

Estimation of a Likelihood Ratio Ordered Family of Distributions – with a Connection to Total Positivity

Alexandre Mösching^{*1} and Lutz Dümbgen^{†2}

¹Georg-August-University of Göttingen

²University of Bern

December 22, 2024

Abstract

Consider bivariate observations $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with unknown conditional distributions Q_x of Y , given that $X = x$. The goal is to estimate these distributions under the sole assumption that Q_x is isotonic in x with respect to likelihood ratio order. If the observations are identically distributed, a related goal is to estimate the joint distribution $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ under the sole assumption that it is totally positive of order two in a certain sense. After reviewing and generalizing the concepts of likelihood ratio order and total positivity of order two, an algorithm is developed which estimates the unknown family of distributions $(Q_x)_x$ via empirical likelihood. The benefit of the stronger regularization imposed by likelihood ratio order over the usual stochastic order is evaluated in terms of estimation and predictive performances on simulated as well as real data.

Keywords: Empirical likelihood, likelihood ratio order, order constraint, quasi-Newton method, stochastic order, total positivity.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 62G05, 62G08, 60E15, 62H12.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by Swiss National Science Foundation. The authors are grateful to Johanna Ziegel and Alexander Jordan for stimulating discussions and to Tilmann Gneiting for pointing us to the connection between likelihood ratio order and concavity of ROC curves.

1 Introduction

Consider a univariate regression setting with observations $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ in $\mathfrak{X} \times \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathfrak{X}$ is an arbitrary real set. We assume that conditional on $\mathbf{X} = (X_i)_{i=1}^n$, the observations $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ are independent with distributions $\mathcal{L}(Y_i | \mathbf{X}) = Q_{X_i}$, where the distributions Q_x , $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, are unknown. The goal is to estimate the latter under the sole assumption that Q_x is isotonic in x in a certain sense. That means, if (X, Y) denotes a generic observation, the larger (or smaller) the value of X , the larger (or smaller) Y tends to be. An obvious notion of order would be the usual stochastic order, i.e. one assumes that $Q_{x_1} \leq_{\text{st}} Q_{x_2}$ whenever $x_1 \leq x_2$. This concept has been investigated and

^{*}alexandre.moesching@uni-goettingen.de

[†]duembgen@stat.unibe.ch

generalized by numerous authors, see [Mösching and Dümbgen \(2020\)](#), [Henzi et al. \(2019\)](#) and the references cited therein. The latter paper illustrates the application of isotonic distributional regression in weather forecasting, and [Henzi et al. \(2021\)](#) use it to analyse the length of stay of patients in Swiss hospitals.

The present paper investigates a stronger notion of order, the so-called likelihood ratio order. The usual definition is that for arbitrary points $x_1 < x_2$ in $\mathfrak{X}$, the distributions Q_{x_1} and Q_{x_2} have densities g_{x_1} and g_{x_2} with respect to some dominating measure such that g_{x_2}/g_{x_1} is isotonic on the set $\{g_{x_1} + g_{x_2} > 0\}$, and this condition will be denoted by $Q_{x_1} \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_{x_2}$. At first glance, this looks like a rather strong assumption coming out of thin air, but as argued later, it is a reasonable constraint. Note that likelihood ratio ordering is familiar from discriminant analysis and mathematical statistics, see [Karlin and Rubin \(1956\)](#), [Lehmann and Rojo \(1992\)](#). Suppose that $(Q_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}}$ satisfies the likelihood order constraint above. If we observe $Y \sim Q_C$ with unknown random class label C in $\mathfrak{X} = \{x_1, x_2\}$ with $x_1 < x_2$, then the posterior probability $\mathbb{P}(C = x_2 | Y)$ is isotonic in Y . If we observe $Y \sim Q_\theta$ with unknown parameter $\theta \in \mathfrak{X}$, then an optimal test of the null hypothesis that $\theta \leq \theta_o$ versus the alternative hypothesis that $\theta > \theta_o$ rejects the null hypothesis for large values of Y . Furthermore, likelihood ratio ordering is a frequent assumption or implication of models in mathematical finance, see [Beare and Moon \(2015\)](#); [Jewitt \(1991\)](#).

The notion of likelihood ratio order is reviewed thoroughly in Section 2, showing that it defines a partial order on the set of all probability measures on the real line which is preserved under weak convergence. That material generalizes definitions and results in [Shaked and Shanthikumar \(2007\)](#) and is potentially of independent interest. It is also explained that two distributions are likelihood ratio ordered if and only if the corresponding receiving operator characteristic (ROC) is a concave curve, and this is related to convexity of their ordinal dominance curve. The latter theory generalizes previous work, e.g. by [Westling et al. \(2019\)](#). Finally, we explain the connection between likelihood ratio ordering and total positivity of order two (TP2) of bivariate distributions.

Thus far, estimation of distributions under a likelihood ratio order constraint was mainly limited to the two-population setting. First, [Dykstra et al. \(1995\)](#) estimated the parameters of two multinomial distributions that are likelihood ratio ordered via a restricted maximum likelihood approach. After reparametrization, they found that the maximization problem at hand had reduced to a specific bioassay problem treated by [Robertson et al. \(1988\)](#) and which makes use of the theory of isotonic regression. It is then suggested that their approach generalizes well to any two distributions that are absolutely continuous with respect to some dominating measure. Later, [Carolan and Tebbs \(2005\)](#) focused on testing procedures for the equality of two continuous distribution functions G_1 and G_2 versus the alternative hypothesis that $G_1 \leq_{\text{lr}} G_2$. To this end, they made use of the equivalence between likelihood ratio order and the convexity of the ordinal dominance curve $\alpha \mapsto G_2(G_1^{-1}(\alpha))$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, which holds in case G_2 is absolutely continuous with respect to G_1 . The convexity of the ordinal dominance curve was also exploited by [Westling et al. \(2019\)](#) to provide nonparametric maximum likelihood estimators of G_1 and G_2 under likelihood ratio order for discrete, continuous, as well as mixed continuous-discrete distributions. Their approach builds on the idea of [Carolan and Tebbs \(2005\)](#), where estimators are produced from the greatest convex minorant of the empirical ordinal dominance curve. However, this method still necessitates the restrictive assumption that G_2 is absolutely continuous with respect to G_1 . Other relevant references on the topic are [Yu et al. \(2017\)](#), who treat the estimation problem with a maximum smoothed likelihood approach – requiring the choice of a kernel and bandwidth parameters – as well as [Roosen and Hennessy \(2004\)](#), who test for likelihood ratio ordering of two or more distributions

using a discretization of the space of outcomes.

Coming back to the regression setting described at the beginning, Section 3 introduces an empirical likelihood approach (Owen, 1988, 2001) to estimate the family $(Q_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}}$ for arbitrary real sets $\mathfrak{X}$. It is shown that the problem of maximizing the (empirical) likelihood under the likelihood ratio ordering constraint yields a finite-dimensional convex optimization problem with linear inequality constraints. Assuming that the observations (X_i, Y_i) are independent copies of a generic random pair (X, Y) , the new estimation method may also be interpreted as an empirical likelihood estimator of the joint distribution of (X, Y) , hypothesizing that the latter is TP2. Indeed, the latter problem is symmetric in X and Y , and utilizing that symmetry in the computation turned out to be beneficial. To compute the unique solution numerically, we devise an algorithm which adapts and extends ideas from Jongbloed (1998) and Dümbgen et al. (2006) for the present, more complex setting. It makes use of a quasi-Newton approach, and new search directions are obtained via multiple isotonic weighted least squares regression. At the end of Section 3, we also indicate briefly an alternative estimator based on minimum Kolmogorov–Smirnov type distances.

In Section 4, a simulation study illustrates the benefits of the new estimation paradigm compared to the usual stochastic order constraint.

Proofs and technical details are deferred to two appendices.

2 Likelihood ratio order and total positivity of order two

2.1 Likelihood ratio order

Let P and Q be probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$, equipped with its Borel σ -field $\mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 2.1. *The following properties of (P, Q) are equivalent:*

(i) *There exist a σ -finite measure μ and densities $f = dP/d\mu$, $g = dQ/d\mu$ such that*

$$g/f \text{ is isotonic on } \{f + g > 0\}.$$

(ii) *There exist a σ -finite measure μ and densities $f = dP/d\mu$, $g = dQ/d\mu$ such that*

$$f(y)g(x) \leq f(x)g(y) \quad \text{whenever } x < y.$$

(iii) *For arbitrary sets $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $A \leq B$ (element-wise),*

$$P(B)Q(A) \leq P(A)Q(B).$$

(iv) *For all intervals $A = (x, y]$ and $B = (y, z]$ with $x < y < z$,*

$$P(B)Q(A) \leq P(A)Q(B).$$

The proof of this proposition provides some additional equivalent properties. Now we state the definition of likelihood ratio order on distributions.

Definition 2.2 (Likelihood ratio order). We say that P is smaller than Q with respect to *likelihood ratio order*, and we write $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$, if it satisfies any, and hence each, of the properties (i–iv) in Proposition 2.1.

Remark 2.3. Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007) restrict their attention to probability measures which are either discrete or dominated by Lebesgue measure. Their definition of likelihood ratio order corresponds to properties (i–ii) with μ being counting measure or Lebesgue measure on the real line.

Remark 2.4 (Weak convergence). An important aspect of Proposition 2.1 is that properties (iii-iv) do not involve an explicit dominating measure or explicit densities of P and Q . With an approximation argument, one can show that property (iv) follows from (iv') For all intervals $A = (x, y]$ and $B = (y, z]$ with boundary points $x < y < z$ in a dense subset D of $\mathbb{R}$,

$$P(B)Q(A) \leq P(A)Q(B).$$

In particular, if $(P_n)_n$ and $(Q_n)_n$ are sequences of distributions on $\mathbb{R}$ converging weakly to P and Q , respectively, and if $P_n \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_n$ for all n , then $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ as well. This follows from (iv') with D being the set of all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $P(\{x\}) = 0 = Q(\{x\})$.

Remark 2.5 (Usual stochastic order). Recall that the distribution P is smaller than Q with respect to the *usual stochastic order*, and we write $P \leq_{\text{st}} Q$, if $P((-\infty, x]) \geq Q((-\infty, x])$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The likelihood ratio order is stronger than the usual stochastic order in the sense that $P \leq_{\text{st}} Q$ if $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$. This follows immediately from property (iii) applied to $A := (-\infty, x]$ and $B := (x, \infty)$ for arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}$, because $P(B)Q(A) = Q(A) - P(A)Q(A)$ and $P(A)Q(B) = P(A) - P(A)Q(A)$.

The reverse statement is false in general, but the likelihood ratio order of two distributions is tightly connected to stochastic order of domain-conditional distributions.

Lemma 2.6. *The following three properties of P and Q are equivalent:*

- (i) $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$.
- (ii) $P(\cdot | C) \leq_{\text{lr}} Q(\cdot | C)$ for all $C \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $P(C), Q(C) > 0$.
- (iii) $P(\cdot | C) \leq_{\text{st}} Q(\cdot | C)$ for all $C \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $P(C), Q(C) > 0$.
- (iv) $P(\cdot | (x, z]) \leq_{\text{st}} Q(\cdot | (x, z])$ for arbitrary $x < z$ such that $P((x, z]), Q((x, z]) > 0$.

The next result shows that the relation $\leq_{\text{lr}}$ defines indeed a partial order on the space of arbitrary probability measures on the real line.

Lemma 2.7. *For arbitrary probability measures P, Q and R on $\mathbb{R}$,*

- $P \leq_{\text{lr}} P$ (reflexivity);
- $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ and $Q \leq_{\text{lr}} P$ implies that $P = Q$ (antisymmetry);
- $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ and $Q \leq_{\text{lr}} R$ implies that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} R$ (transitivity).

Another interesting aspect of the likelihood ratio order is its connection with the *receiver operating characteristic (ROC)* of the pair (P, Q) , that means, the set

$$\text{ROC}(P, Q) := \{(P(H), Q(H)) : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$$

with $\mathcal{H}$ denoting the set of left-bounded half-lines augmented by $\emptyset$ and $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{H} := \{(x, \infty) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{[x, \infty) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Note that the family $\mathcal{H}$ is totally ordered by inclusion. With the distribution functions F of P and G of Q , one may also write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ROC}(P, Q) &= \{(1 - F(x), 1 - G(x)) : x \in [-\infty, \infty]\} \cup \{(1 - F(x-), 1 - G(x-)) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(-\infty), G(-\infty) := 0$ and $F(\infty), G(\infty) := 1$. Thus we take the freedom to refer to $\text{ROC}(P, Q)$ as the *ROC curve* of P and Q , imagining a (possibly non-continuous) curve within the unit square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, connecting the points $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 0)$.

Obviously, the ROC curve is isotonic in the sense that if $(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2) \in \text{ROC}(P, Q)$, then $(a_1, b_1) \leq (a_2, b_2)$ or $(a_1, b_1) \geq (a_2, b_2)$ component-wise. By means of Proposition 2.1, one can easily show that likelihood ratio order is equivalent to concavity of the ROC curve in the following sense.




Figure 1: ROC curves for two pairs (P, Q) .

Corollary 2.8. *Two distributions P and Q satisfy $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ if and only if $\text{ROC}(P, Q)$ is concave in the following sense: If (a_0, b_0) , (a_1, b_1) and (a_2, b_2) are three different points in $\text{ROC}(P, Q)$ with $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2$ and $b_0 \leq b_1 \leq b_2$, then*

$$\frac{b_1 - b_0}{a_1 - a_0} \geq \frac{b_2 - b_1}{a_2 - a_1}.$$

An object related to the ROC curve of P and Q is the *ordinal dominance curve* $H_{F,G} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$,

$$H_{F,G}(\alpha) := G(F^{-1}(\alpha)),$$

where

$$F^{-1}(\alpha) := \min\{x \in [-\infty, \infty] : F(x) \geq \alpha\}.$$

The next result has been shown by [Lehmann and Rojo \(1992\)](#) in the special case of $Q \ll P$ and F, G being continuous and strictly increasing. [Westling et al. \(2019\)](#) proved the same result under the assumption that $Q \ll P$ with a density dQ/dP which is continuous on the support of P .

Corollary 2.9. *Suppose that $Q \ll P$. Then $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ if and only if the ordinal dominance curve $H_{F,G}$ is convex on the image of F , i.e. the set $\text{Im}(F) := \{F(x) : -\infty \leq x \leq \infty\}$.*

Remark 2.10. The assumption that $Q \ll P$ is essential in Corollary 2.9. For instance, if $P = (\delta_0 + \delta_1)/2$ with δ_x Dirac measure at x and $Q = \text{Unif}(0, 1)$, then $H_{F,G}(0) = H_{F,G}(1/2) = 0$ and $H_{F,G}(1) = 1$. In consequence, the ordinal dominance curve restricted to $\text{Im}(F) = \{0, 1/2, 1\}$ is convex, but P is not smaller than Q with respect to likelihood ratio order since $\text{ROC}(P, Q) = \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\} \cup \{(1/2, u) : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$ is not concave.

Example 2.11. Let $P = \mathcal{N}(1, 1)$ and $Q = \mathcal{N}(1.5, 6)$. Here $\log dQ/dP(x)$ is strictly convex in $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with limit ∞ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, whence neither $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ nor $Q \leq_{\text{lr}} P$. The left panel of Figure 1 shows the corresponding ROC curve $\text{ROC}(P, Q)$ which is obviously not concave. Now let us replace these Gaussian distributions with gamma distributions, $P = \text{Gamma}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$ and $Q = \text{Gamma}(\alpha_2, \beta_2)$, where $\text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ denotes the gamma distribution with shape parameter $\alpha > 0$ and scale parameter $\beta > 0$. One can easily show that $\log dQ/dP(x)$ is strictly increasing in $x > 0$ if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$, $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2$ and $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) \neq (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$. The right panel of Figure 1 shows the concave ROC curve for $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) = (1, 1)$ and $(\alpha_2, \beta_2) = (1.5, 2)$, i.e. the first and second moments of P and Q coincide with those of the Gaussian distributions considered before.

2.2 Bivariate distributions and order constraints

Throughout this and the next subsection we consider a pair (X, Y) of real-valued random variables and investigate order constraints on the conditional distributions of Y , given certain conditions on X . The *range* of the random variable X is defined as the set

$$\mathcal{X} := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(X \leq x), \mathbb{P}(X \geq x) > 0\}.$$

One can easily verify that $\mathcal{X}$ is the smallest real interval such that $\mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{X}) = 1$.

It is well-known from measure theory that the conditional distribution of Y , given X , may be described by a stochastic kernel. That means, there exists a mapping $K : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with the following properties:

- For any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $K(x, \cdot)$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}$.
- For any fixed $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $K(\cdot, B)$ is measurable on $\mathbb{R}$.
- For arbitrary $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in A, Y \in B) = \mathbb{E}(1_A(X)K(X, B)).$$

The following two theorems clarify under which conditions on the distribution of (X, Y) , the conditional distributions $K(x, \cdot)$ are isotonic in x with respect to stochastic order or likelihood ratio order. Interestingly, the proof is constructive, that means, the stochastic kernel is constructed explicitly.

Theorem 2.12 (Stochastic order). *The following three conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *For arbitrary Borel sets A_1, A_2 with $A_1 < A_2$ and real numbers y ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in A_1, Y > y) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2) \leq \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2, Y > y). \quad (2.1)$$

- (ii) *For arbitrary real numbers $x_0 < x_1 < x_2$ and y , (2.1) holds true with $A_1 = (x_0, x_1]$ and $A_2 = (x_1, x_2]$.*

- (iii) *The stochastic kernel K may be constructed such that for arbitrary $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$,*

$$K(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{st}} K(x_2, \cdot).$$

Theorem 2.13 (Likelihood ratio order). *The following three conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *For arbitrary Borel sets A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 with $A_1 < A_2$ and $B_1 < B_2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1, Y \in B_2) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2, Y \in B_1) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1, Y \in B_1) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2, Y \in B_2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

- (ii) *For arbitrary real numbers $x_0 < x_1 < x_2$ and $y_0 < y_1 < y_2$, (2.2) holds true with $A_1 = (x_0, x_1]$, $A_2 = (x_1, x_2]$ and $B_1 = (y_0, y_1]$, $B_2 = (y_1, y_2]$.*

- (iii) *The stochastic kernel K may be constructed such that for arbitrary $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$,*

$$K(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x_2, \cdot).$$

Remark 2.14. Condition (i) in Theorems 2.12 and 2.13 is equivalent to the following statement about conditional distributions: Let A_1, A_2 be arbitrary Borel sets such that $A_1 < A_2$ and $\mathbb{P}(X \in A_1), \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2) > 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(Y | X \in A_1) &\leq_{\text{st}} \mathcal{L}(Y | X \in A_2) \quad (\text{Theorem 2.12}), \\ \mathcal{L}(Y | X \in A_1) &\leq_{\text{lr}} \mathcal{L}(Y | X \in A_2) \quad (\text{Theorem 2.13}).\end{aligned}$$

Condition (ii) in Theorems 2.12 and 2.13 may be re-interpreted analogously.

Remark 2.15 (Weak convergence). With an approximation argument, one can show that condition (ii) in Theorems 2.12 and 2.13 may be weakened further by restricting the points $x_0 < x_1 < x_2$ and $y, y_0 < y_1 < y_2$ to a dense subset D of $\mathbb{R}$. Specifically, if D denotes the set of all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(X = x) = 0 = \mathbb{P}(Y = x)$, then we obtain the following closedness property: If $((X_n, Y_n))_n$ is a sequence of random pairs converging in distribution to (X, Y) , and if for each n , the pair (X_n, Y_n) satisfies the conditions in Theorem 2.12 or 2.13, then the limit (X, Y) satisfies these conditions, too.

2.3 Total positivity of order two

Theorem 2.13 hints at a connection between likelihood ratio ordering and total positivity. A good starting point for the latter concept is the monograph of Karlin (1968). Recall that a function $h : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *totally positive of order two (TP2)* if for arbitrary real numbers $x_1 < x_2$ and $y_1 < y_2$,

$$h(x_2, y_1)h(x_1, y_2) \leq h(x_1, y_1)h(x_2, y_2). \quad (2.3)$$

Thus, conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.13 may be interpreted as a distributional notion of total positivity of order two.

Definition 2.16 (Total positivity of order two of bivariate distributions). A probability distribution R on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is called *totally positive of order two (TP2)* if for arbitrary Borel sets $A_1 < A_2$ and $B_1 < B_2$,

$$R(A_2 \times B_1)R(A_1 \times B_2) \leq R(A_1 \times B_1)R(A_2 \times B_2).$$

Suppose that the distribution of (X, Y) has a density h with respect to a product measure $\mu \otimes \nu$ on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, where μ and ν are σ -finite measures on $\mathbb{R}$. If the function h is TP2, then the distribution of (X, Y) is TP2. To verify this, one has to express the probabilities in conditions (i) or (ii) of Theorem 2.13 as integrals of h with respect to $\mu \otimes \nu$.

At first glance, one might think that a reverse statement is true with, say, μ and ν being the marginal distributions of X and Y , respectively. But this is false. For instance, let X be uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$, and let the conditional distribution of Y given X be given by the kernel K with

$$K(x, \cdot) := \begin{cases} \text{Unif}(0, 1/3) & \text{if } x \leq 1/3, \\ \delta_x & \text{if } 1/3 < x < 2/3, \\ \text{Unif}(2/3, 1) & \text{if } x \geq 2/3. \end{cases}$$

Then condition (iii) of Theorem 2.13 is clearly satisfied, but the distribution of (X, Y) has no density with respect to any product measure $\mu \otimes \nu$. Theorem 2.18 below provides a general statement, but let us start with a special case with a clean, positive answer which follows immediately from Theorem 2.13:

Corollary 2.17. Suppose that (X, Y) has a discrete distribution with probability mass function h , i.e. $h(x, y) = \mathbb{P}(X = x, Y = y)$. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:

(i) For arbitrary real numbers $x_1 < x_2$ with $\mathbb{P}(X = x_1), \mathbb{P}(X = x_2) > 0$,

$$K(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x_2, \cdot).$$

(ii) The function h is TP2.

To formulate our general result about total positivity and likelihood ratio order, we introduce a northwest and a southeast boundary for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{nw}}(x) &:= \min\{y \in [-\infty, \infty] : \mathbb{P}(X \leq x, Y > y) = 0\}, \\ S_{\text{se}}(x) &:= \max\{y \in [-\infty, \infty] : \mathbb{P}(X \geq x, Y < y) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

One can easily verify that this defines two isotonic functions $S_{\text{nw}}, S_{\text{se}} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$. Moreover, on $\mathcal{X}$, $S_{\text{nw}} > -\infty$ and $S_{\text{se}} < \infty$.

Theorem 2.18. Suppose that the distribution of (X, Y) is TP2. Let Q be the marginal distribution of Y , and let

$$\mathcal{X}_o := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : S_{\text{nw}}(x) \leq S_{\text{se}}(x)\}$$

Then the kernel K can be constructed such that it satisfies condition (iii) in Theorem 2.13 and has the following properties:

- (a) If $x \in \mathcal{X}_o$, then $K(x, \cdot) = \delta_{S(x)}$, where $S : \mathcal{X}_o \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary isotonic function such that $S_{\text{nw}}(x) \leq S(x) \leq S_{\text{se}}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_o$.
- (b) If $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o$, then $K(x, \cdot)$ has a bounded density $h(x, \cdot)$ with respect to Q such that $h(x, y) = 0$ if $y < S_{\text{se}}(x)$ or $y > S_{\text{nw}}(x)$. Moreover, h is TP2 on the set $(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o) \times \mathbb{R}$, that means, (2.3) holds true for arbitrary numbers $x_1 < x_2$ in $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o$ and real numbers $y_1 < y_2$.

3 Estimation

3.1 Two versions of empirical likelihood modelling

With our observations $(X_i, Y_i) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, let

$$\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\} = \{x_1, \dots, x_\ell\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n\} = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\},$$

with $x_1 < \dots < x_\ell$ and $y_1 < \dots < y_m$. For an index pair (j, k) with $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq k \leq m$, let

$$w_{jk} := \#\{i : (X_i, Y_i) = (x_j, y_k)\}.$$

That means, the empirical distribution $\hat{R}_{\text{emp}}$ of the observations (X_i, Y_i) can be written as

$$\hat{R}_{\text{emp}} = n^{-1} \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} w_{jk} \delta_{(x_j, y_k)}.$$

Estimating the conditional distributions Q_x . To estimate $(Q_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ under likelihood ratio ordering, we first estimate $(Q_{x_j})_{1 \leq j \leq \ell}$. If that results in $(\hat{Q}_{x_j})_{1 \leq j \leq \ell}$, we may define

$$\hat{Q}_x := \begin{cases} \hat{Q}_{x_1} & \text{if } x < x_1, \\ (1 - \lambda)\hat{Q}_{x_j} + \lambda\hat{Q}_{x_{j+1}} & \text{if } x = (1 - \lambda)x_j + \lambda x_{j+1}, \ 1 \leq j < \ell, \ 0 < \lambda < 1, \\ \hat{Q}_{x_\ell} & \text{if } x > x_\ell. \end{cases}$$

This piecewise linear extension preserves isotonicity with respect to $\leq_{\text{lr}}$, see Lemma B.1.

To estimate $Q_{x_1}, \dots, Q_{x_\ell}$, we restrict our attention to distributions with support $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$. That means, we assume temporarily that for $1 \leq j \leq \ell$,

$$Q_{x_j} = \sum_{k=1}^m q_{jk} \delta_{y_k}$$

with weights $q_{j1}, \dots, q_{jm} \geq 0$ summing to one. The empirical log-likelihood for the corresponding matrix $\mathbf{q} = (q_{jk})_{j,k} \in [0, 1]^{\ell \times m}$ equals

$$L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{q}) := \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sum_{k=1}^m w_{jk} \log q_{jk}. \quad (3.1)$$

Then the goal is to maximize this log-likelihood over all matrices $\mathbf{q} \in [0, 1]^{\ell \times m}$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^m q_{jk} = 1 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell, \quad (3.2)$$

$$q_{j_2 k_1} q_{j_1 k_2} \leq q_{j_1 k_1} q_{j_2 k_2} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq \ell \text{ and } 1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq m. \quad (3.3)$$

The latter constraints are equivalent to saying that Q_{x_j} is isotonic in $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ with respect to $\leq_{\text{lr}}$.

Estimating the distribution of (X, Y) . Suppose that the observations (X_i, Y_i) are independent copies of a random pair (X, Y) with unknown TP2 distribution R on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. An empirical likelihood approach to estimating R is to restrict one's attention to distributions

$$R = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sum_{k=1}^m h_{jk} \delta_{(x_j, y_k)}$$

with ℓm weights $h_{jk} \geq 0$ summing to one. The empirical log-likelihood of the corresponding matrix $\mathbf{h} = (h_{jk})_{j,k}$ equals $L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{h})$ with the function L_{raw} defined in (3.1). But now the goal is to maximize $L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{h})$ over all matrices $\mathbf{h} \in [0, 1]^{\ell \times m}$ satisfying the constraints

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sum_{k=1}^m h_{jk} = 1 \quad (3.4)$$

and (3.3). Requirement (3.3) for $\mathbf{h}$ is equivalent to R being TP2. One can get rid of the constraint (3.4) via a Lagrange trick and maximize

$$L(\mathbf{h}) := L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{h}) - n h_{++} + n$$

over all $\mathbf{h}$ satisfying (3.3), where $h_{++} := \sum_j \sum_k h_{jk}$. Indeed, if $\mathbf{h}$ is a matrix in $[0, \infty)^{\ell \times m}$ such that $L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{h}) > -\infty$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} := (h_{jk}/h_{++})_{j,k}$ satisfies (3.3) if and only if $\mathbf{h}$ does, and

$$L(\mathbf{h}) = L_{\text{raw}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) + n(\log h_{++} - h_{++} + 1) \leq L(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = L_{\text{raw}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$$

with equality if and only if $\mathbf{h} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$, i.e. $h_{++} = 1$.

Equivalence of the two estimation problems. For any matrix $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times m}$ define the row sums $a_{j+} := \sum_k a_{jk}$ and column sums $a_{+k} := \sum_j a_{jk}$. If $\mathbf{h}$ is an arbitrary matrix in $[0, \infty)^{\ell \times m}$ such that $L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{h}) > -\infty$, and if we write

$$h_{jk} = p_j q_{jk} \quad \text{with } p_j := h_{j+} \text{ and } q_{jk} := h_{jk}/h_{j+},$$

then $\mathbf{h}$ satisfies (3.3) if and only if $\mathbf{q}$ does. Furthermore, $\mathbf{q}$ satisfies (3.2), and elementary algebra shows that

$$L(\mathbf{h}) = L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{q}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (w_{j+} \log p_j - n p_j + w_{j+}).$$

The unique maximizer $\mathbf{p} = (p_j)_j$ of $\sum_j (w_{j+} \log p_j - n p_j + w_{j+})$ is the vector $(w_{j+}/n)_j$, and this implies the following facts:

- If $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ is a maximizer of $L(\mathbf{h})$ under the constraints (3.3), then $\hat{h}_{j+} = w_{j+}/n$ for all j , and $\hat{q}_{jk} := \hat{h}_{jk}/\hat{h}_{j+}$ defines a maximizer $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ of $L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{q})$ under the constraints (3.2) and (3.3).
- If $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ is a maximizer of $L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{q})$ under the constraints (3.2) and (3.3), then $\hat{h}_{jk} := (w_{j+}/n)\hat{q}_{jk}$ defines a maximizer $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ of $L(\mathbf{h})$ under the constraints (3.3).

Calibration of rows and columns. The previous considerations motivate to find a maximizer $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \in [0, \infty)^{\ell \times m}$ of $L(\mathbf{h})$ under the constraint (3.3), even if the ultimate goal is to estimate the conditional distributions Q_x , $x \in \mathfrak{X}$. They also indicate two simple ways to improve a current candidate $\mathbf{h}$ for $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ be defined via

$$\tilde{h}_{jk} := (w_{j+}/n) h_{jk}/h_{j+},$$

i.e. we rescale the rows of $\mathbf{h}$ such that the new row sums $\tilde{h}_{j+}$ coincide with the empirical weights w_{j+}/n . Then

$$L(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - L(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \left(w_{j+} \log \left(\frac{w_{j+}}{n h_{j+}} \right) + n h_{j+} - w_{j+} \right) \geq 0$$

with equality if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{h}$. Similarly, one can improve $\mathbf{h}$ by rescaling its columns, i.e. replacing $\mathbf{h}$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$, where

$$\tilde{h}_{jk} := (w_{+k}/n) h_{jk}/h_{+k}.$$

3.2 Dimension reduction and reformulation

Dimension reduction. The minimization problem mentioned before involves a parameter $\mathbf{h} \in [0, \infty)^{\ell \times m}$ under $\binom{\ell}{2} \binom{m}{2}$ nonlinear inequality constraints. The parameter space may be reduced as follows.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all index pairs (j, k) such that there exist indices $1 \leq j_1 \leq j \leq j_2 \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq k_1 \leq k \leq k_2 \leq m$ with $w_{j_1 k_2}, w_{j_2 k_1} > 0$.*

- (a) *If $\mathbf{h} \in [0, \infty)^{\ell \times m}$ satisfies (3.3) and $L(\mathbf{h}) > -\infty$, then $h_{jk} > 0$ for all $(j, k) \in \mathcal{P}$.*
- (b) *If such a matrix $\mathbf{h}$ is replaced with $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} := (1_{[(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}]} h_{jk})_{j,k}$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ satisfies (3.3), too, and $L(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \geq L(\mathbf{h})$ with equality if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{h}$.*




Figure 2: In this specific example, $n \geq 8$ raw observations yielded $\ell = 6$ different values x_j and $m = 7$ different values y_k . The green dots represent those (j, k) with $w_{jk} > 0$. The green dots and black circles represent the set $\mathcal{P}$.

All in all, we may restrict our attention to parameters $\mathbf{h} \in (0, \infty)^{\mathcal{P}}$ satisfying (3.3), where $h_{jk} := 0$ for $(j, k) \notin \mathcal{P}$.

As to the set $\mathcal{P}$, it consists of all pairs (j, k) such that the support of the empirical distribution $\hat{R}_{\text{emp}}$ contains a point (x_{j_1}, y_{k_2}) northwest and a point (x_{j_2}, y_{k_1}) southeast of (x_j, y_k) . By definition, an index pair (j, k) belongs to $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if $m_j \leq k \leq M_j$, where

$$\begin{aligned} m_j &:= \min\{k : w_{j'k} > 0 \text{ for some } j' \geq j\}, \\ M_j &:= \max\{k : w_{j'k} > 0 \text{ for some } j' \leq j\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $m_j \leq M_j$ for all j , $1 = m_1 \leq \dots \leq m_\ell$, and $M_1 \leq \dots \leq M_\ell = m$. Analogously, a pair (j, k) belongs to $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if $\ell_k \leq j \leq L_k$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_k &:= \min\{j : w_{jk'} > 0 \text{ for some } k' \geq k\}, \\ L_k &:= \max\{j : w_{jk'} > 0 \text{ for some } k' \leq k\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\ell_k \leq L_k$ for all k , $1 = \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_m$, and $L_1 \leq \dots \leq L_m = \ell$. Figure 2 illustrates the definition of m_j, M_j, ℓ_k, L_k and $\mathcal{P}$.

Reparametrization. If we replace a parameter $\mathbf{h} \in (0, \infty)^{\mathcal{P}}$ with its component-wise logarithm $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$, then property (3.3) is equivalent to

$$\theta_{j_1 k_1} + \theta_{j_2 k_2} - \theta_{j_1 k_2} - \theta_{j_2 k_1} \geq 0 \quad \text{whenever } (j_1, k_2), (j_2, k_1) \in \mathcal{P}, j_1 < j_2, k_1 < k_2. \quad (3.5)$$

An important property of the set $\mathcal{P}$ is that if $(j_2, k_1), (j_1, k_2) \in \mathcal{P}$ for indices $j_1 < j_2$ and $k_1 < k_2$, then $\{j_1, \dots, j_2\} \times \{k_1, \dots, k_2\} \subset \mathcal{P}$. This implies that property (3.5) is equivalent to a smaller collection of constraints:

$$\theta_{j-1, k-1} + \theta_{j, k} - \theta_{j-1, k} - \theta_{j, k-1} \geq 0 \quad \text{whenever } (j-1, k), (j, k-1) \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (3.6)$$

Obviously, (3.6) follows from (3.5). On the other hand, it follows from (3.6) that for $(j_1, k_2), (j_2, k_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $j_1 < j_2$ and $k_1 < k_2$,

$$\theta_{j_1 k_1} + \theta_{j_2 k_2} - \theta_{j_1 k_2} - \theta_{j_2 k_1} = \sum_{j=j_1+1}^{j_2} \sum_{k=k_1+1}^{k_2} (\theta_{j-1, k-1} + \theta_{j, k} - \theta_{j-1, k} - \theta_{j, k-1}) \geq 0,$$

so (3.5) is satisfied as well. The set of all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ satisfying (3.6) and thus (3.5) is a closed convex cone and is denoted by Θ .

Reformulated optimization problem. Now our goal is to minimize

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} (-w_{jk} \theta_{jk} + n \exp(\theta_{jk})) \quad (3.7)$$

over all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$.

Theorem 3.2. *There exists a unique minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ of $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ over all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$.*

Uniqueness follows directly from f being strictly convex, but existence is less obvious, unless $w_{jk} > 0$ for all (j, k) . With $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ at hand, the corresponding solution $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \in [0, \infty)^{\ell \times m}$ of the original problem is given by

$$\hat{h}_{jk} = \begin{cases} \exp(\hat{\theta}_{jk}) & \text{if } (j, k) \in \mathcal{P}, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

3.3 An explicit algorithm

In the proof of Theorem 3.2 and from now on, we view $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ as a Euclidean space with inner product $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle := \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} x_{jk} y_{jk}$ and the corresponding norm $\|\mathbf{x}\| := \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle^{1/2}$. For a differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its gradient is defined as $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) := (\partial f(\mathbf{x}) / \partial x_{jk})_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}}$.

Finding a new proposal, version 1. To determine whether a given parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ is already optimal and, if not, to obtain a better one, we reparametrize the problem a second time. Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ be given by

$$\tilde{\theta}_{jk} = \begin{cases} \theta_{j m_j} & \text{if } k = m_j, \\ \theta_{jk} - \theta_{j, k-1} & \text{if } m_j < k \leq M_j. \end{cases}$$

Then $\boldsymbol{\theta} = T^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = (\sum_{k'=m_j}^k \tilde{\theta}_{jk'})_{j,k}$, and $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) &:= \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sum_{k=m_j}^{M_j} \left(-w_{jk} \sum_{k'=m_j}^k \tilde{\theta}_{jk'} + n \exp\left(\sum_{k'=m_j}^k \tilde{\theta}_{jk'} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sum_{k=m_j}^{M_j} \left(-\underline{w}_{jk} \tilde{\theta}_{jk} + n \exp\left(\sum_{k'=m_j}^k \tilde{\theta}_{jk'} \right) \right) \quad \text{with } \underline{w}_{jk} := \sum_{k'=k}^{M_j} w_{jk}. \end{aligned}$$

More importantly, we may represent $\mathcal{P}$ as

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(j, m_j) : 1 \leq j \leq \ell\} \cup \bigcup_{k=2}^m \{(j, k) : \ell_k \leq j \leq L_{k-1}\},$$

and the constraints (3.6) now read

$$(\tilde{\theta}_{jk})_{j=\ell_k}^{L_{k-1}} \in \mathbb{R}_{\uparrow}^{L_{k-1}-\ell_k+1} \quad \text{whenever } 2 \leq k \leq m \text{ and } L_{k-1} - \ell_k + 1 \geq 2. \quad (3.8)$$

Here $\mathbb{R}_{\uparrow}^d := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_d\}$. The set of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ satisfying (3.8) is denoted by $\tilde{\Theta}$.

For given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = T(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, we approximate $\tilde{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ by the quadratic function

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}} &\mapsto \tilde{f}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) + \langle \nabla \tilde{f}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}), \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \rangle + 2^{-1} \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{f}}{\partial \tilde{\theta}_{jk}^2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) (\tilde{x}_{jk} - \tilde{\theta}_{jk})^2 \\ &= \text{const}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + 2^{-1} \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{v}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\tilde{x}_{jk} - \tilde{\gamma}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2 \\ &= \text{const}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + 2^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \tilde{v}_{jm_j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\tilde{x}_{jm_j} - \tilde{\gamma}_{jm_j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2 \\ &\quad + 2^{-1} \sum_{k=2}^m \sum_{\ell_k \leq j \leq L_{k-1}} \tilde{v}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\tilde{x}_{jk} - \tilde{\gamma}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &:= \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{f}}{\partial \tilde{\theta}_{jk}^2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) &= n \sum_{k'=k}^{M_j} \exp(\theta_{jk'}), \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &:= \tilde{\theta}_{jk} - \tilde{v}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \tilde{\theta}_{jk}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) &= T_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \tilde{v}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1} \underline{w}_{jk} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

This quadratic function of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is easily minimized over $\tilde{\Theta}$ via a suitable variant of the pool-adjacent-violators algorithm, and we obtain the proposal

$$\Psi^{\text{row}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := T^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_*(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \arg \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \tilde{\Theta}} \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{v}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\tilde{x}_{jk} - \tilde{\gamma}_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2.$$

Interestingly, if $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is row-wise calibrated in the sense that $n \sum_{k=m_j}^{M_j} \exp(\theta_{jk}) = w_{j+}$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell$, then $\tilde{\gamma}_{jm_j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \tilde{\theta}_{jm_j}$ and thus $\Psi_{jm_j}^{\text{row}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \theta_{jm_j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell$.

Finding a new proposal, version 2. Instead of reparametrizing $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ in terms of its values θ_{jm_j} , $1 \leq j \leq \ell$, and its increments within rows, one could reparametrize it in terms of its values $\theta_{\ell_k k}$, $1 \leq k \leq m$, and its increments within columns, leading to a proposal $\Psi^{\text{col}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Here, $\Psi_{\ell_k k}^{\text{col}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \theta_{\ell_k k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$, provided that $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is column-wise calibrated.

Calibration. In terms of the log-parametrization with $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, the row-wise calibration mentioned earlier means to replace θ_{jk} with $\theta_{jk} - \log(\sum_{k'=m_j}^{M_j} \exp(\theta_{jk'})) + \log(w_{j+}/n)$. Analogously, replacing θ_{jk} with $\theta_{jk} - \log(\sum_{j'=\ell_k}^{L_k} \exp(\theta_{j'k})) + \log(w_{+k}/n)$ leads to a column-wise calibrated parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Iterating these calibrations alternately, leads to a parameter which is (approximately) calibrated, row-wise as well as column-wise.

From new proposal to new parameter. Both functions $\Psi = \Psi^{\text{row}}, \Psi^{\text{col}}$ have some useful properties summarized in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *The function Ψ is continuous on Θ with $\Psi(\widehat{\theta}) = \widehat{\theta}$. For $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \{\widehat{\theta}\}$,*

$$\delta(\theta) := \langle \nabla f(\theta), \theta - \Psi(\theta) \rangle > 0,$$

$$f(\theta) - f(\widehat{\theta}) \leq \max(2\delta(\theta), \beta_1(\theta)\sqrt{\delta(\theta)}\|\theta - \widehat{\theta}\|),$$

and

$$\max_{t \in [0,1]} \left(f(\theta) - f((1-t)\theta + t\Psi(\theta)) \right) \geq \min\left(2^{-1}\delta(\theta), \frac{\delta(\theta)^2}{\beta_2(\theta)\|\theta - \Psi(\theta)\|^2} \right)$$

with continuous functions $\beta_1, \beta_2 : \Theta \rightarrow (0, \infty)$.

In view of this lemma, we want to replace $\theta \neq \widehat{\theta}$ with $(1 - t_*)\theta + t_*\Psi(\theta)$ for some suitable $t_* = t_*(\theta) \in [0, 1]$ such that $f(\theta)$ really decreases. More specifically, with

$$\rho_\theta(t) := f(\theta) - f((1-t)\theta + t\Psi(\theta)),$$

our goals are that for some constant $\kappa \in (0, 1]$,

$$\rho_\theta(t_*) \geq \kappa \max_{t \in [0,1]} \rho_\theta(t),$$

and in case of ρ_θ being (approximately) a quadratic function, t_* should be (approximately) equal to $\arg \max_{t \in [0,1]} \rho_\theta(t)$. For that, we proceed similarly as in [Dümbgen et al. \(2006\)](#). We determine $t_o := 2^{-n_o}$ with n_o the smallest integer such that $\rho_\theta(2^{-n_o}) \geq 0$. Then we define a Hermite interpolation of ρ_θ :

$$\tilde{\rho}_\theta(t) := \rho'_\theta(0)t - c_o t^2 \quad \text{with} \quad c_o := t_o^{-1}(\rho'_\theta(0) - t_o^{-1}\rho_\theta(t_o)) > 0.$$

This new function is such that $\tilde{\rho}_\theta(t) = \rho_\theta(t)$ for $t = 0, t_o$, and $\tilde{\rho}'_\theta(0) = \rho'_\theta(0) > 0$. Since $\tilde{\rho}'_\theta(t) = \rho'_\theta(0) - 2tc_o$, the maximizer of $\tilde{\rho}_\theta$ over $[0, t_o]$ is given by

$$t_* := \min(t_o, 2^{-1}\rho'_\theta(0)/c_o).$$

As shown in Lemma 1 of [Dümbgen et al. \(2006\)](#), this choice of t_* fulfils the requirements just stated, where $\kappa = 1/4$.

Complete algorithms. A possible starting point for the algorithm is given by $\theta^{(0)} := (-\log(\#\mathcal{P}))_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}}$, but any other parameter $\theta^{(0)} \in \Theta$ would work, too. Suppose we have determined already $\theta^{(0)}, \dots, \theta^{(s)}$ such that $f(\theta^{(0)}) \geq \dots \geq f(\theta^{(s)})$. Let $\Psi(\theta^{(s)})$ be a new proposal with $\Psi = \Psi^{\text{row}}$ or $\Psi = \Psi^{\text{col}}$, and let $\theta^{(s+1)} = (1 - t_*^{(s)})\theta^{(s)} + t_*^{(s)}\Psi(\theta^{(s)})$ with $t_*^{(s)} = t_*(\theta^{(s)}) \in [0, 1]$ as described before. No matter which proposal function Ψ we are using in each step, the resulting sequence $(\theta^{(s)})_{s \geq 0}$ will always converge to $\widehat{\theta}$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $(\theta^{(s)})_{s \geq 0}$ be the sequence just described. Then $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \theta^{(s)} = \widehat{\theta}$.*

Our numerical experiments showed that a particularly efficient refinement is as follows: Before computing a new proposal $\Psi(\theta^{(s)})$, one should calibrate $\theta^{(s)}$ in the sense that it is row-wise and column-wise calibrated. If s is even, we compute $\Psi^{\text{row}}(\theta^{(s)})$ to determine the next candidate $\theta^{(s+1)}$. If s is odd, we compute $\Psi^{\text{col}}(\theta^{(s)})$ to obtain $\theta^{(s+1)}$. The algorithm stops as soon as $\delta(\theta^{(s)}) = \langle \nabla f(\theta^{(s)}), \theta^{(s)} - \Psi(\theta^{(s)}) \rangle$ is smaller than a prescribed small threshold. Table 1 provides corresponding pseudo code.

```

 $\theta \leftarrow \theta^{(0)}$ 
 $\delta \leftarrow \infty$ 
 $s \leftarrow 0$ 
while  $\delta \geq \delta_o$  do
   $\theta \leftarrow \text{calibration of } \theta$ 
  if  $s$  is even, do
     $(\psi, \delta) \leftarrow (\Psi^{\text{row}}(\theta), \langle \nabla f(\theta), \theta - \Psi^{\text{row}}(\theta) \rangle)$ 
  else
     $(\psi, \delta) \leftarrow (\Psi^{\text{col}}(\theta), \langle \nabla f(\theta), \theta - \Psi^{\text{col}}(\theta) \rangle)$ 
  end if
   $\rho' \leftarrow \delta$ 
  while  $f(\psi) > f(\theta)$  do
     $(\psi, \rho') \leftarrow (2^{-1}(\theta + \psi), 2^{-1}\rho')$ 
  end while
   $t_* \leftarrow \min(1, 2^{-1}\rho' / (\rho' - f(\theta) + f(\psi)))$ 
   $\theta \leftarrow (1 - t_*)\theta + t_*\psi$ 
   $s \leftarrow s + 1$ 
end while

```

Table 1: Pseudo code of our algorithm, returning an approximation θ of $\hat{\theta}$.

3.4 An alternative minimum distance estimator

While the present paper is motivated by regression problems, nonparametric estimation of a bivariate TP2 distribution is of independent interest. Maximum empirical likelihood is one of several possible paradigms. If we assume that the observations $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ are a sample from an unknown TP2 distribution R_* , one could estimate R_* by a TP2 distribution $\hat{R}$ minimizing $\|R - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K$ over all TP2 distributions R on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Here $\hat{R}_{\text{emp}}$ is the empirical distribution of the sample, and $\|\sigma\|_K$ denotes the (bivariate version of the) Kuiper norm of a finite signed measure σ on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|\sigma\|_K := \sup_{a_1 < a_2, b_1 < b_2} |\sigma((a_1, a_2] \times (b_1, b_2])|.$$

Of course one could work with the Kolmogorov–Smirnov norm (i.e. $a_1 = b_1 = -\infty$), but in view of Theorem 2.13, the Kuiper norm appears more natural here.

Lemma 3.5. *A minimizer $\hat{R}$ of $\|R - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K$ over all TP2 distributions R exists and satisfies the inequality $\|\hat{R} - R_*\|_K \leq 2\|\hat{R}_{\text{emp}} - R_*\|_K$.*

This lemma shows that the minimum Kuiper distance estimator $\hat{R}$ exists and is automatically $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent. The proof reveals that $\hat{R}$ may be taken to be a distribution on a grid of at most $(2n + 1)^2$ points in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Open questions are how the estimator can be computed explicitly, and how it is related to the maximum empirical likelihood estimator.

4 Simulation study

In this section, we compare estimation and prediction performances of the likelihood ratio order constrained estimator presented in this article with the estimator under usual stochastic order obtained via isotonic distributional regression. The latter estimator was mentioned briefly in the introduction. It is extensively discussed in Henzi et al. (2019) and Mösching and Dümbgen (2020).




Figure 3: Conditional Gamma density with shape $a(x) := 2 + (x + 1)^2$ and scale $b(x) := 1 - 1/\exp(10x)$ for x in the interval $\mathfrak{X} := [1, 4]$.

A Gamma model. We choose a parametric family of distributions from which we draw observations. We will then use these data to provide distribution estimates which we then compare with the truth. The specific model we have in mind is a family $(Q_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}}$ of Gamma distributions with densities

$$g_x(y) := \frac{b(x)^{-a(x)}}{\Gamma(a(x))} y^{a(x)-1} \exp(-y/b(x)),$$

with respect to Lebesgue measure on $(0, \infty)$, with some shape function $a : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and scale function $b : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Then Q_x is isotonic in $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ with respect to likelihood ratio ordering if and only if both functions a and b are isotonic. Recall that since the family is increasing in likelihood ratio order, it is also increasing with respect to the usual stochastic order. Figure 3 shows the true conditional density for the specific parameters a and b selected for this study.

Sampling method. Let $\ell_o \in \{50, 1000\}$ be a predefined number and let

$$\mathfrak{X}_o := 1 + \frac{3}{\ell_o} \cdot \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_o\} \subset \mathfrak{X} := [1, 4].$$

For a given sample size $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sample $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ is obtained as follows: Draw $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ uniformly from $\mathfrak{X}_o$ and sample independently each Y_k from Q_{X_k} . This yields unique covariates $x_1 < \dots < x_\ell$ as well as unique responses $y_1 < \dots < y_m$, for some $1 \leq \ell, m \leq n$.

For each such sample, we compute estimators of $(Q_{x_j})_{j=1}^\ell$ under likelihood ratio ordering constraint, as well as the usual stochastic ordering constraint. Using linear interpolation, we complete both families of estimates with covariates originally in $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\ell$ to families of estimates with covariates in the full set $\mathfrak{X}_o$, see Lemma B.1. We therefore

obtain estimates $(\hat{Q}_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}_o}$ and $(\check{Q}_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}_o}$ under likelihood ratio order and usual stochastic order constraint, respectively. The corresponding families of cumulative distribution functions are written $(\hat{G}_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}_o}$ and $(\check{G}_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}_o}$, whereas the truth is denoted by $(G_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}_o}$. Although the performance of the empirical distribution is worse than those of the two order constrained estimators, it is still useful to study its behaviour, for instance to better understand boundary effects. The family of empirical cumulative distribution functions will be written $(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_x)_{x \in \mathfrak{X}_o}$.

A simple score. To assess the ability of each estimator to retrieve the truth, we produce Monte-Carlo estimates of the mean of the score

$$R_x(G', G) := \int |G'_x(y) - G_x(y)| dQ_x(y),$$

for each estimator $G' \in \{\hat{G}, \check{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}\}$ and for each $x \in \mathfrak{X}_o$. The integral in the above expression is computed numerically. We also compute Monte-Carlo mean and selected quantiles of the relative change in score

$$100 \cdot \frac{R_x(\hat{G}, G) - R_x(\check{G}, G)}{R_x(\check{G}, G)}.$$

The results of the simulations are displayed in Figure 4. A first observation is that the performance of all three estimators decreases towards the boundary points of $\mathfrak{X}$, and this effect is more pronounced for the two order constrained estimators. This is a known phenomenon from shape constrained inference. However, in the interior of $\mathfrak{X}$, taking the stochastic ordering into account pays off.

The second column of plots in Figure 4 shows the relative change in score when estimating the family of distributions with a likelihood ratio ordering constraint instead of the usual stochastic order constraint. It is observed that the improvement in score becomes larger and occurs on a wider sub-interval of $\mathfrak{X}$ as ℓ_o and n increase. Only towards the boundary, the usual stochastic order seems to have better performance.

Theoretical predictive performances. Using the same Gamma model, we evaluate predictive performances of both estimators using the continuous ranked probability score

$$\text{CRPS}(G'_x, y) := \int (G'_x(z) - 1_{[y \leq z]})^2 dz.$$

The CRPS is a strictly proper scoring rule which allows for comparisons of probabilistic forecasts, see [Gneiting and Raftery \(2007\)](#) and [Jordan et al. \(2019\)](#). It can be seen as an extension of the mean absolute error for probabilistic forecasts. The CRPS is therefore interpreted in the same unit of measurement as the true distribution or data.

Because the true underlying distribution is known in the present simulation setting, the expected CRPS score is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_x(G', G) &:= \int \text{CRPS}(G'_x, y) dQ_x(y) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m \int_{[y_j, y_{j+1})} (G'_x(y_j) - G_x(z))^2 dz + \frac{b(x)}{B(1/2, a(x))}, \end{aligned}$$

where $y_0 := -\infty$, $y_{m+1} := +\infty$, $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the beta function, and the latter integrals are computed via numerical integration. Consequently, we compute Monte-Carlo estimates of




Figure 4: Monte Carlo simulations to evaluate estimation performances with a simple score. Left column: Simple scores with G' being either $\hat{G}$ (solid line), $\check{G}$ (dashed line) or $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$ (dotted line). Right column: Relative change of the score when enforcing a likelihood ratio ordering constraint over the usual stochastic ordering constraint. The thicker line is the mean variation, whereas the thin lines are the 25 and 75%-quantiles. Negative values represent an improvement in score.




Figure 5: Monte Carlo simulations to evaluate prediction performances using a CRPS-type score. Left column: CRPS scores with G' being either $\hat{G}$ (solid line), $\check{G}$ (dashed line) or $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$ (dotted line). Right column: Relative change of the score when enforcing a likelihood ratio order constraint over the usual stochastic order constraint. The thicker line is the mean variation, whereas the thin lines are the 25 and 75%-quantiles. Negative values represent an improvement in score.




Figure 6: Subsample of the weight for age data. A logarithmic scale was used for the weight variable.

the mean of each score $S_x(\hat{G}, G)$, $S_x(\check{G}, G)$ and $S_x(\hat{\mathbb{G}}, G)$, as well as estimates of the mean and selected quantiles of the relative change in score when choosing $\hat{G}$ over $\check{G}$.

Figure 5 outlines the results of the simulations. Similar boundary effects as for the simple score are observed. On the interior of $\mathfrak{X}$, the usual stochastic order improves the naive empirical estimator, and the likelihood ratio order yields the best results.

In terms of relative change in score, it appears that imposing a likelihood ratio order constraint to estimate the family of distributions yields an average score reduction of about 2% in comparison with the usual stochastic order estimator for a sample of $n = 50$. For $n = 1000$, this improvement occurs on a wider subinterval of $\mathfrak{X}$ and more frequently, as shown by the 75% mark.

Note further that the expected CRPS increases on the interior of $\mathfrak{X}$. This is due to the fact that the CRPS has the same unit of measurement as the response variable. Since the scale of the response characterized by b increases with x , then so does the corresponding score.

Empirical predictive performances We use the weight for age dataset already studied in Mösching and Dümbgen (2020). It comprises the age and weight of $n := 16\,344$ girls with an age in $\mathfrak{X} := [2, 16]$ years old, of which we present a subsample in Figure 6. The dataset was publicly released as part of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey conducted in the US between 1963 and 1991 (data available from www.cdc.gov) and was analyzed by Kuczmarski et al. (2002) with parametric models to produce smooth quantile curves.

Although the likelihood ratio order constraint is much harder to justify than the very natural stochastic order constraint, we are interested in the effect of a stronger regularization imposed by the former constraint.

The forecast evaluation is performed using a leave- n_{train} -out cross-validation scheme. More precisely, we choose random subsets $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ of n_{train} observations which we use to train our estimators. Using the rest of the $n_{\text{test}} := n - n_{\text{train}}$ data pairs in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$, we evaluate predictive performances by computing the sample mean and selected sample quantiles of




Figure 7: Monte Carlo simulations to evaluate prediction performances using an empirical CRPS score. Left column: empirical CRPS scores with G' being either $\hat{G}$ (solid line), $\tilde{G}$ (dashed line) or $\hat{\tilde{G}}$ (dotted line). Right column: Relative change of the score when enforcing a likelihood ratio order constraint over the usual stochastic order constraint. The thicker line is the mean variation, whereas the thin lines are the 25 and 75%-quantiles. Negative values represent an improvement in score.

$\hat{S}_x(G', \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}})$ for each estimator $G' \in \{\hat{G}, \tilde{G}, \hat{\tilde{G}}\}$ and each $x \in \mathfrak{X}_o$, where

$$\hat{S}_x(G', \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}) := \frac{\sum_{(X,Y) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}: X=x} \text{CRPS}(G'_x, Y)}{\#\{(X,Y) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} : X = x\}}.$$

An estimate of the relative change in score is also computed.

Figure 7 shows the forecast evaluation results. As expected, the empirical CRPS increases with age, since the spread of the weight increases with age. As to the relative change in score, improvements of about 2% can be seen for $n_{\text{train}} = 50$ and of about 1% for $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$, on average. The region of $\mathfrak{X}$ where the estimator under likelihood ratio order constraint shows better predictive performances is the widest for the largest training sample size. These results show the benefit of a stronger regularization.

References

- BEARE, B. K. and MOON, J.-M. (2015). Nonparametric tests of density ratio ordering. *Econometric Theory* **31** 471–492.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466614000401>
- CAROLAN, C. A. and TEBBS, J. M. (2005). Nonparametric tests for and against likelihood ratio ordering in the two-sample problem. *Biometrika* **92** 159–171.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/92.1.159>
- DÜMBGEN, L., FREITAG-WOLF, S. and JONGBLOED, G. (2006). Estimating a unimodal distribution from interval-censored data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **101** 1094–1106.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214506000000032>
- DYKSTRA, R., KOCHAR, S. and ROBERTSON, T. (1995). Inference for likelihood ratio ordering in the two-sample problem. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **90** 1034–1040.
URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/2291340>
- GNEITING, T. and RAFTERY, A. E. (2007). Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **102** 359–378.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214506000001437>
- HENZI, A., KLEGER, G.-R., HILTY, M. P., WENDEL GARCIA, P. D. and ZIEGEL, J. F. (2021). Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *PLoS ONE* **16** e0247265.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247265>
- HENZI, A., ZIEGEL, J. and GNEITING, T. (2019). Isotonic distributional regression. Preprint, arXiv:1909.03725.
- JEWITT, I. (1991). Applications of likelihood ratio orderings in economics. In *Stochastic orders and decision under risk (Hamburg, 1989)*, vol. 19 of *IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser.* Inst. Math. Statist., Hayward, CA, 174–189.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/lnms/1215459856>
- JONGBLOED, G. (1998). The iterative convex minorant algorithm for nonparametric estimation. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.* **7** 310–321.
URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/1390706>
- JORDAN, A., KRÜGER, F. and LERCH, S. (2019). Evaluating probabilistic forecasts with scoringrules. *Journal of Statistical Software* **90** 1–37.
URL <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v090/i12>
- KARLIN, S. (1968). *Total positivity. Vol. I.* Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
- KARLIN, S. and RUBIN, H. (1956). The theory of decision procedures for distributions with monotone likelihood ratio. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **27** 272–299.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728259>
- KUCZMARSKI, R. J., OGDEN, C. L., GUO, S. S., GRUMMER-STRAWN, L. M., FLEGAL, K. M., MEI, Z., WEI, R., CURTIN, L. R., ROCHE, A. F. and JOHNSON, C. L. (2002). CDC Growth Charts for the United States: Methods and development. *Vital Health Stat.* **246**.

- LEHMANN, E. L. and ROJO, J. (1992). Invariant directional orderings. *Ann. Statist.* **20** 2100–2110.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176348905>
- MÖSCHING, A. and DÜMBGEN, L. (2020). Monotone least squares and isotonic quantiles. *Electron. J. Stat.* **14** 24–49.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-EJS1659>
- OWEN, A. B. (1988). Empirical likelihood ratio confidence intervals for a single functional. *Biometrika* **75** 237–249.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/75.2.237>
- OWEN, A. B. (2001). *Empirical likelihood*. No. 92 in Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- ROBERTSON, T., WRIGHT, F. T. and DYKSTRA, R. L. (1988). *Order restricted statistical inference*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester.
- ROOSEN, J. and HENNESSY, D. A. (2004). Testing for the monotone likelihood ratio assumption. *J. Bus. Econom. Statist.* **22** 358–366.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1198/073500104000000235>
- SHAKED, M. and SHANTHIKUMAR, J. G. (2007). *Stochastic orders*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-34675-5>
- SHORACK, G. R. and WELLNER, J. A. (1986). *Empirical processes with applications to statistics*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- WESTLING, T., DOWNES, K. J. and SMALL, D. S. (2019). Nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation under a likelihood ratio order. Preprint, arXiv:1904.12321.
- YU, T., LI, P. and QIN, J. (2017). Density estimation in the two-sample problem with likelihood ratio ordering. *Biometrika* **104** 141–152.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asw069>

A Proofs and details for Section 2

A.1 Isotonic densities

For later purposes, we need a constructive version of the Radon-Nikodym theorem in a special case.

Lemma A.1. *Let μ and ν be finite measures on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\nu \leq \mu$. Further, suppose that*

$$\mu((y, z])\nu((x, y]) \leq \mu((x, y])\nu((y, z]) \quad \text{for arbitrary real numbers } x < y < z. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then

$$f(x) := \sup_{a < x} \frac{\nu((a, x])}{\mu((a, x])} \in [0, 1] \quad (\text{with } 0/0 := 0)$$

defines an isotonic density of ν with respect to μ . Moreover, if $\mu((x, y]) = 0$ for numbers $x < y$, then $f(x) = f(y)$. Further, if $x \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\mu((a, x]) > 0$ for all $a < x$, then

$$f(x) = \lim_{a \rightarrow x-} \frac{\nu((a, x])}{\mu((a, x])}.$$

In particular, $f(x) = \nu(\{x\})/\mu(\{x\})$ in case of $\mu(\{x\}) > 0$.

Remark A.2. The density f constructed in Lemma A.1 is minimal in the sense that any isotonic density $\tilde{f}$ of ν with respect to μ satisfies $\tilde{f} \geq f$ pointwise. For if $f(x) > 0$, then for all $a < x$ with $\mu((a, x]) > 0$,

$$\mu((a, x])^{-1} \nu((a, x]) = \mu((a, x])^{-1} \int_{(a, x]} \tilde{f}(w) \mu(dw) \leq \tilde{f}(x).$$

A maximal isotonic density could be constructed analogously: First note that with a simple approximation argument one can show that condition (A.1) is equivalent to the same condition with $[x, y)$ and $[y, z)$ in place of $(x, y]$ and $(y, z]$, respectively. Then one could define the density at x by

$$\inf_{b > x} \frac{\nu([x, b))}{\mu([x, b))} \in [0, 1] \quad (\text{with } 0/0 := 1).$$

Proof of Lemma A.1. Let $\gamma := \nu/\mu$ with $0/0 := 0$. Then $f(x) = \sup_{a < x} \gamma((a, x])$. Condition (A.1) is easily verified to be equivalent to

$$\gamma((x, y]) \leq \gamma((y, z]) \quad \text{whenever } x < y < z \text{ and } \mu((y, z]) > 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

As to isotonicity of f , let $x < y$. If $\mu((x, y]) = 0$, then $\nu((x, y]) = 0$, too, whence $\gamma((a, y]) = 0$ for $x \leq a < y$ and $\gamma((a, y]) = \gamma((a, x])$ for $a < x$. Consequently,

$$f(y) = \sup_{a < x} \gamma((a, y]) = \sup_{a < x} \gamma((a, x]) = f(x).$$

On the other hand, if $\mu((x, y]) > 0$, then (A.2) implies that $\gamma((a, x]) \leq \gamma((x, y]) \leq f(y)$ for $a < x$, whence $f(x) \leq \gamma((x, y]) \leq f(y)$. This implies that

$$f(x)\mu((x, y]) \leq \nu((x, y]) \leq f(y)\mu((x, y]) \quad \text{whenever } x < y. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

If $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\mu((a, x]) > 0$ for all $a < x$, then it follows from (A.2) that for $a < a' < x$,

$$\gamma((a, x]) = \frac{\mu((a, a'])}{\mu((a, x])} \gamma((a, a']) + \frac{\mu((a', x])}{\mu((a, x])} \gamma((a', x]) \leq \gamma((a', x]),$$

because $\gamma((a, a']) \leq \gamma((a', x])$. Hence, $\gamma((a, x])$ is isotonic in $a < x$, and this implies the representation of $f(x)$ as $\lim_{a \rightarrow x-} \gamma((a, x])$. In particular,

$$\nu(\{x\}) = f(x)\mu(\{x\}) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

because this equation is trivial in case of $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$.

Now the previous inequalities (A.3) and (A.4) are generalized as follows: For any bounded interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\inf_{z \in I} f(z) \mu(I) \leq \nu(I) \leq \sup_{z \in I} f(z) \mu(I). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In case of $I = (x, y]$, this follows from (A.3) applied to $(x', y]$ with $x' \rightarrow x +$. In case of $I = (x, y)$, this follows from (A.5) applied to $(x, y']$ with $y' \rightarrow y -$. In case of $I = [x, y]$ or $I = [x, y)$, we may deduce from (A.4) that

$$\nu(I) = \nu(\{x\}) + \nu(I \setminus \{x\}) = f(x)\mu(\{x\}) + \nu(I \setminus \{x\}),$$

and then the assertion follows from applying the available inequalities to $I \setminus \{x\}$ instead of I .

It remains to be shown that f is a density of ν with respect to μ . That means, $\nu(I) = \int_I f d\mu$ for any bounded interval I . To this end we fix an arbitrary integer $k > 1$ and split I into the disjoint intervals $I_1, \dots, I_k$ where $I_1 := I \cap \{f \leq 1/k\}$ and $I_j := I \cap \{(j-1)/k < f \leq j/k\}$ for $2 \leq j \leq k$. Then it follows from (A.5) that

$$\nu(I) = \sum_{j=1}^k \nu(I_j) \begin{cases} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k (j/k) \mu(I_j) \leq \int_I (f + 1/k) d\mu, \\ \geq \sum_{j=1}^k ((j-1)/k) \mu(I_j) \geq \int_I (f - 1/k) d\mu, \end{cases}$$

and letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ yields the asserted equation. $\square$

A.2 Proofs for Section 2.1

We start with an elementary lemma about products and ratios of nonnegative numbers. The proof is elementary and thus omitted.

Lemma A.3. *Let r_1, r_2 and s_1, s_2 be numbers in $[0, \infty)$ such that $(r_1, s_1), (r_2, s_2) \neq (0, 0)$. Then*

$$r_2 s_1 \leq r_1 s_2 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \frac{s_1}{r_1} \leq \frac{s_2}{r_2}$$

(with $s_i/r_i \in [0, \infty]$).

Proof of Proposition 2.1. We prove the result via a chain of implications, introducing two additional equivalent conditions:

- (v) There exists an isotonic density $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of Q with respect to $P + Q$.
- (vi) Suppose that μ is a σ -finite measure dominating P and Q . Then one can choose corresponding densities $f = dP/d\mu$ and $g = dQ/d\mu$ such that g/f is isotonic on the set $\{f + g > 0\}$.

Step 1. Note that the inequality in condition (ii) is trivial whenever $f(x) = g(x) = 0$ or $f(y) = g(y) = 0$. Thus condition (ii) is equivalent to the same condition with x and y being restricted to the set $\{f + g > 0\} = \{(f, g) \neq (0, 0)\}$. But then it follows from Lemma A.3 that conditions (i) and (ii) are equivalent.

Step 2. Suppose that condition (ii) holds true. Then for Borel sets $A \leq B$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(B)Q(A) &= \int 1_A(x)1_B(y)f(y)g(x)\mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ &\leq \int 1_A(x)1_B(y)f(x)g(y)\mu(dx)\mu(dy) \\ &= P(A)Q(B). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, condition (iii) is satisfied as well, and obviously this implies condition (iv), because the latter is a special case of the former.

Step 3. Suppose that condition (iv) is satisfied. Then we may apply Lemma A.1 to $\mu := P + Q$ and $\nu := Q$. This yields an isotonic density $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of Q with respect to $P + Q$. Hence, condition (v) is satisfied as well.

Step 4. Suppose that condition (v) holds true. Let μ be a σ -finite measure dominating P and Q . Then μ dominates $P + Q$, so by the Radon–Nikodym theorem there exists a density h of $P + Q$ with respect to μ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(B) &= \int_B \rho \, d(P + Q) = \int_B \rho h \, d\mu, \\ P(B) &= \int_B (1 - \rho) \, d(P + Q) = \int_B (1 - \rho) h \, d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $g := \rho h$ and $f := (1 - \rho)h$ are densities of Q and P , respectively, with respect to μ . On $\{f + g > 0\} = \{h > 0\}$, the ratio g/f equals $\rho/(1 - \rho)$ and is isotonic. Hence, condition (vi) is satisfied. Finally, since $\mu := P + Q$ is a finite measure dominating P and Q , condition (vi) implies condition (i). $\square$

Proof of Lemma 2.6. For notational convenience, we write $P_C := P(\cdot | C)$ and $Q_C := Q(\cdot | C)$. Suppose first that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ (property (i)), and let C be a Borel set with $P(C), Q(C) > 0$. Since $P(B)Q(A) \leq P(A)Q(B)$ for all Borel sets A, B such that $A \leq B$, and since $A \cap C \leq B \cap C$, we find that

$$P_C(B)Q_C(A) = \frac{P(B \cap C)}{P(C)} \frac{Q(A \cap C)}{Q(C)} \leq \frac{P(A \cap C)}{P(C)} \frac{Q(B \cap C)}{Q(C)} = P_C(A)Q_C(B).$$

Therefore, $P_C \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_C$ (property (ii)), and by Remark 2.5, this implies that $P_C \leq_{\text{st}} Q_C$ (property (iii)).

Property (iv) is obviously a consequence of property (iii), so it remains to show that property (iv) implies property (i). To verify that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$, it suffices to show that

$$P(A)Q(B) - P(B)Q(A) \geq 0 \tag{A.6}$$

for arbitrary $A = (x, y]$ and $B = (y, z]$ with $x < y < z$. With $C := A \cup B = (x, z]$, it suffices to consider the case $P(C), Q(C) > 0$, because otherwise (A.6) is trivial. But then (A.6) is equivalent to

$$P_C(A)Q_C(B) - P_C(B)Q_C(A) \geq 0,$$

and since $P_C(B) = 1 - P_C(A)$ and $Q_C(B) = 1 - Q_C(A)$, the latter inequality is equivalent to

$$P_C(A) \geq Q_C(A).$$

But this is a consequence of $P_C \leq_{\text{st}} Q_C$, because $P_C(A) = P_C((-\infty, y])$ and $Q_C(A) = Q_C((-\infty, y])$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Reflexivity of the likelihood ratio order is obvious. To show antisymmetry, note that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$ and $Q \leq_{\text{lr}} P$ implies that $P \leq_{\text{st}} Q$ and $Q \leq_{\text{st}} P$. But the latter two inequalities mean that the distribution functions of P and Q coincide, whence $P \equiv Q$.

It remains to prove transitivity. Suppose that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q \leq_{\text{lr}} R$, and let $\mu := P + Q + R$. Then there exist versions $f = dP/d\mu$, $g = dQ/d\mu$ and $h = dR/d\mu$ such that

$$g/f \text{ is isotonic on } \{f + g > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad h/g \text{ is isotonic on } \{g + h > 0\},$$

see condition (vi) in the proof of Proposition 2.1. In particular,

$$\{f + g > 0\} = A \cup B \quad \text{with} \quad A := \{f > 0 = g\} < B := \{g > 0\}$$

and

$$\{g + h > 0\} = B \cup C \quad \text{with} \quad B = \{g > 0\} < C := \{g = 0 < h\},$$

where “ $<$ ” for sets is meant elementwise. In particular, $\{f > 0\} \subset A \cup B$, whence $f = 0$ on C , and $\{h > 0\} \subset B \cup C$, whence $h = 0$ on A . Consequently,

$$\{f + h > 0\} = A \cup B' \cup C \quad \text{with} \quad B' := \{f + h > 0\} \cap B.$$

Since $h/f = 0$ on A and $h/f = \infty$ on C , it suffices to show that h/f is isotonic on B' . But since $g > 0$ on B' , the ratio $h/f = (h/g)(g/f)$ is the product of two isotonic functions from B' to $[0, \infty]$, whence it is isotonic on B' , too. Note that on B' , $h/g > 0$ or $g/f < \infty$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2.8. Suppose first that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$. Let (a_0, b_0) , (a_1, b_1) and (a_2, b_2) be three different points in $\text{ROC}(P, Q)$ such that $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2$ and $b_0 \leq b_1 \leq b_2$. For $0 \leq i \leq 2$, we may write $(a_i, b_i) = (P(H_i), Q(H_i))$ with sets $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$, where $H_0 \subsetneq H_1 \subsetneq H_2$. But then $A := H_2 \setminus H_1 < H_1 \setminus H_0 =: B$ element-wise, and property (iii) in Proposition 2.1 implies that

$$(a_1 - a_0)(b_2 - b_1) = P(B)Q(A) \leq P(A)Q(B) = (a_2 - a_1)(b_1 - b_0).$$

Since $(r_1, s_1) := (a_1 - a_0, b_1 - b_0)$ and $(r_2, s_2) := (a_2 - a_1, b_2 - b_1)$ differ from $(0, 0)$ by assumption, Lemma A.3 shows that the latter displayed inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{b_1 - b_0}{a_1 - a_0} \geq \frac{b_2 - b_1}{a_2 - a_1}.$$

This shows that the ROC curve of P and Q is concave.

Now suppose that $\text{ROC}(P, Q)$ is concave. This implies that for arbitrary points $(a_i, b_i) \in \text{ROC}(P, Q)$, $0 \leq i \leq 2$, with $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2$ and $b_0 \leq b_1 \leq b_2$,

$$(a_2 - a_1)(b_1 - b_0) \leq (a_1 - a_0)(b_2 - b_1),$$

see Lemma A.3. Specifically, if $(a_i, b_i) = (P(H_i), Q(H_i))$ with $H_0 := (z, \infty)$, $H_1 := (y, \infty)$ and $H_2 := (x, \infty)$ and $x < y < z$, then the latter displayed inequality reads

$$P((y, z])Q((x, y]) \leq P((x, y])Q((y, z]),$$

whence P and Q satisfy condition (iv) of Proposition 2.1. $\square$

The proof of Corollary 2.9 uses elementary inequalities for distribution and quantile functions; see for instance Chapter 1 of [Shorack and Wellner \(1986\)](#):

Lemma A.4. *For all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we have $F(F^{-1}(\alpha)) \geq \alpha$, with equality if, and only if, $\alpha \in \text{Im}(F)$. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $F^{-1}(F(x)) \leq x$, with equality if, and only if, $F(x_o) < F(x)$ for all $x_o < x$.*

Proof of Corollary 2.9. Let us write H instead of $H_{F,G}$ to lighten the notations.

Suppose that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$, and let $r, s, t \in \text{Im}(F)$ with $r < s < t$. Lemma A.4 yields that $F^{-1}(r) < F^{-1}(s) < F^{-1}(t)$, so $A := (F^{-1}(r), F^{-1}(s)]$ and $B := (F^{-1}(s), F^{-1}(t)]$ are such that

$$\begin{aligned} P(A) &= F(F^{-1}(s)) - F(F^{-1}(r)) = s - r > 0, \\ P(B) &= F(F^{-1}(t)) - F(F^{-1}(s)) = t - s > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(t-s)(H(s) - H(r)) = P(B)Q(A) \leq P(A)Q(B) = (s-r)(H(t) - H(s)),$$

and dividing both sides by $(s-r)(t-s)$ shows that H is convex on $\text{Im}(F)$.

Suppose now that H is convex on $\text{Im}(F)$. To verify that $P \leq_{\text{lr}} Q$, we have to show that

$$P((x_0, x_1])Q((x_1, x_2]) - P((x_1, x_2])Q((x_0, x_1]) \geq 0 \quad (\text{A.7})$$

for arbitrary real numbers $x_0 < x_1 < x_2$. If $P((x_i, x_j]) = 0$, then $Q((x_i, x_j]) = 0$, because $Q \ll P$. Hence it suffices to verify (A.7) in case of $P((x_0, x_1]) = F(x_1) - F(x_0) > 0$ and $P((x_1, x_2]) = F(x_2) - F(x_1) > 0$. For $0 \leq i \leq 2$, let $\tilde{x}_i := F^{-1}(F(x_i))$. Then $\tilde{x}_i \leq x_i$ and $F(\tilde{x}_i) = F(x_i) =: t_i$, whence $P((\tilde{x}_i, x_i]) = 0$ and $Q((\tilde{x}_i, x_i]) = 0$. Consequently, the left-hand side of (A.7) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & (t_1 - t_0)Q((\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2]) - (t_2 - t_1)Q((\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{x}_1]) \\ &= (t_1 - t_0)(H(t_2) - H(t_1)) - (t_2 - t_1)(H(t_1) - H(t_0)) \\ &= (t_1 - t_0)(t_2 - t_1) \left(\frac{H(t_2) - H(t_1)}{t_2 - t_1} - \frac{H(t_1) - H(t_0)}{t_1 - t_0} \right) \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by convexity of H . □

A.3 Proofs for Section 2.2

Proof of Theorem 2.12. Condition (iii) states that $K(x, \cdot)$ is isotonic in $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with respect to stochastic order. That means, for any fixed number y , $K(x, (y, \infty))$ is isotonic in $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Consequently, for Borel sets A_1, A_2 with $A_1 < A_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1, Y > y) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2) &= \mathbb{E}(1_{A_1 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X)K(X, (y, \infty))) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2 \cap \mathcal{X}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1 \cap \mathcal{X})K(x_o, (y, \infty)) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2 \cap \mathcal{X}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1 \cap \mathcal{X}) \mathbb{E}(1_{A_2 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X)K(X, (y, \infty))) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2, Y > y), \end{aligned}$$

where x_o is an arbitrary number in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $A_1 \cap \mathcal{X} \leq \{x_o\} \leq A_2 \cap \mathcal{X}$. This shows that condition (iii) implies condition (i).

Condition (ii) is just a special case of condition (i), so it remains to deduce condition (iii) from condition (ii). To this end, we apply Lemma A.1 to $\mu(\cdot) := P$ and $\nu(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(X \in \cdot, Y > y)$ with arbitrary $y \in \mathbb{R}$. This yields

$$S(x, y) := \sup_{a < x} \mathbb{P}(Y > y | a < X \leq x)$$

with $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | a < X \leq x) := 0$ in case of $\mathbb{P}(a < X \leq x) = 0$. According to Lemma A.1, $S(\cdot, y)$ is an isotonic density of ν with respect to μ . Moreover, $S(x, \cdot)$ is antitonic and right-continuous. Antitonicity is obvious. To verify right-continuity, note that $S(x, y) = 0$ implies that $S(x, \cdot) \equiv 0$ on $[y, \infty)$. If $S(x, y) > 0$,

$$\liminf_{z \rightarrow y+} S(x, z) \geq \liminf_{z \rightarrow y+} \mathbb{P}(Y > z | a < X \leq x) = \mathbb{P}(Y > y | a < X \leq x)$$

for any fixed $a < x$ such that $\mathbb{P}(a < X \leq x) > 0$. This shows that $\liminf_{z \rightarrow y+} S(x, z) \geq S(x, y)$. Now the idea is to interpret $S(x, y)$ as $K(x, (y, \infty))$ for some probability measure $K(x, \cdot)$ whenever $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Such a probability measure $K(x, \cdot)$ exists if and only if

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} S(x, y) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} S(x, y) = 0.$$

Indeed, if $\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) > 0$, then there exists a real number $a < x$ such that $\mathbb{P}(a < X \leq x) > 0$. Hence, by definition of $S(x, y)$,

$$S(x, y) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y > y | a < X \leq x) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Similary, if $\mathbb{P}(X \geq x) > 0$, then $\mathbb{P}(X = x) > 0$ or $\mathbb{P}(x < X \leq x') > 0$ for some real number $x' > x$. In the former case, Lemma A.1 entails that

$$S(x, y) = \mathbb{P}(Y > y | X = x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.$$

In the latter case, it follows from condition (ii) that

$$S(x, y) \leq \mathbb{P}(Y > y | x < X \leq x') \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.$$

These considerations show that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$K(x, (y, \infty)) := \begin{cases} S(x, y) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X}, \\ Q((y, \infty)) & \text{if } x \notin \mathcal{X}, \end{cases}$$

defines a probability measure $K(x, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $K(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{st}} K(x_2, \cdot)$ for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$. By construction, $K(\cdot, B)$ is measurable and satisfies the equation $\mathbb{P}(X \in A, Y \in B) = \mathbb{E}(1_A(X)K(X, B))$ for all sets $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and every open halfline $B = (y, \infty)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Since the latter family of halflines is closed under intersections and generates $\mathcal{B}$, the preceding properties of $K(\cdot, B)$ extend to any set $B \in \mathcal{B}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.13. Condition (iii) states that $K(x, \cdot)$ is isotonic in $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with respect to likelihood ratio order. This implies that for Borel sets A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 with $A_1 < A_2$ and $B_1 < B_2$ and for independent copies X', X'' of X ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1, Y \in B_2) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2, Y \in B_1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(1_{A_1 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X') 1_{A_2 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X'') K(X', B_2) K(X'', B_1)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(1_{A_1 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X') 1_{A_2 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X'') K(X', B_1) K(X'', B_2)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1, Y \in B_1) \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2, Y \in B_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, condition (iii) implies condition (i). Since condition (ii) is a special case of condition (i), it remains to show that condition (ii) implies condition (iii). One can easily show that condition (ii) in Theorem 2.13 implies condition (ii) in Theorem 2.12 by letting $y_0 \rightarrow -\infty$ and $y_2 \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we may construct the stochastic kernel K precisely as in the proof of Theorem 2.12.

It remains to be shown that $K(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x_2, \cdot)$ for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$. The construction of K implies the following facts: If $\mathbb{P}(x_1 < X \leq x_2) = 0$, then $K(x_1, \cdot) \equiv K(x_2, \cdot)$, and the assertion is trivial. Otherwise, for $j = 1, 2$,

$$x'_j := \min(\{x_j\} \cup \{x < x_j : \mathbb{P}(x < X \leq x_j) = 0\})$$

is well-defined, and $x'_1 \leq x_1 < x'_2 \leq x_2$. Moreover, $\mathbb{P}(a < X \leq x'_j) > 0$ for all $a < x'_j$, whence Lemma A.1 implies that

$$K(x_j, (y, \infty)) = \lim_{a \rightarrow x'_j -} \mathbb{P}(Y > y | a < X \leq x_j)$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, for $y_0 < y_1 < y_2$, the difference

$$K(x_1, (y_0, y_1]) K(x_2, (y_1, y_2]) - K(x_1, (y_1, y_2]) K(x_2, (y_0, y_1])$$

is the limit of the difference

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(y_0 < Y \leq y_1 | a < X \leq x_1) \mathbb{P}(y_1 < Y \leq y_2 | b < X \leq x_2) \\ & - \mathbb{P}(y_1 < Y \leq y_2 | a < X \leq x_1) \mathbb{P}(y_0 < Y \leq y_1 | b < X \leq x_2) \end{aligned}$$

as $a \rightarrow x'_1 -$ and $b \rightarrow x'_2 -$. But the latter difference is nonnegative as soon as $x_1 \leq b$. In case of $\mathbb{P}(x_1 < X \leq b, y_0 < Y \leq y_2) = 0$, this follows from condition (ii) applied with (a, x_1, x_2) in place of (x_0, x_1, x_2) , noting that $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | b < X \leq x_2) \equiv \mathbb{P}(\cdot | x_1 < X \leq x_2)$. In case of $\mathbb{P}(x_1 < X \leq b, y_0 < Y \leq y_2) > 0$, one has to apply condition (ii) with (a, x_1, b) and then with (x_1, b, x_2) in place of (x_0, x_1, x_2) and apply Lemma A.3 twice. $\square$

A.4 Proofs for Section 2.3

In the subsequent proof, we reinterpret occasionally a distribution on $\mathbb{R}$ as a distribution on $[-\infty, \infty]$ with mass zero on $\{-\infty, \infty\}$.

Proof of Theorem 2.18. We start with a general observation which applies to any kernel K as in part (iii) of Theorem 2.13. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(X \in A_1), \mathbb{P}(X \in A_2) > 0$ and $A_1 \leq \{x\} \leq A_2$. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y > S_{\text{nw}}(x) | X \in A_1) = 0 = \mathbb{P}(Y < S_{\text{se}}(x) | X \in A_2) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}(Y | X \in A_1) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} \mathcal{L}(Y | X \in A_2). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Equality (A.8) follows immediately from the definition of $S_{\text{nw}}(x)$ and $S_{\text{se}}(x)$. To verify inequality (A.9), consider sets $B_1 < B_2$ in $\mathcal{B}$. Then the order constraint about K implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y \in B_2 | X \in A_1) K(x, B_1) &= \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1)^{-1} \mathbb{E}(1_{A_1 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) K(X, B_2) K(x, B_1)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X \in A_1)^{-1} \mathbb{E}(1_{A_1 \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) K(X, B_1) K(x, B_2)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(Y \in B_1 | X \in A_1) K(x, B_2), \end{aligned}$$

and the same reasoning yields the inequality

$$K(x, B_2) \mathbb{P}(Y \in B_1 | X \in A_2) \leq K(x, B_1) \mathbb{P}(Y \in B_2 | X \in A_2).$$

Now let K_{w} be the specific kernel constructed in the proof of Theorems 2.12 and 2.13. For $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $K_{\text{w}}(x, (y, \infty))$ is the supremum of $\mathbb{P}(Y > y | a < X \leq x)$ over all $a < x$ such that $\mathbb{P}(a < X \leq x) > 0$. This implies that

$$K_{\text{w}}(x, (y, \infty)) \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } y \geq S_{\text{nw}}(x), \\ > 0 & \text{if } y < S_{\text{nw}}(x), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

because $\mathbb{P}(X \leq x, Y > y) = 0$ implies that $\mathbb{P}(a < X \leq x, Y > y) = 0$ for all $a < x$, while $\mathbb{P}(X \leq x, Y > y) > 0$ implies that $\mathbb{P}(a < X \leq x, Y > y) > 0$ for some $a < x$. Analogously one could construct a kernel K_{e} : For $x \in \mathcal{X}$ let $K_{\text{e}}(x, (-\infty, y))$ be the supremum of $\mathbb{P}(Y < y | x \leq X < b)$ over all $b > x$ such that $\mathbb{P}(x \leq X < b) > 0$, and for $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ let $K_{\text{e}}(x, \cdot) := Q$. Then we have a second version K_{e} of K which satisfies condition (iii) in Theorem 2.13, and now for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$K_{\text{e}}(x, (-\infty, y)) \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } y \leq S_{\text{se}}(x), \\ > 0 & \text{if } y > S_{\text{se}}(x). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

A first consequence of these constructions is that

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{\text{se}}(X) \leq Y \leq S_{\text{nw}}(X)) = 1. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The two kernels $K_{\text{w}}, K_{\text{e}}$ are extremal in the sense that for any kernel K satisfying condition (iii) in Theorem 2.13 and all $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$K_{\text{w}}(x, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K_{\text{e}}(x, \cdot). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

This can be deduced from Remark 2.4 and inequalities (A.9) as follows: With $x_{\text{w}} := \min\{x' \leq x : \mathbb{P}(x' < X \leq x) = 0\}$, the distribution $K_{\text{w}}(x, \cdot)$ is the weak limit of

$$\mathcal{L}(Y | a < X \leq x) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x, \cdot) \quad \text{as } a \rightarrow x_{\text{w}}-,$$

and with $x_{\text{e}} := \max\{x' \geq x : \mathbb{P}(x \leq X < x') = 0\}$, the distribution $K_{\text{e}}(x, \cdot)$ is the weak limit of

$$\mathcal{L}(Y | x \leq X < b) \geq_{\text{lr}} K(x, \cdot) \quad \text{as } b \rightarrow x_{\text{e}}+.$$

An important consequence of inequalities (A.10), (A.11) and (A.13) is that

$$K(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]) > 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Indeed, if $K(x, (-\infty, S_{\text{se}}(x))) > 0$, then the inequalities (A.10) and $K_{\text{w}}(x, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x, \cdot)$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< K_{\text{w}}(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]) K(x, (-\infty, S_{\text{se}}(x))) \\ &\leq K_{\text{w}}(x, (-\infty, S_{\text{se}}(x))) K(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]) \leq K(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]). \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, if $K(x, (S_{\text{nw}}(x), \infty)) > 0$, then the inequalities (A.11) and $K(x, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K_{\text{e}}(x, \cdot)$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< K(x, (S_{\text{nw}}(x), \infty)) K_{\text{e}}(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]) \\ &\leq K(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]) K_{\text{e}}(x, (S_{\text{nw}}(x), \infty)) \leq K(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if we chose an arbitrary isotonic function $S : \mathcal{X}_o \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $S_{\text{nw}} \leq S \leq S_{\text{se}}$ on $\mathcal{X}_o$, we may replace K with K_{new} given by

$$K_{\text{new}}(x, B) := \begin{cases} K(x, [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)])^{-1} K(x, B \cap [S_{\text{se}}(x), S_{\text{nw}}(x)]) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o, \\ \delta_{S(x)}(B) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X}_o, \\ K(x, B) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{X}. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, it follows from (A.12) that $K(X, [S_{\text{se}}(X), S_{\text{nw}}(X)]) = 1$ almost surely, whence $K_{\text{new}}(X, \cdot) \equiv K(X, \cdot)$ almost surely. Consequently, K_{new} describes the conditional distribution of Y given X , too. Moreover, it satisfies condition (iii) of Theorem 2.13: Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$. If x_1 and x_2 lie in $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o$, it follows from $K(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K(x_2, \cdot)$ and part (i) of the subsequent Lemma A.5 that $K_{\text{new}}(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K_{\text{new}}(x_2, \cdot)$, too. If at least one of the two points x_1, x_2 lies in $\mathcal{X}_o$, then $K_{\text{new}}(x_1, (-\infty, y]) = 1 = K_{\text{new}}(x_2, [y, \infty))$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}$, so $K_{\text{new}}(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K_{\text{new}}(x_2, \cdot)$ by Lemma A.5 (ii). Precisely, if $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_o$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o$, then $S(x_1) \leq S_{\text{se}}(x_1) \leq S_{\text{se}}(x_2)$, so the asserted inequalities hold for any y between $S(x_1)$ and $S_{\text{se}}(x_2)$. Likewise, if $x_1 \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_o$, we can pick any y between $S_{\text{nw}}(x_1)$ and $S(x_2)$. Finally, if $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_o$, any y between $S(x_1)$ and $S(x_2)$ is suitable.

Finally, let $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o$. Then we may apply Lemma A.7 to $Q_0 := \mathcal{L}(Y | X \leq x)$, $Q_* := K_{\text{new}}(x, \cdot)$, $Q_1 := \mathcal{L}(Y | X > x)$ and $\lambda_0 := \mathbb{P}(X \leq x)$, $\lambda_1 := \mathbb{P}(X > x)$, so $\lambda_0 Q_0 + \lambda_1 Q_1 = Q = \mathcal{L}(Y)$. In case of $\mathbb{P}(X > x) = 0$, we replace “ $\leq x$ ” with “ $< x$ ” and “ $> x$ ” with “ $\geq x$ ”. Here we exclude the trivial situation that $\mathbb{P}(X = x) = 1$. This shows that

$$h(x, y) := \lim_{w \rightarrow y-} \frac{K_{\text{new}}(x, (w, y])}{Q((w, y])}$$

(with $0/0 := 0$) defines a bounded density of $K_{\text{new}}(x, \cdot)$ with respect to Q , and obviously, $h(x, y) = 0$ if $y < S_{\text{se}}(x)$ or $y > S_{\text{nw}}(x)$. The explicit representation of $h(x, y)$ in terms of probability ratios $K(x, (w, y])/Q((w, y])$, $w < y$, and the fact that $K_{\text{new}}(x_1, \cdot) \leq_{\text{lr}} K_{\text{new}}(x_2, \cdot)$ for arbitrary points $x_1 < x_2$ in $\mathcal{X}$ implies that h is TP2 on $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_o \times \mathbb{R}$. $\square$

Lemma A.5. *Let Q_1, Q_2 be probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}$.*

(i) *If $[a_1, b_1]$ and $[a_2, b_2]$ are intervals in $[-\infty, \infty]$ such that $a_1 \leq a_2$, $b_1 \leq b_2$, and $Q_j([a_j, b_j]) > 0$ for $j = 1, 2$, then it follows from $Q_1 \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_2$ that $Q_1(\cdot | [a_1, b_1]) \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_2(\cdot | [a_2, b_2])$, too.*

(ii) *If $Q_1((-\infty, y]) = 1 = Q_2([y, \infty))$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}$, then $Q_1 \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_2$.*

Proof of Lemma A.5. As to part (i), $Q_1 \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_2$ implies that $Q_1(\cdot | C) \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_2(\cdot | C)$ for any Borel set C with $Q_1(C), Q_2(C) > 0$, see Lemma 2.6. Applying this fact with $C = [a_1, b_2]$ shows that it suffices to prove part (i) with $a_1 = -\infty$ and $b_2 = \infty$. But then, by transitivity of $\leq_{\text{lr}}$, it suffices to show that $Q_1(\cdot | (-\infty, b_1]) \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_1$ and $Q_2 \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_2(\cdot | [a_2, \infty))$. These assertions follow from observing that $Q_1(\cdot | (-\infty, b_1])$ has antitonic density $Q_1((-\infty, b_1])^{-1} 1_{(-\infty, b_1]}$ with respect to Q_1 , and $Q_2(\cdot | [a_2, \infty))$ has isotonic density $Q_2([a_2, \infty))^{-1} 1_{[a_2, \infty)}$ with respect to Q_2 .

As to part (ii), a density ρ of Q_2 with respect to $Q_1 + Q_2$ is given by $\rho(x) = 1_{[x=y]} \gamma + 1_{[x>y]}$, where $\gamma := Q_2(\{y\}) / (Q_1 + Q_2)(\{y\}) \in [0, 1]$. Thus ρ is isotonic, so $Q_1 \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_2$. $\square$

Lemma A.6. *Let Q be a distribution on $\mathbb{R}$, and let $\text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q)$ be the set of all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q((x, y]) > 0$ for arbitrary $x < y$. Then $Q(\text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q)) = 1$.*

Proof of Lemma A.6. If $Q(I) > 0$ for any nonvoid open interval, then $\text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q) = \mathbb{R}$, so the claim is obvious. Otherwise, let $\mathcal{J}$ be the family of maximal open intervals $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q(J) = 0$. This family $\mathcal{J}$ is finite or countable. A point y belongs to $\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q)$ if and only if for some $J \in \mathcal{J}$, either $y \in J$, or $y = \sup(J)$ and $Q(\{y\}) = 0$. Consequently, $\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q)$ is equal to the union of $\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}} J$ and a finite or countable set of points y such that $Q(\{y\}) = 0$. This shows that $Q(\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q)) = 0$. $\square$

Lemma A.7. *Let Q_0, Q_*, Q_1 be probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $Q_0 \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_* \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_1$ and $Q_0((x, \infty)) + Q_1((-\infty, x)) > 0$ for arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $Q := \lambda_0 Q_0 + \lambda_1 Q_1$ with $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 > 0$ such that $\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 = 1$. Then*

$$g(y) := \lim_{x \rightarrow y-} \frac{Q_*((x, y])}{Q((x, y])}$$

with $0/0 := 0$ exists and defines a bounded density of Q_ with respect to Q .*

Proof of Lemma A.7. By assumption, for $j = 0, 1$, there exists a density ρ_j of Q_j with respect to $Q_j + Q_*$ with values in $[0, 1]$, where ρ_0 is isotonic and ρ_1 is antitonic. Note that $1 - \rho_j$ is automatically a version of $dQ_j/d(Q_j + Q_*)$. An important fact is that $\rho_0 + \rho_1$ is bounded away from 2, i.e. $\rho_0 + \rho_1 \leq 2 - \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. To verify this,

suppose the contrary. Then there exists a sequence $(x_k)_k$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_j(x_k) = 1$ for $j = 0, 1$. Without loss of generality let $(x_k)_k$ converge to a point $x \in [-\infty, \infty]$. If $x < \infty$, then $\rho_0 \equiv 1$ on (x, ∞) , whence $Q_0((x, \infty)) = 0$. Likewise, if $x > -\infty$, then $\rho_1 \equiv 1$ on $(-\infty, x)$, whence $Q_1((-\infty, x)) = 0$. In particular, x has to be a real number, but then our assumption on Q_0 and Q_1 is obviously violated.

Note first that $A_0 := \{\rho_0 = 0\} < \{\rho_0 > 0\}$ satisfies $Q_*(A_0) = 0$, and then $Q_* \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_1$ implies that $Q_1(A_0) = 0$. Similarly, $A_1 := \{\rho_1 = 0\} > \{\rho_1 > 0\}$ satisfies $Q_*(A_1) = 0 = Q_0(A_1)$. Thus the real line may be partitioned into the sets $A_0 < A_* := \{\rho_0 \rho_1 > 0\} < A_1$, and $Q_*(A_*) = 1$. For measurable functions $h \geq 0$ on A_* and $j = 0, 1$,

$$\int_{A_*} h dQ_* = \int h \rho_j d(Q_* + Q_j),$$

so

$$\int_{A_*} h(1 - \rho_j) dQ_* = \int h \rho_j dQ_j,$$

and replacing h with h/ρ_j shows that

$$\int_{A_*} h(\rho_j^{-1} - 1) dQ_* = \int h dQ_j.$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{A_*} h(\lambda_0(\rho_0^{-1} - 1) + \lambda_1(\rho_1^{-1} - 1)) dQ_* = \int_{A_*} h dQ.$$

Note that $\lambda_0(\rho_0^{-1} - 1) + \lambda_1(\rho_1^{-1} - 1)$ is not smaller than $\lambda_0(1 - \rho_0) + \lambda_1(1 - \rho_1) \geq \min(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)\delta > 0$. Therefore, we may replace h in the previously displayed integrals with $h/(\lambda_0(\rho_0^{-1} - 1) + \lambda_1(\rho_1^{-1} - 1))$ and conclude that for measurable functions $h \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\int h dQ_* = \int h \tilde{g} dQ$$

with

$$\tilde{g} := \begin{cases} (\lambda_0(\rho_0^{-1} - 1) + \lambda_1(\rho_1^{-1} - 1))^{-1} & \text{on } A_*, \\ 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \setminus A_*. \end{cases}$$

In other words, $dQ_*/dQ = \tilde{g}$, and $\tilde{g} \leq \min(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)^{-1}\delta^{-1}$.

It remains to be shown that $\tilde{g}(y)$ may be replaced with the stated limit $g(y)$. Note first that by Lemma A.6, the set $\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q_*)$ has probability 0 under Q_* , and $g(y) = 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q_*)$, because $Q_*((x, y]) = 0$ if $x < y$ is sufficiently close to y . It suffices to show that $g(y) = \tilde{g}(y)$ for any $y \in \text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q_*) \subset \text{supp}_{\text{left}}(Q)$. If ρ_0 and $1 - \rho_1$ are constructed as in the proof of Proposition 2.1 by means of Lemma A.1, then for $j = 0, 1$,

$$\rho_j(x, y) := \frac{Q_*((x, y])}{(Q_j + Q_*)((x, y])} \rightarrow \rho_j(y) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow y-,$$

and

$$Q_j((x, y]) = (\rho_j(x, y)^{-1} - 1)Q_*((x, y]).$$

Consequently, $Q((x, y]) = (\lambda_0(\rho_0(x, y)^{-1} - 1) + \lambda_1(\rho_1(x, y)^{-1} - 1))Q_*((x, y])$, and this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Q_*((x, y])}{Q((x, y])} &= (\lambda_0(\rho_0(x, y)^{-1} - 1) + \lambda_1(\rho_1(x, y)^{-1} - 1))^{-1} \\ &\rightarrow \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y \notin A_* \\ (\lambda_0(\rho_0(y)^{-1} - 1) + \lambda_1(\rho_1(y)^{-1} - 1))^{-1} & \text{if } y \in A_* \end{cases} \\ &= \tilde{g}(y) \end{aligned}$$

as $x \rightarrow y-$. □

B Proofs and details for Section 3

B.1 Proofs for Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3

Lemma B.1. Let Q_0 and Q_1 be probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $Q_0 \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_1$. If we define $Q_t := (1-t)Q_0 + tQ_1$ for $0 < t < 1$, then $Q_s \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_t$ for $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$.

Proof. By assumption, there exist densities g_0 of Q_0 and g_1 of Q_1 with respect to $Q_0 + Q_1$ such that $g_0 + g_1 \equiv 1$ and g_1 is isotonic. Then Q_t has density

$$g_t := (1-t)g_0 + tg_1 = 1-t + (2t-1)g_1$$

with respect to $Q_0 + Q_1$. Elementary algebra reveals that for $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$ and arbitrary $x < y$,

$$g_s(x)g_t(y) - g_s(y)g_t(x) = (t-s)(g_1(y) - g_1(x)) \geq 0,$$

whence $Q_s \leq_{\text{lr}} Q_t$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let $\mathbf{h} \in [0, \infty)$ satisfy (3.3) and $L(\mathbf{h}) > -\infty$.

As for part (a), it follows from $L(\mathbf{h}) > -\infty$ that $h_{jk} > 0$ whenever $w_{jk} > 0$. We have to show that for arbitrary index pairs $(j_1, k_2), (j_2, k_1)$ with $j_1 \leq j_2$, $k_1 \leq k_2$ and $w_{j_1 k_2}, w_{j_2 k_1} > 0$, also $h_{jk} > 0$ for all $j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_2\}$ and $k \in \{k_1, \dots, k_2\}$.

Since $h_{j_1 k_2}, h_{j_2 k_1} > 0$, it follows from (3.3) that $h_{j_1 k_1}, h_{j_2 k_2} > 0$, too. (If $j_1 = j_2$ or $k_1 = k_2$, this conclusion is trivial.) This type of argument will reappear several times, so we denote it by $A(j_1, j_2, k_1, k_2)$.

Next we show that $h_{j k_1}, h_{j k_2} > 0$ for $j_1 < j < j_2$. Indeed, there exists an index k_* such that $w_{j k_*} > 0$, whence $h_{j k_*} > 0$. If $k_* \leq k_2$, we may conclude from $A(j_1, j, k_*, k_2)$ that $h_{j k_2} > 0$, and then it follows from $A(j, j_2, k_1, k_2)$ that $h_{j k_1} > 0$. Similarly, if $k_* \geq k_1$, we may conclude from $A(j, j_2, k_1, k_*)$ that $h_{j k_1} > 0$, and then $A(j_1, j, k_1, k_2)$ shows that $h_{j k_2} > 0$.

Analogously, one can show that $h_{j_1 k}, h_{j_2 k} > 0$ for $k_1 < k < k_2$.

Finally, if $j_1 < j < j_2$ and $k_1 < k < k_2$, then we may apply $A(j_1, j, k_1, k)$ or $A(j, j_2, k, k_2)$ to deduce that $h_{jk} > 0$.

As to part (b), since $\mathcal{P}$ contains all pairs (j, k) with $w_{jk} > 0$, we know that $L_{\text{raw}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) = L_{\text{raw}}(\mathbf{h})$, and $n - n\tilde{h}_{++} \geq n - nh_{++}$ with equality if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{h}$. This proves the assertions about $L(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$ and $L(\mathbf{h})$. That $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ inherits property (3.3) from $\mathbf{h}$ can be deduced from the fact that for indices $j_1 < j_2$ and $k_1 < k_2$, it follows from $\tilde{h}_{j_1 k_2} \tilde{h}_{j_2 k_1} > 0$, that $(j_1, k_2), (j_2, k_1) \in \mathcal{P}$, so $(j_1, k_1), (j_2, k_2) \in \mathcal{P}$ as well, and $\tilde{h}_{j_1 k_1} \tilde{h}_{j_2 k_2} - \tilde{h}_{j_1 k_2} \tilde{h}_{j_2 k_1}$ is identical to $h_{j_1 k_1} h_{j_2 k_2} - h_{j_1 k_2} h_{j_2 k_1} \geq 0$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Since f is strictly convex and Θ is convex, f has at most one minimizer in Θ . To prove existence of a minimizer, it suffices to show that

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta, \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Suppose that (B.1) is false. Then there exists a sequence $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)})_s$ in Θ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\| \rightarrow \infty$ but $(f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)}))_s$ is bounded. With $r_s := \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)}\|$ and $\mathbf{u}^{(s)} := r_s^{-1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)}$, we may assume without loss of generality that $\mathbf{u}^{(s)} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\mathbf{u} \in \Theta$ with $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$. For any fixed $t > 0$ and sufficiently large s , convexity and differentiability of f imply that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)}) &= f(t\mathbf{u}^{(s)}) + (f(r_s\mathbf{u}^{(s)}) - f(t\mathbf{u}^{(s)})) \\ &\geq f(t\mathbf{u}^{(s)}) + (r_s - t)\partial f(t\mathbf{u}^{(s)})/\partial t. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} f(t\mathbf{u}^{(s)}) = f(t\mathbf{u})$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \partial f(t\mathbf{u}^{(s)})/\partial t = \partial f(t\mathbf{u})/\partial t$, we conclude that

$$\partial f(t\mathbf{u})/\partial t \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

But as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the directional derivative $\partial f(t\mathbf{u})/\partial t = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} (-w_{jk}u_{jk} + u_{jk} \exp(tu_{jk}))$ converges to

$$\begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } u_{jk} > 0 \text{ for some } (j,k) \in \mathcal{P}, \\ -\sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} w_{jk}u_{jk} & \text{if } \mathbf{u} \in (-\infty, 0]^{\mathcal{P}}. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, the limiting direction $\mathbf{u}$ lies in $\Theta \cap (-\infty, 0]^{\mathcal{P}}$ and satisfies $u_{jk} = 0$ whenever $w_{jk} > 0$. But as shown below, this implies that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, a contradiction to $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$.

The proof of $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ is very similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1. If $j_1 \leq j_2$ and $k_1 \leq k_2$ are indices such that $u_{j_1 k_2} = u_{j_2 k_1} = 0$, then it follows from $\mathbf{u} \in (-\infty, 0]^{\mathcal{P}}$ and (3.5) that $u_{j_1 k_1} + u_{j_2 k_2} \geq 0$, whence $u_{j_1 k_1} = u_{j_2 k_2} = 0$. Repeating this argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, one can show that for arbitrary $(j_1, k_2), (j_2, k_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $j_1 \leq j_2, k_1 \leq k_2$, and $w_{j_1 k_2}, w_{j_2 k_1} > 0$, we have $u_{jk} = 0$ for $j_1 \leq j \leq j_2$ and $k_1 \leq k \leq k_2$. By definition of $\mathcal{P}$, this means that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. With the linear bijection $T : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{\Theta} = T(\Theta)$, $\tilde{\theta} = T(\theta)$, $\tilde{f} = f \circ T^{-1}$, one can show that for arbitrary $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = T(\mathbf{x})$,

$$\langle \nabla \tilde{f}(\tilde{\theta}), \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\theta} \rangle = \langle \nabla f(\theta), \mathbf{x} - \theta \rangle,$$

so

$$\Psi(\theta) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Theta} (f(\theta) + \langle \nabla f(\theta), \mathbf{x} - \theta \rangle + 2^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{A}_{\theta}(\theta)\|^2)$$

with

$$\mathbf{A}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) := (\tilde{v}_{jk}(\theta)^{1/2} T_{jk}(\mathbf{x}))_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}}$$

and $\tilde{v}_{jk}(\theta) := \partial^2 \tilde{f}(\tilde{\theta})/\partial \tilde{\theta}_{jk}^2$. It follows from parts (i) and (ii) of Lemma B.2 in Section B.2 that Ψ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$, and that $\delta(\theta) = \langle \nabla f(\theta), \theta - \Psi(\theta) \rangle > 0$ for $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \{\hat{\theta}\}$. Moreover,

$$f(\theta) - f(\hat{\theta}) \leq \max(2\delta(\theta), \sqrt{2\delta(\theta)} \|\mathbf{A}_{\theta}(\theta - \hat{\theta})\|).$$

But

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq \max_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{v}_{jk}(\theta) \|T(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \leq 3 \max_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{v}_{jk}(\theta) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2,$$

so

$$f(\theta) - f(\hat{\theta}) \leq \max(2\delta(\theta), \beta_1(\theta) \sqrt{\delta(\theta)} \|\theta - \hat{\theta}\|)$$

with $\beta_1(\theta)$ being the square root of $6 \max_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{v}_{jk}(\theta)$. In case of $\Psi = \Psi^{\text{row}}$ and θ being row-wise calibrated, $\beta_1(\theta)^2$ is no larger than $6 \max_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} w_{j+}$, and in case of $\Psi = \Psi^{\text{col}}$ and θ being column-wise calibrated, $\beta_1(\theta)^2 \leq 6 \max_{1 \leq k \leq m} w_{+k}$.

Concerning the lower bound for the maximum of $f(\theta) - f((1-t)\theta + t\Psi(\theta))$ over all $t \in [0, 1]$, note that for arbitrary $\theta', \theta'' \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} f((1-t)\theta' + t\theta'') &= n \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \exp((1-t)\theta'_{jk} + t\theta''_{jk})(\theta'_{jk} - \theta''_{jk})^2 \\ &\leq n \max_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \exp(\max(\theta'_{jk}, \theta''_{jk})) \|\theta' - \theta''\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus part (iii) of Lemma B.2 yields the asserted lower bound with

$$\beta_2(\theta) := 2n \max_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{P}} \exp(\max(\theta_{jk}, \Psi_{jk}(\theta))).$$

$\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.4. It follows from Lemma 3.3 and the construction of the sequence $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)})_{s \geq 0}$ that

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)}) - f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s+1)}) \geq \beta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)})$$

for all $s \geq 0$ with some continuous function $\beta : \Theta \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\beta > 0$ on $\Theta \setminus \{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}$. Note that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)})$ is antitonic in $s \geq 0$, so the sequence $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)})_{s \geq 0}$ stays in the compact set $R_0 := \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta : f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)})\}$. For each $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in R_0 \setminus \{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}$, there exists a $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} > 0$ such that the open ball $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ with center $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and radius $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ satisfies

$$|f - f(\boldsymbol{\theta})| < \beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})/3 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta > 2\beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})/3 \quad \text{on } U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}).$$

In particular, if $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)} \in U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ for some $s \geq 0$, then $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s+1)}) < f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})/3$. Consequently, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)} \in U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ for at most one index $s \geq 0$. But for each $\epsilon > 0$, the compact set $\{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in R_0 : \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\| \geq \epsilon\}$ can be covered by finitely many of these balls $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$. Hence, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(s)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\| \geq \epsilon$ for at most finitely many indices $s \geq 0$. $\square$

B.2 Minimizing convex functions via quadratic approximations

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a strictly convex and differentiable function, and let $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a closed, convex set such that a minimizer

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} := \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

exists. For $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o \in \Theta$ and some nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ consider the quadratic approximation

$$f_o(\mathbf{x}) := f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) + \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)^\top (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) + 2^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|^2$$

of $f(\mathbf{x})$. By construction, $f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) = f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)$ and $\nabla f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) = \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)$, and there exists a unique minimizer

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_* := \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

The next lemma clarifies some connections between $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ in terms of the directional derivative

$$\delta_o := \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*) = -\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o + t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)).$$

Lemma B.2. (i) The point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$ equals $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Furthermore,

$$2^{-1}\delta_o \leq f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) \leq \delta_o$$

and

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq \max\left(2\delta_o, \sqrt{2\delta_o} \|\mathbf{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|\right).$$

(ii) If f is continuously differentiable, the minimizer $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$ is a continuous function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o \in \Theta$ and $\mathbf{A}$.

(iii) If f is even twice differentiable such that for some constant $c_o > 0$ and any $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} f((1-t)\boldsymbol{\theta}_o + t\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) \leq c_o \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2,$$

then in case of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$,

$$\max_{t \in [0, 1]} (f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f((1-t)\boldsymbol{\theta}_o + t\boldsymbol{\theta}_*)) \geq 2^{-1} \min\left(\delta_o, \frac{\delta_o^2}{c_o \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2}\right).$$

Proof. By strict convexity of f , $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ if and only if

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o + t(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)) = \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta.$$

But since f_o is strictly convex, too, with $\nabla f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) = \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)$, the latter displayed condition is also equivalent to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o = \boldsymbol{\theta}_*$.

Since the asserted inequalities are trivial in case of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_*$, let us assume in the sequel that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_* \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_o \neq \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. By convexity of f and f_o ,

$$f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) \leq \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1} f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_* + t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*)) = \delta_o$$

and

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1} f(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) = \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}).$$

On the other hand, since $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*$ minimizes f_o over Θ ,

$$0 \leq \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_* + t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*)) = \nabla f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*) = \delta_o - \|\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2,$$

so

$$f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) = \delta_o - 2^{-1} \|\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2 \geq 2^{-1} \delta_o.$$

Moreover, with $\widehat{\delta} := \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ and $\widehat{\gamma} := \|\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \mathbf{A}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta_o &\geq 2(f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*)) = 2 \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} (f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &\geq 2 \max_{t \in [0,1]} (f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f_o((1-t)\boldsymbol{\theta}_o + t\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) \\ &= \max_{t \in [0,1]} (2t\widehat{\delta} - t^2\widehat{\gamma}) \\ &= 2t_o\widehat{\delta} - t_o^2\widehat{\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where $t_o := \min(1, \widehat{\delta}/\widehat{\gamma})$. In case of $\widehat{\delta} \geq \widehat{\gamma}$, we may conclude that $2\delta_o \geq 2\widehat{\delta} - \widehat{\gamma} \geq \widehat{\delta}$, so $\widehat{\delta} \leq 2\delta_o$, and otherwise, $2\delta_o \geq \widehat{\delta}^2/\widehat{\gamma}$, whence $\widehat{\delta} \leq \sqrt{2\delta_o\widehat{\gamma}}$. This proves part (i).

As to part (ii), let $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o^{(s)})_{s \geq 1}$ be a sequence in Θ with limit $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o$, and let $(\mathbf{A}^{(s)})_{s \geq 1}$ be a sequence of nonsingular matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ converging to a nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{A}$. Defining $f_o^{(s)}$ as f_o with $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o^{(s)}, \mathbf{A}^{(s)})$ in place of $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{A})$, we know that $f_o^{(s)} \rightarrow f_o$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on any bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Consequently, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and $R_\epsilon := \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta : \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\| = \epsilon\}$,

$$\gamma_\epsilon^{(s)} := \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in R_\epsilon} f_o^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_o^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) \rightarrow \gamma_\epsilon := \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in R_\epsilon} f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - f_o(\boldsymbol{\theta}_*) > 0$$

as $s \rightarrow \infty$. But as soon as $\gamma_\epsilon^{(s)} > 0$, it follows from convexity of Θ and $f^{(s)}$ that the minimizer $\boldsymbol{\theta}_*^{(s)}$ of $f_o^{(s)}$ satisfies $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_*^{(s)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\| < \epsilon$.

Part (iii) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \in [0,1]} (f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f((1-t)\boldsymbol{\theta}_o + t\boldsymbol{\theta}_*)) &= \max_{t \in [0,1]} (f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o + t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o))) \\ &\geq \max_{t \in [0,1]} (t\delta_o - 2^{-1}t^2c_o\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2) \\ &= t_o\delta_o - 2^{-1}t_o^2c_o\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2 \\ &\geq 2^{-1} \min\left(\delta_o, \frac{\delta_o^2}{c_o\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $t_o := \min(1, \delta_o/(c_o\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_o - \boldsymbol{\theta}_*\|^2))$. □

B.3 Proof of Lemma 3.5

Let $x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{\ell+1}$ and $y_0 < y_1 < \dots < y_{m+1}$ be the different elements of $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ and $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$, respectively. One can easily show that with the family $\mathcal{S} := \{(a_1, a_2] \times (b_1, b_2] : a_1 < a_2, b_1 < b_2\}$,

$$\sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (\hat{R}_{\text{emp}} - R)(S) = \max_{S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}} (\hat{R}_{\text{emp}} - R)(S),$$

and

$$\sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (R - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}})(S) = \max_{S \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}} (R - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}})(S),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{S}} &:= \{[x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}] \times [y_{k_1}, y_{k_2}] : 1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \ell, 1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq m\}, \\ \underline{\mathcal{S}} &:= \{(x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}) \times (y_{k_1}, y_{k_2}) : 0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq \ell + 1, 0 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq m + 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now choose real numbers $\tilde{x}_1 < \tilde{x}_2 < \dots < \tilde{x}_{2\ell+1}$ and $\tilde{y}_1 < \tilde{y}_2 < \dots < \tilde{y}_{2m+1}$ with $\tilde{x}_{2j} = x_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ and $\tilde{y}_{2k} = y_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$. Then $\|R - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K$ does not change if we replace R with the discrete distribution

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \sum_{k=1}^{2m+1} p_{jk} \delta_{(\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_k)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_{2j,2k} &:= R(\{x_j\} \times \{y_k\}) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell, 1 \leq k \leq m, \\ p_{2j-1,2k} &:= R((x_{j-1}, x_j) \times \{y_k\}) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell + 1, 1 \leq k \leq m, \\ p_{2j,2k-1} &:= R(\{x_j\} \times (y_{k-1}, y_k)) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell, 1 \leq k \leq m + 1, \\ p_{2j-1,2k-1} &:= R((x_{j-1}, x_j) \times (y_{k-1}, y_k)) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell + 1, 1 \leq k \leq m + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the values $R(S)$, $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}} \cup \underline{\mathcal{S}}$, do not change when we perform this discretization of R . Moreover, if R is TP2, then this discretized version is TP2 as well. Consequently, to minimize $\|R - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K$ over all TP2 distributions R , we may restrict our attention to all TP2 distributions on the finite grid $\{\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_{2\ell+1}\} \times \{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_{2m+1}\}$. Then $\|R - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K$ is a continuous function of the corresponding matrix $\mathbf{p} = (p_{jk})_{j,k} \in [0, 1]^{(2\ell+1) \times (2m+1)}$, and the constraints on R define a compact subset of $[0, 1]^{(2\ell+1) \times (2m+1)}$. Consequently, a minimizer does exist.

Once we know that a minimizer $\hat{R}$ exists, the inequality for $\|\hat{R} - R_*\|_K$ is a simple consequence of the triangle inequality for $\|\cdot\|_K$:

$$\|\hat{R} - R_*\|_K \leq \|\hat{R} - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K + \|R_* - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K \leq 2\|R_* - \hat{R}_{\text{emp}}\|_K,$$

where the latter inequality follows from the definition of $\hat{R}$. $\square$