)$ as we want, but at the price of a larger ρ.

Remark 1. *If $\rho = 0$ in (2.3), the random variables ε_i are said to be sub-Gaussian conditionally to X_i.*

In the classification case, the Bayes classifier s, given by (2.1), is defined by:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad s(x) = 1\!\!1_{\eta(x) \geq 1/2} \text{ with } \eta(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x].$$

As Y and the predictors u take their values in $\{0; 1\}$, we have $\gamma(u, (x, y)) = 1\!\!1_{u(x) \neq y}$ so we deduce that the loss function l can be expressed as:

$$l(s, u) = \mathbb{P}(Y \neq u(X)) - \mathbb{P}(Y \neq s(X)) = \mathbb{E}\left[|s(X) - u(X)||2\eta(X) - 1|\right].$$

For both frameworks, we consider two situations:

- $(M1)$: the training sample $\mathcal{L}$ is divided in three independent parts $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}_3$ of size n_1, n_2 and n_3 respectively. The subsample $\mathcal{L}_1$ is used to construct the maximal tree, $\mathcal{L}_2$ to prune it and $\mathcal{L}_3$ to perform the final selection;
- $(M2)$: the training sample $\mathcal{L}$ is divided only in two independent parts $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_3$. The first one is both for the construction of the maximal tree and its pruning whereas the second one is for the final selection.

The $(M1)$ situation is theoretically easier since all the subsamples are independent, thus each step of the CART algorithm is performed on independent data sets. With real data, it is often difficult to split the sample in three parts because of the small number of data. That is the reason why we also consider the more realistic situation $(M2)$.

3. Classification

This section deals with the binary classification framework. In this context, we know that the best predictor is the Bayes classifier s defined by:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad s(x) = 1\!\!1_{\eta(x) \geq 1/2}$$

A problem appears when $\eta(x)$ is close to $1/2$, because in this case, the choice between the label 0 and 1 is difficult. If $\mathbb{P}(\eta(x) = 1/2) \neq 0$, then the accuracy of the Bayes classifier is not really good and

the comparison with s is not relevant. For this reason, we consider the margin condition introduced by Tsybakov ([29]):

$$\exists h > 0, \text{ such that } \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^p, \ \ |2\eta(x) - 1| \geq h.$$

For details about this margin condition, we refer to Massart ([21]). Otherwise in ([1]) some considerations about margin-adaptive model selection could be found more precisely in the case of nested models and with the use of the margin condition introduced by Mammen and Tsybakov ([19]).

The following subsection gives results on the variable selection for the methods $(M1)$ and $(M2)$ under margin condition. More precisely, we define convenient penalty functions which lead to oracle bounds. The last subsection deals with the final selection by test sample $\mathcal{L}_3$.

3.1. Variable selection via $(M1)$ *and* $(M2)$

• $(M1)$ case :

Given the collection of models

$$\left\{S_{M,T}, \ M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \text{ and } T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}\right\}$$

built on $\mathcal{L}_1$, we use the second subsample $\mathcal{L}_2$ to select a model $\widehat{(M,T)}$ which is close to the optimal one. To do this, we minimize a penalized criterion

$$crit(M,T) = \gamma_{n_2}\left(\hat{s}_{M,T}\right) + pen\left(M,T\right)$$

The following proposition gives a penalty function *pen* for which the risk of the penalized estimator $\tilde{s} = \hat{s}_{\widehat{M,T}}$ can be compared to the oracle accuracy.

Proposition 1. *Let consider a penalty function of the form:* $\forall\ M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ *and* $\forall\ T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}$

$$pen(M,T) = \alpha\frac{|T|}{n_2 h} + \beta\frac{|M|}{n_2 h}\left(1 + \log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right).$$

If $\alpha > \alpha_0$ *and* $\beta > \beta_0$*, then there exists two positive constants* $C_1 > 1$ *and* C_2*, which only depend on* α *and* β*, such that:*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[l\left(s,\tilde{s}\right)|\mathcal{L}_1\right] \leq C_1 \inf_{(M,T)}\left\{l\left(s, S_{M,T}\right) + pen\left(M,T\right)\right\} + C_2\frac{1}{n_2 h}$$

where $l(s, S_{M,T}) = \inf_{u \in S_{M,T}} l(s,u)$.

The penalty is the sum of two terms. The first one is proportional to $\frac{|T|}{n_2}$ and corresponds to the penalty proposed by breiamn *et al.* ([5]) in their pruning algorithm. The other one is proportional to $\frac{|M|}{n_2}\left(1 + \log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$ and is due to the variable selection. It penalizes models that are based on too much explanatory variables. For a given value of $|M|$, this result validates the CART pruning algorithm in the binary classification framework, result proved also by Gey ([10]) in a more general situation since the author consider a less stronger margin condition.

Thanks to this penalty function, the problem can be divided in practice in two steps:

- First, for every set of variables M, we select a subtree $\hat{T}_M$ of $T_{max}^{(M)}$ by

$$\hat{T}_M = \underset{T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}}{argmin}\left\{\gamma_{n_2}(\hat{s}_{M,T}) + \alpha'\frac{|T|}{n_2}\right\}.$$

This means that $\hat{T}_M$ is a tree obtained by the CART pruning procedure using the subsample $\mathcal{L}_2$

- Then we choose a set $\hat{M}$ by minimizing a criterion which penalizes the big sets of variables:

$$\hat{M} = \underset{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)}{argmin}\left\{\gamma_{n_2}(\hat{s}_{M,\hat{T}_M}) + pen(M,\hat{T}_M)\right\}.$$

The $(M1)$ situation permits to work conditionally to the construction of the maximal trees $T_{max}^{(M)}$ and to select a model among a deterministic collection. Finding a convenient penalty to select a model among a deterministic collection is easier, but we have not always enough observations to split the training sample $\mathcal{L}$ in three subsamples. This is the reason why we study now the $(M2)$ situation.

• $(M2)$ case :

We manage to extend our result for only one subsample $\mathcal{L}_1$. But, while in the $(M1)$ method we work with the expected loss, here we need the expected loss conditionally to $\{X_i,\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}$ defined by:

$$l_1(s,u) = \mathbb{P}\left(u(X)\neq Y|\{X_i,\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(s(X)\neq Y|\{X_i,\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}\right). \tag{3.1}$$

Proposition 2. *Let consider a penalty function of the form: $\forall\ M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ and $\forall\ T\preceq T_{max}^{(M)}$*

$$pen(M,T) = \alpha\left[1+(|M|+1)\left(1+\log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right]\frac{|T|}{n_1h} + \beta\frac{|M|}{n_1h}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right).$$

If $\alpha>\alpha_0$ and $\beta>\beta_0$, then there exists three positive constants $C_1>2$, C_2, Σ which only depend on α and β, such that, with probability $\geq 1-e^{-\xi}\Sigma^2$:

$$l_1(s,\tilde{s}) \leq C_1\inf_{(M,T)}\left\{l_1\left(s,S_{M,T}\right) + pen_n(M,T)\right\} + \frac{C_2}{n_1h}(1+\xi)$$

where $l_1(s,S_{M,T}) = \inf_{u\in S_{M,T}} l_1(s,u)$.

When we consider the $(M2)$ situation instead of the $(M1)$ one, we obtain only an inequality with high probability instead of a result in expectation, Indeed, since all the results are obtained conditionally to the construction of the maximal tree, in this second situation, it is impossible to integrate with respect to $\mathcal{L}_1$ whereas in the first situation, we integrated with respect to $\mathcal{L}_2$.

Since the penalized criterion depends on two parameters α and β, we obtain a family of predictors $\tilde{s} = \hat{s}_{\widehat{M,T}}$ indexed by α and β, and the associated family of sets of variables $\hat{M}$. Now, we choose the final predictor using test sample and we deduce the corresponding set of selected variables.

3.2. Final selection

Now, we have a collection of predictors

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta);\ \alpha>\alpha_0 \text{ and } \beta>\beta_0\}$$

which depends on $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$.

For any M of $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$, the set $\left\{T\preceq T_{max}^{(M)}\right\}$ is finite. As $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ is finite too, the cardinal $\mathcal{K}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ is finite and

$$\mathcal{K} \leq \sum_{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)}\mathcal{K}_M$$

where $\mathcal{K}_M$ is the number of subtrees of $T_{max}^{(M)}$ obtained by the pruning algorithm defined by Breiman *et al.* ([5]). $\mathcal{K}_M$ is very smaller than $\left|\left\{T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}\right\}\right|$. Given the subsample $\mathcal{L}_3$, we choose the final estimator $\tilde{\tilde{s}}$ by minimizing the empirical contrast γ_{n_3} on $\mathcal{G}$.

$$\tilde{\tilde{s}} = \underset{\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{G}}{argmin}\ \gamma_{n_3}\left(\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\right)$$

The next result validates the final selection for the $(M1)$ method.

Proposition 3. *For any $\eta \in (0,1)$, we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[l\left(s,\tilde{\tilde{s}}\right)\ |\mathcal{L}_1,\mathcal{L}_2\right] \leq \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\inf_{(\alpha,\beta)}\left\{l\left(s,\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\right)\right\} + \frac{\left(\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{\eta}\right)\frac{1}{1-\eta}}{n_3 h}\log\mathcal{K} + \frac{\frac{2\eta+\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{\eta}}{1-\eta}}{n_3 h}.$$

For the $(M2)$ method, we get exactly the same result except that the loss l is replaced by the conditional loss l_1 (3.1).

For the $(M1)$ method, since the results in expectation of the **Propositions 1** and **3** involve the same expected loss, we can compare the final estimator $\tilde{\tilde{s}}$ with the entire collection of models:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[l(s,\tilde{\tilde{s}})\,|\mathcal{L}_1,\mathcal{L}_2\right] \leq \tilde{C}_1\inf_{(M,T)}\left\{l(s,S_{M,T}) + pen(M,T)\right\} + \frac{C_2}{n_2 h} + \frac{C_3}{n_3 h}\left(1+\log\mathcal{K}\right).$$

In the classification framework, it may be possible to obtain sharper upper bounds by considering for instance the version of Talagrand concentration inequality developed by Rio ([24]), or another margin condition as the one proposed by Koltchinskii (see [18]) and used by Gey ([10]). However, the idea remains the same and those improvement do not have a real interest since we do not get in our work precise calibration of the constants.

4. Regression

Let us consider the regression framework where the ε_i are supposed to have exponential moments around 0 conditionally to X_i (cf. 2.3).

In this section, we add a stop-splitting rule in the CART growing procedure. During the construction of the maximal trees $T_{max}^{(M)}$, $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$, a node is split only if the two resulting nodes contain, at least, N_{min} observations.

As in the classification section, the following subsection gives results on the variable selection for the methods $(M1)$ and $(M2)$ and the last subsection deals with the final selection by test sample $\mathcal{L}_3$.

4.1. Variable selection via $(M1)$ and $(M2)$

In this subsection, we show that for convenient constants α and β, the same form of penalty function as in classification framework leads to an oracle bound.

• $(M1)$ case :

Proposition 4. *Let suppose that $\|s\|_\infty \leq R$, with R a positive constant.*
Let consider a penalty function of the form: $\forall\ M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ and $\forall\ T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}$

$$pen(M,T) = \alpha\left(\sigma^2+\rho R\right)\frac{|T|}{n_2} + \beta\left(\sigma^2+\rho R\right)\frac{|M|}{n_2}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right).$$

If $p \leq \log n_2$, $N_{min} \geq 24\frac{\rho^2}{\sigma^2}\log n_2$, $\alpha > \alpha_0$ *and* $\beta > \beta_0$,
then there exists two positive constants $C_1 > 2$ *and* C_2, *which only depend on* α *and* β, *such that:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 \ |\mathcal{L}_1\right] \quad &\leq \quad C_1 \inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\inf_{u\in S_{M,T}} \|s-u\|_\mu^2 + pen(M,T)\right\} + C_2\frac{(\sigma^2+\rho R)}{n_2} \\ &\quad + C(\rho,\sigma,R)\frac{1\!\!1_{\rho\neq 0}}{n_2\log n_2}\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\ .\ \|_{n_2}$ *denotes the empirical norm on* $\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}$ *and* $C(\rho,\sigma,R)$ *is a constant which only depends on* ρ, σ *and* R.

As in classification, the penalty function is the sum of two terms: one is proportional to $\frac{|T|}{n_2}$ and the other to $\frac{|M|}{n_2}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$. The first term corresponds also to the penalty proposed by Breiman *et al.* ([5]) in their pruning algorithm and validated by Gey and Nédélec ([11]) for the Gaussian regression case. This proposition validates the CART pruning penalty in a more general regression framework than the Gaussian one.

Remark 2. *In practice, since* σ^2, ρ *and* R *are unknown, we consider penalties of the form*

$$pen(M,T) = \alpha'\frac{|T|}{n_2} + \beta'\frac{|M|}{n_2}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$$

If $\rho = 0$, *the form of the penalty is*

$$pen(M,T) = \alpha\sigma^2\frac{|T|}{n_2} + \beta\sigma^2\frac{|M|}{n_2}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right),$$

the oracle bound becomes

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 \ |\mathcal{L}_1\right] \leq C_1\inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\inf_{u\in S_{M,T}}\|s-u\|_\mu^2 + pen(M,T)\right\} + C_2\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2},$$

and the assumptions on $\|s\|_\infty$, p *and* N_{min} *are no longer required. Moreover, the constants* α_0 *and* β_0 *can be taken as follows:*

$$\alpha_0 = 2(1+3\log 2) \ \text{ and } \ \beta_0 = 3.$$

In this case σ^2 *is the single unknown parameter which appears in the penalty. Instead of using* α' *and* β' *as proposed above, we can in practice replace* σ^2 *by an estimator.*

• $(M2)$ case :

In this situation, the same subsample $\mathcal{L}_1$ is used to build the collection of models

$$\left\{S_{M,T},\ M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \text{ and } T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}\right\}$$

and to select one of them.
For technical reasons, we introduce the collection of models

$$\{S_{M,T},\ M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \text{ and } T\in\mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}\}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$ is the set of trees built on the grid $\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}$ with splits on the variables in M. This collection contains the preceding one and only depends on $\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}$. We find nearly the same result as in the $(M1)$ situation.

Proposition 5. *Let suppose that $\|s\|_\infty \leq R$, with R a positive constant.*
Let consider a penalty function of the form: $\forall\ M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ and $\forall\ T \leq T_{max}^{(M)}$

$$\begin{aligned} pen(M,T) &= \alpha\left(\sigma^2\left(1+\frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^4}\log^2\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right)\right)+\rho R\right)\left(1+(|M|+1)\left(1+\log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right)\frac{|T|}{n_1} \\ &\quad +\beta\left(\sigma^2\left(1+\frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^4}\log^2\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right)\right)+\rho R\right)\frac{|M|}{n_1}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

If $p \leq \log n_1$, $\alpha > \alpha_0$ and $\beta > \beta_0$,
then there exists three positive constants $C_1 > 2$, C_2 and Σ which only depend on α and β, such that:
$\forall \xi > 0$, with probability $\geq 1 - e^{-\xi}\Sigma - \frac{c}{n_1 \log n_1} 1\!\!I_{\rho\neq 0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_1}^2 &\leq C_1 \inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\inf_{u\in S_{M,T}}\|s-u\|_{n_1}^2 + pen(M,T)\right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{C_2}{n_1}\left(\left(1+\frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^4}\log^2\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right)\right)\sigma^2+\rho R\right)\xi \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\ .\ \|_{n_1}$ denotes the empirical norm on $\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}$ and c is a constant which depends on ρ and σ.

Like in the $(M1)$ case, for a given $|M|$, we find a penalty proportional to $\frac{|T|}{n_1}$ as proposed by Breiman *et al.* and validated by Gey and Nédélec in the Gaussian regression framework. So here again, we validate the CART pruning penalty in a more general regression framework.
Unlike the $(M1)$ case, the multiplicative factor of $\frac{|T|}{n_1}$, in the penalty function, depends on M and n_1. Moreover, in the method $(M2)$, the inequality is obtained only with high probability.

Remark 3. *If $\rho = 0$, the form of the penalty is*

$$pen(M,T) = \alpha\sigma^2\left[1+(|M|+1)\left(1+\log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right]\frac{|T|}{n_1} + \beta\sigma^2\frac{|M|}{n_1}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right),$$

the oracle bound is $\forall\ \xi > 0$, with probability $\geq 1 - e^{-\xi}\Sigma$,

$$\|\tilde{s}-s\|_{n_1}^2 \leq C_1 \inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\inf_{u\in S_{M,T}}\|s-u\|_{n_1}^2 + pen(M,T)\right\} + C_2\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\xi$$

and the assumptions on $\|s\|_\infty$ and p are no longer required. Moreover, we see that we can take $\alpha_0 = \beta_0 = 3$.

4.2. Final selection

The next result validates this selection.

Proposition 6. • *In the $(M1)$ situation, taking $p \leq \log n_2$ and $N_{min} \geq 4\frac{\sigma^2+\rho R}{R^2}\log n_2$, we have:*
for any $\xi > 0$, with probability $\geq 1 - e^{-\xi} - 1\!\!I_{\rho\neq 0}\frac{R^2}{2(\sigma^2+\rho R)}\frac{1}{n_2^{1-\log 2}}$, $\forall \eta \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|s-\tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 &\leq \frac{(1+\eta^{-1}-\eta)}{\eta^2}\inf_{\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{G}}\|s-\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\eta^2}\left(\frac{2}{1-\eta}\sigma^2+8\rho R\right)\frac{(2\log\mathcal{K}+\xi)}{n_3}. \end{aligned}$$

- *In the* $(M2)$ *situation, denoting* $\epsilon(n_1) = 2\mathbb{I}_{\rho\neq 0} n_1 \exp\left(-\frac{9\rho^2 \log^2 n_1}{2(\sigma^2+3\rho^2 \log n_1)}\right)$, *we have:*
  for any $\xi > 0$, *with probability* $\geq 1 - e^{-\xi} - \epsilon(n_1)$, $\forall \eta \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 \quad &\leq \quad \frac{(1+\eta^{-1}-\eta)}{\eta^2} \inf_{\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{G}} \|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\eta^2}\left(\frac{2}{1-\eta}\sigma^2 + 4\rho R + 12\rho^2 \log n_1\right)\frac{(2\log\mathcal{K} + \xi)}{n_3}.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4. *If* $\rho = 0$, *by integrating with respect to* ξ, *we get for the two methods* $(M1)$ *and* $(M2)$ *that: for any* $\eta \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 \left|\mathcal{L}_1,\ \mathcal{L}_2\right.\right] \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1+\eta^{-1}-\eta}{\eta^2} \inf_{\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{G}} \left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 \left|\mathcal{L}_1,\ \mathcal{L}_2\right.\right]\right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\eta^2(1-\eta)}\frac{\sigma^2}{n_3}\left(2\log\mathcal{K} + 1\right).\end{aligned}$$

The conditional risk of the final estimator $\tilde{\tilde{s}}$ *with respect to* $\|\ \|_{n_3}$ *is controlled by the minimum of the errors made by* $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)$. *Thus the test sample selection does not alterate so much the accuracy of the final estimator. Now we can conclude that theoretically our procedure is valid.*

Unlike the classification framework, we are not able, even when $\rho = 0$, to compare the final estimator $\tilde{\tilde{s}}$ with the entire collection of models since the different inequalities involve empirical norms that can not be compared.

5. Simulations

The aim of this section is twice. On the one hand, we illustrate by an example the theoretical procedure, described in the **Section 1**. On the other hand, we compare the results of the theoretical procedure with those obtained when we consider the procedure restricted to a family $\mathcal{P}^*$ constructed thanks to Breiman's Variable Importance.

The simulated example, also used by Breiman *et al.* (see [5] p. 237), is composed of $p = 10$ explanatory variables $X^1, \ldots, X^{10}$ such that:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(X^1 = -1) = \mathbb{P}(X^1 = 1) = \frac{1}{2} \\ \forall i \in \{2,\ldots,10\},\ \ \mathbb{P}(X^i = -1) = \mathbb{P}(X^i = 0) = \mathbb{P}(X^i = 1) = \frac{1}{3} \end{cases}$$

and of the explained variable Y given by:

$$Y = s(X^1,\ldots,X^{10}) + \varepsilon = \begin{cases} 3 + 3X^2 + 2X^3 + X^4 + \varepsilon & \text{if} \quad X^1 = 1\,, \\ -3 + 3X^5 + 2X^6 + X^7 + \varepsilon & \text{if} \quad X^1 = -1\,. \end{cases}$$

where the unobservable random variable ε is independent of $X^1, \ldots, X^{10}$ and normally distributed with mean 0 and variance 2.

The variables X^8, X^9 and X^{10} do not appear in the definition of the explained variable Y, they can be considered as observable noise.

The **Table 1** contains the Breiman's Variable Importance. The first row presents the explanatory variables ordered from the most influential to the less influential, whereas the second one contains the Breiman's Variable Importance Ranking.

Variable	X^1	X^2	X^5	X^3	X^6	X^4	X^7	X^8	X^9	X^{10}
Rank	1	2	3	5	4	7	6	8	9	10

Table 1: Variable Importance Ranking for the considered simulated example.

We note that the Variable Importance Ranking is consistent with the simulated model since the two orders coincide. In fact, in the model, the variables X^3 and X^6 (respectively X^4 and X^7) have the same effect on the response variable Y.

To make in use our procedure, we consider a training sample $\mathcal{L}$ which consists of the realization of 1000 independent copies of the pair of random variables (X, Y) where $X = (X^1, \ldots, X^{10})$.

The first results are related to the behaviour of the set of variables associated with the estimator $\tilde{s}$. More precisely, for given values of the parameters α and β of the penalty function, we look at the selected set of variables.

According to the model definition and the Variable Importance Ranking, the expected results are the following ones:

- the size of the selected set should belong to $\{1, 3, 5, 7, 10\}$. As the variables X^2 and X^5 (respectively X^3 and X^6, X^4 and X^7 or X^8, X^9 and X^{10}) have the same effect on the response variable, the other sizes could not appear, theoretically;
- the set of size k, $k \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 10\}$, should contain the k most important variables since Variable Importance Ranking and model definition coincide;
- the final selected set should be $\{1, 2, 5, 3, 6, 4, 7\}$.

The behaviour of the set associated with the estimator $\tilde{s}$, when we apply the theoretical procedure, is summarized by the **Table 2**.
At the intersection of the row β and the column α appears the set of variables associated with $\tilde{s}(\alpha, \beta)$.

First, we notice that those results are the expected ones. Then, we see that for a fixed value of the parameter α (respectively β), the increasing of β (resp. α) results in the decreasing of the size of the selected set, as expected. Therefore, this decreasing is related to Breiman's Variable Importance since the explanatory variables disappear according to the Variable Importance Ranking (see **Table 1**). As the expected final set $\{1, 2, 5, 3, 6, 4, 7\}$ appears in the **Table 2**, obviously, the final step of the procedure, whose results are given by the **Table 3**, returns the "good" set.

The **Table 3** provides some other informations. At present, we do not know how to choose the parameters α and β of the penalty function. This is the reason why the theoretical procedure includes a final selection by test sample. But, if we are able to determine, thanks to the data, the value of those parameters,

β \ α	$\alpha \leq 0.05$	$0.05 < \alpha \leq 0.1$	$0.1 < \alpha \leq 2$	$2 < \alpha \leq 12$	$12 < \alpha \leq 60$	$60 \leq \alpha$
$\beta \leq 100$	$\{1,2,5,6,3,7,4,8,9,10\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3,7,4\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3,7,4\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3\}$	$\{1,2,5\}$	$\{1\}$
$100 < \beta \leq 700$	$\{1,2,5,6,3,7,4\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3,7,4\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3\}$	$\{1,2,5\}$	$\{1\}$
$700 < \beta \leq 1300$	$\{1,2,5,6,3\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3\}$	$\{1,2,5,6,3\}$	$\{1,2,5\}$	$\{1\}$
$1300 < \beta \leq 1700$	$\{1,2,5\}$	$\{1,2,5\}$	$\{1,2,5\}$	$\{1,2,5\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$
$1900 < \beta$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$

Table 2: In this table appears the set associated with the estimator $\tilde{s}$ for some values of the parameters α and β which appear in the penalty function *pen*.

$\hat{\alpha}$	$\hat{\beta}$	selected set
0.3	$\rightarrow 100$	$\{1,2,3,4,5,6,7\}$

Table 3: In this table, we see the results of the final model selection.

this final step would disappear. If we analyse the **Table 3**, we see that the "best" parameter $\hat{\alpha}$ takes only one value and that $\hat{\beta}$ belongs to a "small" range. So, those results lead to the conclusion that a data-driven determination of the parameters α and β of the penalty function may be possible and that further investigations are needed.

As the theoretical procedure is validated on the simulated example, we consider now a more realistic procedure when the number of explanatory variables is large. It involves a smaller family $\mathcal{P}^*$ of sets of variables. To determine this family, we use an idea introduced by Poggi and Tuleau in ([23]) which associates Forward Selection and variable importance (VI) and whose principle is the following one. The sets of $\mathcal{P}^*$ are constructed by invoking and testing the explanatory variables according to Breiman's Variable Importance ranking. More precisely, the first set is composed of the most important variable according to VI. To construct the second one, we consider the two most important variables and we test if the addition of the second most important variable has a significant incremental influence on the response variable. If the influence is significant, the second set of $\mathcal{P}^*$ is composed of the two most importance variables. If not, we drop the second most important variable and we consider the first and the third most important variables and so on. So, at each step, we add an explanatory variable to the preceding set which is less important than the preceding ones.

For the simulated example, the corresponding family $\mathcal{P}^*$ is:

$$\mathcal{P}^* = \Big\{\{1\}; \{1,2\}; \{1,2,5\}; \{1,2,5,6\}; \{1,2,5,6,3\}; \{1,2,5,6,3,7\}; \{1,2,5,6,3,7,4\}\Big\}$$

In this family, the variables X^8, X^9 and X^{10} do not appear. This is consistent with the model definition and Breiman's VI ranking.

The first advantage of this family $\mathcal{P}^*$ is that it involves, at the most p sets of variables instead of 2^p. The second one is that, if we perform our procedure restricted to the family $\mathcal{P}^*$, we obtain nearly the same results for the behavior of the set associated with $\tilde{s}$ than the one obtained with all the 2^p sets of variables (see **Table 2**). The only difference is that, since $\mathcal{P}^*$ does not contain the set of size 10, in the **Table 2**, the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10\}$ is replaced by $\{1, 2, 5, 6, 3, 7, 4\}$.

6. Appendix

This section presents some lemmas which are useful in the proofs of the propositions of the Sections 4 and 3. The lemmas 1 to 4 are known results. We just give the statements and references for the proofs. The lemma 5 is a variation of lemma 4. The remaining lemmas are intermediate results which we prove to obtain both the propositions and their proofs.

The lemma 1 is a concentration inequality due to Talagrand. This type of inequality allows to know how a random variable behaves around its expectation.

Lemma 1 (Talagrand)**.** *Consider n independent random variables $\xi_1, ..., \xi_n$ with values in some measurable space Θ. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be some countable family of real valued measurable functions on Θ, such that $\|f\|_\infty \leq b < \infty$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$.*
Let $Z = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \left|\sum_{i=1}^n (f(\xi_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_i)])\right|$ and $\sigma^2 = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \left\{\sum_{i=1}^n Var[f(\xi_i)]\right\}$
Then, there exists K_1 and K_2 two universal constants such that for any positive real number x,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z \geq K_1\mathbb{E}[Z] + K_2\left(\sigma\sqrt{2x} + bx\right)\right) \leq \exp(-x).$$

Proof. see Massart ([20]). ■

The lemma 2 allows to pass from local maximal inequalities to a global one.

Lemma 2 (Maximal inequality)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{S}, d)$ be some countable set.*
Let Z be some process indexed by $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\sup_{t\in B(u,\sigma)} |Z(t) - Z(u)|$ has finite expectation for any positive real σ, with $B(u, \sigma) = \left\{t \in \mathcal{S} \text{ such that } d(t, u) \leq \sigma\right\}$.
Then, for all $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that:

$$- \quad x \to \frac{\Phi(x)}{x} \text{ is non increasing,}$$

$$- \quad \forall\sigma \geq \sigma_* \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{t\in B(u,\sigma)} |Z(t) - Z(u)|\right] \leq \Phi(\sigma),$$

we have:

$$\forall x \geq \sigma_* \qquad \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{t\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{|Z(t) - Z(u)|}{d^2(t, u) + x^2}\right] \leq \frac{4}{x^2}\Phi(x).$$

Proof. see Massart and Nédélec ([22]), section: "Appendix: Maximal inequalities", lemma 5.5. ■

Thanks to the lemma 3, we see that the Hold-Out is an adaptative selection procedure for classification.

Lemma 3 (Hold-Out)**.** *Assume that we observe $N + n$ independent random variables with common distribution P depending on some parameter s to be estimated. The first N observations $X' = (X'_1, \dots, X'_N)$ are used to build some preliminary collection of estimators $(\hat{s}_m)_{m\in\mathcal{M}}$ and we use the remaining observations $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ to select some estimator $\hat{s}_{\hat{m}}$ among the collection defined before by minimizing the empirical contrast.*
Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is finite with cardinal K.
If there exists a function w such that:

- $w : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$,
- $x \to \dfrac{w(x)}{x}$ *is non increasing,*
- $\forall \epsilon > 0, \quad \sup\limits_{l(s,t)\leq\epsilon^2} Var_P\left(\gamma(t,.) - \gamma(s,.)\right) \leq w^2(\epsilon)$

Then, for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$, one has:

$$(1-\theta)\,\mathbb{E}\left[l(s,\hat{s}_{\hat{m}})|X'\right] \leq (1+\theta)\inf_{m\in\mathcal{M}} l(s,\hat{s}_m) + \delta_*^2\left(2\theta + (1+\log K)\left(\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{\theta}\right)\right)$$

where δ_*^2 satisfies to $\sqrt{n}\delta_*^2 = w(\delta_*)$.

Proof. see ([21]), Chapter: "Statistical Learning", Section: "Advanced model selection problems". ■

The lemmas 4 and 5 are concentration inequalities for a sum of squared random variables whose Laplace transform are controlled. The lemma 4 is due to Sauvé ([26]) and allows to generalize the model selection result of Birgé and Massart ([2]) for histogram models without assuming the observations to be Gaussian. In the first lemma, we consider only partitions m of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ constructed from an initial partition m_0 (i.e. for any element J of m, J is the union of elements of m_0), whereas in the second lemma we consider all partitions m of $\{1, \dots, n\}$.

Lemma 4. *Let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$ n independent and identically distributed random variables satisfying:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i] = 0 \;\; \textit{and} \;\; \textit{for any } \lambda \in (-1/\rho, 1/\rho)\,,\; \log\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda\varepsilon_i}\right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2\lambda^2}{2\,(1-\rho|\lambda|)}$$

Let m_0 a partition of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that, $\forall J \in m_0$, $|J| \geq N_{min}$.
We consider the collection $\mathcal{M}$ of all partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ constructed from m_0 and the statistics

$$\chi_m^2 = \sum_{J\in m} \frac{\left(\sum_{i\in J}\varepsilon_i\right)^2}{|J|},\; m \in \mathcal{M}$$

Let $\delta > 0$ and denote $\Omega_\delta = \left\{\forall J \in m_0;\; \left|\sum_{i\in J}\varepsilon_i\right| \leq \delta\sigma^2|J|\right\}$.
Then for any $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\chi_m^2 1\!\!I_{\Omega_\delta} \geq \sigma^2|m| + 4\sigma^2(1+\rho\delta)\sqrt{2|m|x} + 2\sigma^2(1+\rho\delta)x\right) \leq e^{-x}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_\delta^c\right) \leq 2\frac{n}{N_{min}}\exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2\sigma^2 N_{min}}{2(1+\rho\delta)}\right).$$

Proof. Let $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and denote, for any $J \in m$,

$$Z_J = \frac{(\sum_{i\in J} \varepsilon_i)^2}{|J|} \wedge (\delta^2\sigma^4|J|)$$

$(Z_J)_{J\in m}$ are independent random variables. After calculating their moments, we deduce from Bernstein inequality that, for any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{J\in m} Z_J \geq \sigma^2|m| + 4\sigma^2(1+b\delta)\sqrt{2|m|x} + 2\sigma^2(1+b\delta)x\right) \leq e^{-x}$$

As $\sum_{J\in m} Z_J = \chi^2_m$ on the set Ω_δ, we get that for any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\chi^2_m 1\!\!1_{\Omega_\delta} \geq \sigma^2|m| + 4\sigma^2(1+b\delta)\sqrt{2|m|x} + 2\sigma^2(1+b\delta)x\right) \leq e^{-x}$$

Thanks to the assumption on the Laplace transform of the ε_i, we have for any $J \in m_0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i\in J}\varepsilon_i\right| \geq \delta\sigma^2|J|\right) \leq 2exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2\sigma^2|J|}{2(1+b\delta)}\right)$$

As $|J| \geq N_{min}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega^c_\delta) \leq 2\frac{n}{N_{min}}exp(\frac{-\delta^2\sigma^2 N_{min}}{2(1+b\delta)}$$

■

Lemma 5. *Let $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n$ n independent and identically distributed random variables satisfying:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i] = 0 \ \text{ and } \ \text{for any } \lambda \in (-1/\rho, 1/\rho), \ \log\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda\varepsilon_i}\right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2\lambda^2}{2\,(1-\rho|\lambda|)}$$

We consider the collection $\mathcal{M}$ of all partitions of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and the statistics

$$\chi^2_m = \sum_{J\in m}\frac{(\sum_{i\in J}\varepsilon_i)^2}{|J|}, \ m \in \mathcal{M}$$

Let $\delta > 0$ and denote $\Omega_\delta = \left\{\forall 1 \leq i \leq n; \ |\varepsilon_i| \leq \delta\sigma^2\right\}$.
Then for any $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\chi^2_m 1\!I_{\Omega_\delta} \geq \sigma^2|m| + 4\sigma^2(1+\rho\delta)\sqrt{2|m|x} + 2\sigma^2(1+\rho\delta)x\right) \leq e^{-x}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c_\delta\right) \leq 2n\exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2\sigma^2}{2(1+\rho\delta)}\right).$$

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the preceding one. The only difference is that the set Ω_δ is smaller and $N_{min} = 1$. ■

The lemmas 6 and 7 give the expression of the weights needed in the model selection procedure.

Lemma 6. *The weights $x_{M,T} = a|T| + b|M|\left(1 + \log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$, with $a > 2\log 2$ and $b > 1$ two absolute constants, satisfy*

$$\sum_{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)}\sum_{T\leq T^{(M)}_{max}} e^{-x_{M,T}} \leq \Sigma(a,b) \tag{6.1}$$

with $\Sigma(a,b) = -\log\left(1 - e^{-(a-2\log 2)}\right)\frac{e^{-(b-1)}}{1-e^{-(b-1)}} \in \mathbb{R}^*_+$.

Proof. We are looking for weights $x_{M,T}$ such that the sum

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{L}_1) = \sum_{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \sum_{T\leq T_{max}^{(M)}} e^{-x_{M,T}}$$

is lower than an absolute constant.
Taking x as a function of the number of variables $|M|$ and of the number of leaves $|T|$, we have

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{L}_1) \quad = \quad \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{\substack{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)\\ |M|=k}} \sum_{D=1}^{n_1} \left|\left\{T \leq T_{max}^{(M)};\ |T| = D\right\}\right| \ e^{-x(k,D)}.$$

Since

$$\left|\left\{T \leq T_{max}^{(M)};\ |T| = D\right\}\right| \leq \frac{1}{D}\binom{2(D-1)}{D-1} \leq \frac{2^{2D}}{D}\ ,$$

we get

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{L}_1) \quad \leq \quad \sum_{k=1}^{p} \left(\frac{ep}{k}\right)^k \sum_{D\geq 1} \frac{1}{D} e^{-\left(x(k,D)-(2\log 2)D\right)}.$$

Taking $x(k,D) = aD + bk\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{k}\right)\right)$ with $a > 2\log 2$ and $b > 1$ two absolute constants, we have

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{L}_1) \leq \left(\sum_{k\geq 1} e^{-(b-1)k}\right)\left(\sum_{D\geq 1} \frac{1}{D} e^{-\left(a-(2\log 2)\right)D}\right) = \Sigma(a,b).$$

Thus the weights $x_{M,T} = a|T| + b|M|\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$, with $a > 2\log 2$ and $b > 1$ two absolute constants, satisfy (6.1). ■

Lemma 7. *The weights*

$$x_{M,T} = \left(a + (|M|+1)\left(1+\log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right)|T| + b\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)|M|$$

with $a > 0$ and $b > 1$ two absolute constants, satisfy

$$\sum_{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}} e^{-x_{M,T}} \leq \Sigma'(a,b) \tag{6.2}$$

with $\Sigma'(a,b) = \frac{e^{-a}}{1-e^{-a}}\frac{e^{-(b-1)}}{1-e^{-(b-1)}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$ the set of trees built on the grid $\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}$ with splits on the variables in M.

Proof. We are looking for weights $x_{M,T}$ such that the sum

$$\sum(\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}) = \sum_{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}} e^{-x_{M,T}}$$

is lower than an absolute constant.
Taking x as a function of the number of variables $|M|$ and the number of leaves $|T|$, we have

$$\sum(\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}) = \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)|M|=k} \sum_{D=1}^{n_1} |\{T\in\mathcal{M}_{n_1,M};\ |T| = D\}| e^{-x_{k,D}}$$

Since the Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension of $\mathcal{S}p_M$ (the class of admissible splits which involves only the variables of M) is $|M|+1$, it follows from the lemma 2 in ([11]) that

$$|\{T \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M};\ |T| = D\}| \leq \left(\frac{n_1 e}{|M|+1}\right)^{D(|M|+1)}$$

We get

$$\sum(\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{p}\binom{k}{p}\sum_{D\geq 1} e^{D[(k+1)(1+log(\frac{n_1}{k+1}))]-x(k,D)} \tag{6.3}$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{p}\left(\frac{ep}{k}\right)^{k}\sum_{D\geq 1} e^{D[(k+1)(1+log(\frac{n_1}{k+1}))]-x(k,D)} \tag{6.4}$$

Taking $x(k,D) = D[a+(k+1)\left(1+log\left(\frac{n_1}{k+1}\right)\right)] + \alpha(k)$ with $a>0$ an absolute constant, we have

$$\sum(\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}) \leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} e^{-\left(\alpha(k)-k\left(1+log\left(\frac{p}{k}\right)\right)\right)}\right)\left(\sum_{D\geq 1} e^{-aD}\right)$$

Thus taking $x(k,D) = D[a+(k+1)\left(1+log\left(\frac{n_1}{k+1}\right)\right)] + bk\left(1+log\left(\frac{p}{k}\right)\right)$ with $a>0$ and $b>1$ two absolute constants, we have

$$\sum(\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}) \leq \left(\sum_{k\geq 1} e^{-(b-1)k}\right)\left(\sum_{D\geq 1} e^{-aD}\right) = \Sigma'(a,b)$$

Thus the weights $x(M,T) = |T|[a+(|M|+1)\left(1+log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)] + b|M|\left(1+log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$ with $a>0$ and $b>1$ two absolute constants, satisfy (6.2). ■

The two last lemmas provide controls in expectation for processes studied in classification.

Lemma 8. *Let $(X_1,Y_1),...,(X_n,Y_n)$ be n independent observations taking their values in some measurable space $\Theta\times\{0,1\}$, with common distribution P. We denote d the $L^2(\mu)$ distance where μ is the marginal distribution of X_i.*
Let S_T the set of piecewise constant functions defined on the partition $\tilde{T}$ associated to the leaves of the tree T.
Let suppose that:

$$\exists h>0,\ \forall x\in\Theta,\ |2\eta(x)-1| \geq h \quad \textit{with} \quad \eta(x) = \mathbb{P}(Y=1|X=x)$$

Then:

(i) $\sup_{u\in S_T,\ l(s,u)\leq\varepsilon^2} d(s,u) \leq w(\varepsilon)$ *with* $w(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}}x$,

(ii) $\exists\phi_T : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *such that:*

- $\phi_T(0) = 0$,
- $x \to \frac{\phi_T(x)}{x}$ *is non increasing,*
- $\forall\sigma \geq w(\sigma_T),\quad \sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in S_T,\ d(u,v)\leq\sigma} |\overline{\gamma}_n(u)-\overline{\gamma}_n(v)|\right] \leq \phi_T(\sigma)$,

with σ_T the positive solution of $\phi_T(w(x)) = \sqrt{n}x^2$.

(iii) $\sigma_T^2 \leq \frac{K_3^2|T|}{nh}$.

Proof. The first point (i) is easy to obtain from the following expression of l:

$$l(s,u) = \mathbb{E}\left(|s(X) - u(X)|\,|2\eta(X) - 1|\right)$$

The existence of the function ϕ_T has been proved by Massart and Nédélec ([22]). They also give an upper bound of σ_T^2 based on Sauer's lemma. The upper bound of σ_T^2 is better than the one of ([22]) because it has been adapted to the structure of S_T. ■

Thanks to lemma (8) and (2), we deduce the next one.

Lemma 9. *Let $(X_1, Y_1), ..., (X_n, Y_n)$ a sample taking its values in some measurable space $\Theta \times \{0, 1\}$, with common distribution P. Let T a tree, S_T the space associated, h the margin and K_3 the universal constant which appear in the lemme 8. If $2x \geq \frac{K_3\sqrt{|T|}}{\sqrt{n}h}$, then:*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in S_T} \frac{|\overline{\gamma}_n(u) - \overline{\gamma}_n(v)|}{d^2(u,v) + (2x)^2}\right] \leq \frac{2K_3\sqrt{|T|}}{x\sqrt{n}}$$

7. Proofs

7.1. Classification

7.1.1. Proof of the proposition 1:

Let $\mathrm{M} \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$, $T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}$ and $s_{M,T} \in S_{M,T}$. We let

- $w_{M',T'}(u) = (d(s, s_{M,T}) + d(s,u))^2 + y_{M',T'}^2$
- $V_{M',T'} = \sup_{u\in S_{M',T'}} \dfrac{|\overline{\gamma_{n_2}}(u) - \overline{\gamma_{n_2}}(s_{M,T})|}{w_{M',T'}(u)}$

where $y_{M',T'}$ is a parameter that will be chosen later.
Following the proof of theorem 4.2 in ([20]), we get

$$l(s,\tilde{s}) \leq l(s, s_{M,T}) + w_{\widehat{M,T}}(\tilde{s}) \times V_{\widehat{M,T}} + pen(M,T) - pen(\widehat{M,T}) \tag{7.1}$$

To control $V_{\widehat{M,T}}$, we check a uniform overestimation of $V_{M',T'}$. To do this, we apply the Talagrand's concentration inequality, written in lemma 1, to $V_{M',T'}$. So we obtain that for any (M', T'), and for any $x > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(V_{M',T'} \geq K_1\mathbb{E}\left[V_{M',T'}\right] + K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{x}{2n_2}}y_{M',T'}^{-1} + \frac{x}{n_2}y_{M',T'}^{-2}\right)\right) \leq e^{-x}$$

where K_1 and K_2 are universal positive constants.
Setting $x = x_{M',T'} + \xi$, with $\xi > 0$ and the weights $x_{M',T'} = a|T'| + b|M'|\left(1 + \log\left(\frac{p}{|M'|}\right)\right)$, as defined in lemma 6, and summing all those inequalities with respect to (M', T'), we derive a set $\Omega_{\xi,(M,T)}$ such that:

- $\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_{\xi,(M,T)}^c | \mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i,\ (X_i, Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_2\}\right) \leq e^{-\xi}\Sigma(a,b)$
- on $\Omega_{\xi,(M,T)}$, $\forall (M', T')$,

$$V_{M',T'} \leq K_1\mathbb{E}\left[V_{M',T'}\right] + K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{x_{M',T'} + \xi}{2n_2}}{y_{M',T'}}^{-1} + \frac{x_{M',T'} + \xi}{n_2}{y_{M',T'}}^{-2}\right) \tag{7.2}$$

Now we overestimate $\mathbb{E}\left[V_{M',T'}\right]$.
Let $u_{M',T'} \in S_{M',T'}$ such that $d(s, u_{M',T'}) \leq \inf_{u \in S_{M',T'}} d(s,u)$.
Then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[V_{M',T'}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u_{M',T'}) - \gamma_{n_2}^{-}(s_{M,T})|}{\inf_{u \in S_{M',T'}} (w_{M',T'}(u))}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{w_{M',T'}(u)}\right)\right]$$

We prove:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u_{M',T'}) - \gamma_{n_2}^{-}(s_{M,T})|}{\inf_{u \in S_{M',T'}} (w_{M',T'}(u))}\right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_2} y_{M',T'}}$$

For the second term, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{w_{M',T'}(u)}\right)\right] \leq 4\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{d^2(u, u_{M',T'}) + (2y_{M',T'})^2}\right)\right]$$

By application of the lemma 9 for $2y_{M',T'} \geq \frac{K_3\sqrt{|T'|}}{\sqrt{n_2}h}$, we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{w_{M',T'}(u)}\right)\right] \leq \frac{8K_3\sqrt{|T'|}}{\sqrt{n_2} y_{M',T'}}$$

Thus from (7.2), we know that on $\Omega_{\xi,(M,T)}$ and $\forall (M', T')$

$$V_{M',T'} \leq \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{n_2} y_{M',T'}}\left(8K_3\sqrt{|T'|} + 1\right) + K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{x_{M',T'} + \xi}{2n_2}} {y_{M',T'}}^{-1} + \frac{x_{M',T'} + \xi}{n_2} {y_{M',T'}}^{-2}\right)$$

For $y_{M',T'} = 3K\left(\frac{K_1}{\sqrt{n_2}}\left(8K_3\sqrt{|T'|} + 1\right) + K_2\sqrt{\frac{x_{M',T'}+\xi}{2n_2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3K}}\sqrt{K_2\frac{x_{M',T'}+\xi}{n_2}}\right)$
with $K \geq \frac{1}{48K_1 h}$, we get:

$$V_{M',T'} \leq \frac{1}{K}$$

By overestimating $w_{\widehat{M,T}}(\tilde{s})$, $y^2_{\widehat{M,T}}$ and replacing all of those results in (7.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left(1 - \frac{2}{Kh}\right) l(s, \tilde{s}) \quad \leq \quad & \left(1 + \frac{2}{Kh}\right) l(s, s_{M,T}) - pen(\widehat{M,T}) + pen(M,T) \\ & +18K\left(\frac{64{K_1}^2{K_3}^2}{n_2}|\hat{T}| + 2K_2\frac{x_{\widehat{M,T}}}{n_2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3K}}\right)^2\right) \\ & +18K\left(\frac{2K_1^2}{n_2} + 2K_2\frac{\xi}{n_2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3K}}\right)^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

We let $K = \frac{2}{h}\frac{C_1+1}{C_1-1}$ with $C_1 > 1$.
Taking a penalty $pen(\widehat{M,T})$ which balances all the terms in $\left(\widehat{M,T}\right)$, i.e.

$$pen(M,T) \geq \frac{36(C_1+1)}{h(C_1-1)}\left(\frac{64K_1^2K_3^2}{n_2}|T| + 2K_2\frac{x_{M,T}}{n_2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{C_1-1}{6(C_1+1)}}\right)^2\right)$$

We obtain that on $\Omega_{\xi,(M,T)}$

$$l(s, \tilde{s}) \leq C_1\Big(l(s, s_{M,T}) + pen(M,T)\Big) + \frac{C}{n_2 h}\xi$$

Integrating with respect to ξ and by minimizing , we get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[l(s, \tilde{s})|\mathcal{L}_1\Big] \leq C_1 \inf_{M,T}\Big\{l(s, S_{M,T}) + pen(M,T)\Big\} + \frac{C}{n_2 h}\Sigma(a,b)$$

In brief, with a penalty function such that
$\forall M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda),\ \ \forall T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}$

$$\begin{aligned} pen(M,T) &= \alpha\frac{|T|}{n_2 h} + \beta\frac{|M|}{n_2 h}\left(1 + log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \frac{36(C_1+1)}{C_1-1}\left(64K_1^2K_3^2 + 2aK_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{h(C_1-1)}{6(C_1+1)}}\right)^2\right)\frac{|T|}{n_2 h} \\ &\quad + \frac{36(C_1+1)}{C_1-1}2K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{h(C_1-1)}{6(C_1+1)}}\right)^2 b\frac{|M|}{n_2 h}\left(1 + log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

we have:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[l(s,\tilde{s})|\mathcal{L}_1\Big] \leq C_1 \inf_{M,T}\Big\{l(s, S_{M,T}) + pen(M,T)\Big\} + \frac{C}{n_2 h}\Sigma(a,b)$$

We notice that, the two constants α_0 and β_0, which appear in the proposition 1, are defined by

$$\alpha_0 = 36\left(64K_1^2K_3^2 + 4\log 2K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^2\right) \text{ and } \beta_0 = 72K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^2$$

□

7.1.2. Proof of the proposition 2:
For M, $M' \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$, $T \preceq T_{max}^{(M)}$, $T' \preceq T_{max}^{(M')}$ and $s_{M,T} \in S_{M,T}$. We let

- $w_{(M',T'),(M,T)}(u) = (d(s, s_{M,T}) + d(s,u))^2 + (y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})^2$
- $V_{(M',T'),(M,T)} = \sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \frac{|\gamma_{n_2}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_2}^{-}(s_{M,T})|}{w_{(M',T'),(M,T)}(u)}$

where $y_{M',T'}$ and $y_{M,T}$ are parameters that will be chosen later.
Following the proof of theorem 4.2 in ([20]), we get

$$l(s,\tilde{s}) \leq l(s, s_{M,T}) + w_{(\widehat{M,T}),(M,T)}(\tilde{s}) \times V_{(\widehat{M,T}),(M,T)} + pen(M,T) - pen(\widehat{M,T}) \tag{7.3}$$

To control $V_{(\widehat{M,T}),(M,T)}$, we check a uniform overestimation of $V_{(M',T'),(M,T)}$. To do this, we apply the Talagrand's concentration inequality, written in lemma 1, to $V_{(M',T'),(M,T)}$, for $(M',T') \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \times \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M'}$ and $(M,T) \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \times \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$. So we obtain that for any $(M',M) \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)^2$, any $T' \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M'}$, any $M \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$ and any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(V_{(M',T'),(M,T)} \geq K_1\mathbb{E}\left[V_{(M',T'),(M,T)}\right] + K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{x}{2n_2}}y_{M',T'}^{-1} + \frac{x}{n_2}y_{M',T'}^{-2}\right)\right) \leq e^{-x}$$

where K_1 and K_2 are universal positive constants.
Setting $x = x_{M',T'} + x_{M,T} + \xi$, with $\xi > 0$ and the weights $x_{M',T'} = \left(a + (|M'|+1)\left(1 + log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M'|+1}\right)\right)\right)|T'| + b|M'|\left(1 + \log\left(\frac{p}{|M'|}\right)\right)$, as defined in lemma 7, and summing all those inequalities with respect to (M',T') and (M,T), we derive a set Ω_ξ such that:

- $\mathbb{P}\Big(\Omega_\xi^c|\{X_i,\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}\Big) \leq e^{-\xi}(\Sigma(a,b))^2$
- on Ω_ξ, $\forall (M',T'), (M,T)$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(M',T'),(M,T)} &\leq K_1\mathbb{E}\left[V_{(M',T'),(M,T)}\right] + K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{x_{M',T'} + x_{M,T} + \xi}{2n_1}}(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})^{-1}\right) \\ &\quad + K_2\left(\frac{x_{M',T'} + x_{M,T} + \xi}{n_1}(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})^{-2}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

Now we overestimate $\mathbb{E}\left[V_{(M',T'),(M,T)}\right]$.
Let $u_{M',T'} \in S_{M',T'}$ such that $d(s, u_{M',T'}) \leq \inf_{u \in S_{M',T'}} d(s,u)$.
Then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[V_{(M',T'),(M,T)}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u_{M',T'}) - \gamma_{n_1}^{-}(s_{M,T})|}{\inf_{u \in S_{M',T'}} (w_{(M',T'),(M,T)}(u))}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{w_{(M',T'),(M,T)}(u)}\right)\right]$$

We prove:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u_{M',T'}) - \gamma_{n_1}^{-}(s_{M,T})|}{\inf_{u \in S_{M',T'}} (w_{(M',T'),(M,T)}(u))}\right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1}(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})}$$

For the second term, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{w_{(M',T'),(M,T)}(u)}\right)\right] \leq 4\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{d^2(u, u_{M',T'}) + (2(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T}))^2}\right)\right]$$

By application of lemma 9 for $2y_{M',T'} \geq \frac{K_3\sqrt{|T'|}}{\sqrt{n_1}h}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in S_{M',T'}} \left(\frac{|\gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u) - \gamma_{n_1}^{-}(u_{M',T'})|}{w_{(M',T'),(M,T)}(u)}\right)\right] \leq \frac{8K_3\sqrt{|T'|}}{\sqrt{n_1}(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})}$$

Thus from (7.4), we know that on Ω_ξ and $\forall (M',T'),\ (M,T)$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(M',T'),(M,T)} \quad \leq \quad & \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{n_1}(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})}\left(8K_3\sqrt{|T'|} + 1\right) + K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{x_{M',T'} + x_{M,T} + \xi}{2n_1}}(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})^{-1} + \right) \\ & K_2\left(\frac{x_{M',T'} + x_{M,T} + \xi}{n_1}(y_{M',T'} + y_{M,T})^{-2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

For $y_{M',T'} = 3K\left(\frac{K_1}{\sqrt{n_1}}\left(8K_3\sqrt{|T'|} + 1\right) + K_2\sqrt{\frac{x_{M',T'} + \xi/2}{2n_1}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3K}}\sqrt{K_2\frac{x_{M',T'} + \xi/2}{n_1}}\right)$
with $K \geq \frac{1}{48K_1h}$, we get:

$$V_{(M',T'),(M,T)} \leq \frac{1}{K}$$

By overestimating $w_{(\widehat{M,T}),(M,T)}(\tilde{s})$, $y^2_{\widehat{M,T}}$ and replacing all of those results in (7.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{2}{Kh}\right) l(s, \tilde{s}) \quad \leq \quad & \left(1 + \frac{2}{Kh}\right) l(s, s_{M,T}) - pen(\widehat{M,T}) + pen(M,T) \\ & +36K\left(\frac{64K_1^2K_3^2}{n_1}|\hat{T}| + \frac{64K_1^2K_3^2}{n_1}|T| + 2K_2\frac{x_{\widehat{M,T}}}{n_1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3K}}\right)^2\right) \\ & +36K\left(2K_2\frac{x_{M,T}}{n_1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3K}}\right)^2\right) + 36K\left(\frac{4K_1^2}{n_1} + 2K_2\frac{\xi}{n_1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3K}}\right)^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

We let $K = \frac{2}{h}\frac{C_1+1}{C_1-1}$ with $C_1 > 1$.
Taking a penalty $pen(\widehat{M,T})$ which balances all the terms in $\left(\widehat{M,T}\right)$, i.e.

$$pen(M,T) \geq \frac{72(C_1+1)}{h(C_1-1)}\left(\frac{64K_1^2K_3^2}{n_1}|T| + 2K_2\frac{x_{M,T}}{n_1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{C_1-1}{6(C_1+1)}}\right)^2\right)$$

We obtain that on Ω_ξ

$$l(s,\tilde{s}) \leq 2C_1\Big(l(s,s_{M,T}) + pen(M,T)\Big) + \frac{C_2}{n_1 h} + \frac{C_3}{n_1 h}\xi$$

In brief, with a penalty function such that $\forall M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda), \quad forallT \leq T_{max}^{(M)}$

$$\begin{aligned}
pen(M,T) &= \alpha\frac{|T|}{n_1 h}\left(1 + (|M|+1)\left(1 + log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right) + \beta\frac{|M|}{n_1 h}\left(1 + log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right) \\
&\geq \frac{72(C_1+1)}{C_1-1}\left(64K_1^2K_3^2 + 2K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{C_1-1}{6(C_1+1)}}\right)^2\right)\frac{|T|}{n_1 h} \\
&\quad \times\left(a + (|M|+1)\left(1 + log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{72(C_1+1)}{C_1-1}2K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{C_1-1}{6(C_1+1)}}\right)^2 b\frac{|M|}{n_1 h}\left(1 + log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$l(s,\tilde{s}) \leq 2C_1\Big\{l(s,s_{M,T}) + pen(M,T)\Big\} + \frac{C_2}{n_1 h}(1+\xi)$$

We notice that the two constants α_0 and β_0 which appear in the proposition 2 are defined by

$$\alpha_0 = 72\left(64K_1^2K_3^2 + 2K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^2\right) \text{ and } \beta_0 = 72\times 2\times K_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_2}{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^2$$

□

7.1.3. Proof of the proposition 3:

This result is obtained by a direct application of the lemma 3 which appears in the subsection 6. □

7.2. Regression

7.2.1. Proof of the proposition 4:

Let $a > 2\log 2$, $b > 1$, $\theta \in (0,1)$ and $K > 2-\theta$ four constants.

Let us denote

$$s_{M,T} = \underset{u\in S_{M,T}}{argmin}\, \|s-u\|_{n_2}^2 \text{ and } \varepsilon_{M,T} = \underset{u\in S_{M,T}}{argmin}\, \|\varepsilon-u\|_{n_2}^2$$

Following the proof of theorem 1 in ([2]), we get

$$(1-\theta)\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 = \Delta_{\widehat{M,T}} + \inf_{(M,T)} R_{M,T} \tag{7.5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{M,T} &= (2-\theta)\|\varepsilon_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2 - 2 < \varepsilon, s - s_{M,T} >_{n_2} -\theta\|s - s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2 - pen(M,T) \\
R_{M,T} &= \|s - s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2 - \|\varepsilon_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2 + 2 < \varepsilon, s - s_{M,T} >_{n_2} + pen(M,T)
\end{aligned}$$

We are going first to control $\Delta_{\widehat{M,T}}$ by using concentration inequalities of $\|\varepsilon_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2$ and $- < \varepsilon, s - s_{M,T} >_{n_2}$.

For any M, we denote

$$\Omega_M = \left\{\forall t \in \widetilde{T_{max}^{(M)}} \left|\sum_{X_i\in t}\varepsilon_i\right| \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho}|X_i \in t|\right\}$$

Thanks to lemma 4, we get that for any (M,T) and any $x>0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\|\varepsilon_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega_M} &\geq \frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}|T| + 8\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\sqrt{2|T|x} + 4\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}x \,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\Big)\\ &\leq e^{-x}\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_M^c \,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\right) \leq 2\frac{n_2}{N_{min}}\exp\left(\frac{-\sigma^2 N_{min}}{4\rho^2}\right)$$

Denoting $\Omega = \bigcap_M \Omega_M$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c \,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\right) \leq 2^{p+1}\frac{n_2}{N_{min}}\exp\left(\frac{-\sigma^2 N_{min}}{4\rho^2}\right)$$

To control $-<\varepsilon, s-s_{M,T}>_{n_2}$, we calculate its Laplace transform. Thanks to assumption (2.3) and $\|s\|_\infty \leq R$, we have for any (M,T) and any $\lambda\in\left(0;\ \frac{n_2}{2\rho R}\right)$,

$$log\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda<\varepsilon,s-s_{M,T}>_{n_2}} \,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\right] \leq \frac{\lambda^2\sigma^2\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2}{2n_2\left(1-\lambda\frac{2\rho R}{n_2}\right)}$$

Thus, for any (M,T) and any $x>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(-<\varepsilon, s-s_{M,T}>_{n_2} &\geq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_2}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}\sqrt{2x} + \frac{2\rho R}{n_2}x \,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\Big)\\ &\leq e^{-x}\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

Setting $x = x_{M,T}+\xi$ with $\xi>0$ and the weights $x_{M,T} = a|T| + b|M|\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$ as defined in lemma 6, and summing all inequalities (7.6) and (7.7) with respect to (M,T), we derive a set E_ξ such that

- $\mathbb{P}\left(E_\xi^c \,|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\right) \leq 2e^{-\xi}\Sigma(a,b)$

- on the set $E_\xi\bigcap\Omega$, for any (M,T),

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{M,T} \leq\ & (2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}|T| + 8(2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\sqrt{2|T|(x_{M,T}+\xi)} + 4(2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}(x_{M,T}+\xi)\\ &+2\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_2}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}\sqrt{2(x_{M,T}+\xi)} + 4\frac{\rho R}{n_2}(x_{M,T}+\xi)\\ &-\theta\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2 - pen(M,T)\end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma(a,b) = -\log\left(1-e^{-(a-2\log 2)}\right)\frac{e^{-(b-1)}}{1-e^{-(b-1)}}$.

Using the two following inequalities

$$2\tfrac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_2}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}\sqrt{2(x_{M,T}+\xi)} \leq \theta\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2 + \tfrac{2}{\theta}\tfrac{\sigma^2}{n_2}(x_{M,T}+\xi),$$
$$2\sqrt{|T|(x_{M,T}+\xi)} \leq \eta|T| + \eta^{-1}(x_{M,T}+\xi)$$

with $\eta = \frac{K+\theta-2}{2-\theta}\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} > 0$, we derive that on the set $E_\xi\bigcap\Omega$, for any (M,T),

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{M,T} &\leq (2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}|T| + 8\sqrt{2}(2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\sqrt{|T|(x_{M,T}+\xi)} + \left(4(2-\theta)+\frac{2}{\theta}+4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}(x_{M,T}+\xi) - pen(M,T)\\ &\leq K\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}|T| + \left(4(2-\theta)\left(1+\frac{8(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right)+\frac{2}{\theta}+4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}(x_{M,T}+\xi) - pen(M,T)\end{aligned}$$

Taking a penalty $pen(M,T)$ which compensates for all the other terms in (M,T), i.e.

$$pen(M,T) \geq K\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}|T| + \left[4(2-\theta)\left(1+\frac{8(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right)+\frac{2}{\theta}+4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right]\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}x_{M,T} \tag{7.8}$$

we get that, on the set E_ξ

$$\Delta_{\widehat{M,T}}1\!\!1_\Omega \leq \left(4(2-\theta)\left(1+\frac{8(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right)+\frac{2}{\theta}+4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\xi$$

Integrating with respect to ξ, we derive

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Delta_{\widehat{M,T}}1\!\!1_\Omega\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right] \leq 2\left(4(2-\theta)\left(1+\tfrac{8(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right)+\tfrac{2}{\theta}+4\tfrac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\tfrac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\Sigma(a,b) \tag{7.9}$$

We are going now to control $\mathbb{E}\left[\inf_{(M,T)} R_{M,T}1\!\!1_\Omega\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]$.
In the same way we deduced (7.7) from assumption (2.3), we get that for any (M,T) and any $x>0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(< \varepsilon, s-s_{M,T} >_{n_2} \quad &\geq \quad \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_2}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}\sqrt{2x}+\frac{2\rho R}{n_2}x\,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\Big)\\ &\leq e^{-x}\end{aligned}$$

Thus we derive a set F_ξ such that

- $\mathbb{P}\left(F_\xi^c\,|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\}\right) \leq e^{-\xi}\Sigma(a,b)$

- on the set F_ξ, for any (M,T),

$$< \varepsilon, s-s_{M,T} >_{n_2} \quad \leq \quad \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_2}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}\sqrt{2\left(x_{M,T}+\xi\right)}+\frac{2\rho R}{n_2}\left(x_{M,T}+\xi\right)$$

It follows from definition of $R_{M,T}$ that on the set F_ξ, for any (M,T),

$$\begin{aligned}R_{M,T} = \quad &\leq \quad \|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2+2\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_2}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}\sqrt{2(x_{M,T}+\xi)}+\frac{4\rho R}{n_2}(x_{M,T}+\xi)+pen(M,T)\\ &\leq \quad 2\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2+\left(2+4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}(x_{M,T}+\xi)+pen(M,T)\\ &\leq \quad 2\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2+2pen(M,T)+\left(2+4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\xi\end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\inf_{(M,T)}R_{M,T}1\!\!1_\Omega\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right] \quad &\leq \quad 2\inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]+pen(M,T)\right\}\\ &\quad +\left(\frac{2}{\theta}+4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\Sigma(a,b)\end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

We conclude from (7.5), (7.9) and (7.10) that

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\theta)\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_\Omega\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right] \leq \quad &2\inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_2}^2\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]+pen(M,T)\right\}\\ &+\left(8(2-\theta)\left(1+\tfrac{8(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right)+\tfrac{6}{\theta}+12\tfrac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\tfrac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\Sigma(a,b)\end{aligned}$$

It remains to control $\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\|s-s_{\widehat{M,T}}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]+\mathbb{E}\left[\|\varepsilon_{\widehat{M,T}}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]\\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|s\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]+\sum_M \mathbb{E}\left[\|\varepsilon_{M,T_{max}^{(M)}}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]\\
&\leq R^2\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right)+\sum_M \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\|\varepsilon_{M,T_{max}^{(M)}}\|_{n_2}^4\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right]}\sqrt{\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right)}
\end{aligned}$$

As

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\|\varepsilon_{M,T_{max}^{(M)}}\|_{n_2}^4\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right] &\leq \frac{\sigma^4|T_{max}^{[}M)|^2}{n_2^2}+\frac{c^2(\rho,\sigma)|T_{max}^{(M)}|}{n_2^2 N_{min}}+\frac{3\sigma^4|T_{max}^{(M)}|}{n_2^2}\\
&\leq \frac{C^2(\rho,\sigma)}{N_{min}^2}
\end{aligned}$$

where $C(\rho,\sigma)$ is a constant which depends only on ρ and σ.
Thus we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right] \leq R^2\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right)+2^p\frac{C(\rho,\sigma)}{N_{min}}\sqrt{\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right)}$$

Let us recall that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c\,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right) \leq 2^{p+1}\frac{n_2}{N_{min}}\exp\left(\frac{-\sigma^2 N_{min}}{4\rho^2}\right)$$

For $p\leq\log n_2$ and $N_{min}\geq\frac{24\rho^2}{\sigma^2}\log n_2$,

- $2^p\sqrt{\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_\delta^c\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right)}\leq\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{12}\rho}\frac{1}{n_2\sqrt{\log n_2}}$
- $\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_\delta^c\,\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right)\leq\frac{\sigma^2}{12\rho^2}\frac{1}{n_2^4\log n_2}$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2 1\!\!1_{\Omega^c}\Big|\mathcal{L}_1\right] \leq C'(\rho,\sigma,R)\frac{1}{n_2(\log n_2)^{3/2}}$$

Finally, we have the following result:
Denoting by $\Upsilon=\left[4(2-\theta)\left(1+\frac{8(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right)+\frac{2}{\theta}\right]$ and taking a penalty which satisfies $\forall\ M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)\ \forall\ T\leq T_{max}^{(M)}$

$$pen(M,T) \geq \left((K+a\Upsilon)\sigma^2+4a\rho R\right)\frac{|T|}{n_2}+\left(b\Upsilon\sigma^2+4b\rho R\right)\frac{|M|}{n_2}\left(1+\log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)$$

if $p\leq\log n_2$ and $N_{min}\geq\frac{24\rho^2}{\sigma^2}\log n_2$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-\theta)\mathbb{E}\left[\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_2}^2\,|\mathcal{L}_1\right] &\leq 2\inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\inf_{u\in S_{M,T}}\|s-u\|_\mu^2+pen(M,T)\right\}\\
&\quad+\left(2\Upsilon+2+12\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\Sigma(a,b)\\
&\quad+(1-\theta)C'(\rho,\sigma,R)\frac{1}{n_2(\log n_2)^{3/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce the proposition by taking $K=2$, $\theta\to1$, $a\to2\log2$ and $b\to1$. □

7.2.2. Proof of the proposition 5:

Let $a > 0$, $b > 1$, $\theta \in (0,1)$ and $K > 2-\theta$ four constants.

To follow the preceding proof, we have to consider the "deterministic" bigger collection of models:

$$\{S_{M,T};\ T \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M} \text{ and } M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)\}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$ denote the set of trees built on the grid $\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}$ with splits on the variables in M. By considering this bigger collection of models, we no longer have partitions built from an initial one. So, we use lemma 5 instead of lemma 4.

Let us denote, for any $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ and any $T \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$,

$$s_{M,T} = \underset{u \in S_{M,T}}{argmin}\ \|s-u\|_{n_1}^2 \ \text{ and } \ \varepsilon_{M,T} = \underset{u \in S_{M,T}}{argmin}\ \|\varepsilon-u\|_{n_1}^2$$

Following the proof of theorem 1 in ([2]), we get

$$(1-\theta)\|s-\tilde{s}\|_{n_1}^2 = \Delta_{\widehat{M,T}} + \inf_{(M,T)} R_{M,T} \tag{7.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{M,T} &= (2-\theta)\|\varepsilon_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 - 2 < \varepsilon, s - s_{M,T} >_{n_1} -\theta\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 - pen(M,T)\\
R_{M,T} &= \|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 - \|\varepsilon_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 + 2 < \varepsilon, s - s_{M,T} >_{n_1} + pen(M,T)
\end{aligned}$$

We are going first to control $\Delta_{\widehat{M,T}}$. Let us denote

- $\delta = 5\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2} log\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right)$
- $\Omega = \{\forall\ 1 \le i \le n_1, |\varepsilon_i| \le \delta\sigma^2\}$

Thanks to lemma 5, we get that for any $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$, $T \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$ and any $x > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\Big(\|\varepsilon_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 \mathbb{1}_\Omega \ &\ge\ \frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}|T| + 4(1+\rho\delta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\sqrt{2|T|x} + 4\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}x \,\Big|\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}\Big)\\
&\le e^{-x}
\end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega^c \,\Big|\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}\right) \le 2n_1 \exp\left(\frac{-\sigma^2\delta^2}{2(1+\rho\delta)}\right)$$

Thanks to assumption (2.3), like to the $(M1)$ case, we get that for any $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$,$T \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$ and any $x > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\Big(- < \varepsilon, s - s_{M,T} >_{n_1} \ &\ge\ \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_1}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}\sqrt{2x} + \frac{2\rho R}{n_1}x \,\Big|\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}\Big)\\
&\le e^{-x}
\end{aligned} \tag{7.13}$$

Setting $x = x_{M,T} + \xi$ with $\xi > 0$ and the weights $x_{M,T} = \left(a + (|M|+1)\left(1 + log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right)|T| + b\left(1 + log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)|M|$ as defined in lemma 7, and summing all inequalities (7.12) and (7.13) with respect to $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ and $T \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$, we derive a set E_ξ such that

- $\mathbb{P}\left(E_\xi^c \,|\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}\right) \le 2e^{-\xi}\Sigma(a,b)$

- on the set $E_\xi \bigcap \Omega$, for any (M,T),

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{M,T} \quad &\leq \quad (2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}|T| + 4(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\sqrt{2|T|(x_{M,T}+\xi)} + 2(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}(x_{M,T}+\xi)\\ &\quad +2\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_1}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}\sqrt{2(x_{M,T}+\xi)} + 4\frac{\rho R}{n_1}(x_{M,T}+\xi)\\ &\quad -\theta\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 - pen(M,T)\end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma(a,b) = \frac{e^{-a}}{1-e^{-a}}\frac{e^{-(b-1)}}{1-e^{-(b-1)}}$.

Using the two following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}&2\tfrac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_1}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}\sqrt{2(x_{M,T}+\xi)} \leq \theta\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 + \tfrac{2}{\theta}\tfrac{\sigma^2}{n_1}(x_{M,T}+\xi),\\ &2\sqrt{|T|(x_{M,T}+\xi)} \leq \eta|T| + \eta^{-1}(x_{M,T}+\xi)\end{aligned}$$

with $\eta = \frac{K+\theta-2}{2-\theta}\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} > 0$, we derive that on the set $E_\xi \bigcap \Omega$, for any (M,T),

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{M,T} \quad &\leq \quad (2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}|T| + 4\sqrt{2}(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\sqrt{|T|(x_{M,T}+\xi)} + \left(2(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta) + \frac{2}{\theta} + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}(x_{M,T}+\xi) - pen(M,T)\\ &\leq \quad K\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}|T| + \left(2(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)\left(1+\frac{4(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right) + \frac{2}{\theta} + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}(x_{M,T}+\xi) - pen(M,T)\end{aligned}$$

Taking a penalty $pen(M,T)$ which compensates for all the other terms in (M,T), i.e.

$$pen(M,T) \geq K\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}|T| + \left[2(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)\left(1+\frac{4(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right) + \frac{2}{\theta} + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right]\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}x_{M,T} \tag{7.14}$$

we get that, on the set E_ξ

$$\Delta_{\widehat{M,T}}\mathbb{1}_\Omega \leq \left(2(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)\left(1+\frac{4(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right) + \frac{2}{\theta} + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\xi$$

We are going now to control $\inf\limits_{(M,T)} R_{M,T}$.
In the same way we deduced (7.13) from assumption (2.3), we get that for any $M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ and $T \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1,M}$ and any $x > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(< \varepsilon, s-s_{M,T} >_{n_1} \quad &\geq \quad \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_1}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}\sqrt{2x} + \frac{2\rho R}{n_1}x \,\Big|\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}\Big)\\ &\leq e^{-x}\end{aligned}$$

Thus we derive a set F_ξ such that

- $\mathbb{P}\left(F_\xi^c\,|\{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_1\}\right) \leq e^{-\xi}\Sigma(a,b)$

- on the set F_ξ, for any (M,T),

$$< \varepsilon, s-s_{M,T} >_{n_1} \quad \leq \quad \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_1}}\|s-s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}\sqrt{2\left(x_{M,T}+\xi\right)} + \frac{2\rho R}{n_1}\left(x_{M,T}+\xi\right)$$

It follows from definition of $R_{M,T}$ that on the set F_ξ, for any (M,T),

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{M,T} = \quad &\leq \quad \|s - s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 + 2\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_1}}\|s - s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}\sqrt{2(x_{M,T}+\xi)} + \frac{4\rho R}{n_1}(x_{M,T}+\xi) + pen(M,T) \\
&\leq \quad 2\|s - s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 + \left(2 + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}(x_{M,T}+\xi) + pen(M,T) \\
&\leq \quad 2\|s - s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 + 2pen(M,T) + \left(2 + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\xi
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that on $E_\xi \cap F_\xi \cap \Omega$

$$(1-\theta)\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{n_1}^2 \leq 2\inf_{(M,T)}\{\|s - s_{M,T}\|_{n_1}^2 + pen(M,T)\} + \Upsilon\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\xi$$

And, for $p \leq log(n_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(E_\xi^c \cup F_\xi^c \cup \Omega^c\right) \quad &\leq \quad 3e^{-\xi}\Sigma(a,b) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n_1}\underbrace{2exp\left(\frac{-\frac{5\rho^2}{\sigma^2}(logn_1)^2 + \frac{50\rho^2}{\sigma^2}(logn_1)(loglogn_1) + 4logn_1}{2\left(1+\frac{5\rho^2}{\sigma^2}logn_1\right)}\right)}_{\epsilon(n_1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have the following result:
Denoting by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Upsilon \quad &= \quad 2(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)\left(1 + \frac{2(1+\rho\delta)(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right) + \frac{2}{\theta} \\
&= \quad \left[2(1+5\frac{\rho^2}{\sigma^2}log\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right))(2-\theta)\left(1 + \frac{4(1+5\frac{\rho^2}{\sigma^2}log\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right))(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right) + \frac{2}{\theta}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\epsilon(n_1) = 2exp\left(\frac{-\frac{5\rho^2}{\sigma\epsilon^2}(logn_1)^2 + \frac{50\rho^2}{\sigma^2}(logn_1)(loglogn_1) + 4logn_1}{2\left(1+\frac{5\rho^2}{\sigma^2}logn_1\right)}\right) \underset{n_1\to+\infty}{\to} 0$$

Taking a penalty which satisfies: $\forall(M,T)\ \forall\ M \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)\ \forall\ T \leq T_{max}^{(M)}$

$$\begin{aligned}
pen(M,T) \quad &\geq \quad K\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}|T| \\
&\quad + \left(\Upsilon + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\left(a + (|M|+1)\left(1 + log\left(\frac{n_1}{|M|+1}\right)\right)\right)|T| \\
&\quad + \left(\Upsilon + 4\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}b\left(1 + log\left(\frac{p}{|M|}\right)\right)|M|
\end{aligned}$$

we have $\forall\xi > 0$, with probability $\geq 1 - 3e^{-\xi}\Sigma(a,b) - \frac{1}{n_1}\epsilon(n_1)$

$$(1-\theta)\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{n_1}^2 \leq 2\inf_{(M,T)}\left\{\|s - s_{M,T}|_{n_1}^2 + pen(M,T)\right\} + \left(\Upsilon + 2 + 8\frac{\rho}{\sigma^2}R\right)\frac{\sigma^2}{n_1}\xi$$

We deduce the proposition by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Upsilon \quad &\leq \quad 8(2-\theta)max\left\{1; \frac{4(2-\theta)}{K+\theta-2}\right\}\left(1 + 25\frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^4}log^2\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right)\right) + \frac{2}{\theta} \\
&\leq \quad C(K,\theta)\left(1 + \frac{\rho^4}{\sigma^4}log^2\left(\frac{n_1}{p}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and by taking $K = 2$, $\theta \to 1$, $a \to 0$ and $b \to 1$. □

7.2.3. Proof of the proposition 6:
It follows from the definition of $\tilde{\tilde{s}}$ that for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\left\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 \leq \|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 + 2\left\langle \varepsilon, \tilde{\tilde{s}} - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\right\rangle_{n_3} \tag{7.15}$$

Denoting $M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'} = max\{|\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta')(X_i) - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)(X_i)|\,;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_3\}$, we deduce from assumption (2.3) that for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)$ and $\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\begin{aligned} &log\mathbb{E}\left[exp(\lambda < \varepsilon, \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta) >_{n_3})|\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_3\}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma^2\|\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta')-\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2\lambda^2}{2n_3\left(1-\frac{\rho}{n_3}M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'}|\lambda|\right)} \text{ if } |\lambda| < \frac{n_3}{\rho M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get that for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)$, $\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') \in \mathcal{G}$ and $x > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\ \Big(\langle \varepsilon, \tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\rangle_{n_3} \geq \tfrac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_3}}\|\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}\sqrt{2x} + M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'}\tfrac{\rho}{n_3}x \\ \Big|\ \mathcal{L}_1,\ \mathcal{L}_2, \{X_i,\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_3\}\Big) \leq e^{-x} \end{aligned}$$

Setting $x = 2\log\mathcal{K} + \xi$ with $\xi > 0$, and summing all these inequalities with respect to $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)$ and $\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') \in \mathcal{G}$, we derive a set E_ξ such that

- $\mathbb{P}\left(E_\xi^c\,|\mathcal{L}_1,\ \mathcal{L}_2,\ \text{and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_3\}\right) \leq e^{-\xi}$

- on the set E_ξ, for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)$ and $\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varepsilon, \tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\rangle_{n_3} \quad \leq \quad & \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_3}}\|\tilde{s}(\alpha',\beta') - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}\sqrt{2(2\log\mathcal{K} + \xi)} \\ & + M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'}\frac{\rho}{n_3}(2\log\mathcal{K} + \xi) \end{aligned}$$

It remains to control $M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'}$ in the two situations $(M1)$ and $(M2)$ (except if $\rho = 0$).
In the $(M1)$ situation, we consider the set

$$\Omega_1 = \bigcap_{M\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)}\left\{\forall t \in \widetilde{T_{max}^{(M)}}\left|\sum_{\substack{(X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\\ X_i\in t}}\varepsilon_i\right| \leq R\,|\{i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_2 \text{ and } X_i \in t\}|\right\}$$

Thanks to assumption (2.3), we get that for any $\lambda \in (-1/\rho,\ 1/\rho)$

$$\begin{aligned} &log\mathbb{E}\Big[exp\left(\lambda\textstyle\sum_{(X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2, X_i\in t}\varepsilon_i\right)\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_2\}\Big] \\ &\leq \tfrac{\lambda^2\sigma^2}{2(1-\rho|\lambda|)}|\{i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_2 \text{ and } X_i \in t\}| \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for any $x > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{\substack{(X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2\\ X_i\in t}}\varepsilon_i\right| \geq x\Big|\mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i,Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_2\}\right) \quad \leq \quad 2e^{\frac{-x^2}{2\left(\sigma^2|\{i;\ (X_i,Y_i)\in\mathcal{L}_2 \text{ and } X_i\in t\}|+\rho x\right)}}$$

Taking $x = R|\{i;\ (X_i, Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_2 \text{ and } X_i \in t\}|$ and summing all these inequalities, we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_1^c \middle| \mathcal{L}_1 \text{ and } \{X_i;\ (X_i, Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_2\}\right) \quad \leq \quad 2^{p+1}\frac{n_1}{N_{min}}\exp\left(\frac{-R^2 N_{min}}{2(\sigma^2+\rho R)}\right)$$

On the set Ω_1, as for any (M,T), $\|\hat{s}_{M,T}\|_\infty \leq 2R$, we have $M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'} \leq 4R$.
Thus, on the set $\Omega_1 \bigcap E_\xi$, for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\left\langle \varepsilon, \tilde{\tilde{s}} - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\right\rangle_{n_3} \quad \leq \quad \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_3}}\|\tilde{\tilde{s}} - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}\sqrt{2(2\log\mathcal{K}+\xi)} + 4R\frac{\rho}{n_3}(2\log\mathcal{K}+\xi)$$

It follows from (7.15) that, on the set $\Omega_1 \bigcap E_\xi$, for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{G}$ and any $\eta \in (0;1)$

$$\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\|_{n_3}^2 \leq \|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|{n_3}^2 + (1-\eta)\|\tilde{\tilde{s}} - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|{n_3}^2 + \frac{2}{1-\eta}\frac{\sigma^2}{n_3}(2logK+\xi) + \frac{8\rho R}{n_3}(2logK+\xi)$$

and

$$\eta^2\left\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 \leq (1+\eta^{-1}-\eta)\,\|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 + \left(\frac{2}{1-\eta}\sigma^2 + 8\rho R\right)\frac{(2\log\mathcal{K}+\xi)}{n_3}$$

Taking $p \leq \log n_2$ and $N_{min} \geq 4\frac{\sigma^2+\rho R}{R^2}\log n_2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_1^c\right) \leq \frac{R^2}{2(\sigma^2+\rho R)}\frac{1}{n_2^{1-\log 2}}$$

Finally, in the $(M1)$ situation, we have
for any $\xi > 0$, with probability $\geq 1 - e^{-\xi} - \frac{R^2}{2(\sigma^2+\rho R)}\frac{1}{n_2^{1-\log 2}}$, $\forall\eta \in (0,1)$,

$$\left\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 \leq \frac{(1+\eta^{-1}-\eta)}{\eta^2}\inf_{\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{G}}\|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 + \frac{1}{\eta^2}\left(\frac{2}{1-\eta}\sigma^2 + 8\rho R\right)\frac{(2\log\mathcal{K}+\xi)}{n_3}$$

In the $(M2)$ situation, we consider the set

$$\Omega_2 = \{\forall 1 \leq i \leq n_1\ |\varepsilon_i| \leq 3\rho\log n_1\}$$

Thanks to assumption (2.3), we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Omega_2^c \middle| \{X_i;\ (X_i, Y_i) \in \mathcal{L}_1\}\right) \quad \leq \quad 2n_1\exp\left(-\frac{9\rho^2\log^2 n_1}{2(\sigma^2+3\rho^2\log n_1)}\right)$$

with $\epsilon(n_1) = 2n_1\exp\left(-\frac{9\rho^2\log^2 n_1}{2(\sigma^2+3\rho^2\log n_1)}\right) \underset{n_1\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$
On the set Ω_2, as for any (M,T), $\|\hat{s}_{M,T}\|_\infty \leq R + 3\rho\log n_1$, we have $M_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'} \leq 2(R+3\rho\log n_1)$.
Thus, on the set $\Omega_2 \bigcap E_\xi$, for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\left\langle \varepsilon, \tilde{\tilde{s}} - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\right\rangle_{n_3} \quad \leq \quad \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_3}}\|\tilde{\tilde{s}} - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}\sqrt{2(2\log\mathcal{K}+\xi)} + 2(R+3\rho\log n_1)\frac{\rho}{n_3}(2\log\mathcal{K}+\xi)$$

It follows from (7.15) that, on the set $\Omega_2 \bigcap E_\xi$, for any $\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{G}$ and any $\eta \in (0;1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\|_{n_3}^2 \quad &\leq \quad \|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 + (1-\eta)\|\tilde{\tilde{s}} - \tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta)\|_{n_3}^2 + \frac{2}{1-\eta}\frac{\sigma^2}{n_3}(2logK+\xi) \\ &\quad + \frac{4\rho(R+3\rho logn_1)}{n_3}(2logK+\xi)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\eta^2 \left\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 \leq (1 + \eta^{-1} - \eta) \left\|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha, \beta)\right\|_{n_3}^2 + \left(\frac{2}{1-\eta}\sigma^2 + 4\rho(R + 3\rho \log n_1)\right) \frac{(2 \log \mathcal{K} + \xi)}{n_3}$$

Finally, in the $(M2)$ situation, we have for any $\xi > 0$, with probability $\geq 1 - e^{-\xi} - \epsilon(n_1)$, $\forall \eta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|s - \tilde{\tilde{s}}\right\|_{n_3}^2 \quad \leq \quad & \frac{(1 + \eta^{-1} - \eta)}{\eta^2} \inf_{\tilde{s}(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{G}} \left\|s - \tilde{s}(\alpha, \beta)\right\|_{n_3}^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{\eta^2} \left(\frac{2}{1-\eta}\sigma^2 + 4\rho R + 12\rho^2 \log n_1\right) \frac{(2 \log \mathcal{K} + \xi)}{n_3} \end{aligned}$$

□

References

[1] S. Arlot and P. Bartlett. Margin adaptive model selection in statistical learning. in press in Bernoulli.

[2] L. Birgé and P. Massart. Minimal penalties for gaussian model selection. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 138(1-2):33–73, 2007.

[3] L. Breiman. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.

[4] L. Breiman and A. Cutler. Random forests. http://www.stat.berkeley.edu/users/breiman/RandomForests/, 2005.

[5] L. Breiman, J. Friedman, R. Olshen, and C. Stone. *Classification And Regression Trees*. Chapman et Hall, 1984.

[6] R. Díaz-Uriarte and S. Alvarez de Andrés. Gene selection and classification of microarray data using random forest. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 7(3):1–13, 2006.

[7] B. Efron, T. Hastie, I. Johnstone, and R. Tibshirani. Least angle regression. *Annals of Statistics*, 32(2):407–499, 2004.

[8] G.M. Furnival and R.W. Wilson. Regression by leaps and bounds. *Technometrics*, 16:499–511, 1974.

[9] R. Genuer, J.M. Poggi, and C. Tuleau-Malot. Variable selection using random forests. in press in Pattern Recognition Letters, doi:10.1016/j.patrec.2010.03.014.

[10] S. Gey. Margin adaptive risk bounds for classification trees. hal-00362281.

[11] S. Gey and E. Nédélec. Model Selection for CART Regression Trees. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 51(2):658–670, 2005.

[12] B. Ghattas and A. Ben Ishak. Sélection de variables pour la classification binaire en grande dimension : comparaisons et application aux données de biopuces. *Journal de la société française de statistique*, 149(3):43–66, 2008.

[13] U. Grömping. Estimators of relative importance in linear regression based on variance decomposition. *The American Statistician*, 61:139–147, 2007.

[14] I. Guyon and A. Elisseff. An introduction to variable and feature selection. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:1157–1182, 2003.

[15] I. Guyon, J. Weston, S. Barnhill, and V.N. Vapnik. Gene selection for cancer classification using support vector machines. *Machine Learning*, 46(1-3):389–422, 2002.

[16] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning*. Springer, 2001.

[17] R. Kohavi and G.H. John. Wrappers for feature subset selection. *Artificial Intelligence*, 97(1-2):273–324, 1997.

[18] V. Koltchinskii. Local rademacher complexities and oracle inequalities in risk minimization. *Annals of Statistics*, 34(6):2593–2656, 2004.

[19] E. Mammen and A. Tsybakov. Smooth discrimination analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 27:1808–1829, 1999.

[20] P. Massart. Some applications of concentration inequalities to statistics. *Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse*, 2:245–303, 2000.

[21] P. Massart. *Concentration Inequlaities and Model Selection*. Springer, 2003. Lecture Notes in Mathematics.

[22] P. Massart and E. Nédélec. Risk bounds for statistical learning. *Annals of Statistics*, 34(5), 2006.

[23] J.M. Poggi and C. Tuleau. Classification supervisée en grande dimension. Application à l'agrément de conduite automobile. *Revue de Statistique Appliquée*, LIV(4):41–60, 2006.

[24] E. Rio. Une inégalité de bennett pour les maxima de processus empiriques. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probab. Statist.*, 38(6):1053–1057, 2002.

[25] A. Saltelli, K. Chan, and M. Scott. *Sensitivity Analysis*. Wiley, 2000.

[26] M. Sauvé. Histogram selection in non gaussian regression. *Esaim PS*, 13:70–86, 2009.

[27] I.M. Sobol. Sensitivity estimates for nonlinear mathematical models. *Mathematical Modeling and Computational Experiment*, 1(4):271–280, 1993.

[28] R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.

[29] A.B. Tsybakov. Optimal aggregation of classifiers in statistical learning. *Annals of Statistics*, 32(1):135–166, 2004.