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#### Abstract

Suppose we want to estimate a density at a point where we know the values of its first or higher order derivatives. In this case a given kernel estimator of the density can be modified by adding appropriately weighted kernel estimators of these derivatives. We give conditions under which the modified estimators are asymptotically normal. We also determine the optimal weights. When the highest derivative is known to vanish at a point, then the bias is asymptotically negligible at that point and the asymptotic variance of the kernel estimator can be made arbitrarily small by choosing a large bandwidth.


## 1 Introduction

Consider a point $x$ on the real line and let $f$ be a density that is $r$ times continuously differentiable at $x$. Suppose we have $n$ independent observations $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$ with density $f$. Then $f(x)$ can be estimated with an estimator $\hat{f}(x)$ based on a kernel $K_{0}$ of order $r$. If a bandwidth of order $n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}$ is used, the estimator $\hat{f}(x)$ will converge at the optimal rate $n^{-r /(2 r+1)}$. This goes back to Rosenblatt (1956) and Parzen (1962). Moreover, $n^{r /(2 r+1)}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ is asymptotically normal.

Let us extend this statement to (simultaneously) estimating $f$ and its derivatives $f^{(j)}$ at a point $x$. For this we work with the optimal bandwidth $b=n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}$ and with $j$ times continuously differentiable kernels $K_{j}$ of order $r-j, j=0, \ldots, r$. Then $f(x)$ and its derivatives $f^{(j)}(x)$ can be estimated with kernel estimators

$$
\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{b^{j+1}} K_{j}^{(j)}\left(\frac{x-X_{i}}{b}\right), \quad j=0, \ldots, r .
$$

Each estimator $\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)$ has the optimal rate $n^{-(r-j) /(2 r+1)}$ for estimating $f^{(j)}(x)$. We show as a first result (see Proposition 1) that the joint distribution of $n^{(r-j) /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)-f^{(j)}(x)\right)$, $j=0, \ldots, r$, is asymptotically normal, and calculate the asymptotic mean vector and the covariance matrix.

Suppose now that we have auxiliary information in the form of pointwise constraints on the derivatives. This means, for example, that we know the values of some derivatives at $x$
or, more generally, that certain linear combinations are zero, i.e. $A\left(f^{\prime}(x)-a_{1}, \ldots, f^{(r)}(x)-\right.$ $\left.a_{r}\right)^{\top}=0$ for a known matrix $A$ and a known vector $\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{r}\right)^{\top}$. We can then introduce new estimators for $f(x)$ by modifying $\hat{f}(x)$ as follows,

$$
\hat{f}_{c}(x)=\hat{f}(x)-c^{\top} A\left(\begin{array}{c}
n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}^{\prime}(x)-a_{1}\right) \\
\vdots \\
n^{-r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}^{(r)}(x)-a_{r}\right)
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $c$ is a vector of constants. We show in Remark 1 that $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ can be written as a kernel estimator with bandwidth $b=n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}$ and kernel $\tilde{K}=K_{0}-c^{\top} A\left(K_{1}^{\prime}-a_{1}, \ldots, K_{r}^{(r)}-a_{r}\right)^{\top}$. This representation makes it easy to use Proposition 1 to establish our main result, the limiting normality of $n^{r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)$, which is provided in Theorem 1.

The new estimator $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ exploits the auxiliary information and should therefore outperform the ordinary kernel estimator $\hat{f}(x)$, or, at least, be as good as $\hat{f}(x)$. We distinguish two cases. In the first case the constraint implies that the highest derivative of the density vanishes at $x$, i.e., $f^{(r)}(x)=0$. Then the asymptotic bias of $n^{r /(2 r+1)}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ vanishes (see Lemma 1), and the asymptotic MSE equals the asymptotic variance. In this case, we do not need the 'corrected' estimator $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$. We show that the best kernel with support $[-s, s]$ is the uniform kernel. The asymptotic MSE can then be made arbitrarily small by choosing $s$ large. In the second case, $f^{(r)}(x)$ is not known to be zero. Then we determine the vector $c$ that minimises the MSE of $n^{r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)$.

The main applications are to cases in which we know that certain derivatives are zero at some known point $x$. For example, the density may have a maximum there, $f^{\prime}(x)=0$; an inflection point, $f^{\prime \prime}(x)=0$; or a saddle point, $f^{\prime}(x)=0$ and $f^{\prime \prime}(x)=0$. The important special case where $f^{\prime}(x)$ is zero (or known) is discussed in more detail in Examples 2-4. When we know at which point the density has a maximum or a saddle point, we may also know that it is symmetric (and perhaps bimodal) around this point. This information can be used to improve $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ further, by symmetrisation.

The approach described here is not restricted to kernel estimators. Similar improvements can be obtained for other types of density estimator and for combinations of different types of density estimator. The main tool is a result on the pointwise joint asymptotic normality of estimators for the density and some of its derivatives. The approach also extends to multivariate density estimation and to density estimation for dependent data.

We have restricted ourselves to estimating a density under constraints on its derivatives. Similar results can be obtained for estimators of some derivative under constraints on derivatives of higher or lower order.

The idea behind the modification $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ of $\hat{f}(x)$ is that the variance may be reduced if we add to $\hat{f}(x)$ an estimator of zero that is correlated to $\hat{f}(x)$. This idea is similar to an additive improvement of empirical estimators under linear constraints on the underlying distribution. We briefly describe this. Let $X$ have unknown distribution $P$. Suppose that $f(X)$ is real-valued and square-integrable under $P$, and that $g(X)$ is $r$-dimensional with $P$-squareintegrable components. Assume that $P g=E[g(X)]=0$ constitutes a linear constraint on
$P$. Let $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$ be independent copies of $X$. The best nonparametric estimator of $P f$ is the empirical estimator $\mathbb{P} f=(1 / n) \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(X_{i}\right)$. Its asymptotic variance is $P\left(f^{2}\right)-(P f)^{2}$. The constraint $P g=0$ gives an $r$-dimensional 'estimator' $\mathbb{P} g=(1 / n) \sum_{i=1}^{n} g\left(X_{i}\right)$ of zero. It can be combined with $\mathbb{P} f$ to obtain an estimator of the form

$$
\mathbb{P} f-c^{\top} \mathbb{P} g=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(f\left(X_{i}\right)-c^{\top} g\left(X_{i}\right)\right) .
$$

Such an estimator has asymptotic variance $P\left(f-P f-c^{\top} g\right)^{2}$. It is minimised for $c=$ $c^{*}(P)=\left(P\left(g g^{\top}\right)\right)^{-1} P(g f)$. Hence the minimal asymptotic variance is

$$
P\left(f^{2}\right)-(P f)^{2}-P\left(f g^{\top}\right)\left(P\left(g g^{\top}\right)\right)^{-1} P(g f)
$$

This is strictly smaller than the asymptotic variance $P\left(f^{2}\right)-(P f)^{2}$ of $\mathbb{P} f$ unless $f$ and $g$ are uncorrelated. Since $c^{*}(P)$ depends on $P$ it must be replaced by an estimator, say $c^{*}(\mathbb{P})$. This does not change the asymptotic variance. Levit (1975) shows that

$$
\mathbb{P} f-c^{*}(\mathbb{P})^{\top} \mathbb{P} g=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(X_{i}\right)-\sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(X_{i}\right) g^{\top}\left(X_{i}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} g\left(X_{i}\right) g^{\top}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} g\left(X_{i}\right)
$$

is asymptotically efficient. Müller and Wefelmeyer (2002) consider constraints with $g=g_{\vartheta}$ depending on an unknown finite-dimensional parameter $\vartheta$.

An asymptotically equivalent improvement of $\mathbb{P} f$ is obtained by using empirical likelihood. It replaces the empirical distribution $(1 / n) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{X_{i}}$ by a weighted version that obeys the linear constraint; see Owen (1988), (2001).

Our problem of estimating a density $f$ at $x$ under a pointwise constraint differs from the problem of estimating $f(x)$ under a linear constraint on $f$, say $E[g(X)]=0$ for some known function $g$. Such a linear constraint leads to an improvement of order $n^{-1 / 2}$. The density estimator $\hat{f}(x)$ converges at a slower rate. Hence the improvement vanishes asymptotically; see e.g. Zhang (1998), who demonstrates (first order) equivalence of a standard kernel estimator and a modified version that uses a linear constraint.

The next section contains our main results, in particular the limiting normality of the new estimator $\hat{f}_{c}(t)$. The proofs are in Section 3.

## 2 Results

Let $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$ be real random variables with bounded density $f$. Fix a point $x$ on the real line. Let $r$ be a natural number. Assume that $f$ is $r$ times continuously differentiable at $x$.

Denote by $\mathcal{K}_{j, s}$ the set of all functions $K$ on the real line that vanish outside a compact set and have bounded and continuous derivatives up to the order $j$, and that are (signed) kernels of order $s$, i.e. $\int K(t) d t=1, \int t^{i} K(t) d t=0$ for $i=1, \ldots, s-1$, and $\int t^{s} K(t) d t \neq 0$.

For a function $K$ on the real line and a positive bandwidth $b$, introduce the scaling $K_{b}(x)=K(x / b) / b$. Note that we can rescale the kernel by multiplying the bandwidth
with a positive constant $c$. This corresponds to replacing $K$ in the definition of $K_{b}$ by $K_{c}$ : we have $K_{c b}(x)=K(x /(c b)) /(c b)=K_{c}(x / b) / b$. In the following we will also need the derivatives of $K_{b}$ which, for appropriately differentiable $K$, are

$$
K_{b}^{(j)}(x)=\partial_{x}^{j} K_{b}(x)=\frac{1}{b^{j+1}} K^{(j)}\left(\frac{x}{b}\right) .
$$

Let $K_{0} \in \mathcal{K}_{0, r}$ be a kernel and $b_{0}$ a bandwidth. We estimate $f(x)$ by the kernel estimator

$$
\hat{f}(x)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_{0 b_{0}}\left(x-X_{i}\right)
$$

To estimate the various derivatives, we may use different kernels and bandwidths. For $j=1, \ldots, r$ let $b_{j}$ be a bandwidth and $K_{j} \in \mathcal{K}_{j, r-j}$. Set

$$
\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_{j b_{j}}^{(j)}\left(x-X_{i}\right) .
$$

The following lemma describes approximations for the bias and the variance of $\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)$. The result is essentially known. See Bhattacharya (1967), Schuster (1969) and Singh (1977, 1981). We indicate the proof in Section 3.

Lemma 1. Let $f$ be $r$ times continuously differentiable at $x$. For $j=0, \ldots, r$ let $K_{j} \in$ $\mathcal{K}_{j, r-j}$, and let $b_{j} \rightarrow 0$ and $n b_{j} \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_{j}^{-r+j}\left(E\left[\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)\right]-f^{(j)}(x)\right) & =f^{(r)}(x) \frac{(-1)^{r-j}}{(r-j)!} \int t^{r-j} K_{j}(t) d t+o(1), \\
n b_{j}^{2 j+1} \operatorname{Var} \hat{f}^{(j)}(x) & =f(x) \int K_{j}^{(j) 2}(t) d t+o(1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

For $j=0, \ldots, r$ the rate of $\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)$ is optimal if the variance converges at the same rate as the squared bias. This holds if $b_{j}^{-2(r-j)} \sim n b_{j}^{2 j+1}$, i.e. $b_{j} \sim n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}$. In the following we set

$$
b_{j}=b=n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}
$$

and absorb a possible positive factor of the bandwidth as a scale parameter in $K_{j}$. The following proposition shows that the joint distribution of $n^{(r-j) /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)-f^{(j)}(x)\right)$, $j=0, \ldots, r$, is asymptotically normal. Set

$$
V_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
n^{r /(2 r+1)}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x)) \\
n^{(r-1) /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}^{\prime}(x)-f^{\prime}(x)\right) \\
\vdots \\
\hat{f}^{(r)}(x)-f^{(r)}(x)
\end{array}\right)
$$

and $\mu=\left(\mu_{0}, \mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{r}\right)^{\top}$ with

$$
\mu=\left(\begin{array}{c}
\frac{(-1)^{r}}{r!} \int t^{r} K_{0}(t) d t \\
\frac{\left(-1 r^{!}-1\right.}{(r-1)!} \int t^{r-1} K_{1}(t) d t \\
\vdots \\
\int K_{r}(t) d t
\end{array}\right)
$$

Define $\Sigma=\left(\sigma_{j k}\right)_{j, k}$ with

$$
\sigma_{j k}=\int K_{j}^{(j)}(t) K_{k}^{(k)}(t) d t, \quad j, k=0, \ldots, r
$$

Proposition 1. Let $f$ be $r$ times continuously differentiable at $x$. For $j=0, \ldots, r$ let $K_{j} \in \mathcal{K}_{j, r-j}$. Then $V_{n}$ is asymptotically normal with mean vector $f^{(r)}(x) \mu$ and covariance matrix $f(x) \Sigma$.

A similar result for polynomial estimators of regression functions is in Masry and Fan (1997); see also Fan and Yao (2003), Theorem 5.2. Analogous results hold for time series. Univariate asymptotic normality for density estimators in time series is proved in Bradley (1983) and $\mathrm{Lu}(2001)$. In the following we write briefly $\int t^{k} K_{j}^{m}$ instead of $\int t^{k} K_{j}^{m}(t) d t$.

Example 1. (Vanishing highest derivative.) Suppose we have a constraint $A\left(f^{(\cdot)}(x)-\right.$ $a)=0$, where $f^{(\cdot)}$ denotes the vector of derivatives, $f^{(\cdot)}=\left(f^{\prime}, \ldots, f^{(r)}\right)^{\top}, A$ is some known matrix and $a$ a known vector. We first address the case in which the constraint implies that the highest derivative of the density vanishes at $x$, i.e. $f^{(r)}(x)=0$. This is a special case where the ordinary kernel density estimator $\hat{f}(x)$ for estimating $f(x)$ cannot be improved: the asymptotic bias of $n^{r /(2 r+1)}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ is $f^{(r)}(x) \mu_{0}$ (see Lemma 1), i.e. it vanishes. The asymptotic MSE of $\hat{f}(x)$ therefore equals the asymptotic variance $f(x) \sigma_{00}=f(x) \int K_{0}^{2}$. Let us suppose that $K_{0}$ is supported by the bounded interval $[-s, s]$. Then $\int K_{0}^{2}$ is minimised by the box kernel $K_{0}=B_{s}=(2 s)^{-1} \mathbf{1}[-s, s]$. This follows from the Cauchy inequality

$$
1=\int K_{0}=\int \mathbf{1}[-s, s] K_{0} \leq\left(\int \mathbf{1}[-s, s]^{2} \int K_{0}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}=(2 s)^{1 / 2}\left(\int K_{0}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2},
$$

which implies $\int B_{s}^{2}=(2 s)^{-1} \leq \int K_{0}^{2}$. (This is plausible because the best nonparametric estimator of an expectation is the unweighted sample mean, and here we estimate the expectation of $(2 b s)^{-1} \mathbf{1}[x-b s, x+b s](X)$.) This means that we can make the asymptotic MSE of $\hat{f}(x)$ arbitrarily small by taking $K_{0}=B_{s}$ with $s$ large.

In the following we address the general case in which $f^{(r)}(x)$ is not known to vanish. For an arbitrary vector $c$ we can then introduce a 'corrected' estimator $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ for $f(x)$,

$$
\hat{f}_{c}(x)=\hat{f}(x)-c^{\top} A\left(\begin{array}{c}
n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}^{\prime}(x)-a_{1}\right) \\
\vdots \\
n^{-r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}^{(r)}(x)-a_{r}\right)
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Remark 1. (Alternative presentation of the estimator.) Set $K^{(\cdot)}=\left(K_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, K_{r}^{(r)}\right)^{\top}$. We can write $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ as an ordinary kernel estimator

$$
\hat{f}_{c}(x)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{K}_{b}\left(x-X_{i}\right)
$$

with bandwidth $b=n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}$ and kernel $\tilde{K}=K_{0}-c^{\top} A\left(K^{(\cdot)}-a\right)$.

Write $\mu$ and $\Sigma$ from Lemma 1 as

$$
\mu=\binom{\mu_{0}}{\nu} \quad \text { and } \quad \Sigma=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\sigma_{00} & \lambda^{\top} \\
\lambda & \Lambda
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $\nu=\left(\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{r}\right)^{\top}, \lambda=\left(\sigma_{10}, \ldots, \sigma_{r 0}\right)^{\top}$ and $\Lambda=\left(\sigma_{j k}\right)_{j, k}, j, k=1, \ldots, r$. Introduce the vector $c_{-}=\left(1,-c^{\top}\right)^{\top}$ and the diagonal block matrix $A_{-}=\operatorname{diag}(1,-A)$.

Theorem 1. Let $f$ be $r$ times continuously differentiable at $x$. For $j=0, \ldots, r$ let $K_{j} \in$ $\mathcal{K}_{j, r-j}$. Assume that $A\left(f^{(\cdot)}(x)-a\right)=0$ holds. Then

$$
n^{r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)=c_{-}^{\top} A_{-} V_{n}
$$

is asymptotically normal with mean $f^{(r)}(x)\left(\mu_{0}-c^{\top} A \nu\right)$ and variance

$$
f(x)\left(\sigma_{00}-2 c^{\top} A \lambda+c^{\top} A \Lambda A^{\top} c\right)
$$

Remark 2. (Optimal choice of c.) It follows from Theorem 1 that the asymptotic MSE of $n^{r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f^{(r) 2}(x)\left(\mu_{0}-c^{\top} A \nu\right)^{2}+f(x)\left(\sigma_{00}-2 c^{\top} A \lambda+c^{\top} A \Lambda A^{\top} c\right) \\
& =A-2 c^{\top} B+c^{\top} C c
\end{aligned}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=f(x) \sigma_{00}+f^{(r) 2}(x) \mu_{0}^{2}, \\
& B=f(x) A \lambda+f^{(r) 2}(x) \mu_{0} A \nu, \\
& C=f(x) A \Lambda A^{\top}+f^{(r) 2}(x) A \nu \nu^{\top} A .
\end{aligned}
$$

The matrix $C$ is symmetric. If $C \neq 0$, the asymptotic MSE is minimised by $c=c_{*}=C^{-1} B$. The minimal asymptotic MSE is $A-B^{\top} C^{-1} B$. Both $B$ and $C$ depend on the density through $f(x)$ and $f^{(r)}(x)$. Write $\hat{c}_{*}$ for $c_{*}$ with $f(x)$ and $f^{(r)}(x)$ replaced by $\hat{f}(x)$ and $\hat{f}^{(r)}(x)$. It follows that $n^{r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}_{\hat{c}_{*}}(x)-f(x)\right)$ also has asymptotic MSE $A-B^{\top} C^{-1} B$. The original estimator $\hat{f}(x)$ is $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ with $c=0$. Hence the asymptotic MSE of $n^{r /(2 r+1)}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ is $A$, which is strictly larger than $A-B^{\top} C^{-1} B$.

Example 2. (Vanishing derivative; $\mathbf{r}=1$.) Suppose the density $f$ is continuously differentiable at $x$ and we want to estimate $f(x)$ under the constraint $f^{\prime}(x)=0$. This is a special case of the situation in Example 1, with $r=1$. We treat it now with Theorem 1. As bandwidth with optimal rate we take $b=n^{-1 / 3}$. We can improve $\hat{f}(x)$ by using modified estimators of the form $\hat{f}_{c}(x)=\hat{f}(x)-c n^{-1 / 3} \hat{f}^{\prime}(x)$. The joint asymptotic distribution of $n^{1 / 3}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ and $f^{\prime}(x)-f^{\prime}(x)$ is normal with variances $f(x) \int K_{0}^{2}$ and $f(x) \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}$ and covariance $f(x) \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}$, and with bias $f^{\prime}(x)\left(-\int t K_{0}, \int K_{1}\right)^{\top}=0$. Then $n^{1 / 3}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)$ is asymptotically normal with mean 0 and variance

$$
f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}+c^{2} \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}-2 c \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}\right)
$$

This is therefore the asymptotic MSE. It is minimal for $c=c_{*}=\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime} / \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}$. The minimal asymptotic MSE is

$$
f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-\frac{\left(\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{2}}{\int K_{1}^{\prime 2}}\right)
$$

This is smaller than $f(x) \int K_{0}^{2}$ unless $\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}=0$.
Suppose $K_{0}$ is supported by the bounded interval $[-s, s]$. We minimise the asymptotic MSE over $K_{1}$ by choosing $K_{1}$ with support $[-s, s]$ such that $K_{1}^{\prime}$ is close to $K_{0}$. We must have $\int K_{1}^{\prime}=0$. This holds for the choice $K_{1}^{\prime}=K_{0}-B_{s}$, where $B_{s}=(2 s)^{-1} \mathbf{1}[-s, s]$ is again the box kernel on $[-s, s]$. This means that $K_{1}(t)=\left(L_{0}(t)-t+v\right) \mathbf{1}[-s, s](t)$, where $L_{0}$ is an antiderivative of $K_{0}$ and the constant $v$ is chosen such that

$$
1=\int K_{1}=\int L_{0}-\int_{-s}^{s} t+\int_{-s}^{s} v=\int L_{0}-s^{2}+2 s v
$$

which holds for $v=s / 2-\int L_{0} /(2 s)$. By Remark 2, with $\int K_{0}=1$,

$$
c_{*}=\frac{\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}}{\int K_{1}^{\prime 2}}=\frac{\int K_{0}\left(K_{0}-B_{s}\right)}{\int\left(K_{0}-B_{s}\right)^{2}}=\frac{\int K_{0}^{2}-1 /(2 s)}{\left.\int K_{0}^{2}-2 /(2 s)\right)+1 /(2 s)}=\frac{\int K_{0}^{2}-1 /(2 s)}{\int K_{0}^{2}-1 /(2 s)}=1
$$

The asymptotic MSE is

$$
f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-\frac{\left(\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{2}}{\int K_{1}^{\prime 2}}\right)=f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-1\right)\right)=f(x)
$$

This is the asymptotic MSE of $n^{1 / 3}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ with $K_{0}=B_{s}$. Indeed, by Remark 1 , the kernel of $\hat{f}_{c_{*}}(x)=\hat{f}_{1}(x)$ is $\tilde{K}=K_{0}-c_{*}\left(K_{0}-B_{s}\right)=K_{0}-\left(K_{0}-B_{s}\right)=B_{s}$, which is the optimal kernel for $\hat{f}(x)$ by Example 1 .

Remark 3. (Kernel choice.) It is important to choose different kernels for different derivatives. If we take $K_{1}$ equal to $K_{0}$ in Example 2 and write $K$ for this kernel, then $\int K^{2}=\int K^{2}(t+u) d t$ implies

$$
0=\partial_{u} \int K^{2}(t+u) d t=2 \int\left(K K^{\prime}\right)(t+u) d t=2 \int K K^{\prime}
$$

and there is no improvement over $\hat{f}(x)$.
Now we consider two examples with constraints that do not imply that the highest derivative of $f$ vanishes at $x$.

Example 3. (Nonvanishing derivative; $\mathbf{r}=1$.$) In the simplest example with nonvan-$ ishing highest-order derivative, the density has one continuous derivative at $x$, i.e. $r=1$ as in Example 2, and the constraint is $f^{\prime}(x)=a$ with $a \neq 0$. The bandwidth with optimal rate is again $b=n^{-1 / 3}$. Set $\hat{f}_{c}(x)=\hat{f}(x)-n^{-1 / 3} c\left(\hat{f}^{\prime}(x)-a\right)$. The joint asymptotic distribution
of $n^{1 / 3}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ and $\hat{f}^{\prime}(x)-f^{\prime}(x)$ is normal with covariance matrix as above, and with bias $a\left(-\int t K_{0}, \int K_{1}\right)^{\top}=a\left(-\int t K_{0}, 1\right)^{\top}$. The asymptotic MSE of $n^{1 / 3}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)$ is

$$
f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-2 c \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}+c^{2} \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}\right)+a^{2}\left(\int t K_{0}+c\right)^{2}=A-2 c B+c^{2} C
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
A & =f(x) \int K_{0}^{2}+a^{2}\left(\int t K_{0}\right)^{2} \\
B & =f(x) \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}-a^{2} \int t K_{0} \\
C & =f(x) \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}+a^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

If $f(x)>0$, then $C>0$ and the asymptotic MSE is minimised by $c=c_{*}=B / C$. The minimal asymptotic MSE is $A-B^{2} / C$. Both $B$ and $C$ depend on the density through $f(x)$. Write $\hat{c}_{*}$ for $c_{*}$ with $f(x)$ replaced by $\hat{f}(x)$,

$$
\hat{c}_{*}=\frac{\left(\hat{f}(x) \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}-a^{2} \int t K_{0}\right)^{2}}{\hat{f}(x) \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}+a^{2}}
$$

Then the asymptotic MSE of $n^{1 / 3}\left(\hat{f}_{\hat{c}_{*}}(x)-f(x)\right)$ is $A-B^{2} / C$, while $n^{1 / 3}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ has asymptotic MSE $A$.

Example 4. (Nonvanishing derivative; $\mathbf{r}=2$. .) For a second example with nonvanishing highest-order derivative, again take the constraint $f^{\prime}(x)=0$ as in Example 2, but now assume that $f$ is known to be twice continuously differentiable at $x$. Then $A=\operatorname{diag}(1,0)$ and $a=(1,0)^{\top}$. The bandwidth $b_{0}=n^{-2 / 5}$ gives the optimal rate. Since $f^{\prime \prime}(x)$ is not involved in the constraint, we can set $\hat{f}_{c}(x)=\hat{f}(x)-c n^{-1 / 5} \hat{f}^{\prime}(x)$. By Proposition $1, n^{2 / 5}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ is asymptotically normal with mean $f^{\prime \prime}(x) \frac{1}{2} \int t^{2} K_{0}$ and variance $f(x) \int K_{0}^{2}$. Hence the asymptotic MSE of $n^{2 / 5}(\hat{f}(x)-f(x))$ is

$$
A=f(x) \int K_{0}^{2}+f^{\prime \prime 2}(x) \frac{1}{4}\left(\int t^{2} K_{0}\right)^{2}
$$

On the other hand, by Theorem $1, n^{2 / 5}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)$ is asymptotically normal with mean

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(x)\left(\frac{1}{2} \int t^{2} K_{0}+c \int t K_{1}\right)
$$

and variance $f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-2 c \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}+c^{2} \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}\right)$. Hence the asymptotic MSE of $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-2 c \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}+c^{2} \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}\right) \\
& +f^{\prime \prime 2}(x)\left(\frac{1}{4}\left(\int t^{2} K_{0}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} c \int t^{2} K_{0} \int t K_{1}+c^{2}\left(\int t K_{1}\right)^{2}\right) \\
& =A-2 c B+c^{2} C
\end{aligned}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B=f(x) \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}-\frac{1}{4} f^{\prime \prime 2}(x) \int t^{2} K_{0} \int t K_{1}, \\
& C=f(x) \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}+f^{\prime \prime 2}(x)\left(\int t K_{1}\right)^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $C>0$, the asymptotic MSE of $\hat{f}_{c}(x)$ is minimised by $c=c_{*}=B / C$. The minimal asymptotic MSE is $A-B^{2} / C$.

Suppose that $K_{1}$ is of order 2. Then $\int t K_{1}=0$, and we have $B=f(x) \int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}$ and $C=f(x) \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}$. Assume that $K_{1}^{\prime}$ does not vanish. This means that $K_{1}$ is not a box kernel. Then $\int K_{1}^{\prime 2} \neq 0$, and $c_{*}$ simplifies to $\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime} / \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}$, and the asymptotic MSE simplifies to

$$
f(x)\left(\int K_{0}^{2}-\frac{\left(\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{2}}{\int K_{1}^{\prime 2}}\right)+\frac{1}{4} f^{\prime \prime 2}(x)\left(\int t^{2} K_{0}\right)^{2} .
$$

By the Cauchy inequality, $\left(\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \leq \int K_{0}^{2} \int K_{1}^{\prime 2}$. Note again that $K_{1}^{\prime}$ cannot be proportional to $K_{0}$ since $\int K_{0}=1$ but $\int K_{1}^{\prime}=0$. Hence the variance term of the asymptotic MSE is always positive. It may however happen that $\int K_{0} K_{1}^{\prime}=0$. Then $\hat{f}_{c_{*}}(x)$ has the same asymptotic MSE as $\hat{f}(x)$. This is in particular the case if $K_{0}$ and $K_{1}$ are symmetric, so $K_{1}^{\prime}$ is antisymmetric and hence orthogonal to $K_{0}$.

## 3 Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1. For $j=0, \ldots, r$ we have the Taylor expansion

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f^{(j)}\left(x-b_{j} t\right)-f^{(j)}(x)=\sum_{k=1}^{r-j} \frac{\left(-b_{j} t\right)^{k}}{k!} f^{(j+k)}(x) \\
& \quad+\frac{\left(-b_{j} t\right)^{r-j}}{(r-j-1)!} \int_{0}^{1}(1-t)^{r-j-1}\left(f^{(r-j)}\left(x-b_{j} t\right)-f^{(r-j)}(x)\right) d t .
\end{aligned}
$$

For appropriately differentiable $f$ and $g$ we have $(f * g)^{\prime}=f^{\prime} * g=f * g^{\prime}$ and therefore $(f * g)^{(j)}=f^{(j)} * g=f * g^{(j)}$. In particular,

$$
E\left[\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)\right]=E\left[K_{j b_{j}}^{(j)}(x)\right]=K_{j b_{j}}^{(j)} * f(x)=K_{j b_{j}} * f^{(j)}(x)=\int K_{j}(t) f^{(j)}\left(x-b_{j} t\right) d t .
$$

Since $K_{j}$ is of order $j$ and $f^{(r-j)}$ is $j$ times continuously differentiable, we obtain the asserted expansion of the bias of $\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)$.

The variance of $\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
n \operatorname{Var} \hat{f}^{(j)}(x) & =\operatorname{Var} K_{j b_{j}}^{(j)}(x-X) \\
& =E\left[K_{j b_{j}}^{(j 2}(x-X)\right]-\left(E\left[K_{j b_{j}}^{(j)}(x-X)\right]\right)^{2} \\
& =b_{j}^{-2 j-1} \int K_{j}^{(j) 2}(t) f\left(x-b_{j} t\right) d t-\left(b_{j}^{-j} \int K_{j}^{(j)}(t) f\left(x-b_{j} t\right) d t\right)^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $f^{(j)}$ is continuous at $x$, we obtain the asserted approximation of the variance of $\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)$ similarly as for the bias.

Proof of Proposition 1. Recall that we have set $b_{j}=b=n^{-1 /(2 r+1)}$. Lemma 1 gives expansions for the bias and variance of $\hat{f}^{(j)}(x)$. For the covariances we obtain by a similar argument

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left[K_{j b}^{(j)}(x-X) K_{k b}^{(k)}(x-X)\right]=\frac{1}{b^{j+1} b^{k+1}} E\left[K_{j}^{(j)}\left(\frac{x-X}{b}\right) K_{k}^{(k)}\left(\frac{x-X}{b}\right)\right] \\
& =\frac{1}{b^{j+k+2}} \int K_{j}^{(j)}\left(\frac{x-u}{b}\right) K_{k}^{(k)}\left(\frac{x-u}{b}\right) f(u) d u \\
& =n^{(j+k+2) /(2 r+1)} \int K_{j}^{(j)}(t) K_{k}^{(k)}(t) f\left(x-b_{j} t\right) d t
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
n^{(2 r-j-k) /(2 r+1)} \operatorname{Cov} \hat{f}^{(j)}(x) \hat{f}^{(k)}(x) \rightarrow f(x) \sigma_{j k}
$$

Set $Y_{n i}=b^{r} K^{(\cdot)}\left(\left(x-X_{i}\right) / b\right)$ with $K^{(\cdot)}=\left(K_{0}^{(0)}, \ldots, K_{r}^{(r)}\right)^{\top}$. Then

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
n^{r /(2 r+1)} \hat{f}(x) \\
\vdots \\
\hat{f}^{(r)}(x)
\end{array}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{n i}
$$

With $n b^{2 r+1}=1$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
n E\left\|Y_{n}\right\|^{2} \mathbf{1}\left(\left\|Y_{n}\right\|>\varepsilon\right) & =n b^{2 r} E\left\|K^{(\cdot)}\left(\frac{x-X}{b}\right)\right\|^{2} \mathbf{1}\left(\left\|K^{(\cdot)}\left(\frac{x-X}{b}\right)\right\|>b^{-r} \varepsilon\right) \\
& =\int\left\|K^{(\cdot)}(t)\right\|^{2} \mathbf{1}\left(\left\|K^{(\cdot)}(t)\right\|>b^{-r} \varepsilon\right) f(x-b t) d t \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}
$$

The assertion now follows from the central limit theorem of Lindeberg and Feller. See e.g. van der Vaart (1998), Proposition 2.27, for a multivariate version.

Proof of Theorem 1. Write

$$
n^{r /(2 r+1)}\left(\hat{f}_{c}(x)-f(x)\right)=c_{-}^{\top} A_{-} V_{n}
$$

This is asymptotically normal by Proposition 1. The mean is

$$
f^{(r)}(x) c_{-}^{\top} A_{-} \mu=f^{(r)}(x)\left(\mu_{0}-c^{\top} A \nu\right),
$$

and the variance is

$$
f(x) c_{-}^{\top} A_{-} \Sigma A_{-}^{\top} c_{-}=f(x)\left(\sigma_{00}-2 c^{\top} A \lambda+c^{\top} A \Lambda A^{\top} c\right)
$$
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