

# A New Approach to Tests and Confidence Bands for Distribution Functions

Lutz Dümbgen and Jon A. Wellner  
University of Bern and University of Washington, Seattle

October 2022

## Abstract

We introduce new goodness-of-fit tests and corresponding confidence bands for distribution functions. They are inspired by multi-scale methods of testing and based on refined laws of the iterated logarithm for the normalized uniform empirical process  $\mathbb{U}_n(t)/\sqrt{t(1-t)}$  and its natural limiting process, the normalized Brownian bridge process  $\mathbb{U}(t)/\sqrt{t(1-t)}$ . The new tests and confidence bands refine the procedures of Berk and Jones (1979) and Owen (1995). Roughly speaking, the high power and accuracy of the latter methods in the tail regions of distributions are essentially preserved while gaining considerably in the central region. The goodness-of-fit tests perform well in signal detection problems involving sparsity, as in Ingster (1997), Donoho and Jin (2004) and Jager and Wellner (2007), but also under contiguous alternatives. Our analysis of the confidence bands sheds new light on the influence of the underlying  $\phi$ -divergences.

**AMS subject classifications.** 60E10, 60F10 (primary); 62D99 (secondary).

**Key words.** Confidence band, goodness-of-fit, law of the iterated logarithm, limit distribution, multi-scale test statistics

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and motivations</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Some well-known facts . . . . .	1
1.2	Confidence bands by inversion of tests . . . . .	2
1.3	The tests of Berk and Jones and Owen's bands . . . . .	2
1.4	Goals revisited . . . . .	3
1.5	Our new test statistics and confidence bands . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Limit distributions under the null hypothesis</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Statistical implications</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Goodness-of-fit tests . . . . .	6
3.1.1	Non-contiguous alternatives . . . . .	6
3.1.2	Contiguous alternatives . . . . .	7
3.2	Confidence bands . . . . .	8
<b>4</b>	<b>Proofs for Section ??</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1	Proof of Theorem ?? . . . . .	13
4.2	Proof of Theorem ?? . . . . .	15

<b>5 Proofs for Section ??</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1 Proofs for Subsection ??	19
5.2 Proofs for Subsection ??	25
<b>References</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>S Supplement</b>	<b>30</b>
S.1 Kolmogorov’s upper function test	30
S.2 A general non-Gaussian LIL	30
S.3 Auxiliary functions and (in)equalities	35
S.4 Further proofs for Section 2	40
S.5 Proof of Theorem 3.10	41
S.6 Duality between goodness-of-fit tests and confidence bands	41
S.7 Critical values for various goodness-of-fit tests	43
S.8 Additional numerical examples	43

# 1 Introduction and motivations

## 1.1 Some well-known facts

Let  $\mathbb{F}_n$  be the empirical distribution function of independent random variables  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  with unknown distribution function  $F$  on the real line. The main topic of the present paper is to construct a confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}, B_{n,\alpha})$  for  $F$  with given confidence level  $1 - \alpha \in (0, 1)$ . That is,  $A_{n,\alpha} = A_{n,\alpha}(\cdot, (X_i)_{i=1}^n)$  and  $B_{n,\alpha} = B_{n,\alpha}(\cdot, (X_i)_{i=1}^n)$  are data-driven functions on the real line such that for any true distribution function  $F$ ,

$$P_F(A_{n,\alpha} \leq F \leq B_{n,\alpha} \text{ on } \mathbb{R}) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (1.1)$$

Let us recall some well-known facts about  $\mathbb{F}_n$  (cf. Shorack and Wellner (1986, 2009)). The stochastic process  $(\mathbb{F}_n(x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$  has the same distribution as  $(\mathbb{G}_n(F(x)))_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$ , where  $\mathbb{G}_n$  is the empirical distribution of independent random variables  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n$  with uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ . This enables the well-known Kolmogorov–Smirnov confidence bands: let

$$\mathbb{U}_n(t) := \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{G}_n(t) - t),$$

and let  $\kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}$  be the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the supremum norm  $\|\mathbb{U}_n\|_\infty := \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mathbb{U}_n(t)|$ . Then the confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}})$  with  $A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} := \max(\mathbb{F}_n - n^{-1/2}\kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}, 0)$  and  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} := \min(\mathbb{F}_n + n^{-1/2}\kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}, 1)$  satisfies (1.1) with equality if  $F$  is continuous. Since  $\mathbb{U}_n$  converges in distribution in  $\ell^\infty([0, 1])$  to standard Brownian bridge  $\mathbb{U}$ ,  $\kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}$  converges to the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile  $\kappa_\alpha^{\text{KS}}$  of  $\|\mathbb{U}\|_\infty$ . In particular, the width  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} - A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}$  of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov band is bounded uniformly by  $2n^{-1/2}\kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} = O(n^{-1/2})$ . (Throughout this paper, asymptotic statements refer to  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , unless stated otherwise.) On the other hand, it is well-known that Kolmogorov–Smirnov confidence bands give little or no information in the tails of the distribution  $F$ ; see e.g. Milbrodt and Strasser (1990), Janssen (1995), and Lehmann and Romano (2005), chapter 14, for a useful summary.

## 1.2 Confidence bands by inversion of tests

In general, confidence bands can be obtained by inverting goodness-of-fit tests. For a given continuous distribution function  $F_0$ , let  $T_n(F_0) = T_n(F_0, (X_i)_{i=1}^n)$  be some test statistic for the null hypothesis that  $F \equiv F_0$ . Suppose that for any test level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile  $\kappa_{n,\alpha}$  of  $T_n(F_0)$  under the

null hypothesis does not depend on  $F_0$ . Then a  $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}, B_{n,\alpha})$  for a continuous distribution function  $F$  is given by

$$A_{n,\alpha}(x) := \inf\{F(x) : T_n(F) \leq \kappa_{n,\alpha}\}, \quad B_{n,\alpha}(x) := \sup\{F(x) : T_n(F) \leq \kappa_{n,\alpha}\}.$$

Depending on the specific choice of  $T_n$ , these functions  $A_{n,\alpha}$  and  $B_{n,\alpha}$  can be computed explicitly, and the constraint (1.1) is even satisfied for arbitrary, possibly noncontinuous distribution functions  $F$ ; see Section S.6 for further details.

Since  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}})$  corresponds to  $T_n^{\text{KS}}(F_0) := \sqrt{n}\|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0\|_\infty$ , one possibility to enhance precision in the tails is to consider weighted supremum norms such as

$$T_n(F_0) := \sup_{x: 0 < F_0(x) < 1} \frac{\sqrt{n}|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|(x)}{w(F_0)}(x) \quad (1.2)$$

or

$$T_n(F_0) := \sup_{x \in [X_{n:1}, X_{n:n}]} \frac{\sqrt{n}|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|(x)}{w(\mathbb{F}_n)}(x), \quad (1.3)$$

where  $X_{n:1} \leq X_{n:2} \leq \dots \leq X_{n:n}$  are the order statistics of  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ . Here,  $w : (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is some continuous weight function such that  $w(1 - t) = w(t)$  for  $0 < t < 1$  and  $w(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . Specific proposals include

$$w(t) := \sqrt{t(1-t)h(t)},$$

where  $h \equiv 1$ , see Jaeschke (1979) and Eicker (1979), or  $h(t) \rightarrow \infty$  sufficiently fast as  $t \rightarrow 0$ , see O'Reilly (1974) or Csörgő et al. (1986). Specifically, Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018) propose to construct confidence bands with the test statistic (1.3) and  $h(t) := \log \log(1/[t(1-t)])$ . The latter choice is motivated by the law of the iterated logarithm (LIL) for the Brownian bridge process  $\mathbb{U}$ , stating that

$$\limsup_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{U}(t)}{\sqrt{2t \log \log(1/t)}} = \limsup_{t \nearrow 1} \frac{\mathbb{U}(t)}{\sqrt{2(1-t) \log \log(1/(1-t))}} = 1 \quad (1.4)$$

almost surely.

### 1.3 The tests of Berk and Jones and Owen's bands

Another goodness-of-fit test, proposed by Berk and Jones (1979), uses the test statistic

$$T_n^{\text{BJ}}(F_0) := n \sup_{x: 0 < F_0(x) < 1} K(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x)), \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$K(u, t) := u \log\left(\frac{u}{t}\right) + (1-u) \log\left(\frac{1-u}{1-t}\right)$$

for  $u \in [0, 1]$  and  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Note that  $K(u, t)$  is the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the Bernoulli( $u$ ) and Bernoulli( $t$ ) distributions. Owen (1995) proposed and analyzed confidence bands for  $F$  based on this test statistic. As noted by Jager and Wellner (2007), the test statistic  $T_n^{\text{BJ}}(F_0)$  can be embedded into a general family of test statistics  $T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}(F_0)$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let

$$T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}(F_0) := \begin{cases} \sup_{x: 0 < F_0(x) < 1} nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x)) & \text{if } s > 0, \\ \sup_{x \in [X_{n:1}, X_{n:n}]} nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x)) & \text{if } s \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

with the following divergence function  $K_s$ : for  $t, u \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$K_s(u, t) = \begin{cases} (t(u/t)^s + (1-t)[(1-u)/(1-t)]^s - 1)/[s(s-1)], & s \neq 0, 1, \\ u \log(u/t) + (1-u) \log[(1-u)/(1-t)], & s = 1, \\ t \log(t/u) + (1-t) \log[(1-t)/(1-u)], & s = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

(An alternative representation of  $K_s$  is given in (3.17).) Moreover, for fixed  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $u \in \{0, 1\}$ , the limit  $K(u, t) := \lim_{u' \rightarrow u} K_s(u', t)$  equals  $\infty$  if  $s \leq 0$  and exists in  $(0, \infty)$  otherwise. A detailed discussion of these divergences is given in Section S.3 of the online supplement. At present it suffices to note that for any fixed  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K_s(u, t)$  is strictly convex in  $u$  with unique minimum 0 at  $u = t$  and second derivative  $[t(1-t)]^{-1}$  there. Interesting special cases are  $K = K_1$ ,  $K_{1/2}(u, t) = 4(1 - \sqrt{ut} - \sqrt{(1-u)(1-t)})$  and

$$K_2(u, t) = \frac{(u-t)^2}{2t(1-t)}, \quad K_{-1}(u, t) = \frac{(u-t)^2}{2u(1-u)}.$$

Consequently, if  $w(t) := \sqrt{t(1-t)}$ , then the test statistic  $T_{n,2}^{\text{BJ}}(F_0)$  coincides with 0.5 times the square of  $T_n(F_0)$  in (1.2), and  $T_{n,-1}^{\text{BJ}}(F_0)$  equals 0.5 times the square of (1.3). As shown by Jager and Wellner (2007), for any  $s \in [-1, 2]$ , the null distribution of  $T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}(F_0)$  has the same asymptotic behavior, and the corresponding  $(1-\alpha)$ -quantiles  $\kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}$  satisfy

$$\kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}} = \log \log n + 2^{-1} \log \log \log n + O(1). \quad (1.8)$$

From this one can deduce that the resulting confidence band  $(A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}, B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}})$  for  $F$  satisfies

$$B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}(x) - A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}(x) \leq 2\sqrt{2\gamma_n \mathbb{F}_n(1 - \mathbb{F}_n)(x)} + 4\gamma_n$$

where  $\gamma_n := n^{-1}\kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}} = (1 + o(1))n^{-1} \log \log n$ ; see Lemma S.12 in Section S.3. Hence the band  $(A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}, B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}})$  is substantially more accurate than  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}})$  in the tail regions. But in the central region, i.e. when  $\mathbb{F}_n(x)$  is bounded away from 0 and 1, they are of width  $O(n^{-1/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2})$  rather than  $O(n^{-1/2})$ .

## 1.4 Goals revisited

The goal of Berk and Jones Berk and Jones (1979) was to find goodness-of-fit tests with optimal Bahadur efficiencies. They interpret their test statistic  $T_n^{\text{BJ}}(F_0)$  also as a union-intersection test statistic, where  $nK(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x))$  is the negative likelihood ratio statistic for the null hypothesis that  $F(x) = F_0(x)$ , based on the binomial distribution of  $n\mathbb{F}_n(x)$ . The union-intersection and related paradigms for the present goodness-of-fit testing problem have been treated in more generality by Gontscharuk et al. (2016).

In view of the previous considerations, the confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}})$  of Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018), based on the test statistic

$$T_n^{\text{SP}}(F_0) := \sup_{x \in [X_{n:1}, X_{n:n}]} \frac{\sqrt{n}|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|}{\sqrt{\mathbb{F}_n(1 - \mathbb{F}_n)h(\mathbb{F}_n)}}(x) \quad (1.9)$$

with  $h(t) := \log \log(1/[t(1-t)])$ , provides a trade-off between tail behavior and behavior in the center of the distribution. Previous proposals for the same purpose include Mason and Schuenemeyer (1983) and Révész (1982/83). But we shall demonstrate later that with purely multiplicative correction factors as in (1.9), the tail regions are asymptotically underemphasized in comparison with the new methods presented here.

## 1.5 Our new test statistics and confidence bands

To obtain a better compromise between the Kolmogorov–Smirnov and Berk–Jones tests, we propose a refined adjustment of  $\mathbb{F}_n(x)$  involving a pointwise standardization together with a pointwise additive correction, where the latter takes into account whether  $x$  is in the center or in the tails of  $F_0$  or  $\mathbb{F}_n$ . Only after standardization and additive correction, we take a supremum over  $x$ . This approach of pointwise standardization plus additive correction before taking a supremum has been developed in the context of multi-scale testing and has proved quite successful there; see e.g. Dümbgen and Spokoiny (2001), Dümbgen and Walther (2008), Schmidt-Hieber et al. (2013) and Rohde and Dümbgen (2013). In the present setting, pointwise standardization means that we consider  $nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x))$ , which behaves asymptotically like

$\mathbb{U}(F_0(x))^2/[2F_0(x)(1-F_0(x))]$  under the null hypothesis, that is, a squared standard Gaussian random variable times 0.5. To identify an appropriate additive correction term, we utilize a refinement of the LIL (1.4), based on Kolmogorov's upper class test (cf. Erdős (1942), or Itô and McKean (1974), Chapter 1.8). For  $t \in (0, 1)$  define

$$C(t) := \log \log \frac{e}{4t(1-t)} = \log(1 - \log(1 - (2t-1)^2)) \geq 0,$$

$$D(t) := \log(1 + C(t)^2) \in [0, \min\{C(t), C(t)^2\}].$$

Then for any fixed  $\nu > 3/4$ ,

$$T_\nu := \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C_\nu(t) \right) < \infty \quad (1.10)$$

almost surely, where  $C_\nu := C + \nu D$ . Note that  $C(t) = C(1-t)$ ,  $D(t) = D(1-t)$ , and, as  $t \searrow 0$ ,

$$C(t) = \log \log(1/t) + O((\log(1/t))^{-1}),$$

$$D(t) = 2 \log \log \log(1/t) + O((\log \log(1/t))^{-1}).$$

This indicates why (1.10) follows from Kolmogorov's test (see Section S.1), and shows the connection between (1.10) and (1.4). On  $(0, 1/2]$ , both functions  $C$  and  $D$  are decreasing with  $C(1/2) = D(1/2) = 0$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 1/2} \frac{C(t)}{(2t-1)^2} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 1/2} \frac{D(t)}{(2t-1)^4} = 1.$$

Consequently, we propose the following test statistics:

$$T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0) := \begin{cases} \sup_{x: 0 < F_0(x) < 1} [nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x)) - C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x))] & \text{if } s > 0, \\ \sup_{x \in [X_{n:1}, X_{n:n}]} [nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x)) - C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x))] & \text{if } s \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

where for  $t, u \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$C_\nu(u, t) := \min_{\min(u,t) \leq v \leq \max(u,t)} C_\nu(v) = \begin{cases} C_\nu(\min(u, t)) & \text{if } \min(u, t) > 1/2, \\ C_\nu(\max(u, t)) & \text{if } \max(u, t) < 1/2, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

with  $C(0), C(1), D(0), D(1) := \infty$ . As seen later, using this bivariate version  $C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x))$  instead of  $C_\nu(F_0(x))$  or  $C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n(x))$  has computational advantages and increases power. The additive correction term  $C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x))$  is large only if  $x$  is far in the tails of  $\mathbb{F}_n$  and of  $F_0$ .

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows.

- In Section 2 we show that under the null hypothesis, the test statistics  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  in (1.11) converge in distribution to  $T_\nu$  in (1.10) for any fixed value of  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- Section 3 discusses statistical implications of this finding. As explained in Section 3.1, goodness-of-fit tests based on  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  have desirable asymptotic power. In particular, they are shown to attain a detection boundary of Ingster Ingster (1997) for Gaussian mixture models. Moreover, even under contiguous alternatives they have nontrivial asymptotic power, as opposed to goodness-of-fit tests based on  $T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}$  in (1.6).
- In Section 3.2, we analyze the confidence bands  $(A_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}, B_{n,s,\nu,\alpha})$  resulting from inversion of the tests  $T_{n,s,\nu}(\cdot)$ . It will be shown that these bands have similar accuracy as those of Owen Owen (1995) and the bands  $(A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}, B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}})$  based on  $T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}(\cdot)$  in the tail regions while achieving the usual root- $n$  consistency everywhere. In addition, we compare our bands with the confidence bands of Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018), confirming our claim that a purely multiplicative adjustment of  $\mathbb{F}_n - F_0$  is necessarily suboptimal in the tail regions.

- Our results for the confidence bands elucidate the impact of the parameter  $s$  on these bands for large sample sizes. These considerations are based on new inequalities and expansions for the divergences  $K_s$  which are of independent interest.

All proofs and auxiliary results are deferred to Sections 4, 5 and an online supplement. References to the latter start with ‘S.’ or ‘S.’. Essential ingredients for the proofs in Section 4 are tools and techniques of Csörgő et al. (1986). A first version of this paper used a different, more self-contained approach which is probably of independent interest and outlined in Section S.2. This also includes an alternative proof of (1.10).

## 2 Limit distributions under the null hypothesis

Recall the uniform empirical process  $\mathbb{G}_n$  mentioned in the introduction. Under the null hypothesis that  $F \equiv F_0$ , the test statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  has the same distribution as

$$T_{n,s,\nu} := \begin{cases} \sup_{t \in (0,1)} [nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)] & \text{if } s > 0, \\ \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n})} [nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)] & \text{if } s \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\xi_{n:1} < \dots < \xi_{n:n}$  are the order statistics of the uniform sample  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ . In particular, the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  under the null hypothesis coincides with the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}$  of  $T_{n,s,\nu}$ . Here is our main result for  $T_{n,s,\nu}$  and  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *For all  $\nu > 3/4$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$T_{n,s,\nu} \rightarrow_d T_\nu.$$

Moreover,  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} \rightarrow \kappa_{\nu,\alpha} > 0$  for any fixed test level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , where  $\kappa_{\nu,\alpha}$  is the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of  $T_\nu$ .

A key step along the way to proving Theorem 2.1 will be to consider the case  $s = 2$  and prove the following theorem for the uniform empirical process  $\mathbb{U}_n = \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{G}_n - I)$ , where  $I$  denotes the distribution function of the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 2.2.** *For all  $\nu > 3/4$ ,*

$$\tilde{T}_{n,\nu} := \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C_\nu(t) \right) \rightarrow_d T_\nu.$$

**Remark 2.3** (The impact of  $s$  and the definition of  $T_{n,s,\nu}$ ). Note that the parameter  $s$  could be an arbitrary real number. However, numerical experiments indicate that the convergence to the asymptotic distribution is very slow if, say,  $s < -0.5$  or  $s > 1.5$ . More precisely, Monte Carlo experiments show that for parameters  $s \notin [-0.5, 1.5]$ , the test statistics  $T_{n,s,\nu}$  are mainly influenced by just a few very small or very large order statistics. Moreover, if  $s \in (0, 0.5]$ , one should redefine  $T_{n,s,\nu}$  as a supremum over  $[\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n})$  rather than  $(0, 1)$ . As shown in our proof of Theorem 2.1, this modification does not alter the asymptotic distribution, but for realistic sample sizes  $n$ , taking the supremum over the full set  $(0, 1)$  for small parameters  $s > 0$  leads to distributions which are mainly influenced by  $\xi_{n:1}$ .

Tables S.1 and S.2 provide exact critical values  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}$  for various sample sizes  $n$ ,  $s \in \{j/10 : -10 \leq j \leq 20\}$ ,  $\nu = 1$  and  $\alpha = 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$ .

Similar discrepancies between asymptotic theory and finite sample behaviour can be observed for the Berk-Jones quantiles  $\kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}$  if  $s \notin [-0.5, 1.5]$ , see Tables S.3 and S.4.

### 3 Statistical implications

#### 3.1 Goodness-of-fit tests

As explained in the introduction, we can reject the null hypothesis that  $F$  is a given continuous distribution function  $F_0$  at level  $\alpha$  if the test statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$ , defined in (1.11), exceeds the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}$  of  $T_{n,s,\nu}$ . The test statistics  $T_{n,s,\nu}$  and  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  can be represented as the maximum of at most  $2n$  terms: with  $u_{n,i} := i/n$ , the statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}$  equals

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max \{ nK_s(u_{n,i-1}, \xi_{n:i}) - C_\nu(u_{n,i-1}, \xi_{n:i}), nK_s(u_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i}) - C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i}) \}$$

if  $s > 0$ , and

$$\max_{1 \leq i < n} \max \{ nK_s(u_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i}) - C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i}), nK_s(u_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i+1}) - C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i+1}) \}$$

if  $s \leq 0$ . The statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  can be represented analogously with  $F_0(X_{n:i})$  in place of  $\xi_{n:i}$ . These formulae follow from the fact that for fixed  $u \in (0, 1)$ , the function  $t \mapsto nK_s(u, t) - C_\nu(u, t)$  is continuous on  $(0, 1)$ , increasing on  $[u, 1)$  and decreasing on  $(0, u]$ . For  $K_s(u, t) = K_{1-s}(t, u)$  is convex in  $t$  with minimum at  $t = u$ , see (S.12) in Section S.3, and  $C_\nu(u, t)$  is increasing in  $t \in (0, u]$  and decreasing in  $t \in [u, 1)$ . If  $s > 0$ , these monotonicities are also true for  $u \in \{0, 1\}$ , precisely,

$$C_\nu(0, t) = C_\nu(\min(t, 1/2)) \quad \text{and} \quad K_s(0, t) = \begin{cases} -\log(1-t) & \text{if } s = 1, \\ ((1-t)^{1-s} - 1)/(s(s-1)) & \text{if } s \neq 1, \end{cases}$$

while  $C_\nu(1, t) = C_\nu(0, 1-t)$  and  $K_s(1, t) = K_s(0, 1-t)$ .

##### 3.1.1 Non-contiguous alternatives

Now suppose that the true distribution function of the observations  $X_i$  is a continuous distribution function  $F_n$  such that  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < F_n(x) < 1\} \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < F_0(x) < 1\}$ . A first question is: under what conditions on the sequence  $(F_n)_n$  does our goodness-of-fit test have asymptotic power one for any fixed test level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Since  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} \rightarrow \kappa_{\nu,\alpha} < \infty$ , this goal is equivalent to

$$P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0) > \kappa) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{for any fixed } \kappa > 0. \quad (3.13)$$

To verify this property, the following function  $\Delta_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  plays a key role:

$$\Delta_n := \frac{\sqrt{n}|F_n - F_0|}{\min\{H_n(F_n), H_n(F_0)\}} \quad \text{with} \quad H_n(t) := \sqrt{(1+C(t))t(1-t)} + \frac{1+C(t)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

for  $t \in [0, 1]$  with the conventions  $C(t) := \infty$  and  $C(t)t(1-t) := 0$  for  $t \in \{0, 1\}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that the sequence  $(F_n)_n$  satisfies the condition*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \Delta_n(x) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.14)$$

*Then (3.13) holds true for any  $s \in [-1, 2]$ .*

It follows immediately from this theorem that (3.13) is satisfied whenever  $F_n \equiv F_*$  for all sample sizes  $n$ , where  $F_* \neq F_0$ .

As a litmus test for our procedures and Theorem 3.1, we consider a testing problem studied in detail by Ingster (1997). The null hypothesis is given by  $F_0 = \Phi$ , the standard Gaussian distribution function, whereas

$$F_n(x) := (1 - \epsilon_n)\Phi(x) + \epsilon_n\Phi(x - \mu_n).$$

for certain numbers  $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mu_n > 0$ . By means of Theorem 3.1 one can derive the following result.

**Corollary 3.2.** (a) Suppose that  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\beta+o(1)}$  for some fixed  $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$ . Furthermore let  $\mu_n = \sqrt{2r \log n}$  for some  $r \in (0, 1)$ . Then (3.13) is satisfied for any  $s \in [-1, 2]$  if

$$r > \begin{cases} \beta - 1/2 & \text{if } \beta \in (1/2, 3/4], \\ (1 - \sqrt{1 - \beta})^2 & \text{if } \beta \in [3/4, 1). \end{cases}$$

(b) Suppose that  $\epsilon_n = n^{-1/2+o(1)}$  such that  $\pi_n := \sqrt{n}\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ . Then (3.13) is satisfied for any  $s \in [-1, 2]$  if  $\mu_n = \sqrt{2\lambda \log(1/\pi_n)}$  for some  $\lambda > 1$ .

As explained by Ingster (1997), any goodness-of-fit test at fixed level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  has trivial asymptotic power  $\alpha$  whenever  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\beta}$  for some  $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$  and  $\mu_n = \sqrt{2r \log n}$  with

$$r < \begin{cases} \beta - 1/2 & \text{if } \beta \in (1/2, 3/4], \\ (1 - \sqrt{1 - \beta})^2 & \text{if } \beta \in [3/4, 1). \end{cases}$$

Thus part (a) of the previous corollary shows that our new family of tests achieves this detection boundary, as do the goodness-of-fit tests of Donoho and Jin (2004), Jager and Wellner (2007) and Gontscharuk et al. (2016).

A connection between parts (a) and (b) of Corollary 3.2 can be seen as follows: let  $\epsilon_n = n^{-\beta}$  for some fixed  $\beta \in (1/2, 3/4]$ , and  $\mu_n = \sqrt{2r \log(n)}$  for some  $r > \beta - 1/2$ . Then  $r = \lambda(\beta - 1/2)$  for some  $\lambda > 1$ , and with  $\pi_n = \sqrt{n}\epsilon_n = n^{1/2-\beta}$ , we may write  $\sqrt{2r \log(n)} = \sqrt{2\lambda \log(1/\pi_n)}$ .

### 3.1.2 Contiguous alternatives

Suppose that the distribution functions  $F_0$  and  $F_n$  have densities  $f_0$  and  $f_n$ , respectively, with respect to some continuous measure  $\Lambda$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that for some function  $a$ ,

$$\sqrt{n}(f_n^{1/2} - f_0^{1/2}) \rightarrow 2^{-1} a f_0^{1/2} \quad \text{in } L_2(\Lambda). \quad (3.15)$$

Then it follows easily that  $a \in L_2(F_0)$ ,  $\int a dF_0 = 0$  and

$$\sqrt{n}(F_n - F_0)(t) \rightarrow A(t) := \int_{-\infty}^t a dF_0 \quad \text{uniformly in } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Furthermore, since  $\int_{-\infty}^t a dF_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1_{[x \leq t]} - F_0(t)) a(x) dF_0(x)$ , the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields that

$$|A(t)| \leq \sqrt{F_0(t)(1 - F_0(t))} \|a\|_{L_2(F_0)}. \quad (3.16)$$

**Lemma 3.3** (Power of ‘‘tail-dominated’’ tests under contiguous alternatives). *Let  $(\varphi_n)_n$  be a sequence of tests with the following two properties:*

(i) *For a fixed level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$E_{F_0} \varphi_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) \rightarrow \alpha.$$

(ii) *For any fixed  $0 < \rho < 1/2$  and  $x_\rho := F_0^{-1}(\rho)$ ,  $y_\rho := F_0^{-1}(1 - \rho)$ , there exists a test  $\varphi_{n,\rho}$  depending only on  $(\mathbb{F}_n(x))_{x \notin [x_\rho, y_\rho]}$  such that*

$$P_{F_0}(\varphi_n \neq \varphi_{n,\rho}) \rightarrow 0.$$

*Then under assumption (3.15),*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{F_n} \varphi_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq \alpha.$$

Note that the Berk-Jones tests with  $T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}(F_0)$  satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.3, if tuned to have asymptotic level  $\alpha$ . For all of them involve a test statistic of the type

$$T_n(F_0) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \Gamma_n(\mathbb{F}_n(x))$$



with a function  $\Gamma_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that under the null hypothesis,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \Gamma_n(\mathbb{F}_n(x)) \rightarrow_p \infty,$$

but for any  $0 < \rho < 1/2$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in [x_\rho, y_\rho]} \Gamma_n(\mathbb{F}_n(x)) = O_p(1).$$

Hence  $T_n(F_0)$  equals

$$T_n^{(\rho)}(F_0) := \sup_{x \notin [x_\rho, y_\rho]} \Gamma_n(\mathbb{F}_n(x))$$

with asymptotic probability one. Thus we may replace the test statistic  $T_n(F_0)$  with  $T_n^{(\rho)}(F_0)$  while keeping the critical value.

By way of contrast, the goodness-of-fit test based on  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  has nontrivial asymptotic power in the present setting.

**Theorem 3.4** (Power of new tests under contiguous alternatives). *In the setting (3.15), the test statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  converges in distribution to*

$$T_\nu(A) := \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \left( \frac{(\mathbb{U}(t) + A(F_0^{-1}(t)))^2}{2t(1-t)} - C_\nu(t) \right).$$

In particular,

$$P_{F_n} [T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0) \geq \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}] \rightarrow P[T_\nu(A) \geq \kappa_{\nu,\alpha}] \geq \alpha.$$

Concerning the impact of  $A$ ,

$$P[T_\nu(A) \geq \kappa_{\nu,\alpha}] \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as} \quad \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \left( \frac{|A(F_0^{-1}(t))|}{\sqrt{2t(1-t)}} - \sqrt{C(t)} \right) \rightarrow \infty.$$

### 3.2 Confidence bands

The confidence bands of Owen (1995), defined in terms of  $K = K_1$ , may be generalized to arbitrary fixed  $s \in [-1, 2]$ , but we restrict our attention to  $s \in (0, 2]$ , because for  $s \leq 0$  and a large range of sample sizes  $n$ , the resulting bands would focus mainly on small regions in the tails and be rather wide elsewhere. With confidence  $1 - \alpha$  we may claim that  $\sup_{x: 0 < F(x) < 1} nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F(x))$  does not exceed the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile  $\kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}$  of  $\sup_{t \in (0,1)} nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)$ . As explained in Section S.6, inverting the inequality  $nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F(x)) \leq \kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}$  for fixed  $x$  with respect to  $F(x)$  reveals that for  $0 \leq i \leq n$  and  $X_{n:i} \leq x < X_{n:i+1}$ ,

$$F(x) \in [A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}(x), B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}(x)] = [a_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}}, b_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}}],$$

where  $a_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}} \leq u_{n,i} \leq b_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}}$  are given by  $a_{n,s,\alpha,0}^{\text{BJO}} := 0$ ,  $b_{n,s,\alpha,n}^{\text{BJO}} := 1$  and for  $0 \leq i < n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} b_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}} &:= \max\{t \in (u_{n,i}, 1] : nK_s(u_{n,i}, t) \leq \kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}\}, \\ a_{n,s,\alpha,n-i}^{\text{BJO}} &:= 1 - b_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, computing the confidence band  $(A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}, B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}})$  boils down to determining the  $2(n+1)$  numbers  $a_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}}$  and  $b_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n$ .

Our new method is analogous: with confidence  $1 - \alpha$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq n$  and  $X_{n:i} \leq x < X_{n:i+1}$ , the value  $F(x)$  is contained in

$$[A_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}(x), B_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}(x)] = [a_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i}, b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i}],$$

where  $a_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,0} := 0$ ,  $b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,n} := 1$  and for  $0 \leq i < n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i} &:= \max\{t \in (u_{n,i}, 1] : nK(u_{n,i}, t) - C_\nu(u_{n,i}, t) \leq \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}\}, \\ a_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,n-i} &:= 1 - b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: The auxiliary functions  $a_s$  (below diagonal),  $b_s$  (above diagonal) for  $s \in \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\}$ .

To understand the asymptotic performance of these confidence bands properly, we need auxiliary functions  $a_s, b_s : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . Note first that for any  $s \in [-1, 2]$ ,  $K_s(u, t)$  in (1.7) may be represented as

$$K_s(u, t) = t\phi_s(u/t) + (1-t)\phi_s[(1-u)/(1-t)] \quad (3.17)$$

where

$$\phi_s(x) = \begin{cases} (x^s - sx + s - 1)/[s(s-1)], & s \neq 0, 1, \\ x \log x - x + 1, & s = 1, \\ x - 1 - \log x, & s = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

for  $x \in (0, \infty)$ , and  $\phi_s(0) := \lim_{x \searrow 0} \phi_s(x)$  equals  $1/s^+$ . If  $u$  and  $t$  are close to 0, one may approximate  $K_s(u, t)$  by

$$H_s(u, t) := t\phi_s(u/t).$$

The properties of  $H_s : [0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  are treated in Lemma S.13. In particular, it is shown that

$$a_s(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \inf\{y \in (0, x) : H_s(x, y) \leq 1\} & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

$$b_s(x) := \begin{cases} s^+ & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \max\{y > x : H_s(x, y) \leq 1\} & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

define continuous functions  $a_s, b_s : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , where  $a_s$  is convex with  $a_s(0) = 0 = a'_s(0)$ ,  $a_s(x) = 0$  if and only if  $x \leq (1-s)^+$ , and  $b_s$  is concave. Moreover,  $a_s(x) = x - \sqrt{2x} + O(1)$  and  $b_s(x) = x + \sqrt{2x} + O(1)$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Finally, for fixed  $x > 0$ ,  $a_s(x)$  and  $b_s(x)$  are non-decreasing in  $s \in [-1, 2]$  with  $a_s(x) < x < b_s(x)$ . Figure 1 depicts these functions  $a_s, b_s$  on the interval  $[0, 3]$  for  $s \in \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\}$ .

Our first result shows that the confidence bands  $(A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}, B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}})$  and  $(A_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}, B_{n,s,\nu,\alpha})$  are asymptotically equivalent in the tail regions, that is, for  $\mathbb{F}_n(x)$  close to zero or close to one. Moreover, the test level  $\alpha$  is asymptotically irrelevant there, but the parameter  $s$  does play a role when  $\min\{\mathbb{F}_n(x), 1 - \mathbb{F}_n(x)\} \leq O(n^{-1} \log n)$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** Let  $\gamma_n := n^{-1} \log \log n$ . For any fixed  $s \in (0, 2]$ ,  $\nu > 3/4$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} u_{n,i} - a_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}} \\ u_{n,i} - a_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i} \\ b_{n,s,\alpha,n-i}^{\text{BJO}} - u_{n,n-i} \\ b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,n-i} - u_{n,n-i} \end{array} \right\} = \gamma_n (i/\log \log n - a_s(i/\log \log n))(1 + o(1))$$

and

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} b_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}} - u_{n,i} \\ b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i} - u_{n,i} \\ u_{n,n-i} - a_{n,s,\alpha,n-i}^{\text{BJO}} \\ u_{n,n-i} - a_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,n-i} \end{array} \right\} = \gamma_n (b_s(i/\log \log n) - i/\log \log n)(1 + o(1)),$$

uniformly in  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \cap [0, n^\delta]$ .

**Remark 3.6** (Choice of  $s$ ). Concerning the choice of  $s$ , Theorem 3.5 shows that smaller (resp. larger) values of  $s$  lead to better upper (resp. lower) and worse lower (resp. upper) bounds for  $F(x)$  in the left tail and better lower (resp. upper) and worse upper (resp. lower) bounds for  $F(x)$  in the right tail. The choice  $s = 1$  seems to be a good compromise, see also the numerical examples later.

The next result shows that in the central region, the parameter  $s$  is asymptotically irrelevant, and the width of the band  $(A_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}, B_{n,s,\nu,\alpha})$  is of smaller order than the width of  $(A_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}, B_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}})$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** For any fixed  $s \in (0, 2]$ ,  $\nu > 3/4$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} u_{n,i} - a_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}} \\ b_{n,s,\alpha,i}^{\text{BJO}} - u_{n,i} \end{array} \right\} = \sqrt{2\gamma_n u_{n,i}(1 - u_{n,i})} (1 + o(1)),$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} u_{n,i} - a_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i} \\ b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i} - u_{n,i} \end{array} \right\} = \sqrt{2\gamma_{n,\nu,\alpha}(u_{n,i}) u_{n,i}(1 - u_{n,i})} (1 + o(1)),$$

uniformly in  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \cap [n^\delta, n - n^\delta]$ , where  $\gamma_n = n^{-1} \log \log n$  and  $\gamma_{n,\nu,\alpha}(u) := n^{-1}(C_\nu(u) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha})$ .

Note that  $(C_\nu(u) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha})u(1 - u) \rightarrow 0$  as  $u \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . Thus one can deduce from Theorems 3.5 and 3.7 that

$$\max_{i=0,1,\dots,n} (b_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}} - u_{n,i}) = \max_{i=0,1,\dots,n} (u_{n,i} - a_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}}) = \sqrt{\gamma_n/2}(1 + o(1)),$$

$$\max_{i=0,1,\dots,n} (b_{n,i} - u_{n,i}) = \max_{i=0,1,\dots,n} (u_{n,i} - a_{n,i}) = O(n^{-1/2}).$$

**Remark 3.8** (Comparison with Stepanova–Pavlenko Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018)). The confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}})$  of Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018) with the test statistic  $T_n^{\text{SP}}(\cdot)$  in (1.9) can be represented as follows: for  $0 \leq i \leq n$  and  $X_{n:i} \leq x < X_{n:i+1}$ ,

$$[A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}(x), B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}(x)] = [a_{n,\alpha,i}^{\text{SP}}, b_{n,\alpha,i}^{\text{SP}}],$$

where  $a_{n,\alpha,0}^{\text{SP}} = 0$ ,  $b_{n,\alpha,0}^{\text{SP}} = b_{n,\alpha,1}^{\text{SP}}$ ,  $a_{n,\alpha,n}^{\text{SP}} = a_{n,\alpha,n-1}^{\text{SP}}$ ,  $b_{n,\alpha,n}^{\text{SP}} = 1$ , and for  $1 \leq i < n$ ,

$$[a_{n,\alpha,i}^{\text{SP}}, b_{n,\alpha,i}^{\text{SP}}] = [u_{n,i} \pm n^{-1/2} \kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}} \sqrt{u_{n,i}(1 - u_{n,i})h(u_{n,i})}] \cap [0, 1].$$

Recall that  $h(t) = \log \log(1/[t(1 - t)])$ . Here  $\kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}$  is the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of  $T_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}(F_0)$  in case of  $F \equiv F_0$ , and it converges to the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile  $\kappa_\alpha^{\text{SP}}$  of

$$\sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{|\mathbb{U}(t)|}{\sqrt{t(1 - t)h(t)}}.$$

Consequently, for fixed  $s \in (0, 2]$ ,  $\nu > 3/4$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\frac{b_{n,\alpha,i}^{\text{SP}} - u_{n,i}}{b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i} - u_{n,i}}, \frac{u_{n,i} - a_{n,\alpha,i}^{\text{SP}}}{u_{n,i} - a_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,i}} = \frac{\kappa_\alpha^{\text{SP}} \sqrt{h(u_{n,i})}}{\sqrt{2(C_\nu(u_{n,i}) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha})}} (1 + o(1))$$

uniformly in  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \cap [n^\delta, n - n^\delta]$ . But

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \{0,1\}} \frac{\kappa_\alpha^{\text{SP}} \sqrt{h(u)}}{\sqrt{2(C_\nu(u) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha})}} = \frac{\kappa_\alpha^{\text{SP}}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{cases} \geq 1, \\ \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } \alpha \searrow 0, \end{cases}$$

because  $h(t)/\log \log(1/t)$  and  $C_\nu(t)/\log \log(1/t)$  converge to 1 as  $t \searrow 0$ . Thus, the confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}})$  is asymptotically wider than  $(A_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}, B_{n,s,\nu,\alpha})$  in the tail regions for sufficiently small  $\alpha$ .

Note that these considerations apply to any choice of the continuous function  $h : (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  in (1.9) as long as  $h(t)/\log \log(1/t) \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \searrow 0$ .

**Remark 3.9** (Bahadur and Savage Bahadur and Savage (1956) revisited). On  $(-\infty, X_{n:1}]$ , the upper confidence bounds for  $F$  are constant  $b_{n,s,\alpha,1}^{\text{BJO}}$  or  $b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,1}$ , and this is of order  $O(n^{-1} \log \log n)$ . Likewise, on  $(X_{n:n}, \infty)$ , the lower confidence bounds for  $F$  are constant  $1 - b_{n,s,\alpha,1}^{\text{BJO}}$  or  $1 - b_{n,s,\nu,\alpha,1}$ . Interestingly, for any  $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence band for a continuous distribution function  $F$ , the upper bound has to be greater than  $c/n$  with asymptotic probability at least  $e^c \alpha$ , and the lower bound has to be smaller than  $1 - c/n$  with asymptotic probability at least  $e^c \alpha$ . This follows from a quantitative version of Theorem 2 of Bahadur and Savage (1956), stated as Theorem 3.10 below.

It is also instructive to consider Daniels' lower confidence bound for a continuous distribution function  $F$ , namely

$$P_F(\alpha \mathbb{F}_n(x) \leq F(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}) = 1 - \alpha.$$

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of continuous distribution functions which is convex and closed under translations, that is,  $F(\cdot - \mu) \in \mathcal{F}$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $(A_n, B_n)$  be a  $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence band for  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then for any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$P_F\left(\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} B_n(x) < \epsilon\right) \leq (1 - \epsilon)^{-n} \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad P_F\left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} A_n(x) > 1 - \epsilon\right) \leq (1 - \epsilon)^{-n} \alpha.$$

In our context,  $\mathcal{F}$  would be the family of all continuous distribution functions. But the precision bounds in Theorem 3.10 apply to much smaller families  $\mathcal{F}$  already, for instance, the family of all convex combinations of  $F_o(\cdot - \mu)$ ,  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $F_o$  is an arbitrary continuous distribution function. For the reader's convenience, a proof of Theorem 3.10 is provided in Section S.5.

**Example 3.11** ( $s = 1$ ). The left panel in Figure 2 depicts, for  $n = 100$ , the 95%-confidence band  $(A_{n,1,1,\alpha}, B_{n,1,1,\alpha})$  in case of an idealized standard Gaussian sample with order statistics

$$X_{n:i} = \Phi^{-1}(i/(n+1)).$$

In addition, one sees the Kolmogorov–Smirnov 95%-confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}})$ . In the right panel, one sees for the same setting the centered upper bounds  $B_{n,1,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$ ,  $B_{n,1,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}} - \mathbb{F}_n$  and  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} - \mathbb{F}_n$ . Note that a plot of the centered lower bounds  $A_{n,1,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$ ,  $A_{n,1,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}} - \mathbb{F}_n$  and  $A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} - \mathbb{F}_n$  would be the reflection of the plots for the centered upper bounds with respect to the point  $(0, 0)$ . The corresponding critical values  $\kappa_{n,1,1,\alpha}$ ,  $\kappa_{n,1,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}$  and  $\kappa_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}$  have been computed numerically, see Section S.7.

Figure 3 shows the same as the right panel in Figure 2, but with sample sizes  $n = 500$  and  $n = 4000$  in the left and right panel, respectively.

In the online supplement, these bands  $(A_{n,1,1,\alpha}, B_{n,1,1,\alpha})$  are also compared with the confidence bands of Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018), confirming the purely asymptotic result in Remark 3.8.

**Example 3.12** (The impact of  $s$ ). Figure 4 shows for an idealized Gaussian sample of size  $n = 500$ , the centered upper 95%-confidence bounds  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$  for  $s = 0.6, 1, 1.4$  (left panel) as well as the differences  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - B_{n,1,1,\alpha}$  for  $s = 0.6, 1.4$ , right panel. As predicted by Theorem 3.5, the upper




Figure 2: 95%-confidence bands for  $n = 100$ . Left panel:  $(A_{n,1,1,\alpha}, B_{n,1,1,\alpha})$  (solid) and  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{KS}, B_{n,\alpha}^{KS})$  (dashed). Right panel: centered upper bounds  $B_{n,1,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (solid),  $B_{n,1,\alpha}^{BJO} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (dotted) and  $B_{n,\alpha}^{KS} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (dashed).




Figure 3: Centered upper 95%-confidence bounds  $B_{n,1,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (solid),  $B_{n,1,\alpha}^{BJO} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (dotted) and  $B_{n,\alpha}^{KS} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (dashed) for  $n = 500$  (left panel) and  $n = 4000$  (right panel).




Figure 4: Upper 95%-confidence bounds for  $n = 500$ . Left panel: centered bounds  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$  for  $s = 0.6$  (dashed),  $s = 1.0$  (solid) and  $s = 1.4$  (dotted). Right panel: differences  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - B_{n,1,1,\alpha}$  for  $s = 0.6$  (dashed) and  $s = 1.4$  (dotted).

bounds  $B_{n,s,1}(x)$  are increasing in  $s$  for small values of  $x$  and decreasing in  $s$  for large values of  $x$ . The online supplement contains further plots illustrating the impact of  $s$  on our bands. These plots support our claim that choosing  $s$  close to 1 is preferable. Other values of  $s$  increase the bands' precision somewhere in the tails, but lead to a substantial loss of precision in the central region.

**Remark 3.13** (Discontinuous distribution functions). In the previous considerations, we focused on continuous distribution functions  $F$ , and all confidence bands  $(A_{n,\alpha}, B_{n,\alpha})$  for  $F$  we considered are of the form

$$[A_{n,\alpha}(x), B_{n,\alpha}(x)] = [a_{n,\alpha,i}, b_{n,\alpha,i}] \quad \text{for } x \in [X_{n:i}, X_{n:i+1}) \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq n$$

with certain numbers  $a_{n,\alpha,i}, b_{n,\alpha,i} \in [0, 1]$ . Interestingly, such a band has coverage probability at least  $1 - \alpha$  for arbitrary, not necessarily continuous distribution functions  $F$ ; see Section S.6.

## 4 Proofs for Section 2

### 4.1 Proof of Theorem 2.2

The following three facts are our essential ingredients.

**Fact 4.1** (Csörgő et al. (1986), Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.1). *There exist on a common probability space a sequence of i.i.d.  $U(0, 1)$  random variables  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \dots$  and a sequence of Brownian bridge processes  $\mathbb{U}^{(1)}, \mathbb{U}^{(2)}, \mathbb{U}^{(3)}, \dots$  such that, for all  $0 \leq \delta < 1/4$ ,*

$$\sup_{t \in [1/n, 1-1/n]} \frac{n^\delta |\mathbb{U}_n(t) - \mathbb{U}^{(n)}(t)|}{(t(1-t))^{1/2-\delta}} = O_p(1).$$

**Fact 4.2** (Csörgő et al. (1986), Theorem 4.4.1).

$$\sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t) \log \log n} \rightarrow_p 1.$$

**Fact 4.3** (Csörgő et al. (1986), Lemma 4.4.4). *For any  $1 \leq d_n \leq n$  such that  $d_n/n \rightarrow 0$  and  $d_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\sup_{t \in (0, d_n/n]} \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t) \log \log d_n} \rightarrow_p 1.$$

*The same holds with the supremum over  $[1 - d_n/n, 1)$ .*

The asymptotic distribution of  $\tilde{T}_{n,\nu}$  will be derived from the subsequent Lemmas 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6.

**Lemma 4.4.** For any sequence of constants  $1 \leq d_n \leq n$  such that  $d_n/n \rightarrow 0$  and  $d_n \rightarrow \infty$  and any choice of  $0 < \delta < 1/4$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} \frac{|\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2 - \mathbb{U}^{(n)}(t)^2|}{t(1-t)} = O_p(d_n^{-\delta} (\log \log n)^{1/2}).$$

*Proof.* By Fact 4.1, for  $0 < \delta < 1/4$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} \frac{|\mathbb{U}_n(t) - \mathbb{U}^{(n)}(t)|}{(t(1-t))^{1/2}} \leq O(d_n^{-\delta}) \sup_{t \in [1/n, 1-1/n]} \frac{n^\delta |\mathbb{U}_n(t) - \mathbb{U}^{(n)}(t)|}{(t(1-t))^{1/2-\delta}} = O_p(d_n^{-\delta}).$$

Together with Fact 4.2 and (1.4) this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} \frac{|\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2 - \mathbb{U}^{(n)}(t)^2|}{t(1-t)} \\ & \leq \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} \frac{|\mathbb{U}_n(t) - \mathbb{U}^{(n)}(t)|}{(t(1-t))^{1/2}} \cdot \left( \frac{|\mathbb{U}_n(t)|}{(t(1-t))^{1/2}} + \frac{|\mathbb{U}^{(n)}(t)|}{(t(1-t))^{1/2}} \right) \\ & = O_p(d_n^{-\delta} (\log \log n)^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 4.5.** For all  $\nu \geq 0$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, n^{-1} \log n]} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C_\nu(t) \right) \rightarrow_p -\infty.$$

The same holds with the supremum over  $(0, n^{-1} \log n]$  replaced by  $[1 - n^{-1} \log n, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Note that with  $d_n = \log n$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, d_n/n]} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C_\nu(t) \right) \leq \sup_{t \in (0, d_n/n]} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C(d_n/n) \right) \quad (4.19)$$

since  $C_\nu \geq C$  and  $C$  is non-increasing. By Fact 4.3,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, d_n/n]} \frac{|\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2|}{2t(1-t) \log \log \log n} \rightarrow_p 1,$$

while

$$\frac{C(d_n/n)}{\log \log \log n} = \frac{(1 + o(1)) \log \log n}{\log \log \log n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, the right side of (4.19) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in (0, d_n/n]} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t) \log \log \log n} \cdot \log \log \log n - C(d_n/n) \right) \\ & = \sup_{t \in (0, d_n/n]} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}_n(t)^2}{2t(1-t) \log \log \log n} - \frac{C(d_n/n)}{\log \log \log n} \right) \log \log \log n \\ & \rightarrow_p (1 - \infty) \cdot \infty = -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 4.6.** For any fixed  $\nu > 3/4$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, \rho] \cup [1-\rho, 1)} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C_\nu(t) \right) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{almost surely as } \rho \searrow 0.$$

*Proof.* Recall that

$$T_\nu = \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C(t) - \nu D(t) \right)$$

is finite almost surely for any  $\nu > 3/4$ . If we choose  $\nu' \in (3/4, \nu)$  and write  $\nu D(t) = \nu' D(t) + (\nu - \nu') D(t)$ , then we see that for any  $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in (0,\rho] \cup [1-\rho,1)} \left( \frac{\mathbb{U}(t)^2}{2t(1-t)} - C(t) - \nu D(t) \right) &\leq \sup_{t \in (0,\rho] \cup [1-\rho,1)} (T_{\nu'} - (\nu - \nu') D(t)) \\ &= T_{\nu'} - (\nu - \nu') D(\rho), \end{aligned}$$

because  $D(\cdot)$  is symmetric around  $1/2$  and monotone decreasing on  $(0, 1/2]$ . Now the claim follows from  $T_{\nu'} < \infty$  almost surely and  $D(\rho) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\rho \searrow 0$ .  $\square$

Now we can finish the proof of Theorem 2.2. According to Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, with  $d_n := \log n$ ,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \tilde{T}_{n,\nu} \\ T_\nu \end{array} \right\} = \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} \left( \frac{1}{2t(1-t)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbb{U}_n(t)^2 \\ \mathbb{U}(t)^2 \end{array} \right\} - C_\nu(t) \right)$$

with asymptotic probability one. If we replace the Brownian bridge  $\mathbb{U}$  with the Brownian bridge  $\mathbb{U}^{(n)}$ , then Lemma 4.4 implies that the latter two suprema over  $[d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]$  differ only by  $o_p(1)$ . Consequently,  $\tilde{T}_{n,\nu}$  converges in distribution to  $T_\nu$ .

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Note first that in case of  $s > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, \xi_{n:1})} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)) = nK_s(0, \xi_{n:1}) - C_\nu(\min(\xi_{n:1}, 1/2)) \rightarrow_p -\infty,$$

because  $K_s(0, t) = t/s + o(t)$  as  $t \searrow 0$  and  $E(\xi_{n:1}) = 1/(n+1)$ . Since  $K_s(1, t) = K_s(0, 1-t)$ ,  $C_\nu(t) = C_\nu(1-t)$  and  $\xi_{n:1} \stackrel{d}{=} 1 - \xi_{n:n}$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:n}, 1)} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)) = nK_s(1, \xi_{n:n}) - C_\nu(\max(\xi_{n:n}, 1/2)) \rightarrow_p -\infty.$$

Consequently, it suffices to verify Theorem 2.1 with the modified test statistic

$$T_{n,s,\nu} := \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n}]} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)),$$

provided that we can show that the latter converges in distribution.

In what follows, we show that replacing  $s$  with 2 and  $C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)$  with  $C_\nu(t)$  has no effect asymptotically. For these tasks, the following two facts are useful.

**Fact 4.7** (Linear bounds for  $\mathbb{G}_n$ ).

A. By inequality 1, Shorack and Wellner (1986, 2009), page 415,

$$\sup_{\xi_{n:1} \leq t \leq 1} \frac{t}{\mathbb{G}_n(t)} = O_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t < \xi_{n:n}} \frac{1-t}{1-\mathbb{G}_n(t)} = O_p(1).$$

B. From Daniels' theorem (Theorem 2, Shorack and Wellner (1986, 2009), page 341),

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq 1} \frac{\mathbb{G}_n(t)}{t} = O_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t < 1} \frac{1-\mathbb{G}_n(t)}{1-t} = O_p(1).$$



**Fact 4.8.** For any sequence of constants  $d_n$  with  $1 \leq d_n \leq n$  such that  $d_n/n \rightarrow 0$  and  $d_n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\sup_{d_n/n \leq t \leq 1} \frac{|\mathbb{G}_n(t) - t|}{t} = O_p(d_n^{-1/2})$$

and

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - d_n/n} \frac{|\mathbb{G}_n(t) - t|}{1 - t} = O_p(d_n^{-1/2})$$

(Wellner (1978), Lemma 3 and Theorem 1S; Shorack and Wellner (1986, 2009), Chapter 10, Section 5, page 424). In fact,

$$d_n^{1/2} \sup_{d_n/n \leq t \leq 1} \frac{|\mathbb{G}_n(t) - t|}{t} \rightarrow_d \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\mathbb{W}(t)|,$$

where  $\mathbb{W}$  is a standard Brownian motion, see Rényi (1969).

A particular consequence of Fact 4.7 is that

$$M_{n,1} := \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n}]} |\text{logit}(\mathbb{G}_n(t)) - \text{logit}(t)| = O_p(1), \quad (4.20)$$

where  $\text{logit}(t) := \log(t/(1-t))$ , and Fact 4.8 implies that

$$M_{n,2} := \sup_{t \in [n^{-1} \log n, 1 - n^{-1} \log n]} |\text{logit}(\mathbb{G}_n(t)) - \text{logit}(t)| = O_p((\log n)^{-1/2}), \quad (4.21)$$

with the conventions that  $\text{logit}(0) := -\infty$  and  $\text{logit}(1) := \infty$ . This leads to the following useful bounds:

**Lemma 4.9.** For any fixed  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n}]} \frac{K_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)}{K_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)} = O_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n}]} (C_\nu(t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)) = O_p(1),$$

where  $K_s(t, t)/K_2(t, t) := 1$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [n^{-1} \log n, 1 - n^{-1} \log n]} \left| \frac{K_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)}{K_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)} - 1 \right| &= O_p((\log n)^{-1/2}) \quad \text{and} \\ \sup_{t \in [n^{-1} \log n, 1 - n^{-1} \log n]} (C_\nu(t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)) &= O_p((\log n)^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $K_s(0, t) = K_s(1, t) := \infty$  in case of  $s < 1$ .

*Proof.* With the auxiliary quantities  $M_{n,1}$  in (4.20) and  $M_{n,2}$  in (4.21), it follows from the inequalities (S.14) and Lemma S.10 that for  $\xi_{n:1} \leq t < \xi_{n:n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)}{K_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)} &\leq \exp(|s - 2|M_{n,1}) = O_p(1) \quad \text{and} \\ 0 \leq C_\nu(t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) &\leq (1 + \nu)M_{n,1} = O_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for  $n^{-1} \log n \leq t \leq 1 - n^{-1} \log n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{K_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)}{K_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)} - 1 \right| &\leq \exp(|s - 2|M_{n,2}) - 1 = O_p((\log n)^{-1/2}) \quad \text{and} \\ 0 \leq C_\nu(t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) &\leq (1 + \nu)M_{n,2} = O_p((\log n)^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

(Note that  $M_{n,2} = \infty$  if  $t < \xi_{n:1}$  or  $t \geq \xi_{n:n}$ ) □

Now the statement about the (modified) test statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}$  is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.2 and the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.10.** For  $\nu > 3/4$  and any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$T_{n,s,\nu} = \tilde{T}_{n,\nu} + o_p(1).$$

*Proof.* With  $d_n := \log n$ , we know that  $\xi_{n:n} > 1 - d_n/n$  with asymptotic probability one, and thus it follows from Fact 4.3 and Lemma 4.9 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, d_n/n]} nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) \\ & \leq \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, 1-d_n/n]} \frac{K_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)}{K_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)} \sup_{t \in (0, d_n/n]} nK_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) = O_p(\log \log \log n). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\min_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, d_n/n]} C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) \geq C(d_n/n) + O_p(1) = (1 + o(1)) \log \log n.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, d_n/n]} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)) \rightarrow_p -\infty,$$

and for symmetry reasons,

$$\sup_{t \in [1-d_n/n, \xi_{n:n}]} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)) \rightarrow_p -\infty.$$

Since  $\tilde{T}_{n,\nu}$  is equal to

$$\tilde{T}_{n,\nu}^{\text{restr}} = \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} (nK_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(t))$$

with asymptotic probability one, it suffices to show that

$$T_{n,s,\nu}^{\text{restr}} := \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)) = \tilde{T}_{n,\nu}^{\text{restr}} + o_p(1).$$

To this end, note that  $\tilde{T}_{n,\nu}^{\text{restr}} \rightarrow_d T_\nu$  implies that

$$\sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} nK_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) \leq C_\nu(d_n/n) + O_p(1) = (1 + o_p(1)) \log \log n.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & |T_{n,s,\nu}^{\text{restr}} - \tilde{T}_{n,\nu}^{\text{restr}}| \\ & \leq \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} |nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - nK_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)| + O_p((\log n)^{-1/2}) \\ & \leq \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} \left| \frac{K_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)}{K_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)} - 1 \right| \sup_{t \in [d_n/n, 1-d_n/n]} nK_2(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) + O_p((\log n)^{-1/2}) \\ & = O_p((\log n)^{-1/2})(1 + o_p(1)) \log \log n = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

It remains to prove the claim that  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} \rightarrow \kappa_{\nu,\alpha} > 0$ . But this follows immediately from the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.11.** Let  $G(r) := P(T_\nu \leq r)$ . Then  $G(0) = 0$ , and  $G$  is continuous and strictly increasing on  $[0, \infty)$ .

To prove this lemma and other results, we make use of the following well-known result.

**Fact 4.12** (Borell (1974), Corollary 2.1; Gaenssler et al. (2007), Lemma 1.1). *The distribution  $Q$  of  $\mathbb{U}$  is a log-concave measure on  $\mathcal{C}[0, 1]$ . That means, for Borel sets  $\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1 \subset \mathcal{C}[0, 1]$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\log Q_*((1 - \lambda)\mathcal{B}_0 + \lambda\mathcal{B}_1) \geq (1 - \lambda)Q(\mathcal{B}_0) + \lambda Q(\mathcal{B}_1),$$

where  $Q_*$  stands for the inner measure induced by  $Q$ , and  $(1 - \lambda)\mathcal{B}_0 + \lambda\mathcal{B}_1 := \{(1 - \lambda)g_0 + \lambda g_1 : g_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1\}$ .

From this fact one can deduce the following properties of  $\mathbb{U}$ :

**Proposition 4.13.** *For arbitrary functions  $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and  $h_o : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$G_1(x) := P(|xh_o + \mathbb{U}| \leq h)$$

*is an even, log-concave function of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, if  $h_o \geq 0$ , then*

$$G_2(x) := P(|\mathbb{U}| \leq \sqrt{h + xh_o})$$

*is a non-decreasing and log-concave function of  $x \geq 0$ .*

Let  $\mathbb{W}$  be a standard Brownian motion process on  $[0, 1]$ . Then it is well-known that  $\mathbb{U}(t) := \mathbb{W}(t) - t\mathbb{W}(1)$  defines a Brownian bridge process on  $[0, 1]$ . The following self-similarity property of the Brownian bridge process  $\mathbb{U}$  seems to be less well-known.

**Proposition 4.14.** *For fixed numbers  $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$ , define a stochastic process  $\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}$  on  $[0, 1]$  as follows:*

$$\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}(v) := \mathbb{U}((1 - v)a + vb) - (1 - v)\mathbb{U}(a) - v\mathbb{U}(b),$$

*that is,  $\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}$  describes the interpolation error when replacing  $\mathbb{U}$  on  $[a, b]$  with its linear interpolation there. Then the two processes  $(\mathbb{U}(t))_{t \in [0, 1] \setminus (a, b)}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}$  are stochastically independent, and*

$$\mathbb{Z}_{a,b} \stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{b - a} \mathbb{U}.$$

Proofs of Propositions 4.13 and 4.14 are provided in Section S.4.

*Proof of Lemma 4.11.* Note first that the distribution function  $r \mapsto G(r)$  coincides with the function  $G_2$  in Proposition 4.13, where  $h(t) := 2t(1 - t)C_\nu(t)$  and  $h_o(t) := 2t(1 - t)$ . In particular,  $G(r) \leq P(|\mathbb{U}(1/2)| \leq \sqrt{r/2})$ , and the latter bound equals 0 for  $r = 0$  and is strictly smaller than 1 for any  $r \geq 0$ .

By Proposition 4.13,  $G : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is log-concave, and since  $G(r) < 1 = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} G(s)$  for all  $r \geq 0$ , this implies that  $G$  is continuous and strictly increasing on  $(r_o, \infty)$ , where  $r_o := \inf\{r > 0 : G(r) > 0\}$ . If we can show that  $r_o = 0$ , then we know that  $G$  is, in fact, continuous and strictly increasing on  $[0, \infty)$ .

To show that  $G(r) > 0$  for any  $r > 0$ , we pick a number  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and write  $T_\nu$  as the maximum of the three random variables

$$\begin{aligned} T_\nu^{(\rho, 1)} &:= \max_{t \in [\rho, 1 - \rho]} (\mathbb{U}(t)^2 / [2t(1 - t)] - C_\nu(t)), \\ T_\nu^{(\rho, 2, L)} &:= \max_{t \in (0, \rho]} (\mathbb{U}(t)^2 / [2t(1 - t)] - C_\nu(t)), \\ T_\nu^{(\rho, 2, R)} &:= \max_{t \in [1 - \rho, 1)} (\mathbb{U}(t)^2 / [2t(1 - t)] - C_\nu(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} G(r) &= P(T_\nu^{(\rho, 1)} \leq r, T_\nu^{(\rho, 2, L)} \leq r, T_\nu^{(\rho, 2, R)} \leq r) \\ &\geq P\left(\max_{t \in [\rho, 1 - \rho]} |\mathbb{U}(t)| \leq \delta, T_\nu^{(\rho, 2, L)} \leq 0, T_\nu^{(\rho, 2, R)} \leq 0\right) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\delta := \sqrt{2\rho(1 - \rho)r} > 0$ .

According to Lemma 4.6, we may choose  $\rho$  such that  $P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2,L)} \leq 0) = P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2,R)} \leq 0) \geq 1/2$ . Now we apply Proposition 4.14 twice, first with  $[a, b] = [0, \rho]$ , and then with  $[a, b] = [1 - \rho, 1]$ . This shows that  $\mathbb{U}$  may be rewritten on  $[0, \rho]$  and on  $[1 - \rho, 1]$  as follows: for  $v \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{U}(\rho v) &= v\mathbb{U}(\rho) + \sqrt{\rho}\mathbb{U}^{(L)}(v), \\ \mathbb{U}(1 - \rho v) &= v\mathbb{U}(1 - \rho) + \sqrt{\rho}\mathbb{U}^{(R)}(v),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}^{(L)}, \mathbb{U}^{(R)}$  are independent Brownian bridge processes. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2,L)} \leq 0 \mid (\mathbb{U}(t))_{t \in [\rho, 1-\rho]}) &= P(|v\mathbb{U}(\rho) + \sqrt{\rho}\mathbb{U}^{(L)}(v)| \leq \sqrt{2\rho v(1-\rho v)C_\nu(\rho v)} \text{ for all } v \in [0, 1] \mid (\mathbb{U}(t))_{t \in [\rho, 1-\rho]}) \\ &= P(|\mathbb{U}(\rho)v/\sqrt{\rho} + \mathbb{U}^{(L)}(v)| \leq \sqrt{2v(1-\rho v)C_\nu(\rho v)} \text{ for all } v \in [0, 1] \mid (\mathbb{U}(t))_{t \in [\rho, 1-\rho]}) \\ &= G_1(\mathbb{U}(\rho)),\end{aligned}$$

where  $G_1(x) := P(|xh_o + \mathbb{U}| \leq h)$  with  $h_o(v) := v/\sqrt{\rho}$  and  $h(v) := \sqrt{2v(1-\rho v)C_\nu(\rho v)}$  for  $v \in [0, 1]$ . Analogously,

$$P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2,R)} \leq 0 \mid (\mathbb{U}(t))_{t \in [\rho, 1-\rho]}) = G_1(\mathbb{U}(1 - \rho)).$$

According to Proposition 4.13,  $G_1$  is an even, log-concave function on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since  $1/2 \leq P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2,L)} \leq 0) = E[G_1(\mathbb{U}(\rho))]$ , there exists a  $\delta_o > 0$  such that  $G_1(x) \geq 1/2$  for all  $x \in [-\delta_o, \delta_o]$ . Consequently,

$$G(r) \geq E(1_{\|\mathbb{U}\| \leq \delta \text{ on } [\rho, 1-\rho]} G_1(\mathbb{U}(\rho)) G_1(\mathbb{U}(1 - \rho))) \geq 4^{-1} P(\|\mathbb{U}\|_\infty \leq \min(\delta, \delta_o)) > 0.$$

That  $P(\|\mathbb{U}\|_\infty \leq \lambda) > 0$  for any  $\lambda > 0$  follows, for instance, from the expansion

$$P(\|\mathbb{U}\|_\infty \leq \lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{8\lambda^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2}{8\lambda^2}\right) (1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } \lambda \searrow 0;$$

see Mogul'skiĭ (1979) or Shorack and Wellner (2009), pp. 526-527. Alternatively, one could use Proposition 4.13 and separability of  $\mathcal{C}[0, 1]$ .  $\square$

## 5 Proofs for Section 3

### 5.1 Proofs for Subsection 3.1

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let  $(x_n)_n$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\Delta_n(x_n) \rightarrow \infty$ . Then for any fixed  $\kappa > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}P_{F_n} [T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0) \leq \kappa] &\leq P_{F_n} [x_n \notin [X_{n:1}, X_{n:n}]] \\ &\quad + P_{F_n} [nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x_n), F_0(x_n)) \leq C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n(x_n), F_0(x_n)) + \kappa],\end{aligned}\tag{5.22}$$

where  $K_s(u, \cdot) := \infty$  if  $s \leq 0$  and  $u \in \{0, 1\}$ .

To ensure that the first summand on the right hand side of (5.22) converges to 0, we show that  $x_n$  may be chosen such that  $d_n/n \leq F_n(x_n) \leq 1 - d_n/n$ , where  $d_n := \log \log n$ . To this end we have to analyze the auxiliary function  $H_n$  in more detail. Elementary calculus reveals that for  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $(1 + C(t))t(1 - t)$  is an increasing and  $1 + C(t)$  is a decreasing function of  $t(1 - t) \in [0, 1/4]$ . Moreover,

$$1 + C(d_n/n) = (1 + o(1))d_n \quad \text{and} \quad (d_n/n)(1 - d_n/n) = (1 + o(1))d_n/n,$$

whence

$$\min_{t \in [0, 1]} H_n(t) \geq (1 + o(1))n^{-1/2}d_n \quad \text{and} \quad H_n(d_n/n) = (2 + o(1))n^{-1/2}d_n.$$

In particular,

$$|F_n - F_0|(x_n) \geq \Delta_n(x_n)(1 + o(1))d_n/n.$$

Now suppose that  $F_n(x_n) < d_n/n$ . With  $\tilde{x}_n := F_n^{-1}(d_n/n)$  we may conclude that

$$F_n(\tilde{x}_n) \geq F_n(x_n) > |F_n - F_0|(x_n) - d_n/n \geq \Delta_n(x_n)(1 + o(1))d_n/n.$$

In particular,  $\max\{d_n/n, F_n(x_n)\}$  is of order  $o(F_n(\tilde{x}_n))$ , so

$$\Delta_n(\tilde{x}_n) \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}|F_n - F_0|(\tilde{x}_n)}{H_n(F_n)} \geq \frac{(1 + o(1))\sqrt{n}F_n(\tilde{x}_n)}{(2 + o(1))n^{-1/2}d_n} \geq (1/2 + o(1))\Delta_n(x_n) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Analogously one can show that in case of  $F_n(x_n) > 1 - d_n/n$ , we may replace  $x_n$  with  $\tilde{x}_n := F_n^{-1}(1 - d_n/n)$  at the cost of reducing  $\Delta_n(x_n)$  by a factor of at most  $1/2 + o(1)$ .

It remains to show that

$$P_{F_n} [nK_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x_n), F_0(x_n)) \leq C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n(x_n), F_0(x_n)) + \kappa] \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.23)$$

By means of the second part of Lemma S.12, the inequality for  $K_s(\mathbb{F}_n(x_n), F_0(x_n))$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|(x_n) &\leq \sqrt{2(C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n, F_0) + \kappa) \min\{\mathbb{F}_n(1 - \mathbb{F}_n), F_0(1 - F_0)\}(x_n)} \\ &\quad + 2(C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n, F_0) + \kappa)(x_n)/\sqrt{n} \\ &\leq 2 \max(1 + \nu, \kappa) \min\{H_n(\mathbb{F}_n), H_n(F_0)\}(x_n), \end{aligned}$$

because  $C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n, F_0) \leq \min\{C_\nu(\mathbb{F}_n), C_\nu(F_0)\}$ , and for the univariate function  $C_\nu$ , it follows from  $D \leq C$  that  $C_\nu + \kappa \leq \max(1 + \nu, \kappa)(1 + C)$ . Moreover, the assumption that  $d_n/n \leq F_n(x_n) \leq 1 - d_n/n$  implies that

$$\frac{h(\mathbb{F}_n)}{h(F_n)}(x_n) \rightarrow_p 1 \quad \text{for } h(t) = t, 1 + C(t), t(1 - t).$$

Consequently, (5.23) would be a consequence of

$$P_{F_n} [\sqrt{n}|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|(x_n) \leq O_p(1) \min\{H_n(F_n), H_n(F_0)\}(x_n)] \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.24)$$

To bound the left-hand side of (5.24) we consider the quantity

$$M_n := \max\left\{\frac{F_0(1 - F_0)}{F_n(1 - F_n)}(x_n), \frac{F_n(1 - F_n)}{F_0(1 - F_0)}(x_n)\right\} \geq 1$$

and distinguish two cases. Suppose first that  $M_n \leq \Delta_n(x_n)$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 + C(F_n)}{1 + C(F_0)}(x_n) \leq 1 &\leq \frac{F_n(1 - F_n)}{F_0(1 - F_0)}(x_n) \leq M_n \quad \text{or} \\ \frac{F_n(1 - F_n)}{F_0(1 - F_0)}(x_n) \leq 1 &\leq \frac{1 + C(F_n)}{1 + C(F_0)}(x_n) \leq 1 + \log M_n, \end{aligned}$$

the definition of  $H_n$  implies that

$$\frac{H_n(F_n)}{H_n(F_0)}(x_n) \leq \Delta_n(x_n)^{1/2}.$$

Then it follows from  $\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{F}_n - F_n)(x_n) = O_p(\sqrt{F_n(1 - F_n)}(x_n)) = O_p(H_n(F_n(x_n)))$  that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{F_n} [\sqrt{n}|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|(x_n) \leq O_p(1) \min\{H_n(F_n), H_n(F_0)\}(x_n)] \\ \leq P_{F_n} [\sqrt{n}|F_n - F_0|(x_n) \leq O_p(1) \min\{H_n(F_n), H_n(F_0)\}(x_n) + O_p(H_n(F_n(x_n)))] \\ \leq P_{F_n} [\sqrt{n}|F_n - F_0|(x_n) \leq O_p(\Delta_n(x_n)^{1/2}) \min\{H_n(F_n), H_n(F_0)\}(x_n)] \\ = P_{F_n} [\Delta_n(x_n) \leq O_p(\Delta_n(x_n)^{1/2})] \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $M_n \geq \Delta_n(x_n)^{1/2}$ . Then,

$$\frac{|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|}{|F_n - F_0|}(x_n) \geq 1 - \frac{|\mathbb{F}_n - F_n|}{|F_n - F_0|}(x_n) \geq 1 - \frac{|\mathbb{F}_n - F_n|}{|F_n(1 - F_n) - F_0(1 - F_0)|}(x_n) = 1 + O_p(\rho_n)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_n &:= \frac{\sqrt{F_n(1-F_n)}}{\sqrt{n}|F_n(1-F_n) - F_0(1-F_0)|}(x_n) \\ &= \frac{F_n(1-F_n)}{\sqrt{nF_n(1-F_n)}|F_n(1-F_n) - F_0(1-F_0)|}(x_n) \leq \frac{M_n}{(1+o(1))\sqrt{d_n}(M_n-1)} \rightarrow 0.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}P_{F_n}[\sqrt{n}|\mathbb{F}_n - F_0|(x_n) \leq O_p(1) \min\{H_n(F_n), H_n(F_0)\}(x_n)] \\ \leq P_{F_n}[\sqrt{n}|F_n - F_0|(x_n)(1+o_p(1)) \leq O_p(1) \min\{H_n(F_n), H_n(F_0)\}(x_n)] \\ \leq P_{F_n}[\Delta_n(x_n) \leq O_p(1)] \rightarrow 0.\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Corollary 3.2.* Since  $\|F_n - F_0\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ , it suffices to show that (3.14) is satisfied. In what follows we use frequently the elementary inequalities

$$\frac{\phi(x)}{x+1} \leq \Phi(-x) \leq \frac{\phi(x)}{x} \quad \text{for } x > 0, \quad (5.25)$$

where  $\phi(x) := \Phi'(x) = \exp(-x^2/2)/\sqrt{2\pi}$ . In particular, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(-x) &= \exp(-x^2/2 + O(\log x)) \quad \text{and} \\ C(\Phi(x)) &= \log(O(1) + \log(1/\Phi(-x))) = 2\log(x) - \log(2) + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Now consider two sequences  $(x_n)_n$  and  $(\mu_n)_n$  tending to  $\infty$ , and let  $F_0 = \Phi$ ,  $F_n = (1 - \varepsilon_n)\Phi + \varepsilon_n\Phi(\cdot - \mu_n)$ . Then the inequalities (5.25) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}[1 + C(F_0(x_n))]F_0(x_n)(1 - F_0(x_n)) &= [2\log(x_n) + O(1)]\Phi(-x_n)(1 + o(1)) \\ &= \exp[-x_n^2/2 + O(\log(x_n))].\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$F_0(x_n) - F_n(x_n) = \varepsilon_n(\Phi(\mu_n - x_n) - \Phi(-x_n)) = \varepsilon_n\Phi(\mu_n - x_n)(1 + o(1)),$$

because  $\Phi(-x_n) \leq \phi(x_n)/x_n$  while

$$\Phi(\mu_n - x_n) \geq \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{if } \mu_n \geq x_n, \\ \frac{\phi(x_n - \mu_n)}{x_n - \mu_n + 1} \geq \frac{\phi(x_n)\exp(\mu_n^2/2)}{x_n + 1} & \text{if } \mu_n < x_n. \end{cases}$$

Consequently,  $\Delta_n(x_n) \rightarrow \infty$  if

$$\frac{n\varepsilon_n\Phi(\mu_n - x_n)}{n^{1/2}\exp[-x_n^2/4 + O(\log(x_n))] + O(\log(x_n))} \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.26)$$

In part (a) with  $\varepsilon_n = n^{-\beta+o(1)}$  and  $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$ , we imitate the arguments of Donoho and Jin (2004) and consider

$$\mu_n = \sqrt{2r\log(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad x_n = \sqrt{2q\log(n)}$$

with  $0 < r < q \leq 1$ . Then by (5.25),

$$\begin{aligned}n\varepsilon_n\Phi(\mu_n - x_n) &= n^{1-\beta-(\sqrt{q}-\sqrt{r})^2+o(1)}, \\ n^{1/2}\exp[-x_n^2/4 + O(\log(x_n))] &= n^{1/2-q/2+o(1)}, \\ O(\log(x_n)) &= n^{o(1)},\end{aligned}$$

so the left hand side of (5.26) equals

$$\frac{n^{1-\beta-(\sqrt{q}-\sqrt{r})^2+o(1)}}{n^{1/2-q/2+o(1)} + n^{o(1)}} = \frac{n^{1/2-\beta+q/2-(\sqrt{q}-\sqrt{r})^2+o(1)}}{1 + n^{(q-1)/2+o(1)}} = \frac{n^{1/2-\beta+2\sqrt{r}\sqrt{q}-\sqrt{q}^2/2-r+o(1)}}{1 + n^{(q-1)/2+o(1)}}.$$

The exponent in the numerator is maximal in  $q \in (r, 1]$  if  $\sqrt{q} = \min\{2\sqrt{r}, 1\}$ , i.e.  $q = \min\{4r, 1\}$ , and this leads to

$$\begin{cases} 1/2 - \beta + r & \text{if } r \leq 1/4, \\ 1 - \beta - (1 - \sqrt{r})^2 & \text{if } r \geq 1/4. \end{cases}$$

Thus when  $\beta \in (1/2, 3/4)$  we should choose  $\beta - 1/2 < r < 1/4$  and  $q = 4r$ . When  $\beta \in [3/4, 1)$  we should choose  $(1 - \sqrt{1 - \beta})^2 < r < 1$  and  $q = 1$ .

As to part (b), we consider the more general setting that  $\varepsilon_n = n^{-\beta+o(1)}$  for some  $\beta \in [1/2, 3/4)$ , where  $\pi_n = \sqrt{n}\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ . Note that this scenario covers also a part of part (a), so we establish a connection between the two parts. The constraint that  $\pi_n \rightarrow 0$  is trivial when  $\beta > 1/2$  but relevant when  $\beta = 1/2$ . Now we consider

$$\mu_n := \sqrt{2\lambda \log(1/\pi_n)} \quad \text{and} \quad x_n := \sqrt{2q \log(1/\pi_n)}$$

with arbitrary constants  $0 < \lambda < q$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} n\varepsilon_n \Phi(\mu_n - x_n) &= n^{1/2} \pi_n \Phi(\mu_n - x_n) \\ &= n^{1/2} \pi_n^{1+(\sqrt{q}-\sqrt{\lambda})^2+o(1)}, \\ n^{1/2} \exp(-x_n^2/4 + O(\log(x_n))) &= n^{1/2} \pi_n^{q/2+o(1)}, \\ O(\log(x_n)) &= \pi_n^{o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

so the left hand side of (5.26) equals

$$\frac{n^{1/2} \pi_n^{1+(\sqrt{q}-\sqrt{\lambda})^2+o(1)}}{n^{1/2} \pi_n^{q/2+o(1)} + \pi_n^{o(1)}} = \frac{\pi_n^{1+q/2-2\sqrt{q}\sqrt{\lambda}+\lambda+o(1)}}{1 + n^{-1/2} \pi_n^{-q/2+o(1)}} = \frac{\pi_n^{1+q/2-2\sqrt{q}\sqrt{\lambda}+\lambda+o(1)}}{1 + n^{-1/2+(\beta-1/2)q/2+o(1)}}.$$

The exponent of  $\pi_n$  becomes minimal in  $q \in (\lambda, \infty)$  if  $q = 4\lambda$ . Then we obtain

$$\frac{\pi_n^{1-\lambda+o(1)}}{1 + n^{-1/2+(2\beta-1)\lambda+o(1)}} = \frac{\pi_n^{1-\lambda+o(1)}}{1 + \sqrt{n}^{(4\beta-2)\lambda-1+o(1)}},$$

and this converges to  $\infty$  if the limiting exponents of  $\pi_n$  and  $\sqrt{n}$  are negative. This is the case if  $1 < \lambda < 1/(4\beta - 2)$ . (Note that  $4\beta - 2 < 1$  because  $\beta < 3/4$ .)  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* Standard LAN theory implies that  $P_{F_n}(S_n) \rightarrow 0$  for arbitrary events  $S_n$  depending on  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  such that  $P_{F_0}(S_n) \rightarrow 0$ . Thus for any fixed  $0 < \rho < 1/2$ ,  $\varphi_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) \neq \varphi_{n,\rho}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  with asymptotic probability zero, both under the null and under the alternative hypothesis. Hence it suffices to show that

$$\limsup_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{F_n} \varphi_{n,\rho}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq \alpha.$$

But  $E_{F_n} \varphi_{n,\rho}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  does not change if we replace  $f_n$  with the modified density

$$f_{n,\rho}(x) := \begin{cases} f_n(x), & \text{if } x \notin [x_\rho, y_\rho] \\ c_{n,\rho} f_0(x), & \text{if } x \in [x_\rho, y_\rho] \end{cases}$$

with

$$c_{n,\rho} := \frac{F_n(y_\rho) - F_n(x_\rho)}{1 - 2\rho}.$$

This follows from the fact that the distribution function  $F_{n,\rho}$  of  $f_{n,\rho}$  satisfies  $F_{n,\rho}(x) = F_n(x)$  for  $x \notin [x_\rho, y_\rho]$ , so the distribution of  $\{\mathbb{F}_n(x) : x \notin [x_\rho, y_\rho]\}$  under the alternative hypothesis remains unchanged if we replace  $f_n$  with  $f_{n,\rho}$ . But

$$\sqrt{n}(c_{n,\rho} - 1) \rightarrow \delta_\rho := \frac{A(y_\rho) - A(x_\rho)}{1 - 2\rho},$$

so

$$\sqrt{n}(f_{n,\rho}^{1/2} - f_0^{1/2}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}a_\rho f_0^{1/2} \quad \text{in } L_2(\lambda)$$

with

$$a_\rho(x) = \begin{cases} a(x), & \text{if } x \notin [x_\rho, y_\rho], \\ \delta_\rho, & \text{if } x \in [x_\rho, y_\rho]. \end{cases}$$

Hence the asymptotic power of the test  $\varphi_{n,\rho}$  under the alternative is bounded by the asymptotic power of the optimal test of  $F_0$  versus  $F_{n,\rho}$  at level  $\alpha$ , so

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{F_n} \varphi_{n,\rho}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \|a_\rho\|_{L_2(F_0)}).$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \|a_\rho\|_{L_2(F_0)}^2 &= \int_{(-\infty, x_\rho) \cup (y_\rho, \infty)} a^2 dF_0 + (1 - 2\rho)\delta_\rho^2 \\ &= \int_{(-\infty, x_\rho) \cup (y_\rho, \infty)} a^2 dF_0 + \frac{(A(y_\rho) - A(x_\rho))^2}{(1 - 2\rho)} \end{aligned}$$

converges to 0 as  $\rho \searrow 0$ , so  $\Phi(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) + \|a_\rho\|_{L_2(F_0)}) \rightarrow \alpha$  as  $\rho \searrow 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* Let  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  be fixed. The test statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}$  for the uniform empirical process may be written as the maximum of  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)}$  and  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,2)}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)} &:= \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{n,s} \cap [\rho, 1-\rho]} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)), \\ T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,2)} &:= \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{n,s} \setminus [\rho, 1-\rho]} (nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\mathcal{T}_{n,s} := (0, 1)$  if  $s > 0$  and  $\mathcal{T}_n := [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n}]$  if  $s \leq 0$ . A supremum over the empty set is defined to be  $-\infty$ . The proofs of Theorems 2.2 and 2.1 can be easily adapted to show that

$$T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)} \rightarrow_d T_\nu^{(\rho,1)} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,2)} \rightarrow_d T_\nu^{(\rho,2)} := \max\{T_\nu^{(\rho,2,L)}, T_\nu^{(\rho,2,R)}\},$$

where the test statistics  $T_\nu^{(\rho,1)}$ ,  $T_\nu^{(\rho,2,L)}$  and  $T_\nu^{(\rho,2,R)}$  are defined as in the proof of Lemma 4.11. In particular, since  $C_\nu(1/2) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{U}(1/2) \neq 0$  almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)} > 0) &= 1, \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,2)} \geq 0) &\leq \pi_0(\rho) := P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2)} \geq 0). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\pi_0(\rho) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  by virtue of Lemma 4.6.

Now we consider the goodness-of-fit test statistic  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$ . It is the maximum of  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)}(F_0)$  and  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,2)}(F_0)$ . Here  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,j)}(F_0)$  is defined as  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,j)}$ , where  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{n,s}$  is replaced with  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  if  $s > 0$  and  $x \in [X_{n:1}, X_{n:n}]$  if  $s \leq 0$ ,  $[\rho, 1 - \rho]$  is replaced with  $[x_\rho, y_\rho] = [F_0^{-1}(\rho), F_0^{-1}(1 - \rho)]$ , and  $(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)$  is replaced with  $(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F_0(x))$ . Under the null hypothesis,  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,j)}(F_0)$  has the same distribution as  $T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,j)}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . This convergence and standard LAN theory imply that under the alternative hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)}(F_0) > 0) &= 1, \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,2)}(F_0) \geq 0) &\leq \pi_A(\rho) := \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(\pi_0(\rho)) + \|a\|_{L_2(F_0)}). \end{aligned}$$



With standard empirical process theory one can show that under the alternative hypothesis,

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0) \rightarrow_d \mathbb{U} \circ F_0 + A$$

in the space  $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  of bounded functions on  $\mathbb{R}$ , equipped with the supremum norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . Moreover, for arbitrary bounded functions  $h, h_n$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\|h_n - h\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$nK_s(F_0 + n^{-1/2}h_n, F_0) - C_\nu(F_0 + n^{-1/2}h_n, F_0) \rightarrow h^2/[2F_0(1 - F_0)] - C_\nu(F_0)$$

uniformly on  $[x_\rho, y_\rho]$ . By virtue of an extended continuous mapping theorem, e.g. van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), Theorem 1.11.1, page 67, one can conclude that

$$T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)}(F_0) \rightarrow_d T_\nu^{(\rho,1)}(A),$$

where  $T_\nu^{(\rho,j)}(A)$  is defined as  $T_\nu^{(\rho,j)}$  with  $\mathbb{U} + A \circ F_0^{-1}$  in place of  $\mathbb{U}$ . Finally, note that the distribution  $Q_A$  of  $\mathbb{U} + A \circ F_0^{-1}$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the distribution  $Q_0$  of  $\mathbb{U}$ , where  $\log(dQ_A/dQ_0)$  has distribution  $N(-\|a\|_{L_2(F_0)}^2/2, \|a\|_{L_2(F_0)}^2)$  under  $Q_0$ . This follows from Shorack and Wellner (2009) (Section 4.1 and especially Theorem 4.1.5, page 157), or van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) (Section 3.10). Consequently,

$$P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2)}(A) \geq 0) \leq \pi_A(\rho).$$

All in all, we may conclude that

$$P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0) \leq 0) \leq P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)}(F_0) \leq 0) \rightarrow 0,$$

and for fixed  $r > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0) \leq r) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)}(F_0) \leq r) \\ &\leq P(T_\nu^{(\rho,1)}(A) \leq r) \\ &\leq P(T_\nu(A) \leq r) + P(T_\nu^{(\rho,2)}(A) > r) \\ &\leq P(T_\nu(A) \leq r) + \pi_A(\rho), \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0) \geq r) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,1)}(F_0) < r) \\ &\quad + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{F_n}(T_{n,s,\nu}^{(\rho,2)}(F_0) \geq r) \\ &\leq P(T_\nu^{(\rho,1)}(A) \geq r) + \pi_A(\rho) \\ &\leq P(T_\nu(A) \geq r) + \pi_A(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\pi_A(\rho) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \searrow 0$ , this proves that  $T_{n,s,\nu}(F_0)$  converges in distribution to  $T_\nu(A)$  under the alternative hypothesis.

The convergence claimed in the second part of the theorem follows from the first part together with convergence of the critical values  $\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}$  to  $\kappa_{\nu,\alpha}$ . The inequality claimed in the second part is a consequence of Anderson's Anderson (1955) inequality or Proposition 4.13 with  $h_o := A \circ F_0^{-1}$  and  $h(t) := \sqrt{2t(1-t)}(C_\nu(t) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha})$ .

The third part of the theorem follows from the fact that for any  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(T_\nu(A) > \kappa_{\nu,\alpha}) &\geq P\left(\frac{(\mathbb{U} + A \circ F_0^{-1})^2(t)}{2t(1-t)} > C_\nu(t) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha}\right) \\ &\geq \Phi\left(\frac{|A(F_0^{-1}(t))|}{\sqrt{t(1-t)}} - \sqrt{2C_\nu(t) + 2\kappa_{\nu,\alpha}}\right) \\ &= \Phi\left(\frac{|A(F_0^{-1}(t))|}{\sqrt{t(1-t)}} - \sqrt{2C(t)} - b_{\nu,\alpha}(t)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $b_{\nu,\alpha} := (2\nu D + 2\kappa_{\nu,\alpha})/(\sqrt{2C} + 2\nu D + 2\kappa_{\nu,\alpha} + \sqrt{2C})$  is bounded on  $(0, 1)$ .  $\square$

## 5.2 Proofs for Subsection 3.2

For notational convenience, we suppress the dependence of the confidence bounds on  $s, \nu$  and  $\alpha$  and just write  $a_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}}, a_{n,i}, b_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}}$  and  $b_{n,i}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.5.* Note first that  $H_s(u, t) = \gamma H_s(u/\gamma, t/\gamma)$  for arbitrary  $u \geq 0, t > 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ .

Now we prove the claim for the upper bounds  $b_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}} = 1 - a_{n,n-i}^{\text{BJO}}$  and  $b_{n,i} = 1 - a_{n,n-i}$ . For any integer  $i \in [0, n^\delta]$  let

$$x_{n,i} := u_{n,i}/\gamma_n = i/\log \log n.$$

For fixed  $\lambda > 0$  let

$$\tilde{b}_{n,i} := u_{n,i} + \lambda \gamma_n (B_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i}) = \gamma_n (x_{n,i} + \lambda (B_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i})) > u_{n,i}.$$

It follows from  $x + s \leq B_s(x) \leq x + 1 + \sqrt{2x + 1}$  that

$$\lambda s \gamma_n \leq \tilde{b}_{n,i} \leq \lambda \gamma_n B_s(n^\delta / \log \log n) = (\lambda + o(1)) n^{\delta-1}.$$

On the one hand, if  $\lambda > 1$ , then it follows from the first inequality in (S.15) that

$$nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) \geq nH_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) = n\gamma_n H_s(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i} + \lambda (B_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i})) \geq n\gamma_n \lambda,$$

because  $H_s(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i} + t(B_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i}))$  is convex in  $t$  with values 0 for  $t = 0$  and 1 for  $t = 1$ . And if  $\lambda < 1$ , the second inequality in (S.15) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) &\leq nH_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) / (1 - \tilde{b}_{n,i})^+ \\ &= n\gamma_n H_s(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i} + \lambda (B_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i})) / (1 - \tilde{b}_{n,i}) \\ &\leq n\gamma_n \lambda / (1 - (\lambda + o(1)) n^{\delta-1}) = n\gamma_n (\lambda + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,  $\kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}} = (1 + o(1)) n\gamma_n$  and

$$\begin{aligned} C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} &= C_\nu(\tilde{b}_{n,i}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} \\ &\begin{cases} \leq C_\nu(\lambda s \gamma_n) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} = (1 + o(1)) n\gamma_n, \\ \geq C_\nu((\lambda + o(1)) n^{\delta-1}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} = (1 + o(1)) n\gamma_n. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for any fixed  $\lambda > 1$  and sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) > \max\{C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}, \kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}\}$$

and thus

$$\max\{b_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}} - u_{n,i}, b_{n,i} - u_{n,i}\} \leq \lambda \gamma_n (B_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i})$$

for all integers  $i \in [0, n^\delta]$ . Likewise, for any fixed  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) < \min\{C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}, \kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}}\}$$

and thus

$$\min\{b_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}} - u_{n,i}, b_{n,i} - u_{n,i}\} \geq \lambda \gamma_n (B_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i})$$

for all integers  $i \in [0, n^\delta]$ .

The differences  $u_{n,i} - a_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}} = b_{n,n-i}^{\text{BJO}} - u_{n,n-i}$  and  $u_{n,i} - a_{n,i} = b_{n,n-i} - u_{n,n-i}$  can be treated analogously. For each integer  $i \in [1, n^\delta]$  and fixed  $\lambda > 0$  let  $x_{n,i} = u_{n,i}/\gamma_n = i/\log \log n$  as before and

$$\tilde{a}_{n,i} := u_{n,i} + \lambda \gamma_n (A_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i}) = \gamma_n (x_{n,i} + \lambda (A_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i})) < u_{n,i}.$$

On the one hand, if  $\lambda > 1$  and  $\tilde{a}_{n,i} > 0$ , then  $A_s(x_{n,i}) > 0$  and

$$nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{a}_{n,i}) \geq nH_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{a}_{n,i}) = n\gamma_n H_s(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i} + \lambda (A_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i})) \geq n\gamma_n \lambda,$$

because  $H_s(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i} + t(A_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i}))$  is convex in  $t \in [0, \lambda]$  with values 0 for  $t = 0$  and 1 for  $t = 1$ . And if  $\lambda < 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{a}_{n,i}) &\leq nH_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{a}_{n,i})/(1 - u_{n,i}) \\ &= n\gamma_n H_s(x_{n,i}, x_{n,i} + \lambda(A_s(x_{n,i}) - x_{n,i}))/ (1 - u_{n,i}) \\ &\leq n\gamma_n \lambda / (1 - n^{\delta-1}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,  $\kappa_{n,s,\alpha}^{\text{BJ}} = (1 + o(1))n\gamma_n$  and

$$\begin{aligned} C_\nu(u_{i,n}, \tilde{a}_{i,n}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} &= C_\nu(u_{i,n}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} \\ &\begin{cases} \leq C_\nu(n^{-1}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} = (1 + o(1))n\gamma_n, \\ \geq C_\nu(\min\{n^{\delta-1}, 1/2\}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} = (1 + o(1))n\gamma_n. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for any fixed  $\lambda > 1$  and sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\max\{u_{n,i} - a_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}}, u_{n,i} - a_{n,i}\} \leq \lambda\gamma_n(x_{n,i} - A_s(x_{n,i}))$$

for all integers  $i \in [1, n^\delta]$ . Likewise, for any fixed  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\min\{u_{n,i} - a_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}}, u_{n,i} - a_{n,i}\} \geq \lambda\gamma_n(x_{n,i} - A_s(x_{n,i}))$$

for all integers  $i \in [1, n^\delta]$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.7.* We only prove the bounds for  $a_{n,i}$  and  $b_{n,i}$ . The bounds for  $a_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}}$  and  $b_{n,i}^{\text{BJO}}$  can be derived analogously with obvious modifications. Moreover, since  $u_{n,i} - a_{n,i} = b_{n,n-i} - u_{n,n-i}$ , it suffices to prove the bounds for  $b_{n,i}$  only. For a fixed factor  $\lambda > 0$  and any integer  $i \in [n^\delta, n - n^\delta]$  let

$$\tilde{b}_{n,i} := u_{n,i} + \lambda\sqrt{2\gamma_n(u_{n,i})u_{n,i}(1 - u_{n,i})}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \frac{\tilde{b}_{n,i} - u_{n,i}}{u_{n,i}(1 - u_{n,i})} &\leq \lambda\sqrt{2n^{-1}(C_\nu(n^{\delta-1}) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha})n^{1-\delta}(1 - n^{\delta-1})^{-1}} \\ &= O(n^{-\delta/2}(\log \log n)^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$c_n := \max_{n^\delta \leq i \leq n - n^\delta} |\text{logit}(\tilde{b}_{n,i}) - \text{logit}(u_{n,i})| = o(1).$$

On the one hand, the inequalities (S.14) imply that uniformly in  $n^\delta \leq i \leq n - n^\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) &= nK_{1-s}(\tilde{b}_{n,i}, u_{n,i}) = (1 + o(1))nK_2(\tilde{b}_{n,i}, u_{n,i}) \\ &= (1 + o(1))\lambda^2(C_\nu(u_{n,i}) + \kappa_{\nu,\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Lemma S.10 and Theorem 2.1 imply that uniformly in  $n^\delta \leq i \leq n - n^\delta$ ,

$$|C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} - C_\nu(u_{n,i}) - \kappa_{\nu,\alpha}| \leq (1 + \nu)c_n + |\kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha} - \kappa_{\nu,\alpha}| = o(1).$$

Consequently, for fixed  $\lambda > 1$  and sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) > C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}$$

and thus

$$b_{n,i} - u_{n,i} \leq \lambda\sqrt{2\gamma_n(u_{n,i})u_{n,i}(1 - u_{n,i})}$$

for all integers  $i \in [n^\delta, n - n^\delta]$ . Likewise, for fixed  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$nK_s(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) < C_\nu(u_{n,i}, \tilde{b}_{n,i}) + \kappa_{n,s,\nu,\alpha}$$

and thus

$$b_{n,i} - u_{n,i} \geq \lambda\sqrt{2\gamma_n(u_{n,i})u_{n,i}(1 - u_{n,i})}$$

for all integers  $i \in [n^\delta, n - n^\delta]$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** The authors owe thanks to David Mason for pointing out the relevance of the tools of Csörgő et al. Csörgő et al. (1986) for some of the results presented here. We are also grateful to Günther Walther for stimulating conversations about likelihood ratio tests in nonparametric settings and to Rudy Beran for pointing out the interesting results of Bahadur and Savage Bahadur and Savage (1956). Constructive comments of two referees and an associate editor are gratefully acknowledged.

The first author was supported in part by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

The second author was supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-1104832 and NI-AID grant 2R01 AI291968-04.

## References

- ALFERS, D. and DINGES, H. (1984). A normal approximation for beta and gamma tail probabilities. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **65** 399–420.
- ANDERSON, T. W. (1955). The integral of a symmetric unimodal function over a symmetric convex set and some probability inequalities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6** 170–176.
- BAHADUR, R. R. and SAVAGE, L. J. (1956). The nonexistence of certain statistical procedures in nonparametric problems. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **27** 1115–1122.
- BERK, R. H. and JONES, D. H. (1979). Goodness-of-fit test statistics that dominate the Kolmogorov statistics. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **47** 47–59.
- BORELL, C. (1974). Convex measures on locally convex spaces. *Ark. Mat.* **12** 239–252.
- CSÖRGŐ, M., CSÖRGŐ, S., HORVÁTH, L. and MASON, D. M. (1986). Weighted empirical and quantile processes. *Ann. Probab.* **14** 31–85.
- DONOHU, D. L. and JIN, J. (2004). Higher criticism for detecting sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *Ann. Statist.* **32** 962–994.
- DÜMBGEN, L. (1998). New goodness-of-fit tests and their application to nonparametric confidence sets. *Ann. Statist.* **26** 288–314.
- DÜMBGEN, L. and SPOKOINY, V. G. (2001). Multiscale testing of qualitative hypotheses. *Ann. Statist.* **29** 124–152.
- DÜMBGEN, L. and WALTHER, G. (2008). Multiscale inference about a density. *Ann. Statist.* **36** 1758–1785.
- EICKER, F. (1979). The asymptotic distribution of the suprema of the standardized empirical processes. *Ann. Statist.* **7** 116–138.
- ERDŐS, P. (1942). On the law of the iterated logarithm. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **43** 419–436.
- GAENSSLER, P., MOLNÁR, P. and ROST, D. (2007). On continuity and strict increase of the CDF for the sup-functional of a Gaussian process with applications to statistics. *Results Math.* **51** 51–60.
- GONTSCHARUK, V., LANDWEHR, S. and FINNER, H. (2016). Goodness of fit tests in terms of local levels with special emphasis on higher criticism tests. *Bernoulli* **22** 1331–1363.
- HOEFFDING, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **58** 13–30.
- INGSTER, Y. I. (1997). Some problems of hypothesis testing leading to infinitely divisible distributions. *Math. Methods Statist.* **6** 47–69.
- ITÔ, K. and MCKEAN, H. P., JR. (1974). *Diffusion Processes and their Sample Paths*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. Second printing, corrected, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 125.

- JAESCHKE, D. (1979). The asymptotic distribution of the supremum of the standardized empirical distribution function on subintervals. *Ann. Statist.* **7** 108–115.
- JAGER, L. and WELLNER, J. A. (2007). Goodness-of-fit tests via phi-divergences. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 2018–2053.
- JANSSEN, A. (1995). Principal component decomposition of non-parametric tests. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **101** 193–209.
- KIEFER, J. (1973). Iterated logarithm analogues for sample quantiles when  $p_n \downarrow 0$ . In *Proceedings of the 6th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, vol. 1. University of California.
- LEHMANN, E. L. and ROMANO, J. P. (2005). *Testing Statistical Hypotheses*. 3rd ed. Springer, New York.
- MASON, D. M. and SCHUENEMEYER, J. H. (1983). A modified Kolmogorov-Smirnov test sensitive to tail alternatives. *Ann. Statist.* **11** 933–946.
- MILBRODT, H. and STRASSER, H. (1990). On the asymptotic power of the two-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **26** 1–23.
- MOGUL'SKIĬ, A. A. (1979). The law of the iterated logarithm in Chung's form for function spaces. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **24** 399–407.
- NOÉ, M. (1972). The calculation of distributions of two-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov type statistics. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **43** 58–64.
- ORASCH, M. and POULIOT, W. (2004). Tabulating weighted sup-norm functionals used in change-point analysis. *J. Stat. Comput. Simul.* **74** 249–276.
- O'REILLY, N. E. (1974). On the weak convergence of empirical processes in sup-norm metrics. *Ann. Probability* **2** 642–651.
- OWEN, A. B. (1995). Nonparametric likelihood confidence bands for a distribution function. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **90** 516–521.
- R CORE TEAM (2019). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.  
URL <https://www.R-project.org/>
- RÉNYI, A. (1969). On some problems in the theory of order statistics. *Bull. Inst. Internat. Statist.* **42** 165–176.
- RÉVÉSZ, P. (1982/83). A joint study of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Eicker-Jaeschke statistics. *Statist. Decisions* **1** 57–65.
- ROHDE, A. and DÜMBGEN, L. (2013). Statistical inference for the optimal approximating model. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **155** 839–865.
- SCHMIDT-HIEBER, J., MUNK, A. and DÜMBGEN, L. (2013). Multiscale methods for shape constraints in deconvolution: confidence statements for qualitative features. *Ann. Statist.* **41** 1299–1328.
- SHORACK, G. R. and WELLNER, J. A. (1986). *Empirical Processes with Applications to Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- SHORACK, G. R. and WELLNER, J. A. (2009). *Empirical Processes with Applications to Statistics*, vol. 59 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA. Reprint of the 1986 original [MR0838963].
- SIMON, B. (2011). *Convexity*, vol. 187 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- STEPANOVA, N. A. and PAVLENKO, T. (2018). Goodness-of-fit tests based on sup-functionals of weighted empirical processes. *Teor. Veroyatn. Primen.* **63** 358–388.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. and WELLNER, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer-Verlag, New York. With applications to statistics.
- WELLNER, J. A. (1978). Limit theorems for the ratio of the empirical distribution function to the true distribution function. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **45** 73–88.
- ZUBKOV, A. M. and SEROV, A. A. (2013). A complete proof of universal inequalities for the distribution function of the binomial law. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **57** 539–544.

## S Supplement

References within this document start with ‘S.’ or ‘(S.’. All other references refer to the main paper.

### S.1 Kolmogorov’s upper function test

As mentioned in the introduction, inequality (1.10) is a consequence of Kolmogorov’s integral test for “upper and lower functions” for Brownian motion. Let  $\mathbb{W}$  denote standard Brownian motion on  $[0, \infty)$  starting at 0, and let  $h$  be a positive continuous function on a nonempty interval  $(0, b] \subset (0, \infty)$  such that  $h \nearrow$  and  $t^{-1/2}h(t) \searrow$ .

**Proposition S.1.** *Let*

$$I_h := \int_0^b t^{-3/2} h(t) \exp(-h^2(t)/2t) dt.$$

Then

$$P(\mathbb{W}(t) \geq h(t) \text{ infinitely often as } t \searrow 0) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } I_h < \infty, \\ 1, & \text{if } I_h = \infty. \end{cases}$$

If  $I_h < \infty$ , then  $h$  is an “upper-class function” for  $\mathbb{W}$ , and if  $I_h = \infty$ , then  $h$  is a “lower-class function” for  $\mathbb{W}$ . In particular, the function

$$h_\epsilon(t) = \sqrt{2t(\log \log(1/t) + (3/2 + \epsilon) \log \log \log(1/t))}, \quad t \in (0, e^{-e}],$$

is an upper class function for  $\mathbb{W}$  if  $\epsilon > 0$ , and it is a lower class function for  $\mathbb{W}$  if  $\epsilon = 0$ . See Erdős (1942) and Itô and McKean (1974), pages 33-36.

### S.2 A general non-Gaussian LIL

Our conditions and results involve the previously defined function  $\text{logit} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\text{logit}(t) = \log(t/(1-t))$ . Its inverse is the logistic function  $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  given by

$$\ell(x) := \frac{e^x}{1 + e^x} = \frac{1}{e^{-x} + 1},$$

and

$$\ell'(x) = \ell(x)(1 - \ell(x)) = \frac{1}{e^x + e^{-x} + 2}.$$

We consider stochastic processes  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$  on subsets  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $(0, 1)$  which have locally uniformly sub-exponential tails in the following sense:

**Condition S.2.** There exist real constants  $M \geq 1$ ,  $\gamma \geq 0$  and a non-increasing function  $L : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $L(c) = 1 - O(c)$  as  $c \searrow 0$ , and

$$P\left(\sup_{t \in [\ell(a), \ell(a+c)] \cap \mathcal{T}} X(t) > \eta\right) \leq M \exp(-L(c)\eta) \max(1, L(c)\eta)^{-\gamma} \quad (\text{S.1})$$

for arbitrary  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $c \geq 0$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem S.3.** *Suppose that  $X$  satisfies Condition S.2. For arbitrary  $\nu > 1 - \gamma/2$  and  $L_0 \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a real constant  $M_0 \geq 1$  depending only on  $M$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $L(\cdot)$ ,  $\nu$  and  $L_0$  such that*

$$P\left(\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (X(t) - C_\nu(t)) > \eta\right) \leq M_0 \exp(-L_0\eta) \quad \text{for arbitrary } \eta \geq 0.$$

**Remark S.4.** Suppose that  $X$  satisfies Condition S.2, where  $\inf(\mathcal{T}) = 0$  and  $\sup(\mathcal{T}) = 1$ . For any  $\nu > 1 - \gamma/2$ , the supremum  $T_\nu(X)$  of  $X - C_\nu$  over  $\mathcal{T}$  is finite almost surely. But this implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \{0,1\}} (X(t) - C_\nu(t)) = -\infty$$

almost surely. For if  $1 - \gamma/2 < \nu' < \nu$ , then

$$X(t) - C_{\nu'}(t) = X(t) - C(t) - \nu D(t) \leq T_{\nu'}(X) - (\nu - \nu')D(t),$$

so the claim follows from  $T_{\nu'}(X) < \infty$  almost surely and  $D(t) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ .

**Remark S.5.** Our definition of the function  $D = \log(1 + C^2)$  may look somewhat arbitrary. Indeed, we tried various choices, e.g.  $D = 2 \log(1 + C)$ . Theorem S.3 is valid for any nonnegative function  $D$  on  $(0, 1)$  such that  $D(1 - \cdot) = D(\cdot)$  and  $D(t)/\log \log \log(1/t) \rightarrow 2$  as  $t \searrow 0$ . The special choice  $D = \log(1 + C^2)$  yields a rather uniform distribution of  $\operatorname{argmax}_{(0,1)}(X - C_{\nu})$  in case of  $X(t) = \mathbb{U}(t)^2/(2t(1-t))$  and  $\nu$  close to one.

*Proof of Theorem S.3.* For symmetry reasons it suffices to prove upper bounds for

$$P\left(\sup_{\mathcal{T} \cap [1/2, 1)} (X - C_{\nu}) > \eta\right).$$

Let  $(a_k)_{k \geq 0}$  be a sequence of real numbers with  $a_0 = 0$  such that

$$a_k \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \delta_k := a_{k+1} - a_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{S.2})$$

Then it follows from  $0 \leq \operatorname{logit}(t) - \operatorname{logit}(\ell(a_k)) \leq \delta_k$  for  $t \in [\ell(a_k), \ell(a_{k+1})]$  and Lemma S.10 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{T} \cap [\ell(a_k), \ell(a_{k+1})]} (X - C_{\nu}) &\leq \sup_{\mathcal{T} \cap [\ell(a_k), \ell(a_{k+1})]} X - C_{\nu}(\ell(a_k)) + (1 + \nu)\delta_k \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathcal{T} \cap [\ell(a_k), \ell(a_{k+1})]} X - C_{\nu}(\ell(a_k)) + (1 + \nu)\delta_* \end{aligned}$$

with  $\delta_* := \max_{k \geq 0} \delta_k$ . Thus Condition S.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\sup_{\mathcal{T} \cap [1/2, 1)} (X - C_{\nu}) > \eta\right) &\leq \sum_{k \geq 0} P\left(\sup_{\mathcal{T} \cap [\ell(a_k), \ell(a_{k+1})]} (X - C_{\nu}) > \eta\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 0} P\left(\sup_{\mathcal{T} \cap [\ell(a_k), \ell(a_{k+1})]} X > \eta - (1 + \nu)\delta_* + C(\ell(a_k)) + \nu D(\ell(a_k))\right) \\ &\leq M \exp((1 + \nu)\delta_*) L(\delta_*)^{-\gamma} \exp(-\eta L(\delta_*)) \cdot G, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G &:= \sum_{k \geq 0} \exp(-L(\delta_k)C(\ell(a_k)) - L(\delta_k)\nu D(\ell(a_k))) \max(1, C(\ell(a_k)) - (1 + \nu)\delta_*)^{-\gamma} \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \left(\log \frac{e}{4\ell'(a_k)}\right)^{-L(\delta_k)} \left(1 + \left(\log \log \frac{e}{4\ell'(a_k)}\right)^2\right)^{-\nu L(\delta_k)} \\ &\quad \cdot \max\left(1, \log \log \frac{e}{4\ell'(a_k)} - (1 + \nu)\delta_*\right)^{-\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we define

$$a_k := \delta_* A(k) \quad \text{with} \quad A(s) := \frac{s}{\log(e + s)}$$

for some  $\delta_* > 0$  such that  $L(\delta_*) \geq L_0 \in (0, 1)$ . Note that  $A(\cdot)$  is a continuously differentiable function on  $[0, \infty)$  with  $A(0) = 0$ , limit  $A(\infty) = \infty$  and derivative

$$A'(s) = \frac{1}{\log(e + s)} \left(1 - \frac{s}{(e + s)\log(e + s)}\right) \in \left(0, \frac{1}{\log(e + s)}\right).$$

This implies that (S.2) is indeed satisfied with

$$\log a_k = \log k + o(\log k) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_k \leq \frac{\delta_*}{\log(e + k)} = O(1/\log k) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$



Moreover, for any number  $a \geq 0$ ,

$$1 \leq \log \frac{e}{4\ell'(a)} = \log \frac{e(e^a + e^{-a} + 2)}{4} \in (a + \log(e/4), a + 1].$$

Consequently, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \log \frac{e}{4\ell'(a_k)} \right)^{-L(\delta_k)} \left( 1 + \left( \log \log \frac{e}{4\ell'(a_k)} \right)^2 \right)^{-\nu L(\delta_k)} \\ & \quad \max \left( 1, \log \log \frac{e}{4\ell'(a_k)} - (1 + \nu)\delta_* \right)^{-\gamma} \\ & = O(a_k^{-L(\delta_k)} \log(a_k)^{-2\nu L(\delta_k) - \gamma}) \\ & = O(k^{-L(\delta_k)} (\log k)^{L(\delta_k)} (\log k)^{-2\nu L(\delta_k) - \gamma}) \\ & = O(k^{-1 + O(1/\log k)} (\log k)^{-(2\nu - 1)L(\delta_k) - \gamma}) \\ & = O(k^{-1} (\log k)^{-(2\nu - 1 + \gamma + o(1))}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $2\nu - 1 + \gamma > 1$ , this implies that  $G < \infty$ . Hence the asserted inequality is true with the constant  $M_0 = 2M \exp((1 + \nu)\delta_*)L(\delta_*)^{-\gamma} \cdot G$ .  $\square$

**Example 1** Our first example for a process  $X$  satisfying Condition S.2 is squared and standardized Brownian bridge:

**Lemma S.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{T} = (0, 1)$  and  $X(t) = \mathbb{U}(t)^2 / (2t(1-t))$  with standard Brownian bridge  $\mathbb{U}$ . Then Condition S.2 is satisfied with  $M = 2$ ,  $\gamma = 1/2$  and  $L(c) = e^{-c}$ .*

In particular, Lemma S.6 and Theorem S.3 yield inequality (1.6) for any  $\nu > 3/4$ .

*Proof of Lemma S.6.* To verify Condition S.2 here, recall that if  $\mathbb{W} = (\mathbb{W}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is standard Brownian motion, then  $(\mathbb{U}(t))_{t \in (0,1)}$  has the same distribution as the stochastic process  $((1-t)\mathbb{W}(s(t)))_{t \in (0,1)}$  with  $s(t) := t/(1-t) = \exp(\text{logit}(t))$ . Hence for  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $c \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [\ell(a), \ell(a+c)]} X(t) & \stackrel{d}{=} \sup_{t \in [\ell(a), \ell(a+c)]} \frac{(1-t)^2 \mathbb{W}(s(t))^2}{2t(1-t)} \\ & = \sup_{t \in [\ell(a), \ell(a+c)]} \frac{\mathbb{W}(s(t))^2}{2s(t)} \\ & = \sup_{s \in [e^a, e^{a+c}]} \frac{\mathbb{W}(s)^2}{2s} \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} \sup_{u \in [e^{-c}, 1]} \frac{\mathbb{W}(u)^2}{2u} \\ & \leq \frac{e^c}{2} \max_{u \in [0,1]} \mathbb{W}(u)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the probability that  $\sup_{t \in [\ell(a), \ell(a+c)]} X(t)$  is at least  $\eta \geq 0$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( \max_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathbb{W}(u)| \geq \sqrt{2\eta e^{-c}} \right) & = 2P \left( \max_{u \in [0,1]} \mathbb{W}(u) \geq \sqrt{2\eta e^{-c}} \right) \\ & = 4P(\mathbb{W}(1) \geq \sqrt{2\eta e^{-c}}) \\ & = 4(1 - \Phi(\sqrt{2\eta e^{-c}})), \end{aligned}$$

where the second last step follows from a standard argument for processes with independent and symmetrically distributed increments, and  $\Phi$  denotes the standard Gaussian distribution function. The well-known inequalities  $1 - \Phi(x) \leq \exp(-x^2/2)/2$  and  $1 - \Phi(x) \leq \Phi'(x)/x$  for  $x \geq 0$  lead to the bound

$$P \left( \sup_{t \in [\ell(a), \ell(a+c)]} X(t) \geq \eta \right) \leq 2 \exp(-e^{-c}\eta) \max(1, e^{-c}\eta)^{-1/2}$$

for  $\eta \geq 0$ , and for negative  $\eta$ , this bound is obviously true.  $\square$

**Example 2** A second example for Theorem S.3 is given by

$$X_n(t) := nK(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T} = (0, 1),$$

with  $K = K_1$ .

**Lemma S.7.** *The stochastic process  $X_n$  satisfies Condition S.2 with  $M = 2$ ,  $\gamma = 0$  and  $L(c) = e^{-c}$ .*

Combining this lemma, Theorem S.3 and Donsker's Theorem for the uniform empirical process shows that

$$\sup_{t \in (0,1)} (nK(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_\nu(t)) \rightarrow_d T_\nu$$

for any fixed  $\nu > 1$ . We conjecture that Lemma S.7 is true with  $\gamma = 1/2$ . This conjecture is supported by refined tail inequalities of Alfors and Dinges (1984) and Zubkov and Serov (2013) for binomial distributions.

Before proving Lemma S.7, recall that for  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} K(u, t) &:= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} (\lambda u - \log(1 - t + te^\lambda)) \\ &= \begin{cases} u \log(u/t) + (1 - u) \log[(1 - u)/(1 - t)] & \text{if } u \in [0, 1], \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, Hoeffding (1963) showed that for a random variable  $Y \sim \text{Bin}(n, t)$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$P(Y \geq nu) \leq \exp\left(-n \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} (\lambda u - \log(1 - t + te^\lambda))\right) = \exp(-nK(u, t)) \quad \text{if } u \geq t,$$

$$P(Y \leq nu) \leq \exp\left(-n \sup_{\lambda \leq 0} (\lambda u - \log(1 - t + te^\lambda))\right) = \exp(-nK(u, t)) \quad \text{if } u \leq t.$$

*Proof of Lemma S.7.* We imitate and modify a martingale argument of Berk and Jones (1979) which goes back to Kiefer (1973). Note first that  $\mathbb{G}_n(t)/t$  is a reverse martingale in  $t \in (0, 1)$ ; that means,

$$E(\mathbb{G}_n(s)/s \mid (\mathbb{G}_n(t'))_{t' \geq t}) = \mathbb{G}_n(t)/t \quad \text{for } 0 < s < t < 1.$$

Consequently, for  $0 < t < t' < 1$  and  $0 \leq u \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\inf_{s \in [t, t']} \mathbb{G}_n(s)/s \leq u\right) &= \inf_{\lambda \leq 0} P\left(\sup_{s \in [t, t']} \exp(\lambda \mathbb{G}_n(s)/s - \lambda u) \geq 1\right) \\ &\leq \inf_{\lambda \leq 0} E \exp(\lambda \mathbb{G}_n(t)/t - \lambda u) \end{aligned}$$

by Doob's inequality for non-negative submartingales. But  $n\mathbb{G}_n(t) \sim \text{Bin}(n, t)$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\lambda \leq 0} E \exp(\lambda \mathbb{G}_n(t)/t - \lambda u) &= \inf_{\lambda \leq 0} E \exp(\lambda n \mathbb{G}_n(t) - n \lambda t u) \\ &= \exp\left(-n \sup_{\lambda \leq 0} (\lambda t u - \log(1 - t + te^\lambda))\right) \\ &= \exp(-nK(tu, t)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$P\left(\inf_{s \in [t, t']} \mathbb{G}_n(s)/s \leq u\right) \leq \exp(-nK(tu, t)) \quad \text{for all } u \in [0, 1].$$

One may rewrite this inequality as

$$P\left(\sup_{s \in [t, t']} nK(t \min\{\mathbb{G}_n(s)/s, 1\}, t) \geq \eta\right) \leq \exp(-\eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta \geq 0.$$

For if  $\eta > -n \log(1-t)$ , the probability on the left hand side equals 0. Otherwise there exists a unique  $u = u(t, \eta) \in [0, 1]$  such that  $nK(tu, t) = \eta$ . But then

$$nK(t \min\{\mathbb{G}_n(s)/s, 1\}, t) \geq \eta \quad \text{if, and only if,} \quad \mathbb{G}_n(s)/s \leq u.$$

Finally, it follows from the inequalities (S.13) for  $K(\cdot, \cdot)$  that for  $t \leq s \leq t'$ ,

$$K(\min\{\mathbb{G}_n(s), s\}, s) = K(s \min\{\mathbb{G}_n(s)/s, 1\}, s) \leq e^c K(t \min\{\mathbb{G}_n(s)/s, 1\}, t)$$

with  $c := \text{logit}(t') - \text{logit}(t)$ . Hence

$$P\left(\sup_{s \in [t, t']} nK(\min\{\mathbb{G}_n(s), s\}, s) \geq \eta\right) \leq \exp(-e^{-c}\eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta \geq 0.$$

Since  $(\mathbb{G}_n(t))_{t \in (0,1)}$  has the same distribution as  $(1 - \mathbb{G}_n((1-t)-))_{t \in (0,1)}$ , and because of the symmetry relations  $K(s, t) = K(1-s, 1-t)$  and  $\text{logit}(1-t) = -\text{logit}(t)$ , the previous inequality implies further that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\sup_{s \in [t, t']} nK(\max\{\mathbb{G}_n(s), s\}, s) \geq \eta\right) \\ &= P\left(\sup_{s \in [t, t']} nK(\min\{1 - \mathbb{G}_n(s), 1 - s\}, 1 - s) \geq \eta\right) \\ &= P\left(\sup_{s \in [1-t', 1-t]} nK(\min\{\mathbb{G}_n(s), s\}, s) \geq \eta\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-e^{-c}\eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, since  $K(\cdot, s) = \max\{K(\min\{\cdot, s\}, s), K(\max\{\cdot, s\}, s)\}$ ,

$$P\left(\sup_{s \in [t, t']} nK(\mathbb{G}_n(s), s) \geq \eta\right) \leq 2 \exp(-e^{-c}\eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta \geq 0. \quad \square$$

**Example 3** Our third and last example concerns a stochastic process on  $\mathcal{T}_n := \{t_{n,i} : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  with  $t_{n,i} = i/(n+1)$ :

$$\tilde{X}_n(t_{n,i}) := (n+1)K(t_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i})$$

with  $K = K_1$ .

**Lemma S.8.** *The stochastic process  $\tilde{X}_n$  satisfies Condition S.2 with  $M = 2$ ,  $\gamma = 0$  and  $L(c) = e^{-c}$ .*

Again one could combine this with Theorem S.3 and Donsker's theorem for partial sum processes to show that

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, n} ((n+1)K(t_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i}) - C_\nu(t)) \rightarrow_d T_\nu$$

for any  $\nu > 1$ .

Our proof of Lemma S.8 involves an exponential inequality for Beta distributions from Dümbgen (1998):

**Lemma S.9.** *Let  $s, t \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $Y \sim \text{Beta}(mt, m(1-t))$  for some  $m > 0$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y \leq s) &\leq \inf_{\lambda \leq 0} E \exp(\lambda Y - \lambda s) \leq \exp(-mK(t, s)) \quad \text{if } s \leq t, \\ P(Y \geq s) &\leq \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} E \exp(\lambda Y - \lambda s) \leq \exp(-mK(t, s)) \quad \text{if } s \geq t. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma S.8.* We use a well-known representation of uniform order statistics: Let  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_{n+1}$  be independent random variables with standard exponential distribution, i.e. Gamma(1), and let  $S_j := \sum_{i=1}^j E_i$ . Then

$$(\xi_{n:i})_{i=1}^n \stackrel{d}{=} (S_i/S_{n+1})_{i=1}^n.$$

In particular,  $\xi_{n:i} \sim \text{Beta}(i, n+1-i) = \text{Beta}((n+1)t_{n,i}, (n+1)(1-t_{n,i}))$  and  $EU_{n:i} = t_{n,i}$ . Furthermore, for  $2 \leq k \leq n+1$ , the random vectors  $(S_i/S_k)_{i=1}^{k-1}$  and  $(S_i)_{i=k}^{n+1}$  are stochastically independent. This implies that  $(\xi_{n:i}/t_{n,i})_{i=1}^n$  is a reverse martingale, because for  $1 \leq j < k \leq n$ ,

$$E\left(\frac{\xi_{n:j}}{t_{n,j}} \mid (S_i)_{i=k}^{n+1}\right) = E\left(\frac{S_j}{t_{n,j}S_k} \cdot \frac{S_k}{S_{n+1}} \mid (S_i)_{i=k}^{n+1}\right) = \frac{j}{t_{n,j}k} \cdot \frac{S_k}{S_{n+1}} = \frac{\xi_{n:k}}{t_{n,k}}.$$

Consequently, for  $1 \leq j \leq k \leq n$  and  $0 < u < 1$ , it follows from Doob's inequality and Lemma S.9 that

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\min_{j \leq i \leq k} \frac{\xi_{n:i}}{t_{n,i}} \leq u\right) &= \inf_{\lambda < 0} P\left(\min_{j \leq i \leq k} \exp\left(\lambda \frac{\xi_{n:i}}{t_{n,i}} - \lambda u\right) \geq 1\right) \\ &\leq \inf_{\lambda < 0} E \exp(\lambda \xi_{n:j} - \lambda u t_{n,j}) \\ &\leq \exp(-(n+1)K(t_{n,j}, t_{n,j}u)). \end{aligned}$$

Again one may reformulate the previous inequalities as follows: For any  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$P\left(\max_{j \leq i \leq k} (n+1)K(t_{n,j}, t_{n,j} \min\left\{\frac{\xi_{n:i}}{t_{n,i}}, 1\right\}) \geq \eta\right) \leq \exp(-\eta).$$

But the inequalities (S.13) for  $K(\cdot, \cdot)$  imply that for  $j \leq i \leq k$ ,

$$K(t_{n,i}, \min\{\xi_{n:i}, t_{n,i}\}) \leq e^c K(t_{n,j}, t_{n,j} \min\left\{\frac{\xi_{n:i}}{t_{n,i}}, 1\right\})$$

with  $c := \text{logit}(t_{n,k}) - \text{logit}(t_{n,j})$ . Consequently,

$$P\left(\max_{j \leq i \leq k} (n+1)K(t_{n,i}, \min\{\xi_{n:i}, t_{n,i}\}) \geq \eta\right) \leq \exp(-e^{-c}\eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta > 0.$$

Since  $(1 - \xi_{n:n+1-i})_{i=1}^n$  has the same distribution as  $(\xi_{n:i})_{i=1}^n$ , a symmetry argument as in the proof of Lemma S.7 reveals that

$$P\left(\max_{j \leq i \leq k} (n+1)K(t_{n,i}, \xi_{n:i}) \geq \eta\right) \leq 2 \exp(-e^{-c}\eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta > 0. \quad \square$$

### S.3 Auxiliary functions and (in)equalities

**Inequalities involving the logit function** Recall first that for arbitrary numbers  $x > 0$  and  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ , the representation  $x^\gamma = \exp(\gamma \log x)$  implies that

$$\exp(-|\gamma| |\log x|) \leq x^\gamma \leq \exp(|\gamma| |\log x|).$$

Now we consider arbitrary numbers  $t, u \in (0, 1)$ . Note that either  $u/t < 1 < (1-u)/(1-t)$  or  $u/t \geq 1 \geq (1-u)/(1-t)$ . Consequently,

$$|\log(u/t)| + |\log[(1-u)/(1-t)]| = |\text{logit}(u) - \text{logit}(t)|, \quad (\text{S.3})$$

and this implies that

$$(u/t)^\gamma, [(1-u)/(1-t)]^\gamma \in [e^{-|\gamma|c}, e^{|\gamma|c}] \quad \text{with } c := |\text{logit}(u) - \text{logit}(t)|. \quad (\text{S.4})$$

In the proofs of Theorem S.3 and Theorem 2.1, we utilize the following continuity properties of the functions  $C, D : (0, 1) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ .

**Lemma S.10.** For arbitrary  $s, t \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$|D(s) - D(t)| \leq |C(s) - C(t)| \leq |\text{logit}(s) - \text{logit}(t)|.$$

*Proof.* Since  $D = \log(1 + C^2)$ , the first inequality follows from  $d \log(1 + x^2)/dx = 2x/(1 + x^2) \in [0, 1]$  for  $x \geq 0$ . As to the second inequality, if  $s(1 - s) \leq t(1 - t)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq C(s) - C(t) &= \log \left( \log \left( \frac{e}{4s(1-s)} \right) / \log \left( \frac{e}{4t(1-t)} \right) \right) \\ &= \log \left( 1 + \log \left( \frac{t(1-t)}{s(1-s)} \right) / \log \left( \frac{e}{4t(1-t)} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \log \left( \frac{t(1-t)}{s(1-s)} \right) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \log \left( \frac{t}{s} \right), \log \left( \frac{1-t}{1-s} \right) \right\} \\ &\leq |\text{logit}(s) - \text{logit}(t)|, \end{aligned}$$

because  $\log(t/s) \geq 0 \geq \log((1-t)/(1-s))$  or  $\log(t/s) \leq 0 \leq \log((1-t)/(1-s))$ .  $\square$

**The divergences  $K_s$**  Recall that the divergences  $K_s$  can be written as  $K_s(u, t) = t\phi_s(u/t) + (1-t)\phi_s[(1-u)/(1-t)]$  with certain auxiliary functions  $\phi_s : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and their limits  $\phi_s(0) := \lim_{x \searrow 0} \phi_s(x) \in (0, \infty]$ . In particular,

$$K_s(u, t) = K_s(1-u, 1-t).$$

Precisely,  $\phi_s$  is given by  $\phi_s(1) = 0 = \phi'_s(1)$  and  $\phi''_s(x) = x^{s-2}$ . Any twice continuously differentiable function  $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  may be written as

$$f(x) = f(1) + f'(1)(x-1) + \int_1^x (x-u)f''(u) du. \quad (\text{S.5})$$

For  $\phi_s$  this yields the representation

$$\phi_s(y) = \int_1^y (y-x)x^{s-2} dx \quad (\text{S.6})$$

for  $y > 0$ . Starting from this representation, elementary calculations yield the explicit formulae (3.18) for  $\phi_s$  and (1.7) for  $K_s$ .

Plugging in the representation (S.6) in the representation of  $K_s$  in terms of  $\phi_s$  and transforming the two integrals appropriately leads to the representation

$$K_s(u, t) = \int_t^u (u-x) [t^{1-s}x^{s-2} + (1-t)^{1-s}(1-x)^{s-2}] dx. \quad (\text{S.7})$$

In particular,

$$K_2(u, t) = \int_t^u (u-x)[t^{-1} + (1-t)^{-1}] dx = \frac{(u-t)^2}{2t(1-t)}.$$

Comparing (S.7) with (S.5) reveals that

$$K_s(t, t) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \Big|_{u=v} K_s(u, t) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{S.8})$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2} K_s(u, t) = t^{1-s}u^{s-2} + (1-t)^{1-s}(1-u)^{s-2}. \quad (\text{S.9})$$

Integrating the latter formula leads to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u} K_s(u, t) = \begin{cases} \text{logit}(u) - \text{logit}(t) & \text{if } s = 1, \\ \frac{(u/t)^{s-1} - [(1-u)/(1-t)]^{s-1}}{s-1} & \text{if } s \neq 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.10})$$

Another interesting identity follows from (S.6) via the substitution  $\tilde{x} = 1/x$ :

$$\phi_s(y) = y\phi_{1-s}(1/y) \quad (\text{S.11})$$

for  $y > 0$ , and this leads to

$$K_s(u, t) = K_{1-s}(t, u). \quad (\text{S.12})$$

**Some particular inequalities for  $K = K_1$**  For fixed  $v \in (0, 1)$  and arbitrary  $0 < t < t' < 1$ ,

$$\frac{K(0, t')}{K(0, t)}, \frac{K(t'v, t')}{K(tv, t)}, \frac{K(t', t'v)}{K(t, tv)} \in \left( \frac{t'}{t}, \frac{t'(1-t)}{(1-t')t} \right). \quad (\text{S.13})$$

To prove these inequalities, note that on the one hand,

$$K(tv, t) = \int_{tv}^t \frac{\partial K_0(x, tv)}{\partial x} dx = \int_{tv}^t \frac{(x-tv)}{x(1-x)} dx = \int_v^1 \frac{t(y-u)}{y(1-ty)} dy.$$

These formulae remain true if we replace  $v$  with 0. On the other hand,

$$K(t, tv) = \int_{tv}^t (t-x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} K(x, tv) dx = \int_{tv}^t \frac{(t-x)}{x(1-x)} dx = \int_v^1 \frac{t(1-y)}{y(1-ty)} dy.$$

But for any  $y \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log \frac{t}{1-ty} = \frac{1}{t(1-ty)} \in \left( \frac{1}{t}, \frac{1}{t(1-t)} \right) = (\log'(t), \text{logit}'(t)).$$

Thus for  $0 < t < t' < 1$ ,

$$\frac{t'}{1-t'y} / \frac{t}{1-ty} \in \left( \frac{t'}{t}, \frac{t'(1-t)}{(1-t')t} \right),$$

and this entails the asserted inequalities for the three ratios  $K(0, t')/K(0, t)$ ,  $K(t'v, t')/K(tv, t)$  and  $K(t', t'v)/K(t, tv)$ .

**Relating  $K_s$  and  $K_2$**  Starting from (S.7), we may write

$$\begin{aligned} K_s(u, t) &= \int_t^u (u-x) [t^{-1}(x/t)^{s-2} + (1-t)^{-1}[(1-x)/(1-t)]^{s-2}] dx \\ &= \int_u^t (x-u) [t^{-1}(x/t)^{s-2} + (1-t)^{-1}[(1-x)/(1-t)]^{s-2}] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that either  $t < u$  and  $u/t \geq x/t \geq 1 \geq (1-x)/(1-t) \geq (1-u)/(1-t)$ , or  $t \geq u$  and  $u/t \leq x/t \leq 1 \leq (1-x)/(1-t) \leq (1-u)/(1-t)$ . Hence, it follows from these representations of  $K_s(u, t)$  and the inequalities (S.4) that

$$\frac{K_s(u, t)}{K_2(u, t)} \in [e^{-|s-2|c}, e^{|s-2|c}] \quad \text{with } c := |\text{logit}(u) - \text{logit}(t)|, \quad (\text{S.14})$$

where  $K_s(t, t)/K_2(t, t) := 1$ .

**Some bounds for  $\phi_s$  and  $K_s$**  In what follows, we restrict our attention to parameters  $s \in [-1, 2]$ . The next lemma provides lower bounds for  $\phi_s$ .

**Lemma S.11.** *Let  $s \in [-1, 2]$ . Then*

$$\phi_s(1+x) \geq \frac{x^2}{2(1+ax)} \quad \text{for } x > -1,$$

where  $a := (2-s)/3 \in [0, 1]$ .

Lemma S.11 implies useful bounds for  $K_s$ .

**Lemma S.12.** *Let  $s \in [-1, 2]$ . Then for  $t, u \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$K_s(u, t) \geq \frac{\delta^2}{2(t+a\delta)(1-t-a\delta)},$$

where  $\delta := u - t \in (-t, 1 - t)$  and  $a := (2 - s)/3 \in [0, 1]$ . Moreover, for any  $\gamma > 0$ , the inequality  $K_s(u, t) \leq \gamma$  implies that

$$|\delta| \leq \begin{cases} \sqrt{2\gamma t(1-t)} + 2|1 - 2t|a\gamma, \\ \sqrt{2\gamma u(1-u)} + 2|1 - 2u|(1-a)\gamma. \end{cases}$$

*Proof of Lemma S.11.* The asserted inequality reads  $\phi_s(1+x) \geq h_a(x)$  for  $x > -1$  with the auxiliary function  $h_a(x) := 2^{-1}x^2/(1+ax)$ . Elementary calculations reveal that  $h_a(0) = 0 = h'_a(0)$  and  $h''_a(x) = (1+ax)^{-3}$ . On the other hand,  $\phi_s(1) = 0 = \phi'_s(1)$  and  $\phi''_s(1+x) = (1+x)^{s-2} = (1+x)^{-3a}$ . Consequently, it suffices to show that  $\phi''_s(1+\cdot) \geq h''_a$ , that is,

$$(1+x)^{-3a} \geq (1+ax)^{-3}$$

for  $x > -1$ . This is equivalent to the inequality

$$-a \log(1+x) \geq -\log(1+ax).$$

But this inequality follows from convexity of  $-\log$ , because

$$\begin{aligned} -\log(1+ax) &= -\log[a \cdot (1+x) + (1-a) \cdot 1] \\ &\leq -a \log(1+x) - (1-a) \log(1) = -a \log(1+x). \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma S.12.* It follows from Lemma S.11 that

$$\begin{aligned} K_s(u, t) &= t\phi_s(1+\delta/t) + (1-t)\phi_s[1-\delta/(1-t)] \\ &\geq \frac{t(\delta/t)^2}{2(1+a\delta/t)} + \frac{(1-t)[\delta/(1-t)]^2}{2(1-a\delta/(1-t))} \\ &= \frac{\delta}{2(t+a\delta)} + \frac{\delta^2}{2(1-t-a\delta)} = \frac{\delta^2}{2(t+a\delta)(1-t-a\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, the inequality  $K_s(u, t) \leq \gamma$  implies that

$$\delta^2 \leq 2\gamma(t+a\delta)(1-t-a\delta) \leq 2\gamma t(1-t) + 2\delta(1-2t)a\gamma.$$

With  $b := a(1-2t)$ , this leads to  $\delta^2 - 2\delta b\gamma \leq 2\gamma t(1-t)$ , that is,

$$(\delta - b\gamma)^2 \leq 2\gamma t(1-t) + b^2\gamma^2.$$

Consequently,

$$|\delta| \leq |b|\gamma + \sqrt{2\gamma t(1-t) + b^2\gamma^2} \leq \sqrt{2\gamma t(1-t)} + 2|b|\gamma = \sqrt{2\gamma t(1-t)} + 2|1-2t|a\gamma,$$

because  $\sqrt{x+y} \leq \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y}$  for  $x, y \geq 0$ . The second inequality for  $|\delta|$  follows from the first one and the identity (S.12): Since  $K_s(u, t) = K_{1-s}(t, u)$ , and since  $(2 - (1-s))/3 = (s+1)/3 = 1-a$ , it follows from  $K_s(u, t) \leq \gamma$  that

$$|\delta| \leq \sqrt{2\gamma u(1-u)} + 2|1-2u|(1-a)\gamma.$$

□

**Approximating  $K_s$  close to  $(0, 0)$**  The following bounds show that  $K_s(u, t)$  can be approximated by a simpler function if  $u, t$  are close to 0: For  $s \in [-1, 2]$  and  $u, t \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$t\phi_s(u/t) \leq K_s(u, t) \leq t\phi_s(u, t)/(1 - \max\{u, t\}). \quad (\text{S.15})$$

If  $s \in (0, 2]$ , then (S.15) is even true for  $u = 0$  and reads as  $t/s \leq K_s(0, t) \leq (t/s)/(1-t)$ . To verify (S.15), recall that  $K_s(u, t)$  is the sum of the nonnegative terms  $t\phi_s(u/t)$  and  $(1-t)\phi_s[(1-u)/(1-t)]$ . If  $u < t$ , then

$$t\phi_s(u/t) = t \int_{u/t}^1 (r - u/t)r^{s-2} dr \geq t \int_{u/t}^1 (r - u/t) dr = (u-t)^2/(2t),$$

because  $r \leq 1$  and  $s - 2 \leq 0$ , whereas

$$\begin{aligned} (1-t)\phi_s[(1-u)/(1-t)] &= (1-t) \int_1^{(1-u)/(1-t)} [(1-u)/(1-t) - r] r^{s-2} dr \\ &\leq (1-t) \int_1^{(1-u)/(1-t)} [(1-u)/(1-t) - r] dr \\ &= (u-t)^2/[2(1-t)] = (u-t)^2/(2t) \cdot t/(1-t), \end{aligned}$$

because  $r \geq 1$ . If  $t < u$ , we use the identity (S.11) to verify that

$$t\phi_s(u/t) = u\phi_{1-s}(t/u) \geq (u-t)^2/(2u)$$

and

$$(1-t)\phi_s[(1-u)/(1-t)] = (1-u)\phi_{1-s}[(1-t)/(1-u)] \leq (u-t)^2/(2u) \cdot u/(1-u),$$

because  $(1-s) - 2 = -s - 1 \leq 0$ .

The next lemma summarizes some properties of the function  $(x, y) \mapsto y\phi_s(x/y)$  which appears in (S.15).

**Lemma S.13.** For  $s \in [-1, 2]$  and  $x, y > 0$  let

$$H_s(x, y) := y\phi_s(x/y) = x\phi_{1-s}(y/x).$$

This defines a continuous, convex function  $H_s : (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . For  $x, \lambda > 0$ ,  $H_s(x, \lambda x) = x\phi_{1-s}(\lambda)$ , and  $H_s(x, x) = 0$ . In case of  $s > 0$ , the function  $H_s$  can be extended continuously to  $[0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$  via  $H_s(0, y) := y/s$ , and in case of  $0 < s < 1$ , it can be extended continuously to  $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$  via  $H_s(x, 0) := x/(1-s)$ .

For  $x \geq 0$  let

$$\begin{aligned} a_s(x) &:= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \inf\{y \in (0, x) : H_s(x, y) \leq 1\} & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ b_s(x) &:= \begin{cases} s^+ & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \max\{y > x : H_s(x, y) \leq 1\} & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This defines continuous functions  $a_s, b_s : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  where  $a_s$  is convex with  $a_s(x) = 0$  if and only if  $x \leq (1-s)^+$ , and  $b_s$  is concave. Moreover, for fixed  $x \geq 0$ ,  $a_s(x)$  and  $b_s(x)$  are non-decreasing in  $s \in [-1, 2]$  and satisfy the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} x + \tilde{a} - \sqrt{2x + \tilde{a}^2} &\leq a_s(x) \leq x + 1 - \sqrt{2x + 1}, \\ x + \max\{s, \sqrt{2x}\} &\leq b_s(x) \leq x + \tilde{a} + \sqrt{2x + \tilde{a}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{a} := (1+s)/3 \in [0, 1]$ .

This lemma implies that  $a_s(x)/x \rightarrow 0$  and  $b_s(x)/x \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \searrow 0$ , whereas  $a_s(x) = x - \sqrt{2x} + O(1)$  and  $b_s(x) = x + \sqrt{2x} + O(1)$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark S.14.** Since  $K_s(u, t) = H_s(u, z) + H_s(1-u, 1-t)$ , Lemma S.13 implies that  $K_s$  is a convex function on  $(0, 1) \times (0, 1)$  with  $K_s(t, t) = 0$  for all  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Joint convexity of the functions  $(u, v) \mapsto K_s(u, v)$  is a very special case of Simon (2011), Theorem 16.3.

*Proof of Lemma S.13.* Convexity of  $H_s$  follows from the fact that for  $x, y > 0$ , the Hessian matrix of  $H_s$  at  $(x, y)$  equals

$$x^{s-1}y^{-s} \begin{bmatrix} y/x, & -1 \\ -1, & x/y \end{bmatrix},$$



which is positive semidefinite.

For  $x > 0$ , it follows from the formula  $H_s(x, y) = x\phi_{1-s}(y/x)$  and  $\phi_{1-s} : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  being increasing and bijective that  $b_s(x)$  is the unique number  $y \in (x, \infty)$  such that  $H_s(x, y) = 1$ . More precisely, for  $y > x$ ,  $b_s(x) \leq y$  is equivalent to  $H_s(x, y) \geq 1$ , and  $b_s(x) \geq y$  is equivalent to  $H_s(x, y) \leq 1$ .

If  $s \leq 0$ , then for any fixed  $y > 0$ ,  $H_s(x, y) = y\phi_s(x/y) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \searrow 0$ , whence  $b_s(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \searrow 0$ . If  $s > 0$ , then  $H_s(x, s) = s\phi_s(x/s)$  is strictly decreasing in  $x \in [0, s]$  with  $H_s(0, s) = 1$ , whence  $b_s(x) \geq s$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . On the other hand, for any  $y > s$ ,  $H_s(x, y) = y\phi_s(x/y) \rightarrow y/s > 1$  as  $x \searrow 0$ , whence  $b_s(x) \rightarrow s$  as  $x \searrow 0$ . This shows that  $b_s$  is continuous at 0.

Convexity of  $H_s$  implies that  $b_s$  is concave and thus continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ . Together with continuity at 0, this implies that  $b_s$  is continuous and concave on  $[0, \infty)$ .

For  $x > 0$  and  $y \in [0, x]$ , it follows from  $\phi_{1-s} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1/(1-s)^+]$  being decreasing and bijective that  $a_s(x) = 0$  if  $x \leq (1-s)^+$ , and for  $x > (1-s)^+$ ,  $a_s(x)$  is the unique number  $y \in (0, x)$  such that  $H_s(x, y) = 1$ . More precisely, for  $y \in (0, x)$ ,  $a_s(x) \geq y$  is equivalent to  $H_s(x, y) \geq 1$ , and  $a_s(x) \leq y$  is equivalent to  $H_s(x, y) \leq 1$ . Convexity of  $H_s$  implies that  $a_s$  is convex too, and since  $0 \leq a_s(x) < x$  for all  $x > 0$ ,  $a_s$  is a convex and continuous function on  $[0, \infty)$ .

By continuity, it suffices to verify the remaining claims for  $x > 0$ . It follows from Lemma S.11 that for  $x, y > 0$ ,

$$H_s(x, y) = y\phi_s(x/y) \geq \frac{y(x/y - 1)^2}{2(1 - a + ax/y)} = \frac{(x - y)^2}{2(\tilde{a}y + ax)},$$

where  $a = (2 - s)/3 \in [0, 1]$  and  $\tilde{a} = 1 - a = (1 + s)/3$ . Consequently, the inequality  $H_s(x, y) \leq 1$  implies that  $(y - x)^2 \leq 2(\tilde{a}y + ax)$ , and this is equivalent to  $(y - x - \tilde{a})^2 \leq 2x + \tilde{a}^2$ , that is,

$$a_s(x) \geq x + \tilde{a} - \sqrt{2x + \tilde{a}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad b_s(x) \leq x + \tilde{a} + \sqrt{2x + \tilde{a}^2}.$$

For  $0 < x < y$ ,  $H_s(x, y) = y \int_{x/y}^1 (r - x/y)r^{s-2} dr$  is monotone decreasing in  $s \in [-1, 2]$ . By construction of  $b_s(x)$ , this entails that  $b_s(x)$  is monotone increasing in  $s \in [-1, 2]$ . Consequently,  $b_s(x) \geq b_{-1}(x) = x + \sqrt{2x}$ , because

$$H_{-1}(x, y) = x\phi_2(y/x) = (y - x)^2/(2x) = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad y = x \pm \sqrt{2x}.$$

Furthermore, if  $s > 0$ , then  $H_s(0, s) = 1$ , and  $H_s(x, x + \sqrt{2x}) \leq 1$  for all  $x > 0$ . For  $x_o = s^2/2$ ,  $x_o + \sqrt{2x_o} = x_o + s$ . By convexity of  $H_s$ ,

$$H_s(x, x + s) \leq (1 - x/x_o)H_s(0, s) + (x/x_o)H_s(x_o, x_o + s) \leq 1$$

for  $0 \leq x \leq x_o$ , whence  $b_s(x) \geq x + s$  for  $0 \leq x \leq x_o$ . Since  $x + \sqrt{2x} \geq x + s$  if and only if  $x \geq x_o$ , this shows that  $b_s(x) \geq x + \max\{s, \sqrt{2x}\}$ .

For  $0 < y < x$ ,  $H_s(x, y) = y \int_1^{x/y} (x/y - r)r^{s-2} dr$  is monotone increasing in  $s \in [-1, 2]$ , so  $a_s(x)$  is monotone increasing by its construction. Consequently  $a_s(x) \leq a_2(x) = x + 1 - \sqrt{2x + 1}$ , because

$$H_2(x, y) = y\phi_2(x/y) = (y - x)^2/(2y) = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad y = x + 1 \pm \sqrt{2x + 1}. \quad \square$$

## S.4 Further proofs for Section 2

*Proof of Proposition 4.13.* Log-concavity of  $G_1$  follows from the facts that  $G_1(x) = Q(\mathcal{B}_1(x))$  with the closed set  $\mathcal{B}_1(x) := \{g \in \mathcal{C}[0, 1] : |xh_o + g| \leq h\}$ , and that  $(1 - \lambda)\mathcal{B}_1(x_o) + \lambda\mathcal{B}_1(x_1) \subset \mathcal{B}_1((1 - \lambda)x_o + \lambda x_1)$  for  $x_o, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Indeed, if  $g_o \in \mathcal{B}_1(x_o)$  and  $g_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1(x_1)$ , then

$$|(1 - \lambda)x_o h_o + \lambda x_1 h_o + (1 - \lambda)g_o + \lambda g_1| \leq (1 - \lambda)|x_o h_o + g_o| + \lambda|x_1 h_o + g_1| \leq h.$$

Similarly,  $G_2(x) = Q(\mathcal{B}_2(x))$  with  $\mathcal{B}_2(x) := \{g \in \mathcal{C}[0, 1] : |g| \leq \sqrt{h + xh_o}\}$ , and for  $x_o, x_1 \geq 0$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ ,  $(1 - \lambda)\mathcal{B}_2(x_o) + \lambda\mathcal{B}_2(x_1) \subset \mathcal{B}_2((1 - \lambda)x_o + \lambda x_1)$ . Indeed, if  $g_o \in \mathcal{B}_2(x_o)$  and  $g_1 \in \mathcal{B}_2(x_1)$ ,

then

$$\begin{aligned} |(1-\lambda)g_0 + \lambda g_1| &\leq (1-\lambda)|g_0| + \lambda|g_1| \leq (1-\lambda)\sqrt{h+x_0h_o} + \lambda\sqrt{h+x_1h_o} \\ &\leq \sqrt{h + ((1-\lambda)x_0 + \lambda x_1)h_o}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of  $\sqrt{\cdot}$  being concave.

That  $G_1$  is an even function follows from  $Q$  being symmetric around  $0 \in \mathcal{C}[0, 1]$ . That  $G_2$  is non-decreasing follows from  $\mathcal{B}_2(x_1) \subset \mathcal{B}_2(x_2)$  for  $0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.14.* Note that  $\mathbb{U}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}$  have pointwise expectation 0 and are jointly Gaussian, because  $\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}$  is a linear function of  $\mathbb{U}$ . Recall that the covariance function of  $\mathbb{U}$  is given by  $E(\mathbb{U}(r)\mathbb{U}(t)) = r(1-t)$  for  $0 \leq r \leq t \leq 1$ . With elementary calculations one can show that

$$E(\mathbb{U}(t)\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}(v)) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1] \setminus (a, b) \text{ and } v \in [0, 1],$$

and this implies stochastic independence of  $(\mathbb{U}(t))_{t \in [0, 1] \setminus (a, b)}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}$ . Furthermore, tedious but elementary calculations reveal that

$$E(\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}(v)\mathbb{Z}_{a,b}(w)) = (b-a)v(1-v) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq v \leq w \leq 1,$$

and this shows that  $\mathbb{Z}_{a,b} \stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{b-a}\mathbb{U}$ .  $\square$

## S.5 Proof of Theorem 3.10

By symmetry, it suffices to prove the claim about  $B_n$ . By monotonicity of  $B_n$

$$P_F\left(\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} B_n(x) < \epsilon\right) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}, \delta \in (0, \epsilon)} P_F(B_n(x) < \delta).$$

Hence it suffices to show that  $P_F(B_n(x) < \delta) \leq (1-\epsilon)^{-n}\alpha$  for any single point  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$ . To this end, consider  $F_{\epsilon, \mu} := (1-\epsilon)F + \epsilon F(\cdot - \mu)$  for our given  $\epsilon$  and some  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{L}_{F_{\epsilon, \mu}}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  describes the distribution of

$$(Y_1 + Z_1\mu, Y_2 + Z_2\mu, \dots, Y_n + Z_n\mu)$$

with  $2n$  independent random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \sim F$  and  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n \sim \text{Bin}(1, \epsilon)$ . In particular, for any event  $S_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{F_{\epsilon, \mu}}((X_1, \dots, X_n) \in S_n) &= P((Y_1 + Z_1\mu, \dots, Y_n + Z_n\mu) \in S_n) \\ &\geq P((Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in S_n, Z_1 = \dots = Z_n = 0) \\ &= (1-\epsilon)^n P_F((X_1, \dots, X_n) \in S_n). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, since  $F_{\epsilon, \mu} \in \mathcal{F}$  too, we may conclude from

$$P_{F_{\epsilon, \mu}}(A_n \leq F_{\epsilon, \mu} \leq B_n \text{ on } \mathbb{R}) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\geq P_{F_{\epsilon, \mu}}(B_n(x) < F_{\epsilon, \mu}(x)) \\ &\geq (1-\epsilon)^n P_F(B_n(x) < (1-\epsilon)F(x) + \epsilon F(x - \mu)) \\ &\geq (1-\epsilon)^n P_F(B_n(x) < \epsilon F(x - \mu)). \end{aligned}$$

But for sufficiently small (negative)  $\mu$ , the value  $\epsilon F(x - \mu)$  is greater than or equal to  $\delta$ . Then we may conclude that  $\alpha \geq (1-\epsilon)^n P_F(B_n(x) < \delta)$ .  $\square$

## S.6 Duality between goodness-of-fit tests and confidence bands

**Continuous distribution functions** All goodness-of-fit tests considered in this paper are of the following type. For a continuous distribution function  $F$ , the test statistic  $T_n(F) = T_n(F, (X_i)_{i=1}^n)$  equals

$$T_n(F) = \sup_{x \in [X_{n:1}, X_{n:n-1}]} \Gamma_n(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F(x)) \quad (\text{S.16})$$

or

$$T_n(F) = \sup_{x: 0 < F(x) < 1} \Gamma_n(\mathbb{F}_n(x), F(x)) \quad (\text{S.17})$$

with  $\Gamma_n : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  such that for any fixed  $u \in [0, 1]$ , the function  $\Gamma_n(u, \cdot)$  is continuous, decreasing on  $[0, u]$  and increasing on  $[u, 1]$ . This implies that  $T_n(F)$  in (S.16) can be written as

$$T_n(F) = \max_{1 \leq i < n} \max\{\Gamma_n(i/n, F(X_{n:i})), \Gamma_n(i/n, F(X_{n:i+1}))\}, \quad (\text{S.18})$$

while  $T_n(F)$  in (S.17) equals

$$T_n(F) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max\{\Gamma_n((i-1)/n, F(X_{n:i})), \Gamma_n(i/n, F(X_{n:i}))\}. \quad (\text{S.19})$$

In particular, if  $F$  is the distribution function of the observations  $X_i$ , then  $T_n(F)$  has the same distribution as

$$T_n = \max_{1 \leq i < n} \max\{\Gamma_n(i/n, \xi_{n:i}), \Gamma_n(i/n, \xi_{n:i+1})\},$$

or

$$T_n = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max\{\Gamma_n((i-1)/n, \xi_{n:i}), \Gamma_n(i/n, \xi_{n:i})\},$$

respectively, because  $(F(X_{n:i}))_{i=1}^n$  has the same distribution as  $(\xi_{n:i})_{i=1}^n$ . For any critical value  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , the inequality  $T_n(F) \leq \kappa$  is equivalent to

$$F(x) \in [a_{n,i}(\kappa), b_{n,i}(\kappa)] \quad \text{for } x \in [X_{n:i}, X_{n:i+1}) \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq n \quad (\text{S.20})$$

with certain constants  $a_{n,i}(\kappa), b_{n,i}(\kappa) \in [0, 1]$  such that  $a_{n,0}(\kappa) = 0$  and  $b_{n,n}(\kappa) = 1$ . Specifically, if  $T_n(F)$  is given by (S.16), then  $a_{n,n}(\kappa) = a_{n,n-1}(\kappa)$ ,  $b_{n,0}(\kappa) = b_{n,1}(\kappa)$ , and for  $1 \leq i < n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n,i}(\kappa) &= \min\{t \in [0, i/n] : \Gamma_n(i/n, t) \leq \kappa\}, \\ b_{n,i}(\kappa) &= \max\{t \in [i/n, 1] : \Gamma_n(i/n, t) \leq \kappa\}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $T_n(F)$  is given by (S.17), then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n,i}(\kappa) &= \min\{t \in [0, i/n] : \Gamma_n(i/n, t) \leq \kappa\} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ b_{n,i}(\kappa) &= \max\{t \in [i/n, 1] : \Gamma_n(i/n, t) \leq \kappa\} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i < n. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\Gamma_n$  satisfies the symmetry property that  $\Gamma_n(u, t) = \Gamma_n(1-u, 1-t)$  for all  $u, t \in [0, 1]$ , then

$$a_{n,i}(\kappa) = 1 - b_{n,n-i}(\kappa) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

To compute the probability  $P_F(T_n(F) \leq \kappa) = P(T_n \leq \kappa)$  numerically, one can use the dual representation (S.20), applied to the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ , to verify that

$$P(T_n \leq \kappa) = P(a_{n,i}(\kappa) \leq \xi_{n:i} \leq b_{n,i-1}(\kappa) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n). \quad (\text{S.21})$$

If for all relevant  $u$ ,  $\Gamma_n(u, t)$  is strictly decreasing on  $[0, u]$  and strictly increasing on  $[u, 1]$ , then the bounds  $a_{n,i}(\kappa)$  and  $b_{n,i}(\kappa)$  are continuous in  $\kappa$ , whence the distribution function of  $T_n$  is continuous.

**Confidence bands for arbitrary distribution functions** Suppose that we have chosen numbers  $0 \leq a_{n,i,\alpha} < b_{n,i,\alpha} \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , with  $a_{n,0,\alpha} = 0$  and  $b_{n,n,\alpha} = 1$  such that  $P(a_{n,i,\alpha} \leq \xi_{n:i} \leq b_{n,i-1,\alpha} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n) \geq 1 - \alpha$ . This leads to the confidence band  $(A_{n,\alpha}, B_{n,\alpha})$  given by

$$[A_{n,\alpha}(x), B_{n,\alpha}(x)] := [a_{n,i,\alpha}, b_{n,i,\alpha}] \quad \text{for } x \in [X_{n:i}, X_{n:i+1}) \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

Indeed, this confidence band satisfies inequality (1.1),

$$P_F(A_{n,\alpha} \leq F \leq B_{n,\alpha} \text{ on } \mathbb{R}) \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

even if the underlying distribution function  $F$  is not continuous. To verify this, note that  $(X_{n:i})_{i=1}^n$  has the same distribution as  $(F^{-1}(\xi_{n:i}))_{i=1}^n$  with  $F^{-1}(u) = \min\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq u\}$  for  $0 < u < 1$ . Moreover,  $F(F^{-1}(\xi_{n:i})-) \leq \xi_{n:i} \leq F(F^{-1}(\xi_{n:i}))$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n+1$ . Consequently,  $A_{n,\alpha} \leq F \leq B_{n,\alpha}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  whenever  $[\xi_{n:i}, \xi_{n:i+1}] \subset [a_{n,i,\alpha}, b_{n,i,\alpha}]$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , and the latter inclusions are equivalent to  $a_{n,i,\alpha} \leq \xi_{n:i} \leq b_{n,i-1,\alpha}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

## S.7 Critical values for various goodness-of-fit tests

Tables 1 and 2 contain  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of the statistics

$$T_{n,s,1} := \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n-1})} [nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_1(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)] \quad (\text{S.22})$$

and

$$T_{n,s,1} := \sup_{t \in (0,1)} [nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) - C_1(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t)], \quad (\text{S.23})$$

respectively, for various sample sizes  $n$  and test levels  $\alpha$ . The parameters  $s$  for the divergences  $K_s$  are in  $\{j/10 : -10 \leq j \leq 9\}$  and  $\{j/10 : 0 < j \leq 20\}$ , respectively. Thus, the critical values  $\kappa_{n,s,1,\alpha}$  in the main paper are the quantiles in Table 1 for  $s \leq 0$  only and all quantiles in Table 2.

Note the big difference between the quantiles for  $T_{n,s,1}$  in (S.22) and for  $T_{n,s,1}$  in (S.23) if  $s > 0$  is small. This is not surprising, because the full supremum differs from the restricted supremum by the two terms  $nK_s(0, \xi_{n:1}) \geq n\xi_{n:1}/s - C_\nu(\min\{\xi_{n:1}, 0.5\})$  and  $nK_s(1, \xi_{n:n}) \geq n(1 - \xi_{n:n})/s - C_\nu(\max\{\xi_{n:n}, 0.5\})$ , see the beginning of the proof of Theorem 2.1. Taking the full supremum has the advantage that the upper confidence bound for  $F(x)$  is strictly smaller on  $(-\infty, X_{n:1})$  than at  $X_{n:1}$ , just as the bound of Berk-Jones-Owen, so we might not want to always restrict the supremum.

In a similar fashion, Tables 3 and 4 contain  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of

$$T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}} := \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n-1})} nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t) \quad (\text{S.24})$$

and

$$T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}} := \sup_{t \in (0,1)} nK_s(\mathbb{G}_n(t), t), \quad (\text{S.25})$$

respectively.

Finally, Table 5 contains critical values for the goodness-of-fit statistic

$$T_n^{\text{SP}} = \sup_{t \in [\xi_{n:1}, \xi_{n:n})} \frac{\sqrt{n} |\mathbb{G}_n(t) - t|}{\sqrt{\mathbb{G}_n(1 - \mathbb{G}_n(t))h(t)}} \quad (\text{S.26})$$

of Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018), where  $h(t) = \log(1/[t(1-t)])$ . These critical values are larger than the asymptotic ones provided by Orasch and Pouliot (2004) and used by Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018). Table 6 shows that even for rather large sample sizes  $n$ , using the asymptotic critical values would imply too small coverage probabilities.

All these critical values and coverage probabilities have been computed numerically via the dual representation (S.21) and a variant of Noé's Noé (1972) recursion; we do not rely on asymptotic theory. The

critical values have been rounded up to three digits. The algorithm is essentially the same as the one of Owen (1995), but our variant of Noé’s recursion works with log-probabilities rather than probabilities. As confirmed by extensive Monte Carlo experiments, this improves numerical accuracy substantially. A description and complete computer code in R R Core Team (2019) can be found on the first author’s web site <https://github.com/duembgen-lutz/ConfidenceBands>.

## S.8 Additional numerical examples

In Example 3.10, we compared the new 95%-confidence bands  $(A_{n,1,1,\alpha}, B_{n,1,1,\alpha})$  with the confidence bands  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}})$  and  $(A_{n,1,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}}, B_{n,1,\alpha}^{\text{BJO}})$ . In Figures 5 and 6, we compare the new bands with the 95%-confidence bands  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}})$  of Stepanova and Pavlenko Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018). The latter have been computed with the nonasymptotic critical values in Section S.7. As predicted by our Remark 3.8, the band  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}})$  is wider than  $(A_{n,1,1,\alpha}, B_{n,1,1,\alpha})$  in the boundary regions, except for a rather small region in the left (resp. right) tail where  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}} < B_{n,1,1,\alpha}$  (resp.  $A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}} > A_{n,1,1,\alpha}$ ). An explanation for this is the fact that the test statistic  $T_n^{\text{SP}}$  corresponds to the divergences  $\tilde{K}_s(\cdot, \cdot)$  with  $s = -1$ , see also Remark 3.6.

In Example 3.11, we illustrated the impact of  $s$  on the confidence bands  $(A_{n,s,1,\alpha}, B_{n,s,1,\alpha})$  by comparing these bands for  $n = 500$ ,  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $s \in \{0.6, 1, 1.4\}$ . Figure 7 provides these comparisons for the same  $n$  and  $\alpha$  but  $s \in \{0.6, 0.8, 1, 1.2, 1.4\}$ . Figure 8 shows analogous pictures for  $n = 2000$ .

$s$	$n$					
	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000
-1.0	2.109	2.130	2.133	2.131	2.126	2.120
	6.718	6.545	6.372	6.203	6.051	5.918
	9.690	9.529	9.315	9.087	8.868	8.667
	18.769	19.009	18.920	18.745	18.544	18.343
-0.9	2.066	2.088	2.092	2.091	2.087	2.082
	6.303	6.140	5.984	5.834	5.699	5.584
	8.953	8.773	8.559	8.338	8.129	7.941
	16.978	17.110	16.983	16.787	16.575	16.368
-0.8	2.026	2.049	2.053	2.053	2.051	2.047
	5.936	5.788	5.649	5.517	5.400	5.300
	8.302	8.112	7.905	7.696	7.503	7.332
	15.404	15.445	15.284	15.071	14.850	14.637
-0.7	1.989	2.012	2.017	2.018	2.017	2.014
	5.613	5.481	5.360	5.246	5.145	5.059
	7.729	7.538	7.344	7.152	6.978	6.826
	14.021	13.985	13.796	13.569	13.340	13.124
-0.6	1.954	1.977	1.984	1.986	1.985	1.983
	5.329	5.215	5.111	5.013	4.927	4.854
	7.226	7.043	6.866	6.694	6.541	6.409
	12.807	12.708	12.498	12.260	12.026	11.808
-0.5	1.921	1.945	1.953	1.955	1.955	1.955
	5.080	4.984	4.896	4.812	4.740	4.678
	6.787	6.619	6.461	6.311	6.179	6.066
	11.743	11.595	11.371	11.128	10.894	10.679
-0.4	1.891	1.916	1.924	1.927	1.928	1.928
	4.861	4.783	4.709	4.639	4.578	4.526
	6.405	6.255	6.118	5.990	5.877	5.783
	10.814	10.631	10.401	10.161	9.934	9.729
-0.3	1.864	1.888	1.897	1.901	1.903	1.904
	4.670	4.608	4.548	4.490	4.439	4.396
	6.075	5.946	5.829	5.721	5.627	5.548
	10.006	9.804	9.578	9.349	9.138	8.951
-0.2	1.838	1.863	1.872	1.877	1.880	1.882
	4.503	4.457	4.408	4.361	4.320	4.285
	5.789	5.683	5.586	5.496	5.419	5.354
	9.307	9.101	8.888	8.679	8.492	8.329
-0.1	1.815	1.840	1.849	1.855	1.859	1.861
	4.358	4.325	4.287	4.250	4.217	4.189
	5.544	5.460	5.381	5.308	5.245	5.193
	8.707	8.511	8.320	8.138	7.977	7.841

$s$	$n$					
	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000
0.0	1.794	1.819	1.829	1.835	1.840	1.843
	4.231	4.212	4.183	4.155	4.129	4.107
	5.334	5.271	5.209	5.151	5.101	5.060
	8.197	8.022	7.858	7.704	7.572	7.462
0.1	1.775	1.800	1.810	1.817	1.822	1.827
	4.122	4.114	4.094	4.073	4.054	4.038
	5.155	5.111	5.064	5.020	4.982	4.950
	7.767	7.620	7.485	7.362	7.256	7.169
0.2	1.758	1.783	1.794	1.801	1.807	1.812
	4.028	4.030	4.018	4.004	3.991	3.980
	5.003	4.977	4.944	4.911	4.883	4.860
	7.408	7.294	7.188	7.092	7.011	6.945
0.3	1.744	1.768	1.779	1.787	1.794	1.799
	3.949	3.959	3.953	3.945	3.937	3.931
	4.876	4.866	4.844	4.822	4.802	4.787
	7.112	7.031	6.953	6.882	6.822	6.774
0.4	1.732	1.756	1.767	1.775	1.782	1.788
	3.882	3.899	3.900	3.897	3.893	3.891
	4.770	4.774	4.763	4.749	4.737	4.728
	6.871	6.823	6.769	6.719	6.678	6.645
0.5	1.722	1.745	1.756	1.765	1.772	1.799
	3.827	3.851	3.856	3.857	3.858	3.858
	4.685	4.700	4.697	4.691	4.685	4.681
	6.679	6.659	6.626	6.595	6.569	6.549
0.6	1.714	1.737	1.748	1.757	1.765	1.771
	3.784	3.812	3.821	3.826	3.830	3.833
	4.618	4.641	4.645	4.646	4.645	4.645
	6.530	6.534	6.519	6.503	6.489	6.479
0.7	1.710	1.732	1.742	1.751	1.759	1.766
	3.753	3.783	3.795	3.802	3.809	3.814
	4.568	4.598	4.607	4.612	4.616	4.619
	6.420	6.442	6.441	6.436	6.432	6.429
0.8	1.709	1.729	1.740	1.748	1.756	1.763
	3.734	3.765	3.778	3.787	3.795	3.802
	4.537	4.569	4.581	4.589	4.596	4.602
	6.346	6.380	6.388	6.392	6.394	6.397
0.9	1.715	1.732	1.741	1.749	1.756	1.763
	3.731	3.759	3.772	3.781	3.789	3.796
	4.527	4.558	4.570	4.579	4.586	4.593
	6.313	6.349	6.361	6.368	6.374	6.380

Table 1:  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of  $T_{n,s,1}$  in (S.22) for  $\alpha = 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$ .

$s$	$n$						$s$	$n$					
	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000		100	250	500	1000	2000	4000
0.1	9.785	9.419	9.182	8.972	8.786	8.619	1.1	1.787	1.785	1.785	1.786	1.789	1.791
	27.325	27.060	26.834	26.615	26.411	26.224		3.872	3.861	3.856	3.852	3.851	3.851
	34.306	34.140	33.942	33.732	33.529	33.340		4.700	4.683	4.673	4.667	4.664	4.662
	50.094	50.263	50.166	49.999	49.811	49.625		6.594	6.556	6.534	6.519	6.507	6.500
0.2	4.136	3.908	3.770	3.656	3.560	3.478	1.2	1.805	1.804	1.804	1.805	1.807	1.810
	12.692	12.304	12.038	11.798	11.584	11.393		3.984	3.963	3.950	3.941	3.935	3.931
	16.253	15.893	15.630	15.387	15.168	14.971		4.888	4.850	4.828	4.811	4.798	4.789
	24.302	24.062	23.826	23.590	23.367	23.163		7.160	7.050	6.987	6.938	6.899	6.869
0.3	2.828	2.712	2.643	2.586	2.539	2.500	1.3	1.831	1.831	1.831	1.832	1.834	1.836
	7.919	7.532	7.282	7.067	6.881	6.721		4.157	4.120	4.098	4.081	4.068	4.058
	10.278	9.866	9.589	9.344	9.127	8.937		5.202	5.131	5.090	5.057	5.031	5.010
	15.712	15.337	15.055	14.796	14.562	14.353		8.398	8.161	8.023	7.912	7.821	7.746
0.4	2.336	2.266	2.225	2.193	2.166	2.144	1.4	1.863	1.864	1.864	1.865	1.866	1.867
	5.823	5.543	5.376	5.239	5.126	5.033		4.396	4.338	4.303	4.275	4.253	4.235
	7.468	7.108	6.882	6.693	6.535	6.401		5.675	5.556	5.487	5.431	5.386	5.350
	11.469	11.044	10.750	10.491	10.263	10.063		10.901	10.534	10.306	10.113	9.946	9.802
0.5	2.090	2.046	2.021	2.002	1.986	1.974	1.5	1.901	1.903	1.903	1.903	1.903	1.904
	4.844	4.671	4.572	4.493	4.430	4.379		4.711	4.625	4.574	4.532	4.497	4.469
	6.064	5.821	5.678	5.563	5.471	5.396		6.376	6.189	6.079	5.991	5.918	5.859
	9.084	8.702	8.458	8.254	8.084	7.943		15.201	14.812	14.566	14.352	14.163	13.993
0.6	1.951	1.923	1.908	1.896	1.888	1.882	1.6	1.944	1.946	1.946	1.945	1.945	1.945
	4.347	4.246	4.188	4.144	4.109	4.083		5.127	5.002	4.928	4.867	4.817	4.776
	5.349	5.203	5.121	5.056	5.006	4.967		7.427	7.153	6.988	6.853	6.741	6.647
	7.750	7.487	7.331	7.208	7.110	7.033		21.701	21.319	21.076	20.865	20.677	20.509
0.7	1.866	1.849	1.841	1.835	1.832	1.830	1.7	1.992	1.994	1.993	1.992	1.990	1.990
	4.076	4.019	3.989	3.966	3.949	3.936		5.678	5.502	5.397	5.311	5.241	5.182
	4.967	4.887	4.843	4.810	4.785	4.766		9.001	8.646	8.424	8.236	8.075	7.937
	7.032	6.883	6.799	6.735	6.687	6.650		31.292	30.914	30.674	30.464	30.278	30.111
0.8	1.815	1.805	1.801	1.800	1.799	1.800	1.8	2.044	2.045	2.044	2.042	2.040	2.038
	3.923	3.895	3.881	3.871	3.865	3.862		6.420	6.180	6.035	5.916	5.817	5.734
	4.758	4.720	4.700	4.685	4.675	4.669		11.255	10.864	10.614	10.397	10.206	10.038
	6.652	6.583	6.545	6.518	6.498	6.484		45.476	45.101	44.862	44.654	44.468	44.302
0.9	1.787	1.782	1.780	1.781	1.782	1.785	1.9	2.100	2.101	2.099	2.096	2.093	2.090
	3.842	3.832	3.827	3.825	3.824	3.826		7.426	7.118	6.926	6.766	6.631	6.517
	4.650	4.636	4.629	4.625	4.624	4.624		14.323	13.929	13.677	13.458	13.263	13.090
	6.464	6.441	6.429	6.421	6.416	6.414		66.584	66.212	65.974	65.766	65.582	65.416
1.0	1.780	1.776	1.776	1.777	1.779	1.782	2.0	2.160	2.161	2.158	2.154	2.150	2.146
	3.824	3.817	3.815	3.815	3.816	3.819		8.777	8.414	8.182	7.983	7.811	7.662
	4.624	4.616	4.613	4.612	4.613	4.615		18.383	17.995	17.747	17.530	17.338	17.167
	6.415	6.406	6.401	6.398	6.397	6.398		98.206	97.837	97.600	97.393	97.209	97.044

Table 2:  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of  $T_{n,s,1}$  in (S.23) for  $\alpha = 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$ .

$s$	$n$	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000
-1.0	2.800	3.037	3.186	3.316	3.431	3.534	
	7.955	8.258	8.379	8.452	8.497	8.529	
	11.012	11.420	11.567	11.643	11.684	11.706	
	20.055	20.927	21.229	21.382	21.459	21.497	
-0.9	2.744	2.980	3.129	3.259	3.375	3.479	
	7.492	7.783	7.902	7.977	8.027	8.063	
	10.242	10.617	10.753	10.826	10.866	10.889	
	18.251	19.015	19.279	19.413	19.481	19.515	
-0.8	2.692	2.927	3.076	3.206	3.322	3.427	
	7.075	7.355	7.474	7.552	7.607	7.649	
	9.552	9.899	10.028	10.099	10.140	10.165	
	16.661	17.332	17.565	17.683	17.742	17.772	
-0.7	2.645	2.878	3.026	3.157	3.273	3.378	
	6.699	6.971	7.092	7.174	7.235	7.283	
	8.934	9.258	9.382	9.453	9.496	9.524	
	15.259	15.851	16.056	16.161	16.214	16.241	
-0.6	2.600	2.832	2.980	3.111	3.227	3.332	
	6.361	6.627	6.750	6.837	6.904	6.958	
	8.382	8.687	8.809	8.881	8.928	8.960	
	14.022	14.546	14.728	14.822	14.870	14.894	
-0.5	2.560	2.790	2.938	3.068	3.184	3.290	
	6.057	6.318	6.445	6.538	6.611	6.672	
	7.889	8.180	8.300	8.376	8.428	8.466	
	12.930	13.396	13.560	13.645	13.689	13.712	
-0.4	2.523	2.752	2.898	3.028	3.145	3.250	
	5.784	6.042	6.173	6.272	6.351	6.419	
	7.449	7.728	7.850	7.931	7.988	8.033	
	11.966	12.380	12.533	12.611	12.653	12.676	
-0.3	2.489	2.716	2.862	2.992	3.108	3.213	
	5.540	5.798	5.932	6.036	6.122	6.196	
	7.058	7.330	7.454	7.540	7.605	7.657	
	11.114	11.494	11.632	11.706	11.748	11.772	
-0.2	2.459	2.684	2.829	2.958	3.074	3.179	
	5.323	5.580	5.718	5.827	5.919	5.999	
	6.710	6.978	7.105	7.198	7.270	7.330	
	10.366	10.713	10.843	10.917	10.960	10.988	
-0.1	2.432	2.655	2.799	2.928	3.043	3.148	
	5.129	5.386	5.528	5.643	5.741	5.826	
	6.403	6.668	6.800	6.899	6.979	7.047	
	9.708	10.030	10.156	10.232	10.280	10.313	

$s$	$n$	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000
0.0	2.408	2.629	2.772	2.900	3.015	3.120	
	4.958	5.216	5.362	5.481	5.584	5.674	
	6.133	6.397	6.533	6.640	6.727	6.803	
	9.132	9.436	9.561	9.641	9.696	9.737	
0.1	2.387	2.606	2.749	2.876	2.990	3.095	
	4.808	5.066	5.215	5.340	5.447	5.542	
	5.897	6.160	6.302	6.416	6.510	6.593	
	8.631	8.922	9.050	9.136	9.200	9.250	
0.2	2.370	2.587	2.728	2.855	2.969	3.073	
	4.678	4.936	5.088	5.216	5.328	5.427	
	5.692	5.956	6.103	6.223	6.324	6.414	
	8.197	8.481	8.613	8.709	8.783	8.844	
0.3	2.358	2.571	2.711	2.837	2.950	3.054	
	4.566	4.825	4.979	5.111	5.225	5.328	
	5.517	5.782	5.933	6.059	6.166	6.261	
	7.826	8.106	8.245	8.350	8.435	8.507	
0.4	2.349	2.560	2.699	2.823	2.936	3.038	
	4.473	4.731	4.887	5.021	5.139	5.244	
	5.369	5.635	5.790	5.921	6.034	6.134	
	7.513	7.792	7.939	8.054	8.150	8.232	
0.5	2.345	2.553	2.690	2.813	2.925	3.027	
	4.399	4.654	4.812	4.948	5.068	5.175	
	5.249	5.514	5.673	5.808	5.925	6.030	
	7.255	7.535	7.689	7.814	7.919	8.012	
0.6	2.344	2.550	2.686	2.808	2.919	3.021	
	4.343	4.596	4.754	4.891	5.012	5.121	
	5.157	5.420	5.581	5.718	5.839	5.947	
	7.050	7.330	7.491	7.624	7.738	7.839	
0.7	2.357	2.557	2.689	2.809	2.918	3.019	
	4.309	4.558	4.714	4.851	4.973	5.083	
	5.094	5.353	5.514	5.653	5.776	5.887	
	6.899	7.178	7.343	7.482	7.604	7.711	
0.8	2.380	2.576	2.705	2.823	2.930	3.028	
	4.301	4.543	4.697	4.833	4.954	5.063	
	5.066	5.319	5.478	5.617	5.740	5.851	
	6.806	7.080	7.247	7.390	7.515	7.627	
0.9	2.408	2.602	2.730	2.846	2.952	3.049	
	4.339	4.568	4.715	4.846	4.964	5.071	
	5.090	5.330	5.483	5.618	5.739	5.848	
	6.792	7.052	7.214	7.356	7.481	7.593	

Table 3:  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of  $T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}$  in (S.24) for  $\alpha = 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$ .



$s$	$n$						$s$	$n$					
	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000		100	250	500	1000	2000	4000
0.1	12.248	12.271	12.279	12.283	12.285	12.286	1.1	2.620	2.786	2.898	3.002	3.097	3.185
	29.327	29.549	29.623	29.661	29.679	29.689		4.698	4.879	5.000	5.109	5.209	5.301
	36.177	36.527	36.644	36.709	36.732	36.747		5.536	5.715	5.834	5.941	6.039	6.129
	51.722	52.460	52.708	52.708	52.896	52.927		7.518	7.677	7.785	7.882	7.971	8.053
0.2	6.235	6.273	6.296	6.316	6.335	6.353	1.2	2.623	2.794	2.909	3.015	3.112	3.201
	14.689	14.788	14.822	14.838	14.847	14.851		4.871	5.046	5.163	5.268	5.364	5.453
	18.123	18.279	18.331	18.357	18.370	18.377		5.850	6.012	6.120	6.218	6.308	6.390
	25.930	26.258	26.369	26.424	26.452	26.466		8.492	8.593	8.663	8.727	8.787	8.843
0.3	4.424	4.506	4.563	4.615	4.663	4.709	1.3	2.638	2.812	2.930	3.038	3.137	3.228
	9.845	9.911	9.936	9.950	9.959	9.965		5.125	5.291	5.401	5.500	5.591	5.674
	12.122	12.217	12.249	12.266	12.275	12.280		6.336	6.473	6.565	6.649	6.726	6.797
	17.336	17.529	17.594	17.627	17.643	17.651		10.284	10.323	10.349	10.374	10.397	10.419
0.4	3.633	3.747	3.825	3.897	3.963	4.026	1.4	2.661	2.840	2.960	3.070	3.171	3.263
	7.511	7.584	7.621	7.649	7.674	7.695		5.470	5.621	5.721	5.812	5.895	5.971
	9.181	9.260	9.292	9.313	9.328	9.341		7.035	7.140	7.211	7.275	7.335	7.390
	13.063	13.193	13.238	13.261	13.274	13.280		13.224	13.232	13.237	13.240	13.243	13.246
0.5	3.211	3.344	3.434	3.517	3.594	3.666	1.5	2.693	2.875	2.998	3.110	3.212	3.305
	6.227	6.330	6.391	6.444	6.492	6.537		5.922	6.053	6.140	6.219	6.291	6.358
	7.518	7.613	7.663	7.704	7.739	7.772		8.016	8.086	8.132	8.173	8.211	8.247
	10.560	10.668	10.711	10.737	10.756	10.770		17.669	17.672	17.673	17.674	17.674	17.674
0.6	2.959	3.103	3.201	3.291	3.374	3.452	1.6	2.732	2.918	3.042	3.156	3.259	3.354
	5.477	5.611	5.697	5.773	5.842	5.906		6.505	6.613	6.684	6.748	6.806	6.861
	6.527	6.653	6.729	6.796	6.856	6.911		9.364	9.404	9.428	9.449	9.467	9.485
	8.999	9.117	9.177	9.223	9.262	9.297		24.209	24.211	24.212	24.213	24.213	24.213
0.7	2.800	2.951	3.054	3.148	3.236	3.317	1.7	2.778	2.967	3.093	3.208	3.312	3.408
	5.024	5.184	5.288	5.381	5.467	5.545		7.253	7.336	7.388	7.435	7.478	7.518
	5.926	6.083	6.183	6.271	6.352	6.425		11.178	11.200	11.211	11.219	11.226	11.231
	8.021	8.170	8.257	8.332	8.399	8.459		33.817	33.820	33.821	33.822	33.822	33.822
0.8	2.708	2.862	2.966	3.063	3.153	3.236	1.8	2.831	3.022	3.150	3.266	3.371	3.467
	4.754	4.931	5.048	5.153	5.248	5.336		8.205	8.265	8.300	8.330	8.357	8.382
	5.568	5.748	5.865	5.969	6.064	6.151		13.576	13.591	13.597	13.600	13.602	13.604
	7.431	7.613	7.727	7.828	7.918	8.000		48.012	48.016	48.017	48.018	48.018	48.018
0.9	2.656	2.813	2.921	3.019	3.111	3.195	1.9	2.891	3.084	3.214	3.330	3.436	3.533
	4.618	4.803	4.925	5.036	5.137	5.230		9.407	9.449	9.471	9.488	9.503	9.515
	5.384	5.576	5.702	5.815	5.918	6.012		16.716	16.729	16.733	16.735	16.736	16.737
	7.120	7.324	7.455	7.571	7.676	7.771		69.125	69.131	69.133	69.134	69.134	69.135
1.0	2.629	2.791	2.901	3.002	3.095	3.181	2.0	2.958	3.153	3.283	3.400	3.506	3.603
	4.609	4.793	4.916	5.027	5.129	5.222		10.914	10.945	10.959	10.968	10.975	10.980
	5.377	5.566	5.691	5.804	5.907	6.001		20.815	20.827	20.831	20.833	20.834	20.835
	7.103	7.300	7.429	7.545	7.650	7.746		100.76	100.76	100.77	100.77	100.77	100.77

Table 4:  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of  $T_{n,s}^{\text{BJ}}$  in (S.25) for  $\alpha = 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$ .

$n$	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000
2.892	2.914	2.919	2.919	2.916	2.912	2.907	
4.286	4.282	4.270	4.256	4.244	4.233	4.224	
4.768	4.758	4.742	4.726	4.712	4.701	4.691	
5.780	5.754	5.728	5.704	5.684	5.668	5.655	

Table 5:  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of  $T_n^{\text{SP}}$  in (S.26) for  $\alpha = 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$ .




Figure 5: 95%-confidence bands for  $n = 100$ . Upper panel:  $(A_{n,1,1,\alpha}, B_{n,1,1,\alpha})$  (solid) and  $(A_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}}, B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}})$  (green, dotted). Lower panel: centered upper bounds  $B_{n,1,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (solid),  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (green, dotted) and  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (dashed).




Figure 6: Centered upper 95%-confidence bounds  $B_{n,1,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (solid),  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{SP}} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (green, dotted) and  $B_{n,\alpha}^{\text{KS}} - \mathbb{F}_n$  (yellow, dashed) for  $n = 500$  (upper panel) and  $n = 4000$  (lower panel).




Figure 7: Upper 95%-confidence bounds for  $n = 500$  and  $s \in \{0.6, 0.8, 1, 1.2, 1.4\}$ . Upper panel: centered bounds  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$ . Lower panel: differences  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - B_{n,1,1,\alpha}$ .




Figure 8: Upper 95%-confidence bounds for  $n = 2000$  and  $s \in \{0.6, 0.8, 1, 1.2, 1.4\}$ . Upper panel: centered bounds  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - \mathbb{F}_n$ . Lower panel: differences  $B_{n,s,1,\alpha} - B_{n,1,1,\alpha}$ .

$\kappa$	$n$							
	100	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000	$\infty^*$
2.80	0.4586	0.4473	0.4438	0.4428	0.4433	0.4446	0.4464	0.50
4.12	0.8748	0.8751	0.8770	0.8792	0.8811	0.8829	0.8843	0.90
4.57	0.9331	0.9339	0.9353	0.9367	0.9380	0.9390	0.9399	0.95
5.53	0.9849	0.9855	0.9860	0.9865	0.9869	0.9873	0.9875	0.99

Table 6: True coverage probabilities of the confidence bands of Stepanova and Pavlenko (2018) with the quantiles of Orasch and Pouliot (2004), rounded to four digits. \*Intended limits.