

Asymptotic tests for monotonicity and convexity of a probability mass function

Fadoua Balabdaoui^{1*} and Antonio Di Noia^{1,2†}

¹*Seminar for Statistics, Department of Mathematics, ETH Zurich*

²*Faculty of Economics, Euler Institute, Università della Svizzera italiana*

July 3, 2024

Abstract

In shape-constrained nonparametric inference, it is often necessary to perform preliminary tests to verify whether a probability mass function (p.m.f.) satisfies qualitative constraints such as monotonicity, convexity or in general k -monotonicity. In this paper, we are interested in testing k -monotonicity of a compactly supported p.m.f. and we put our main focus on monotonicity and convexity; i.e., $k \in \{1, 2\}$. We consider new testing procedures that are directly derived from the definition of k -monotonicity and rely exclusively on the empirical measure, as well as tests that are based on the projection of the empirical measure on the class of k -monotone p.m.f.s. The asymptotic behaviour of the introduced test statistics is derived and a simulation study is performed to assess the finite sample performance of all the proposed tests. Applications to real datasets are presented to illustrate the theory.

Keywords: k -monotonicity, asymptotic tests, monotonicity, convexity, probability mass function, nonparametric estimation, shape-constrained estimation.

1 Introduction

Modelling count data is an important task in many statistical problems. Several parametric families of count distributions have been proposed in the literature with their associated inference and goodness-of-fit procedures. For real-world applications, there is often a great interest in modelling the distribution of count data by assuming that the underlying probability mass function (p.m.f.) satisfies some shape constraint such as monotonicity, convexity, log-concavity, unimodality, k -monotonicity including complete monotonicity ($k = \infty$);

*fadoua.balabdaoui(✉)stat.math.ethz.ch

†antonio.dinoia(✉)stat.math.ethz.ch

see e.g. Balabdaoui et al. (2013), Durot et al. (2013), Chee and Wang (2016), Balabdaoui and Kulagina (2020). Recently, several papers have focused on developing and studying nonparametric estimators for discrete distributions under such constraints, see e.g. Balabdaoui et al. (2017), Jankowski and Wellner (2009), Giguelay (2017). However, it appears that less attention has been paid to proposing testing procedures for these qualitative constraints. This oversight often stems from the complexity involved in deriving distributional results for the test statistics. The attempts made in Balabdaoui et al. (2018) in the case of convexity, and Giguelay and Huet (2018) in the general case of k -monotonicity have motivated us to investigate this problem from several perspectives.

In this work, we propose a general procedure to derive the asymptotic behaviour of some intuitive statistics that we use to test for k -monotonicity. Moreover, the obtained results allow us to design a data-driven algorithm that selects the so-called k -knots points or just knots; i.e., the points where the true p.m.f. is characterized by a positive sign of a specific k -th order forward difference operator which captures certain analytical properties of a sequence of numbers. This selection procedure is one important contribution of this work that allows building consistent tests for k -monotonicity for each fixed degree k . Moreover, for testing monotonicity ($k = 1$) and convexity ($k = 2$), the procedure will allow us to consistently approximate the limit distribution of the test statistics built upon the Grenander estimator (see e.g. Jankowski and Wellner, 2009) and the discrete convex least-squares estimator (Durot et al., 2013) respectively. We shall restrict attention to discrete distributions that are supported on a finite subset of the natural numbers. However, we do not assume that the support is known. We believe that our framework is not very restrictive for applications with the advantage of significantly simplifying the notation as well as the exposition. It is worth noting that the test statistics based on the empirical measure are quite intuitive. This aspect is usually very desirable as practitioners can easily understand the main idea and can correctly interpret the obtained result of the test. However, the asymptotic behaviour of the statistics is not straightforward to establish, and as we show in the Appendix, it is not always possible to approximate the limiting distribution via bootstrap resampling methods.

Note that one main difference between our paper and that of Giguelay and Huet (2018) is the very definition of k -monotonicity. While the inequality constraints in Giguelay (2017) and Giguelay and Huet (2018) are imposed on all non-negative integers (even in the case where the true p.m.f. is finitely supported), we only assume here that the constraints hold on a particular subset of the finite support of the true distribution. Thus, the inequalities through which k -monotonicity in those papers is defined do not have in general to be satisfied in our case beyond a certain point. Our definition adds a greater degree of flexibility to the modelling scope, thereby losing a few theoretical properties which are not very crucial for our main purpose. In the case of monotonicity ($k = 1$) both definitions coincide since the true p.m.f. is equal to 0 to the right of its support and hence continues to be non-increasing. An example, that we construct below in Section 2, showcases the existing difference between our definition of convexity and the one considered in Giguelay

(2017).

The present paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we introduce the k -monotonicity sample statistic and investigate its asymptotic behaviour. Next, we introduce three different approaches to approximate the limiting distribution. Those approximations are based on data-driven procedures for knot selection. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to monotonicity and convexity tests. In particular, we discuss two different testing approaches: The first one relies solely on the sample statistics introduced in Section 2 and is an application of the results obtained there to $k = 1, 2$. The second testing approach is based on the ℓ_2 -distance between the raw empirical estimator and a shape-constrained version thereof. In Section 5 we present the results of an extensive Monte Carlo simulation study that we conducted to assess the finite sample performance of the proposed tests. To highlight the practical use of the methods, we employed the testing procedures in some real data applications. Section 6 offers some concluding remarks. In the Appendix we provide details regarding the bootstrap procedure and why it cannot be used to approximate the limiting distribution of the testing statistic based on the empirical measure.

2 Asymptotics for k -monotonicity sample statistics

In the sequel, we consider a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) on which a random variable (r.v.) $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ is defined such that $|\mathcal{S}| < \infty$; i.e., X is supported on a finite subset of non-negative integers. Let p denote the probability mass function (p.m.f.) associated with the distribution of X . We start this section by recalling the definition of k -monotonicity.

Definition 1. *Let $k \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{m, \dots, M\}$ for some (not necessarily known) non-negative integers $m \leq M - k$. The p.m.f. p is k -monotone if*

$$\nabla^k p(j) = (-1)^k \Delta^k p(j) \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

for all $j \in \mathcal{S}_k := \{m, \dots, M - k\}$, where Δ^k is the k -th degree discrete Laplacian defined by the recursive relationship

$$\Delta^1 p(j) = p(j+1) - p(j), \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta^r p(j) = \Delta^1[\Delta^{r-1} p(j)] \quad \text{for } r \geq 2.$$

We recall that if $\nabla^k p(j) > 0$, then j is called a k -knot point or just a knot of p . Moreover, we observe that the operator ∇^k can be seen as a forward difference operator which captures certain analytical properties of a sequence of numbers, for instance, ∇^1 returns the right-hand slopes and ∇^2 returns the right-hand curvature. As mentioned in Section 1, our definition is different from the one used in Giguélay (2017) and Giguélay and Huet (2018). The main difference is that we restrict attention to the support of the underlying distribution and hence require the constraint in (1) to be satisfied only for the integers in \mathcal{S}_k . Giguélay (2017) uses the same definition as in Lefèvre and Loisel (2013) where the inequalities in (1) have to be satisfied for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This means that

these inequalities have to hold beyond the set \mathcal{S}_k . In this sense, the definition used in Giguelay (2017) and Giguelay and Huet (2018) is more restrictive. On the other hand, some interesting properties can be shown in that case, e.g. k -monotonicity implies strict l -monotonicity for $1 \leq l \leq k - 1$, where the strictness refers to the inequalities in (1); see Giguelay (2017). In the following example, we again stress the fact that our focus in this work is finitely supported distributions. For this reason, we are mainly interested in the “local” shape of the corresponding p.m.f. on its support and not in the “global” one.

Example 1. To give a concrete example, consider the p.m.f. p defined on the set $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ as follows:

$$p(0) = 1/3, \quad p(1) = p(2) = 1/6, \quad p(3) = 1/3, \quad p(j) = 0 \quad \forall j > 3.$$

Then, with $k = 2$ we have that $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{0, 1\}$,

$$\nabla^2 p(0) = p(0) + p(2) - 2p(1) = 1/6 > 0,$$

and

$$\nabla^2 p(1) = p(1) + p(3) - 2p(2) = 1/6 > 0.$$

This means that p is convex according to Definition 1. However, the same p.m.f. is not convex in the sense of Giguelay (2017). This can be seen in a simple sketch of the p.m.f. or using a formal calculation. For instance,

$$\nabla^2 p(2) = p(2) + p(4) - 2p(3) = 1/6 + 0 - 2/3 = -1/2 < 0.$$

Note that a convex p.m.f. in the sense of Giguelay (2017) has to be strictly decreasing on \mathbb{N}_0 , a property which is clearly violated in this example.

It follows from the definition of k -monotonicity given above that it is equivalent to the condition

$$\rho_k := \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k p(j) \geq 0.$$

To describe our statistical procedure to test whether a sample is drawn from a k -monotone p , let us consider X_1, \dots, X_n independent copies of X as defined above. Define the empirical p.m.f. as

$$\hat{p}_n(j) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i=j\}}.$$

In the sequel, we shall focus on studying the properties of the estimator

$$\hat{\rho}_{k,n} = \min_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j)$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n} = \{X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)} - k\}$ is obtained through the extreme order statistics $X_{(1)} = \min\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, and $X_{(n)} = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. Let us consider the following centred and re-scaled version of $\widehat{\rho}_{k,n}$

$$T_{k,n} := \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\rho}_{k,n} - \rho_k).$$

We propose to use the statistics $T_{k,n}$ because it is straightforward to compute since it completely depends on the empirical measure. The advantage of our proposal is that the asymptotic behaviour of $T_{k,n}$ can be easily derived as done in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{S}_k = \{m, \dots, M - k\}$ and consider the set*

$$I = \{i \in \mathcal{S}_k : \nabla^k p(i) = \rho_k\}.$$

Then, $T_{k,n}$ converges in distribution to $W = \min_{j \in I} Z_j$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k}$ is a random vector with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ with

$$\Sigma_{r,s} = \text{Cov}[\nabla^k \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+r-1\}}, \nabla^k \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+s-1\}}]$$

for $r, s \in \{1, \dots, M - k - m + 1\}$. In particular, if $\rho_k = 0$ then $I = \mathcal{S}_k \setminus J$ where J is the set of knots of p ; i.e. $J = \{j \in \mathcal{S}_k : \nabla^k p(j) > 0\}$.

Note that Theorem 1 can be proved either using the properties of the empirical p.m.f. or the Generalized Delta Method for quasi-differentiable functions (Marcheselli, 2000). In the Appendix, we provide both versions of the proof, although it is clear the first version is easier to understand as it does not involve the notions of A -differentiability and quasi-differentiability. For our purposes, a suitable test statistic for the testing problem

$$H_0 : \rho_k \geq 0 \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : \rho_k < 0$$

is given by

$$\widehat{T}_{k,n} := \sqrt{n}\widehat{\rho}_{k,n},$$

and it is at once apparent that its asymptotic behaviour depends on the unknown set I . We aim next to provide valid approximations to the limiting r.v. $W = \min_{j \in I} Z_j$. Such a task may be approached in at least three different ways.

Method 1. Let us replace I by the set $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n} = \{X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)} - k\}$, which is equal to \mathcal{S}_k almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$, as a consequence of the Strong Law of Large Numbers. The resulting limiting distribution is different from W . If we denote the α -order quantile of the r.v. $\min_{j \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}} Z_j$ by \bar{q}_α , the resulting rejection region is

$$\bar{C}_{\alpha,n}^k = \left\{ \widehat{T}_{k,n} = t : t < \bar{q}_\alpha \right\}. \quad (2)$$

The main advantage of this method is that it is easily implementable. However, it is clear that it is conservative and will lead to a testing procedure that has a smaller power. Thus, to perform a valid statistical inference about ρ_k we would need a data-driven method that allows us to obtain a proper approximation of the set I and hence of the limiting distribution W .

Method 2. Let us consider a random sequence $\{a_n\}_n$ to construct the set

$$\tilde{I} = \left\{ j \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n} : \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \leq \frac{a_n}{c} \max_{i \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i) \right\}$$

where $c > 0$ is some suitable constant. This leads to the rejection region

$$\widetilde{C}_{\alpha,n}^k = \left\{ \widehat{T}_{k,n} = t : t < \widetilde{q}_\alpha \right\} \quad (3)$$

where \widetilde{q}_α is the α -order quantile of $\widetilde{W} = \min_{j \in \tilde{I}} Z_j$. This approach comes with the drawback of the arbitrariness in the choice of the sequence a_n as well as the constant c . In our numerical experiments we achieve a good performance choosing $a_n = n^{-1/|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}|}$ and $c = 1$. However, it is not straightforward to derive theoretical guarantees for some given subclasses of discrete distributions with finite support. Furthermore, when \tilde{I} is the empty set we suggest adopting the (conservative) Method 1 because this method guarantees that the resulting test is anyway valid.

Method 3. We shall assume that $\rho_k \leq 0$. In the case where the true p.m.f. p is k -monotone (the null hypothesis), then $\rho_k = 0$. This implies that p has regions where k -monotonicity is not strict. For instance, in the case of monotonicity (respectively convexity), the p.m.f. is assumed to have a flat (respectively linear) region. This case is the most difficult to test. For example, for $k = 1$, a strictly decreasing p.m.f will yield strictly ordered values of its empirical estimator for n large enough. A formal test for monotonicity would not be necessary in this case as a visual inspection can be considered by a practitioner to be sufficient. Formally, the testing problem can be given by

$$H_0 : \rho_k = 0 \text{ against } H_1 : \rho_k < 0. \quad (4)$$

Consider again the test statistic $\widehat{T}_{k,n} = \sqrt{n} \widehat{\rho}_{k,n}$, and let us assume that the set I were known. Then, the test based on the rejection region

$$C_{\alpha,n}^k = \left\{ \widehat{T}_{k,n} = t : t < q_\alpha \right\},$$

where q_α is the α -order quantile of the r.v. $W = \min_{j \in I} Z_j$, has (significance) level asymptotically tending to α . Since I is unknown, a data-driven selection of the elements of I should be based on testing whether for a given integer $j \in \mathcal{S}_k$ it holds that $\nabla^k p(j) = 0$. Under the assumption that $\nabla^k p(j) = 0$, the Central Limit Theorem yields that

$$\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j-m+1, j-m+1}}} \xrightarrow{d} N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (5)$$

where the value of $\Sigma_{j-m+1, j-m+1}$ should be determined under the condition $\nabla^k p(j) = 0$. For instance, if $k = 1$ then

$$\Sigma_{j-m+1, j-m+1} = p(j+1) + p(j) - (\nabla^1 p(j))^2 = 2p(j+1),$$

see Proposition 2 for more details. Thus, this selection approach consists of conducting multiple tests which aim at picking all of the indices $j \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}$ that are “compatible” with the weak convergence stated in (5). Formally, we select

$$\widehat{I}_\gamma = \left\{ j \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n} : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j-m+1, j-m+1}}} \leq z_{1-\gamma} \right\} \quad (6)$$

where z_β is the β -order quantile of the standard Gaussian and $\widehat{\Sigma}$ is a consistent estimator of Σ ; e.g. the one based on the empirical estimator of p . Therefore, a level α test has the following rejection region

$$\widehat{C}_{n,\alpha}^k = \left\{ \widehat{T}_{k,n} = t : t < \widehat{q}_\alpha \right\} \quad (7)$$

where \widehat{q}_α is the α -order quantile of $\widehat{W} = \min_{j \in \widehat{I}_\gamma} Z_j$. Before proceeding with the derivation of theoretical guarantees for \widehat{I}_γ , note that whenever $\rho_k > 0$, \widehat{I}_γ can be the empty set; in this misspecified case there is no theoretically solid way to adopt the empirical p.m.f. to select non-knots, therefore in our experiments for convenience we will select I according to Method 2, i.e. we set $I = \widetilde{I}$. In turn, if \widetilde{I} is empty, as already mentioned for Method 2 we adopt the (conservative) Method 1 setting $I = \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}$ and thus adopt the rejection region in (2).

The following proposition gives theoretical guarantees for Method 3; i.e. for the convergence $\widehat{I}_\gamma \xrightarrow{P} I$, providing a consistent choice of the quantile order $1 - \gamma$ appearing in the definition of \widehat{I}_γ in (6). As a consequence, such a choice makes the level of the test based on (7) asymptotically tend to the nominal level α .

Proposition 1. *Let $\delta > 0$ be small and $\gamma := \gamma_n = 1/n$. For the testing problem in (4), there exists n large enough such that*

$$P(\widehat{I}_\gamma \neq I) < \delta$$

under H_0 .

To illustrate the validity of our theoretical results, we present in Figure 1 the kernel density estimators of the true distribution of $\widehat{T}_{1,n}$ for $n = 10000$ and its theoretical limiting behaviour using the true knots and our estimation of these knots, using the three proposed methods. The true p used in this example is supported on $\{0, \dots, 9\}$ and it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p(0) = p(1) = p(2) &= \frac{5}{31}, & p(3) = p(4) &= \frac{4}{31}, & p(5) &= \frac{3}{31}, \\ p(6) &= \frac{2}{31}, & p(7) = p(8) = p(9) &= \frac{1}{31}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Density of $\widehat{T}_{1,n}$ for $n = 10000$ and its approximations: true density (blue), theoretical limit (red), approximated limit with Method 1 (dashed cyan), approximated limit with Method 2 (dashed orange), approximated limit with Method 3 (dashed green).

To plot the true distribution of $\widehat{T}_{1,n}$ for $n = 10000$ we generate 1000 independent Monte Carlo replicas of X_1, \dots, X_{10000} and each time we compute $\widehat{T}_{1,n}$. To plot the theoretical limit we draw a single sample of size 10000 from p , and we use it to draw 1000 independent samples from the limiting r.v. W and from its approximations using Methods 1, 2 and 3. From Figure 1 it is apparent that Method 1 provides an approximation of W which is stochastically smaller, thus, as we will show in Section 5 it will lead to a conservative test. On the other hand both Methods 2 and 3 provide a consistent estimation of the set I , leading to accurate approximations of the theoretical limiting r.v. W .

Before moving to the next sections which are devoted to testing monotonicity ($k = 1$) and convexity ($k = 2$), we would like to note that our Method 3 differs fundamentally from the one used by Giguelay and Huet (2018). Indeed, to construct a test, the authors do not directly derive the limit distribution of $\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}(j)$ but rather that of the stochastically smaller r.v.

$$\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k (\widehat{p}_n(j) - p(j))$$

under k -monotonicity; i.e. H_0 . In fact, when p is k -monotone we have $\nabla^k p(j) \geq 0$ for all

$j \in \mathcal{S}_k$ implying that for all $j \in \mathcal{S}_k$

$$\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \geq \nabla^k \widehat{p}(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}(j).$$

Then, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$P\left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \leq t\right) \leq P\left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j)\} \leq t\right). \quad (8)$$

Since the Central Limit Theorem and the Continuous Mapping Theorem can be applied to the r.v. on the right-hand side of (8), the above inequality gives a way of finding the quantile q_α that (asymptotically) should yield the targeted level α of the test. This quantile can be easily approximated by simulation and the clear advantage of the approach is that the critical region can be easily determined. However, the resulting test is by construction conservative since the actual probability of rejecting H_0 while it is true (level of the test) is, by definition, always smaller than the nominal level α (even asymptotically), with equality occurring if and only if the true p.m.f. p is a constant function, in which case their test and our proposal coincide. It is worth mentioning that the procedure proposed in Giguélay and Huet (2018) turns out to be equivalent to our Method 1 outlined above. Also, note that our Theorem 1 characterizes the limiting behaviour of $\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)$ which holds in general, and not only under H_0 .

3 Monotonicity tests

In this section, we discuss procedures that are specifically tailored to testing monotonicity. First of all, we will apply the results obtained in Section 2 and subsequently propose an alternative approach based on the ℓ_2 -distance between the empirical estimator and its monotone projection better known as the Grenander estimator. The limit distribution of the re-scaled ℓ_2 -distance can be consistently approximated using the knot selection procedure described in Method 3 as well as the consistency result of Proposition 1.

3.1 Monotonicity testing based on the empirical measure

A p.m.f. p supported on $\{m, \dots, M\}$ is monotone non-increasing if it is 1-monotone; i.e., if for every $j = m, \dots, M-1$ it holds that $\nabla^1 p(j) = -(p(j+1) - p(j)) \geq 0$. Then, with $\rho_1 = \min_{j \in \{m, \dots, M-1\}} \nabla^1 p(j)$ and $\widehat{\rho}_{1,n} = \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{1,n}} \nabla^1 \widehat{p}_n(j)$ it follows from Theorem 1 that $T_{1,n} = \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\rho}_{1,n} - \rho_1)$ converges in distribution to $W = \min_{j \in I} Z_j$ where $I = \{m, \dots, M-1\} \setminus \{j : \nabla^1 p(j) > 0\}$ and (Z_m, \dots, Z_{M-1}) is a centered Gaussian random vector whose covariance is given in the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random vector*

$$\sqrt{n}(\nabla^1 \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^1 p(j))_{j \in \{m, \dots, M-1\}}$$

converges in distribution to a centered Gaussian vector $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ where the asymptotic covariance matrix $\Sigma = (\Sigma_{r,s})_{r,s=1,\dots,M-m}$ is such that

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{r,s} &= -\nabla^1 p(m-1+r) \nabla^1 p(m-1+s), \quad |r-s| \geq 2, \\ \Sigma_{r,r+1} &= -p(m+r) - \nabla^1 p(m-1+r) \nabla^1 p(m+r), \\ \Sigma_{r,r} &= p(m+r) + p(m-1+r) - (\nabla^1 p(m-1+r))^2.\end{aligned}$$

The statistical tests for 1-monotonicity in this section are all based on the statistic $\widehat{T}_{1,n} = \sqrt{n} \widehat{\rho}_{1,n}$. Recall that $\widehat{T}_{1,n}$ is the most appropriate statistic to use under the assumption that $\rho_1 \leq 0$. As mentioned above, this assumption focuses on the case where under H_0 (1-monotonicity) the true p.m.f. has at least one flat region; i.e., $\rho_1 = 0$. Our Method 3 described above provides a statistical procedure to consistently identify the constancy regions using the set \widehat{I}_γ with $\gamma = 1/n$; see also (6). By Proposition 2 we have that

$$\widehat{I}_{1/n} = \left\{ j \in \widehat{S}_{1,n} : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^1 \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{2\widehat{p}_n(j+1)}} \leq z_{1-1/n} \right\}.$$

Therefore, for a level α test, the rejection region using Method 3 is given by

$$\widehat{C}_{\alpha,n}^1 = \left\{ \widehat{T}_{1,n} = t : t < \widehat{q}_\alpha \right\}$$

where \widehat{q}_α is the α -order quantile of $\widehat{W} = \min_{j \in \widehat{I}_{1/n}} Z_j$. Methods 1 and 2 give rise to different tests based on the rejection regions given in (2) and (3) for the particular case of $k = 1$. More details will be given in Section 5.

3.2 Monotonicity testing based on the Grenander estimator

In this section, we propose another testing procedure which is based on the monotone projection of the empirical estimator of p . First of all, we recall the definition of monotone projection of \widehat{p}_n also known as the Grenander estimator, and which we denote by \widehat{p}_n^M . Then,

$$\widehat{p}_n^M = \arg \min_{q \text{ non-increasing}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} (\widehat{p}_n(j) - q(j))^2 \right)^{1/2} = \arg \min_{q \text{ non-increasing}} \|\widehat{p}_n - q\|_2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean ℓ_2 -norm on \mathbb{N}_0 . For a given sample size n , it is clear that the true (and unknown) support \mathcal{S} is replaced by $\{X_1, \dots, X_{(n)}\}$. However, this set is equal to \mathcal{S} almost surely for n large enough by the Strong Law of Large Numbers. It can be shown that the Grenander estimator can be related to the concave hull of a certain diagram. Following Jankowski and Wellner (2009), let $v = (v_m, \dots, v_M)$ and consider the set of $M - m + 1$ points

$$A = \left\{ \left(j, \sum_{i=m}^j v_i \right) : j = m-1, m, \dots, M \right\},$$

with the convention $\sum_{i=m}^{m-1} v_i = 0$. The set A is also known under the *cumulative sum diagram* of v . Now, let L_A be the least concave majorant of A , that is

$$L_A := \inf_{\substack{f \text{ concave on} \\ \{m-1, \dots, M\}}} \left\{ f : f_j \geq \sum_{i=m}^j v_i \text{ for all } j = m-1, m, \dots, M \right\}.$$

The Grenander estimator \hat{p}_n^M can be shown to be equal to the left slopes of L_A for $v = \hat{p}_n$. The well-known Pooling Adjacent Violators Algorithm (PAVA) is so far the most efficient numerical procedure to compute \hat{p}_n^M ; see Barlow et al. (1972).

Based on \hat{p}_n^M we define the test statistic

$$\hat{T}_n^M := \sqrt{n} \|\hat{p}_n^M - \hat{p}_n\|_2. \quad (9)$$

From the results of Jankowski and Wellner (2009) on the asymptotic behaviour of the Grenander estimator we can easily characterize the asymptotic behaviour of \hat{T}_n^M which is summarised in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Under H_0 , as $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\hat{T}_n^M \xrightarrow{d} T^M := \|G^M - G\|_2$$

where G is a Gaussian vector $\mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{M-m+1}$ with $\Gamma_{r,s} = \mathbf{1}_{\{r=s\}}p(m-1+r) - p(m-1+r)p(m-1+s)$ for $r, s \in \{1, \dots, M-m+1\}$, and $G^M = (G_1^M, \dots, G_{M-m+1}^M)$ is defined as follows: For $m \leq i \leq j \leq M$ such that $\{i, \dots, j\}$ is a constancy region of p i.e. $p(i-1) > p(i) = \dots = p(j) > p(j+1)$, then

$$(G_{i-m+1}^M, \dots, G_{j-m+1}^M) = \arg \min_{\substack{q \text{ non-increasing} \\ \text{on } \{i, \dots, j\}}} \left(\sum_{l=i}^j (G_{l-m+1} - q_l)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

From the definition of G^M it follows that it is equal in distribution to G if p is strictly 1-monotone. Indeed, in this case, every point in the support of p is a knot, thus, the monotone projection of G on a region that contains a single point is G itself at this point. In general, characterizing the distribution of the limiting random variable T^M depends on having a good guess about the constancy regions of p , or equivalently its knots. This issue can be solved directly by the selection method described in Method 3. More precisely, a well-calibrated test for monotonicity, with level asymptotically tending to α , is given by the following rejection region

$$\hat{C}_{\alpha, n}^M = \left\{ \hat{T}_n^M = t : t > q_{1-\alpha}^M \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where $q_{1-\alpha}^M$ is the quantile of order $1 - \alpha$ of the r.v. \hat{T}_n^M where the true set of knots of p are replaced by $\hat{J} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{1, n} \setminus \hat{I}_{1/n}$.

To illustrate the validity of the theoretical results, we present in Figure 2 the kernel density estimators of the true distribution of $\hat{T}_n^{\mathcal{M}}$ for $n = 10000$ and its theoretical limiting behaviour using the true knots and our estimation of these knots (using Method 3). The true p used in this example is that of a truncated Poisson with support $\{0, \dots, 9\}$ and parameter $\lambda = 1$ so that the distribution is monotone; see Table 1. To plot the true distribution we generated 1000 independent Monte Carlo replicas of X_1, \dots, X_{10000} and each time we computed $\hat{T}_n^{\mathcal{M}}$. To plot the theoretical limit we drew a single sample of size 10000 from p , and we used it to draw 1000 independent samples from the limiting r.v. $T^{\mathcal{M}}$ and from its approximation using Method 3. Figure 2 shows that Method 3 provides a consistent estimation of the set of knots.




Figure 2: Density of $\hat{T}_n^{\mathcal{M}}$ for $n = 10000$ and its approximations: True density (blue), theoretical limit (red), and the approximated limit based on Method 3 (dashed green).

4 Convexity tests

As for monotonicity, we describe in this section our procedures for testing convexity. Besides the simple test proposed in Section 2 we will propose an alternative approach based on the ℓ_2 -distance between the empirical estimator and the convex least-squares estimator of the empirical p.m.f. studied in (Durot et al., 2013).

4.1 Convexity testing based on the empirical measure

Recall that p is convex on its support $\{m, \dots, M\}$ if and only if

$$\rho_2 = \min_{j \in \{m, \dots, M-2\}} \nabla^2 p(j) \geq 0.$$

In the following proposition, we give the covariance of the Gaussian vector Z on which depends the distribution of

$$T_{2,n} = \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\rho}_{2,n} - \rho_2),$$

see Theorem 1.

Proposition 3. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random vector*

$$\sqrt{n}(\nabla^2 \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^2 p(j))_{j \in \{m, \dots, M-2\}},$$

converges in distribution to a centered Gaussian vector $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ where the asymptotic covariance matrix $\Sigma = (\Sigma_{r,s})_{r,s=1, \dots, M-m-1}$ is such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{r,s} &= -\nabla^2 p(m-1+r) \nabla^2 p(m-1+s), \quad |r-s| > 2, \\ \Sigma_{r,r+2} &= p(m+r+1) - \nabla^2 p(m+r-1) \nabla^2 p(m+r+1), \\ \Sigma_{r,r+1} &= -2(p(m+r+1) + p(m+r)) - \nabla^2 p(m-1+r) \nabla^2 p(m+r), \\ \Sigma_{r,r} &= p(m+r+1) + 4p(m+r) + p(m-1+r) - (\nabla^2 p(m-1+r))^2. \end{aligned}$$

The statistical test of convexity is based on $\widehat{T}_{2,n} = \sqrt{n}\widehat{\rho}_{2,n}$ under the assumption that $\rho_2 = 0$ under the null hypothesis of convexity. As already mentioned above, this is the hardest case to test as a strictly convex distribution (with $\rho_2 > 0$) should give rise to a convex empirical estimator for n large enough. When $\rho_2 = 0$, the true p.m.f. has linear regions which need to be consistently extracted from the support. This is done using the set

$$\widehat{I}_{1/n} = \left\{ j \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{2,n} : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^2 \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{6\widehat{p}_n(j+1)}} \leq z_{1-1/n} \right\}.$$

Therefore, for a level α test, the rejection region adjusted using Method 3 is

$$\widehat{C}_{\alpha,n}^2 = \left\{ \widehat{T}_{2,n} = t : t < \widehat{q}_\alpha \right\}$$

where \widehat{q}_α is the α -order quantile of $\widehat{W} = \min_{j \in \widehat{I}_{1/n}} Z_j$. As for the monotonicity Methods 1 and 2 can be used to approximate the distribution of W yielding different tests. More details will be given in Section 5.

4.2 Convexity testing based on the convex least-squares estimator

Balabdaoui et al. (2018) propose a procedure to test convexity of a p.m.f. supported on $\{0, \dots, M\}$ for some integer $M \geq 1$. In their scope, the p.m.f. p , although compactly supported, is assumed to be convex on \mathbb{N}_0 . This means that the definition of convexity is the same as the one used in Giguelay (2017). The proposed test is based on the least-squares estimator (LSE) of p studied in Durot et al. (2013). More specifically, the convex LSE of p is given by

$$\hat{p}_n^{\mathcal{C}} := \arg \min_{q \in \mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\hat{p}_n(j) - q(j))^2 \right)^{1/2} = \arg \min_{q \in \mathcal{C}} \|\hat{p}_n - q\|_2$$

where \mathcal{C} denotes the set of all convex p.m.f.s on \mathbb{N}_0 and $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean ℓ_2 -norm on \mathbb{N}_0 .

Here, we will propose a testing procedure which is similar to the one proposed in Balabdaoui et al. (2018) with the main difference that our convex LSE estimator is only required to satisfy the convexity constraint on the empirical support $\{X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}\}$. In particular, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the support of our convex LSE is equal to the true support of p ; i.e., $\{m, \dots, M\}$. Let $\hat{p}_n^{\mathcal{C}}$ denote this estimator and consider the statistic

$$\hat{T}_n^{\mathcal{C}} := \sqrt{n} \|\hat{p}_n^{\mathcal{C}} - \hat{p}_n\|_2, \quad (11)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean ℓ_2 -norm on the true support (assuming that n is large enough).

The following result can be proved using similar arguments as in Balabdaoui et al. (2017) and Balabdaoui et al. (2018). As in Balabdaoui et al. (2017), the convex LSE $\hat{p}_n^{\mathcal{C}}$ can be characterized through an envelop function which acts like the least concave majorant in the monotone problem. In particular, if for a given sequence $\{q_i\}_{i \in \{m, \dots, M\}}$ we define

$$F_q(j) = \sum_{i=m}^j q_i \quad \text{and} \quad H_q(j) = \sum_{i=m}^{j-1} F_q(i)$$

for $j \in \{m, \dots, M\}$ (with the convention $H_q(m) = 0$) then we can show that $q = \hat{p}_n^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the convex LSE if and only if

$$H_q(j) \begin{cases} \geq H_{\hat{p}_n}(j), & \text{for all } j \in \{m, \dots, M\}, \\ = H_{\hat{p}_n}(j), & \text{if } j \text{ is a knot of } q. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3. *Under H_0 , as $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\hat{T}_n^{\mathcal{C}} \xrightarrow{d} T^{\mathcal{C}} := \|G^{\mathcal{C}} - G\|_2$$

where $G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma)$ with $\Gamma_{r,s} = \mathbf{1}_{\{r=s\}}p(m+r-1) - p(m+r-1)p(m+s-1)$ for $r, s \in \{1, \dots, M-m+1\}$, and $(G_1^{\mathcal{C}}, \dots, G_{M-m+1}^{\mathcal{C}})$ is defined as follows: For $m \leq i \leq j \leq M$ such that $\{i, \dots, j\}$ is a linear region of p , i.e. $i-1$ and $j-1$ are consecutive knots of p ($\nabla^2 p(i-1) > 0$ and $\nabla^2 p(j-1) > 0$), then

$$(G_{i-m+1}^{\mathcal{C}}, \dots, G_{j-m+1}^{\mathcal{C}}) = \arg \min_{\substack{q \text{ convex on} \\ \{i, \dots, j\}}} \left(\sum_{l=i}^j (G_{l-m+1} - q_l)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

To compute the convex estimator $\widehat{p}_n^{\mathcal{C}}$, a support reduction algorithm based on the characterization above can be used where support points are added sequentially, thereby losing the “inactive” ones, until all the conditions of the characterization are met (this is the stopping criterion).

The distribution of the limit $T^{\mathcal{C}}$ depends on the unknown location of the knots of the true p.m.f. p . Our approach which gives a consistent estimation of these locations using the set $\widehat{T}_{1/n}$ has a clear advantage over the method proposed in Balabdaoui et al. (2018). Indeed, the authors propose using a non-negative sequence $\{v_n\}_n$ such that $v_n = o(1)$ and $v_n \gg n^{-1/2}$ to select in the following way: If $\nabla^2 \widehat{p}_n(i) \leq v_n$, then i belongs to a linear region of p . In other words, a point in the support will be considered as a knot of p if the previous inequality is replaced by $\nabla^2 \widehat{p}_n(i) > v_n$. The main disadvantage of this approach is there are infinitely many sequences $\{v_n\}_n$ that can be used but it is unclear which ones are optimal for the particular data at hand. Thus, the arbitrariness in the choice of the sequence $\{v_n\}_n$ makes the resulting testing procedure strongly dependent on p , as shown in the simulation study presented in Balabdaoui et al. (2018). The authors also propose an alternative calibration of the limit distribution under the “least favourable hypothesis”. While the resulting test does not depend on a tuning parameter, it is by definition conservative since its actual level is always (asymptotically) strictly smaller than the targeted nominal level, which is only approached when p is a triangular p.m.f. and n is large enough.

Our alternative convexity testing procedure gives an easy and consistent approximation of the limit distribution for a large enough sample size. To illustrate this, we present in Figure 3 the kernel density estimators of the true distribution of $\widehat{T}_n^{\mathcal{C}}$ for $n = 10000$ and its theoretical limiting behaviour using the true knots and our estimation of these knots (using Method 3). The true p used in this example is that of a truncated Poisson with support $\{0, \dots, 9\}$ and parameter $\lambda = 2 - \sqrt{2}$ so that the distribution is convex; see Table 1. The procedures used to generate the plots of the densities in this case are the same as in the previous section and their description is hence omitted. We conclude again that Method 3 provides a consistent estimation of the set of knots. Therefore, a well-calibrated test for convexity, with level asymptotically tending to α , is given by the following rejection region

$$\widehat{C}_{\alpha, n}^{\mathcal{C}} = \left\{ \widehat{T}_n^{\mathcal{C}} = t : t > q_{1-\alpha}^{\mathcal{C}} \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where $q_{1-\alpha}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the quantile of order $1 - \alpha$ of the r.v. $\hat{T}^{\mathcal{C}}$ where the true set of knots of p are replaced by $\hat{J} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{2,n} \setminus \hat{I}_{1/n}$.




Figure 3: Density of $\hat{T}_n^{\mathcal{C}}$ for $n = 10000$ and its approximations: True density (blue), theoretical limit (red), and its approximated limit based on Method 3 (dashed green).

5 Numerical experiments

5.1 Simulation study

In this section, we inspect the performance and applicability to real data of the proposed testing methodologies. In the following we will evaluate the performance of the following tests:

- (i) Test based on the rejection region (2) obtained using Method 1.
- (ii) Test based on the rejection region (3) obtained using Method 2.
- (iii) Test based on the rejection region (7) obtained using Method 3.
- (iv) Test based on either the rejection region (10) (for monotonicity) or rejection region (12) (for convexity).

To evaluate the finite sample performance of the tests, independent Monte Carlo samples were generated under H_0 (monotonicity and convexity) and also under some fixed alternatives (H_1). The results for the empirical level and empirical power of the tests are reported as the percentage of rejections of the tests at a nominal level, here $\alpha = 0.05$. We considered the following distributions: The truncated Poisson denoted by $\mathcal{P}(m, M, \lambda)$ where λ can be selected according to the required order of k -monotonicity, see Giguelay and Huet (2018) and Table 3 in Balabdaoui et al. (2019). Specifically we consider $\lambda = 2$ for non-monotonicity, $\lambda = 1$ for monotonicity ($k = 1$) and $\lambda = 2 - \sqrt{2}$ for convexity ($k = 2$). Table 1 summarizes the considered scenarios.

Table 1: Monotonicity and convexity of the Poisson distribution at different parameter values.

$\lambda \setminus$ Test	monotonicity	convexity
2 (non-monotone)	H_1	H_1
1 (1-monotone)	H_0	H_1
$2 - \sqrt{2}$ (2-monotone)	H_0	H_0

Moreover, Durot et al. (2013) shows that any convex p.m.f. p on $\{0, \dots, M\}$ can be represented as a mixture of triangular distributions

$$p = \sum_{r=1}^{M+1} \pi_r \mathcal{T}_r$$

where $\mathcal{T}_r(i) = \frac{2(r-i)_+}{r(r+1)}$ is the Triangular p.m.f. supported on $\{0, \dots, r-1\}$. We denote such law as $\mathcal{MT}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{M+1})$. Under H_1 we consider also the truncated binomial distribution denoted by $\mathcal{B}(m, M, r, q)$ supported on $\{m, \dots, M\}$ where r is the number of trials and q is the success probability. In our simulations, we consider convex distributions supported on $\{0, \dots, M\}$ with $\pi_1 = \dots = \pi_{M+1} = 1/(M+1)$. In all the simulations we fix $\alpha = 0.05$, we let $n \in \{100, 1000\}$ and we consider 1000 independent Monte Carlo replications drawn from each fixed model. For each Monte Carlo replication we draw 1000 samples from the distribution of the test statistics used to approximate the quantiles of interest.

From both Tables 2 and 4 one can see that Test (i) exhibits a conservative behaviour since the empirical level is smaller than the nominal one. This behaviour is particularly evident in the case of $\mathcal{P}(0, 4, 1)$ and $\mathcal{P}(0, 9, 1)$ when testing for monotonicity. On the other hand, under the same models, Tests (ii), (iii) and (iv) attain the nominal level for $n = 1000$. In the case of convexity, it is shown in Table 4 that the proposed tests attain the nominal level for large samples. However, Test (i) shows a slightly conservative behaviour also for $n = 1000$. It should be noticed that, in general, when we test for k -monotonicity and the distribution is h -monotone, for $h > k$ we get that the empirical level converges to

0. Therefore, in all the considered simulation settings where the distribution satisfies k -monotonicity with k larger than the one used in H_0 , the empirical level tends to 0. This behaviour is a direct consequence of the fact that $\rho_k > 0$, which means we are in a misspecified scenario. This behaviour can be seen for Poisson models with intensity parameter chosen such that the model is k -monotone with k larger than the one under H_0 , see Table 1 for the considered parameter values and the corresponding k -monotonicity. A similar behaviour can be noted in Table 4 for the \mathcal{MT} distributions. Although the mentioned misspecification occurs, one can see that the tests get less conservative as the cardinality of the support increases for all the proposed approaches.

Tables 3 and 5 show that Tests (i), (ii) and (iii) exhibit a comparable behaviour in terms of empirical power, with a slightly better performance of Tests (ii) and (iii). Indeed, their behaviours are comparable because the three selection methods for the set of non-knots tend to give very similar results under H_1 leading to similar approximations of the limiting distribution of the test statistic. On the other hand, Test (iv) outperforms the other tests for some alternatives, reaching high empirical power already for small sample sizes. In Table 5 we see that under the Binomial alternatives it reaches 100% power already for $n = 100$. Moreover, as a general remark, all the proposed testing procedures are shown to be consistent, i.e. the empirical power increases to 1 as n increases.

Table 2: Percentage of rejections under H_0 for monotonicity tests.

Model \ Test	$n = 100$				$n = 1000$			
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
$\mathcal{P}(0, 4, 1)$	2.8	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.2	5.6	5.5	4.9
$\mathcal{P}(0, 4, 2 - \sqrt{2})$	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
$\mathcal{P}(0, 9, 1)$	2.6	4.1	3.9	3.7	2.9	5.4	5.2	5.2
$\mathcal{P}(0, 9, 2 - \sqrt{2})$	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
$\mathcal{MT}(\frac{1}{5}, \dots, \frac{1}{5})$	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
$\mathcal{MT}(\frac{1}{10}, \dots, \frac{1}{10})$	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

5.2 Applications to real data

We considered 5 real datasets to illustrate the applicability of the proposed testing procedures. Some datasets are taken from Chee and Wang (2016) who proposed a method to estimate the number of species using discrete k -monotone models, and they also propose a model selection approach to select the parameter k , nevertheless, it must be pointed out that their definition of k -monotonicity is different from the one that we adopted. In fact, according to their definition, for a given value of k , a discrete distribution is said to be k -monotone if it is a mixture of certain discrete monotone decreasing beta distributions.

Table 3: Percentage of rejections under H_1 for monotonicity tests.

Model \ Test	$n = 100$				$n = 1000$			
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
$\mathcal{P}(0, 4, 2)$	48.7	56.6	50.2	60.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\mathcal{P}(0, 9, 2)$	46.3	54.5	50.0	57.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\mathcal{B}(0, 4, 4, 0.5)$	92.1	96.3	93.7	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\mathcal{B}(0, 9, 4, 0.5)$	91.6	95.1	92.4	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 4: Percentage of rejections under H_0 for convexity tests.

Model \ Test	$n = 100$				$n = 1000$			
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
$\mathcal{P}(0, 4, 2 - \sqrt{2})$	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.2
$\mathcal{P}(0, 9, 2 - \sqrt{2})$	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.5
$\mathcal{MT}(\frac{1}{5}, \dots, \frac{1}{5})$	0.1	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
$\mathcal{MT}(\frac{1}{10}, \dots, \frac{1}{10})$	1.4	3.0	1.9	1.2	0.1	1.3	0.3	0.1

Table 5: Percentage of rejections under H_1 for convexity tests.

Model \ Test	$n = 100$				$n = 1000$			
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
$\mathcal{P}(0, 4, 2)$	29.2	35.1	28.9	99.7	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\mathcal{P}(0, 4, 1)$	31.8	34.8	32.2	34.6	98.5	98.7	98.9	99.8
$\mathcal{P}(0, 9, 2)$	28.7	32.1	28.8	94.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\mathcal{P}(0, 9, 1)$	32.2	36.0	32.3	34.5	98.2	98.5	98.4	99.4
$\mathcal{B}(0, 4, 4, 0.5)$	53.0	55.6	53.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\mathcal{B}(0, 9, 4, 0.5)$	53.7	55.6	53.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Although such a definition is very different from the one adopted in this paper, we will still mention that their results are compatible with our findings.

The datasets that we consider for our analysis are the following:

- “Accidents”: This dataset contains the counts of claims of $n = 9461$ issued accident insurance policies. The dataset has been studied by Chee and Wang (2016) and their analysis suggests an optimal value $k = 9$.
- “Shakespeare”: It is about Shakespeare’s vocabulary richness; see Spevack (1968)

for the original reference. It has been studied in Bohning et al. (2017), Chee and Wang (2016), Efron and Thisted (1976) and Giguelay and Huet (2018). We use the dataset reported in Table 5 of Chee and Wang (2016) which contains frequencies of words used by Shakespeare up to 100 occurrences, and for which the authors fitted a discrete 25-monotone model. On the other hand, the results reported in Giguelay and Huet (2018) suggest $k = 6$.

- “Stamboliyski”: This is a biodosimetry application based on the measurements of the biological response to radiation. In particular, exposure to radiation causes a certain (random) number of chromosome aberrations (generally dicentrics and/or rings) on the cells. The dataset, already used in Puig and Weiß (2020), consists of the counts of aberrations (dicentrics and rings) from a patient exposed to radiation after the nuclear accident of Stamboliyski (Bulgaria) in 2011.
- “Tokai-mura”: It is again a biodosimetry application, and consists of the count of dicentrics of a patient exposed to high doses of radiation caused by the nuclear accident that happened in Tokai-mura (Japan) in 1999.
- “Microbial”: This dataset contains 149 counts of observed species richness. Both Bunge and Barger (2008) and Chee and Wang (2016) have studied it. In the latter paper, the authors report a selected monotonicity degree equal to $k = 27$.

For all the datasets, we report the obtained test statistics and corresponding p-values in Tables 6 and 7. For the Accidents and Shakespeare datasets, all the testing procedures show that there is no empirical evidence against H_0 (either monotonicity or convexity). The results are in line with the results of Chee and Wang (2016) who fit a 9-monotone model and a 25-monotone model respectively. Furthermore, our results for the Shakespeare dataset are also in line with the value of $k = 6$ suggested in Giguelay and Huet (2018). The Stamboliyski dataset shows no evidence against H_0 (either monotonicity or convexity), but convexity seems to be less likely satisfied. The Tokai-mura dataset shows strong evidence against monotonicity and convexity. Finally, the Microbial dataset shows no evidence at all against H_0 (either monotonicity or convexity), and this is also in line with Chee and Wang (2016) who fitted a 27-monotone model.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we introduced asymptotic tests for k -monotonicity of a compactly supported p.m.f., restricting our attention to monotonicity ($k = 1$) and convexity ($k = 2$), which are the most relevant constraints used in practical applications. We started with deriving the asymptotic behaviour of simple k -monotonicity sample statistics and proposed three methods to provide an approximation to their limiting distributions. In particular, we proposed a data-driven method to select the knots of the p.m.f. with proven theoretical

Table 6: Monotonicity test statistics and corresponding p-values (in parenthesis) for the 5 considered datasets.

Test \ Dataset	Accidents	Shakespeare	Stamboliyski	Tokai-mura	Microbial
(i)	0 (1.00)	-0.11 (1.00)	-0.06 (1.00)	-2.49 (0)	0 (1)
(ii)	0 (1.00)	-0.11 (1.00)	-0.06 (0.75)	-2.49 (0)	0 (1)
(iii)	0 (0.96)	-0.11 (0.99)	-0.06 (0.76)	-2.49 (0)	0 (1)
(iv)	0 (0.96)	0.19 (1.00)	0.00 (0.88)	2.11 (0)	0 (1)

Table 7: Convexity test statistics and corresponding p-values (in parenthesis) for the 5 considered datasets.

Test \ Dataset	Accidents	Shakespeare	Stamboliyski	Tokai-mura	Microbial
(i)	-0.03 (1.00)	-0.26 (1.00)	-1.19 (0.35)	-3.25 (0)	-0.15 (1)
(ii)	-0.03 (0.97)	-0.26 (0.99)	-1.19 (0.33)	-3.25 (0)	-0.15 (1)
(iii)	-0.03 (0.80)	-0.26 (0.96)	-1.19 (0.33)	-3.25 (0)	-0.15 (1)
(iv)	0.01 (0.81)	0.31 (1.00)	0.53 (0.38)	2.78 (0)	0.30 (1)

guarantees. This selection method is also employed to approximate the limiting behaviour of alternative test statistics based on the ℓ_2 -distance between the raw empirical estimator and the shape-constrained estimators of the p.m.f. Our results lead to several approaches for testing monotonicity and convexity which are discussed and compared. A Monte Carlo simulation study aimed to assess finite sample performances shows that the proposed tests are consistent and well-calibrated. Moreover, they attain the nominal level and achieve high power for small sample sizes. Therefore, the novel proposed tests overcome the issues related to the unknown limiting behaviour of the test statistics that previously appeared in the literature.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Professor Luca Pratelli (Italian Naval Academy, Leghorn) for his insightful discussions and comments, which helped improve the paper.

References

Balabdaoui, F., de Fournas-Labrosse, G., and Giguélay, J. (2019). Multiple monotonicity of discrete distributions: The case of the Poisson model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 13(1):1744 – 1758.

- Balabdaoui, F., Durot, C., and Koladjo, B. F. (2018). Testing convexity of a discrete distribution. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 137:8–13.
- Balabdaoui, F., Durot, C., and Koladjo, F. (2017). On asymptotics of the discrete convex LSE of a p.m.f. *Bernoulli*, 23(3):1449 – 1480.
- Balabdaoui, F., Jankowski, H., Rufibach, K., and Pavlides, M. (2013). Asymptotics of the Discrete Log-Concave Maximum Likelihood Estimator and Related Applications. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 75(4):769–790.
- Balabdaoui, F. and Kulagina, Y. (2020). Completely monotone distributions: Mixing, approximation and estimation of number of species. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 150:107014.
- Barlow, R. E., Bartholomew, D. J., Bremner, J. M., and Brunk, H. D. (1972). *Statistical Inference Under Order Restrictions. The Theory and Application of Isotonic Regression*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bohning, D., van der Heijden, P., and Bunge, J., editors (2017). *Capture-Recapture Methods for the Social and Medical Sciences (1st ed.)*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Bunge, J. and Barger, K. (2008). Parametric models for estimating the number of classes. *Biometrical Journal: Journal of Mathematical Methods in Biosciences*, 50(6):971–982.
- Chee, C.-S. and Wang, Y. (2016). Nonparametric estimation of species richness using discrete k-monotone distributions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 93:107–118.
- Durot, C., Huet, S., Koladjo, F., and Robin, S. (2013). Least-squares estimation of a convex discrete distribution. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 67:282–298.
- Efron, B. and Thisted, R. (1976). Estimating the number of unseen species: How many words did Shakespeare know? *Biometrika*, 63(3):435–447.
- Giguelay, J. (2017). Estimation of a discrete probability under constraint of k -monotonicity. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 11(1):1 – 49.
- Giguelay, J. and Huet, S. (2018). Testing k -monotonicity of a discrete distribution. Application to the estimation of the number of classes in a population. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 127:96–115.
- Jankowski, H. K. and Wellner, J. A. (2009). Estimation of a discrete monotone distribution. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3(none):1567 – 1605.
- Lefèvre, C. and Loisel, S. (2013). On multiply monotone distributions, continuous or discrete, with applications. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 50(3):827–847.

Marcheselli, M. (2000). A generalized delta method with applications to intrinsic diversity profiles. *Journal of applied probability*, 37(2):504–510.

Puig, P. and Weiß, C. H. (2020). Some goodness-of-fit tests for the Poisson distribution with applications in Biodosimetry. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 144:106878.

Spevack, M. (1968). *A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare, Vols. 1-6*. Hildesheim: George Olms.

Appendix

A Proofs

Proof of Theorem 1

As stated in the theorem, let I be the set of indices i such that $\nabla^k p(i) = \rho_k = \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k p(j)$. For all $j \notin I$ it holds that $\nabla^k p(j) > \rho_k$. Using convergence in probability of $\nabla^k \hat{p}(j)$ to $\nabla^k p(j)$ for $j \in \mathcal{S}_k$ it follows that for all $j \notin I$ and $i \in I$ it holds $\nabla^k \hat{p}(j) > \nabla^k \hat{p}(i)$ with probability tending to 1. Thus, with probability tending to 1 it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k p(j) \right) &= \sqrt{n} \left(\min_{i \in I} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) - \rho_k \right) \\ &= \min_{i \in I} \left\{ \sqrt{n} (\nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) - \rho_k) \right\} \\ &= \min_{i \in I} \left\{ \sqrt{n} (\nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) - \nabla^k p(i)) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that ρ_k is the common value of $\nabla^k p(i)$ for all $i \in I$. Using the multivariate Central Limit Theorem applied to the vector $(\nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j))_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k}$ and the Continuous Mapping Theorem it follows that

$$\min_{i \in I} \left\{ \sqrt{n} (\nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) - \nabla^k p(i)) \right\} \xrightarrow{d} \min_{i \in I} Z_i,$$

where $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ and Σ is the covariance matrix defined in the statement of the theorem. \square

An alternative proof of Theorem 1 via the Generalized Delta Method

Since $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_k$ almost surely, without loss of generality and for simplicity of exposition we can just replace $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}$ by \mathcal{S}_k . In the following, we will use the results of Section 4 in Marcheselli (2000). For an integer $s \geq 1$, consider the ordering function $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ given by

$$\Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_s) = (x_{(s)}, \dots, x_{(1)})$$

where $\min_{1 \leq i \leq s} x_i = x_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(s)} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq s} x_i$. Since we are interested in computing the quasi-differential of the function

$$(x_1, \dots, x_s) \mapsto x_{(1)} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq s} x_i$$

we will consider the function $h : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(x_1, \dots, x_s) \mapsto h(x_1, \dots, x_s) = x_s.$$

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^s$ and fix θ an accumulation point in A , then, the function h is A -differentiable at θ (see Definition 1 of Marcheselli, 2000) since it is differentiable in the usual sense, and we denote by H_θ its A -differential at θ . Now, let $v_1 > \dots > v_r$ be the distinct values taken by $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s$, and for $i = 1, \dots, r$, let $J_i = \{j \in \{1, \dots, s\} : \theta_j = v_i\}$ with cardinality $|J_i|$. For a given vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_s) \in \mathbb{R}^s$ and for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ we denote by x_{J_i} the sub-vector of x whose components are indexed by J_i . For every $i = 1, \dots, r$, let us define the function $\Gamma_i : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|J_i|}$ as

$$x \mapsto \tilde{\Gamma}_i(x) := \Gamma(x_{J_i}),$$

that is $\tilde{\Gamma}_i(x)$ is the vector of components of x_{J_i} arranged in decreasing order. If $\tilde{\Gamma} : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ denotes the function

$$x \mapsto \tilde{\Gamma}(x) := (\tilde{\Gamma}_1(x), \dots, \tilde{\Gamma}_r(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^s,$$

then Theorem 2 of Marcheselli (2000) implies that the (regular) quasi-differential of the function $(x_1, \dots, x_s) \mapsto x_{(1)}$ at θ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x) &= (H_{\Gamma(\theta)} \circ \tilde{\Gamma})(x) \\ &= \langle \nabla h(\Gamma(\theta)), \tilde{\Gamma}(x) \rangle \\ &= \langle (0, \dots, 0, 1), (\tilde{\Gamma}_1(x), \dots, \tilde{\Gamma}_r(x)) \rangle \\ &= \min_{l \in J_r} x_l. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

In other words $\tau(x)$ gives the very last component of $\tilde{\Gamma}(x)$ which is equal to the last component of $\tilde{\Gamma}_r(x) = \Gamma(x_{J_r})$, that is $\min_{l \in J_r} x_l$. Note that J_r is the set of indices where the minimal value in $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s\}$ is attained.

Let $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ where Σ is the covariance matrix defined in the statement of the theorem, the classical multivariate Central Limit Theorem implies that

$$\sqrt{n}(\nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j))_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \xrightarrow{d} (Z_1, \dots, Z_{|\mathcal{S}_k|}).$$

Therefore, using the expression derived in (13) and the Generalized Delta Method introduced in Theorem 1 of Marcheselli (2000) (with $a_n = \sqrt{n}$ and $C = \emptyset$) it follows that

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k p(j) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \tau(Z_1, \dots, Z_{|\mathcal{S}_k|}) = \min_{j \in I} Z_j$$

where I is the set of indices in \mathcal{S}_k where $\rho_k = \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k p(j)$ is attained. \square

Proof of Proposition 1

Without loss of generality we assume $\mathcal{S}_k = \{1, \dots, M - k\}$. Since $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n} = \mathcal{S}_k$ almost surely for n large enough, the equality occurs with probability tending to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let us denote by I_γ the set where we only replace $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{k,n}$ by \mathcal{S}_k in the definition of \widehat{I}_γ . Let $\epsilon > 0$, there exists n large enough such that, for every γ , it yields

$$\begin{aligned} P(\widehat{I}_\gamma \neq I) &= P(\widehat{I}_\gamma \neq I \cap \widehat{I}_\gamma = I_\gamma) + P(\widehat{I}_\gamma \neq I \cap \widehat{I}_\gamma \neq I_\gamma) \\ &\leq P(I_\gamma \neq I) + P(\widehat{I}_\gamma \neq I_\gamma) \\ &\leq P(I_\gamma \neq I) + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for n large enough. Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned} P(I_\gamma \neq I) &= P(\exists j \in \mathcal{S}_k : j \in I_\gamma \cap I^c) + P(\exists j \in \mathcal{S}_k : j \in I_\gamma^c \cap I) \\ &= P\left(\exists j \in \mathcal{S}_k : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq z_{1-\gamma} \cap \nabla^k p(j) > 0\right) \\ &\quad + P\left(\exists j \in \mathcal{S}_k : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} > z_{1-\gamma} \cap \nabla^k p(j) = 0\right) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where in the first probability term we use the fact that p is k -monotone, which implies that $\nabla^k p(j) \geq 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}_k$, which means that if $\nabla^k p(j) \neq 0$, then it holds $\nabla^k p(j) > 0$. Using the union bound and recalling that $\Sigma_{j,j}$ is the asymptotic variance of $\sqrt{n}(\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j))$ we obtain that the first term of (14) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\exists j \in \mathcal{S}_k : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq z_{1-\gamma} \cap \nabla^k p(j) > 0\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq z_{1-\gamma} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}\right) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} \left(z_{1-\gamma} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

To further upper bound the probabilities in (14), we will use the following three results. The first two results are related to strong consistency and weak convergence of the empirical p.m.f., and the third result is related to Gaussian tail behaviour. Firstly, strong consistency of the empirical p.m.f. implies strong consistency of the empirical estimator $\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}$. As a consequence, there exists n large enough such that

$$P\left(\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}} \leq 2\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}\right) = 1. \tag{16}$$

Secondly, for every $j \in \mathcal{S}_k$ define the distribution function

$$F_n^j(x) := P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq x\right),$$

by the classical Berry-Essen (quantitative) Central Limit Theorem it follows that for every $j \in \mathcal{S}_k$

$$|F_n^j(x) - \Phi(x)| < \frac{C \rho_j}{\sqrt{n \widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}^{3/2}}}, \quad (17)$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant and $\rho_j = \mathbb{E}[|\nabla^k \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=j\}} - \nabla^k p(j)|^3]$ is the third central moment. Lastly, consider $\gamma = \gamma_n = 1/n$, let $b_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $z_{1-1/n} = b_n$, then using the well-known tail behaviour $1 - \Phi(x) \sim \phi(x)/x$ where Φ and ϕ are respectively the distribution function, and the density function of the standard Gaussian, it follows $1/n \sim \phi(b_n)/b_n$, or equivalently $\log n \sim b_n^2/2$ and $z_{1-1/n} \sim \sqrt{2 \log n}$. Thus, for n large enough we obtain the bound

$$z_{1-1/n} \leq 2\sqrt{2 \log n}. \quad (18)$$

Proceeding with bounding the first probability term of (14), replacing $\gamma = \gamma_n = 1/n$, and using (15) and (16), for n large enough we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\exists j \in \mathcal{S}_k : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq z_{1-1/n} \cap \nabla^k p(j) > 0\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \left(z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}\right)\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \left(z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}\right) \cap \sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}} \leq 2\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}\right) + \epsilon \\ & \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} \left(z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{2\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}}\right)\right) + \epsilon \\ & = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} F_n^j\left(2z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}}\right) + \epsilon \\ & \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left|F_n^j\left(2z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}}\right) - \Phi\left(2z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}}\right)\right| \\ & \quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \Phi\left(2z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n} \nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}}\right) + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&< |\mathcal{S}_k| \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left\{ \frac{C\rho_j}{\sqrt{n}\Sigma_{j,j}^{3/2}} \right\} + |\mathcal{S}_k| \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left\{ \Phi \left(2z_{1-1/n} - \frac{\sqrt{n}\nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} \right) \right\} + \epsilon \\
&\leq |\mathcal{S}_k| \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left\{ \frac{C\rho_j}{\sqrt{n}\Sigma_{j,j}^{3/2}} \right\} + |\mathcal{S}_k| \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left\{ \Phi \left(4\sqrt{2\log n} - \frac{\sqrt{n}\nabla^k p(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} \right) \right\} + \epsilon \leq 3\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last two steps we used, respectively, (17) and (18). Now, we turn to the second probability term of (14). Replacing $\gamma = \gamma_n = 1/n$, and using again the union bound and (16), for n large enough we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\exists j \in \mathcal{S}_k : \sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} > z_{1-1/n} \cap \nabla^k p(j) = 0\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}} > z_{1-1/n} \cap \nabla^k p(j) = 0\right) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} > \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} z_{1-1/n} \cap \nabla^k p(j) = 0\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} > \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} z_{1-1/n} \cap \nabla^k p(j) = 0 \cap \frac{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}}{2} \leq \sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{j,j}}\right) + \epsilon \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} P\left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)}{\sqrt{\Sigma_{j,j}}} > \frac{z_{1-1/n}}{2} \cap \nabla^k p(j) = 0\right) + \epsilon \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left(1 - F_n^j\left(\frac{z_{1-1/n}}{2}\right)\right) + \epsilon \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left|F_n^j\left(\frac{z_{1-1/n}}{2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{z_{1-1/n}}{2}\right)\right| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \Phi\left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{z_{1-1/n}}{2}\right)\right) + \epsilon \\
&< |\mathcal{S}_k| \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left\{ \frac{C\rho_j}{\sqrt{n}\Sigma_{j,j}^{3/2}} \right\} + |\mathcal{S}_k| \left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{z_{1-1/n}}{2}\right)\right) + \epsilon \\
&\leq |\mathcal{S}_k| \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left\{ \frac{C\rho_j}{\sqrt{n}\Sigma_{j,j}^{3/2}} \right\} + |\mathcal{S}_k| \left(1 - \Phi(\sqrt{2\log n})\right) + \epsilon \leq 3\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

where again in the last two steps we used (17) and (18). Merging all the pieces, it suffices to choose δ accordingly, e.g. we can fix $\delta = 7\epsilon$ to conclude that $P(\widehat{I}_\gamma \neq I) < \delta$ for n large enough. \square

Proof of Proposition 2

Thanks to the Central Limit Theorem

$$\sqrt{n}(\nabla^1 \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^1 p(j))_{j \in \{m, \dots, M-1\}}$$

converges in distribution to a centered Gaussian vector $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ since it is a linear combination of weakly convergent and asymptotically centered Gaussian sequences. Now, note that for every $r, s = 1, \dots, M - m$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{r,s} = \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+r-1\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+r\}})(\mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+s-1\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+s\}}) \right] \\ - \nabla^1 p(m+r-1) \nabla^1 p(m+s-1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that for the component $\Sigma_{r,s}$ when $|r-s| \geq 2$ we immediately get $\Sigma_{r,s} = -\nabla^1 p(m-1+r) \nabla^1 p(m-1+s)$ since all the cross products are equal to 0. For $\Sigma_{r,r+1}$ we have that $\Sigma_{r,r+1} = -p(m+r) - \nabla^1 p(m-1+r) \nabla^1 p(m+r)$, since the products of indicator functions are non-zero only for the index $m+r$. Finally, we similarly have that $\Sigma_{r,r} = p(m+r) + p(m-1+r) - (\nabla^1 p(m-1+r))^2$, and the proof is concluded. \square

Proof of Theorem 2

By Theorem 3.8 from Jankowski and Wellner (2009) and the classical multivariate Central Limit Theorem we obtain the following joint weak convergence

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n}(\widehat{p}_n^{\mathcal{M}} - p) \\ \sqrt{n}(\widehat{p}_n - p) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} G^{\mathcal{M}} \\ G \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, by the Continuous Mapping Theorem we conclude

$$\widehat{T}_n^{\mathcal{M}} = \sqrt{n} \|\widehat{p}_n^{\mathcal{M}} - \widehat{p}_n\|_2 \xrightarrow{d} \|G^{\mathcal{M}} - G\|_2,$$

which is the thesis. \square

Proof of Proposition 3

The proof follows the same weak convergence arguments as the proof of Proposition 2. For the covariance matrix, note that for every $r, s = 1, \dots, M - m - 1$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{r,s} = \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+r+1\}} - 2\mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+r\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+r-1\}}) \right. \\ \left. \times (\mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+s+1\}} - 2\mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+s\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=m+s-1\}}) \right] - \nabla^2 p(m+r-1) \nabla^2 p(m+s-1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when $|r-s| > 2$ we immediately get $\Sigma_{r,s} = -\nabla^2 p(m-1+r) \nabla^2 p(m-1+s)$ since all the cross products are equal to 0. For $\Sigma_{r,r+2}$ we get $\Sigma_{r,r+2} = p(m+r+1) -$

$\nabla^2 p(m+r-1)\nabla^2 p(m+r+1)$, since the products of indicator functions are non-zero only for the index $m+r+1$. Following the same reasoning for $\Sigma_{r,r+1}$ and $\Sigma_{r,r}$ we get $\Sigma_{r,r+1} = -2(p(m+r+1) + p(m+r)) - \nabla^2 p(m-1+r)\nabla^2 p(m+r)$, and $\Sigma_{r,r} = p(m+r+1) + 4p(m+r) + p(m-1+r) - (\nabla^2 p(m-1+r))^2$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3

As a direct consequence of Theorem 3.2 from Balabdaoui et al. (2017) and the classical multivariate Central Limit Theorem we obtain the following joint weak convergence

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n}(\widehat{p}_n^c - p) \\ \sqrt{n}(\widehat{p}_n - p) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} G^c \\ G \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, by the Continuous Mapping Theorem we conclude

$$\widehat{T}_n^c = \sqrt{n}\|\widehat{p}_n^c - \widehat{p}_n\|_2 \xrightarrow{d} \|G^c - G\|_2,$$

which is the thesis. \square

B Bootstrap

In this section, we show that Bootstrap resampling does not provide appropriate approximations to the r.v. $\min_{i \in I} Z_i$ when I is not a singleton. To fix notation, let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent copies of a r.v. with p.m.f. p which is supported on $\{m, \dots, M\}$. Denote again by $\rho_k = \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k p(j)$. Let X_1^*, \dots, X_n^* be a bootstrap sample drawn from the empirical distribution function of X_1, \dots, X_n , that is, X_1^*, \dots, X_n^* are independent copies of a r.v. with p.m.f. \widehat{p}_n . We denote by \widehat{p}_n^* the empirical p.m.f. based on the bootstrap sample.

Proposition 4. *Let I be a singleton, conditionally on X_1, \dots, X_n the weak limit of*

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right)$$

converges in probability to $\min_{i \in I} Z_i$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $|I| \geq 2$, conditionally on X_1, \dots, X_n the weak limit of

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right)$$

is stochastically larger than $\min_{i \in I} Z_i$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. In the following, we let $\{X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)} - k\} = \mathcal{S}_k$ as this event occurs with probability 1 for n large enough. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) &= \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \left\{ \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) + \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right\} \\ &= \min_{j \in I} \left\{ \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) + \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right\} \\ &\wedge \min_{j \in I^c} \left\{ \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) + \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Now, conditionally on X_1, \dots, X_n we have by the Central Limit Theorem that

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right)_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \xrightarrow{d} (\widehat{Z}_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \widehat{\Sigma}_n)$$

where $\widehat{\Sigma}_n$ is the empirical estimator of the true covariance matrix Σ introduced in Theorem 1. Suppose that $I^c \neq \emptyset$. Then, for $i \in I$ and $j \in I^c$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(i) \\ &= \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) + \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \left(\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(i) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i) + \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i) \right) \\ &= \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i) + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

with probability tending to 1 as n grows, as a consequence of consistency of the empirical estimator \widehat{p}_n . Thus, thanks to (19) we have that

$$\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) = \min_{i \in I} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(i).$$

with probability tending to 1. Since the same argument implies that

$$\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) = \min_{j \in I} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j)$$

with increasing probability, we conclude that for n large enough

$$\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) = \min_{i \in I} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(i) - \min_{i \in I} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i).$$

Suppose that $I = \{i_0\}$. Then,

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right\} = \sqrt{n} (\nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(i_0) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i_0)) \xrightarrow{d} \widehat{Z}_{i_0} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \widehat{\sigma}_n^2)$$

with $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} \sigma^2$ such that $\widehat{Z}_{i_0} \xrightarrow{d} Z_{i_0} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ (using the same notation as above). Therefore, when I is a singleton the limit distribution of

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) \right)$$

conditionally on the original random sample X_1, \dots, X_n converges in probability to the same limit distribution of

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(j) - \rho_k \right).$$

Suppose now that I is not necessarily a singleton. Using the fact that $\min_i (a_i + b_i) \geq \min_i a_i + \min_i b_i$ we have that

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{i \in I} \left\{ \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n^*(i) - \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i) + \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i) \right\} - \min_{i \in I} \nabla^k \widehat{p}_n(i) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \sqrt{n} \min_{i \in I} \left\{ \nabla^k \hat{p}_n^*(i) - \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) \right\} + \sqrt{n} \min_{i \in I} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) - \sqrt{n} \min_{i \in I} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) \\
&= \min_{i \in I} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \nabla^k \hat{p}_n^*(i) - \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (19) it follows that with increasing probability

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n^*(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j) \right) \geq \min_{i \in I} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \nabla^k \hat{p}_n^*(i) - \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(i) \right\} \xrightarrow{d} \min_{i \in I} \hat{Z}_i$$

conditionally on X_1, \dots, X_n , where $(\hat{Z}_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma}_n)$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ is as above. Since $\min_{i \in I} \hat{Z}_i \xrightarrow{P} \min_{i \in I} Z_i$, for the general case we conclude that as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n^*(j) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j) \right)$$

is asymptotically stochastically larger than $\min_{i \in I} Z_i$, that is the weak limit

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_k} \nabla^k \hat{p}_n(j) - \rho_k \right).$$

conditionally on X_1, \dots, X_n . □