

A DECONVOLUTION APPROACH TO ESTIMATION OF A COMMON SHAPE IN A SHIFTED CURVES MODEL

BY JÉRÉMIE BIGOT AND SÉBASTIEN GADAT

Université de Toulouse

This paper considers the problem of adaptive estimation of a mean pattern in a randomly shifted curve model. We show that this problem can be transformed into a linear inverse problem, where the density of the random shifts plays the role of a convolution operator. An adaptive estimator of the mean pattern, based on wavelet thresholding is proposed. We study its consistency for the quadratic risk as the number of observed curves tends to infinity, and this estimator is shown to achieve a near-minimax rate of convergence over a large class of Besov balls. This rate depends both on the smoothness of the common shape of the curves and on the decay of the Fourier coefficients of the density of the random shifts. Hence, this paper makes a connection between mean pattern estimation and the statistical analysis of linear inverse problems, which is a new point of view on curve registration and image warping problems. We also provide a new method to estimate the unknown random shifts between curves. Some numerical experiments are given to illustrate the performances of our approach and to compare them with another algorithm existing in the literature.

1. Introduction.

1.1. *Model and objectives.* In many fields of interests including biology, medical imaging, or chemistry, observations are coming from n individuals curves or graylevel images. Such observations are commonly referred to as functional data, and models involving such data have been recently extensively studied in statistics (see [40, 41] for a detailed introduction to functional data analysis). In such settings, it is reasonable to assume that the data at hand $Y_m, m = 1, \dots, n$, satisfy the following white noise regression model:

$$(1.1) \quad dY_m(x) = f_m(x) dx + \varepsilon_m dW_m(x), \quad x \in \Omega, m = 1, \dots, n,$$

where Ω is a subset of \mathbb{R}^d , $f_m : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are unknown regression functions, and W_m are independent standard Brownian motions on Ω with ε_m representing different levels of additive noise. In many situations, the individual curves or images have a certain common structure which may lead to the assumption that they are generated

Received April 2009; revised January 2010.

AMS 2000 subject classifications. Primary 62G08; secondary 42C40.

Key words and phrases. Mean pattern estimation, curve registration, inverse problem, deconvolution, Meyer wavelets, adaptive estimation, Besov space, minimax rate.

from some semi-parametric model of the form

$$(1.2) \quad f_m(x) = f(x, \tau_m) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega \text{ and some } \tau_m \in \mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{R}^p,$$

where $f : \Omega \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represents an unknown shape common to all the f_m 's. This shape function (also called mean pattern) may depend on unknown individual *random* parameters $\tau_m, m = 1, \dots, n$, belonging to a compact set \mathcal{T} of \mathbb{R}^p , which model individual variations. Such a semi-parametric representation for the f_m 's is the so-called *self-modeling regression framework* (SEMOR) introduced by Kneip and Gasser [27]. *Shape invariant models* (SIM) are a special class of such models for which (see, e.g., [27])

$$(1.3) \quad f_m(x) = f(\phi(x, \tau_m)),$$

where for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, the function $x \mapsto \phi(x, \tau)$ is a smooth diffeomorphism of Ω and $\phi : \Omega \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \Omega$ is a *known* function. Models such as (1.3) are useful to account for shape variability in time between curves (see, e.g., [19, 30]) or in space between images, which is the well-known problem of curve registration or image warping (see [18] and the discussion therein for an overview, [5, 6] and references therein). SIM models (1.3) also represent a large class of statistical models to study the difficult problem of recovering a mean pattern from a set of similar curves or images in the presence of random deformations and additive noise, which corresponds to the general setting of Grenander's theory of shapes [21]. The overall objective of this paper is to discuss the fundamental problem of estimating of the mean pattern f which can then be used to learn nonlinear modes of variations in time or shape between similar curves or images.

1.2. *Previous work on mean pattern estimation.* Very few results exist in the literature on nonparametric estimation of f for SIM models (1.3) based on noisy data from (1.1). The problem of estimating the common shape of a set of curves that differ only by a time transformation is usually referred to as the curve registration problem in statistics, and it has received a lot of attention over the last two decades; see, for example, [4, 16, 17, 30, 39, 45]. However, in these papers, an asymptotic study as the number of curves n grows to infinity is generally not considered. Estimation of the shape function for SEMOR models related to (1.1) and (1.2) is studied in [27] with a double asymptotic in the number n of curves and the number of observed time points per curve. In the simplest case of shifted curves, various approaches have been developed. Based on a model with a fixed number n of curves, semiparametric estimation of the deformation parameters τ_m and nonparametric estimation of the shape function is proposed in [31] and [44]. A generalization of this approach for the estimation of scaling, rotation and translation parameters for two-dimensional images is proposed in [6]. Estimation of a common shape for randomly shifted curves and asymptotic in n is also considered in [42]. There is also a huge literature in image analysis on mean pattern estimation, and some papers have recently addressed the problem of estimating the

common shape of a set of similar images with asymptotic in the number of images; see, for example, [1, 5, 32] and references therein. However, in all the above cited papers rates of convergence and optimality of the proposed estimators for f have not been studied.

1.3. *A benchmark model for nonparametric estimation of a mean pattern.* The simplest SIM model is the case of randomly shifted curves, namely

$$f_m(x) = f(x - \tau_m) \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \tau_m \in \mathbb{R},$$

that has recently received some attention in the statistical literature [8, 31, 42, 44]. In this paper, it will thus be assumed that we observe realizations of n noisy and randomly shifted curves Y_1, \dots, Y_n coming from the following Gaussian white noise model:

$$(1.4) \quad dY_m(x) = f(x - \tau_m) dx + \varepsilon_m dW_m(x), \quad x \in [0, 1], m = 1, \dots, n,$$

where f is the unknown mean pattern of the curves, W_m are independent standard Brownian motions on $[0, 1]$, the ε_m 's represent levels of noise which may vary from curve to curve, and the τ_m 's are unknown random shifts independent of the W_m 's. The aim of this paper is to study some statistical aspects related to the problem of estimating f , and to propose new methods of estimation.

Model (1.4) is realistic in many situations where it is reasonable to assume that the observed curves represent replications of almost the same process and when a large source of variation in the experiments is due to transformations of the time axis. Such a model is commonly used in many applied areas dealing with functional data such as neuroscience [25] or biology [42]. More generally, the model (1.4) represents a kind of benchmark model for studying the problem of recovering the mean pattern f in SIM models. The results derived in this paper show that the model (1.4), although simple, already provides some new insights on the statistical aspects of mean pattern estimation.

The function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be periodic with period 1, and the shifts τ_m are supposed to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with density $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure dx on \mathbb{R} . Our goal is to estimate nonparametrically the shape function f on $[0, 1]$ as the number of curves n goes to infinity.

Let $L^2([0, 1])$ be the space of squared integrable functions on $[0, 1]$ with respect to dx , and denote by $\|f\|^2 = \int_0^1 |f(x)|^2 dx$ the squared norm of a function f . Assume that $\mathcal{F} \subset L^2([0, 1])$ represents some smoothness class of functions (e.g., a Sobolev or a Besov ball), and let $\hat{f}_n \in L^2([0, 1])$ be some estimator of the common shape f , that is, a measurable function of the random processes $Y_m, m = 1, \dots, n$. For some $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the risk of the estimator \hat{f}_n is defined to be

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_n, f) = \mathbb{E} \|\hat{f}_n - f\|^2,$$

where the above expectation \mathbb{E} is taken with respect to the law of $\{Y_m, m = 1, \dots, n\}$. In this paper, we propose to investigate the optimality of an estimator by introducing the following minimax risk

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}) = \inf_{\hat{f}_n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_n, f),$$

where the above infimum is taken over the set of all possible estimators in model (1.4). One of the main contributions of this paper is to derive asymptotic lower and upper bounds for $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F})$ which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been considered before.

Indeed, we show that there exist constants M_1, M_2 , a sequence of reals $r_n = r_n(\mathcal{F})$ tending to infinity, and an estimator \hat{f}_n^* such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} r_n \mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}) \geq M_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} r_n \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_n^*, f) \leq M_2.$$

However, the construction of \hat{f}_n^* may depend on unknown quantities such as the smoothness of f , and such estimates are therefore called nonadaptive. Since it is now recognized that wavelet decomposition is a powerful tool to derive adaptive estimators (see, e.g., [13]), a second contribution of this paper is thus to propose wavelet-based estimators \hat{f}_n that attain a near-minimax rate of convergence in the sense there exists a constant M_2 such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\log n)^{-\beta} r_n \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_n, f) \leq M_2 \quad \text{for some } \beta > 0.$$

1.4. *Main result.* Minimax risks will be derived under particular smoothness assumptions on the density g . The main result of this paper is that the difficulty of estimating f is quantified by the decay to zero of the Fourier coefficients γ_ℓ of the density g of the shifts defined as

$$(1.5) \quad \gamma_\ell = \mathbb{E}(e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau}) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-i2\pi\ell x} g(x) dx$$

for $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Depending how fast these Fourier coefficients tend to zero as $|\ell| \rightarrow +\infty$, the reconstruction of f will be more or less accurate. This comes from the fact that the expected value of each observed process $Y_m(x)$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}Y_m(x) = \mathbb{E}f(x - \tau_m) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(x - \tau)g(\tau) d\tau \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1].$$

This expected value is thus the convolution of f by the density g which makes the problem of estimating f an inverse problem whose degree of ill-posedness and associated minimax risk depend on the smoothness assumptions on g .

This phenomenon is a well-known fact in deconvolution problems (see, e.g., [26, 36, 37]), and more generally for linear inverse problems as studied in [9]. In this paper, the following type of assumption on g is considered.

ASSUMPTION 1. The Fourier coefficients of g have a polynomial decay, that is, for some real $\nu > 0$, there exist two constants $C_{\max} \geq C_{\min} > 0$ such that $C_{\min}|\ell|^{-\nu} \leq |\gamma_\ell| \leq C_{\max}|\ell|^{-\nu}$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$.

In standard inverse problems, such as deconvolution, the optimal rate of convergence we can expect from an arbitrary estimator typically depends on such smoothness assumptions. The parameter ν is usually referred to as the degree of ill-posedness of the inverse problem, and it quantifies the difficulty of inverting the convolution operator. The following theorem shows that a similar phenomenon holds for the minimax risk associated to model (1.4). Note that to simplify the presentation, all the theoretical results are given for the simple setting where the level of noise is the same for all curves, that is, $\varepsilon_m = \varepsilon$ for all $m = 1, \dots, n$ and some $\varepsilon > 0$. Finally, one also needs the following assumption on the decay of the density g .

ASSUMPTION 2. There exists a constant $C > 0$ and a real $\alpha > 1$ such that the density g satisfies $g(x) \leq \frac{C}{1+|x|^\alpha}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Note that Assumption 2 is not a very restrictive condition as g is supposed to be an integrable function on \mathbb{R} .

THEOREM 1. Suppose that the smoothness class \mathcal{F} is a Besov ball $B_{p,q}^s(A)$ of radius $A > 0$ with $p, q \geq 1$ and smoothness parameter $s > 0$ (a precise definition of Besov spaces will be given later on). Suppose that g satisfies Assumptions 1 and 2. Let $p' = \min(2, p)$ and assume that $s \geq 1/p'$. If $s > 2\nu + 1$, then

$$r_n(\mathcal{F}) = n^{(2s)/(2s+2\nu+1)}.$$

Hence, Theorem 1 shows that under Assumption 1 the minimax rate r_n is of polynomial order of the sample size n , and that this rate deteriorates as the degree of ill-posedness ν increases. Such a behavior is well known for standard periodic deconvolution in the white noise model [26, 36], and Theorem 1 shows that a similar phenomenon holds for the model (1.4). To the best of our knowledge, this is a new result which makes a connection between mean pattern estimation and the statistical analysis of deconvolution problems.

1.5. *Fourier analysis and an inverse problem formulation.* Let us first remark that the model (1.4) exhibits some similarities with periodic deconvolution in the white noise model as described in [26]. For $x \in [0, 1]$, let us define the following density function:

$$(1.6) \quad G(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g(x+k).$$

Note that $G(x)$ exists for all $x \in [0, 1]$ provided g has a sufficiently fast decay at infinity; see Assumption 2. Since f is periodic with period 1, one has

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(x - \tau)g(\tau) d\tau = \int_0^1 f(x - \tau)G(\tau) d\tau,$$

and note that $\gamma_\ell = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-i2\pi\ell x} g(x) dx = \int_0^1 e^{-i2\pi\ell x} G(x) dx$. Hence, if one defines $\xi_m(x) = f(x - \tau_m) - \int_0^1 f(x - \tau)G(\tau) d\tau$ and $\xi(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \xi_m(x)$, then taking the mean of the n equations in (1.4) yields the model

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} dY(x) &= \int_0^1 f(x - \tau)G(\tau) d\tau dx + \xi(x) dx \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} dW(x), \quad x \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(1.8) \quad \varepsilon^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \varepsilon_m^2,$$

and where $W(x)$ is a standard Brownian motion $[0, 1]$.

The model (1.7) differs from the periodic deconvolution model investigated in [26] by the error term $\xi(x)$. Asymptotically, $\xi(x)$ is a Gaussian variable, so this suggests to use the wavelet thresholding procedures developed in [26] to derive upper bounds for the minimax risk. However, it should be noted that the additive error term $\xi(x)$ significantly complicates the estimating procedure as *the variance of $\xi(x)$ clearly depends on the unknown function f* . Moreover, deriving lower bounds for the minimax risk in models such as (1.7) is significantly more difficult than in the standard white noise model without the additive term $\xi(x)$.

Now let us formulate models (1.4) and (1.7) in the Fourier domain. Supposing that $f \in L^2([0, 1])$, we denote by θ_ℓ its Fourier coefficients for $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, namely $\theta_\ell = \int_0^1 e^{-2i\ell\pi x} f(x) dx$. The model (1.4) can then be rewritten as

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{m,\ell} &:= \int_0^1 e^{-2i\ell\pi x} dY_m(x) = \theta_\ell e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau_m} + \varepsilon_m z_{\ell,m} \\ &= \theta_\ell \gamma_\ell + \xi_{\ell,m} + \varepsilon_m z_{\ell,m} \end{aligned}$$

with $\xi_{\ell,m} = \theta_\ell e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau_m} - \theta_\ell \gamma_\ell$, and where $z_{\ell,m}$ are i.i.d. $N_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$ variables, that is, complex Gaussian variables with zero mean and such that $\mathbb{E}|z_{\ell,n}|^2 = 1$.

Thus, we can compute the sample mean \tilde{c}_ℓ of the ℓ th Fourier coefficient over the n curves as

$$(1.10) \quad \tilde{c}_\ell = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n c_{\ell,m} = \theta_\ell \tilde{\gamma}_\ell + \varepsilon \eta_\ell = \theta_\ell \gamma_\ell + \xi_\ell + \varepsilon \eta_\ell$$

with $\tilde{\gamma}_\ell = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau_m}$, $\xi_\ell = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \xi_{\ell,m}$ and where the η_ℓ 's are i.i.d. complex Gaussian variables with zero mean and such that $\mathbb{E}|\eta_\ell|^2 = \frac{1}{n}$. The average Fourier coefficients \tilde{c}_ℓ in equation (1.10) can thus be viewed as a set of observations which is very close to a sequence space formulation of a statistical inverse problem as described, for example, in [9]. As in model (1.7), the additive error term ξ_ℓ is asymptotically Gaussian, however its variance is $\frac{1}{n}|\theta_\ell|^2(1 - |\gamma_\ell|^2)$ which is obviously unknown as it depends on f .

If we assume that the density g of the random shifts is known, one can perform a deconvolution step by taking

$$(1.11) \quad \hat{\theta}_\ell = \frac{\tilde{c}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} = \theta_\ell \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} + \varepsilon \frac{\eta_\ell}{\gamma_\ell}$$

to estimate the Fourier coefficients of f since, for large n , $\frac{\tilde{\gamma}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell}$ is close to 1 by the strong law of large numbers.

Based on the $\hat{\theta}_\ell$'s, two types of estimators are studied. The simplest one uses spectral cut-off with a cutting frequency depending on the smoothness assumptions on f , and is thus nonadaptive. The second estimator is based on wavelet thresholding and is shown to be adaptive using the procedure developed in [26]. Note that part of our results are presented for the case where the coefficients γ_ℓ are known. Such a framework is commonly used in nonparametric regression and inverse problems to obtain consistency results and to study asymptotic rates of convergence, where it is generally supposed that the law of the additive error is Gaussian with zero mean and known variance ε^2 ; see, for example, [9, 26, 36]. In model (1.4), the random shifts may be viewed as a second source of noise and for the theoretical analysis of this problem the law of this other random noise is also supposed to be known.

1.6. *An inverse problem with unknown operator.* If the density g is unknown, one can view the problem of estimating f in model (1.4) as a deconvolution problem with unknown eigenvalues which complicates significantly the estimation procedure. Such a framework corresponds to the general setting of an inverse problem with a partially unknown operator. Recently, some papers have addressed this problem; see, for example, [10, 14, 23, 35], assuming that an independent sample of noisy eigenvalues or noisy operator is available which allows an estimation of the γ_ℓ 's. However, such an assumption is not applicable to our model (1.4). Therefore, we introduce a new method for estimating f in the case of an unknown density g which leads to a new class of estimators to recover a mean pattern.

1.7. *Organization of the paper.* In Section 2, we consider a linear but nonadaptive estimator based on spectral cut-off. In Section 3, a nonlinear and adaptive estimator based on wavelet thresholding is studied in the case of known density g , and upper bound for the minimax risk are studied over Besov balls. In Section 4,

we derive lower bounds for the minimax risk. In Section 5, it is explained how one can estimate the mean pattern f when the density g is unknown. Finally, in Section 6, some numerical examples are proposed to illustrate the performances of our approach and to compare them with another algorithm proposed in the literature. All proofs are deferred to a technical Appendix at the end of the paper.

2. Linear estimation of the common shape and upper bounds for the risk for Sobolev balls.

2.1. *Risk decomposition.* For $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, a linear estimator of the θ_ℓ 's is given by $\hat{\theta}_\ell^\lambda = \lambda_\ell \frac{\hat{c}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell}$, where $\lambda = (\lambda_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of nonrandom weights called a filter. An estimator $\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}$ of f is then obtained via the inverse Fourier transform $\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}(x) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{\theta}_\ell^\lambda e^{-i2\pi\ell x}$, and thanks to the Parseval's relation, the risk of this estimator is given by $\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}, f) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\hat{\theta}_\ell - \theta_\ell|^2$. The problem is then to choose the sequence $(\lambda_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$ in an optimal way. The following proposition gives the bias-variance decomposition of $\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}, f)$.

PROPOSITION 1. *For any given nonrandom filter λ , the risk of the estimator $\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}$ can be decomposed as*

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}, f) = \underbrace{\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (\lambda_\ell - 1)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2}_{\text{Bias}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda_\ell^2 \left[|\theta_\ell|^2 \left(\frac{1}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} - 1 \right) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} \right]}_{\text{Variance}}.$$

Note that the decomposition (2.1) does not correspond exactly to the classical bias-variance decomposition for linear inverse problems. Indeed, the variance term in (2.1) differs from the classical expression of the variance for linear estimator in statistical inverse problems which would be in our notation $\varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\lambda_\ell^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2}$. Hence, contrary to classical inverse problems, the variance term of the risk depends also on the Fourier coefficients θ_ℓ of the unknown function f to recover.

2.2. *Linear estimation.* Let us introduce the following smoothness class of functions which can be identified with a periodic Sobolev ball:

$$H_s(A) = \left\{ f \in L^2([0, 1]); \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |\ell|^{2s}) |\theta_\ell|^2 \leq A \right\}$$

for some constant A and some smoothness parameter $s > 0$, where $\theta_\ell = \int_0^1 e^{-2i\ell\pi x} f(x) dx$. Now consider a linear estimator obtained by spectral cut-off, that is, for a projection filter of the form $\lambda_\ell^M = \mathbb{1}_{|\ell| \leq M}$ for some integer M . For an appropriate choice of M , the following proposition gives the asymptotic behavior of the risk $\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda^M}, f)$.

PROPOSITION 2. *Assume that f belongs to $H_s(A)$ for some real $s > 1/2$ and $A > 0$, and that g satisfies Assumption 1, that is, polynomial decay of the γ_ℓ 's. Then, if $M = M_n$ is chosen such that $M_n \sim n^{1/(2s+2\nu+1)}$, then there exists a constant C not depending on n such that as $n \rightarrow +\infty$*

$$\sup_{f \in H_s(A)} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda^M}, f) \leq Cn^{-(2s)/(2s+2\nu+1)}.$$

The above choice for M_n depends on the smoothness s of the function f which is generally unknown in practice and such a spectral cut-off estimator is thus called nonadaptive. Moreover, the result is only suited for smooth functions since Sobolev balls $H_s(A)$ for $s > 1/2$ are not suited to model shape functions f which may have singularities such as points of discontinuity.

3. Nonlinear estimation with Meyer wavelets and upper bounds for the risk for Besov balls. Wavelets have been successfully used for various inverse problems [12], and for the specific case of deconvolution Meyer wavelets, a special class of band-limited functions introduced in [34], have recently received special attention in nonparametric regression: see [26] and [36].

3.1. Wavelet decomposition and the periodized Meyer wavelet basis. This wavelet basis is derived through the periodization of the Meyer wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ (see [26] for further details on its construction). Denote by $\phi_{j,k}$ and $\psi_{j,k}$ the Meyer scaling and wavelet functions at scale $j \geq 0$ and location $0 \leq k \leq 2^j - 1$. For any function f of $L^2([0, 1])$, its wavelet decomposition can be written as: $f = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} c_{j_0,k} \phi_{j_0,k} + \sum_{j=j_0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \beta_{j,k} \psi_{j,k}$, where $c_{j_0,k} = \int_0^1 f(x) \phi_{j_0,k}(x) dx$, $\beta_{j,k} = \int_0^1 f(x) \psi_{j,k}(x) dx$ and $j_0 \geq 0$ denotes the usual coarse level of resolution. Moreover, the squared norm of f is given by $\|f\|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} c_{j_0,k}^2 + \sum_{j=j_0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \beta_{j,k}^2$. It is well known that Besov spaces can be characterized in terms of wavelet coefficients (see, e.g., [26]). Let $s > 0$ denote the usual smoothness parameter, then for the Meyer wavelet basis and for a Besov ball $B_{p,q}^s(A)$ of radius $A > 0$ with $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$, one has that $B_{p,q}^s(A) = \{f \in L^2([0, 1]) : (\sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} |c_{j_0,k}|^p)^{1/p} + (\sum_{j=j_0}^{+\infty} 2^{j(s+1/2-1/p)q} (\sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} |\beta_{j,k}|^p)^{q/p})^{1/q} \leq A\}$ with the respective above sums replaced by maximum if $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$.

Meyer wavelets can be used to efficiently compute the coefficients $c_{j,k}$ and $\beta_{j,k}$ by using the Fourier transform. Indeed, thanks to the Plancherel's identity, one obtains that

$$(3.1) \quad \beta_{j,k} = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \psi_\ell^{j,k} \theta_\ell,$$

where $\psi_\ell^{j,k} = \int_0^1 \psi_{j,k}(x) e^{-i2\pi \ell x} dx$ denote the Fourier coefficients of $\psi_{j,k}$ and $\Omega_j = \{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}; \psi_\ell^{j,k} \neq 0\}$. As Meyer wavelets $\psi_{j,k}$ are band-limited, Ω_j is a finite

subset set of $[-2^{j+2}c_0, -2^j c_0] \cup [2^j c_0, 2^{j+2}c_0]$ with $c_0 = 2\pi/3$ (see [26]), and fast algorithms for computing the above sum have been proposed in [28] and [38]. The coefficients $c_{j_0,k}$ can be computed analogously with ϕ instead of ψ and $\tilde{\Omega}_{j_0} = \{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}; \phi_\ell^{j_0,k} \neq 0\}$ instead of Ω_j .

Hence, the noisy Fourier coefficients $\hat{\theta}_\ell$ given by (1.11) can be used to quickly compute the following empirical wavelet coefficients of f as

$$(3.2) \quad \hat{\beta}_{j,k} = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \psi_\ell^{j,k} \hat{\theta}_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{c}_{j_0,k} = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j_0}} \phi_\ell^{j_0,k} \hat{\theta}_\ell.$$

3.2. *Nonlinear estimation via hard-thresholding.* It is well known that adaptivity can be obtained by using nonlinear estimators based on appropriate thresholding of the estimated wavelet coefficients (see, e.g., [13]). A nonlinear estimator by hard-thresholding is defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \hat{f}_n^h = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} \hat{c}_{j_0,k} \phi_{j_0,k} + \sum_{j=j_0}^{j_1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \hat{\beta}_{j,k} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\hat{\beta}_{j,k}| \geq \lambda_{j,k}\}} \psi_{j,k},$$

where the $\lambda_{j,k}$'s are appropriate thresholds (positive numbers), and j_1 is the finest resolution level used for the estimator. As shown by [26], for periodic deconvolution the choice for j_1 and the thresholds $\lambda_{j,k}$ typically depends on the degree ν of ill-posedness of the problem. Following Theorem 1 in [26], to derive rate of convergence for \hat{f}_n^h one has to control moments of order 2 and 4 of $|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|$ and the probability of deviation of $\hat{\beta}_{j,k}$ from $\beta_{j,k}$.

PROPOSITION 3. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty, 1 \leq q \leq \infty, s - 1/p + 1/2 > 0$ and $A > 0$. Assume that g satisfies Assumptions 1 and 2. Then there exist positive constants C_3 and C_4 such that for any $j \geq j_0 \geq 0, 0 \leq k \leq 2^j - 1$ and all $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A), \mathbb{E}|\hat{c}_{j_0,k} - c_{j_0,k}|^2 \leq C_3 \frac{2^{2j_0\nu}}{n}, \mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^2 \leq C_3 \frac{2^{2j\nu}}{n}$ and $\mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^4 \leq C_4(\frac{2^{4j\nu}}{n^2} + \frac{2^{j(4\nu+1)}}{n^3})$.*

Proposition 3 shows that the variance of the empirical wavelet coefficients is proportional to $\frac{2^{2j\nu}}{n}$ which comes from the amplification of the noise by the inversion of the convolution operator. The choice of the threshold $\lambda_{j,k}$ is done by controlling the probability of deviation of the empirical wavelet coefficients $\hat{\beta}_{j,k}$ from the true wavelet coefficient $\beta_{j,k}$ which is given by the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 4. *Let $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A), n \geq 1$ and $j \geq 0$. Suppose that g satisfies Assumption 2. Let $\eta > 0$. For $j \geq 0$ and $0 \leq k \leq 2^j - 1$ define the following threshold:*

$$(3.4) \quad \lambda_{j,k} = \lambda_j = 2\sigma_j \sqrt{\frac{2\eta \log(n)}{n}}$$

with $\sigma_j^2 = 2^{-j} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\gamma_\ell|^{-2}$. Then, for all sufficiently large j ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}| \geq \lambda_j) \leq 2n^{-\eta}.$$

Note that the level-dependent threshold (3.4) corresponds to the usual universal thresholds for deconvolution problem based on wavelet decomposition as in [26]. Then, using the thresholds λ_j , we finally arrive at the following theorem which gives an upper bound for the minimax risk over a large class of Besov balls.

THEOREM 2. *Assume that g satisfies Assumptions 1 and 2. Let j_1 and j_0 be the largest integers such that $2^{j_1} \leq (n \log(n)^{-1})^{1/(2\nu+1)}$ and $2^{j_0} \leq \log(\log(n))$. Let \hat{f}_n^h be the nonlinear estimator obtained by hard-thresholding with the above choice for j_1 and j_0 , and using the thresholds λ_j defined by (3.4) with $\eta \geq 2$. Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $A > 0$. Let $p' = \min(2, p)$, $s' = s + 1/2 - 1/p$, and assume that $s \geq 1/p'$.*

If $s \geq (2\nu + 1)(1/p - 1/2)$, then

$$\sup_{f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)} \|\hat{f}_n^h - f\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{-(2s)/(2s+2\nu+1)} (\log n)^\beta) \quad \text{with } \beta = \frac{2s}{2s + 2\nu + 1}.$$

If $s < (2\nu + 1)(1/p - 1/2)$, then

$$\sup_{f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)} \|\hat{f}_n^h - f\|^2 = \mathcal{O}((n^{-1} \log(n))^{(2s')/(2s'+2\nu)}).$$

In standard periodic deconvolution in the white noise model (see, e.g., [26]), there exist two different upper bounds for the minimax rate which are usually referred to as the dense case [$s \geq (2\nu + 1)(1/p - 1/2)$] when the hardest functions to estimate are spread uniformly over $[0, 1]$, and the sparse case [$s < (2\nu + 1)(1/p - 1/2)$] when the worst functions to estimate have only one nonvanishing wavelet coefficient. Theorem 2 shows that a similar phenomenon holds for the model (1.4), and to the best of our knowledge, this is a new result.

4. Minimax lower bound. The following theorem gives an asymptotic lower bound on the minimax risk $\mathcal{R}_n(B_{p,q}^s(A))$ for a large class of Besov balls.

THEOREM 3. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $A > 0$. Suppose that g satisfies Assumption 1. Let $p' = \min(2, p)$. Assume that $s \geq 1/p'$ and $\nu > 1/2$.*

If $s \geq (2\nu + 1)(1/p - 1/2)$ and $s > 2\nu + 1$ (dense case), there exists a constant M_1 depending only on A, s, p, q such that

$$\mathcal{R}_n(B_{p,q}^s(A)) \geq M_1 n^{-(2s)/(2s+2\nu+1)} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

In the dense case, the hardest functions to estimate are spread uniformly over the interval $[0, 1]$, and the proof is based on an adaptation of Assouad's cube technique (see, e.g., Lemma 10.2 in [22]) to the specific setting of model (1.4). Lower bounds for minimax risk are classically derived by controlling the probability for the likelihood ratio (in the statistical model of interested) of being strictly greater than some constant uniformly over an appropriate set of test functions. To derive Theorem 3, we show that one needs to control the expectation over the random shifts of the likelihood ratio associated to model (1.4), and not only the likelihood ratio itself. Hence, the proof of Theorem 3 is not a direct and straightforward adaptation of Assouad's cube technique or Lemma 10.1 in [22] as used classically in a standard white noise model to derive minimax risk in nonparametric deconvolution in the dense case. For more details, we refer to the proof of Theorem 3 in the Appendix.

Deriving minimax risk in the dense case for the model (1.4) is rather difficult and the proof is quite long and technical. In the sparse case, finding lower bounds for the minimax rate is also a difficult task. We believe that this could be done by adapting to model (1.4) a result by [29] which yields a lower bound for a specific problem of distinguishing between a finite number of hypotheses (see Lemma 10.1 in [22]). However, this is far beyond the scope of this paper and we leave this problem open for future work.

5. Estimating f when the density g is unknown. Obviously, assuming that the density g of the shifts is known is not very realistic in practice. However, estimating f when the density g is unknown falls into the setting of inverse problems with an unknown operator which is a difficult problem. Recently, some papers [10, 14, 23, 35] have considered nonparametric estimator for inverse problem with a partially unknown operator, by assuming that an independent sample of noisy eigenvalues is available which allows to build an estimator of the γ_ℓ 's. In the settings of these papers, the distribution of the noisy eigenvalues sample is supposed to be known (typically Gaussian). However, in model (1.4), such assumptions are not realistic, and therefore a data-based estimator of g has to be found. For this purpose, we propose to make a connection between mean pattern estimation in model (1.4) and well-known results on Fréchet mean estimation for manifold-valued variables; see, for example, [2, 3].

5.1. *Fréchet mean for functional data.* Suppose that Z_1, \dots, Z_n denote i.i.d. random variables taking their values in a vector space V . As V is a linear space (with addition well defined), an estimator of a mean pattern for the Z_m 's is given by the usual linear average $\bar{Z}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n Z_m$. However, in many applications, some geometric and statistical considerations may lead to the assumption that two vectors Z, Z' in V are considered to be the same if they are equal up to certain transformations which are represented by the action of some group H on the space V . A well-known example (see [2, 3] and references therein) is the case

where $V = \mathbb{R}^{2 \times k}$, the space of k points in the plane \mathbb{R}^2 , and H is generated by composition of scaling, rotations and translations of the plane, namely

$$h \cdot Z = a \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} Z + b,$$

for $h = h(a, \theta, b) \in H$, with $(a, \theta, b) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times [0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{R}^2$. In this setting, two vectors $Z, Z' \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times k}$ represent the same shape if

$$d_H(Z, Z') := \inf_{(a, \theta, b) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times [0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{R}^2} \|Z - h(a, \theta, b) \cdot Z'\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2k}} = 0,$$

which leads to Kendall’s shape space Σ_2^k consisting of the equivalent classes of shapes in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times k}$ under the action of scaling, rotations and translations (see, e.g., [2, 3] and references therein). Since the space Σ_2^k is a nonlinear manifold, the usual linear average \bar{Z}_n does not fall into Σ_2^k due to the fact that the Euclidean distance $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2 \times k}}$ is not meaningful to represent shape variations. A better notion of empirical mean \tilde{Z}_n of n shapes in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times k}$ is given by (see, e.g., [2]): $\tilde{Z}_n = \arg \min_{Z \in \Sigma_2^k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n d_H^2(Z, Z_m)$. More generally, Frechet [15] has extended the notion of averaging to general metric spaces via mean squared error minimization in the following way: if Z_1, \dots, Z_n are i.i.d. random variables in a general metric space \mathcal{M} , with a distance $d: \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, then the Frechet mean of a collection of such data points is defined as the minimizer (not necessarily unique) of the sum-of-squared distances to each of the data points, that is

$$\tilde{Z}_n = \arg \min_{Z \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n d^2(Z, Z_m).$$

Now let us return to the randomly shifted curve model (1.4). Define $H = \mathbb{R}$ as the translation group acting on periodic functions $f \in L^2([0, 1])$ with period 1 by

$$\tau \cdot f(x) = f(x + \tau) \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \tau \in H.$$

Let Y_1, \dots, Y_n be n functions (possibly random) in $L^2([0, 1])$. Following the definition of Frechet mean, a notion of average for functional data taking into account the action of the translation group $H = \mathbb{R}$ would be

$$\tilde{f}_n = \arg \min_{f \in L^2([0, 1])} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \min_{\tau_m \in \mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 |f(x) - Y_m(x + \tau_m)|^2 dx.$$

If the Y_m ’s are noisy curves generated from the randomly shifted curve model (1.4), a presmoothing step of the observed curves seems natural to compute a consistent Frechet mean estimate. In the case of the translation group, this smoothing step and the definition of Frechet mean can be expressed in the Fourier domain as

$$(5.1) \quad (\hat{\theta}_{-\ell_0}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{\ell_0}) = \arg \min_{(\theta_{-\ell_0}, \dots, \theta_{\ell_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\ell_0+1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \min_{\tau_m \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |c_{m, \ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_m} - \theta_\ell|^2,$$

where $c_{m,\ell} = \int_0^1 e^{-2i\ell\pi x} dY_m(x)$ and ℓ_0 is some frequency cut-off parameter whose choice will be discussed later. A smoothed Frechet mean is then given by $\tilde{f}_{n,\ell_0} = \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} \hat{\theta}_\ell e^{-2i\ell\pi x}$. Then define the following criterion for $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$(5.2) \quad M_n(\tau) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} \left| c_{m,\ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_m} - \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{q=1}^n c_{q,\ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_q} \right) \right|^2,$$

and remark that the computation of \tilde{f}_{n,ℓ_0} can be made in two steps since it can be checked that $\hat{\theta}_\ell = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n c_{m,\ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\hat{\tau}_m}$, where

$$(5.3) \quad (\hat{\tau}_1, \dots, \hat{\tau}_n) = \underset{(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} M_n(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n).$$

Therefore, computing the Frechet mean of the smoothed curves Y_1, \dots, Y_n requires minimization of the above criteria which automatically yields estimators of the random shifts τ_1, \dots, τ_n in model (1.4). This allows us to construct an estimator of the common shape f by \tilde{f}_{n,ℓ_0} in the case of an unknown density g , and the estimates $(\hat{\tau}_1, \dots, \hat{\tau}_n)$ of the random shifts can be used to estimate the density g itself and the eigenvalues γ_ℓ . The goal of this section is thus to study some statistical properties of such a two-step procedure which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been considered before in the setting of model (1.4) and in connection with Frechet mean for functional data. Moreover, it will be shown in our numerical experiments that the criterion (5.3) can be minimized using a gradient-descent algorithm which leads to a new and fast method for estimating f in the case of an unknown density g .

5.2. *Upper bound for the estimation of the shifts.* Recall that our model (1.4) in the Fourier domain is

$$(5.4) \quad c_{m,\ell} = \theta_\ell e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau_m^*} + \varepsilon z_{\ell,m}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } m = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $z_{\ell,m}$ are i.i.d. $N_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$ variables, the random shifts $\tau_m^*, m = 1, \dots, n$, are i.i.d. variables with density g , and $\theta_\ell = \int_0^1 f(x) e^{-i2\pi\ell x} dx$. Model (5.4) is clearly nonidentifiable, as for any $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, one can replace the θ_ℓ 's by $\theta_\ell e^{i2\pi\ell\tau_0}$ and the τ_m^* 's by $\tau_m^* - \tau_0$ without changing the formulation of the model. Let us thus introduce the following identifiability conditions.

ASSUMPTION 3. The density g has a compact support included in the interval $\mathcal{T} = [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$ and has zero mean, that is, is such that $\int_{\mathcal{T}} \tau g(\tau) d\tau = 0$.

ASSUMPTION 4. The unknown shape function f is such that $\theta_1 \neq 0$.

Let $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n = \{(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathcal{T}^n \text{ such that } \sum_{m=1}^n \tau_m = 0\}$. Using the identifiability condition given by Assumption 3, it is natural to define estimators of the true shifts

$\tau_1^*, \dots, \tau_n^*$ as

$$\hat{\tau} = (\hat{\tau}_1, \dots, \hat{\tau}_n) = \arg \min_{\tau \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}_n} M_n(\tau),$$

that is, by considering the estimators that minimize the empirical criterion $M_n(\tau)$ on the constrained set $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n$. Then the following theorem holds.

THEOREM 4. *Suppose that Assumptions 3 and 4 hold. Then for any $t > 0$*

$$(5.5) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\hat{\tau}_m - \tau_m^*)^2 \geq C(f, \ell_0, \varepsilon, n, t, g)\right) \leq 3 \exp(-t)$$

with $C(f, \ell_0, \varepsilon, n, t, g) = 4 \max[C_1(f, \ell_0)(\sqrt{C_2(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t)} + C_2(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t)), C_3(t, n, g)]$, where $C_1(f, \ell_0)$ is a positive constant depending only on the shape function f and the frequency cut-off parameter ℓ_0 ,

$$C_2(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t) = \varepsilon^2(2\ell_0 + 1) + 2\varepsilon^2 \sqrt{\frac{2\ell_0 + 1}{n}t} + 2\frac{\varepsilon^2}{n}t$$

and

$$C_3(t, n, g) = \left(\sqrt{2\sigma_g^2 \frac{t}{n}} + \frac{t}{12n}\right)^2 \quad \text{with } \sigma_g^2 = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \tau^2 g(\tau) d\tau.$$

Theorem 4 provides an upper bound (in probability) for the consistency of the estimators $\hat{\tau}_m$ of the true random shifts $\tau_m^*, m = 2, \dots, n$, using the standard squared distance. Note that since the minimum of $M_n(\tau)$ is computed on the constrained set $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_n$, it follows that $\hat{\tau}_1 = -\sum_{m=2}^n \hat{\tau}_m$. However, one can remark that as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, the constant $C(f, \ell_0, \varepsilon, n, t, g)$ in inequality (5.5) tends to $4C_1(f, \ell_0)(\varepsilon^2(2\ell_0 + 1) + \varepsilon\sqrt{2\ell_0 + 1})$. This shows that $\hat{\tau}_m, m = 2, \dots, n$, are not consistent estimators in the sense that inequality (5.5) cannot be used to prove that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\hat{\tau}_m - \tau_m^*)^2 = 0$ in probability. On the contrary, inequality (5.5) suggests that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\hat{\tau}_m - \tau_m^*)^2 > C(\varepsilon^2(2\ell_0 + 1) + \varepsilon\sqrt{2\ell_0 + 1})$ with positive probability, and that the accuracy of the estimates $\hat{\tau}_m, m = 2, \dots, n$, should depend on the level of noise ε^2 and the frequency cut-off ℓ_0 .

The choice of the frequency cut-off ℓ_0 used to compute these estimators is a delicate model selection problem. Theorem 4 suggests that this choice should depend on n and the level of noise ε , but finding data-based values for ℓ_0 remains a challenge that we leave open for future work.

5.3. Lower bound for the estimation of the shifts. Let us now prove that the consistency of any estimate of the random shifts in model (5.4) is limited by the level of noise ε^2 in the observed curves. For this, let us make the following smoothness assumptions.

ASSUMPTION 5. The function f is such that $\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (2\pi\ell)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 < +\infty$.

ASSUMPTION 6. The density g is compactly supported on a interval $\mathcal{T} = [\tau_{\min}, \tau_{\max}]$ such that $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\min}} g(\tau) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\max}} g(\tau) = 0$.

Then, using general results on the Van Tree’s inequality [20] in model (5.4), the following theorem holds.

THEOREM 5. Denote by $X = (c_{m,\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, m=1, \dots, n}$ the set of observations taking values in the set $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{C}^{\infty \times n}$. Let $\hat{\tau}^n = \hat{\tau}^n(X)$ denote any estimator (a measurable function of the observations X) of the true shifts (τ_1, \dots, τ_n) . Then, under Assumptions 5 and 6,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n (\hat{\tau}_m^n - \tau_m^*)^2 \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (2\pi\ell)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathcal{T}} (\partial/\partial\tau \log g(\tau))^2 g(\tau) d\tau}.$$

Clearly, Theorem 5 shows that as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ then $\mathbb{E}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n (\hat{\tau}_m^n - \tau_m^*)^2)$ does not converge to zero which explains the results obtained in Theorem 4 on the consistency of the estimators $\hat{\tau}_m, m = 2, \dots, n$, based on Frechet mean for functional data. Note that Assumption 5 can be avoided if one only considers estimators $\hat{\tau}^{n,\ell_0}$ of the shifts based on the observations $c_{m,\ell}$ for $m = 1, \dots, n$ and $|\ell| \leq \ell_0$ in model (5.4). In this case, the lower bound in Theorem 5 becomes

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n (\hat{\tau}_m^{n,\ell_0} - \tau_m^*)^2 \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} (2\pi\ell)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathcal{T}} (\partial/\partial\tau \log g(\tau))^2 g(\tau) d\tau}.$$

5.4. Estimation of the mean pattern f and the density g . An estimator of the eigenvalue γ_ℓ is given by

$$(5.6) \quad \hat{\gamma}_\ell = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n e^{-i2\pi\ell\hat{\tau}_m}$$

for $|\ell| \leq \ell_0$ and an estimator for the density g is naturally given by $\hat{g}(x) = \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} \hat{\gamma}_\ell e^{-i2\pi\ell x}$. The mean pattern f can be estimated by the smoothed Frechet mean \tilde{f}_{n,ℓ_0} defined in Section 5.1, but following the results in Section 3 on nonlinear wavelet-based estimation, two other estimators for f can be defined: the first one is given by

$$(5.7) \quad \hat{f}_{n,1} = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} \hat{c}_{j_0,k,1} \phi_{j_0,k} + \sum_{j=j_0}^{j_1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \hat{\beta}_{j,k,1} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\hat{\beta}_{j,k,1}| \geq \hat{\lambda}_{j,1}\}} \psi_{j,k},$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{j,k,1} = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \psi_\ell^{j,k} \hat{\theta}_{\ell,1}$ and $\hat{c}_{j_0,k,1} = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j_0}} \phi_\ell^{j_0,k} \hat{\theta}_{\ell,1}$ with $\hat{\theta}_{\ell,1} = \frac{1}{\gamma_\ell} \times (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n c_{\ell,m})$, and

$$\hat{\lambda}_{j,1} = 2\hat{\sigma}_j \sqrt{\frac{2\eta \log(n)}{n}}$$

is the threshold suggested by the expression (3.4) of λ_j with $\hat{\sigma}_j^2 = 2^{-j} \varepsilon^2 \times \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\hat{\gamma}_\ell|^{-2}$. A second estimator is given by first realigning the curves using the estimators of the shifts, namely,

$$(5.8) \quad \hat{f}_{n,2} = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} \hat{c}_{j_0,k,2} \phi_{j_0,k} + \sum_{j=j_0}^{j_1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \hat{\beta}_{j,k,2} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\hat{\beta}_{j,k,2}| \geq \hat{\lambda}_{j,2}\}} \psi_{j,k},$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{j,k,2} = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \psi_\ell^{j,k} \hat{\theta}_{\ell,2}$ and $\hat{c}_{j_0,k,2} = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j_0}} \phi_\ell^{j_0,k} \hat{\theta}_{\ell,2}$ with

$$\hat{\theta}_{\ell,2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n c_{\ell,m} e^{i2\pi \ell \hat{\tau}_m},$$

and $\hat{\lambda}_{j,2}$ is a threshold whose choice would depend on the law of the $\hat{\beta}_{j,k,2}$'s. Studying the consistency and the rate of convergence of the estimators $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and $\hat{f}_{n,2}$ is a difficult task. Indeed the results in Section 3 have been derived using the fact that the law of the wavelet coefficients $\hat{\beta}_{j,k}$ and $\hat{c}_{j_0,k}$ given by (3.2) is known which allows the calibration of the threshold λ_j in (3.4). Thus, we simply suggest to take $\hat{\lambda}_{j,2} = \hat{\lambda}_{j,1}$. Extending the asymptotic results of Section 3 remains a challenge that is beyond the scope of this paper. Moreover, the results of Theorems 4 and 5 suggest that the estimators $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and $\hat{f}_{n,2}$ could be consistent by considering a double asymptotic setting with $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ which is an interesting point of view for future work that certainly leads to different minimax rates of convergence.

6. Numerical experiments. We compare our approach with the Procrustean mean which is a standard algorithm commonly used to extract a mean pattern. The Procrustean mean is based on an alternative scheme between estimation of the shifts and averaging of back-transformed curves given estimated values of the shifts parameters; see, for example, [27, 45]. To be more precise, it consists of an initialization step $\hat{f}_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n Y_m$ which is the simple average of the observed curves, that is taken as a first reference mean pattern. Then, at iteration $1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}$, it computes for all $1 \leq m \leq n$ the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{m,i}$ of the m th shift as $\hat{\tau}_{m,i} = \arg \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \|Y_m(\cdot + \tau) - \hat{f}_{i-1}\|^2$ and then takes $\hat{f}_i(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n Y_m(x + \hat{\tau}_{m,i})$ as a new reference mean pattern. This is repeated until the estimated reference curve does not change, and usually the algorithm converges in a few steps (we took $i_{\max} = 3$). In all simulations, we used the wavelet toolbox Wavelab [7] and the WaveD algorithm developed by [38] for fast deconvolution with Meyer wavelets.

6.1. *Shift estimation by gradient descent.* Let us denote by $\nabla M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the gradient of $M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ at $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This gradient is simple to compute as for $m = 1, \dots, n$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} \Re \left[2i\pi \ell c_{\ell,m} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_m} \overline{\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n c_{\ell,q} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_q} \right)} \right].$$

In practice, to estimate the shifts, the criterion $M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ is minimized by the following gradient descent algorithm with the constraint that $\tau_1 = -\sum_{m=2}^n \tau_m$:

Initialization: let $\boldsymbol{\tau}^0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\delta_0 = \frac{1}{\|\nabla M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}^0)\|}$, $M(0) = M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}^0)$ and set $p = 0$.

Step 2: let $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\text{new}} = \boldsymbol{\tau}^p - \delta_p \nabla M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}^p)$ and $\tau_1^{\text{new}} = -\sum_{m=2}^n \tau_m^{\text{new}}$.

Let $M(p + 1) = M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\text{new}})$.

While $M(p + 1) > M(p)$ *do*

$$\delta_p = \delta_p / \kappa \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\tau}^{\text{new}} = \boldsymbol{\tau}^p - \delta_p \nabla M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}^m) \quad \text{with} \quad \tau_1^{\text{new}} = -\sum_{m=2}^n \tau_m^{\text{new}},$$

and set $M(p + 1) = M_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\text{new}})$.

End while

Then, take $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{p+1} = \boldsymbol{\tau}^{\text{new}}$.

Step 3: if $M(p) - M(p + 1) \geq \rho(M(1) - M(p + 1))$ then set $p = p + 1$ and return to Step 2, else stop the iterations, and take $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}} = \boldsymbol{\tau}^{p+1}$.

In the above algorithm, $\rho > 0$ is a small stopping parameter and $\kappa > 1$ is a parameter to control the choice of the adaptive step δ_p .

6.2. *Estimation with an unknown density g.* For the mean pattern f to recover, we consider the four tests functions shown in Figures 1(a)–4(a). Then, we simulate $n = 200$ randomly shifted curves with shifts following a Laplace distribution $g(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \exp(-\sqrt{2}\frac{|x|}{\sigma})$ with $\sigma = 0.1$. Gaussian noise with a moderate variance (different to that used in the Laplace distribution) is then added to each curve. A subsample of 10 curves is shown in Figures 1(b)–4(b) for each test function, and the average of the observed curves, referred to as the direct mean in what follows, is displayed in Figures 1(c)–4(c). Note this gives a poor estimator of the mean pattern.

The Fourier coefficients of the density g are given by $\gamma_\ell = \frac{1}{1+2\sigma^2\pi^2\ell^2}$ which corresponds to a degree of ill-posedness $\nu = 2$. An estimator $\hat{\gamma}_\ell$ of γ_ℓ can be computed as explained in Section 5 using the gradient descent algorithm described in Section 6.1. In our simulations, we took the arbitrary choice $\ell_0 = 3$ for the frequency cut-off which gives satisfactory results in the numerical experiments.

To compute the threshold, $\hat{\lambda}_{j,1} = \hat{\lambda}_{j,2}$ used in the definition of $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and $\hat{f}_{n,2}$ (see Section 5) one has to estimate ε^2 . This is done by taking $\hat{\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_m^2$, where the variance ε_m^2 of the noise for the m th curve is easily estimated using the wavelet coefficients at the finest resolution level. Note that such thresholds are quite simple to compute using the fast Fourier transform and the fact that the set of frequencies Ω_j can be easily obtained using Wavelab. Finally, we have found that choosing η between 1 and 2 to compute $\hat{\lambda}_{j,1}$ gives quite satisfactory results.

Then we took $j_0 = 3 \approx \log_2(\log(n))$, but the choice $j_1 \approx \frac{1}{2\nu+1} \log_2(\frac{n}{\log(n)})$ is obviously too small. So in our simulations, j_1 is chosen to be the maximum resolution level allowed by the discretization, that is, $j_1 = \log_2(N) - 1 = 7$. For each




FIG. 1. Wave function. (a) Mean pattern f , (b) sample of 10 curves out of $n = 200$, (c) direct mean, deconvolution by wavelet thresholding with (d) $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and (e) $\hat{f}_{n,2}$, (f) Procrustean mean.




FIG. 2. HeaviSine function. (a) Mean pattern f , (b) sample of 10 curves out of $n = 200$, (c) direct mean, deconvolution by wavelet thresholding with (d) $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and (e) $\hat{f}_{n,2}$, (f) Procrustean mean.




FIG. 3. *Blocks function.* (a) Mean pattern f , (b) sample of 10 curves out of $n = 200$, (c) direct mean, deconvolution by wavelet thresholding with (d) $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and (e) $\hat{f}_{n,2}$, (f) Procrustean mean.




FIG. 4. *Bumps function.* (a) Mean pattern f , (b) sample of 10 curves out of $n = 200$, (c) direct mean, deconvolution by wavelet thresholding with (d) $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and (e) $\hat{f}_{n,2}$, (f) Procrustean mean.

test function, the estimators $\hat{f}_{n,1}, \hat{f}_{n,2}$ are displayed in Figures 1(d)(e)–4(d)(e). The Procrustean mean is displayed in Figures 1(f)–4(f). One can see that the results are rather satisfactory for $\hat{f}_{n,1}$ and the Procrustean mean. Clearly, the best results are given by the estimator $\hat{f}_{n,2}$ which gives very good estimates of the function f particularly for functions with isolated singularities such as the Blocks and Bumps functions in Figures 3 and 4. It should be noted that these results are obtained in the case of an unknown density g which shows the quality of the procedure proposed in Section 5 to estimate the shifts and the γ_ℓ 's. For reasons of space a detailed simulation study is not given, but it has been found that the good performances of the wavelet-based estimator remain consistent across other standard test signals.

7. Conclusions and future work. This paper makes a connection between mean pattern estimation and the statistical analysis of inverse problems for a very simple model with shifted curves. A natural extension would be to consider more complex deformations in SIM models such as the homothetic shifted regression model proposed in [44], or the rigid deformation model for images considered in [6]. The results obtained on the nonconsistency of the estimation of the shifts can be elaborated in future work on deformable models for signal and image analysis. In particular, it would be interesting to obtain similar results for more general deformation parameters in SIM models. Another interesting question in such models is whether one can estimate an unknown mean pattern consistently even if it is impossible to construct consistent estimators for the deformation parameters such as the random shifts in model (1.4).

Another promising approach would be to consider a double asymptotic setting with $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to study the consistency and rate of convergence for estimators of the mean pattern and the unknown density g .

APPENDIX

In what follows, C will denote a generic constant whose value may change from line to line.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. It follows immediately from Theorems 2 and 3. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1. Let $\kappa_\ell = (\frac{\tilde{\gamma}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} - 1)\theta_\ell$ and $\varepsilon_{\ell,n} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma_\ell} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n z_{\ell,m})$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, for a given filter λ , the risk $\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}, f)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}, f) &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (\lambda_\ell - 1)^2 \theta_\ell^2 + \mathbb{E}[\lambda_\ell^2 |\kappa_\ell|^2 + \lambda_\ell^2 |\varepsilon_{\ell,n}|^2] \\ &\quad + \lambda_\ell (\lambda_\ell - 1) \mathbb{E}[\bar{\theta}_\ell \kappa_\ell + \theta_\ell \bar{\kappa}_\ell] + \lambda_\ell (\lambda_\ell - 1) \mathbb{E}[\theta_\ell \bar{\varepsilon}_{\ell,n} + \bar{\theta}_\ell \varepsilon_{\ell,n}] \\ &\quad + \lambda_\ell^2 \mathbb{E}[\bar{\kappa}_\ell \varepsilon_{\ell,n} + \kappa_\ell \bar{\varepsilon}_{\ell,n}]. \end{aligned}$$

Now using the fact that κ_ℓ and $\varepsilon_{\ell,n}$ are independent and that $\mathbb{E}\varepsilon_{\ell,n} = 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} R(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda}, f) &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left[(\lambda_\ell - 1)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 + \lambda_\ell^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} - 1 \right|^2 + \frac{\lambda_\ell^2 \varepsilon^2}{n |\gamma_\ell|^2} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (\lambda_\ell - 1)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 + \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda_\ell^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 \left(\frac{1}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{n-1}{n} \gamma_\ell \gamma_{-\ell} \right) - 1 \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\lambda_\ell^2 \varepsilon^2}{n |\gamma_\ell|^2} \\ &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (\lambda_\ell - 1)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 + \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\lambda_\ell^2}{n} \left[|\theta_\ell|^2 \left(\frac{1}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} - 1 \right) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2. From Proposition 1 it follows that

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{n,\lambda^M}, f) = \sum_{|\ell| > M_n} |\theta_\ell|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{|\ell| \leq M_n} \left(|\theta_\ell|^2 \left(\frac{1}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} - 1 \right) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} \right).$$

By assumption $f \in H_s(A)$, which implies that there exist two positive constants C_1 and C_2 not depending on f and n such that for all sufficiently large n , $\sum_{|\ell| > M_n} |\theta_\ell|^2 \leq C_1 M_n^{-2s}$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{|\ell| \leq M_n} |\theta_\ell|^2 \leq C_2 n^{-1}$. Now, given that g satisfies Assumption 1, it follows that there exists a positive constant C_3 not depending on f and n such that for all sufficiently large n , $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{|\ell| \leq M_n} \frac{|\theta_\ell|^2 + \varepsilon^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} \leq C_3 n^{-1} M_n^{2\nu+1}$. Hence, the result immediately follows from the choice $M_n \sim n^{1/(2s+2\nu+1)}$, which completes the proof. \square

For the proofs of Propositions 3 and 5, let us remark that that $\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k} = Z_1 + Z_2$ with

$$(A.1) \quad Z_1 = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \psi_\ell^{j,k} \theta_\ell \left(\frac{\tilde{\gamma}_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} - 1 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad Z_2 = \varepsilon \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k}}{\gamma_\ell} \eta_\ell.$$

Under Assumption 2, $G(x) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} g(x+m)$ exists for all $x \in [0, 1]$ and is a bounded density. Throughout the proof, we use the following lemma whose proof is straightforward.

LEMMA 1. *Let $h \in L^2([0, 1])$ be a 1-periodic function on \mathbb{R} . Then, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x) \times g(x) dx = \int_0^1 h(x) G(x) dx$.*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3. First note that since $|\psi_\ell^{j,k}| \leq 2^{-j/2}$ and $\Omega_j \subset [-2^{j+2}c_0, -2^j c_0] \cup [2^j c_0, 2^{j+2}c_0]$ (see [26]) it follows that $\#\{\Omega_j\} \leq 4\pi 2^j$ and that under Assumption 1, $|\gamma_\ell|^{-2} \sim 2^{2j\nu}$ for all $\ell \in \Omega_j$. This implies that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(A.2) \quad \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \left| \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k}}{\gamma_\ell} \right|^2 \leq C 2^{2j\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \left| \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k}}{\gamma_\ell} \right| \leq C 2^{j(\nu+1/2)}.$$

Then, we need the following lemma which shows that the Fourier coefficients $\theta_\ell = \int_0^1 e^{-2i\ell\pi x} f(x) dx$ are uniformly bounded for all $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$.

LEMMA 2. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, $s - 1/p + 1/2 > 0$ and $A > 0$. Then there exists a constant $A' > 0$ such that for all $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$ and all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|\theta_\ell| \leq A'$.*

PROOF. Since $|\phi_\ell^{j_0,k}| \leq 2^{-j_0/2}$ and $|\psi_\ell^{j,k}| \leq 2^{-j/2}$ one can remark using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that for any $j_0 \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_\ell| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} |c_{j_0,k}| |\phi_\ell^{j_0,k}| + \sum_{j=j_0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} |\beta_{j,k}| |\psi_\ell^{j,k}| \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} |c_{j_0,k}|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sum_{j=j_0}^{+\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} |\beta_{j,k}|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the inequality $(\sum_{r=1}^m |a_r|^2)^{1/2} \leq m^{(1/2-1/p)_+} (\sum_{r=1}^m |a_r|^p)^{1/p}$ for ℓ_p -norm in \mathbb{R}^m it follows that $|\theta_\ell| \leq 2^{j_0(1/2-1/p)_+} (\sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} |c_{j_0,k}|^p)^{1/p} + \sum_{j=j_0}^{+\infty} 2^{j(1/2-1/p)_+} (\sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} |\beta_{j,k}|^p)^{1/p}$.

Since $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$, one has that $(\sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} |\beta_{j,k}|^p)^{1/p} \leq A 2^{-j(s+1/2-1/p)}$ and $(\sum_{k=0}^{2^{j_0}-1} |c_{j_0,k}|^p)^{1/p} \leq A$ which implies that $|\theta_\ell| \leq A 2^{j_0(1/2-1/p)_+} + A \times \sum_{j=j_0}^{+\infty} 2^{-j(s+1/2-1/p-(1/2-1/p)_+)}$. Taking, for instance, $j_0 = 0$ completes the proof since by assumption $s + 1/2 - 1/p > 0$. \square

An upper bound for $\mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^2$ (the proof to control $\mathbb{E}|\hat{c}_{j_0,k} - c_{j_0,k}|^2$ follows from the same arguments): from the decomposition (A.1) it follows that $\mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}|Z_1|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}|Z_2|^2$. Since η_ℓ are i.i.d. $N_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1/n)$, the bound (A.2) implies that

$$(A.3) \quad \mathbb{E}|Z_2|^2 \leq C \frac{2^{2j\nu}}{n}.$$

Then let us write $Z_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n (W_m - \mathbb{E}W_m)$ with $W_m = h_{j,k}(\tau_m)$ and $h_{j,k}(\tau) = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k} \theta_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau}$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. By independence of the τ_m 's, one has that

$\mathbb{E}|Z_1|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}|W_1|^2$. Applying Lemma 1 with $h = h_{j,k}$ and since the density G is bounded, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|W_1|^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^2 g(\tau) d\tau \\ (A.4) \quad &= \int_0^1 |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^2 G(\tau) d\tau \leq C \int_0^1 |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^2 d\tau \\ &\leq C \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\psi_\ell^{j,k}|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Parseval’s relation. Then, using the bound (A.2) and Lemma 2, inequality (A.4) implies that there exists a constant C such that for all $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$

$$(A.5) \quad \mathbb{E}Z_1^2 \leq C \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\psi_\ell^{j,k}|^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} \leq C \frac{2^{2j\nu}}{n}.$$

Hence, using the bounds (A.3) and (A.5), it follows that there exists a constant C such that for all $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$, $\mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^2 \leq C \frac{2^{2j\nu}}{n}$.

An upper bound for $\mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^4$: from the decomposition (A.1) it follows that $\mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^4 \leq C(\mathbb{E}|Z_1|^4 + \mathbb{E}|Z_2|^4)$. As Z_2 is a centered Gaussian variable with variance $\frac{1}{n}\varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \left|\frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k}}{\gamma_\ell}\right|^2 \leq C \frac{2^{2j\nu}}{n}$, one has that

$$(A.6) \quad \mathbb{E}|Z_2|^4 \leq C \frac{2^{4j\nu}}{n^2}.$$

Then remark that $Z_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n Y_m$ with $Y_m = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k} \theta_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} (e^{-i2\pi \ell \tau_m} - \gamma_\ell)$, and recall the so-called Rosenthal inequality for moment bounds of i.i.d. variables [43]: if X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. random variables such that $\mathbb{E}X_j = 0$, $\mathbb{E}X_j^2 \leq \sigma^2$, there exists a positive constant C such that $\mathbb{E}|\sum_{j=1}^n X_j/n|^4 \leq C(\sigma^4/n^2 + \mathbb{E}|X_1|^4/n^3)$.

Now remark that $\mathbb{E}Y_m = 0$, and arguing as previously for the control of $\mathbb{E}|W_1|^2$, see (A.4), it follows that $\mathbb{E}|Y_m|^2 \leq C2^{2j\nu}$ where C is constant not depending on f . Then remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4 &\leq C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^4 g(\tau) d\tau + |\beta_{j,k}|^4 \right) \\ &\quad \text{with } h_{j,k}(\tau) = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k} \theta_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} e^{-i2\pi \ell \tau}, \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^4 g(\tau) d\tau \leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \{|h_{j,k}(\tau)|^2\} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^2 g(\tau) d\tau.$$

Note that using (A.2) and Lemma 2, it follows that $|h_{j,k}(\tau)| \leq \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\psi_\ell^{j,k}||\theta_\ell|}{|\gamma_\ell|} \leq C \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\psi_\ell^{j,k}|}{|\gamma_\ell|} \leq C2^{j(\nu+1/2)}$ uniformly for $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$. Then, arguing as for the control of $\mathbb{E}|W_1|^2$, see (A.4), one has that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^2 g(\tau) d\tau \leq C2^{2j\nu}$, which finally implies that $\mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4 \leq C2^{j(4\nu+1)}$, since $|\beta_{j,k}| \leq C$ uniformly for $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$. Then, using Rosenthal’s inequality, it follows that there exists a constant C such that for all $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$

$$(A.7) \quad \mathbb{E}|Z_1|^4 \leq C \left(\frac{2^{j4\nu}}{n^2} + \frac{2^{j(4\nu+1)}}{n^3} \right),$$

which completes the proof for the control of $\mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}|^4$ using (A.6) and (A.7). □

A.1. Proof of Proposition 4 and Theorem 2. First, let us prove the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 5. *Let $f \in L^2([0, 1])$, $n \geq 1$ and $j \geq 0$. Suppose that g satisfies Assumption 2. For $0 \leq k \leq 2^j - 1$ and $\theta_\ell = \int_0^1 f(x)e^{-i2\pi\ell x} dx$, define*

$$\sigma_j^2 = 2^{-j} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\gamma_\ell|^{-2}, \quad V_j^2 = \|g\|_\infty^2 2^{-j} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\theta_\ell|^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2}$$

and

$$\delta_j = 2^{-j/2} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\theta_\ell|}{|\gamma_\ell|}$$

with $\|g\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{g(x)\}$. Let $t > 0$, then,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}| \geq 2 \max \left(\sigma_j \sqrt{\frac{2t}{n}}, \sqrt{\frac{2V_j^2 t}{n}} + \delta_j \frac{t}{3n} \right) \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t).$$

PROOF. Let $u > 0$, and remark that from the decomposition (A.1) it follows

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}| \geq u) \leq \mathbb{P}(|Z_1| \geq u/2) + \mathbb{P}(|Z_2| \geq u/2).$$

Recall that the η_ℓ ’s are i.i.d. $N_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1/n)$. Hence, Z_2 is a centered Gaussian variable with variance $\frac{1}{n} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \left| \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k}}{\gamma_\ell} \right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sigma_j^2$, with $\sigma_j^2 = 2^{-j} \varepsilon^2 \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\gamma_\ell|^{-2}$, which implies that (see, e.g., [33]) for any $t > 0$

$$(A.8) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(|Z_2| \geq \sigma_j \sqrt{\frac{2t}{n}} \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t).$$

By definition,

$$\tilde{\gamma}_\ell = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau_m},$$

and thus $Z_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n (W_m - \mathbb{E}W_m)$ with $W_m = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k} \theta_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau_m}$. Remark that W_m are random variables bounded by $\delta_j = 2^{-j/2} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\theta_\ell|}{|\gamma_\ell|}$. Moreover, using Lemma 1 with $h = h_{j,k}(\tau) = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{\psi_\ell^{j,k} \theta_\ell}{\gamma_\ell} e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau}$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}|W_1|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |h_{j,k}(\tau)|^2 g(\tau) d\tau \leq \|G\|_\infty \sum_{\ell \in C_j} \frac{|\psi_\ell^{j,k}|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} \leq V_j^2,$$

where $V_j^2 = \|g\|_\infty 2^{-j} \sum_{\ell \in C_j} \frac{|\theta_\ell|^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2}$, since $|\psi_\ell^{j,k}| \leq 2^{-j/2}$ and $\|g\|_\infty = \|G\|_\infty$. Hence, from Bernstein’s inequality it follows that for any $t > 0$ (see, e.g., Proposition 2.9 in [33])

$$(A.9) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(|Z_1| \geq \sqrt{\frac{2V_j^2 t}{n}} + \delta_j \frac{t}{3n}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-t).$$

Taking $u = 2 \max(\sigma_j \sqrt{\frac{2t}{n}}, \sqrt{\frac{2V_j^2 t}{n}} + \delta_j \frac{t}{3n})$ for $t > 0$ concludes the proof of Proposition 5. \square

Proposition 5 would suggest to take level-dependent thresholds of the form

$$(A.10) \quad \lambda_{j,k}^* = \lambda_j^* = 2 \max\left(\sigma_j \sqrt{\frac{2\eta \log(n)}{n}}, \sqrt{\frac{2\eta V_j^2 \log(n)}{n}} + \delta_j \frac{\eta \log(n)}{3n}\right)$$

for some constant $\eta > 0$. The first term in the maximum (A.10) is the classical universal threshold with heteroscedastic variance σ_j^2 which corresponds to an upper bound of the variance of the Gaussian term $\varepsilon \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{\eta \ell}{\gamma_\ell}$ in the expression of $\hat{\beta}_{j,k}$. However, the second term in the maximum (A.10) depends on the modulus of the unknown Fourier coefficients θ_ℓ , and thus the thresholds λ_j^* cannot be used in practice.

Fortunately, the computation of the threshold $\lambda_{j,k}^*$ can be simplified using the following arguments. Since there exist two constants C_1, C_2 such that for all $\ell \in \Omega_j$, $C_1 2^j \leq \ell \leq C_2 2^j$ and since $\lim_{|\ell| \rightarrow +\infty} \theta_\ell = 0$ uniformly for $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$ it follows that as $j \rightarrow +\infty$

$$V_j^2 = \|g\|_\infty 2^{-j} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\theta_\ell|^2}{|\gamma_\ell|^2} = o\left(2^{-j} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\gamma_\ell|^{-2}\right) = o(\sigma_j^2).$$

Also, if $f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$ then $\sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\theta_\ell|^2 = o(1)$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, and thus by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, then as $j \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\delta_j = 2^{-j/2} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} \frac{|\theta_\ell|}{|\gamma_\ell|} \leq 2^{-j/2} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\theta_\ell|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\gamma_\ell|^{-2} \right)^{1/2} = o(\sigma_j),$$

which finally implies that $\lambda_j^* = o(\lambda_j)$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$ where $\lambda_j = 2\sigma_j \sqrt{\frac{2\eta \log(n)}{n}}$. Hence, if one chooses j_0 to be slowly growing with n [e.g., $j_0 = \log(\log(n))$], or avoid thresholding at very low resolution levels, then the threshold λ_j can be used instead of λ_j^* whose computation would require an estimator of the $|\theta_\ell|$'s.

Combining Propositions 3 and 5, the above remarks on the thresholds λ_j and λ_j^* , and by arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1 in [26], then Proposition 4 and Theorem 2 follow.

A.2. Proof of Theorem 3. Let us fix a resolution $j \geq 0$ whose choice will be discussed later on, and consider for any $\eta = (\eta_i)_{i \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}} \in \{\pm 1\}^{2^j}$ the function $f_{j,\eta}$ defined as $f_{j,\eta} = \gamma_j \sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1} \eta_k \psi_{j,k}$, where $\gamma_j = c2^{-j(s+1/2)}$, and c is a positive constant satisfying $c \leq A$ which implies that $f_{j,\eta} \in B_{p,q}^s(A)$. For some $0 \leq i \leq 2^j - 1$ and $\eta \in \{\pm 1\}^{2^j}$, define also the vector $\eta^i \in \{\pm 1\}^{2^j}$ with components equal to those of η except the i th one.

Let $\psi_{j,k} \star g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_{j,k}(x - u)g(u) du$. By Parseval's relation, one has that $\|\psi_{j,k} \star g\|^2 = \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_j} |\psi_\ell^{j,k}|^2 |\gamma_\ell|^2$. Hence, under Assumption 1 of a polynomial decay for γ_ℓ and using the fact that $|\psi^{j,k}| \leq 2^{-j/2}$ for Meyer wavelets (see [26]) it follows that there exists a constant C such that $\|\psi_{j,k} \star g\|^2 \leq C2^{-2jv}$.

A.2.1. Asymptotic settings. We set the resolution $j = j(n)$ to be the largest integer satisfying $2^{j(n)} \leq n^{1/(2s+2v+1)}$. However, to simplify the presentation, the dependency of j on n is dropped in what follows. The definition of $f_{j,\eta}$, γ_j and the bound $\|\psi_{j,k} \star g\|^2 \leq C2^{-2jv}$ thus imply that

$$\gamma_j = \mathcal{O}(n^{-(s+1/2)/(2s+2v+1)})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 &= \mathcal{O}(n^{-(2s)/(2s+2v+1)}), \\ \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2 &= \left\| \gamma_j \sum_k \eta_k (\psi_{j,k} \star g) \right\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(n^{(-2s-2v)/(2s+2v+1)}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\|(f_{j,\eta} - f_{j,\eta^i}) \star g\|^2 = \|2\gamma_j \eta_i (\psi_{j,i} \star g)\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(\gamma_j^2 2^{-2jv}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}).$$

From the above equations, we can thus conclude that $n\|(f_{j,\eta} - f_{j,\eta^i}) \star g\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, but note that the term $n\|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2$ does not converge to 0. At last, observe that by assumption $s > 2v + 1$ which implies that $n\|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^3 \rightarrow 0$, $n\|(f_{j,\eta} - f_{j,\eta^i}) \star g\| \|f_{j,\eta}\| \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\| \rightarrow 0$ and $n\|f_{j,\eta}\|^3 \rightarrow 0$.

A.2.2. *Likelihood ratio.* Let $F(Y)$ be real valued and bounded measurable function of the n trajectories $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$. Because of the independence of the τ_i 's and the W_i 's, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_f[F(Y)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{E}_{f,W}[F(Y)|\tau_1 = t_1, \dots, \tau_n = t_n]g(t_1) \cdots g(t_n) dt_n,$$

where \mathbb{E}_f denotes the expectation with respect to the law of $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ when f is the true hypothesis, and $\mathbb{E}_{f,W}$ is used to denote expectation only with respect to law of the Brownian motions W_1, \dots, W_n where the shifts are fixed and f is the true hypothesis. Now using the classical Girsanov formula it follows that for any function $h \in L^2([0, 1])$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_f[F(Y)] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{E}_{h,W}[F(Y)|\tau_1 = t_1, \dots, \tau_n = t_n]\Lambda_n(f, h)g(t_1) dt_1 \cdots g(t_n) dt_n \\ &= \mathbb{E}_h[F(Y)\Lambda_n(f, h)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda_n(f, h)$ is the following likelihood ratio:

$$\Lambda_n(f, h) = \prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left(\int_0^1 (f(x - \tau_i) - h(x - \tau_i)) dY_i(x) + \frac{1}{2}\|h\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|f\|^2\right).$$

In what follows, f_0 is used to denote the hypothesis $f \equiv 0$.

A.2.3. *Technical lemmas.* Given n arbitrary trajectories Y_1, \dots, Y_n from model (1.4), we define $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^i}, f_0))$ as the expectation of the likelihood ratio with respect to the law of the random shifts, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^i}, f_0)) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \prod_{i=1}^n e^{\int_0^1 (f(x-\tau_i)-h(x-\tau_i)) dY_i(x) + 1/2\|h\|^2 - 1/2\|f\|^2} \\ &\quad \times g(\tau_1) \cdots g(\tau_n) d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_n. \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 3. *Suppose for some constants $\lambda > 0$ and $\pi_0 > 0$ and all sufficiently large n we have that*

$$(A.11) \quad \mathbb{P}_{f_{j,\eta}}\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^i}, f_0))}{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0))} \geq e^{-\lambda}\right) \geq \pi_0$$

for all $f_{j,\eta}$ and all $i \in \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}$. Then there exists a positive constant C , such that for all sufficiently large n and any estimator \hat{f}_n

$$\max_{\eta \in \{\pm 1\}^{2^j}} \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}} \|\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}\|^2 \geq C\pi_0 e^{-\lambda} 2^j \gamma_j^2.$$

PROOF. Our proof is inspired by the proof of Lemma 2.10 in [22]. For this, let $I_{jk} = [\frac{k}{2^j}, \frac{k+1}{2^j}]$ and arguing as in [22] it follows that for any estimator \hat{f}_n

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\eta \in \{\pm 1\}^{2^j}} \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}} \|\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}\|^2 \\ & \geq 2^{-2^j} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \sum_{\eta|\eta_k=1} \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}} \left[\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}|^2 \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. + \Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_{j,\eta}) \int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z(Y) = [\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}|^2 + \Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_{j,\eta}) \int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2]$ and remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}} [Z(Y)] &= \mathbb{E}_{f_0, W} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0) \int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}|^2 \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. + \Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_0) \int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2 \right] \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \times g(\tau_1) d\tau_1 \cdots g(\tau_n) d\tau_n. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since under the hypothesis f_0 the trajectories Y_1, \dots, Y_n do not depend on the random shifts τ_1, \dots, τ_n it follows that \hat{f}_n does not depend on the shifts τ_1, \dots, τ_n as it is by definition a measurable function with respect to the sigma algebra generated by Y_1, \dots, Y_n . This implies that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}} [Z(Y)] &= \mathbb{E}_{f_0, W} \left[\mathbb{E}_\tau (\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0)) \int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}|^2 \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. + \mathbb{E}_\tau (\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_0)) \int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2 \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{f_0, W} \left[\mathbb{E}_\tau (\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0)) \delta^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}|^2 > \delta^2\}} \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. + \mathbb{E}_\tau (\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_0)) \delta^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2 > \delta^2\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, remark that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \geq \left(\int_{I_{j,k}} |f_{j,\eta} - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \geq 2\gamma_j \left(\int_{I_{j,k}} |\psi_{jk}|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and let us argue as in the proof of Lemma 2 in [46] to find a lower bound for $\int_{I_{j,k}} |\psi_{jk}|^2$. By definition (see Section 3) $\psi_{j,k}(x) = 2^{j/2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi^*(2^j(x+i) - k)$ where ψ^* is the Meyer wavelet over \mathbb{R} used to construct ψ . A change of variable shows that $\int_{I_{j,k}} |\psi_{jk}(x)|^2 dx = \int_0^1 |\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi^*(x + 2^j i)|^2 dx$ which implies that $\int_{I_{j,k}} |\psi_{jk}(x)|^2 dx \geq \int_0^1 |\psi^*(x)|^2 dx - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_0^1 |\psi^*(x + 2^j i)|^2 dx$. Now as ψ^* has a fast decay, it follows that there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that $|\psi^*(x)| \leq \frac{A}{1+x^2}$. Thus, $\int_{I_{j,k}} |\psi_{jk}(x)|^2 dx \geq \int_0^1 |\psi^*(x)|^2 dx - A^2 2^{-2j} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^*} i^{-2}$. Hence, it follows that there exists a constant $\rho > 0$ such that $(\int_{I_{j,k}} |\psi_{jk}|^2)^{1/2} \geq \rho$ for any k , and all j sufficiently large.

Hence, if one takes $\delta = 2\rho\gamma_j$ it follows that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}|^2 > \delta^2\}} \geq \mathbb{1}_{\{\int_{I_{j,k}} |\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta^k}|^2 \leq \delta^2\}},$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}}[Z(Y)] &\geq \delta^2 \mathbb{E}_{f_0, W} \left[\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0)) \min\left(1, \frac{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_0))}{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0))}\right) \right] \\ &= \delta^2 \mathbb{E}_{f_0} \left[\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0) \min\left(1, \frac{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_0))}{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0))}\right) \right] \\ &= \delta^2 \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}} \left[\min\left(1, \frac{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^k}, f_0))}{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0))}\right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2.10 in [22] completes the proof. \square

Now remark that under the hypothesis $f = f_{j,\eta}$, then each Y_i is given by $dY_i(x) = f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx + dW_i(x)$ where each α_i is the true random shift of the i th trajectory. Thus, under this hypothesis, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0)) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) e^{\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x-\tau_i) f_{j,\eta}(x-\alpha_i) dx + f_{j,\eta}(x-\tau_i) dW_i(x) - 1/2 \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2} d\tau_i \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^i}, f_0)) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) e^{\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta^i}(x-\tau_i) f_{j,\eta}(x-\alpha_i) dx + f_{j,\eta^i}(x-\tau_i) dW_i(x) - 1/2 \|f_{j,\eta^i}\|^2} d\tau_i. \end{aligned}$$

Using the two expressions above, we now study condition (A.11).

LEMMA 4. *Following the choices of $j(n)$ and $\gamma_{j(n)}$ given in our algebraic setting, there exist $\lambda > 0$ and $\pi_0 > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n*

$$\mathbb{P}_{f_{j,\eta}} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^i}, f_0))}{\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0))} \geq e^{-\lambda} \right) \geq \pi_0.$$

PROOF. To obtain the required bound, we use several second order Taylor expansions. From the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$e^{\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x-\tau_i)f_{j,\eta}(x-\alpha_i) dx} = 1 + \int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i)f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx + \mathcal{O}_p(\|f_{j,\eta}\|^4).$$

A similar argument yields $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x)] \leq \|f_{j,\eta}\|$, and the Markov inequality used with a second order expansion implies $e^{\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x-\tau_i) dW_i(x)} = 1 + \int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) + \frac{1}{2}[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x)]^2 + \mathcal{O}_p(\|f_{j,\eta}\|^3)$. Looking now at the complete expression of $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0))$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0)) = \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i)[1 + \int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i)f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx + \int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) + \frac{1}{2}[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x)]^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 + \mathcal{O}_p(\|f_{j,\eta}\|^3)]$. The Fubini-type theorem for stochastic integrals (see, e.g., [24], Chapter 3, Lemma 4.1) enables us to write $\log \mathbb{E}_\tau(\Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log[1 + \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x)f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx + \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} [\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x)]^2 g(\tau_i) d\tau_i - \frac{1}{2}\|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 + \mathcal{O}_p(\|f_{j,\eta}\|^3)]$.

Then applying a classical expansion of the logarithm $\log(1 + z) = z - \frac{z^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(z^3)$, we obtain

$$\log \mathbb{E}_\tau \Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0) = z - \frac{z^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}_p(z^3)$$

$$(A.12) \quad = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x)f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx + \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x)$$

$$(A.13) \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2$$

$$(A.14) \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x)f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx \right.$$

$$(A.15) \quad \left. + \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}_p(n\|f_{j,\eta}\|^3).$$

We first discuss the size of the terms in (A.14) and (A.15). The first term in (A.14) can be bounded using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx \right)^2 \leq n \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2 \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 = \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^4).$$

But observe that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{W_i} (\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x))^2 = n \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2$ which does not converge to 0. Then the Jensen inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{W_i} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 d\tau_i \right)^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \mathbb{E}_{W_i} \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^4 d\tau_i \\ & = \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^4). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now study the terms derived from double products in (A.14) and (A.15), use first that $2|ab| \leq (a^2 + b^2)$ to get $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\alpha_i, W_i} |\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx| \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) [\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x)]^2 d\tau_i = \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^4)$.

The Cauchy–Schwarz and Jensen inequalities imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{W_i} \left| \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right| \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 d\tau_i \right| \\ & = \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^3). \end{aligned}$$

At last, the Cauchy–Schwarz and Jensen inequalities on the remaining double-product term imply also

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{W,\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right| \\ & = \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^3). \end{aligned}$$

All the above bounds enables us to write

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 & := \log \Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta}, f_0) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx + \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^3). \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, we can also write

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_2 &:= \log \Lambda_n(f_{j,\eta^i}, f_0) \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta^i} \star g)(x) f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx \\
 &\quad + \int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta^i} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta^i}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta^i}\|^2 \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta^i} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^3).
 \end{aligned}$$

For sake of simplicity, let us write $h = f_{j,\eta^i} - f_{j,\eta} = 2\eta_i \psi_{j,i}$. The difference $L = L_2 - L_1$ can thus be decomposed as

$$(A.16) \quad L = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (h \star g)(x) [f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) - f_{j,\eta} \star g(x)] dx$$

$$(A.17) \quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (h \star g)(x) (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dx + \int_0^1 (h \star g)(x) dW_i(x)$$

$$(A.18) \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta^i}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta^i}\|^2$$

$$(A.19) \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x) \right]^2 + \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2$$

$$(A.20) \quad - \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta^i} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right)^2 - n \|f_{j,\eta^i} \star g\|^2 \right]$$

$$(A.21) \quad - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta^i} \star g\|^2$$

$$(A.22) \quad + \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right)^2 - n \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2 \right]$$

$$(A.23) \quad + \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2$$

$$(A.24) \quad + \mathcal{O}_p(n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^3).$$

Bound for (A.16): we use the classical Bennett inequality (see, e.g., [33]) for a sum of independent and bounded variables. Define $S = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (h \star$

$g)(x)[f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) - f_{j,\eta} \star g(x)] dx$. From the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the random variables $\int_0^1 (h \star g)(x) f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx$ are bounded by a constant b such that $b = \|h \star g\| \|f_{j,\eta}\|$. Let v and c to be defined as

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (h \star g)(x) f_{j,\eta}(x - \alpha_i) dx \right]^2 \quad \text{and} \quad c = b/3.$$

From the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have that $v \leq n \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 \|h \star g\|^2$ and as $h = f_{j,\eta^i} - f_{j,\eta}$, by using our algebraic settings in Section A.2.1, we observe that $v \rightarrow 0$. Bennett’s inequality therefore implies that for any $\kappa > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(|S| \geq \kappa) \leq 2e^{-\kappa^2 / (2(n\|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 \|h \star g\|^2 + \kappa \|h \star g\| \|f_{j,\eta}\|/3))}.$$

From our algebraic settings in Section A.2.1, one has thus that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the $\mathbb{P}(|S| \geq \kappa)$ converges to 0.

Bound for (A.18), (A.19), (A.20), (A.22): applying Lemma 5 (proved below) to the chi-square statistics in the expressions (A.18), (A.19) yields that for any $\kappa > 0$ $\mathbb{P}(|\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) [\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta^i}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x)]^2 - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta^i}\|^2| \geq \kappa) \leq 2e^{-\kappa^2 / (n\|f_{j,\eta^i}\|^4 + 2\kappa \|f_{j,\eta^i}\|^2)}$ and $\mathbb{P}(|\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) [\int_0^1 f_{j,\eta}(x - \tau_i) dW_i(x)]^2 - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2| \geq \kappa) \leq 2e^{-\kappa^2 / (n\|f_{j,\eta}\|^4 + 2\kappa \|f_{j,\eta}\|^2)}$. Similarly, we obtain for the chi-square statistics in (A.20), (A.22) that for any $\kappa > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right)^2 - n \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2 \right] \right| \geq \kappa \right) \\ & \leq 2e^{-\kappa^2 / (n\|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^4 + 2\kappa \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 (f_{j,\eta^i} \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right)^2 - n \|f_{j,\eta^i} \star g\|^2 \right] \right| \geq \kappa \right) \\ & \leq 2e^{-\kappa^2 / (n\|f_{j,\eta^i} \star g\|^4 + 2\kappa \|f_{j,\eta^i} \star g\|^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the algebraic setting in Section A.2.1 that $n\|f_{j,\eta}\|^4 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|f_{j,\eta}\|^2 \rightarrow 0$, as well as $n\|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^4 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ and the above probabilities converge to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Bound for (A.17), (A.21), (A.23): using the first term of (A.17), simple computation shows that yields $\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 ((f_{j,\eta^i} - f_{j,\eta}) \star g)(x) (f_{j,\eta} \star g)(x) dx - \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta^i} \star g\|^2 + \frac{n}{2} \|f_{j,\eta} \star g\|^2 = -\frac{n}{2} \|h \star g\|^2$ and we obtain from our algebraic settings that this term converges to 0 since $n\|h \star g\|^2 \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, the second term of (A.17) is the sum of n i.i.d. centered normal variables and the Cirelson–Ibragimov–Sudakov inequality [11] ensures that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 (h \star g)(x) dW_i(x) \right| \geq \kappa \right) \leq 2e^{-\kappa^2 / (2n\|h \star g\|^2)},$$

and thus the above probability goes to zero.

Bound for (A.24): from our algebraic settings in Section A.2.1, it follows immediately that $n\|f_{j,\eta}\|^3 \rightarrow 0$.

Hence, by combining all the above bounds, it follows that we have shown that $L_2 - L_1$ is the sum of various terms which all converge to zero in probability or that are larger than some negative constant with probability tending to one as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, which completes the proof of Lemma 4. \square

LEMMA 5. *Let g be a density function on \mathbb{R} , and $(W_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ be independent standard Brownian motions on $[0, 1]$. Then, for any $f \in L^2([0, 1])$ and $\alpha > 0$,*

$$P\left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \left[\int_0^1 f(t - \tau_i) dW_i(t) \right]^2 d\tau_i - \frac{n}{2} \|f\|^2 \geq \alpha\right) \leq e^{-\alpha^2 / (n\|f\|^4 + 2\alpha\|f\|^2)}.$$

PROOF. Consider $\zeta_n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) [\int_0^1 f(t - \tau_i) dW_i(t)]^2 d\tau_i - \frac{n}{2} \|f\|^2$. We use a Laplace transform technique to bound $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_n \geq \alpha)$. For any $\frac{1}{\|f\|^2} > t > 0$, we have by Markov's inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_n \geq \alpha) \leq e^{-\alpha t - n/2\|f\|^2 t} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{t/2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) (\int_0^1 f(t - \tau_i) dW_i(t))^2 d\tau_i}].$$

We apply now Jensen's inequality for the exponential function and the measure $g(\tau) d\tau$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_n \geq \alpha) \leq e^{-\alpha t - n/2\|f\|^2 t} \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\tau_i) \mathbb{E}[e^{t/2 (\int_0^1 f(t - \tau_i) dW_i(t))^2}] d\tau_i.$$

Remark that $(\int_0^1 f(t - \tau_i) dW_i(t))^2$ follows a chi-square distribution whose Laplace transform does not depend on τ_i and thus

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_n \geq \alpha) \leq e^{-\alpha t - n/2\|f\|^2 t - n/2 \log(1 - t\|f\|^2)}.$$

Let $\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{n/2\|f\|^2}$ and minimizing now the last bound with respect to t yield the optimal choice $t^* = \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{1 + \tilde{\alpha}}$. With this choice, we obtain $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_n \geq \alpha) \leq \exp(\frac{n}{2} [\log(1 + \tilde{\alpha}) - \tilde{\alpha}])$. Now use the classical bound $\log(1 + u) - u \leq \frac{-u^2}{2(1+u)}$, valid for all $u \geq 0$, to get $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_n \geq \alpha) \leq \exp(\frac{n}{2} \times \frac{\tilde{\alpha}^2}{2(1+\tilde{\alpha})}) = \exp(\frac{-\alpha^2}{n\|f\|^4 + 2\alpha\|f\|^2})$, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

A.2.4. *A lower bound for the minimax risk.* By Lemmas 3 and 4, it follows that there exists a constant C_1 such that for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\inf_{\hat{f}_n} \sup_{f \in B_{p,q}^s(A)} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{f}_n - f\|^2 \geq \inf_{\hat{f}_n} \max_{\eta \in \{\pm 1\}^{2j}} \mathbb{E}_{f_{j,\eta}} \|\hat{f}_n - f_{j,\eta}\|^2 \geq C_1 n^{-(2s)/(2s+2\nu+1)},$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 3.

A.3. Proof of Theorem 4. For $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathcal{T}^n$ define the criterion $M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_m - \tau_m^*)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n \theta_\ell e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)}|^2$. Then let us first prove the following lemma.

LEMMA 6. *Suppose that Assumption 4 hold. Then, the function $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mapsto M(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ has a unique minimum on $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n$ at $\boldsymbol{\tau} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ such that $M(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) = 0$ given by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}} = (\tau_1^* - \bar{\tau}_n, \tau_2^* - \bar{\tau}_n, \dots, \tau_n^* - \bar{\tau}_n)$, where $\bar{\tau}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \tau_m^*$.*

PROOF. By definition of $M(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ it follows immediately that $M(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) = 0$ and thus $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ is a minimum since $M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \geq 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}^n$. Now suppose that there exists $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n$ such that $M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = 0$. This implies that for all $m = 1, \dots, n$ and all $-\ell_0 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$ $|\theta_\ell|^2 |e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_m - \tau_m^*)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)}|^2 = 0$. Since by assumption $\theta_\ell^* \neq 0$, it follows that for $\ell = 1$, $|e^{2i\pi(\tau_m - \tau_m^*)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n e^{2i\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)}|^2 = 0$ for all $m = 1, \dots, n$, which implies that $e^{2i\pi(\tau_m - \tau_m^*)} = e^{2i\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)}$ for all $m, q = 1, \dots, n$, since $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n e^{2i\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)}$ does not depend on m . This implies that $\tau_m - \tau_m^* = \tau_0 \pmod 1$ for $m = 2, \dots, n$, where $\tau_0 = \tau_1 - \tau_1^*$. By assumption τ_1, τ_1^* belong to $\mathcal{T} = [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$ and thus $|\tau_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, $\tau_m = \tau_m^* + \tau_0$ for $m = 1, \dots, n$. Since $\sum_{m=1}^n \tau_m = 0$ this implies that $\tau_0 = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \tau_m^*$ and thus $\tau_m = \tilde{\tau}_m$ for $m = 1, \dots, n$ which completes the proof. \square

Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ given by $F(\tau_2, \dots, \tau_n) = (-\sum_{m=2}^n \tau_m, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n)^t$, and let $\tilde{M} : \mathcal{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by $\tilde{M}(\tau_2, \dots, \tau_n) = M(F(\tau_2, \dots, \tau_n))$.

LEMMA 7. *Let $\nabla^2 \tilde{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1})$ denotes the Hessian of \tilde{M} at $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1} = (\tilde{\tau}_2, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_n)$, then $\nabla^2 \tilde{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}) = (\frac{2}{n} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |2\pi\ell|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2) (I_{n-1} + \mathbb{1}_{n-1}^t \mathbb{1}_{n-1})$, where I_{n-1} is the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ identity matrix and $\mathbb{1}_{n-1} = (1, \dots, 1)^t$ is the vector of \mathbb{R}^{n-1} with all entries equal to one. Moreover, $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \tilde{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1})) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |2\pi\ell|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2$, where $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ denotes the smallest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix A .*

PROOF. First remark that for $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1} = (\tau_2, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ then $\nabla^2 \tilde{M}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1}) = \nabla F^t \nabla^2 M(F(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1})) \nabla F$ where $\nabla^2 M(F(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1}))$ denotes the Hessian of M at $F(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1})$ and ∇F is the gradient of F [$n \times (n-1)$ matrix not depending on $\boldsymbol{\tau}$]. Now, since for any $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}^n$ $M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 (1 - |\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)}|^2)$ it follows that for $m = 2, \dots, n$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = -\frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 \Re \left[2i\pi\ell e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_m - \tau_m^*)} \left(\sum_{q=1}^n e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)} \right) \right],$$

where $\Re[z]$ denotes the real part of a complex number. Hence, for $m_1 \neq m_2$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau_{m_2} \partial \tau_{m_1}} M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = -\frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |2\pi\ell|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 \Re \left[e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_{m_1} - \tau_{m_1}^* - \tau_{m_2} + \tau_{m_2}^*)} \right]$$

and for $m_1 = m_2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau_{m_1} \partial \tau_{m_1}} M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \\ &= -\frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |2\pi \ell|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 \Re \left[1 - e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_{m_1} - \tau_{m_1}^*)} \left(\sum_{q=1}^n e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, remark that $F(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$. Hence, by taking $\tau_m = \tilde{\tau}_m$ for $m = 2, \dots, n$ in the above formulas, it follows that

$$(A.25) \quad \nabla^2 M(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) = \nabla^2 M(F(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1})) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |2\pi \ell|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 \left(I_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{1}_n \mathbb{1}_n^t \right),$$

where I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $\mathbb{1}_n = (1, \dots, 1)^t$ is the vector of \mathbb{R}^n with all entries equal to one. Hence, the result follows from (A.25) and the equality $\nabla^2 \tilde{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}) = \nabla F^t \nabla^2 M(F(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1})) \nabla F$, and the fact that the eigenvalues of the matrix $A = I_{n-1} + \mathbb{1}_{n-1}^t \mathbb{1}_{n-1}$ are n (of multiplicity 1) and 1 (of multiplicity $n - 2$). □

LEMMA 8. *Suppose that Assumption 4 holds. Then, there exists a constant $\kappa(f) > 0$ (depending on the shape function f) such that for all $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - M(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) \geq \kappa(f) (\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2) (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\tau_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2)$.*

PROOF. First, remark that for any $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n$ then $\tilde{M}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1}) = M(F(\boldsymbol{\tau}))$ where $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1} = (\tau_2, \dots, \tau_n)$. Since $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ is a minimum of $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mapsto M(\boldsymbol{\tau})$, a second order Taylor expansion implies that for all $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1}$ in neighborhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{T}^{n-1}$ of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - M(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) &= \tilde{M}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1}) - \tilde{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}) \\ &= (\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1})^t \nabla^2 \tilde{M}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}) (\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}) + o(\|\boldsymbol{\tau}_{-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_{-1}\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 7 and the above equation, it follows that there exists a universal constant $0 < c_1 < 1$ and an open neighborhood $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} \subset \mathcal{V}$ of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ such that for all $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \tilde{\mathcal{V}}$

$$M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - M(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) \geq 2c_1 \left(\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |2\pi \ell|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\tau_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2 \right).$$

Now remark that under Assumption 4, $M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) > M(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ by Lemma 6. Since $M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 (1 - |\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)}|^2)$, the compactness of $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n$ and the continuity of $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mapsto M(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ implies that there exists a constant $0 < c_2(f) < 1$ (depending on $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ and thus on f) such that for all $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{V}}$, $M(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \geq \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 (1 - c_2(f))$. Moreover, since \mathcal{T} is a compact set it follows that there exists a universal constant $c_3 > 0$ such that $(\tau_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2 \leq c_3$ for all

$m = 2, \dots, n$, which implies that for all $\tau \in \overline{T}_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\tau_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2 \leq c_3$. Therefore,

$$M(\tau) - M(\tilde{\tau}) \geq \left(c_3^{-1} (1 - c_2(f)) \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\tau_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2 \right)$$

for all $\tau \in \overline{T}_n \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{V}}$. Then the result follows by taking $\kappa(f) = \min(2c_1, c_3^{-1} (1 - c_2(f)))$ and the fact that $\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |2\pi\ell|^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 \geq \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2$. \square

Now recall that $\hat{\tau} = (\hat{\tau}_1, \dots, \hat{\tau}_n) = \arg \min_{\tau \in \overline{T}_n} M_n(\tau)$. Since $\hat{\tau}$ is a minimum of $\tau \mapsto M_n(\tau)$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ is a minimum of $\tau \mapsto M(\tau)$, it follows that $M(\hat{\tau}) - M(\tilde{\tau}) \leq 2 \sup_{\tau \in \overline{T}_n} |M_n(\tau) - M(\tau)|$. Therefore, Lemma 8 implies that

$$(A.26) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\hat{\tau}_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2 \leq 2 \left(\kappa(f) \left(\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 \right) \right)^{-1} \sup_{\tau \in \overline{T}_n} |M_n(\tau) - M(\tau)|.$$

LEMMA 9. *Let $Z = \sup_{\tau \in \overline{T}_n} |M_n(\tau) - M(\tau)|$. Then for any $t > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(Z \leq \left(1 + 2 \left(\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \left(\sqrt{C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t)} + C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t) \right) \right) \geq 1 - \exp(-t),$$

where $C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t) = \varepsilon^2 (2\ell_0 + 1) + 2\varepsilon^2 \sqrt{\frac{2\ell_0 + 1}{n} t} + 2\frac{\varepsilon^2}{n} t$.

PROOF. Remark that $M_n(\tau)$ can be decomposed as $M_n(\tau) = M(\tau) + L(\tau) + Q(\tau)$, where

$$L(\tau) = 2\frac{\varepsilon}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} \Re \left[\left(\theta_\ell e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_m - \tau_m^*)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n \theta_\ell e^{2i\ell\pi(\tau_q - \tau_q^*)} \right) \times \left(z_{m,\ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_m} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n z_{q,\ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_q} \right) \right],$$

$$Q(\tau) = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} \left| z_{m,\ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_m} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q=1}^n z_{q,\ell} e^{2i\ell\pi\tau_q} \right|^2.$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, $|L(\tau)| \leq 2\sqrt{M(\tau)}\sqrt{Q(\tau)}$. Since $M(\tau) \leq \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2$ for all $\tau \in T^n$, one has that $|L(\tau)| \leq 2(\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2)^{1/2} \sqrt{Q(\tau)}$. Therefore,

$$(A.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{\tau \in \overline{T}_n} |M_n(\tau) - M(\tau)| \\ & \leq \left(1 + 2 \left(\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \left(\sqrt{\sup_{\tau \in \overline{T}_n} Q(\tau)} + \sup_{\tau \in \overline{T}_n} Q(\tau) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it suffices to derive a concentration inequality for $\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^n} Q(\tau)$. For this remark that $Q(\tau) \leq W_1$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^n$, where $W_1 = \sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n |z_{m,\ell}|^2$. Then using a standard concentration inequality for sum of χ^2 variables (see, e.g., [33]) one has that for any $t > 0$ $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^n} Q(\tau) \geq C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t)) \leq \mathbb{P}(W_1 \geq C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t)) \leq \exp(-t)$, where $C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t) = \varepsilon^2(2\ell_0 + 1) + 2\varepsilon^2 \sqrt{\frac{2\ell_0 + 1}{n}t} + 2\frac{\varepsilon^2}{n}t$. Therefore, the result follows using inequality (A.27). \square

From Lemma 9 and inequality (A.26), it follows that

$$(A.28) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\hat{\tau}_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2 \leq \frac{2 + 4(\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2)^{1/2}}{\kappa(f)(\sum_{|\ell| \leq \ell_0} |\theta_\ell|^2)} \times (\sqrt{C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t)} + C(\varepsilon, n, \ell_0, t))\right) \geq 1 - \exp(-t).$$

To complete the proof, remark that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\hat{\tau}_m - \tau_m^*)^2 \leq 2(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=2}^n (\hat{\tau}_m - \tilde{\tau}_m)^2 + (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \tau_m^*)^2)$. Since the τ_m^* are i.i.d. variables with zero mean and bounded by $1/4$, Bernstein’s inequality (see, e.g., [33]) implies that for any $t > 0$ then

$$(A.29) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \tau_m^*\right| \geq \sqrt{2\sigma_g^2 \frac{t}{n}} + \frac{t}{12n}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-t),$$

where $\sigma_g^2 = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \tau^2 g(\tau) d\tau$. Then Theorem 4 follows from inequalities (A.28) and (A.29).

A.4. Proof of Theorem 5. To simplify the notation, we write $\tau_m = \tau_m^*$ to denote the true shifts. Part of the proof is inspired by general results on Van Tree inequalities in [20]. First, let us consider the case where the shifts $\tau_m, m = 1, \dots, n$, are fixed parameters to estimate and let $\tau^n = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$. Recall that $X = (c_{m,\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}, m=1, \dots, n}$ denote the set of observations taking values in the set $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{C}^{\infty \times n}$. Then, the likelihood of the random variable X is given by $p(x|\tau^n) = C \prod_{m=1}^n \prod_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} |c_{m,\ell} - \theta_\ell e^{-i2\pi\ell\tau_m}|^2\}$. Therefore, for $m = 1, \dots, n$,

$$(A.30) \quad \mathbb{E}_\tau \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log p(x|\tau^n) \right) = 0,$$

where for a function $h(X)$ of the random variable X , $\mathbb{E}_\tau h(X) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} h(x) p(x|\tau^n) dx$. Then, for $m_1 \neq m_2$ one has that $\mathbb{E}_\tau (\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{m_1}} \log p(x|\tau^n) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{m_2}} \log p(x|\tau^n)) = 0$, and for $m_1 = m_2$ $\mathbb{E}_\tau (\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{m_1}} \log p(x|\tau^n))^2 = \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (2\pi\ell)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2$.

Now assume that the shifts are i.i.d. random variables with density $g(\tau)$ satisfying Assumption 6. Let $\hat{\tau}^n = \hat{\tau}^n(X)$ denote any estimator of the shifts τ^n . Then

define the following vectors U and $V = (V_1, \dots, V_n)'$ in \mathbb{R}^n as

$$U = \hat{\tau}^n - \tau^n$$

and

$$V_m = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} [p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n)] \frac{1}{p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n)} \quad \text{for } m = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $g_n(\tau^n) = \prod_{m=1}^n g(\tau_m)$. First, remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(U'V) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{T}^n} \sum_{m=1}^n (\hat{\tau}_m^n - \tau_m) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} [p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n)] d\tau^n dx \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{m=1}^n \hat{\tau}_m^n \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}^n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} [p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n)] d\tau^n \right) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}^n} \tau_m \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} [p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n)] d\tau^n \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

An integration by parts and the fact that $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\min}} g(\tau) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\max}} g(\tau) = 0$ implies that $\int_{\mathcal{T}^n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} [p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n)] d\tau^n = 0$. Using again an integration by parts and Assumption 3, one has that $\int_{\mathcal{T}^n} \tau_m \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} [p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n)] d\tau^n = - \int_{\mathcal{T}^n} p(x|\tau^n) \times g_n(\tau^n) d\tau^n$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}(U'V) = \sum_{m=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{T}^n} \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n) d\tau = n$. Now using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, it follows that $n^2 = (\mathbb{E}(U'V))^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(U'U) \times \mathbb{E}(V'V)$. Then remark that

$$\mathbb{E}(U'U) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{m=1}^n (\hat{\tau}_m^n - \tau_m)^2 = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{T}^n} (\hat{\tau}_m^n(x) - \tau_m)^2 p(x|\tau^n)g_n(\tau^n) dx d\tau$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(V'V) &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} [\log p(x|\tau^n) + \log g_n(\tau^n)] \right)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log p(x|\tau^n) \right)^2 + \mathbb{E} \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log g_n(\tau^n) \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

since by using (A.30) it follows that $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{m=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log p(x|\tau^n) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log g_n(\tau^n)) = \sum_{m=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{T}^n} (\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log p(x|\tau^n)) p(x|\tau^n) dx) (\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log g_n(\tau^n)) g_n(\tau^n) d\tau^n = 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(V'V) &= n\varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (2\pi \ell)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 + \mathbb{E} \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_m} \log g(\tau_m) \right)^2 \\ &= n\varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (2\pi \ell)^2 |\theta_\ell|^2 + n \int_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \log g(\tau) \right)^2 g(\tau) d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof using that $n^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(U'U)\mathbb{E}(V'V)$.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Patrick Cattiaux for fruitful discussions. Both authors are very much indebted to the two anonymous referees and the Associate Editor for their constructive criticism, comments and remarks that resulted in a major revision of the original manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] ALLASSONIÈRE, S., AMIT, Y. and TROUVÉ, A. (2007). Toward a coherent statistical framework for dense deformable template estimation. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **69** 3–29. [MR2301497](#)
- [2] BHATTACHARYA, R. and PATRANGENARU, V. (2003). Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds. I. *Ann. Statist.* **31** 1–29. [MR1962498](#)
- [3] BHATTACHARYA, R. and PATRANGENARU, V. (2005). Large sample theory of intrinsic and extrinsic sample means on manifolds. II. *Ann. Statist.* **33** 1225–1259. [MR2195634](#)
- [4] BIGOT, J. (2006). Landmark-based registration of curves via the continuous wavelet transform. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.* **15** 542–564. [MR2291263](#)
- [5] BIGOT, J., GADAT, S. and LOUBES, J. M. (2009). Statistical M-estimation and consistency in large deformable models for image warping. *J. Math. Imaging Vision* **34** 270–290. [MR2515449](#)
- [6] BIGOT, J., GAMBOA, F. and VIMOND, M. (2009). Estimation of translation, rotation and scaling between noisy images using the Fourier Mellin transform. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* **2** 614–645. [MR2519925](#)
- [7] BUCKHEIT, J. B., CHEN, S., DONOHO, D. L. and JOHNSTONE, I. (1995). Wavelab reference manual. Dept. Statistics, Stanford Univ. Available at <http://www-stat.stanford.edu/software/wavelab>.
- [8] CASTILLO, I. and LOUBES, J. M. (2009). Estimation of the distribution of random shifts deformation. *Math. Methods Statist.* **18** 21–42. [MR2508947](#)
- [9] CAVALIER, L., GOLUBEV, G. K., PICARD, D. and TSYBAKOV, A. B. (2002). Oracle inequalities for inverse problems. *Ann. Statist.* **30** 843–874. [MR1922543](#)
- [10] CAVALIER, L. and RAIMONDO, M. (2007). Wavelet deconvolution with noisy eigenvalues. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **55** 2414–2424. [MR1500172](#)
- [11] CIRELSON, B. S., IBRAGIMOV, I. A. and SUDAKOV, V. N. (1976). *Norms of Gaussian Sample Functions. Lecture Notes in Math.* **550** 20–41. Springer, Berlin. [MR0458556](#)
- [12] DONOHO, D. L. (1995). Nonlinear solution of linear inverse problems by wavelet-vaguelette decomposition. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **2** 101–126. [MR1325535](#)
- [13] DONOHO, D. L., JOHNSTONE, I. M., KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (1995). Wavelet shrinkage: Asymptopia? *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **57** 301–369. [MR1323344](#)
- [14] EFROMOVICH, S. and KOLTCHINSKII, V. (2001). On inverse problems with unknown operators. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **47** 2876–2894. [MR1872847](#)
- [15] FRECHET, M. (1948). Les éléments aleatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distancié. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré* 215–310. [MR0027464](#)
- [16] GASSER, T. and KNEIP, A. (1995). Searching for structure in curve samples. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **90** 1179–1188.
- [17] GASSER, T. and KNEIP, A. (1992). Statistical tools to analyze data representing a sample of curves. *Ann. Statist.* **20** 1266–1305. [MR1186250](#)
- [18] GLASBEY, C. A. and MARDIA, K. V. (2001). A penalized likelihood approach to image warping (with discussion). *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **63** 465–514. [MR1858399](#)
- [19] GERVINI, D. and GASSER, T. (2004). Self-modeling warping functions. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **66** 959–971. [MR2102475](#)

- [20] GILL, R. D. and LEVIT, Y. (1995). Applications of the Van Trees inequality: A Bayesian Cramér–Rao bound. *Bernoulli* **1** 59–79. [MR1354456](#)
- [21] GRENDER, U. (1993). *General Pattern Theory: A Mathematical Study of Regular Structures*. Oxford Univ. Press, New York. [MR1270904](#)
- [22] HARDLE, W., KERKYACHARIAN, G., PICARD, D. and TSYBAKOV, A. (1998). *Wavelets, Approximation and Statistical Applications*. Springer, New York. [MR1618204](#)
- [23] HOFFMAN, M. and REISS, M. (2008). Nonlinear estimation for linear inverse problems with error in the operator. *Ann. Statist.* **36** 310–336. [MR2387973](#)
- [24] IKEDA, N. and WATANABE, S. (1989). *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*, 2nd ed. North-Holland, Amsterdam. [MR1011252](#)
- [25] ISSERLES, U., RITOV, Y. and TRIGANO, T. (2008). Semiparametric curve alignment and shift density estimation for biological data. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.1271>.
- [26] JOHNSTONE, I., KERKYACHARIAN, G., PICARD, D. and RAIMONDO, M. (2004). Wavelet deconvolution in a periodic setting. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **66** 547–573. [MR2088290](#)
- [27] KNEIP, A. and GASSER, T. (1988). Convergence and consistency results for self-modelling regression. *Ann. Statist.* **16** 82–112. [MR0924858](#)
- [28] KOLACZYK, E. D. (1994). Wavelet methods for the inversion of certain homogeneous linear operators in the presence of noisy data. Ph.D. thesis, Dept. Statistics, Stanford Univ.
- [29] KOROSTEL'EV, A. P. and TSYBAKOV, A. B. (1993). *Minimax Theory of Image Reconstruction. Lecture Notes in Statist.* **82**. Springer, Berlin.
- [30] LIU, X. and MÜLLER, H. G. (2004). Functional convex averaging and synchronization for time-warped random curves. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **99** 687–699. [MR2090903](#)
- [31] LOUBES, J. M., MAZA, E. and GAMBOA, F. (2007). Semi-parametric estimation of shifts. *Electron. J. Stat.* **1** 616–640. [MR2369028](#)
- [32] MA, J., MILLER, M. I., TROUVÉ, A. and YOUNES, L. (2008). Bayesian template estimation in computational anatomy. *NeuroImage* **42** 252–261.
- [33] MASSART, P. (2006). *Concentration Inequalities and Model Selection: Ecole d'été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXIII—2003*. Springer, Berlin. [MR2319879](#)
- [34] MEYER, Y. (1992). *Wavelets and Operators*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. [MR1228209](#)
- [35] NEUMANN, M. H. (1997). On the effect of estimating the error density in nonparametric deconvolution. *J. Nonparametr. Stat.* 307–330. [MR1460203](#)
- [36] PENSKY, M. and SAPATINAS, T. (2009). Functional deconvolution in a periodic setting: Uniform case. *Ann. Statist.* **37** 73–104. [MR2488345](#)
- [37] PENSKY, M. and VIDAKOVIC, B. (1999). Adaptive wavelet estimator for nonparametric density deconvolution. *Ann. Statist.* **27** 2033–2053. [MR1765627](#)
- [38] RAIMONDO, M. and STEWART, M. (2007). The waveD transform in R: Performs fast translation-invariant wavelet deconvolution. *J. Softw.* **21** 1–27.
- [39] RAMSAY, J. O. and LI, X. (2001). Curve registration. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **63** 243–259.
- [40] RAMSAY, J. O. and SILVERMAN, B. W. (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*, 2nd ed. Springer, New York. [MR2168993](#)
- [41] RAMSAY, J. O. and SILVERMAN, B. W. (2002). *Applied Functional Data Analysis*. Springer, New York. [MR1910407](#)
- [42] RONN, B. (1998). Nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation for shifted curves. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **60** 351–363.
- [43] ROSENTHAL, H. P. (1972). On the span in L_p of sequences of independent random variables. II. In *Proc. Sixth Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. Probab.* **2** 149–167. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, CA. [MR0440354](#)
- [44] VIMOND, M. (2010). Efficient estimation for a subclass of shape invariant models. *Ann. Statist.* **38** 1885–1912.

- [45] WANG, K. and GASSER, T. (1997). Alignment of curves by dynamic time warping. *Ann. Statist.* **25** 1251–1276. [MR1447750](#)
- [46] WILLER, T. (2005). Deconvolution in white noise with a random blurring function. LPMA, Unpublished technical report.

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE TOULOUSE ET CNRS
UNIVERSITÉ DE TOULOUSE
31062 TOULOUSE CEDEX 9
FRANCE
E-MAIL: Jeremie.Bigot@math.univ-toulouse.fr
Sebastien.Gadat@math.univ-toulouse.fr