

# On the tails of log-concave density estimators

Didier B. Ryter and Lutz Dümbgen  
University of Bern

September 27, 2024

**Abstract.** This note proves that the nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator of a univariate log-concave probability density satisfies some consistency properties in the tail regions.

**AMS subject classification:** 62G05, 62G07, 62G20, 62G32

**Key words:** Chernov bounds, consistency, exponential inequalities, log-linear densities.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $f$  be a log-concave probability density on the real line, that is,  $f(x) = \exp(\varphi(x))$  for some concave and upper semicontinuous function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ . Suppose we observe independent random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with density  $f$  and corresponding distribution function  $F$ . As noted by Walther (2002) and Pal et al. (2007), for any sample size  $n \geq 2$ , there exists a unique maximum-likelihood estimator (MLE)  $\hat{f}_n = \exp(\hat{\varphi}_n)$  of  $f$ , where the MLE  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  of  $\varphi$  maximizes

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \psi(X_i)$$

over all concave functions  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$  such that  $\int e^{\psi(x)} dx = 1$ . Denoting the order statistics of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with  $X_{(1)} < \dots < X_{(n)}$ , this estimator  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  is piecewise linear on  $[X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$  with changes of slope only at observations, and  $\hat{\varphi}_n = -\infty$  outside of  $[X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$ .

Concerning consistency of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$ , let  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < F(x) < 1\} =: (a_o, b_o)$  with  $-\infty \leq a_o < b_o \leq \infty$ . It was shown by Dümbgen and Rufibach (2009) that for any fixed interval  $[a, b] \subset (a_o, b_o)$ , the supremum of  $|\hat{\varphi}_n - \varphi|$  over  $[a, b]$  is of order  $O_p(\rho_n^{1/3})$ , where  $\rho_n := \log(n)/n$ . If  $\varphi$  is Hölder-continuous on a neighborhood of  $[a, b]$  with exponent  $\beta \in (1, 2]$ , this rate improves to  $O_p(\rho_n^{\beta/(2\beta+1)})$ . Uniform consistency of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  on arbitrary compact subintervals of  $(a_o, b_o)$  implies that  $\int |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| dx \rightarrow_p 0$ . (Throughout this note, asymptotic statements refer to  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .) Pointwise limiting distributions at a single point  $x_o \in (a_o, b_o)$  have been derived by Balabdaoui et al. (2009), assuming that  $\varphi$  is twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of  $x_o$ . Kim and Samworth (2016) showed that the expected squared Hellinger distance between  $\hat{f}_n$  and  $f$  is of order  $O(n^{-4/5})$ . Numerous further results about  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  and  $\hat{f}_n$  have been derived thereafter, including multivariate settings, see the review of Samworth (2018). In the present univariate

setting, fast algorithms for the computation of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  and related objects are provided by Dümbgen and Rufibach (2011) and Dümbgen et al. (2021). Experiments with simulated data show that even in the tail regions, that is, close to  $a_o$  and  $b_o$ , the estimator  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  is surprisingly accurate. In view of this empirical finding, Müller and Rufibach (2009) developed new estimators for extreme value analysis with excellent empirical performance. However, the currently available theory about the asymptotic properties of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  does not explain its good performance in the tail regions. The present note provides a first step into that direction by proving several results about  $\hat{\varphi}_n(x)$  and the right-sided derivative  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)$  for  $x$  close to  $b_o$ . By symmetry, these findings carry over to results in the left tail region.

Section 2 contains the main results, and Section 3 the proofs.

## 2 Main results

We start with a simple consequence of the pointwise consistency of  $\hat{f}_n$ ,  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  and concavity of  $\varphi$ ,  $\hat{\varphi}_n$ .

**Theorem 1.** *The estimator  $\hat{f}_n$  does not overestimate  $f$  in the sense that*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x))^+ \rightarrow_p 0.$$

Moreover, for any sequence  $(b_n)_n$  in  $(a_o, b_o)$  with limit  $b_o$ ,

$$\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \begin{cases} \leq \varphi'(b_o-) + o_p(1) & \text{if } \varphi'(b_o-) > -\infty, \\ \rightarrow_p -\infty & \text{if } \varphi'(b_o-) = -\infty, \end{cases}$$

where  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+) := -\infty$  for  $x \geq X_{(n)}$ .

The remaining goal is to show that the right tails are not “severely underestimated”, and for this task we distinguish the cases  $b_o = \infty$  and  $b_o < \infty$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose that  $b_o < \infty$ .*

(a) *Let  $f(b_o) = 0$ . Then for any fixed  $a \in (a_o, b_o)$ ,*

$$\sup_{x \geq a} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| \rightarrow_p 0.$$

Moreover, for any given sequence  $(b_n)_n$  in  $(a_o, b_o)$  with limit  $b_o$ ,

$$\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \rightarrow_p \varphi'(b_o-) = -\infty.$$

(b) *Let  $f(b_o) > 0$ . Then for arbitrary fixed intervals  $[a, b_n] \subset (a_o, b_o)$  such that  $b_n \uparrow b_o$  and  $n(1 - F(b_n)) \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b_n]} |\hat{\varphi}_n(x) - \varphi(x)| \rightarrow_p 0,$$

(c) *Let  $f(b_o) > 0$  and  $\varphi'(b_o-) > -\infty$ . Then for any given sequence  $(b_n)_n$  in  $(a_o, b_o)$  such that  $b_n \uparrow b_o$  and  $\rho_n^{-1/3}(1 - F(b_n)) \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \rightarrow_p \varphi'(b_o-).$$

**Example 3.** We illustrate Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 (b-c) for samples from the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ . Figure 1 depicts the functions  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  (left panel) and  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(\cdot+)$  (right panel) for one “typical sample” of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom). Figure 2 shows the performance of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  in 10000 simulations of a sample of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom). The left panels show the estimated  $\gamma$ -quantiles of  $\hat{\varphi}_n(x)$ ,  $x \in (0, 1)$ , for  $\gamma = 0.01, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 0.9, 0.99$ . For the same values of  $\gamma$ , the right panels show the estimated  $\gamma$ -quantiles of  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)$ ,  $x \in (0, 1)$ . As expected, the estimators  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  and  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(\cdot+)$  suffer from a substantial bias very close to the boundaries 0 and 1, but these problematic regions shrink as the sample size  $n$  increases.

If the support of  $P$  is unbounded to the right, then  $\varphi(x) \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $\varphi'(x+) \rightarrow \varphi'(\infty-) \in [-\infty, 0)$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Here are some results complementing Theorem 1.

**Theorem 4.** Suppose that  $b_o = \infty$ . Let  $(b_n)_n$  be a sequence in  $(a_o, \infty)$  such that  $b_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $(1 - F(b_n))/\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ .

(a) With asymptotic probability one,  $\hat{f}_n(b_n) > 0$  and

$$\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \rightarrow_p \varphi'(\infty-).$$

(b) Suppose that  $\varphi'(\infty-) = -\infty$  and  $\varphi$  is differentiable on some halfline  $(a, \infty) \subset (a_o, \infty)$  with Lipschitz-continuous derivative  $\varphi' < 0$ . Then for arbitrary  $a_n \in [a, b_n)$  such that  $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in [a_n, b_n]} \frac{\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)}{\varphi'(x)} \leq 1 + o_p(1).$$

Part (a) is of interest if  $\varphi'(\infty-)$  is finite, for instance, if  $P$  is a logistic distribution or a gamma distribution with shape parameter in  $[1, \infty)$ . Part (b) explains why the estimator  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  is remarkably accurate in the tails if, for instance,  $P$  is a Gaussian distribution. Note that  $\varphi'$  is negative on  $[a_n, b_n]$ , so part (b) means that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+) \geq \varphi'(x) - \varepsilon|\varphi'(x)| \text{ for all } x \in [a_n, b_n]) \rightarrow 1.$$

**Example 5.** We illustrate Theorem 1 and Theorem 4 (b) for samples from the standard Gaussian distribution. Figure 3 depicts the functions  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  (left panel) and  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(\cdot+)$  (right panel) for one “typical sample” of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom). Figure 4 shows the performance of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  in 10000 simulations of a sample of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom). The left-hand side shows the estimated  $\gamma$ -quantiles of  $\hat{\varphi}_n(x)$ ,  $x \in (-4, 4)$  for  $\gamma = 0.01, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 0.9, 0.99$ . For the same values of  $\gamma$ , the right-hand side shows the estimated  $\gamma$ -quantiles of  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)$ ,  $x \in (-4, 4)$ .

## 3 Proofs

### 3.1 Auxiliary results

In what follows, let  $P$  and  $\hat{P}_n$  be the distribution with density  $f$  and  $\hat{f}_n$ , respectively. The corresponding distribution functions are denoted by  $F$  and  $\hat{F}_n$ , respectively. In addition, let  $\hat{P}_n^{\text{emp}}$




Figure 1: The functions  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  (left panel) and  $\hat{\varphi}_n(\cdot+)$  (right panel) for one particular sample of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom) from  $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ . The sample is indicated as a rug plot, and the true values  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi'$  are shown in red.




Figure 2: Estimated  $\gamma$ -quantiles of  $\hat{\varphi}_n(x)$  (left panel) and  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)$  (right panel) for samples of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom) from  $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ . The true values  $\varphi(x)$  and  $\varphi(x)'$  are shown in red.




Figure 3: The functions  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  (left panel) and  $\hat{\varphi}_n(\cdot+)$  (right panel) for one particular sample of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom) from  $N(0, 1)$ . The sample is indicated as a rug plot, and the true values  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi'$  are shown in red.




Figure 4: Estimated  $\gamma$ -quantiles of  $\hat{\varphi}_n(x)$  (left panel) and  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)$  (right panel) for samples of size  $n = 150$  (top),  $n = 500$  (middle) and  $n = 2000$  (bottom) from  $N(0, 1)$ . The true values  $\varphi(x)$  and  $\varphi(x)'$  are shown in red.

and  $\hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}$  be the empirical distribution and the empirical distribution function, respectively, of the observations  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ .

**More about  $\hat{f}_n$  and  $\hat{\varphi}_n$ .** We mentioned already some properties of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  and  $\hat{f}_n$ . Recall that for any fixed  $[a, b] \subset (a_o, b_o)$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} |\hat{\varphi}_n(x) - \varphi(x)| \rightarrow_{\text{p}} 0, \quad (1)$$

and since  $\varphi$  is bounded on  $[a, b]$ , this implies that

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| \rightarrow_{\text{p}} 0. \quad (2)$$

An important consequence of the latter result is that

$$\sup_{B \in \text{Borel}(\mathbb{R})} |\hat{P}_n(B) - P(B)| = 2^{-1} \int |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| dx \rightarrow_{\text{p}} 0, \quad (3)$$

see Dümbgen and Rufibach (2009). The latter paper also provides the following inequalities: For arbitrary  $b < b_o$ ,

$$\int (x - b)^+ \hat{P}_n^{\text{emp}}(dx) \begin{cases} \geq \int (x - b)^+ \hat{P}_n(dx) \\ = \int (x - b)^+ \hat{P}_n(dx) \quad \text{if } b \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

with

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n := \{X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}\} \cup \{x \in (X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}) : \hat{\varphi}_n(x-) > \hat{\varphi}_n(x+)\} \subset \{X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}\},$$

the set of kinks of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$ . Moreover,

$$\hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}(x) - n^{-1} \leq \hat{F}_n(x) \leq \hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n. \quad (5)$$

**The right tails of  $\hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}$ .** Concerning  $\hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}$ , note the following useful inequality: For any  $b < b_o$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{x \leq b} \left| \frac{\hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}(x) - F(x)}{1 - F(x)} \right|^2 \right) \leq \frac{4}{n(1 - F(b))}.$$

This follows from the well-known fact that  $M_x := [\hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}(x) - F(x)]/[1 - F(x)]$  defines a martingale  $(M_x)_{x < b_o}$  and one of Doob's martingale inequalities (Shorack and Wellner, 1986; Hall and Heyde, 1980). In particular, for any sequence of numbers  $b_n \in (a_o, b_o)$ ,

$$\sup_{x \leq b_n} \left| \frac{1 - \hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}(x)}{1 - F(x)} - 1 \right| \rightarrow_{\text{p}} 0 \quad \text{if } n(1 - F(b_n)) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6)$$

Combining this with (5) leads to the fact that

$$\max_{x \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n: x \leq b_n} \left| \frac{1 - \hat{F}_n(x)}{1 - F(x)} - 1 \right| \rightarrow_{\text{p}} 0 \quad \text{if } n(1 - F(b_n)) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7)$$

**Conditional means of  $P$ .** For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , let

$$\mu(x) := \begin{cases} (1 - F(x))^{-1} \int (y - x)^+ P(dy) & \text{if } F(x) < 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } F(x) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Let  $\hat{\mu}_n(x)$  and  $\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(x)$  be defined analogously with  $\hat{P}_n$  and  $\hat{P}_n^{\text{emp}}$  in place of  $P$ . The function  $\mu$  is known as the mean excess function or mean residual lifetime in fields such as extreme value theory and actuarial science. The next proposition summarizes several useful properties of  $\mu$  and its relation to  $\varphi$ . Of course, some of these findings apply to  $\hat{\mu}_n$  and  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  too. The monotonicity property of  $\mu$  in part (a) was noted already by Bagnoli and Bergstrom (2005). Parts (b) and (c) are based on comparisons of  $f$  with suitable log-linear densities.

**Proposition 1.** (a) *The function  $\mu$  given by (8) is non-increasing and Lipschitz-continuous with constant one.*

(b) *Suppose that  $b_o < \infty$ . Then for arbitrary real  $x \in [a_o, b_o)$ ,*

$$(b_o - x)\nu(\varphi'(b_o-)(b_o - x)) \leq \mu(x) \leq (b_o - x)\nu(\varphi'(x+)(b_o - x))$$

where  $\nu(t) := \int_0^1 ue^{tu} du / \int_0^1 e^{tu} du$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\nu(-\infty) := 0$ ,  $\nu(\infty) := 1$ . The function  $\nu$  is continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $\nu(0) = 1/2$ ,  $\nu'(0) = 1/12$  and  $\nu' > 0$ .

(c) *Suppose that  $b_o = \infty$ . Then for arbitrary real  $x \in [a_o, \infty)$  with  $\varphi'(x+) < 0$ ,*

$$-1/\varphi'(\infty-) \leq \mu(x) \leq -1/\varphi'(x+).$$

(d) *Suppose that  $b_o = \infty$ , and let  $\varphi$  be differentiable on some halfline  $(a, \infty)$  with Lipschitz-continuous derivative  $\varphi' < 0$ . Then,*

$$\mu(x) = -\frac{1 + o(1)}{\varphi'(x)} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* As to part (a), By Fubini's theorem, one may write

$$\mu(x) = (1 - F(x))^{-1} \int \int_0^\infty 1_{[r < y - x]} dr P(dy) = \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - F(x + r)}{1 - F(x)} dr$$

for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $F(x) < 1$ . For  $x < x'$  with  $F(x') = 1$ ,

$$\mu(x) - \mu(x') = \mu(x) = \int_0^{x' - x} \frac{1 - F(x + r)}{1 - F(x)} dr \in [0, x' - x].$$

For  $x < x'$  with  $F(x') < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x) - \mu(x') &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - F(x + r)}{1 - F(x)} dr - \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - F(x' + r)}{1 - F(x')} dr \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - F(x + r)}{1 - F(x)} dr - \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - F(x' + r)}{1 - F(x)} dr \\ &= \int_x^{x'} \frac{1 - F(x + r)}{1 - F(x)} dr \leq x' - x. \end{aligned}$$

That  $\mu(x) \geq \mu(x')$  was noted already by Bagnoli and Bergstrom (2005), but for later reference, we provide an argument here. For  $\xi \in \{x, x'\}$ , one may write

$$\mu(\xi) = \int_{[0, \infty)} z f_\xi(z) dz$$

with the probability density  $f_\xi$  on  $[0, \infty)$  given by  $f_\xi(z) := \exp(\varphi(\xi + z) - \log(1 - F(\xi)))$ . By concavity of  $\varphi$ ,  $f_x/f_{x'}$  is non-decreasing on  $\{f_x > 0\} = [0, b_o - x) \supset \{f_{x'} > 0\}$ . This implies that the distribution with density  $f_x$  is stochastically greater than (or equal to) the distribution with density  $f_{x'}$ . In particular, the mean  $\mu(x)$  of the former is not smaller than the mean  $\mu(x')$  of the latter.

To prove part (b), we consider for fixed real  $x \in [a_o, b_o)$  up to three probability densities  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  on  $[0, b_o - x]$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(z) &:= \exp(\varphi'(b_o-)z - c_1) && (\text{if } \varphi'(b_o-) > -\infty), \\ g_2(z) &:= \exp(\varphi(z) - c_2), \\ g_3(z) &:= \exp(\varphi'(x+)z - c_3) && (\text{if } \varphi'(x+) < \infty), \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  are normalizing constants. Note that for any  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_0^{b_o-x} z \exp(\theta z) dz / \int_0^{b_o-x} \exp(\theta z) dz = (b_o - x)\nu(\theta(b_o - x)).$$

If  $\varphi'(b_o-) > -\infty$ , then  $g_2/g_1$  is non-decreasing, because

$$\varphi(x+z) - \varphi'(b_o-)z = \varphi(x) + \int_0^z [\varphi'((x+r)+) - \varphi'(b_o-)] dr,$$

and the integrand is non-negative on  $(0, z)$  by concavity of  $\varphi$ . Hence, the distribution  $Q_1$  with density  $g_1$  is stochastically smaller than the distribution  $Q_2$  with density  $g_2$ . This implies that the mean  $(b_o - x)\nu(\varphi'(b_o-)(b_o - x))$  of  $Q_1$  is not larger than the mean  $\mu(x)$  of  $Q_2$ . Analogously, if  $\varphi'(x+) < \infty$ , then  $g_3/g_2$  is non-decreasing, because

$$\varphi'(x+)z - \varphi(x+z) = \int_0^z [\varphi'(x+) - \varphi'((x+r)+)] dr - \varphi(x),$$

and the integrand is non-negative on  $(0, z)$ . Thus the mean  $\mu(x)$  is not smaller than the mean  $(b_o - x)\nu(\varphi'(x+)(b_o - x))$ .

Part (c) is verified similarly. Here we consider two or three probability densities  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  on  $[0, \infty)$  given by  $g_1(z) := \lambda_1 \exp(-\lambda_1 z)$  with  $\lambda_1 := -\varphi'(\infty-)$  (if  $\varphi'(\infty-) > -\infty$ ),  $g_2(z) := \exp(\varphi(x+z) - \log(1 - F(x)))$  and  $g_3(z) := \lambda_3 \exp(-\lambda_3 z)$  with  $\lambda_3 := -\varphi'(x+)$ . Again, if  $\varphi'(\infty-) > -\infty$ , then  $g_2/g_1$  is non-decreasing, whence  $-1/\varphi'(\infty-) = 1/\lambda_1 \leq \mu(x)$ . And  $g_3/g_2$  is non-decreasing too, so  $\mu(x) \leq 1/\lambda_3 = -1/\varphi'(x+)$ .

Concerning the properties of  $\nu$ , consider the distribution  $Q_t$  on  $[0, 1]$  with log-linear density  $u \mapsto \exp(tu - \kappa(t))$ , where  $\kappa(t) := \log \int_0^1 e^{tu} du$ . The distributions  $(Q_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  form an exponential family, where  $\nu(t) = \kappa'(t)$  is the mean of  $Q_t$ , and  $\nu'(t) = \kappa''(t)$  is the variance of  $Q_t$ . Moreover,  $Q_0$  is the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$  with mean  $1/2$  and variance  $1/12$ .

As to part (d), we know from part (c) that  $\mu(x) \leq -1/\varphi'(x)$  for any  $x > a$  with  $\varphi'(x+) < 0$ , and  $\mu(x) \geq -1/\varphi'(\infty-)$ . Consequently, if  $\varphi'(\infty-) > -\infty$ , the assertion follows from  $\varphi'(x) \rightarrow \varphi'(\infty-)$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Now suppose that  $\varphi'(\infty-) = -\infty$ . We consider the probability densities  $g_1, g_2$  on  $[0, \infty)$ , where  $g_2(z) := \exp(\varphi(x+z) - \log(1 - F(x)))$  as before, and

$$g_1(z) := \exp(\varphi'(x)z - \lambda z^2/2 - c(x))$$

with a Lipschitz constant  $\lambda > 0$  of  $\varphi'$  on  $(a, \infty)$  and a normalizing constant  $c(x)$ . Again,  $g_2/g_1$  is non-decreasing, because

$$\log(g_2/g_1)(z) = c(x) - \log(1 - F(x)) + \varphi(x) + \int_0^z [\varphi'(x+t) - \varphi'(x) + \lambda t] dt,$$

and the integrand is non-negative by Lipschitz-continuity of  $\varphi'$  with constant  $\lambda$ . Hence, the mean of the distribution with density  $g_1$  is non larger than  $\mu(x)$ . Thus it suffices to show that  $\varphi'(x) \int_0^\infty z g_1(z) dz \rightarrow -1$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . With  $\theta := -\varphi'(x)/\sqrt{\lambda}$ , elementary calculations show that this is equivalent to the claim that

$$\theta \int_\theta^\infty x \phi(x) dx / (1 - \Phi(\theta)) - \theta^2 = \frac{\theta \phi(\theta)}{1 - \Phi(\theta)} - \theta^2 \rightarrow 1$$

as  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\phi$  and  $\Phi$  denote the standard Gaussian density and distribution function, respectively. It is known from the statistical folklore about Mill's ratio  $(1 - \Phi)/\phi$  (and can be shown via partial integration) that  $1 - \Phi(\theta) = \phi(\theta)(\theta^{-1} - \theta^{-3} + O(\theta^{-5}))$ , whence

$$\frac{\theta \phi(\theta)}{1 - \Phi(\theta)} - \theta^2 = \theta^2 \left( \frac{1}{1 - \theta^{-2} + O(\theta^{-4})} - 1 \right) = 1 + O(\theta^{-2})$$

as  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ . □

Our next key results are simultaneous inequalities for  $\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}/\mu$  and  $\hat{\mu}_n/\mu$ .

**Proposition 2.** *For any  $\tau > 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(X_{(k)})}{\mu(X_{(k)})} - 1 \right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\tau \log(n)}{n-k}} + \frac{\tau \log(n)}{n-k} \text{ for some } k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \right) \leq 2n^{1-\tau}.$$

Note that  $\log(n)/(n-k)$  equals  $\rho_n/(1 - \hat{F}_n^{\text{emp}}(X_{(k)}))$ , so combining Proposition 2 with (6) shows that

$$\max_{k < n: X_{(k)} \leq b_n} \left| \frac{\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(X_{(k)})}{\mu(X_{(k)})} - 1 \right| = O_p(\sqrt{\rho_n/(1 - F(b_n))}) \quad \text{if } \rho_n^{-1}(1 - F(b_n)) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (9)$$

Combining Proposition 2 with (4), (6) and (7) shows that

$$\max_{x \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n: x \leq b_n} \left| \frac{\hat{\mu}_n(x)}{\mu(x)} - 1 \right| = O_p(\sqrt{\rho_n/(1 - F(b_n))}) \quad \text{if } \rho_n^{-1}(1 - F(b_n)) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (10)$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Suppose first that  $P$  is the exponential distribution with mean  $\mu(0)$ . Then Chernov's bound, applied to exponential distributions, shows that for  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\pm\left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(0)}{\mu(0)} - 1\right) \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \exp[-nH(\pm\varepsilon)], \quad (11)$$

where  $H(t) := t - \log(1+t)$  for  $t > -1$  and  $H(t) := \infty$  for  $t \leq -1$ .

Now suppose that  $P$  is an arbitrary distribution with log-concave density such that  $a_o \geq 0$ . Let  $\tilde{\varphi}$  be the log-density of the exponential distribution  $\tilde{P}$  with mean  $\mu(0)$ , that is,  $\tilde{\varphi}(x) = -x/\mu(0) - \log(\mu(0))$  for  $x \geq 0$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}(x) = -\infty$  for  $x \leq 0$ . If  $\varphi \neq \tilde{\varphi}$ , then there exist points  $0 < a < b < \infty$  such that  $\varphi < \tilde{\varphi}$  on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus [a, b]$  and  $\varphi > \tilde{\varphi}$  on  $(a, b)$ . Indeed, by concavity of  $\varphi - \tilde{\varphi}$  on  $[0, \infty)$ , the set  $\{\varphi > \tilde{\varphi}\}$  is an interval with infimum  $a \geq 0$  and supremum  $b \leq \infty$ , and  $\varphi < \tilde{\varphi}$  on  $[0, \infty) \setminus [a, b]$ . Since  $\int e^{\varphi(x)} dx = \int e^{\tilde{\varphi}(x)} dx = 1$ , we know that  $a < b$  and  $(a, b) \neq (0, \infty)$ . If  $a = 0$ , then the distribution function  $F$  would be strictly larger than the distribution function  $\tilde{F}$  of  $\tilde{P}$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , leading to the contradiction that  $\mu(0) = \int_0^\infty (1 - F(x)) dx < \mu(0)$ . With the same argument one can argue that  $b < \infty$ . But now, for any convex function  $\Psi$  on the real line,

$$\int \Psi dP \leq \int \Psi d\tilde{P}. \quad (12)$$

Indeed, since  $\int (c+dx) P(dx) = \int (c+dx) \tilde{P}(dx)$  for arbitrary  $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ , the difference  $\int \Psi dP - \int \Psi d\tilde{P}$  equals

$$\int \Psi(x)(e^{\varphi(x)} - e^{\tilde{\varphi}(x)}) dx = \int \left( \Psi(x) - \frac{b-x}{b-a} \Psi(a) - \frac{x-a}{b-a} \Psi(b) \right) (e^{\varphi(x)} - e^{\tilde{\varphi}(x)}) dx \leq 0,$$

because the integrand of the latter integral is non-positive. Applying (12) to  $\Psi(x) = \exp(tx)$  for arbitrary  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , one sees that the Chernov bound (11) holds true for arbitrary distributions  $P$  with log-concave density such that  $a_o \geq 0$ .

Coming back to the general case, note that for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  and  $a < b_o$ , the conditional distribution of  $(X_{(k+\ell)} - a)_{\ell=1}^{n-k}$ , given that  $X_{(k)} = a$ , coincides with the distribution of  $(Y_{(\ell)})_{\ell=1}^{n-k}$ , where  $Y_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq Y_{(n-k)}$  are the order statistics of  $n-k$  independent random variables with density  $f_a(y) := 1_{[y \geq 0]} f(a+y)/(1-F(a))$ . Since  $\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(a)$  is the mean of  $X_{(k+\ell)} - a$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq n-k$ , we may apply the inequalities (11) to deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\pm\left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(X_{(k)})}{\mu(X_{(k)})} - 1\right) \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \exp[-(n-k)H(\pm\varepsilon)] \quad (13)$$

for arbitrary  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ . Since  $H(-\varepsilon) \geq H(\varepsilon)$  for all  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , this implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(X_{(k)})}{\mu(X_{(k)})} - 1\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp[-(n-k)H(\varepsilon)]. \quad (14)$$

Note that  $H(\sqrt{2r} + r) \geq r$  for arbitrary  $r \geq 0$ , because  $H(\sqrt{2r} + r) - r$  is equal to  $\sqrt{2r} -$

$\log(1 + \sqrt{2r} + r)$ , and  $\exp(\sqrt{2r}) \geq 1 + \sqrt{2r} + \sqrt{2r}^2/2 = 1 + \sqrt{2r} + r$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(X_{(k)})}{\mu(X_{(k)})} - 1\right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\tau \log(n)}{n-k}} + \frac{\tau \log(n)}{n-k} \text{ for some } k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\hat{\mu}_n^{\text{emp}}(X_{(k)})}{\mu(X_{(k)})} - 1\right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\tau \log(n)}{n-k}} + \frac{\tau \log(n)}{n-k}\right) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \exp(-\tau \log(n)) < 2n^{1-\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3.2 Proofs of the main results

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Since  $f$  and  $\hat{f}_n$  are zero on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus (a_o, b_o)$ , and because of (2), it suffices to show that for fixed points  $a_o < a < b < b_o$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in (a_o, a]} (\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)) \leq L(a) + o_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{x \in [b, b_o)} (\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)) \leq R(b) + o_p(1)$$

with bounds  $L(a), R(b)$  such that  $L(a) \rightarrow 0$  as  $a \downarrow a_o$  and  $R(b) \rightarrow 0$  as  $b \uparrow b_o$ . For symmetry reasons we only consider the second claim. We fix an arbitrary  $m \in (a_o, b_o)$  such that  $\varphi'(m+) < 0$  in case of  $\varphi'(b_o-) < 0$  and restrict our attention to  $b \in (m, b_o)$ . If  $b_o < \infty$  and  $\varphi'(b_o-) \geq 0$ , then concavity of  $\varphi$  and  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [b, b_o)} (\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)) & \leq \sup_{x \in [b, b_o)} \hat{f}_n(b) \exp\left(\frac{\hat{\varphi}_n(b) - \hat{\varphi}_n(m)}{b-m}(x-b)\right) - f(b) \\ & \rightarrow_p f(b) (f(b)/f(m))^{(b_o-b)/(b-m)} - f(b) \\ & \leq f(b_o) [(f(b_o)/f(m))^{(b_o-b)/(b-m)} - 1] =: R(b), \end{aligned}$$

and  $R(b) \rightarrow 0$  as  $b \uparrow b_o$ . If  $\varphi'(b_o-) < 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [b, b_o)} (\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)) & \leq \sup_{x \in [b, b_o)} \hat{f}_n(b) \exp\left(\frac{\hat{\varphi}_n(b) - \hat{\varphi}_n(m)}{b-m}(x-b)\right) - f(b_o) \\ & \rightarrow_p f(b) - f(b_o) =: R(b), \end{aligned}$$

because  $(\hat{\varphi}_n(b) - \hat{\varphi}_n(m))/(b-m) \rightarrow_p (\varphi(b) - \varphi(m))/(b-m) \leq \varphi'(m+) < 0$ , and  $R(b) \rightarrow 0$  as  $b \uparrow b_o$ . Here  $f(\infty) := 0$ .

Let  $(b_n)_n$  be a sequence in  $(a_o, b_o)$  with limit  $b_o$ . For arbitrary fixed  $a_o < a < b < b_o$ , it follows from concavity of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  that for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \leq \frac{\hat{\varphi}_n(b) - \hat{\varphi}_n(a)}{b-a} \rightarrow_p \frac{\varphi(b) - \varphi(a)}{b-a}.$$

Now the assertion follows from the fact that the right-hand side converges to  $\varphi'(b_o-)$  as  $a, b \rightarrow b_o$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 2.* As to part (a), it follows from (2) and Theorem 1 that for any fixed  $b \in (a, b_o)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \geq a} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| &\leq \sup_{x \in [a, b]} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| + \sup_{x \geq b} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| \\ &\leq o_p(1) + \sup_{x \geq b} (\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x))^+ + \sup_{x \geq b} f(x) \\ &= o_p(1) + \sup_{x \geq b} f(x), \end{aligned}$$

and  $\sup_{x \geq b} f(x) \rightarrow f(b_o) = 0$  as  $b \uparrow b_o$ . Furthermore, since  $\varphi'(b_o-) = -\infty$ , it follows from Theorem 1 that  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \rightarrow_p \varphi'(b_o-)$ .

As to part (b), it follows from (1) and Theorem 1 that for any fixed  $b \in (a, b_o)$  and all  $n$  with  $b_n > b$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [a, b_n]} |\hat{\varphi}_n(x) - \varphi(x)| &\leq \sup_{x \in [a, b]} |\hat{\varphi}_n(x) - \varphi(x)| + \sup_{x \in [b, b_n]} |\hat{\varphi}_n(x) - \varphi(x)| \\ &\leq o_p(1) + \sup_{x \in [b, b_o]} (\hat{\varphi}_n(x) - \varphi(x))^+ + \sup_{x \in [b, b_n]} (\varphi(x) - \hat{\varphi}_n(x))^+ \\ &= o_p(1) + \sup_{x \in [b, b_n]} (\varphi(x) - \hat{\varphi}_n(x))^+, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $\delta(b) := \min_{x \in [b, b_o]} f(x) > 0$ , so  $(\hat{\varphi}_n - \varphi)^+ \leq (\hat{f}_n - f)^+ / \delta(b)$  on  $[b, b_o]$ . By concavity of  $\hat{\varphi}_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [b, b_n]} (\varphi(x) - \hat{\varphi}_n(x))^+ &\leq \sup_{x \in [b, b_n]} (\varphi(x) - \varphi(b_o))^+ + \sup_{x \in [b, b_n]} (\varphi(b_o) - \hat{\varphi}_n(x))^+ \\ &= \sup_{x \in [b, b_o]} (\varphi(x) - \varphi(b_o))^+ + \max_{x \in \{b, b_n\}} (\varphi(b_o) - \hat{\varphi}_n(x))^+ \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{x \in [b, b_o]} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(b_o)| + (\varphi(b) - \hat{\varphi}_n(b))^+ + (\varphi(b_o) - \hat{\varphi}_n(b_n))^+ \\ &= 2 \sup_{x \in [b, b_o]} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(b_o)| + o_p(1) + (\varphi(b_o) - \hat{\varphi}_n(b_n))^+ \end{aligned}$$

by (1). Since  $\sup_{x \in [b, b_o]} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(b_o)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $b \uparrow b_o$ , it suffices to show that

$$(\varphi(b_o) - \hat{\varphi}_n(b_n))^+ \rightarrow_p 0.$$

To this end, we show that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the inequality  $\hat{\varphi}_n(b_n) \leq \varphi(b_o) - \varepsilon$  holds with asymptotic probability zero. Let  $b(\varepsilon) \in (a_o, b_o)$  such that  $|\varphi - \varphi(b_o)| \leq \lambda\varepsilon/2$  on  $[b(\varepsilon), b_o]$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  to be specified later. From (1) and Theorem 1 we may conclude that  $\hat{\varphi}_n(b(\varepsilon)) \geq \varphi(b_o) - \lambda\varepsilon$  and  $\hat{\varphi}_n \leq \varphi(b_o) + \lambda\varepsilon$  on  $[b(\varepsilon), b_o]$  with asymptotic probability one. Thus it suffices to show that the event

$$A_{n,\varepsilon} := [\hat{\varphi}_n(b_n) \leq \varphi(b_o) - \varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}_n(b(\varepsilon)) \geq \varphi(b_o) - \lambda\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}_n \leq \varphi(b_o) + \lambda\varepsilon \text{ on } [b(\varepsilon), b_o]]$$

has asymptotic probability zero. From now on we assume that the event  $A_{n,\varepsilon}$  occurs. Suppose that  $n$  is sufficiently large such that  $b_n > b(\varepsilon)$ . Note that  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) < 0$ , because  $\hat{\varphi}_n(b(\varepsilon)) > \hat{\varphi}_n(b_n)$ .

Let  $Y_n$  be the largest point in  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \cap (a_o, b_n]$ . Then,  $\hat{\varphi}_n$  is affine on  $[Y_n, b_n]$  and non-increasing on  $[Y_n, b_o]$ . Consequently,  $\hat{f}_n$  is convex on  $[Y_n, b_n]$  and non-increasing on  $[Y_n, b_o]$ .

Suppose first that  $Y_n \geq b(\varepsilon)$ . Then the properties of  $\hat{f}_n$  on  $[Y_n, b_o]$  imply that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \hat{F}_n(Y_n) &= \hat{P}_n([Y_n, b_o]) \leq (b_n - Y_n) \frac{\hat{f}_n(Y_n) + \hat{f}_n(b_n)}{2} + (b_o - b_n) \hat{f}_n(b_n) \\ &\leq (b_o - Y_n) \frac{\hat{f}_n(Y_n) + \hat{f}_n(b_n)}{2} \\ &\leq (b_o - Y_n) f(b_o) \frac{e^{\lambda\varepsilon} + e^{-\varepsilon}}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

whereas

$$1 - F(Y_n) = P([Y_n, b_o]) \geq (b_o - Y_n) f(b_o) e^{-\lambda\varepsilon/2}.$$

Consequently, for sufficiently large  $n$ , the event  $A_{n,\varepsilon}$  implies that

$$\frac{1 - \hat{F}_n(Y_n)}{1 - F(Y_n)} \leq \frac{e^{3\lambda\varepsilon/2} + e^{\lambda\varepsilon/2 - \varepsilon}}{2} = 1 + (\lambda - 1/2)\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . Hence, if  $\lambda < 1/2$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small, it follows from (7) that the event  $A_{n,\varepsilon}$  has asymptotic probability zero.

Suppose that  $Y_n \leq b(\varepsilon)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}_n([b(\varepsilon), b_o]) &\leq (b_n - b(\varepsilon)) \frac{\hat{f}_n(b(\varepsilon)) + \hat{f}_n(b_n)}{2} + (b_o - b_n) \hat{f}_n(b_n) \\ &\leq (b_o - b(\varepsilon)) f(b_o) \frac{e^{\lambda\varepsilon} + e^{-\varepsilon}}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

whereas

$$P([Y_n, b_o]) \geq (b_o - b(\varepsilon)) f(b_o) e^{-\lambda\varepsilon/2}.$$

Consequently, for sufficiently large  $n$ , the event  $A_{n,\varepsilon}$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (P - \hat{P}_n)([b(\varepsilon), b_o]) &\geq (b_o - b(\varepsilon)) f(b_o) \left( e^{-\lambda\varepsilon/2} - \frac{e^{\lambda\varepsilon} + e^{-\varepsilon}}{2} \right) \\ &= (b_o - b(\varepsilon)) f(b_o) ((1/2 - \lambda)\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . Hence, if  $\lambda < 1/2$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small, it follows from (3) that the event  $A_{n,\varepsilon}$  has asymptotic probability zero.

As to part (c), because of Theorem 1, it suffices to show that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the event  $B_{n,\varepsilon} := [\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) < \varphi'(b_o-) - \varepsilon]$  has asymptotic probability zero. Let  $Y_n$  be the largest point in  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$  such that  $Y_n \leq b_n$ . It follows from (1) that for any fixed  $a \in (a_o, b_o)$ , the event  $B_{n,\varepsilon} \cap [Y_n \leq a]$  has asymptotic probability zero, because for any fixed  $b \in (a, b_o)$ ,

$$\hat{\varphi}'_n(a+) \geq \frac{\hat{\varphi}_n(b) - \hat{\varphi}_n(a)}{b - a} \rightarrow_p \frac{\varphi(b) - \varphi(a)}{b - a} \geq \varphi'(b_o-),$$

whereas  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(Y_n+) = \hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+)$ . Consequently, there exist numbers  $a_{n,\varepsilon} \in (a_o, b_n)$  such that  $a_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow b_o$  and  $\mathbb{P}(B_{n,\varepsilon} \cap [Y_n \leq a_{n,\varepsilon}]) \rightarrow 0$ . It remains to be shown that  $B_{n,\varepsilon} \cap [Y_n > a_{n,\varepsilon}]$  has

asymptotic probability zero. Assuming that the latter event occurs, note that by Proposition 1 (b),

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(Y_n) &\geq (b_o - Y_n)\nu(\varphi'(b_o-)(b_o - Y_n)), \\ \hat{\mu}_n(Y_n) &\leq (b_o - Y_n)\nu((\varphi'(b_o-) - \varepsilon)(b_o - Y_n)),\end{aligned}$$

and since the moduli of  $\varphi'(b_o-)(b_o - Y_n)$  and  $(\varphi'(b_o-) - \varepsilon)(b_o - Y_n)$  are not larger than  $(|\varphi'(b_o-)| + \varepsilon)(b_o - a_{n,\varepsilon}) \rightarrow 0$ , we may conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\hat{\mu}_n(Y_n)}{\mu(Y_n)} - 1 &\leq \frac{1/2 + (\varphi'(b_o-) - \varepsilon)(b_o - Y_n)/12 + O(1)(b_o - Y_n)^2}{1/2 + \varphi'(b_o-)(b_o - Y_n)/12 + O(1)(b_o - Y_n)^2} - 1 \\ &= -\frac{\varepsilon(b_o - Y_n)/6 + O(1)(b_o - Y_n)^2}{1 + \varphi'(b_o-)(b_o - Y_n)/6 + O(1)(b_o - Y_n)^2} \\ &= -(\varepsilon + o(1))(b_o - Y_n)/6 \\ &\leq -(\varepsilon + o(1))(b_o - b_n)/6 \\ &= -(\varepsilon/f(b_o) + o(1))(1 - F(b_n)),\end{aligned}$$

uniformly on  $B_{n,\varepsilon} \cap [Y_n > a_{n,\varepsilon}]$ . On the other hand, we know from (10) that

$$\frac{\hat{\mu}_n(Y_n)}{\mu(Y_n)} - 1 \geq O_p(\sqrt{\rho_n/(1 - F(b_n))}) = o_p(1 - F(b_n)),$$

because  $\rho_n/(1 - F(b_n))^3 \rightarrow 0$  by assumption, whence  $\mathbb{P}(B_{n,\varepsilon} \cap [Y > a_{n,\varepsilon}]) \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* As to part (a), since  $\{\hat{f}_n > 0\} = [X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{f}_n(b_n) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(X_{(1)} > b_n) + \mathbb{P}(X_{(n)} < b_n) = (1 - F(b_n))^n + F(b_n)^n \rightarrow 0,$$

because  $F(b_n) \rightarrow 1$  and  $n(1 - F(b_n)) \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $\varphi'(\infty-) = -\infty$ , it follows already from Theorem 1 that  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \rightarrow_p \varphi'(\infty-)$ . Otherwise, we know that  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \leq \varphi(\infty-) + o_p(1)$ , and it suffices to show that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the inequality  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \leq \varphi'(\infty-) - \varepsilon$  holds true with asymptotic probability zero. If  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(b_n+) \leq \varphi'(\infty-) - \varepsilon$ , then it follows from Proposition 1 (c) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(b_n) &\geq -1/\varphi'(\infty-), \\ \hat{\mu}_n(b_n) &\leq -1/(\varphi'(\infty-) - \varepsilon),\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\frac{\hat{\mu}_n(b_n)}{\mu(b_n)} \leq \frac{\varphi'(\infty-)}{\varphi'(\infty-) - \varepsilon} = (1 + \varepsilon/|\varphi'(\infty-)|)^{-1}.$$

According to (10), the latter inequality holds true with asymptotic probability zero.

As to part (b), note first that  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(a_n+) \rightarrow_p -\infty$ , so the event  $B_n := [\hat{\varphi}'_n(a_n+) < 0]$  has asymptotic probability one. It follows from Proposition 1 (d,c,a,c) that on this event  $B_n$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in [a_n, b_n]} \frac{\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)}{\varphi'(x)} = (1 + o(1)) \sup_{x \in [a_n, b_n]} \mu(x)(-\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)) \leq (1 + o(1)) \max_{y \in \mathcal{S}_n: y \leq b_n} \frac{\mu(y)}{\hat{\mu}_n(y)},$$

because for any  $x \in [a_n, b_n]$ , the point  $y := \max(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \cap (a_o, x])$  satisfies  $y \leq x$  and  $\hat{\varphi}'_n(y+) = \hat{\varphi}'_n(x+) \leq \hat{\varphi}'_n(a_n+) < 0$ , whence

$$\mu(x)(-\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)) \leq \mu(y)(-\hat{\varphi}'_n(x+)) = \mu(y)(-\hat{\varphi}'_n(y+)) \leq \mu(y)/\hat{\mu}_n(y).$$

Now part (b) follows from the fact that the maximum of  $\mu/\hat{\mu}_n$  over  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \cap (a_o, b_n]$  equals  $1 + o_p(1)$ , see (10).  $\square$

**Acknowledgement.** Part of this work was supported by Swiss National Science Foundation.

## References

- BAGNOLI, M. and BERGSTROM, T. (2005). Log-concave probability and its applications. *Econom. Theory* **26** 445–469.
- BALABDAOUI, F., RUFIBACH, K. and WELLNER, J. A. (2009). Limit distribution theory for maximum likelihood estimation of a log-concave density. *Ann. Statist.* **37** 1299–1331.
- DÜMBGEN, L., MÖSCHING, A. and STRÄHL, C. (2021). Active set algorithms for estimating shape-constrained density ratios. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **163** Paper No. 107300, 19.
- DÜMBGEN, L. and RUFIBACH, K. (2009). Maximum likelihood estimation of a log-concave density and its distribution function: basic properties and uniform consistency. *Bernoulli* **15** 40–68.
- DÜMBGEN, L. and RUFIBACH, K. (2011). logcondens: Computations related to univariate log-concave density estimation. *Journal of Statistical Software* **39** 128.
- HALL, P. and HEYDE, C. C. (1980). *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London.
- KIM, A. K. H. and SAMWORTH, R. J. (2016). Global rates of convergence in log-concave density estimation. *Ann. Statist.* **44** 2756–2779.
- MÜLLER, S. and RUFIBACH, K. (2009). Smooth tail-index estimation. *J. Stat. Comput. Simul.* **79** 1155–1167.
- PAL, J. K., WOODROOFE, M. and MEYER, M. (2007). Estimating a Polya frequency function<sub>2</sub>. In *Complex datasets and inverse problems*, vol. 54 of *IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser.* Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH, 239–249.
- SAMWORTH, R. J. (2018). Recent progress in log-concave density estimation. *Statist. Sci.* **33** 493–509.

SHORACK, G. R. and WELLNER, J. A. (1986). *Empirical processes with applications to statistics*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

WALTHER, G. (2002). Detecting the presence of mixing with multiscale maximum likelihood. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **97** 508–513.