

Optimal rates of convergence for topological persistence estimation

Frédéric Chazal,* Marc Glisse †, Catherine Labruère ‡, Bertrand Michel §

April 26, 2013

Abstract

1 Introduction

Main contributions of the paper :

- we set a complete and rigorous statistical framework for the analysis of persistence diagram.
- we propose a general method for computing rates of convergence of topological estimators (can be used for different metrics and under different geometrical approaches)
- it works for general metric spaces (without any vectorial and euclidean structure)
- schema general : on beneficie des vitesses de convergence en Hausdorff. On montre que dans différentes situations les vitesses sont les bonnes en refaisant les bornes inf. Dans ces contextes, il est donc inutile de tenter une mthode directe qui eviterait Hausdorff ...
- A placer quelque part : les rsultats en homologie sont beaucoup plus rapide, c est logique car c est moins fin que la persistance

Biblio :

- inference topo, diagrammes de persistence.
- estimation de support.

*frederic.chazal@inria.fr

†marc.glisse@inria.fr

‡clabruer@u-bourgogne.fr

§bertrand.michel@upmc.fr

- dans les espaces metriques voir + general : citer [11, 2]
- Dans \mathbb{R}^d : many methods are available for estimating the support of a measure in \mathbb{R}^d but most of them consider the measure of symmetric set difference to compare the support approximations with the true support, see [12, 18, 19, 21, 1] among others.
For Hausdorff : [19, 17, 13, 9, 25, 10, 4, 24, 7] .

- manifold learning (un peu), surtout manifold estimation.

In this paper, we will discuss rates of convergence of persistence diagram estimation with a minimax approach. We may apply known results about support measure estimation to deduce rates of convergence for the estimation of persistence diagrams. We will need to compute lower bounds for these rates whereas we may deduce upper bounds from known results about support estimation in Hausdorff metric.

In Section 3, we give rates of convergence for the estimation of persistence diagrams in general metric spaces. We then consider in Section 4 more standard frameworks in \mathbb{R}^d .

2 Background

We use the notation $x \wedge y$ and $x \vee y$ for the minimum and the maximum between two real x and y .

2.1 Measured metric spaces

Let (\mathbb{M}, ρ) be a metric space. In the following, $B(x, r)$ denotes the open ball of center x and radius r in \mathbb{M} . We denote by $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{M})$ the set of all the compact subsets of \mathbb{M} .

Definitions :

- distance to a set $d(x, C)$
- Hausdorff distance d_H ; $(\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{M}), d_H)$ is a metric space and then $(\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{M}), d_H)$ can be endowed with its σ -borel algebra.
- Gromov Hausdorff distance d_{GH} between compact metric spaces: see definition in [6], section 4.2 for example. We consider the set $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ of all the compact metric spaces endowed with d_{GH} . Let \mathcal{K} be the quotient set of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ by the equivalence relation induced by d_{GH} . Then (\mathcal{K}, d_{GH}) is a Polish metric space and we can consider measures defined on its Borel σ -algebra.

Let μ be a probability measure on (\mathbb{M}, ρ) equipped with its Borel algebra. Let \mathbb{X}_μ denotes the support of the measure μ , namely the smallest closed set with probability one. In the following of the paper, we will assume that \mathbb{X}_μ is compact and thus $\mathbb{X}_\mu \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{M})$. Also note that $(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \rho) \in \mathcal{K}$.

The main assumption we will need in the following of the paper provides a lower bound on the measure μ . We say that μ satisfies the *standard assumption* if there exists $a' > 0$, $r_0 > 0$ and $b > 0$

such that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{X}_\mu, \forall r \in (0, r_0), \mu(B(x, r)) \geq a' r^b. \quad (2.1)$$

This assumption is popular in the literature about set estimation (see for instance [8]) but it has generally been considered with $b = d$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Since \mathbb{X}_μ is supposed to be a compact set, then \mathbb{X}_μ is totally bounded and also bounded. By reducing the constant a' to a smaller constant a , we see that assuming (2.1) is equivalent to assuming that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{X}_\mu, \forall r > 0, \mu(B(x, r)) \geq 1 \wedge ar^b \quad (2.2)$$

and we then say that μ satisfies the (a, b) -*standard assumption*.

2.2 Simplicial complexes on metric spaces

Geometric complexes. For a complete definition of these geometric filtered complexes built on top of metric spaces, we refer to [6], Section 4.2. We only give here a brief reminder. Given a metric space \mathbb{X} which will also serve as the vertex set, the *Vietoris-Rips complex* $\text{Rips}_\alpha(\mathbb{X})$ is the set of simplices $[x_0, \dots, x_k]$ such that $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x_i, x_j) \leq \alpha$ for all (i, j) . The *Čech complex* $\text{Cech}_\alpha(\mathbb{X})$ is similarly defined as the set of simplices $[x_0, \dots, x_k]$ such that the $k + 1$ closed balls $B(x_i, \alpha)$ have a non-empty intersection. Given two sets L and W and a non-negative function $\Lambda : L \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, the *witness complex* $\text{Wit}_\alpha(L, K)$ on the vertex set L is defined as the set of simplices σ whose facets are all in the complex and such that there exists an α -witness $w \in W$, i.e. a point such that $\Lambda(w, l) \leq \Lambda(w, l') + \alpha$ for all $l \in \sigma$ and $l' \notin \sigma$. Those three families of complexes have the fundamental property that they are non-decreasing with α ; for any $\alpha \leq \beta$, there is an inclusion of $\text{Rips}_\alpha(\mathbb{X})$ in $\text{Rips}_\beta(\mathbb{X})$, and similarly for the Čech and Witness complexes. They are thus called *filtrations*.

Complexes associated to compact subsets (embedded approach) distance to compact. ??? Given a compact set \mathbb{X} embedded in a larger metric space \mathbb{M} , for a parameter α , we can consider the subspace of \mathbb{M} that consists of all points at distance less than α from \mathbb{X} . Building for instance a Vietoris-Rips complex of fixed parameter β on those subspaces defines a filtered family of complexes.

In the following, the notation $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}) := (\text{Filt}_\alpha(\mathbb{X}))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ denotes one of the filtrations defined above. ??? What about the witness complex?

Persistence diagrams. An extensive presentation of persistence diagrams is available in [5]. We recall a few definitions and results that are needed in this paper.

Given a filtration as above, we can apply the \mathbb{Z}_2 -homology functor and get a sequence of vector spaces $(H(\text{Filt}_\alpha(\mathbb{X})))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, where the inclusions $\text{Filt}_\alpha(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \text{Filt}_\beta(\mathbb{X})$ induce linear maps $H(\text{Filt}_\alpha(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow H(\text{Filt}_\beta(\mathbb{X}))$. In many cases, this sequence can be decomposed as a direct sum of intervals, where an interval is a sequence of the form

$$0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow 0$$

(the linear maps $\mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ are all the identity). These intervals can be interpreted as features of the (filtered) complex, such as a connected component or a loop, that appear at parameter α_{birth} in the filtration and disappear at parameter α_{death} . An interval is determined uniquely by these two parameters and can thus be represented as a point in the plane, where the x -coordinate indicates the birth time and the y -coordinate the death time. The set of points (with multiplicity) representing the intervals is called the persistent diagram $\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}))$. Note that the diagram is entirely contained in the half-plane above the diagonal Δ defined by $y = x$, since death always occurs after birth. [5] shows that this diagram is still well defined even in cases where the sequence might not be decomposable as a sum of intervals, and in particular $\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}))$ is well defined for any compact metric space \mathbb{X} . Note that for technical reasons, the points of the diagonal Δ are considered as part of every persistence diagram, with infinite multiplicity.

The space of persistence diagrams is endowed with a metric called the bottleneck distance d_b . Given two persistence diagrams, it is defined as the minimum over all perfect matchings of their points of the largest L^∞ -distance between two matched points.

BM: Si on vise one revue de stat il faudrait quelques dessins ici pour aider le lecteur ...

A fundamental property of persistence diagrams, proved in [5], is their *stability*. If \mathbb{X} and $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ are two compact metric spaces then one has

$$d_b \left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X})), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}})) \right) \leq 2d_{\text{GH}} \left(\mathbb{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}} \right). \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, if \mathbb{X} and $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ are embedded in the same metric space (\mathbb{M}, ρ) then one has

$$d_b \left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X})), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}})) \right) \leq 2d_{\text{GH}} \left(\mathbb{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}} \right) \leq 2d_{\text{H}} \left(\mathbb{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}} \right). \quad (2.4)$$

Notice that these properties are only metric properties: they do not involve here any probability measure on \mathbb{X} and $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$.

3 Topological inference in metric spaces through support measure estimation

Let (\mathbb{M}, ρ) be a metric space. Assume that we observe n points X_1, \dots, X_n in \mathbb{M} drawn i.i.d. from some unknown measure μ which support is a compact set denoted \mathbb{X}_μ .

3.1 From support estimation to persistence diagram estimation

We now give a formal definition to an estimator of \mathbb{X}_μ . The Gromov-Hausdorff distance allows us to compare \mathbb{X}_μ with metric spaces that are not necessary compact subsets of \mathbb{M} . We thus consider (\mathbb{X}_μ, ρ) as an element of \mathcal{K} (instead of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{M})$). In the following, an estimator $\hat{\mathbb{X}}$ of \mathbb{X}_μ is thus a function of X_1, \dots, X_n which takes its values in \mathcal{K} and which is measurable for the Borel algebra induced by d_{GH} .

Let $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)$ and $\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}})$ be two filtrations defined on \mathbb{X}_μ and $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$. The statistical analysis of persistence diagrams proposed in the sequence starts from the following key fact: according to (2.3), for any $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{d}_b\left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}))\right) > \varepsilon\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\text{d}_{\text{GH}}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \widehat{\mathbb{X}}) > 2\varepsilon\right) \quad (3.1)$$

where the probability corresponds to the product measure $\mu^{\otimes n}$. Our strategy is thus to find an estimator of the support which is close for the d_{GH} distance. Note that this general strategy consisting in estimating \mathbb{X}_μ in \mathcal{K} is not only of theoretical interest. Indeed in some real situations the observations can be known only through the distances to each others. This is for instance when the data comes from a set of individual sensors moving in a given space and for which we know the distance between sensors without knowing the exact position of each sensor.

This general framework embraces the more standard approach consisting in estimating the support by restraining the values of $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ to $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{M})$. According to (2.4), in this case, for any $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{d}_b\left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}))\right) > \varepsilon\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\text{d}_{\text{H}}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \widehat{\mathbb{X}}) > 2\varepsilon\right). \quad (3.2)$$

The persistence diagram inference issue then reduces to the better known problem of support measure estimation in Hausdorff distance.

Let $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n := \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ be a set of independent observations sampled according to μ . This set is a natural estimator of the support \mathbb{X}_μ and we may use this last for doing persistence diagram estimation in the sequel. Note that the expended version of $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ corresponds to the well known Devroye and Wise estimator [12]:

$$\hat{S}_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \bar{B}(X_i, \varepsilon_n)$$

where $\bar{B}(x, \varepsilon)$ denotes the closed ball of (\mathbb{M}, ρ) centered at x with radius ε . The interest in using \hat{S}_n instead of $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ is more sensible when choosing for metric some measure of the symmetric set difference then when considering the Hausdorff metric.

In several contexts discussed in the following, $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ shows optimal rates of convergence for the estimation of the support in Hausdorff distance. From (3.2) we will then obtain upper bounds on the rate of convergence of $\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n)$, and we will need to find the corresponding lower bounds to prove the optimality for the topological inference issue.

In the next section, we tackle persistence diagram estimation in the general framework of abstract metric spaces. We will consider more particular contexts in the sequel of the paper.

3.2 Persistence diagram estimation on abstract compact metric spaces

Cuevas and Rodríguez-Casal give in [10] the rates of convergences in Hausdorff distance of $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ for some probability measure μ satisfying an (a, d) -standard assumption on \mathbb{R}^d . In this section, we consider the more general context where μ is a probability measure satisfying an (a, b) -standard assumption on a metric space (\mathbb{M}, ρ) , with $b > 0$. We give below the rates of convergences of $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ in this context. The proof follows the lines of the proof of Theorem 3 in [10].

Theorem 3.3. Assume that a probability measure μ on \mathbb{M} satisfies the (a, b) -standard assumption. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(d_H(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \hat{\mathbb{X}}_n) > 2\varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{2^b}{a\varepsilon^b} \exp(-na\varepsilon^b) \wedge 1.$$

Moreover, there exists two constants C_1 and C_2 only depending on a and b such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/b} d_H(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \hat{\mathbb{X}}_n) \leq C_1 \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(d_H(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \hat{\mathbb{X}}_n) \leq C_2 \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/b} \right) = 1.$$

Using (3.1) and (2.4), we then derive from the previous result the following corollary for the convergence rate of the persistence diagram $\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n)$ toward $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)$.

Corollary 3.4. Assume that the probability measure μ on \mathbb{M} satisfies the (a, b) -standard assumption, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(d_b \left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n)) \right) > 4\varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{2^b}{a\varepsilon^b} \exp(-na\varepsilon^b) \wedge 1. \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, there exists two constants C_1 and C_2 only depending on a and b such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/b} d_b \left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n)) \right) \leq C_1 \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(d_b \left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n)) \right) \leq C_2 \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/b} \right) = 1.$$

Remark. As explained in Section 2.2, in some particular situations the only data available are the distances between X_1, \dots, X_n . In this case, the estimator $\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ can not be used for estimating the persistence diagram of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)$. Hopefully, by considering Gromov-Hausdorff metric d_{GH} instead of d_H , any compact metric spaces (not necessary embedded in (\mathbb{M}, ρ)) can be used to approximate \mathbb{X}_μ . Moreover, according to (2.3), any compact metric spaces can be used to estimate persistence diagram of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)$ if it is close enough from \mathbb{X}_μ . We then consider the discrete metric space $M_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$ endowed with the distance d_n between the observations $d_n(i, j) = \rho(X_i, X_j)$. According to (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(M_n, d_n))) &\leq d_{\text{GH}}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \text{Filt}(M_n, d_n)) \\ &\leq d_{\text{GH}}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n)) + d_{\text{GH}}(\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n), \text{Filt}(M_n, d_n)) \\ &\leq d_H(\mathbb{X}_\mu, \text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n)) + 0 \end{aligned}$$

and we see that Corollary 3.4 is also valid by replacing $\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n)$ by $\text{Filt}(M_n, d_n)$.

3.3 Optimal rates of convergences in expectation

Let $\mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M})$ be the set of all the probability measures on the metric space (\mathbb{M}, ρ) satisfying the (a, b) -standard assumption on \mathbb{M} .

$$\mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M}) := \left\{ \mu \text{ on } \mathbb{M} \mid \mathbb{X}_\mu \text{ is compact and } \forall x \in \mathbb{X}_\mu, \forall r > 0, \mu(B(x, r)) \geq 1 \wedge ar^b \right\}.$$

Next proposition gives an upper bound and a lower bound for the estimation of the persistence diagram. To prove the lower bound, we apply Le Cam's lemma (see Lemma A.1 in Appendix). In this context, the quantity to be estimated is the persistence diagram of some filtration of the support \mathbb{X}_μ in the metric space of persistence diagrams equipped with the bottleneck distance.

Proposition 3.6. *Let (\mathbb{M}, ρ) be a metric space and let $a > 0$ and $b > 0$. Then:*

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M})} \mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n))) \right] \leq C \left(\frac{\ln n}{n} \right)^{1/b} \quad (3.7)$$

where the constant C only depends on a and b (not on \mathbb{M}). Assume moreover that there exists a non isolated point x in \mathbb{M} and a sequence $(x_n) \in (\mathbb{M} \setminus \{x\})^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\rho(x, x_n) \leq (an)^{-1/b}$. Then for any estimator $\widehat{\text{dgm}}_n$ of $\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu))$:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x, x_n)^{-1} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M})} \mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \widehat{\text{dgm}}_n) \right] \geq C'$$

where C' is an absolute constant.

Consequently, the estimator $\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n))$ is minimax optimal on the spaces $\mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M})$ up to a logarithm term as soon as we can find a sequence $x_n \in \mathbb{M}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\rho(x_n, x) \sim (an)^{-1/b}$. This is obviously the case for the euclidean spaces \mathbb{R}^d .

3.4 Confidence regions for persistence diagram inference.

Corollaries 3.4 and ?? can be used to find confidence regions for persistence diagrams. Assume that a and b are known and let $\Psi : \eta \rightarrow \exp(-\eta)/\eta$. Then for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$B_{d_b} \left(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \left[\frac{1}{na} \Psi^{-1} \left(\frac{\alpha}{n2^b} \right) \right]^{1/b} \right)$$

is a confidence region for $\text{dgm}(\text{Rips}(\mu(K)))$ of level $1 - \alpha$. Nevertheless, in practice the coefficients a and b can be unknown. In \mathbb{R}^d , the coefficient b can be taken equal to the dimension in many situations (see next section). But finding lower bounds on the coefficient a is a more difficult issue. Thus, the confidence region proposed above may not be usable for the practice. An alternative solution has been proposed in a paper of Aarti Singh

4 Persistence diagram estimation in \mathbb{R}^d

In this section, μ is assumed to be defined on \mathbb{R}^d . As explained in Section 3.1, the estimation of persistence diagrams is related to support estimation with the Hausdorff metric. This problem has been studied in \mathbb{R}^d in several particular frameworks.

4.1 Support estimation methods in \mathbb{R}^d

The estimator $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ is also a natural choice for estimating the support of measure in \mathbb{R}^d . If the measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d satisfies an (a, d) standard assumption, then according to Proposition 3.6, $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ converges to the support with rate upper bounded by $(\log n/n)^{1/d}$ and this rate is optimal on the sets $\mathcal{P}(a, d, \mathbb{R}^d)$.

However, for some particular situations in \mathbb{R}^d , $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ is not the best choice for estimating the support. We now briefly review known results about support estimation in \mathbb{R}^d (see also the recent review [8] on support estimation). In all the contexts presented below, the considered estimators can be used for persistence diagram inference. According to (2.3), all the rates of convergences of the support estimators given below are also valid for the persistence diagram estimators defined this way.

If \mathbb{X}_μ is assumed to be convex, the convex hull H_n of X_1, \dots, X_n is a natural alternative to $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ for estimating the support. The asymptotic analysis of $d_h(H_n, S)$ for S convex is done in [13]. If S is convex the rate is $O(\log n/n)^{1/d}$ with probability one. Under additional smooth assumptions on the boundary ∂S , the rate can be improved onto $O(\log n/n)^{2/(d+1)}$. These results have been generalized in [4] to r -convex sets.

Estimation of boundary fragments is another part of the literature on support estimation. Chapter 7 in [19] gives some results on Hausdorff estimation of Boundary fragments (see also the technical report [20] for the lower bound). Boundary fragments are subsets of the form

$$\{x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d \mid x_d \leq g(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})\}$$

where $g : [0, 1]^{d-1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a smooth function. The estimation of boundary fragments reduces the set estimation problem to a boundary function estimation problem. Assuming that the boundary fragments are such that g is Holderian of order γ , it can be proved that a piecewise-polynomial estimator is asymptotic minimax with rates $O(\log n/n)^{1/(d+\gamma-1)}$ in expectation. A special case of boundary fragments is considered in [17]. In this paper the support is assumed to be “under” a monotone function. It is proved that in this case the free disposal hull estimator (here given in \mathbb{R}^2):

$$F_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n SE(X_i) \quad \text{where} \quad SE(v) = \{x = (x_1, x_2) \in K : x_1 \geq v_1, x_2 \leq v_2\}$$

is minimax optimal with rates $O(\log n/n)^{1/2}$.

A classical assumption for support estimation in \mathbb{R}^d is to assume that the probability measure μ has a density f for the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . The support of μ can then be estimated using a “plug-in” method: for some non-parametric estimator \hat{f}_n of f , the support is estimated by $\widehat{\mathbb{X}} := \{\hat{f}_n > 0\}$

or more generally by $\hat{\mathbb{X}} := \{\hat{f}_n > \alpha_n\}$ where α_n is a sequence converging to zero. Such plug-in methods have been studied for instance by [9] and [25].

4.2 Optimal persistence diagram estimation for nonsingular measures on \mathbb{R}^d

The paper [24] is a significantly breakthrough for level set estimation through density estimation. This paper presents a fully data-driven procedure in the spirit of Lepski's method that is adaptive to unknown local density regularity, and achieves minimax optimal Hausdorff error control for a class of level sets with very general shapes. In particular, the assumptions of [24] describe the smoothness of the density in the neighborhood of the boundary of the support.

In this section, we propose to study persistence diagram inference in the framework of [24] since this framework is very intuitive and natural. Nevertheless, do not use the estimator of [24] for this task since we only consider here the support estimation problem (and not the more general level set issue as in [24]). Indeed, we will see that the estimator $\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n$ has the optimal rates of convergence for estimating the support according to d_H , as well as for estimating the persistence diagram. We now recall the framework of [24] corresponding to the support set estimation issue (see Section 4.3 of their paper).

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. observations drawn from an unknown probability measure μ having density f with respect to the Lebesgue measure and defined on a compact set χ of \mathbb{R}^d . Let \mathbb{X}_f denotes the support of μ , and remember that \mathbb{X}_f is closed by definition. Let $G_0 := \{x \in \chi : f(x) > 0\}$. The boundary of a set G is denoted ∂G and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $I_\varepsilon(G) := \bigcup_{x \mid B(x, \varepsilon) \subset G} B(x, \varepsilon)$ is an ε -inner of G . The two main assumptions of [24] are the following:

[A] : the density f is upper bounded by $f_{\max} > 0$ and there exist constants $C_a, \delta_a > 0$ such that for all $x \in G_0$ with $f(x) \leq \delta_a$, $f(x) \geq C_a d(x, \partial G_0)^\alpha$.

[B] : there exist constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $C_b > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, $I_\varepsilon(G_0) \neq \emptyset$ and $d(x, I_\varepsilon(G_0)) \leq C_b \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \partial G_0$.

We denote by $\mathcal{F}(\alpha)$ the set composed of all the densities on χ satisfying assumptions [A] and [B], for a fixed set of positive constants $C_a, C_b, \delta_a, \varepsilon_0, f_{\max}, p$ and α .

Assumption [A] describes how fast the density increases in the neighborhood of the boundary of the support: the smaller α , the easier the support may be possible to detect. Assumption [B] prevents the boundary from having arbitrarily small features (as for cusps). We refer to [24] for more details and discussions about these two assumptions and their connexions with assumptions in previous works.

For persistence diagram estimation, we are interested in estimating the support \mathbb{X}_f whereas the assumptions [A] and [B] involves the set G_0 . Hopefully, as stated by the following lemma, these two sets are here almost identical in the sense that $d_H(G_0, \mathbb{X}_f) = 0$. Moreover, it can be proved that under assumptions [A] and [B], the measure μ also satisfied the standard assumption. The proof of the two points are given in Appendix.

Lemma 4.1. 1. Under assumption $[B]$, we have $d_H(G_0, \mathbb{X}_f) = 0$.

2. Under Assumptions $[A]$ and $[B]$, μ satisfies a standard assumption with $b = \alpha + d$ and with a depending on $\mathcal{F}(\alpha)$.

According to the first point of Lemma 4.1 together with Proposition 3.6, the estimator $\mathbf{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n))$ converges in expectation towards $\mathbf{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_f))$ with a rate upper bounded by $(\log n/n)^{1/(d+\alpha)}$. We also show that this rate is minimax over the sets $\mathcal{F}(\alpha)$ by adapting the ideas of the proof given in [24] for the Hausdorff lower bound.

Proposition 4.2. 1. For all $n \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\alpha)} \mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\mathbf{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_f)), \mathbf{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n))) \right] \leq C \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{-1/(d+\alpha)}$$

where C is a constant only depending on $C_a, C_b, \delta_a, \varepsilon_0, f_{\max}, p$ and α .

2. There exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\widehat{\mathbf{dgm}}_n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\alpha)} \mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\mathbf{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_f)), \widehat{\mathbf{dgm}}_n) \right] \geq cn^{-1/(d+\alpha)}$$

for n large enough. The infimum is taken over all possible estimators $\widehat{\mathbf{dgm}}_n$ of $\mathbf{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_f))$ based on n observations.

Remark. The paper [24] is more generally about adaptive level set estimation. For this difficult issue, Singh *et al.* define an histogram based estimator. Let \mathcal{A}_j denotes the collection of cells in a regular partition of $\chi = [0, 1]^d$ into hypercubes of dyadic side length 2^{-j} . Their estimator \hat{f} is the histogram $\hat{f}(A) = \hat{P}(A)/\mu(A)$, where $\hat{P}(A) = \sum_{i=1 \dots n} 1_{X_i \in A}$. For estimating the level set $G_\gamma := \{x | f(x) \geq \gamma\}$, they consider the estimator

$$\hat{G}_{\gamma, j} = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_j \mid \hat{f}(A) > \gamma} A.$$

It is proved in [24] that $\hat{G}_{\gamma, \hat{j}}$ achieves optimal rates of convergence for estimating the level sets, with \hat{j} chosen in a data driven way. Concerning the support estimation issue, they also show that $\hat{G}_{0, j}$ achieves optimal rates of convergence for estimating G_0 . We have seen that in this context it is also the case for the estimator \mathbb{X}_n . Since no knowledge of α is required for this last estimator, we thus prefer to use this simpler estimator in this context.

4.3 Optimal rates of convergence of persistence diagram estimation for singular measures in \mathbb{R}^D

The estimation of the support of a singular measure embedded in \mathbb{R}^D is a difficult task. A classical assumption in this context is to suppose that the support of the singular measure is a Riemannian manifold, this issue is generality called manifold estimation in the literature. **BM: Ici : biblio manifold estimation, sans forcement des vit des cv, lit. on estimating principal surfaces ?**. As far we know, rates

of convergence for the estimation of the support of a singular probability measure supported on a Riemannian manifold of \mathbb{R}^D has only been studied recently in [16] and [15]. These papers assume several noise models, we only consider here the context where no additional noise is observed, which is referred as the *noiseless model* in the first of these two papers. As before, upper bounds given in [16] on the rates of convergence for the support estimation in Hausdorff distance directly provides upper bounds on the rates of convergence of the persistence diagram of the support. Before giving the rates of convergence we first recall and discuss the assumptions of [16].

For any $r > 0$ and any set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $A \oplus \varepsilon := \bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, r)$. Let $\Delta(\mathbb{X}_\mu)$ be the largest r such that each point in $\mathbb{X}_\mu \oplus r$ has a unique projection onto \mathbb{X}_μ , this quantity has been introduced by Federer in [14], it is called reach or condition number in the literature.

For a fixed positive integer $d < D$, for some fixed positive constants b, B, κ and for a fixed compact domain χ in \mathbb{R}^p , [16] defines the set of probability measures $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}(d, A, B, \kappa, \chi)$ on χ satisfying the two following assumptions:

- $[H_1]$ The support of the measure μ is a compact Riemannian manifold \mathbb{X}_μ (included in χ) of dimension d which reach satisfies

$$\Delta(\mathbb{X}_\mu) \geq \kappa. \quad (4.3)$$

- $[H_2]$ The measure μ is assumed to have a density g with respect to the uniform measure λ_u on \mathbb{X}_μ , such that

$$0 < A \leq \inf_{y \in \mathbb{X}_\mu} g(y) \leq \sup_{y \in \mathbb{X}_\mu} g(y) \leq B < \infty. \quad (4.4)$$

These two assumptions can be easily connected to the standard assumption. Indeed, according to [23] and using $[H_1]$, for all $r \leq \kappa$ there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{X}_\mu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_u(B(x, r) \cap \mathbb{X}_\mu) &\geq C \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{4\kappa^2}\right)^{d/2} r^d \\ &\geq C' r^d \end{aligned}$$

and the same holds for μ according to $[H_2]$. Thus, if we take $\hat{\mathbb{X}}_\mu$ for estimating the support \mathbb{X}_μ in this context, we then obtain the rate of convergence $(\frac{\log n}{n})^{1/d}$ according to Theorem 3.3. Nevertheless, this rate is not minimax optimal on the spaces \mathcal{H} as shown by Theorem 2 in [16]. Indeed the correct rate is $n^{-2/d}$. For proving this result, [16] propose some “theoretical” estimator that can not be computed in practice. As far as know, no usable and optimal estimator has been proposed in the literature for this issue. In consequence, the situation is the same for the estimation of persistence diagram in this context. The following proposition shows that the optimal rates of convergence for support estimation are the same as for the persistence diagram estimation in this context.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume that we observe a n -sample under the previous assumptions, then there exists two constants C and C' depending only on \mathcal{H} such that*

$$Cn^{-2/d} \leq \inf_{\widehat{\text{dgm}}_n} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \widehat{\text{dgm}}_n) \right] \leq C'n^{-2/d} \quad (4.6)$$

where the infimum is taken over all the estimators of the persistence diagram.

Of course this result is only of theoretical interest since it is not based on some usable estimators for the practice.

5 Experiments

6 Discussion and further works

- Bilan
- Wasserstein loss for persistence diagram inference ?
- **Persistence landscapes** Persistence landscapes were introduced by Bubenik [3] as a convenient alternative representation of persistence diagrams. Given a diagram, he defines a function $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lambda_k(t)$ is the maximum width of an interval centered at t that is included in at least k persistence intervals. Equivalently, it says how far from $(t, t) \in \Delta$ one can translate an upper-left quadrant of the plane and still contain at least k points of the diagram. The mapping from (locally-finite???) diagrams to these functions is injective. Now that the space of diagrams is seen as a subspace of a function space, we can consider a norm instead of the bottleneck distance. In particular, the ℓ_∞ distance on landscapes is upper bounded by the bottleneck distance between diagrams. Although there is no reverse inequality, the two distances still define the same topology at least (TODO: le vérifier, Bubenik montre juste a pour L^p et W^p , et c'est peut-être restreint aux diagrammes finis, ou de L^1 fini???) and since this ℓ_∞ norm is fast to compute and has nicer properties than the bottleneck distance, we will use it in practice. Note that it is also possible to use a weighted ℓ_2 norm on landscapes instead of ℓ_∞ for techniques that require an inner product.
- Contexte Genovese : évoquer l'objectif de construire un estimateur du support et de la persistence qui soit optimal et constructible ?

A Lecam's Lemma

The version of Lecam's Lemma given below is from [26] (see also [15]). Recall that the total variation distance between two distributions P_0 and P_1 on a measured space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ is defined by

$$\text{TV}(P_0, P_1) = \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} |P_0(B) - P_1(B)|.$$

Moreover, if P_0 and P_1 have densities p_0 and p_1 for the same measure λ on \mathcal{X} , then

$$\text{TV}(P_0, P_1) = \frac{1}{2} \ell_1(p_0, p_1) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} |p_0 - p_1| d\lambda.$$

Lemma A.1. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of distributions. For $P \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\theta(P)$ take values in a metric space (\mathbb{X}, ρ) . Let P_0 and P_1 in \mathcal{P} be any pair of distributions in \mathcal{Q} . Let X_1, \dots, X_n be drawn i.i.d. from*

some $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be any estimator of $\theta(P)$, then

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{P^n}(\theta, \hat{\theta}) \geq \frac{1}{8} \rho(\theta(P_0), \theta(P_1)) [1 - \text{TV}(P_0, P_1)]^{2n}.$$

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.3

The proof follows the lines of the proof of Theorem 3 in [10]. The only point to be checked is that the covering number of \mathbb{X}_μ under the (a, b) -standard assumption can be controlled as when $b = d \in \mathbb{N}$, the rest of the proof being unchanged.

The covering number $\text{cv}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r)$ of \mathbb{X}_μ is the minimum number of balls of radius r that are necessary to cover \mathbb{X}_μ :

$$\text{cv}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r) = \min \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N}^* : \exists (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in (\mathbb{X}_\mu)^k \text{ such that } \mathbb{X}_\mu = \bigcup_{i=1}^k B(x_i, r) \right\}.$$

The packing number $\text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r)$ is the maximum number of balls of radius r that can be packed in \mathbb{X}_μ without overlap:

$$\text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r) = \max \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N}^* : \exists (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in (\mathbb{X}_\mu)^k \text{ such that } B(x_i, r) \subset \mathbb{X}_\mu \text{ and } \forall i \neq j, B(x_i, r) \cap B(x_j, r) = \emptyset \right\}$$

The covering and packing numbers are related by the following inequality (see for instance [22] p.71):

$$\text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, 2r) \leq \text{cv}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, 2r) \leq \text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Lemma B.2. *Assume that the probability μ satisfies a standard (a, b) -assumption. Then for any $r > 0$ we have*

$$\text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r) \leq \frac{1}{ar^b} \vee 1 \text{ and } \text{cv}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r) \leq \frac{2^b}{ar^b} \vee 1.$$

Proof. The result is trivial for $r \geq a^{-1/b}$. Let $r < a^{-1/b}$ and let $p = \text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r)$, we choose a maximal packing $B_1 = B(x_1, r), \dots, B_p = B(x_p, r)$ of \mathbb{X}_μ . Since the balls of the packing are pairwise disjoint and μ is a probability measure we have $\sum_{i=1}^p \mu(B_i) \leq 1$. Using that $\mu(B_i) \geq ar^b$ we obtain that $par^b \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \mu(B_i) \leq 1$ from which we get the upper bound on $\text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r)$. Since from (B.1) we have $\text{cv}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r) \leq \text{pk}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r/2)$ we immediately deduce the upper bound on $\text{cv}(\mathbb{X}_\mu, r)$. \square

B.2 Proof of Proposition 3.6

Upper bound

We first prove the upper bound. According to Corollary 3.4, thanks to Fubini we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n))) \right] \leq \int_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathbb{P} \left[d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\hat{\mathbb{X}}_n))) > \varepsilon \right] d\varepsilon$$

Let $\varepsilon_n = 4 \left(\frac{\log n}{an} \right)^{1/b}$. By bounding the probability inside this integral by one on $[0, \varepsilon_n]$, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n))) \right] &\leq \varepsilon_n + \int_{\varepsilon > \varepsilon_n} \frac{8^b}{a} \varepsilon^{-b} \exp(-na\varepsilon^b/4^b) d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \varepsilon_n + \frac{4n2^b}{b} (na)^{-1/b} \int_{u \geq \log n} u^{1/b-2} \exp(-u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $b \geq \frac{1}{2}$ then $u^{1/b-2} \leq (\log n)^{1/b-2}$ for any $u \geq \log n$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_\mu)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\widehat{\mathbb{X}}_n))) \right] &\leq \varepsilon_n + 4 \frac{2^b}{b} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/b} (\log n)^{-2} \\ &\leq C_1(a, b) \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1/b} \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

where the constant $C_1(a, b)$ only depends on a and b . If $0 < b < \frac{1}{2}$, let $p := \lfloor \frac{1}{b} \rfloor$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{u \geq u_n := \log n} u^{1/b-2} \exp(-u) du &= u_n^{1/b-2} \exp(u_n) + \left(\frac{1}{b} - 2 \right) u_n^{1/b-3} \exp(u_n) + \cdots + \\ &\quad + \prod_{i=2}^p \left(\frac{1}{b} - i \right) u_n^{1/b-p} \exp(u_n) + \int_{u \geq \log n} u^{1/b-p-1} \exp(-u) du \\ &\leq C_2(a, b) \frac{(\log n)^{1/b-2}}{n} \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2(a, b)$ only depends on a and b . Thus (B.3) is also satisfied for $b < \frac{1}{2}$ and the upper bound is proved.

Lower bound

To prove the lower bound, it will be sufficient to consider two Dirac distributions. We take for $P_{0,n} = P_x$ the Dirac distribution on $\mathbb{X}_0 := \{x\}$ and it is clear that $P_0 \in \mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M})$. Let $P_{1,n}$ be the distribution $\frac{1}{n} \delta_{x_n} + (1 - \frac{1}{n}) P_0$. The support of $P_{1,n}$ is denoted $\mathbb{X}_{1,n} := \{x\} \cup \{x_n\}$. Note that for any $n \geq 2$ and any $r \leq \rho(x, x_n)$:

$$P_{1,n}(B(x, r)) = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \geq \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2\rho(x, x_n)^b} r^b \geq ar^b$$

and

$$P_{1,n}(B(x_n, r)) = \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{n\rho(x, x_n)^b} r^b \geq ar^b.$$

Moreover, for $r > \rho(x, x_n)$, $P_{1,n}(B(0, r)) = P_{1,n}(B(x_n, r)) = 1$. Thus for any $r > 0$ and any $x \in \mathbb{X}_{1,n}$:

$$P_{1,n}(B(x, r)) \geq ar^b \wedge 1$$

and $P_{1,n}$ also belongs to $\mathcal{P}(a, b, \mathbb{M})$.

The probability measure P_0 is absolutely continuous with respect to $P_{1,n}$ and the density of P_0 with respect to $P_{1,n}$ is $p_{0,n} := \frac{n}{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} TV(P_0, P_{1,n}) &= \int_{\mathbb{M}} \left| 1 - \frac{n}{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}} \right| dP_{1,n} \\ &= \frac{2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, $[1 - TV(P_0, P_{1,n})]^{2n} = (1 - \frac{2}{n})^{2n} \rightarrow e^{-4}$ as n tends to infinity. It remains to compute $d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{1,n})))$. We only consider here the Rips case, the other filtrations can be treated in a similar way. The bar code of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)$ is composed of only one segment $(0, +\infty)$ for the 0-cycles. The barcode of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{1,n})$ is composed of the segment of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)$ and one more 0-cycle : $(0, \rho(x, x_n))$. Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{1,n}))) &= d_\infty(\Delta, (0, \rho(x, x_n))) \\ &= \frac{\rho(x, x_n)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is then complete using Lecam's Lemma (Lemma A.1).

B.3 Proofs for Section 4.2

Proof of Lemma 4.1

First, note that we always have

$$\overset{\circ}{G}_0 \subset \mathbb{X}_f \subset \overline{G}_0. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Indeed, if $\overset{\circ}{G}_0 \cap (\chi \setminus \mathbb{X}_f)$ is non empty, let x be in the intersection. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset \overset{\circ}{G}_0$ and $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset (\chi \setminus \mathbb{X}_f)$ since \mathbb{X}_f is assumed to be closed. The first inclusion then gives that $\mu(B(x, \varepsilon)) > 0$ whereas the second inclusion gives that $\mu(B(x, \varepsilon)) = 0$. Thus $\overset{\circ}{G}_0 \cap (\chi \setminus \mathbb{X}_f)$ is empty, the second inclusion in (B.4) is obvious since \mathbb{X}_f is assumed to be closed.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(\mathbb{X}_f, G_0) &= \max(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}_f} d(x, G_0), \sup_{x \in \overline{G}_0} d(x, \mathbb{X}_f)) \\ &= \max(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}_f} d(x, \overline{G}_0), \sup_{x \in \overline{G}_0} d(x, \mathbb{X}_f)) \\ &= \sup_{x \in \overline{G}_0} d(x, \mathbb{X}_f) \\ &= \sup_{x \in \partial G_0} d(x, \mathbb{X}_f) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where we use the continuity of the distance function for the second equality and (B.4) for the two last ones. It follows from assumption $[B]$ that for any $x \in \partial G_0$, $d(x, \overset{\circ}{G}_0) = 0$. Thus $d(x, \mathbb{X}_f) = 0$ according to (B.4) and we have proved that (B.5) is equal to zero.

We now prove the second point of the Lemma. Let $x \in \bar{G}_0$ and let $r > 0$ such that

$$\frac{r}{2} \left(1 \wedge \frac{1}{C_b} \right) < \varepsilon_0 \wedge \left(\frac{\delta_a}{C_a} \right)^{1/\alpha}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

According to Assumption [B], for $\varepsilon = \frac{r}{2} \left(1 \wedge \frac{1}{C_b} \right)$, there exists $y \in I_\varepsilon(G_0)$ such that $d(x, y) \leq C_b \varepsilon \leq \frac{r}{2}$. Then, there exists $z \in I_\varepsilon$ such that $y \in B(z, \varepsilon) \subset I_\varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon \leq \frac{r}{2}$ we find that $B(z, \varepsilon) \subset B(x, r) \cap G_0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(x, r)) &\geq \int_{B(z, \varepsilon)} f(u) d\lambda(u) \\ &\geq \int_{B(z, \varepsilon)} \delta_a \wedge C_a d(u, \partial G_0)^\alpha d\lambda(u) \\ &\geq C_a \int_{B(z, \varepsilon)} (\varepsilon - \|u - z\|)^\alpha d\lambda(u) \\ &\geq C_a s_{d-1} \int_0^\varepsilon (\varepsilon - r)^\alpha r^{d-1} dr \end{aligned}$$

where s_{d-1} denotes the surface area of the unit $d - 1$ -sphere of \mathbb{R}^d , and where we have used Assumption [A] for the second inequality and the fact $C_a \varepsilon^\alpha \leq \delta_a$ for the third one. Finally we find that for any r satisfying (B.6):

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(x, r)) &\geq \frac{C_a s_{d-1} (d-1)!}{(\alpha+1) \dots (\alpha+d)} \varepsilon^{\alpha+d} \\ &\geq \frac{C_a s_{d-1} (d-1)! (1 \wedge \frac{1}{C_b})^{\alpha+d}}{2^{\alpha+d} (\alpha+1) \dots (\alpha+d)} r^{\alpha+d} \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain that μ satisfies that standard assumption with $b = \alpha + d$.

Proof of Proposition 4.2

BM: Insérer une figure ?

The first point of the proposition is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3 in [24] and Lemma 4.1. We now prove the lower bound by adapting some ideas from the proof of Proposition 3 in [24] about the Hausdorff lower bound. At the price of losing a logarithm term in the lower bound, we propose here a proof based on a two-alternative analysis.

The function f_0 is defined on χ as follows for $r_0 > 0$ small enough:

$$f_0 = \begin{cases} C_a \|x\|^\alpha & \text{if } \|x\| \leq r_0 \\ C_0 & \text{if } r_0 \leq \|x\| \leq 2r_0 \\ C_a (3r_0 - \|x\|)^\alpha & \text{if } 2r_0 \leq \|x\| \leq 3r_0 \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

where

$$C_0 = \frac{1 - C_a s_{d-1} r_0^{d+\alpha} (\frac{1}{d+\alpha} + I_\alpha)}{s_{d-1} r_0^d (2^d - 1)/d} \quad \text{with } I_\alpha = \int_2^3 d^{d-1} (3-u)^\alpha du.$$

For $n \geq 1$ let $\varepsilon_n := n^{-1/(d+\alpha)}$, the function $f_{1,n}$ is defined on χ by

$$f_{1,n} = \begin{cases} \|x\|^\alpha & \text{if } \varepsilon_n \leq \|x\| \leq r_0 \\ C_{1,n} & \text{if } r_0 \leq \|x\| \leq 2r_0 \\ C_a(3r_0 - \|x\|)^\alpha & \text{if } 2r_0 \leq \|x\| \leq 3r_0 \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{1,n} &= \frac{1 - C_a s_{d-1} \left\{ r_0^{d+\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{d+\alpha} + I_\alpha \right) - \frac{\varepsilon_n^{d+\alpha}}{d+\alpha} \right\}}{s_{d-1} r_0^d (2^d - 1)/d} \\ &= C_0 + \frac{d C_a \varepsilon_n^{d+\alpha}}{(d+\alpha) r_0^d (2^d - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We assume that δ_a is small enough so that we can choose r_0 such that $\delta_a \leq C_0$ for n large enough. Then f_0 and $f_{1,n}$ are both densities and they both belong to $\mathcal{F}(\alpha)$ for n large enough. The support of $f_0 d\lambda$ is equal to $\mathbb{X}_0 := \bar{B}(0, 3r_0)$ whereas the support of $f_{1,n} d\lambda$ is equal to $\mathbb{X}_{1,n} = \bar{B}(0, 3r_0) \setminus \bar{B}(0, \varepsilon_n)$. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(f_0 d\lambda, f_{1,n} d\lambda) &= \int_{\chi} |f_0 - f_{1,n}| dx \\ &= s_{d-1} C_a \int_0^{\varepsilon_n} r^{\alpha+d-1} dr + s_{d-1} \int_{r_0}^{2r_0} (C_{1,n} - C_0) r^{d-1} dr \\ &= \frac{2s_{d-1} C_a}{d+\alpha} \varepsilon_n^{d+\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(1 - \text{TV}(f_0 d\lambda, f_{1,n} d\lambda))^{2n} \rightarrow \exp(-\frac{4s_{d-1} C_a}{d+\alpha})$ as n tends to infinity. It remains to compute $d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{1,n})))$. We only consider here the Rips case, the other filtrations can be treated in a similar way. The bar code of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)$ is composed of only one segment $(0, +\infty)$ for the 0-cycles. The barcode of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{1,n})$ is composed of the segment of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)$ and one more 1-cycle : $(0, 2\varepsilon_n)$. Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_b(\text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)), \text{dgm}(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_{1,n}))) &= d_\infty(\Delta, (0, \varepsilon)) \\ &= \varepsilon_n. \end{aligned}$$

We then finish the proof using Lecam's Lemma.

BM: Si on veut gagner le terme log, il faut faire un schema a N hypotheses mais c est pas evident dans ce contexte car la localisation dans χ ne joue plus ...

B.4 Proof of Proposition 4.5

BM: Insérer une figure ?

We only need to prove the lower bound since the upper bound is a direct corollary of Theorem 3 in [16]. To prove the lower bound, we may use the particular manifolds defined in [15] and also used

by the same authors for the proof of Theorem 2 in [16]. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\chi = [-L, L]^D$ and that $\kappa < L/2$. For $\ell \leq L$, let M and M' be the two manifolds of χ defined by

$$M = [-\ell, \ell]^D \cap \{x \in \chi \mid x_{d+1} = \dots = x_D = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad M' = 2\kappa e_{d+1} + M$$

where e_{d+1} is the $d+1$ -th vector of the canonical basis in \mathbb{R}^D . We assume that ℓ is chosen so that $b < 2(2\ell)^{-d} < B$. Let μ_0 be the uniform measure on $\mathbb{X}_0 := M \cup M'$ and then $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{H}$.

According to Theorem 6 in [15], for $0 < \gamma < \kappa$, we can define a manifold M_γ which can be seen as a perturbation of M such that:

- $\Delta(M_\gamma) = \kappa$
- $d_H(M_\gamma, M) = \gamma$ and $d_H(M_\gamma, M') = 2\kappa - \gamma$
- If $A = \{x \in M_\gamma \mid x \notin M\}$ then $\mu_1(A) \leq C\gamma^{d/2}$ where $C > 0$ and where μ_1 is the uniform measure on $\mathbb{X}_1 := M_\gamma \cup M'$.

For small enough γ we see that μ_1 satisfies $[H_2]$ and thus $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{H}$.

As before, we only consider here filtrations of Rips complexes. The persistence diagrams of $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0)$ and $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_1)$ are exactly the same except for the diagram of 0-cycles : the first filtration has a bar code with a segment $(0, 2\kappa)$ whereas the corresponding bar code for $\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_1)$ is $(0, 2\kappa - \gamma)$. Thus, $d_b(\text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_0), \text{Filt}(\mathbb{X}_1)) = \gamma$. Moreover, $\text{TV}(\mu_0, \mu_1) \leq |\mu_0(A) - \mu_1(A)| \leq C\gamma^{d/2}$. Finally, we choose $\gamma = (1/n)^{d/2}$ as in the proof of Theorem 2 in [16] and we conclude using Lecam's Lemma.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support of the DIGITEO Project C3TTA, of the European project CG-Learning EC contract No. 255827, and of the ANR project GIGA (ANR-09-BLAN-0331-01).

References

- [1] Gérard Biau, Benoît Cadre, David M. Mason, and Bruno Pelletier. Asymptotic normality in density support estimation. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 14:no. 91, 2617–2635, 2009.
- [2] Denis Bosq. On estimation of the support in metric spaces. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl.*, (81):55–58, 2009.
- [3] P. Bubenik. Statistical topology using persistence landscapes. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2012.
- [4] Alberto Rodriguez Casal. Set estimation under convexity type assumptions. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, 43(6):763 – 774, 2007.
- [5] F. chazal, V. de Silva, M. Glisse, and S. Oudot. The structure and stability of persistence modules. *in Progress*, 2012.

- [6] F. Chazal, V. de Silva, and S. Oudot. Persistence stability for geometric complexes. *arXiv*, july 2012.
- [7] A. Cuevas, R. Fraiman, and B. Pateiro-López. On statistical properties of sets fulfilling rolling-type conditions. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 44(2):311–329, 2012.
- [8] Antonio Cuevas. Set estimation: another bridge between statistics and geometry. *Bol. Estad. Investig. Oper.*, 25(2):71–85, 2009.
- [9] Antonio Cuevas and Ricardo Fraiman. A plug-in approach to support estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, 25(6):2300–2312, 1997.
- [10] Antonio Cuevas and Alberto Rodríguez-Casal. On boundary estimation. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 36(2):340–354, 2004.
- [11] E. De Vito, L. Rosasco, and A. Toigo. Learning sets with separating kernels, 2012. submitted.
- [12] Luc Devroye and Gary L. Wise. Detection of abnormal behavior via nonparametric estimation of the support. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 38(3):480–488, 1980.
- [13] Lutz Dümbgen and Günther Walther. Rates of convergence for random approximations of convex sets. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 28(2):384–393, 1996.
- [14] Herbert Federer. Curvature measures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 93:418–491, 1959.
- [15] C. Genovese, M. Perone-Pacifico, I. Verdinelli, and L. Wasserman. Minimax manifold estimation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:1263–1291, july 2012.
- [16] Christopher R. Genovese, Marco Perone-Pacifico, Isabella Verdinelli, and Larry Wasserman. Manifold estimation and singular deconvolution under hausdorff loss. *Ann. Statist.*, 40:941–963, 2012.
- [17] A. P. Korostelev, L. Simar, and A. B. Tsybakov. Efficient estimation of monotone boundaries. *Ann. Statist.*, 23(2):476–489, 1995.
- [18] A. P. Korostelev and A. B. Tsybakov. Estimating the support of a density and functionals of it. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 29(1):3–18, 1993.
- [19] A. P. Korostelev and A. B. Tsybakov. *Minimax theory of image reconstruction*, volume 82 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [20] A.P. Korostelev and A.B. Tsybakov. Estimation of support of a probability density and estimation of support functionals. CORE Discussion Papers 1992029, Universit catholique de Louvain, Center for Operations Research and Econometrics (CORE), 1992.
- [21] E. Mammen and A. B. Tsybakov. Asymptotical minimax recovery of sets with smooth boundaries. *Ann. Statist.*, 23(2):502–524, 1995.
- [22] P. Massart. *Concentration inequalities and model selection*. Springer, Berlin, 2007. Lectures from the 33rd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–23, 2003.

- [23] P. Niyogi, S. Smale, and S. Weinberger. Finding the homology of submanifolds with high confidence from random samples. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 39(1-3):419–441, March 2008.
- [24] Aarti Singh, Clayton Scott, and Robert Nowak. Adaptive Hausdorff estimation of density level sets. *Ann. Statist.*, 37(5B):2760–2782, 2009.
- [25] A. B. Tsybakov. On nonparametric estimation of density level sets. *Ann. Statist.*, 25(3):948–969, 1997.
- [26] Bin Yu. Assouad, Fano, and Le Cam. In *Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam*, pages 423–435. Springer, New York, 1997.