

Estimation for Monotone Sampling: Competitiveness and Customization

Edith Cohen^{*†}

Abstract

Random samples are lossy summaries which allow queries posed over the data to be approximated by applying an appropriate estimator to the sample. The effectiveness of sampling, however, hinges on estimator selection. The choice of estimators is subjected to global requirements, such as unbiasedness and range restrictions on the estimate value, and ideally, we seek estimators that are both efficient to derive and apply and *admissible* (not dominated, in terms of variance, by other estimators). Nevertheless, for a given data domain, sampling scheme, and query, there are many admissible estimators.

We study the choice of admissible nonnegative and unbiased estimators for monotone sampling schemes. Monotone sampling schemes are implicit in many applications of massive data set analysis. Our main contribution is general derivations of admissible estimators with desirable properties. We present a construction of *order-optimal* estimators, which minimize variance according to *any* specified priorities over the data domain. Order-optimality allows us to customize the derivation to common patterns that we can learn or observe in the data. When we prioritize lower values (e.g., more similar data sets when estimating difference), we obtain the L^* estimator, which is the unique monotone admissible estimator. We show that the L^* estimator is 4-competitive and dominates the classic Horvitz-Thompson estimator. These properties make the L^* estimator a natural default choice. We also present the U^* estimator, which prioritizes large values (e.g., less similar data sets). Our estimator constructions are both easy to apply and possess desirable properties, allowing us to make the most from our summarized data.

1 Introduction

Random sampling is a common tool in the analysis of massive data. Sampling is highly suitable for parallel or distributed platforms. The samples facilitate scalable approximate processing of queries posed over the original data, when exact processing is too resource consuming or when the original data is no longer available. Random samples have a distinct advantage over other synopsis in their flexibility. In particular, they naturally support *domain* (subset) queries, which specify a selected set of records. Moreover, the same sample can be used for basic statistics, such as sums, moments, and averages, and more complex relations: distinct counts, size of set intersections, and difference norms.

The value of a sample hinges on the accuracy within which we can estimate query results. In turn, this boils down to the *estimators* we use, which are the functions we apply to the sample to produce the estimate. As a rule, we are interested in estimators that satisfy desirable *global* properties, which must hold for *all possible data* in our data domain. Common desirable properties are:

- *Unbiasedness*, which means that the expectation of the estimate is equal to the estimated value. Unbiasedness is particularly important when we are ultimately interested in estimating a sum aggregate, and our

^{*}Microsoft Research, Mountain View, CA, USA editco@microsoft.com

estimator is applied to each summand. Typically, the estimate for each summand has high variance, but with unbiasedness (and pairwise independence), the relative error to decreases with aggregation.

- *Range restriction* of estimates: since the estimate is often used as a substitute of the true value, we would like it to be from the same domain as the query result. Often, the domain is *nonnegative* and we would like the estimate to be nonnegative as well. Another natural restriction is *boundedness* which means that all the estimate for each given input is bounded.
- *Finite variance* (implied by boundedness but less restrictive)

Perhaps the most ubiquitous quality measure of an estimator is its variance. The variance, however, is a function of the input data. An important concept in estimation theory is a Uniform Minimum Variance Unbiased (UMVUE) estimator [30], that is, a single estimator which attains the minimum possible variance for all inputs in our data domain [27]. A UMVUE estimator, however, generally does not exist. We instead seek an *admissible* (Pareto variance optimal) estimator [30] – meaning that strict improvement is not possible without violating some global properties. More precisely, an estimator is admissible if there is no other estimator that satisfies the global properties with at most the variance of our estimator on all data and strictly lower variance on some data. A UMVUE must be admissible, but when one does not exist, there is typically a full Pareto front of admissible estimators. We recently proposed *variance competitiveness* [15], as a robust “worst-case” performance measure when there is no UMVUE. We defined the variance competitive ratio to be the maximum, over data, of the ratio of the expectation of the square of our estimator to the minimum possible for the data subject to the global properties. A small ratio means that variance on each input in the data domain is not too far off the minimum variance attainable on this data by an estimator which satisfies the global properties.

We work with the following definition of a sampling scheme. In the sequel we show how it applies to common sampling schemes and their applications.

A *monotone sampling scheme* (\mathbf{V}, S^*) is specified by a *data domain* \mathbf{V} and a mapping $S^* : \mathbf{V} \times (0, 1] \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{V}}$. The mapping is such that the set $S^*(\mathbf{v}, u)$ for a fixed \mathbf{v} is monotone non-decreasing with u .

The sampling interpretation is that a *sample* $S(\mathbf{v}, u)$ of the *input* \mathbf{v} (which we also refer to as the *data vector*) is obtained by drawing a *seed* $u \sim U[0, 1]$, uniformly at random from $[0, 1]$. The sample deterministically depends on \mathbf{v} and the (random) *seed* u . The mapping $S^*(\mathbf{v}, u)$ is the set of all data vectors that are consistent with S (which we assume includes the seed value u). It represents all the information we can glean from the sample on the input. In particular, we must have $\mathbf{v} \in S^*(\mathbf{v}, u)$ for all \mathbf{v} and u . The sampling scheme is monotone in the randomization: When fixing \mathbf{v} , the set $S^*(\mathbf{v}, u)$ is non-decreasing with u , that is, the smaller u is, the more information we have on the data \mathbf{v} .

In the applications we consider, the (expected) representation size of the sample $S(\mathbf{v}, u)$ is typically much smaller size than \mathbf{v} . The set S^* can be very large (or infinite), and our estimators will only depend on performing certain operations on it, such as obtaining the infimum of some function. Monotone sampling can also be interpreted as obtaining a “measurement” $S(\mathbf{v}, u)$ of the data \mathbf{v} , where u determines the granularity of our measuring instrument. Ultimately, the goal is to recover some function of the data from the sample (the outcome of our measurement):

A *monotone estimation* problem is specified by a monotone sampling scheme and a nonnegative function $f : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The goal is to specify an *estimator*, which is a function of all possible outcomes $\hat{f} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $\mathcal{S} = \{S(\mathbf{v}, u) | \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}, u \in (0, 1]\}$. The estimator should be unbiased $\forall \mathbf{v}, \mathbb{E}_{u \sim U[0, 1]} \hat{f}(S(\mathbf{v}, u)) = f(\mathbf{v})$ and satisfy some other desirable properties.

The interpretation is that we obtain a query, specified in the form of a nonnegative function $f : \mathbf{V} \geq 0$ on all possible data vectors \mathbf{v} . We are interested in knowing $f(\mathbf{v})$, but we can not see \mathbf{v} and only have access to the sample S . The sample provides us with little information on \mathbf{v} , and thus on $f(\mathbf{v})$. We approximate $f(\mathbf{v})$ by applying an *estimator*, $\hat{f}(S) \geq 0$ to the sample. The monotone estimation problem is a bundling of a function f and a monotone sampling scheme. We are interested in estimators \hat{f} that satisfy properties. We always require nonnegativity and unbiasedness and consider admissibility, variance competitiveness, and what we call customization (lower variance on some data patterns).

Our formulation departs from traditional estimation theory. We view the data vectors in the domain as the possible inputs to the sampling scheme, and we treat estimator derivation as an optimization problem. The variance of the estimator parallels the “performance” we obtain on a certain input. The work horse of estimation theory, the maximum likelihood estimator, is not even applicable here as it does not distinguish between the different data vectors in S^* . Instead, the random “coin flips,” in the form of the seed u , that are available to the estimator are used to restrict the set S^* and obtain meaningful estimates.

We next show how monotone sampling relates to the well-studied model of coordinated sampling, that has extensive applications in massive data analysis. In particular, estimator constructions for monotone estimation can be applied to estimate functions over coordinated samples.

Coordinated shared-seed sampling

In this framework our data has a matrix form of multiple *instances* ($r > 1$), where each instance (row) has the form of a weight assignment to the (same) set of items (columns). Different instances may correspond to snapshots, activity logs, measurements, or repeated surveys that are taken at different times or locations. When instances correspond to documents, items can correspond to features. When instances are network neighborhoods, items can correspond to members or objects they store.

Over such data, we are interested in queries which depend on two or more instances and a subset (or all) items. Some examples are Jaccard similarity, distance norms, or the number of distinct items with positive entry in at least one instance (distinct count). These queries can be conditioned on a subset of items.

Such queries often can be expressed, or can be well approximated, by a sum over (selected) items of an *item function* that is applied to the tuple containing the values of the item in the different instances. Distinct count is a sum aggregate of logical OR and the L_p difference is the p th root of L_p^p , which sum-aggregates $|v_1 - v_2|^p$, when $r = 2$. For $r \geq 2$ instances, we can consider sum aggregates of the exponentiated range functions $\text{RG}_p(\mathbf{v}) = (\max(\mathbf{v}) - \min(\mathbf{v}))^p$, where $p > 0$. This is made concrete in Example 1 which illustrates a data set of 3 instances over 8 items, example queries, specified over a selected set of items, and the corresponding item functions.

We now assume that each instance is sampled and the sample of each instance contains a subset of the items that were active in the instance (had a positive weight). Common sampling schemes for a single instance are Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) [24] or bottom- k sampling which includes Reservoir sampling [26, 36], Priority (Sequential Poisson) [31, 19], or Successive weighted sample without replacement [33, 20, 11]. The sampling of items in each instance can be completely independent or slightly dependent (as with Reservoir or bottom- k sampling, which samples exactly k items).

Coordinated sampling is a way of specifying the randomization so that the sampling of different instances utilizes the same “randomization” [2, 35, 6, 32, 34, 4, 3, 13, 28, 16]. That is, the sampling of the same item in different instances becomes very correlated. Alternative term used in the survey sampling literature is Permanent Random Numbers (PRN). Coordinated sampling is also a form of locality sensitive hashing (LSH): When the weights in two instances (rows) are very similar, the samples we obtain are similar, and more likely to be identical.

The method of coordinating samples had been rediscovered many times, for different application, in both statistics and computer science. The main reason for its consideration by computer scientists is that it allows for more accurate estimates of queries that span multiple instances such as distinct counts and similarity measures [4, 3, 6, 17, 29, 21, 22, 5, 18, 1, 23, 28, 13, 16]. In some cases, such as all-distances sketches [6, 10, 29, 11, 12, 8] of neighborhoods of nodes in a graph, coordinated samples are obtained much more efficiently than independent samples. Coordination can be efficiently achieved by using a random hash function, applied to the item key, to generate the seed, in conjunction with the single-instance scheme of our choice (PPS or Reservoir). The use of hashing allows the sampling of different instances to be performed independently when storing very little state.

The result of coordinated sampling of different instances when restricted to a single item is a monotone sampling scheme that is applied to the tuple \mathbf{v} of the weights of the item on the different instances (a column in our matrix).¹ The estimation problem of an item-function is a monotone estimation problem for this sampling scheme.

The data domain is a subset of $r \geq 1$ dimensional vectors $\mathbf{V} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$ (where r is the number of instances in the query specification). The sampling is specified by r continuous non-decreasing functions on $(0, 1]$: $\tau = \tau_1, \dots, \tau_r$. The sample S includes the i th entry of \mathbf{v} with its value v_i if and only $v_i \geq \tau_i(u)$. Note that when entry i is not sampled, we also have some information, as we know that $v_i < \tau_i(u)$. Therefore the set S^* of data vectors consistent with our sample (which we do not explicitly compute) includes the exact values of some entries and upper bounds on other entries. Since the functions τ_i are non-decreasing, the sampling scheme is monotone. In particular, PPS sampling of different instances, restricted to a single item, is expressed with $\tau_i(u)$ that are linear functions: There is a fixed vector $\boldsymbol{\tau}^*$ such that $\tau_i(u) \equiv u\tau_i^*$.

Coordinated PPS sampling of the instances in Example 1 is demonstrated in Example 2. The term *coordinated* refers to the use of the same random seed u to determine the sampling of all entries in the tuple. This is in contrast to *independent* where a different (independent) seed is used for each entry [14].

We now return to the original setup of estimating sum aggregates, such as L_p^p . Sum aggregates over a domain of items $\sum_{i \in D} f(\mathbf{v}^{(i)})$ are estimated by summing up estimators for the item function over the selected items, that is $\sum_{i \in D} \hat{f}(S(\mathbf{v}^{(i)}, u^{(i)}))$. In general, the “sampling” is very sparse, and we expect that $\hat{f} = 0$ for most items. These item estimates typically have high variance, since most or all of the entries are missing from the sample. We therefore insist on unbiasedness and pairwise independence of the single-item estimates. That way, $\text{VAR}[\sum_{i \in D} \hat{f}(S(\mathbf{v}^{(i)}, u^{(i)}))] = \sum_{i \in D} \text{VAR}[\hat{f}(S(\mathbf{v}^{(i)}, u^{(i)}))]$, the variance of the sum estimate is the sum over items in $i \in D$ of the variance of \hat{f} for $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$. Thus (assuming variance is balanced) we can expect the relative error to decrease $\propto 1/\sqrt{|D|}$. Lastly, since the functions we are interested in are nonnegative, we also require the estimates to be nonnegative (results extend to any one-sided range restriction on the estimates). Therefore, the estimation of the sum-aggregate is reduced to monotone estimation on single items.

In [15] we provided a complete characterization of estimation problems over coordinated samples for which estimators with desirable global properties exist. This characterization can be extended to monotone estimation. The properties considered were unbiasedness and nonnegativity, and together with finite variances or boundedness. We also showed that for any coordinated estimation problem for which an unbiased nonnegative estimator with finite variances exists, we can construct an estimator, which we named the J estimator, that is 84-competitive. The J estimator, however, is generally not admissible, and also, the

¹Bottom- k samples select exactly k items in each instance, hence inclusions of items are dependent. We obtain a single-item restriction by considering the sampling scheme for the item conditioned on fixing the seed values of other items. A similar situation is with all-distances sketches, where we can use the HIP inclusion probabilities [8], which are conditioned on fixing the randomization of all closer nodes.

construction was geared to establish $O(1)$ competitiveness rather than obtain a “natural” estimator or to minimize the constant.

Contributions

The main contributions we make in this paper are the derivation of estimators for general monotone estimation problems. Our estimators are admissible, easy to apply, and satisfy desirable properties. We now state the main contributions in detail. We provide pointers to examples and to the appropriate sections in the body of the paper.

The optimal range: We start by defining the admissibility playing field for unbiased nonnegative estimators. We define the *optimal range* of estimates (Section 3) for each particular outcome, *conditioned* on the estimate values on all “less-informative” outcomes (outcomes which correspond to larger seed value u). The range includes all estimate values that are “locally” optimal with respect to at least one data vector that is consistent with the outcome. We show that being “in range” almost everywhere is necessary for admissibility and is sufficient for unbiasedness and nonnegativity, when an unbiased nonnegative estimator exists.

The L^* estimator: The lower extreme of the optimal range is obtained by solving the constraints that force the estimate on each outcome to be equal to the infimum of the optimal range. We refer to this solution as the L^* estimator, and study it extensively in Section 4.

We show that the L^* estimator, which is the solution of a respective integral equation, can be expressed in the following convenient form:

$$\hat{f}^{(L)}(S, \rho) = \frac{\underline{f}^{(v)}(\rho)}{\rho} - \int_{\rho}^1 \frac{\underline{f}^{(v)}(u)}{u^2} du, \quad (1)$$

(2)

where ρ is the seed value used to obtain the sample S , $v \in S^*$ is any (arbitrary) data vector consistent with S and ρ , and the *lower bound* function $\underline{f}^{(v)}(u)$ is defined as the infimum of $f(z)$ over all vectors $z \in S^*(v, u)$ that are consistent with the sample obtained for data v with seed u . We note that the estimate is the same for any choice of v and that the values $\underline{f}^{(v)}(u)$ for all $u \geq \rho$ can be computed from S and ρ . Therefore, the estimate is well defined. This expression allows us to efficiently compute the estimate, for any function, by numeric integration or a closed form (when a respective definite integral has a closed form). The lower bound function is presented more precisely in Section 2 and an example is provided in Example 3. An example derivation of the L^* estimator for the functions RG_{p+} is provided in Example 4.

We show that the L^* estimator has a natural and compelling combination of properties. It satisfies both our quality measures, being both admissible and 4-competitive for any instance of the monotone estimation problem for which a bounded variance estimator exists. The competitive ratio of 4 improves over the previous upper bound of 84 [15]. We show that the ratio of 4 of the L^* estimator is tight in the sense that there is a family of functions on which the supremum of the ratio, over functions and data vectors, is 4. We note however that the L^* estimator has lower ratio for specific functions. For example, we computed ratios of 2 and 2.5, respectively, for exponentiated range with $p = 1, 2$ (Which facilitates estimation of L_p differences, see Example 1).

Moreover, the L^* estimator is *monotone*, meaning that when fixing the data vector, the estimate value is monotone non-decreasing with the information in the outcome (the set S^* of data vectors that are consistent with our sample). In terms of our monotone sampling formulation, estimator monotonicity means that when

we fix the data v , the estimate is non-increasing with the seed u . Furthermore, the L^* estimator is the *unique* admissible monotone estimator and thus dominates (has at most the variance on every data vector) the Horvitz-Thompson (HT) estimator [25] (which is also unbiased, nonnegative, and monotone).

To further illustrate this point, recall that the HT estimate is positive only on outcomes when we know $f(v)$. In this case, we have the inverse probability estimate $f(v)/p$, where p is the probability of an outcome which reveals $f(v)$. When we have partial information on $f(v)$, the HT estimate does not utilize that and is 0 whereas admissible estimators, such as the L^* estimators, must use this information. It is also possible that the probability of an outcome that reveals $f(v)$ is 0. In this case, the HT estimator is not even applicable. One natural example is estimating the range $|v_1 - v_2|$ with say $\tau_1(u) \equiv \tau_2(u) \equiv u$, this is essentially classic Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) sampling (coordinated between “instances”). When the input is $(0.5, 0)$, the range is 0.5, but there is 0 probability of revealing $v_2 = 0$. We can obtain nontrivial lower (and upper) bounds on the range: When $u \in (0, 0.5)$, we have a lower bound of $0.5 - u$. Nonetheless, the probability of knowing the exact value ($u = 0$) is 0. In contrast to the HT estimate, our L^* estimator is defined for any monotone estimation instance for which a nonnegative unbiased estimator with finite variance exists.

Order-optimal estimators: In many situations we have information on data patterns. For example, if our data consists of hourly temperature measurements across locations or daily summaries of Wikipedia, we expect it to be fairly stable. That is, we expect instances to be very similar. That is, most tuples of values, each corresponding to a particular geographic location or Wikipedia article, would have most entries being very similar. In other cases, such as IP traffic, differences are typically larger. Since there is a choice, the full Pareto front of admissible estimators, we would like to be able to select an estimator that would have lower variance on more likely patterns of data vectors, this while still providing some weaker “worst case” guarantees for all applicable data vectors in our domain.

Customization of estimators to data patterns can be facilitated through *order optimality* [14]. More precisely, an estimator is \prec^+ -optimal with respect to some partial order \prec on data vectors if any other (nonnegative unbiased) estimator with lower variance on some data v must have strictly higher variance on some data that precedes v . Order-optimality implies admissibility, but not vice versa. Order-optimality also uniquely specifies an admissible estimator. By specifying an order which prioritizes more likely patterns in the data, we can customize the estimator to these patterns.

We show (Section 5) how to construct a \prec^+ -optimal nonnegative unbiased estimators for *any* function and order \prec for which such estimator exists. We show that when the data domain is discrete, such estimators always exist whereas continuous domains require some natural convergence properties of \prec .

We also show that the L^* estimator is \prec^+ -optimal with respect to the order \prec such that $z \prec v \iff f(z) < f(v)$. This means that when estimating the exponentiated range function, the L^* estimator is optimized for high similarity (this while providing a strong 4-competitiveness guarantee even for highly dissimilar data).

The U^* estimator: We also explore the upper extreme of the optimal range, that is, the solution obtained by aiming for the supremum of the range. We call this solution the *U^* estimator* and we study it in Section 6. This estimator is unbiased, nonnegative, and has finite variances. We formulate some conditions on the tuple function, that are satisfied by natural functions including the exponentiated range, under which the estimator is admissible. The U^* estimator, under some conditions, is \prec^+ -optimal with respect to the order $z \prec v \iff f(z) > f(v)$. In the context of the exponentiated range, it means that it is optimized for highly dissimilar instances.

Lastly, in Section 7 we conclude with a discussion of future work and of follow-up uses of our estimators in applications, including pointers to experiments. One application of particular importance that is enabled

by our work here is the estimation of L_p difference norms over sampled data. Another application is similarity estimation in social networks. We hope and believe that our methods and estimators, once understood, will be more extensively applied.

Example 1 Dataset with 3 instances and queries

Instances $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and items $k \in \{a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h\}$:

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
v_1	0.95	0	0.23	0.70	0.10	0.42	0	0.32
v_2	0.15	0.44	0	0.80	0.05	0.50	0.20	0
v_3	0.25	0	0	0.10	0	0.22	0	0

Example queries over selected items $H \subset [a-h]$. L_p difference, L_p^p , which is the p th power of L_p difference and a sum aggregate which can be used to estimate the L_p difference, L_{p+}^p : asymmetric (increase only) L_p^p , the sum of the increase-only and the decrease-only changes (decrease only is obtained by switching the roles of v_1 and v_2) is L_p^p , but each component is a useful metric for asymmetric change. G an “arbitrary” sum aggregate, illustrating versatility of queries.

$$L_p(H) = \left(\sum_{k \in H} |v_1^{(k)} - v_2^{(k)}|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

$$L_p^p(H) = \sum_{k \in H} |v_1^{(k)} - v_2^{(k)}|^p$$

$$L_{p+}^p(H) = \sum_{k \in H} \max\{0, v_1^{(k)} - v_2^{(k)}\}^p$$

$$G(H) = \sum_{k \in H} |v_1^{(k)} - 2v_2^{(k)} + v_3^{(k)}|^2$$

sum aggregate	item function
L_p^p	$\text{RG}_p(\mathbf{v}) = (\max(\mathbf{v}) - \min(\mathbf{v}))^p$
L_{p+}^p	$\text{RG}_{p+}(v_1, v_2) = \max\{0, v_1 - v_2\}^p$
G	$g(v_1, v_2, v_3) = v_1 + v_3 - 2v_2 ^2$

$$L_1(\{b, c, e\}) = |0 - 0.44| + |0.23 - 0| + |0.10 - 0.05| = 0.71$$

$$L_2^2(\{c, f, h\}) = (0.23 - 0)^2 + (0.50 - 0.42)^2 + (0.32 - 0)^2 \approx 0.16$$

$$L_2(\{c, f, h\}) = \sqrt{L_2^2(\{c, f, h\})} \approx 0.40$$

$$L_{1+}(\{b, c, e\}) = \max\{0, 0 - 0.44\} + \max\{0, 0.23 - 0\} + \max\{0, 0.10 - 0.05\} = 0.235$$

$$G(\{b, d\}) = |0 - 2 * 0.44 + 0|^2 + |0.7 - 2 * 0.8 + 0.1|^2 \approx 1.18$$

2 Preliminaries

We present some properties of monotone sampling and briefly review concepts and of results from [14, 15] which we build upon here.

Consider monotone sampling, as defined in the introduction. For any two outcomes, $S_1^* = S^*(u, \mathbf{v})$ and

Example 2 Coordinated PPS sampling for Example 1

Consider shared-seed coordinated sampling, where each of the instances 1,2,3 is PPS sampled with threshold $\tau^* = 1$. In this particular case, each entry is sampled with probability equal to its value. To coordinate the samples, we draw $u^{(k)} \in U[0, 1]$, independently for different items. An item k is sampled in instance i if and only if $v_i^{(k)} \geq u^{(k)}$. $S^{*(k)}$ contains all vectors consistent with the sampled entries and with value at most $u^{(k)}$ in unsampled entries.

item	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
v_1	0.95	0	0.23	0.70	0.10	0.42	0	0.32
v_2	0.15	0.44	0	0.80	0.05	0.50	0.20	0
v_3	0.25	0	0	0.10	0	0.22	0	0
$u^{(k)}$	0.32	0.21	0.04	0.23	0.84	0.70	0.15	0.64


The outcomes for the different items are: $S^{(a)} = (0.95, *, *)$, $S^{(b)} = (*, 0.44, *)$, $S^{(c)} = (0.23, *, *)$, $S^{(d)} = (0.7, 0.8, *)$, $S^{(e)} = S^{(f)} = S^{(h)} = (*, *, *)$, $S^{(g)} = (*, 0.2, *)$. The sets of vectors consistent with the outcomes are $S^{*(a)} = \{0.95\} \times [0, 0.32]^2$ and $S^{*(h)} = [0, 0.64]^3$.

Example 3 Lower bound function and its lower hull

Consider $\text{RG}_{p+}(v_1, v_2) = \max\{0, v_1 - v_2\}^p$ (see Example 1) over the domain $\mathbf{V} = [0, 1]^2$ and PPS sampling with $\tau_1^* = \tau_2^* = 1$ (as in Example 2). The lower bound function for data $v = (v_1, v_2)$ is

$$\underline{\text{RG}}_{p+}(u, v) = \max\{0, v_1 - \max\{v_2, u\}\}^p.$$

The figures below illustrate $\underline{\text{RG}}_{p+}^{(v)}(u)$ (LB) and its lower hull (CH) for the data vectors $(0.6, 0.2)$ and $(0.6, 0)$ and $p = \{0.5, 1, 2\}$. For $u > 0.2$, the outcome when sampling both vectors is the same, and thus the lower bound function is the same. For $u \leq 0.2$, the outcomes diverge. For $p \leq 1$, $\underline{\text{RG}}_{p+}^{(v)}(u)$ is concave and the lower hull is linear on $(0, v_1]$. For $p > 1$, the lower hull coincides with $\underline{\text{RG}}_{p+}^{(v)}(u)$ on some interval $(a, v_1]$ and is linear on $(0, a]$. When $v_2 = 0$, $\underline{\text{RG}}_{p+}^{(v)}(u)$ is equal to its lower hull.




The v -optimal estimates are the negated slopes of the lower hulls. They are 0 when $u \in (0.6, 1]$, since these outcomes are consistent with data on which $\underline{\text{RG}}_{p+} = 0$. They are constant for $u \in (0, v_1]$ when $p \leq 1$. Observe that for $u \in (0.2, 0.6]$, the v -optimal estimates are different even though the outcome of sampling the two vectors are the same – demonstrating that it is not possible to simultaneously minimize the variance of the two vectors.

Example 4 L* and U* estimates for Example 3

We compute the L* and U* estimators for RG_{p+} for the sampling scheme and data in Example 3. For the two vectors $(0.6, 0.2)$ and $(0.6, 0)$, both the L* and U* estimates are 0 when $u \geq 0.6$, this is necessary from unbiasedness and nonnegativity because for these outcomes $\exists \mathbf{v} \in S^*$, $RG_{p+}(\mathbf{v}) = 0$. Otherwise, the L* estimate is $\hat{R}G_{p+}^{(L)}(S) = (v_1 - v'_2)^p / v'_2 - \int_{v'_2}^{v_1} \frac{(v_1 - x)^p}{x^2} dx$, where $v'_2 = u$ when $S = \{1\}$ and $v'_2 = v_2$ when $S = \{1, 2\}$. When $p \geq 1$, the U* estimate is $\hat{R}G_{p+}^{(U)}(S) = p(v_1 - u)^{p-1}$ when $u \in (v_2, v_1]$ and 0 when $u \leq v_2 < v_1$. When $p \leq 1$ the U* estimate is v_1^{p-1} when $u \in (v_2, v_1]$ and $\frac{(v_1 - v_2)^p - v_1^{p-1}(v_1 - v_2)}{v_2}$ when $u \leq v_2 < v_1$.

The figure also include the \mathbf{v} -optimal estimates, discussed in Example 3. When $v_2 = 0$, the U* estimates are \mathbf{v} -optimal. The L* estimate is not bounded when $v_2 = 0$ (but has bounded variance and is competitive).



$S_2^* = S^*(u', \mathbf{v}')$, the sets S_1^* and S_2^* must be either disjoint or one is contained in the other. This is because if there is a common data vector $\mathbf{z} \in S_1^* \cap S_2^*$, then $S_1^* = S^*(u, \mathbf{z})$ and $S_2^* = S^*(u', \mathbf{z})$. From definition of monotone sampling, if $u' > u$ then $S_1^* \subseteq S_2^*$ and vice versa. For any $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{V}$, the set of u values which satisfy $S^*(u, \mathbf{v}) = S^*(u, \mathbf{z})$ is a suffix of the interval $(0, 1]$. This is because $S^*(u, \mathbf{v}) = S^*(u, \mathbf{z})$ implies $S^*(u', \mathbf{v}) = S^*(u', \mathbf{z})$ for all $u' > u$. For convenience, we assume that this interval is open to the left:²

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \rho \in (0, 1] \forall \mathbf{v}, \\ \mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v}) \implies \exists \epsilon > 0, \forall x \in (\rho - \epsilon, 1], \mathbf{z} \in S^*(x, \mathbf{v}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Estimators: We are interested in estimating, from the outcome $S(u, \mathbf{v})$, the quantity $f(\mathbf{v})$, where the function $f : \mathbf{V}$ maps \mathbf{V} to the nonnegative reals. We apply an *estimator* \hat{f} to the outcome (including the seed) and use the notation $\hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) \equiv \hat{f}(S(u, \mathbf{v}))$. When the domain is continuous, we assume \hat{f} is (Lebesgue) integrable.

Two estimators \hat{f}_1 and \hat{f}_2 are *equivalent* if for all data \mathbf{v} , $\hat{f}_1(u, \mathbf{v}) = \hat{f}_2(u, \mathbf{v})$ with probability 1, which is the same as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_1 \text{ and } \hat{f}_2 \text{ are equivalent} &\iff \forall \mathbf{v} \forall \rho \in (0, 1], \\ \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}_1(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}_2(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

An estimator \hat{f} is *nonnegative* if $\forall S, \hat{f}(S) \geq 0$ and is *unbiased* if $\forall \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{E}[\hat{f}|\mathbf{v}] = f(\mathbf{v})$. An estimator has *finite variance* on \mathbf{v} if $\int_0^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v})^2 du < \infty$ (the expectation of the square is finite) and is *bounded* on

²This assumption can be integrated while affecting at most a “zero measure” set of outcomes for any data point. Therefore, this does not affect estimator properties.

Example 5 Walk-through derivation of \prec^+ -optimal estimators

We derive \prec^+ -optimal RG_{1+} estimators over the finite domain $\mathbf{V} = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^2$. Assuming same sampling scheme on both entries, there are 3 threshold values of interest, where π_i $i \in [3]$ is such that entry of value i is sampled if and only if $u \leq \pi_i$. We have $\pi_1 < \pi_2 < \pi_3$.

The lower bounds $\text{RG}_{1+}^{(v)}$ are step functions with steps at $u = \pi_i$. The table below shows $\text{RG}_{1+}^{(v)}(u)$ for all u and v such that $\text{RG}_{1+}(v) > 0$. When $\text{RG}_{1+}(v) = 0$, we have $\text{RG}_{1+}^{(v)}(u) \equiv 0$ and any unbiased nonnegative estimator must have 0 estimates on outcomes that are consistent with v .

$\text{RG}_{1+}^{(v)}$	(1, 0)	(2, 1)	(2, 0)	(3, 2)	(3, 1)	(3, 0)
$(0, \pi_1]$	1	1	2	1	2	3
$(\pi_1, \pi_2]$	0	1	1	1	2	2
$(\pi_2, \pi_3]$	0	0	0	1	1	1
$(\pi_3, 1]$	0	0	0	0	0	0

The v -optimal estimate, $\hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(v)}(u)$ is the negated slope at u of the lower hull of $\text{RG}_{1+}^{(v)}$. The lower hull of each step function is piecewise linear with breakpoints at a subset of π_i , and thus, the v -optimal estimates are constant on each segment $(\pi_{i-1}, \pi_i]$. The table shows the estimates for all v and u . The notation \downarrow refers to value in same column and one row below and \Downarrow to value two rows below.

$\hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(v)}$	(1, 0)	(2, 1)	(2, 0)	(3, 2)	(3, 1)	(3, 0)
$(0, \pi_1]$	$\frac{1}{\pi_1}$	$\frac{1}{\pi_2}$	$\frac{2 - (\pi_2 - \pi_1)\downarrow}{\pi_1}$	$\frac{1}{\pi_3}$	$\frac{2 - \Downarrow}{\pi_2}$	$\frac{3 - \Downarrow(\pi_3 - \pi_2) - \Downarrow(\pi_2 - \pi_1)}{\pi_2 - \pi_1}$
$(\pi_1, \pi_2]$	0	$\frac{1}{\pi_2}$	$\min\{\frac{2}{\pi_2}, \frac{1}{\pi_2 - \pi_1}\}$	$\frac{1}{\pi_3}$	$\frac{2 - \downarrow}{\pi_2}$	$\min\{\frac{3 - \downarrow(\pi_3 - \pi_2)}{\pi_2}, \frac{2 - \downarrow(\pi_3 - \pi_2)}{\pi_2 - \pi_1}\}$
$(\pi_2, \pi_3]$	0	0	0	$\frac{1}{\pi_3}$	$\min\{\frac{2}{\pi_3}, \frac{1}{\pi_3 - \pi_2}\}$	$\min\{\frac{3}{\pi_3}, \frac{1}{\pi_3 - \pi_2}\}$

The order $(2, 1) \prec (2, 0)$ and $(3, 2) \prec (3, 1) \prec (3, 0)$ yields the L^* estimator, which is v -optimal for $(1, 0)$, $(2, 1)$, and $(3, 2)$. The order $(2, 0) \prec (2, 1)$ and $(3, 0) \prec (3, 1) \prec (3, 2)$ yields the U^* estimator which is v -optimal for $(1, 0)$, $(2, 0)$, and $(3, 0)$. Observe that it suffices to only specify \prec so that the order is defined between vectors consistent with the same outcome S when $\text{RG}_{1+}(S) > 0$. For RG_{1+} , this means specifying the order between vectors with the same v_1 value (and only consider those with strictly smaller v_2). It follows that any admissible estimator is $(1, 0)$ -optimal. To specify an estimator, we need to specify it on all possible outcomes, where each distinct outcome is uniquely determined by a corresponding set of data vectors S^* . The 8 possible outcomes (we exclude those consistent with vectors with $\text{RG}_{1+}(v) = 0$ on which the estimate must be 0) are $(1, 0)$, $(2, \leq 1)$, $(2, 1)$, $(3, \leq 2)$, $(3, 2)$, $(3, \leq 1)$, $(3, 1)$, and $(3, 0)$, where an entry " $\leq a$ " specifies all vectors in \mathbf{V} where the entry is at most a .

We show how we construct the \prec^+ -optimal estimator for \prec which prioritizes vectors with difference of 2: $(3, 1) \prec (3, 2) \prec (3, 0)$ and $(2, 0) \prec (2, 1)$. The estimator is v -optimal for $(3, 1)$, $(2, 0)$, and $(1, 0)$. This determines the estimates $\hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}$ on all outcomes consistent with these vectors: The value on outcome $(1, 0)$ is $\hat{\text{RG}}^{(1,0)}((0, \pi_1])$, the values on outcomes $(2, \leq 1)$ and $(2, 0)$ are according to $\hat{\text{RG}}^{(2,0)}$ on $(\pi_1, \pi_2]$ and $(0, \pi_1]$, respectively, and value on the outcomes $(3, \leq 2)$, $(3, \leq 1)$ and $(3, 1)$ is according to $\hat{\text{RG}}^{(3,1)}$ on $(\pi_2, \pi_3]$ and $(\pi_1, \pi_2]$. These values are provided in the table above. The remaining outcomes are $(3, 0)$, $(3, 2)$, and $(2, 1)$. We need to specify the estimator so that it is unbiased on these vectors, given the existing specification. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}(2, 1) &= \frac{1 - (\pi_2 - \pi_1)\hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}(2, \leq 1)}{\pi_1} \\ \hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}(3, 0) &= \frac{3 - (\pi_3 - \pi_2)\hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}(3, \leq 2) - (\pi_2 - \pi_1)\hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}(3, \leq 1)}{\pi_1} \\ \hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}(3, 2) &= \frac{2 - (\pi_3 - \pi_2)\hat{\text{RG}}_{1+}^{(\prec)}(3, \leq 2)}{\pi_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that to apply these estimators, we do not have to precompute the estimator on all possible outcomes. An estimate only depends on values of the estimate on all less informative outcomes. In a discrete domain as in this example, it is the number of breakpoints larger than the seed u (which is at most the number of distinct values in the domain).

\mathbf{v} if $\sup_{u \in (0,1]} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) < \infty$. If a nonnegative estimator is bounded on \mathbf{v} , it also has finite variance for \mathbf{v} . An estimator is *monotone* on \mathbf{v} if when fixing \mathbf{v} and considering outcomes consistent with \mathbf{v} , the estimate value is non decreasing with the information on the data that we can glean from the outcome, that is, $\hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v})$ is non-increasing with u . We say that an estimator is bounded, has finite variances, or is monotone, if the respective property holds for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}$.

The lower bound function. For $Z \subset \mathbf{V}$, we define $\underline{f}(Z) = \inf\{f(v) \mid v \in Z\}$ as the infimum of f on Z . We use the notation $\underline{f}(S) \equiv \underline{f}(S^*)$, $\underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) \equiv \underline{f}(S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v}))$. When \mathbf{v} is fixed, we use $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u) \equiv \underline{f}(u, \mathbf{v})$. Some properties which we need in the sequel are [15]:

$$\bullet \forall \mathbf{v}, \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u) \text{ is monotone non increasing and left-continuous.} \quad (5)$$

$$\bullet \hat{f} \text{ is unbiased and nonnegative} \implies \quad (6)$$

$$\forall \mathbf{v}, \forall \rho, \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \leq \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\rho). \quad (7)$$

The lower bound function $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$, and its lower hull $H_f^{(\mathbf{v})}$, are instrumental in capturing existence of estimators with desirable properties [15]:

$$\bullet \exists \text{ unbiased nonnegative } f \text{ estimator} \iff \quad (8)$$

$$\forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}, \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u) = f(\mathbf{v}). \quad (9)$$

$$\bullet \text{If } f \text{ satisfies (9),}$$

$$\exists \text{ unbiased nonnegative estimator with finite variance for } \mathbf{v}$$

$$\iff \int_0^1 \left(\frac{dH_f^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)}{du} \right)^2 du < \infty. \quad (10)$$

$$\exists \text{ unbiased nonnegative estimator that is bounded on } \mathbf{v}$$

$$\iff \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(\mathbf{v}) - \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)}{u} < \infty. \quad (11)$$

Example 3 illustrates lower bound functions and respective lower hulls for $\text{RG}_{\rho+}$.

Partially specified estimators. We use *partial specifications* \hat{f} of (nonnegative and unbiased) estimators, which are specified on a set of outcomes \mathcal{S} so that

$$\forall \mathbf{v} \exists \rho_{\mathbf{v}} \in [0, 1], S(u, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ almost everywhere for } u > \rho_{\mathbf{v}} \wedge \\ S(u, \mathbf{v}) \notin \mathcal{S} \text{ almost everywhere for } u \leq \rho_{\mathbf{v}}.$$

When $\rho_{\mathbf{v}} = 0$, we say that the estimator is *fully specified* for \mathbf{v} . We also require that \hat{f} is nonnegative where specified and satisfies

$$\forall \mathbf{v}, \rho_{\mathbf{v}} > 0 \implies \int_{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \leq f(\mathbf{v}) \quad (12a)$$

$$\forall \mathbf{v}, \rho_{\mathbf{v}} = 0 \implies \int_{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du = f(\mathbf{v}). \quad (12b)$$

Lemma 2.1 [15] *If f satisfies (9) (has a nonnegative unbiased estimator), then any partially specified estimator can be extended to an unbiased nonnegative estimator.*

v -optimal extensions and estimators. Given a partially specified estimator \hat{f} so that $\rho_v > 0$ and $M = \int_{\rho_v}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$, a v -optimal extension is an extension which is fully specified for \mathbf{v} and minimizes variance for \mathbf{v} (amongst all such extensions). The v -optimal extension is defined on outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \in (0, \rho_v]$ and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \int_0^{\rho_v} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v})^2 du \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \int_0^{\rho_v} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du = f(\mathbf{v}) - M \\ & \forall u, \int_u^{\rho_v} \hat{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) dx \leq \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u) - M \\ & \forall u, \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For $\rho_v \in (0, 1]$ and $M \in [0, \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\rho_v)]$, we define the function $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v}, \rho_v, M)} : (0, \rho_v] \rightarrow R_+$ as the solution of

$$\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v}, \rho_v, M)}(u) = \inf_{0 \leq \eta < u} \frac{\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\eta) - M - \int_u^{\rho_v} \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v}, \rho_v, M)}(u) du}{\rho - \eta}. \quad (14)$$

Geometrically, the function $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v}, \rho_v, M)}$ is the negated derivative of the lower hull of the lower bound function $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$ on $(0, \rho_v)$ and the point (ρ_v, M) .

Theorem 2.1 [15] *Given a partially specified estimator \hat{f} so that $\rho_v > 0$ and $M = \int_{\rho_v}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$, then $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v}, \rho_v, M)}$ is the unique (up to equivalence) v -optimal extension of \hat{f} .*

The v -optimal estimates are the minimum variance extension of the empty specification. We use $\rho_v = 1$ and $M = 0$ and obtain $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})} \equiv \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v}, 1, 0)}$. $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$ is the solution of

$$\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u) = \inf_{0 \leq \eta < u} \frac{\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\eta) - \int_u^1 \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u) du}{\rho - \eta}, \quad (15)$$

which is the negated slope of the lower hull of the lower bound function $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$. This is illustrated in Example 3.

Admissibility and order optimality. An estimator is *admissible* if there is no (nonnegative unbiased) estimator with same or lower variance on all data and strictly lower on some data. We also consider *order optimality*, specified with respect to a partial order \prec on \mathbf{V} : An estimator \hat{f} is \prec^+ -optimal if there is no other nonnegative unbiased estimator with strictly lower variance on some data \mathbf{v} and at most the variance of \hat{f} on all vectors that precede \mathbf{v} . Order-optimality (with respect to some \prec) implies admissibility but the converse is not true in general [14].

Variance competitiveness An estimator \hat{f} is *c-competitive* if

$$\forall \mathbf{v}, \int_0^1 \left(\hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) \right)^2 du \leq c \inf_{\hat{f}'} \int_0^1 \left(\hat{f}'(u, \mathbf{v}) \right)^2 du,$$

where the infimum is over all unbiased nonnegative estimators of f . When the estimator is unbiased, the expectation of the square is closely related to variance, and an estimator that minimizes one also minimizes the other.

$$\text{VAR}[\hat{f}|\mathbf{v}] = \int_0^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v})^2 du - f(\mathbf{v})^2 \quad (16)$$

3 The optimal range




Figure 1: Lower bound functions for vectors $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}$. Outcomes are consistent for all $x \geq u$: $S(x, \mathbf{v}) = S(x, \mathbf{z}) = S(x, \mathbf{w}) \equiv S_x$. The figure illustrates the \mathbf{y} -optimal estimates $\lambda(u, \mathbf{y}, M)$ at u given M for $\mathbf{y} \in \{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}\}$. The estimates are the negated slopes of the lower hull of the point (u, M) and the lower bound function $\underline{f}(\mathbf{y})$. The optimal range at S_u given M is lower-bounded by \mathbf{w} , that is $\lambda_L(S_u, M) = \lambda(u, \mathbf{w}, M)$, and upper-bounded by \mathbf{v} , $\lambda_U(S_u, M) = \lambda(u, \mathbf{v}, M)$. The figure illustrates the general property that the optimal range is lower bounded by the \mathbf{w} which satisfies $f(\mathbf{w}) = \underline{f}(\mathbf{w}, u)$.

We say that an estimator \hat{f} is \mathbf{v} -optimal at an outcome $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ if it satisfies (15). For an outcome $S(\rho, \mathbf{v})$, we are interested in the range of \mathbf{z} -optimal estimates at S for all $\mathbf{z} \in S^*$, with respect to a value M , which captures the contribution to the expectation of the estimator made by outcomes which are less informative than S .

$$\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{v}, M) = \inf_{0 \leq \eta < \rho} \frac{\underline{f}(\eta, \mathbf{v}) - M}{\rho - \eta} \quad (17)$$

$$\lambda_U(\rho, \mathbf{v}, M) \equiv \lambda_U(S, M) = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}, M) \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_L(\rho, \mathbf{v}, M) &\equiv \lambda_L(S, M) = \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}, M) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \inf_{0 \leq \eta < \rho} \frac{\underline{f}(\eta, \mathbf{z}) - M}{\rho - \eta} \\ &= \frac{\underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) - M}{\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

To verify equality (19), observe that from left continuity of $\underline{f}(u, \mathbf{z})$,

$$\inf_{\eta < \rho, \mathbf{z} \in S^*} \underline{f}(\eta, \mathbf{z}) = \underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v})$$

and that the denominator $\rho - \eta$ is maximized at $\eta = 0$. $\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{v}, M)$ is the \mathbf{v} -optimal estimate at ρ , given a specification of the estimator $\hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \in (\rho, 1]$ with $\int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du = M$. In short, we refer to $\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{v}, M)$ as the \mathbf{v} -optimal estimate at ρ given M . Geometrically, $\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{v}, M)$ is the negated slope of the lower hull of $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$ and the point (ρ, M) . $\lambda_U(S, M)$ and $\lambda_L(S, M)$, respectively, are the supremum and infimum of the range of \mathbf{z} -optimal estimates at S given M . Figure 1 illustrates an outcome S and the optimal range at S given M . We can see how the lower endpoint of the range is realized by a vector with f value equal to the lower bound at S , as in equality (19).

When \hat{f} is provided for seed values $u \in (\rho, 1]$, we use $M = \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$. We then abbreviate the notations (we remove M) to $\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{v})$, $\lambda_U(S)$, and $\lambda_L(S)$.

We say that the estimator f is *in-range* (in the optimal range) at outcome $S(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ if

$$\lambda_L(S) \leq \hat{f}(S) \leq \lambda_U(S). \quad (20)$$

Writing (20) explicitly, we obtain

$$\hat{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) \geq \lambda_L(\rho, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{f(\rho, \mathbf{v}) - \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho} \quad (21a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) &\leq \lambda_U(\rho, \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*} \inf_{0 \leq \eta < \rho} \frac{f(\eta, \mathbf{z}) - \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} \end{aligned} \quad (21b)$$

Two special solutions that we study are the L^* estimator ($\hat{f}^{(L)}$, see Section 4) and the U^* estimator ($\hat{f}^{(U)}$, see Section 6), which respectively solve (21a) and (21b) with equalities. For all $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and \mathbf{v} , $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ minimizes and $\hat{f}^{(U)}$ maximizes $\int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$ among all solutions of (20).

We show that being in-range (satisfying (20) for all outcomes S) is sufficient for nonnegativity and unbiasedness.

Lemma 3.1 *If f satisfies (9) then any in-range estimator is unbiased and nonnegative.*

Proof For nonnegativity, it suffices to show that a solution of (20) satisfies (7), since (21a) and (7) together imply nonnegativity. Assume to the contrary that a solution \hat{f} violates (7) and let ρ be the supremum of x satisfying $\int_x^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du > \underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v})$. From (5), which is monotonicity and left-continuity of $\underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v})$, we have $\int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du = \underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v})$. Since $\int_x^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$ is continuous in x , and $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$ left-continuous, there must be $\delta > 0$ so that

$$\forall x \in [\rho - \delta, \rho), \int_x^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du > \underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v}). \quad (22)$$

Let $x \in [\rho - \delta, \rho)$ and $M(x) = \int_x^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$. From (22), $M(x) > \underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v})$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(x, \mathbf{v})} \inf_{0 \leq \eta < x} \frac{f(\eta, \mathbf{z}) - M(x)}{x - \eta} \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(x, \mathbf{v})} \inf_{0 \leq \eta < x} \frac{f(\eta, \mathbf{z}) - \underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v})}{x - \eta} \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(x, \mathbf{v})} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow x^-} \frac{f(\eta, \mathbf{z}) - \underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v})}{x - \eta} \\ &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow x^-} \frac{f(\eta, \mathbf{v}) - \underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v})}{x - \eta} = -\frac{\partial \underline{f}(x, \mathbf{v})}{\partial x^-} \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all $x \in (\rho - \delta, \rho)$, we obtain that $\int_{\rho - \delta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) dx \leq \underline{f}(\rho - \delta, \mathbf{v}) - \underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v})$. Therefore, $\int_{\rho - \delta}^1 \hat{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) dx \leq \underline{f}(\rho - \delta, \mathbf{v})$, which contradicts (22).

We now establish unbiasedness. From (21a) and $\underline{f}(u, \mathbf{v})$ being non increasing in u , we obtain that $\forall u \forall \rho > u$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) &\geq \frac{\underline{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) - \int_u^1 \hat{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) dx}{u} \\ &\geq \frac{\underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) - \int_u^1 \hat{f}(x, \mathbf{v}) dx}{u} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

We argue that

$$\forall \mathbf{v} \forall \rho > 0, \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \int_x^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \geq \underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}). \quad (24)$$

To prove (24), define $\Delta(x) = \underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) - \int_x^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$ for $x \in (0, \rho]$. We show that $\int_{x/2}^x \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \geq \Delta(x)/4$. To see this, assume to the contrary that $\int_y^x \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \leq \Delta(x)/4$ for all $y \in [x/2, x]$. Then from (23), the value of $\hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \in [x/2, x]$ must be at least $(3/4)\Delta(x)/x$. Hence, the integral over the interval $[x/2, x]$ is at least $(3/8)\Delta(x)$ which is a contradiction. We can now apply this iteratively, obtaining that $\Delta(\rho/2^i) \leq (3/4)^i \Delta(\rho)$. Thus, the gap $\Delta(x)$ diminishes as $x \rightarrow 0$ and we established (24).

Since (24) holds for all $\rho \geq 0$, then $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \int_u^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \geq \lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \underline{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) = f(\mathbf{v})$ (using (9)). Combining with (already established) (7) we obtain $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \int_u^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du = f(\mathbf{v})$. ■

We next show that being in-range is necessary for optimality. For our analysis of order-optimality (Section 5), we need to slightly refine the notion of admissibility to be with respect to a partially specified estimator \hat{f} and a subset of data vectors $Z \subset \mathbf{V}$.

An extension of \hat{f} that is fully specified for all vectors in Z is admissible on Z if any other extension with strictly lower variance on at least one $\mathbf{v} \in Z$ has a strictly higher variance on at least one $\mathbf{z} \in Z$. We say that a partial specification is in-range *with respect to* Z if:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall \mathbf{v} \in Z, \text{ for } \rho \in (0, \rho_{\mathbf{v}}] \text{ almost everywhere,} \\ &\inf_{\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \leq \hat{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Using (4), (25) is the same as requiring that $\forall \mathbf{v} \forall \rho \in (0, \rho_{\mathbf{v}}]$, when fixing the estimator on $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \geq \rho$, then

$$\inf_{\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \leq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \quad (26)$$

We show that a necessary condition for admissibility with respect to a partial specification and Z is that almost everywhere, estimates for outcomes consistent with vectors in Z are in-range for Z . Formally:

Theorem 3.1 *An extension is admissible on Z only if (25) holds.*

Proof Consider an (nonnegative unbiased) estimator \hat{f} that violates (25) for some $\mathbf{v} \in Z$ and ρ . We show that there is an alternative estimator, equal to $\hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v})$ on outcomes $u > \rho$ and which satisfies (25) at ρ that has strictly lower variance than \hat{f} on all vectors $Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$. This will show that \hat{f} is not admissible on Z .

The estimator \hat{f} violates (26), so either

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} < \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \equiv L \quad (27)$$

or

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} > \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \equiv U. \quad (28)$$

Violation (28), for a nonnegative unbiased \hat{f} , means that $M \equiv \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du < \underline{f}(u, \mathbf{v})$. Consider $\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ and the \mathbf{z} -optimal extension, $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{z}, \rho, M)}$ (see Theorem 2.1). Because the point (ρ, M) lies strictly below $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{z})}$, the lower hull of both the point and $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{z})}$ has a linear piece on some interval with right end point ρ . More precisely, $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{z}, \rho, M)}(u) \equiv \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}, M)$ on $S(u, \mathbf{z})$ at some nonempty interval $u \in (\eta_z, \rho]$ so that at the point η_z , the lower bound is met, that is, $M + (\rho - \eta_z)\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}, M) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \eta_z^+} \underline{f}(u, \mathbf{z})$. Therefore, all extensions (maintaining nonnegativity and unbiasedness) must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\eta_z}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{z}) du &\leq \lim_{u \rightarrow \eta_z^+} \underline{f}(u, \mathbf{z}) - M \\ &= (\rho - \eta_z)\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}, M) \leq (\rho - \eta_z)U. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

From (28), for some $\epsilon > 0$, \hat{f} has average value strictly higher than U on $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for all u in $(\eta, \rho]$ for $\eta \in [\rho - \epsilon, \rho)$. For each $\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ we define ζ_z as the maximum of $\rho - \epsilon$ and $\inf\{u \mid S^*(u, \mathbf{v}) = S^*(u, \mathbf{z})\}$. From (3), $\zeta_z < \rho$. For each \mathbf{z} , the higher estimate values on $S(u, \mathbf{z})$ for $u \in (\zeta_z, \rho]$ must be ‘‘compensated for’’ by lower values on $u \in (\eta_z, \zeta_z)$ (from nonnegativity we must have the strict inequality $\eta_z < \zeta_z$) so that (29) holds. By modifying the estimator to be equal to U for all outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ $u \in (\rho - \epsilon, \rho]$ and correspondingly increasing some estimate values that are lower than U to U on $S(u, \mathbf{z})$ for $u \in (\eta_z, \zeta_z)$ we obtain an estimator with strictly lower variance than \hat{f} for all $\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ and same variance as \hat{f} on all other vectors. Note we can perform the shift consistently across all branches of the tree-like partial order on outcomes.

Violation (27) means that for some $\epsilon > 0$, \hat{f} has average value strictly lower than L on $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for all intervals $u \in (\eta, \rho]$ for $\eta \in [\rho - \epsilon, \rho)$. For all \mathbf{z} , the \mathbf{z} -optimal extension $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{z}, \rho, M)}(u)$ has value $\lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}, M) \geq L$ at ρ and (from convexity of lower hull) values that are at least that on $u < \rho$. From unbiasedness, we must have for all $\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$, $\int_0^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{z}) du = \int_0^{\rho} \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{z}, \rho, M)}(u) du$. Therefore, values lower than L must be compensated for in \hat{f} by values higher than L . We can modify the estimator such that it is equal to L for $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \in (\rho - \epsilon, \rho)$ and compensate for that by lowering values at lower u values $u < \zeta_z$ that are higher than L . The modified estimator has strictly lower variance than \hat{f} for all $\mathbf{z} \in Z \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ and same variance as \hat{f} on all other vectors. ■

4 The L* Estimator

The L* estimator, $\hat{f}^{(L)}$, is the solution of (21a) with equalities, obtaining values that are minimum in the optimal range. Formally, it is the solution of the integral equation $\forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}, \forall \rho \in (0, 1]$:

$$\hat{f}^{(L)}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\rho) - \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}^{(L)}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho} \quad (30)$$

Geometrically, as visualized in Figure 2, the L* estimate on an outcome $S(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ is exactly the slope value that if maintained for outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ ($u \in (0, \rho]$), would yield an expected estimate of $\underline{f}(S)$. We derive a




Figure 2: An example lower bound function $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)$ with 3 steps and the respective cummulative L estimate $\int_u^1 \hat{f}^{(L)}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$. The estimate $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ is the negated slope and in this case is also a step function with 3 steps.

convenient expression for the L* estimator, which enables us to derive explicit forms or compute it for any function f . We show that the L* estimator is 4-competitive and that it is the unique admissible monotone estimator. We also show it is order-optimal with respect to the natural order that prioritizes data vectors with lower $f(\mathbf{v})$.

Fixing \mathbf{v} , (30) is a first-order differential equation for $F(\rho) \equiv \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}^{(L)}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$ and the initial condition $F(1) = 0$. Since the lower bound function $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$ is monotonic and bounded, it is continuous (and differentiable) almost everywhere. Therefore, the equation with the initial condition has a unique solution:

Lemma 4.1

$$\hat{f}^{(L)}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\rho)}{\rho} - \int_{\rho}^1 \frac{\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)}{u^2} du \quad (31)$$

$$(32)$$

When $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(1) = 0$, which we can assume without loss of generality³, the solution has the simpler form:

$$\hat{f}^{(L)}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) = - \int_{\rho}^1 \frac{d\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)}{u} du \quad (33)$$

³Otherwise, we can instead estimate the function $f(\mathbf{v}) - \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(1)$, which satisfies this assumption, and then add a fixed value of $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(1)$ to the resulting estimate.

We show a tight bound of 4 for the competitive ratio for $\hat{f}^{(L)}$, meaning that it is at most 4 for all functions f and for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a function f on which the ratio is no less than $4 - \epsilon$.

Theorem 4.1

$$\sup_{f, \mathbf{v} \mid \int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)^2 du < \infty} \frac{\int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(L)}(u, \mathbf{v})^2 du}{\int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)^2 du} = 4 ,$$

We present a family of functions for which the supremum of this ratio is 4. We use the domain $\mathbf{V} = [0, 1]$, a PPS sampling scheme with $\tau(u) = u$, and the function $f(v) = \frac{1}{1-p} - \frac{v^{1-p}}{1-p}$ for $p \in [0, 0.5)$. For the data $v = 0$ we have the following convex lower bound function

$$\underline{f}(u, 0) = \frac{1}{1-p} - \frac{u^{1-p}}{1-p} .$$

Being convex, this lower bound function is equal to its lower hull. Therefore, by taking its negated derivative, we get $\hat{f}^{(0)}(u) = 1/u^p$. The function $\hat{f}^{(0)}$ is square integrable when $p < 0.5$:

$$\int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(0)}(u)^2 du = \int_0^1 1/u^{2p} du = \frac{1}{1-2p} .$$

From (33), the L* estimator on outcomes consistent with $v = 0$ for $p \in (0, 0.5)$ is⁴

$$\hat{f}^{(L)}(x, 0) = \int_x^1 \frac{1}{u^{1+p}} = \frac{1}{p} \left(\frac{1}{x^p} - 1 \right) .$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(L)}(u, 0)^2 du &= \frac{1}{p^2} \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{u^{2p}} - \frac{2}{u^p} + 1 \right) du \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2} \left(\frac{1}{1-2p} - \frac{2}{1-p} + 1 \right) = \frac{2}{(1-2p)(1-p)} . \end{aligned}$$

We obtain the ratio

$$\frac{\int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(L)}(u, 0)^2 du}{\int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(0)}(u)^2 du} = \frac{2}{1-p} \leq 4 .$$

The ratio approaches 4 when $p \rightarrow 0.5^-$.

We conclude the proof of Theorem 4.1 using the following lemma that shows that if $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)$ is square integrable, that is, (10) holds, then $\hat{f}^{(L)}(u, \mathbf{v})$ is also square integrable and the ratio between these integrals is at most 4.

Lemma 4.2

$$\forall \mathbf{v}, \int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)^2 du < \infty \implies \frac{\int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(L)}(u, \mathbf{v})^2 du}{\int_0^1 \hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)^2 du} \leq 4 .$$

⁴ For $p = 0$ the estimate is $-\ln(x)$.

Proof Fixing \mathbf{v} , the function $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}$ only depends on the lower hull of the lower bound function $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)$. The estimator $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ depends on the lower bound function \underline{f} and can be different for different lower bound functions with the same lower hull. Fixing the lower hull, the variance of the L* estimator is maximized for f such that $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})} \equiv H_f^{(\mathbf{v})}$. It therefore suffices to consider convex $\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)$, that is, $\frac{d^2 \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)}{d^2 u} > 0$ for which we have

$$\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u) = -\frac{d \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)}{du}.$$

Recall that $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)$ is monotone non-increasing. From (33), $\hat{f}^{(L)}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) = -\int_{\rho}^1 \frac{d \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(u)}{du} du$.

To establish our claim, it suffices to show that for all monotone, non increasing, square integrable functions $g : (0, 1]$,

$$\frac{\int_0^1 (\int_x^1 \frac{g(u)}{u} du)^2 dx}{\int_0^1 g(x)^2 dx} \leq 4 \quad (34)$$

Define $h(x) = \int_x^1 \frac{g(u)}{u} du$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\epsilon}^1 h^2(x) dx &= \int_{\epsilon}^1 \int_x^1 2h(y)h'(y) dy dx \\ &= \int_{\epsilon}^1 \int_{\epsilon}^y 2h(y)h'(y) dx dy \\ &= 2 \int_{\epsilon}^1 h(y)h'(y) \int_{\epsilon}^y dx dy \\ &= 2 \int_{\epsilon}^1 h(y)h'(y)(y - \epsilon) dy \\ &= 2 \int_{\epsilon}^1 h(y) \frac{g(y)}{y} (y - \epsilon) dy \leq 2 \int_{\epsilon}^1 h(y)g(y) dy \\ &\leq 2 \sqrt{\int_{\epsilon}^1 h^2(y) dy} \sqrt{\int_{\epsilon}^1 g^2(y) dy} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is Cauchy-Schwartz. To obtain (34), we divide both sides by $\sqrt{\int_{\epsilon}^1 h^2(y) dy}$ and take the limit as ϵ goes to 0. ■

Theorem 4.2 *The estimator $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ is monotone. Moreover, it is the unique admissible monotone estimator and dominates all monotone estimators.*

Proof Recall that an estimator \hat{f} is monotone if and only if, for any data \mathbf{v} , the estimate $\hat{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ is non-increasing with ρ . To show monotonicity of the L* estimator, we rewrite (31) to obtain

$$\hat{f}^{(L)}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) = \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\rho) + \int_{\rho}^1 \frac{\underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\rho) - \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(x)}{x^2} dx, \quad (35)$$

which is clearly non-increasing with ρ .

We now show that $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ dominates all monotone estimators (and hence is the unique admissible monotone estimator). By definition, a monotone estimator \hat{f} can not exceed λ_L on any outcome, that is, it must satisfy the inequalities $\forall \mathbf{v}, \forall \rho \in [0, 1]$:

$$\rho \hat{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) + \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \leq \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \int_0^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{z}) du = \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} f(\mathbf{z}) = \underline{f}^{(\mathbf{v})}(\rho). \quad (36)$$

Estimator $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ satisfies (36) with equalities. If there is a monotone estimator \hat{f} which is not equivalent to $\hat{f}^{(L)}$, that is, for some \mathbf{v} , the integral is strictly smaller than the integral of $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ on some interval $(\rho - \epsilon, \rho)$ ($\epsilon > 0$ may depend on \mathbf{v}), we can obtain a monotone estimator that strictly dominates \hat{f} by decreasing the estimate for $u \leq \rho - \epsilon$ and increasing it for $u > \rho - \epsilon$. The variance decreases because we decrease the estimate on higher values and increase on lower values. ■

Lastly, we show that $\hat{f}^{(L)}$ is order-optimal with respect to the order \prec which prioritizes vectors with lower $f(\mathbf{v})$:

Theorem 4.3 *A \prec^+ -optimal estimator for f with respect to the partial order*

$$\mathbf{v} \prec \mathbf{v}' \iff f(\mathbf{v}) < f(\mathbf{v}')$$

must be equivalent to $\hat{f}^{(L)}$.

Proof We use our results of order-optimality (Section 5). We can check that we obtain (30) using (43) and \prec as defined in the statement of the Theorem. Thus, a \prec^+ -optimal solution must have this form. ■

The L^* estimator may not be bounded (see Example 4). An estimator that is both bounded and competitive (but not necessarily in-range, not monotone, and has a large competitive ratio) is the J estimator [15].

5 Order-optimality

We identify conditions on f and \prec under which a \prec^+ -optimal estimator exists and specify this estimator as a solution of a set of equations. Our derivations of \prec^+ -optimal estimators follow the intuition to require the estimate on an outcome S to be \mathbf{v} -optimal with respect to the \prec -minimal vector that is consistent with the outcome:

$$\forall S = S(\rho, \mathbf{v}), \hat{f}(S) = \lambda(\rho, \min_{\prec}(S^*)). \quad (37)$$

When \prec is a total order and V is finite, $\min_{\prec}(S^*)$ is unique and (37) is well defined. Moreover, as long as f has a nonnegative unbiased estimator, a solution (37) always exists and is \prec^+ -optimal. We preview a simple construction of the solution: Process vectors in increasing \prec order, iteratively building a partially defined nonnegative estimator. When processing \mathbf{v} , the estimator is already defined for $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \geq \rho_{\mathbf{v}}$, for some $\rho_{\mathbf{v}} \in (0, 1]$. We extend it to the outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \leq \rho_{\mathbf{v}}$ using the \mathbf{v} -optimal extension $\hat{f}^{(\mathbf{v}, \rho_{\mathbf{v}}, M)}(u)$, where $M = \int_{\rho_{\mathbf{v}}}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du$ (see Theorem 2.1).

We now formulate conditions that will allow us to establish \prec^+ -optimality of a solution of (37) in more general settings. These conditions always hold when \prec is a total order and V is finite. Generally,

$$\min_{\prec}(S^*) = \{z \in S^* \mid \neg \exists w \in S^*, w \prec z\}$$

is a set and (37) is well defined when $\forall S$, this set is not empty and $\lambda(\rho, \min_{\prec}(S^*))$ is unique, that is, the value $\lambda(\rho, z)$ is the same for all \prec -minimal vectors $z \in \min_{\prec}(S^*)$. A sufficient condition for this is that

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \rho \forall \mathbf{v} \forall x \in (0, \underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v})] \forall z, \mathbf{w} \in \min_{\prec}(S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})), \\ & \inf_{\eta < \rho} \frac{f(\eta, z) - x}{\rho - \eta} = \inf_{\eta < \rho} \frac{f(\eta, \mathbf{w}) - x}{\rho - \eta} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

In this case, the respective Equation (37) on $u \in (0, \rho]$ are the same for all $z \in \min_{\prec}(S^*)$ and thus so are the estimate values $\hat{f}(u, z)$.

We say that $Z \subset V$ is \prec -bounded if

$$\forall \mathbf{v} \in Z \exists z \in \min_{\prec}(Z), z \preceq \mathbf{v} \quad (39)$$

That is, for all $z \in Z$, z is \prec -minimal or is preceded by some vector that is \prec -minimal in Z .

We say that an outcome S is \prec -bounded if S^* is \prec -bounded, that is,

$$\forall \mathbf{v} \in S^* \exists z \in \min_{\prec}(S^*), z \preceq \mathbf{v} \quad (40)$$

When all outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ are \prec -bounded, we say that a set of vectors R represents \mathbf{v} if any outcome consistent with \mathbf{v} has a \prec -minimal vector in R :

$$\forall u \in (0, 1], \exists z \in R, z \in \min_{\prec}(S^*(u, \mathbf{v})).$$

We now show that we can obtain a \prec^+ -optimal estimator if every vector \mathbf{v} has a set of finite size that represents it. Example 5 walks through a derivation of \prec^+ -optimal estimators.

Lemma 5.1 *If f satisfies (9), (38), (40) and*

$$\forall \mathbf{v}, \min\{|R| \mid \forall u \in (0, 1], \exists z \in R, z \in \min_{\prec} S^*(u, \mathbf{v})\} < \infty,$$

then a \prec^+ -optimal estimator exists and must be equivalent to a solution of (37).

Proof We provide an explicit construction of a \prec^+ -optimal estimator for f .

Fixing \mathbf{v} , we select a finite set of representatives. We can map the representatives (or a subset of them) to distinct subintervals covering $(0, 1]$. The subintervals have the form $(a_i, a_{i-1}]$ where $0 = a_n < \dots < a_1 < a_0 = 1$ such that a representative z that is minimal for $(a_i, a_{i-1}]$ is not minimal for $u \leq a_i$. Such a mapping can always be obtained since from (3), each vector is consistent with an open interval of the form $(a, 1]$, and thus if \prec -minimum at $S^*(u, \mathbf{v})$ (we must have $u > a$) it must be \prec -minimum for $S^*(x, \mathbf{v})$ for $x \in (a, u]$. Thus, the region on which z is in $\min_{\prec} S^*(u, \mathbf{v})$ is open to the left. We can always choose a mapping such that the left boundary of this region corresponds to a_i .

Let $z^{(i)}$ ($i \in [n]$) be the representative mapped to outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ where $u \in (a_i, a_{i-1}]$. Since $S^*(u, \mathbf{v})$ is monotone non-decreasing with u , $i < j$ implies that $z^{(i)} \prec z^{(j)}$ or that they are incomparable in the partial order.

We construct a partially specified nonnegative estimator in steps, by solving (37) iteratively for the vectors $\mathbf{z}^{(i)}$. Initially we invoke Theorem 2.1 to obtain estimate values for $S(u, \mathbf{z}^{(1)})$ $u \in (0, 1]$ that minimize the variance for $\mathbf{z}^{(1)}$. The result is a partially specified nonnegative estimator. In particular for \mathbf{v} , the estimator is now specified for outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ where $u \in (a_1, 1]$. Any modification of this estimator on a subinterval of $(a_1, 1]$ with positive measure will strictly increase the variance for $\mathbf{z}^{(1)}$ (or result in an estimator that can not be completed to a nonnegative unbiased one).

After step i , we have a partially specified nonnegative estimator that is specified for $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \in (a_i, 1]$. The estimator is fully specified for $\mathbf{z}^{(j)}$ $j \leq i$ and is \prec^+ -optimal on these vectors in the sense that any other partially specified nonnegative estimator that is fully specified for $\mathbf{z}^{(j)}$ $j \leq i$ and has strictly lower variance on some $\mathbf{z}^{(j)}$ ($j \leq i$) must have strictly higher variance on some $\mathbf{z}^{(h)}$ such that $h < j$.

We now invoke Theorem 2.1 with respect to the vector $\mathbf{z}^{(i+1)}$. The estimator is partially specified for $S(u, \mathbf{z}^{(i+1)})$ on $u > a_i$ and we obtain estimate values for the outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{z}^{(i+1)})$ for $u \in (0, a_i]$ that constitute a partially specified nonnegative estimator with minimum variance for $\mathbf{z}^{(i+1)}$. Note again that this completion is unique (up to equivalence). This extension now defines $S(u, \mathbf{v})$ for $u \in (a_{i+1}, 1]$.

Lastly, note that we must have $f(\mathbf{z}^{(n)}) = f(\mathbf{v})$ because $f(\mathbf{z}^{(n)}) < f(\mathbf{v})$ implies that (9) is violated for \mathbf{v} whereas the reverse inequality implies that (9) is violated for $\mathbf{z}^{(n)}$. Since at step n the estimator is specified for all outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{z}^{(n)})$ and unbiased, it is unbiased for \mathbf{v} .

The estimator is invariant to the choice of the representative sets R_v for $\mathbf{v} \in V$ and also remains the same if we restrict \prec so that it includes only relations between \mathbf{v} and R_v .

We so far showed that there is a unique, up to equivalence, partially specified nonnegative estimator that is \prec^+ optimal with respect to a vector \mathbf{v} and all vectors it depends on. Consider now all outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v})$, for all u and \mathbf{v} , arranged according to the containment order on $S^*(u, \mathbf{v})$ according to decreasing u values with branching points when $S^*(u, \mathbf{v})$ changes. If for two vectors \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{z} , the sets of outcomes $S(u, \mathbf{v}), u \in (0, 1]$ and $S(u, \mathbf{z}), u \in (0, 1]$ intersect, the intersection must be equal for $u > \rho$ for some $\rho < 1$. In this case the estimator values computed with respect to either \mathbf{z} or \mathbf{v} would be identical for $u \in (\rho, 1]$. Also note that partially specified nonnegative solutions on different branches are independent. Therefore, solutions with respect to different vectors \mathbf{v} can be consistently combined to a fully specified estimator. ■

5.1 Continuous domains

The assumptions of Lemma 5.1 may break on continuous domains. Firstly, outcomes may not be \prec -bounded and in particular, $\min_{\prec}(S^*)$ can be empty even when S^* is not, resulting in (37) not being well defined. Secondly, even if \prec is a total order, minimum elements do not necessarily exist and thus (40) may not hold, and lastly, there may not be a finite set of representatives. To treat such domains, we utilize a notion of *convergence with respect to \prec* :

We define the \prec -lim of a function h on a set of vectors $Z \subset V$:

$$\begin{aligned} \prec\text{-lim}(h(\cdot), Z) = x &\iff \\ \forall \mathbf{v} \in Z \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \mathbf{w} \preceq \mathbf{v}, \forall \mathbf{z} \preceq \mathbf{w}, |h(\mathbf{z}) - x| &\leq \epsilon \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The \prec -lim may not exist but is unique if it does. Note that when Z is finite or more generally, \prec -bounded, and $h(\mathbf{z})$ is unique for all $\mathbf{z} \in \min_{\prec} Z$, then $\prec\text{-lim}(h(\cdot), Z) = h(\min_{\prec} Z)$.

We define the \prec -closure of \mathbf{z} as the set containing \mathbf{z} and all preceding vectors $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{z}) = \{\mathbf{v} \in V | \mathbf{v} \preceq \mathbf{z}\}$.

We provide an alternative definition of the \prec -lim using the notion of \prec -closure.

$$\begin{aligned} \prec\text{-lim}(h(\cdot), Z) &= x \\ \iff \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in Z} \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v}) \cap Z} h(\mathbf{z}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in Z} \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v}) \cap Z} h(\mathbf{z}) = x \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

We say that the lower bound function \prec -converges on outcome $S = S(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ if $\prec\text{-lim}(\underline{f}(\eta, \cdot), S^*)$ exists for all $\eta \in (0, \rho)$. When this holds, the \prec -lim of the optimal values (17) over consistent vectors S^* exists for all $M = \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du \leq \underline{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v})$. We use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\prec}(S, M) &= \prec\text{-lim}(\lambda(\rho, \cdot, M), S^*) \\ &= \inf_{0 \leq \eta < \rho} \frac{\prec\text{-lim}(\underline{f}(\eta, \cdot), S^*) - M}{\rho - \eta}. \end{aligned}$$

When the partially specified estimator \hat{f} is clear from context, we omit the parameter M and use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\prec}(S) &= \prec\text{-lim}(\lambda(\rho, \cdot), S^*) \\ &= \inf_{0 \leq \eta < \rho} \frac{\prec\text{-lim}(\underline{f}(\eta, \cdot), S^*) - \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta}. \end{aligned}$$

We can finally propose a generalization of (37):

$$\forall S, \hat{f}(S) = \lambda_{\prec}(S) \quad (43)$$

which is well defined when the lower bound function \prec -converges for all S :

$$\forall S = S(\rho, \mathbf{v}), \forall \eta \leq \rho, \prec\text{-lim}(\underline{f}(\eta, \cdot), S^*) \text{ exists.} \quad (44)$$

Using the definition (42) of \prec -convergence and (4) we obtain that an estimator is equivalent to (43) if and only if

$$\forall \mathbf{v} \forall \rho \in (0, 1], \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} = \lambda_{\prec}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) \quad (45)$$

We show that equivalence to (43) is *necessary* for \prec^+ -optimality. To facilitate the proof, we express \prec^+ -optimality in terms of restricted admissibility:

Lemma 5.2 *An estimator is \prec^+ -optimal if and only if, for all $\mathbf{v} \in V$, it is admissible with respect to $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v})$.*

Proof If there is \mathbf{v} such that \hat{f} is not admissible on $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v})$, there is an alternative estimator with strictly lower variance on some $\mathbf{z} \in \text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v})$ and at most the variance on all $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v}) \setminus \{\mathbf{z}\}$. Since $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v})$ contains all vectors that precede \mathbf{z} , the estimator \hat{f} can not be \prec^+ -optimal. To establish the converse, assume an estimator \hat{f} is admissible on $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v})$ for all \mathbf{v} . Consider $\mathbf{z} \in V$. Since \hat{f} is admissible on $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{z})$, there is no alternative estimator with strictly lower variance on \mathbf{z} and at most the variance of \hat{f} on all preceding vectors. Since this holds for all \mathbf{z} , we obtain that \hat{f} is \prec^+ -optimal. ■

Lemma 5.3 *If f satisfies (9) and (44) then \hat{f} is \prec^+ -optimal only if it satisfies (45).*

Proof Lemma 5.2 states that an estimator is \prec^+ -optimal if and only if $\forall \mathbf{w} \in V$ it is admissible with respect to $\text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{w})$. Applying Lemma 3.1, the latter holds only if

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \mathbf{v} \in V \forall \rho \in (0, 1] \\ \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v}) \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{v}) \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

From definition, $S(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \equiv S(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ for all vectors $\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$. Moreover, for $\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ there is a nonempty interval $(\eta_{\mathbf{z}}, \rho]$ such that $\forall u \in (\eta_{\mathbf{z}}, \rho]$, $S^*(u, \mathbf{z}) \equiv S^*(u, \mathbf{v})$. Therefore, for all $\mathbf{z} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})$, the limits $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{z}) du}{\rho - \eta}$ are the same. Therefore, (46) \iff

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \mathbf{v} \in V \forall \rho \in (0, 1] \\ \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \rho^-} \frac{\int_{\eta}^{\rho} \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{w}) \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \\ &\leq \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \text{cl}_{\prec}(\mathbf{w}) \cap S^*(\rho, \mathbf{v})} \lambda(\rho, \mathbf{z}) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

■

We leave open the question of determining the most inclusive conditions on f and \prec under which a \prec^+ -optimum exists, and thus the solution of (43) is \prec^+ -optimal. We show that any solution of (43) is unbiased and nonnegative when f has a nonnegative unbiased estimator.

Lemma 5.4 *When f and \prec satisfy (9) and (44), a solution $\hat{f}^{(\prec^+)}$ of (43) is unbiased and nonnegative.*

Proof From Lemma 3.1, since all values are in-range, the solution is unbiased and nonnegative. ■

6 The U^* Estimator

The estimator $\hat{f}^{(U)}$ satisfies (21b) with equality.

$$\forall S(\rho, \mathbf{v}), \hat{f}(\rho, \mathbf{v}) = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*} \inf_{0 \leq \eta < \rho} \frac{\underline{f}(\eta, \mathbf{z}) - \int_{\rho}^1 \hat{f}(u, \mathbf{v}) du}{\rho - \eta} \quad (48)$$

The U^* estimator is not always admissible. We do show, however, that under a natural condition, it is order-optimal with respect to an order that prioritizes vectors with higher f values (and hence also admissible). The condition states that for all $S(\rho, \mathbf{v})$ and $\eta < \rho$, the supremum of the lower bound function $\underline{f}(\eta, \mathbf{z})$ over $\mathbf{z} \in S^*$ is attained (in the limiting sense) at vectors that maximize f on S^* . Formally:

$$\forall \eta < \rho, \lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{f}(S)} \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^* | f(\mathbf{z}) \geq x} \underline{f}(\eta, \mathbf{z}) = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*} \underline{f}(\eta, \mathbf{z}), \quad (49)$$

where $\bar{f}(S) = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S^*} f(\mathbf{z})$.

Lemma 6.1 *If f satisfies (49), then the U^* estimator is \prec^+ -optimal with respect to the order $\mathbf{z} \prec \mathbf{v} \iff f(\mathbf{z}) > f(\mathbf{v})$.*

Proof We can show that when (49) holds then (48) is the same as (43). ■

The condition (49) is satisfied by RG_p and RG_{p+} . In this case, the conditions of Lemma 5.1 are also satisfied and thus the U^* estimator is \prec^+ optimal.

7 Conclusion

We take an optimization approach to the derivation of estimators, targeting both worst-case and common-case variance. We explore this for monotone sampling, deriving novel and powerful estimators.

An interesting open question for monotone sampling is bounding the universal ratio: What is the lowest ratio we can guarantee on any monotone estimation problem for which there is an estimator with finite variances? Our L^* estimator shows that the ratio is at most 4. On the other end, one can construct examples where the ratio is at least 1.4. We partially address this problem in follow-up work.

Another natural question is to find efficient constructions of estimators with *instance optimal* competitive ratio. This question is interesting even in the context of specific functions (such as exponentiated range, which facilitates L_p difference estimation [7]).

Our general treatment of arbitrary functions facilitates the design of automated tools which derive estimators according to specifications. Our motivating applications of monotone sampling are for the important special case of coordinated shared-seed sampling. We expect more applications in that domain, but also believe that the monotone sampling formulation will find further applications in pattern recognition, and plan to explore this in future work. Beyond monotone sampling, we hope that the foundations we provided can lead to a better understanding of other sampling schemes, and better estimators. In particular, the projection on a single item of *independent* (rather than coordinated) PPS or bottom- k samples of instances is essentially an extended monotone estimation problem with r independent seeds instead of a single seed.

Lastly, the relevance of our work for the analysis of massive data sets is demonstrated (in follow-up work) on two basic problems:

Estimating L_p difference from sampled data [7]: Extending Example 4, we derive closed form expressions for RG_p estimators and their variances, with focus on $p = 1, 2$. We estimate L_p as the p th roots of sums of our L^* and U^* estimators for exponentiated range functions RG_p ($p > 0$). These estimators, for L_1 and L_2 , were applied to samples of data sets with different characteristics: IP flow records exhibited larger differences between bandwidth usage assumed by a flow key (IP source destination pair, port, and protocol) in different times. The surnames dataset (frequencies of surnames in published books in different years) had more similar values. Accordingly, the U^* estimator, which is optimized for large differences dominated on the IP flow records dataset whereas the L^* estimator dominated on the surnames dataset. This demonstrates the potential value in selecting a custom estimator. The L^* estimator, however, which is competitive (the ratio turns out to be 2.5 for L_1 and 2 for L_2), never exceedingly underperformed the U^* estimator, whereas the U^* estimator could perform much worse than the L^* . This shows the value of variance competitiveness and selecting a competitive estimator when there is no understanding of patterns in data. For the L_1 and L_2 differences, we also computed (via a program) the optimally competitive estimator. Prior to our work, there were no good estimators for L_p differences over coordinated samples for any $p \neq 1$. Only a non-optimal estimator was known for L_1 [16] and for the special case of 0/1 values for the related Jaccard coefficient [4, 3]. Our study demonstrates that we obtain accurate estimates even when only a small fraction of entries is sampled.

Sktech-based similarity estimation in social networks [9]: We applied our L^* estimator to obtain sketch-based closeness similarities between nodes in social networks. As mentioned in the introduction, a set of all-distances sketches (ADS) can be computed for all nodes in near-linear time [6]. The ADS of a node v is essentially a sample of other nodes, where a node u is included with probability inversely proportional to their Dijkstra rank (neighbor rank) with respect to v . As mentioned, ADSs of different nodes are coordinated samples. Closeness similarity [9] between nodes measures the similarity of their distance relation to other nodes:

$$\text{sim}(u, v) = \frac{\sum_i \alpha(\max\{d_{vi}, d_{ui}\})}{\sum_i \alpha(\min\{d_{vi}, d_{ui}\})},$$

where α is non-increasing. To estimate closeness similarity of u and v from $\text{ADS}(u)$ and $\text{ADS}(v)$, we use the HIP inclusion probabilities (which with conditioning allow us to consider one item at a time) [8]. We then applied the L^* estimator to estimate, for each node i , $\alpha(\min\{d_{vi}, d_{ui}\})$. These unbiased nonnegative estimates were then added up to obtain an estimate for the sum.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Micha Sharir for his help in the proof of Lemma 4.2. The author is grateful to Haim Kaplan for many comments and helpful feedback.

References

- [1] K. S. Beyer, P. J. Haas, B. Reinwald, Y. Sismanis, and R. Gemulla. On synopses for distinct-value estimation under multiset operations. In *SIGMOD*, pages 199–210. ACM, 2007.
- [2] K. R. W. Brewer, L. J. Early, and S. F. Joyce. Selecting several samples from a single population. *Australian Journal of Statistics*, 14(3):231–239, 1972.
- [3] A. Z. Broder. On the resemblance and containment of documents. In *Proceedings of the Compression and Complexity of Sequences*, pages 21–29. IEEE, 1997.
- [4] A. Z. Broder. Identifying and filtering near-duplicate documents. In *Proc. of the 11th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching*, volume 1848 of *LNCS*, pages 1–10. Springer, 2000.
- [5] J. W. Byers, J. Considine, M. Mitzenmacher, and S. Rost. Informed content delivery across adaptive overlay networks. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 12(5):767–780, October 2004.
- [6] E. Cohen. Size-estimation framework with applications to transitive closure and reachability. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 55:441–453, 1997.
- [7] E. Cohen. Distance queries from sampled data: Accurate and efficient. Technical Report cs.DS/1203.4903, arXiv, 2012.
- [8] E. Cohen. All-distances sketches, revisited: Hip estimators for massive graphs analysis. In *PODS*. ACM, 2014.
- [9] E. Cohen, D. Delling, F. Fuchs, A. Goldberg, M. Goldszmidt, and R. Werneck. Scalable similarity estimation in social networks: Closeness, node labels, and random edge lengths. In *COSN*, 2013.
- [10] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Spatially-decaying aggregation over a network: model and algorithms. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 73:265–288, 2007. Full version of a SIGMOD 2004 paper.
- [11] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Summarizing data using bottom-k sketches. In *Proceedings of the ACM PODC’07 Conference*, 2007.
- [12] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Tighter estimation using bottom-k sketches. In *Proceedings of the 34th VLDB Conference*, 2008.

- [13] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Leveraging discarded samples for tighter estimation of multiple-set aggregates. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMETRICS'09 Conference*, 2009.
- [14] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Get the most out of your sample: Optimal unbiased estimators using partial information. In *Proc. of the 2011 ACM Symp. on Principles of Database Systems (PODS 2011)*. ACM, 2011. full version: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.4903>.
- [15] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. What you can do with coordinated samples. In *The 17th. International Workshop on Randomization and Computation (RANDOM)*, 2013. full version: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.5637>.
- [16] E. Cohen, H. Kaplan, and S. Sen. Coordinated weighted sampling for estimating aggregates over multiple weight assignments. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 2(1–2), 2009. full version: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0906.4560>.
- [17] E. Cohen, Y.-M. Wang, and G. Suri. When piecewise determinism is almost true. In *Proc. Pacific Rim International Symposium on Fault-Tolerant Systems*, pages 66–71, December 1995.
- [18] A. Das, M. Datar, A. Garg, and S. Rajaram. Google news personalization: scalable online collaborative filtering. In *WWW*, 2007.
- [19] N. Duffield, M. Thorup, and C. Lund. Priority sampling for estimating arbitrary subset sums. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 54(6), 2007.
- [20] P. S. Efraimidis and P. G. Spirakis. Weighted random sampling with a reservoir. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 97(5):181–185, 2006.
- [21] P. Gibbons and S. Tirthapura. Estimating simple functions on the union of data streams. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures*. ACM, 2001.
- [22] P. B. Gibbons. Distinct sampling for highly-accurate answers to distinct values queries and event reports. In *International Conference on Very Large Databases (VLDB)*, pages 541–550, 2001.
- [23] M. Hadjieleftheriou, X. Yu, N. Koudas, and D. Srivastava. Hashed samples: Selectivity estimators for set similarity selection queries. In *Proceedings of the 34th VLDB Conference*, 2008.
- [24] J. Hájek. *Sampling from a finite population*. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1981.
- [25] D. G. Horvitz and D. J. Thompson. A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 47(260):663–685, 1952.
- [26] D. E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Vol 2, Seminumerical Algorithms*. Addison-Wesley, 1st edition, 1968.
- [27] J. Lanke. On UMV-estimators in survey sampling. *Metrika*, 20(1):196–202, 1973.
- [28] P. Li, K. W. Church, and T. Hastie. One sketch for all: Theory and application of conditional random sampling. In *NIPS*, 2008.
- [29] D. Mosk-Aoyama and D. Shah. Computing separable functions via gossip. In *Proceedings of the ACM PODC'06 Conference*, 2006.
- [30] P. Mukhopandhyay. *Theory and Methods of Survey Sampling*. PHI learning, New Delhi, 2 edition, 2008.
- [31] E. Ohlsson. Sequential poisson sampling. *J. Official Statistics*, 14(2):149–162, 1998.
- [32] E. Ohlsson. Coordination of pps samples over time. In *The 2nd International Conference on Establishment Surveys*, pages 255–264. American Statistical Association, 2000.
- [33] B. Rosén. Asymptotic theory for successive sampling with varying probabilities without replacement, I. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 43(2):373–397, 1972.
- [34] B. Rosén. Asymptotic theory for order sampling. *J. Statistical Planning and Inference*, 62(2):135–158, 1997.

- [35] P. J. Saavedra. Fixed sample size pps approximations with a permanent random number. In *Proc. of the Section on Survey Research Methods, Alexandria VA*, pages 697–700. American Statistical Association, 1995.
- [36] J.S. Vitter. Random sampling with a reservoir. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 11(1):37–57, 1985.