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#### Abstract

Using two definitions of the conditional empirical processes we obtain some approximations for these processes. We also prove the functional law of the iterated logarithm for the conditional processes. Our results say that the asymptotic behavior of the conditional and unconditional empirical processes are very similar. © 1988 Academic Press, Inc.


## 1. Introduction

We investigate asymptotic approximations of two estimators of the conditional empirical process of $Y$ given $X=x$, leading to a functional law of the iterated logarithm. Our main results show that the weak behavior of the conditional empirical processes at a given $x$ is essentially the same as that of the empirical process, although the rates now depend on the bandwidth.
We examine the kernel estimator of Nadaraya [20] and Watson [29] and the nearest neighbor (NN) estimator of Yang [31] and others. The subject of nonparametric regression was reviewed by Stone $[24,25]$ and Collomb [4]. Recently Révész [22], Johnston [12], Liero [17], and Konakov and Piterbarg [15] developed strong approximations of residual mean regression functions. Mack and Silverman [18] and Cheng [2]

[^0]derived uniform convergence rates for kernel estimates. Stute [26,27] proved almost sure and weak convergence results for kernel and nearest neighbor estimates of the conditional empirical function. Several authors have recently explored robust nonparametric regression (cf. Cheng and Cheng [3] and Härdle [11]).

Let $(Y, X)$ be a random vector in $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ with continuous distribution function $F(y, x)=P(Y \leqslant y, X \leqslant x\}$ and marginals $H(y)=P\{Y \leqslant y\}$, $G(x)=P\{X \leqslant x\}$. In statistical applications one may need an estimator of the conditional distribution function

$$
m(y \mid x)=P\{Y \leqslant y \mid X=x\}, \quad y \in \mathbf{R},
$$

at a fixed point $x \in \mathbf{R}$. Based on the random i.i.d. sample $\left\{\left(Y_{i}, X_{i}\right)\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$, the usual estimators for $F$ and $G$ are

$$
F_{n}(y, x)=n^{-1} \#\left\{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n: Y_{i} \leqslant y, X_{i} \leqslant x\right\}
$$

and

$$
G_{n}(x)=F_{n}(\infty, x)=n^{-1} \#\left\{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n: X_{i} \leqslant x\right\} .
$$

(Throughout this paper, $\mu(\infty)=\lim \mu(x), x \rightarrow \infty$.)
Our first estimator for $m(y \mid x)$ is essentially due to Nadaraya [20] and Watson [29]. Let $K$ be an appropriate kernel function, $a_{n}$ be a sequence of bandwidths and define

$$
h_{n}(y, x)=a_{n}^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} F_{n}(y, u)
$$

(Integrals are over $\mathbf{R}$ unless otherwise noted.) Standard arguments involving multivariate densities show that $h_{n}(y, x)$ is a reasonable estimate for

$$
h(y, x)=\frac{\partial}{\partial x} F(y, x)
$$

We assume that $g=G^{\prime}$ exists in a neighborhood of $x$ and estimate it by

$$
g_{n}(x)=h_{n}(\infty, x)=a_{n}^{-1} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d G_{n}(u)
$$

The estimator

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{n}(y \mid x) & =h_{n}(y, x) / g_{n}(x) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left\{\dot{Y}_{i} \leqslant y\right\} K\left(\frac{x-X_{i}}{a_{n}}\right) / \sum_{i=1}^{n} K\left(\frac{x-X_{i}}{a_{n}}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $I(A)$ is the indicator of the set $A$, will be referred to as a kernel-type estimator of $m(y \mid x)$.

A different estimator is proposed by Yang [31] and Stute [28, 26]. Let

$$
r_{n}(y \mid x)=a_{n}^{-1} \int K\left(\frac{G_{n}(x)-G_{n}(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} F_{n}(y, u)
$$

and

$$
l_{n}(x)=r_{n}(\infty \mid x)=a_{n}^{-1} \int K\left(\frac{G_{n}(x)-G_{n}(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d G_{n}(u) .
$$

The estimator

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{n}(y \mid x) & =r_{n}(y \mid x) / l_{n}(x) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left\{Y_{i} \leqslant y\right\} K\left(\frac{G_{n}(x)-G_{n}\left(X_{i}\right)}{a_{n}}\right) / \sum_{i=1}^{n} K\left(\frac{G_{n}(x)-G_{n}\left(X_{i}\right)}{a_{n}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

is called a nearest-neighbor (NN) type estimator.
The central part of this paper is the almost sure behavior of the processes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta_{n}(y \mid x)=\left(n a_{n}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(m_{n}(y \mid x)-m_{(n)}(y \mid x)\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)=\left(n a_{n}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(k_{n}(y \mid x)-k_{(n)}(y \mid x)\right) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m_{(n)}(y \mid x)=h_{(n)}(y, x) / g_{(n)}(x) \\
& k_{(n)}(y \mid x)=a_{n}^{1} \int K\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} F(y, u),
\end{aligned}
$$

and $g_{(n)}$ and $h_{(n)}$ are defined analogously to $g_{n}$ and $h_{n}$, respectively, with $F_{n}$ and $G_{n}$ replaced by $F$ and $G$. Standard methods can give the usual rates for the "numerical errors" $m_{(n)}-m$ and $k_{(n)}-m$ by assuming more regularity conditions on $F$. Thus $m_{(n)}$ and $k_{(n)}$ can be replaced by $m$ in (1.1) and (1.2) and our results will remain true (cf. Lemmas 3.1 and 4.1 ).

We assume that $x \in \mathbf{R}$ is a fixed point throughout this paper. It is well known that $\beta_{n}(y \mid x)$ and $\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)$ have normal limits for any fixed $y \in \mathbf{R}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Stute [26] proves that $\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)$ converges weakly to a timetransformed Brownian bridge. The main aim of this paper is a further investigation of the asymptotic properties of the conditional empirical processes $\beta_{n}(y \mid x)$ and $\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)$. We obtain rates for the Gaussian approximations and derive functional laws of the iterated logarithm for
these processes. The proofs are based on the observation that $\beta_{n}$ and $\gamma_{n}$ can be expressed as integrals with respect to

$$
\begin{gathered}
\alpha_{n}(y, x)=n^{1 / 2}\left(F_{n}(y, x)-F(y, x)\right), \\
t_{n}(x)=\alpha_{n}(\infty, x)=n^{1 / 2}\left(G_{n}(x)-G(x)\right),
\end{gathered}
$$

with a small remainder term.
In Section 2 we list some results which will be very useful later on. Section 3 contains the approximation of $\beta_{n}$ and in Section 4 we prove a similar result for $\gamma_{n}$. The functional laws of the iterated logarithm will be proven in Section 5.

Throughout this paper, $C$ in proofs stands for a generic constant whose value may differ from line to line. Suprema and integrals are over $\mathbf{R}$ unless otherwise stated. We can assume without loss of generality that our probability space $(\Omega, A, \mathbf{P})$ is so rich that all the random variables and processes introduced so far or later on can be defined on it (cf. de Acosta [8]).

## 2. Preliminaries

This section contains some approximations for $\alpha_{n}, t_{n}$ and a symmetric kernel based on results in the literature. The following multivariate approximation is due to Borisov [1].

Theorem A. We can define a sequence of Gaussian processes $\left\{\Gamma_{n}^{(1)}(y, x),-\infty<y, x<\infty\right\}$ such that

$$
P\left\{\sup \left|\alpha_{n}(y, x)-\Gamma_{n}^{(1)}(y, x)\right|>C_{1} n^{-1 / 6} \log n\right\} \leqslant C_{2} n^{-2}
$$

and $E \Gamma_{n}^{(1)}(y, x)=0$,

$$
E \Gamma_{n}^{(1)}(y, x) \Gamma_{n}^{(1)}\left(y^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=F\left(y \wedge y^{\prime}, x \wedge x^{\prime}\right)-F(y, x) F\left(y^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right) .
$$

(Here $a \wedge b=\min (a, b)$.) Using Komlós, Major, and Tusnády [14] and Lemma 1.1.1 of Csörgö and Révész [5] one can establish the next inequality.

Theorem B. If $G$ is continuous in a neighborhood of $x$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P\left\{\sup _{|G(x)-G(u)| \leqslant d}\left|t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right|>C_{3}\left(n^{-1 / 2} \log n+(d \log n)^{1 / 2}\right)\right\} \\
& \quad \leqslant n^{-2}+d^{-1} n^{-4},
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $0<d<1$.

Let $\mu\left(\mathbf{z}_{1} ; \mathbf{z}_{2}\right), \mathbf{z}_{1}, \mathbf{z}_{2} \in \mathbf{R}^{2}$, be a symmetric function, i.e., $\mu\left(\mathbf{z}_{1} ; \mathbf{z}_{2}\right)=$ $\mu\left(\mathbf{z}_{2} ; \mathbf{z}_{1}\right)$ for all $\mathbf{z}_{1}, \mathbf{z}_{2} \in \mathbf{R}^{2}$. Assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E \mu\left(Y_{1}, X_{1} ; Y_{2}, X_{2}\right)=0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left\{\mu\left(Y_{1}, X_{1} ; Y_{2}, X_{2}\right) \mid Y_{1}, X_{1}\right\}=0 \quad \text { a.s. } \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the symmetric kernel $\mu$ we can define a multivariate V -statistic by

$$
U_{n}=\sum_{1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n} \mu\left(Y_{i}, X_{i} ; Y_{j}, X_{j}\right)
$$

Condition (2.2) implies that $U_{n}$ is essentially a degenerate U -statistic. For a survey on U- and V-statistics, see Serfling [23, Chap. 5]. The following result is essentially due to Dehling, Denker, and Philipp [9]. They proved the result for a bivariate kernel $\mu$. It is easy to see that their method also works for a multivariate kernel.

Theorem C. Assume that (2.1) and (2.2) hold, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mu\left(\mathbf{z}_{1} ; \mathbf{z}_{2}\right)\right| \leqslant C_{4} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for all positive integers $v$,

$$
E\left(U_{n}\right)^{2 v} \leqslant n^{2 v}\left\{4 v^{2 v}\left(4 C_{4} / e\right)^{2 v}+n^{-1} v^{2 v+1}(80 / e)^{2 v+1} C_{4}^{2 v}\right\}
$$

Theorem $\Lambda$ is tailored for getting a rate in weak invariance principles but it is not enough to obtain exact laws of the iterated logarithm. In Section 5 we need the following result.

Theorem D. We can define a Gaussian process $\left\{\Gamma^{(2)}(y, x, t),-\infty<y\right.$, $x<\infty, t>0$ ) such that

$$
\sup \left|\alpha_{n}(y, x)-n^{-1 / 2} \Gamma^{(2)}(y, x, n)\right| \stackrel{\text { a.s. }}{=} o\left(n^{-\lambda}\right)
$$

with some $\lambda>0$ and $E \Gamma^{(2)}(y, x, t)=0$,
$E \Gamma^{(2)}(y, x, t) \Gamma^{(2)}\left(y^{\prime}, x^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)=\left(t \wedge t^{\prime}\right)\left(F\left(y \wedge y^{\prime}, x \wedge x^{\prime}\right)-F(y, x) F\left(y^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)\right)$.
Csörgő and Révész [5] obtained a similar result with $\lambda<\frac{5}{16}$ in the case of a smooth distribution function. Theorem $D$ was proven by Philipp and Pinzur [21] with $\lambda<\frac{1}{20000}$ without assuming any regularity conditions on F. Recently Csörgö and Horváth [6] improved the Philipp-Pinzur result to $\lambda<\frac{1}{8}$ without assuming any regularity conditions on $F$.

## 3. Kernel Type Estimator

We now show that when the conditions below hold we can approximate $\beta_{n}$ using a sequence of Brownian bridges. From this we have immediately a strong law. The following conditions which we will use are not very restrictive, requiring some smoothness and an appropriate rate for the bandwidth.

$$
\begin{gather*}
g(x)>0  \tag{3.1}\\
\sup _{y, u} h(y, u)<\infty  \tag{3.2}\\
\sup _{y, u}\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial u} h(y, u)\right|<\infty, \quad \sup _{u}\left|g^{\prime}(u)\right|<\infty  \tag{3.3}\\
K \geqslant 0, \lim _{u \rightarrow \pm \infty} K(u)=0, \quad \int K(u) d u=1  \tag{3.4}\\
\int|u| K^{2}(u) d u<\infty  \tag{3.5}\\
\int K^{2}(u) d u<\infty \tag{3.6}
\end{gather*}
$$

$K$ has bounded variation on $\mathbf{R}$
and

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
a_{n} \log n \rightarrow 0 & \text { as } & n \rightarrow \infty \\
n a_{n}^{3}(\log n)^{-6} \rightarrow \infty & \text { as } & n \rightarrow \infty . \tag{3.9}
\end{array}
$$

If we assume that $K$ vanishes outside of a finite interval, then (3.3) can be replaced with

$$
\left|g^{\prime}(u)\right|<\infty, \quad \sup _{y}\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial u} h(y, u)\right|<\infty
$$

uniformly in $u$ in a neighborhood of $x$.
Theorem 3.1. We assume that (3.1)-(3.9) hold. We can define a sequence of Brownian bridges $\left\{B_{n}^{(1)}(t), 0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1\right\}$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|\beta_{n}(y \mid x)-\left(\int K^{2}(u) d u / g(x)\right)^{1 / 2} B_{n}^{(1)}(m(y \mid x))\right|\right. \\
\left.>C_{5}\left(\left(a_{n} \log n\right)^{1 / 2}+n^{-1 / 6} a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \log n\right)\right\} \leqslant C_{6} n^{-2}
\end{gathered}
$$

Theorem 3.1 and the Borel-Cantelli lemma immediately imply the following strong law.

Corollary 3.1. If (3.1)-(3.9) hold, then

$$
\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty}(\log n)^{-1 / 2} \sup _{y}\left|\beta_{n}(y \mid x)\right| \leqslant 2^{-1 / 2}\left(\int K^{2}(u) d u / g(x)\right)^{1 / 2} \quad \text { a.s. }
$$

Assuming more regularity conditions we improve Corollary 3.1 in Section 5 and prove a law of the iterated logarithm.

The results of this section will hold for $\left(n a_{n}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(m_{n}(y \mid x)-m(y \mid x)\right)$ if we can prove that $m_{(n)}(y \mid x)-m(y \mid x)$ is asymptotically negligible. This is done in the following lemma, whose proof is immediate using a two-term Taylor expansion.

Lemma 3.1. We assume that (3.1)-(3.4) hold, $\int u^{2} K(u) d u<\infty$ and

$$
\sup _{y, u}\left|\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial u^{2}} h(y, u)\right|<\infty
$$

Then

$$
\sup _{y}\left|m_{(n)}(y \mid x)-m(y \mid x)\right|=O\left(a_{n}^{3}\right)
$$

If we assume that $K$ vanishes outside a finite interval, then the extra condition on $h$ in Lemma 3.1 can be replaced by

$$
\sup _{y}\left|\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial u^{2}} h(y, u)\right|<\infty
$$

uniformly in $u$ in a neighborhood of $x$.
In order to prove Theorem 3.1, we first approximate $\beta_{n}$ by stochastic integrals involving $\alpha_{n}$ and $t_{n}$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. If (3.1)-(3.9) hold, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{n}(y \mid x)= & \frac{a_{n}^{-1 / 2}}{g(x)} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u) \\
& -\frac{a_{n}^{-1 / 2} m(y \mid x)}{g(x)} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)+R_{n}^{(1)}(y, x)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
P\left\{\sup \left|R_{n}^{(1)}(y, x)\right|>C_{7}\left(\left(a_{n} \log n\right)^{1 / 2}+n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2} \log n\right)\right\} \leqslant C_{8} n^{-2}
$$

Proof. First we note that

$$
\begin{align*}
\beta_{n}(y \mid x)= & \frac{a_{n}^{-1 / 2}}{g_{(n)}(x)} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u) \\
& -\frac{a_{n}^{-1 / 2} h_{(n)}(y, x)}{g_{(n)}^{2}(x)} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u) \\
& -\frac{n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2}}{g^{(n)}(x) g_{n}(x)} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u) \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u) \\
& +\frac{n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2} h_{(n)}(y, x)}{g_{(n)}^{2}(x) g_{n}(x)}\left(\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)\right)^{2} \tag{3.10}
\end{align*}
$$

By (3.3)-(3.5) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{y}\left|h_{(n)}(y, x)-h(y, x)\right|=O\left(a_{n}\right) \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{(n)}(x)-g(x)\right|=O\left(a_{n}\right) \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integration by parts and Kiefer's [13] inequality imply that

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u)\right|>C(\log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \\
& \quad=P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|\int_{n}\left(y, x-t a_{n}\right) d K(t)\right|>C(\log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \\
& \quad \leqslant P\left\{\sup _{y, u}\left|\alpha_{n}(y, u)\right| \int d|K(t)|>C(\log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \\
& \quad \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.13}
\end{align*}
$$

and similarly

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)\right|>C(\log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using now (3.11)-(3.14), we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{a_{n}^{-1 / 2}\left|\frac{1}{g_{(n)}(x)}-\frac{1}{g(x)}\right| \sup _{y}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u)\right|\right. \\
& \left.\quad>C\left(a_{n} \log n\right)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.15}
\end{align*}
$$

and, for the second term in (3.10),

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|\frac{h_{(n)}(y, x)}{g_{(n)}^{2}(x)}-\frac{m(y \mid x)}{g(x)}\right| a_{n}^{-1 / 2}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)\right|\right. \\
& \left.\quad>C\left(a_{n} \log n\right)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.16}
\end{align*}
$$

Observing that

$$
g_{n}(x)-g_{(n)}(x)=a_{n}^{-1} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d\left(G_{n}(u)-G(u)\right)
$$

we get from (3.1), (3.9), (3.13), and (3.14) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{g_{n}(x)>C\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence (3.1), (3.14), and (3.17) yield

$$
\begin{gather*}
P\left\{\frac{n^{1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2}}{g_{(n)}(x) g_{n}(x)}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)\right| \sup _{y}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u)\right|\right. \\
\left.\quad>C n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.18}
\end{gather*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{\sup _{y} \frac{n^{1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2} h_{(n)}(y, x)}{g_{(n)}^{2}(x) g_{n}(x)}\left(\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)\right)^{2}\right. \\
& \left.\quad>C n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.19}
\end{align*}
$$

Lemma 3.2 now follows from (3.15), (3.16), (3.18), and (3.19).
If we assume that

$$
\inf _{1_{1} \leqslant x \leqslant t_{2}} g(x)>0
$$

instead of (3.1), then Lemma 3.2 holds uniformly in $x \in\left[t_{1}^{*}, t_{2}^{*}\right]$ for $t_{1}<t_{1}^{*} \leqslant t_{2}^{*}<t_{2}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Lemma 3.2 an approximation of
$a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \int K\left((x-u) / a_{n}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u)$ results in an approximation of $\beta_{n}$. Now applying Theorem A we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \sup _{y}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u}\left(\Gamma_{n}^{(1)}(y, u)-\alpha_{n}(y, u)\right)\right|\right. \\
& \left.>C a_{n}^{-1 / 2} n^{-1 / 6} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} . \tag{3.20}
\end{align*}
$$

It is well known (cf. Wichura [30]) that there is a two-dimensional distribution function $J$ with uniform marginals such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(y, x)=J(H(y), G(x)) . \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\left\{W_{J}(s, t), 0 \leqslant s, t \leqslant 1\right\}$ be a two-dimensional Wiener process with $E W_{J}(s, t)=0$ and $E W_{J}(s, t) W_{J}\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)=J\left(s \wedge s^{\prime}, t \wedge t^{\prime}\right)$. Then for each $n$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{\Gamma_{n}^{(1)}(y, x), y, x \in \mathbf{R}\right\} \stackrel{\boldsymbol{D}}{=}\left\{W_{J}(H(y), G(x))-F(y, x) W_{J}(1,1), y, x \in \mathbf{R}\right\}, \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\{\int K\right. & \left.\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \Gamma_{n}^{(1)}(y, u), y, x \in \mathbf{R}\right\} \\
\stackrel{D}{=} & \left\{\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} W_{J}(H(y), G(u))\right. \\
& \left.-W_{J}(1,1) \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) h(y, u) d u, y, x \in \mathbf{R}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now applying (3.2) and (3.4) we get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\left|W_{J}(1,1)\right| \sup _{y}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) h(y, u) d u\right|>C a_{n}(\log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} . \tag{3.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Elementary calculations show that

$$
E \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} W_{J}(H(y), G(u))=0
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E a_{n}^{-1} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} W_{J}(H(y), G(u)) \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} W_{J}\left(H\left(y^{\prime}\right), G(u)\right) \\
& \quad=a_{n}^{-1} \int K^{2}\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) h\left(y \wedge y^{\prime}, u\right) d u=l_{n}^{*}\left(y \wedge y^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we get
$\left\{a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} W_{J}(H(y), G(u)), y \in \mathbf{R}\right\} \stackrel{D}{=}\left\{W\left(l_{n}^{*}(y)\right), y \in \mathbf{R}\right\}$,
where $\{W(t), 0 \leqslant t<\infty\}$ is a standard Wiener process. Let $l(y)=$ $h(y, x) \int K^{2}(u) d u$. A one-term Taylor expansion and (3.3), (3.5) imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{y}\left|l_{n}^{*}(y)-l(y)\right|=\sup _{y}\left|\int K^{2}(u)\left\{h\left(y, x-u a_{n}\right)-h(y, x)\right\} d u\right|=O\left(a_{n}\right) . \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (3.26) and Lemma 1.1.1 of Csörgö and Révész [5] we get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|W\left(l_{n}^{*}(y)\right)-W(l(y))\right|>C\left(a_{n} \log n\right)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Lemma 3.2, (3.20), (3.23)-(3.25), and (3.27) we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\{\beta_{n}(y \mid x), y \in \mathbf{R}\right\} \\
& \quad \stackrel{D}{=}\left\{\frac{1}{g(x)} W(l(y))-\frac{m(y \mid x)}{g(x)} W(l(\infty))+R_{n}^{(2)}(y), y \in \mathbf{R}\right\} \tag{3.28}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|R_{n}^{(2)}(y)\right|>C\left(\left(a_{n} \log n\right)^{1 / 2}+n^{-1 / 6} a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \log n\right)\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{3.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to check that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\{\frac{1}{g(x)} W(l(y))-\frac{m(y \mid x)}{g(x)} W(l(\infty)), y \in \mathbf{R}\right\} \\
& \quad \stackrel{D}{=}\left\{\left(\int K^{2}(u) d u / g(x)\right)^{1 / 2} B(m(y \mid x)), y \in \mathbf{R}\right\} \tag{3.30}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\{B(t), 0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1\}$ is a Brownian bridge. Theorem 3.1 now follows from (3.28)-(2.30) and Lemma 4.4.4 of Csörgö and Révész [5].

## 4. Nearest-Neighbor Type Estimator

We start again with the conditions. We assume that there is a neighborhood of $x$, denoted by $V=V(x)$, such that the following conditions hold true:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\inf _{u \in V} g(u)>0, \\
\sup _{u \in V} \sup _{y} h(y, u)<\infty, \\
\sup _{u \in V} \sup _{y}\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial u} h(y, u)\right|<\infty
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{u \in V}\left|g^{\prime}(u)\right|<\infty . \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We need more restrictive conditions on $K$ than those assumed in Section 3, namely,

$$
\begin{align*}
& K \text { is bounded and vanishes outside of a finite interval, }  \tag{4.5}\\
& \qquad \sup ^{\prime}\left|K^{\prime}(u)\right|<\infty \tag{4.6}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{u}\left|K^{\prime \prime}(u)\right|<\infty . \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $K(u)=0$ unless $u \in[-1,1]$. It will follow from the proofs that instead of (4.6) and (4.7) it is enough to assume that $K^{\prime}$ and $K^{\prime \prime}$ exist and are uniformly bounded almost everywhere with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 4.1. Assume that (4.1)-(4.7) and (3.8)-(3.9) hold. We can define a sequence of Brownian bridges $\left\{B_{n}^{(2)}(t), 0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1\right\}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)-\left(\int K^{2}(u) d u\right)^{1 / 2} B_{n}^{(2)}(m(y \mid x))\right|\right. \\
& \left.\quad>C_{9}\left(\left(a_{n} \log n\right)^{1 / 2}+n^{-1 / 6} a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \log n\right)\right\} \leqslant C_{10} n^{-2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 4.1 and the Borel-Cantelli lemma immediately imply the following.

Corollary 4.1. If (4.1)-(4.7) and (3.8)-(3.9) hold, then

$$
\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty}(\log n)^{-1 / 2} \sup _{y}\left|\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)\right| \leqslant\left(\int K^{2}(u) d u / 2\right)^{1 / 2} \quad \text { a.s. }
$$

The next lemma gives a rate for $k_{(n)}-m$.
Lemma 4.1. Assume that (3.4) and (4.1)-(4.4) hold and

$$
\sup _{u \in V(x)} \sup _{y}\left|\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial u^{2}} h(y, u)\right|<\infty .
$$

Then

$$
\sup _{y}\left|k_{(n)}(y \mid x)-m(y \mid x)\right|=O\left(a_{n}^{3}\right) .
$$

The proof of the Theorem 4.1 uses Theorem A and calculations similar to those in the proof of Theorem 3.1. The proof is omitted, except for the following

Lemma 4.2. If (4.1)-(4.7) and (3.8), (3.9) hold, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)= & a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \int K\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u) \\
& -a_{n}^{-1 / 2} m(y \mid x) \int K\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)+R_{n}^{(3)}(y, x)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|R_{n}^{(3)}(y, x)\right|>C_{11} n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C_{12} n^{-2} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. A two-term Taylor expansion yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{n}(y \mid x)= & a_{n}^{-1} \int K\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} F_{n}(y, u) \\
& +n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-2} \int\left(t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} F_{n}(y, u) \\
& +\frac{1}{2} n^{-1} a_{n}^{-3} \int\left(t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right)^{2} K^{\prime \prime}(\delta) d_{u} F_{n}(y, u) \\
= & R_{n}^{(4)}+R_{n}^{(5)}+R_{n}^{(6)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\delta$ is between $\left(G_{n}(x)-G_{n}(u)\right) / a_{n}$ and $(G(x)-G(u)) / a_{n}$. We approximate the first two terms of the expansion of $\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)$ by
$\left(n a_{n}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(R_{n}^{(4)}-k_{(n)}(y \mid x)\right)$ and $\left(n a_{n}\right)^{1 / 2} R_{n}^{(5)}$, respectively, and show that $R_{n}^{(6)}$ is negligible.

First we consider $R_{n}^{(6)}$. Using the Dvoretzky, Kiefer, and Wolfowitz [10] inequality we get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\sup _{u}\left|G_{n}(u)-G(u)\right|>C(\log n / n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

By condition (3.8) this means that $\delta$ is essentially in the interval $(G(x)-G(u)) / a_{n} \pm C a_{n}^{1 / 2}$. Using (4.5), (4.7), (4.10), and Theorem B with (3.8) we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|R_{n}^{(6)}(y)\right|>C n^{-1} a_{n}^{-2} \log n\right\} \\
& \quad \leqslant P\left\{\sup _{|G(x)-G(u)| \leqslant C a_{n}}\left(t_{n}(u)-t_{n}(x)\right)^{2}>C a_{n} \log n\right\} \\
& \quad \leqslant C n^{-2} . \tag{4.11}
\end{align*}
$$

To estimate $R_{n}^{(5)}$ we observe that

$$
\begin{align*}
n^{1 / 2} a_{n}^{2} R_{n}^{(5)}= & \int\left(t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right) m(y \mid u) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d G_{n}(u) \\
& +R_{n}^{(7)}-R_{n}^{(8)} \tag{4.12}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{n}^{(7)}=t_{n}(x) \int K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right)\left\{d_{u} F_{n}(y, u)-m(y \mid u) d G_{n}(u)\right\}, \\
& R_{n}^{(8)}=\int t_{n}(u) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right)\left\{d_{u} F_{n}(y, u)-m(y \mid u) d G_{n}(u)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We show that $R_{n}^{(7)}$ and $R_{n}^{(8)}$ are asymptotically small. For convenience, let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{y}^{1}(s, t)=I\{t \leqslant y\} K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(s)}{a_{n}}\right), \\
& \mu_{y}^{2}(s, t)=m(y \mid s) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(s)}{a_{n}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.10) it is enough for $R_{n}^{(7)}$ to consider

$$
\begin{align*}
R_{n}^{(9)} & =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(I\left\{Y_{i} \leqslant y\right\}-m\left(y \mid X_{i}\right)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G\left(X_{i}\right)}{a_{n}}\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\mu_{y}^{1}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)-\mu_{y}^{2}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)\right\} \tag{4.13}
\end{align*}
$$

It is easy to see that there exist $N=C n$ points $-\infty=y_{1}<y_{2}<\cdots<$ $y_{N}=\infty$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\left|E \mu_{y_{j}}^{1}\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right)-E \mu_{\mu_{j+1}}^{1}\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right)\right| \leqslant 1 / n  \tag{4.14}\\
E I\left\{y_{j}<Y_{1} \leqslant y_{j+1}\right\} \leqslant 1 / n
\end{array}
$$

$1 \leqslant j \leqslant N-1$. Using the monotonicity of $\mu_{y}^{1}$ and $\mu_{y}^{2}$ in $y$, we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup _{y}\left|R_{n}^{(9)}(y)\right| \leqslant & 3 \max _{1 \leqslant j \leqslant N}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\mu_{y_{j}}^{1}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)-\mu_{y_{j}}^{2}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)\right\}\right| \\
& +3 \max _{1 \leqslant j \leqslant N-1}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\mu_{y_{j}}^{1}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)-\mu_{y_{j+1}}^{1}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)\right\}\right| \\
& =R_{n}^{(10)}+R_{n}^{(11)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Observing that $E \mu_{y}^{1}\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right)=E \mu_{y}^{2}\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right)$, we have by Hoeffding's inequality (cf. Serfling [23, p. 75]) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\max _{1 \leqslant j \leqslant N}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\mu_{y_{j}}^{1}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)-\mu_{v_{j}}^{2}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)\right)\right|>C(n \log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (4.14) we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{n}^{(11)} \leqslant 3+6 \max _{1 \leqslant j \leqslant N}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\mu_{y_{j}}^{1}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)-E \mu_{y_{j}}^{1}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i}\right)\right)\right| \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Arguing similarly to (4.15) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{R_{n}^{(11)}>C(n \log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (4.15), (4.17), and (4.10) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{R_{n}^{(7)}>C n^{-1 / 2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Estimation of $R_{n}^{(8)}$ is similar to $R_{n}^{(7)}$, but is somewhat lengthier. We can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{n}^{(8)}= & n^{-3 / 2} \sum_{1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n}\left(I\left\{X_{j} \leqslant X_{i}\right\}-G\left(X_{i}\right)\right)\left(I\left\{Y_{i} \leqslant y\right\}\right. \\
& \left.-m\left(y \mid X_{i}\right)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G\left(X_{i}\right)}{a_{n}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{y}^{3}\left(z_{1}, z_{2} ; z_{3}, z_{4}\right)= & I\left\{z_{2} \leqslant y\right\}\left(I\left\{z_{3} \leqslant z_{1}\right\}-G\left(z_{1}\right)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G\left(z_{1}\right)}{a_{n}}\right) \\
& +I\left\{z_{4} \leqslant y\right\}\left(I\left\{z_{1} \leqslant z_{3}\right\}-G\left(z_{3}\right)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G\left(z_{3}\right)}{a_{n}}\right), \\
\mu_{y}^{4}\left(z_{1}, z_{2} ; z_{3}, z_{4}\right)= & m\left(y \mid z_{1}\right)\left(I\left\{z_{3} \leqslant z_{1}\right\}-G\left(z_{1}\right)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G\left(z_{1}\right)}{a_{n}}\right) \\
& +m\left(y \mid z_{3}\right)\left(I\left\{z_{1} \leqslant z_{3}\right\}-G\left(z_{3}\right)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G\left(z_{3}\right)}{a_{n}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
R_{n}^{(12)}=\sum_{1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n}\left\{\mu_{y}^{3}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i} ; X_{j}, Y_{j}\right)-\mu_{y}^{4}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i} ; X_{j}, Y_{j}\right)\right\}
$$

It is easy to check that

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{n}^{(8)}=\frac{1}{2} n^{-3 / 2} R_{n}^{(12)} \tag{4.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (4.14) we can show by elementary arguments that

$$
\begin{align*}
\sup _{y}\left|R_{n}^{(12)}(y)\right| \leqslant & \left.3 \max _{1 \leqslant N}\right|_{1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n}\left(\mu_{y_{k}}^{3}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i} ; X_{j}, Y_{j}\right)-\mu_{y_{k}}^{4}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i} ; X_{j}, Y_{j}\right)\right) \mid \\
& +\left.3 \max _{1 \leqslant k \leqslant N-1}\right|_{1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n}\left(\mu_{y_{k}}^{3}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i} ; X_{j}, Y_{j}\right)\right. \\
& \left.-\mu_{y_{k+1}}^{3}\left(X_{i}, Y_{i} ; X_{j}, Y_{j}\right)\right) \mid \\
= & 3 \max _{1 \leqslant k \leqslant N}\left|R_{n, k}^{(13)}\right|+3 \max _{1 \leqslant k \leqslant N}\left|R_{n, k}^{(14)}\right| . \tag{4.20}
\end{align*}
$$

For each $k, R_{n, k}^{(13)}$ is a degenerate U-statistic, and an application of Theorem C implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left(R_{n, k}^{(13)}\right)^{2 v} \leqslant C^{2 v} n^{2 v}\left\{v^{2 v}+n^{-1} v^{2 v+1}\right\}, \tag{4.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $C$ does not depend on $k$. Therefore, with $v=\log n$,

$$
\begin{align*}
P\left\{\left|R_{n, k}^{(13)}\right|>b n \log n\right\} & =P\left\{\left(R_{n, k}^{(13)}\right)^{2 v}>(b n \log n)^{2 v}\right\} \\
& \leqslant \frac{n^{2 v}}{(b n \log n)^{2 v}} C^{2 v}\left[(\log n)^{2 v}+n^{-1}(\log n)^{2 v+1}\right] \\
& =(C / b)^{\log n}\left[1+n^{-1} \log n\right] \leqslant n^{-3} \tag{4.22}
\end{align*}
$$

if $b$ is large enough, which implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\max _{1 \leqslant k \leqslant N}\left|R_{n, k}^{(13)}\right|>C n \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the definition of $\mu_{y}^{3}$ we get that

$$
\left|R_{n, k}^{(14)}\right| \leqslant C n \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left\{y_{k}<Y_{i} \leqslant y_{k+1}\right\} .
$$

Now (4.14) and Bernstein's inequality (cf. Serfling [23, p. 95]) imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\max _{1 \leqslant k \leqslant N-1}\left|R_{n, k}^{(14)}\right| \geqslant C n \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Collecting together (4.19), (4.20), (4.23), and (4.24) we get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|R_{n}^{(8)}(y)\right|>C n^{-1 / 2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, for $R_{n}^{(5)}$ it is enough to consider

$$
\int\left(t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right) m(y \mid u) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d G_{n}(u)
$$

Using (4.5) we get that

$$
\begin{align*}
R_{n}^{(15)}= & \sup _{y}\left|\int\left(t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right)(m(y \mid u)-m(y \mid x)) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d G_{n}(u)\right| \\
\leqslant & C \sup _{y} \sup _{|G(x)-G(u)| \leqslant a_{n}}|m(y \mid u)-m(y \mid x)| \\
& \times \sup _{|G(x)-G(u)| \leqslant a_{n}}\left\{\left|t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right|\left|G_{n}(u)-G_{n}(x)\right|\right\} . \tag{4.26}
\end{align*}
$$

We obtain from (4.1), (4.3), and (4.4) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{y} \sup _{|G(x)-G(u)| \leqslant a_{n}}|m(y \mid u)-m(y \mid)|=O\left(a_{n}\right) . \tag{4.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

We get from (4.4) that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sup _{|G(x)-G(u)| \leqslant a_{n}}\left|G_{n}(u)-G_{n}(x)\right| \\
& \quad \leqslant \sup _{|G(x)-G(u)| \leqslant a_{n}} n^{-1 / 2}\left|t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right|+O\left(n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}\right) . \tag{4.28}
\end{align*}
$$

Using now (4.27), (4.28), and Theorem B, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{R_{n}^{(15)}>C(\log n / n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} \tag{4.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

In a similar fashion to the estimation of $R_{n}^{(8)}$, an application of Theorem C yields

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|\int\left(t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d\left(G_{n}(u)-G(u)\right)\right|\right. \\
& \left.\quad>C n^{-1 / 2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} . \tag{4.30}
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore, since $R_{n}^{(7)}$ and $R_{n}^{(8)}$ are negligible, it is enough to consider the first term on the righthand side of (4.12). Integration by parts gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int\left(t_{n}(x)-t_{n}(u)\right) K^{\prime}\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d G(u)=-a_{n} \int K\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u) . \tag{4.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (4.12), (4.18), (4.25), (4.26), and (4.29)-(4.31) we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|R_{n}^{(5)}(y)+\frac{m(y \mid x)}{n^{1 / 2} a_{n}} \int K\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)\right|\right. \\
& \left.>C n^{-1} a_{n}^{-2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} . \tag{4.32}
\end{align*}
$$

All that remains is the approximation of $R_{n}^{(4)}-k_{(n)}(y \mid x)$. Condition (4.5) implies that $l_{(n)}(x)=k_{(n)}(\infty \mid x)=1$ if $n$ is large enough. Using (4.9), (4.11), and (4.32) we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\left(n a_{n}\right)^{1 / 2}\left|l_{n}(x)-1\right|>C n^{-1 / 2} a_{n}^{-3 / 2} \log n\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} . \tag{4.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Kiefer's [13] inequality we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left\{\sup _{y}\left|\int K\left(\frac{G(x)-G(u)}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u)\right|>C(\log n)^{1 / 2}\right\} \leqslant C n^{-2} . \tag{4.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Observing that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(n a_{n}\right)^{-1 / 2} \gamma_{n}(y \mid x)= & r_{n}(y \mid x)-k_{(n)}(y \mid x)-\left(l_{n}(x)-1\right)\left(r_{n}(y \mid x)\right. \\
& \left.-k_{(n)}(y \mid x)\right) / l_{n}(x)+k_{(n)}(y \mid x)\left(1-l_{n}(x)\right) / l_{n}(x),
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 4.2 follows from (4.9), (4.11), and (4.32)-(4.34).

## 5. Limit Points of Conditional Empirical Processes

Theorems 3.1 and 4.1 say that the weak behavior of the conditional empirical processes are essentially the same as for the usual empirical process. Now we consider the exact almost sure properties of the conditional processes. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
r(s)=r(s \mid x)=\inf \{y: m(y \mid x) \geqslant s\}, \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

the inverse (quantile) of $m(y \mid x)$. We will assume that there is a neighborhood of $x$, say $V=V(x)$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{u \in V}\left|m(r(s \mid x) \mid u)-m\left(r\left(s^{\prime} \mid x\right) \mid u\right)\right| \leqslant C\left|s-s^{\prime}\right|^{\tau} \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with some $C>0$ and $0<\tau \leqslant 1$. This condition is implied by the condition that for $y<y^{\prime}$,

$$
\sup _{u \in V}\left|m(y \mid u)-m\left(y^{\prime} \mid u\right)\right| \leqslant C\left|m(y \mid x)-m\left(y^{\prime} \mid x\right)\right|^{\tau} .
$$

Let $\boldsymbol{H}$ be the set of absolutely continuous functions (with respect to Lebesgue measure) on $[0,1]$ for which $f(0)=f(1)=0$ and $\int_{0}^{1}\left(f^{\prime}(t)\right)^{2} d t \leqslant 1$.

Theorem 5.1. Assume that (3.1)-(3.4), (3.8), (3.9), (4.5), and (5.2) hold and that $a_{n}=n^{-\mu}, 0<\mu<2 \lambda$, where $\lambda$ is given in Theorem D .
(i) If (3.1)-(3.4) hold, then

$$
\left\{\left(2 \log \log n \int K^{2}(u) d u / g(x)\right)^{-1 / 2} \beta_{n}(r(s \mid x) \mid x), 0 \leqslant s \leqslant 1\right\}
$$

is almost surely relatively compact in $D[0,1]$ with $\boldsymbol{H}$ as its set of limit points.
(ii) If (4.1)-(4.4) hold instead, then

$$
\left\{\left(2 \log \log n \int K^{2}(u) d u\right)^{-1 / 2} \gamma_{n}(r(s \mid x) \mid x), 0 \leqslant s \leqslant 1\right\}
$$

is almost surely relatively compact in $D[0,1]$ with $\boldsymbol{H}$ as its set of limit points.

The next result follows immediately from Theorem 5.1.

Corollary 5.1. Assume the conditions of Theorem 5.1. For the kernel estimator, if (3.1)-(3.4) hold, then

$$
\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty}(\log \log n)^{-1 / 2} \sup _{y}\left|\beta_{n}(y \mid x)\right|=\left(\frac{\int K^{2}(u) d u}{2 g(x)}\right)^{1 / 2} \quad \text { a.s. }
$$

For the NN estimator, if (4.1)-(4.4) hold, then

$$
\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty}(\log \log n)^{-1 / 2} \sup _{y}\left|\gamma_{n}(y \mid x)\right|=\left(\int K^{2}(u) d u / 2\right)^{1 / 2} \quad \text { a.s. }
$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We show the proof only for $\beta_{n}$, as the result for the NN estimator follows along similar lines. By Lemma 3.2, it is enough to consider

$$
a_{n}^{-1 / 2}\left\{\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} \alpha_{n}(y, u)-m(y \mid x) \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d t_{n}(u)\right\}
$$

Applying Theorem D , we get

$$
\sup _{y}\left|a_{n}^{-1 / 2} \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u}\left(\alpha_{n}(y, u)-n^{-1 / 2} \Gamma^{(2)}(y, u, n)\right)\right| \stackrel{\text { a.s. }}{=} o\left(n^{-\lambda} a_{n}^{-1 / 2}\right)
$$

Let $\left\{W_{J}(s, t, u), 0 \leqslant s, t \leqslant 1, u>0\right\}$ be a three-dimensional Wiener process with $E W_{J}(s, t, u)=0$ and $E W_{J}(s, t, u) W_{J}\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}, u^{\prime}\right)=\left(u \wedge u^{\prime}\right) J\left(s \wedge s^{\prime}\right.$, $t \wedge t^{\prime}$ ). Then from (3.21) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\{\Gamma^{(2)}(y, u, n), y, u \in \mathbf{R}, n \geqslant 1\right\} \\
& \quad \stackrel{\boldsymbol{D}}{=}\left\{W_{J}(H(y), G(u), n)-F(y, u) W_{J}(1,1, n), y, u \in \mathbf{R}, n \geqslant 1\right\} \tag{5.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Integration by parts and the law of the iterated logarithm for Wiener processes gives

$$
\left(n a_{n}\right)^{-1 / 2}\left|W_{J}(1,1, n)\right| \sup _{y}\left|\int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) h(y, u) d u\right| \stackrel{\text { a.s. }}{=} O\left(\left(a_{n} \log \log n\right)^{1 / 2}\right)
$$

Hence it suffices to investigate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(s)=\left(n a_{n}\right)^{-1 / 2}\{ & \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d_{u} W_{J}(H(r(s), G(u), n) \\
& \left.-s \int K\left(\frac{x-u}{a_{n}}\right) d W_{J}(1, G(u), n)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We obtain from (3.26) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{0 \leqslant s, 1 \leqslant 1}\left|E \Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(s) \Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(t)-\int K^{2}(u) d u g(x)(t \wedge s-t s)\right|=o(1) \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Elementary calculations show that

$$
E\left(\Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(t)-\Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(s)\right)^{2} \leqslant C|t-s|^{\tau},
$$

where $\tau$ is given by (5.2).
Let $c>1$ and define $n_{v}=\left[c^{\nu}\right]$, with $v$ an integer. We next show that for every $\varepsilon>0$ there is a $c=c(\varepsilon)>1$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\limsup _{v \rightarrow \infty} \max _{n_{r} \leqslant n \leqslant n_{v}+1}(\log v)^{-1 / 2} \sup _{0 \leqslant s \leqslant 1}\left|\Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(s)-\Gamma_{n_{v}}^{(3)}(s)\right| \leqslant \varepsilon \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $n \leqslant m$ such that $\frac{1}{2} \leqslant n / m$ and define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma^{(4)}(t, s)=\Gamma_{n+1(m-n)}^{(3)}(s)-\Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(s), \quad 0 \leqslant s, t \leqslant 1 . \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is not difficult to calculate the covariance function of $\Gamma^{(4)}$ because the process is given in terms of integrals with respect to a Wiener measure. Long but elementary calculations give the following results:

$$
\begin{align*}
& E\left(\Gamma^{(4)}(t, s)-\Gamma^{(4)}\left(t^{\prime}, s\right)\right)^{2} \leqslant C|1-m / n|\left|t-t^{\prime}\right|  \tag{5.7}\\
& E\left(\Gamma^{(4)}(t, s)-\Gamma^{(4)}\left(t, s^{\prime}\right)\right)^{2} \leqslant C|1-m / n|\left|s-s^{\prime}\right|^{\tau} \tag{5.8}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left(\Gamma^{(4)}(t, s)\right)^{2} \leqslant C|1-m / n|, \tag{5.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C$ is an absolute constant. By (5.7)-(5.9) we can apply Lemma 2 of Lai [16] and get that for all $x \geqslant 10$
$P\left\{\sup _{0 \leqslant s, t \leqslant 1}\left|\Gamma^{(4)}(t, s)\right|>x C|1-m / n|\right\} \leqslant 100 \int_{x}^{\infty} \exp \left(-u^{2} / 2\right) d u$.
Hence (5.5) follows immediately from (5.6) and (5.10) with $x=(4 \log v)^{1 / 2}$. Now we observe that $\varepsilon$ can be arbitrarily small in (5.5), and $\log \log n_{v} /$ $\log v \rightarrow 1$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ for all $c>1$. Thus Theorem 1.1a of Mangano [19] implies that $\left\{\left(2 \log \log n \int K^{2}(u) d u / g(x)\right)^{-1 / 2} \Gamma_{n}^{(3)}(s), 0 \leqslant s \leqslant 1\right\}$, is almost surely relatively compact in $\mathrm{C}[0,1]$ with limit points in $\boldsymbol{H}$.

Next we show that $\boldsymbol{H}$ must be in the cluster set. Let $\eta>v$. Then straightforward calculations yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{E\left(\Gamma_{n_{\eta}}^{(3)}(s) \mid \Gamma_{u}^{(3)}(t), 0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1,0 \leqslant u \leqslant n_{v}\right)\right\}^{2} \\
& \quad \leqslant E\left\{E\left(\Gamma_{n_{\eta}}^{(3)}(s) \mid W_{J}(t, v, u), 0 \leqslant t, v \leqslant 1,0 \leqslant u \leqslant n_{v}\right)\right\}^{2} \\
& \quad \leqslant C c^{v-\eta},
\end{aligned}
$$

which goes to zero as $\eta-v \rightarrow \infty$. Now we can apply Theorem 1.1b of Mangano [19] (cf. his remark on p. 912) to show that the cluster set is $\boldsymbol{H}$. The proof of Theorem 5.1 is now complete.
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