

Mean-variance constrained priors have finite maximum Bayes risk in the normal location model

BY JIAFENG CHEN

Department of Economics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.
 jiafengchen@g.harvard.edu

SUMMARY

Consider a normal location model $X | \theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$ with known σ^2 . Suppose $\theta \sim G_0$, where the prior G_0 has zero mean and unit variance. Let G_1 be a possibly misspecified prior with zero mean and unit variance. We show that the squared error Bayes risk of the posterior mean under G_1 is bounded, uniformly over $G_0, G_1, \sigma^2 > 0$.

Some key words: Bayes risk; normal location model; Bayesian robustness; moments

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

We consider the estimation problem in the normal location model. For a known $\sigma^2 > 0$, let $X | \theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$ be a Gaussian signal on some unknown parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. We assume that $\theta \sim G_0$ is itself random, and we refer to G_0 as the true prior. We can view G_0 either as some latent subjective beliefs or as some objective sampling process for θ . We additionally assume G_0 has zero mean and unit variance. However, suppose the data analyst does not know G_0 , but they do know that the true prior has zero mean and unit variance. They instead use some possibly misspecified prior G_1 . Given G_1 , the analyst's Bayes decision rule, for estimating θ under squared error loss, is given by the posterior mean under G_1

$$\mu_1(x) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \theta \varphi\left(\frac{x-\theta}{\sigma}\right) \sigma^{-1} G_1(d\theta)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi\left(\frac{x-\theta}{\sigma}\right) \sigma^{-1} G_1(d\theta)}, \quad \varphi(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-t^2/2}.$$

The Bayes risk of $\mu_1(x)$, under the true prior G_0 , is

$$R(G_0, G_1, \sigma^2) = E[(\mu_1(X) - \theta)^2],$$

where the expectation integrates over $\theta \sim G_0$ and $X | \theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$. Let \mathcal{M} denote the set of distributions on \mathbb{R} with zero mean and unit variance. The worst-case Bayes risk, over G_0, G_1, σ^2 , is given by

$$\bar{R} = \sup \{ R(G_0, G_1, \sigma^2) : G_0 \in \mathcal{M}, G_1 \in \mathcal{M}, \sigma > 0 \}.$$

This paper proves the following bound on \bar{R} .

THEOREM 1. *Under the preceding setup, $\bar{R} < 535$.*

2. DISCUSSION

Gaussian decision theory is a canonical problem in statistics. Our result upper bounds the Bayes risk of misspecified Bayes decision rules in this setting. Misspecification refers to the fact

that the prior G_1 used to derive Bayes decision rules may be different from the prior G_0 used to evaluate their Bayes risk. This risk quantity features in some classical results, for instance, in Lemma 4.8 of Johnstone (2019).

Our result relates to the Bayesian literature on partial prior information (see chapter 3 in Robert, 2007, and references therein), where information is available for some features of a decision-maker’s beliefs, but the full prior is too difficult to elicit. With only partial information on the prior, this literature is interested in robustness of the posterior distribution with respect to the prior choice. Viewed through this lens, we think of G_0 as some true subjective beliefs that are hard to elicit, and G_1 as some convenient approximation of G_0 . In our case, the decision-maker has access to the first two moments of the prior distribution G_0 , which are normalized to zero and one without loss of generality. When the prior distribution admits constraints in terms of moments, the closest result to our knowledge is Goutis (1994), who shows that the posterior mean is pointwise finite. That is, in our notation, for all x ,

$$\sup_{G_1 \in \mathcal{M}} |\mu_1(x)| < \infty.$$

Compared to Goutis (1994), we restrict to the normal location model, but our bound for the Bayes risk, which integrates over x , is not directly implied by the pointwise-in- x finiteness of the posterior mean.

Our interest in the result is motivated by empirical Bayes procedures (Efron, 2019). Empirical Bayes in the Gaussian model envisions a setup where $X_i | \theta_i, \sigma_i^2 \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_i, \sigma_i^2)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\theta_i \sim G_0$. Since we have repeated measurements over i , empirical Bayesians can estimate the prior distribution G_0 and report posterior means relative to an estimate G_1 of G_0 . Here, G_0 no longer denotes a subjective belief, but instead some assumed physical sampling process for the parameters θ_i . Empirical Bayes procedures face the challenge that the distribution G_0 itself is often much harder to estimate than its moments (Dedecker & Michel, 2013; Pensky, 2017). In this context, \bar{R} puts a ceiling on the worst-case behavior of empirical Bayes procedures corresponding to G_1 , assuming that G_1 has the same moments as G_0 . Specifically, Chen (2023) considers an empirical Bayes model where $(\theta_i, \sigma_i) \sim P$, but θ_i may not be independent with σ_i under P . Chen (2023) proposes to model P as a location-scale family for $\theta_i | \sigma_i$:

$$P(\theta_i \leq t | \sigma_i) = G_1 \left(\frac{t - E[\theta_i | \sigma_i]}{\text{var}(\theta_i | \sigma_i)^{1/2}} \right),$$

for G_1 of mean zero and variance one. When this location-scale assumption fails, empirical Bayes procedures based on this assumption use some common G_1 to compute posterior means for $\tau_i = (\theta_i - E[\theta_i | \sigma_i]) / \text{var}(\theta_i | \sigma_i)^{1/2}$, whose true prior distribution may be different from G_1 , but obeys the moment restrictions by construction. Our result would then bound the worst-case behavior of this procedure.

To be clear, if we are solely concerned about worst-case behavior and are free to choose G_1 , then we do not need Theorem 1. The choice $G_1 = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ minimizes the maximum risk $\sup \{R(G_0, G_1, \sigma^2) : G_0 \in \mathcal{M}\}$ for any $\sigma^2 > 0$. This minimax risk is the posterior variance $\sigma^2 / (\sigma^2 + 1)$, which is at most 1. However, note that, under $G_1 = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, $R(G_0, G_1, \sigma^2) = \sigma^2 / (\sigma^2 + 1)$ is constant over $G_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, and so the Gaussian prior G_1 is pessimistic in the sense that every underlying G_0 attains G_1 ’s worst-case behavior. In contrast, using a non-Gaussian G_1 may be advantageous when G_1 is close to G_0 . In this case, Theorem 1 is useful in providing a worst-case assurance.

The specific value of the bound, 535, is not tight. We suspect our proof method can be refined in various places to obtain a tighter constant. We conjecture that the tightest possible upper bound

is 2, which is obtained by the construction used to prove the following lemma. Unfortunately, an early step in our proof already pushes the upper bound over 2, and it is thus unlikely that we could achieve this upper bound with our line of argument.

LEMMA 1. *Under the preceding setup, $\overline{R} \geq 2$.*

Proof. Suppose G_1 puts 1/2 mass each on $\{-1, +1\}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose G_0 puts mass $\epsilon^2/(1 + \epsilon^2)$ on $-1/\epsilon$, and mass $1/(1 + \epsilon^2)$ on ϵ . We verify that $G_0, G_1 \in \mathcal{M}$. The posterior distribution under prior G_1 has mass for $\theta = 1$ equal to

$$p_1(X) = \text{pr}_{G_1}(\theta = 1 \mid X) = \Lambda \left(\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left[(-1 - X)^2 - (1 - X)^2 \right] \right), \quad \Lambda(t) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-t}}.$$

Thus the posterior mean is $2p_1(X) - 1$. The Bayes risk is

$$\begin{aligned} R(G_0, G_1, \sigma^2) &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{1 + \epsilon^2} E \left[\left(2p_1(X) - 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \mid \theta = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon^2} E \left[(2p_1(X) - 1 - \epsilon)^2 \mid \theta = \epsilon \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, taking $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ and then $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ shows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} R(G_0, G_1, \sigma^2) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\epsilon^2}{1 + \epsilon^2} (1/\epsilon - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon^2} (1 - \epsilon)^2 = 2.$$

This completes the proof. □

There may be reasons to suspect the upper bound is indeed 2. Note that if we simply ignored the data and sampled $\hat{\theta} \sim G_1$ independently as our decision, then we would achieve Bayes risk of 2. Conditioning on the data X should bring the posterior under G_1 closer to G_0 , and so it should not hurt the Bayes risk.¹ Zellner (1988) provides one information-theoretic sense in which this is true, as the posterior minimizes a weighted average of the Kullback–Leibler divergence to the prior and the integrated log-likelihood. However, since we make no support or continuity restrictions on G_0, G_1 , it is not immediate how to use these results in terms of information-theoretic divergences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is particularly grateful to Isaiah Andrews, Xiao-Li Meng, Natesh Pillai, Neil Shephard, and Elie Tamer for their comments. In early conversations, Alexander Frankel suggested the configuration in the proof of Lemma 1.

REFERENCES

- CHEN, J. (2023). Gaussian heteroskedastic empirical bayes without independence.
DEDECKER, J. & MICHEL, B. (2013). Minimax rates of convergence for wasserstein deconvolution with super-smooth errors in any dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **122**, 278–291.
EFRON, B. (2019). Bayes, oracle bayes and empirical bayes. *Statistical science* **34**, 177–201.
GOUTIS, C. (1994). Ranges of posterior measures for some classes of priors with specified moments. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*, 245–256.
JOHNSTONE, I. M. (2019). Gaussian estimation: sequence and wavelet models. Tech. rep.

¹ Note that this heuristic leads to an incorrect conclusion if we report the prior mean under G_1 when we ignore the data, instead of sampling $\hat{\theta} \sim G_1$. In that case, we achieve a risk of 1 but the worst-case risk is at least 2.

- PENSKY, M. (2017). Minimax theory of estimation of linear functionals of the deconvolution density with or without sparsity .
- ROBERT, C. P. (2007). *The Bayesian choice: from decision-theoretic foundations to computational implementation*, vol. 2. Springer.
- ZELLNER, A. (1988). Optimal information processing and bayes's theorem. *The American Statistician* **42**, 278–280.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The main idea of the proof is as follows: Using a result of Goutis (1994), any distribution in \mathcal{M} may be represented by a mixture of discrete distributions in \mathcal{M} with at most three support points. Jensen's inequality then shows that the optimal for \bar{R} is achieved at a distribution with at most three support points, and so we may assume G_1 satisfies this restriction. Chebyshev's inequality yields a bound on the mass points of G_1 that are far away from zero, and implies that some mass point is close to zero. The posterior mass ratio between any mass point far away from zero and the mass point close to zero is tractable, and the expected squared error of $\mu_1(x)$ can be bounded in terms of the posterior mass ratio. We obtain an upper bound on \bar{R} through further bounding various expressions.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first recall Lemma 1 in Goutis (1994), which states that G_1 can be represented as a mixture over mean-zero, variance-one distributions with at most three support points. Observe that a mean-zero, variance-one distribution supported on at most three points is uniquely determined by its support points, since the probability masses assigned to the support points must satisfy moment constraints. We let a denote a particular arrangement of the support points, and \mathcal{A} denote the set of all such arrangements. Goutis (1994) states that there exists some mixing distribution Π over \mathcal{A} such that, for any Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\text{pr}_{G_1}(A) = \int \text{pr}_{G_a}(A) d\Pi(a),$$

where G_a is a mean-zero, variance-one distribution supported on a .

For a given arrangement of support points a , let $\theta_k(a)$ denote the individual support points, where k ranges from 1 to either 2 or 3. Then, the posterior mean over G_1 is an average over the posterior means for G_a , which can further be written as an average of $\theta_k(a)$:

$$\mu_1(x) = \int \sum_k \text{pr}_{G_a}(\theta = \theta_k(a) \mid X = x) \theta_k(a) d\Pi(a).$$

By Jensen's inequality,

$$E[(\mu_1(X) - \theta)^2] \leq \int \sum_k E[\text{pr}_{G_a}(\theta = \theta_k(a) \mid X = x) (\theta_k(a) - \theta)^2] d\Pi(a). \quad (\text{A1})$$

We can write $X = \theta + \sigma Z$, where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Correspondingly, we can define the posterior mass in terms of σ, θ , and $Z = z$: Let $\pi_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta, z) = \text{pr}_{G_a}(\theta = \theta_k(a) \mid X = \theta + \sigma z)$. We can also define its expectation over Z : Let $\bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \pi_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta, z) \varphi(z) dz$. Substituting these into (A1), we have that

$$E[(\mu_1(X) - \theta)^2] \leq \int \sum_k E[\bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta) (\theta_k(a) - \theta)^2] d\Pi(a)$$

where the expectation $E[\cdot]$ integrates solely over $\theta \sim G_0$.

It suffices to bound $\sum_k E[\bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta) (\theta_k(a) - \theta)^2]$ over choices of G_0, σ , and the support point arrangement a . To that end, consider a fixed but arbitrary a with support points $\{\theta_k\}$. Since we have fixed some a , we suppress it from notation.

Case 1: All of G_a 's support points are within $[-2, 2]$. In this case, we can expand

$$\sum_k E[\bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta) (\theta_k - \theta)^2] = E[\theta^2] + \sum_k E[\bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta)] \theta_k^2 - 2E\left[\theta \sum_k \bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta) \theta_k\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 1 + 2^2 + 2E[|\theta| \cdot 2] \\
&\leq 1 + 4 + 4 \\
&= 9.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: At least one of G_a 's support points are outside of $[-2, 2]$. In this case, there are at least one and at most two support points within $[-2, 2]$. By Chebyshev's inequality, then, there is at least one support point within $[-2, 2]$ with mass exceeding $\pi_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{4}\right) = \frac{3}{8}$. We can denote that support point as θ_0 . For a given θ_k , we shall compare its posterior probability to θ_0 . As a result, it will be convenient to translate by $-\theta_0$ so that we can normalize this comparison point to zero.

Precisely speaking, let $H \sim \theta - \theta_0$ when $\theta \sim G_a$. Let $H_0 \sim \theta - \theta_0$ when $\theta \sim G_0$. By construction, $\text{pr}_H(\{0\}) \geq \pi_0$. Denote the mass points of H by $\tau_k = \theta_k - \theta_0$. Observe that

$$\text{pr}_H(\tau = \tau_k \mid X = \theta + \sigma z) = \text{pr}_{G_a}(\theta = \theta_k \mid X = \theta + \sigma z) = \pi_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta, z).$$

Thus, we define

$$\pi_k(\sigma, \tau, z) = \pi_{k,a}(\sigma, \tau + \theta_0, z), \quad \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau) = \int \pi_k(\sigma, \tau, z) \varphi(z) dz.$$

We are interested in $\sum_k E [\bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta)(\theta_k - \theta)^2]$, which is preserved by the translation:

$$\sum_k E [\bar{\pi}_{k,a}(\sigma, \theta)(\theta_k - \theta)^2] = \sum_k E [\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)(\tau_k - \tau)^2]$$

where the $E[\cdot]$ on the right-hand side integrates over $\tau \sim H_0$. As a result, we shall bound $\sum_k E [\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)(\tau_k - \tau)^2]$.

After the translation, we note that the second moments of H and H_0 are now bounded by $5 = 1 + 2^2$. Since there are at most two non-zero support points $\tau_k \neq 0$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_k E [\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)(\tau_k - \tau)^2] &\leq 2 \max_{k:\tau_k \neq 0} E[(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)] + E[\tau^2] \\
&= 5 + 2 \max_{k:\tau_k \neq 0} E[(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)]. \tag{A2}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it suffices to bound $E[(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)]$ for some nonzero τ_k . Without loss of generality, assume $\tau_k > 0$. Define the constants $C_0 = \pi_0/5 = 3/40 < 1$ and $s_0 = \sqrt{1/C_0} = 2\sqrt{10/3} > \sqrt{5} > 2$.

Case 2.1: $\tau_k \leq s_0$. In this case,

$$E[(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)] \leq E[(\tau_k - \tau)^2] = E[(\theta_k - \theta)^2] = 1 + \theta_k^2$$

Note that $|\theta_k| = |\tau_k + \theta_0| \leq s_0 + 2$. Thus, plugging into the preceding display, in this case,

$$E[(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)] \leq 33,$$

and thus

$$\sum_k E [\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)(\tau_k - \tau)^2] \leq 71.$$

Case 2.2: $\tau_k > s_0$. We decompose $E[(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)]$ on four intervals for τ , where

$$\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, -\tau_k] \cup [\tau_k/2, \infty) \cup (-\tau_k, 0) \cup (0, \tau_k/2).$$

Note that if $\tau \in (-\infty, -\tau_k]$, then $(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \leq 4\tau^2$. If $\tau \in [\tau_k/2, \infty)$, then $(\tau_k - \tau)^2 \leq \tau^2$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
E [\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)(\tau_k - \tau)^2] &\leq E[4\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(\tau \leq -\tau_k)] + E[\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(\tau \geq \tau_k/2)] \\
&\quad + \int_{-\tau_k}^0 (\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau) H_0(d\tau) + \int_0^{\tau_k/2} (\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau) H_0(d\tau).
\end{aligned}$$

The first two terms in the preceding display are bounded by $E[4\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(\tau < -\tau_k \cup \tau > \tau_k/2)]$. The next two terms are respectively bounded by the ensuing Lemmas A2 and A3. The key to doing so is a bound of $\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)$ in terms of the posterior ratio (Lemma A1). Note that

$$\pi_k(\sigma, \tau, z) \leq \min \left(\frac{\text{pr}_H(\tau = \tau_k \mid \sigma z + \tau)}{\text{pr}_H(\tau = 0 \mid \sigma z + \tau)}, 1 \right),$$

where the right-hand side can be integrated tractably.

Collecting the results in Lemmas A2 and A3, we find that

$$E[\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)(\tau_k - \tau)^2] \leq \left(4 \vee \left(1.5 + \frac{3}{\sqrt{C_0}} \right) \vee \frac{2.92}{C_0} \right) E[\tau^2] + \frac{2.92}{C_0} + \frac{3}{2C_0} + \frac{3}{\sqrt{C_0}} \leq 264.6$$

where $E[\tau^2] \leq 5$. Plugging into (A2), we obtain an upper bound

$$E[\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau)(\tau_k - \tau)^2] \leq 535.$$

This is worse than the bounds obtained from Case 2.1 and Case 1. Hence, $\bar{R} \leq 535$. \square

LEMMA A1. Let $\Phi(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \varphi(x) dx$ be the cumulative distribution function of a standard Gaussian random variable. Let $\bar{\Phi}(t) = 1 - \Phi(t)$ be its complement. If $\tau_k \geq \sqrt{5}$, then

$$\bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau) \leq \frac{1}{C_0 \tau_k^2} \exp\left(\frac{\tau_k \tau}{\sigma^2}\right) \bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{\tau_k/2 + \tau}{\sigma} - \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)\right) + \bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{\tau_k/2 - \tau}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)\right) \quad (\text{A3})$$

where we recall $C_0 = \frac{\pi_0}{5} = \frac{3}{40}$.

Proof. Note that,

$$\pi_k(\sigma, \tau, z) = \left(\text{pr}_H(\tau = 0 \mid \sigma z + \tau) \frac{\text{pr}_H(\tau = \tau_k \mid \sigma z + \tau)}{\text{pr}_H(\tau = 0 \mid \sigma z + \tau)} \right) \wedge 1 \leq R(\sigma, \tau, z) \wedge 1.$$

where $R = \frac{\text{pr}_H(\tau = \tau_k \mid \sigma z + \tau)}{\text{pr}_H(\tau = 0 \mid \sigma z + \tau)}$ is the posterior mass ratio. Note that, since $\text{pr}(\tau = \tau_k) \tau_k^2 \leq E_H[\tau^2] \leq 5$, the prior mass is bounded: $\text{pr}(\tau = \tau_k) \leq \frac{5}{\tau_k^2}$. We can thus compute the posterior mass ratio

$$R(\sigma, \tau, z) \leq \frac{1}{C_0} \frac{1}{\tau_k^2} \exp\left(\frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} z + \frac{\tau_k(\tau - \tau_k/2)}{\sigma^2}\right),$$

where the inequality stems from bounding the prior mass ratio with $\frac{5/\tau_k^2}{\pi_0}$. Define the right-hand side of the above display as $\bar{R}(\sigma, \tau, z)$. We note that $\bar{R}(\sigma, \tau, z) \leq 1$ if and only if $z \leq u$ where $u = \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) + \frac{\tau_k/2 - \tau}{\sigma}$. Hence, letting $\bar{\Phi}(t) = 1 - \Phi(t)$ denote the complementary normal CDF, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\pi}_k(\sigma, \tau) &\leq \int_{-\infty}^u \bar{R}(\sigma, \tau, z) \varphi(z) dz + (1 - \Phi(u)) \\ &= \frac{1}{C_0 \tau_k^2} \exp\left(\frac{\tau_k \tau}{\sigma^2}\right) \bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{\tau_k/2 + \tau}{\sigma} - \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)\right) + \bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{\tau_k/2 - \tau}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

LEMMA A2. Recall that $s_0 = \sqrt{1/C_0} = \sqrt{40/3}$. Define $K_{(-\tau_k, 0)} = \int_{-\tau_k}^0 (\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}(\sigma, \tau) H_0(d\tau)$. For $\tau_k \geq s_0$,

$$K_{(-\tau_k, 0)} \leq \frac{3}{2C_0} + \frac{3}{\sqrt{C_0}} + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{\sqrt{C_0}}\right) E[\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)]. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Proof. Define $c = c(\tau) = \tau/\tau_k \in [-1, 0]$ when $\tau \in [-\tau_k, 0]$. Then, plugging in (A3),

$$K_{(-\tau_k, 0)} \leq \int_{-\tau_k}^0 \frac{(1-c)^2}{C_0} + (1-c)^2 \tau_k^2 \bar{\Phi} \left((1/2 - c) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \right) H(d\tau)$$

where we use the fact that $\exp(\tau_k \tau / \sigma^2) \leq 1$ and $\bar{\Phi}(\cdot) < 1$ to simplify the first term in (A3). These are true since we integrate over $(-\tau_k, 0)$.

Observe that, by Corollary A1,

$$\bar{\Phi} \left((1/2 - c) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-(1-2c) \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)) = \frac{1}{2} (C_0 \tau_k^2)^{2c-1} = \frac{1}{2} C_0^{2c-1} \tau_k^{4c-2}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{(-\tau_k, 0)} &\leq \int_{-\tau_k}^0 \frac{(1-c)^2}{C_0} + \frac{(1-c)^2}{2} C_0^{2c-1} \tau_k^{4c} H_0(d\tau) \\ &= \frac{1}{C_0} \int_{-\tau_k}^0 (1-c)^2 \left[1 + \frac{1}{2} (\sqrt{C_0} \tau_k)^{4c} \right] H_0(d\tau) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C_0} \int_{-\tau_k}^0 \frac{(\tau_k - \tau)^2}{\tau_k^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) H_0(d\tau) && \text{(Note that } (\sqrt{C_0} \tau_k)^{4c} \leq 1) \\ &= \frac{3}{2} E \left[\mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0) \frac{(\tau_k - \tau)^2}{C_0 \tau_k^2} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2C_0} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\tau_k} E[|\tau| \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)] + \frac{1}{\tau_k^2} E[\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2C_0} + \frac{3}{\sqrt{C_0}} E[|\tau| \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)] + \frac{3}{2} E[\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)]. \quad (\tau_k > 1/\sqrt{C_0}) \end{aligned}$$

Conclude by noting that

$$E[|\tau| \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)] \leq E[(\tau^2 \vee 1) \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)] \leq E[\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(-\tau_k \leq \tau \leq 0)] + 1.$$

This completes the proof. \square

LEMMA A3. Assume that $\tau_k > s_0$. Define $K_{(0, \tau_k/2)} = \int_0^{\tau_k/2} (\tau_k - \tau)^2 \bar{\pi}(\sigma, \tau) H_0(d\tau)$. Then

$$K_{(0, \tau_k/2)} \leq \frac{2.92}{C_0} + \frac{2.92}{C_0} E[\tau^2 \mathbb{1}(\tau \in (0, \tau_k/2))].$$

Proof. Let $c = \frac{\tau}{\tau_k} \in [0, 1/2]$. Then we can write (A3), multiplied by $(\tau_k - \tau)^2 = (1-c)^2 \tau_k^2$, as

$$\frac{(1-c)^2}{C_0} \exp\left(\frac{c\tau_k^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \bar{\Phi}\left((c+1/2) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} - \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)\right) + (1-c)^2 \tau_k^2 \bar{\Phi}\left((1/2-c) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)\right) \quad (\text{A5})$$

This quantity upper bounds the integrand in $K_{(0, \tau_k/2)}$. Let us consider the first term.

First term, case a: In particular, let us consider the case where

$$\tau_k^2 \leq (1/2 + c)^{-1} \sigma^2 \log(C_0 \tau_k^2).$$

In this case, the first term in (A5) is bounded by the following, via ignoring the $\bar{\Phi}(\cdot)$ term:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1-c)^2}{C_0} \exp\left(\frac{c}{1/2+c} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)\right) &= (1-c)^2 C_0^{-\frac{1}{1+2c}} \tau_k^{\frac{4c}{1+2c}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C_0} (1-c)^2 \tau_k^{\frac{4c}{1+2c}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C_0} \tau_k^{4c/(1+2c)} (1-c)^2 (1/c)^{\frac{4c}{1+2c}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1.76}{C_0}(\tau \vee 1)^2.$$

The last inequality follows from the bound

$$\sup_{c \in [0, 1/2]} (1-c)^2 (1/c)^{\frac{4c}{1+2c}} \leq 1.76.$$

and $\tau^{4c/(1+2c)} \leq \tau \vee 1 \leq (\tau \vee 1)^2$

First term, case b: Now, assume that

$$\tau_k^2 > (1/2 + c)^{-1} \sigma^2 \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \iff (1/2 + c) \tau_k / \sigma > \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)$$

so that the argument in $\bar{\Phi}$ in the first term is positive. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(1-c)^2}{C_0} \exp(c \tau_k^2 / \sigma^2) \bar{\Phi} \left((c + 1/2) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} - \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2C_0} (1-c)^2 \exp \left[c \frac{\tau_k^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{2} \left((c + 1/2) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} - \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Lemma A4})$$

We compute that, by expanding and applying the inequality $(a+b) \geq 2\sqrt{ab}$ for nonnegative a, b ,

$$\begin{aligned} & c \frac{\tau_k^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{2} \left((c + 1/2) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} - \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \right)^2 \\ & = c \frac{\tau_k^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{2} (c + 1/2)^2 \frac{\tau_k^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2\tau_k^2} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)^2 + (c + 1/2) \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \\ & = (c + 0.5) \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) - \left\{ (0.5(c + 0.5)^2 - c) \frac{\tau_k^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2)^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau_k^2} \right\} \\ & \leq - \left\{ 2\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2}(c + 0.5)^2 - c \right)} - (c + 0.5) \right\} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \\ & = 2c \log(C_0 \tau_k^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the first term in (A5) is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{2C_0} (1-c)^2 (C_0 \tau_k^2)^{2c} = (1-c)^2 \frac{\tau^{4c}}{2C_0} C_0^{2c} (1/c)^{4c} \leq \frac{1.16}{C_0} (\tau \vee 1)^2.$$

The last inequality comes from maximizing the expression over $c \in [0, 1/2]$. **The two cases imply that the first term is bounded by $1.76C_0^{-1}(\tau \vee 1)^2$.**

Second term: The second term in (A5) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-c)^2 \tau_k^2 \bar{\Phi} \left((1/2 - c) \frac{\tau_k}{\sigma} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau_k} \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \right) \\ & \leq (1-c)^2 \tau_k^2 \frac{1}{2} \exp \left((2c - 1) \log(C_0 \tau_k^2) \right) \quad (\text{Corollary A1}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2C_0} \tau^{1+2c} c^{-4c} (1-c)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1.16}{C_0} (\tau \vee 1)^2 \quad (\text{Maximizing over } c \text{ and using } \tau^{1+2c} \leq (\tau \vee 1)^2) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, overall, the integrand (A5) is bounded by $\frac{2.92}{C_0} (\tau \vee 1)^2$. We use $\tau^2 \vee 1 \leq \tau^2 + 1$ to conclude the proof. \square

LEMMA A4 (MILL'S RATIO BOUND). For all $t > 0$,

$$\bar{\Phi}(t) \leq \frac{\varphi(t)}{t \vee \sqrt{2/\pi}} \leq \sqrt{\pi/2} \varphi(t) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-t^2/2}.$$

Proof. It is well known that $\bar{\Phi}(t) \leq \frac{\varphi(t)}{t}$ for all positive t , which is tighter when t is large. At $t = 0$, the truncation $\sqrt{2/\pi}$ is such that both sides are equal to $1/2$. We can differentiate for $t < \sqrt{2/\pi}$ to verify that $\bar{\Phi}'(t) < \sqrt{\pi/2} \varphi'(t)$. \square

COROLLARY A1. For nonnegative $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{\Phi}(a + b) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-2ab)$.

Proof. Immediate by noting that the arithmetic-mean–geometric-mean inequality implies $\bar{\Phi}(a + b) \leq \bar{\Phi}(2\sqrt{ab})$ and applying Lemma A4. \square