

Adaptive minimax optimality in statistical inverse problems via SOLIT — Sharp Optimal Lepskiĭ-Inspired Tuning

Housen Li¹, and Frank Werner²

¹Institute for Mathematical Stochastics, University of Göttingen, Germany

²Institute of Mathematics, University of Würzburg, Germany

December 12, 2023

Abstract

We consider statistical linear inverse problems in separable Hilbert spaces and filter-based reconstruction methods of the form $\hat{f}_\alpha = g_\alpha (T^*T)^{-1} T^*Y$, where Y is the available data, T the forward operator, $(g_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ an ordered filter, and $\alpha > 0$ a regularization parameter. Whenever such a method is used in practice, α has to be appropriately chosen. Typically, the aim is to find or at least approximate the best possible α in the sense that mean squared error (MSE) $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_\alpha - f^\dagger\|^2]$ w.r.t. the true solution f^\dagger is minimized. In this paper, we introduce the Sharp Optimal Lepskiĭ-Inspired Tuning (SOLIT) method, which yields an a posteriori parameter choice rule ensuring adaptive minimax rates of convergence. It depends only on Y and the noise level σ as well as the operator T and the filter $(g_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ and does not require any problem-dependent tuning of further parameters. We prove an oracle inequality for the corresponding MSE in a general setting and derive the rates of convergence in different scenarios. By a careful analysis we show that no other a posteriori parameter choice rule can yield a better performance in terms of the order of the convergence rate of the MSE. In particular, our results reveal that the typical understanding of Lepskiĭ-type methods in inverse problems leading to a loss of a log factor is wrong. In addition, the empirical performance of SOLIT is examined in simulations.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider statistical linear inverse problems of the form

$$Y = Tf^\dagger + \sigma Z \tag{1}$$

with a linear and injective Hilbert–Schmidt operator $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ mapping between separable Hilbert spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , and the standard Gaussian Hilbert space process $Z : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$. Here and in what follows, we denote by $f^\dagger \in \mathcal{X}$ the true (but unknown) solution, by $\sigma > 0$ the noise level, and by Y the available measurements. Note that Z in (1) can be identified with an element in \mathcal{Y} only if $\dim(\mathcal{Y}) < \infty$. Otherwise, we have $Y \notin \mathcal{Y}$ a.s., which implies that the model (1) has to be understood in a weak sense, i.e., for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ we have access to the real-valued random variable

$$\langle Y, y \rangle := \langle Tf^\dagger, y \rangle + \sigma Z(y).$$

Statistical inverse problems of form (1) are a widely investigated field as they arise in applications spanning from astronomy over medical imaging to engineering, see, e.g., [7, 17, 32]. The

assumption of Gaussian white noise as in (1) is most common and can be justified by either central limit theorems or asymptotic equivalence statements [34].

To reconstruct the quantity of interest f^\dagger from the available data Y , we consider the filter-based regularization

$$\hat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha (T^*T) T^*Y, \quad (2)$$

where $(q_\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$ is an ordered filter (cf. Definition 1 below). Spectral regularization schemes (2) based on filters were introduced by Bakushinski [3] and yield a variety of regularized estimators for the desired quantity f^\dagger . They have also received substantial attention in the literature (see, e.g., the monograph [11] for a deterministic treatment and [8,23,29] for a stochastic investigation).

An important property of the estimators \hat{f}_α under investigation is their behavior as the noise level σ tends to 0. Due to the famous result by Schock [35], this behavior, if measured in the rate of convergence of the mean squared error (MSE) $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_\alpha - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2]$, can be arbitrarily slow. However, under additional smoothness conditions on f^\dagger , it is in many situations possible to derive convergence rates

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha^*} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2] = \mathcal{O}(\psi(\sigma))$$

with a monotonically increasing and continuous rate function $\psi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\psi(0) = 0$, for the ideal parameter choice $\alpha^{\text{opt}} = \alpha^{\text{opt}}(\sigma)$ given by

$$\alpha^{\text{opt}} := \arg \min_{\alpha>0} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_\alpha - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}].$$

We stress that the focus of this paper is on the order of convergence rate, namely, $\psi(\sigma)$, rather than the multiplying constant hidden in Landau's big O notation. Thus, for brevity, the optimality statement throughout is meant for the order of convergence rate, not the multiplying constant, without explicit declaration. Under reasonable assumptions on the filter $(q_\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$, the rates of convergence can actually be shown to be minimax optimal, i.e., best possible under all estimators uniformly over a smoothness class (cf. Section 2 for details). This is a strong indicator that the chosen family of estimators will perform well in practice, but it is unfortunately useless for applications since the oracle parameter choice α^{opt} cannot be implemented (as f^\dagger is unknown). Therefore, one is actually interested in practically implementable (i.e., not depending on unknown quantities such as f^\dagger or its smoothness) choices of α that mimic the minimax convergence behavior.

In this paper, we investigate a specific a posteriori parameter choice rule, which we call **Sharp Optimal Lepskiĭ-Inspired Tuning (SOLIT)**. In terms of the estimator (2), the corresponding parameter $\hat{\alpha}$ is constructed as follows. We first choose a suitable finite set of candidates $\{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}$, ordered increasingly with respect to variance (or model complexity), and then set $\hat{\alpha} := \alpha_{\hat{m}}$ with

$$\hat{m} := \min \left\{ 0 \leq m_1 \leq m_{\max} : \max_{m_{\max} \geq m_2 > m_1} (\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_1}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_2}}\| - \eta_{m_1, m_2}) \leq 0 \right\},$$

where $\eta_{m_1, m_2} \geq 0$ are explicitly computable critical values depending only on the noise level σ , the filter q_α , and the forward operator T (see Section 3 for the formal definition and Section 5.2 for computational issues). It is derived from a more general principle proposed in [37], and our analysis exploits and extends results from that paper.

The SOLIT rule $\hat{\alpha} \equiv \alpha_{\hat{m}}$ can be seen as a variant of Lepskiĭ-type balancing principle. The Lepskiĭ-type balancing principles are well-known in inverse problems and typically of the form $\alpha_{\text{LEP}} = \alpha_{m_{\text{LEP}}}$ with

$$m_{\text{LEP}} := \min \left\{ 0 \leq m_1 \leq m_{\max} : \max_{m_{\max} \geq m_2 > m_1} (\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_1}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_2}}\| - 4\kappa\mu_{m_2}) \leq 0 \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mu_k := \sigma \sqrt{\text{trace}(q_{\alpha_k} (T^*T)^2 T^*T)}$ and $\kappa \geq 1$ is a tuning parameter, see, e.g., [4, 27–29, 40, 41]. Parameter choice rules of the form α_{LEP} have originally been introduced in [22], and the usage in inverse problems is summarized in the overview paper [27]. It has been shown in [6, 29] that α_{LEP} leads to an oracle inequality which allows to compare the MSE under α_{LEP} , i.e., $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_{\text{LEP}}} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]$, with the minimal MSE $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha^{\text{opt}}} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]$ with high probability up to a $\sqrt{m_{\text{max}}} \exp(-C\kappa^2)$ term. From this one can deduce that a reasonable choice of κ (depending on the minimax rate of convergence, see Section 2 below, and hence on the ill-posedness of T) leads to minimax rates of convergence up to a logarithmic factor.

Opposed to this, we will show that the SOLIT rule $\hat{\alpha} \equiv \alpha_{\hat{m}}$ yields the best possible rate (precisely the *adaptive* minimax rate, see also Section 2 below) of convergence without loss of logarithmic factors and without the necessity to adjust any tuning parameters to the ill-posedness of T over a wide range of smoothness classes for f^\dagger . One reason behind this is that the SOLIT $\hat{\alpha}$ employs a subtle upper bound η_{m_1, m_2} depending on both m_1 and m_2 , while the Lepskii-type balancing principle α_{LEP} utilises an upper bound μ_{m_2} depending just on m_2 . Also importantly, SOLIT requires a special choice of the candidate parameters $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\text{max}}}$, see Section 3.2.1 below.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the questions of minimax optimality and adaptation in inverse problems and provide the corresponding rates of convergence in a wide class of problems. This also serves as an overview or a review of already known results while adding some new aspects. Section 3 is then devoted to filter-based regularization and a detailed derivation of our parameter choice SOLIT. In this section, we also state a generic oracle inequality for the risk based on the SOLIT. The final result on rates of convergence including all necessary assumptions and computations is then presented in Section 4. In Section 5 we discuss how the SOLIT can be implemented and provide details on the computation of the critical values η_{m_1, m_2} involved in $\hat{\alpha}$. Furthermore we present various numerical simulations supporting our analysis, before we end this paper with some conclusions in Section 6.

2 Minimax optimality and adaptation

Before we define and analyze the SOLIT, let us recall the minimax paradigm in statistical inverse problems. Note that the forward operator T in (1) is assumed to be compact, injective and Hilbert–Schmidt. Thus, there is an eigendecomposition of T^*T with strictly positive eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ ordered decreasingly and corresponding eigenfunctions $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that

$$T^*T e_k = \lambda_k e_k, \quad \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k < \infty. \quad (4)$$

We stress that this decomposition is only used in our theoretical analysis and is not necessarily required for the construction of our estimator or the SOLIT parameter choice, see Section 5.

The degree of ill-posedness of the model (1) is often characterized by the decay rate $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Most commonly assumed is a polynomial rate of decay

$$c_{\min} k^{-a} \leq \lambda_k \leq c_{\max} k^{-a} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (5)$$

with $0 < c_{\min} \leq c_{\max}$ and $a > 0$. This is often referred to as *mild ill-posedness*. Applications where this occurs include medical X-ray tomography (with T the d -dimensional Radon transform, $d \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, which satisfies (5) with $a = d - 1$, see [31]), parameter identification problems in partial

differential equations (see, e.g., [18]), and density estimation in statistics (see, e.g., [39]), to name a few. Also widely accepted are models with an exponential decay of the singular values

$$c_{\min} k^{-a} \exp(-bk^\vartheta) \leq \lambda_k \leq c_{\max} k^{-a} \exp(-bk^\vartheta) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (6)$$

with $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b, \vartheta > 0$, which is typically called *severe ill-posedness*. Some examples include inverse heat equation problems [12] as well as image deblurring and light microscopy (where T is the convolution operator with, e.g., a Gaussian kernel) [20]. In most of this paper, we will focus on mild ill-posedness (5), but in Section 4.2 we will also study the severely ill-posed case (6).

As mentioned in the Introduction, nothing can be said without further assumptions on the unknown f^\dagger . Typically, one poses spectral source conditions of the form

$$f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho) := \{f \in \mathcal{X} : f = \varphi(T^*T)g \quad \text{for } \|g\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \rho\} \quad (7)$$

with an *index* function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (i.e., monotonically increasing, continuous and $\varphi(0) = 0$). With the eigendecomposition of T^*T in (4), we can rewrite the source condition (7) equivalently as an ellipsoid

$$\mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho) = \left\{ f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k e_k : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k f_k^2 \leq \rho^2 \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{X},$$

where $w_k = \varphi(\lambda_k)^{-2}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For several operators T , spectral source conditions with specific index functions φ can be interpreted as classical smoothness conditions in terms of Sobolev spaces. Note that for every f^\dagger there exist an index function φ and a parameter $\rho > 0$ such that $f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)$ (see [26]), but the decay behavior of φ at 0 can be arbitrarily slow.

We are particularly interested in index functions φ of form

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi_{\nu, \tau}(x) := x^\nu (-\log x)^{-\tau} \quad \text{for } x \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

where either $\nu > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ (referred to as *polynomial smoothness*), or $\nu = 0$ and $\tau > 0$ (referred to as *logarithmic smoothness*). To ensure well-definedness of $\varphi_{\nu, \tau}(T^*T)$, we assume that $\lambda_1 \leq \exp(-1)$, without loss of generality.

Given an index function φ and a parameter $\rho > 0$, one can now ask for the minimax risk of the MSE, denoted by

$$\psi(\sigma) = \psi(\sigma, \varphi, \rho, T) := \inf_{\hat{f} \text{ estimator}} \sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]. \quad (9)$$

Here and below (e.g., in (12)) an estimator is any measurable mapping from \mathcal{Y}^* to \mathcal{X} , with typical Borel σ -algebras, where \mathcal{Y}^* denotes the space of linear mappings from \mathcal{Y} to $\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$. To derive the minimax risk (9), it turns out that spectral cutoff — corresponding to the filter-based regularization (2) with $q_\alpha(\lambda) := \lambda^{-1} \mathbf{1}\{\lambda \geq \alpha\}$ — is particularly helpful. It has been shown, e.g., in [13, 19, 25], that, for known smoothness parameters ν and τ , the spectral cutoff estimator achieves the minimax rate of convergence (this is the same rate as the minimax risk in (9) as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$) with the index function $\varphi_{\nu, \tau}$ in (8). Furthermore, a modified spectral cutoff [33], often known as Pinsker's filter, is shown to achieve asymptotically the exact minimax risk (i.e., front constants are also optimal) in many cases, e.g., when $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k / \lambda_{k+1} < \infty$, and the radius ρ is also known, see [14].

However, note that the minimax risk (9) allows the estimator to have knowledge of φ , which is typically unknown in practice. A more realistic setting is to suppose that $\varphi \in \Phi$ with a collection of index functions Φ . For example, it might be a priori known that f^\dagger is of polynomial smoothness, which corresponds to

$$\Phi_{\nu_0} = \{\varphi = \varphi_{\nu, \tau} : 0 < \nu \leq \nu_0, \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad (10)$$

or that a f^\dagger is of logarithmic smoothness, i.e.,

$$\Phi_{\tau_0} = \{\varphi = \varphi_{\nu, \tau} : \nu = 0, 0 < \tau \leq \tau_0\}, \quad (11)$$

where $\nu_0, \tau_0 > 0$ are known. In this case, one is interested to *adapt to the unknown smoothness over Φ* , and wants to achieve the minimal price of adaptation over Φ with respect to the MSE, defined as

$$\varpi(\sigma) = \varpi(\sigma, \Phi, \rho, T) := \inf_{\hat{f} \text{ estimator}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi} \sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]}{\psi(\sigma, \varphi, \rho, T)}, \quad (12)$$

with $\psi(\sigma, \varphi, \rho, T)$ defined in (9). For a fixed $\varphi \in \Phi$, we refer to

$$\psi_*(\sigma) = \psi_*(\sigma, \varphi, \Phi, \rho, T) := \varpi(\sigma, \Phi, \rho, T) \psi(\sigma, \varphi, \rho, T) \quad (13)$$

as the adaptive minimax risk of the MSE over Φ . Clearly, it holds that the adaptive minimax risk $\psi_*(\sigma, \varphi, \Phi, \rho, T)$ is always no better (i.e., no faster decay as the argument tends to 0) than the minimax risk $\psi(\sigma, \varphi, \rho, T)$, since $\varpi(\sigma) \geq 1$. There are situations that both risks coincide up to a constant factor and also situations that both differ by a logarithmic factor depending on σ even when Φ contains only two index functions.

Determining the adaptive minimax risk in (13) or equivalently the minimal price of adaptation in (12) is more delicate. In case of logarithmic smoothness (i.e., Φ_{τ_0}), the convergence rate of the adaptive minimax risk (13) coincides with that of the (non-adaptive) minimax risk (9) even for $\Phi := \bigcup_{\tau_0 > 0} \Phi_{\tau_0}$. Interestingly, the order of optimal adaptation rates can be attained by, e.g., the spectral cutoff with regularization parameter $\alpha \asymp \sigma$, which depends solely on the noise level, and thus requires no knowledge of the smoothness parameter τ and the radius ρ (see Proposition A.1 in A for general ordered filters). In case of polynomial smoothness (i.e., Φ_{ν_0}), the relation between the minimax risk and the adaptive minimax risk is subtle and depends on the degree of ill-posedness. For mildly ill-posed problems (which we mainly consider), the optimal adaptation rates can be equal to the optimal rates, as it shown by [9] using a spectral cutoff variant together with a penalized blockwise Stein's rule, see also [23]. For severely ill-posed problems (i.e., eigenvalues of T^*T decaying at an exponential rate; cf. (6) and Section 4.2), the optimal adaptation rates can differ from the optimal rates by a logarithmic factor. This has, e.g., been shown [38], and we will discuss this in detail in Section 4.2. The difference to the minimax risk is exactly the price that one has to pay for the missing information about the underlying smoothness of the truth.

One of the main results of this paper is that the filters of form (2) with the SOLIT rule are able to attain the sharp order of optimal adaptation rates for different combinations of smoothness and mild ill-posedness without manually adjusting the tuning parameters. In particular, this shows that the typical understanding in inverse problems that one has to lose a log-factor (see, e.g., Theorem 1 in [29]) when applying Lepskiĭ-type methods is *not* correct.

3 Filter-based regularization and SOLIT

Before we introduce the SOLIT rule, let us briefly set up the notation for filter-based regularization of (1).

3.1 Filter-based regularization

In this paper, we consider the estimator \hat{f}_α in form of an *ordered filter* $q_\alpha(\cdot)$, i.e.,

$$\hat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha(T^*T)T^*Y,$$

where α is a tuning parameter (i.e., regularization parameter).

3.1.1 Ordered filters

Definition 1 (Ordered filters). The function $q_\alpha(\cdot) : [0, \|T^*T\|] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, indexed by $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, is called an *ordered filter*, if it satisfies:

1. For all $x \in [0, \|T^*T\|]$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\alpha q_\alpha(x) \leq C'_q \quad \text{and} \quad x q_\alpha(x) \leq C''_q \equiv 1.$$

2. It is *ordered* with respect to “variance”, i.e.,

$$\alpha \geq \tilde{\alpha} \quad \Rightarrow \quad q_\alpha(x) \leq q_{\tilde{\alpha}}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, \|T^*T\|].$$

Here $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ has an accumulation point at 0.

Remark 3.1. In comparison with the literature (e.g., [23]), we make here two additional but rather weak assumptions, namely, the nonnegativity of the filter $q_\alpha(\cdot) \geq 0$, and the non-expansiveness $C''_q = 1$. In particular, Definition 1 still includes common examples of regularization methods, such as spectral cutoff, Tikhonov, iterated Tikhonov, Landweber, and Showalter, etc. ◀

3.1.2 Spectral source condition

For the analysis of filter-based regularizations, further conditions on f^\dagger are necessary. Despite the discussion in the Introduction, we will work with a more general setting here (i.e., with general source conditions and general decay of the singular values of the forward operator).

Assumption 1 (Spectral source condition). 1. Assume the source condition in (7) holds with index function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ being continuous, strictly increasing and $\varphi(0) = 0$.

2. We assume

$$\phi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad x \mapsto x\varphi^{-1}(\sqrt{x}) \quad \text{is convex,}$$

where $\varphi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse function of $\varphi(\cdot)$.

Assumption 1(ii) is made only for technical convenience, and imposes no restriction, as one can always work with a convex surrogate of ϕ in case that this assumption is violated. In particular, the index function in (8) satisfies Assumption 1.

We further require some compatibility between ordered filters and smoothness characterizations.

Assumption 2 (Qualification). The index function φ in (7) is a *qualification* of ordered filter q_α in the sense that

$$\sup_{x \in [0, \|T^*T\|]} \varphi(x)(1 - xq_\alpha(x)) \leq C_\varphi \varphi(\alpha) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}.$$

As a consequence of Definition 1(i), and Assumptions 1(i) and 2, it holds that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} x q_\alpha(x) = 1$ for all $x \in [0, \|T^*T\|]$. It further follows that $q_\alpha(T^*T) \rightarrow (T^*T)^{-1}$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Thus, the filter-based regularization can be seen as a stable approximation of the least squares estimate.

In this paper, the notation $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0}$ or $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ means that α goes to zero while remains in \mathcal{A} . This is possible, since 0 is an accumulation point of \mathcal{A} .

3.2 SOLIT

Let us now introduce the SOLIT rule in detail.

3.2.1 Candidates for the regularization parameter α

As many other parameter choice methods in the literature, our method relies heavily on a suitably chosen set of candidate parameters $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_{m_{\max}} > 0$. Generally, the value of regularization parameter can be interpreted as some sort of “degree of model complexity”: the smaller α_j (and hence the larger j), the smaller the bias and the larger the variance of the investigated estimator \hat{f}_{α_j} .

A standard way is to consider geometrically equispaced candidates, i.e.

$$\alpha_m \equiv [\sigma^2 \theta^{m_{\max} - m}]_{\mathcal{A}}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, m_{\max},$$

where $[x]_{\mathcal{A}} := \arg \min_{z \in \mathcal{A}} |z - x|$ and $\theta > 1$ is a tuning parameter. The maximal index m_{\max} is determined to ensure that the smallest candidate $\alpha_{m_{\max}}$ is of the same order as σ^2 . The “rounding” function $[x]_{\mathcal{A}}$ is necessary to ensure that only regularization parameters out of the possible set \mathcal{A} are considered as candidates. For instance, in case of spectral cutoff, we have that $\alpha_m \in \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\}$ as $[x]_{\mathcal{A}} = \lambda_{k_x}$ with $k_x = \arg \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |x - \lambda_k|$.

For the SOLIT, we proceed differently and assume that we are able to discretize \mathcal{A} in a way that not the candidate parameters α_j decrease geometrically, but the variance of \hat{f}_{α_j} does. Let us therefore introduce the function

$$V_{T,q}(\alpha) := \frac{\text{tr}(\text{Var}(\hat{f}_{\alpha}))}{\sigma^2} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k (q_{\alpha}(\lambda_k))^2, \quad \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \quad (14)$$

which is independent of the noise level σ and depends only on the operator T (via its singular values) and the ordered filter q_{α} .

We briefly collect some properties of $V_{T,q}$:

Lemma 3.2. *Let q_{α} be an ordered filter such that some index function φ is a qualification. Then the function $V_{T,q} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ obeys the following properties:*

1. $V_{T,q}$ is decreasing.
2. $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} V_{T,q}(\alpha) = \infty$.

Proof. 1. This follows immediately from Definition 1(ii).

2. By Assumption 2 it holds $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} q_{\alpha}(\lambda) = \lambda^{-1}$. By Fatou’s lemma we obtain

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} V_{T,q}(\alpha) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \left(\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} q_{\alpha}(\lambda_k) \right)^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_k} = \infty.$$

□

We now suppose the following:

Assumption 3 (Candidate selection). Let $\theta_1 > 1$ be fixed. Suppose there exist a sequence of parameters

$$\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_n > \dots$$

in \mathcal{A} and a universal constant $\theta_2 \geq \theta_1$ such that

$$\theta_1 \leq \frac{V_{T,q}(\alpha_m)}{V_{T,q}(\alpha_{m-1})} \leq \theta_2 \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (15)$$

Assumption 3 is satisfied in nearly all practically relevant examples, especially under the following mild conditions on the filter q :

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (0, \infty)$ and $\alpha \mapsto q_\alpha(\lambda)$ be continuous for all $\lambda \in [0, \|T^*T\|]$. Then for any fixed $\theta_1 > 1$, Assumption 3 is satisfied with $\theta_2 = \theta_1$.*

Proof. As discussed above, the function $V_{T,q}$ is decreasing. Furthermore, the series in the definition (14) converges uniformly over all compact sets of $(0, \|T^*T\|]$ according to the first upper bound in Definition 1(i). As $\alpha \mapsto q_\alpha(\lambda)$ is assumed to be continuous for fixed λ , this shows that $V_{T,q}$ as a uniformly convergent sum over continuous functions is also continuous itself on $(0, \|T^*T\|]$.

Now we set $\alpha_0 > 0$ arbitrarily and generate the sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ recursively by

$$\alpha_n = \max \{ \alpha < \alpha_{n-1} : V_{T,q}(\alpha) = \theta_1 V_{T,q}(\alpha_{n-1}) \}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As $V_{T,q}$ is continuous and obeys Lemma 3.2(ii), this maximum is attained by the intermediate value theorem. This choice clearly obeys (15) with $\theta_2 = \theta_1$. \square

The above lemma, in particular, implies that Assumption 3 is satisfied if we consider filters such as Tikhonov, iterated Tikhonov or Showalter.

Given a sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Assumption 3, we now determine our candidates as $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_{m_{\max}}$ with

$$m_{\max} = \min \{ m \in \mathbb{N} : \sigma^2 V_{T,q}(\alpha_m) \geq 1 \}.$$

By Lemma 3.2(ii) it is ensured that m_{\max} exists. Note that $m_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. Let us denote

$$\mathcal{A}_{\theta_1, \theta_2} = \{ \alpha_m : m = 0, 1, \dots, m_{\max} \}. \quad (16a)$$

Then it holds that

$$\infty > \theta_2 \geq \frac{v_m}{v_{m-1}} \geq \theta_1 > 1 \quad \text{for all } m = 1, \dots, m_{\max}, \quad (16b)$$

$$\text{with } v_m := \sigma^2 V_{T,q}(\alpha_m) \quad (16c)$$

and $v_{m_{\max}} \approx 1$ in our asymptotic considerations as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. Ideally, α_0 should be chosen such that $v_0 \approx \sigma^2$ to ensure a good performance in practice, but this does not influence our asymptotic results at all, as α_0 is a fixed constant.

Besides v_m (shorthand notation for $V_{T,q}(\alpha_m)$ up to σ^2), we introduce another size of variance as

$$u_m := \sigma^2 \max_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k q_{\alpha_m}(\lambda_k)^2.$$

This measures the ‘‘amplification’’ effect, if we view the covariance

$$\text{Var}(\hat{f}_{\alpha_m}) = \sigma^2 q_{\alpha_m}(T^*T) T^* T q_{\alpha_m}(T^*T) = \sigma^2 T^* T q_{\alpha_m}(T^*T)^2$$

as a linear operator on \mathcal{X} . More precisely, it holds that $u_m = \|\text{Var}(\hat{f}_{\alpha_m})\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm.

3.2.2 The SOLIT rule

Now let $\beta > 0$ be a fixed parameter, e.g., $\beta = 1$. In the end, β can be seen as a tuning parameter of SOLIT, even though the results proven later hold independent of its specific value.

For $m_1, m_2 \in \{0, 1, \dots, m_{\max}\}$, we define the *deterministic* part of the comparison between m_1 and m_2 as

$$B_{m_1, m_2} := \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_1}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_2}} \right] \right\| = \|f_{\alpha_{m_1}} - f_{\alpha_{m_2}}\|, \quad \text{with } f_{\alpha} = q_{\alpha}(T^*T)T^*Tf^{\dagger},$$

the *random* part as

$$N_{m_1, m_2} := \|Z_{\alpha_{m_1}} - Z_{\alpha_{m_2}}\|, \quad \text{with } Z_{\alpha} := q_{\alpha}(T^*T)T^*Z,$$

and the *variance* (arising from the random part) as

$$V_{m_1, m_2} := \text{tr} \left(\text{Var}(\hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_1}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_2}}) \right) = \sigma^2 \mathbb{E} [N_{m_1, m_2}^2] = \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k (q_{\alpha_{m_1}}(\lambda_k) - q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\lambda_k))^2.$$

These terms arise naturally from the identity

$$\hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_1}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_2}} = (f_{\alpha_{m_1}} - f_{\alpha_{m_2}}) + \sigma (Z_{\alpha_{m_1}} - Z_{\alpha_{m_2}}).$$

Note that $B_{m_1, m_2} = B_{m_2, m_1}$, $N_{m_1, m_2} = N_{m_2, m_1}$ and $V_{m_1, m_2} = V_{m_2, m_1}$, but we often use such notation with the convention that the first index is smaller than the second index. Given $m_1 \leq m_2$, it holds that $\alpha_{m_1} \geq \alpha_{m_2}$ and $0 \leq q_{\alpha_{m_1}}(\lambda_k) \leq q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\lambda_k)$ by the filter properties in Definition 1. Thus,

$$V_{m_1, m_2} = \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k (q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\lambda_k) - q_{\alpha_{m_1}}(\lambda_k))^2 \leq \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\lambda_k)^2 = V_{m_2} < \infty.$$

Similar to the spirit of standard Lepskiĭ-type principles, we introduce an *oracle* choice $\alpha_* := \alpha_{m_*}$, which is defined as

$$m_* := \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \max_{m_2 > m_1 \geq m} (B_{m_1, m_2}^2 - \beta^2 V_{m_1, m_2}) \leq 0 \right\}, \quad (17)$$

see also [37]; If the set in (17) is empty, we define $m_* = m_{\max}$. Note that m_* is deterministic, and independent of the noise Z . However, this oracle rule is practically useless, since B_{m_1, m_2} is not accessible. A natural modification is to replace B_{m_1, m_2} by its empirical counterpart

$$\hat{B}_{m_1, m_2} := \|\hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_1}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_2}}\|.$$

This leads to the following rule of parameter choice.

Definition 2 (SOLIT). Given a decreasingly ordered set of candidate parameters $\{\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}$, the *Sharp Optimal Lepskiĭ-Inspired Tuning* (SOLIT) rule $\hat{\alpha} := \alpha_{\hat{m}}$ is defined as

$$\hat{m} := \min \left\{ m_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \max_{m_2 > m_1} (\hat{B}_{m_1, m_2} - \eta_{m_1, m_2}) \leq 0 \right\}, \quad (18a)$$

where $\eta_{m_1, m_2} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is some proper threshold given by

$$\eta_{m_1, m_2} = \sigma z_{m_1, m_2}(x_{m_1}) + \beta \sqrt{V_{m_1, m_2}}, \quad (18b)$$

with

$$z_{m_1, m_2}(x) \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathbb{P} \{N_{m_1, m_2} > z_{m_1, m_2}(x)\} = e^{-x}, \quad (18c)$$

and

$$x_m = 2(1 + \gamma) \log \frac{V_{m+1}}{V_0} \quad \text{for } \gamma > 0. \quad (18d)$$

3.3 Adaptive minimax convergence rates via SOLIT

With the minimax paradigm from Section 2, we are now in position to derive results for filter based regularization (2) with α chosen according to SOLIT.

3.3.1 An oracle inequality

Using the results from [37], we can now state the following oracle inequality:

Theorem 3.4 (Oracle inequality [37]). *Assume the model in (1), and that Assumptions 1 and 4 hold. Let $\hat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha(T^*T)T^*Y$ with $q_\alpha(\cdot)$ an ordered filter and let the oracle choice α_{m_*} in (17) and the SOLIT rule $\alpha_{\hat{m}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \equiv \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}$ in (16a)–(16c) with $\hat{m} \equiv \hat{m}(\beta, \gamma)$ in Definition 2. Then, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{\hat{m}}} - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \leq C_{1, m_*} \mathcal{R}_{m_*} + (\sqrt{\mathcal{R}_{m_*}} + C_{2, m_*})^2,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{m_*} := \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_*}} - f^\dagger\|^2]$, and

$$C_{1, m_*} := \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\theta_1^\gamma - 1} \left(\frac{V_0}{V_{m_*}} \right)^{1+\gamma} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\theta_1^\gamma - 1},$$

and

$$C_{2, m_*} := \beta\sqrt{V_{m_*}} + \sqrt{2U_{m_*} \left(2(1+\gamma) \log \frac{V_{m_*}}{V_0} + \log(1+m_{\max}) \right)}.$$

Proof. This can be shown by casting the abstract and general result developed in [37] into our particular setup. To this end, we only need to check the following two conditions:

- (i) Decreasingly ordered bias, i.e.

$$\|f_{\alpha_m} - f^\dagger\| \leq \|f_{\alpha_{m_*}} - f^\dagger\| \quad \text{for all } m > m_*.$$

- (ii) Exponentially growing variance, i.e.

$$\sum_{m > m_*} \left(\frac{V_{m_*}}{V_m} \right)^\gamma \leq C < \infty,$$

with C a constant independent of m_* and γ .

Note that the properties (1) and (2) of ordered filter $q_\alpha(\cdot)$ in Definition 1, in particular, the assumptions $C_q'' = 1$ and $q_\alpha(\cdot) \geq 0$, imply that

$$0 \leq 1 - \lambda_k q_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\lambda_k) \leq 1 - \lambda_k q_\alpha(\lambda_k) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and } \tilde{\alpha} < \alpha.$$

Thus, the condition (i) above is satisfied.

From (16b) it follows that

$$\frac{V_{m_*}}{V_{m_*+k}} = \frac{V_{m_*}}{V_{m_*+1}} \dots \frac{V_{m_*+k-1}}{V_{m_*+k}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\theta_1} \right)^k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Further, noting $\theta_1 > 1$, we have

$$\sum_{m > m_*} \left(\frac{V_{m_*}}{V_m} \right)^\gamma \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\theta_1} \right)^{k\gamma} = \frac{1}{\theta_1^\gamma - 1},$$

i.e. the condition (ii) above is also satisfied for every $\gamma > 0$.

Then, the assertion of this theorem follows immediately from Theorem B.1 and Proposition B.2 in the supplement of [37]. \square

Remark 3.5. In many cases, we have $v_0/v_{m_*} \rightarrow 0$ as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, and then $C_{1,m_*} \rightarrow 0$. Thus, the price that one needs to pay for the SOLIT rule, in comparison with the oracle choice, is asymptotically determined by C_{2,m_*} . The first term in C_{2,m_*} can be bounded using the fact that $v_{m_*} \leq \mathcal{R}_{m_*}$. Note that U_m are increasing with respect to m , and we can thus bound the second term in C_{2,m_*} by bounding m_* from above. The term $\log(1 + m_{\max})$ in C_{2,m_*} is of order $\log \log(1/\sigma^2)$ by (16b), thus being asymptotically negligible in usual situations. \triangleleft

3.3.2 Oracle risks

Next we recall some results on the convergence rates of a priori choice rules for parameters in the literature. To state those, we require a rather general assumption on the decay behaviour of the singular values. Functionals of T^*T can be determined by functionals on eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of T^*T , for instance, $\text{tr}(T^*T) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k$. Calculations that involve summations over $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be formulated as Lebesgue–Stieltjes integrals with respect to the counting measure

$$\Sigma(x) := \Sigma([x, \infty)) := \#\{k \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_k \geq x\}. \quad (19)$$

We employ the techniques developed in [8] to tackle the difficulty caused by the discontinuity of $\Sigma(\cdot)$ and assume:

Assumption 4 (Smooth surrogate). 1. There exists a continuous surrogate function $S : (0, \lambda_1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ of $\Sigma(\cdot)$ in (19) satisfying

$$\liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{S(\alpha)}{\Sigma(\alpha)} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \alpha S(\alpha) = 0.$$

2. There exists a constant $C_S > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \Sigma(t) dt \leq C_S S(\alpha) \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Lemma 3.6 (Bias–variance decomposition [8]). *Assume the model in (1) and suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 and 4 hold. Let $\hat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha(T^*T)T^*Y$ with $q_\alpha(\cdot)$ an ordered filter. Then there exist constants C_b and C_v such that*

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_\alpha - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \leq C_b \varphi(\alpha)^2 + C_v \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha)}{\alpha} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}.$$

More precisely, $C_b := C_\varphi^2 \rho^2$ and $C_v := C_S \max\{C'_q, C''_q\}^2$, with C'_q and $C''_q \equiv 1$ as in Definition 1, and C_φ in Assumption 2.

Proof. It follows essentially from Theorem 3 in [8]. As we slightly simplify (or modify) the requirement on the smooth surrogate of [8], we provide below the upper bound on the variance part for completeness. Let $C_q := \max\{C'_q, C''_q\}$. Then, by Definition 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_\alpha - \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{f}_\alpha \right] \right\|^2 \right] &= \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k q_\alpha(\lambda_k)^2 = -\sigma^2 \int_0^\infty x q_\alpha(x)^2 d\Sigma(x) \\ &\leq C_q^2 \sigma^2 \left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2} \int_0^\alpha x d\Sigma(x) - \int_\alpha^\infty \frac{1}{x} d\Sigma(x) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \alpha \Sigma(\alpha) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} (\alpha S(\alpha)) (\Sigma(\alpha)/S(\alpha)) = 0$, by Assumption 4(1). Further, we apply partial integration and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \widehat{f}_\alpha - \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{f}_\alpha \right] \right\|^2 \right] &\leq C_q^2 \sigma^2 \left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2} \int_0^\alpha x d\Sigma(x) - \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_\alpha^\infty d\Sigma(x) \right) \\ &= C_q^2 \sigma^2 \left(-\frac{\Sigma(\alpha)}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \int_0^\alpha \Sigma(x) dx + \frac{\Sigma(\alpha)}{\alpha} \right) \\ &\leq C_S C_q^2 \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha)}{\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Assumption 4(2). \square

Remark 3.7. In fact, the term $C_b \varphi(\alpha)^2$ in Lemma 3.6 is an upper bound for the squared bias part $\|f_\alpha - f^\dagger\|^2$ and the term $C_v \sigma^2 S(\alpha)/\alpha$ is for the variance part $\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{f}_\alpha - f_\alpha\|^2]$. In order to derive an as sharp upper bound for the risk as possible, one is often searching for the smallest possible smooth surrogate $S(\cdot)$ of $\Sigma(\cdot)$. For such $S(\cdot)$, we usually have $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} S(\alpha)/\Sigma(\alpha) < \infty$, even though this is not required in Assumption 4 (cf. Section 4). In this situation, the bounds in Lemma 3.6 are often sharp up to multiplying constants, since they lead to minimax optimality in order in many situations, as detailed in [8]. \triangleleft

As a consequence, we can find a reasonable α by minimizing the upper bound of the risk in Lemma 3.6. Recall that we consider candidate parameters in $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_1, \theta_2} = \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}$, a discrete subset of \mathcal{A} . Thus, we define

$$m_\diamond := \arg \min_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left(C_b \varphi(\alpha_m)^2 + C_v \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_m)}{\alpha_m} \right). \quad (20)$$

Based on it, the ordered filters are able to achieve (up to possible logarithmic factors) the minimax optimal rates over various smoothness classes for mildly and severely ill-posed problems (cf. [8]). Recall, however, that the performance of SOLIT is evaluated with respect to a different oracle rule defined in (17). Thus, an important step in deriving the explicit rates for ordered filters with the SOLIT rule in particular situations is to investigate the relations between these two oracle rules.

Theorem 3.8 (Comparison of oracles). *Assume the model in (1) and suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 and 4 hold. Let $\widehat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha(T^*T)T^*Y$ with $q_\alpha(\cdot)$ an ordered filter. Let also m_* be defined in (17), and m_\diamond in (20). Then, $m_* \leq \log_{\theta_1}(C_1 C_2 S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})/\alpha_{m_\diamond})$ and, for $f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)$,*

$$\mathcal{R}_{m_*} \leq C_1(2\beta^2 + 4)\mathcal{R}_{m_\diamond} \leq C_1(2\beta^2 + 4) \min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_1, \theta_2}} \left(C_b \varphi(\alpha)^2 + C_v \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha)}{\alpha} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_m = \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{f}_{\alpha_m} - f^\dagger\|^2]$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $C_1 = 1 + \max\{(\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 \beta^2, \theta_2(\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^{-2} \beta^{-2}\}$ and C_2 is a constant depending only on ρ, φ, S, C'_q .

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{A}_{\theta_1, \theta_2} = \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}$ in (16a)–(16c). We define

$$m_{**} := \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : B_m^2 \leq (\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 \beta^2 v_m \right\}$$

where $B_m := \|f_{\alpha_m} - f^\dagger\|$. Note that B_m is decreasing (see the proof of Theorem 3.4), while v_m is increasing, with respect to m . Thus, m_{**} is well-defined.

We split the proof into four steps.

Step 1. We will show $m_* \leq m_{**}$. To this end, we consider $m_2 > m_1 > m_{**}$. The ordered property and $C_q'' = 1$ in Definition 1 imply that

$$B_{m_1, m_2}^2 = \|f_{\alpha_{m_2}} - f_{\alpha_{m_1}}\|^2 \leq \|f^\dagger - f_{\alpha_{m_1}}\|^2 = B_{m_1}^2 \leq (\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 \beta^2 v_{m_1},$$

where the last inequality is due to $m_1 > m_{**}$ and the definition of m_{**} .

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{m_1, m_2} &= \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k (q_{\alpha_{m_1}}(\lambda_k) - q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\lambda_k))^2 \\ &= v_{m_1} + v_{m_2} - 2\sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k q_{\alpha_{m_1}}(\lambda_k) q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\lambda_k) \\ &\geq v_{m_1} + v_{m_2} - 2\sqrt{v_{m_1} v_{m_2}} \\ &= v_{m_1} (\sqrt{v_{m_2}/v_{m_1}} - 1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note further that $v_{m_2}/v_{m_1} \geq \theta_1 > 1$ from (16b). Then,

$$v_{m_1, m_2} \geq v_{m_1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{v_{m_2}}{v_{m_1}}} - 1 \right)^2 \geq (\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 v_{m_1}.$$

Combining the derived inequalities above, we obtain

$$B_{m_1, m_2}^2 \leq (\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 \beta^2 v_{m_1} \leq \beta^2 v_{m_1, m_2}.$$

Namely, m_{**} lies in the set in (17), so $m_* \leq m_{**}$.

Step 2. We will show $\mathcal{R}_{m_*} \lesssim \mathcal{R}_{m_{**}}$. Because of $m_* \leq m_{**}$ and the definition of m_* in (17), it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_*}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_{**}}} \right\|^2 \right] = B_{m_*, m_{**}}^2 + v_{m_*, m_{**}} \leq (1 + \beta^2) v_{m_*, m_{**}} \leq (1 + \beta^2) v_{m_{**}},$$

where the last inequality is due to the ordered property and nonnegativity of $q_\alpha(\cdot)$, see Definition 1. Further, by the triangle inequality, we obtain, for $f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{m_*} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_*}} - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_*}} - \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_{**}}} \right\|^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_{**}}} - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2(1 + \beta^2) v_{m_{**}} + 2\mathcal{R}_{m_{**}} \\ &\leq (2\beta^2 + 4) \mathcal{R}_{m_{**}}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. We will show $\mathcal{R}_{m_{**}} \lesssim \mathcal{R}_{m_\diamond}$. We consider two cases:

- Case: $m_\diamond \geq m_{**}$. The definition of m_{**} and the increasing of v_m imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{m_{**}} = v_{m_{**}} + B_{m_{**}}^2 &\leq (1 + (\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 \beta^2) v_{m_{**}} \\ &\leq (1 + (\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 \beta^2) v_{m_\diamond} \\ &\leq (1 + (\sqrt{\theta_1} - 1)^2 \beta^2) \mathcal{R}_{m_\diamond}. \end{aligned}$$

- Case: $m_\diamond < m_{**}$. The definition of m_{**} and the decreasing of B_m imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{m_{**}} &= v_{m_{**}} + B_{m_{**}}^2 && \leq \theta_2 v_{m_{**}-1} + B_{m_{**}-1}^2 \\
&&& \leq \left(\frac{\theta_2}{(\sqrt{\theta_1}-1)^2 \beta^2} + 1 \right) B_{m_{**}-1}^2 \\
&&& \leq \left(\frac{\theta_2}{(\sqrt{\theta_1}-1)^2 \beta^2} + 1 \right) B_{m_\diamond}^2 \\
&&& \leq \left(\frac{\theta_2}{(\sqrt{\theta_1}-1)^2 \beta^2} + 1 \right) \mathcal{R}_{m_\diamond},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality above is due to (16b).

Thus, combining both cases, we have $\mathcal{R}_{m_{**}} \leq C_1 \mathcal{R}_{m_\diamond}$ with $C_1 := 1 + \max\{(\sqrt{\theta_1}-1)^2 \beta^2, \theta_2(\sqrt{\theta_1}-1)^{-2} \beta^{-2}\}$. This together with Step 2 and Lemma 3.6 leads to the second part of the assertion.

Step 4. We will show $m_* \lesssim \log(S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})/\alpha_\diamond)$. By the definition of m_\diamond in (20), and $v_0 = \sigma^2$, we have

$$C_b \varphi(\alpha_{m_\diamond})^2 + C_v \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}} \leq C_2 v_0 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}},$$

where C_2 is a constant depending only on C_b, C_v, φ and S . The forms of C_b, C_v in Lemma 3.6 further imply that C_1 depends only on ρ, φ, S and C'_q .

Note that

$$v_{m_{**}} \leq \mathcal{R}_{m_{**}} \leq C_1 \left(C_b \varphi(\alpha_{m_\diamond})^2 + C_v \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}} \right) \leq C_1 C_2 v_0 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}},$$

and, due to (16b), that $v_{m_{**}} \geq v_0 \theta_1^{m_{**}}$. Thus,

$$m_* \leq m_{**} \leq \log_{\theta_1} \frac{C_1 C_2 S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}},$$

which is the first part of the assertion. \square

Remark 3.9. In usual cases, the upper bound of \mathcal{R}_{m_\diamond} in the form given in Lemma 3.6 tends to 0 as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. In particular, we have $\sigma^2 S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})/\alpha_{m_\diamond} \rightarrow 0$, and thus $C_1 C_2 S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})/\alpha_{m_\diamond} \leq 1/\sigma^2$ for sufficiently small σ . This together with Theorem 3.8 implies that $m_* \leq -\log_{\theta_1}(\sigma^2)$. Moreover, note that

$$U_m := \sigma^2 \max_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k q_{\alpha_m}(\lambda_k)^2 \leq \sigma^2 \max_{k \in \mathbb{N}} q_{\alpha_m}(\lambda_k) \leq \frac{C'_q \sigma^2}{\alpha_m},$$

where the inequalities are based on the filter property in Definition 1(i). Thus, the (possible) price of adaptation for SOLIT in Theorem 3.4 is an additional term of order $\sigma^2(-\log \sigma^2)/\alpha_{m_*}$. \triangleleft

4 Adaptive minimax rates via SOLIT

Combining Theorems 3.4 and 3.8, we can derive the minimax adaptation rates in various cases for the SOLIT rule $\hat{\alpha}$ in Definition 2.

4.1 The mildly ill-posed case

We further require a lower bound on the variance part that arises in the bias–variance decomposition (cf. Lemma 3.6). This is formulated as follows.

Assumption 5. There exists a similar lower bound on v_m as the upper bound in Lemma 3.6, namely, for some constant c_v ,

$$v_m \geq c_v \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_m)}{\alpha_m}, \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Note that $v_m/\sigma^2 = V_{T,q} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k (q_\alpha(\lambda_k))^2$, and $\lambda_k \asymp k^{-a}$ by (5). One can show that Assumption 5 holds for common ordered filters, including spectral cut-off, (iterated) Tikhonov, Landweber and Showalter, with $S(x) \asymp x^{-1/a}$. For instance, in case of spectral cut-off, i.e., $q_\alpha(\lambda) = \lambda^{-1} \mathbf{1}\{\lambda \geq \alpha\}$, it holds that

$$\frac{v_m}{\sigma^2} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\lambda_k \geq \alpha\}}{\lambda_k} \gtrsim \int_0^{\infty} x^a \mathbf{1}\{x^{-a} \gtrsim \alpha\} dx \asymp \alpha^{-\frac{a+1}{a}},$$

which is $S(\alpha)/\alpha$ up to a multiplying constant.

Theorem 4.1 (Mildly ill-posed problems). *Assume the model in (1), and suppose that the eigenvalues of the forward operator decay at a polynomial rate as in (5) with $a > 1$. Let Assumptions 2 and 5 hold, where the index function $\varphi \equiv \varphi_{\nu,\tau}$ is given in (8) with the parameters $\nu > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, or $\nu = 0$ and $\tau > 0$. Let $\hat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha(T^*T)T^*Y$ with an ordered filter q_α , and consider SOLIT $\alpha_{\hat{m}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_1,\theta_2} \equiv \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}$ in (16a)–(16c) with $\hat{m} \equiv \hat{m}(\beta, \gamma)$ as in Definition 2 as the parameter choice rule. Then, for some constant $C > 0$,*

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{\hat{m}}} - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \leq C(\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1/a+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{-\frac{2\tau(1+1/a)}{2\nu+1+1/a}}.$$

Proof. It follows from the polynomial decay of $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that there is a smooth surrogate function S satisfying Assumption 4, which takes the form of $S(x) \asymp x^{-1/a}$. Recall that the index function φ in (8) meets the requirement of Assumption 1. Thus, applying Lemma 3.6, we obtain, with m_\diamond in (20),

$$\alpha_{m_\diamond} \asymp (\sigma^2)^{\frac{1}{2\nu+1+1/a}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\tau}{2\nu+1+1/a}},$$

and

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_\diamond}} - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \lesssim \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}} \asymp (\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1/a+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{-\frac{2\tau(1+1/a)}{2\nu+1+1/a}}.$$

Further, by Theorem 3.8 and Assumption 5, it holds that

$$\sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_*})}{\alpha_{m_*}} \lesssim v_{m_*} \leq \mathcal{R}_{m_*} \lesssim \varphi(\alpha_{m_\diamond})^2 + \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}} \asymp \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})}{\alpha_{m_\diamond}},$$

which yields $\alpha_{m_\diamond} \lesssim \alpha_{m_*}$. Hence, applying again Theorem 3.8 (see also Remark 3.9), we have $m_* \lesssim \log(1/\sigma^2)$ and $u_{m_*} \lesssim \sigma^2/\alpha_{m_*} \lesssim \sigma^2/\alpha_{m_\diamond}$. Note that $m_{\max} \asymp \log(1/\sigma^2)$ by Assumption 5 and the form of $S(\cdot)$, see also Remark 3.5. It follows that C_{2,m_*} in Theorem 3.4 satisfies $C_{2,m_*}^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 \log(1/\sigma^2)/\alpha_{m_\diamond} \ll \sigma^2 S(\alpha_{m_\diamond})/\alpha_{m_\diamond}$. Thus, the assertion of theorem follows now from Theorems 3.4 and 3.8. \square

Remark 4.2. The convergence rate in Theorem 4.1 is minimax optimal for the function class $\mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)$, see e.g. Theorem 1 in [33]. Note that the SOLIT rule does not require the exact smoothness of the truth, namely, the parameters ν and τ of the index function φ . Thus, the ordered filters with the SOLIT rule automatically adapt to the smoothness of the true. In particular, when $\nu > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, it corresponds to the polynomial smoothness, and when $\nu = 0$ and $\tau > 0$, it corresponds to the logarithmic smoothness. In the latter case, the convergence rate in Theorem 4.1 is of order $(-\log \sigma^2)^{-2\tau}$, because of $\nu = 0$. \triangleleft

4.2 Severely ill-posed problems

In this section, we consider severely ill-posed problems, namely, that the eigenvalues λ_k of T^*T in (4) decay exponentially as in (6) for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b, \vartheta > 0$.

4.2.1 Technical challenges

We start with the additional technical issues arising from severe ill-posedness.

The super fast decay of eigenvalues poses difficulty in the selection of candidate parameters (cf. Section 3.2.1): Finding parameters with geometrically changing variance may be impossible. For instance, in case of spectral cut-off, we have $\mathcal{A} = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\}$ and consequently, $V_{T,q}$ can be seen as a function of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$V_{T,q}(n) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\lambda_k}.$$

It can be readily seen that Assumption 3 can be fulfilled only if the eigenvalues λ_k decay not faster than $k^a \exp(-bk^\vartheta)$ with parameters $b > 0$, $a < 0$ and $\vartheta \in [0, 1]$. As soon as $\vartheta > 1$, we already have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_{T,q}(n)}{V_{T,q}(n-1)} = \infty,$$

so that (15) cannot be valid for any sequence of regularization parameters in \mathcal{A} .

Another difficulty is that the analysis technique of replacing summation over eigenvalues by integral with respect to surrogate function (cf. Assumption 4; originally developed in [8]) are no longer sharp in rates, but the gap is only in log factors. More precisely, provided that $\lambda_k \asymp k^a \exp(-bk^\vartheta)$ with $b, \vartheta > 0$, the variance of spectral cut-off is of order

$$\sigma^2 \alpha (-\log \alpha)^{1/\vartheta - 1} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \equiv \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\},$$

while the bound in Lemma 3.6 gives that the variance part is of order $\sigma^2 \alpha (-\log \alpha)^{1/\vartheta}$. In the severely ill-posed situation, a sharp bound on the variance part remains open for general (ordered) filters, and is an interesting topic for future research.

4.2.2 Performance of SOLIT

As mentioned above, the upper bound on the variance part in Lemma 3.6 is sub-optimal in case of serious ill-posedness. Thus, we need a weaker assumption than Assumption 5 as follows.

Assumption 6. We assume a lower bound on v_m slightly smaller than the upper bound in Lemma 3.6, more precisely, for some constant c_v ,

$$v_m \geq c_v \sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_m)}{(-\log \alpha_m) \alpha_m}, \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Similar as Assumption 5 for mildly ill-posed problems, one can show that Assumption 6 is satisfied for common ordered filters, e.g., spectral cut-off, (iterated) Tikhonov, Landweber and Showalter, for severely ill-posed problems. As a showcase, we consider the spectral cut-off $q_\alpha(\lambda) = \lambda^{-1} \mathbf{1}\{\lambda \geq \alpha\}$. Then, by (6), we obtain

$$\frac{v_m}{\sigma^2} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\lambda_k \geq \alpha\}}{\lambda_k} \gtrsim \int_0^{\infty} x^a \exp(bx^\vartheta) \mathbf{1}\{x^{-a} \exp(-bx^\vartheta) \gtrsim \alpha\} dx \asymp \frac{(-\log \alpha)^{\frac{1-\vartheta}{\vartheta}}}{\alpha}.$$

Note that the exponential decay of eigenvalues in (6) implies that $S(x) \asymp (-\log x)^{1/\vartheta}$. Thus, Assumption 6 holds for the spectral cut-off.

Theorem 4.3 (Severely ill-posed problems). *Assume the model in (1), and suppose that the eigenvalues of the forward operator decay at an exponential rate as in (6) with $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b > 0$ and $0 < \vartheta \leq 1/2$. Let Assumptions 2, 4 and 6 hold, where the index function $\varphi \equiv \varphi_{\nu, \tau}$ is given in (8) with the parameters $\nu > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, or $\nu = 0$ and $\tau > 0$. Let $\hat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha(T^*T)T^*Y$ with an ordered filter q_α , and consider SOLIT $\alpha_{\hat{m}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \equiv \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}$ as in (16a)–(16c) with $\hat{m} \equiv \hat{m}(\beta, \gamma)$ as in Definition 2 as the parameter choice rule. Then, for some constant $C > 0$,*

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_{\varphi_{\nu, \tau}}(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{\hat{m}}} - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \leq C(\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu/\vartheta - 2\tau}{2\nu+1}}.$$

Proof. It can be proven in exactly the same way as Theorem 4.1, so, to avoid repetitions, we list only the differences in detailed computation:

- The smooth surrogate function takes the form of

$$S(x) \asymp \left(-\log x + \frac{a}{\vartheta} \log(-\log x) \right)^{1/\vartheta} \asymp (-\log x)^{1/\vartheta}.$$

- The convergence rate corresponding to m_\diamond in (20) is

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{\alpha_{m_\diamond}} - f^\dagger \right\|^2 \right] \lesssim (\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu/\vartheta - 2\tau}{2\nu+1}},$$

$$\text{with } \alpha_{m_\diamond} \asymp (\sigma^2)^{\frac{1}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\tau+1/\vartheta}{2\nu+1}}.$$

- By Assumption 6 and Theorem 3.8 we have

$$\sigma^2 \frac{S(\alpha_{m_*})}{(-\log \alpha_{m_*})\alpha_{m_*}} \lesssim v_{m_*} \leq \mathcal{R}_{m_*} \lesssim (\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu/\vartheta - 2\tau}{2\nu+1}},$$

which together with the form of $S(\cdot)$ implies that (cf. Remark 3.9)

$$C_{2, m_*}^2 \lesssim m_* u_{m_*} \lesssim \frac{\sigma^2 (-\log \sigma^2)}{\alpha_{m_*}} \lesssim (\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu/\vartheta - 2\tau}{2\nu+1} + 2 - \frac{1}{\vartheta}}.$$

Thus, if $0 < \vartheta \leq 1/2$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_{\hat{m}}} - f^\dagger\|^2] \lesssim (\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu/\vartheta - 2\tau}{2\nu+1}}$ by Theorems 3.4 and 3.8. \square

Remark 4.4. We consider the logarithmic and the polynomial smoothness separately.

First, in case of logarithmic smoothness (i.e., index function φ with $\nu = 0$ and $\tau > 0$), the convergence rate in Theorem 4.3 is in fact of order $(-\log \sigma^2)^{-2\tau}$, which is minimax optimal (cf. [33]). As in the mildly ill-posed problems, the ordered filters with the SOLIT rule perform as well as if the exact smoothness specified by τ were known.

Second, in case of polynomial smoothness (i.e., index function φ with $\nu > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$), the minimax optimal rate on $\mathcal{W}_\varphi(\rho)$ is of order

$$(\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu/\vartheta - 2\tau}{2\nu+1} - \frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}}.$$

The convergence rate in Theorem 4.3 is slower by a factor of $(-\log \sigma^2)^{2\nu/(2\nu+1)}$, and thus not minimax optimal. However, it is unclear whether our slower rate is improvable or not, as it is

required to hold simultaneously over more than one smoothness class. In [38], it is shown that the optimal adaption rate (cf. Section 2) is of order

$$(\sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu}{2\nu+1}} (-\log \sigma^2)^{\frac{2\nu/\vartheta - 2\tau}{2\nu+1}},$$

in the special case of $\vartheta = 1$. This is exactly the same as in Theorem 4.3, which requires though $\vartheta \in (0, 1/2]$. We thus conjecture that the convergence rate of the SOLIT rule would be adaptively minimax optimal over the whole range of smoothness classes specified by the index function φ with $\nu > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. \triangleleft

Remark 4.5 (Highly serious ill-posedness, $\vartheta > 1/2$). There is a restriction on the decaying speed of eigenvalues in Theorem 4.3, more precisely, $\vartheta \leq 1/2$. The reason behind is the sub-optimality of the upper bound on the variance part in Lemma 3.6. If a sharp bound were available, the result of Theorem 4.3 would hold for $\vartheta \leq 1$.

Moreover, in the super fast decaying regime of $\vartheta > 1$, it turns out that the discretization of regularization parameter α uniform in geometric scaling, detailed in (16a)–(16c), is no longer appropriate, as mentioned above. In fact, one should consider instead a smaller set $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\theta_1, \theta_2} = \{\alpha_m; m \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ such that

$$\infty > \theta_2 \geq \frac{\exp((\log v_m)^{1/\vartheta})}{\exp((\log v_{m-1})^{1/\vartheta})} \geq \theta_1 > 1 \quad \text{for all } m.$$

Under such a discretization, it seems to be possible to show that the convergence rate of the SOLIT rule is adaptively minimax optimal for every $\vartheta > 0$. This would require a generalization of Theorem 3.4. Thus, the details are left as part of future research. \triangleleft

5 Implementation and numerical simulations

To investigate the performance of SOLIT in practice, we start with a potential implementation. Note that for suitable filters $q_\alpha(\cdot)$, it is possible to implement the computation of \hat{f}_α without using the SVD of T . As an exemplary case we consider the Tikhonov regularization. Here \hat{f}_α can be computed as the solution of

$$(\alpha \text{Id} + T^*T) \hat{f}_\alpha = T^*Y,$$

where Id denotes the identity operator on \mathcal{X} . Similar computational possibilities exist e.g. for Landweber and Showalter regularizations. Given an SVD-free method to compute \hat{f}_α , it is also possible to compute the SOLIT parameter $\hat{\alpha}$ without making use of the SVD, as we will detail below.

5.1 Choosing the candidate parameters

To implement SOLIT, we first have to generate a sequence of regularization parameters $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_{m_{\max}} > 0$ obeying (16b). This can be done using a line search for the function $V(\alpha) := \text{tr}(\text{Var}(\hat{f}_\alpha))$. By recursively splitting an interval into halves, this algorithm provides an approximation $\hat{\alpha}$ to the solution α of $V(\alpha) = \lambda$ with $|V(\alpha) - V(\hat{\alpha})| \leq \epsilon$ for a prescribed error level ϵ in $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon))$ steps. If no such $\hat{\alpha}$ exists, an alternative value $\hat{\alpha}$ and the corresponding error ϵ is returned.

Now we fix a tuning parameter $\theta > 1$, set $\theta_2 = \theta + \frac{\theta-1}{2}$, $\theta_1 = \theta - \frac{\theta-1}{2}$ and choose α_0 as the line search approximation of $V(\alpha_0) = \sigma^2$ with $\epsilon = \frac{\theta-1}{2}$. If no such approximation exists, then

we take the smallest possible value α_0 such that $V(\alpha_0) > \sigma^2$ and enlarge θ_2 correspondingly. Given α_{m-1} , the relation (16b) corresponds to

$$\log(\theta_1) + \log(V(\alpha_{m-1})) \leq \log(V(\alpha_m)) \leq \log(\theta_2) + \log(V(\alpha_{m-1})),$$

i.e., we can choose α_m as the line search approximation to the equation $\log(V(\alpha_m)) = \log(\theta) + \log(V(\alpha_{m-1}))$ with $\epsilon = \frac{\theta-1}{2}$. Again, if no such solution exists we take a potentially larger α_m and enlarge θ_2 .

Note that the above procedure is in fact just a discrete approximation of the technique used in the proof of Lemma 3.3. However, it also works in case of discontinuous filters $\alpha \mapsto q_\alpha(\lambda)$ as the sequence needs to be constructed only until a minimal value $\alpha_{m_{\max}} > 0$. From this point of view, the upper bound in (16b) is trivial (as only finitely many α s are considered), but the above procedure ensures a good (i.e., small) value of θ_2 .

Since $\text{Var}(\hat{f}_\alpha) = \sigma^2 T^* T q_\alpha (T^* T)^2$, we obtain in case of Tikhonov regularization that $V(\alpha) = \sigma^2 \text{tr}((\alpha \text{Id} + T^* T)^{-2} T^* T)$. To compute this function exactly, one has to evaluate $T^* T$ on an arbitrary orthonormal system of \mathcal{X} , which numerically is as expensive as computing the SVD itself. However, by making use of random trace estimation algorithms [2], the function V can be approximated with high accuracy without computing the SVD and with reasonable computational cost.

5.2 Computing the critical values $z_{m,m'}$

Given the regularization parameters α_m , the implementation of SOLIT only requires thresholds in (18b), which are given in terms of the critical values $z_{m_1, m_2}(x)$ in (18c). The latter correspond to quantiles of the random variable

$$N_{m_1, m_2}^2 = \|Z_{\alpha_{m_1}} - Z_{\alpha_{m_2}}\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k (q_{\alpha_{m_1}}(\lambda_k) - q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\lambda_k))^2 \varepsilon_k^2$$

with $\varepsilon_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, i.e., standard Gaussian random variables. In our implementation, the operator T is approximated by a matrix A , and hence the sum is truncated at $k = n$. This implies that N_{m_1, m_2} has the same distribution as

$$Z_{m_1, m_2} := \varepsilon^\top A_{m_1, m_2} \varepsilon$$

with the matrix $A_{m_1, m_2} = A^* A ((q_{\alpha_{m_1}}(A^* A) - q_{\alpha_{m_2}}(A^* A))^2)$ and a random vector $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$, i.e., n -dimensional standard Gaussian random vector. Note that Z_{m_1, m_2} is a generalized χ^2 random variable, the distribution of which can either be simulated by a Monte Carlo method or be approximated by a non-central χ^2 approximation as described in [24]. There it is shown that the distribution of $\chi_l^2(\delta)$ (where l is the number of degrees of freedom and δ the non-centrality parameter) is a reasonable approximation of the distribution of Z_{m_1, m_2} in the following sense. With $c_k = \text{tr}(A_{m_1, m_2}^k)$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and the values $s_1 = c_3/c_2^{3/2}$ and $s_2 = c_4/c_2^2$, which correspond multiples of the skewness and kurtosis of Z_{m_1, m_2} , we define

if $s_1^2 > s_2$ $a = \frac{1}{s_1 - \sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2}}$, $\delta = s_1 a^3 - a^2$, $l = a^2 - 2\delta$, and

if $s_1^2 \leq s_2$ $\delta = 0$, $l = \frac{c_3^3}{c_2^3}$, $a = \frac{1}{s_1}$.

Then it holds

$$\mathbb{P}\{Z_{m_1, m_2} > t\} \approx \mathbb{P}\left\{\chi_l^2(\delta) > \sqrt{2}a \frac{t - c_1}{\sqrt{2c_2}} + l + \delta\right\}.$$

We compared this approximation with the exact distribution of Z (as computed in [10]) and Monte Carlo simulations and found that the error in the quantiles is overwhelmingly small, and hence we use this approximation in our implementation. The necessary traces can once more be computed efficiently and without using the SVD of T by means of (random) approximations, see [2].

5.3 Numerical simulations

In this section we will report on numerical experiments supporting the minimax behaviour of SOLIT. We therefore follow the simulation of convergence rates in [40] and consider the same synthetic problems and there:

Antiderivative. A mildly ill-posed problem with Fredholm integral operator $T : \mathbf{L}^2([0, 1]) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2([0, 1])$ such that $(Tf)'' = -f$ for all $f \in \mathbf{L}^2([0, 1])$, see also [16] for details. It is known that the eigenvalues λ_k of T^*T have the decay behaviour $\lambda_k \asymp k^{-4}$.

2D-Gradiometry. A severely ill-posed problem, which occurs when one aims to reconstruct the earth's gravitational potential on the surface from satellite measurements of the potentials second derivative in radial direction. In the two-dimensional case, using Fourier-coefficients $\hat{f}(k)$, the explicit formula is

$$(Tf)(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |k|(|k| + 1) R^{-|k|-2} \exp(ikx) \hat{f}(k)$$

for the corresponding operator $T : \mathbf{L}^2(S, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(RS, \mu)$ with the surface measure μ on the unit sphere $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x\|_2 = 1\}$ and the relative radius $R > 1$ of the satellite is known, see, e.g., [21]. Thus, the eigenvalues λ_k of T^*T are given as $\lambda_k = |k|^2(|k| + 1)^2 R^{-2|k|-4}$. Furthermore it follows that the Fourier coefficient $\hat{f}(0)$ cannot be determined from Tf .

Heat. A severely ill-posed problem where one aims at reconstructing the source f in the periodic heat equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x, t) &= \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x, t) & \text{in } & (-\pi, \pi] \times (0, \bar{t}), \\ u(x, 0) &= f(x) & \text{on } & [-\pi, \pi], \\ u(-\pi, t) &= u(\pi, t) & \text{on } & t \in (0, \bar{t}] \end{aligned}$$

from measurements of the final heat distribution $g = u(\cdot, \bar{t})$ with $\bar{t} > 0$. By separation of variables, an explicit representation of $T : \mathbf{L}^2([-\pi, \pi]) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2([-\pi, \pi])$ in form of a Fourier series can be computed, i.e.,

$$(Tf)(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-k^2 \bar{t}) \exp(ikx) \tilde{f}(k),$$

where $\tilde{f}(k)$ is the k -th Fourier coefficient of f . Consequently, the eigenvalues λ_k of T^*T are given by $\lambda_k = \exp(-2k^2 \bar{t})$.

We simulate the rate of convergence for specific exact solutions f^\dagger described below when using three different ordered filters, namely,

- *Tikhonov regularization*, where $q_\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda + \alpha}$. In this case, all requirements of Definition 1 are satisfied with $C'_q = 1$, and the maximal qualification is $\varphi(x) = x$. Moreover, the mapping $\alpha \mapsto q_\alpha(\lambda)$ is obviously continuous and hence Lemma 3.3 is applicable.
- *Showalter's method*, where $q_\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1 - \exp(-\lambda/\alpha)}{\lambda}$. Again, all requirements of Definition 1 are met with $C'_q = 1$ and an arbitrary index function φ . Moreover, the mapping $\alpha \mapsto q_\alpha(\lambda)$ is obviously continuous and hence Lemma 3.3 is applicable.
- *Spectral cut-off regularization*, where $q_\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{[\alpha, \infty)}(\lambda)$. Again, all requirements of Definition 1 are met with $C'_q = 1$ and an arbitrary index function φ , but in this case Lemma 3.3 is not applicable and as discussed in Section 4.2.1 the choice of suitable candidates α 's is questionable.

Besides the rate of convergence, we also depict the *price of adaptation*

$$(\sqrt{\mathcal{R}_{m_*}} + C_{2, m_*})^2 \quad (21)$$

on the right-hand side of the oracle inequality in Theorem 3.8.

5.3.1 The antiderivative problem

We choose the continuous function

$$f^\dagger(x) = x \mathbf{1}_{[0, \frac{1}{2}]}(x) + (1-x) \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1]}(x) \quad (22)$$

as exact solution. As argued in [23], the optimal rate of convergence in this situation is $\mathcal{O}(\sigma^{3/4-\varepsilon})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. To avoid an inverse crime, the exact data $g = T f^\dagger$ is implemented analytically:

$$g(x) = -\frac{x(4x^2 - 3)}{24} \mathbf{1}_{[0, \frac{1}{2}]}(x) + \frac{(x-1)(4x^2 - 8x + 1)}{24} \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1]}(x).$$

In Figure 1 we depict the ideal rate $\mathcal{O}(\sigma^{3/4})$ the convergence rate obtained with SOLIT, the convergence rate obtained by the oracle α_* in (17), and the convergence rate obtained for the optimal choice

$$\alpha_{\text{opt}} := \arg \min_{\alpha \in \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m_{\max}}\}} \|f_\alpha - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}. \quad (23)$$

The results show that SOLIT clearly obtains the minimax rate and yields also a surprisingly small loss compared to the oracle choice. For Tikhonov and Showalter regularization, the oracle choice and the optimal choice cannot even be distinguished, for spectral cut-off regularization (where determining the candidate α 's is more subtle) a less regular behavior can be observed. It is also visible that the price of adaptation (21) is of the same order as the optimal rate, supporting our analysis.

5.3.2 The 2D-gradiometry problem

As $\widehat{f}(0)$ cannot be determined from $T f^\dagger$, we adopt the exact solution from Section 5.3.1 to

$$f^\dagger(x) = \frac{\pi}{2} - |x|, \quad x \in [-\pi, \pi].$$

As discussed in [40], the optimal rate of convergence in this situation is $\mathcal{O}((-\log \sigma)^{-3+\varepsilon})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Again, the ideal data g can be computed analytically as,

$$g(x) = \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2m+1}\right) R^{-2m-3} \cos((2m+1)x), \quad x \in [-\pi, \pi]$$




Figure 1: Simulation results for the antiderivate problem. Depicted are different noise levels σ (x-axis) against empirical mean squared errors $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_\alpha - f \right\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]$ simulated in $M = 10^4$ Monte Carlo runs, for different parameter choices α , namely SOLIT (eq. 18a–18d, ---), optimal alpha (eq. 23,), and the oracle choice (eq. 17, -.-.-). Furthermore shown is the empirical price of adaptation (eq. 21, -.-.-), and a slope (—) indicating the optimal rate of convergence $\mathcal{O}(\sigma^{3/4})$.

and in our implementation we truncate this sum at $m = 128$. In our simulations, we set $R = 2$.

In Figure 2 we again depict besides the ideal rate $\mathcal{O}((-\log \sigma)^{-3})$ the convergence rates obtained by SOLIT, (17) and (23) as well as empirical price of adaptation (21). Despite the faster decay of the singular values it seems that SOLIT still obtains the minimax rate and has again a surprisingly small loss compared to the oracle choice. Furthermore, the price of adaptation (21) is also of the same order as the optimal rate.




Figure 2: Results for the gradiometry problem. Depicted are different noise levels σ (x-axis) against empirical mean squared errors $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_\alpha - f \right\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]$ simulated in $M = 10^4$ Monte Carlo runs, for different parameter choices α , namely SOLIT (eq. 18a–18d, ---), optimal alpha (eq. 23,), and the oracle choice (eq. 17, -.-.-). Furthermore shown is the empirical price of adaptation (eq. 21, -.-.-) and a slope (—) indicating the optimal rate of convergence $\mathcal{O}((-\log \sigma)^{-3})$.

5.3.3 The heat problem

As exact solution we choose again

$$f^\dagger(x) = \frac{\pi}{2} - |x|, \quad x \in [-\pi, \pi].$$

Similarly as in [15, Remark 15] it can be seen that the optimal rate of convergence is $\mathcal{O}((-\log \sigma)^{-3/2+\varepsilon})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Again, the ideal data g can be computed analytically as a infinite sum, which is in our simulations truncated at a different value that the formula used for the implementation of the operator T . We set $\bar{t} = 0.1$.

The results depicted in Figure 3 show once more that the rate obtained for SOLIT is very close to the oracle rate. However, it seems unclear if his rate of convergence equals the minimax rate (which might again be due to the difficulty of choosing suitable candidate parameters α_k), and the behavior of the empirical price of adaptation especially for spectral cut-off regularization is somewhat irregular.




Figure 3: Results for the heat problem. Depicted are different noise levels σ (x-axis) against empirical mean squared errors $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_\alpha - f \right\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]$ simulated in $M = 10^4$ Monte Carlo runs, for different parameter choices α , namely SOLIT (eq. 18a–18d, ---), optimal alpha (eq. 23,), and the oracle choice (eq. 17, -.-.-). Furthermore shown is the empirical price of adaptation (eq. 21, -.-.-) and a slope (—) indicating the optimal rate of convergence $\mathcal{O}((-\log \sigma)^{-3/2})$.

5.3.4 Comparison with the classical Lepskiĭ-type balancing principle

For the sake of completeness, we also compare the performance of SOLIT with the classical Lepskiĭ-type balancing principle (3) for the Tikhonov regularization. For a theoretical analysis of this parameter choice method (3) we refer to [4,27–29,41] and emphasize that in all these papers the tuning parameter $\kappa \geq 1$ has to be chosen in dependence of the noise level σ . However, in our simulations we fix $\kappa = 1$ as in [40], so that the corresponding Lepskiĭ method will empirically perform well though without a theoretical justification, see also [5].

The results depicted in Figure 4 show a comparable behavior for all three testing problems with a slightly superior performance of SOLIT. However, it cannot be expected that the potential difference of a log-factor will be visible in such a simulation. Beyond these numerical findings, we emphasize that SOLIT is proven to yield the optimal rate of convergence in many situations without a need of tuning parameters in dependency of the noise level σ and the ill-posedness of the problem, which is a substantial advantage over the classical Lepskiĭ-type balancing principle.




Figure 4: Comparison of SOLIT with the classical Lepskiĭ-type balancing principle (3) for all three different testing problems with Tikhonov regularization. Depicted are different noise levels σ (x-axis) against empirical mean squared errors $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_\alpha - f \right\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right]$ simulated in $M = 10^4$ Monte Carlo runs, for different parameter choices α , namely, SOLIT (eq. 18a–18d, ---), Lepskiĭ (eq. 3 with $\kappa = 1$,), and the optimal rate of convergence (—).

6 Conclusion and outlook

In the setup of statistical linear inverse problems with white (i.e., independent) Gaussian noises, we have investigated the SOLIT rule of choosing the regularization parameter for (ordered) filter based regularization methods. SOLIT is an automatic and data adaptive procedure, as it requires only the knowledge of forward operator and the noise level. From a computational perspective, it involves $\mathcal{O}(\log \sigma)$ number of computations of the estimator \hat{f}_α and $\mathcal{O}((\log \sigma)^2)$ number of evaluations of the variance estimate $\text{tr}(\text{Var}(\hat{f}_\alpha))$. The overall computational complexity of SOLIT is thus of nearly (i.e., up to log-factors) the same order as that of evaluation of \hat{f}_α for a fixed α . In particular, a singular value decomposition of the forward operator is not required, unless spectral cut-off and its variants are used as regularization methods. In short, SOLIT is piratically attractive for various applications (even with massive data), which has also been demonstrated by our simulation study in Section 5.

Besides desirable empirical performance, the SOLIT rule is shown to attain the sharp order of optimal adaptation rates under various smoothness conditions (including logarithmic and polynomial smoothness) for mildly ill-posed problems. This is in sharp contrast to the standard Lepskiĭ rule, where one often loses unnecessarily a log-factor in the convergence rates. In case of severely ill-posed problems, we have also established the convergence rates for SOLIT under general smoothness conditions, but it remains open whether such rates are adaptively optimal or not.

In addition, we would like to point out that there are at least two ways of estimation of the noise level (required by SOLIT) when it is not available in practice. The one approach is to employ bootstrap procedures as it is done in [37], which allows to estimate the threshold η_{m_1, m_2} (cf. Definition 2) without knowing the noise level. The other approach is to estimate the noise level directly from the data, see, e.g., [1, 30, 36]. Further, it may be possible to extend SOLIT beyond the Gaussian noises. If the distribution of the noises is known, e.g., Poisson, one could modify SOLIT by simply replacing $z_{m_1, m_2}(x)$ (cf. Definition 2) with the $(1 - x)$ -quantile of the noise distribution. Otherwise, one could attempt to estimate such a quantile from the data, e.g., by following the idea in [42]. All of these extensions of SOLIT are interesting topics for future research.

Acknowledgments

FW wants to thank M. Reiss and V. Spokoiny for pointing his attention to the topic at hand and especially the inspiring paper [37] while he was visiting HU Berlin and WIAS. HL is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy–EXC 2067/1-390729940, and acknowledges the support of DFG Collaborative Research Center 1456.

A Adaptation rates

We show a simple and interesting fact that the ordered filters with the posteriori parameter choice $\alpha \asymp \sigma$ attain the sharp order of optimal adaptation rates for logarithmic smoothness classes. This is because the upper bound on MSE in Proposition A.1 below coincides (up to multiplying constants) with the well-known lower bound in this smoothness class (see e.g. [33]).

Proposition A.1 (Noise-level-rule). *Assume the model (1) and that the eigenvalues of T^*T decays as in (6) with either $a > 1$ and $b = 0$, or $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b, \vartheta > 0$. Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 4 hold, where the index function $\varphi = \varphi_{\nu, \tau}$ is given in (8) with the parameters $\nu = 0$ and $0 < \tau < \tau_0 \leq \infty$. Let also $\hat{f}_\alpha = q_\alpha(T^*T)T^*Y$ with $q_\alpha(\cdot)$ be an ordered filter. Then, for the noise-level-rule $\alpha_* \asymp \sigma$, it holds that*

$$\limsup_{\sigma^2 \rightarrow 0} \sup_{0 < \tau < \tau_0} \frac{1}{\psi_{0, \tau}(\sigma^2)} \sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_{\varphi_{0, \tau}}(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_*} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right] < \infty,$$

where $\psi_{0, \tau}(\sigma^2) := (-\log(\sigma^2))^{-2\tau}$.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary $\tau \in (0, \tau_0)$. By Lemma 3.6 we obtain

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_{\varphi_{0, \tau}}(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_*} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right] \lesssim \varphi_{0, \tau}(\sigma)^2 + \sigma^2 \frac{S(\sigma)}{\sigma}. \quad (24)$$

In case of mild ill-posedness, namely, $a > 1$ and $b = 0$, we have the surrogate function $S(x) \asymp x^{-1/a}$, which together with (24) implies

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_{\varphi_{0, \tau}}(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_*} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right] \lesssim (-\log(\sigma^2))^{-2\tau} + \sigma^{1-1/a} \lesssim (-\log(\sigma^2))^{-2\tau}.$$

In case of severe ill-posedness, namely, $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b, \vartheta > 0$, we have the surrogate function $S(x) \asymp (-\log x)^{1/\vartheta}$, which together with (24) implies

$$\sup_{f^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_{\varphi_{0, \tau}}(\rho)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{\alpha_*} - f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right] \lesssim (-\log(\sigma^2))^{-2\tau} + \sigma(-\log \sigma)^{1/\vartheta} \lesssim (-\log(\sigma^2))^{-2\tau}.$$

Combining two cases concludes the proof. \square

References

- [1] A. Y. Aravkin and T. van Leeuwen. Estimating nuisance parameters in inverse problems. *Inverse Problems*, 28(11):115016, 13, 2012.

- [2] H. Avron and S. Toledo. Randomized algorithms for estimating the trace of an implicit symmetric positive semi-definite matrix. *J. ACM*, 58(2):Art. 8, 17, 2011.
- [3] A. Bakushinskii. A general method of constructing regularizing algorithms for a linear ill-posed equation in hilbert space. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 7(3):279–287, 1967.
- [4] F. Bauer and T. Hohage. A Lepskij-type stopping rule for regularized Newton methods. *Inverse Probl.*, 21(6):1975, 2005.
- [5] F. Bauer and M. A. Lukas. Comparing parameter choice methods for regularization of ill-posed problems. *Math. Comput. Simulation*, 81(9):1795–1841, 2011.
- [6] F. Bauer and S. Pereverzev. Regularization without preliminary knowledge of smoothness and error behaviour. *European J. Appl. Math.*, 16(3):303–317, 2005.
- [7] M. Bertero, P. Boccacci, G. Desideri, and G. Vicidomini. Image deblurring with Poisson data: from cells to galaxies. *Inverse Problems*, 25(12), 2009.
- [8] N. Bissantz, T. Hohage, A. Munk, and F. Ruymgaart. Convergence rates of general regularization methods for statistical inverse problems and applications. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(6):2610–2636, 2007.
- [9] L. Cavalier and A. Tsybakov. Sharp adaptation for inverse problems with random noise. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 123(3):323–354, 2002.
- [10] A. Das and W. S. Geisler. A method to integrate and classify normal distributions. *Journal of Vision*, 21(10):1–1, 09 2021.
- [11] H. Engl, M. Hanke, and A. Neubauer. *Regularization of Inverse Problems*. Springer, 1996.
- [12] H. W. Engl and W. Rundell, editors. *Inverse problems in diffusion processes*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA; Gesellschaft für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik, Regensburg, 1995.
- [13] M. S. Ermakov. Minimax estimation of the solution of an ill-posed problem of convolution type. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 25(3):28–39, 1989.
- [14] G. K. Golubev and R. Z. Khasminskii. A statistical approach to some inverse problems for partial differential equations. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 35(2):51–66, 1999.
- [15] T. Hohage. Regularization of exponentially ill-posed problems. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, 21:439–464, 2000.
- [16] T. Hohage and F. Werner. Convergence rates for inverse problems with impulsive noise. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 52(3):1203–1221, 2014.
- [17] T. Hohage and F. Werner. Inverse problems with Poisson data: statistical regularization theory, applications and algorithms. *Inverse Problems*, 32(9), 2016.
- [18] V. Isakov. *Inverse problems for partial differential equations*, volume 127 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, Cham, third edition, 2017.
- [19] J.-Y. Koo. Optimal rates of convergence for nonparametric statistical inverse problems. *Ann. Statist.*, 21(2):590–599, 1993.

- [20] A. P. Korostel'ev and A. B. Tsybakov. *Minimax theory of image reconstruction*, volume 82 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [21] C. König, F. Werner, and T. Hohage. Convergence rates for exponentially ill-posed inverse problems with impulsive noise. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 54(1):341–360, 2016.
- [22] O. V. Lepskii. On a problem of adaptive estimation in Gaussian white noise. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 35(3):454–466, 1991.
- [23] H. Li and F. Werner. Empirical risk minimization as parameter choice rule for general linear regularization methods. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 56(1):405–427, 2020.
- [24] H. Liu, Y. Tang, and H. H. Zhang. A new chi-square approximation to the distribution of non-negative definite quadratic forms in non-central normal variables. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*, 53(4):853–856, 2009.
- [25] B. A. Mair and F. H. Ruymgaart. Statistical inverse estimation in Hilbert scales. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 56(5):1424–1444, 1996.
- [26] P. Mathé and B. Hofmann. How general are general source conditions? *Inverse Problems*, 24(1):015009, 2008.
- [27] P. Mathé. The Lepskii principle revisited. *Inverse Probl.*, 22(3):L11–L15, 2006.
- [28] P. Mathé and S. V. Pereverzev. Geometry of linear ill-posed problems in variable Hilbert scales. *Inverse Probl.*, 19(3):789–803, 2003.
- [29] P. Mathé and S. V. Pereverzev. Regularization of some linear ill-posed problems with discretized random noisy data. *Math. Comp.*, 75(256):1913–1929 (electronic), 2006.
- [30] A. Munk, N. Bissantz, T. Wagner, and G. Freitag. On difference-based variance estimation in nonparametric regression when the covariate is high dimensional. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 67(1):19–41, 2005.
- [31] F. Natterer. *The mathematics of computerized tomography*, volume 32 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2001. Reprint of the 1986 original.
- [32] F. O'Sullivan. A statistical perspective on ill-posed inverse problems. *Statist. Sci.*, 1(4):502–527, 1986. With comments and a rejoinder by the author.
- [33] M. S. Pinsker. Optimal filtering of square-integrable signals in gaussian noise. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 16(2):52–68, 1980.
- [34] K. Ray and J. Schmidt-Hieber. The Le Cam distance between density estimation, Poisson processes and Gaussian white noise. *Mathematical Statistics and Learning*, 1(2):101–170, 2018.
- [35] E. Schock. Approximate solution of ill-posed equations: arbitrarily slow convergence vs. superconvergence. In *Constructive methods for the practical treatment of integral equations (Oberwolfach, 1984)*, volume 73 of *Internat. Schriftenreihe Numer. Math.*, page 234–243. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1985.
- [36] V. Spokoiny. Variance estimation for high-dimensional regression models. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 82(1):111–133, 2002.

- [37] V. Spokoiny and N. Willrich. Bootstrap tuning in Gaussian ordered model selection. *Ann. Statist.*, 47(3):1351–1380, 2019.
- [38] A. Tsybakov. On the best rate of adaptive estimation in some inverse problems. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 330(9):835–840, 2000.
- [39] A. B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2009. Revised and extended from the 2004 French original, Translated by Vladimir Zaiats.
- [40] F. Werner. Adaptivity and oracle inequalities in linear statistical inverse problems: a (numerical) survey. In *New trends in parameter identification for mathematical models*, Trends Math., pages 291–316. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [41] F. Werner and T. Hohage. Convergence rates in expectation for Tikhonov-type regularization of Inverse Problems with Poisson data. *Inverse Probl.*, 28(10):104004, 15 pp., 2012.
- [42] H. Zou and M. Yuan. Composite quantile regression and the oracle model selection theory. *Ann. Statist.*, 36(3):1108–1126, 2008.