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Let $(X, Y)$ be an $\mathbf{R}^{d} \times \mathbf{R}$-valued random vector and let ( $X_{1}, Y_{1}$ ), $\cdots$, $\left(X_{n}, Y_{n}\right)$ be a random sample drawn from its distribution. We study the consistency properties of the kernel estimate $m_{n}(x)$ of the regression function $m(x)=E\{Y \mid X=x\}$ that is defined by

$$
m_{n}(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i} k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right) / \Sigma_{i-1}^{n} k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)
$$

where $k$ is a bounded nonnegative function on $\mathbf{R}^{d}$ with compact support and $\left\{h_{n}\right\}$ is a sequence of positive numbers satisfying $h_{n} \rightarrow_{n} 0, n h_{n}^{d} \rightarrow_{n} \infty$. It is shown that $E\left\{\int\left|m_{n}(x)-m(x)\right|^{p} \mu(d x)\right\} \rightarrow_{n} 0$ whenever $E\left\{|Y|^{p}\right\}<\infty(p>1)$. No other restrictions are placed on the distribution of $(X, Y)$. The result is applied to verify the Bayes risk consistency of the corresponding discrimination rules.

1. Introduction and summary. In this paper we present consistency results for the nonparametric regression function estimation problem. Assume that $(X, Y)$, $\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right), \cdots,\left(X_{n}, Y_{n}\right)$ are independent identically distributed $\mathbb{R}^{d} \times \mathbb{R}$-valued random vectors with $E\{|Y|\}<\infty$. The purpose is to estimate the regression function

$$
m(x)=E\{Y \mid X=x\}
$$

from the data, $\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right), \cdots,\left(X_{n}, Y_{n}\right)$. The estimate studied here is the kernel estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{n}(x)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i} k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

first proposed by Watson (1964) and Nadaraya (1964). In (1) $k$ is a nonnegative function on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ and $\left\{h_{n}\right\}$ is a sequence of positive numbers. The pointwise consistency of (1) is discussed by Watson (1964), Nadaraya (1964, 1965), Rosenblatt (1969), Schuster (1972), Greblicki (1974) and Noda (1976). The uniform consistency is treated in the papers by Nadaraya (1965, 1970), Greblicki (1974) and Devroye (1978a).

[^0]In this note we are interested in the convergence to 0 of

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{n p}=E\left\{\rho\left|m_{n}(x)-m(x)\right|^{p} \mu(d x)\right\}, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ is the probability measure of $X$.
Theorem 1. If

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left\{|Y|^{p}\right\}<\infty \quad p \geqslant 1 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{gather*}
h_{n} \rightarrow_{n} 0,  \tag{4}\\
n h_{n}^{d} \rightarrow_{n} \infty \tag{5}
\end{gather*}
$$

and if $k$ satisfies
(i) $k$ is a nonnegative function on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ bounded by $k^{*}<\infty$;
(ii) $k$ has compact support $A$;
(iii) $k \geqslant \beta I_{B}$ for some $\beta>0$ and some closed sphere $B$ centered at the origin and having positive radius ( $I$ is the indicator function),
then $J_{n p} \rightarrow_{n} 0$.
Notice that no conditions whatever are put on the underlying distribution of ( $X, Y$ ) except for the necessary condition $E\left\{|Y|^{p}\right\}<\infty$. Recently, Stone (1977) showed that the nearest neighbor regression function estimates also have $J_{n p} \rightarrow_{n} 0$ for all possible distributions of ( $X, Y$ ). (For other consistency properties, see Royall (1966), Cover (1968), and Devroye (1978b.) This same property is also shared by some regression function estimates that are based upon the partitioning of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ into blocks (Gordon and Olshen (1978), see also Mahalanobis (1961), Parthasarathy and Bhattacharya (1961), Anderson (1966)).
2. Development. The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the inequalities developed in Lemmas 1 and 2. In (1) and subsequent expressions, we arbitrarily define $0 / 0$ to be 0 .

Lemma 1. Let $k$ be a function on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ satisfying (6). Then there exists a constant $0<\gamma<\infty$ only depending upon $k$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, all $r>0$ and all probability measures $\mu$ on the Borel sets of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$,

$$
\int \frac{k((z-x) / r)}{\int k((y-x) / r) \mu(d y)} \mu(d x) \leqslant \gamma .
$$

Proof of Lemma 1. We define the set $a+b C, a \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, b \in \mathbb{R}, C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d}$ by $\{x \mid x=a+b y, y \in C\}$. We will use the symbols $k^{*}, \beta, A, B$ defined in (6). The sphere $B$ has a positive radius $\rho>0$.

First we find a finite cover $\left\{A_{1}, \cdots, A_{N}\right\}$ of $A$ by translates of $B / 2$. Because this is a cover we have

$$
k((z-x) / r) \leqslant k^{*} I_{z-r A}(x) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{N} k^{*} I_{z-r A_{i}}(x)
$$

Further, for every $x \in z-r A_{i}, z-r A_{i} \subseteq x+r B$. Thus,

$$
\int k((y-x) / r) \mu(d y) \geqslant \beta \mu(x+r B) \geqslant \beta \mu\left(z-r A_{i}\right)
$$

for such $x$. Consequently,

$$
\int \frac{k((z-x) / r)}{\int k((y-x) / r) \mu(d y)} \mu(d x) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{k^{*} \mu\left(z-r A_{i}\right)}{\beta \mu\left(z-r A_{i}\right)}=N k^{*} / \beta,
$$

independently of $z, r$ and $\mu$.
Lemma 2. Let $k$ be a function satisfying (6), and let $(X, Y),\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right), \cdots$, $\left(X_{n}, Y_{n}\right)$ be a sequence of independent, identically distributed random vectors from $\mathbb{R}^{d} \times \mathbb{R}$ where $X$ has probability measure $\mu$.

For all $r>0$ and all $n \geqslant 1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left\{\Sigma_{i=1}^{n}\left|Y_{i}\right| k\left(\left(X_{i}-X\right) / r\right) / \sum_{j=1}^{n} k\left(\left(X_{j}-X\right) / r\right)\right\} \leqslant 7 \gamma E\{|Y|\} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\gamma$ is the constant of Lemma 1.
Proof of Lemma 2. We need only consider $E\{|Y|\}<\infty$. We assume that $n \geqslant 8$ since (8) is clearly satisfied for $n \leqslant 7$ because $\gamma$ in Lemma 1 is greater than 1. Let

$$
N(x)=\sum_{j=2}^{n} k\left(\left(X_{j}-x\right) / r\right)
$$

so that $N_{1}(x)=E\{N(x)\}=(n-1) \int k((y-x) / r) \mu(d y)$. Noting that $\operatorname{Var}\{N(x)\}$ $\leqslant(n-1) k^{*} \int k((y-x) / r) \mu(d y)$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
P\left\{N(x)<N_{1}(x) / 2\right\} & =P\left\{N(x)-N_{1}(x)<-N_{1}(x) / 2\right\}  \tag{9}\\
& \leqslant \min \left\{1,4 k^{*} / N_{1}(x)\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

by Chebyshev's inequality. Since $N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right)=E\left\{N\left(X_{1}\right) / X_{1}\right\}$, we rewrite (8) as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} E\{|Y| k & \left.\left(\left(X-X_{i}\right) / r\right) /\left(\sum_{j \neq i} k\left(\left(X_{j}-X_{i}\right) / r\right)+k\left(\left(X-X_{i}\right) / r\right)\right)\right\} \\
= & n E\left\{|Y| k\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right) /\left(\sum_{j=2}^{n} k\left(\left(X_{j}-X_{1}\right) / r\right)+k\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right)\right)\right\} \\
< & n E\left\{|Y| k\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right) /\left(N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right) / 2+k\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right)\right)\right\} \\
& \left.+n E\left\{|Y| I_{\left[N\left(X_{1}\right)<N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right) / 2 ;\right.} ;\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right)>0\right]\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The first term in the last expression is upper bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& n E\left\{|Y| \min \left\{1,2 k\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right) / N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right)\right\}\right\} \\
&=n E\left\{|Y| E\left\{\min \left\{1,2 k\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right) / N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right)\right\} \mid X\right\}\right\} \\
& \leqslant n E\left\{|Y| \sup _{z} E\left\{\min \left(1,2 k\left(\left(z-X_{1}\right) / r\right) / N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right)\right)\right\}\right\} \\
&=n E\{|Y|\} \sup _{z} \int \min \left\{1, \frac{2 k((z-x) / r)}{N_{1}(x)}\right\} \mu(d x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The second term is upper bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
n E\left\{| Y | I _ { A } ( \frac { X - X _ { 1 } } { r } ) P \left\{N\left(X_{1}\right)\right.\right. & \left.\left.<N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right) / 2 \mid X_{1}\right\}\right\} \\
& \leqslant n E\left\{|Y| I_{A}\left(\frac{X-X_{1}}{r}\right) \min \left\{1, \frac{4 k^{*}}{N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right)}\right\}\right\} \\
& \leqslant n E\left\{|Y| \min \left\{1, \frac{4 k^{*} I_{A}\left(\left(X-X_{1}\right) / r\right)}{N_{1}\left(X_{1}\right)}\right\}\right\} \\
& \leqslant n E\{|Y|\} \sup _{z} \int \min \left\{1, \frac{4 k^{*} I_{A}((z-x) / r)}{N_{1}(x)}\right\} \mu(d x)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (9) and the previous argument. Combining both inequalities with Lemma 1, we upper bound the left-hand-side of (8) by:

$$
6 \frac{n}{n-1} \gamma E\{|Y|\} \leqslant 7 \gamma E\{|Y|\}
$$

Corollary. By Jensen's inequality, we have for all $p \geqslant 1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|Y_{i}\right| k\left(\left(X_{i}-X\right) / r\right) / \sum_{j=1}^{n} k\left(\left(X_{j}-X\right) / r\right)\right]^{p}\right\} \\
& \quad \leqslant E\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|Y_{i}\right|^{p} k\left(\left(X_{i}-X\right) / r\right) / \sum_{j=1}^{n} k\left(\left(X_{j}-X\right) / r\right)\right\} \leqslant 7 \gamma E\left\{|Y|^{p}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The constant $\gamma>0$ is a covering constant because it is proportional to the number of spheres $B / 2$ needed to cover a compact set $A$. In the next lemma another facet of the covering problem is used.

Lemma 3. Let $k$ be a nonnegative function on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ satisfying (6) (iii). If (5) holds, then

$$
P\left\{n \int k\left((y-X) / h_{n}\right) \mu(d y)<c\right\} \rightarrow_{n} 0
$$

for all $c>0$ and all probability measures $\mu$ for $X$.
Proof of Lemma 3. Since $k \geqslant \beta I_{B}$ for some $\beta>0$ and some closed sphere $B$ centered at the origin with radius $\rho>0$, we have for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$,

$$
n \int k\left((y-x) / h_{n}\right) \mu(d y) \geqslant n \beta \mu\left(x+h_{n} B\right) .
$$

A sphere of radius $r$ can be covered by $\max (4,4 d r / s)^{d}$ closed spheres of radius $s / 2$. To see this, construct a set $C$ of points $a_{i}=i s / d, i=0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \cdots$, with $\left|a_{i}\right| \leqslant r$. Add to $C$ the end points $-r$ and $+r$. The grid $C^{d}$ has at most $(2+2 d r / s)^{d} \leqslant \max (4,4 d r / s)^{d}$ points. We show that the spheres with radius $s / 2$ centered at the points in $C^{d}$ cover the sphere $S(0, r)$ centered at 0 with radius $r$. For each $x \in S(0, r)$ we have $\|x-a\| \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{d} s / 2 d=s / 2$ for some $a \in C^{d}$.

Find $r$ so large that $1-\mu(S(0, r))<\varepsilon$. If $S_{1}, S_{2}, \cdots$ are the spheres of radius $\rho h_{n} / 2$ covering $S(0, r)$, then $x \in S_{i}$ implies $S_{i} \subset x+h_{n} B$. Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P\left\{n \int k\left((y-X) / h_{n}\right) \mu(d y)<c\right\} \\
& \leqslant P\left\{n \beta \mu\left(X+h_{n} B\right)<c\right\} \\
& \leqslant P\{X \notin S(0, r)\}+P\left\{X \in S(0, r) ; n \beta \mu\left(X+h_{n} B\right)<c\right\} \\
&<\varepsilon+\sum_{i} P\left\{X \in S_{i} ; n \beta \mu\left(X+h_{n} B\right)<c\right\} \\
& \leqslant \varepsilon+\Sigma_{i: P\left\{X \in S_{i}\right\}<c / \beta n} P\left\{X \in S_{i}\right\} \\
& \leqslant \varepsilon+4^{d} c / \beta n+\left(4 d r / \rho h_{n}\right)^{d} c / \beta n \\
& \leqslant 2 \varepsilon \text { for } n \text { large enough. }
\end{aligned}
$$

The lemma follows by the arbitrariness of $\varepsilon>0$.
We now prove Theorem 1. One of the facts crucial to the proof is the denseness of all bounded continuous functions in $L_{p}(\mu)$, a property also exploited by Stone (1977) in his consistency proof for nearest neighbor estimates.

Proof of Theorem 1. For any function $g: \mathbb{R}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have $\left|m_{n}(x)-m(x)\right|^{p}$ $\leqslant\left(U_{1}^{p}(x)+U_{2}^{p}(x)+U_{3}^{p}(x)+U_{4}^{p}(x)\right) 4^{p-1}$ where now

$$
\begin{aligned}
N(x) & =\Sigma_{i} k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right), \\
U_{1}(x) & =N(x)^{-1}\left|\Sigma_{i}\left(Y_{i}-m\left(X_{i}\right)\right) k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)\right|, \\
U_{2}(x) & =N(x)^{-1} \Sigma_{i}\left|m\left(X_{i}\right)-g\left(X_{i}\right)\right| k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right), \\
U_{3}(x) & =\left|N(x)^{-1} \Sigma_{i} g\left(X_{i}\right) k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)-g(x)\right|,
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
U_{4}(x)=|g(x)-m(x)| .
$$

We will show that $E\left\{\int U_{i}^{p}(x) \mu(d x)\right\}<\varepsilon$ for $n$ large enough, $i=1,2,3,4$.
Since $m^{p}$ is $\mu$-integrable, we can find a function $g$ that is bounded, continuous, and zero outside a compact set such that $\int U_{4}^{p}(x) \mu(d x)<\varepsilon$ (Dunford and Schwartz, 1957, page 298).

By the corollary to Lemma 2

$$
E\left\{U_{2}^{p}(X)\right\}=\int E\left\{U_{2}^{p}(x)\right\} \mu(d x) \leqslant 7 \gamma E\left\{|m(X)-g(X)|^{p}\right\}<\varepsilon
$$

by the choice of $g$.
Let $g$ be fixed and put $c_{g}=\sup _{x}|g(x)|^{p}$. We can find $\delta>0$ so small that

$$
\sup _{x \in \mathbf{R}^{d} ; y \in x+\delta A}|g(y)-g(x)|<(\varepsilon / 2)^{1 / p},
$$

where $A$ is the support of $k$. Thus $U_{3}^{p}(x)<\varepsilon / 2$ when $h_{n}<\delta$ and $N(x)>0$. Thus, if $h_{n}<\delta$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left\{U_{3}^{p}(X)\right\} & \leqslant c_{g} \int P\{N(x)=0\} \mu(d x)+\varepsilon / 2 \\
& \leqslant c_{g} \int\left(1-\mu\left(x+h_{n} A\right)\right)^{n} \mu(d x)+\varepsilon / 2 \\
& \leqslant c_{g} \int e^{-n \mu\left(x+h_{n} A\right)} \mu(d x)+\varepsilon / 2 \\
& \leqslant c_{g}\left(e^{-\lambda}+P\left\{n \mu\left(X+h_{n} A\right)<\lambda\right\}\right)+\varepsilon / 2
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\lambda>0$ is picked large enough to make $c_{g} e^{-\lambda}$ smaller than $\varepsilon / 4$. Letting $n$ grow large and applying Lemma 3 with $k=I_{A}$ to the term $P\left\{n \mu\left(X+h_{n} A\right)<\lambda\right\}$ shows that $E\left\{U_{3}^{p}(x)\right\}<\varepsilon$ for all $n$ large enough.

Next, we use the fact that conditioned on $X_{1}, \cdots, X_{n}$, the random variables $Y_{1}-m\left(X_{1}\right), \cdots, Y_{n}-m\left(X_{n}\right)$ are independent. Assume first that $\left|Y_{1}\right| \leqslant c_{t}<\infty$ a.s. (so that $\left|Y_{1}-m\left(X_{1}\right)\right| \leqslant 2 c_{t}$ a.s.). Then for $p \leqslant 2$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(E\left\{\int U_{1}^{p}(x) \mu(d x)\right\}\right)^{2 / p} \leqslant & \int E\left\{U_{1}^{2}(x)\right\} \mu(d x) \\
& =\int E\left\{E\left\{U_{1}^{2}(x) \mid X_{1}, \cdots, X_{n}\right\}\right\} \mu(d x) \\
& =\int E\left\{\Sigma_{i} E\left\{\left(Y_{i}-m\left(X_{i}\right)\right)^{2} \mid X_{i}\right\}\right. \\
& \left.k^{2}\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right) / N^{2}(x)\right\} \mu(d x) \\
\leqslant & 4 c_{t}^{2} \int E\left\{\min \left\{1 ; k^{*} / N(x)\right\}\right\} \mu(d x) \\
\leqslant & c_{t}^{2} k^{*} / c_{s}+4 c_{t}^{2} \int P\left\{N(x)<c_{s}\right\} \mu(d x) \\
\leqslant & 4 c_{t}^{2} k^{*} / c_{s}+4 c_{t}^{2} \int P\{N(x)<E\{N(x)\} / 2\} \mu(d x) \\
& +4 c_{t}^{2} \int I_{\left(0,2 c_{s}\right)}(E\{N(x)\}) \mu(d x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

For any $c_{s}, c_{t}$, the last term tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 3. The first term can be made arbitrarily small by choosing $c_{s}$ large enough. For the middle term, which is estimated as in the proof of Lemma 2 (see (9)) by

$$
4 c_{t}^{2} \int \min \left\{1 ; 4 k^{*} / E\{N(x)\}\right\} \mu(d x) \leqslant 4 c_{t}^{2} 4 k^{*} / c_{s}+4 c_{t}^{2} \int I_{\left(0, c_{s}\right)}(E\{N(x)\}) \mu(d x)
$$

we have already demonstrated that it is small for large $n$ and large $c_{s}$.
For $p>2$, use the facts that

$$
U_{1}^{p}(x)=U_{1}^{2}(x) U_{1}^{p-2}(x) \leqslant\left(2 c_{t}\right)^{p-2} U_{1}^{2}(x)
$$

and

$$
\int E\left\{U_{1}^{p}(x)\right\} \mu(d x) \leqslant\left(2 c_{t}\right)^{p-2} \int E\left\{U_{1}^{2}(x)\right\} \mu(d x)
$$

and proceed similarly.
To complete the proof of Theorem 1, we only have to show that $E\left\{U_{1}^{p}(x)\right\}$ can be made arbitrarily small even if $Y_{1}$ is not a.s. bounded. Assume that $c_{t}>0$ is a
constant, and let $Y_{i}=Y_{i}^{\prime}+Y_{i}^{\prime \prime}$ where

$$
Y_{i}^{\prime}=Y_{i} I_{\left[-c_{t}, c_{t}\right]}\left(Y_{i}\right)
$$

and

$$
Y_{i}^{\prime \prime}=Y_{i} I_{\left[-c_{i}, c_{t}\right]^{c}}\left(Y_{i}\right)
$$

Further, let $m^{\prime}(x)=E\left\{Y_{1}^{\prime} \mid X_{1}=x\right\}, m^{\prime \prime}(x)=E\left\{Y_{1}^{\prime \prime} \mid X_{1}=x\right\}$, and notice that $m(x)=m^{\prime}(x)+m^{\prime \prime}(x)$ for almost all $x(\mu)$. We have for almost all $x(\mu)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{1}^{p}(x) \leqslant & 2^{p-1}\left(N(x)^{-1}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(Y_{i}^{\prime}-m^{\prime}\left(X_{i}\right)\right) k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)\right|\right)^{p} \\
& +2^{p-1}\left(N(x)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|Y_{i}^{\prime \prime}-m^{\prime \prime}\left(X_{i}\right)\right| k\left(\left(X_{i}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)\right)^{p} \\
\equiv & U_{1}^{\prime p}(x)+U_{1}^{\prime \prime p}(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

It is clear from the previous argument (since $\left|Y_{1}^{\prime}-m\left(X_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant 2 c_{t}$ a.s.) that for any $c_{t}>0, E\left\{\int U_{1}^{\prime p}(x) \mu(d x)\right\}$ can be made arbitrarily small. For the last term we use

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left\{\int U_{1}^{\prime \prime p}(x) \mu(d x)\right\} & \leqslant 7 \gamma E\left\{\left|Y_{1}^{\prime \prime}-m^{\prime \prime}\left(X_{1}\right)\right|^{p}\right\} 2^{p-1} \\
& \leqslant 7 \gamma 2^{2 p-2}\left(E\left\{\left|Y_{1}\right|^{p} I_{\left[-c_{p}, c_{l}\right]} c\left(Y_{1}\right)\right\}+E\left\{\left|m^{\prime \prime}\left(X_{1}\right)\right|^{p}\right\}\right) \\
& \left.\leqslant 4 \gamma 2^{2 p} E\left\{\left|Y_{1}\right|^{p} I_{\left[-c_{p}, c_{c}\right]} c^{( } Y_{1}\right)\right\} \\
& \rightarrow 0 \text { as } c_{t} \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

by the finiteness of $E\left\{\left|Y_{1}\right|^{p}\right\}$.
3. Bayes risk consistency in discrimination. In discrimination $Y$ takes values from a known finite set $\{1, \cdots, M\}$ and the problem, as before, is to estimate $Y$ from $X$. The estimate $g_{n}(X)$ is a measurable function of $X$ with values in $\{1, \cdots, M\}$ and the performance of the estimate with the data is now measured by the probability of error,

$$
L_{n}=P\left\{g_{n}(X) \neq Y \mid X_{1}, Y_{1}, \cdots, X_{n}, Y_{n}\right\}
$$

Clearly, $L_{n}$ cannot be smaller than the Bayes probability of error

$$
L^{*}=\inf _{g: \mathbf{R}^{d} \rightarrow\{1, \cdots, M\}} P\{g(X) \neq Y\}
$$

If we define

$$
p_{i}(x)=P\{Y=i \mid X=x\}, \quad 1 \leqslant i \leqslant M, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}
$$

then all discrimination rules $g$ satisfying

$$
g(x) \neq i \quad \text { whenever } \quad p_{i}(x)<\max _{1 \leqslant l \leqslant M} p_{e}(x)
$$

have probability of error $L^{*}$. The unknown regression functions $p_{i}$ can be estimated by any method. Writing $p_{n i}$ for the estimate of $p_{i}$, we can in turn pick $g_{n}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{n}(x) \neq i \quad \text { whenever } \quad p_{n i}(x)<\max _{1 \leqslant l \leqslant M} p_{n l}(x) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

For all discrimination rules satisfying (11) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leqslant L_{n}-L^{*} \leqslant 2 \sum_{i=1}^{M} \int\left|p_{i}(x)-p_{n i}(x)\right| \mu(d x) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inequality (12) is easy to show (see, e.g., Stone (1977)). If we write $a(x)$ for $p_{i}(x)$ with $i=g_{n}(x)$, and $a_{n}(x)$ for $p_{n i}(x)$ when $i=g_{n}(x)$, then it is true that $L^{*}=\int(1-$ $\left.\max _{i} p_{i}(x)\right) \mu(d x), L_{n}=\int(1-a(x)) \mu(d x), a_{n}(x)=\max _{i} p_{n i}(x)$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_{n}-L^{*}= & \int\left(\max _{i} p_{i}(x)-a(x)\right) \mu(d x) \\
= & \int\left(\max _{i} p_{i}(x)-\max _{i} p_{n i}(x)\right) \mu(d x) \\
& +\int\left(a_{n}(x)-a(x)\right) \mu(d x) \\
\leq & 2 \sum_{i=1}^{M} \int\left|p_{i}(x)-p_{n i}(x)\right| \mu(d x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves (12). The inequality (12) links in a very simple way the distance in $L_{1}$ between the $p_{n i}$ and the $p_{j}$ with $L_{n}-L^{*}$. For instance, if we use (1) as our regression function estimate (i.e., to estimate $p_{j}$, replace $Y_{i}$ in (1) by $I_{\left[Y_{i}=j\right]}$ ), then the condition (11) reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{n}(x) \neq i \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

whenever

$$
\Sigma_{j: Y_{j}=i} k\left(\left(X_{j}-x\right) / h_{n}\right)<\max _{1<l \leqslant M} \Sigma_{j: Y_{j}=l} k\left(\left(X_{j}-x\right) / h_{n}\right) .
$$

If $k$ is the indicator function of the unit sphere centered at the origin, then (13) is equivalent to taking a majority vote with those $Y_{j}$ for which $\left\|X_{j}-x\right\| \leqslant h_{n}$. This simple rule can be traced back to the work of Fix and Hodges (1951). The following theorem is a direct corollary of inequality (12) and Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. (Bayes risk consistency). All discrimination rules satisfying (13) are Bayes risk consistent (that is, $E\left\{L_{n}\right\} \rightarrow_{n} L^{*}$ ) if (4-6) hold.
Theorem 2 is entirely distribution-free: no restrictions are put on the distribution of ( $X, Y$ ). This result may seem a bit surprising because (13) was originally obtained in the literature for the Parzen density estimate under the assumption that $X$ has a density (Van Ryzin (1966), Glick (1972, 1976), Greblicki (1974, 1977), Devroye and Wagner (1976, 1977)). In all but the last of the cited papers, additional continuity conditions were put on the density of $X$ to prove Bayes risk consistency.
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