

Inference for Median and a Generalization of HulC

Manit Paul¹ and Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla²

¹Department of Statistics & Data Science, University of Pennsylvania

²Department of Statistics & Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University

Abstract

Constructing distribution-free confidence intervals for the median, a classic problem in statistics, has seen numerous solutions in the literature. While coverage validity has received ample attention, less has been explored about interval width. Our study breaks new ground by investigating the width of these intervals under non-standard assumptions. Surprisingly, we find that properly scaled, the interval width converges to a non-degenerate random variable, unlike traditional intervals. We also adapt our findings for constructing improved confidence intervals for general parameters, enhancing the existing HulC procedure. These advances provide practitioners with more robust tools for data analysis, reducing the need for strict distributional assumptions.

1 Introduction and Motivation

The interval estimation of the median of a distribution based on independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) observations is a well-studied problem in Statistics. Suppose X, X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. univariate random variables from a distribution F . Any $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a median of F if

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq \theta_0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(X \geq \theta_0) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1)$$

It is clear that median of a distribution is not necessarily unique without further assumptions on the distribution F . If θ_0 satisfying (1) is a continuity point of F , then the median is unique and is given by θ_0 . Constructing valid confidence intervals for any median θ_0 is a problem interesting in itself but has wide-range implications for confidence intervals of arbitrary parameters.

Kuchibhotla et al. [2023] proved that non-trivial asymptotically valid confidence intervals can be constructed for a parameter/functions $\theta(F)$ based on i.i.d. observations $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim F$ if and only if there exists a non-trivial estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ that satisfies

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \min \left\{ \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_n \geq \theta(F)), \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_n \leq \theta(F)) \right\} \right)_+ = 0.$$

This condition means that both $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_n \leq \theta(F))$ and $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_n \geq \theta(F))$ are asymptotically above 1/2, or equivalently, $\theta(F)$ is asymptotically the median of $\hat{\theta}_n$. One can use the methods developed for median for inference for $\theta(F)$ given an asymptotically median unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ as follows: (1) randomly split the data of n observations into $B = B_n$ non-overlapping blocks; (2) compute versions of $\hat{\theta}_n$ on each block, naming them $\hat{\theta}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\theta}^{(B)}$; (3) now treat $\hat{\theta}^{(j)}, 1 \leq j \leq B_n$ as i.i.d. observations for a distribution with median $\theta(F)$, and apply the inference methods developed for

median. This is, in essence, the general-purpose inference method HulC developed in [Kuchibhotla et al. \[2021\]](#) but with $B = \lceil \log_2(2/\alpha) \rceil$. In this paper, we consider the extension allowing B to be larger than $\lceil \log_2(2/\alpha) \rceil$ and even diverge with sample size.

Getting back to the problem of inference for the median, in this paper, we analyze the coverage and width of a distribution-free finite sample valid confidence interval for any median θ_0 of a distribution F based on i.i.d. observations. We are especially concerned with the behavior of the width of the confidence interval under non-standard assumptions as the sample size diverges. Then we consider the implications for the extension of HulC.

1.1 Literature Review

Throughout the paper, we reserve the notation $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ to denote the required miscoverage for the confidence interval for the median θ_0 . Several interval estimation procedures are available in the literature. One of the most commonly used confidence intervals is based on the asymptotic normality of the properly normalized sample median (see Example 5.24 of [van der Vaart \[1998\]](#), page 54] and [Serfling \[2009\]](#), Sec. 2.6] for details). Formally, suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are independent and identically distributed random variables with distribution function F such that $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$ and $F'(\theta_0) > 0$. Let $X_{(1)} \leq X_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}$ denote the increasing rearrangement (i.e., order statistics) of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n . The condition $F'(\theta_0) > 0$ implies that θ_0 is a continuity point of F and hence θ_0 is the unique median of F . A natural estimator of the median is the sample median $\hat{\theta}_n$ given by

$$\hat{\theta}_n := \begin{cases} X_{((n+1)/2)}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ X_{(n/2)}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

and satisfies

$$n^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{1}{4(F'(\theta_0))^2}\right).$$

Using this result, a Wald-type confidence interval can be constructed as

$$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{AN}} := \left[\hat{\theta}_n - \frac{\hat{\sigma} z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}}, \hat{\theta}_n + \frac{\hat{\sigma} z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \right], \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}$ is a consistent estimator of the asymptotic standard deviation of the sample median $\hat{\theta}_n$. Such an estimator can be obtained using kernel density estimator or spacings as described in [Sen \[1966\]](#), Sec. 6] or using bootstrap as described in [Ghosh et al. \[1984\]](#). Jackknife is known to be inconsistent for estimating the asymptotic variance of median [[Martin, 1990](#)].

Another standard method for constructing a confidence interval for θ_0 when no assumptions are given on F is to consider the closed intervals whose end-points are order statistics i.e. intervals of the form $[X_{(r)}, X_{(s)}]$. One of the first papers that used order statistics to construct distribution-free finite sample confidence intervals for quantiles is [Scheffe and Tukey \[1945\]](#). It is well known (see [Guilbaud \[1979\]](#), [David and Nagaraja \[2004\]](#)) that for any distribution function F ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in [X_{(r)}, X_{(s)}]) \geq \sum_{i=r}^{s-1} \binom{n}{i} 2^{-n}, \quad (3)$$

and the equality holds if and only if F is continuous at the point θ_0 . It is generally recommended to take $s = n - r + 1$ and then r is chosen so that the required confidence coefficient is achieved, but this choice of s need not necessarily yield the shortest interval. This interval shall be referred to as the S -interval in this work.

Note that the right-hand side of (3) can only take a finite set of values when s, r are varied and hence, cannot be set equal to any arbitrary $1 - \alpha$. For this reason, alternative distribution-free confidence intervals are studied in the literature. For example, it is possible to construct a confidence interval of median by taking a confidence interval of the form $[Y_{(r)}, Y_{(s)}]$ where Y_i 's are the pairwise averages $(X_j + X_k)/2$ where $1 \leq j, k \leq n$. The order statistics $Y_{(r)}$ and $Y_{(s)}$ are chosen in such a way that the required confidence coefficient is attained. This confidence interval originates from the well-known Wilcoxon signed-rank test. For details regarding this work, refer to [Gibbons and Chakraborti \[2014, Sec. 5.7\]](#), [Lehmann \[1963\]](#), and [Noether \[1967\]](#). This interval shall be referred to as the W -interval in this work.

Another approach in this direction was made by [Noether \[1973\]](#) towards constructing a confidence interval for the center of a *symmetric* distribution. He considered a family of confidence intervals, $\{(0.5(X_{(g)} + X_{(n+1-h)}), 0.5(X_{(h)} + X_{(n+1-g)})) | 1 \leq g < h, g + h \leq n + 1\}$, whose endpoints are averages of order statistics and then considered the interval with the shortest expected length (referred to as the (g, h) -confidence interval). He also compared the asymptotic length of the (g, h) -confidence interval with S -, W -, and the Wald confidence interval for three different distributions namely, normal, logistic, and the double-exponential distribution. He observed that the Wald confidence interval is optimal for normal distributions (i.e. it has the shortest asymptotic length), the W -interval is optimal for logistic distributions, and the S -interval is optimal for double exponential distributions.

[Guilbaud \[1979\]](#) considered similar intervals to construct a confidence interval of the median for general (not necessarily symmetric) distributions. He considered intervals of the form $[(X_{(r)} + X_{(r+t)})/2, (X_{(s-t)} + X_{(s)})/2]$ where $1 \leq r \leq s = n - r + 1$ and $0 \leq t \leq s - r$. He provided a lower bound, which does not depend on the distribution function F , on the probability that θ_0 lies in the aforementioned intervals. Therefore, this result gives an idea about the probability of θ_0 being in the mentioned confidence interval in the general case when no assumptions are made about F . Other works in this direction include [Guilbaud \[2006\]](#), where weighted means of adjacent sign intervals for interval estimation of median i.e. intervals of the form $[wX_{(r)} + (1 - w)X_{(r+1)}, (1 - w)X_{(s-1)} + wX_{(s)}]$ with $0 \leq w \leq 1$ and $1 \leq r < s = n - r + 1$ are considered. He obtained the best possible lower bound (which does not depend on the underlying distribution) for the coverage probability of this confidence interval for the general case (without any assumptions on the distributions), for the class of all symmetric distributions, and for the class of all symmetric and unimodal distributions. [Nagaraja and Nagaraja \[2020\]](#) discusses various distribution-free methods of constructing approximate confidence intervals for quantiles. The main contribution of their work is however the usage of asymmetric spacings of order statistics to construct confidence intervals for quantiles and in particular of median (see Proposition-5 of the paper). Their work is an extension of [Goh \[2004\]](#) which uses symmetric spacings to estimate the population median.

Apart from these approaches, one can also obtain a confidence interval of median through bootstrap methods. A popular method of obtaining a confidence interval of the median is through classical bootstrap. [Bickel and Freedman \[1981\]](#) prove the consistency of the bootstrap under the standard conditions of $F'(\theta_0) > 0$; also see Section 3.4.3 of [Bose and Chatterjee \[2018\]](#) for more details. Another method of interval estimation of the median is by combining information from subsamples as discussed in [Knight and Bassett \[2002\]](#). They obtain an estimate of the population median by taking weighted averages of sample medians from non-overlapping subsamples or from balanced overlapping subsamples. Theorem 1 of [Knight and Bassett \[2002\]](#) provides a result on the distributional convergence of the properly scaled and centered version of this estimate of population median, which we can use to obtain a confidence interval of the required confidence coefficient.

However in all the above works, very little seems to have been done in the direction of analyzing the width of the confidence interval beyond the standard conditions. Under the standard conditions,

[Serfling \[2009, Sec. 2.6.3\]](#) analyzes the width of confidence intervals based on order statistics. Except for the methods based on distribution-free lower bounds on coverage, all other methods are not even consistent (i.e., do not have valid coverage) under non-standard conditions. The limiting distribution is non-normal and the rate of convergence of the sample median can be different from $n^{1/2}$ under non-standard conditions; see, for example, [Knight \[1998a,b\]](#). In fact, [Smirnov \[1952\]](#) characterized all possible limiting distributions of the sample quantiles; also, see [Knight \[2002\]](#) for a detailed discussion. Moreover, it is well-known that classical Efron’s bootstrap is inconsistent under non-standard conditions as shown in [Huang et al. \[1996\]](#) and [Knight \[1998a\]](#). The consistency of m -of- n bootstrap with $m/n \rightarrow 0$ follows from the results of [Huang et al. \[1996\]](#), but only in the case when the distribution function has a finite non-zero left and right derivatives at θ_0 . Under more complicated non-standard conditions, we consider, both m -of- n bootstrap and subsampling are not readily applicable because the rate of convergence is usually unknown. It may be worthwhile to mention here that subsampling with an estimated rate of convergence can be applied as suggested in [Bertail et al. \[1999\]](#).

1.2 Contributions and Organization

In light of the fact that finite sample valid confidence intervals can be constructed for the median without requiring any assumptions on the underlying distribution, we do not study asymptotically valid confidence interval procedures such as bootstrap/subsampling. Another reason for ignoring the asymptotically valid procedures is that their uniform validity guarantees are much less understood under non-standard conditions. To the best of our knowledge, all limiting distribution results in the literature for the sample median are derived pointwise fixing the behavior of the distribution function at the median as sample size changes.

Before listing the contributions of the paper, let us recall the $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval, $(g(\mathbf{X}_n), h(\mathbf{X}_n))$ of the median θ_0 of a distribution function F , where $g(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$ are suitable functions of the sample $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ which has been generated i.i.d. from F . We say that the confidence interval, $(g(\mathbf{X}_n), h(\mathbf{X}_n))$, is a distribution-free finite sample valid confidence interval for θ_0 if, for all $n \geq 1$ and for all distribution functions F , the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in (g(\mathbf{X}_n), h(\mathbf{X}_n))) \geq 1 - \alpha \text{ where } X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F. \quad (4)$$

In this paper, we focus on a specific S -interval, i.e., $g(\cdot), h(\cdot)$ both representing specific order statistics. The optimal distribution-free lower bound for the coverage of S -intervals is well-known as stated in (3). We, however, study this coverage property for a specific choice of r, s chosen based on the quantiles of a binomial distribution. This specific instantiation of the S -interval is well-known in the literature and is also known to asymptotically match the Wald interval in terms of the width [Serfling \[2009, Sec. 2.6.3\]](#) when the sample size is large enough with respect to a function of miscoverage level α . The contributions of this paper are as follows:

1. We rederive a distribution-free finite sample confidence interval for any median of a distribution and provide explicit conditions on n, α such that the confidence interval can be expressed in terms of the order statistics. (Note that any bounded confidence interval is bound to not cover the population median if the sample size is too small.)
2. We derive precise (asymptotically sharp) and easily computable upper and lower bounds for quantiles of the Binomial($n, 1/2$) distribution. These precise bounds yield quick computation of the proposed confidence interval and also allow us to characterize in finite samples the closeness between the width of the proposed interval and that of the Wald interval (under standard conditions).

3. Under non-standard conditions on the distribution, allowing for zero density at θ_0 and/or jump discontinuity at θ_0 , we derive the rate of convergence as well as a precise characterization of the limiting distribution of scaled width. The fact that the scaled width converges to a non-degenerate distribution is the most surprising finding of our work.
4. In addition to the asymptotic limits, we provide a finite sample concentration inequality for the scaled width of the confidence interval under non-standard conditions.
5. Finally, we consider the implications of the results for the median to inference for general parameters/functionals extending the HulC approach.

Organization In Section 2, we introduce two different non-parametric distribution-free finite sample confidence intervals for the population median without any assumptions on F . In Section 3, we show that under the standard conditions required for asymptotic normality of the sample median (or the assumptions under which Bahadur representation exists), the confidence interval that we discuss in this paper performs asymptotically as well as the Wald confidence interval i.e. the width of this confidence interval is asymptotically equal to the width of Wald confidence interval. In addition to this, we also analyze the width of this confidence interval under several non-standard cases discussed in Knight [1998a] and Ghosh and Sukhatme [1981]. In Section 3.3, we present a limited simulation study to corroborate our theoretical results. We further compare our confidence interval to the subsampling with an estimated rate of convergence in terms of width and coverage. In Section 4, we present generalized HulC methodology and compare the performance with classical HulC of Kuchibhotla et al. [2021]. Finally, we conclude the article with a summary and a discussion of some future directions in Section 5.

The proofs of all the main results along with auxiliary results are presented in the appendix. We use $\text{Bin}(n, p)$ to denote the binomial distribution with index n and success probability $p \in (0, 1)$.

2 Methods

Our goal is to find a distribution-free finite sample confidence interval for the population median. Formally, we assume access to independent and identically distributed observations X_1, \dots, X_n with distribution F such that θ_0 is the median of F . The confidence interval we propose is based on the fact that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta_0\} \geq k\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq k), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta_0\} \geq k\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq k),$$

where $M_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2)$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. Without using the exact distribution, one can also obtain a distribution-free finite-sample valid confidence interval using Hoeffding's inequality under the assumption that $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$: Hoeffding's inequality implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/2}|\hat{F}_n(\theta_0) - F(\theta_0)| \geq \lambda\right) \leq 2e^{-2\lambda^2}.$$

Setting $\lambda = \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)/2}$ and using $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}} &:= \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : n^{1/2}|\hat{F}_n(\theta) - 1/2| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \right\}, \\ &= \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{n}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{n \log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \leq \frac{n}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{n \log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1 \text{ and all distributions } F \text{ such that } F(\theta_0) = 1/2.$$

See Proposition 1 for a proof. The confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}}$ can be conservative as it ignores the exact binomial distribution of $n\widehat{F}_n(\theta_0)$, but serves as a good approximation to the confidence interval based on the exact binomial distribution.

The distribution-free finite-sample confidence interval for the population median (which we shall analyse in this work) based on the sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n is presented in Algorithm 1. From Algorithm 1, it is clear that the confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ is very similar to the Hoeffding inequality based confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}}$.

Algorithm 1: A distribution-free finite sample confidence interval for the population median

Input: Sample: X_1, \dots, X_n and Confidence Level: $1 - \alpha$

Output: Distribution-free confidence interval for the population median with finite sample coverage

- 1 Define $c_{n,\alpha}$ to be the smallest integer x such that $\mathbb{P}(Y_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - x) \geq 1 - \alpha/2$, where $Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2)$, i.e.,

$$c_{n,\alpha} := \inf\{x : \mathbb{P}(Y_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - x) \geq 1 - \alpha/2\}.$$

- 2 Compute the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} &:= \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \right\}, \\ \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha} &:= \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\} \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

- 3 Return the confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}$; see (6).
-

We shall show that the confidence interval in Algorithm 1 ensures finite sample coverage for all sample sizes and for any underlying distribution function F from which the sample X_1, \dots, X_n has been generated in an i.i.d manner. Moreover if the sample size is greater than a certain threshold (depending on α), the confidence interval can be represented in terms of order statistics. The following theorem addresses these issues. Refer to Appendix S.2 for the detailed proof of this theorem.

Theorem 1. *Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are independent and identically distributed as F with median θ_0 i.e. $\mathbb{P}(X_i \leq \theta_0) \geq 1/2$ and $\mathbb{P}(X_i \geq \theta_0) \geq 1/2$. Then the confidence interval returned by Algorithm 1 satisfies the following:*

1. For all $n \geq 1$ and for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \geq 1 - \alpha$.
2. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = \begin{cases} [X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}, X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}], & \text{if } n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha), \\ \mathbb{R}, & \text{if } n < \log_2(2/\alpha). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

3. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the $c_{n,\alpha}$ defined in Step 1 of Algorithm Algorithm 1 satisfies,

$$c_{n,\alpha} - \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \in \begin{cases} \left[-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{2\ln(2)-1}{n^2}} \right\} - 1.5, 1 \right], & \text{if } n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha), \\ \{ \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - (\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2})/2 \}, & \text{if } n < \log_2(2/\alpha). \end{cases}$$

Outline of the proof. We give a brief outline of the proof of the theorem before formally stating the proof. We use the fact that if θ_0 is a median of F , then $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta_0\} \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq k)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta_0\} \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq k)$ where $M_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2)$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. Thereafter, we find an interval $\mathcal{I} := [\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}, n]$ that contains both $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta_0\}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta_0\}$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha/2$; this is done in Step 1 of Algorithm 1. The confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ is the set of all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that both $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\}$ belong to the interval \mathcal{I} ; this is done in Step 2 of Algorithm 1. This implies that the confidence interval returned by Algorithm 1 has a finite sample coverage for all distributions F with median θ_0 , proving part 1 of Theorem 1. Note that the finite sample coverage of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) is in sharp contrast to the asymptotic validity of confidence intervals based on the sample median such as those obtained via asymptotic normality or the bootstrap.

To prove part 2 of Theorem 1, we note that the confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ can be represented in terms of the order statistics if and only if $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [1, n]$. In part 2 of Theorem 1, we argue that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [1, n]$ if and only if $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$. This condition on the sample size has an interesting connection to the impossibility of the existence of a finite width confidence interval for the median θ_0 ; see the discussion following the outline of the proof.

To prove part 3 of Theorem 1, by the central limit theorem $\text{Bin}(n, 1/2)$ is approximately $N(n/2, n/4)$ and hence, $c_{n,\alpha}$ is asymptotically equal to $\sqrt{n/4}z_{\alpha/2}$. To obtain a result that is valid for all $n \geq 1$, we use the universal inequalities for the distribution function of binomial law mentioned in Zubkov and Serov [2012]. These universal inequalities precisely bound the binomial distribution function using the normal CDF and the KL divergence, $\text{KL}(p, q)$, between two Bernoulli random variables with success probabilities p and q , respectively. To verify part-3 of Theorem 1, we prove precise bounds for $\text{KL}(p, 1/2)$ for all $p \in [0, 1]$ and obtain bounds for quantiles of $\text{Bin}(n, 1/2)$. Figure 1 show $c_{n,\alpha} - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2$ and the corresponding upper and lower bounds in Theorem 1 under two scenarios, one when α is fixed to be either 0.01 or 0.05 and $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$. Figure 1 show $c_{n,\alpha} - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}$ and the corresponding upper and lower bounds in Theorem 1 when the sample size n is fixed to be either 15 or 25 and $\alpha > 2^{-(n-1)}$. We observe that the difference between the upper and lower bounds for $c_{n,\alpha} - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2$ mentioned in Theorem 1 lies between three to five in all the four figures. This shows that the bounds obtained for $c_{n,\alpha} - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2$ are very precise. Because $z_{\alpha/2} \leq \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}$ (see Proposition 2), we get that $c_{n,\alpha}$ is asymptotically smaller than $\sqrt{n \log(2/\alpha)}/2$ and hence $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) is smaller than the Hoeffding inequality based confidence interval. The asymptotics of $c_{n,\alpha}$ plays a very important role in our study of the asymptotics of the width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$.

Remark 1 (Sample size condition and impossibility). *Note that Theorem 2 of Lanke [1974] states that it is not possible to find real, locally bounded functions g_L and g_R on R^n such that $\mathbb{P}(g_L(\mathbf{X}_n) < \theta < g_R(\mathbf{X}_n)) > 1 - \alpha$ for all random n -vectors \mathbf{X}_n the components of which are independent copies of a continuous random variable, symmetric about θ if $\alpha < 2^{-(n-1)}$ (or equivalently, $n < \log_2(2/\alpha)$). Thus the bound on sample size $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$ which is required for obtaining a non-trivial confidence interval through Algorithm 1 is tight.*




Figure 1: In the first two plots (from left-hand side) we see the plot of $c_{n,\alpha} - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2$ as n varies ($n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$) for fixed $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05$. In the following two plots we see the plot of $c_{n,\alpha} - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2$ as α varies ($\alpha > 2^{-(n-1)}$) for fixed $n = 15, 25$.

Remark 2 (Comparison with Wald and bootstrap confidence intervals). *It is important to note that the Wald confidence interval and the classical bootstrap confidence interval of median (discussed in Section 1) both ensure only the asymptotic coverage (i.e. for large enough sample sizes) to be close to $1 - \alpha$. On the other hand, $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ ensures the coverage to be at least $1 - \alpha$ for all sample sizes n . Moreover as mentioned in Example 5.24 of [van der Vaart \[1998\]](#) and Section 3.4.3 of [Bose and Chatterjee \[2018\]](#) respectively, the required confidence level is guaranteed (asymptotically) for both the confidence intervals under the additional assumption of the differentiability of the distribution function at the median and the boundedness of the derivative of the distribution function at the median away from zero. As discussed in the introduction, such a requirement is also necessary for their validity as proved in [Knight \[1998a\]](#). Hence, in cases, where the aforementioned assumption does not hold, $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ performs much better when compared to the Wald or the bootstrap confidence interval. See Section 3.3 for a demonstration.*

Remark 3 (Coverage of quantiles close to the median). *$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ ensures finite sample-coverage of the population median θ_0 . Let us denote by θ_h the $((1/2) + h)$ quantile of F where $-1/2 < h < 1/2$. It is often interesting to see how much the coverage of θ_h by $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ deviates from the required level of $1 - \alpha$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Refer to Theorem 10 for a discussion regarding this.*

3 Width Analysis

In this section, we analyze the width of the confidence interval given by Algorithm 1. Although the validity of the confidence interval holds even without the assumption of continuity of the distribution, analyzing the width will benefit from such an assumption. Such a continuity assumption implies the uniqueness of the median which gives any confidence interval a chance to shrink to a singleton (or equivalently, the width of the confidence interval to converge to zero). If median of F

is not unique, then there exists an interval $[\theta_-, \theta_+]$ such that any point $\theta_0 \in [\theta_-, \theta_+]$ is a median of F . From Theorem 1, it follows that with probability at least $1 - 2\alpha$, $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ contains both θ_- and θ_+ . Hence, $\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \geq |\theta_+ - \theta_-|$ with probability at least $1 - 2\alpha$, which implies that the width cannot shrink to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (unless $|\theta_+ - \theta_-| \rightarrow 0$). For this reason, we will assume in the remaining part of this section that θ_0 is a continuity point of F .

3.1 Width analysis under standard assumptions

To begin with, we assume that the underlying distribution function F is differentiable at the population median θ_0 with $F'(\theta_0) > 0$. This is a standard assumption under which one can obtain the Bahadur representation for the sample median (See Bahadur [1966] and Ghosh [1971] for details). Under this assumption, we have the following theorem. As mentioned before, Section 2.6.3 of Serfling [2009] essentially contains this result.

Theorem 2. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Assume that F is continuously differentiable at the population median θ_0 with $F'(\theta_0) > 0$. Then for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) = \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}F'(\theta_0)} + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (7)$$

Hence, the width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ defined in (6) is asymptotically equal to the width of the Wald confidence interval of the median.

Theorem 2 essentially states that $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ performs as well as the Wald confidence interval when assumptions in Theorem 2 hold. Note that these are the same assumptions that are required to guarantee the required coverage for the Wald confidence interval. The proof of Theorem 2 relies on Theorem 1 of Ghosh [1971]. We know that if the sample size $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, then Theorem 1 implies $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = [X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}, X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}]$. We write out the Bahadur representations (see Theorem 1 of Ghosh [1971]) of the sample quantiles involved and simplify the expression. Finally, applying Part 3 of Theorem 1 proves Theorem 2; see Appendix S.3 for a complete proof.

We now provide a finite sample version of Theorem 2 under an assumption that is a qualitative version of the statement “ $F(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable at θ_0 .” Formally, we assume that there exists positive constants M, C, δ, η such that

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - Mh| \leq C|h|^{1+\delta} \quad \text{for all } |h| < \eta.$$

It is easy to observe that this assumption implies that F is differentiable at the population median θ_0 and $F'(\theta_0) = M > 0$. Note that the assumption is only required for h in the neighborhood of zero. Under this assumption, we have the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous distribution function with median θ_0 and*

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - Mh| \leq C|h|^{1+\delta} \quad \forall |h| < \eta, \quad (8)$$

where $0 < M, C, \delta, \eta < \infty$. Define $\zeta := (M/2) \min\{\eta, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}$. Then for every $n \geq 2, \alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that $n \geq \max\{\log_2(2/\alpha), 49 \log(2n/\alpha)/\zeta^2\}$, with probability at least $1 - 6n^{-2}$,

$$\left| \frac{n^{1/2}M}{z_{\alpha/2}} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - 1 \right| \leq \frac{1 + 14 \log(n)/z_{\alpha/2}}{n^{1/4}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{8n}} + \frac{2C(14)^{1+\delta}(\log(2n/\alpha))^{(1+\delta)/2}}{z_{\alpha/2}M^{1+\delta}n^{\delta/2}}. \quad (9)$$

Theorem 3 studies the rate of convergence of $\sqrt{n}M\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha})/z_{\alpha/2}$ to 1. For fixed values of $\alpha, M, C, \eta, \delta$, the rate of convergence is $\max\{\log(n)n^{-1/4}, (\log(n))^{(1+\delta)/2}n^{-\delta/2}\}$. For example, with $\delta = 1$, the rate of convergence is $\log(n)/n^{1/4}$. It should be noted here that the appearance of $\log(n)$ factors is only because the bound is guaranteed to hold with probability at least $1 - 6/n^2$ which is converging to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The advantage of Theorem 3 over the asymptotic statement in Theorem 2 is that we can allow α and M to tend to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For example, if $\delta = 1$, then for every fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ (assuming $C = O(1)$), the right hand side of (9) converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if $M^{-1} = O(n^{1/4}/\sqrt{\log(n)})$; for general $\delta > 0$, this condition becomes $M^{-1} = O(n^{\delta/(2+2\delta)}/\sqrt{\log(n)})$. It may be worth pointing that δ can be larger than 1.

We give a brief outline of the proof of this result. Arguing that $X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}$ and $X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}$ belong to a neighborhood of θ_0 with high probability and taking $\theta_0 + h$ to be either of these order statistics in (8), we can conclude that

$$|F(X_{(r)}) - F(\theta_0) - M(X_{(r)} - \theta_0)| \leq C|X_{(r)} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta},$$

for $r = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1$ and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}$. Applying triangle inequality, we obtain with high probability,

$$\begin{aligned} & |M\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - (F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}))| \\ & \leq C \left\{ |X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} + |X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side can be controlled by classical concentration inequalities for order statistics. The remaining part of the proof is completed by analyzing $F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})$ using uniform order statistics. A more detailed version of the result and its proof is provided in Appendix S.4.

3.2 Width analysis under non-standard assumptions

In this subsection, we analyze the width of the confidence interval when the assumptions in Theorem 2 do not hold. General theory for the asymptotic limits of the sample median exists under such non-standard assumptions [Ghosh and Sukhatme, 1981, Knight, 1998a, 2002]. We start with a simpler result on the width of the confidence interval when the density at the median is zero. We then proceed to study the general case when density may not even exist. The most surprising finding of this subsection (and this paper as well) is that the properly scaled width does not converge in probability to a constant but converges in distribution to a non-degenerate random variable.

Theorem 4. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 and*

$$F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - M|h|^\rho \text{sgn}(h) = o(|h|^\rho) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0. \quad (10)$$

where $\rho \geq 1$ and $0 < M < \infty$. Then

$$\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \leq 2^{1-1/\rho} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}M} \right)^{1/\rho} + o_p(n^{-1/2\rho}). \quad (11)$$

Theorem 4 states that the width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ converges to zero at the rate of $n^{-1/(2\rho)}$, or equivalently for fixed M we have $n^{1/(2\rho)}\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) = O_p(1)$. This is in contrast to Theorem 2 where we had an asymptotic equality.

The proof of Theorem 4 is very similar in strategy to that of Theorem 3. We substitute $X_{(\lceil n/2 \rceil + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}$ and $X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}$ respectively in place of $\theta_0 + h$ in (10) to obtain

$$F(X_{(r)}) - F(\theta_0) - M|X_{(r)} - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_{(r)} - \theta_0) = o_p(|X_{(r)} - \theta_0|^\rho).$$

for $r = \lceil n/2 \rceil + c_{n,\alpha} + 1, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}$. Subtracting one equation from the other we see that the difference $F(X_{(\lceil n/2 \rceil + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})$ can be approximated by

$$M|X_{(\lceil n/2 \rceil + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_{(\lceil n/2 \rceil + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - \theta_0) + M|\theta_0 - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}|^\rho \text{sgn}(\theta_0 - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}),$$

which by Jensen's inequality can be lower bounded by $M(\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}))^\rho / 2^{\rho-1}$. As before, the remaining part of the proof is completed by analyzing $F(X_{(\lceil n/2 \rceil + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})$ using uniform order statistics. See Appendix S.5 for a detailed proof.

Theorem 4 only provides an asymptotic bound on the width and that too only applies to the case of $\rho \geq 1$ (i.e., density exists at the median but is zero). In the following, we provide a finite-sample analysis of the width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ under non-standard cases and thereby precisely characterize the width of the distribution-free confidence interval. For the finite-sample analysis, we make use of a quantitative version of assumption (10).

Theorem 5. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 and

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - M|h|^\rho \text{sgn}(h)| \leq C|h|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \forall \quad |h| < \eta, \quad (12)$$

where $0 < M, C, \Delta, \eta, \rho < \infty$. Let $\delta = \Delta/\rho$ and $\zeta = (M/2) \min\{\eta^\rho, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}$. Also, define

$$Q = \left(\frac{c_{n,\alpha} + \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left\{ F(X_i) \leq \frac{c_{n,\alpha} + \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1}{n} \right\} - \frac{c_{n,\alpha} + \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1}{n} \right),$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(a, b) := |a|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a) - |a - b|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a - b).$$

Then for every $n \geq 2, \alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that $n \geq \max\{\log_2(2/\alpha), 49 \log(2n/\alpha)/\zeta^2, 4z_{\alpha/2}^2\}$, with probability at least $1 - 1350n^{-2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1/(2\rho)} \left| M^{1/\rho} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \mathcal{G}(Q, z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}) \right| \\ & \leq \max\{4, 2C_{\rho,\alpha}\} \left[\frac{208(\log n)^{3/4}}{n^{1/4}} + \frac{C}{n^{\delta/2}} \left(\frac{14\sqrt{\log(2n/\alpha)}}{M} \right)^{1+\delta} \right]^{\min\{1, 1/\rho\}} \\ & + \max\{2, C_{\rho,\alpha}\} \left[\frac{4.2(\log(2/\alpha))^{1/4} \sqrt{\log(2n/\alpha)}}{n^{1/4}} + \frac{9.5\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \right]^{\min\{1, 1/\rho\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $C_{\rho,\alpha}$ is a constant depending on ρ and α (see (E.76) for details). Moreover, for any fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} M^{1/\rho} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2}), \quad \text{where } W \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4). \quad (14)$$

Note that assumption (12) of Theorem 5 allows for the density to be zero and infinity depending on whether $\rho \geq 1$ or $\rho < 1$. As expected, if the density is infinity at the median (i.e., $\rho < 1$), then the sample median converges to θ_0 at a rate faster than $n^{1/2}$ and accordingly, the width of the confidence interval shrinks at a rate faster than $n^{1/2}$.

Theorem 5 generalizes Theorem 3 allowing for $\rho \neq 1$. Note that Q is a random variable satisfying $n^{1/2}(Q - z_{\alpha/2}/2) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1/4)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similar to Theorem 3, the variables M, α can be allowed to tend to zero with sample size n . For example, for any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (assuming $C = O(1)$), the right hand side of (13) converges to zero as long as $M^{-1} = O(n^{\delta/(2+2\delta)}/\sqrt{\log n})$. An interesting consequence of Theorem 5 is that the scaled width converges to a non-degenerate distribution shown in (14) if $\rho \neq 1$. Note that for $\rho = 1$,

$$\mathcal{G}(a, b) = |a|\text{sgn}(a) - |a - b|\text{sgn}(a - b) = a - (a - b) = b,$$

which implies $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2}) = z_{\alpha/2}$. For $\rho \neq 1$, the limiting distribution is also non-standard (depending only on ρ, α). For $\alpha = 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$, the densities of the limiting distributions $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})$ are shown in Figure 2 as ρ varies from 0.75 to 10. It can be seen that the variance of the limiting distribution increases as α increases. The limiting distribution is right-skewed for $\rho < 1$. For $\rho \geq 1$, it can be observed that the limiting distribution is left-skewed and has a bounded support. This can also be shown theoretically. For $\rho \geq 1$ the function $h(x) = |x|^{1/\rho}\text{sgn}(x)$ is holder-continuous with $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq 2|x - y|^{1/\rho}$. Using this result we can say that $|\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})| \leq 2z_{\alpha/2}^{1/\rho}$.




Figure 2: Density of the limiting distribution $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})$ for different values of the level of significance $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1$ as ρ varies from 0.5 to 10. The densities have been trimmed at $y \in [0, 60]$ and $x \in [1.5, 3]$ for better visibility.

The proof of Theorem 5, interestingly, makes use of Theorem 3, by finding an monotone transformation $\varphi(\cdot)$ of X_i 's such that the distribution function of $\varphi(X_i)$'s satisfies assumption (8). Formally, observe that $H(t) = F(\theta_0 + |t|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(t))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is a distribution function with median 0 i.e. $H(0) = F(\theta_0) = 1/2$, and by (12), satisfies

$$|H(t) - H(0) - Mt| \leq C|t|^{1+\delta} \quad \text{for all } |t| < \eta^\rho, \quad (15)$$

where $0 < \delta = \Delta/\rho < \infty$ and $0 < M, C, \rho, \eta < \infty$. Moreover, $H(\cdot)$ is the distribution function of $\varphi(X_i) = |X_i - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_i - \theta_0)$. We apply Theorem 3 to these transformed random variables and simplify further to prove Theorem 5. A more detailed version of the result and its proof are provided in Appendix S.6.

Although Theorems 4 and 5 relax the assumption of the Bahadur representation, they require the existence of a density (in the extended real line) at θ_0 . As a final result, we provide an extension of Theorem 5 explicitly allowing for the non-existence of density at the median θ_0 .

Theorem 6. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 and*

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - |h|^\rho \text{sgn}(h)[M_- \mathbf{1}\{h < 0\} + M_+ \mathbf{1}\{h > 0\}]| \leq C|h|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \forall |h| < \eta, \quad (16)$$

where $0 < M_-, M_+, C, \Delta, \eta, \rho < \infty$. Set

$$\delta = \Delta/\rho, \quad M = \min\{M_-, M_+\}, \quad \zeta = (M/2) \min\{\eta^\rho, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}.$$

Also, define Q as in Theorem 5, and

$$\mathcal{G}(a, b) = M^{1/\rho} \left\{ |a|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a) \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{a < 0\}}{M_-^{1/\rho}} + \frac{\mathbf{1}\{a > 0\}}{M_+^{1/\rho}} \right] - |a - b|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a - b) \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}\{a < b\}}{M_-^{1/\rho}} + \frac{\mathbf{1}\{a > b\}}{M_+^{1/\rho}} \right] \right\}.$$

Then for every $n \geq 2, \alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that $n \geq \max\{\log_2(2/\alpha), 49 \log(2n/\alpha)/\zeta^2, 4z_{\alpha/2}^2\}$, with probability at least $1 - 1350n^{-2}$, inequality (13) holds true. Moreover, for any fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, M, ρ , as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} M^{1/\rho} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2}), \quad \text{where } W \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4).$$

If $\rho = 1$ and $M_- \neq M_+$, then under (16) the left derivative of F at θ_0 is M_- and the right derivative at θ_0 is M_+ . If $M_- = M_+$, then condition (16) becomes (12). Figure 3 shows the limiting distribution $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})$ when $(M_-, M_+) \in \{(0.5, 0.5), (0.2, 0.8), (0.4, 0.6)\}$ when $\rho = 0.75, 2, 10$. It can be observed that the variance of the limiting distributions decrease with increase in ρ . Another observation that can be made from Figure 3 is that the variance of the limiting distribution of the scaled width is lower when the behavior of the underlying distribution function is same on either side of θ_0 i.e. when we have $M_- = M_+$. The proof of Theorem 6 follows similar techniques as those of Theorem 5. A more detailed version of the theorem and its proof is provided in Appendix S.7.

All the results presented in this section assume that the growth rate of $F(\cdot)$ on either side of θ_0 is the same (except maybe for some constants). Even in Theorem 6, our assumption (16) implies $|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0)| \asymp |h|^\rho$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. The techniques involved can be easily generalized to handle more general cases where, for example, $|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0)| \asymp |h|^{\rho_1} \mathbf{1}\{h > 0\} + |h|^{\rho_2} \mathbf{1}\{h < 0\}$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. We believe there is a unified result but for brevity, we do not pursue it in this work.

3.3 Numerical results

In this section, we shall compare the observed distribution of the scaled width of the finite sample distribution-free confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ defined in (6) with its limiting distribution. We shall also demonstrate the performance of the distribution-free confidence interval. The performance shall be primarily assessed on the basis of coverage and the width of the confidence interval.




Figure 3: Density of the limiting distribution $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})$ for different values of $\rho = 0.75, 2, 10$ and for different pairs $(M_-, M_+) \in \{(0.5, 0.5), (0.2, 0.8), (0.4, 0.6)\}$. The densities have been trimmed at $y \in [0, 15]$ and $x \in [0.5, 2.5]$ for better visibility.

3.3.1 Comparing observed and limiting distribution of scaled width of distribution-free C.I.

In order to compare the observed distribution of scaled width $n^{1/(2\rho)}M^{1/\rho}\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha})$ with the limiting distribution $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})$ we simulate observations from the distribution F_ρ ,

$$F_\rho(x) = 0.5|x|^\rho \text{sgn}(x) + 0.5 \text{ for } x \in [-1, 1] \text{ and } \rho > 0. \quad (17)$$

Note that median of F_ρ is $\theta_0 = 0$ and we have the following limit,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|F_\rho(\theta_0 + h) - F_\rho(\theta_0)|}{|h|^\rho} = 0.5 = M.$$

For $\rho = 0.75, 2, 10$ we generate $n = 1000$ observations from F_ρ and compare the resulting histogram with the corresponding limiting distribution. The resulting plots can be seen in Figure 4. It can be seen that the observed distribution of the scaled width is converging to the limiting distribution $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})$. However the convergence is quite slow. In particular we know from Theorem 5 that for smoothness parameter $\rho > 0$ the rate of convergence is $n^{1/(2\rho)}$. Thus the rate of convergence is faster for smaller values of ρ . The same can be seen from Figure 4. The resemblance between the observed and the limiting distribution is highest for $\rho = 0.75$ and lowest for $\rho = 10$.




Figure 4: Histogram of the scaled width $n^{1/(2\rho)}M^{1/\rho}\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha})$ (for sample-size $n = 1000$) along with the density of the limiting distribution $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2})$ for different values $\rho = 0.75, 2, 10$. The densities and histograms have been trimmed at $y \in [0, 10]$ and $x \in [1.5, 3]$ for better visibility.

3.3.2 Performance of distribution-free C.I. against benchmark methods.

We describe the process of generating observations from different distributions and comparing the distribution-free confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ with various benchmark methods such as classical bootstrap and sub-sampling with estimated rate of convergence.

1. We shall use the distribution function F_ρ (see (17)). We consider n to be 50, 200, 500, 1000. We vary ρ from 0.2 to 10.
2. For each value of ρ we generate n many observations from the distribution F_ρ 1000 times.
3. For each iteration we compute the distribution-free C.I. the sub-sample based C.I. (with estimated rate of convergence and with sub-sample size $n^{1/2}$), and the classical bootstrap based C.I. for the given n observations at the level of confidence $100(1-\alpha)\%$ (we use $\alpha = 0.05$).
4. From this data, we calculate the coverage for all the three types of C.I.'s.
5. We also provide box-plots for $n^{1/(2\rho)}\text{Width}$ for all the three types of C.I.'s obtained from this data.

The result of the simulation can be seen in Figure 5. We see that only the distribution-free confidence interval maintains the required coverage of 95% for all sample sizes and for all values of




Figure 5: Comparison of the width and coverage of different types of confidence intervals (the distribution-free C.I. the sub-sample based C.I. (with estimated rate of convergence and with sub-sample size $n^{1/2}$), and the classical bootstrap based C.I.) for different values of sample sizes ($n = 50, 200, 500, 1000$) and for different growth-rates of the distribution function on either side of the median (ρ takes values from 0.2 to 10). The box-plots have been thresholded at $y = 40$ for better visibility, so there might be some outlying observations beyond the threshold.

ρ . The classical bootstrap and the sub-sample based confidence intervals on the other hand do the maintain the required coverage for $\rho \neq 1$. It can also be seen from the inter-quartile ranges of the confidence intervals that the variance of the the width of the distribution-free confidence interval is in general lower than that of the bootstrap and sub-sampling based confidence intervals for higher values of ρ . More simulations illustrating the performance of the distribution-free confidence interval against the benchmark methods can be found in Appendix S.11.

4 Generalized HulC

In this section we propose a generalized version of HulC (Hull based Confidence Regions) where we update the method developed in Kuchibhotla et al. [2021]. To understand the algorithm we require certain definitions. The median bias of an estimator $\hat{\theta}_j$ for θ_0 ,

$$\text{Med-Bias}_{\theta_0}(\hat{\theta}_j) = \frac{1}{2} - \min\{\mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0 \geq 0), \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0 \leq 0)\}_+.$$

We define the following quantity,

$$P(n, k) = \sum_{i=\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - k}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + k} \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

The algorithm for Generalized HulC (G-HulC) is proposed in Algorithm 2. Instead of returning the

Algorithm 2: Confidence Interval of θ_0 (G-HulC)

Input: Sample: W_1, \dots, W_N and Confidence Level: $1 - \alpha$, estimation procedure: $\mathcal{A}(\cdot)$,
Number of batches: $B \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$.

Output: A confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) \geq 1 - \alpha$.

- 1 Randomly split the data W_1, \dots, W_N into B disjoint sets $\{\{W_i : i \in S_j\} : 1 \leq j \leq B\}$.
These need not be equal sized sets, but having approximately equal sizes yields good width properties.
- 2 Compute estimators $\hat{\theta}_j := \mathcal{A}(\{W_i : i \in S_j\})$ for $1 \leq j \leq B$.
- 3 Compute $c_{B,\alpha} = \inf\{x : \mathbb{P}(Y_B \geq \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - x) \geq 1 - \alpha/2\}$ where $Y_B \sim \text{Bin}(B, 1/2)$.
- 4 Generate a uniform(0,1) random variable U and set,

$$\tau_\alpha = \frac{P(B, c_{B,\alpha}) - (1 - \alpha)}{P(B, c_{B,\alpha}) - P(B, c_{B,\alpha} - 1)}, \quad c_{B,\alpha}^* = \begin{cases} c_{B,\alpha} - 1 & \text{if } U \leq \tau_\alpha, \\ c_{B,\alpha} & \text{if } U > \tau_\alpha. \end{cases}$$

- 5 Return the distribution-free confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}$

$$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}} := \left[\hat{\theta}_{(\lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}^*)}, \hat{\theta}_{(\lfloor B/2 \rfloor + c_{B,\alpha}^* + 1)} \right].$$

range of estimators obtained from each split, G-HulC splits the data into a larger number of disjoint subsets and instead returns a confidence interval for the population median of the estimators. The advantage of using G-HulC is that the algorithm provides confidence intervals of smaller width (when $B > \log_2(2/\alpha)$) while still maintaining the required coverage for asymptotically median unbiased estimators.

4.1 Coverage analysis of G-HulC

To show that G-HulC maintains the required coverage for asymptotically median unbiased estimators we will use Theorem 10 with $\hat{\theta}_j, 1 \leq j \leq B$ as the sample. Let \mathcal{E}_B be the maximum of median biases of these estimators, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}_B := \max_{1 \leq j \leq B} \text{Med-Bias}_{\theta_0}(\hat{\theta}_j).$$

Theorem 7. *If W_1, \dots, W_N are independent observations, then for any $B \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \notin \widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) &\leq \alpha(1 + 2B(B-1)\mathcal{E}_B^2(1 + 2\mathcal{E}_B)^{B-2}) \\ &\leq \alpha(1 + 2B^2\mathcal{E}_B^2e^{2B\mathcal{E}_B}). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Hence, if $B\mathcal{E}_B \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, then $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}$ is an asymptotically valid $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for θ_0 .

The proof of Theorem 7 is provided in Appendix S.8. The upper bound on the mis-coverage probability of the G-HulC confidence interval is exactly the same as that of HulC (see Theorem-2 of Kuchibhotla et al. [2021]). Thus in terms of coverage G-HulC procedure enjoys the same properties as that of HulC. For details refer to the discussion in remark 2.3 in Kuchibhotla et al. [2021]. Moreover G-HulC provides us with shorter confidence intervals as compared to HulC which we shall see both theoretically and through simulations in the following sections.

Another thing to note is that the coverage probability $P(B, c)$ increases in steps as c increases over the positive integers. This can lead to conservative coverage i.e. miscoverage probability strictly less than α . This is because there might not exist positive integer c such that $P(B, c) = 1 - \alpha$. To solve this problem we adopt a randomization procedure. We know from previous derivations that $c_{B,\alpha}$ is the smallest positive integer so that $P(B, c_{B,\alpha}) \geq 1 - \alpha$. Thus we randomize between $c_{B,\alpha} - 1$ and $c_{B,\alpha}$ with probability τ_α (see step-4 of Algorithm 2) to ensure that the coverage probability is exactly $1 - \alpha$.

4.2 Width analysis of G-HulC

Throughout this section we shall assume that $B\mathcal{E}_B \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ so that by Theorem 7 the required coverage is guaranteed. We shall analyse the width of confidence interval returned by G-HulC under two different assumptions. However we shall see that the major take-away from both the analysis is essentially the same.

Theorem 8. Suppose $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}$ is the confidence interval returned by G-HulC (Algorithm 2) using approximately equal B splits. Let $\hat{\theta}^m$ be an estimator of θ_0 based on a sample of size m and let r_m be its rate of convergence i.e.,

$$r_m(\hat{\theta}^m - \theta_0) = O_p(1) \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

We assume the following regarding the distribution function $\tilde{F}_{N/B}(\cdot)$ of $r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B} - \theta_0)$,

$$|\tilde{F}_{N/B}(x) - \tilde{F}_{N/B}(0)| > \mathcal{C}|x|^\rho \quad \forall \quad |x| < \tilde{\Delta},$$

for some $\mathcal{C}, \tilde{\Delta} > 0$. Let $|\tilde{F}_{N/B}(0) - (1/2)| \leq \mathcal{E}_B$. Then we have the following with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2\delta$,

$$\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) \leq \frac{2}{\mathcal{C}^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \left\{ \frac{5 \log(2/\delta) + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho},$$

provided B is large enough so that the last expression is less than $2\tilde{\Delta}/r_{N/B}$.

Theorem 8 states that the rate of $\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}})$ is $B^{1/(2\rho)} r_{N/B}$ i.e. $B^{1/(2\rho)} r_{N/B} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) = O_p(1)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The proof of Theorem 8 can be seen in Appendix S.9.

The next theorem is based on a stronger assumption. The assumption made is similar in nature to those made in Theorem 5 and Theorem 6.

Theorem 9. Suppose $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}$ is the confidence interval returned by G-HulC (Algorithm 2) using approximately equal B splits. Let $\hat{\theta}^m$ be an estimator of θ_0 based on a sample of size m and let r_m be its rate of convergence i.e.,

$$r_m(\hat{\theta}^m - \theta_0) = O_p(1) \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

We assume the following regarding the distribution function $\tilde{F}_{N/B}(\cdot)$ of $r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B} - \theta_0)$,

$$\left| \tilde{F}_{N/B}(t) - \tilde{F}_{N/B}(0) - M_N |t|^\rho \text{sgn}(t) \right| \leq C_N |t|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \forall \quad |t| < \eta,$$

where $0 < M_N, C_N, \Delta, \eta, \rho < \infty$. Let $|\tilde{F}_{N/B}(0) - (1/2)| \leq \mathcal{E}_B$. Then the following distributional convergence holds as $N/B, B \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(B)^{1/2\rho} r_{N/B} M_N^{1/\rho} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2}),$$

where $\mathcal{G}(a, b) := |a|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a) - |a - b|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a - b)$ and $W \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$.

Theorem 9 states that under suitable regularity conditions on the distribution function $\tilde{F}_{N/B}$ we can obtain the exact limiting distribution (non-degenerate in most scenarios) of the scaled width of the confidence interval returned by G-HulC as $N, B \rightarrow \infty$. As in Theorem 8, the rate of convergence of $\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}})$ in Theorem 9 is $(B)^{1/2\rho} r_{N/B}$. The main idea behind the proof of Theorem 9 is same as that for Theorem 5. A finite-sample generalisation of Theorem 9 has been stated and proved in Appendix S.10.

Remark 4 (Interpretation of the rate of convergence of width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}$). We note that the rate of convergence of the width of confidence interval returned by G-HulC is $(B)^{1/2\rho} r_{N/B}$. Thus the rate is composed of two components: $(B)^{1/2\rho}$ which models the regularity of the distribution of properly scaled and centered estimator $r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B} - \theta_0)$ at 0; and $r_{N/B}$ which is the rate of convergence of each estimator $\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B}$ based on a sample of size roughly N/B .

4.2.1 Comparison with Wald confidence intervals

In this sub-section, we shall see how the width of the confidence interval returned by G-HulC compares to that of Wald confidence interval and if there is any improvement over using HulC (Kuchibhotla et al. [2021]). We assume that G-HulC is using approximately equal B splits. Suppose the following holds,

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad \sqrt{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

as $B, N/B \rightarrow \infty$ for $1 \leq j \leq B$. Here $\hat{\theta}$ is the estimator based on the entire data. We also assume that $\tilde{F}_{N/B}$ (the distribution function of $\sqrt{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0)$) satisfies the following,

$$\left| \tilde{F}_{N/B}(t) - \tilde{F}_{N/B}(0) - (1/(\sqrt{2\pi}))t \right| \leq C_N |t|^2 \quad \text{for } |t| < \eta,$$

where $0 < C_N, \eta < \infty$. In other words $\tilde{F}'_{N/B}(0) = 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ and $\tilde{F}_{N/B}$ converges weakly to $N(0, 1)$ as $B, N/B \rightarrow \infty$. Comparing to the set-up of Theorem 9 we see that $M_N = 1/(\sqrt{2\pi})$, $r_{N/B} = \sqrt{N/B}$, $\rho = 1$. Since $\rho = 1$, $\mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2}) = W - (W - z_{\alpha/2}) = z_{\alpha/2}$. Using Theorem 9 gives us the following as $B, N/B \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{B} \sqrt{N/B} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) \xrightarrow{d} z_{\alpha/2} \\ \implies & \sqrt{N} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{2\pi} z_{\alpha/2}. \end{aligned}$$

If we assume that $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is a consistent estimator of $\sigma^2 = 1$ then the Wald confidence interval for this problem is given by $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{Wald}} = [\hat{\theta} - \hat{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{N}, \hat{\theta} + \hat{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{N}]$. Thus $\sqrt{N}\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{Wald}}) = 2\hat{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2} \xrightarrow{P} 2z_{\alpha/2}$. Dividing one equation by the other we obtain the following,

$$\frac{\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}})}{\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{Wald}})} \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} > 1.$$

Thus the ratio of the width of the confidence interval returned by G-HulC to that returned by Wald converges in probability to $\sqrt{\pi/2}$ which is strictly greater than 1. However we should note that Wald confidence interval explicitly makes use of the asymptotic normality of the estimator. G-HulC on the other hand relies mainly on the median-unbiasedness of the estimator. It was shown in section 2.3 of [Kuchibhotla et al. \[2021\]](#) that the ratio of the expected width of HulC confidence interval to that of the Wald interval is approximately equal to $\sqrt{\log_2(\log_2(2/\alpha))}$ which grows slowly to ∞ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. The advantage of G-HulC is that the ratio of the widths is independent of α and thus G-HulC can potentially produce much smaller valid confidence intervals than HulC as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

4.3 Simulations

To understand the validity and power of the confidence intervals generated by G-HulC we consider the following numerical example of quantile regression. Suppose $(X_i, Y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ are independent and identically distributed random vectors. We define the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ as follows,

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i - \theta X_i|.$$

The objective function is a convex function of θ . Suppose $M_n(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i - \theta X_i|$ then we have the following,

$$\{\hat{\theta}_n \geq \theta_0\} = \{\dot{M}_n(\theta_0) \leq 0\} \quad \text{if} \quad \{\hat{\theta}_n \leq \theta_0\} = \{\dot{M}_n(\theta_0) \geq 0\}.$$

Since $\dot{M}_n(\theta_0)$ is a sum of mean 0 independent random variables by CLT we have that $\mathbb{P}(\dot{M}_n(\theta_0) \leq 0) \rightarrow 1/2$ and $\mathbb{P}(\dot{M}_n(\theta_0) \geq 0) \rightarrow 1/2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ is asymptotically median-unbiased.

Suppose $X_i \sim \text{Unif}[-1, 1]$ and $Y_i = X_i + \epsilon$. We suppose that ϵ_i and X_i are independent and $F_i(x) = \mathbb{P}(\epsilon_i \leq x) = 0.5(1 + \text{sgn}(x)|x|^\beta)$ where $x \in [-1, 1]$ for some $\beta > 0$. If $\beta = 1$ then this is the classical setting of error distribution with density bounded away from zero. If $\beta < 1$ then the rate of convergence of the quantile estimator is faster than $n^{1/2}$. If $\beta > 1$ then the rate of convergence is slower than $n^{1/2}$. We generate data for values of $\beta \in [0, 2)$ and compare the performance of HulC and G-HulC (at level $\alpha = 0.05$) for higher values of B . In particular for the purpose of simulations, we have take $B = 24, 48, 96$ which are essentially multiples of $\lceil \log_2(2/\alpha) \rceil = 6$ (for $\alpha = 0.05$). The performance of each procedure is based on 1000 Monte Carlo replications for each sample size and each β . We observe from [Figure 6](#) that like HulC, the generalized version of HulC also maintains the coverage at the nominal level of 0.95 for all sample sizes. Moreover from [Figure 6](#), we can also infer that G-HulC with higher value of B yields confidence intervals of smaller width. [Figure 7](#) clearly suggests that the dispersion of the width of the confidence interval returned by G-HulC also tends to decrease with increasing values of B .

5 Conclusions and Future Directions

In this paper, we study the coverage and width of a distribution-free confidence interval for the median of a distribution. Under the standard assumption that the Lebesgue density at median




Figure 6: Comparison of the coverage and median of the scaled width ($n^{1/(2\beta)}\text{Width}$) of HulC and G-HulC (for $B > \log_2(2/\alpha)$) in quantile regression under non-standard conditions. The sample size is mentioned at the top of each plot and the smoothness parameter of the distribution β is on the x -axis. The tuning parameter B is mentioned in the parenthesis.

is bounded away from zero, we show that the width of the distribution-free CI matches that of the Wald interval asymptotically. Under more general assumptions allowing for a zero/infinite density or even a non-existent density, we show that the width when properly scaled converges to a non-degenerate distribution. This is the first non-trivial example where such a phenomenon is observed. In both standard and non-standard cases, we supplement the asymptotic statements with non-asymptotic analogues.

Inference for the median is an age-old problem in statistics. In addition to studying the basic properties of the confidence intervals for the median, we show wide ranging implications of our results for inference of arbitrary functionals for which asymptotically median unbiased estimators exist. In particular, we develop a generalization of HulC that provides confidence intervals of improved width.

This work can be extended in several directions. Firstly, it is of interest to know if similar conclusions hold true for distribution-free confidence intervals of other quantiles. Secondly, inference of shift parameter in other location models are also of interest. Inference for shift parameter of a unimodal location family or a symmetric location family are some interesting examples.




Figure 7: Comparison of box-plots of the scaled width ($n^{1/(2\beta)}\text{Width}$) of HulC and G-HulC (for $B > \log_2(2/\alpha)$) in quantile regression under non-standard conditions. The sample size is mentioned at the top of each plot and the smoothness parameter of the distribution β is on the x -axis. The tuning parameter B is mentioned in the parenthesis. The box-plots have been thresholded at $y = 100$ for better visibility, so there might be some outlying observations beyond the threshold.

References

- R Raj Bahadur. A note on quantiles in large samples. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 37(3):577–580, 1966.
- Patrice Bertail, Dimitris N Politis, and Joseph P Romano. On subsampling estimators with unknown rate of convergence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(446):569–579, 1999.
- Peter J Bickel and David A Freedman. Some asymptotic theory for the bootstrap. *The annals of statistics*, 9(6):1196–1217, 1981.
- Arup Bose and Snigdhansu Chatterjee. *U-statistics, Mm-estimators and Resampling*. Springer, 2018.
- Herbert A David and Haikady N Nagaraja. *Order statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- Lutz Dumbgen. New goodness-of-fit tests and their application to nonparametric confidence sets. *Annals of statistics*, pages 288–314, 1998.

- Jayanta K Ghosh. A new proof of the bahadur representation of quantiles and an application. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 1957–1961, 1971.
- Malay Ghosh and Shashikala Sukhatme. On Bahadur’s representation of quantiles in nonregular cases. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 10(3):269–282, 1981.
- Malay Ghosh, William C Parr, Kesar Singh, and G Jogesh Babu. A note on bootstrapping the sample median. *The Annals of Statistics*, 12(3):1130–1135, 1984.
- Jean Dickinson Gibbons and Subhabrata Chakraborti. *Nonparametric statistical inference*. CRC press, 2014.
- Chuan Goh. *Smoothing choices and distributional approximations for econometric inference*. University of California, Berkeley, 2004.
- Olivier Guilbaud. Interval estimation of the median of a general distribution. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 29–36, 1979.
- Olivier Guilbaud. Confidence coefficients of interpolated nonparametric sign intervals for medians under no or weak shape assumptions. In *Advances in distribution theory, order statistics, and inference*, pages 225–237. Springer, 2006.
- JS Huang, PK Sen, and J Shao. Bootstrapping a sample quantile when the density has a jump. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 299–309, 1996.
- Keith Knight. Bootstrapping sample quantiles in non-regular cases. *Statistics & probability letters*, 37(3):259–267, 1998a.
- Keith Knight. A “delta method” approach to Bahadur–Kiefer theorems. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 25(3):555–568, 1998b.
- Keith Knight. What are the limiting distributions of quantile estimators? In *Statistical Data Analysis Based on the L 1-Norm and Related Methods*, pages 47–65. Springer, 2002.
- Keith Knight and GW Bassett. Second order improvements of sample quantiles using subsamples. *University of Toronto and University of Illinois, Chicago*, 2002.
- Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, and Larry Wasserman. The HulC: Confidence regions from convex hulls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14577*, 2021.
- Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, and Larry Wasserman. Median regularity and honest inference. *Biometrika*, 110(3):831–838, 2023.
- Jan Lanke. Interval estimation of a median. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 28–32, 1974.
- Erich L Lehmann. Nonparametric confidence intervals for a shift parameter. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 34(4):1507–1512, 1963.
- Michael A Martin. On using the jackknife to estimate quantile variance. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 18(2):149–153, 1990.
- Chaitra H Nagaraja and Haikady N Nagaraja. Distribution-free approximate methods for constructing confidence intervals for quantiles. *International Statistical Review*, 88(1):75–100, 2020.

- Gottfried E Noether. Wilcoxon confidence intervals for location parameters in the discrete case. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 62(317):184–188, 1967.
- Gottfried E Noether. Some simple distribution-free confidence intervals for the center of a symmetric distribution. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 68(343):716–719, 1973.
- R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2021. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rolf-Dieter Reiss. *Approximate distributions of order statistics: with applications to nonparametric statistics*. Springer science & business media, 2012.
- Harry D Ruderman. Two new inequalities. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 59(1):29–32, 1952.
- Henry Scheffe and John W Tukey. Non-parametric estimation. i. validation of order statistics. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 16(2):187–192, 1945.
- Pranab Kumar Sen. On a distribution-free method of estimating asymptotic efficiency of a class of non-parametric tests. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 37(6):1759–1770, 1966.
- Robert J Serfling. *Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- Simon J Sheather. Density estimation. *Statistical science*, pages 588–597, 2004.
- N.V. Smirnov. Limit distributions for the terms of a variational series. *American Mathematical Society Translations*, (67), 1952.
- A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511802256.
- Andrey M Zubkov and Alexander A Serov. A full proof of universal inequalities for the distribution function of the binomial law. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.3838*, 2012.

Appendix to “Distribution-free finite sample confidence interval of median”

S.1 Auxiliary Results

Lemma 1. *We have the following upper and lower bound for $H(x, 1/2) = x \ln(2x) + (1-x) \ln(2(1-x))$ for $x \in [0, 1]$,*

$$2 \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{4}{3} \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^4 \leq H \left(x, \frac{1}{2}\right) \leq 2 \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + (16 \ln(2) - 8) \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^4. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Proof of Lemma 1. We shall first prove the upper bound for $H(x, 1/2)$. Let $f(\cdot)$ be the following function,

$$f(x) = 2(x - 0.5)^2 + (16 \ln(2) - 8)(x - 0.5)^4 - \ln(2) - x \ln(x) - (1 - x) \ln(1 - x).$$

Since $f(\cdot)$ is symmetric about 0.5, it is enough to show that $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \geq 0.5$. We note that $f(0.5) = 0$. We compute the derivatives of various order of the function $f(\cdot)$,

$$\begin{cases} f^{(1)}(x) &= 4(x - 0.5) + (64 \ln(2) - 32)(x - 0.5)^3 - (\ln(x) - \ln(1 - x)), \\ f^{(2)}(x) &= 4 + (192 \ln(2) - 96)(x - 0.5)^2 - ((1/x) + (1/(1 - x))), \\ f^{(3)}(x) &= (384 \ln(2) - 192)(x - 0.5) - (-(1/x^2) + (1/(1 - x)^2)), \\ f^{(4)}(x) &= (384 \ln(2) - 192) - 2((1/x^3) + (1/(1 - x)^3)). \end{cases}$$

We observe that $f^{(1)}(0.5) = f^{(2)}(0.5) = f^{(3)}(0.5) = 0$ and $f^{(4)}(0.5) = (384 \ln(2) - 192) - 32 > 0$. Since $f^{(4)}(x)$ is a continuous function on $(0, 1)$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f^{(4)}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (0.5, 0.5 + \epsilon)$. This implies that $f^{(3)}(\cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function on $[0.5, 0.5 + \epsilon)$. Hence $f^{(3)}(x) > f^{(3)}(0.5) = 0$ for all $x \in (0.5, 0.5 + \epsilon)$. Repeating the same argument two more times we obtain that $f^{(1)}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (0.5, 0.5 + \epsilon)$. However we note that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f^{(1)}(x) = -\infty$. Since $f^{(1)}(x)$ is a continuous function, by intermediate value property we can say that there exists $0.5 < y < 1$ such that $f^{(1)}(y) = 0$. Let $0.5 < z < 1$ be the first root of $f^{(1)}(x) = 0$. $f^{(1)}(\cdot)$ is continuous on the compact interval $[0.5, z]$ and hence attains maximum in this interval. The maximum is not attained at end-points as $f^{(1)}(0.5 + \epsilon/2) > f^{(1)}(0.5) = f^{(1)}(z) = 0$. Suppose $f^{(1)}(\cdot)$ attains the maximum at $u \in (0.5, z)$. This implies that $f^{(2)}(u) = 0$. Since $f^{(2)}(\cdot)$ is symmetric about 0.5, we also have $f^{(2)}(1 - u) = 0$. Moreover 0.5 is a double root of $f^{(2)}(x) = 0$ because of the symmetry of $f^{(2)}(\cdot)$ about 0.5 and $f^{(2)}(0.5) = 0$. Therefore we have got four real roots of $f^{(2)}(x) = 0$ viz $0.5, 0.5, u, 1 - u$. We now note that the equation $f^{(2)}(x) = 0$ is essentially the following biquadratic equation,

$$4x(1 - x) + (192 \ln(2) - 96)(x - 0.5)^2 x(1 - x) - 1 = 0,$$

and hence $0.5, 0.5, u, 1 - u$ is the exhaustive set of roots of $f^{(2)}(x) = 0$. If there exists $z < z' < 1$ such that $f^{(1)}(z') = 0$, then proceeding as before we can obtain $u' \in (z, z')$ such that $f^{(2)}(u') = 0$. However this is not possible as $f^{(2)}(\cdot)$ can admit at most four real roots. Hence $f^{(1)}(x) = 0$ has only two roots in $[0.5, 1]$, one at 0.5 and the other at z . We can say the following about $f^{(1)}(\cdot)$,

$$\begin{cases} f^{(1)}(x) &\geq 0 &\text{on } x \in [0.5, z], \\ f^{(1)}(x) &< 0 &\text{on } x \in (z, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Therefore $f(\cdot)$ increases from 0.5 to z and thereafter decreases from z to 1. For $x \in [0.5, z]$, $f(x) \geq f(0.5) = 0$. For $x \in (z, 1]$, $f(x) \geq f(1) = 0.5 + (1/16)(16 \ln(2) - 8) - \ln(2) = 0$. This proves the upper bound for $H(x, 1/2)$.

For proving the lower bound on $H(x, 1/2)$, we proceed in the same way as for proving the upper bound. We define $f(\cdot)$ the same way as before with $(16 \ln(2) - 8)$ replaced by $4/3$,

$$f(x) = 2(x - 0.5)^2 + (4/3)(x - 0.5)^4 - \ln(2) - x \ln(x) - (1 - x) \ln(1 - x).$$

Note that this time we have, $f^{(1)}(0.5) = f^{(2)}(0.5) = f^{(3)}(0.5) = f^{(4)}(0.5) = f^{(5)}(0.5) = 0$. We also have $f^{(6)}(0.5) = -24(32 + 32) < 0$. Therefore like before, we can find $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f^{(1)}(x) < 0$ for all $x \in (0.5, 0.5 + \epsilon)$. From the previous analysis, we know that $f^{(1)}(\cdot)$ can not have more than one root in $(0.5, 1]$. If $f^{(1)}(x)$ does not have any root in $(0.5, 1]$, we can say that $f^{(1)}(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in [0.5, 1]$ (as otherwise by intermediate value property we can find a root of $f^{(1)}(\cdot)$ in $(0.5, 1]$). Therefore $f(\cdot)$ is a decreasing function in $[0.5, 1]$ implying that $f(x) \leq f(0.5) = 0$ for all $x \in [0.5, 1]$. If $f^{(1)}(x)$ has a root $z \in (0.5, 1]$, we observe that $f^{(1)}(x) < 0$ in both the intervals $(0.5, z)$ and $(z, 1]$. Therefore $f^{(1)}(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in [0.5, 1]$ implying that $f(x) \leq f(0.5) = 0$ for all $x \in [0.5, 1]$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Proposition 1. X_1, \dots, X_n are independent and identically distributed random variables from a distribution function F whose median is θ_0 and $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$. Then we have the following for all sample sizes $n \geq 1$ and for all distribution functions F such that $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (\text{E.2})$$

where,

$$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}} = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{n}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{n \log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \leq \frac{n}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{n \log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \right\}. \quad (\text{E.3})$$

Proof of Proposition 1. We have the following from Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/2} |\widehat{F}_n(\theta_0) - F(\theta_0)| \geq \lambda\right) \leq 2e^{-2\lambda^2}, \quad (\text{E.4})$$

where \widehat{F}_n is the empirical distribution function. The above holds for $n \geq 1$. Setting $\lambda = \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)/2}$ and using $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$, we get that the following holds for all $n \geq 1$ and for all distribution functions F with $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/2} |\widehat{F}_n(\theta_0) - (1/2)| \geq \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)/2}\right) \leq \alpha \\ \implies & \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/2} |\widehat{F}_n(\theta_0) - (1/2)| \leq \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)/2}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha \\ \implies & \mathbb{P}\left(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.5})$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{Hoeff}} & := \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : n^{1/2} |\widehat{F}_n(\theta) - 1/2| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \right\}, \\ & = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{n}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{n \log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \leq \frac{n}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{n \log(2/\alpha)}{2}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.6})$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 2. We have the following inequality for $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$z_{\alpha/2} \leq \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Proof of Proposition 2. To prove this, we shall first show that, $x(1 - \Phi(x)) \leq \phi(x)$. Consider the function, $f(x) = -(\phi(x)/x)$. We observe that,

$$\frac{df}{dx} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{x^2}\right) \phi(x). \quad (\text{E.8})$$

We perform the following computation,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \Phi(x) &= \int_{t=x}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_{t=x}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{x^2}\right) \phi(x) dx \\ &= \int_{t=x}^{\infty} \frac{df}{dx} dx \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} f(t) - f(x) \\ &= -f(x) \\ &= \frac{\phi(x)}{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.9})$$

Thus we have shown that,

$$1 - \Phi(x) \leq \frac{\phi(x)}{x}. \quad (\text{E.10})$$

Substituting $\sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}$ in place of x in the above equation, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \Phi(\sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}) &\leq \frac{\phi(\sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)})}{\sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi \log(2/\alpha)}} \exp(-\log(2/\alpha)) \\ &< \alpha/2 \\ &= 1 - \Phi(z_{\alpha/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.11})$$

The above deduction implies that $\Phi(\sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}) \geq \Phi(z_{\alpha/2})$ and since $\Phi(\cdot)$ is a monotonically increasing function, we can say that $z_{\alpha/2} \leq \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 10. Suppose $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$ and let θ_h be the $(0.5 + h)$ -th population quantile of the distribution F i.e. if $X \sim F$ then $\mathbb{P}(X \leq \theta_h) \geq 0.5 + h$ and $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \theta_h) \geq 0.5 - h$. If $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ is the confidence interval returned by Algorithm 1 then

$$\inf_{h \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]} \mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \geq 1 - \alpha - 2\alpha n(n-1)(1+2\varepsilon)^{n-2}\varepsilon^2.$$

Proof of Theorem 10. We have $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. We recall the following from Algorithm 1,

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\}, \\ \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha} := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\} \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover the $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval that we work with is $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}$. We want to compute the probability that our confidence interval for the median contains θ_h . We observe the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) \quad \text{where } W_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 0.5 + h). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\} \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(Z_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) \quad \text{where } Z_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 0.5 - h). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 0.5)$. We consider the following functions $\{f_k(\cdot)\}_{k=0}^n$,

$$f_k(h) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(W_n = k)}{\mathbb{P}(Y_n = k)} = (1 + 2h)^k (1 - 2h)^{n-k} \quad \text{for } h \in (-0.5, 0.5) \text{ and } k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}.$$

We can check that $f_k(0) = 1$ and $f'_k(0) = 2(2k - n)$ (the derivative is taken w.r.t. h) for $k = 0, \dots, n$. We also have the following bound on $f''_k(h)$ for $h \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$,

$$\begin{aligned} f''_k(h) &= 4k(k-1)(1+2h)^{k-2}(1-2h)^{n-k} - 8k(n-k)(1+2h)^{k-1}(1-2h)^{n-k-1} \\ &\quad + 4(n-k)(n-k-1)(1+2h)^k(1-2h)^{n-k-2} \\ &\leq 4(1+2\varepsilon)^{n-2}\{k(k-1) - 2k(n-k) + (n-k)(n-k-1)\} \\ &= 4(1+2\varepsilon)^{n-2}\{(2k-n)^2 - n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $k < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}$ then $f''_k(h) \leq u_{n,\varepsilon}$ for $h \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ where $u_{n,\varepsilon} = 4n(n-1)(1+2\varepsilon)^{n-2}$. For $h \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ we have the following bounds on $\mathbb{P}(W_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})$ and $\mathbb{P}(Z_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) &= \sum_{k < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} \mathbb{P}(W_n = k) \\ &= \sum_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} f_k(h) \mathbb{P}(Y_n = k) \\ &\leq \sum_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} [f_k(0) + f'_k(0)h + (1/2)u_{n,\varepsilon}\varepsilon^2] \mathbb{P}(Y_n = k) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(Y_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) + \sum_{k < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} 2(2k-n)h \mathbb{P}(Y_n = k) + \frac{u_{n,\varepsilon}}{2} \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{P}(Y_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{2} + \sum_{k < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} 2(2k-n)h \mathbb{P}(Y_n = k) + \frac{u_{n,\varepsilon}\alpha}{4} \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Z_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) &= \sum_{k < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} \mathbb{P}(Z_n = k) \\ &= \sum_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} f_k(-h) \mathbb{P}(Y_n = k) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{2} - \sum_{k < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}} 2(2k-n)h \mathbb{P}(Y_n = k) + \frac{u_{n,\varepsilon}\alpha}{4} \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above derivations we have the following for $h \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\theta_h \notin \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) &= \mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in (\widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha})^c) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha}^c \cup \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}^c) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha}^c) + \mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}^c) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(W_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) + \mathbb{P}(Z_n < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) \\
&\leq \alpha + \frac{u_{n,\varepsilon}\alpha}{2}\varepsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus for $h \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ we can say that $\mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \geq 1 - \alpha - (u_{n,\varepsilon}\alpha/2)\varepsilon^2$. We note that for fixed sample size n as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $u_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 4n(n-1)$. Thus the coverage probability of θ_h , $\mathbb{P}(\theta_h \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \geq 1 - \alpha + o(h^2)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. \square

Lemma 2. *If U_1, \dots, U_n are i.i.d. random variables from Uniform(0,1) distribution, we have the following concentration inequality for the k th order statistic $U_{k:n}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|U_{k:n} - \frac{k}{n+1}\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left|1 - \frac{2k}{n+1}\right| \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}\right) \geq 1 - 2n^{-2}. \quad (\text{E.12})$$

The following simplified inequalities suffice, respectively, for $k \ll (n+1)/2$ and $k \approx (n+1)/2$. But they are, nonetheless, valid for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\left|U_{k:n} - \frac{k}{n+1}\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{4k\log(n)}{(n+1)^2} + \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}}\right) &\geq 1 - 2n^{-2}, \\
\mathbb{P}\left(\left|U_{k:n} - \frac{k}{n+1}\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n+1}} + \left|1 - \frac{2k}{n+1}\right| \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}\right) &\geq 1 - 2n^{-2}.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.13})$$

Proof of Lemma 2. It is well-known that $U_{k:n} \sim \text{Beta}(k, n-k+1)$. Here $U_{k:n}$ represents the k -th smallest among n iid uniform random variables U_1, \dots, U_n . Proposition 2.1 of [Dumbgen \[1998\]](#) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(U_{k:n} \geq x) &\leq \exp(-(n+1)\Psi(x, k/(n+1))), \quad \text{if } x \geq k/(n+1), \\
\mathbb{P}(U_{k:n} \leq x) &\leq \exp(-(n+1)\Psi(x, k/(n+1))), \quad \text{if } x \leq k/(n+1),
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.14})$$

where

$$\Psi(x, p) = p \log\left(\frac{p}{x}\right) + (1-p) \log\left(\frac{1-p}{1-x}\right).$$

Note that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \Psi(x, p) = -\frac{p}{x} + \frac{1-p}{1-x} = \frac{x-p}{x(1-x)}.$$

This implies that $x \mapsto \Psi(x, p)$ is a decreasing function for $x \leq p$ and an increasing function for $x > p$.

Consider now the event

$$\{\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \eta, U_{k:n} \geq k/(n+1)\}.$$

The function $x \mapsto \Psi(x, k/(n+1))$ is increasing on $[k/(n+1), 1]$ and in particular, there is a unique solution $x_\eta \geq k/(n+1)$ to the equation $\Psi(x, k/(n+1)) = \eta$. Therefore,

$$U_{k:n} \geq \frac{k}{n+1} \text{ and } \Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \eta \quad \Rightarrow \quad U_{k:n} \geq x_\eta.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \eta, U_{k:n} \geq k/(n+1)) &\leq \mathbb{P}(U_{k:n} \geq x_\eta) \\ &\leq \exp(-(n+1)\Psi(x_\eta, k/(n+1))) \\ &= \exp(-(n+1)\eta). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.15})$$

Here the second inequality follows from (E.14) because $x_\eta \geq k/(n+1)$. A similar argument corresponding to the event $\{\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \eta, U_{k:n} \leq k/(n+1)\}$ implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \eta, U_{k:n} \leq k/(n+1)) \leq \exp(-(n+1)\eta). \quad (\text{E.16})$$

Combining (E.15) and (E.16), we get that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \eta) \leq 2 \exp(-(n+1)\eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta > 0.$$

Replacing η with $\eta/(n+1)$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}((n+1)\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \eta) \leq 2 \exp(-\eta) \quad \text{for any } \eta > 0. \quad (\text{E.17})$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-2}$,

$$\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \leq \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}.$$

Proposition 2.1 of [Dumbgen \[1998\]](#) again implies then that with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &-\sqrt{\frac{2k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}} - \left(1 - \frac{2k}{n+1}\right)_- \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1} \\ &\leq U_{k:n} - \frac{k}{n+1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(1 - \frac{2k}{n+1}\right)_+ \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $(x)_+ = \max\{0, x\}$. This can be succinctly written as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|U_{k:n} - \frac{k}{n+1}\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}} + \left|1 - \frac{2k}{n+1}\right| \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}\right) \geq 1 - 2n^{-2}. \quad (\text{E.18})$$

For $k \ll (n+1)/2$, we can use $(1 - k/(n+1)) \in [0, 1]$ and $|1 - 2k/(n+1)| \leq 1$, and further simplify this to write

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|U_{k:n} - \frac{k}{n+1}\right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{4k \log(n)}{(n+1)^2} + \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}}\right) \geq 1 - 2n^{-2}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. Then for every sample size $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-2}$,

$$\left| (F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}))) - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \leq \frac{5.18 + 0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 2 \log n + 2(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2})^{1/2} \sqrt{\log n}}{n+1}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3. We shall use Lemma 2 to perform finite sample analysis of $F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})$ where F is assumed to be a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 . Under the assumption that F is a continuous c.d.f. $Y_i = F(X_i)$ are i.i.d. from $U \stackrel{d}{=} U(0, 1)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Note that, we have $Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} = F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)})$ and $Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})} = F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})$. Theorem 1.6.7 of Reiss [2012] implies that the spacing $Y_{(r)} - Y_{(s)}$ has the same distribution as $Y_{(r-s)}$. Thus we obtain that

$$Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})} \stackrel{d}{=} \begin{cases} Y_{(2c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ Y_{(2c_{n,\alpha} + 2)}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

We now apply the concentration inequality with $k = 2c_{n,\alpha} + 1$ and $k = 2c_{n,\alpha} + 2$ for n even and n odd, respectively. For notational convenience, set $k_{n,\alpha} = 2c_{n,\alpha} + 1 + \mathbb{1}\{n \text{ odd}\}$. We thus obtain that,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})} - \frac{k_{n,\alpha}}{n+1} \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{4k_{n,\alpha} \log n}{(n+1)^2} + \frac{2 \log n}{n+1}} \right) \geq 1 - 2n^{-2}. \quad (\text{E.19})$$

Theorem 1 states that,

$$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{2 \ln(2) - 1}{n^2}} \right\} - 1.5 \leq c_{n,\alpha} - \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \leq 1.$$

We observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{2 \ln(2) - 1}{n^2}} \right\} - 1.5 &= -\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{1 + \frac{2 \ln(2) - 1}{n^2}} - 1.5 \\ &\geq -\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10\sqrt{n}} - \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2)}{2}} - 1.5 \\ &\geq -\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10\sqrt{n}} - 2.1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can say that,

$$-\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10\sqrt{n}} - 2.1 \leq c_{n,\alpha} - \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \leq 1.$$

Note that we are concerned with $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha) = \log(2/\alpha)/\log 2$. Hence $z_{\alpha/2} \leq \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)} \leq \sqrt{2 \log(2)n}$. Using this inequality we have, $z_{\alpha/2}^3/(5\sqrt{n}) \leq z_{\alpha/2}^2/4$. Using this and the above simplified bounds obtained from Theorem 1, we have,

$$\left| \frac{k_{n,\alpha} - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{n+1} \right| \leq \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 4}{n+1}.$$

We also have,

$$\left| \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{n+1} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \right| = \left| \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}(n+1)} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\sqrt{2\log(2)}}{n+1} \right| \leq \frac{1.18}{n+1}. \quad (\text{E.20})$$

Combining the above three inequalities we obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2n^{-2}$ the following inequality holds true,

$$\begin{aligned} |(Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - Y_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}) - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})| &\leq \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4k_{n,\alpha} \log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2 \log n}{n+1} \\ &\leq \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2 \log n}{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.21})$$

Thus, we have shown that for $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, the following event occurs with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2n^{-2}$,

$$|(F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})) - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})| \leq \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2 \log n}{n+1}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. Note that we can further simplify the bounds as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2 \log n}{n+1} &\leq \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \frac{4\sqrt{\log n}}{n+1} + \frac{2\sqrt{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} \log n}}{n+1} + \frac{2 \log n}{n+1} \\ &\leq \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \frac{6 + 2\sqrt{z_{\alpha/2}}}{(n+1)^{3/4}} (\log(n) + 1) \\ &\leq \frac{0.5 \log(2/\alpha) + 5.18}{n+1} + \frac{6 + 2(2 \log(2/\alpha))^{1/4}}{(n+1)^{3/4}} (\log(n) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can say that for $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, the following event occurs with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2n^{-2}$,

$$|(F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})) - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})| \leq \frac{0.5 \log(2/\alpha) + 5.18}{n+1} + \frac{6 + 2(2 \log(2/\alpha))^{1/4}}{(n+1)^{3/4}} (\log(n) + 1),$$

which can be also written as,

$$|\sqrt{n}(F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})) - z_{\alpha/2}| \leq \frac{0.5 \log(2/\alpha) + 5.18}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{6 + 2(2 \log(2/\alpha))^{1/4}}{n^{1/4}} (\log(n) + 1)$$

□

Lemma 4. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 . Then for every sample size $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, we have the following,

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(|F(X_{(k_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(\theta_0)| \leq A_n) &\geq 1 - 2n^{-2}, \\ \mathbb{P}(|F(X_{(n - k_{n,\alpha})}) - F(\theta_0)| \leq B_n) &\geq 1 - 2n^{-2}, \end{cases}$$

where $k_{n,\alpha} = G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2))$ and A_n, B_n are defined as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{4}{n}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}, \\ B_n &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{3}{2n} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{3}{n}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.22})$$

Proof of Lemma 4. Using Lemma 2 with $k = k_{n,\alpha} + 1$, we have the following inequality with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2n^{-2}$ for all sample sizes $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| F(X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}) - \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n+1} \right| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2(k_{n,\alpha} + 1)}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n+1}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left|1 - \frac{2(k_{n,\alpha} + 1)}{n+1}\right| \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{4\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{2(k_{n,\alpha} + 1)}{n+1} - 1\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{2((n/2) + (\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2) + 2)}{n+1} - 1\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{4}{n}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The above follows from the application of the lower and upper bound on $k_{n,\alpha}$ mentioned in (E.54). In the above computation we also used the fact that $2(k_{n,\alpha} + 1) \geq n + 1$. This holds because $k_{n,\alpha} = G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) \geq (n - 1)/2$ which implies that $2(k_{n,\alpha} + 1) \geq n + 1$. By another application of (E.54) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right| &= \left(\frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{(n/2) + (\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2) + 2}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities using triangle inequality we obtain that,

$$\mathbb{P}(|F(X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}) - F(\theta_0)| \leq A_n) \geq 1 - 2n^{-2},$$

where A_n is as defined in the lemma. Note that since $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$, we have replaced $1/2$ with $F(\theta_0)$. We proceed in a similar manner to prove the other inequality. Using Lemma 2 with $k = n - k_{n,\alpha}$, we have the following inequality with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2n^{-2}$ for all sample sizes $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| F(X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}) - \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n+1} \right| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2(n - k_{n,\alpha})}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n+1}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left|1 - \frac{2(n - k_{n,\alpha})}{n+1}\right| \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \frac{4\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(1 - \frac{2(n - k_{n,\alpha})}{n+1}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(1 - \frac{2(n - ((n/2) + (\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2) + 1))}{n+1}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{3}{n}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We showed earlier that $2(k_{n,\alpha} + 1) \geq n + 1$. This implies that $2(n - k_{n,\alpha}) \leq n + 1$. We have used this in the above derivation to remove the modulus. Using (E.54) we obtain that,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n + 1} - \frac{1}{2} \right| &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n + 1} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n - ((n/2) + (\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2) + 1)}{n + 1} \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + 3}{n + 1} \\ &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{3}{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities using triangle inequality we obtain that,

$$\mathbb{P}(|F(X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}) - F(\theta_0)| \leq B_n) \geq 1 - 2n^{-2},$$

where B_n is as defined in the lemma. We note that $[n/2] + c_{n,\alpha} + 1 = k_{n,\alpha} + 1$ and $[n/2] - c_{n,\alpha} = n - k_{n,\alpha}$. Thus the confidence interval of θ_0 for $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, $[X_{([n/2]-c_{n,\alpha})}, X_{([n/2]+c_{n,\alpha}+1)}]$ is same as the confidence interval $[X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}, X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}]$. \square

Proposition 3. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Assume that F is a continuous c.d.f. whose p -th quantile is η_p (i.e. $F^{-1}(p) = \eta_p$). Let $\{k_n\}$ be a sequence of positive integers such that $k_n = np + O(n^{1/2})$. Then we have,

$$F(X_{(k_n)}) = \frac{k_n}{n} - F_n(\eta_p) + F(\eta_p) + R_n, \quad (\text{E.23})$$

where $\sqrt{n}R_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

Proof of Proposition 3. We observe that if F is a continuous distribution function then $F(X_1), F(X_2), \dots, F(X_n)$ are i.i.d. Uniform(0, 1) random variables. Let $Y_i = F(X_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. The Y_i 's are i.i.d. from $U \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$. Applying Theorem-1 of Ghosh [1971] on $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U$ and noting that $p_n - p = (k_n/n) - p = O(n^{-1/2})$ and $F(\eta_p) = p$, we obtain the desired result. \square

Lemma 5. $(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n})$ has the following asymptotic joint distribution,

$$\sqrt{n}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}) \xrightarrow{d} N\left(\left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2}, -\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2}\right), \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T\right).$$

Proof of Lemma 5. We decompose $Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}$ and $Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} &= P_n + S_n, \\ Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} &= R_n + T_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.24})$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} P_n &= \left(\frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \\ R_n &= \left(\frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \\ S_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq (k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n\} - \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n}, \\ T_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq (n - k_{n,\alpha})/n\} - \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.25})$$

We shall obtain the asymptotic joint distribution of (S_n, T_n) by deriving the asymptotic distributions of the linear combinations $l_1 S_n + l_2 T_n$ where $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. We shall use Lyapounov CLT for this purpose. We define Y_{ni} for $i = 1, \dots, n$ as follows,

$$Y_{ni} = \frac{l_1(\mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq p_{1n}\} - p_{1n}) + l_2(\mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq p_{2n}\} - p_{2n})}{\sqrt{n(l_1^2 p_{1n}(1-p_{1n}) + l_2^2 p_{2n}(1-p_{2n}) + 2l_1 l_2 p_{2n}(1-p_{1n}))}}, \quad (\text{E.26})$$

where $p_{1n} = (k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n$ and $p_{2n} = (n - k_{n,\alpha})/n$. Note that for each n , Y_{ni} for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are mutually independent. The following conditions can be easily verified:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{ni}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } n, i, \quad (\text{E.27})$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(Y_{ni}^2) = 1 \quad \text{for all } n, \quad (\text{E.28})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(Y_{ni}^4) = 0. \quad (\text{E.29})$$

Thus using Lyapounov CLT we obtain that $\sum_{i=1}^n Y_{ni} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$. In other words, for any $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ we have,

$$\sqrt{n}(l_1 S_n + l_2 T_n) \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{1}{4}(l_1 + l_2)^2\right). \quad (\text{E.30})$$

To obtain above, we used the fact that both p_{1n} and p_{2n} converge to $1/2$ as n goes to infinity. Hence the asymptotic joint distribution of (S_n, T_n) is as follows,

$$\sqrt{n}(S_n, T_n) \xrightarrow{d} N\left((0, 0), \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T\right). \quad (\text{E.31})$$

From earlier computations we know that $\sqrt{n}P_n \rightarrow z_{\alpha/2}/2$ and $\sqrt{n}R_n \rightarrow -z_{\alpha/2}/2$. Applying Slutsky's theorem we get that,

$$\sqrt{n}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}) \xrightarrow{d} (W_1, W_2), \quad (\text{E.32})$$

where,

$$(W_1, W_2) \sim N\left(\left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2}, -\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2}\right), \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T\right). \quad (\text{E.33})$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

S.2 Proof of Theorem 1

At first we shall compute the value of $c_{n,\alpha}$ which has been defined in Step 1 of Algorithm Algorithm 1. Let $G_n(\cdot)$ denote the cumulative distribution function of $\text{Bin}(n, 1/2)$ and let

$$G_n^{-1}(p) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : G_n(x) \geq p\},$$

denote the quantile function (inverse CDF) of $\text{Bin}(n, 1/2)$ distribution. Let us first consider the case that n is even. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{n,\alpha} &= \inf\{x : \mathbb{P}(Y_n \geq (n/2) - x) \geq 1 - \alpha/2\} \text{ where } Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2) \\ &= \inf\left\{x : 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(Y_n < \frac{n}{2} - x\right) \geq 1 - \alpha/2\right\} \text{ where } Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2) \\ &= \inf\{x : 1 - G_n((n/2) - x - 1) \geq 1 - \alpha/2\} \\ &= \inf\{x : G_n((n/2) + x) \geq 1 - \alpha/2\} \\ &= G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) - (n/2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.34})$$

The second last inequality follows from the following computation,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_n\left(\frac{n}{2} - c_{n,\alpha} - 1\right) &= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=0}^{\frac{n}{2} - c_{n,\alpha} - 1} \binom{n}{t} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=0}^{\frac{n}{2} - c_{n,\alpha} - 1} \binom{n}{n-t} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=\frac{n}{2} + c_{n,\alpha} + 1}^n \binom{n}{t} \\
&= 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=0}^{\frac{n}{2} + c_{n,\alpha}} \binom{n}{t} \\
&= 1 - G_n\left(\frac{n}{2} + c_{n,\alpha}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{E.35}$$

We approach in a similar manner for the case when n is odd.

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{n,\alpha} &= \inf \left\{ x : \mathbb{P} \left(Y_n \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - x \right) \geq 1 - \alpha/2 \right\} \text{ where } Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2) \\
&= \inf \left\{ x : 1 - \mathbb{P} \left(Y_n < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - x \right) \geq 1 - \alpha/2 \right\} \text{ where } Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2) \\
&= \inf \left\{ x : 1 - G_n \left(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - x - 1 \right) \geq 1 - \alpha/2 \right\} \\
&= \inf \{ x : G_n(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + x + 1) \geq 1 - \alpha/2 \} \\
&= G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor.
\end{aligned} \tag{E.36}$$

The second last inequality again follows from the following computation,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_n(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} - 1) &= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} - 1} \binom{n}{t} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} - 1} \binom{n}{n-t} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 2}^n \binom{n}{t} \\
&= 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1} \binom{n}{t} \\
&= 1 - G_n(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{E.37}$$

Hence combining both the cases (for even and odd sample sizes) we conclude that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$c_{n,\alpha} = G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) - \lfloor (n/2) \rfloor. \tag{E.38}$$

Proof of 1 From the derivation of the value of $c_{n,\alpha}$, we obtain that

$$c_{n,\alpha} \in \{ x : \mathbb{P}(Y_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - x) \geq 1 - \alpha/2 \}.$$

This holds because $G_n(G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2))) \geq 1 - (\alpha/2)$. Hence we can say the following,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}) \geq 1 - \alpha/2 \quad \text{where } Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2). \quad (\text{E.39})$$

We now note that under the assumption that X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are independent and identically distributed as F with median θ_0 . Thus, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha}) &= \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta_0\} \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{Y_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\} \quad \text{where } Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2) \\ &\geq 1 - \alpha/2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.40})$$

Similarly we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}) &= \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta_0\} \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{Y_n \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\} \quad \text{where } Y_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/2) \\ &\geq 1 - \alpha/2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.41})$$

Combining the above two equations, the coverage probability of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}$ is obtained as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) &= \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha}) + \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}) - \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \in \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cup \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha}) \\ &\geq (1 - \alpha/2) + (1 - \alpha/2) - 1 \\ &= 1 - \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.42})$$

This proves the first part of the theorem.

Proof of 2 We observe that if $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} = 0$, then

$$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha} = \mathbb{R} \cap \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R},$$

because both $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\}$ are greater than or equal to 0 no matter what the value of θ is. Hence we shall obtain a non-trivial confidence region only when $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} > 0$. This condition can be further simplified as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} > 0 &\iff \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - (G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor) > 0 \\ &\iff G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \\ &\iff G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) < n \\ &\iff G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) \leq n - 1 \\ &\iff G_n(n - 1) \geq 1 - (\alpha/2) \\ &\iff 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} \geq 1 - (\alpha/2) \\ &\iff n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.43})$$

Therefore we conclude that if $n < \log_2(2/\alpha)$, then $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = \mathbb{R}$. If $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, then the confidence interval is non-trivial as $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} > 0$. We now show that if $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, then $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ can be represented in terms of the order statistics. Recall that

$$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha},$$

where,

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\}, \\ \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\} \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}\}. \end{cases}$$

Observe that if $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})} \leq \theta &\iff \text{At least } \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \text{ many } X_i\text{'s are less than or equal to } \theta \\ &\iff \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}. \end{aligned} \tag{E.44}$$

This implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} &= \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \leq \theta\} \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \right\} \\ &= \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})} \leq \theta\} \\ &= [X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}, \infty). \end{aligned} \tag{E.45}$$

We also note that under the condition $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} > 0$, the following happens,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} \geq \theta &\iff X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}, \dots, X_{(n)} \geq \theta \\ &\iff \text{At least } n - (\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1) + 1 = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \text{ many } X_i\text{'s are } \geq \theta \\ &\iff \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\} \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}. \end{aligned} \tag{E.46}$$

This implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha} &= \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{X_i \geq \theta\} \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha} \right\} \\ &= \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} \geq \theta\} \\ &= (-\infty, X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}]. \end{aligned} \tag{E.47}$$

This shows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} &= \widehat{\text{CI}}_{1,n,\alpha} \cap \widehat{\text{CI}}_{2,n,\alpha} \\ &= [X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}, \infty) \cap (-\infty, X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}] \\ &= [X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}, X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}]. \end{aligned} \tag{E.48}$$

This completes the proof of the second part of the theorem.

Proof of 3 We shall now establish the relation between $c_{n,\alpha}$ and the normal quantile, $z_{\alpha/2}$. We have already seen that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_{n,\alpha} = G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) - \lfloor (n/2) \rfloor$. Suppose $G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) = k$. We know that $G_n^{-1}(1 - (\alpha/2)) = k$ iff the following two inequalities hold true:

$$G_n(k-1) < 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \leq G_n(k). \quad (\text{E.49})$$

Note that $1 - \alpha/2 \geq 1 - 2^{-n}$ (or equivalently, $n \leq \log_2(2/\alpha)$) if and only if $k = n$ because $G_n(n-1) = 1 - 2^{-n}$ and $G_n(n) = 1$. Therefore, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\log_2(2/\alpha) < n$, $k \leq n-1$. For such k , the universal inequalities for binomial distribution mentioned in Theorem 1 of [Zubkov and Serov \[2012\]](#) imply that,

$$C_n(k-1) \leq G_n(k-1) \leq C_n(k) \leq G_n(k) \leq C_n(k+1) \quad \text{for all } k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\},$$

where for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,

$$C_n(k) = \Phi \left(\operatorname{sgn} \left(\frac{k}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \sqrt{2nH \left(\frac{k}{n}, \frac{1}{2} \right)} \right), \quad \text{with } H(x, 1/2) = x \ln(2x) + (1-x) \ln(2-2x).$$

Suppose $k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is such that $C_n(k') < 1 - \alpha/2 \leq C_n(k'+1)$, then

$$G_n(k'-1) \leq C_n(k') < 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \leq C_n(k'+1) \leq G_n(k'+1).$$

This implies $k \in \{k', k'+1\}$ or equivalently, $k' \leq k \leq k'+1$. Note that for $\alpha < 1$,

$$C_n(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor) = \Phi \left(-\sqrt{2nH \left(\frac{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}{n}, \frac{1}{2} \right)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} < 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad C_n(\lceil n/2 \rceil) = \Phi \left(\sqrt{2nH \left(\frac{\lceil n/2 \rceil}{n}, \frac{1}{2} \right)} \right) > \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence, $k' = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ if and only if

$$\Phi \left(\sqrt{2nH \left(\frac{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}{n}, \frac{1}{2} \right)} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad H \left(\frac{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}{n}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \geq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n}.$$

If n is even, this cannot occur as $H(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor/n, 1/2) = 0$ in this case. If n is odd, then $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor = (n+1)/2$ and the inequality $H(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor/n, 1/2) \geq z_{\alpha/2}^2/(2n)$ becomes

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n} \right) \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n} \right) \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) = H \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \geq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n}. \quad (\text{E.50})$$

By Lemma 1 we get $H(x, 1/2) \geq 2(x-1/2)^2 + (4/3)(x-1/2)^4$. This implies that inequality (E.50) holds only if

$$2 \left(\frac{1}{2n} \right)^2 + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2n} \right)^4 \geq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{6n^3} \geq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n}.$$

Assume n is large enough so that $H(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor/n, 1/2) < z_{\alpha/2}^2/(2n)$. Then $k' > n/2$ and hence,

$$C_n(k') < 1 - \alpha/2 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad H \left(\frac{k'}{n}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n}.$$

Similarly, $C_n(k' + 1) \geq 1 - \alpha/2$ becomes

$$H\left(\frac{k' + 1}{n}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \geq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n}.$$

Hence, the defining inequality for k' is

$$H\left(\frac{k'}{n}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n} \leq H\left(\frac{k' + 1}{n}, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

From Lemma 1 we know that,

$$2(x - 1/2)^2 + (4/3)(x - 1/2)^4 \leq H(x, 1/2) \leq 2(x - 1/2)^2 + 3.2(x - 1/2)^4 \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, 1].$$

Therefore, k' satisfies

$$2\left(\frac{k'}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + (4/3)\left(\frac{k'}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^4 \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n} \leq 2\left(\frac{k' + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + 3.2\left(\frac{k' + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^4.$$

These inequalities are equivalent to

$$\frac{k'}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\sqrt{9 + \frac{6z_{\alpha/2}^2}{n}} - 3} \Leftrightarrow k' \leq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{(1/2)\sqrt{1 + (2/3)z_{\alpha/2}^2/n} + 1/2}},$$

and

$$\frac{k' + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\sqrt{25 + \frac{80z_{\alpha/2}^2}{2n}} - 5} \Leftrightarrow k' \geq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{(1/2)\sqrt{1 + (8/5)z_{\alpha/2}^2/n} + (1/2)}} - 1.$$

Therefore, we conclude that if $z_{\alpha/2}^2 \geq 2nH(\lceil n/2 \rceil/n, 0.5)$,

$$\frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{1 + (8/5)z_{\alpha/2}^2/n} + 1}} - 1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{1 + (2/3)z_{\alpha/2}^2/n} + 1}} + 1. \quad (\text{E.51})$$

Both upper and lower bounds are asymptotically the same as $n/2 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2$. The right-hand side is less than $n/2 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}/2 + 1$ for all $n \geq 1$. To simplify the left-hand side, define $f(c) = \sqrt{2/(1 + \sqrt{1 + c})} - 1$. Clearly, $f''(c) \geq 0$, $f''(c) \leq 2^{-3/2}/4 + (3/8)2^{-5/2}$ for all $c \geq 0$ and hence,

$$-\frac{1}{8}c = f(0) + f'(0)c \leq f(c) \leq f(0) = 0.$$

This implies

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{1 + \sqrt{1 + (8/5)z_{\alpha/2}^2/n}}} - 1 \right) \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \left(-\frac{18}{85} \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^2}{n} \right) = -\frac{1}{10} \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that if $z_{\alpha/2}^2 \geq 2nH(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor/n, 0.5)$, then

$$\frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10\sqrt{n}} - 1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} + 1. \quad (\text{E.52})$$

If, on the other hand, $z_{\alpha/2}^2 \leq 2nH(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor/n, 0.5)$, then

$$\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{n}{2} - 1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2} + 1.$$

From Lemma 1 and the fact that $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq (n+1)/2$, we get

$$H\left(\frac{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}{n}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \leq 2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + (16\ln(2) - 8)\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^4 \leq \frac{1}{2n^2} + (\ln(2) - 1/2)\frac{1}{n^4}.$$

Therefore, $z_{\alpha/2}^2 \leq 2nH(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor/n, 0.5)$ implies $nz_{\alpha/2}^2 \leq n^{-1} + (2\ln(2) - 1)n^{-3}$. This further implies that if $z_{\alpha/2}^2 \leq 2nH(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor/n, 0.5)$, then

$$\frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{n^{-1} + (2\ln(2) - 1)n^{-3}}}{2} - 1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} + 1. \quad (\text{E.53})$$

Combining inequalities (E.52) and (E.53), we get for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \max\left\{\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{2\ln(2) - 1}{n^2}}\right\} - 1 \leq k - \left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2}\right) \leq 1. \quad (\text{E.54})$$

For $n \leq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, $k = n$. In this case, the confidence interval is anyway \mathbb{R} and there is no need to compare k to the quantile from normal approximation. Using the fact that $c_{n,\alpha} = k - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, we have for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \max\left\{\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{2\ln(2) - 1}{n^2}}\right\} - 1.5 \leq c_{n,\alpha} - \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \leq 1.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

S.3 Proof of Theorem 2

We have already seen that if the sample size $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, the confidence interval described in Algorithm 1 is $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha} = [X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}, X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}]$. We analyse the width of this confidence interval as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) &= X_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - X_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})} \\ &= F_n^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n}\right) - F_n^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{c_{n,\alpha}}{n}\right) \\ &= F^{-1}(1/2) + \frac{c_{n,\alpha}/n}{F'(F^{-1}(1/2))} + \frac{(1/2) - F_n(F^{-1}(1/2))}{F'(F^{-1}(1/2))} \\ &\quad - F^{-1}(1/2) + \frac{c_{n,\alpha}/n}{F'(F^{-1}(1/2))} - \frac{(1/2) - F_n(F^{-1}(1/2))}{F'(F^{-1}(1/2))} + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{2c_{n,\alpha}}{nF'(F^{-1}(1/2))} + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.55})$$

Theorem 1 states that,

$$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{2 \ln(2) - 1}{n^2}} \right\} - 1.5 \leq c_{n,\alpha} - \frac{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}}{2} \leq 1.$$

This implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{n^{3/2}F'(F^{-1}(1/2))} \max \left\{ \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5}, \sqrt{1 + \frac{2 \ln(2) - 1}{n^2}} \right\} - \frac{3}{nF'(F^{-1}(1/2))} &\leq \frac{2c_{n,\alpha}}{nF'(F^{-1}(1/2))} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}F'(F^{-1}(1/2))} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{nF'(F^{-1}(1/2))}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can say that,

$$\frac{2c_{n,\alpha}}{nF'(F^{-1}(1/2))} = \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}F'(F^{-1}(1/2))} + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Using this in (E.55) and the fact that $F^{-1}(1/2) = \theta_0$, we obtain,

$$\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) = \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}F'(\theta_0)} + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{E.56})$$

Note that $z_{\alpha/2}/(\sqrt{n}F'(\theta_0))$ is the width of the Wald confidence interval. This completes the proof of this theorem.

S.4 Proof of Theorem 3

We state and prove a stronger version of the result stated in Theorem 3.

Theorem 11. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 . We assume that the following holds for the distribution function F ,*

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - Mh| \leq C|h|^{1+\delta} \quad \text{for all } |h| < \eta,$$

where $0 < M, C, \delta, \eta < \infty$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &:= (M/2) \min\{\eta, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}, \\ A_n &:= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{4}{n} \right) \frac{2 \log(n)}{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for every sample size $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, we have the following with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 6n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}M} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{M} \left(\frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2 \log n}{n+1} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{2}{M} \right)^{2+\delta} C A_n^{1+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us see how the simpler version presented in Theorem 3 follows from this more general statement. We shall first obtain a bound on A_n .

$$\begin{aligned}
A_n &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{4}{n}\right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1} \\
&= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n+1}} \left(\frac{2}{n}\sqrt{\frac{n+1}{\log n}} + 1 + \frac{8}{n}\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n+1}}\right) \\
&\leq 1.1\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + 5.1\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n+1}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(2n/\alpha)}{n}} \left(\frac{1.1z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{\log(2n/\alpha)}} + 5.1\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log(2n/\alpha)}}\right) \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(2n/\alpha)}{n}} \left(\frac{1.1\sqrt{2\log(2/\alpha)}}{\sqrt{\log(4/\alpha)}} + 5.1\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log(2n)}}\right) \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(2n/\alpha)}{n}} (1.1\sqrt{2} + 5.1) \\
&\leq 7\sqrt{\frac{\log(2n/\alpha)}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the condition $A_n < \zeta$ will be satisfied if $7\sqrt{\log(2n/\alpha)/n} < \zeta$ i.e. $n \geq (49/\zeta^2)\log(2n/\alpha)$. Thus if $n \geq \max\{\log_2(2/\alpha), (49/\zeta^2)\log(2n/\alpha)\}$, then the following holds with probability at-least $1 - 6n^{-2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{\sqrt{n}M}{z_{\alpha/2}} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - 1 \right| \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{z_{\alpha/2}} \left(\frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2})\log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2\log n}{n+1} \right) + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{z_{\alpha/2}} \frac{2^{2+\delta}}{M^{1+\delta}} CA_n^{1+\delta} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}} \left\{ n^{1/4}z_{\alpha/2} \left(1 + \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}}{n^{1/4}} \right) + n^{1/4}\log(n) \left(1 + \frac{2\log(n) + 4\sqrt{\log(n)} + 5.18}{n^{1/4}\log(n)} \right) \right\} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{z_{\alpha/2}} \frac{2^{2+\delta}}{M^{1+\delta}} CA_n^{1+\delta} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n^{1/4}} \left(1 + \frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}}{n^{1/4}} + \frac{13.1\log(n)}{z_{\alpha/2}} \right) + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{z_{\alpha/2}} \frac{2^{2+\delta}}{M^{1+\delta}} C \left(7\sqrt{\frac{\log(2n/\alpha)}{n}} \right)^{1+\delta} \\
&\leq \frac{1 + 14(\log(n)/z_{\alpha/2})}{n^{1/4}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{8n}} + \frac{2C(14)^{1+\delta}(\log(2n/\alpha))^{(1+\delta)/2}}{z_{\alpha/2}M^{1+\delta}n^{\delta/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This is the simpler version which has been stated in Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 11. We first state and prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 . We assume that the following holds for the distribution function F ,

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - Mh| \leq C|h|^{1+\delta} \quad \text{for all } |h| < \eta,$$

where $0 < M, C, \delta, \eta < \infty$. Then for every sample size $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$, we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0| \leq \frac{2A_n}{M}\right) &\geq (1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}, \\ \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{(n-k_n, \alpha)} - \theta_0| \leq \frac{2B_n}{M}\right) &\geq (1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{B_n < \zeta\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.57})$$

where $\zeta = (M/2) \min\{\eta, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}$ and A_n, B_n are as defined in Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 6. We start by observing that for $0 < \epsilon < \eta$ the following inequality holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0| \geq \epsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} \geq \theta_0 + \epsilon) + \mathbb{P}(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} \leq \theta_0 - \epsilon) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) \geq F(\theta_0 + \epsilon)) + \mathbb{P}(F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) \leq F(\theta_0 - \epsilon)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0) \geq F(\theta_0 + \epsilon) - F(\theta_0)) + \mathbb{P}(F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0) \leq F(\theta_0 - \epsilon) - F(\theta_0)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0)| \geq \min\{F(\theta_0 + \epsilon) - F(\theta_0), F(\theta_0 - \epsilon) - F(\theta_0)\}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0)| \geq M\epsilon - C\epsilon^{1+\delta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We observe that if $\epsilon < (M/2C)^{1/\delta}$ then $M\epsilon - C\epsilon^{1+\delta} > M\epsilon - M\epsilon/2 = M\epsilon/2$. Thus if $0 < \epsilon < \min\{\eta, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}$ we can say the following,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0| \leq \epsilon) \geq \mathbb{P}(|F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0)| \leq M\epsilon/2).$$

Setting $M\epsilon/2 = A_n$ (i.e., $\epsilon = 2A_n/M$) we obtain the following provided $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$ and $A_n < \zeta$ where $\zeta = (M/2) \min\{\eta, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0| \leq \frac{2A_n}{M}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}(|F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0)| \leq A_n) \\ &\geq 1 - 2n^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality in the above derivation follows from Lemma 4. This completes the proof of the first concentration inequality. The proof of the second concentration inequality follows exactly the same path. \square

From Lemma 6 we know that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$, $|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0| \leq 2A_n/M$. We observe that $A_n < \zeta$ implies that $A_n < (M/2)\eta$ (i.e. $2A_n/M < \eta$) which in turn implies that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$, $|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0| \leq \eta$. Therefore using the assumption on F (for $|h| < \eta$) mentioned in the theorem we obtain the following for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}\left(|F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0) - M(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0)| \leq C|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta}\right) \geq (1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}, \\ \mathbb{P}\left(|F(X_{(n-k_n, \alpha)}) - F(\theta_0) - M(X_{(n-k_n, \alpha)} - \theta_0)| \leq C|X_{(n-k_n, \alpha)} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta}\right) \geq (1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}. \end{cases}$$

This implies that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$ we have for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M}\{F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0)\} - \frac{C}{M}|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} &\leq X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M}\{F(X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)}) - F(\theta_0)\} + \frac{C}{M}|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

and with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{B_n < \zeta\}$ we have for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M}\{F(X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}) - F(\theta_0)\} - \frac{C}{M}|X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} &\leq X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})} - \theta_0 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M}\{F(X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}) - F(\theta_0)\} + \frac{C}{M}|X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the second equation from the first and further subtracting $z_{\alpha/2}/(\sqrt{n}M)$ from all sides we obtain that with probability $(1 - 4n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{\max\{A_n, B_n\} < \zeta\}$ (i.e. with probability $(1 - 4n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$ as $B_n < A_n$) the following holds for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M}\{F(X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})}) - F(X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}) - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}}\} - \frac{C}{M}|X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} - \frac{C}{M}|X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} \\ \leq X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})} - X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}M} \\ \leq \frac{1}{M}\{F(X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})}) - F(X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}) - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}}\} + \frac{C}{M}|X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} + \frac{C}{M}|X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

We take modulus and apply Lemma 3 and Lemma 6. We get that the following event occurs with probability $(1 - 6n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$ for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})} - X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}M}\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M}\left|F(X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})}) - F(X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}) - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}}\right| + \frac{C}{M}|X_{(k_{n,\alpha+1})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} + \frac{C}{M}|X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0|^{1+\delta} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M}\left(\frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2})\log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2\log n}{n+1}\right) + \frac{C}{M}\left(\left(\frac{2A_n}{M}\right)^{1+\delta} + \left(\frac{2B_n}{M}\right)^{1+\delta}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M}\left(\frac{0.25z_{\alpha/2}^2 + 5.18}{n+1} + \sqrt{\frac{4(4 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2})\log n}{(n+1)^2}} + \frac{2\log n}{n+1}\right) + \left(\frac{2}{M}\right)^{2+\delta} CA_n^{1+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the probability of occurrence of the above event is $(1 - 6n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$ because of the concentration inequality mentioned in Lemma 3 and because of the fact $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(B) - \mathbb{P}(A \cup B) \geq \mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(B) - 1$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

S.5 Proof of Theorem 4

We shall use Proposition 3 to analyse the width of $\widehat{C\mathbb{I}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6). We note that using Theorem 1, we have $c_{n,\alpha} = O(n^{1/2})$. Let θ_0 denote the population median. Since F is a continuous c.d.f. using Proposition 3 for $p = 1/2$ we obtain the following,

$$\begin{aligned} F(X_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{c_{n,\alpha}}{n} - F_n(\theta_0) + F(\theta_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \\ F(X_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}))} &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{c_{n,\alpha}}{n} - F_n(\theta_0) + F(\theta_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \tag{E.58}$$

Combining both the equations, we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned} F(X_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha}))} &= \frac{2c_{n,\alpha}}{n} + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + o_p(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \tag{E.59}$$

where the second equality follows from Theorem 1. Under the assumption made in Theorem 4, we have,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0)|}{|h|^\rho} = M, \quad (\text{E.60})$$

where $\rho \geq 1$ and $0 < M < \infty$. Note that this assumption automatically implies that F is continuous in every neighbourhood of θ_0 . In view of this and the convergence of $X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}$ and $X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}$ to θ_0 in probability, $F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}) = F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}) - F(\theta_0) + F(\theta_0) - F(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})$ can be approximated by $M|X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - \theta_0) + M|\theta_0 - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}|^\rho \text{sgn}(\theta_0 - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})$. Thus we obtain the following,

$$|X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - \theta_0) + |\theta_0 - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}|^\rho \text{sgn}(\theta_0 - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}) = \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}M} + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{E.61})$$

For simplicity, let us denote $a = X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)}$ and $b = X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})}$. Hence clearly $a \geq b$. There can be three possible cases here. If $b \leq \theta_0 \leq a$ holds true, then using Jensen inequality we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned} |a - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(a - \theta_0) + |\theta_0 - b|^\rho \text{sgn}(\theta_0 - b) &= (a - \theta_0)^\rho + (\theta_0 - b)^\rho \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{1}{2}(a - \theta_0)^\rho + \frac{1}{2}(\theta_0 - b)^\rho \right) \\ &\geq 2 \left(\frac{a - \theta_0 + \theta_0 - b}{2} \right)^\rho \\ &\geq \frac{(a - b)^\rho}{2^{\rho-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.62})$$

If $b \leq a \leq \theta_0$ holds true, we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned} |a - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(a - \theta_0) + |\theta_0 - b|^\rho \text{sgn}(\theta_0 - b) &= -(\theta_0 - a)^\rho + (\theta_0 - b)^\rho \\ &= ((\theta_0 - a) + (a - b))^\rho - (\theta_0 - a)^\rho \\ &\geq (a - b)^\rho \\ &\geq \frac{(a - b)^\rho}{2^{\rho-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.63})$$

Similarly we can proceed for the case when $\theta_0 \leq b \leq a$ holds true. Thus we can say that,

$$\frac{(a - b)^\rho}{2^{\rho-1}} \leq |a - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(a - \theta_0) + |\theta_0 - b|^\rho \text{sgn}(\theta_0 - b). \quad (\text{E.64})$$

Using (E.61) and (E.64), we obtain the following,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})^\rho}{2^{\rho-1}} \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}M} + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ \implies &\frac{\sqrt{n}M(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})^\rho}{z_{\alpha/2}} \leq 2^{\rho-1} + o_p(1) \\ \implies &T_n \leq 2^{\rho-1} + o_p(1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.65})$$

where,

$$T_n = \frac{\sqrt{n}M(X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c_{n,\alpha} + 1)} - X_{(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - c_{n,\alpha})})^\rho}{z_{\alpha/2}}. \quad (\text{E.66})$$

It is easy to see that,

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &\leq 2^{\rho-1} + o_p(1) \\ \implies \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) &\leq \left(\frac{2^{\rho-1} z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}M} \right)^{1/\rho} + o_p(n^{-1/2\rho}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.67})$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

S.6 Proof of Theorem 5

We state and prove two theorems which are stronger versions of the result stated in Theorem 5.

Theorem 12. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 . We assume that the following holds for the distribution function F ,*

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - M|h|^\rho \text{sgn}(h)| \leq C|h|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \text{for all } |h| < \eta, \quad (\text{E.68})$$

where $0 < M, C, \rho, \Delta, \eta < \infty$. We define the following quantities,

$$\begin{aligned} k_{n,\alpha} &= c_{n,\alpha} + \lceil n/2 \rceil, \\ \delta &= \Delta/\rho, \\ A_n &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n+1}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{4}{n} \right) \frac{2\log(n)}{n+1}, \\ \zeta &= (M/2) \min\{\eta^\rho, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}, \\ \kappa(k/n, 2, n) &= \max \left\{ \sqrt{21 \frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)}, 21\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \right\}, \\ \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n) &= \max \left\{ \sqrt{12 \frac{k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right)}, 12\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \right\} + \frac{1}{n}, \\ K_n &= \{\kappa((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n)\} \cap \{\kappa((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can say that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event occurs for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n)\} \\ &\leq \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} &= \left(\frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq (k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n\} + \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n}, \\ Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} &= \left(\frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq (n - k_{n,\alpha})/n\} + \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n}, \\ D_2 &= 2 + e^{13/2}, \\ \gamma_n &= \max \left\{ \frac{35}{\sqrt{2}}, 35\sqrt{\frac{35 \log(n)}{n}} \right\} \left(\frac{\log(n)}{n} \right)^{3/4} + C \left(\frac{2A_n}{M} \right)^{1+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 12. We define $H(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as follows,

$$H(t) = F(\theta_0 + |t|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(t)).$$

It is easy to see that $H(\cdot)$ is a distribution function with median 0 i.e. $H(0) = F(\theta_0) = 1/2$. Therefore by substituting $|t|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(t)$ in place of h in assumption (E.68), the assumption on $F(\cdot)$ translates into the following assumption on $H(\cdot)$,

$$|H(t) - H(0) - Mt| \leq C|t|^{1+\delta} \quad \text{for all } |t| < \eta^\rho, \quad (\text{E.69})$$

where $0 < \delta = \Delta/\rho < \infty$ and $0 < M, C, \rho, \eta < \infty$. Assumption (E.69) is identical to the assumption made in Lemma 6. We note that if $X \sim F$ then $H^{-1}(F(X)) \sim H$. Since $H^{-1}(y) = |F^{-1}(y) - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(F^{-1}(y) - \theta_0)$, we obtain that $H^{-1}(F(X)) = |X - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X - \theta_0)$. Therefore if $X \sim F$ then $|X - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X - \theta_0) \sim H$. We now apply Lemma 6 for the distribution function $H(\cdot)$ on the transformed random variables $|X_i - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_i - \theta_0)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ keeping in mind that this is an increasing transformation (which implies that $(|X - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X - \theta_0))_{(k)} = |X_{(k)} - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_{(k)} - \theta_0)$),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{(k_n, \alpha+1)} - \theta_0|^\rho \leq \frac{2A_n}{M}\right) &\geq (1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\} & \text{for } n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha), \\ \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{(n-k_n, \alpha)} - \theta_0|^\rho \leq \frac{2B_n}{M}\right) &\geq (1 - 2n^{-2}) \mathbb{1}\{B_n < \zeta\} & \text{for } n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.70})$$

where $\zeta = (M/2) \min\{\eta^\rho, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\}$, A_n, B_n are as defined in Lemma 6. We set $Y_i = F(X_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ which implies that $Y_{(1)}, \dots, Y_{(n)}$ are uniform order statistics. Theorem 6.3.1 of Reiss [2012] implies that,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|Y_{(k)} - \frac{k}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq k/n\} - \frac{k}{n}\right| \geq \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{3/4} \tilde{\delta}\left(\frac{k}{n}, 2, n\right)\right) \leq \frac{C(2, n)}{n^2},$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\delta}\left(\frac{k}{n}, 2, n\right) &= 35 \max\left\{\left(\frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)\right)^{1/4}, \sqrt{35 \frac{\log(n)}{n}}\right\} \\ &\leq 35 \max\left\{\frac{1}{4^{1/4}}, \sqrt{35 \frac{\log(n)}{n}}\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{\frac{35}{\sqrt{2}}, 35\sqrt{\frac{35 \log(n)}{n}}\right\} \\ &= D_{1,n} \quad (\text{say}), \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C(2, n)}{n^2} &= \frac{A(2, n)}{n^2} + \frac{B(2, n)}{n^2} \\ &= (n+2)^2 \exp\{-5 \log(n) + (3/4) \log(n) + (13/2)\} + \left(\frac{2}{n^2} - 1\right) \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\} + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{e^{13/2}}{n^2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{(n+2)^2}{n^{9/4}} - 1\right) \mathbb{1}\{n < 8\}\right) + \left(\frac{2}{n^2} - 1\right) \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\} + 1 \\ &\leq 1 + \left\{\frac{1}{n^2} \left(2 + e^{13/2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{(n+2)^2}{n^{9/4}} - 1\right) \mathbb{1}\{n < 8\}\right)\right) - 1\right\} \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa(k/n, 2, n) &= \max \left\{ \sqrt{21 \frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)}, 21 \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \right\}, \\ \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n) &= \max \left\{ \sqrt{12 \frac{k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right)}, 12 \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \right\} + \frac{1}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have,

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P} \left(\left| Y_{(k)} - \frac{k}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq k/n\} - \frac{k}{n} \right| \geq \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{3/4} D_{1,n} \right) \\ & \leq 1 + \left\{ \frac{1}{n^2} \left(2 + e^{13/2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{(n+2)^2}{n^{9/4}} - 1 \right) \mathbb{1}\{n < 8\} \right) \right) - 1 \right\} \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\},\end{aligned}$$

which is the same as saying,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| Y_{(k)} - \frac{k}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq k/n\} - \frac{k}{n} \right| \geq \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{3/4} D_{1,n} \right) \leq 1 + \left(\frac{D_2}{n^2} - 1 \right) \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\}, \quad (\text{E.71})$$

where $D_2 = 2 + e^{13/2}$. Rewritten in terms of X_i 's and using $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$, this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P} \left(\left| F(X_{(k)}) - F(\theta_0) - \left(\frac{k}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq k/n\} - \frac{k}{n} \right| \geq D_{1,n} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{3/4} \right) \\ & \leq 1 + \left(\frac{D_2}{n^2} - 1 \right) \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\}.\end{aligned}$$

We apply this result on the transformed order statistics $T_{(k)} = |X_{(k)} - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(X_{(k)} - \theta_0)$ when the underlying distribution function is $H(\cdot)$,

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P} \left(\left| H(T_{(k)}) - H(0) - \left(\frac{k}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{H(T_i) \leq k/n\} - \frac{k}{n} \right| \geq D_{1,n} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{3/4} \right) \\ & \leq 1 + \left(\frac{D_2}{n^2} - 1 \right) \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $H(T_i) \leq k/n \iff F(X_i) \leq k/n$, we can say that the following event happens with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (D_2/n^2)) \mathbb{1}\{\kappa(k/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n)\}$,

$$\left| H(T_{(k)}) - H(0) - \left(\frac{k}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq k/n\} - \frac{k}{n} \right| \leq D_{1,n} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{3/4}.$$

In particular for $k = k_{n,\alpha} + 1$ we have with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (D_2/n^2)) \mathbb{1}\{\kappa((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n)\}$,

$$\left| H(T_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}) - H(0) - Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} \right| \leq D_{1,n} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{3/4},$$

where,

$$Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} = \left(\frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq (k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n\} + \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n}.$$

Note that $Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}$ is same as Q defined in Theorem 5. From the assumption (E.69) we obtain that,

$$|H(T_{(k)}) - H(0) - Mt| \leq C|T_{(k)}|^{1+\delta} \quad \text{provided} \quad |T_{(k)}| < \eta^\rho.$$

Therefore for $k = k_{n,\alpha} + 1$, using (E.70) we obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \min\{\zeta, (M\eta^\rho)/2\}\}$ (which is same as $(1 - 2n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}$ as $\zeta = (M/2)\min\{\eta^\rho, (M/2C)^{1/\delta}\} \leq (M\eta^\rho)/2$) the following event happens for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |H(T_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}) - H(0) - MT_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}| &\leq C|T_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}|^{1+\delta} \\ &\leq C\left(\frac{2A_n}{M}\right)^{1+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Using triangle inequality on the above two bounds we obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (2 + D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{\kappa((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n)\}$ the following event happens for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$|MT_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} - Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}| \leq D_{1,n} \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{3/4} + C \left(\frac{2A_n}{M}\right)^{1+\delta}.$$

Similarly for $k = n - k_{n,\alpha}$ we obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (2 + D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{B_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{\kappa((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n)\}$ the following event happens for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |MT_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}| &\leq D_{1,n} \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{3/4} + C \left(\frac{2B_n}{M}\right)^{1+\delta} \\ &\leq D_{1,n} \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{3/4} + C \left(\frac{2A_n}{M}\right)^{1+\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} = \left(\frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{F(X_i) \leq (n - k_{n,\alpha})/n\} + \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n}.$$

Hence with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{\kappa((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n)\}\mathbb{1}\{\kappa((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n)\}$ both the above events hold true. If we let K_n to be the event for which $\mathbb{1}\{K_n\} = \mathbb{1}\{\kappa((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((k_{n,\alpha} + 1)/n, 2, n)\}\mathbb{1}\{\kappa((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n) > \tilde{\kappa}((n - k_{n,\alpha})/n, 2, n)\}$, we obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ both the above events hold true. We let $\gamma_n = D_{1,n}(\log(n)/n)^{3/4} + C(2A_n/M)^{1+\delta}$. To sum up, with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following events occur for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) &\leq T_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} \leq \frac{1}{M}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n), \\ \frac{1}{M}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) &\leq T_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} \leq \frac{1}{M}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n). \end{aligned}$$

Using the monotonicity of the transformation we obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following events occur for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}}|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) &\leq X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} - \theta_0 \leq \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}}|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n), \\ \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}}|Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) &\leq X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0 \leq \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}}|Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following happens for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n)\} \\ & \leq X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} - X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Theorem 13. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 . We assume that the following holds for the distribution function F ,

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - M|h|^\rho \text{sgn}(h)| \leq C|h|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \text{for all } |h| < \eta, \quad (\text{E.72})$$

where $0 < M, C, \Delta, \eta, \rho < \infty$. Then with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (6 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $1 \leq \rho < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| n^{1/(2\rho)} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}))\} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{4}{M^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right)^{1/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

With probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (10 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $0 < \rho < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| n^{1/(2\rho)} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}))\} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \sqrt{n}\gamma_n + \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\rho,\alpha}$ is a constant depending on ρ (see (E.76) for details). We also have the following,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}))\} \\ & \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \{|W_1|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1) - |W_1 - z_{\alpha/2}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1 - z_{\alpha/2})\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_1 \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$.

Let us see how Theorem 13 implies the simplified version of the result stated in Theorem 5. We have already seen in Appendix S.4 that the constraint on sample-size n $A_n < \zeta$ holds true if $n \geq 49 \log(2n/\alpha)/\zeta^2$. We need to find a sufficient condition on n so that the event K_n holds true.

Let $p = k/(n + 1)$ and $q = k/n$. Let $\delta = p/q = n/(n + 1)$. We observe the following,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{p(1-p)}{q(1-q)} - 1 &= \frac{\delta(1-q\delta)}{1-q} - 1 \\
&= \frac{\delta(1-\delta + \delta(1-q))}{1-q} - 1 \\
&= \frac{\delta(1-\delta)}{1-q} + \delta^2 - 1 \\
&= \left(-\frac{\delta}{1-q} + \delta + 1 \right) (\delta - 1) \\
&= \frac{1}{n+1} \left(\delta \left(\frac{q}{1-q} \right) - 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We have shown in Appendix S.2 that,

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1.6}{n} \leq \frac{k_{n,\alpha}}{n} = q \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n}.$$

In our case q is either $k_{n,\alpha} + 1$ or $n - k_{n,\alpha}$. Therefore we can bound $q/(1-q)$ in the following way,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{q}{1-q} &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{n}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n\sqrt{n}} + \frac{0.6}{n}}, \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1.6}{n}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n}} \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{n}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}}}, \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1.6}{n}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}}} \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 1 + 2 \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n} \right), 1 - \frac{\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n\sqrt{n}}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}}} + \frac{0.8}{1/2} \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 1 + 2 \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n} \right), 2.6 - \frac{\left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n\sqrt{n}} \right)}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}}} \right\} \\
&\leq \max\{4, 2.6\} \quad (\text{if } n \geq 4z_{\alpha/2}^2) \\
&\leq 4.
\end{aligned}$$

We use this bound in the previous derivation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{p(1-p)}{q(1-q)} - 1 &= \frac{1}{n+1} \left(\delta \left(\frac{q}{1-q} \right) - 1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n+1} \left(\frac{4n}{n+1} - 1 \right) \\
&\leq 0.56.
\end{aligned}$$

For $k = k_{n,\alpha} + 1, n - k_{n,\alpha}$ last equation can be re-written as,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{1.56} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right)} \\
\implies & \sqrt{18.72} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)} \geq \sqrt{12} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right)} \\
\implies & \sqrt{18.72} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)} + (\sqrt{21} - \sqrt{18.72}) \sqrt{\frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)} \geq \sqrt{12} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right)} + \frac{1}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The following inequality holds true,

$$\begin{aligned}
& 9^2 \log(n) \geq \frac{1}{n} \\
\implies & 21 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \geq 12 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \frac{1}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining both the inequalities we obtain the following for $k = k_{n,\alpha} + 1, n - k_{n,\alpha}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \left\{ \sqrt{21} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)}, 21 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right\} \geq \max \left\{ \sqrt{12} \sqrt{\frac{k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right)}, 12 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right\} + \frac{1}{n} \\
\implies & \kappa(k/n, 2, n) \geq \tilde{\kappa}(k/n, 2, n).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the event K_n holds when $n \geq 4z_{\alpha/2}^2$. Therefore the result of Theorem 13 holds true when $n \geq \max\{\log_2(2/\alpha), 49 \log(2n/\alpha)/\zeta^2, 4z_{\alpha/2}^2\}$. We have shown in Appendix S.4 that $A_n \leq 7\sqrt{\log(2n/\alpha)/n}$. We use this to bound γ_n .

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_n &= \max \left\{ \frac{35}{\sqrt{2}}, 35 \sqrt{\frac{35 \log(n)}{n}} \right\} \left(\frac{\log(n)}{n} \right)^{3/4} + C \left(\frac{2A_n}{M} \right)^{1+\delta} \\
&\leq 208 \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{3/4} + C \left(\frac{14}{M} \right)^{1+\delta} \left(\frac{\log(2n/\alpha)}{n} \right)^{(1+\delta)/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can bound the second term as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \\
& \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{18 \log(n)}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6z_{\alpha/2} \log(n)}{\sqrt{n}}} \\
& \leq \sqrt{z_{\alpha/2}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{6 \log(n)}}{n^{1/4}} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^{5/2}}{5n} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{18 \log(n)}{n}} \left(1 + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{18 \log(n)}} \right) \\
& \leq \sqrt{z_{\alpha/2}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{6 \log(n)}}{n^{1/4}} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{5n^{1/4}} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{18 \log(n)}{n}} \left(1 + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{18 \log(n)}} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{(2 \log(2/\alpha))^{1/4}}{n^{1/4}} \left(\sqrt{6 \log(n)} + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{18 \log(n)}{n}} \left(1 + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{18 \log(n)}} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{(2 \log(2/\alpha))^{1/4}}{n^{1/4}} \sqrt{12 \log(2n/\alpha)} + 2.2 \sqrt{\frac{18 \log(n)}{n}} \\
& \leq \frac{4.2 \log(2/\alpha)^{1/4} \sqrt{\log(2n/\alpha)}}{n^{1/4}} + 9.5 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining all the above bounds we obtain the simplified result in Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 13. We shall first deal with the case $\rho \geq 1$. We shall start by proving that the function $h(x) = |x|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(x)$ is a holder continuous function for $\rho \geq 1$. We note that the following holds for all $\rho \geq 1$ and for all $a, b > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{a}{a+b} \right)^{1/\rho} + \left(\frac{b}{a+b} \right)^{1/\rho} \geq 1 \\
& \implies a^{1/\rho} + b^{1/\rho} \geq (a+b)^{1/\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq |x - y|^{1/\rho}$ when x, y are of the same sign. Suppose w.l.o.g. $x < 0 < y$. In this case we can say the following,

$$\left(\frac{|x|}{|x|+y} \right)^{1/\rho} + \left(\frac{y}{|x|+y} \right)^{1/\rho} \leq 2.$$

This implies that $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq 2|x - y|^{1/\rho}$ when x, y are of the opposite sign. Combining both the cases we obtain that $h(x)$ is holder continuous and the following holds true,

$$|h(x) - h(y)| \leq 2|x - y|^{1/\rho} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Repeatedly using the holder continuity of the function $h(x)$ we obtain the following inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left| \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \right| \quad (\text{E.73}) \\
& \leq \frac{4}{M^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{M^{1/\rho}} |\sqrt{n}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}) - z_{\alpha/2}|^{1/\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we also have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left| \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \right| \quad (\text{E.74}) \\
& \leq \frac{4}{M^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{M^{1/\rho}} |\sqrt{n}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}) - z_{\alpha/2}|^{1/\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

We shall now analyse the difference $(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n})$. We observe the following,

$$Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} = \frac{2k_{n,\alpha} - n + 1}{n} - \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n} \leq F(X_i) \leq \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} \right\} - \frac{2k_{n,\alpha} - n + 1}{n} \right\}.$$

Using part-3 of Theorem 1 we have the following bound,

$$\left| \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{2k_{n,\alpha} - n + 1}{n} \right) - z_{\alpha/2} \right| \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Using Chernoff bound we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sqrt{n} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{n - k_{n,\alpha}}{n} \leq F(X_i) \leq \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} \right\} - \frac{2k_{n,\alpha} - n + 1}{n} \right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right\} \\
& \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{n}{3(2k_{n,\alpha} - n + 1)} \frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n} \right\} + \exp \left\{ -\frac{n}{2(2k_{n,\alpha} - n + 1)} \frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n} \right\} \\
& \leq \exp\{-2 \log(n)\} + \exp\{-3 \log(n)\} \\
& \leq \frac{2}{n^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have the following concentration inequality for $(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n})$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sqrt{n}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}) - z_{\alpha/2} \right| > \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right\} \leq \frac{2}{n^2}. \quad (\text{E.75})$$

Using (E.73) and (E.75) we conclude that the following event happens with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left| \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{4}{M^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right)^{1/\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly using (E.74) and (E.75) we conclude that the following event happens with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left| \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{4}{M^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right)^{1/\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2n^{-2})$ both the above events hold simultaneously. Finally, using Theorem 12 and the above two results we conclude that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (6 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $\rho \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| n^{1/(2\rho)} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left\{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{4}{M^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right)^{1/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 5 we know that $\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} \xrightarrow{d} N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$. By continuous mapping theorem we obtain the following,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left\{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \right\} \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \left\{ |W_1|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1) - |W_1 - z_{\alpha/2}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1 - z_{\alpha/2}) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_1 \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$. This completes the proof of the first part of the theorem. Now we move to the case when $0 < \rho < 1$. We recall that,

$$Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} = \left(\frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left\{ F(X_i) \leq \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} \right\} - \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} \right\}.$$

Using part-3 of Theorem 1 we have the following bound,

$$\left| \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}} \right| \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Using Chernoff bound we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sqrt{n} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left\{ F(X_i) \leq \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} \right\} - \frac{k_{n,\alpha} + 1}{n} \right] \right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{3(n + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + 4) \log(n)}{n}} \right\} \\ & \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{n}{3(k_{n,\alpha} + 1)} \frac{3(n + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + 4) \log(n)}{n} \right\} + \exp \left\{ -\frac{n}{2(k_{n,\alpha} + 1)} \frac{3(n + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + 4) \log(n)}{n} \right\} \\ & \leq \exp\{-2 \log(n)\} + \exp\{-3 \log(n)\} \\ & = \frac{2}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two bounds we obtain the following concentration inequality for $Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/2) \right| > \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(n + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + 4) \log(n)}{n}} \right\} \leq \frac{2}{n^2}.$$

Similarly we have the following concentration inequality for $Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sqrt{n}Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + (z_{\alpha/2}/2) \right| > \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(n - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + (z_{\alpha/2}^3/(5\sqrt{n})) + 3.2) \log(n)}{n}} \right\} \leq \frac{2}{n^2}.$$

We define the following constants,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{1n} &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(n + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + 4) \log(n)}{n}} \\
E_{2n} &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10n} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(n - \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2} + (z_{\alpha/2}^3/(5\sqrt{n})) + 3.2) \log(n)}{n}} \\
E_{3n} &= \sqrt{n}\gamma_n, \\
E_1 &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_{1n} \\
E_2 &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_{2n} \\
E_3 &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_{3n}.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $0 < E_1, E_2, E_3 < \infty$. We see that with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 4n^{-2}$ both the events $\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} \in [z_{\alpha/2}/2 - E_1, z_{\alpha/2}/2 + E_1]$ and $\sqrt{n}Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} \in [-z_{\alpha/2}/2 - E_2, -z_{\alpha/2}/2 + E_2]$ hold true. Let us denote $E_0 = z_{\alpha/2}/2 + \max\{E_1, E_2\} + E_3$. We can show that for $0 < \rho < 1$, $h(\cdot)$ is holder-continuous in the compact set $[-E_0, E_0]$. For $x, y \in [-E_0, E_0]$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
|h(x) - h(y)| &= |h'(x^*)||x - y| \quad \text{where } x^* \in [x, y] \\
&\leq (|h'(x)| + |h'(y)|)|x - y| \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{\rho}|x|^{(1/\rho)-1} \text{sgn}(x) + \frac{1}{\rho}|y|^{(1/\rho)-1} \text{sgn}(y) \right) |x - y| \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\rho} E_0^{(1/\rho)-1} |x - y| \\
&= C_{\rho,\alpha} |x - y|,
\end{aligned}$$

where,

$$C_{\rho,\alpha} = \frac{2}{\rho} E_0^{(1/\rho)-1} \quad \text{where } E_0 = z_{\alpha/2}/2 + \max\{E_1, E_2\} + E_3. \quad (\text{E.76})$$

We know from earlier concentration inequalities that both $\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} \pm \sqrt{n}\gamma_n, \sqrt{n}Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} \pm \sqrt{n}\gamma_n$ lie in the interval $[-E_0, E_0]$ with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 4n^{-2}$. Using the holder-continuity of the function $h(\cdot)$ in the interval $[-E_0, E_0]$ we can say that with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 4n^{-2}$, the following event holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left\{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) \right\} \\
&\quad - \left\{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \left\{ |\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \sqrt{n}\gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \sqrt{n}\gamma_n) - |\sqrt{n}Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \sqrt{n}\gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(\sqrt{n}Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \sqrt{n}\gamma_n) \right\} \\
&\quad - \left\{ |\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - z_{\alpha/2}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(\sqrt{n}Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - z_{\alpha/2}) \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} |\sqrt{n}\gamma_n| + \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} |\sqrt{n}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n}) - z_{\alpha/2}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (E.75) and the above bound we conclude that the following event happens with probability

greater than or equal to $(1 - 6n^{-2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) \} \\ & - \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \\ & \leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \sqrt{n}\gamma_n + \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we conclude that the following event happens with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 6n^{-2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \} \\ & - \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \\ & \leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \sqrt{n}\gamma_n + \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 6n^{-2})$ both the above events hold simultaneously. Finally, using Theorem 12 and the above two results we conclude that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (10 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $0 < \rho < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| n^{1/(2\rho)} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \sqrt{n}\gamma_n + \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{M^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally by continuous mapping theorem we know that the following holds,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^{1/2\rho}}{M^{1/\rho}} \{ |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}) - |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \} \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{M^{1/\rho}} \{ |W_1|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1) - |W_1 - z_{\alpha/2}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1 - z_{\alpha/2}) \}, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_1 \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$. Note that W_1 has the same distribution as W in Theorem 5. \square

S.7 Proof of Theorem 6

We state and prove a stronger version of the result stated in Theorem 6.

Theorem 14. *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Suppose that F is a continuous c.d.f. with median θ_0 . We assume that the following holds for the distribution function F ,*

$$|F(\theta_0 + h) - F(\theta_0) - |h|^\rho \text{sgn}(h)[L_{-1}\mathbf{1}\{h < 0\} + L_1\mathbf{1}\{h > 0\}]| \leq C|h|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \text{for all } |h| < \eta, \quad (\text{E.77})$$

where $0 < L_{-1}, L_1, C, \Delta, \eta, \rho < \infty$. We introduce the following notation,

$$\mathcal{G}(a, b) = |a|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(a) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a > 0\} \right] - |a - b|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(a - b) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a < b\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a > b\} \right].$$

Then with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (6 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $\rho \geq 1$,

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} \left| \operatorname{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \mathcal{G}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \right| \leq \frac{4}{L_0^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{L_0^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right)^{1/\rho}$$

With probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (10 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $0 < \rho < 1$,

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} \left| \operatorname{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \mathcal{G}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \right| \leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\alpha}}{L_0^{1/\rho}} \sqrt{n}\gamma_n + \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{L_0^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right).$$

where $C_{\rho,\alpha}$ is a constant depending on ρ, α (see (E.76) for details). The constant M is replaced with $L_0 = \min\{L_{-1}, L_1\}$ in the definitions of γ_n and ζ in Theorem 12. All other notations are same as defined in Theorem 12. We also have the following,

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} \mathcal{G}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{G}(W_1, z_{\alpha/2}),$$

where $W_1 \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$.

Proof of Theorem 14. The assumptions made in Theorem 14 are same as in Theorem 6 with M_-, M_+, M replaced by L_{-1}, L_1, L_0 respectively. The proof of this theorem follows along the same path as the proofs of Theorem 12 and Theorem 5. Let us define $L_0 = \min\{L_1, L_{-1}\}$. With a slight modification to the derivations in Lemma 6 we have the following concentration inequalities for $X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)}$ and $X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(|X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} - \theta_0|^\rho \leq \frac{2A_n}{L_0} \right) &\geq (1 - 2n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\} \quad \text{for } n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha), \\ \mathbb{P} \left(|X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0|^\rho \leq \frac{2B_n}{L_0} \right) &\geq (1 - 2n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{B_n < \zeta\} \quad \text{for } n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha), \end{aligned} \tag{E.78}$$

where $\zeta = (L_0/2) \min\{\eta^\rho, (L_0/2C)^{1/\delta}\}$, A_n, B_n are as defined in Lemma 6. The above follows by observing that $\min\{H(\epsilon) - H(0), H(0) - H(-\epsilon)\} \geq \min\{L_{-1}\epsilon - C\epsilon^{1+\delta}, L_1\epsilon - C\epsilon^{1+\delta}\} = L_0\epsilon - C\epsilon^{1+\delta}$ and accordingly modifying Lemma 6. Following the same steps as in Theorem 12 we obtain that, with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following events occur for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) &\leq T_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} [L_{-1}\mathbf{1}\{T_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} < 0\} + L_1\mathbf{1}\{T_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} > 0\}] \leq (Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n), \\ (Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) &\leq T_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} [L_{-1}\mathbf{1}\{T_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} < 0\} + L_1\mathbf{1}\{T_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} > 0\}] \leq (Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n), \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_n = D_{1,n}(\log(n)/n)^{3/4} + C(2A_n/L_0)^{1+\delta}$. Note that M is replaced by L_0 in the definition of γ_n . While repeating the derivations in the proofs of Theorem 12 and Theorem 5 we shall use this modified version of γ_n . Using monotonicity of the transformation we obtain that with probability

greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following events occur for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n > 0\} \right] \\
& \leq X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} - \theta_0 \\
& \leq |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n > 0\} \right], \\
& \text{and} \\
& |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n > 0\} \right] \\
& \leq X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} - \theta_0 \\
& \leq |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n > 0\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (4 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following happens for all $n \geq \log_2(2/\alpha)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n > 0\} \right] \\
& - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n > 0\} \right] \\
& \leq X_{(k_{n,\alpha}+1)} - X_{(n-k_{n,\alpha})} \\
& \leq |Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n} + \gamma_n > 0\} \right] \\
& - |Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n|^{1/\rho} \operatorname{sgn}(Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{Q_{2,\mathbf{X},n} - \gamma_n > 0\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define the following function,

$$\tilde{h}(x) = \frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{x < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{x > 0\}.$$

It can be easily checked that the function $\tilde{h}(\cdot)$ is holder continuous and that the following holds for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|\tilde{h}(x) - \tilde{h}(y)| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}}, \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \right\} |x - y| = \frac{1}{L_0^{1/\rho}} |x - y|.$$

Using the holder continuity of $h(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{h}(\cdot)$ we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{h}(h(x)) - \tilde{h}(h(y))| & \leq \frac{2}{L_0^{1/\rho}} |x - y|^{1/\rho} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R} \text{ if } 1 \leq \rho < \infty, \\
|\tilde{h}(h(x)) - \tilde{h}(h(y))| & \leq \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{L_0^{1/\rho}} |x - y| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [-E_0, E_0] \text{ if } 0 \leq \rho < 1,
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define the composition of functions $\tilde{h}(h(\cdot))$ as $\hat{h}(\cdot)$. We introduce the following notation,

$$\mathcal{G}(a, b) = |a|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a < 0\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a > 0\} \right] - |a - b|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a - b) \left[\frac{1}{L_{-1}^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a < b\} + \frac{1}{L_1^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{1}\{a > b\} \right].$$

Using the holder continuity of the function $\hat{h}(\cdot)$ (in place of $h(\cdot)$) we can re-do the steps in the proof of Theorem 5 and we obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (6 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $\rho \geq 1$,

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} \left| \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \mathcal{G}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \right| \leq \frac{4}{L_0^{1/\rho}} (\sqrt{n}\gamma_n)^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{L_0^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right)^{1/\rho}$$

We also obtain that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - (10 + 2D_2)n^{-2})\mathbb{1}\{A_n < \zeta\}\mathbb{1}\{K_n\}$ the following event holds true for $0 < \rho < 1$,

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} \left| \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}) - \mathcal{G}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \right| \leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\alpha}}{L_0^{1/\rho}} \sqrt{n}\gamma_n + \frac{C_{\rho,\alpha}}{L_0^{1/\rho}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5n} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{6(3 + \sqrt{n}z_{\alpha/2}) \log(n)}{n}} \right).$$

By continuous mapping theorem we know that the following holds,

$$n^{1/(2\rho)} \mathcal{G}(Q_{1,\mathbf{X},n}, (z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n})) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{G}(W_1, z_{\alpha/2}),$$

where $W_1 \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

S.8 Proof of Theorem 7

The estimators $\hat{\theta}_j$ ($1 \leq j \leq B$) are independent with maximum median-bias \mathcal{E}_B . We observe the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \notin \widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) &= \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_{(\lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha})} > \theta_0) + \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_{(\lfloor B/2 \rfloor + c_{B,\alpha} + 1)} < \theta_0) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^B \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_j \leq \theta_0\} < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^B \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_j \geq \theta_0\} < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^B Y_j < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^B Z_j < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $Y_j = \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_j \leq \theta_0\} \sim \text{Ber}(p_j)$, $Z_j = \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\theta}_j \geq \theta_0\} \sim \text{Ber}(q_j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq B$. Moreover we have the additional constraints that $p_j + q_j \geq 1$, $p_j \geq 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B$, $q_j \geq 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B$ for $1 \leq j \leq B$. We see that $\sum_{j=1}^B Y_j \sim \text{Poi-Bin}(p_1, \dots, p_B)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^B Z_j \sim \text{Poi-Bin}(q_1, \dots, q_B)$. Therefore we can say that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \notin \widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^B Y_j < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^B Z_j < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}\right) \\ &\leq \sup_{p_j + q_j \geq 1; p_j, q_j \geq 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B} f(p_1, \dots, p_B) + f(q_1, \dots, q_B), \end{aligned}$$

where $f(p_1, \dots, p_B)$ is the probability that a $\text{Poi-Bin}(p_1, \dots, p_B)$ is less than $\lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}$. Observe that,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Poi-Bin}(p_1, \dots, p_B) = k) = \sum_{A \in F_k} \prod_{i \in A} p_i \prod_{j \in A^c} (1 - p_j),$$

where F_k is the collection of all k -subsets of $\{1, \dots, B\}$. Thus $f(p_1, \dots, p_B)$ is a linear function in each of the p_j 's, in particular it is a linear function in p_1 . Let $f(p_1, \dots, p_B) = ap_1$ ($a > 0$). Similarly we let $f(q_1, \dots, q_B) = bq_1$ ($b > 0$) as $f(q_1, \dots, q_B)$ is a linear function in q_1 . We concentrate on the sub-problem of maximising $ap_1 + bq_1$ under the constraints $p_1 + q_1 \geq 1$, $p_1 \geq 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B$, and $q_1 \geq 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B$. This is a classical convex optimization problem and can be solved easily using Lagrange multipliers. It can be shown that the maxima is attained only at the boundary points i.e. either $p_1 = 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B, q_1 = 1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B$ or $p_1 = 1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B, q_1 = 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B$. The same can be said about each p_j, q_j for $1 \leq j \leq B$.

We note that the number of times p_j appear in $f(p_1, \dots, p_B)$ is same as number of times q_j appear in $f(q_1, \dots, q_B)$. Therefore in the optimum case, the sum $f(p_1, \dots, p_B) + f(q_1, \dots, q_B)$ is a sum of product of some permutations of sequences containing equal number of $1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B$ and $1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B$. Using the result in Ruderman [1952] we reach to the conclusion that the maximum is attained when all the sequences are arranged in the same order i.e. either $p_1 = \dots = p_B = 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B, q_1 = \dots = q_B = 1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B$ or $p_1 = \dots = p_B = 1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B, q_1 = \dots = q_B = 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B$.

We are now in the set-up of Theorem 10 with $\epsilon = \mathcal{E}_B$ and $n = B$. The miscoverage probability is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 \notin \widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(B, 1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B) < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}) + \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(B, 1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B) < \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha}) \\ &\leq \alpha (1 + 2B(B-1)(1 + 2\mathcal{E}_B)^{n-2} \mathcal{E}_B^2) \\ &\leq \alpha (1 + 2B^2 \mathcal{E}_B^2 e^{2B\mathcal{E}_B}). \end{aligned} \tag{E.79}$$

This completes the proof of the result.

S.9 Proof of Theorem 8

Suppose the data has been split into B disjoint sets of equal size. Let \mathcal{F} be the distribution function of $\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0$ for $1 \leq j \leq B$. Suppose the following holds true,

$$|\mathcal{F}(x) - \mathcal{F}(0)| > C_1 |x|^\rho \text{ for } |x| < \Delta,$$

where $\rho, C_1, C_2 > 0$. We also assume the following,

$$\left| \mathcal{F}(0) - \frac{1}{2} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_B.$$

We know from Lemma 3.1.1 of Reiss [2012] that,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{\frac{r}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{r}{n+1}\right)}} \left| U_{r:n} - \frac{r}{n+1} \right| \leq 5\xi \right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\xi). \tag{E.80}$$

We observe the following for the r -th order statistic $\widehat{\theta}_{(r)}$ ($1 \leq r \leq B$),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\theta}_{(r)} - \theta_0 \geq v) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}(\theta_{(r)} - \theta_0) \geq \mathcal{F}(v)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r}{B+1}\left(1 - \frac{r}{B+1}\right)}}\left(U_{r:B} - \frac{r}{B+1}\right) \geq \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r}{B+1}\left(1 - \frac{r}{B+1}\right)}}\left(\mathcal{F}(v) - \frac{r}{B+1}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $r^- = \lfloor B/2 \rfloor - c_{B,\alpha} = B - k_{B,\alpha}$ and $r^+ = \lfloor B/2 \rfloor + c_{B,\alpha} + 1 = k_{B,\alpha} + 1$. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^+}{B+1}\left(1 - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right)}}\left(\mathcal{F}(v) - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right) \\ & \geq \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^+}{B+1}\left(1 - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right)}}\left(\mathcal{F}(v) - (\mathcal{F}(0) - (1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B)) - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right) \\ & \geq \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^+}{B+1}\left(1 - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right)}}\left((\mathcal{F}(v) - \mathcal{F}(0)) + (1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B) - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right) \\ & \geq \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^+}{B+1}\left(1 - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right)}}\left(C_1 v^\rho + (1/2 - \mathcal{E}_B) - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right) \text{ provided } |v| < \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

The final quantity in the above analysis is greater than or equal to 5ξ if,

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \frac{1}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\frac{r^+}{B+1}\left(1 - \frac{r^+}{B+1}\right)}}{\sqrt{B}} 5\xi - \frac{1}{2} + \mathcal{E}_B + \frac{r^+}{B+1} \right\}^{1/\rho} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{5\xi}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{5\xi + \sqrt{2\log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho} \\ & = c_+ \text{ (say)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus using (E.80) we can say that,

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\theta}_{(r^+)} - \theta_0 \leq c_+) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-\xi) \text{ provided } c_+ < \Delta. \quad (\text{E.81})$$

We can also put an upper bound in the following way,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^-}{B+1} \left(1 - \frac{r^-}{B+1}\right)}} \left(\mathcal{F}(v) - \frac{r^-}{B+1} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^-}{B+1} \left(1 - \frac{r^-}{B+1}\right)}} \left(\mathcal{F}(v) + ((1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B) - \mathcal{F}(0)) - \frac{r^-}{B+1} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^-}{B+1} \left(1 - \frac{r^-}{B+1}\right)}} \left((\mathcal{F}(v) - \mathcal{F}(0)) + (1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B) - \frac{r^-}{B+1} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\sqrt{\frac{r^-}{B+1} \left(1 - \frac{r^-}{B+1}\right)}} \left(-C_1(-v)^\rho + (1/2 + \mathcal{E}_B) - \frac{r^-}{B+1} \right) \text{ provided } |v| < \Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

The final quantity in the above analysis is less than or equal to -5ξ if,

$$\begin{aligned}
-v &= \frac{1}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\frac{r^-}{B+1} \left(1 - \frac{r^-}{B+1}\right)}}{\sqrt{B}} 5\xi + \frac{1}{2} + \mathcal{E}_B - \frac{r^-}{B+1} \right\}^{1/\rho} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{5\xi}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{3}{2B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{5\xi + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{3}{2B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho} \\
&= c_- \text{ (say)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus using (E.80) we can say that,

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_{(r^-)} - \theta_0 \geq -c_-) \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\xi) \text{ provided } c_- < \Delta. \quad (\text{E.82})$$

Combining (E.81) and (E.82) we can say that the following holds with probability at-least $1 - 2\delta$ (we substitute $\xi = \log(2/\delta)$),

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) &= \hat{\theta}_{(r^+)} - \hat{\theta}_{(r^-)} \\
&= (\hat{\theta}_{(r^+)} - \theta_0) - (\hat{\theta}_{(r^-)} - \theta_0) \\
&\leq c_+ + c_- \\
&= \frac{1}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left[\left\{ \frac{5 \log(2/\delta) + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho} + \left\{ \frac{5 \log(2/\delta) + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{3}{2B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho} \right] \\
&< \frac{2}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{5 \log(2/\delta) + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

provided the last expression is less than 2Δ .

Now we return to the condition given in the theorem. The sample-size of each of the splits is approximately N/B . The distribution function $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ (this is same as $\tilde{F}_{N/B}$ mentioned in the theorem) of $r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0)$ satisfies the following,

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(x) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(0)| > \mathcal{C}|x|^\rho \quad \text{for } |x| < \tilde{\Delta},$$

for some $\mathcal{C}, \tilde{\Delta} > 0$. Note the following relation between \mathcal{F} and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathcal{F}(x) = \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0 \leq x)$ which is same as $\mathbb{P}(r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0) \leq r_{N/B}x) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(r_{N/B}x)$. Thus the condition on $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ translates to the following condition on \mathcal{F} ,

$$|\mathcal{F}(x) - \mathcal{F}(0)| > C_1|x|^\rho \quad \text{for } |x| < \Delta,$$

where $C_1 = \mathcal{C}r_{N/B}^\rho$ and $\Delta = \tilde{\Delta}/r_{N/B}$. Using our previous analysis we obtain that the following event holds with probability at-least $1 - 2\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}) \\ & < \frac{2}{C_1^{1/\rho}} \left\{ \frac{5 \log(2/\delta) + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho} \\ & = \frac{2}{\mathcal{C}^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \left\{ \frac{5 \log(2/\delta) + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\alpha)}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \right\}^{1/\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

provided the last expression is less than $2\Delta = 2\tilde{\Delta}/r_{N/B}$. This completes the proof of the result.

S.10 Proof of Theorem 9

We state and prove a stronger version of the result stated in Theorem 9.

Theorem 15. Suppose $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-HulC}}$ is the confidence interval returned by G-HulC (Algorithm 2) using approximately equal B splits. Let $\hat{\theta}^m$ be an estimator of θ_0 based on a sample of size m and let r_m be its rate of convergence i.e.,

$$r_m(\hat{\theta}^m - \theta_0) = O_p(1) \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

We assume the following regarding the distribution function $\tilde{F}_{N/B}(\cdot)$ of $r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B} - \theta_0)$,

$$\left| \tilde{F}_{N/B}(t) - \tilde{F}_{N/B}(0) - M_N |t|^\rho \text{sgn}(t) \right| \leq C_N |t|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \text{for } |t| < \eta,$$

where $0 < M_N, C_N, \Delta, \eta, \rho < \infty$. Let $|\tilde{F}_{N/B}(1/2) - (1/2)| \leq \mathcal{E}_B$. We introduce the following

notations,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{B,\xi} &= \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{2(B+1)}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} + \frac{4}{B}\right) \frac{\xi}{B+1}, \\
\zeta_{\rho,N} &= \frac{M_N}{2} \min \left\{ \eta^\rho, \left(\frac{M_N}{2C_N}\right)^{1/\delta} \right\}, \\
D_{\xi,n} &= \left\{ \frac{11}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} + \frac{\xi + (13/2)}{\sqrt{n \log(n+2)}} \right\} \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{5\xi}{2\sqrt{n}}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} \right\}, \\
\gamma_{\xi,B,N} &= D_{\xi,B} + \mathcal{E}_B + C_N \left(\frac{2(A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B)}{M_N} \right)^{1+\delta}, \\
Q_B &= \left(\frac{c_{B,\alpha} + [B/2] + 1}{B} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbf{1} \left\{ U_i \leq \frac{c_{B,\alpha} + [B/2] + 1}{B} \right\} - \frac{c_{B,\alpha} + [B/2] + 1}{B} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where U_1, \dots, U_B are iid uniform(0,1) random variables and $\delta = \Delta/\rho$ and

$$\mathcal{G}(a, b) := |a|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a) - |a - b|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(a - b).$$

Then the following event holds with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 16 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1}\{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (B)^{1/2\rho} r_{N/B} M_N^{1/\rho} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) - (B)^{1/2\rho} \mathcal{G}(Q_B, z_{\alpha/2}/\sqrt{B}) \right| \\
& \leq \max\{4, 2C_{\rho,\xi,\alpha}\} (\sqrt{B} \gamma_{\xi,B,N})^{\min\{1, 1/\rho\}} + \max\{2, C_{\rho,\xi,\alpha}\} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5B} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(3 + \sqrt{B} z_{\alpha/2}) \xi}{B}} \right)^{\min\{1, 1/\rho\}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\rho,\xi,\alpha}$ is a constant (see (E.89)). We have the following distributional convergence as $N/B, B \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(B)^{1/2\rho} r_{N/B} M_N^{1/\rho} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{G}(W, z_{\alpha/2}),$$

where $W \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$.

Proof of Theorem 15. We know the following regarding uniform order statistics $(U_{k:n})$ from the proof of Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \xi) \leq 2 \exp(-(n+1)\xi) \\
& \implies \mathbb{P}((n+1)\Psi(U_{k:n}, k/(n+1)) \geq \xi) \leq 2 \exp(-\xi) \\
& \implies \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| U_{k:n} - \frac{k}{n+1} \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2k}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) \frac{\xi}{n+1}} + \left| 1 - \frac{2k}{n+1} \right| \frac{\xi}{n+1} \right\} \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\xi).
\end{aligned} \tag{E.83}$$

We denote by $\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B}$ ($1 \leq j \leq B$) the estimators of θ_0 based on the equal sized splits of size roughly equal to N/B . It is given that $r_{N/B}$ is the rate of convergence of each of the above estimators i.e. $r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B} - \theta_0) = O_P(1)$. The following is known for the distribution function $\tilde{F}_{N/B}(\cdot)$ of $r_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B} - \theta_0)$,

$$\left| \tilde{F}_{N/B}(t) - \tilde{F}_{N/B}(0) - M_N |t|^\rho \text{sgn}(t) \right| \leq C_N |t|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \text{for } |t| < \eta.$$

The above condition translates to the following condition for the distribution function $F_{N/B}(\cdot)$ of $\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B}$,

$$\left| F_{N/B}(\theta_0 + s) - F_{N/B}(\theta_0) - M_N r_{N/B}^\rho |s|^\rho \text{sgn}(s) \right| \leq C_N r_{N/B}^{\rho+\Delta} |s|^{\rho+\Delta} \quad \text{for } r_{N/B} |s| < \eta.$$

We define the distribution function $H_{N/B}(\cdot)$ as follows, $H_{N/B}(t) = F_{N/B}(\theta_0 + |t|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(t))$. The condition for $F_{N/B}(\cdot)$ translates to the following condition for $H_{N/B}(\cdot)$,

$$\left| H_{N/B}(t) - H_{N/B}(0) - M_N r_{N/B}^\rho t \right| \leq C_N r_{N/B}^{\rho(1+\delta)} |t|^{1+\delta} \quad \text{for } r_{N/B}^\rho |t| < \eta^\rho, \quad (\text{E.84})$$

where $0 < \delta = \Delta/\rho < \infty$. From here on we shall denote $\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B}$ by $\hat{\theta}_j$ unless otherwise mentioned. Since $\hat{\theta}_j \sim F_{N/B}$ we obtain that $H_{N/B}^{-1}(F_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j)) = |\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0|^\rho \text{sgn}(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_0) = T_j$ (say) $\sim H_{N/B}$. We prove some concentration bounds on uniform order-statistics below which will be used in our proof later on. We note that $H_{N/B}(T_j) \sim U(0, 1)$ for $1 \leq j \leq B$. Using (E.83) we obtain the following with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2 \exp(-\xi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| H_{N/B}(T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}) - H_{N/B}(0) \right| \\ & \leq \left| H_{N/B}(T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}) - \frac{k_{B,\alpha}+1}{B+1} \right| + \left| \frac{k_{B,\alpha}+1}{B+1} - H_{N/B}(0) \right| \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}{B+1} \left(1 - \frac{k_{B,\alpha}+1}{B+1} \right) \frac{\xi}{B+1}} + \left| 1 - \frac{2(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}{B+1} \right| \frac{\xi}{B+1} + \left| \frac{k_{B,\alpha}+1}{B+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{2} - H_{N/B}(0) \right| \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}{B+1} \left(1 - \frac{k_{B,\alpha}+1}{B+1} \right) \frac{\xi}{B+1}} + \left| 1 - \frac{2(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}{B+1} \right| \frac{\xi}{B+1} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \mathcal{E}_B \\ & \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{2}{B} + \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{2(B+1)}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} + \frac{4}{B} \right) \frac{\xi}{B+1} + \mathcal{E}_B \\ & = A_{B,\xi} \text{ (say)} + \mathcal{E}_B, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{E}_B is the median bias of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_j^{N/B}$ based on a sub-sample of size approximately $N/(B)$. Similarly we can show that with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2 \exp(-\xi)$ the following holds,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| H_{N/B}(T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}) - H_{N/B}(0) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{B}} + \frac{3}{2B} + \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{2(B+1)}} + \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} + \frac{3}{B} \right) \frac{\xi}{B+1} + \mathcal{E}_B \\ & = B_{i,\xi} \text{ (say)} + \mathcal{E}_B \\ & \leq A_{B,\xi} \text{ (say)} + \mathcal{E}_B. \end{aligned}$$

Following the steps in the proof of Lemma 6 we obtain the following bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(|T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}| \leq \epsilon) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| H_{N/B}(T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}) - H_{N/B}(0) \right| \leq \frac{M_N r_{N/B}^\rho \epsilon}{2} \right) \quad \text{for } \epsilon < \frac{1}{r_{N/B}^\rho} \min \left\{ \eta^\rho, \left(\frac{M_N}{2C_N} \right)^{1/\delta} \right\}.$$

We set $\epsilon = (2(A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B))/(M_N r_{N/B}^\rho)$ in the above inequality. The earlier bound on ϵ now changes to a bound on $A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B$. We thus have the following concentration inequality for the order statistic $T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}| \leq \frac{2}{M_N r_{N/B}^\rho} (A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B) \right) \geq (1 - 2 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1} \{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\}$$

where,

$$\zeta_{\rho,N} = \frac{M_N}{2} \min \left\{ \eta^\rho, \left(\frac{M_N}{2C_N} \right)^{1/\delta} \right\}.$$

Similarly we have a concentration inequality for the order statistic $T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}| \leq \frac{2}{M_N r_{N/B}^\rho} (A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B) \right) \geq (1 - 2 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1} \{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\}$$

The above statements also imply that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1} \{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\}$ both $|T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}|$ and $|T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}|$ are less than $(2(A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B))/(M_N r_{N/B}^\rho)$ which is less than $(2\zeta_{\rho,N})/(M_N r_{N/B}^\rho) < \eta^\rho/r_{N/B}^\rho$. Using (E.84) we can say that with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1} \{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\}$ each the following two events hold,

$$\begin{aligned} |H_{N/B}(T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}) - H_{N/B}(0) - M_N r_{N/B}^\rho T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}| &\leq C_N r_{N/B}^{\rho(1+\delta)} T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}^{1+\delta} \leq C_N \left(\frac{2(A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B)}{M_N} \right)^{1+\delta}, \\ |H_{N/B}(T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}) - H_{N/B}(0) - M_N r_{N/B}^\rho T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}| &\leq C_N r_{N/B}^{\rho(1+\delta)} T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}^{1+\delta} \leq C_N \left(\frac{2(A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B)}{M_N} \right)^{1+\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.85})$$

We shall now prove a result regarding uniform order statistics $(U_{k:n})$ based on the derivations in Reiss [2012]. Let V and V_n denote the cdf of Uniform(0,1) and empirical cdf of $U_{1:n}, \dots, U_{n:n}$ respectively. We know from Lemma 3.1.1 of Reiss [2012] that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{\frac{r}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{r}{n+1}\right)}} \left| U_{r:n} - \frac{r}{n+1} \right| \leq 5\xi \right) &\geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\xi) \\ \implies \mathbb{P} \left(|V_n^{-1}(q) - q| \leq \sqrt{\frac{r(q)}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{r(q)}{n+1}\right)} \frac{5\xi}{\sqrt{n}} \text{ for some } q \in (0, 1) \right) &\geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\xi), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.86})$$

where $r(q) = nq$ if nq is integer and $r(q) = \lfloor nq \rfloor + 1$ otherwise. We also know from the proof of Lemma 6.3.2 of Reiss [2012] that for given $\epsilon, \rho > 0$ the following holds,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\sqrt{n} |Q_n(I) - Q_0(I)|}{\max\{\sigma(I), \rho/\sqrt{n}\}} \geq \epsilon \right\} \leq (n+2)^2 \exp \left[-\epsilon \rho + \frac{3}{4} \rho^2 + \frac{13}{2} \right].$$

We set $\rho = \sqrt{\log(n+2)}$ and $\epsilon = (11/4)\sqrt{\log(n+2)} + (\xi + 13/2)/\sqrt{\log(n+2)}$ in the above statement to obtain the following,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\sqrt{n} |Q_n(I) - Q_0(I)|}{\max\{\sigma(I), \sqrt{\log(n+2)}/\sqrt{n}\}} \leq \frac{11}{4} \sqrt{\log(n+2)} + \frac{\xi + (13/2)}{\sqrt{\log(n+2)}} \right\} \geq 1 - \exp(-\xi). \quad (\text{E.87})$$

We use (E.86) and (E.87) and follow the same steps as in the proof of the Theorem 6.3.1 of Reiss [2012]. We obtain that the following event holds with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 3 \exp(-\xi)$ for some $q \in (0, 1)$,

$$|V_n^{-1}(q) - q + V_n(q) - q| \leq \left\{ \frac{11}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} + \frac{\xi + (13/2)}{\sqrt{n \log(n+2)}} \right\} \max \left\{ \sqrt{\sqrt{\frac{r(q)}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{r(q)}{n+1}\right) \frac{5\xi}{\sqrt{n}}}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} \right\}.$$

In particular for $q = k/n$ we can say that the following event holds with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 3 \exp(-\xi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| U_{k:n} - \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{k}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left\{ U_{i:n} \leq \frac{k}{n} \right\} - \frac{k}{n} \right| \\ & \leq \left\{ \frac{11}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} + \frac{\xi + (13/2)}{\sqrt{n \log(n+2)}} \right\} \max \left\{ \sqrt{\sqrt{\frac{k(n+1-k)}{n} \frac{5\xi}{n+1}}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} \right\} \\ & \leq \left\{ \frac{11}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} + \frac{\xi + (13/2)}{\sqrt{n \log(n+2)}} \right\} \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{5\xi}{2\sqrt{n}}}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(n+2)}{n}} \right\} = D_{\xi,n} \text{ (say)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above result we obtain that the following two events hold, each with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 3 \exp(-\xi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| H_{N/B}(T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)}) - H_{N/B}(0) - Q_{1,B} \right| \leq D_{\xi,B} + \mathcal{E}_B, \\ & \left| H_{N/B}(T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})}) - H_{N/B}(0) - Q_{2,B} \right| \leq D_{\xi,B} + \mathcal{E}_B, \end{aligned} \tag{E.88}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{1,B} &= \left(\frac{k_{B,\alpha} + 1}{B} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbf{1} \left\{ F_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j) \leq \frac{k_{B,\alpha} + 1}{B} \right\} + \frac{k_{B,\alpha} + 1}{B}, \\ Q_{2,B} &= \left(\frac{B - k_{B,\alpha}}{B} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbf{1} \left\{ F_{N/B}(\hat{\theta}_j) \leq \frac{B - k_{B,\alpha}}{B} \right\} + \frac{B - k_{B,\alpha}}{B}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $Q_{1,B}$ is same as Q_B defined in Theorem 9. We note that in the above deduction we used the fact that $|H_{N/B}(0) - 1/2| = |F_{N/B}(\theta_0) - 1/2| = \mathcal{E}_B$. Combining (E.85) and (E.88) using triangle inequality we obtain that the following two events hold, each with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 5 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1}\{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| M_N r_{N/B}^\rho T_{(k_{B,\alpha}+1)} - Q_{1,B} \right| \leq \gamma_{\xi,B,N}, \\ & \left| M_N r_{N/B}^\rho T_{(B-k_{B,\alpha})} - Q_{2,B} \right| \leq \gamma_{\xi,B,N}, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\gamma_{\xi,B,N} = D_{\xi,B} + \mathcal{E}_B + C_N \left(\frac{2(A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B)}{M_N} \right)^{1+\delta}.$$

Combining the above two equations and using the monotonicity of the transformation of T_j from $\hat{\theta}_j$ we conclude that the following event holds with probability greater than or equal to $(1 -$

$10 \exp(-\xi) \mathbf{1}\{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\},$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \{|Q_{1,B} - \gamma_{\xi,B,N}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,B} - \gamma_{\xi,B,N}) - |Q_{2,B} + \gamma_{\xi,B,N}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,B} + \gamma_{\xi,B,N})\} \\ & \leq \widehat{\theta}_{k_B, \alpha+1} - \widehat{\theta}_{B-k_B, \alpha} = \text{Width} \left(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N, \alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \{|Q_{1,B} + \gamma_{\xi,B,N}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,B} + \gamma_{\xi,B,N}) - |Q_{2,B} - \gamma_{\xi,B,N}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{2,B} - \gamma_{\xi,B,N})\}. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining part of the proof we follow exactly the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 5. We update the Chernoff bounds used in that proof. It can be shown that each of the three events below hold with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 2 \exp(-\xi))$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sqrt{B}(Q_{1,B} - Q_{2,B}) - z_{\alpha/2}| & \leq \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5B} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(3 + \sqrt{B}z_{\alpha/2})\xi}{B}}, \\ |\sqrt{B}Q_{1,B} - (z_{\alpha/2}/2)| & > \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10B} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(B + \sqrt{B}z_{\alpha/2} + 4)\xi}{2B}}, \\ |\sqrt{B}Q_{2,B} + (z_{\alpha/2}/2)| & > \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10B} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(B - \sqrt{B}z_{\alpha/2} + (z_{\alpha/2}^3/(5\sqrt{B})) + 3.2)\xi}{2B}}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to the proof of Theorem 5 we define the following quantities using the above Chernoff bounds,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{1,B,\xi} & = \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10B} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(B + \sqrt{B}z_{\alpha/2} + 4)\xi}{2B}}, \\ E_{2,B,\xi} & = \frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{10B} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(B - \sqrt{B}z_{\alpha/2} + (z_{\alpha/2}^3/(5\sqrt{B})) + 3.2)\xi}{2B}}, \\ E_{3,B,\xi} & = \sqrt{B}\gamma_{\xi,B,N}, \\ E_{1,\xi} & = \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} E_{1,B,\xi}, \\ E_{2,\xi} & = \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} E_{2,B,\xi}, \\ E_{3,\xi} & = \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} E_{3,B,\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define,

$$C_{\rho,\xi,\alpha} = (2/\rho)E_{0,\xi}^{(1/\rho)-1} \text{ where } E_{0,\xi} = (z_{\alpha/2}/2) + \max\{E_{1,\xi}, E_{2,\xi}\} + E_{3,\xi}, \quad (\text{E.89})$$

for $0 < \rho < 1$. On going through all the steps in the proof of Theorem 5 as they are, we obtain that for $\rho \geq 1$, the following event holds with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 12 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1}\{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\},$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (B)^{1/(2\rho)} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N, \alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) - \frac{(B)^{1/2\rho}}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \left\{ |Q_{1,B}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,B}) - \left| Q_{1,B} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} \right|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn} \left(Q_{1,B} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} \right) \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{4}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} (\sqrt{B}\gamma_{\xi,B,N})^{1/\rho} + \frac{2}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5B} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(3 + \sqrt{B}z_{\alpha/2})\xi}{B}} \right)^{1/\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand for $0 < \rho < 1$ we get that the following event holds with probability greater than or equal to $(1 - 16 \exp(-\xi)) \mathbf{1}\{A_{B,\xi} + \mathcal{E}_B < \zeta_{\rho,N}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (B)^{1/(2\rho)} \text{Width}(\widehat{\text{CI}}_{N,\alpha}^{\text{G-Hu1C}}) - \frac{(B)^{1/2\rho}}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \left\{ |Q_{1,B}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,B}) - \left| Q_{1,B} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} \right|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn} \left(Q_{1,B} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} \right) \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{2C_{\rho,\xi,\alpha}}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \sqrt{B} \gamma_{\xi,B,N}^{1/\rho} + \frac{C_{\rho,\xi,\alpha}}{M_N^{1/\rho} r_{N/B}} \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}^3}{5B} + \frac{4.2}{\sqrt{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{3(3 + \sqrt{B} z_{\alpha/2}) \xi}{B}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As before we have the following distributional convergence as $l \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(B)^{1/2\rho}}{M_N^{1/\rho}} \left\{ |Q_{1,B}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(Q_{1,B}) - \left| Q_{1,B} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} \right|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn} \left(Q_{1,B} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{B}} \right) \right\} \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{M_N^{1/\rho}} \{ |W_1|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1) - |W_1 - z_{\alpha/2}|^{1/\rho} \text{sgn}(W_1 - z_{\alpha/2}) \}, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_1 \sim N(z_{\alpha/2}/2, 1/4)$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

S.11 Further simulations

In this section, we shall test the performance of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) for distributions for which the assumptions of Bahadur representation hold true (in other words the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold true) i.e. the underlying distribution F is differentiable at the population median θ_0 with $F'(\theta_0) > 0$ and $F(\theta_0) = 1/2$. We shall compare the performance of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) against the Wald confidence interval. See Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 3 for details regarding construction of these confidence intervals. We describe the simulation procedure below for $N(0, 1)$ distribution. We shall repeat the same simulation steps for Exp(1) and Beta(3, 3) distribution.

1. For each value of n (n may vary from 50 to 5000), we generate n many observations from the $N(0, 1)$ distribution 5000 times.
2. For each time we compute both $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) and the Wald confidence interval (see Algorithm 3) for the given n observations.
3. From this data, we calculate the coverage (the proportion of times the computed confidence interval contains the true parameter i.e. median) for both the types of confidence intervals.
4. We also estimate the mean of the scaled width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) (width of distribution-free confidence interval divided by the width of the Wald confidence interval) from this data using the idea of delta-method.

It should be noted that there are two ways of evaluating $\hat{\sigma}$ as mentioned in Algorithm 3. We will perform simulation under both the scenarios for all three distributions. We shall refer the simulation setup as B-I for the case when assumptions of Theorem 2 hold and the family of densities is known and we shall refer the simulation setup as B-II for the case when assumptions of Theorem 2 hold and the family of densities is unknown. The inferences made from the simulations are noted below.

- We observe the plot of the mean of the scaled width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) with n in Figure A.1. It can be observed that although there are initial fluctuations, the scaled width of $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) approaches 1 as the value of n increases. This supports the conclusions of Theorem 2.

Algorithm 3: Wald confidence interval for the population median

Input: Sample: X_1, \dots, X_n and Confidence Level: $1 - \alpha$

Output: Wald confidence interval for the population median

- 1 Compute the sample median $\hat{\theta}_n$ as follows,

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \begin{cases} X_{((n+1)/2)} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \\ X_{(n/2)} & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

- 2 Compute an estimator $\hat{\sigma}$ of the standard deviation of the asymptotic standard deviation of the sample median $\hat{\theta}_n$,

$$\hat{\sigma} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\hat{f}(\hat{\theta}_n)} & \text{if the family of densities is unknown.} \\ \frac{1}{2f_{\hat{\eta}}(\hat{\theta}_n)} & \text{if the family of densities is known.} \end{cases}$$

Here in the first case (when the family of densities is unknown) $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ is the kernel density estimate of the underlying density using a gaussian kernel. To compute the bandwidth of the kernel density estimator, the `bw.nrd0` function of the `stats` package ([R Core Team \[2021\]](#)) is used which uses a rule-of-thumb for choosing the bandwidth of a Gaussian kernel density estimator (see Section-3.1 of [Sheather \[2004\]](#)). In the second case, if the family of densities is known to be $\{f_{\eta}\}$ (where η is the parameter), an estimate of η namely $\hat{\eta}$ is obtained from the sample and used for computing $\hat{\sigma}$.

- 3 Compute the set,

$$\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{AN}} := \left[\hat{\theta}_n - \frac{\hat{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}}, \hat{\theta}_n + \frac{\hat{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}} \right].$$

- 4 Return the confidence interval $\widehat{\text{CI}}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{AN}}$.
-




Figure A.1: In the first plot (from left) we see the comparison of the mean of the ratio of width of $\widehat{CI}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) to the width of Wald interval (Algorithm 3) with maximum likelihood based variance estimator (set-up B-I). In the second plot we see the comparison of the mean of the ratio of width of $\widehat{CI}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) to the width of Wald interval (Algorithm 3) with kernel density based variance estimator (set-up B-II).

- We also observe that the behaviour of mean scaled width is almost same for all the three distributions in Figure A.1.
- We further analyse the coverage of both the confidence intervals under consideration for all the three distributions in Figures A.2 and A.3. We note that not only does the coverage lies very close to the expected value of 0.95 in all the six scenarios, both the range and the fluctuations of the coverage match for the distribution-free confidence interval and the Wald confidence interval under both the scenarios.




Figure A.2: B-I: Comparison of the coverage obtained by using $\widehat{CI}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) and the traditional Wald confidence interval for various sample sizes, n . Here **A.N.** denotes the asymptotic normality-based confidence interval and **D.F.** denotes the distribution-free confidence interval.




Figure A.3: B-II: Comparison of the coverage obtained by using $\widehat{CI}_{n,\alpha}$ (6) and the traditional Wald confidence interval for various sample sizes, n . Here **A.N.** denotes the asymptotic normality-based confidence interval and **D.F.** denotes the distribution-free confidence interval.