

Testing Imprecise Hypotheses

Lucas Kania[†] Tudor Manole[◊] Larry Wasserman^{†,‡} Sivaraman Balakrishnan^{†,‡}

[†]Department of Statistics and Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University

[◊]Statistics and Data Science Center, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

[‡]Machine Learning Department, Carnegie Mellon University

lucaskania@cmu.edu, tmanole@mit.edu, {larry,siva}@stat.cmu.edu

January 28, 2026

Abstract

Many scientific applications involve testing theories that are only partially specified. This task often amounts to testing the goodness-of-fit of a candidate distribution while allowing for reasonable deviations from it. The *tolerant testing* framework provides a systematic way of constructing such tests. Rather than testing the simple null hypothesis that data was drawn from a candidate distribution, a tolerant test assesses whether the data is consistent with any distribution that lies within a given neighborhood of the candidate. As this neighborhood grows, the tolerance to misspecification increases, while the power of the test decreases. In this work, we characterize the information-theoretic trade-off between the size of the neighborhood and the power of the test, in several canonical models. On the one hand, we characterize the optimal trade-off for tolerant testing in the Gaussian sequence model, under deviations measured in both smooth and non-smooth norms. On the other hand, we study nonparametric analogues of this problem in smooth regression and density models. Along the way, we establish the sub-optimality of the classical χ^2 -statistic for tolerant testing, and study simple alternative hypothesis tests.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	2
2	The minimax framework for tolerant testing	9
3	The Gaussian sequence model	10
4	The smooth Gaussian white noise model	21
5	The smooth density model	23
6	Systematic uncertainties in high-energy physics	24
7	Discussion	26
	Supplementary material	28
	References	72

1 Introduction

Evaluating whether data support or refute a hypothesis is a fundamental task in the sciences. Statistical hypothesis testing provides a formal framework for this problem. Typically, a researcher states a null hypothesis which represents the absence of a scientific discovery, and designs a test to assess it. A rejection of the null hypothesis thus suggests a discovery of the scientific phenomenon of interest.

This process conflates statistical and scientific discovery. To test a hypothesis, one specifies a model representing *no scientific discovery* and checks whether the observed data aligns with its predictions. If the model accurately reflects the underlying process, statistical rejection implies scientific discovery. In practice, however, models are imperfect, and rejection simply indicates a discrepancy between the model and the data, not necessarily a discovery.

To mitigate this issue, practitioners attempt to account for acceptable deviations from the *no discovery* model, thus requiring stronger evidence for rejection. A prominent example is the field of experimental high-energy physics, in which datasets are collected from large-scale particle colliders with the aim of probing the *Standard Model* of particle physics [van Dyk, 2014]. The Standard Model is a classification of elementary particles and the forces which act upon them, which leads to predictions of the probability distribution P_0 governing the kinematic behavior of particles within a collider. Given a set of experimental observations $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim P$ of such particles, a sought-after goal is to test the goodness-of-fit hypothesis

$$H_0 : P = P_0, \text{ versus } H_1 : d(P, P_0) > \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where d is a divergence between probability distributions, and $\epsilon > 0$ is a separation parameter. A rejection of the null indicates a departure from the Standard Model, and thus a discovery of new physics. One of the difficulties in testing this hypothesis lies in the fact that P_0 is unavailable in closed form, and is typically approximated through simulators. These simulators themselves rely on parameters which are either inferred from past analyses, or are computed mathematically, typically using approximations. As a result of these various imperfections, physicists acknowledge that the putative null distribution P_0 may be slightly misspecified. The degree of misspecification is quantified through the notion of *systematic uncertainties* [Heinrich and Lyons, 2007], and an important goal is to construct goodness-of-fit tests which are tolerant to deviations of the null hypothesis within the confines of a systematic uncertainty set.

Motivated by such applications—which we return to in Section 6—the goal of our work is to develop methods for testing *imprecise* goodness-of-fit hypotheses, and to sharply characterize the information-theoretic trade-off between statistical power and imprecision. We study these questions for several of canonical divergence functionals and model classes, such as high-dimensional location families and smoothness classes. Although each problem will involve different optimal tests, and different information theoretic trade-offs, we identify a variety of common phenomena across these problems which allow us to reason more broadly about null misspecification in goodness-of-fit

testing.

To formalize our problem, we adopt a framework known as *tolerant testing* [Ingster, 2001, Parnas et al., 2006]. Unlike the goodness-of-fit problem (1), the tolerant testing problem consists of the hypotheses

$$H_0 : d(P, P_0) \leq \epsilon_0, \text{ versus } H_1 : d(P, P_0) \geq \epsilon_1, \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is a *tolerance* or *imprecision* parameter, and $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 > 0$ is a *separation* parameter. By analogy with the physical applications described previously, one can think of ϵ_0 as defining a *systematic* uncertainty ball $\{\tilde{P}_0 : d(\tilde{P}_0, P_0) \leq \epsilon_0\}$ centered at P_0 , and the goal is to detect deviations not only from P_0 , but from any distribution which lies in this ball.

We study tolerant testing via the *minimax framework* for hypothesis testing, which has its roots in the foundational works of Mann and Wald [1942], Ingster [1982, 1993], Ermakov [1990, 1991], and Lepski and Spokoiny [1999]. Given a tolerance parameter ϵ_0 , the main figure of merit in the minimax framework is the notion of critical separation, also called the critical separation radius, defined as the smallest distance $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0$ for which the hypotheses can be tested with nontrivial power, uniformly over all elements of the null and alternative classes; see Section 2 below for precise definitions. Any test which achieves this condition is said to be minimax optimal.

The minimax criterion stands in contrast to more traditional frameworks to quantifying the difficulty of hypothesis testing problems, which typically quantify the relative efficiency of tests along contiguous alternatives. These two viewpoints both have their strengths and drawbacks [Bickel et al., 2006]. The contiguous framework is well-suited to problems where the set of alternatives is believed to lie in a small set of directions that can accurately be captured by one-dimensional paths of alternatives. On the other hand, analyzing power against such paths can be misleading in genuinely non-parametric problems, as they typically cannot capture the full dimensionality of the space of alternatives, and can therefore lead to conclusions which obscure the curse of dimensionality [Arias-Castro et al., 2018]. We find the minimax framework to be particularly illuminating for analyzing the tolerant testing problem, since it allows us to quantify the interplay between the geometry and dimensionality of the composite null and alternative classes as a function of the parameter ϵ_0 .

From a more technical lens, the minimax perspective on tolerant testing provides a common framework for analyzing two seemingly-distinct but well-studied problems in the minimax theory literature:

- (a) *Testing* the goodness-of-fit hypothesis (1).
- (b) *Estimating* the divergence functional $d(P, P_0)$.

It is clear that problem (a) is a special case of tolerant testing. To see the connection to problem (b), notice that any estimator \hat{d}_n of the divergence functional $d(P, P_0)$ induces a tolerant test, which rejects the null hypothesis when \hat{d}_n takes on values which are

appreciably larger than ϵ_0 . In particular, if the minimax rate of *estimating* $d(P, P_0)$ is δ_n , then there exists a tolerant *test* with nontrivial power whenever

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \geq C \cdot \delta_n,$$

for a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$. This reduction is described in further detail in Section 3.1.1, though is well-known, and forms a common strategy for certifying lower bounds on the minimax estimation risk [Tsybakov, 2009]. In our context, this reduction is typically sharp when ϵ_0 takes on sufficiently large values, thus one can generally interpret the critical separation as interpolating between the minimax testing rate of problem (a) when ϵ_0 is small, and the minimax estimation rate (b) when ϵ_0 is large. In between these two regimes, there sometimes appears an *interpolation* regime, which is unique to tolerant testing. In what follows, we provide a more detailed view into these phenomena, before drawing further comparisons to prior work.

Outline Section 1.1 provides an overview of our main results, while Section 2 introduces the minimax framework for tolerant testing. In Section 3, we characterize the critical separation in the Gaussian sequence model. In Sections 4 and 5, we characterize the critical separation for the Gaussian white noise model and densities separated in the L_1 norm. Finally, in Section 6, we comment on the application of tolerant testing for handling systematic uncertainties in high-energy physics.

Notation We write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if there exists a positive constant C such that $a_n \leq C \cdot b_n$ for all n large enough. Analogously, $a_n \asymp b_n$ denotes that $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \lesssim a_n$. Furthermore, given a distribution π , we use $m_l(\pi) = E_{p \sim \pi}[p^l]$ to denote its l -th moment. Additionally, let $\delta_A(a)$ equal 1 if $a \in A$, and 0 otherwise. Similarly, we use the following notation $I(\text{condition})$ to denote the indicator function that evaluates to one whenever the condition is true and returns zero otherwise. Whenever clear from context, we omit stating the random variable in expectations and variances: $E_P[T] = E_{X \sim P}[T(X)]$ and $V_P[T] = V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]$.

1.1 Overview of main results

We study the minimax tolerant testing problem in the following three settings:

- (i) The Gaussian sequence model, under the ℓ_p -metrics (Section 3).
- (ii) A smooth Gaussian white noise model, under the L_1 metric (Section 4).
- (iii) A smooth density testing model, under the L_1 metric (Section 5).

We derive minimax upper bounds across these various problems, and we complement them with matching minimax lower bounds in many cases. Along the way, we identify the suboptimality of certain classical goodness-of-fit tests for these problems, and provide alternative tests which are both practical and minimax-optimal.

Let us illustrate our results in the simplest case of the Gaussian sequence model (i), which is a canonical model for the study of minimax hypothesis testing problems, and serves as a convenient benchmark for more general nonparametric regression problems [Ingster and Suslina, 2003, Johnstone, 2019]. In this setting, one is given a d -dimensional, homoscedastic observation of the form

$$X \sim \mathcal{N}(v, I_d/n), \quad (3)$$

for some $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n, d \geq 1$. Let us first consider the ℓ_1 -tolerant testing problem:

$$H_0 : \|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0, \text{ versus } H_1 : \|v\|_1 \geq \epsilon_1. \quad (4)$$

It has been known since the work of Ingster [1993] that the classical χ^2 -test is minimax optimal for this problem when $\epsilon_0 = 0$, with corresponding critical radius scaling as $d^{3/4}/\sqrt{n}$. Surprisingly, however, we will show that the χ^2 -test is generally suboptimal for the tolerant testing problem, and we will instead show that a different test achieves the following minimax hypothesis testing rate.

Theorem 1.1 (Informal version of Theorem 3.1 in Section 3.1). *Given $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$, let $\lambda = \sqrt{n}\epsilon_0$. Then, the hypotheses (4) can be tested with nontrivial power if and only if*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \begin{cases} d^{3/4}, & \text{if } 0 \leq \lambda \lesssim \sqrt{d}, & (\text{Free tolerance regime}) \\ d^{1/2} \cdot \lambda^{1/2}, & \text{if } \sqrt{d} \lesssim \lambda \lesssim d, & (\text{Interpolation regime}) \\ d, & \text{if } \lambda \asymp d, & (\text{Functional estimation regime}) \end{cases}$$

where we hide polylogarithmic factors in d .

A striking feature of the critical separation under the ℓ_1 -norm is the existence of three regimes. When ϵ_0 takes on small values, the critical separation remains constant, and scales as $d^{3/4}/\sqrt{n}$. Once again, this matches the well-known critical separation for goodness-of-fit testing under the ℓ_1 norm [Ingster, 1993]. We refer to this regime as the *free tolerance regime*, since the goodness-of-fit rate persists even as ϵ_0 increases. Let us emphasize that the existence of this regime was already known from the work of Ingster [2001]. When ϵ_0 crosses the critical rate \sqrt{d}/n , we enter the *interpolation regime*, which exhibits a new rate that is specific to tolerant testing, and decays polynomially in ϵ_0 . Finally, a third regime occurs when $\epsilon_0 \asymp d/\sqrt{n}$, in which case, for the first time, the critical separation $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0$ coincides with ϵ_0 . The convergence rate of this regime coincides with the minimax rate of estimating the functional $\|v\|_1$, up to polylogarithmic factors [Cai and Low, 2011]. Although we do not characterize the ℓ_1 tolerant testing rate for larger values of ϵ_0 , we shall do so for some other norms discussed below.

The existence of a free tolerance regime provides a means of quantifying the robustness of goodness-of-fit tests to null misspecification. Indeed, one can heuristically define the *tolerance* of a goodness-of-fit test as the largest value of ϵ_0 for which the critical separation of the test stays constant—namely, the largest ϵ_0 for which the test remains powerful when ϵ_1 equals the goodness-of-fit minimax critical separation. In the

Gaussian sequence model, Theorem 1.1 shows that the maximal achievable tolerance is $d^{1/2}/\sqrt{n}$. Perhaps surprisingly, this tolerance is not achieved by certain well-known goodness-of-fit tests: In Section 3, we will see that the test statistics

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d X_j^2, \quad \text{and} \quad T = \sum_{j=1}^d |X_j|,$$

are both minimax-optimal for goodness-of-fit testing (i.e. for problem (4) with $\epsilon_0 = 0$), however the χ^2 -test merely has tolerance $d^{1/4}/\sqrt{n}$, whereas the plugin test T has optimal tolerance $d^{1/2}/\sqrt{n}$. Despite its popularity, the χ^2 -test thus has suboptimal tolerance, and can be improved by a simple alternative test without sacrificing minimax optimality, at least when measuring deviations under the ℓ_1 norm.

Theorem 1.1 builds upon recent work by [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#), which established closely-related phenomena for tolerant testing in the setting of discrete distributions. Concretely, given n observations from a discrete probability distribution P supported on $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$, and a reference distribution P_0 , [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#) study the tolerant testing problem

$$H_0 : V(P, P_0) \leq \epsilon_0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : V(P, P_0) \geq \epsilon_1, \quad (5)$$

where V denotes the total variation distance. They prove that for $d \lesssim n$, the hypotheses (5) can be tested with non-trivial power, up to polylogarithmic factors, if and only if

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \begin{cases} d^{1/4}, & \text{if } 0 \leq \lambda \lesssim 1, & (\text{Free tolerance regime}) \\ d^{1/4} \cdot \lambda^{1/2}, & \text{if } 1 \lesssim \lambda \lesssim \sqrt{d}, & (\text{Interpolation regime}) \\ d^{1/2}, & \text{if } \lambda \asymp \sqrt{d}. & (\text{Functional estimation regime}) \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Here again, we can observe that the critical separation interpolates between the goodness-of-fit rate [[Paninski, 2008](#)], which persists over a free tolerance region, and the risk of estimating the total variation distance between the distributions [[Jiao et al., 2018](#)]. We will later see that this same pattern also occurs in the infinite-dimensional models (ii) and (iii).

Nevertheless, the interpolation regime does not always need to exist. To illustrate this point, we now turn to a second setting considered in this paper, consisting of the hypotheses

$$H_0 : \|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0, \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \|v\|_p \geq \epsilon_1, \quad \text{with } p \text{ an even integer}, \quad (7)$$

where we continue to work under the Gaussian sequence model (3). Unlike the ℓ_1 problem studied previously, the ℓ_p norms arising in problem (7) are smooth. It is well-known that functional estimation and goodness-of-fit testing rates tend to coincide for smooth functionals [[Giné and Nickl, 2016](#)]; for example, when $p = 2$, it is known that both the goodness-of-fit testing rate and the functional estimation rate are of the same order $d^{1/4}/\sqrt{n}$, in the Gaussian sequence model. It is therefore natural to expect the critical

separation to remain constant for all $\epsilon_0 \leq d^{1/4}/\sqrt{n}$, absent any interpolation regime. The following result proves that this is indeed the case, and additionally characterizes the tolerant testing rate when ϵ_0 exceeds the functional estimation rate.

Theorem 1.2 (Informal version of Lemma 3.4 in Section 3.3). *Given $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$, let $\lambda = \sqrt{n}\epsilon_0$. Then, the hypotheses (7) can be tested with nontrivial power if*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \begin{cases} d^{1/2p}, & \text{if } 0 \leq \lambda \lesssim d^{1/2p}, \\ d^{1/2} \cdot \lambda^{1-p}, & \text{if } d^{1/2p} \lesssim \lambda \lesssim d^{1/p}, \\ d^{1/p-1/2}, & \text{if } \lambda \asymp d^{1/p}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{Free tolerance regime})$$

Theorem 1.2 confirms the absence of an interpolation regime for tolerant testing under the smooth ℓ_p norms, and shows that the traditional goodness-of-fit critical separation radius $d^{1/2p}/\sqrt{n}$ [Ingster, 1993] persists until ϵ_0 coincides with this rate. Once again, the existence of this free tolerance regime was already known from the work of Ingster [2001]. On the other hand, when ϵ_0 exceeds this rate, we find that the critical separation begins to shrink, indicating that the tolerant testing problem becomes easier. Nevertheless, this phenomenon is still linked to functional estimation, which we explain in Section 3.3.

Since only moderate tolerance levels are relevant in practice—when testing provides a clear advantage over estimation—we focus on the case where the tolerance parameter ϵ_0 lies between zero and the functional estimation rate, throughout what follows. Beyond this point, an estimation-based test becomes preferable.

1.2 Related Work

The study of robust hypothesis testing within the minimax framework has a long history. Le Cam [1986] and Kraft [1955] studied the conditions for the distinguishability of disjoint convex sets of distributions, see the left panel of Figure 1. Huber [1965] derived minimax optimal tests when the distributions under the null and alternative hypotheses form disjoint balls in the total variation metric. Huber and Strassen [1973], Rieder [1977], Bednarski [1982] extended these results to general disjoint sets dominated by capacities. Later works by Birgé [1979, 1983b,a, 2015] and Le Cam [1986] developed analogous tests for Hellinger balls, with the aim of studying the convergence of estimators [Le Cam, 1973]. In all cases, the disjointness of the sets ensures that the optimal testing procedure is a likelihood ratio test between a pair of *closest* distributions lying on the boundaries of each set. Together, these developments provide a strong generalization of binary hypothesis testing. However, they do not apply to tolerant testing (2), where distributions under the alternative hypothesis *surround* the set of distributions under the null hypothesis [Ingster and Suslina, 2003], see the right panel of Figure 1.

To the best of our knowledge, the first study of minimax tolerant testing is due to Ingster [2001] for the Gaussian sequence and white noise models under general ℓ_p metrics,




Figure 1: Comparison between robust hypothesis testing and tolerant testing.

and by [Batu et al. \[2000\]](#) for discrete distributions under the ℓ_1 distance. Both of these works focused on the case where ϵ_0 is small. In the Gaussian sequence model, [Carpentier and Verzelen \[2019\]](#) subsequently analyzed tolerant testing under the ℓ_0 divergence. The discrete Multinomial model (5) has received comparatively more attention, including further refinements in the small- ϵ_0 regime under the ℓ_1 norm [[Paninski, 2008](#), [Valiant, 2011](#), [Valiant and Valiant, 2014](#), [Diakonikolas et al., 2015](#)], mild tolerance under ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 [[Batu et al., 2013](#), [Chan et al., 2014](#), [Acharya et al., 2015](#), [Diakonikolas and Kane, 2016](#), [Daskalakis et al., 2018](#), [Bhattacharyya et al., 2025](#)], intermediate tolerance under ℓ_1 [[Canonne et al., 2022](#)], and more general metrics [[Chakraborty et al., 2022](#)].

As mentioned in the previous section, when ϵ_0 is of the same order as the risk of estimating $d(P, P_0)$, testing becomes equally hard to estimating this divergence [[Parnas et al., 2006](#)]. For smooth and non-smooth divergences, this estimation problem has been studied extensively, in the discrete model [[Valiant and Valiant, 2011](#), [Han et al., 2015](#), [Jiao et al., 2018](#)], the Gaussian sequence model [[Cai and Low, 2011](#), [Koltchinskii and Zhilova, 2021a,b](#)], and the Gaussian white noise model [[Ibragimov et al., 1987](#), [Lepski et al., 1999](#), [Han et al., 2020](#)]. In many of these works, lower bounds on the critical separation are established by creating pairs of distributions that share many moments but remain significantly different in terms of the divergence of interest [[Wu and Yang, 2016](#)]. Explicit constructions are a central focus of the work by [Ingster \[2001\]](#), while [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#) relies on implicit constructions that are based on the duality between moment-matching and polynomial approximation. There is also a wealth of work on minimax estimation for smooth divergences in the various model classes studied in this paper (e.g. [Bickel and Ritov \[1988\]](#), [Giné and Nickl \[2008\]](#), [Kerkycharian and Picard \[1996\]](#), [Robins et al. \[2009\]](#), [Birgé and Massart \[1995\]](#), [Laurent \[1996\]](#), Tch-

etgen et al. [2008]), for which minimax lower bounds are typically obtained through reductions to goodness-of-fit testing problems [Ingster, 1993]. In the special case of linear functionals, we emphasize that the celebrated work of Donoho and Liu [1991] established a tight link between estimation and tolerant testing.

As discussed in Section 1, one key motivation for studying the tolerant testing problem comes from scientific applications that require testing goodness-of-fit hypotheses under systematic or epistemic uncertainty. A common source of systematic uncertainty occurs when the null distribution P_0 is only approximately known due to simulation error. This setting is often referred to as *likelihood-free hypothesis testing*, a problem recently investigated within the minimax framework [Gerber and Polyanskiy, 2024, Gerber et al., 2023a, Jia and Polyanskiy, 2025]. A related line of research in *imprecise probability* [Walley, 1991] models epistemic uncertainty arising from a practitioner’s partial knowledge. In this case, P_0 is assumed to belong to *Credal set*, a convex set of distributions, that captures this lack of complete information [Levi, 1980, Sale et al., 2023]. Across these frameworks and related ones, tests based on the maximum mean discrepancy [Gretton et al., 2006] have become prominent for their strong empirical performance and theoretical tractability [Gerber et al., 2023b, Chau et al., 2025, Zhou et al., 2025].

Finally, we note that tolerant testing subsumes several other robustness frameworks in the literature. These include the semiparametric framework of Liu and Lindsay [2009], which examines deviations from a parametric model through the Kullback–Leibler divergence; and the equivalence testing framework [Wellek, 2002, Romano, 2005], which reverses the roles of the hypotheses in (2). Therefore, general results in tolerant testing provide unified tools for reasoning about these frameworks. In Appendix A of the supplementary material, we illustrate this connection by examining how the critical separation in tolerant testing relates to that in equivalence testing.

2 The minimax framework for tolerant testing

Our aim is to distinguish hypotheses (2) while controlling the probability of choosing the wrong hypothesis. In this section, we define the smallest distance between the hypotheses, called the critical separation, such that a test is able to reliably distinguish them.

Given a set of distributions \mathcal{P} , define the set of distributions that belong to the null and alternative hypotheses:

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : d(P, P_0) \leq \epsilon_0\} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_1 = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : d(P, P_0) \geq \epsilon_1\}.$$

A test ψ maps the sample space to $\{0, 1\}$. It returns 0 if it considers that the data supports the null hypothesis and 1 otherwise. The type-I error corresponds to the probability of choosing the alternative hypothesis when the null hypothesis is true. Henceforth, let Ψ denote the set of all tests that control the type-I error by α , known

as valid tests,

$$\Psi(\mathcal{P}_0) = \left\{ \psi : \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_0} P(\psi(X) = 1) \leq \alpha \right\}$$

where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is a vector of n observations. The type-II error is the probability of selecting the null when the alternative is true. The risk of a valid test is the maximum type-II error under the alternative:

$$R(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \mathcal{P}, \psi) = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_1} P(\psi(X) = 0) \text{ for } \psi \in \Psi(\mathcal{P}_0).$$

Throughout the paper, we call a test powerful if its risk is bounded by $\beta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$. Finally, the minimax risk quantifies the best possible performance over all valid tests:

$$R_*(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \mathcal{P}) = \inf_{\psi \in \Psi(\mathcal{P}_0)} R(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \mathcal{P}, \psi). \quad (8)$$

We say that a valid test ψ is optimal if its risk $R(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \psi, \mathcal{P})$ equals the minimax risk $R_*(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \mathcal{P})$ up to constants and logarithmic factors. For a fixed sample size n , a powerful valid test may not exist when the gap between ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 is too small. Thus, we define the critical separation as the smallest distance that admits a powerful valid test:

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \mathcal{P}) - \epsilon_0 = \inf\{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 : \epsilon_1 \geq \epsilon_0 \text{ and } R_*(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \mathcal{P}) < \beta\}.$$

The critical separation is the detection threshold for the problem class \mathcal{P} at sample size n : below this threshold, no valid test can reliably distinguish the hypotheses in (2).

3 The Gaussian sequence model

As a starting point, we study the d -dimensional isotropic Gaussian sequence model, since it provides the right intuition for later models studied in the paper:

$$X \sim P_v \text{ where } P_v = \mathcal{N}(v, \sigma^2 \cdot I_d) \text{ , } \sigma \in (0, 1] \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (9)$$

Given a real number $p \geq 1$ and a tolerance parameter $\epsilon_0 > 0$, we consider the problem of testing whether the mean of P_v lies near the origin under the ℓ_p norm:

$$H_0 : \|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|v\|_p \geq \epsilon_1. \quad (10)$$

Let $\text{GS} = \{P_v : v \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ denote the set of Gaussian distributions (9). Our goal is to sharply characterize the critical separation $s_1(\epsilon_0, \text{GS})$ for this problem. We begin by discussing two special cases—where $p = 1$ or $p = 2$ —which capture many of the essential phenomena of our problem.

3.1 Tolerant Testing under the ℓ_1 norm

Consider testing the simple null hypothesis problem, $\epsilon_0 = 0$ in (10) with $p = 1$:

$$H_0 : v = 0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|v\|_1 \geq \epsilon_1. \quad (11)$$

A minimax test for (11) is the well-known Pearson chi-squared test:

$$\psi_2(X, 0) = I(T_2(X) \geq q_{1-\alpha}(T_2, P_0)) \text{ where } T_2(X) = \|X\|_2^2 - E_{P_0}\|X\|_2^2,$$

where $q_{1-\alpha}(T_2, P_0)$ is the $1-\alpha$ quantile of $T_2(X)$ for $X \sim P_0$. The test is known [Ingster, 1993] to consistently distinguish the hypotheses (11) as soon as $\epsilon_1 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot d^{3/4}$. We refer to this rate as the simple null hypothesis testing rate. To understand its significance, note that the testing rate is faster than the rate at which the functional $\|v\|_1$ can be estimated, which is $\sigma \cdot d / \sqrt{\log d}$ and called the functional estimation rate [Cai and Low, 2011]. If we choose the natural scaling $\sigma = n^{-1/2}$, this means that for $\sqrt{n} \lesssim d \lesssim n^{2/3}$, we can test the size of $\|v\|_1$ even though we cannot reliably estimate it.

Given that the chi-squared test is valid, it cannot reject distributions that are statistically indistinguishable from P_0 . Thus, one would expect that the null hypothesis can be *enlarged* without affecting the test's power. By slightly modifying the decision threshold, it can be shown that the chi-squared test maintains the same power guarantee (up to constants) for larger null hypotheses. The proof is deferred to Appendix C.1 of the supplementary material.

Lemma 1 (Suboptimality of the chi-squared test). *For hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$, there exists a decision threshold t_* , such that the chi-squared test $\psi(X) = I(T_2(X) \geq t_*)$ is valid. Furthermore, there exists positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that, the test is powerful whenever*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot d^{3/4} \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \leq C_1 \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{1/4}. \quad (12)$$

However, for $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot d^{3/4}$ and $C_2 \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{1/4} \leq \epsilon_0 \lesssim \sigma \cdot d^{3/4}$, there exists no decision threshold t such that the chi-squared test $\psi(X) = I(T_2(X) \geq t)$ is both valid and powerful.

In other words, the chi-squared test tolerates some deviations from P_0 for free, in the sense that it maintains the same power guarantees as in goodness-of-fit testing, although the null has size $\epsilon_0 \asymp d^{1/4} \cdot \sigma$. However, the second part Lemma 1 states that as soon as ϵ_0 is larger than $d^{1/4} \cdot \sigma$, this power guarantee is lost.

It is natural to wonder whether the tolerance stated in equation (12) is optimal: Is it possible to tolerate larger deviations from P_0 while maintaining the same power as when testing a simple null? In a follow-up work, Ingster [2001] proved that the following simple plug-in test achieves a better guarantee:

$$\psi_1(X, \epsilon_0) = I\left(T_1(X) \geq \sup_{\|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0} q_{1-\alpha}(T_1, P_v)\right) \text{ where } T_1(X) = \|X\|_1 - E_{P_0}\|X\|_1. \quad (13)$$

The plug-in test is usually not employed for testing $v = 0$ due to the ℓ_1 norm being non-smooth, i.e., non-differentiable, which complicates studying its asymptotic distribution. However, the ℓ_1 norm naturally provides more robustness than the plug-in test. This can be anticipated from the fact that $V_{P_v}[T_1] \asymp \sigma^2 \cdot d$ while $V_{P_v}[T_2] \asymp \sigma^4 \cdot d + \sigma^2 \cdot \|v\|_2^2$. Thus, large deviations from P_0 , under the null hypothesis, affect the variance of T_2 more than T_1 , which is detrimental to the performance of the chi-squared test.

Proposition 1 (Ingster [2001], Optimal tolerant testing for small deviations). *For hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$, the plug-in test (13) is powerful whenever*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot d^{3/4} \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \lesssim \sigma \cdot \sqrt{d}. \quad (\text{Free tolerance regime}) \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, the above result is optimal. That is, for $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \lesssim \sigma \cdot d^{3/4}$ and $\epsilon_0 \lesssim \sigma \cdot \sqrt{d}$, there is no test that is both valid and powerful.

In what follows, we prove that the plug-in test remains optimal even when we allow for larger values of ϵ_0 . Most interestingly, as soon as we leave the free tolerance regime, the performance of the plug-in test depends on both the size of the null hypothesis, dictated by the amount of tolerance allowed, and the cost of estimating the underlying ℓ_1 norm.

Theorem 3.1. *Given $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$, let $\lambda = \epsilon_0/\sigma$. Then, for hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$, the critical separation is characterized up to logarithmic factors by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot \begin{cases} d^{3/4}, & \text{if } 0 \leq \lambda \lesssim \sqrt{d}, & (\text{Free tolerance regime}) \\ d^{1/2} \cdot \lambda^{1/2}, & \text{if } d^{1/2} \lesssim \lambda \lesssim d, & (\text{Interpolation regime}) \\ d, & \text{if } \lambda \asymp d. & (\text{Functional estimation regime}) \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, the plug-in test (13) attains it.

The free tolerance regime in Theorem 3.1 simply restates Proposition 1. In the following two subsections, we discuss upper bounds on the critical separation for the interpolation and functional estimation regimes of Theorem 3.1, beginning with the second. Then, in Section 3.2, we provide lower bounds on the critical separation for both regimes. Together, these sections provide a proof of Theorem 3.1.

3.1.1 Reduction to functional estimation under the ℓ_1 norm

Using an estimator to construct a test often leads to suboptimal performance for simple null hypotheses. However, estimation becomes optimal for tolerant testing when the required tolerance is larger than the estimator's accuracy. The following lemma formalizes this intuition. It shows that any estimator of $\|v\|_1$ might be used to construct a tolerant test insofar as a bound of its accuracy is available [Parnas et al., 2006]. Similar statements appear in Proposition 2.17 of Ingster and Suslina [2003] and Proposition 6.2.2 of Giné and Nickl [2016]; the proof is deferred to Appendix B of the supplementary material.

Lemma 2 (Testing by learning). *For any estimator T such that*

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^d} E_{X \sim P_v} [T(X) - \|v\|_1]^2 \leq \phi, \quad (15)$$

the following estimation-based test is valid for hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$

$$\psi(X) = I \left(T(X) > \epsilon_0 + \sqrt{\phi/\alpha} \right). \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, it is powerful whenever $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \geq C_\alpha \cdot \sqrt{\phi}$ where $C_\alpha = \alpha^{-1/2} + \beta^{-1/2}$.

Intuitively, the above result states that for tolerant testing, we cannot do worse than estimating the underlying ℓ_1 norm. For the plug-in statistic (13), the bias and variance satisfy

$$\forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad |E_{P_v}[T_1] - \|v\|_1| \leq \|v\|_1 \wedge \mu_1 \cdot \sigma \cdot d \text{ and } V_{P_v}[T_1] \leq \sigma^2 \cdot d, \quad (17)$$

where $\mu_1 = \sqrt{2/\pi}$. Hence (15) holds with $\phi = (\mu_1^2 + 1) \cdot \sigma^2 d^2$, since the bias dominates the variance when v is unbounded. Consequently, the test (16) is valid and powerful whenever:

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot d \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

Proposition 1 proves that the above result is suboptimal when the tolerance parameter is small. However, we should expect it to be optimal whenever the distance between the hypotheses is larger than the approximation error of estimating the ℓ_1 norm. In Section 3.2.2, we argue that this is the case when $\epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot d$. We can foresee that result by noting that at $\epsilon_0 = C_\alpha \cdot \sqrt{\mu_1^2 + 1} \sigma \cdot d$, (16) consistently distinguishes the hypotheses: $H_0 : \|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0$ versus $H_1 : \|v\|_1 \geq 2\epsilon_0$, which we cannot expect to improve rate-wise.

Finally, we note that it is possible to improve over the plug-in estimator by approximating the absolute value function with a polynomial. Based on that strategy, [Cai and Low \[2011\]](#) propose an estimator that guarantees (15) with $\phi = \sigma^2 \frac{d^2}{\log d}$. Thus, (18) can be improved by a polylogarithmic factor.

3.1.2 Interpolation regime under the ℓ_1 norm

From the discussion in the previous section, we would expect that being able to consistently test $H_0 : \|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0$ versus $H_1 : \|v\|_1 \geq \epsilon_1$ for $\epsilon_1 = 2\epsilon_0$ implies that we can estimate $\|v\|_1$ up to error ϵ_0 . This is indeed the case for $\epsilon_0 \asymp d \cdot \sigma$. However, we know that this cannot be the case for $\epsilon_0 \asymp d^{3/4} \cdot \sigma$, since [Cai and Low \[2011\]](#) proved that it is not possible to estimate $\|v\|_1$ faster than $d \cdot \sigma$. Thus, whenever $\epsilon_1 \asymp d^{3/4} \cdot \sigma$, it must be that ϵ_0 is smaller. Indeed, in Section 3.1, we show that ϵ_0 can be at most $d^{1/2} \cdot \sigma$. Consequently, for ϵ_0 between $d^{1/2} \cdot \sigma$ and $d \cdot \sigma$, we expect ϵ_1 to interpolate between $d^{3/4} \cdot \sigma$ and $d \cdot \sigma$, i.e. between the goodness-of-fit testing and functional estimation rates.

Lemma 3. *Let $\lambda = \epsilon_0/\sigma$. For hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$, the plug-in test (13) is powerful whenever*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot \sqrt{d \cdot \lambda} \quad \text{for } \sqrt{d} \lesssim \lambda \lesssim d. \quad (19)$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix C.2 of the supplementary material. Note that the upper bound on critical separation in this regime, called the interpolation regime, depends on the functional estimation rate and the required tolerance. This mirrors the aforementioned findings of [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#) in the Multinomial model under the ℓ_1 metric.

Looking at (17), note that in the free tolerance regime ($\epsilon_0 \lesssim \sigma \cdot \sqrt{d}$), the variance of T_1 dominates its bias. In the functional estimation regime ($\epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot d$), the bias is of the same order as the functional estimation rate $\sigma \cdot d$. However, the interpolation regime arises due to the bias dominating the variance but remaining smaller than the functional estimation rate, thus allowing us to test the null hypothesis faster than we can estimate the ℓ_1 functional.

Intuitively, to derive (19), consider the case where $\epsilon_0 \gg \sqrt{d} \cdot \sigma$ and $\epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon_1 \ll d \cdot \sigma$. In this intermediate regime, we can establish that $\|v\|_1^2 \cdot (d \cdot \sigma)^{-1} \lesssim E_{P_v}[T_1] \leq \|v\|_1$. Since the variance of the statistic is negligible relative to its mean under both hypotheses, the minimum separation required for the plug-in test (13) to distinguish them is driven by the largest mean under the null hypothesis and the smallest mean under the alternative hypothesis. Therefore, we must require that $\epsilon_1^2 \cdot (d \cdot \sigma)^{-1} \gtrsim \epsilon_0$, which leads to (19).

3.2 Lower-bounds via moment-matching distributions

To demonstrate the sharpness of the upper bounds on the critical separation in Sections 3.1, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, we next derive minimax lower bounds, showing that the plug-in test is optimal up to logarithmic factors. In Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, we derive lower bounds for the free and functional estimation regimes by constructing mixtures under the null and alternative that no test can reliably distinguish. In Section 3.2.3, we adapt this approach to establish lower bounds in the interpolation regime.

3.2.1 Lower bound for the free tolerance regime

We introduce a variant of Le Cam's two-point argument [[Tsybakov, 2009](#)], and match the critical separation rate in the free tolerance regime (14). Henceforth, given a distribution π , we let P_π be the corresponding mixture distribution: $P_\pi(B) = \int P_v(B) d\pi(v)$. Let π_0^d and π_1^d be corresponding product measures, with marginals π_0 and π_1 , supported on the hypothesis sets:

$$V_0 = \{v : \|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0\} \text{ and } V_1 = \{v : \|v\|_1 \geq \epsilon_1\}. \quad (20)$$

If the total variation distance between the induced mixtures P_{π_0} and P_{π_1} is small, then no test can reliably distinguish them. Therefore, the separation between the hypothesis sets yields a lower bound on the critical separation.

Lemma 4. *Consider distributions π_0^d and π_1^d supported on (20), i.e. $\pi_0^d(V_0) = \pi_1^d(V_1) = 1$. If the total variation between their induced mixtures satisfies $V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) \leq C_\alpha$*

where $C_\alpha = 1 - (\alpha + \beta)$. Then, the critical separation is lower-bounded by:

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \geq \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0.$$

To construct a lower-bound for the free tolerance regime (14), consider the following symmetric mixing distributions: $\pi_0 = \delta_0$ and $\pi_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\epsilon/d} + \delta_{-\epsilon/d})$ where $\epsilon = C\sigma \cdot d^{3/4}$ and $C = [2\log(1 + (C_\alpha)^2)]^{1/4}$. These distributions share their first moment, and their separation is given by ϵ since

$$\|v\|_1 \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0 \text{ under } \pi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_1 \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \epsilon \text{ under } \pi_1,$$

where the equalities hold almost surely. A simple computation shows that $V(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) \leq C_\alpha$, see Theorem C.10 in Appendix C.6 of the supplementary material. Thus, by Lemma 4, it follows that $\epsilon_1^*(0, \text{GS}) \geq \epsilon$. Furthermore, note that we can expand the null set V_0 until it nearly touches V_1 , up to constants, without invalidating the construction. Consequently, we have proved that the critical separation is lower-bounded by

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \geq \frac{C}{2}\sigma \cdot d^{3/4} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{C}{2}\sigma \cdot d^{3/4}.$$

Since $d^{3/4} \geq d^{1/2}$, we match (14), which shows that the plug-in test is optimal in the free tolerance region. A detailed version of this argument can be found in Appendix C.7 of the supplementary material.

3.2.2 Lower bound for the functional estimation regime

The construction in the previous section relies on the fact that the mixing distributions are centered and share the first moment. This structure facilitates bounding their total variation. The following lemma extends this idea by providing general conditions under which the total variation of Gaussian mixtures with moment-matching mixing distributions can be bounded, a technique that has been employed to great success across the estimation and testing literature [Lepski et al., 1999, Ingster, 2001, Cai and Low, 2011, Wu and Yang, 2016, Han et al., 2020]. A proof of the statement can be found in Appendix C.6 of the supplementary material.

Lemma 5 (Wu and Yang [2016]). *There exists positive constant C depending only on α and β such that for any $\delta \geq 0$ and $L \geq 1$ that satisfy*

$$\delta^2 \leq C \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot \frac{L}{d^{1/(L+1)}} \quad , \tag{21}$$

it holds that for any π_0 and π_1 centered distributions supported on $[-\delta, \delta]$ that share the first L moments, the total variation distance between the corresponding mixture distributions is bounded by $V(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) \leq C_\alpha = 1 - (\alpha + \beta)$.

Therefore, if we are given two mixing distribution π_0 and π_1 that match L moments, are supported on $[-\delta, \delta]$ and their respective product measures are supported on the sets

$$V_0 = \{v : \|v\|_1 \leq E_{v \sim \pi_0^d} \|v\|_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad V_1 = \{v : \|v\|_1 \geq E_{v \sim \pi_1^d} \|v\|_1\} \quad ,$$

then by Lemma 4, the critical separation is lower-bounded by

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \geq E_{v \sim \pi_1^d} \|v\|_1 - E_{v \sim \pi_0^d} \|v\|_1.$$

Hence, a sharp lower bound can be obtained if we optimize over all mixing distributions satisfying the constraints. Theorem 3.2 formalizes this notion by lower-bounding the critical separation by the maximum separation among all moment-matching distributions.

Let $M_p(L)$ denote the maximum functional separation achieved among distributions that share their first L moments

$$\begin{aligned} M_p(L) &= \sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1} E_{v \sim \pi_1} |v|^p - E_{v \sim \pi_0} |v|^p \\ \text{s.t. } m_l(\pi_0) &= m_l(\pi_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq L \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the supremum is taken over all probability measures supported on $[-1, 1]$. Then, Theorem 3.2 states that the critical separation can be lower-bounded by the moment-matching problem insofar as the indistinguishability condition (21) is satisfied. The proof is deferred to Appendix D.2 of the supplementary material.

Theorem 3.2. *Choose $\delta \geq 0$ and $L \geq 1$ satisfying (21). If $M_1(L) > 0$, the critical separation for hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$ is lower bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \epsilon_0 \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \asymp \delta \cdot d \cdot M_1(L) \text{ and } d^{1/2} \gtrsim M_1^{-1}(L).$$

Moment-matching problems are challenging to solve directly. An effective approach is to study their duals, which is the well-researched best polynomial approximation problem.

Lemma 6 (Duality of the moment-matching problem [Wu and Yang, 2016]). *Let P_L be the set of all L -order polynomials supported on $[-1, 1]$, then it holds that the moment-matching problem and the best polynomial approximation problem are equivalent up-to-constants: $M_p(L) = 2 \cdot A_p(L)$ where $A_p(L) = \inf_{f \in P_L} \sup_{|x| \leq 1} ||x|^p - f(x)|$.*

Using this connection, we can derive a matching lower bound for the functional tolerance regime (18). Bernstein [1912] proved that the best polynomial approximation of the absolute value satisfies:

$$A_1(L) = \beta_1 \cdot (1 + C_L)/L \quad (23)$$

where $\beta_1 \approx 0.28$ and $C_L \rightarrow 0$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, combining Theorem 3.2, Lemma 6, and (23), we obtain a sharp lower-bound by choosing $\delta \asymp \sigma \cdot \sqrt{L}$ and $L \asymp \log d$. This argument yields the following lower bound on the critical separation.

Corollary 1. *For hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$, the critical separation is lower bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \epsilon_0 \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot \frac{d}{\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

The above rate matches (18) up to polylogarithmic factors. Therefore, the plug-in test (13) is optimal in the functional estimation regime.

3.2.3 Lower bound for the interpolation regime

The lower bounds in Section 3.2.1 and Section 3.2.2 are driven by moment-matching arguments. It is therefore natural to expect these arguments to extend to the interpolation setting. Note that in (22), we do not control how large $E_{v \sim \pi_0} |v|$ can be. In order to study the interpolation regime, we must guarantee that it does not exceed $\epsilon_0/(\delta \cdot d)$, while making sure that $E_{v \sim \pi_1} |v|$ is above that threshold. Let $M_p(\epsilon, L)$ denote the constrained moment-matching problem where we maximize the functional distance among moment-matching distributions while constraining their mean

$$\begin{aligned} M_p(\epsilon, L) &= \sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1} E_{v \sim \pi_1} |v|^p \\ \text{s.t. } & E_{v \sim \pi_0} |v|^p \leq \epsilon^p \text{ and } m_l(\pi_0) = m_l(\pi_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq L \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the supremum is taken over all probability measures supported on $[-1, 1]$. Then, analogously to Theorem 3.2, the constrained moment-matching problem can be used to lower bound the critical separation. The proof is deferred to Appendix D.2 of the supplementary material.

Theorem 3.3. *Choose $\delta \geq 0$ and $L \geq 1$ satisfying (21). The critical separation for hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$ is lower bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim b_1(\epsilon_0) \quad \text{where } b_1(\epsilon_0) = d \cdot \delta \cdot M_1(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L) \text{ and } \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp \frac{\epsilon_0}{d\delta}$$

for $0 < \epsilon_0 \lesssim b_1(\epsilon_0)$ and $d^{1/2} \gtrsim M_1^{-1}(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L)$.

Thus, any lower bound on the constrained moment-matching problem (24) leads to a lower bound of the critical separation in the interpolation regime. The major contribution from [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#) is proving such a lower bound.

Lemma 7 ([Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#)). *MOneEpsilon For L large enough, it holds that*

$$M_1(\epsilon, L) \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{L}} \quad \text{for } 0 < \epsilon \lesssim 1/L.$$

The proof is related to Lemma 6. Rather than directly solving the optimization problem, [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#) lower bounded the dual of $M_1(\epsilon, L)$, which is a constrained best polynomial approximation problem. A presentation of their proof can be found in Appendix D.2.2 of the supplementary material.

Finally, to match the upper bound on interpolation regime (19) up to constants and logarithmic factors, it is enough to combine Theorem 3.3, Lemma 7 and choose $L \asymp \log d$ and $\delta \asymp \sigma \cdot \sqrt{L}$. This leads to the desired result.

Corollary 2. *Let $\lambda = \epsilon/\sigma$. For $d \gtrsim 1$ and hypotheses (10) with $p = 1$, the critical separation is lower bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d}{\sqrt{\log d}}} \cdot \lambda \quad \text{for } \sqrt{d} \lesssim \lambda \lesssim \frac{d}{\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

3.3 Testing under general smooth ℓ_p norms

We next consider the tolerant testing problem (10) under the ℓ_p norms when p is an even integer. As discussed in Section 1.1, these norms are analytic, and in this case the testing problem is closely related to the corresponding functional estimation problem for all choices of ϵ_0 .

In order to construct upper bounds, we consider a debiased plug-in statistic which was first introduced by Ingster [2001]. Concretely, let $\tilde{T}_p = \|X\|_p^p - E_{P_0}\|X\|_p^p$, and notice that for all even $p > 2$, its bias can be quantified exactly as

$$E_{P_v} [\tilde{T}_p] = \|v\|_p^p + E_{P_v} [r_p(X)] \quad (25)$$

$$\text{with } r_p(X) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{p}{2j} \cdot \mu_{p-2j} \cdot \sigma^p \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d H_{2j} \left(\frac{X_i}{\sigma} \right),$$

where $k = \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$, $\binom{p}{k} = p \cdot (p-1) \dots (p-k+1)/k!$, $\mu_p = E_{Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} |Z|^p$, and H_j is the j -th probabilistic Hermite polynomial. Thus, we construct a debiased plug-in test by subtracting $r_p(X)$ from the plug-in test

$$T_p(X) = \begin{cases} \tilde{T}_p(X) & \text{if } p \leq 2 \\ \tilde{T}_p(X) - r_p(X) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (26)$$

and calibrating the resulting statistic

$$\psi_p(X, \epsilon_0) = I \left(T_p(X) \geq \sup_{\|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0} q_{1-\alpha}(T_p, P_v) \right). \quad (27)$$

Since there is no bias-variance trade-off for any smooth ℓ_p norm, the debiased plug-in test [Ingster, 2001] achieves fast goodness-of-fit testing when $\epsilon_0 \lesssim \sigma \cdot d^{1/2p}$. For $\epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot d^{1/2p}$, even faster rates can be achieved. The proof of the following lemma appears in Appendix C.3 of the supplementary material.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\lambda = \epsilon_0/\sigma$. For hypotheses (10) with fixed p even integer, there exist universal constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that the debiased plug-in test (27) is powerful whenever*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot \begin{cases} d^{1/2p}, & \text{if } \lambda \leq C_1 \cdot d^{1/2p}, \\ d^{1/2} \cdot \lambda^{1-p}, & \text{if } C_1 \cdot d^{1/2p} \leq \lambda \leq C_2 \cdot d^{1/p}, \\ d^{1/p-1/2}, & \text{if } \lambda \geq C_2 \cdot d^{1/p}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{Free tolerance regime})$$

Another pattern that can be observed above is that the dependence on the dimension diminishes as p increases, resulting in faster testing rates. Intuitively, under ℓ_p , large values of p diminish the influence of the tail entries of v because raising small values to

the p -th power reduces their contribution. Consequently, only the largest entries of v significantly impact the test, effectively lowering the problem's dimensionality.

From a lower bound perspective, consider testing the simple null hypothesis $H_0 : v = 0$ versus $H_1 : \|v\|_p \geq \epsilon$. Under the alternative hypothesis, an adversary allocates mass across the d coordinates of v to maximize $\|v\|_p$ while staying close to the origin. Initially, the mass is spread uniformly. As p increases, each entry decays rapidly at a d^{-p} rate. To maintain some distance from the origin, the adversary must concentrate most of the mass in a few entries. This shift enables faster testing rates because the test can focus on deviations in the largest coordinates of v .

Relationship to functional estimation The rates observed in Lemma 3.4 are fundamentally linked to the performance of the debiased plug-in statistic (26) as an estimator, meaning that estimation also becomes easier as the norm of the mean increases if measured under the appropriate scale. The proof is deferred to Appendix C.4 of the supplementary material.

Proposition 2. *Let $\lambda = \epsilon_0/\sigma$, p be an even integer, and T_p be the debiased plug-in statistic (26). It holds that*

$$\sup_{\|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0} E_{X \sim P_v} |T_p^{1/p}(X) - \|v\|_p| \lesssim \sigma \cdot \begin{cases} d^{1/2p}, & \text{if } \lambda \leq d^{1/2p}, \\ d^{1/2} \cdot \lambda^{1-p}, & \text{if } d^{1/2p} \leq \lambda \leq d^{1/p}, \\ d^{1/p-1/2}, & \text{if } \lambda \geq d^{1/p}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, for smooth norms, tolerant testing and functional estimation coincide across the whole tolerance spectrum.

Lower bound on the critical separation in the free tolerance regime We recall that for the free tolerance regime, [Ingster \[2001\]](#) proved that the upper bound in Lemma 3.4 is sharp up to constants. While [Ingster \[2001\]](#) constructed lower bounds based on an explicit moment-matching distribution, we can use a similar argument as in Section 3.2.2, to exploit implicitly moment-matching distributions and verify the sharpness of the free tolerance region when $\epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot d^{1/2p}$.

First, we note that Theorem 3.2 can be easily generalized for any ℓ_p norm. That is, any lower bound on the unconstrained moment-matching problem (22) leads to a lower bound on the critical separation. The proof is deferred to Appendix D.2 of the supplementary material.

Theorem 3.5. *Choose $\delta \geq 0$ and $L \geq 1$ satisfying (21). If $M_p(L) > 0$, the critical separation for hypotheses (10) is lower bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \epsilon_0 \quad \text{if } \epsilon_0 \asymp \delta \cdot d^{1/p} \cdot M_p^{1/p}(L) \text{ and } d^{1/2} \gtrsim M_p^{-1}(L).$$

As noted, $\|v\|_p^p$ can be estimated without bias when p is even, which leads to faster testing rates. From the point of view of moment-matching distributions, this is reflected by the fact that we can construct two distributions that match at most $p - 1$

moments rather than some multiple of $\log d$, as we did for the ℓ_1 norm in Section 3.2.2. Meaning that under smooth norms, there is a fundamental limit regarding how close two indistinguishable distributions can be.

Lemma 8 (Newman and Rivlin [1976], Equation (1) of Saibaba [2021]). *Let p be an even integer. For $1 \leq L < p$, it holds that $(2e)^{-1} \cdot g(p, L) \leq M_p(L) \leq 2 \cdot g(p, L)$ where $g(p, L) = 2^{-(p-1)} \cdot \sum_{j=\lfloor (p+L)/2 \rfloor}^p \binom{p}{j}$. Furthermore, for $L \geq p$, $M_p(L) = 0$.*

Using Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 8, we can choose $\delta \asymp \sigma \cdot d^{-1/2p}$ and $L = p - 1$, in which case $M_p(L)$ behaves like a constant for fixed p . Thus, the following bound holds for d large enough.

Corollary 3. *For $d \gtrsim 1$, and hypotheses (10) with fixed even p , the critical separation is lower bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \epsilon_0 \quad \text{if } \epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot d^{1/2p}.$$

3.4 Testing under general non-smooth ℓ_p norms

Let us finally comment on testing hypotheses (10) when $p > 1$ is not an even integer. In this case, there is no unbiased estimator of $\|v\|_p^p$, and the bias of the the plug-in statistic (27) grows with the magnitude of $\|v\|_p$. Thus, we can expect the testing rates to follow the same pattern as for ℓ_1 norm in Theorem 3.1.

The next result establishes that, for $p \in [1, 2)$, the smallest separation between hypotheses at which the debiased plug-in test can reliably distinguish them interpolates between the known testing rates for a simple null hypothesis [Ingster, 2001] and the functional estimation rates [Lepski et al., 1999, Han et al., 2020]. The proof appears in Section C.2 of the supplementary material.

Lemma 9. *Let $\lambda = \epsilon_0/\sigma$. For hypotheses (10) with fixed $p \in (1, 2)$, the debiased plug-in test (27) is powerful whenever:*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot \begin{cases} d^{1/p-1/4}, & \text{if } \lambda \lesssim d^{1/2p}, & (\text{Free tolerance regime}) \\ (d^{1/p})^{1-p/2} \cdot \lambda^{p/2}, & \text{if } d^{1/2p} \lesssim \lambda \lesssim d^{1/p}, & (\text{Interpolation regime}) \\ d^{1/p} \cdot \sigma, & \text{if } \lambda \asymp d^{1/p}. & (\text{Functional estimation regime}) \end{cases}$$

However, for odd $p > 2$, the rates must change. This can be foreseen by analyzing the mean of T_p (27). For $1 \leq p < 2$, $E_{P_v}[T_p]$ behaves like $\|v\|_p^p$ as $\|v\|_p \rightarrow 0$. However, for p odd such that $2k < p < 2(k+1)$, the $E_{P_v}[T_p]$ behaves like $\|v\|_{2k}^{2k} \cdot \sigma^{p-2k}$ as $\|v\|_p \rightarrow 0$. Thus, for $p > 2$, testing $H_0 : \|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0$ for small values of ϵ_0 should lead to a free tolerance regime that is similar to the one observed for smooth norms in Lemma 3.4. This observation leads to the following lemma, whose proof appears in Appendix C.5 of the supplementary material.

Lemma 10. *Let $\lambda = \epsilon_0/\sigma$. For hypotheses (10) with fixed p such that $2k < p < 2(k+1)$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the debiased plug-in test (27) is powerful whenever*

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot \begin{cases} d^{1/2p}, & \text{if } \lambda \lesssim d^{1/p-1/4k}, & (\text{Free tolerance regime}) \\ (d^{1/p})^{1-2k/p} \cdot \lambda^{2k/p}, & \text{if } d^{1/p-1/4k} \lesssim \lambda \lesssim d^{1/p}, & (\text{Interpolation regime}) \\ d^{1/p}, & \text{if } \lambda \asymp d^{1/p}. & (\text{Functional estimation regime}) \end{cases}$$

Comparing the rates obtained in Lemma 10 with those in Lemma 3.4 for smooth ℓ_p norms, we find that they are discontinuous (from the left) at every even $p > 2$. This discontinuity, observed by [Lepski and Spokoiny \[1999\]](#) and [Ingster \[2001\]](#), arises because the analysis treats p as fixed, and the debiased plug-in statistic only introduces an additional debiasing term, through $r_p(X)$ in (25), at even values of p .

Lower bound on the critical separation in the functional estimation regime

We recall that [Ingster \[2001\]](#) proved that the upper bounds in the free tolerance regime in Lemmas 9 and 10 are tight up to constants. Regarding the functional estimation regime of Lemmas 9 and 10, they can be matched up to logarithmic factors using the duality between moment-matching and polynomial approximation as done in Section 3.1.1.

[Han et al. \[2020\]](#) analyzed the minimax estimation of the L^p norm in the Gaussian white noise model using moment-matching distributions. From their results, it is possible to conclude that $M_p^{1/p}(L)$ must decay linearly with the number of matched moments. The proof is deferred to Appendix D.2.1 of the supplementary material.

Lemma 11. *For fixed $p \geq 1$ non-even and $L \geq 1$, it holds that $M_p^{1/p}(L) \asymp L^{-1}$.*

Using Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 11, we can choose $L \asymp \log d$ and $\delta = \sigma \cdot \sqrt{L}$, and match the functional estimation regime up to polylogarithmic factors in Lemmas 9 and 10 for d large enough.

Corollary 4. *For $d \gtrsim 1$, the critical separation for hypotheses (10) with fixed odd $p \geq 1$ is lower-bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \epsilon_0 \quad \text{if } \epsilon_0 \asymp \sigma \cdot \frac{d^{1/p}}{\sqrt{\log d}}.$$

Finally, we conjecture that the interpolation rates in Lemmas 9 and 10 are also tight up to polylogarithmic factors, but defer further comments to Appendix C.8 of the supplementary material.

4 The smooth Gaussian white noise model

Let $(X(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$ denote a realization from the the Gaussian white noise model

$$dX(t) = f(t) dt + \sigma \cdot dW(t) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1], \quad (28)$$

with respect to a signal $f \in L_2[0, 1]$. In this section, our goal is to characterize the minimax tolerant testing problem under deviations of f under the $L_p[0, 1]$ norms:

$$\|f\|_p = \left(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty.$$

Ideally, we would like to test the L_p norm of the signal without additional assumptions: $H_0 : \|f\|_p \leq \epsilon_0$ versus $H_1 : \|f\|_p \geq \epsilon_1$. However, without further restrictions under the alternative, distinguishing these hypotheses becomes impossible since the set of distribution under the null hypothesis is dense in the set of distribution under the alternative [Janssen, 2000]. In other words, the critical separation remains constant; see Theorem 2.3 of Ingster [1993].

We will do so under the assumption that f lies in a Besov body with smoothness parameter $s > 0$ and integrability parameters $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$; we recall the definition of the Besov norm $\|\cdot\|_{s,p,q}$, in Appendix H of the supplementary material. Our goal is to distinguish between a small signal under the null hypothesis, versus a large smooth signal under the alternative:

$$H_0 : f \in \mathcal{G}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : f \in \mathcal{G}_1^s \quad (29)$$

where the null set is given by those signals that are close to the origin, and the alternative set contains smooth signals that are far from the origin:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_0 &= \{f \in L_2[0, 1] : \|f\|_p \leq \epsilon_0\}, \\ \text{and } \mathcal{G}_1^s &= \{f \in L_2[0, 1] : \|f\|_p \geq \epsilon_1 \text{ and } \|f\|_{s,p,q} \leq L\}, \end{aligned}$$

for a fixed radius $L > 0$. Henceforth, let P_f denote the probability measure corresponding to the Gaussian white noise model (28), and fix $\text{GW} = \{P_f : f \in L_p[0, 1] \cap L_2[0, 1]\}$ is the collection of all such processes. The next theorem shows that we can use results for testing the Gaussian sequence model, to derive the critical separation for the smooth Gaussian white noise model. The proof appears in Appendix E of the supplementary material.

Theorem 4.1 (Equivalence between Gaussian white noise and sequence models). *Let $\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GW})$ denote the critical separation for hypotheses (29), and $\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS})$ the critical separation for hypotheses (10). It holds that*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GW}) - \epsilon_0 \asymp (\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0) \cdot d^{1/2-1/p} \text{ where } \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp \epsilon_0 \cdot d^{1/p-1/2}$$

and $d^{-s} \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) \cdot d^{1/2-1/p}$, where the hidden constants depend on L, p and q .

The proof of the theorem leverages the fact that, under sufficient smoothness, a Gaussian white noise model can be appropriately discretized into a Gaussian sequence model without losing valuable information. The original argument for the free tolerance region goes back to Ingster [2001].

We illustrate Lemma 4.1 by considering the $p = 1$. Henceforth, assume that $s > 0$ and $\sigma = n^{-1/2}$. Lemma 4.1 implies that the critical separation continuously interpolates between known rates for testing simple null hypotheses [Ingster, 1982, 1994] and functional estimation [Lepski et al., 1999].

Corollary 5. *The critical separation for hypotheses (28) with $p = 1$ is characterized up to polylogarithmic factors by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GW}) - \epsilon_0 \asymp \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{2s}{4s+1}}, & \text{if } 0 \leq \epsilon_0 \lesssim n^{-1/2}, \\ [n^{-1/2} \cdot \epsilon_0]^{\frac{2s}{4s+1}}, & \text{if } n^{-1/2} \lesssim \epsilon_0 \lesssim n^{-\frac{s}{2s+1}}, \\ n^{-\frac{s}{2s+1}}, & \text{if } \epsilon_0 \asymp n^{-\frac{s}{2s+1}}. \end{cases}$$

5 The smooth density model

Consider the case where we have access to n observation from an unknown density f :

$$X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} f \in \mathcal{D} = \left\{ f \in L_2[0, 1] : \int f = 1 \text{ and } f \geq 0 \text{ almost everywhere} \right\}. \quad (30)$$

We aim to test whether f is close to a reference density $g \in \mathcal{D}$ under the L_p norm. As in Section 4, testing requires smoothness assumptions under the alternative to ensure a non-trivial critical separation. Given a reference density g , define the null set as those distributions that are close to g

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \{f \in \mathcal{D} : \|f - g\|_p \leq \epsilon_0\},$$

and the alternative set, as those densities that are far from g but which differ in a smooth way

$$\mathcal{D}_1^s = \{f \in \mathcal{D} : \|f - g\|_p \geq \epsilon_1 \text{ and } \|f - g\|_{s,p,q} \leq L\}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{s,p,q}$ denotes the Besov norm, defined in Appendix H of the supplementary material. Then, we aim to test:

$$H_0 : f \in \mathcal{D}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : f \in \mathcal{D}_1^s. \quad (31)$$

Analogously to Lemma 4.1, density testing (31) can be reduced to Multinomial testing (5) by using discretization arguments introduced by Ingster [2001] and Arias-Castro et al. [2018], see also Balakrishnan and Wasserman [2019]. Henceforth, let P_F denote the d -dimensional Multinomial distribution whose probability mass function is given by

$$F \in \Delta^d = \left\{ G \in [0, 1]^d : \sum_{i=1}^d G_i = 1 \text{ and } \min_{1 \leq i \leq d} G_i \geq 0 \right\},$$

Given observations $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim P_F$ and reference distribution P_G where $F \in \Delta^d$, we define the tolerant testing for Multinomials under ℓ_p as:

$$H_0 : \|F - G\|_p \leq \epsilon_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|F - G\|_p \geq \epsilon_1. \quad (32)$$

The next theorem proves the equivalence between (31) and (32). The proof can be found in Appendix F of the supplementary material.

Theorem 5.1 (Equivalence between Density and Multinomial models). *Let $\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{D})$ denote the critical separation for hypotheses (31), and let $\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \mathcal{M}_d)$ denote the critical separation for hypotheses (32). Then, the following equivalence holds*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \mathcal{D}) - \epsilon_0 \asymp (\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0) \cdot d^{1-1/p} \quad \text{where } \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp \epsilon_0 \cdot d^{1/p-1}$$

and $d^{-s} \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) \cdot d^{1-1/p}$, where the hidden constants depend on L , p and q .

To illustrate Lemma 5.1, we characterize the critical separation for hypotheses (31) with $p = 1$. Note that rate-wise, the following equivalence between the critical separation under the Gaussian sequence, see Theorem 3.1, and the Multinomial, see (6), holds:

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0 \cdot d^{-1/2}, \mathcal{M}_d) \cdot d^{1/2} \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) \quad \text{for } \sigma = n^{-1/2} \text{ and } 0 \leq \epsilon_0 \lesssim d \cdot \sigma.$$

Together with Lemma 5.1, this implies that tolerant testing under the L_1 norm is equally hard in the density and Gaussian white noise models.

Corollary 6. *The critical separation for hypotheses (31) with $p = 1$ is characterized, up to polylogarithmic factors, by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \mathcal{D}) \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GW}) \quad \text{for } \sigma = n^{-1/2} \text{ and } 0 \leq \epsilon_0 \lesssim n^{-\frac{s}{2s+1}}. \quad (33)$$

Usually, equivalence between density and Gaussian white noise models is established by proving that the Le Cam deficiency between the models vanishes asymptotically under the assumption that the density is uniformly lower bounded [Nussbaum, 1996, Carter, 2002, Mariucci, 2016, Ray and Schmidt-Hieber, 2018]. However, the equivalence (33) does not require a lower bound on the density. This is because, proving that the Le Cam deficiency vanishes is a stronger requirement that implies the indistinguishability of the models under any divergence measure, while (33) only makes a claim regarding distinguishability under the L_1 distance.

6 Systematic uncertainties in high-energy physics

As mentioned in the introduction, scientific applications routinely give rise to goodness-of-fit testing problems with imprecise null hypotheses [Gerber et al., 2023b, Liu and Briol, 2024, Baíllo and Cárcamo, 2025]. In this section, we explore implications of the tolerant testing framework for goodness-of-fit testing in high-energy physics.

In collider experiments, such as the Large Hadron Collider (LHC; ATLAS [2008]), data often arise from an inhomogeneous Poisson point process with an unknown intensity function [van Dyk, 2014, Kuusela and Panaretos, 2015]. A canonical problem

in these applications is that of assessing whether data are consistent with the *Standard Model* (SM)—a theory describing the elementary particles and the forces which act upon them. To test this goodness-of-fit hypothesis, physicists typically discretize the observed Poisson point process into a Poisson sequence model, and test whether the observed rates match those predicted by the SM. From a minimax perspective, the Poisson sequence model and the Multinomial model are equivalent: tests developed in one setting can be adapted to the other—we refer to Appendix G of the supplementary material for a review of this well-known result [Neykov et al., 2021, Canonne, 2022, Kim et al., 2023]. We can therefore think of an LHC experiment as giving rise to independent observations X_1, \dots, X_n sampled from an unknown discrete distribution F supported on d points. The goal is to assess if the data follows the Standard Model, which defines a discrete distribution B :

$$H_0 : F = B \text{ versus } H_1 : V(F, B) \geq \epsilon. \quad (34)$$

In practice, however, the distribution B predicted by the SM is only available through Monte Carlo simulation, and is only known up to nuisance parameters. Some of these nuisance parameters are fully unspecified, while others are estimated from past studies, or approximated mathematically, and thus carry statistical or systematic uncertainties [Heinrich and Lyons, 2007]. Taking these various sources of imprecision into account, physicists define a plausible set of discrete distributions \mathcal{B} , which is assumed to contain the true SM distribution B . With this set in hand, their goal is to test the following composite analogue of the hypotheses (34):

$$H_0 : F \in \mathcal{B} \text{ versus } H_1 : \inf_{\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}} V(F, \tilde{B}) \geq \epsilon. \quad (35)$$

We argue that the tolerant testing framework provides a rigorous framework for determining efficient testing procedures in composite hypothesis testing problems of this type. As an example, suppose that \mathcal{B} is a total variation ball, centered at a prior estimate \hat{B} of the SM distribution:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\tilde{B} : V(\tilde{B}, \hat{B}) \leq r\}, \quad (36)$$

where $r > 0$ is an approximation error. In this case, problem (35) coincides with the tolerant testing problem for discrete distributions [Canonne et al., 2022], discussed in Section 1.1. The optimal test that attains the rate in equation (6) is valid and powerful for testing hypotheses (35) whenever

$$\epsilon \gtrsim \max \left(\frac{d^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{d^{1/4}}{n^{1/4}} \cdot \sqrt{r} \right) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r \lesssim \sqrt{d/n}.$$

We can immediately conclude that if the uncertainty ball \mathcal{B} shrinks at the parametric rate, i.e. $r \lesssim 1/\sqrt{n}$, replacing B by its approximation does not imply any loss of power. This is expected, as no test can distinguish \hat{B} from B under that condition. However, whenever $r \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{n}$, the smallest detectable deviation from the Standard Model grows with \sqrt{r} .

One can also imagine variants of this problem in which it is difficult to perfectly specify the uncertainty set \mathcal{B} , in which case the parameter r in equation (36) is unknown. Even in such contexts, the tolerant testing framework provides a way to quantify the tolerance of a goodness-of-fit when naively testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : F = \hat{B}$. In particular, we argue that inverting tolerant tests helps assess the sensitivity of goodness-of-fit p-values to the accuracy of \hat{B} .

To elaborate, let ψ_ϵ^α be a level- α test for $H_0(\epsilon) : d(F, \hat{B}) \leq \epsilon$ where d is some distance. A p-value is the smallest α at which we reject the null hypothesis $\alpha_*(X, \epsilon) = \inf \{\alpha : \psi_\epsilon^\alpha(X) = 1\}$. Consider the case where we reject the simple null hypothesis $\psi_0^\alpha(X) = 1$, and we want to understand how sensitive our conclusion is with respect to \hat{B} . The natural idea is to find the largest null hypothesis $H_0(\epsilon)$ that we can reject:

$$\epsilon_*(X, \alpha) = \sup \{\epsilon : \psi_\epsilon^\alpha(X) = 1\}.$$

We call $\epsilon_*(X, \alpha)$ the tolerance factor, but note that it has appeared in related works under other names, see the *minimum distance* in Baíllo and Cárcamo [2025] and the *minimum contamination level* in del Barrio et al. [2020]. In fact, under mild assumptions, the tolerance factor serves as a lower confidence bound for the distance between B and \hat{B} [Liu and Lindsay, 2009]. A larger tolerance factor suggests less concern about the accuracy of \hat{B} , i.e., the observed deviations from \hat{B} are large. Conversely, if $\epsilon_*(X) = 0$ the results are highly dependent on \hat{B} . Thus, one might use the p-value to make a decision and $\epsilon_*(X, \alpha)$ to analyze the sensitivity of such a decision.

7 Discussion

In this work, we study tolerant testing in the Gaussian sequence model. We characterize the critical separation under the ℓ_1 norm up to polylogarithmic factors, building on lower bound techniques from Ingster [2001] and Canonne et al. [2022]. We provide partial results for general smooth and non-smooth ℓ_p norms that reveal a trade-off between the size of the null hypothesis and the difficulty of estimating the underlying norm. We also explore extensions to smooth Gaussian white noise and density models.

We conclude by noting that tolerant testing opens the possibility of generically testing composite hypotheses [Balakrishnan and Wasserman, 2018]. Consider the problem of deciding whether P belongs to a class of distributions \mathcal{C} , that is, testing the null $H_0 : P \in \mathcal{C}$. A practical testing strategy splits the sample: use the first half to choose a candidate, denoted by \hat{P}_0 , under the null hypothesis, then use the second half of the data to test the candidate's proximity to the data distribution via tolerant testing $H_0 : d(P, \hat{P}_0) \leq \epsilon_0$, where ϵ_0 accounts for the cost of choosing the candidate. A naive implementation offers no advantage over directly estimating the distance of P to the class, denoted by $d(P, \mathcal{C})$. However, in structured settings where the \mathcal{C} is not too large, this approach has yielded tests that require fewer observations to make a reliable decision than estimating $d(P, \mathcal{C})$ [Acharya et al., 2015, Canonne et al., 2018]. This motivates a central question: how large can \mathcal{C} be so that this practical sample

splitting procedure outperforms directly estimating $d(P, \mathcal{C})$? Our work gives a prerequisite for this approach to be successful in a few canonical models: the cost of choosing a candidate in \mathcal{C} should not exceed the cost of estimating $d(P, \mathcal{C})$.

Acknowledgments The authors thank Alexandra Carpentier, Ryan Tibshirani, Edward H. Kennedy, Kai Hormann, Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla, Dominik Rothenhäusler, Mikael Kuusela, Kenta Takatsu, and Siddhaarth Sarkar for useful comments and discussions during the development of this work. The authors gratefully acknowledge funding from the National Science Foundation (DMS-2310632). TM gratefully acknowledges the support of a Norbert Wiener fellowship.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table of contents

A	Connection between tolerant and equivalence testing	29
B	General arguments for upper bounding the critical separation	31
C	Critical separation for the Gaussian sequence model	33
C.1	Suboptimality of the chi-squared test for testing hypotheses separated under the ℓ_1 norm	33
C.2	Upper bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p for $p \in [1, 2)$	36
C.3	Upper bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p for p even	42
C.4	Upper bound on the estimation error under ℓ_p for p even	43
C.5	Upper bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p for $2k < p < 2(k + 1)$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$	44
C.6	Bounding the chi-squared distance by moment differences	47
C.7	Lower bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p norms for $p \in (0, 2]$ in the free tolerance regime	50
C.8	Conjecture for the lower bound on the critical separation under non-smooth ℓ_p norms in the interpolation regime	51
D	General arguments for lower bounding the critical separation	51
D.1	Two fuzzy hypotheses	51
D.2	Moment-matching lower-bounds	54
E	Critical separation for the Gaussian white noise model	63
F	Critical separation for the Density model	67
G	Critical separation for the Poisson sequence model	70
H	Besov norm	71
	References	72

A Connection between tolerant and equivalence testing

Bioequivalence (or equivalence) studies aim to show that two drugs yield similar effects [Wellek, 2002]. The standard design is a two-phase crossover trial: participants are randomly assigned to two groups. In phase one, one group receives the standard treatment, and the other receives an alternative treatment. After a washout period, the groups switch the assigned treatment. This design produces bivariate observations that capture each individual's response across both phases:

$$X_g = (X_{g,1}, X_{g,2}) \mid G = g \sim P_g,$$

where P_1 and P_2 are the response distributions for the two groups. Bioequivalence is established if P_1 and P_2 are indistinguishable under the alternative:

$$H_0 : d(P_1, P_2) \geq \epsilon_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : d(P_1, P_2) \leq \epsilon_1. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Many studies assume P_1 and P_2 are Gaussian [Dragalin et al., 2003, Chow, 2014] and choose distances based on comparing means, variances, or combinations of both [Chow, 2014]. Others propose tests based on asymptotic normality [Romano, 2005]. In practice, however, normality often fails, and nonparametric approaches are of interest [Freitag et al., 2007]. For instance, Freitag et al. [2007] consider the 2-Wasserstein distance since it approximates metrics recommended by regulatory guidelines [FDA, 2001] under Gaussianity and extends to arbitrary distributions.

Rather than tackling equivalence testing (A.1) directly, we can connect it to tolerant testing and leverage known results. To simplify the discussion, assume one of the distributions in (A.1) is known. The next lemma shows that the critical separation in equivalence and tolerant testing is the same up to constants.

Proposition A.3 (Correspondence between tolerant and equivalence testing). *Define the hypotheses sets $H_0(\epsilon_0) = \{P : d(P, P_0) \leq \epsilon_0\}$ and $H_1(\epsilon_1) = \{P : d(P, P_0) \geq \epsilon_1\}$. Furthermore, define a set of valid tests $\psi_\alpha(H) = \{\psi : \sup_{P \in H} P(\psi(X) = 1) \leq \alpha\}$. For tolerant testing, the closest detectable alternative is*

$$\epsilon_1(\epsilon_0, \alpha, \beta) = \inf \left\{ \epsilon_1 : \epsilon_1 \geq \epsilon_0 \text{ and } \inf_{\psi \in \Psi_\alpha(H_0(\epsilon_0))} \sup_{P \in H_1(\epsilon_1)} P(\psi(X) = 0) \leq \beta \right\},$$

and the critical separation is defined as $s(\epsilon_0, T) = \epsilon_1(\epsilon_0, \alpha, \beta) - \epsilon_0$. Analogously, for equivalence testing, the closest detectable alternative is

$$\epsilon_0(\epsilon_1, \alpha, \beta) = \sup \left\{ \epsilon_0 : \epsilon_1 \geq \epsilon_0 \text{ and } \inf_{\psi \in \Psi_\alpha(H_1(\epsilon_1))} \sup_{P \in H_0(\epsilon_0)} P(\psi(X) = 0) \leq \beta \right\},$$

and the critical separation is defined as : $s(\epsilon_1, E) = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0(\epsilon_1, \alpha, \beta)$.

It follows that for any $\epsilon_1^ > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_0^* \leq \epsilon_1^*$ such that $s(\epsilon_1^*, E) \lesssim s(\epsilon_0^*, T)$. Additionally, for any $\epsilon_0^* > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_1^* \geq \epsilon_0^*$ such that $s(\epsilon_0^*, T) \lesssim s(\epsilon_1^*, E)$.*

Proof. We prove only the first claim, since the second claim can be proved analogously. Let $\psi_{\epsilon_0}^\alpha$ be an optimal tolerant test, that is:

$$\sup_{P \in H_0(\epsilon_0)} P(\psi(X) = 1) \leq \alpha \text{ and } \sup_{P \in H_1(\epsilon_1(\epsilon_0, \alpha, \beta))} P(\psi(X) = 0) \leq \beta.$$

Define the test

$$\tilde{\psi}_\alpha^{\epsilon_1^*} = 1 - \psi_\beta^{\epsilon_0^*} \text{ where } \epsilon_0^* = \sup\{\epsilon_0 : \epsilon_1^* = \epsilon_1(\epsilon_0, \beta, \alpha)\}.$$

Then, the test satisfies:

$$\sup_{P \in H_1(\epsilon_1^*)} P(\psi(X) = 1) \leq \alpha \text{ and } \sup_{P \in H_0(\epsilon_0^*)} P(\psi(X) = 0) \leq \beta.$$

Consequently, we have derived an upper-bound for the equivalence testing critical separation:

$$s(\epsilon_1^*, E) \leq \epsilon_1^* - \epsilon_0^* = \epsilon_1(\epsilon_0^*, \beta, \alpha) - \epsilon_0^* \asymp \epsilon_1(\epsilon_0^*, \alpha, \beta) - \epsilon_0^* = s(\epsilon_0^*, T).$$

The claim follows. \square

To apply Proposition A.3, one must express ϵ_1 as a function of ϵ_0 or vice versa to convert a test for tolerant testing into one for equivalence testing. Since these functions are typically known only up to constants, a more practical approach uses a test statistic that is optimal for tolerant testing and recalibrates it for equivalence testing.

Proposition A.4. *Let V_0 and V_1 be two sets of distributions. Consider a statistic $T(X)$ such that $E_{X \sim P} [T(X) - \mu(P)]^2 \leq \phi(P)$. If the following inequality is satisfied*

$$\sup_{P \in V_0} \mu(P) + \sqrt{\frac{\phi(P)}{\alpha}} \leq \inf_{P \in V_1} \mu(P) - \sqrt{\frac{\phi(P)}{\alpha}}.$$

Then the test

$$\psi(X) = I(T(X) \geq \sup_{P \in V_0} \mu(P) + \sqrt{\frac{\phi(P)}{\alpha}})$$

controls the type-I and type-II errors by α for $H_0 : P \in V_0$ versus $H_1 : P \in V_1$. Furthermore, the test

$$\psi(X) = I(T(X) \leq \inf_{P \in V_1} \mu(P) - \sqrt{\frac{\phi(P)}{\alpha}})$$

controls the type-I and type-II errors by α for $H_0 : P \in V_1$ versus $H_1 : P \in V_0$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Lemma B.12. \square

B General arguments for upper bounding the critical separation

In this section, we recap a series of results used for upper-bounding the critical separation.

Lemma B.12. *Let the hypotheses be*

$$H_0 : P \in V_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : P \in V_1 .$$

Consider the statistic T such that

$$E_{X \sim P} [T(X) - \mu(P)]^2 \leq \phi(P) . \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Then the test $\psi(X) = I(T(X) > t)$ where

$$t \geq t_* = \sup_{P \in V_0} q_{1-\alpha}(T, P) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

controls the type-I error by α . In particular, any t such that

$$t \geq t_{\sup} = \sup_{P \in V_0} \mu(P) + \sqrt{\frac{\phi(P)}{\alpha}} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

satisfies (B.3). Furthermore, if

$$t \leq t_{\inf} = \inf_{P \in V_1} \mu(P) - \sqrt{\frac{\phi(P)}{\beta}} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

then the test controls type-II error by β .

Corollary B.7. *Let the hypotheses be*

$$H_0 : P \in V_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : P \in V_1 .$$

Then the test $\psi(X) = I(T(X) > t)$ where

$$t \geq t_* = \sup_{P \in V_0} q_{1-\alpha}(T, P)$$

controls the type-I error by α . In particular, the above condition is satisfied by any t such that

$$t \geq t_{\sup} = \sup_{P \in V_0} E_{X \sim P}[T(X)] + \sqrt{\frac{V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]}{\alpha}} .$$

Furthermore, if

$$t \leq t_{\inf} = \inf_{P \in V_1} E_{X \sim P}[T(X)] - \sqrt{\frac{V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]}{\beta}}$$

then the test controls the type-II error by β .

Corollary B.8 (Testing by learning). *Let the hypotheses be*

$$H_0 : P \in V_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : P \in V_1 .$$

Furthermore, let $V = V_0 \cup V_1$ and consider a statistic T such that

$$\sup_{P \in V} E_{X \sim P} [T(X) - \mu(P)]^2 \leq \phi$$

then the test

$$\psi(X) = I(T(X) > t) \text{ where } t = \sup_{P \in V_0} \mu(P) + \sqrt{\frac{\phi}{\alpha}}$$

controls the type-I error by α . Furthermore, it controls the type-II error by β whenever

$$\inf_{P \in V_1} \mu(P) - \sup_{P \in V_0} \mu(P) \geq C \cdot \phi^{1/2}$$

where $C = \alpha^{-1/2} + \beta^{-1/2}$.

Proof of Lemma B.12. By definition of t_* , it holds that for any $t \geq t_*$ the type-I error is bounded by α :

$$\sup_{P \in V_0} P(T(X) > t) \leq \sup_{P \in V_0} P(T(X) > t_*) \leq \alpha.$$

By Markov's inequality, for any $t \geq t_{\sup}$, it holds that the type-I error is bounded by α :

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{P \in V_0} P(T(X) > t) &= \sup_{P \in V_0} P(T(X) - \mu(P) > t - \mu(P)) \\ &\leq \sup_{P \in V_0} P(|T(X) - \mu(P)| \geq t - \mu(P)) \\ &\leq \sup_{P \in V_0} \frac{E [T(X) - \mu(P)]^2}{[t - \mu(P)]^2} && \text{since } t \geq \sup_{P \in V_0} \mu(P) \\ &\leq \sup_{P \in V_0} \frac{\phi(P)}{[t - \mu(P)]^2} && \text{by (B.2)} \\ &\leq \alpha && \text{by (B.4)} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it must hold that

$$t \geq t_{\sup} \geq t_*.$$

Finally, by Markov's inequality and condition (B.5), the type-II error is bounded by

β :

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{P \in V_1} P(T(X) \leq t) &= \sup_{P \in V_1} P(T(X) - \mu(P) \leq t - \mu(P)) \\
&\leq \sup_{P \in V_1} P(|T(X) - \mu(P)| \geq \mu(P) - t) \\
&\leq \sup_{P \in V_1} \frac{E [T(X) - \mu(P)]^2}{[t - \mu(P)]^2} && \text{since } \inf_{P \in V_1} \mu(P) \geq t \\
&\leq \sup_{P \in V_1} \frac{\phi(P)}{[t - \mu(P)]^2} && \text{by (B.2)} \\
&\leq \beta && \text{by (B.5)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

C Critical separation for the Gaussian sequence model

C.1 Suboptimality of the chi-squared test for testing hypotheses separated under the ℓ_1 norm

In the following, we provide a proof of Lemma 1. Next, we provide a proof of the auxiliary result Proposition C.5.

Proof of Lemma 1. Existence of a valid and powerful chi-squared test. Under the null hypothesis: $H_0 : \|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0$, it holds that $\|v\|_2 \leq \epsilon_0$ by norm monotonicity. Thus, the chi-squared test $\psi_2(X, \epsilon_0)$ (27) is valid under the null hypothesis. By (C.22) in the proof of Lemma 3.4, it holds that the chi-squared test rejects with probability at least $1 - \beta$ whenever

$$\|v\|_2 - \epsilon_0 \geq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{1/4} \quad \text{if } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{1/4} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where C_1 is a positive constant that depends on α and β . Under the alternative hypothesis $H_1 : \|v\|_1 \geq \epsilon_1$, it holds that $\|v\|_2 \geq d^{-1/2} \cdot \epsilon_1$. Thus, by (C.6), under the alternative hypothesis, the chi-squared test rejects with probability at least $1 - \beta$ whenever

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \geq (\sqrt{d} - 1) \cdot \epsilon_0 + \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{3/4} \quad \text{if } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{1/4}$$

Consequently, under the alternative hypothesis, the test rejects with probability at least $1 - \beta$ whenever

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \geq C_1 \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{3/4} \quad \text{if } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \sigma \cdot d^{1/4}.$$

Limit on the power of any chi-squared test. In the following, we prove that for hypotheses

$$H_0 : \|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|v\|_1 \geq \epsilon_1 \asymp d^{3/4} \cdot \sigma \quad \text{where } d^{1/4} \cdot \sigma \lesssim \epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon_1,$$

no valid chi-squared test uniformly controls the type-II error under the alternative hypothesis.

Henceforth, let ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 satisfy

$$C_0 \cdot d^{1/4} \cdot \sigma \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_1 = C_1 \cdot d^{3/4} \cdot \sigma \quad (\text{C.7})$$

where C_0 and C_1 are positive constants that will be defined later. Consider any valid chi-squared test

$$\psi(X) = (T_2(X) \geq t). \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where t is called the decision threshold. Since the test is valid, it holds that

$$t \geq \sup_{\|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0} q_{1-\alpha}(T_2, P_v)$$

where $q_{1-\alpha}(T_2, P_v)$ is the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of $T_2(X)$ when $X \sim P_v = \mathcal{N}(v, \sigma^2 \cdot I_d)$. Furthermore, by Proposition C.5, it holds that

$$q_{1-\alpha}(T_2, P_v) \geq E_{P_v}[T_2] - \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \sqrt{V_{P_v}[T_2]}.$$

Thus, we have the following lower bound on the decision threshold

$$t \geq \sup_{C_0 \cdot d^{1/4} \cdot \sigma \leq \|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0} E_{P_v}[T_2] - \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \sqrt{V_{P_v}[T_2]}.$$

For any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that

$$E_{P_v}[T_2] = \|v\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad V_{P_v}[T_2] = 2 \cdot d \cdot \sigma^4 + 4 \cdot \|v\|_2^2 \cdot \sigma^2.$$

Consequently, the following lower bound on the decision threshold holds

$$t \geq \sup_{\|v\|_1 \leq \epsilon_0} \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{2} = C \cdot \epsilon_0^2 \quad \text{where} \quad C = 2^{-1} \quad \text{if} \quad C_0 \geq 4 \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \vee \sqrt{2} \right). \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Henceforth, assume that C_0 satisfies the inequality above.

Under the alternative hypothesis, let

$$v_i = \frac{\epsilon_1}{d} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq d,$$

so that $\|v\|_1 = \epsilon_1$ and $\|v\|_2 = \epsilon_1^2/d$. Our goal is to bound the probability that the chi-squared test (C.8) rejects under the alternative hypothesis by an arbitrary constant β . The probability of rejecting is:

$$P_v(T_2(X) \geq t) = P_v(T_2(X) - \|v\|_2^2 \geq t - \|v\|_2^2) = P_v\left(T_2(X) - \|v\|_2^2 \geq t - \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{d}\right) \quad (\text{C.10})$$

Henceforth, we require that

$$\frac{\epsilon_1^2}{d} \leq \frac{t}{2}$$

which, by (C.7) and (C.9) is satisfied whenever

$$C_1 \leq (C/2)^{-1/2} \cdot C_0.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality and (C.10), it follows that the probability of rejecting under the alternative hypothesis is bounded by

$$P_v(T_2(X) \geq t) \leq \frac{V_{P_v} T_2(X)}{(t/2)^2} \leq \beta$$

whenever

$$2\beta^{-1/2} \cdot \sqrt{V_{P_v} T_2(X)} \leq t. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

By (C.9), condition (C.11) is implied by

$$C^{-1} 2 \cdot \beta^{-1/2} \cdot \sqrt{2 \cdot d \cdot \sigma^4 + 4 \cdot \frac{\epsilon_1^2}{d} \cdot \sigma^2} \leq \epsilon_0^2,$$

which, by (C.7), is satisfied whenever

$$C_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{(C^2 \cdot \beta/4) \cdot C_0^4 - 2}{4}} \cdot d^{1/2} \text{ and } C_0 > \left[\frac{8}{C^2 \cdot \beta} \right]^{1/4}.$$

In summary, for any C_1 and C_0 that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < C_1 &\leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{(C^2 \cdot \beta/4) \cdot C_0^4 - 2}{4}} \cdot d^{1/2} \right) \wedge ((C/2)^{-1/2} \cdot C_0) \\ \text{and } C_0 &> \left[\frac{8}{C^2 \cdot \beta} \right]^{1/4} \vee 4 \left(\sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \vee \sqrt{2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

it holds that the probability that any chi-squared test (C.8) rejects under the alternative hypothesis is upper bounded by β . □

We conclude the section by proving a proof of Proposition C.5, which is a consequence of Cantelli's inequality.

Proposition C.5. *Let P be a probability distribution on \mathbb{R} , and let $q_{1-\alpha}(T, P)$ be the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of $T(X)$ when $X \sim P$. Then, it holds that*

$$|q_{1-\alpha}(T, P) - E_{X \sim P}[T(X)]| \leq \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \sqrt{V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]}$$

Proof. Cantelli's inequality states that

$$P \left(T \geq E_{X \sim P}[T(X)] + \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \sqrt{V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]} \right) \leq \alpha.$$

Consequently, it must holds that

$$q_{1-\alpha}(T, P) \leq E_{X \sim P}[T(X)] + \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \sqrt{V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]}.$$

Analogously, Cantelli's inequality states that

$$P \left(T \leq E_{X \sim P_v}[T(X)] - \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \sqrt{V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]} \right) \leq \alpha.$$

Thus, it must hold that

$$q_{1-\alpha}(T, P) \geq E_{X \sim P}[T(X)] - \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \sqrt{V_{X \sim P}[T(X)]}.$$

The claim follows. \square

C.2 Upper bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p for $p \in [1, 2)$

In the following, we provide a proof of Lemma 9. After it, we provide a proof of the auxiliary result Corollary C.11.

Proof of Lemma 9. Free tolerance and interpolation regimes

It follows from Corollary B.7 that the debiased plug-in test (27) controls the type-II by β error if

$$\sup_{\|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0} E[T_p] + \sqrt{\frac{V[T_p]}{\alpha}} \leq \inf_{\|v\|_p \geq \epsilon_1} E[T_p] - \sqrt{\frac{V[T_p]}{\beta}}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Using the bounds on the expectation and variance in Corollary C.11, (C.12) is implied by

$$C_1 \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma^{p-2}}{d^{2/p-1}} \cdot \epsilon_1^2 \wedge \epsilon_1^p \right) \geq \epsilon_0^p + C_2 \cdot \left[\sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} + \sigma \cdot d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot (\epsilon_1^{p-1} + \epsilon_0^{p-1}) \cdot I(p > 1) \right]$$

where $C_1 \in (0, 1/8)$ and C_2 is a positive constant that depends on p , α and β . There are two cases, depending on which term on the LHS attains the minimum.

Case I. The following condition must be satisfied

$$C_1 \cdot \epsilon_1^p \geq \epsilon_0^p + C_2 \cdot \left[\sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} + \sigma \cdot d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot (\epsilon_1^{p-1} + \epsilon_0^{p-1}) \cdot I(p > 1) \right]$$

which is implied by

$$\epsilon_1^p \geq C \cdot (\epsilon_0^p + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1-p/2} \cdot I(p > 1))$$

where $C > 1$. Note that for $p \geq 1$, it holds that $1 - p/2 \leq 1/2$. Thus, the above condition reduces to

$$\epsilon_1^p \geq C \cdot (\epsilon_0^p + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2})$$

Case II. The following condition must be satisfied

$$C_1 \cdot \frac{\sigma^{p-2}}{d^{2/p-1}} \cdot \epsilon_1^2 \geq \epsilon_0^p + C_2 \cdot [\sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} + \sigma \cdot d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot (\epsilon_1^{p-1} + \epsilon_0^{p-1}) \cdot I(p > 1)]$$

which is implied by

$$\epsilon_1^p \geq C \left([\sigma^p \cdot d]^{2/p-1} \cdot \epsilon_0^p \right)^{p/2} + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1-p/4} + \sigma^p \cdot d^{\frac{3p}{3-p} \cdot (1/p-1/2)} \cdot I(1 < p)$$

where $C > 1$. Note that $1 - p/4 \geq (3p/(3-p))(1/p - 1/2)$ for $1 < p \leq 2$; hence the above equation is implied by

$$\epsilon_1^p \geq [\sigma^p \cdot d]^{2/p-1} \cdot \epsilon_0^p \right)^{p/2} + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1-p/4}$$

Case I and II. Consider cases I and II together, (C.12) is satisfied whenever

$$\epsilon_1^p \geq 2C \left(\epsilon_0^p + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} + [\sigma^p \cdot d]^{2/p-1} \cdot \epsilon_0^p \right)^{p/2} + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1-p/4}.$$

Noting that $1 - p/4 \geq 1/2$ for $p \leq 2$, the analysis above equation reduces to

$$\epsilon_1^p \geq 2C \left(\epsilon_0^p + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} + [\sigma^p \cdot d]^{2/p-1} \cdot \epsilon_0^p \right)^{p/2}. \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Summary. By (C.13), we have that the debiased plug-in test rejects with probability at least $1 - \beta$ whenever

$$\epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p \gtrsim \begin{cases} \sigma^p \cdot d^{1-p/4} & \text{if } \epsilon_0^p \lesssim \sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} \\ [\sigma^p \cdot d^{1/p}]^{2-p} \cdot \epsilon_0^p \right)^{p/2} & \text{if } \sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} \lesssim \epsilon_0^p \lesssim \sigma^p \cdot d \\ \sigma^p \cdot d & \text{if } \epsilon_0^p \asymp \sigma^p \cdot d \end{cases}$$

The claim of Lemma 9 follows by noting that

$$(\epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p)^{1/p} \asymp \epsilon_1 \asymp \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}.$$

□

We conclude the section by recapping Lemma 3.1 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#), and proving the corresponding Corollary C.11 used in the proof of Lemma 9. They allows us to control the mean and variance of the debiased plug-in statistic (27) for $p \in (0, 2]$. Before providing a proof, we state some useful auxiliary results.

Proposition C.6 (C_r inequality, see theorem 2 of [Clarkson \[1936\]](#)). *For $p > 0$*

$$|a + b|^p \leq A_p \cdot (|a|^p + |b|^p) \quad \text{where } A_p = 2^{(p-1)+}$$

Corollary C.9. *Let $\tilde{a} = a + b$ and $\tilde{b} = -b$, it follows that $|a + b|^p \geq \frac{|a|^p}{A_p} - |b|^p$.*

Corollary C.10.

$$||Z + u|^p - |u|^p| \leq \begin{cases} |Z|^p & \text{if } 0 < p \leq 1 \\ p \cdot A_{p-1} \cdot [|Z|^p + |Z| \cdot |u|^{p-1}] & \text{if } 1 < p \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $p \leq 1$, the bound follows from Proposition C.6

$$|Z + u|^p - |u|^p \leq (A_p - 1) \cdot |u|^p + A_p \cdot |Z|^p$$

For $p > 1$, by Taylor expansion we have that

$$\begin{aligned} ||Z + u|^p - |u|^p| &= p \cdot |\lambda Z + u|^{p-1} \cdot |Z| && \text{where } 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 \\ &\leq p \cdot A_{p-1} \cdot (\lambda^p |Z|^p + |Z| \cdot |u|^{p-1}) && \text{by Proposition C.6} \\ &\leq p \cdot A_{p-1} \cdot (|Z|^p + |Z| \cdot |u|^{p-1}) && \text{since } \lambda \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Using the above auxiliary results, we prove Lemma 3.1 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#) and Corollary C.11.

Lemma C.13 (Lemma 3.1 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#)). *Let $0 < p \leq 2$, let*

$$f_p(u) = E|Z + u|^p \text{ and } g_p(u) = |u|^p - f_p(0)$$

and consider the following expectation and variance

$$h(u) = E[g_p(Z + u)] \text{ and } H(u) = V[g_p(Z + u)] \text{ where } Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

It holds that

$$C_1 \cdot (|u|^p \wedge u^2) \leq h(u) \leq C_p \cdot |u|^p$$

and

$$H(u) \leq \begin{cases} \mu_{2p} & \text{if } 0 < p \leq 1 \\ 2p \cdot [\mu_{2p} + \mu_2 \cdot |u|^{2(p-1)}] & \text{if } 1 < p \leq 2 \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mu_p = E|Z|^p = \sqrt{\frac{2^p}{\pi}} \text{ and } A_p = 2^{(p-1)+} \text{ and } 0 < C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2A_p} \text{ and } 0 < C_p \leq 1.$$

Proof. Lower bound on the expectation. h is infinitely differentiable at zero, it is convex, and it achieves a minimum at zero. Thus, $h(0) = 0, h'(0) = 0$ and $h''(0) > 0$. Therefore, by Taylor expansion we get that

$$h(u) = \frac{h''(\lambda \cdot u)}{2} \cdot u^2 \quad \text{where } 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 \quad (\text{C.14})$$

Since h'' is continuous and $h''(0) > 0$, for any b , there exists $a \leq b$ such that

$$\min_{|u| \leq a} \frac{h''(u)}{2} > 0$$

and consequently,

$$h(u) \geq C_a \cdot u^2 \quad \text{for } |u| \leq a \quad \text{where } C_a = \left[\min_{|u| \leq a} \frac{h''(u)}{2} \right].$$

Using the convexity of h , it follows that

$$h(u) \geq \frac{b}{a} \cdot h\left(\frac{a}{b} \cdot u\right) \geq C_b \cdot u^2 \quad \text{for } |u| \leq b \quad \text{where } C_b = C_a \cdot \frac{a}{b}$$

Furthermore, by Corollary C.9, it holds that

$$h(u) \geq \frac{|u|^p}{A_p} - 2\mu_p \geq \left[\frac{1}{A_p} - \frac{2\mu_p}{b^p} \right] \cdot |u|^p \quad \text{for } |u| \geq b \quad \text{and } b > [2\mu_p A_p]^{1/p}$$

Consequently, choosing $b_\gamma = \gamma \cdot [2\mu_p A_p]^{1/p}$ for $\gamma > 1$, one of the two lower-bounds must always hold

$$h(u) \geq C_{b_\gamma} \cdot u^2 \wedge \frac{1}{A_p} \cdot \left[1 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \right] \cdot |u|^p \quad \text{for } \gamma > 1$$

Note that $C_{b_\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ and $1 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \rightarrow 1$ as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, choosing $\gamma = 2$, we get

$$h(u) \geq \left[\frac{1}{2A_p} \wedge C_{b_2} \right] \cdot (|u|^p \wedge u^2)$$

Upper bound on the expectation. By Proposition C.6, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} h(u) &\leq (A_p - 1) \cdot \mu_p + A_p \cdot |u|^p \\ &\leq \begin{cases} |u|^p & \text{if } 0 < p \leq 1 \\ 2p \cdot |u|^p & \text{if } 1 < p < 2 \text{ and } |u| \geq [(1 - A_p^{-1})\mu_p]^{1/p} \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} |u|^p & \text{if } 0 < p \leq 1 \\ 2p \cdot |u|^p & \text{if } 1 < p < 2 \text{ and } |u| \geq 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

since $(1 - 1/A_p)\mu_p \leq 1$ for $1 < p < 2$. Additionally, for $1 < p < 2$, by the Taylor expansion in (C.14) it holds that

$$h(u) \leq \left[\max_{|u| \leq 1} \frac{h''(u)}{2} \right] \cdot u^2 \leq C \cdot |u|^p \quad \text{for } |u| \leq 1$$

where $C = \max_{|u| \leq 1} \frac{h''(u)}{2} \geq \frac{h''(0)}{2} > 0$. Thus, it holds that

$$h(u) \leq C_p \cdot |u|^p \text{ where } C_p \geq 2p \vee C \text{ and } 1 < p < 2.$$

Upper bound on the variance. For the variance, note that

$$H(u) = V[|Z + u|^p] = V[|Z + u|^p - |u|^p].$$

By Corollary C.10, the following upper-bound holds

$$\begin{aligned} H(u) &\leq E[|Z + u|^p - |u|^p]^2 \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \mu_{2p} & \text{if } 0 < p \leq 1 \\ 2p \cdot [\mu_{2p} + \mu_2 \cdot |u|^{2(p-1)}] & \text{if } 1 < p \leq 2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary C.11. For $0 < p \leq 2$, it holds that the debiased plug-in statistic (27) satisfies

$$T_p(X) = \sigma^p \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d g_p(\sigma^{-1} \cdot X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^d |X_i|^p - \sigma^p \cdot d \cdot \mu_p$$

where $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(v_i, \sigma^2)$ and $\mu_p = E|Z|^p$ such that $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The expectation of T_p is bounded as follows

$$L_p \leq E[T_p(X)] \leq \|v\|_p^p$$

where

$$L_p = \begin{cases} C \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma^{p-2}}{d^{2/p-1}} \cdot \|v\|_p^2 \wedge \|v\|_p^p \right) & \text{if } 0 < p < 2 \\ \|v\|_2^2 & \text{if } p = 2 \end{cases}$$

and $C \in (0, 1/8)$. Furthermore, the variance of T_p is bounded by

$$V[T_p(X)] \leq \begin{cases} d \cdot \mu_{2p} \cdot \sigma^{2p} & \text{if } 0 < p \leq 1 \\ 2p \cdot \left[d \cdot \mu_{2p} \cdot \sigma^{2p} + \mu_2 \cdot d^{\frac{2}{p}-1} \cdot \|v\|_p^{2(p-1)} \cdot \sigma^2 \right] & \text{if } 1 < p < 2 \\ 2 \cdot d \cdot \sigma^4 + 4 \cdot \|v\|_2^2 \cdot \sigma^2 & \text{if } p = 2 \end{cases}$$

Finally, for $1 \leq p \leq 2$, the bias is bounded:

$$\left| \|v\|_p^p - E[T_p(X)] \right| \leq \|v\|_p^p \wedge d \cdot \sigma^p \cdot \mu_p. \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Proof of Corollary C.11. It holds that

$$E[T_p] = \sigma^p \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d h(\sigma^{-p} \cdot v_i) \text{ and } V[T_p] = \sigma^{2p} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d H(\sigma^{-p} \cdot v_i)$$

From Lemma C.13, the upper bounds on the expectation and variance follow immediately. Regarding, the lower bound on the expectation, by Lemma C.13, we have that

$$E[T_p] \geq C_1 \cdot \left(\sum_{i \notin I} |v_i|^p + \sigma^{p-2} \cdot \sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \right)$$

where $I = \{i : |v_i| \leq \sigma\}$. Since

$$\|v\|_p^p = \sum_{i \notin I} |v_i|^p + \sum_{i \in I} |v_i|^p,$$

it must hold that

$$(A) \quad \sum_{i \in I} |v_i|^p \geq \frac{\|v\|_p^p}{2} \quad \text{or} \quad (B) \quad \sum_{i \notin I} |v_i|^p \geq \frac{\|v\|_p^p}{2}$$

Under (B), we have that

$$E[T_p] \geq C_1 \sum_{i \notin I} |v_i|^p \geq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \|v\|_p^p. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Alternatively, under (A), it follows that

$$E[T_p] \geq C_1 \sigma^{p-2} \sum_{i \in I} v_i^2 \geq C_1 \cdot \frac{\sigma^{p-2}}{|I|^{2/p-1}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in I} v_i^p \right)^{2/p} \geq \frac{C_1}{4^{1/p}} \cdot \frac{\sigma^{p-2}}{d^{2/p-1}} \cdot \|v\|_p^2. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

Hence by (C.16) and (C.17), it holds that

$$E[T_p] \geq C \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma^{p-2}}{d^{2/p-1}} \cdot \|v\|_p^2 \wedge \|v\|_p^p \right) \quad (\text{C.18})$$

where $C = C_1 \cdot (\frac{1}{2} \wedge \frac{1}{4^{1/p}})$. Since $0 < C_1 \leq \frac{1}{2A_p}$ where $A_p = 2^{(p-1) \vee 0}$, it follows that $0 < C < 1/8$.

Bias. For $1 \leq p \leq 2$, $u \rightarrow |u|^p$ is convex. Thus, by Jensen's inequality, we have that

$$\|v\|_p^p - d\sigma^p \mu_p = \sum_{i=1}^d |EX_i| - d\sigma^p \mu_p \leq E[T].$$

Together with the fact that $E[T] \leq \|v\|_p^p$, it holds that the bias of T_p is capped

$$|\|v\|_p^p - E[T]| \leq d\sigma^p \mu_p$$

Using (C.18), it also holds that

$$|\|v\|_p^p - E[T]| \leq \|v\|_p^p - C \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma^{p-2}}{d^{2/p-1}} \cdot \|v\|_p^2 \wedge \|v\|_p^p \right) \leq (1 - C) \cdot \|v\|_p^p$$

Thus, (C.15) follows. \square

C.3 Upper bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p for p even

In the following, we provide a proof of Lemma 3.4.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. It follows from Corollary B.7 and Corollary C.12 that the debiased plug-in test (27) controls the type-II by β error whenever

$$\sup_{\|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0} E[T_p] + \sqrt{\frac{V[T_p]}{\alpha}} \leq \inf_{\|v\|_p \geq \epsilon_1} E[T_p] - \sqrt{\frac{V[T_p]}{\beta}}. \quad (\text{C.19})$$

where

$$E_{P_v}[T_p] = \|v\|_p^p \text{ and } V_{P_v}[T_p] \leq C \cdot (d \cdot \sigma^{2p} + d^{2/p-1} \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot \|v\|_p^{2(p-1)})$$

for some positive constant C that depends only on p . The RHS of (C.19) is non-negative whenever

$$\epsilon_1 \geq C_0 \cdot d^{1/2p} \cdot \sigma \quad (\text{C.20})$$

where C_1 is a positive constant. Henceforth, assume that the above condition holds. Then, it holds that (C.19) is implied by

$$\epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p \geq C \cdot [d^{1/2} \cdot \sigma^p + d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot \sigma \cdot (\epsilon_0^{p-1} + \epsilon_1^{p-1})] \quad (\text{C.21})$$

where $C > 0$, and it depends only on p , α and β .

Free tolerance regime. Note that (C.20) and (C.21) hold under the following conditions

$$\epsilon_1 \geq C_1 \cdot d^{1/2p} \cdot \sigma \text{ and } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}$$

for C_1 large enough that, where C_1 is a positive constant that depends on p , α and β . Thus, it also holds for

$$\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \geq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot d^{1/2p} \cdot \sigma \text{ and } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot d^{1/2p} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

Beyond the free tolerance regime. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Using the fact that

$$\frac{\epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p}{\epsilon_1^{p-1} + \epsilon_0^{p-1}} = (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0) \cdot \frac{\epsilon_1^{p-1} + \epsilon_1^{p-2}\epsilon_0 + \dots + \epsilon_1\epsilon_0^{p-2} + \epsilon_0^{p-1}}{\epsilon_1^{p-1} + \epsilon_0^{p-1}} \geq \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0,$$

it follows that (C.20) and (C.21) are implied by

$$\epsilon_1 \geq C_0 \cdot d^{1/2p} \cdot \sigma \text{ and } \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \geq 2C \cdot \sigma \cdot \max\left(d^{1/2} \cdot \frac{\sigma^{p-1}}{\epsilon_0^{p-1}}, d^{1/p-1/2}\right)$$

from which the last two regimes of the lemma follow. □

C.4 Upper bound on the estimation error under ℓ_p for p even

In this section, we prove Lemma 2, and after it, we provide a proof of the auxiliary result Proposition C.7.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let

$$\gamma_p = (d^{1/2} \cdot \sigma^p) \vee (d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot \sigma \cdot \|v\|_p^{p-1}).$$

By Corollary C.12, it holds that

$$E_{X \sim P_v} |T_p(X) - \|v\|_p^p| \leq \sqrt{V_{X \sim P_v} [T_p(X)]} \lesssim \gamma_p.$$

By Proposition C.7, it holds that

$$|a^{1/p} - b^{1/p}| \leq |a - b|^{1/p} \quad \text{since } |a - b| \leq |a^p - b^p|^{1/p}.$$

Hence, the following bound on the estimation error holds

$$E_{X \sim P_v} |T_p^{1/p}(X) - \|v\|_p| \leq E_{X \sim P_v} |T_p(X) - \|v\|_p^p|^{1/p} \leq (E_{X \sim P_v} |T_p(X) - \|v\|_p^p|)^{1/p}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality in the last step. Additionally, by the difference of powers formula, we have the following relationship

$$a - b = (a^{1/p})^p - (b^{1/p})^p \geq (a^{1/p} - b^{1/p}) \cdot (a^{(p-1)/p} + b^{(p-1)/p}).$$

Thus, the following bound on the estimation error holds

$$E_{X \sim P_v} |T_p^{1/p}(X) - \|v\|_p| \leq E_{X \sim P_v} \left| \frac{T_p(X) - \|v\|_p^p}{T_p^{(p-1)/p}(X) + \|v\|_p^{p-1}} \right|$$

In summary, the following bound holds on the estimation error

$$E_{X \sim P_v} |T_p^{1/p}(X) - \|v\|_p| \lesssim \frac{\gamma_p}{\|v\|_p^{p-1}} \wedge \gamma_p^{1/p} = \begin{cases} \gamma_p^{1/p}, & \text{if } \|v\|_p^p \leq \gamma_p \\ \frac{\gamma_p}{\|v\|_p^{p-1}}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The claim follows by a case-by-case analysis. □

We proceed to prove Proposition C.7.

Proposition C.7. *Let p be an integer, and $a, b \geq 0$. It holds that*

$$|a - b| \leq |a^p - b^p|^{1/p}$$

Proof. Let $m = a \wedge b$ and $u = |a - b|$. By the Binomial theorem, it follows that

$$|a^p - b^p| = (m + u)^p - m^p = \sum_{k=1}^p \binom{p}{k} m^{p-k} \cdot u^k \geq u^p = |a - b|^p$$

□

C.5 Upper bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p for $2k < p < 2(k+1)$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

In this section, we prove Lemma 10. After it, we provide a proof of the auxiliary result Corollary C.12.

Proof of Lemma 10. It follows from Corollary B.7 and Corollary C.12 that the debiased plug-in test (27) controls the type-II by β error whenever

$$\epsilon_1^p \geq C \cdot \left(\epsilon_0^p + \sigma^{p-2k} \cdot d^{1-2k/p} \cdot \epsilon_0^{2k} + \sigma^p \cdot d^{1/2} + \sigma \cdot d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot \left[\epsilon_0^{(p-1)} + \epsilon_1^{(p-1)} \right] \right),$$

where $C \geq 1$ and it depends on p , α and β . Using the fact that $\epsilon_1 \geq \epsilon_0$, the above equation is implied by

$$(\epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p)^{1/p} \gtrsim \epsilon_0 + \sigma^{1-2k/p} \cdot d^{1/p-2k/p^2} \cdot \epsilon_0^{2k/p} + \sigma \cdot d^{1/2p} + \sigma \cdot d^{1/p-1/2}.$$

Note that $1/p - 1/2 \leq 1/2p$ for $p \geq 2$; Hence,

$$(\epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p)^{1/p} \gtrsim \epsilon_0 + \sigma^{1-2k/p} \cdot d^{1/p-2k/p^2} \cdot \epsilon_0^{2k/p} + \sigma \cdot d^{1/2p},$$

The claim of Lemma 10 follows by noting that

$$(\epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p)^{1/p} \asymp \epsilon_1 \asymp \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0 \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}.$$

□

In the following, we recap Lemma 3.2 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#) and prove Corollary C.12, which allows us to control the mean and variance of the debiased plug-in statistic (27).

Lemma C.14 (Lemma 3.2 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#)). *Let $2k \leq p < 2(k+1)$ s.t. $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and let*

$$f_p(u) = E|Z + u|^p \quad \text{and} \quad g_p(u) = |u|^p - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{f_p^{(2j)}(0)}{(2j)!} \cdot H_{2j}(u)$$

where $f_p^{(2j)}(0)$ denotes the $2j$ th derivative of f_p evaluated at zero, and H_{2j} is the $2j$ th Hermite polynomial. Consider the following expectation and variance

$$h(u) = E[g_p(Z + u)] \quad \text{and} \quad H(u) = V[g_p(Z + u)] \quad \text{where } Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

It holds that

$$C_1 \cdot |u|^p \leq h(u) \leq C_2 \cdot (|u|^p + u^{2k}) \quad \text{and} \quad H(u) \leq C_3 \cdot (1 + |u|^{2(p-1)})$$

where C_1 and C_3 are positive constants that depends only on p , and

$$C_2 = 2 \cdot \frac{d_{2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot A_{p-2k} \cdot (\mu_{p-2k} + 2^{p-2k}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad d_j = p \cdot (p-1) \dots (p-j+1).$$

For the particular case of p even, it holds that $h(u) = u^p$.

Proof. Upper and lower bound on the expectation. By propagating the expectation, we have that

$$h(u) = f_p(u) - r_{k-1}(u) \text{ where } r_{k-1}(u) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{f_p^{(2j)}(0)}{(2j)!} \cdot u^{2j}.$$

Note that $h(u)$ is an even infinite differentiable function, and it is convex. It follows that $h^{(j)}(0) = 0$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, 2k-1\}$ by definition and evenness. Additionally, h is convex.

By Taylor expansion, it holds that

$$h(u) = \frac{h^{(2k)}(\lambda \cdot u)}{(2k)!} \cdot u^{2k} = \frac{f_p^{(2k)}(\lambda \cdot u)}{(2k)!} \cdot u^{2k} \text{ where } 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$$

Since $|Z+u|^p$ is integrable on \mathbb{R} for $|u| \leq \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$, $\frac{\partial^{2k}|Z+u|^p}{\partial u^{2k}}$ exists on $\mathbb{R} \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$, and $|\frac{\partial^{2k}|Z+u|^p}{\partial u^{2k}}|$ is upper-bounded by the integrable function $d_{2k} \cdot A_{p-2k} \cdot (|Z|^{p-2k} + |u|^{p-2k})$, by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem [Bartle, 1995][Corollary 5.9], it follows that

$$f_p^{(2k)}(u) = E \left[\frac{\partial^{2k}|Z+u|^p}{\partial u^{2k}} \right] = d_{2k} \cdot E|Z+u|^{p-2k}$$

Furthermore $f_p^{(2k+1)}(0) = 0$ since f_p is an even function. Consequently

$$h(u) = \frac{d_{2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot E|Z + \lambda u|^{p-2k} \cdot u^{2k}$$

For $|u| \leq b$ with $b > 0$, it follows that

$$\frac{d_{2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot \mu_{p-2k} \cdot u^{2k} \leq h(u) \leq \frac{d_{2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot A_{p-2k} \cdot (\mu_{p-2k} + b^{p-2k}) \cdot u^{2k}$$

Note that from the lower-bound, it follows that

$$\frac{d_{2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot \mu_{p-2k} \cdot |u|^p \leq h(u) \quad \text{for } |u| \leq 1$$

using the convexity of h , we get for arbitrary b that

$$\frac{d_{2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot \mu_{p-2k} \cdot b^{1-p} \cdot |u|^p \leq b \cdot h\left(\frac{u}{b}\right) \leq h(u) \quad \text{for } |u| \leq b.$$

For $|u| \geq b$ and $b \geq 2$, by Corollary C.9, it follows that

$$h(u) \geq \frac{|u|^p}{A_{p-1}} - \mu_p - |r_{k-1}(u)| \geq C_b \cdot (|u|^p - 1 - u^{2(k-1)}) \geq C_b \cdot (1 - 2^{-p} - 2^{2(k-1)-p}) \cdot |u|^p,$$

and for the upper-bound, we have that

$$h(u) \leq \frac{d_{2k} \cdot A_{p-2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot (\mu_{p-2k} + |u|^{p-2k}) \cdot u^{2k} \leq \frac{2 \cdot d_{2k} \cdot A_{p-2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot |u|^p.$$

In summary, choosing $b = 2$, it holds that

$$C \cdot |u|^p \leq h(u) \leq \frac{2 \cdot d_{2k} \cdot A_{p-2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot |u|^p + \frac{d_{2k} \cdot A_{p-2k}}{(2k)!} \cdot (\mu_{p-2k} + 2^{p-2k}) \cdot u^{2k}$$

where $C > 0$.

Upper bound on the variance. Note that the following chain of inequalities holds

$$\begin{aligned} H(u) &= V[|Z + u|^p - q_{k-1}(Z + u)^2] \quad \text{where } q_{k-1} \text{ is a } k-1 \text{ polynomial} \\ &= V[|Z + u|^p - |u|^p - q_{k-1}(Z + u)] \\ &\leq 2 \cdot E[|Z + u|^p - |u|^p]^2 + 2 \cdot E[q_{k-1}(Z + u)^2]^2 \\ &\leq 2 \cdot E[|Z + u|^p - |u|^p]^2 + C \cdot E[Z + u]^{4(k-1)} \\ &\leq C_p \cdot (1 + |u|^{2(p-1)}) + C'_p \cdot (1 + |u|^{4(k-1)}) \\ &\leq C''_p \cdot (1 + |u|^{2(p-1)} + |u|^{4(k-1)}) \end{aligned}$$

For $|u| \leq 1$ the first term dominates, while for $|u| \geq 1$ the second term dominates since $2(p-1) > 4(k-1)$. Thus,

$$H(u) \leq C_p \cdot (1 + |u|^{2(p-1)}).$$

Expectation when p is an even integer. By the Binomial theorem, the following equality holds

$$E[Z + u]^p = E \left[\sum_{j=0}^p \binom{p}{j} \cdot Z^{p-2j} \cdot u^j \right].$$

Then, using the fact that the odd moments of a standard Gaussian vanish, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E[Z + u]^p &= \sum_{j=0}^{p/2} \binom{p}{2j} \cdot \mu_{p-2j} \cdot u^{2j} \\ &= u^p + \sum_{j=0}^{p/2-1} \frac{d_{2j}}{(2j)!} \cdot \mu_{p-2j} \cdot u^{2j} \quad \text{since } \frac{d_j}{j!} = \binom{p}{j} \\ &= u^p + \sum_{j=0}^{p/2-1} \frac{f_p^{(2j)}(0)}{(2j)!} \cdot u^{2j} \quad \text{since } f_p^{(2j)}(0) = d_{2j} \cdot \mu_{p-2j}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$h(u) = E[Z + u]^p - \sum_{j=0}^{p/2-1} \frac{f_p^{(2j)}(0)}{(2j)!} \cdot u^{2j} = u^p.$$

□

Corollary C.12. For $2k \leq p < 2(k+1)$ s.t. $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the debiased plug-in statistic satisfies

$$T_p(X) = \sigma^p \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d g_p(\sigma^{-1} \cdot X_i) \text{ where } X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(v_i, \sigma^2).$$

Hence it follows that

$$E[T_p] = \sigma^p \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d h(\sigma^{-1} v_i) \text{ and } V[T_p] = \sigma^{2p} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d H(\sigma^{-1} v_i).$$

Consequently, the following bounds on the expectation and variance hold:

$$C_1 \cdot \|v\|_p^p \leq E[T_p] \leq C_2 \cdot (\|v\|_p^p + d^{1-2k/p} \cdot \sigma^{p-2k} \cdot \|v\|_p^{2k})$$

$$\text{and } V[T_p] \leq C_3 \cdot (d \cdot \sigma^{2p} + d^{2/p-1} \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot \|v\|_p^{2(p-1)})$$

Furthermore, for p even, it holds that $E[T_p] = \|v\|_p^p$.

C.6 Bounding the chi-squared distance by moment differences

In this section, we recap known results for bounding the chi-squared distance between Gaussian mixtures by moment differences between their mixing distributions.

Lemma C.15 (Wu and Yang [2016]). Let π_0 be a centered distribution, i.e. $m_1(\pi_0) = 0$, supported on $[-\delta, \delta]$ that matches L moments of π_1

$$m_l(\pi_0) = m_l(\pi_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq L.$$

The chi-squared distance between their mixture distributions is bounded by the moment difference of the mixing distributions

$$\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_{\pi_0}) \leq e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2\sigma^2}} \cdot \sum_{j \geq L+1} \frac{\Delta_j^2}{j! \sigma^{2j}}$$

where $\Delta_j = m_j(\pi_1) - m_j(\pi_0)$.

Proof of Lemma C.15. Let ϕ be the density of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$

$$\phi(x) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}},$$

and let H_k be the k -th probabilist Hermite polynomial, it holds that

$$E_{X \sim N(0, \sigma^2)} [H_k(X/\sigma) H_j(X/\sigma)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k(x/\sigma) H_j(x/\sigma) \phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) \frac{1}{\sigma} dx = k! \delta_{k,j}$$

and

$$\sum_{j \geq 0} H_j(x/\sigma) \cdot \frac{u^j}{j! \sigma^j} = e^{-\frac{u^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{ux}{\sigma^2}} = \frac{\phi\left(\frac{x-u}{\sigma}\right)}{\phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right)}.$$

Thus

$$dP_\pi(x) = \int \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x-v}{\sigma}\right) d\pi(v) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) \cdot \sum_{j \geq 0} H_j(x/\sigma) \cdot \frac{m_j(\pi)}{j! \sigma^j}$$

Finally, if a mixing distribution is supported on $[-\delta, \delta]$ and is centered, its density is bounded away from zero

$$\begin{aligned} dP_\pi(x) &= \int \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x-v}{\sigma}\right) d\pi(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) \cdot \int e^{-\frac{v^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{xv}{\sigma^2}} d\pi(v) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) \cdot e^{E_{v \sim \pi} \left[-\frac{v^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{xv}{\sigma^2} \right]} && \text{by Jensen's inequality} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) \cdot e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{2\sigma^2}} && \text{since } m_1(\pi) = 0 \text{ and } \text{supp}(\pi) \subseteq [-\delta, \delta] \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_{\pi_0}) &= \int \frac{(dP_{\pi_1}(x) - dP_{\pi_0}(x))^2}{dP_{\pi_0}(x)} \\ &= \int \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \phi^2\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) \frac{\left(\sum_{j \geq 0} H_j(x/\sigma) \cdot \frac{\Delta_j}{j! \sigma^j}\right)^2}{dP_{\pi_0}(x)} \\ &\leq e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2\sigma^2}} \cdot \int \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} H_j(x/\sigma) \cdot \frac{\Delta_j}{j! \sigma^j}\right)^2 \\ &= e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2\sigma^2}} \cdot \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{\Delta_j^2}{j! \sigma^{2j}} && \text{by orthogonality} \\ &= e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2\sigma^2}} \cdot \sum_{j \geq L+1} \frac{\Delta_j^2}{j! \sigma^{2j}} && \text{matching L moments} \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary C.13. *Let $\pi_0 = \delta_0$, and π_1 be a symmetric mixing distribution supported on $[-\delta, \delta]$. Then it follows that*

$$\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_0^d) \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{d}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{\delta}{\sigma} \right)^4 \right\} - 1.$$

Proof of Corollary C.13.

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_0) &\leq e^{\frac{0}{2\sigma^2}} \cdot \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{m_j(\pi_1)^2}{\sigma^{2j} \cdot j!} && \text{by lemma C.15} \\
&= \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{m_{2j}(\pi_1)^2}{\sigma^{4j} \cdot (2j)!} && \text{by symmetry, all odd moments vanish} \\
&\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(\delta^2/\sigma^2)^{2j}}{(2j)!} && \text{since } \text{supp}(\pi_1) \subseteq [-\delta, \delta] \\
&= \cosh(\delta^2/\sigma^2) - 1 \\
&\leq e^{(\frac{\delta}{\sigma})^4 \cdot \frac{1}{2}} - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

By tensorization, it follows that

$$\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_0^d) = (1 + \chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_0))^d - 1 \leq e^{\frac{d}{2} \cdot (\frac{\delta}{\sigma})^4} - 1.$$

□

Lemma C.16. *For $0 < \eta < 1$, and any $\delta \geq 0$ and $L \geq 1$ that satisfy*

$$\delta^2 \leq C_\eta \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot \frac{L}{d^{1/(L+1)}},$$

where C_η is a universal positive constant that depends only on η . If π_0 and π_1 are centered distributions supported on $[-\delta, \delta]$ that share the first L moments, then the chi-squared distance between their corresponding mixtures is bounded $\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) \leq \eta$.

Proof of Lemma C.16. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_{\pi_0}) &\leq e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2} \cdot \sigma^{-2}} \cdot \sum_{j \geq L+1} \frac{\Delta_j^2 \cdot \sigma^{-2j}}{j!} && \text{by Lemma C.15} \\
&\leq e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2} \cdot \sigma^{-2}} \cdot \sum_{j \geq L+1} \frac{(4\delta^2 \sigma^{-2})^j}{j!} && \text{since } \text{supp}(\pi_1) \cup \text{supp}(\pi_0) \subseteq [-\delta, \delta] \\
&\leq e^{\frac{\delta^2}{2} \cdot \sigma^{-2}} \cdot e^{4\delta^2 \cdot \sigma^{-2}} \cdot \frac{(4\delta^2 \sigma^{-2})^{L+1}}{(L+1)!} \\
&\leq C \cdot e^{\frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2}} \cdot \left(\frac{\delta^2}{L\sigma^2} \right)^{L+1}
\end{aligned}$$

for some universal positive constant $C \geq 1$. Recall that

$$\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) = (1 + \chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_{\pi_0}))^d - 1 \leq \exp\{\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_{\pi_0}) \cdot d\} - 1.$$

Thus, $\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) \leq \eta$ whenever

$$\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}, P_{\pi_0}) \leq \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{d},$$

where $\tilde{\eta} = \log(1 + \eta)$. It is sufficient to choose δ and L such that

$$C \cdot e^{\frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2}} \cdot \left(\frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2 L} \right)^{L+1} \leq \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{d}$$

which is implied by

$$e^{\frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2 L}} \cdot \frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2 L} \leq \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{C} \right)^{1/(L+1)} \cdot d^{-1/(L+1)}.$$

That condition is satisfied whenever

$$\frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2 L} \leq 1 \wedge \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{C} \right)^{1/(L+1)} \cdot d^{-1/(L+1)},$$

which is satisfied by the assumptions since $\left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{C} \right)^{1/(L+1)} \cdot d^{-1/(L+1)} \leq 1$. \square

C.7 Lower bound on the critical separation under ℓ_p norms for $p \in (0, 2]$ in the free tolerance regime

In this section, we present a simple lower bound on the critical separation in the free-tolerance regime.

Proposition C.8. *For $0 < p \leq 2$, the critical separation for hypotheses (10) is lower-bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim d^{1/p-1/4} \cdot \sigma \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \epsilon_0 \lesssim d^{1/2p} \cdot \sigma.$$

Proof of Proposition C.8. Consider the following symmetric mixing distributions

$$\pi_0 = \delta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_1 = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{\epsilon \cdot d^{-1/p}} + \delta_{-\epsilon \cdot d^{-1/p}})$$

Note that they share their first moment, and their separation is given by ϵ

$$\|X\|_p^p = 0 \text{ a.s. under } \pi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|X\|_p^p = \epsilon^p \text{ a.s. under } \pi_1.$$

By Corollary C.13, it holds that

$$\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) \leq \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma \cdot d^{1/p-1/4}} \right)^4 \right] - 1.$$

Thus, choosing

$$\epsilon^p = C_p \cdot d^{1-p/4} \cdot \sigma^p \quad \text{where } C_p = [2 \log(1 + (C_\alpha/2)^2)]^{p/4},$$

the chi-squared distance is bounded: $\chi^2(P_{\pi_1}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) \leq (C_\alpha/2)^2$. Hence by Lemma D.17, it follows that

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim d^{1/p-1/4} \cdot \sigma \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \epsilon_0 \lesssim d^{1/p-1/4} \cdot \sigma^p,$$

which implies the statement of Proposition C.8 since $d^{1/p-1/4} \geq d^{1/2p}$ for $p \leq 2$. \square

C.8 Conjecture for the lower bound on the critical separation under non-smooth ℓ_p norms in the interpolation regime

Theorem 3.5 can be generalized such that any lower bound on the constrained moment-matching problem (24) leads to a lower bound on the critical separation. We defer the proof to Theorem D.1 in Section D.2.

Theorem C.1. *Choose $\delta \geq 0$ and $L \geq 1$ satisfying (21). The critical separation for hypotheses (10) is lower bounded by*

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim b_p(\epsilon_0) \quad \text{where } b_p(\epsilon_0) = d^{1/p} \delta \cdot M_p^{1/p}(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L) \quad \text{and } \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp \frac{\epsilon_0}{d^{1/p} \delta}$$

for $0 < \epsilon_0 \lesssim b_p(\epsilon_0)$ and $d^{1/2} \gtrsim M_p^{-1}(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L)$.

We conjecture that the constrained moment-matching problem satisfies the following lower bound whenever ϵ is not too large.

Conjecture 1. *For $0 < \epsilon \lesssim 1/L$, it holds that:*

$$M_p^{1/p}(\epsilon, L) \gtrsim \begin{cases} \frac{\epsilon^{p/2}}{L^{1-p/2}} & \text{if } 1 \leq p < 2 \\ \frac{\epsilon^{2k/p}}{L^{1-2k/p}} & \text{if } 2k < p < 2(k+1) \text{ with } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \end{cases}$$

Under the above conjecture, the following lower-bound on the critical separation would hold via Theorem C.1:

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim \begin{cases} \left(d^{1/p} \cdot \frac{\delta}{L} \right)^{1-p/2} \cdot \epsilon_0^{p/2} & \text{if } 1 \leq p < 2 \\ \left(d^{1/p} \cdot \frac{\delta}{L} \right)^{1-2k/p} \cdot \epsilon_0^{2k/p} & \text{if } 2k < p < 2(k+1) \text{ with } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \end{cases}$$

Thus, matching rates for the interpolation regimes in Lemma 9 and Lemma 10, would follow for any d large enough by choosing $L \asymp \log d$ and $\delta \asymp \sigma \cdot \sqrt{L}$.

D General arguments for lower bounding the critical separation

D.1 Two fuzzy hypotheses

The following is a variant of the well-known fuzzy hypotheses techniques [Tsybakov, 2009].

Lemma D.17 (Indistinguishable fuzzy hypotheses [Tsybakov, 2009]). *Let the hypothesis sets be*

$$V_0 = \{v : \|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0\} \text{ and } V_1 = \{v : \|v\|_p \geq \epsilon_1\}$$

and $C_\alpha = 1 - (\alpha + \beta)$. Consider mixing distributions concentrated in such sets

$$\pi_0^d(V_0) \geq 1 - \frac{C_\alpha}{4} \text{ and } \pi_1^d(V_1) \geq 1 - \frac{C_\alpha}{4}$$

whose induced mixtures are close in total variation or chi-squared distance

$$V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) < \frac{C_\alpha}{2} \text{ or } \chi^2(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) < \left[\frac{C_\alpha}{2} \right]^2.$$

Then, the minimax risk (8) is lower bounded by β :

$$R_*(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \text{GS}) > \beta.$$

Proof of lemma D.17. Let $\beta_0 = \beta_1 = C_\alpha/4$. Consider the restriction of the priors to their hypothesis sets

$$\tilde{\pi}_i(B) = \frac{\pi_i(B \cap V_i)}{\pi_i(V_i)}.$$

The risk of any valid test is at least

$$\begin{aligned} R(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \psi, \text{GS}) &= \sup_{v \in V_1} E_{P_v^d} [1 - \psi] \\ &\geq \sup_{v \in V_0} E_{P_v^d} [\psi] + \sup_{v \in V_1} E_{P_v^d} [1 - \psi] - \alpha \\ &\geq \int E_{P_v^d} [\psi] d\tilde{\pi}_0^d + \int E_{P_v^d} [1 - \psi] d\tilde{\pi}_1^d - \alpha \\ &= \int \psi dP_{\tilde{\pi}_0}^d + \int [1 - \psi] dP_{\tilde{\pi}_1}^d - \alpha \\ &\geq \int [\psi + 1 - \psi] d(P_{\tilde{\pi}_0}^d \wedge P_{\tilde{\pi}_1}^d) - \alpha \\ &= 1 - V(P_{\tilde{\pi}_0}^d, P_{\tilde{\pi}_1}^d) - \alpha \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by Sheffe's theorem. Furthermore, by the triangle inequality and the data processing inequality, it follows by the triangle inequality

$$V(P_{\tilde{\pi}_0}^d, P_{\tilde{\pi}_1}^d) \leq V(P_{\tilde{\pi}_0}^d, P_{\pi_0}^d) + V(P_{\tilde{\pi}_1}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) + V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d).$$

Furthermore, by the data processing inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} V(P_{\tilde{\pi}_0}^d, P_{\tilde{\pi}_1}^d) &\leq V(\tilde{\pi}_0^d, \pi_0^d) + V(\tilde{\pi}_1^d, \pi_1^d) + V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) \\ &\leq V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) + \beta_0 + \beta_1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we used the fact that

$$V(\tilde{\pi}_0^d, \pi_0^d) = \pi_0^d(V_0^c) = 1 - \pi_0^d(V_0) \leq \beta_0.$$

Consequently, the risk of any valid test is lower-bounded by β

$$R_*(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \text{GS}) = \inf_{\psi} R(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \psi, \text{GS}) \geq 1 - V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) - (\beta_0 + \beta_1) - \alpha > \beta.$$

Thus, the statement of the lemma follows. \square

Lemma D.18 (Difference in means lower bounds critical separation). *Let $s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS})$ denote a critical separation for hypotheses (10)*

$$s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) = \inf \{ \epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p : \epsilon_1 \geq \epsilon_0 \text{ and } R_*(\epsilon_0, \epsilon, \text{GS}) < \beta \}. \quad (\text{D.23})$$

Let π_0 be a distribution that satisfies

$$E_{v \sim \pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p \leq C_0 \cdot \epsilon_0^p, \quad (\text{D.24})$$

where $C_0 = C_\alpha/4$ and $C_\alpha = 1 - (\alpha + \beta)$. Furthermore, let π_1 be a distribution that satisfies

$$E_{v \sim \pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p \geq C_0^{-1/2} (1 - C_1)^{-1} \cdot \sqrt{V_{v \sim \pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p} \quad (\text{D.25})$$

for some $C_1 \in (0, 1)$ and whose mixture measure P_{π_1} is close in total variation or chi-squared distance to P_{π_0} : $V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) < C_\alpha/2$ or $\chi^2(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) < [C_\alpha/2]^2$.

Define the hypotheses

$$H_0 : v \in V_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : v \in V_1$$

where

$$V_0 = \{v : \|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0\}, \quad V_1 = \{v : \|v\|_p \geq \epsilon_1\} \text{ and } \epsilon_1^p = C_1 \cdot E_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p$$

It follows that $s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS})$ is lower bounded

$$s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) \geq \epsilon_1^p - \epsilon_0^p \geq (C_1 - \tilde{C}_1) \cdot E_{v \sim \pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p \geq (C_1 - \tilde{C}_1) \cdot \left(E_{v \sim \pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p - E_{v \sim \pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p \right)$$

for $C_0^{-1} \cdot E_{v \sim \pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p \leq \epsilon_0^p \leq \tilde{C}_1 \cdot E_{v \sim \pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p$ where $0 \leq \tilde{C}_1 < C_1$.

Proof. The probability that π_0 is supported on V_0 is bounded from below:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0^d(V_0) &= \pi_0^d(\|v\|_p \leq \epsilon_0) \\ &= \pi_0^d(\|v\|_p^p \leq \epsilon_0^p) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{E_{\pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p}{\epsilon_0^p} && \text{By Markov's inequality} \\ &\geq 1 - C_0 && \text{by (D.24)} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{C_\alpha}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, the probability that π_1 is supported on V_1 is also bounded from below

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_1^d(V_1) &= \pi_1^d(\|v\|_p \geq \epsilon_1) \\
&= \pi_1^d(\|v\|_p^p \geq \epsilon_1^p) \\
&= 1 - \pi_1^d(\|v\|_p^p \leq \epsilon_1^p) \\
&= 1 - \pi_1^d(\|v\|_p^p - E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p \leq \epsilon_1^p - E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p) \\
&\geq 1 - \pi_1^d(|\|v\|_p^p - E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p| \geq E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p - \epsilon_1^p) \\
&= 1 - \pi_1^d(|\|v\|_p^p - E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p| \geq (1 - C_1) \cdot E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p) \quad \text{since } \epsilon_1^p = C_1 \cdot E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{V_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p}{\left((1 - C_1) \cdot E_{\pi_1^d}\|v\|_p^p\right)^2} \quad \text{by Markov's inequality} \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{C_\alpha}{4} \quad \text{by (D.25)}
\end{aligned}$$

The claim of Lemma D.18 follows by Lemma D.17. \square

D.2 Moment-matching lower-bounds

The following theorem enables using a lower bound for a moment-matching problem to derive a lower bound on the critical separation. The theorem depends on Lemma D.19 and Corollary D.14, which are stated and proved at the end of the section.

Theorem D.1 (Moment-matching problems lower bound critical separation). *Let $s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS})$ denote a critical separation for hypotheses (10), see (D.23) for a definition.*

Choose $\delta \geq 0$ and $L \geq 1$ such that for any centered distributions π_0 and π_1 supported on $[-\delta, \delta]$ that share the first L moments, the total variation between their mixtures is bounded $V(P_{\pi_0}^d, P_{\pi_1}^d) \leq C_\alpha$. It holds that

$$s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) \gtrsim d\delta^p \cdot M_p(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L) \quad \text{where } \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp \frac{\epsilon_0}{d^{1/p}\delta} \quad (\text{D.26})$$

for $0 < \epsilon_0^p \lesssim d\delta^p \cdot M_p(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L)$ and $d^{1/2} \gtrsim M_p^{-1}(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L)$. Furthermore, if $M_p(L) > 0$, then

$$s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) \gtrsim \delta^p d \cdot M_p(L) \quad (\text{D.27})$$

for $\epsilon_0^p \asymp \delta^p \cdot d \cdot M_p(L)$ and $d^{1/2} \gtrsim M_p^{-1}(L)$. Finally, we remark that for hypotheses (10) it holds that

$$s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) \asymp (\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}))^p \asymp (\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0)^p \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}.$$

Therefore we can replace $s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS})$ for $(\epsilon_1^(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) - \epsilon_0)^p$ in (D.26) and (D.27).*

Proof. Constrained moment-matching. Let π_0 and π_1 be the solutions of $\tilde{M}_p(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L, \delta)$ (D.29) where $\tilde{\epsilon}_0 = \epsilon_0 \cdot C_0^{1/p}$. Let $\tilde{C}_1 = C_1/2$ for some $0 < C_1 < 1$. Using the facts that

$\tilde{M}_p(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L, \delta) = E_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p$ and $V_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p \leq \delta^{2p} \cdot d$, Lemma D.18 implies

$$s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) \geq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \tilde{M}_p(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L, \delta)$$

for

$$\epsilon_0^p \leq \frac{C_1}{2} \cdot \tilde{M}_p(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L, \delta)$$

and

$$\tilde{M}_p(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, L, \delta) \geq C_0^{-1/2} (1 - C_1)^{-1} \cdot d^{1/2} \delta^p$$

The statement follows by Corollary D.14.

Unconstrained moment-matching. Let π_0 and π_1 be the solutions of $\tilde{M}_p(L, \delta)$ (D.30). If $\tilde{M}_p(L, \delta) > 0$, since $\tilde{M}_p(L, \delta) = E_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p - E_{\pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p$, it follows that

$$\exists 0 < C < 1 \text{ s.t. } E_{\pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p = C \cdot E_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p.$$

Let $\tilde{C}_1 = C$ and $C_1 = C + \gamma$ for some $0 < \gamma < 1 - C$. Using the facts that $\tilde{M}_p(L, \delta) \leq E_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p$ and $V_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p \leq \delta^{2p} \cdot d$, Lemma D.18 implies

$$s_p^p(\epsilon_0, \text{GS}) \geq \gamma \cdot \tilde{M}_p(L, \delta)$$

for

$$\epsilon_0^p = C_0^{-1} \cdot E_{\pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p = C_0^{-1} \cdot C \cdot (1 - C)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{M}_p(L, \delta)$$

and

$$\tilde{M}_p(L, \delta) \geq C_0^{-1/2} (1 - C_1)^{-1} \cdot d^{1/2} \delta^p.$$

The statement follows by Corollary D.14. □

We finish the section by proving the auxiliary Lemma D.19 and Corollary D.14.

Lemma D.19 (Centered moment-matching problems). *Define the centered versions of problem (24)*

$$\tilde{M}_p(\epsilon, L) = \sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1} E_{\pi_1} |v|^p \text{ s.t. } E_{\pi_0} |v|^p \leq \epsilon^p \quad (\text{D.28})$$

$$m_1(\pi_0) = m_1(\pi_1) = 0$$

$$m_l(\pi_0) = m_l(\pi_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq L$$

$$\pi_0 \text{ and } \pi_1 \text{ are prob. measures supp. on } [-1, 1]$$

and (22)

$$\tilde{M}_p(L) = \sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1} E_{\pi_1} |v|^p - E_{\pi_0} |v|^p \text{ s.t. } m_1(\pi_0) = m_1(\pi_1) = 0$$

$$m_l(\pi_0) = m_l(\pi_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq L$$

$$\pi_0 \text{ and } \pi_1 \text{ are prob. measures supp. on } [-1, 1]$$

It holds that

$$\tilde{M}_p(\epsilon, L) = M_p(\epsilon, L) \text{ and } \tilde{M}_p(L) = M_p(L)$$

Proof of Lemma D.19. We do the proof for $M_p(\epsilon, L)$, since the proof for $M_p(L)$ is analogous. The solution of (D.28) is upper bounded by (24)

$$\tilde{M}_p(\epsilon, L) \leq M_p(\epsilon, L)$$

since we are removing a constraint.

Let (π_0, π_1) be any feasible solution of (24), we can define the symmetrized measures $(\tilde{\pi}_0, \tilde{\pi}_1)$ as

$$X_i \cdot \epsilon_i \sim \tilde{\pi}_i \text{ where } X_i \sim \pi_i \text{ and } \epsilon_i \sim \text{Unif}\{-1, 1\}$$

Note that due to the symmetrization, $(\tilde{\pi}_0, \tilde{\pi}_1)$ are centred, and consequently, all their odd moments vanish. Furthermore, all the absolute and even moments remain untouched

$$E_{\pi_i} X^{2k} = E_{\tilde{\pi}_i} X^{2k} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ and } E_{\pi_i} |X|^p = E_{\tilde{\pi}_i} |X|^p$$

Thus, any feasible solution of (24) can be transformed into a feasible solution of (D.28). Ergo,

$$M_p(\epsilon, L) \leq \tilde{M}_p(\epsilon, L)$$

and the lemma is proved. \square

Corollary D.14. *Define the high-dimensional, centered, and scaled versions of problems (24) and (22).*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M}_p(\epsilon, L, \delta) = & \sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1} E_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p & (D.29) \\ \text{s.t. } & E_{\pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p \leq \epsilon^p \\ & m_1(\pi_0) = m_1(\pi_1) = 0 \\ & m_l(\pi_0) = m_l(\pi_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq L \\ & \pi_0 \text{ and } \pi_1 \text{ are probability measures supported on } [-\delta, \delta] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M}_p(L, \delta) = & \sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1} E_{\pi_1^d} \|v\|_p^p - E_{\pi_0^d} \|v\|_p^p & (D.30) \\ \text{s.t. } & m_1(\pi_0) = m_1(\pi_1) = 0 \\ & m_l(\pi_0) = m_l(\pi_1) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq L \\ & \pi_0 \text{ and } \pi_1 \text{ are probability measures supported on } [-\delta, \delta] \end{aligned}$$

It holds that

$$\tilde{M}_p(\epsilon, L, \delta) = d \cdot \delta^p \cdot M_p\left(\frac{\epsilon}{d^{1/p}\delta}, L\right) \text{ and } \tilde{M}_p(L, \delta) = d \cdot \delta^p \cdot M_p(L)$$

Proof. The statement follows by re-scaling the measures in Lemma D.19 and using the fact that every dimension has the same distribution. \square

D.2.1 Unconstrained moment-matching bounds

In the following, we prove Lemma 11, which follows from section 5.3.2 of [Han et al. \[2020\]](#).

Lemma (Restated Lemma 11). *Let $p \geq 1$ non-even and $L \geq 1$, then*

$$C_p \cdot L^{-p} \leq M_p(L) \leq \tilde{C}_p \cdot L^{-p}$$

where C_p and \tilde{C}_p are positive constants that depends only on p .

Proof of Lemma 11. Upper bound. The upper bound follows directly as a corollary of the duality between moment matching and polynomial approximation in Lemma 6 together with the following result on polynomial approximation.

Lemma ([Bernstein \[1912\]](#), [Varga and Carpenter \[1985\]](#)). *Let $p > 0$ and $L \geq 1$, it holds that $A_p(L) \leq \beta_p \cdot L^{-p}$, where β_p is a positive constant that depends only on p .*

Lower bound. By Lemma 5.6 of [Han et al. \[2020\]](#), there exists (ν_0, ν_1) non-negative measures that match $\lceil L \rceil + q$ moments, where $q = \lceil p/2 \rceil$, are supported on $[c/n^2, 1]$, and they satisfy

$$\int f(x) d\nu_1(x) - \int f(x) d\nu_0(x) \geq c' \cdot L^{2q-p} \quad \text{for } f(x) = x^{-q+r/2},$$

where $c \in (0, 1)$ and c' are positive constants that depend only on (q, p) .

Define the measures

$$\tilde{\nu}_i(dx) = \left(1 - E_{v_i} \left[\frac{c}{L^2 \cdot X} \right]^q\right) \cdot \delta_0(dx) + \left[\frac{c}{L^2 \cdot x} \right]^q \cdot v_i(dx)$$

$(\tilde{\nu}_0, \tilde{\nu}_1)$ are probability measures supported on $[0, 1]$ since

$$E_{v_i} \left[\frac{c}{L^2 \cdot X} \right]^q \leq 1$$

due to $X \geq c/\lceil L \rceil^2$ almost surely for $X \sim v_i$. Furthermore, the distributions match moments

$$m_l(\tilde{\nu}_1) = \frac{c^q}{L^{2q}} \cdot E_{X \sim v_1} [X^{l-q}] = m_l(\tilde{\nu}_0) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l \leq \lceil L \rceil + q.$$

They are far away when measured by f

$$E_{\tilde{\nu}_1}[X^{p/2}] - E_{\tilde{\nu}_0}[X^{p/2}] = \frac{c^q}{L^{2q}} \cdot (E_{v_1}[f(X)] - E_{v_0}[f(X)]) \geq \frac{c^q c'}{L^p},$$

and they have bounded q-moments

$$m_q(\tilde{\nu}_i) = \frac{c^q}{L^{2q}} \cdot m_0(v_i) = \frac{c^q}{L^{2q}}.$$

We symmetrize and scale the measures. Let μ_i be such that

$$\epsilon_i \cdot X_i^{1/2} \sim \mu_i \text{ where } X_i \sim \tilde{v}_i \text{ and } \epsilon_i \sim \text{Unif}\{-1, 1\}$$

Then (μ_1, μ_2) are symmetric probability distributions supported on the $[-1, 1]$ interval. It follows that all their odd moments vanish, and their even moments match up to $\lceil L \rceil + q$

$$m_l(\mu_1) = m_{l/2}(\tilde{v}_i) = m_l(\mu_0) \text{ for } 1 \leq l/2 \leq \lceil L \rceil + q \text{ and } l \text{ even.}$$

They are far away when measured by $x \rightarrow |x|^p$

$$E_{\mu_1}|X|^p - E_{\mu_0}|X|^p = (E_{\tilde{v}_1}X^{p/2} - E_{\tilde{v}_0}X^{p/2}) \geq c^q c' \cdot L^{-p}.$$

Thus, the statement of Lemma 11 follows. □

D.2.2 Constrained moment-matching bounds

In this section, we provide a simplified proof of [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#)'s main contribution.

Proof of Lemma 7. The dual of $M_1(\epsilon_0, L)$. Consider the dual of $M_1(\epsilon_0, L)$ (24)

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\alpha, z_1, z_2, \lambda} \quad & \epsilon_0 \cdot \alpha + z_1 + z_2 \text{ s.t. } z_1 + \sum_{l=1}^L \lambda_l x^l \geq |x| & \text{for } |x| \leq 1 \\ & \alpha |x| \geq \sum_{l=1}^L \lambda_l x^l - z_2 & \text{for } |x| \leq 1 \\ & \alpha \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the λ 's correspond the moment-matching restrictions, the z 's guarantee that the (π_0, π_1) integrate to one, and α corresponds to the upper-bound on π_0 . Lemma 3.8 of [Canonne et al. \[2022\]](#) states that the above dual and the primal have the same value. We rewrite the dual for simplicity as

$$\inf_{\alpha \geq 0, z_1, z_2, \lambda} \epsilon_0 \cdot \alpha + z_1 + z_2 \text{ s.t. } \alpha |x| \geq \sum_{l=1}^L \lambda_l x^l - z_2 \geq |x| - (z_1 + z_2) \text{ for } |x| \leq 1.$$

The condition of the dual indicates that $z_1 + z_2 \geq 0$. We can further lower-bound the problem by considering all polynomials of order L .

$$\inf_{\alpha \geq 0, z \geq 0, p \in P_L} \epsilon_0 \cdot \alpha + z \text{ s.t. } \alpha |x| \geq p(x) \geq |x| - z \text{ for } |x| \leq 1. \quad (\text{D.31})$$

Let (α_*, z_*, p_*) denote the optimal solution of the above optimization. Note that

$$(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{z}, p_*) \text{ where } \tilde{\alpha} \epsilon_0 = \tilde{z} = \alpha_* \epsilon_0 \vee z_*$$

is a feasible solution whose achieved value is at most 2 times the optimal solution of (D.31)

$$\epsilon_0 \cdot \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{z} = 2 \cdot \tilde{z} \leq 2 \cdot [\epsilon_0 \cdot \alpha_* + z_*].$$

Consequently, the optimal solution of the following restricted optimization

$$\inf_{\alpha \geq 0, p \in P_L(\alpha)} \alpha \epsilon_0 \quad \text{where } P_L(\alpha) = \{p \in P_L : |x| - \alpha \epsilon_0 \leq p(x) \leq \alpha |x| \quad \text{for } |x| \leq 1\} \quad (\text{D.32})$$

is at most 2 times the optimal solution of (D.31) since

$$\alpha' \epsilon_0 \leq \tilde{\alpha} \epsilon_0$$

where (α', p') be the optimal solution of (D.32). Putting it all together, the restricted dual problem (D.32) is at most 2 times the value of the solution to the original primal problem $M_1(\epsilon_0, L)$ (24) .

$\alpha \geq 1 + C/L$ **for C small enough.** Let (α, p) be the solution of (D.32). Note that under the assumption $\epsilon_0 \leq C/L$ it must hold that α is strictly positive since by the constraints of the dual we have that

$$\alpha \geq \sup_{|x| \leq 1} \frac{|x|}{|x| + \epsilon_0} = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon_0} \geq \frac{1}{1 + C/L}$$

Furthermore, consider $L \geq C$, then evaluating the ratio at $x = \epsilon_0 \cdot \frac{L-C}{C}$, we get

$$\alpha \geq 1 - C/L \quad (\text{D.33})$$

Consider any $0 < C \leq \bar{\beta}/(1 + \bar{\beta})$ where

$$\bar{\beta} = \inf \left\{ \beta : \inf_{p \in P_L} \sup_{|x| \leq 1} |p(x) - |x|| \leq \frac{\beta}{L} \right\},$$

it follows that $\alpha \geq 1 + \bar{\beta}/L$. We argue by contradiction, that $\alpha \notin (1 - \bar{\beta}/L, 1 + \bar{\beta}/L)$. If there exists $\alpha \in (1 - \bar{\beta}/L, 1 + \bar{\beta}/L)$ optimal solution, then there exists

$$\begin{aligned} p \in P_L(\alpha) &\implies \sup_{|x| \leq 1} |p(x) - |x|| \leq \alpha \epsilon_0 \vee |\alpha - 1| < \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\beta}}{L}\right) \epsilon_0 \vee \frac{\bar{\beta}}{L} \\ &\implies \sup_{|x| \leq 1} |p(x) - |x|| < \frac{\bar{\beta}}{L} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.34})$$

where in the last line we used the fact that $\epsilon_0 \leq \frac{\bar{\beta}}{1 + \bar{\beta}/L} \cdot \frac{1}{L}$. However, (D.34) is absurd since no polynomial of order L can achieve an error smaller than $\frac{\bar{\beta}}{L}$.

Canonne et al. [2022]’s proof. Let (α, p) be the solution of (D.32). It’s easy to see that $p(\pm 2\alpha\epsilon_0) \geq \alpha\epsilon_0$. Thus, if we find c such that

$$|x| \leq c \implies p(x) < \alpha\epsilon_0,$$

that would imply that $2\alpha\epsilon_0 \geq c$. In order to get that result, one does a local expansion of p around zero. In the following, we cancel the zeroth and first derivatives of p in order to get the right rate.

From the restrictions of p , it follows that $-\epsilon_0 \leq \lambda_0 \leq 0$ and

$$|x| - \alpha\epsilon_0 - \lambda_1 \cdot x \leq |x| - \alpha\epsilon_0 - \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 \cdot x \leq g(x) \leq \alpha|x| + \alpha\epsilon_0 - \lambda_1 \cdot x \quad \text{for } |x| \leq 1$$

where $g(x) = \sum_{l=2}^L \lambda_l \cdot x^l$. Consequently, $g(\pm 2\alpha\epsilon_0) \geq \alpha\epsilon_0 \mp \lambda_1 \cdot 2\alpha\epsilon_0$, that is,

$$2\alpha\epsilon_0 \in \{|x| : g(x) \geq \ell\} \quad \text{where } \ell = \alpha\epsilon_0 \cdot (1 + 2|\lambda_1|). \quad (\text{D.35})$$

We proceed to find c such that

$$|x| \leq c \implies g(x) < \ell.$$

Since the first two derivatives of g are zero, we expect $|g(x)| \asymp x^2$ when x is close to zero. The following argument exploits this property.

Let's upper bound $|g|$

$$|g(x)| \leq R \cdot |x| + \alpha\epsilon_0 \quad \text{where } R = \alpha \vee 1 + |\lambda_1|.$$

Hence, we have that

$$|g(x)| \leq R \cdot |x| + \alpha\epsilon_0, \quad g \in P_L \quad \text{and} \quad g(0) = g'(0) = 0.$$

By Lemma D.21, we get

$$g(x) \leq |g(x)| \leq C \cdot R \cdot |x| \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \frac{C}{L} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_0 < \frac{R}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{C}{L}.$$

Furthermore, by Lemma D.20, it follows that

$$g(x) \leq |g(x)| \leq C \cdot R \cdot L \cdot x^2 \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \frac{C}{L} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_0 < \frac{\alpha}{R} \cdot \frac{C}{L}.$$

Thus,

$$g(x) < \ell \quad \text{for } |x| \leq C \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\alpha(1 + 2|\lambda_1|)}{R}} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_0}{L} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{R}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{C}{L}.$$

Using the fact that $\alpha \geq 1 - C/L$, see (D.33), we get that

$$\frac{\alpha(1 + 2|\lambda_1|)}{R} = \frac{\alpha(1 + 2|\lambda_1|)}{\alpha \vee 1 + |\lambda_1|} \geq 1 - C/L \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{R}{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha \vee 1 + |\lambda_1|}{\alpha} \geq 1.$$

Furthermore, the above condition reduces to

$$g(x) < \ell \quad \text{for } |x| \leq C \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_0}{L}} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{C}{L}.$$

Consequently by (D.35)

$$\alpha\epsilon_0 \geq C' \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_0}{L}} \quad \text{for } \epsilon_0 < C/L$$

This implies that the solutions of the primal problem $M_1(\epsilon_0, L)$ (24) satisfy

$$E_{\pi_1}|X| \geq C' \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_0}{L}} \geq C' \cdot \epsilon_0 \geq E_{\pi_0}|X| \quad \text{if } \epsilon_0 < C''/L$$

in addition to match L moments and be supported on $[-1, 1]$.

□

We now prove the auxiliary results needed for Lemma 7.

Theorem D.2 (Generalized Bernstein's inequality. Theorem 8.1 of Totik [2022]. Equation 37 of Kalmykov et al. [2021]). *Let $g \in P_L$ be a L th order polynomial, and let $\|g\|_C$ denote its maximum value over the C set:*

$$\|g\|_C = \sup_{x \in C} |g(x)|.$$

It follows that its k th derivative is bounded by.

$$|g^{(k)}(x)| \leq C_L(x) \cdot \left[\frac{L}{1-x^2} \right]^k \cdot \|g\|_{[-1,1]} \quad \text{for } x \in (-1, 1)$$

where

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in (-1,1)} C_L(x) = 1.$$

Consequently

$$\|g^{(k)}\|_{[-\delta/\sqrt{2}, \delta/\sqrt{2}]} \leq (1 + o(1)) \cdot 4^k \cdot \left[\frac{L}{\delta} \right]^k \cdot \|g\|_{[-\delta, \delta]}.$$

Lemma D.20 (Canonne et al. [2022]). *Let $g \in P_L$ be a L th order polynomial such that*

$$g(0) = g'(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |g(x)| \leq \alpha|x| \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \delta.$$

It holds that

$$|g(x)| \leq C \cdot \alpha \cdot \frac{L}{\delta} \cdot x^2 \quad \text{for } |x| \leq C \cdot \frac{\delta}{L}$$

Proof. Since $g(0) = g'(0) = 0$, g admits the following representation

$$g(x) = x \cdot h(x) \quad \text{where} \quad h(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \lambda_l \cdot x^l$$

where $h \in P_{L-1}$, $h(0) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{|x| \leq \delta} |h(x)| &\leq \max_{|c| \leq \delta, x \neq 0} |h(x)| && \text{since } h(0) = 0 \\ &= \max_{|x| \leq \delta, x \neq 0} |g(x)/x| \\ &\leq \alpha && \text{for } |x| \leq \delta \text{ since } |g(x)| \leq \alpha|x| \end{aligned}$$

By Taylor expansion, it holds

$$|g(x)| \leq x^2 \cdot \max_{|c| \leq |x|} |g^{(2)}(c)| \quad \text{since } g(0) = g'(0) = 0$$

Note that

$$|g^2(x)| = |x \cdot h^{(2)}(x) + 2h^{(1)}(x)|$$

Thus for $|x| \leq \delta/\sqrt{2}$ and Bernstein's inequality (Theorem D.2)

$$\max_{|x| \leq \delta/\sqrt{2}} |g^2(x)| \leq C \cdot \left[|x| \cdot \frac{L^2}{\delta^2} + \frac{L}{\delta} \right] \cdot \max_{|x| \leq \delta} |h(x)| \leq C \cdot \frac{L}{\delta} \cdot \alpha \quad \text{for } |x| \leq C \cdot \left[\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} \wedge \frac{\delta}{L} \right]$$

Consequently

$$|g(x)| \leq C \cdot x^2 \cdot \frac{L}{\delta} \cdot \alpha \quad \text{for } |x| \leq C' \cdot \delta/L \text{ and } L > C''.$$

□

Lemma D.21 (Canonne et al. [2022]). *Let $g \in P_L$ and $\alpha > 1$ be a L th order polynomial such that*

$$g(0) = g'(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |g(x)| \leq \alpha|x| + \beta \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \delta$$

It holds that

$$|g(x)| \leq 2\alpha|x| \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \delta/L \quad \text{if } \beta < C \cdot \alpha \cdot \frac{\delta}{L}$$

Proof. The claim is trivial if $|x| > \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$. The claim is also true for $x = 0$ since $g(0) = 0$. Henceforth, we implicitly assume that $x \neq 0$ to simplify the notation. For $|x| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$, assume that the claim is not true. Then

$$\exists y \text{ s.t. } |y| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \text{ and } |g(y)| > 2\alpha|y|$$

Define

$$r = \max_{|x| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \frac{|g(x)|}{2\alpha|x|} \text{ and } \tilde{g}(x) = \frac{g(x)}{r}$$

It holds that $r > 1$ and $\tilde{g} \in P_L$, additionally

$$|\tilde{g}(x)| = \frac{|g(x)|}{2\alpha|x|} \cdot \frac{1}{r} \cdot 2\alpha|x| \leq 2\alpha|x| \text{ for } |x| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \quad \text{since } \frac{|g(x)|}{2\alpha|x|} \cdot \frac{1}{r} \leq 1 \text{ for } |x| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$$

Furthermore, since $\frac{|g(x)|}{2\alpha|x|}$ is a continuous function, it achieves a maximum in the closed interval $|x| \leq \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$. Thus,

$$\exists z \text{ s.t. } |z| \leq \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \text{ and } |\tilde{g}(z)| = 2\alpha|z|$$

However, we show that such z cannot exist leading to a contradiction.

We have established that

$$\tilde{g}(x) \in P_L \text{ and } \tilde{g}(0) = \tilde{g}'(0) = 0 \text{ and } \tilde{g}(x) \leq 2\alpha|x| \text{ for } |x| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$$

By assumption $\frac{\beta}{\alpha} < C \cdot \frac{\delta}{2}$ and lemma D.20, it follows that

$$|\tilde{g}(x)| \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}\alpha L}{\delta} \cdot x^2 \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \delta/L$$

The desired contraction immediately follows

$$\text{for } |x| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \quad |\tilde{g}(x)| < 2\alpha|x| \iff C \cdot \frac{L}{\delta} \cdot |x| < 1 \iff \frac{\beta}{\alpha} < C \cdot \frac{\delta}{L}$$

□

Corollary D.15 (Of Lemma D.21 and Lemma D.20). *Let $g \in P_L$ and $\alpha > 1$ such that*

$$g(0) = g'(0) = 0 \text{ and } |g(x)| \leq \alpha \cdot |x| + \beta \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \delta$$

It holds that

$$|g(x)| \leq 4\sqrt{2} \cdot \alpha \cdot \frac{L}{\delta} \cdot x^2 \quad \text{for } |x| \leq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and } \beta < \frac{\alpha}{2\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{\delta}{L}.$$

E Critical separation for the Gaussian white noise model

In the following we prove Lemma 4.1, which provides lower and upper bounds on the critical separation for the Gaussian white noise model. The arguments are based on sections 4.1 and 4.2 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#). Finally, we note that the lower bound depends on Lemma E.22, which is stated and proved at the end of this section.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Upper bound. Assume that we observe a realization of a Gaussian white noise model (28)

$$dX(t) = f(t) dt + \sigma \cdot dW(t) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1].$$

Our goal is to test the hypotheses (29)

$$H_0 : f \in \mathcal{G}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : f \in \mathcal{G}_1^s,$$

by using a tolerant test designed for a Gaussian sequence model (10).

We note that observing the Gaussian white noise model (28) corresponds to having access to any projection in $L_2[0, 1]$:

$$X(g) = v(g) + \sigma \cdot W(g) \quad \forall g \in L_2[0, 1]$$

where

$$v(g) = \int_0^1 g(t) \cdot f(t) dt \quad \text{and} \quad W(g) = \int_0^1 g(t) dW(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \|g\|_2^2).$$

Let Δ_d be a uniform partition of $[0, 1]$ into d intervals of length $1/d$

$$I_i = \left[\frac{i-1}{d}, \frac{i}{d} \right] \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d$$

and define

$$\varphi_i = d^{1/2} \cdot \delta_{I_i}.$$

It follows that $\varphi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is an orthonormal basis in $L_2[0, 1]$:

$$\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{L_2[0,1]} = d \int \delta_{I_i} \cdot \delta_{I_j} = \delta_{i=j}.$$

Define the following d observation by projecting onto the orthonormal basis:

$$X_i = X(\varphi_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(v_i, \sigma^2) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

For any $f \in L_2[0, 1]$, let f_φ be its projection onto the above basis:

$$f_\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi_i \cdot v_i \quad \text{where } v_i = \langle f, \varphi_i \rangle_{L_2[0,1]}.$$

Since $\varphi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is a basis, under the null hypothesis, $H_0 : \|f\|_p \leq \epsilon_0$, it holds that

$$\epsilon_0 \geq \|f\|_p \geq \|f_\varphi\|_p = h(0, p) \cdot \|v\|_p$$

where $h(0, p) = d^{1/2-1/p}$. Consequently,

$$\|v\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \quad \text{where } \tilde{\epsilon}_0 = h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_0.$$

Under the alternative hypothesis $H_1 : \epsilon_1 \leq \|f\|_p$ and $\|f\|_{s,p,q} \leq L$, it follows by Lemma H.24 that

$$\|f_\varphi\|_p \geq C_2 \cdot \epsilon_1 - C_3 \cdot C \cdot d^{-s} = \frac{C_2}{2} \epsilon_1 \quad \text{for } d = \left[\frac{C_3 C}{C_2/2} \right]^{1/s} \cdot \epsilon_1^{-1/s}.$$

Finally, by Equation 4.2 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#), it holds that

$$\|v\|_p \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \quad \text{where } \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \frac{C_0 C_2}{2} \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_1.$$

Consequently, we have reduced the Gaussian white noise problem to the following Gaussian sequence:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Given } & X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(v_i, \sigma^2) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d \\ \text{Test } & H_0 : \|v\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|v\|_p \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.36})$$

Let ψ be the minimax test statistic for (E.36). We define the following test for hypotheses (29)

$$\psi(X, \epsilon_0) = \psi(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\epsilon}_0) \text{ where } \tilde{X} = \{X_i\}_{i=1}^d.$$

It follows that the hypotheses (29) can be consistently distinguished for any

$$\epsilon_1 \text{ s.t. } \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0)$$

where $d \asymp \epsilon_1^{-1/s}$. Hence, we have that

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GW}) - \epsilon_0 \lesssim (\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0) \cdot h(0, p)$$

where $d^{-s} \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) \cdot h(0, p)$.

Lower bound. Using the null and alternative hypotheses sets in Lemma E.22, tolerant testing under the Gaussian white noise model (29) is at least as hard as tolerant testing under the following Gaussian sequence model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Given } & X_i = X(\varphi_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(v_i, \sigma^2) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d \\ \text{Test } & H_0 : \|v\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|v\|_p = \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_0 = C_0 \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_0, \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = C_1 \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_1, \quad d = \left[\frac{C_0}{C_1} \cdot L \right]^{1/s} \cdot \epsilon_1^{-1/s},$$

and C_0 and C_1 are positive constants.

Fixing ϵ_0 , the hypotheses cannot be consistently distinguished for any

$$\epsilon_1 \text{ s.t. } \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0)$$

where $d \asymp \epsilon_1^{-1/s}$. Hence, we have that

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \text{GW}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim (\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0) \cdot h(0, p)$$

where $d^{-s} \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \text{GS}) \cdot h(0, p)$.

□

We conclude the section by proving Lemma E.22.

Lemma E.22. *Let φ be any $(s+2)$ -continuously differentiable function supported on $(0,1)$ with $\|\varphi\|_2 = 1$, and define the following orthonormal system in $L_2[0,1]$ with disjoint supports*

$$\varphi_i(t) = d^{1/2} \cdot \varphi(d \cdot t - i + 1) \cdot \delta_{I_i} \text{ where } I_i = \left[\frac{i-1}{d}, \frac{i}{d} \right] \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Henceforth, for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let

$$f_{\varphi,v} = \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi_i \cdot v_i.$$

For $s \geq 0$, $\epsilon_1 \geq \epsilon_0 \geq 0$, define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0 &= \{f_{\varphi,v} : v \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \|v\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0\} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1^s &= \{f_{\varphi,v} : v \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \|v\|_p = \tilde{\epsilon}_1\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_0 = C_0 \cdot d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot \epsilon_0, \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = C_1 \cdot d^{1/p-1/2} \cdot \epsilon_1 \text{ and } d = \left[\frac{C_0}{C_1} \cdot L \right]^{1/s} \cdot \epsilon_1^{-1/s},$$

and C_0 and C_1 are positive constants.

Finally, consider hypotheses (29), it follows that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0 \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1^s \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1^s$$

Proof. Let $h(s,p) = d^{s+1/2-1/p}$, then Equation (4.2) of [Ingster \[2001\]](#) states that

$$C_0 \cdot \|f_{\varphi,v}\|_p \leq \|v\|_p \cdot h(0,p) \leq C_1 \cdot \|f_{\varphi,v}\|_p.$$

Thus, it holds that

$$\|v\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \implies \|f_{\varphi,v}\|_p \leq \epsilon_0,$$

which implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$. Furthermore, we have that

$$\|v\|_p \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \implies \|f_{\varphi,v}\|_p \geq \epsilon_1.$$

By Equation (4.1) of [Ingster \[2001\]](#), it holds that

$$C_0 \cdot \|f_{\varphi,v}\|_{s,p,q} \leq \|v\|_p \cdot h(s,p) \leq C_1 \cdot \|f_{\varphi,v}\|_{s,p,q}.$$

Thus, we guarantee that $\|f_{\varphi,v}\|_{s,p,q} \leq L$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1^s \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1^s$ whenever

$$\|v\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = CC_0 \cdot h(s,p)^{-1},$$

which is implied by

$$C_1 \cdot h(0,p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_1 = C_0 C \cdot h(s,p)^{-1},$$

or equivalently

$$d^s = \frac{C_0}{C_1} \cdot L \cdot \epsilon_1^{-1}.$$

□

F Critical separation for the Density model

In this section, we prove Lemma 5.1, which provides upper and lower bounds for the critical separation of the density model. The proof of the lower bound depends on Lemma F.23, which is stated and proved at the end of this section.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Upper bound. Assume that we have access to n observations from a density (30)

$$X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} f \text{ where } f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Our goal is to test the hypotheses (31)

$$H_0 : f \in \mathcal{D}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : f \in \mathcal{D}_1^s,$$

by using a tolerant test for Multinomial distributions.

Let $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a uniform partition of $[0, 1]$ into d intervals of length $1/d$:

$$I_i = \left[\frac{i-1}{d}, \frac{i}{d} \right] \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d$$

and define the functions

$$\varphi_i = d^{1/2} \cdot \delta_{I_i} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

It follows that $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is an orthonormal basis in $L_2[0, 1]$:

$$\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{L_2[0,1]} = d \int \delta_{I_i} \cdot \delta_{I_j} = \delta_{i=j}$$

Define the following d observations:

$$Y_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{I_i}(X_j) \quad 1 \leq i \leq d$$

For any $f \in L_2[0, 1]$, let f_φ be its projection into $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^d$. Namely,

$$f_\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi_i \cdot v_i(f) \text{ where } v_i(f) = \langle f, \varphi_i \rangle_{L_2[0,1]} = d^{1/2} \cdot F_i \text{ and } F_i = \int_{I_i} f(u) \, du.$$

Consequently, we have that

$$(Y_1, \dots, Y_d) \sim \mathcal{M}_d(n, F).$$

Since $\varphi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is a basis, under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \|f - g\|_p \leq \epsilon_0$, it holds that

$$\epsilon_0 \geq \|f - g\|_p \geq \|f_\varphi - g_\varphi\|_p = h(0, p) \cdot \|v(f) - v(g)\|_p = h(0, p) \cdot d^{1/2} \cdot \|F - G\|_p.$$

where $h(0, p) = d^{1/2-1/p}$. Thus, under the null hypothesis, it holds that

$$\|F - G\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \text{ where } \tilde{\epsilon}_0 = d^{-1/2} \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_0$$

Under the alternative hypothesis $H_1 : \epsilon_1 \leq \|f - g\|_p$ and $\|f - g\|_{s,p,q} \leq L$. By Lemma H.24, it follows that

$$\|f_\varphi - g_\varphi\|_p \geq C_2 \cdot \epsilon_1 - C_3 \cdot L \cdot d^{-s} = \frac{C_2}{2} \epsilon_1 \quad \text{for } d = \left[\frac{C_3}{C_2/2} \cdot L \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon_1} \right]^{1/s}$$

Furthermore, by Equation (4.2) of Ingster [2001], it holds that

$$C_0 \cdot \|f_\varphi - f_\varphi\|_p \leq d^{1/2} \cdot \|F - G\|_p \cdot h(0, p).$$

Consequently, under the alternative hypothesis, it holds that

$$\|F - G\|_p \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \quad \text{where } \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \frac{C_0 C_2}{2} \cdot d^{-1/2} \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_1.$$

In summary, we have reduced the tolerant testing under the density model to tolerant testing under the Multinomial model

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Given } Y \sim \mathcal{M}_d(n, F) \\ &\text{Test } H_0 : \|F - G\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|F - G\|_p \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \end{aligned} \tag{F.37}$$

Let $\tilde{\psi}$ be the minimax test statistic for (F.37). We define the following test for hypotheses (31)

$$\psi(X, \epsilon_0) = \tilde{\psi}(Y, \tilde{\epsilon}_0)$$

It follows that the hypotheses (31) can be consistently distinguished for

$$\epsilon_1 \text{ s.t. } \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp d^{-1/2} \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0)$$

where $d \asymp \epsilon_1^{-1/s}$. Hence, we have that

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \mathcal{D}) - \epsilon_0 \lesssim (\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) - \epsilon_0) \cdot h(0, p) \cdot d^{1/2}$$

where $d^{-s} \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) \cdot d^{1/2} \cdot h(0, p)$.

Lower bound. Using the null and alternative hypotheses sets in Lemma F.23, tolerant testing under the density model (31) is at least as hard as tolerant testing under the following Multinomial model:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Given } (Y_1, \dots, Y_d) \sim \mathcal{M}_d(n, F) \\ &\text{Test } H_0 : \|F - G\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : \|F - G\|_p = \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_0 = C_0 \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_0, \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = C_1 \cdot h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot d^{-1/2} \cdot \epsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad d = \left[\frac{C_0}{C_1} \cdot L \right]^{1/s} \cdot \epsilon_1^{-1/s},$$

$h(0, p) = d^{1/2-1/p}$, and C_0 and C_1 are positive constants. Fixing ϵ_0 , the hypotheses cannot be consistently distinguished for any

$$\epsilon_1 \text{ s.t. } \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_0 \asymp h(0, p)^{-1} \cdot d^{-1/2} \cdot (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0)$$

where $d \asymp \epsilon_1^{-1/s}$. Hence, we have that

$$\epsilon_1^*(\epsilon_0, \mathcal{D}) - \epsilon_0 \gtrsim (\epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) - \tilde{\epsilon}_0) \cdot h(0, p)$$

where $d^{-s} \asymp \epsilon_1^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \mathcal{M}_d) \cdot h(0, p) \cdot d^{1/2}$.

□

We conclude this section by proving Lemma F.23.

Lemma F.23. *Let φ be any $(s+2)$ -continuously differentiable function supported on $(0, 1)$ with $\|\varphi\|_2 = 1$ and $\|\varphi\|_1 = 1$, and define the following orthonormal system in $L_2[0, 1]$ with disjoint supports*

$$\tilde{\varphi}_i(t) = d^{1/2} \cdot \varphi(d \cdot t - i + 1) \cdot \delta_{I_i}(t) \quad \text{where } I_i = \left[\frac{i-1}{d}, \frac{i}{d} \right] \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Henceforth, for any $F, G \in \Delta^d$, let

$$f_\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi_i \cdot F_i \quad \text{and} \quad g_\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi_i \cdot G_i \quad \text{where } \varphi_i = \tilde{\varphi}_i \cdot d^{1/2}.$$

For $s \geq 0$, $\epsilon_1 \geq \epsilon_0 \geq 0$, define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0 &= \{f_\varphi \in \mathcal{D} : F \in \Delta^d \text{ and } \|F - G\|_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0\} \\ \text{and } \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1^s &= \{f_\varphi \in \mathcal{D} : F \in \Delta^d \text{ and } \|F - G\|_p = \tilde{\epsilon}_1\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_0 = C_0 \cdot d^{1/p-1} \cdot \epsilon_0, \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = C_1 \cdot d^{1/p-1} \cdot \epsilon_1, \text{ and } d = \left[\frac{C_0}{C_1} \cdot L \right]^{1/s} \cdot \epsilon_1^{-1/s},$$

and C_0 and C_1 are positive constants. Consider hypotheses (31), it follows that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1^s \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1^s.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int f_\varphi &= 1 \iff 1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi_i \cdot F_i \\ &\iff F \in \Delta^d \text{ and } \int_{I_i} \varphi_i(t) dt = 1 \\ &\iff F \in \Delta^d \text{ and } \int_{I_i} \varphi(d \cdot t - i + 1) dt = \frac{1}{d} \\ &\iff F \in \Delta^d \text{ and } \int_0^1 |\varphi(t)| dt = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we have that $\int g_\varphi = 1$. Following a similar argument to the proof of Lemma E.22, it follows that $\|f_\varphi - g_\varphi\|_p \leq \epsilon_0$ for $f_\varphi \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0$. Thus, $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_0$. Furthermore, $\|f_\varphi - g_\varphi\|_p = \epsilon_1$ and $\|f_\varphi - g_\varphi\|_{s,p,q} \leq L$ for $f_\varphi \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1^s$. Thus, $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1^s \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1^s$. □

G Critical separation for the Poisson sequence model

This section reviews the known fact that Multinomial and Poisson sequence models are equivalent when restricted to the simplex. The equivalence is based on the Poissonization trick [Canonne, 2022, Kim et al., 2023], and the testing algorithm proposed by Neykov et al. [2021].

Henceforth, restrict λ and λ_0 to be a positive d -dimensional probability vectors

$$\lambda, \lambda_0 \in \Delta^d, \min_{1 \leq i \leq d} \lambda_i > 0 \text{ and } \min_{1 \leq i \leq d} \lambda_{0,i} > 0.$$

Furthermore, let $\epsilon_1^*(n, \text{Poi}_d)$ denote the critical separation for tolerant testing under the Poisson sequence model

$$\text{Given } X_i \sim \text{Poi}(n \cdot \lambda_i) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d \quad (\text{G.38})$$

$$\text{Test } H_0 : (\lambda - \lambda_0) \in V_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : (\lambda - \lambda_0) \in V_1$$

and let $\epsilon_1^*(n, \mathcal{M}_d)$ denote the critical separation for tolerant testing under the Multinomial model

$$\text{Given } X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{M}(1, \lambda) \text{ where } \mathcal{M}(1, \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^d \delta_i \cdot \lambda_i \quad (\text{G.39})$$

$$\text{Test } H_0 : (\lambda - \lambda_0) \in V_0 \text{ versus } H_1 : (\lambda - \lambda_0) \in V_1.$$

It holds that

$$\epsilon_1^*(n, \text{Poi}_d) \asymp \epsilon_1^*(n, \mathcal{M}_d)$$

From Multinomial to Poisson. Let ψ_n be a test for problem (G.38) that controls type-I and type-II error by α and β respectively. Furthermore, for $k \leq n$, define

$$X^k = \sum_{i=1}^k X_i \sim \mathcal{M}(k, \lambda),$$

and note that

$$X^{\tilde{n}} | \tilde{n} \sim \mathcal{M}(\tilde{n}, \lambda) \text{ and } X^{\tilde{n}} \sim \text{Poi}(n \cdot \lambda) \text{ for } \tilde{n} \sim \text{Poi}(n/2).$$

We proceed as follows: sample $\tilde{n} \sim \text{Poi}(n/2)$, $\tilde{n} > n$, accept the null hypothesis. Otherwise, return $\psi_{\tilde{n}}(X^{\tilde{n}})$. That is, we construct the following randomized test

$$\psi(X) = \psi_{\tilde{n}}(X^{\tilde{n}}) \cdot I(\tilde{n} \leq n) \quad \text{where } \tilde{n} \sim \text{Poi}(n/2).$$

First note that the type-I error is bounded by α :

$$P_{X, \tilde{n}}(\tilde{\psi}(X) = 1) \leq P_{X^{\tilde{n}} \sim \text{Poi}(n \cdot \lambda)}(\psi_{\tilde{n}}(X^{\tilde{n}}) = 1) \leq \alpha$$

where the last inequality follows from the facts that $X^{\tilde{n}} \sim \text{Poi}(n \cdot \lambda)$ and $\psi_{\tilde{n}}$ is a valid test. Furthermore, the type-II error is bounded by 2β . To see that, first note that by

the concentration of measure of Poisson random variables, and the fact that $\psi_{\tilde{n}}$ is a powerful test, we have that

$$P_{X,\tilde{n}}(\tilde{\psi}(X) = 0) = P_{X^{\tilde{n}} \sim \text{Poi}(n \cdot \lambda)}(\psi_{\tilde{n}}(X^{\tilde{n}}) = 0) + P_{\tilde{n} \sim \text{Poi}(n/2)}(\tilde{n} > n) \leq \beta + e^{-n/8}.$$

Consequently,

$$P_{X,\tilde{n}}(\tilde{\psi}(X) = 0) \leq 2\beta \quad \text{for } n \geq 8 \log(1/\beta).$$

In summary, we have that

$$\epsilon_1^*(n, \mathcal{M}_d) \gtrsim \epsilon_1^*(n, \text{Poi}_d) \quad \text{for } n \gtrsim 1.$$

From Poisson to Multinomial. Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$, it holds that

$$X|K \sim \mathcal{M}(K, \lambda) \quad \text{where } K = \sum_{i=1}^d X_i \sim \text{Poi}(n).$$

Let ψ_k be a test that controls type-I and II errors in (G.39) for $n = k$, and define the test

$$\psi(X) = \psi_K(X) \cdot I(\mathcal{A}) \quad \text{where } \mathcal{A} = \left\{ \frac{n}{2} \leq K \leq \frac{3}{2}n \right\}.$$

For type-I error, it follows that

$$P_X(\tilde{\psi}(X) = 1) \leq E_K [I(\mathcal{A}) \cdot E_{X|K} [\psi_K(X)]] \leq \alpha,$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that $X|K \sim \mathcal{M}(K, \lambda)$ and $\psi_K(X)$ is a valid test. Finally, the type-II error is at most doubled

$$\begin{aligned} P_X(\psi(X) = 0) &= P_X(\psi(X) = 1|\mathcal{A}) + P(\mathcal{A}^c) \\ &\leq E_K [I(\mathcal{A}) \cdot E_{X|K} [1 - \psi_K(X)]] + 2 \exp(-n/12) \\ &\leq 2\beta \quad \text{for } n \geq 12 \cdot \log(2/\beta), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the concentration of measure for the Poisson random variable K and the fact that $\psi_K(X)$ is powerful.

Note that we have mapped one Poisson hypothesis testing problem to a set of Multinomial hypothesis testing problems. Thus, the overall difficulty is dominated by the hardest of the problems. Namely,

$$\epsilon_1^*(n, \text{Poi}) \gtrsim \max_{\frac{n}{2} \leq k \leq \frac{3}{2}n} \epsilon_1^*(k, \mathcal{M}_d) = \epsilon_1^*\left(\frac{n}{2}, \mathcal{M}_d\right) \quad \text{for } n \gtrsim 1$$

H Besov norm

We refer the reader to section 4.3 of [Giné and Nickl \[2016\]](#) for an introduction to the Besov norm. In the following, we state the definition of the Besov norm, followed up by

a lemma that indicates that projections of functions in a Besov ball are well behaved, which is needed for our lower-bound arguments for the Gaussian white-noise model, see Section E, and the density model, see Section F.

The Besov norm is defined as

$$\|f\|_{s,p,q} = \|f\|_p + \begin{cases} \left[\int_0^\infty \left(\frac{w_{r,p}(f,u)}{u^s} \right)^q \frac{du}{u} \right]^{1/q} & \text{if } 1 \leq q < \infty \\ \sup_{0 < u < 1} \frac{w_{r,p}(f,u)}{u^s} & \text{if } q = \infty \end{cases}$$

where $\|f\|_p$ is the norm in $L_p(0,1)$ and $w_{r,p}(f,u)$ is the L_p norm of the r th difference of f :

$$w_{r,p}(f,u) = \int_0^{1-ru} |(\Delta_u^{(r)} f)(t)|^p dt \quad \text{where} \quad (\Delta_u^{(r)} f)(t) = \sum_{k=0}^r C_r^k (-1)^k f(t+ku).$$

The previous definitions allow us to state that low-frequency projections of functions that live in a Besov space preserve the size of the L_p norm. The following lemma can be found in inequality 5.16 of part III of [Ingster \[1993\]](#) or inequality 4.10 of [Ingster \[2001\]](#). A simple proof is provided in proposition 2.16 of [Ingster and Suslina \[2003\]](#).

Lemma H.24 (Projection of functions on a Besov ball). *Let $p \geq 1$ and $s > 0$. For any $f \in L_2(0,1)$ such that $\|f\|_{s,p,q} \leq L$. Furthermore, let $\varphi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be an d -dimensional orthonormal system in $L_2[0,1]$, and define the L_2 projection of f onto φ :*

$$f_\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi_i \cdot v_i \quad \text{where} \quad v_i = \langle f, \varphi_i \rangle_{L_2[0,1]}.$$

It holds that

$$\|f_\varphi\|_p \geq C_2 \cdot \|f\|_p - C_3 \cdot L \cdot d^{-s} \tag{H.40}$$

where C_2 and C_3 are positive constants that depend only on (p,s) .

Note that (H.40) is weaker than guaranteeing a bound on the approximation error

$$\|f - f_\varphi\|_p \leq C' \cdot L \cdot d^{-s}$$

which doesn't hold for $s > 1$. In other words, f_φ might be a bad approximation for f but still have good projection properties, which allow us to construct consistent tests.

References

Jayadev Acharya, Constantinos Daskalakis, and Gautam Kamath. Optimal Testing for Properties of Distributions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28, 2015.

- Ery Arias-Castro, Bruno Pelletier, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Remember the curse of dimensionality: The case of goodness-of-fit testing in arbitrary dimension. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 30(2):448–471, 2018.
- ATLAS. The atlas experiment at the cern large hadron collider. *JINST*, 3:S08003, 2008.
- Amparo Baíllo and Javier Cárcamo. Bootstrap tests for almost goodness-of-fit, 2025. arXiv:2410.20918.
- Sivaraman Balakrishnan and Larry Wasserman. Hypothesis testing for high-dimensional multinomials: A selective review. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 12(2), 2018.
- Sivaraman Balakrishnan and Larry Wasserman. Hypothesis testing for densities and high-dimensional multinomials: Sharp local minimax rates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(4):1893–1927, 2019.
- Robert Gardner Bartle. *The Elements of Integration and Lebesgue Measure*. Wiley Classics Library. Wiley, New York, wiley classics library ed edition, 1995. ISBN 978-0-471-04222-8.
- T. Batu, L. Fortnow, R. Rubinfeld, W.D. Smith, and P. White. Testing that distributions are close. In *Proceedings 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 259–269, 2000.
- Tuğkan Batu, Lance Fortnow, Ronitt Rubinfeld, Warren D. Smith, and Patrick White. Testing closeness of discrete distributions. *J. ACM*, 60(1), 2013.
- Tadeusz Bednarski. Binary Experiments, Minimax Tests and 2-Alternating Capacities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 10, 1982.
- Serge Bernstein. *Sur l'ordre de La Meilleure Approximation Des Fonctions Continues Par Des Polynômes de Degré Donné*, volume 4. Hayez, imprimeur des académies royales, 1912.
- Arnab Bhattacharyya, Davin Choo, Philips George John, and Themis Gouleakis. Learning multivariate Gaussians with imperfect advice, 2025. arXiv:2411.12700.
- Peter J. Bickel and Yaacov Ritov. Estimating integrated squared density derivatives: Sharp best order of convergence estimates. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 381–393, 1988.
- Peter J. Bickel, Ya'acov Ritov, and Thomas M. Stoker. Tailor-made tests for goodness of fit to semiparametric hypotheses. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(2), 2006.
- Lucien Birgé. *Sur un théoreme de minimax et son application aux tests*. Univ. de Paris-Sud, Dép. de Mathématique, 1979.

- Lucien Birgé. Approximation dans les espaces métriques et théorie de l'estimation. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 65, 1983a.
- Lucien Birgé. Robust Testing for Independent Non Identically Distributed Variables and Markov Chains. In *Specifying Statistical Models*. Springer, 1983b.
- Lucien Birgé. Discussion of “Hypotheses testing by convex optimization”. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9, 2015.
- Lucien Birgé and Pascal Massart. Estimation of integral functionals of a density. *The Annals of Statistics*, 23(1):11–29, 1995.
- T. Tony Cai and Mark G. Low. Testing composite hypotheses, Hermite polynomials and optimal estimation of a nonsmooth functional. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(2): 1012–1041, 2011.
- Clément L. Canonne. *Topics and Techniques in Distribution Testing*. Now Publishers, 2022.
- Clément L. Canonne, Ilias Diakonikolas, Themis Gouleakis, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Testing Shape Restrictions of Discrete Distributions. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 62(1):4–62, 2018.
- Clément L. Canonne, Ayush Jain, Gautam Kamath, and Jerry Li. The Price of Tolerance in Distribution Testing. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 573–624. PMLR, 2022.
- Alexandra Carpentier and Nicolas Verzelen. Adaptive estimation of the sparsity in the Gaussian vector model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47, 2019.
- Andrew V. Carter. Deficiency distance between multinomial and multivariate normal experiments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(3):708–730, 2002.
- Sourav Chakraborty, Eldar Fischer, Arijit Ghosh, Gopinath Mishra, and Sayantan Sen. Exploring the Gap between Tolerant and Non-tolerant Distribution Testing, 2022.
- Siu-On Chan, Ilias Diakonikolas, Paul Valiant, and Gregory Valiant. Optimal Algorithms for Testing Closeness of Discrete Distributions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1193–1203. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2014.
- Siu Lun Chau, Antonin Schrab, Arthur Gretton, Dino Sejdinovic, and Krikamol Muandet. Credal Two-Sample Tests of Epistemic Uncertainty, 2025. arXiv:2410.12921.
- Shein-Chung Chow. Bioavailability and bioequivalence in drug development. *WIREs Computational Statistics*, 6(4):304–312, 2014.
- James A. Clarkson. Uniformly Convex Spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 40(3):396–414, 1936.

- Constantinos Daskalakis, Gautam Kamath, and John Wright. Which distribution distances are sublinearly testable? In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2747–2764. SIAM, 2018.
- Eustasio del Barrio, Hristo Inouzhe, and Carlos Matrán. On approximate validation of models: A Kolmogorov-Smirnov based approach. *TEST*, 29(4):938–965, 2020.
- Ilias Diakonikolas and Daniel M Kane. A new approach for testing properties of discrete distributions. In *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 685–694. IEEE, 2016.
- Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M Kane, and Vladimir Nikishkin. Testing identity of structured distributions. In *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1841–1854. SIAM, 2015.
- David L. Donoho and Richard C. Liu. Geometrizing Rates of Convergence, II. *The Annals of Statistics*, 19, 1991.
- Vladimir Dragalin, Valerii Fedorov, Scott Patterson, and Byron Jones. Kullback–Leibler divergence for evaluating bioequivalence. *Statistics in Medicine*, 22(6):913–930, 2003.
- M. S. Ermakov. Asymptotically minimax tests for nonparametric hypotheses concerning the distribution density. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 52(2):2891–2898, 1990.
- M. S. Ermakov. Minimax Detection of a Signal In a Gaussian White Noise. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 35(4):667–679, 1991.
- FDA. Guidance for industry: statistical approaches to establishing bioequivalence. *US Department of Health and Human Services, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research*, 2001.
- Gudrun Freitag, Claudia Czado, and Axel Munk. A nonparametric test for similarity of marginals—With applications to the assessment of population bioequivalence. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 137(3):697–711, 2007.
- Patrik R Gerber, Yanjun Han, and Yury Polyanskiy. Minimax optimal testing by classification. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5395–5432. PMLR, 2023a.
- Patrik Róbert Gerber and Yury Polyanskiy. Likelihood-free hypothesis testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(11):7971–8000, 2024.
- Patrik Róbert Gerber, Tianze Jiang, Yury Polyanskiy, and Rui Sun. Kernel-based tests for likelihood-free hypothesis testing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:15680–15715, 2023b.
- Evarist Giné and Richard Nickl. A simple adaptive estimator of the integrated square of a density. *Bernoulli*, 14(1), 2008. ISSN 1350-7265.

- Evarist Giné and Richard Nickl. *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 2016. ISBN 978-1-107-04316-9.
- Arthur Gretton, Karsten Borgwardt, Malte Rasch, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alex Smola. A kernel method for the two-sample-problem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 19, 2006.
- YanJun Han, Jiantao Jiao, and Tsachy Weissman. Minimax Estimation of Discrete Distributions Under ℓ_1 Loss. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(11): 6343–6354, 2015.
- YanJun Han, Jiantao Jiao, and Rajarshi Mukherjee. On estimation of L_r norms in Gaussian white noise models. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 177(3-4):1243–1294, 2020.
- Joel Heinrich and Louis Lyons. Systematic errors. *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 57(1): 145–169, 2007.
- Peter J. Huber. A Robust Version of the Probability Ratio Test. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(6):1753–1758, 1965.
- Peter J. Huber and Volker Strassen. Minimax Tests and the Neyman-Pearson Lemma for Capacities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1, 1973.
- I. A. Ibragimov, A. S. Nemirovskii, and R. Z. Khas'minskii. Some Problems on Non-parametric Estimation in Gaussian White Noise. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 31, 1987.
- Yuri I. Ingster. On the minimax nonparametric detection of signals in white gaussian noise. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 18(2):61–73, 1982.
- Yuri I. Ingster. Asymptotically minimax hypothesis testing for nonparametric alternatives. I, II and III. *Math. Methods Statist*, 2(2):85–114, 1993.
- Yuri. I. Ingster. Minimax detection of a signal in ℓ_p metrics. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 68, 1994.
- Yuri. I. Ingster. On Testing a Hypothesis Which Is Close to a Simple Hypothesis. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 45(2):310–323, 2001.
- Yuri. I. Ingster and Irina A. Suslina. *Nonparametric Goodness-of-Fit Testing Under Gaussian Models*, volume 169. Springer, 2003.
- Arnold Janssen. Global Power Functions of Goodness of Fit Tests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 28, 2000.
- Zeyu Jia and Yury Polyanskiy. Gaussian Sequence Model: Sample Complexities of Testing, Estimation and LFHT, 2025. arXiv:2507.16734.

- Jiantao Jiao, Yanjun Han, and Tsachy Weissman. Minimax Estimation of the L_1 distance. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(10):6672–6706, 2018.
- Iain M. Johnstone. Gaussian estimation: Sequence and wavelet models. Unpublished manuscript, 2019. URL https://imjohnstone.su.domains/GE_09_16_19.pdf.
- Sergei Kalmykov, Béla Nagy, and Vilmos Totik. Bernstein- and Markov-type inequalities, 2021. arXiv:2104.02348.
- Gerard Kerkycharian and Dominique Picard. Estimating Nonquadratic Functionals of a Density Using Haar Wavelets. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(2):485–507, 1996. ISSN 0090-5364.
- Ilmun Kim, Matey Neykov, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, and Larry Wasserman. Conditional Independence Testing for Discrete Distributions: Beyond χ^2 and G tests, 2023. arXiv:2308.05373.
- Vladimir Koltchinskii and Mayya Zhilova. Efficient estimation of smooth functionals in Gaussian shift models. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57, 2021a.
- Vladimir Koltchinskii and Mayya Zhilova. Estimation of Smooth Functionals in Normal Models: Bias Reduction and Asymptotic Efficiency. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49, 2021b.
- Charles Kraft. Some conditions for consistency and uniform consistency of statistical procedures. *University of California Publication in Statistics*, 2, 1955.
- Mikael Kuusela and Victor M Panaretos. Statistical unfolding of elementary particle spectra: Empirical bayes estimation and bias-corrected uncertainty quantification. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 9(3), 2015.
- Béatrice Laurent. Efficient estimation of integral functionals of a density. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(2):659–681, 1996.
- L. Le Cam. Convergence of Estimates Under Dimensionality Restrictions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1, 1973.
- Lucien Le Cam. *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory*. Springer New York, 1986.
- O. Lepski, A. Nemirovski, and V. Spokoiny. On estimation of the L_r norm of a regression function. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 113(2):221–253, 1999.
- Oleg V. Lepski and Vladimir G. Spokoiny. Minimax Nonparametric Hypothesis Testing: The Case of an Inhomogeneous Alternative. *Bernoulli*, 5(2):333, 1999.
- Isaac Levi. *The enterprise of knowledge: An essay on knowledge, credal probability, and chance*. MIT press, 1980.

- Jiawei Liu and Bruce G. Lindsay. Building and using semiparametric tolerance regions for parametric multinomial models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(6A):3644–3659, 2009.
- Xing Liu and François-Xavier Briol. On the Robustness of Kernel Goodness-of-Fit Tests, 2024. arXiv:2408.05854.
- H. B. Mann and A. Wald. On the Choice of the Number of Class Intervals in the Application of the Chi Square Test. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 13(3):306–317, 1942.
- Ester Mariucci. Le cam theory on the comparison of statistical models, 2016. arXiv:1605.03301.
- D. J. Newman and T. J. Rivlin. Approximation of monomials by lower degree polynomials. *aequationes mathematicae*, 14(3):451–455, 1976.
- Matey Neykov, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, and Larry Wasserman. Minimax Optimal Conditional Independence Testing, 2021. arXiv:2001.03039.
- Michael Nussbaum. Asymptotic equivalence of density estimation and Gaussian white noise. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(6):2399–2430, 1996.
- Liam Paninski. A Coincidence-Based Test for Uniformity Given Very Sparsely Sampled Discrete Data. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54, 2008.
- Michal Parnas, Dana Ron, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Tolerant property testing and distance approximation. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(6):1012–1042, 2006.
- Kolyan Ray and Johannes Schmidt-Hieber. The Le Cam distance between density estimation, Poisson processes and Gaussian white noise. *Mathematical Statistics and Learning*, 1, 2018.
- Helmut Rieder. Least Favorable Pairs for Special Capacities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 5, 1977.
- James Robins, Lingling Li, Eric Tchetgen, and Aad W. van der Vaart. Quadratic semiparametric Von Mises calculus. *Metrika*, 69(2-3):227–247, 2009. ISSN 0026-1335.
- Joseph P. Romano. Optimal testing of equivalence hypotheses. *The Annals of Statistics*, 33(3), 2005.
- Arvind K. Saibaba. Approximating monomials using Chebyshev polynomials, 2021. arXiv:2101.06818.
- Yusuf Sale, Michele Caprio, and Eyke Höllermeier. Is the volume of a credal set a good measure for epistemic uncertainty? In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1795–1804. PMLR, 2023.

- Eric Tchetgen, Lingling Li, James Robins, and Aad van der Vaart. Minimax estimation of the integral of a power of a density. *Statistics & probability letters*, 78(18):3307–3311, 2008.
- Vilmos Totik. Reflections on a theorem of V. Andrievskii. *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*, 148(2):711–738, 2022.
- Alexandre B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer, 2009.
- Gregory Valiant and Paul Valiant. Estimating the unseen: An $n/\log(n)$ -sample estimator for entropy and support size, shown optimal via new CLTs. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. ACM, 2011.
- Gregory Valiant and Paul Valiant. An Automatic Inequality Prover and Instance Optimal Identity Testing. In *Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE Computer Society, 2014.
- Paul Valiant. Testing symmetric properties of distributions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40, 2011.
- David A van Dyk. The role of statistics in the discovery of a higgs boson. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1(1):41–59, 2014.
- Richard S. Varga and Amos J. Carpenter. On the bernstein conjecture in approximation theory. *Constructive Approximation*, 1(1):333–348, 1985.
- Peter Walley. *Statistical Reasoning with Imprecise Probabilities*. Chapman and Hall, 1991.
- Stefan Wellek. *Testing Statistical Hypotheses of Equivalence*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2002.
- Yihong Wu and Pengkun Yang. Minimax Rates of Entropy Estimation on Large Alphabets via Best Polynomial Approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(6):3702–3720, 2016.
- Zhijian Zhou, Liuhua Peng, Xunye Tian, and Feng Liu. A kernel distribution closeness testing, 2025. arXiv:2507.12843.