

# How should we aggregate ratings? Accounting for personal rating scales via Wasserstein barycenters

Daniel Raban\*

Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley

## Abstract

A common method of making quantitative conclusions in qualitative situations is to collect numerical ratings on a linear scale. We investigate the problem of calculating aggregate numerical ratings from individual numerical ratings and propose a new, non-parametric model for the problem. We show that, with minimal modeling assumptions, the equal-weights average is inconsistent for estimating the quality of items. Analyzing the problem from the perspective of optimal transport, we derive an alternative rating estimator, which we show is asymptotically consistent almost surely and in  $L^p$  for estimating quality, with an optimal rate of convergence. Further, we generalize Kendall’s  $W$ , a non-parametric coefficient of preference concordance between raters, from the special case of rankings to the more general case of arbitrary numerical ratings. Along the way, we prove Glivenko–Cantelli-type theorems for uniform convergence of the cumulative distribution functions and quantile functions for Wasserstein-2 Fréchet means on  $[0, 1]$ .

## 1 Introduction

A common method of making quantitative conclusions in qualitative situations is to collect numerical ratings in a range of, say, 1 to 10, and to then average the ratings. Usage of numerical ratings data is almost a hundred years old [Thu28, Lik32], and analysis of ratings data is ubiquitous, appearing in psychology (e.g. [SDL80, Uhe18, NB18]), the study of consumer preferences [TLM21], natural language processing [BK11], and more ([WPL+06] discusses the use and analysis of ratings data in advertising, financial analysis, and social policy).

In his 1932 article [Lik32], Likert observed that subject ratings in studies of attitudes toward various topics tend to follow a normal distribution. Therefore, he proposed using the equal-weights average of these scores to aggregate ratings. Likert’s convenient use of the equal-weights average has persisted to this day, but is it appropriate for all ratings data? And should we interpret the numerical ratings in the way that an average would suggest?

Unfortunately, the actual numerical values in ratings data are essentially meaningless if taken at face value. Indeed, it is unclear whether, for example, the difference in quality between items rated 2 and 4 is the same as the difference in quality between items rated 4 and 6. Simply averaging the different ratings for an item and then attempting to interpret the rating enforces an interpretation of the above relationship between the ratings, which, in general, may not be true. [SF14] raises this criticism in the context of student evaluations of teaching, and in the same context, [MR11, MT18] argue that proportions are more appropriate than averages of rating data.

The central issue we will consider in this work—which we address in an attempt to alleviate the above concerns—is that people’s ratings do not only provide noisy versions of some unknown

---

\*Email: danielraban@berkeley.edu

“quality score” for an item, for which taking an equal-weights average would be appropriate. Rather, people provide ratings on different *scales*. In other words, each rater has their own, personal distribution of ratings that they follow, so the values from these different distributions are not directly comparable.

**Example 1.1.** Consider two users of a movie rating website, one of whom usually rates movies between 3 to 7 and the other of whom only rates half of the movies they watch 9 and the other half 10. If the two users rate movie A as 9, then their ratings do not mean the same thing. The first user considers movie A to be better in quality than the vast majority of movies, while the second user is saying that movie A is in the bottom half of movies in quality.

In situations such as the above example, where we have access to *multiple ratings by each user*, we can understand users’ personal rating scales by looking at their personal distribution of ratings across multiple items. Indeed, if the statistician wants to calculate an aggregate score for item  $j$ , the data available to the statistician is not only a vector  $(r_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  of ratings for that particular item. If there are  $M$  items and  $n$  users, then (in the ideal situation where all users have rated all items) the statistician has access to an entire matrix  $(r_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq M}$  of ratings.

	Inception	Oppenheimer	Tenet	The Prestige
Alice	5	6	4	8
Bob	9	8	10	8

Using this additional information, the statistician has access to, for example, an empirical distribution  $\mu_j$  of ratings for each user, given by the rows of such a matrix. Averaging the values of each column of this matrix, i.e., the equal-weights average of ratings for each item, neglects the wealth of information available. On the other hand, a clear understanding of each user’s personal rating distribution allows us to compare users’ ratings across differing rating scales. For the rest of the paper, we will continue to use the terminology associated to ratings websites, i.e., “users” rating “items.”

**Our contributions.** The purpose of this paper is to establish a framework for and attempt to address the issue of users rating on personal scales. The first novel contribution of this paper is to provide a new, non-parametric model for the ratings problem which incorporates the notion of personal rating scales.

The second novel contribution of this paper to provide a better-informed scheme for calculating aggregate ratings for each item using the additional information of users’ empirical distributions. In this vein, we will show that for our model, the equal-weights average of ratings for each item is asymptotically *inconsistent* for estimating the numerical quality scores of items. Furthermore, we will propose an alternative method of producing aggregate ratings, which we show is asymptotically consistent for estimating the numerical quality of items, with an optimal  $1/\sqrt{n}$  rate of convergence.

The key insight in both of these aspects is to consider this ratings problem from the perspective of optimal transport. Optimal transport naturally arises when considering this problem because of the need to convert ratings from individualized scales to a common scale in order to compare them. In particular, when converting the ratings from each user to match a common rating distribution, we should transform the ratings in a way which preserves the order, i.e., applying an increasing function to each user’s ratings. The only increasing function  $f$  which pushes forward user  $k$ ’s personal rating distribution to a common distribution is the optimal transport map between these two distributions. Moreover, if we want to convert all the ratings to a common scale, we need a notion of averaging probability distributions to provide a consensus scale on which to interpret ratings. The canonical choice for such a distribution is the Wasserstein-2 barycenter, as it minimizes the total transport distance to all the user distributions.

The third novel contribution of this paper is to propose a generalization of Kendall’s  $W$  statistic. Kendall’s  $W$  measures the degree of agreement in a collection of ranked preference lists. Our framework for studying ratings includes rankings as a special case and suggests a natural generalization to the case of numerical ratings, yielding a statistic that measures the degree of agreement among rating profiles.

**Related work.** Our work builds upon the theory of optimal transport, which concerns methods for and the efficiency of transforming one probability distribution into another. Optimal transport was first considered in the 18th century by Gaspard Monge in the context of efficiently moving dirt from one place to another [Mon81] but has had a rich mathematical development since ([Kan42, Bre91, JKO98], to name a few). More recently, the theory of optimal transport has found applications in fields such as image processing [GM00], city planning [BPSS08], and engineering [Wan96]. Particular attention has been given to the notion of Wasserstein barycenters, a notion of averaging distributions that minimizes the transport costs to do so (e.g. [RPDB12, CD14, LGL17, CMRS20]). Standard texts on the classical theory of optimal transport include [RR98, Vil09, Vil21], and [PZ20] is a recent book which focuses more on modern statistical applications of Wasserstein barycenters.

Our model for how ratings are generated resembles models from functional data analysis (e.g. [GK95, GG04] and [PZ16], which utilizes optimal transport in the context of estimation of point processes), in which we view a number of warped perspectives (user ratings, in our case) of an average behavior (numerical quality scores). We are then tasked with recovering the average behavior from the warped perspectives. A key difference in our case will be that, because users can disagree on preferences, we must necessarily allow for *nonincreasing* warpings. See also [BGL15] for a general discussion of the use of Wasserstein barycenters in this way.

A popular alternative to using ratings data is to collect pairwise comparisons between various items under consideration. This method of comparisons has been well-studied in the statistics literature, most notably via the Bradley-Terry-Luce model [BT52], which has attracted recent interest devoted to extracting minimax rates (e.g. [NOS16, HOS20, LSR22]). Pairwise comparisons are also commonly used in the context of Elo ratings for competitive games such as chess [Ber20] but also with applications to the study of animal behavior [AV01] and elsewhere (e.g. [Pel16]).

Even amid the success of pairwise comparison models, the utility of numerical ratings is still apparent, as evidenced by their continued widespread use. One advantage of using ratings data is that numerical ratings allow one to compare multiple alternatives without needing to check all possible pairwise comparisons. For example, each user of a movie rating website only needs to rate the  $M$  movies they watch, rather than provide  $O(M^2)$  comparisons. Moreover, in applications such as teaching evaluations, checking all pairwise comparisons is often impossible (i.e., no student takes a class with every professor). Numerical ratings also contain additional information that pairwise comparisons do not, captured by the *distance* between the ratings of various items.

Ultimately, the choice between using ratings vs pairwise comparisons should be determined by the situation at hand because the two approaches apply to *different situations*. When collecting pairwise comparisons, the results can be non-transitive. For example, it could be estimated that if sports teams A, B, and C play against each other in 1 on 1 matches, then A will beat B, B will beat C, and C will beat A. By contrast, a single user providing numerical ratings for multiple items necessarily enforces a transitive ordering. In particular, the pairwise comparisons gleaned from ratings data will not follow the independence assumptions in a pairwise comparison model such as the Bradley-Terry-Luce model. Our experiments in Section 8.3 and Section 8.4 examine the results of applying the BTL model to pairwise comparisons from rating data.

There is a significant amount of mathematical psychology literature on the topic of combining preferences. The use of rating data originated in this field [Thu28, Lik32], and has persisted over the years [SDL80, AW00, Uhe18, NB18]. Particular attention has been paid to the self-consistency of preferences (and lack thereof in a phenomenon known as *preference reversal*), analyzing the use of preferences and mathematical models that attempt to describe them [TT90,

[TSK90]. One major legacy of Amos Tversky is a collection of papers which axiomatize the theory of preferences and study them from this perspective (e.g. [Tve69, TSS88, TS93]).

Kendall’s W [KS39], also known as Kendall’s coefficient of concordance, is a statistic for measuring the degree of agreement on preference order when multiple users rank items. It is widely used in a number of fields, including behavioral science [Fie05], environmental studies [Leg05, GBSS13], and linguistics [BK11]. Friedman’s test [Fri40] is a hypothesis test using Kendall’s W to test concordance between rankings.

A somewhat recent body of work on ratings came from the Netflix prize, a public challenge to accurately predict user ratings given incomplete ratings data (see [BL+07] for an introduction and early developments; [Kor09] and [TJB09] discuss the winning algorithm). In this paper, we will not attempt to predict or “fill in” missing ratings, but an interesting further direction of inquiry would be to examine application of our methods on incomplete ratings data after imputing the missing values.

**Definition of the rating estimator.** Our proposed rating estimator is given by the following 2-step computation: Suppose users have personal rating distributions  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  with associated cumulative distribution functions  $F_1, \dots, F_n$  (and hence generalized inverses  $F_1^{-1}, \dots, F_n^{-1}$ , where  $F_k^{-1}(y) := \inf\{x : F_k(x) \geq y\}$ ).

Step 1. (Primitive ratings): Given an item with user ratings  $r_1, \dots, r_n$ , define the *primitive aggregate rating* for that item as

$$R_0(r_1, \dots, r_n) := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n F_j^{-1} \circ F_k(r_k).$$

Calculate the primitive rating for all items, and obtain the distribution  $\nu$  of primitive ratings for all items.

Step 2. (Final rescaling): Adjust each primitive rating  $r$  by reporting the aggregate rating for that item as

$$R(r) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n F_\ell^{-1} \circ F_\nu(r).$$

Step 2, applied to a primitive rating for each item, provides an aggregate rating for each item.

The interpretation is that  $R_0$ , which can be expressed as

$$R_0(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k(r_k),$$

where  $\hat{\mu}$  is the Wasserstein-2 barycenter of  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$ , first puts the ratings on a common numerical scale and then averages them. The maps  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k$  are the optimal transport maps transporting user  $k$ ’s personal rating distribution  $\mu_k$  to the common/consensus scale distribution  $\hat{\mu}$ ; these maps preserve the order of user  $k$ ’s ratings while adjusting the scale of their rating distribution. The choice of the Wasserstein-2 barycenter  $\hat{\mu}$  as the common scale to which we convert all personal rating distributions is canonical because it is the choice which minimizes the total transport distance to all the  $\mu_k$ .

An estimator in this context needs to recover both the scale/distribution and the order of population consensus numerical quality scores. If the users have differing preferences, then the resulting distribution  $\nu$  of primitive ratings will not be exactly  $\hat{\mu}$ , which we view as the consensus scale that our aggregate ratings should follow, so we rescale the result to

$$R = F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\nu \circ R_0$$

to get more accurate ratings. Again, this rescaling preserves the ordering of the ratings and is hence an optimal transport map. We will see that when all users agree on preferences (but possibly rate on differing scales), the rating estimator  $R$  equals the equal-weights average. So it may be viewed as an extension of the average to the general case in which users disagree on preferences.

**Outline.** In what follows, we will investigate the estimator  $R$  and its efficacy as a notion of aggregate ratings.

- In Section 2, we make explicit our model for the rating problem.
- In Section 3, we recall the necessary optimal transport background.
- In Section 4, we consider the special case where all users agree on preferences (but rate on differing scales). In Section 4.1, we derive the primitive rating estimator  $R_0$ , using the geometry of the Wasserstein space of rating distributions. Proposition 4.1 provides almost sure and  $L^p$  asymptotic consistency results for estimators of individual items' quality.
- In Section 5, we extend our analysis and proofs of consistency to the general case in which users rate on different scales with differing preferences. Example 5.1 shows that the equal-weights average of ratings is in general inconsistent for estimating the quality of items, Remark 5.2 provides a derivation of the improved rating estimator  $R$  using the perspective of optimal transport, Theorem 5.1 provides almost sure and  $L^p$  consistency for our proposed rating estimator, and Theorem 5.2 provides rates of convergence for the estimation error.
- In Section 6, we address the situation where not all users have rated all items. Theorem 6.1 proves consistency for our rating estimator in this case, with an optimal rate of convergence.
- In Section 7, we discuss the combining of preferences from ranked orders, which is a special case of our problem. Using this perspective, we propose two new statistics for measuring the concordance of user ratings and of their rating scales. Our statistic for user ratings generalizes Kendall's W statistic for concordance of rankings. Proposition 7.1 and Proposition 7.2 give properties of these statistics.
- In Section 8, we apply these estimators to real-world data.
- In the Appendix, we prove two Glivenko–Cantelli-type theorems for estimation of measures in the Wasserstein space on  $[0, 1]$ . Lemma 5.2 shows uniform convergence (with a quantitative rate) for quantile functions, and Theorem A.1 shows uniform convergence of cumulative distribution functions.

## 2 Modeling the ratings problem


Any attempt to interpret ratings and compare them on a *numerical scale*, rather than comparing items via a ranked list, presupposes that the items have some “true quality” that can be compared on a numerical scale. Consequently, we view (and model) the problem of calculating aggregate ratings as an estimation problem, where the estimands are numerical scores, one for each item under consideration, and where these numbers can be compared in some meaningful way (that is, not only for determining the ordering of the scores but also for determining the difference in quality of items we wish to compare). As ratings data is subjective, these estimands are determined by population consensus. Section 2.1 outlines the details of our model. Section 2.2 provides minimal, non-parametric assumptions on how the notion of consensus determines these numerical quality scores; these assumptions will make the model identifiable.

### 2.1 Modeling assumptions

From here onwards, user ratings will be assumed to be values in  $[0, 1]$ . We take the space of true numerical quality scores for items (unknown to the statistician) to be  $[0, 1]$ , as well. The distribution on  $[0, 1]$  of true numerical quality scores for all items (unknown to the statistician, as well) will be  $\mu$ . For example, if we have  $M$  items of differing quality under consideration, then  $\mu = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{x_j}$ , where  $x_j$  is the numerical quality score for item  $j$ .

We will assume that every one of  $n$  users has ratings for all items under consideration and that no two items have the same “true quality,” so that given an item with numerical quality score  $q$ , there exist well-defined values  $\phi_1(q), \dots, \phi_n(q)$  that the  $n$  users give as ratings for the

item. In this way, there exist  $\mu$ -a.e. well-defined *scale functions*  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\mu_k := (\phi_k)_* \mu$  is the distribution of ratings by user  $k$ . In other words, each user warps the true quality space  $([0, 1], \mu)$  via their personal scale function  $\phi_k$  to give their own ratings on the rating space  $([0, 1], \mu_k)$ , and their personal rating distribution  $\mu_k$  is the push-forward of the target distribution  $\mu$  by  $\phi_k$ .



Assuming that the  $\phi_k$  are well-defined  $\mu$ -a.e. is tantamount to asserting that our ratings data are complete, i.e. every user has rated every item. For now, we will operate under this assumption for simplicity, and in Section 6, we will extend our analysis to incomplete data.

Intuitively, we wish to capture the notion that all the ratings of an item are interpretations of a value on a space of true/target numerical quality scores. Consequently, our broad goal is to reconstruct the original space of quality scores after viewing  $n$  distorted copies of the space, one from each user. This modeling setup resembles models of estimating functions in functional data analysis (e.g. [GK95, GG04]; [PZ16] adapts these ideas to estimation of point processes), in which we view  $n$  warped copies of some function, where the warping is done by altering the amplitude of the function's values and by warping the space via an *increasing* function. In our context, the warping functions are the personal scale functions  $\phi_k$ . Crucially, however, users may disagree on preferences between items (i.e. we can have  $\phi_1(x) < \phi_1(y)$  and  $\phi_2(x) > \phi_2(y)$ ), so our  $\phi_k$  need not be increasing, in general. Our model, viewed as an extension of these types of functional data analysis models to the case of non-increasing warp functions, will allow us to prove general consistency results which apply to situations where we do not only care about a finite set of values. Consequently, our theorems will not in general assume  $\mu$  to be an atomic measure. *However, for the purposes of aggregating ratings, the reader can safely assume that  $\mu = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \delta_{x_j}$ .*

We will assume the statistician has access to two kinds of data:

1. For  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in [0, 1]$  (that is, for the unique item with numerical quality score  $x$ ), the statistician has access to the vector of ratings  $(\phi_k(x))_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ .
2. For each user  $k$ , the statistician has access to  $\mu_k = (\phi_k)_* \mu$ , the distribution of user  $k$ 's ratings across all items. Equivalently, the statistician has the cumulative distribution function  $F_k$  associated to  $\mu_k$  (and hence also the quantile function  $F_k^{-1}$ ).

Recall that for a distribution  $\mu$  with cumulative distribution function  $F_\mu$ , the *quantile function* is the generalized inverse function  $F_\mu^{-1}(x) := \inf\{y : F_\mu(y) \geq x\}$ . We will define all inverse CDFs in this way so as to ignore invertibility concerns; [EH13] discusses properties of generalized inverse functions in detail.

The statistician *does not* have access to the actual functions  $\phi_k$ , as this would trivialize the problem by indicating the true numerical quality score associated with each item user  $k$  has rated. In particular, the statistician does not know which quality score  $x$  was warped into user  $k$ 's rating  $\phi_k(x)$ ; the statistician only knows that the values  $\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_n(x)$  are associated to the same item. Similarly, the statistician also does not have access to the distribution  $\mu$  of true numerical quality scores.

In our analysis of the performance of estimators, we will take full advantage of the existence of the functions  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  and express estimators directly as functions with domain  $([0, 1], \mu)$  (the original space of true numerical quality scores), even though the functions  $\phi_k$  are not actually known to the statistician. For example, the equal-weights average of ratings for an item will be expressed as  $A(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k(x)$ , rather than  $A(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n r_k$  for ratings  $r_1, \dots, r_n$  of the unique item with numerical quality score  $x$ .

Our goal is to provide a function  $R : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , using only the data  $(\phi_k(x))_{1 \leq k \leq n, x \in [0, 1]}$  and  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$ , such that  $R(x)$  recovers the numerical quality score  $x$ . The loss in estimating  $x$  via  $R(x)$  will be measured by  $|R(x) - x|^2$ , averaged over all items; in other words, our estimation error will be measured by  $\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}$ .

So far, our description of the problem has not included any randomness. The only aspect which will be considered “random” is how we generate the scale functions  $\phi_k$ . In our model, we pick users iid from some unknown distribution of users to add to our sample. Keeping in mind the two “layers” of distributions (the rating distributions  $\mu, \mu_k$  and the overall probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  from which we generate iid user scale functions  $\phi_k$ ), we will always use “almost everywhere” or “a.e.” when discussing  $\mu$ -null sets (or  $\mu_k$ -null sets, etc.) and “almost surely” or “a.s.” when discussing  $\mathbb{P}$ -null sets.

## 2.2 Identifiability assumptions

Thus far, the model is not identifiable, since we have not yet specified any information about the distribution  $\mu$  or the personal scale functions  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$ . The goals of the assumptions we now make are to make the model identifiable and to express the notion that “an aggregate rating should reflect population consensus.” The assumptions we make will also serve to separate the problem into two components: the differing *scales* of users’ personal rating distributions and the differing *orders* of each user’s preferences.

(A1). (Consensus scale):  $\mu$  is the population  $W_2$ -Fréchet mean of the law of  $\mu_1$ .

This assumption says that the scales of the users’ personal rating distributions determine the scale of the distribution of “consensus quality scores.”

If we want to rescale user ratings to a common distribution  $\nu$  before averaging them (i.e. calculating  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_\nu^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x)$  for user ratings  $\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_n(x)$  of each item), the canonical choice of  $\nu$  would be the measure for which we have to change the user ratings the least; the Wasserstein-2 distance  $W_2(\mu_k, \nu)$  quantifies how far we need to move points to rescale user  $k$ ’s ratings to the distribution  $\nu$ , so the unique distribution  $\nu$  which minimizes this cost over all users is the empirical  $W_2$ -Fréchet mean  $\hat{\mu}$ . Therefore, the population  $W_2$ -Fréchet mean should be considered the “correct common scale” to view user ratings on, which is precisely the content of assumption (A1).

A variant of assumption (A1) has appeared before in the literature on phase variation in functional data analysis (e.g. [PZ16]) in the context of random *increasing* homeomorphisms  $\phi_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , where it appears as the “unbiasedness” assumption  $\mathbb{E}[\phi_1(x)] = x$  for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in [0, 1]$ . In our setting, since users may disagree on preferences between pairs of items, our maps  $\phi_k$  are not necessarily increasing; this crucial difference motivates much of the work in Section 5 and sets our work apart from previous models in the functional data analysis literature. Nevertheless, we will see (Proposition 4.1) that when all users do agree on preferences (i.e.  $\phi_k$  is increasing  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.), our assumption (A1) becomes equivalent to the unbiasedness assumption. Thus, we may also regard this assumption as a generalization of the notion of unbiased personal scale functions to the situation where users disagree on preferences (as well as scale).

This scale assumption is not sufficient to describe the problem, as the following example shows:

**Example 2.1.** Suppose that  $\mu$  is Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ , and suppose that  $\phi_k(x) = 1 - x$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Then the system satisfies assumption (A1), but there is no way to tell that the items are being rated in the wrong order by all the users. The issue here is that assumption (A1) provides no way to identify *contrarians*, users who report ratings in a different order than the natural order of the target numerical quality scores.

Of course, if every user is a contrarian, then no one is. So we need an assumption which allows us to correctly determine the ordering of the quality scores. How should we be able to determine the ordering of the scores of two items with quality scores  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  (unknown to the statistician) from the users’ ratings? Well, if we ask all the users, then the majority opinion



should be considered correct. And if we weigh opinions by how strong the users feel about their rating, then a quantity such as  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k$  should determine the correct ordering by giving  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k(x) < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k(y)$  for all sufficiently large  $n$  when  $x < y$ . However, as discussed earlier, the direct average of the ratings is not appropriate because users are rating on different scales. So we should instead hope that  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\mu_k}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(y)$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ , where  $F_k, F_{\mu}$  are the respective cumulative distribution functions of  $\mu_k, \mu$ , respectively. Keeping the strong law of large numbers in mind, which tells us that  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\mu_k}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_1 \circ \phi_1(x)]$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we require that  $\mathbb{E}[F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_1 \circ \phi_1(x)] < \mathbb{E}[F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_1 \circ \phi_1(y)]$  when  $x < y$ .

(A2). (Consensus preference order): The function  $g(x) := \mathbb{E}[F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_1 \circ \phi_1(x)]$  is strictly increasing  $\mu$ -a.e.

When  $\mu$  is not purely atomic, we will need to replace assumption (A2) with the following technical strengthening.

(A2'). (Preference order regularity): The functions  $g, F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k$  are differentiable with  $g' \geq \alpha > 0$  and  $(F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k)' \geq -\beta$ .

### 3 The Wasserstein metric and Fréchet means

To provide an appropriate estimator for ratings, we would like to first determine a consensus distribution to convert all the user rating distributions  $\mu_k$  to. The consensus distribution should be an average of the users' rating distributions. We first consider the most basic form of averaging distributions.

**Example 3.1.** One way to average the distributions  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  is to simply use the equal-weights linear average  $\bar{\mu} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k$ . A random variable associated to this distribution has the following two-step interpretation:

Step 1: Pick a user  $K$  uniformly at random.

Step 2: Estimate the rating of a random item  $I$  by returning  $I_K$ , user  $K$ 's rating for  $I$ .

A critical issue with this approach is that if users report ratings on a finite set of values, then  $\bar{\mu}$  will report ratings on the same finite set of values. This would lead to many ties in ratings, which is undesirable.

Our choice of average will be based on the Wasserstein 2-distance between rating distributions on  $[0, 1]$ . We now review some basic facts about Wasserstein distances and their associated Fréchet means. For a more detailed account of this theory, see e.g. [PZ20].

**Definition 3.1.** The **Wasserstein 2-distance** (with cost function  $c(x, y) = |x - y|^2$ ) between two probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(\mu, \nu) &:= \inf_{\text{couplings } \pi \text{ of } (\mu, \nu)} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x - y|^2 d\pi(x, y)} \\ &= \inf_{X \sim \mu, Y \sim \nu} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[|X - Y|^2]}. \end{aligned}$$

We will use the notation  $\mathcal{P}_2([0, 1])$  to denote the space of probability measures on  $[0, 1]$ , endowed with this metric.

For a more general discussion of Wasserstein distances on spaces other than  $\mathbb{R}$  with more general cost functions, see [Vil09].

Since we are looking at distributions on  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have the following convenient formula for the Wasserstein distance in terms of quantile functions.



**Lemma 3.1** (CDF formula for Wasserstein distance). *Let  $\mu, \nu$  be measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  with respective cumulative distribution functions  $F_\mu, F_\nu$ . Then*

$$W_2(\mu, \nu) = \sqrt{\int_0^1 |F_\mu^{-1}(x) - F_\nu^{-1}(x)|^2 dx}.$$

For a proof of Lemma 3.1, see Chapter 1 of [PZ20]. The idea is that  $F_\nu^{-1} \circ F_\mu$  is the optimal transport map sending  $\mu$  to  $\nu$ . Indeed, the optimal transport map for measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  are the increasing functions. Moreover, as we now recall, increasing maps in  $\mathbb{R}$  must be of this form.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\mu, \nu$  be measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function such that  $\nu = f_*\mu$ . If  $f$  is strictly increasing  $\mu$ -a.e., then  $f = F_\nu^{-1} \circ F_\mu$   $\mu$ -a.e., where  $F_\mu, F_\nu$  are the respective cumulative distribution functions of  $\mu, \nu$ .*

This result is standard. See, for example, Chapter 2 of [San15]), which discusses 1-dimensional optimal transport in more detail.

*Proof.* Let  $Y \sim \nu$ , so that  $f^{-1}(Y) \sim \mu$ , where  $f^{-1}$  is well-defined  $\nu$ -a.e. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F_\mu(x) &= \mathbb{P}(f^{-1}(Y) \leq x) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(Y \leq f(x)) \\ &= F_\nu \circ f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $F_\mu = F_\nu \circ f$  for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Applying  $F_\nu^{-1}$  to both sides gives  $f = F_\nu^{-1} \circ F_\mu$ .  $\square$

Next, we recall the concept of a Fréchet mean of elements in a metric space.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \rho)$  be a metric space, and let  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{X}$ . An **empirical Fréchet mean** of  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  is a global minimizer  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  of the quantity

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \rho(x_k, x)^2.$$

A **population Fréchet mean** of the law of an  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued random variable  $X$  is a global minimizer  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  of the quantity

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho(X, x)^2].$$

In general, one must assume that  $\mathbb{E}[\rho(X, x_0)^2] < \infty$  for some  $x_0$  (and hence for all  $x$ ), but we will only be considering cases where  $\rho \leq 1$ .

Fréchet means in Wasserstein spaces are also sometimes called *barycenters*. In our simple case, the empirical Fréchet mean of the personal rating distributions  $\mu_k$ , using the Wasserstein 2-distance, can be expressed easily via the inverse CDFs  $F_k^{-1}$  associated to the  $\mu_k$ .

**Proposition 3.1** ( $W_2$ -Fréchet mean formula). *Let  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  be measures on  $[0, 1]$ . The empirical Fréchet mean of  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  with respect to the Wasserstein 2-distance is the measure  $\hat{\mu}$  with inverse CDF*

$$F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1}.$$

We provide a brief proof, but a more thorough discussion can be found in [PZ20].

*Proof.* First, we embed the Wasserstein space  $\mathcal{P}_2([0, 1])$  into  $L^2([0, 1])$  as follows. Consider the map  $Q : \mathcal{P}_2([0, 1]) \rightarrow L^2([0, 1], \text{Leb})$  sending  $\mu \mapsto F_\mu^{-1}$ . Lemma 3.1 tells us that  $Q$  is an isometry, so it suffices to find the Fréchet mean of  $F_1^{-1}, \dots, F_n^{-1}$  in  $L^2$ . So we want to find the  $L^2$  function  $g$  minimizing  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|F_k^{-1} - g\|_{L^2}^2$ .

The standard bias-variance decomposition calculation tells us that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|F_k^{-1} - g\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left\| F_k^{-1} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F_j^{-1} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| g - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F_j^{-1} \right\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The right hand side is uniquely minimized when  $g = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F_j^{-1}$ , so this must be the Fréchet mean.  $\square$

In Section 5, we will make use of Brenier's polar factorization theorem to decouple the contributions of scale and order in ratings estimation. The theorem first appeared in its modern, general form in [Bre91], but the special case we will make use of has been long well-known (see e.g. [Ryf65]). We recall the theorem here, for our special case of  $[0, 1]$ .

**Lemma 3.3** (Brenier polar factorization). *Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , and let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $[0, 1]$ . Then there exist a unique nondecreasing function  $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and a unique  $\mu$ -preserving map  $\sigma$  such that  $f = h \circ \sigma$ .*

Lemma 3.2 tells us that if  $f_*\mu = \nu$ , then  $h = F_\nu^{-1} \circ F_\mu$ . For a more detailed discussion of the polar factorization theorem, including a more general statement of the theorem and a proof, see Chapter 3 of [Vil21].

## 4 Rating estimation with universal preferences

In this section, to lay the groundwork for the general case in Section 5, we will treat the case where all users agree on all preferences, i.e. all users agree whether item  $x$  should be rated higher than item  $y$ , but users still report ratings on individualized scales. We will remove this assumption in favor of (A2) and (A2') in Section 5. Mathematically, the existence of universal preferences is expressed as follows:

(A2''). (Universal preferences):  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.,  $\phi_k$  is increasing  $\mu$ -a.e.

Lemma 3.2 tells us that with assumption (A2''),  $\phi_k$  can be expressed in terms of the cumulative distribution functions  $F_\mu, F_k$  associated to  $\mu, \mu_k$ , respectively:

$$\phi_k = F_k^{-1} \circ F_\mu.$$

### 4.1 The primitive rating estimator

To estimate the quality of items, we use the following 3 step process, inspired by the analysis in [PZ16]:

Step 1: Calculate the Wasserstein 2-distance Fréchet mean  $\widehat{\mu}$  of the personal rating distributions  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$ . Proposition 3.1 tells us that

$$F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1}.$$

The measure  $\widehat{\mu}$  will consistently estimate  $\mu$ .

Step 2: Estimate the inverse scale functions  $\phi_k^{-1}$  by calculating the optimal transport plans  $\widehat{\phi}_k^{-1}$  from  $\mu_k$  to  $\widehat{\mu}$ . These are increasing, so Lemma 3.2 shows us that

$$\widehat{\phi}_k^{-1} = F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k.$$

Step 3: Given an item with user ratings  $\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_n(x)$ , estimate the quality  $x$  via the *primitive rating estimator*

$$R_0(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{\phi_k}^{-1} \circ \phi_k(x).$$

Putting the formulas for steps 1 to 3 together, we get the simple formula for the primitive rating estimator

$$R_0(x) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n F_j^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x).$$

This process gives us two estimators:  $\widehat{\mu}$  for estimating  $\mu$  and  $R_0$  for estimating individual item quality.

## 4.2 Asymptotic consistency with universal preferences

We now prove that when all users agree on preferences, the estimator  $R_0$  is asymptotically consistent. As a stepping stone, we first concern ourselves with consistent estimation of  $\mu$  via the empirical Fréchet mean  $\widehat{\mu}$ . The consistency of the empirical Fréchet mean  $\widehat{\mu}$  in estimating the population Fréchet mean  $\mu$  is well-known (see e.g. Chapter 3 of [PZ20]) and does not depend on any of the assumptions (A2), (A2'), or (A2'').

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a random probability measure in  $\mathcal{P}_2([0, 1])$ , and let  $\lambda$  be the population  $W_2$ -barycenter of the law of  $\Lambda$ . Draw iid samples  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots$  according to the law of  $\Lambda$ , and let  $\lambda_n$  be the empirical  $W_2$ -barycenter of  $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$ . Then  $W_2(\lambda_n, \lambda) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely.*

Consistency of estimating Wasserstein barycenters was first done in [LGL17], which established results in a far more general context than our simple case of  $\mathcal{P}_2([0, 1])$ . Rates of convergence for estimating Wasserstein barycenters were investigated in [ACLP20], and [CMRS20] studied this convergence from the perspective of gradient descent.

**Remark 4.1.** The rate of convergence in Lemma 4.1 is  $1/\sqrt{n}$ , which we will encounter in Section 5.2.

The case of universal preferences is actually much simpler than it may seem at first. Remarkably, it turns out that in this case, the primitive rating estimator is actually the same as  $A$ , the estimator which just averages user ratings without any prior scaling! Moreover, the error in ratings estimation with either of these estimators is naturally expressed in terms of the Wasserstein distance between  $\widehat{\mu}$  and  $\mu$ .

**Proposition 4.1** (Consistency of the average and primitive rating estimators with  $L^2$ -loss and universal preferences). *Let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be iid random functions. Let  $\mu_k := (\phi_k)_* \mu$  for each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and denote the cumulative distribution functions of  $\mu_k, \mu$  as  $F_k, F_\mu$ , respectively. Define the assumptions*

(A1). (Consensus preference order):  $\mu$  is the population  $W_2$ -barycenter of the law of  $\mu_1$ .

(A2''). (Universal preferences):  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.,  $\phi_k$  is increasing  $\mu$ -a.e.

Define the rating distribution estimator  $\widehat{\mu}$  as the Fréchet mean of the  $\mu_k$  with respect to the Wasserstein 2-distance; i.e.  $F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1}$ , where  $F_{\widehat{\mu}}$  and  $F_k$  are the cumulative distribution functions of  $\widehat{\mu}, \mu_k$ , respectively. Define the average estimator

$$A := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k$$

and the primitive rating estimator

$$R_0 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k.$$

Then

(i) Under assumption (A2<sup>n</sup>),  $A = R_0 = F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$   $\mu$ -a.e.,

(ii)  $\|F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} = W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu)$ .

Consequently, under assumptions (A1), (A2<sup>n</sup>),

$$\|A - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu(m))} = \|R_0 - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu(m))} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}\text{-a.s., } L^p(\mathbb{P})} 0 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq p < \infty$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* The key to both of these properties is that by Lemma 3.2,  $\phi_k = F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$   $\mu$ -a.e.

(i) Write

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ (F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \\ &= F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}) \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1} \right) \circ F_{\mu} \\ &= F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$  is the optimal transport map from  $\mu$  to  $\hat{\mu}$ , so

$$\|F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} = \sqrt{\int_0^1 (F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}(x) - x)^2 d\mu(x)} = W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu).$$

Convergence follows from Lemma 4.1. □

Statement (ii) can alternatively be proven by making a change of variables and applying the CDF formula for Wasserstein distance, Lemma 3.1.

Why should  $A$  and  $R_0$  be the same? From the perspective of optimal transport, the key point is that the average of increasing functions is increasing, so the average of optimal transport maps in  $\mathbb{R}$  (which are precisely the increasing maps) is an optimal transport map. Geometrically, this is just the fact that  $\mathcal{P}_2([0, 1])$  is flat. A more hands-on perspective is that if preferences are universal, then any given item is at the same quantile in all users' personal rating distributions; so  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}$ , which averages users' ratings at the same quantile, is just averaging the values of a given item. In Section 5.1, we will see another perspective on the relationship between  $A$  and  $R_0$ .

## 5 Rating estimation with misaligned preferences

### 5.1 Inconsistency of $A$ and $R_0$ and derivation of the rating estimator $R$

Moving on to the general case where users can disagree on matters of both preference and scale, the following simple example shows us that  $A, R_0$  can differ and that neither of them is a consistent estimator of  $\text{id}$  in general.

**Example 5.1.** The key feature of this example is that the personal scale functions  $\phi_k$  will only be comprised of rescaling and reversing preferences. Let  $\mu$  be the uniform distribution on  $[1/4, 3/4]$ , and let  $\phi_k(x) = \alpha_k(x - 1/2) + 1/2$ , where the  $\alpha_k$  are picked iid from some distribution with  $|\alpha_k| \leq 2$  almost surely.

It follows that the optimal transport maps pushing forward  $\mu$  to  $\mu_k$  are  $\phi_k^*(x) = |\alpha_k|(x - 1/2) + 1/2$ , and therefore the optimal transport map pushing forward  $\mu$  to  $\widehat{\mu}$  is  $F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}(x) = (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\alpha_k|)(x - 1/2) + 1/2$ . We also know

$$F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k(x) = F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \circ (F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu})^{-1}(x) = \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_j| \right) \frac{1}{|\alpha_k|} \left( x - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2}.$$

We can directly calculate the relevant quantities of interest:

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(\widehat{\mu}, \mu) &= \|F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\ &= \sqrt{\int_{1/4}^{3/4} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\alpha_k|(x - 1/2) + 1/2 - x \right)^2 dx} \\ &= \sqrt{\int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\alpha_k|y - y \right)^2 dy} \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\alpha_k| - 1 \right| \sqrt{\int_{-1/4}^{1/4} y^2 dy} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\alpha_k| - 1 \right|, \end{aligned}$$

We know by assumption (A1) and Lemma 4.1 that  $W_2(\widehat{\mu}, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ , so the strong law of large numbers tells us that  $\mathbb{E}[|\alpha_1|] = 1$ . Now compare that quantity to the loss for the estimators  $A$  and  $R_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|A - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} &= \sqrt{\int_{1/4}^{3/4} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k(x - 1/2) + 1/2 - x \right)^2 dx} \\ &= \sqrt{\int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k y - y \right)^2 dy} \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k - 1 \right| \sqrt{\int_{-1/4}^{1/4} y^2 dy} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k - 1 \right|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_0 - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} &= \sqrt{\int_{1/4}^{3/4} \left( \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_j| \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{sgn}(\alpha_k)(x - 1/2) + 1/2 - x \right)^2 dx} \\ &= \sqrt{\int_{-1/4}^{1/4} \left( \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_j| \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{sgn}(\alpha_k)y - y \right)^2 dy} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_j| \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_k) \right) - 1 \right| \sqrt{\int_{-1/4}^{1/4} y^2 dy} \\
&= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}} \left| \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_j| \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_k) \right) - 1 \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_1 < 0) > 0$ , then neither  $\|A - \operatorname{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}$  nor  $\|R_0 - \operatorname{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}$  converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words, if users are allowed to disagree at all in their preferences, then neither  $A$  nor  $R_0$  will accurately recover the numerical quality scores.

The deficiency in using  $R_0$  to estimate quality stems from the fact that some users can be *contrarians* with preferences  $\phi_k$  which are not increasing, i.e. their preference order differs from the consensus preference order. This poses a problem because we try to approximate  $\phi_k^{-1}$ , which may not be increasing, by increasing functions  $\widehat{\phi}_k^{-1} := F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k$ . This deficiency can be measured by the fact that  $R_0$  pushes forward  $\mu$  to a measure  $\nu$ , which may not equal  $\widehat{\mu}$  if some of the  $\phi_k$  are not increasing.

In other words, because the  $\phi_k$  need not always be increasing,  $R_0$  can report the scale of the target numerical quality scores incorrectly. However, assumption (A2) suggests that  $R_0$  asymptotically recovers the ordering of items' numerical quality scores, so we can just correct the scale of  $R_0$  by transporting the result from  $\nu$  to  $\widehat{\mu}$ . This gives us the *rating estimator*

$$R = F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu} \circ R_0.$$

Note that, in applications,  $F_{\nu}$  can be calculated by applying the primitive rating estimator  $R_0$  to all items and looking at the resulting distribution of primitive aggregate ratings.

**Remark 5.1.** By Proposition 4.1, when all users agree on preferences (assumption (A2')), the rating estimator  $R$  equals  $A$ , the equal weights average of the ratings.

**Remark 5.2.** The construction of  $R$  may seem arbitrary at first, but it turns out that we do not have much choice in choosing an estimator. An estimator  $E$  (theoretically considered as a function of the true numerical quality  $m$ ) that recovers both the scale and the order of the true numerical quality scores should ideally have the following two properties:

1. (Scale)  $E_*\mu = \widehat{\mu}$ : An estimator which accurately recovers individual numerical quality scores should also recover the distribution  $\mu$  of scores, and assumption (A1) tells us that  $\widehat{\mu}$  is the natural estimator to recover  $\mu$ .
2. (Order)  $E$  is increasing: If  $E$  does not (at least approximately) preserve the order of the true scores, then it is not reliable for comparing the quality of items.

By Lemma 3.2, these two properties imply that  $E = F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$ .

Now suppose that we want a rating estimator of the form  $E = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f_k \circ \phi_k$  for some choice of functions  $f_k$ , i.e. an estimator where we average the ratings given to us by the users, perhaps post-processing the ratings before averaging them. There are two general strategies for making the sum  $E$  equal the sum  $F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$ :

- (a) Make the sums equal term by term:  $f_k \circ \phi_k = F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$ .
- (b) Make each term  $f_k \circ \phi_k$  equal to  $F_{\widehat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$ .

To see what  $f_k$  needs to be in each of these cases, apply Brenier's polar factorization theorem, Lemma 3.3, to  $\phi_k^{-1}$ . This tells us that  $\phi_k^{-1} = F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \tau_k$ , where  $\tau_k$  preserves  $\mu_k$ . Inverting both sides tells us that  $\phi_k = \tau_k^{-1} \circ F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$ . Substituting this into our definition of  $E$  gives

$$E = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f_k \circ \tau_k^{-1} \circ F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}.$$

So using strategy (a), we need  $f_k = \tau_k$ . Similarly, using strategy (b),  $f_k = F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \tau_k$ . Notice that when  $\phi_k$  is increasing (so  $\tau_k = \text{id}$ ), strategy (a) recovers the average estimator  $A$ , and strategy (b) recovers the primitive rating estimator  $R_0$ .

To estimate  $\tau_k$ , observe that  $\tau_k = F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \circ \phi_k^{-1}$ , which we may write as

$$\tau_k = F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \circ \text{id} \circ \phi_k^{-1}.$$

The statistician does not have access to  $F_{\mu}$ , so we need to use a bootstrap estimate. We could try using  $F_{\hat{\mu}}$ , but we want our estimate  $\hat{\tau}_k$  to preserve  $\mu_k$ , so we would need to estimate  $\text{id}$  by a map which pushes forward  $\mu$  to  $\hat{\mu}$ . We don't have such a map (and in fact that is the problem that  $E$  is supposed to solve!); the most we have is the primitive rating estimator  $R_0$ , which asymptotically recovers the ordering of the ratings, and  $F_{\nu}$ , which we can obtain by calculating the primitive rating of all items. Therefore, we are essentially forced into using the bootstrap estimator  $\hat{\tau}_k := F_k^{-1} \circ F_{\nu} \circ R_0 \circ \phi_k^{-1}$ . Plugging in this estimate of  $\tau_k$  into the equation  $E = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f_k \circ \phi_k$  (using either strategy (a) or (b)) gives the estimator

$$E = F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu} \circ R_0,$$

which we recognize as our rating estimator  $R$ .

## 5.2 Asymptotic consistency of the rating estimator

The goal of this section is to prove the following asymptotic consistency result for the rating estimator.

**Theorem 5.1** (Consistency of the rating estimator with  $L^2$  loss). *Let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be iid random functions. Let  $\mu_k := (\phi_k)_* \mu$  for each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and denote the cumulative distribution functions of  $\mu_k, \mu$  as  $F_k, F_{\mu}$ , respectively. Let  $g(x) := \mathbb{E}[F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x)]$ . Suppose that*

(A1). (Consensus scale):  $\mu$  is the population  $W_2$ -Fréchet mean of the law of  $\mu_1$ .

(A2'). (Preference order regularity): The functions  $g, F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k$  are differentiable with  $g' \geq \alpha > 0$  and  $(F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k)' \geq -\beta$ .

Define the rating distribution estimator  $\hat{\mu}$  as the Fréchet mean of the  $\mu_k$  with respect to the Wasserstein 2-distance; i.e.  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1}$ , where  $F_{\hat{\mu}}$  and  $F_k$  are the cumulative distribution functions of  $\hat{\mu}, \mu_k$ , respectively. Define the primitive rating estimator

$$R_0 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k$$

and the rating estimator

$$R := F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu} \circ R_0,$$

where  $\nu := (R_0)_* \mu$ . Then

$$\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu^{(m)})} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}\text{-a.s., } L^p(\mathbb{P})} 0 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq p < \infty$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

If  $\mu$  is purely atomic, then assumption (A2') can be weakened to

(A2). (Consensus preference order): The function  $g(x) := \mathbb{E}[F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_1 \circ \phi_1(x)]$  is strictly increasing  $\mu$ -a.e.

**Remark 5.3.** In real-life situations, where there are only finitely many items to rate, the measure  $\mu$  will be purely atomic. So we only need the minimal assumptions (A1), (A2).



Before we can prove this theorem, we first need to take care of a loose end. Looking at the function  $g$  from Assumption (A2), the strong law of large numbers tells us that  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_\mu^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k \rightarrow g$  pointwise, recovering the true ordering of scores as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , but we don't actually have access to  $F_\mu^{-1}$ ; instead, we use the bootstrap inverse CDF  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}$ . We must take care to ensure that this bootstrap estimate does not incur much error, even when feeding the bootstrap inverse CDF inputs from random functions.

**Lemma 5.1.** *For each  $x \in [0, 1]$ , the following holds  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.:*

$$R_0(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \rightarrow g(x)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 5.4.** This result holds  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely for each point, but it does not necessarily hold  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $x \in [0, 1]$  simultaneously. However, using the regularity afforded to us by assumption (A2'), we will be able to upgrade this to a more uniform understanding of the accuracy of the ordering  $R_0$  recovers.

We will keep the error from being amplified by function composition by establishing *uniform* convergence of  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}$  to  $F_\mu^{-1}$ . The key is the following general result about Wasserstein barycenters on  $[0, 1]$ :

**Lemma 5.2** (Glivenko–Cantelli-type theorem for inverse CDFs of Wasserstein barycenters on  $[0, 1]$ ). *Let  $\Lambda$  be a random measure on  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $\lambda$  be the population  $W_2$ -barycenter of the law of  $\Lambda$ . Draw iid samples  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots$  according to the law of  $\Lambda$ , and let  $\lambda_n$  be the empirical  $W_2$ -barycenter of  $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$ . Denote the cumulative distribution functions of  $\lambda_n$  and  $\lambda$  as  $F_{\lambda_n}, F_\lambda$ , respectively, and define the generalized inverse cumulative distribution functions as*

$$F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) := \inf\{t : F_{\lambda_n}(t) \geq x\}, \quad F_\lambda^{-1}(x) := \inf\{t : F_\lambda(t) \geq x\}.$$

Then

$$\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_\lambda^{-1}(x)| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, if  $\text{supp } \lambda = [0, 1]$ , then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_\lambda^{-1}(x)| \right] \leq 4 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}.$$

for all  $n \geq 3$ .

We postpone the proof of Lemma 5.2 to the appendix. Assuming Lemma 5.2, the proof of Lemma 5.1 is quick.

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* By the strong law of large numbers,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_\mu^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \rightarrow g(x)$$

$\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . To show that  $R_0(x)$  has the same limit, Lemma 5.2 tells us that  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \rightarrow F_\mu^{-1}$  uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . So given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $N$  be large enough such that for  $n \geq N$ ,  $\sup_{y \in [0, 1]} |F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}(y) - F_\mu^{-1}(y)| \leq \varepsilon$ . Then for all such  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| R_0(x) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_\mu^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) - F_\mu^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x)| \\ & \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Now we are prepared to prove the consistency of the rating estimator  $R$ :

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* We need only prove  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. convergence because this implies convergence in probability. Then, for any  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^p] \leq \varepsilon^p \cdot \mathbb{P}(\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon) + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} > \varepsilon),$$

where the right hand side tends to  $\varepsilon^p$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Here, we have used the fact that  $\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^p \leq 1$ . This gives convergence in  $L^p(\mathbb{P})$ .

To decouple the roles of scale and order in the estimation, Brenier's polar factorization theorem tells us that there exists a unique  $\mu$ -preserving map  $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $R_0 = F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \circ \sigma$ . Substituting this decomposition into the definition of  $R$  gives us the simplified theoretical representation

$$R = F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \circ \sigma.$$

Now we can analyze the rating estimation error in two terms which represent the scaling error and ordering error, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} &\leq \|R - \sigma\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\ &= \|F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \circ \sigma - \sigma\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $\sigma$  is  $\mu$ -preserving,

$$= \|F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}$$

By Proposition 4.1, the former term is just  $W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu)$ .

$$= W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu) + \|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

The first term goes to 0  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. by assumption (A1) and Lemma 4.1, so we now need only concern ourselves with the ordering error term.

To deal with  $\|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}$ , we first address the case of a purely atomic  $\mu$  under assumption (A2). The key point is that the rearrangement  $\sigma$  must map atoms of  $\mu$  to atoms of  $\mu$ , so if we preserve the ordering of the atoms, they must be fixed in place. The measure  $\mu$  can have at most countably infinitely many atoms, so given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $A_\varepsilon$  be a *finite* set of atoms of  $\mu$  such that the total mass of atoms not in  $A_\varepsilon$  is  $\leq \varepsilon$ ; choosing  $A_\varepsilon$  so that  $\mu(\{x\}) > \mu(\{y\})$  for all  $x \in A_\varepsilon$  and  $y \notin A_\varepsilon$ , we must have  $\sigma(A_\varepsilon) = A_\varepsilon$ . Then, letting  $\delta = \min\{|g(x) - g(y)| : x, y \in A_\varepsilon\}$ , we look to Lemma 5.1 to guarantee that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e., for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $|R_0(x) - g(x)| < \delta/2$  for all  $x \in A_\varepsilon$ . Since  $g$  is increasing, the ordering of the  $x \in A_\varepsilon$  is the same as the ordering of the  $g(x)$  in  $g(A_\varepsilon)$ . Moreover, the choice of  $\delta$  guarantees that the  $R_0(x)$  preserve the same ordering because if  $x < y$ , then

$$R_0(y) - R_0(x) > g(y) - g(x) - 2\delta \geq 0.$$

Finally, recalling that  $R_0 = F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu} \circ \sigma$ , where  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$  is nondecreasing, we see that  $\sigma$  preserves the ordering of atoms in  $A_\varepsilon$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ , as well. The conclusion is that since  $\sigma$  preserves the ordering of the points in the finite set  $A_\varepsilon$  and maps  $A_\varepsilon$  to  $A_\varepsilon$  bijectively,  $\sigma$  must act as the identity on  $A_\varepsilon$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. This proves the statement in the case where  $\mu$  is purely atomic.

Assuming (A2'), given an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we will show that with high probability, for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\sigma$  moves points at most  $\varepsilon$ . The strategy is to have  $R_0$  preserve the ordering of a fine mesh of points in  $[0, 1]$  and then use the regularity assumption (A2) to extend this to preserving order between most pairs of points; this preservation of order will be captured by  $\sigma$ , which will then be close to the identity map. Denote  $R_1 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k$ , and let  $m$  be large enough such that  $3\beta/(\alpha m) + 2/m \leq \varepsilon$ . The strong law of large numbers tells us that for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $|R_1(j/m) - g(j/m)| < \delta$  for all  $0 \leq j \leq m$ , where we choose  $\delta = \beta/(8m)$ . We may also let  $n$  be large enough such that  $\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |R_0(x) - R_1(x)| < \delta$ , by Lemma 5.2.

Now let  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  with  $x < y$ , and denote  $k, \ell$  as the indices such that  $(k-1)/M \leq x < k/M$  and  $(\ell-1)/M \leq y < \ell/M$ . Then if  $|x - y| > \varepsilon$  (so that  $(\ell - 1 - k)/M \geq 3\beta/(\alpha M)$ ),

$$\begin{aligned}
R_0(y) - R_0(x) &\geq R_1(y) - R_1(x) - 2\delta \\
&= \left[ R_1\left(\frac{\ell-1}{m}\right) + (R_1(y) - R_1\left(\frac{\ell-1}{m}\right)) \right] - \left[ R_1\left(\frac{k}{m}\right) - (R_1\left(\frac{k}{m}\right) - R_1(x)) \right] - 2\delta \\
&= \left[ R_1\left(\frac{\ell-1}{m}\right) + \int_{\frac{\ell-1}{m}}^y R_1'(s) ds \right] - \left[ R_1\left(\frac{k}{m}\right) - \int_x^{\frac{k}{m}} R_1'(s) ds \right] - 2\delta
\end{aligned}$$

Since each  $(F_\mu^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k)' \geq -\beta$ ,  $R_1' \geq -\beta$ , as well.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq R_1\left(\frac{\ell-1}{m}\right) - R_1\left(\frac{k}{m}\right) - \beta(y - \frac{\ell-1}{m}) - \beta(\frac{k}{m} - x) - 2\delta \\
&\geq g\left(\frac{\ell-1}{m}\right) - g\left(\frac{k}{m}\right) - \beta(y - \frac{\ell-1}{m}) - \beta(\frac{k}{m} - x) - 4\delta \\
&\geq \alpha\left(\frac{\ell-1-k}{m}\right) - \beta(y - \frac{\ell-1}{m}) - \beta(\frac{k}{m} - x) - 4\delta \\
&\geq \frac{3\beta}{m} - \frac{2\beta}{m} - 4\delta \\
&= \frac{\beta}{2m} \\
&> 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Keep in mind that this conclusion holds  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all such pairs  $x, y$  simultaneously.

We have proven that for any  $\varepsilon$ , there exists a sample size  $N$  such that for all  $n \geq N$ ,

$$|x - y| > \varepsilon \text{ and } x < y \implies R_0(y) > R_0(x) \implies \sigma(y) > \sigma(x).$$

We then have that for  $x \in (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)$ ,  $\sigma(x) > \sigma(y)$  for all  $y \in [0, x - \varepsilon]$  and  $\sigma(x) < \sigma(y)$  for all  $y \in [x + \varepsilon, 1]$ . So, since  $\sigma$  preserves  $\mu$ , we get

$$F_\mu^{-1} \circ F_\mu(x - \varepsilon) \leq \sigma(x) \leq F_\mu^{-1} \circ F_\mu(x + \varepsilon),$$

Since  $\sigma$  maps  $\text{supp } \mu$  to itself, we may conclude that that for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$x - \varepsilon \leq \sigma(x) \leq x + \varepsilon.$$

So for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \varepsilon$$

$\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, we get that  $\|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \rightarrow 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 5.5** (Order-scale decomposition for  $L^2$  loss). The setup for this proof can be used to analyze any estimator  $E$  of consensus ratings. Brenier's polar factorization characterizes the  $\mu$ -preserving map  $\sigma$  (associated to  $E$ ) as the  $L^2$ -projection of  $E$  onto the set of  $\mu$ -preserving maps. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|E - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 &= \|E - \sigma\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + \|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \\
&= W_2(E_*\mu, \mu)^2 + \|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So the loss can always be decoupled into these separate order and scale terms.

If we keep track of the sample size needed for each step of the above proof, we can strengthen our understanding to include the rate of convergence of the rating estimator  $R$  to  $\text{id}$ .

**Theorem 5.2** (Rates of convergence for the rating estimator). *With the same notation as Theorem 5.1,*

(i) If  $\mu$  is purely atomic with  $M$  atoms, assuming (A1) and (A2),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} + 4Me^{-n\delta^2/8} \quad \forall n \geq 1 \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta := \min\{g(y) - g(x) : x, y \text{ are atoms of } \mu, x < y\}$ .

(ii) If  $\text{supp } \mu = [0, 1]$ , assuming (A1) and (A2'),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] &\leq \left(\frac{3C}{\alpha} + \frac{11}{2}\right) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \quad \forall n \geq 3 \\ &= O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending only on  $\beta$ .

**Remark 5.6.** The rate of convergence  $1/\sqrt{n}$  is optimal. Recall that when all users agree on preference order, Proposition 4.1 tells us that  $R = A$ , the equal weights average of the ratings. In this case, we are estimating  $x = \mathbb{E}[\phi_1(x)]$  by  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k(x)$ , which follows the central limit theorem rate of  $1/\sqrt{n}$ . So in the ‘‘real life’’ setting where users rate finitely many items, we have captured the optimal rate of convergence.

*Proof.* Writing  $\mathbb{E}[\|R - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu)] + \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}]$ , we bound each term. The first term can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu)] &= \mathbb{E}[\|F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} - F_{\mu}^{-1}\|_{L^2(dx)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1} - F_{\mu}^{-1}\right\|_{L^2(dx)}\right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_k^{-1} - F_{\mu}^{-1}\right\|_{L^2(dx)}^2\right]} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \int_0^1 (F_k^{-1}(x) - F_{\mu}^{-1}(x))(F_j^{-1}(x) - F_{\mu}^{-1}(x)) dx\right]} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[(F_k^{-1}(x) - F_{\mu}^{-1}(x))(F_j^{-1}(x) - F_{\mu}^{-1}(x))] dx}\end{aligned}$$

Assumption (A1) implies that  $\mathbb{E}[F_1^{-1}(x)] = F_{\mu}^{-1}(x)$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$  (see Lemma A.1), so noting that the  $F_k^{-1}(x) - F_{\mu}^{-1}(x)$  are centered, iid random variables for each  $x$ , we see that the off-diagonal terms will all be 0.

$$\begin{aligned}&= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^1 \text{Var}(F_k^{-1}(x)) dx} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}.\end{aligned}$$

For the remaining term, if  $\mu$  is purely atomic with  $N$  atoms and we are assuming (A2), then we will have  $\sigma = \text{id}$  once  $|R_0(x) - g(x)| < \delta/2$  for each of the  $N$  atoms  $x$  of  $\mu$ , where  $\delta$  is a

constant depending on  $g$ . To compare  $R_0$  to  $g$ , it will be convenient to modify  $R_0$  by removing the doubled dependence on each  $F_k$  in each term. In each term, we replace  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F_j^{-1}$  with  $F_{\nu_k}^{-1} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq k} F_j^{-1} + \frac{1}{n} F_{k'}^{-1}$ , where  $F_{k'}^{-1}$  is an independent copy of  $F_k^{-1}$ . This gives  $R_2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\nu_k}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k$ , where  $|R_0 - R_2| \leq \frac{1}{n}$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}[R_2(x)] = g(x)$  because

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[F_{\nu_k}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \mid \phi_k] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq k} \mathbb{E}[F_j^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \mid \phi_k] + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[F_{k'}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \mid \phi_k] \\ &= F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x), \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{E}[R_2(x)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[F_{\nu_k}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k(x) \mid \phi_k]] = g(x).$$

Using the bounded differences inequality (see, e.g., Corollary 2.21 of [Wai19]) with bounded difference  $\frac{2}{n}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_2(x) - g(x)| \geq t) \leq 2e^{-nt^2/2},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|R_0(x) - g(x)| \geq \delta/2) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|R_2(x) - g(x)| \geq \delta/2 - 1/n) \\ &\leq 2e^{-n(\delta/2 - 1/n)^2/2} \\ &\leq 4e^{-n\delta^2/8}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $e^{\delta^2/2} \leq e^{1/2} \leq 2$ . Applying a union bound over the  $M$  atoms, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_0(x) - g(x)| \geq \delta/2 \text{ for any atom } x) \leq 4Me^{-n\delta^2/8}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] &\leq 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(|R_0(x) - g(x)| \geq \delta/2 \text{ for some atom } x) \\ &\leq 4Me^{-n\delta^2/8} \end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof for this case.

For the remaining case, assuming (A2') and  $\text{supp } \mu = [0, 1]$ , we will show that on the event where  $\sigma$  approximates  $\text{id}$  as in the proof of Theorem 5.1,  $\|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq (3\beta/\alpha + 2)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$ . We will also show that the probability of the complement event is appropriately small. Denoting  $R_1 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ F_k \circ \phi_k$ , for the ‘‘good’’ event to occur, we need  $|R_1(x) - g(x)| \leq \delta := \beta/(8m)$  for  $m$  values of  $x$  and  $\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |R_0(x) - R_1(x)| \leq \delta := \beta/(8m)$ , where we choose  $m = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}}$ . Again by Hoeffding’s inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_1(x) - g(x)| \geq \delta) \leq 2e^{-2n\delta^2},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(|R_1(x) - g(x)| \geq \delta \text{ for any of the } m \text{ points } x) \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} e^{-2n\delta^2} \\ & = 2\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \exp(-\beta^2 \log n/32) \\ & = \frac{2}{n^{\beta^2/32 - 1/2} \sqrt{\log n}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.2 and the bounded differences inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |R_0(x) - R_1(x)| \geq \delta \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |R_0(x) - R_1(x)| - \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |R_0(x) - R_1(x)| \right] \geq \delta - 4\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \\
& \leq \exp \left( -\frac{n(\delta - 4\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}})^2}{4} \right) \\
& = \exp \left( -\frac{(\beta/8 - 4)^2 \log n}{4} \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{n^{(\beta/16-2)^2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In total, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\sigma - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] & \leq (3\beta/\alpha + 2)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \cdot 1 \\
& \quad + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(|R_1(x) - g(x)| \geq \delta \text{ for any of } M \text{ points}) \\
& \quad + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |R_0(x) - R_1(x)| \geq \delta \right) \\
& = (3\beta/\alpha + 2)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \frac{2}{n^{\beta^2/32-1/2}\sqrt{\log n}} + \frac{1}{n^{(\beta/16-2)^2}}
\end{aligned}$$

If assumption (A2') holds for  $(\alpha, \beta)$ , then it holds for  $(\alpha, \beta')$  for any  $\beta' > \beta$ , so if  $\beta^2/32 - 1/2 < 1/2$  or  $(\beta/16 - 2)^2 < 1/2$ , we may repeat the argument with the increased value  $\beta' = 4\sqrt{2}$  (if  $\beta' < 4\sqrt{2}$ ) or  $\beta' = 32 + 8\sqrt{2}$ . So we get

$$\leq \left( \frac{3C}{\alpha} + 5 \right) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}},$$

where

$$C = \begin{cases} 4\sqrt{2} & \text{if } \beta \leq 4\sqrt{2} \\ \beta & \text{if } 4\sqrt{2} < \beta \leq 32 - 8\sqrt{2} \\ 32 + 8\sqrt{2} & \text{if } 32 - 8\sqrt{2} < \beta \leq 32 + 8\sqrt{2} \\ \beta & \text{if } \beta > 32 + 8\sqrt{2}. \end{cases}$$

Adding this to the  $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}$  contribution from  $W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu)$  completes the proof.  $\square$

## 6 Rating with incomplete user data

In many settings, we have an incomplete set of ratings, i.e. not every user has rated every item. In such a case, should we expect our rating estimator to be reliable? To answer this question quantitatively, we must first clarify our assumptions about which ratings are missing. Consider the following example.

**Example 6.1.**  $M$  applicants apply for a job, and their applications are collectively rated by  $n$  judges. To split up the work, the applicants are randomly assigned to judges, with each application reviewed  $q$  times and each judge rating  $\frac{qM}{n}$  applications. If the random assignment of judges to applications is uniform and independent of the judges' personal rating scales, then we would intuitively expect that for large  $q$  (and hence large  $\frac{qM}{n}$ ), we can accurately recover the judges' personal rating scales (à la the Glivenko–Cantelli theorem).

Notice that this example only changes our model in 1 aspect: there is now additional randomness which determines which items each user rates. A priori, this random assignment may not be independent of the users and their personal rating scales, so care needs to be taken to specify how this additional randomness affects the data.

Here is some notation. Denote  $N_x$  as the (possibly random) set of users rating the item with quality score  $x$ , and let  $N = \{N_x : x \in \text{supp } \mu\}$  be the collective information of “who rates what.” Rather than  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$ , the statistician has access to  $N$ , along with the *empirical personal rating distributions*  $\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_n$ , represented by the empirical CDFs  $\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_n$ . The empirical Wasserstein-2 Fréchet mean  $\tilde{\mu}$  is given by  $F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \tilde{F}_k^{-1}$ , and our adjusted rating estimator is

$$\tilde{R} := F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_{(\tilde{R}_0)_*\mu} \circ \tilde{R}_0,$$

where

$$\tilde{R}_0(x) := \frac{1}{|N_x|} \sum_{k \in N_x} F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x).$$

It will be mathematically useful to maintain our notion of the personal scale functions  $\phi_k$  and to assume that they are defined  $\mu$ -a.e., regardless of whether or not the corresponding user has rated each item. We interpret  $\phi_k(x)$  as the *hypothetical rating* of user  $k$  for the item with quality score  $x$ .

Two new challenges arise in our analysis:

- (i) Do the items user  $k$  rates give an accurate depiction of their personal rating scale  $\mu_k$ ?
- (ii) Have enough users rated each item for us to accurately understand its numerical quality?

To address the second concern, we will necessarily need to work in the regime where the number of ratings for each item goes to infinity. To address the first concern, we will need assumptions regarding which items each user rates. In reality, there are a number of different ways in which “who rates what” is chosen, and one set of assumptions may not apply to all contexts. Here, we aim to provide relatively general assumptions to serve as a proof of concept in justifying the robustness of our rating estimator.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $\mu$  be purely atomic with  $M$  atoms, and assume that*

(A1). (Consensus scale):  $\mu$  is the population  $W_2$ -Fréchet mean of the law of  $\tilde{\mu}_1$ .

(A2’). (Consensus preference order with incomplete data): The function  $h(x) := \mathbb{E}[F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_1 \circ \phi_1(x)]$  is increasing.

(A3). (Balanced choices):  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(x) | \phi_1] = F_1^{-1}(x)$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

(A4). (Item choices don’t influence profiles): The collection  $N := \{N_x : x \in [0, 1]\}$  of “who rates what” is independent of  $\{\phi_k : k \geq 1\}$ .

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{R} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} + 6.5 \sum_{\text{atoms } x} \mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|\delta^2/128}],$$

where  $\delta := \min\{h(y) - h(x) : x, y \text{ are atoms of } \mu, x < y\}$ . Consequently, if for all atoms  $x$  of  $\mu$ ,  $|N_x| \geq \frac{64}{\delta^2} \log n$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{R} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] &\leq \frac{7M}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The constants are not optimized and have been weakened to simplify the presentation.



**Remark 6.1.** Together, assumptions (A1) and (A3) imply that  $\mu$  is the  $W_2$ -Fréchet mean of the law of  $\tilde{\mu}_1$ , as  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(x)] = F_\mu^{-1}(x)$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . One can prove (with almost the exact same proof, verbatim) the same theorem below by replacing (A1) and (A3) by the assumption that  $\mu$  is the  $W_2$ -Fréchet mean of the law of  $\tilde{\mu}_1$ . However, we find that the assumptions (A1), (A2), (A3) more closely match how one conceptualizes rating systems.

**Remark 6.2.** In some applications, (A3) may not be exactly satisfied. A careful modification of our proof will show that (A3) can be replaced with a suitable asymptotic statement as the number of items each user rates goes to infinity. However, we will use (A3) to avoid overcomplicating our calculations.

**Lemma 6.1.**

$$\mathbb{E}[W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu)] \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}.$$

We will not prove this lemma, as the proof is a simplified version of the proof of the following lemma, which we will also need.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Assume that  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(x) | \phi_1] = F_\mu^{-1}(x)$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[W_2(\tilde{\mu}, \hat{\mu})] \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.2.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W_2(\tilde{\mu}, \hat{\mu})] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[W_2(\tilde{\mu}, \hat{\mu})^2]} \\ &= \sqrt{\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[(F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1}(x) - F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}(x))^2] dx} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{F}_j^{-1}(x) - F_j^{-1}(x))(\tilde{F}_k^{-1}(x) - F_k^{-1}(x))] dx} \end{aligned}$$

For  $j \neq k$ , the two terms in the expectation are independent. Moreover, they are centered, as  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_k^{-1}(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_k^{-1}(x) | \phi_k]] = \mathbb{E}[F_k^{-1}(x)]$ . So only the diagonal terms survive.

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(x) - F_1^{-1}(x))^2] dx} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(x) - F_1^{-1}(x))^2 | \phi_1]] dx} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(x) | \phi_1)] dx} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 6.3** (Concentration of primitive ratings). *Assume (A2) and (A3). Then for any  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $0 < t \leq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{R}_0(x) - h(x)| \geq t) \leq 6.5 \mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|t^2/32}].$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.3.* Write

$$|\tilde{R}_0(x) - h(x)| \leq \underbrace{\left| \frac{1}{|N_x|} \sum_{k \in N_x} F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) \right|}_a - \underbrace{\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) \right|}_b$$

$$+ \underbrace{\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) - h(x) \right|}_{II}.$$

To deal with  $I$ , we will show that each of the two averages is similar to its mean, conditioned on all  $N_x$ ; these conditional expectations are the same, so this will show that the two averages are very similar to each other. Letting  $N := \{N_x : x \in [0, 1]\}$ , for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|I| \geq t/2 \mid N) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|a - \mathbb{E}[a \mid N]| \geq t/4 \mid N) + \mathbb{P}(|b - \mathbb{E}[b \mid N]| \geq t/4 \mid N) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(|a - \mathbb{E}[a \mid N]| \geq t/4 \mid N, \{\phi_j : j \notin N_a\}) \mid N] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(|b - \mathbb{E}[b \mid N]| \geq t/4 \mid N) \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounded differences inequality on each term (with bounded differences  $\frac{2}{|N_x|}$  and  $\frac{2}{n}$ , respectively),

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbb{E}[2e^{-|N_x|t^2/32} \mid N] + 2e^{-nt^2/32} \\ &\leq 4e^{-|N_x|t^2/32}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation over  $N$ , we get

$$\mathbb{P}(|I| \geq t/2) \leq 4 \mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|t^2/32}].$$

To deal with  $II$ , first look at each term  $F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \tilde{F}_\ell^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x)$ . We can replace  $F_k^{-1}$  by an independent copy  $F_{k'}^{-1}$ , denoting the resulting term as  $F_{\tilde{\nu}_k}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x)$ , at the cost of, at most,  $1/n$ . That is,

$$|F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) - F_{\tilde{\nu}_k}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x)| \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

Doing so ensures that  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\tilde{\nu}_k}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) - h(x)$  is centered, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F_{\tilde{\nu}_k}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[F_{\tilde{\nu}_k}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) \mid \phi_k, \tilde{F}_k]] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell \neq k} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_\ell^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) \mid \phi_k, \tilde{F}_k]] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_{k'}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) \mid \phi_k, \tilde{F}_k]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F_{\mu}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x)] \\ &= h(x) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $k$ . Thus, we may apply the bounded differences inequality (with bounded difference  $2/n$ ), conditioned on  $\tilde{F}_{1'}^{-1}, \dots, \tilde{F}_{n'}^{-1}$ , to get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\tilde{\nu}_k}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) - h(x)\right| \geq t/2 \mid N, \tilde{F}_{1'}^{-1}, \dots, \tilde{F}_{n'}^{-1}\right) \leq 2e^{-nt^2/8}.$$

Note that, as in our previous use of the bounded differences inequality, we are leveraging the fact that  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  are independent given  $N$ , i.e. assumption (A4). Averaging over  $\tilde{F}_{1'}^{-1}, \dots, \tilde{F}_{n'}^{-1}$  gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\tilde{\nu}_k}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) - h(x)\right| \geq t/2\right) \leq 2e^{-nt^2/8},$$

and we replace the  $\tilde{\nu}_k$  terms with the original  $\tilde{\mu}$  terms as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(|II| \geq t/2) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) - h(x)\right| \geq t/2\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}_k \circ \phi_k(x) - h(x)\right| \geq t/2 - 1/n\right) \\
&\leq 2e^{-n(t/2-1/n)^2/8}
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the bounds for  $I$  and  $II$  together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{R}_0(x) - h(x)| \geq t) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|I| + |II| \geq t) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(|I| \geq t/2) + \mathbb{P}(|II| \geq t/2) \\
&\leq 4\mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|t^2/32}] + 2e^{-n(t/2-1/n)^2/8}
\end{aligned}$$

Using  $e^{t/8} \leq e^{1/8} \leq 1.25$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 4\mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|t^2/32}] + 2.5e^{-nt^2/32} \\
&\leq 6.5\mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|t^2/32}]. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* Using Brenier's polar factorization theorem, we may write  $\tilde{R}_0 := F_{(\tilde{R}_0)_*\mu}^{-1} \circ F_\mu \circ \tilde{\sigma}$ , where  $\tilde{\sigma}$  preserves  $\mu$ . Then  $\tilde{R} = F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\mu \circ \tilde{\sigma}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{R} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} &\leq \|F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\mu \circ \tilde{\sigma} - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \|\tilde{\sigma} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\
&= \|F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\mu - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \|\tilde{\sigma} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\
&\leq \|F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\mu - F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\mu\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \|F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\mu - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \|\tilde{\sigma} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\
&= \|F_{\tilde{\mu}}^{-1} - F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}\|_{L^2(\lambda)} + W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu) + \|\tilde{\sigma} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\
&= W_2(\tilde{\mu}, \hat{\mu}) + W_2(\hat{\mu}, \mu) + \|\tilde{\sigma} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{R} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\sigma} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}].$$

To deal with the remaining term, our strategy is to show that with high probability,  $\tilde{R}_0$  and  $h$  are about the same. This will tell us that the orderings  $\tilde{R}_0$  and  $h$  give to the inputs in  $[0, 1]$  are approximately the same, and, by extension,  $\tilde{\sigma}$  approximately preserves the ordering of inputs in  $[0, 1]$ . Since  $\tilde{\sigma}$  is  $\mu$ -preserving, this will force  $\tilde{\sigma} \approx \text{id}$  on the support of  $\mu$ .

Using Lemma 6.3 with  $t = \delta/2$ , we have that for each atom  $x$  of  $\mu$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{R}_0(x) - h(x)| \geq \delta/2) \leq 6.5\mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|\delta^2/128}].$$

A union bound over all  $M$  values of  $x$  gives

$$\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{R}_0(x) - h(x)| \geq \delta/2 \text{ for any atom } x) \leq 6.5 \sum_{\text{atoms } x} \mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|\delta^2/128}].$$

Putting all the pieces together gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{R} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} + \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\sigma} - \text{id}\|_{L^2(\mu)}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\sigma} \neq \text{id}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} + \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{R}_0(x) - h(x)| \geq \delta/2 \text{ for } \geq 1 \text{ of the } M \text{ item ratings } x) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} + 6.5 \sum_{\text{atoms } x} \mathbb{E}[e^{-|N_x|\delta^2/128}]. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

## 7 Rankings and Kendall's W

A common alternative type of data to numerical ratings is rankings, i.e. users provide a preference list for items. This can be viewed as a special case of our model by viewing a rank of  $k$  out of  $M$  items as the numerical rating  $1 - \frac{k-1}{M}$ ; this transformation is just scaling the ratings down to fit into the interval  $[0, 1]$  and reversing the order to align with the convention that a lower rating is a higher score. In this setting, the distances between users' successive numerical ratings is uniformly set to  $\frac{1}{M}$ , and users all have the same personal rating scale,  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_n = \mu = \text{Uniform}(\{1/M, 2/M, \dots, 1\})$ . Consequently, the primitive rating estimator  $R_0$  equals the equal-weights average,  $A$ . So all three of  $A$ ,  $R_0$ , and  $R$  give the same consensus preference order, with the rating estimator  $R$  outputting the order in the same equally spaced format as the input, i.e. with distribution  $\mu$ .

The discrepancy between  $A$  and  $R$  in this context has been previously studied as Kendall's W statistic [KS39]. Kendall's W is a widely used (e.g. [Fie05, Leg05, GBSS13]) statistic for measuring the degree of agreement on preference order when multiple users rank items. Given a matrix  $(m_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq M}$  of rank  $i$  of item  $j$ , let  $\bar{m}_j := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_{i,j}$  denote the average of the ranks given to item  $j$ , and let  $\bar{m} := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \bar{m}_j$  be the grand mean of the entire matrix. Kendall's W is given by

$$W := \frac{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M (\bar{m}_j - \bar{m})^2}{\frac{1}{12}(M^2 - 1)},$$

which we can express in our notation as

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(A_*\mu)}{\text{Var}(\mu)}.$$

Since  $\mu$  is not a quantity known to the statistician, it is more appropriate to express this as

$$= \frac{\text{Var}(A_*\mu)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\mu_i)}$$

(Here, we mean the variance associated to these measures, rather than with respect to the randomness generated by the underlying probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ .)

Intuitively, if there is disagreement among users, the differing opinions will “destructively interfere,” leading the average ranks to tend away from the extreme values  $1/M, 1$ . Accordingly,  $0 \leq W \leq 1$ , with the equality cases being when all items are tied after tallying the rankings (no concordance in preferences) and when all users submit the exact same rankings for all items. Following this intuition, we can propose analogous statistics for measuring the concordance in user rating scales and in user ratings overall:

$$W_{\text{scale}} := \frac{\text{Var}(R_*\mu)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\mu_i)}, \quad W_{\text{ratings}} := \frac{\text{Var}((R_0)_*\mu)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\mu_i)}.$$

Note that in general,  $R_*\mu$  is  $\hat{\mu}$ , the empirical  $W_2$ -barycenter of  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$ . Also note that since  $R_0 = A$  in the case of rankings,  $W_{\text{ratings}}$  directly generalizes Kendall's  $W$  from the special case of rankings to the general case of numerical ratings.

We record formulas for these quantities, although in practice, it may be faster to calculate  $W_{\text{scale}}, W_{\text{ratings}}$  from  $R_*\mu, (R_0)_*\mu$  after calculating  $R, R_0$ , respectively for all items.

**Proposition 7.1** (Concordance statistic formulas). *Given a matrix  $(r_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq M}$  of rating  $i$  of item  $j$ , let  $\bar{r}_i := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M r_j$  be user  $i$ 's rating mean, and let  $\sigma_i^2 := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M (r_{i,j} - \bar{r}_i)^2$  be user  $i$ 's rating variance.*

(a)

$$W_{\text{scale}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Cov}(X_i, X_k)}{n \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i)}$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n (\sum_{j=1}^M r_{i,(j)} r_{k,(j)}) - M \bar{r}_i \bar{r}_k}{nM \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2}$$

where  $X_i \sim \mu_i$  and the  $X_i$  are monotone coupled (i.e.  $X_k = F_k^{-1} \circ F_i(X_i)$  for each  $i, k$ ). Here,  $r_{i,(j)}$  means the  $j$ -th lowest rating from user  $i$ .

(b)

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{ratings}} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \sum_{p=1}^n \text{Cov}(Y_{i,k}, Y_{\ell,p})}{n^3 \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \sum_{p=1}^n (\sum_{j=1}^M r_{k,(\text{ind}(r_{i,j}))} r_{p,(\text{ind}(r_{\ell,j}))}) - M \bar{r}_i \bar{r}_k)}{n^3 M \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $Y_{i,k} := F_k^{-1} \circ F_i(r_{i,J})$  and  $J \sim \text{Uniform}(\{1, \dots, M\})$ . Here,  $\text{ind}(r_{i,j})$  denotes the index of  $r_{i,j}$  among user  $i$ 's sorted ratings  $r_{i,(1)}, \dots, r_{i,(M)}$ , and  $r_{k,(\text{ind}(r_{i,j}))}$  is the  $\text{ind}(r_{i,j})$ -th smallest rating given by user  $k$ .

*Proof.*

(a) First, we calculate the expectation of  $\hat{\mu}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \int x d\hat{\mu}(x) &= \int F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}(y) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int F_i^{-1}(y) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{r}_i, \end{aligned}$$

which we denote as  $\bar{r}$ . It now remains to calculate  $\text{Var}(\hat{\mu})$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \int (x - \bar{r})^2 d\mu(x) &= \int (F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}(y) - \bar{r})^2 dy \\ &= \int \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (F_i^{-1}(y) - \bar{r}_i) \right)^2 dy \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int (F_i^{-1}(y) - \bar{r}_i)(F_k^{-1}(y) - \bar{r}_k) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Cov}(X_i, X_k). \end{aligned}$$

(b) Now, we calculate the expectation and variance of  $(R_0)_*\mu$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \int R_0(x) d\mu(x) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int y d\hat{\mu}(y) \\ &= \bar{r}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\int (R_0(x) - \bar{r})^2 d\mu(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) - \bar{r} \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\
&= \int \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n F_k^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) - \bar{r}_k \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \sum_{p=1}^n \int (F_k^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) - \bar{r}_k)(F_p^{-1} \circ F_\ell \circ \phi_\ell(x) - \bar{r}_p) d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \sum_{p=1}^n \text{Cov}(Y_{i,k}, Y_{\ell,p}). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

As with Kendall's  $W$ , these statistics give values between 0 and 1, with values closer to 1 expressing higher degrees of concordance between user rating scales and user rating profiles, respectively.

**Proposition 7.2.** *Assume that  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  are not all point masses (so the denominators of  $W_{\text{scale}}, W_{\text{ratings}}$  are nonzero).*

(a)

$$0 \leq W_{\text{scale}} \leq 1.$$

*Equality on the left never occurs. Equality on the right occurs iff all  $\mu_i$  are the same, up to translation by a constant.*

(b)

$$0 \leq W_{\text{ratings}} \leq 1.$$

*Equality on the left occurs iff user opinions on every item are equally balanced, i.e.  $R_0$  is constant. Equality on the right occurs iff all user ratings are the same, up to translation by a constant, i.e.  $\phi_i = \phi_\ell + a_{i,\ell}$  for all  $1 \leq i, \ell \leq M$ .*

*Proof.* The non-negativity of variance implies that both quantities are  $\geq 0$ . The upper bounds both follow from applying Jensen's inequality:

(a)  $\text{Var}(\hat{\mu}) = 0$  when  $\hat{\mu}$  is a point mass. Since  $F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_i^{-1}$ , this can only happen when all  $\mu_i$  are point masses and they are all equal. For the upper bound, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(\hat{\mu}) &= \int (F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}(y) - \bar{r})^2 dy \\
&= \int \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (F_i^{-1}(y) - \bar{r}_i) \right)^2 dy \\
&\leq \int \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (F_i^{-1}(y) - \bar{r}_i)^2 dy \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\mu_i),
\end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if  $F_i^{-1}(y) - \bar{r}_i = F_k^{-1}(y) - \bar{r}_k$  for all  $1 \leq i, k \leq n$  and Lebesgue-a.e.  $y$ . This is precisely when  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  are translates of each other.

(b)

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}((R_0)_* \mu) &= \int \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) - \bar{r} \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\
&= \int \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n F_k^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) - \bar{r}_k \right)^2 d\mu(x)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n (F_k^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) - \bar{r}_k)^2 d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\mu_k) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Var}(\mu_k),
\end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if  $F_k^{-1} \circ F_i \circ \phi_i(x) - \bar{r}_k = F_p^{-1} \circ F_\ell \circ \phi_\ell(x) - \bar{r}_p$  for all  $1 \leq i, k, \ell, p \leq n$  and  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x$ . This implies that  $F_k^{-1}, F_p^{-1}$  give the same distribution, except perhaps translated by a constant. The translation equivalence of these distributions, along with these  $\mu$ -a.e. equalities then implies that  $\phi_i, \phi_\ell$  must give the same ordering to all  $M$  atoms of  $\mu$ . Therefore, equality occurs exactly when all user rating profiles are the same, up to translation by a constant.  $\square$

To provide a sense of calibration for the numbers given by these statistics, we calculate the values for Example 5.1.

**Example 7.1.** Let  $\mu$  be any probability measure on  $[0, 1]$  which is symmetric about  $1/2$  (besides the point mass at  $1/2$ ), and let  $\phi_k(x) := \alpha_k(x - 1/2) + 1/2$  for some iid  $\alpha_k$  with  $\mathbb{E}[|\alpha_1|] = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_1 > 0) > 1/2$ . Then, recalling from Example 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_0(x) &= \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_k| \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{sgn}(\alpha_k) \right) (x - 1/2) + 1/2, \\
F_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} \circ F_\mu &= \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_k| \right) (x - 1/2) + 1/2,
\end{aligned}$$

we can calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(\mu_k) &= \alpha_k^2 \text{Var}(\mu), \\
\text{Var}((R_0)_* \mu) &= \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_k| \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{sgn}(\alpha_k) \right)^2 \text{Var}(\mu), \\
\text{Var}(\hat{\mu}) &= \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_k| \right)^2 \text{Var}(\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

So we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\text{scale}} &= \frac{(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\alpha_k|)^2}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k^2} \xrightarrow{a.s., n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\alpha_1^2]}, \\
W_{\text{ratings}} &= \frac{(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\alpha_k|)^2 (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{sgn}(\alpha_k))^2}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k^2} \xrightarrow{a.s., n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{sgn}(\alpha_1)]}{\mathbb{E}[\alpha_1^2]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the distribution of  $\alpha_k$  is subject to the constraint that  $\mathbb{E}[|\alpha_k|] = 1$ , we can see that  $W_{\text{scale}}$  decreases as  $\text{Var}(|\alpha_1|)$  increases. Similarly,  $W_{\text{ratings}}$  decreases as  $\text{Var}(|\alpha_1|)$  increases but also incorporates a multiplicative factor which decreases the value as the population agrees less on preference, i.e. when  $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_1 < 0)$  grows closer to  $1/2$ .



## 8 Numerical experiments with real-world rating data

We have applied the estimators analyzed in the previous sections to real data, a sample of publicly accessible ratings from the ratings website <https://www.MyAnimeList.net>, where users rate Japanese animation (anime). The dataset, obtained from Kaggle.com (<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/azathoth42/myanimelist>), contains over 46 million ratings from over 300000 users on over 14000 anime. MyAnimeList ratings are given on an integer scale of 1 to 10, 1 being the lowest possible score and 10 being the highest. The code to reproduce these calculations (or to apply these estimators to your own rating data) is available at <https://github.com/pillowmath/Rating-Estimator>.

### 8.1 Rating distributions and concordance between rating profiles

Figures 1, 2, and 3 show the resulting rating distributions (over all rated anime in the sample) when using the estimators  $A$ ,  $R_0$ , and  $R$ , respectively. Since not every user in the sample has rated every anime, we modified the rating estimators as discussed in Section 6. We also removed anime and users from the data which had fewer than 10 ratings associated to them.




Figure 1: The distribution  $A_*\mu$ , generated by applying the average estimator  $A$ .




Figure 2: The distribution  $(R_0)_*\mu$ , generated by applying the primitive rating estimator  $R_0$ .




Figure 3: The distribution  $\hat{\mu}$ , generated by applying the rating estimator  $R$ .

The resulting distributions are quite different, which is an indication of preference disagreement among the population; recall that if users agree on their preference orders for items, then all three estimators will give the same result (see Proposition 4.1). To measure the level of agreement among personal rating scales and among all user rating profiles, we calculate our analogues of Kendall’s  $W$  statistic, as proposed in Section 7, for this dataset:

$$W_{\text{scale}} = 0.814, \quad W_{\text{ratings}} = 0.178.$$

From the relatively high value of  $W_{\text{scale}}$  and relatively low value of  $W_{\text{ratings}}$ , we surmise that MyAnimeList users’ personal rating scales tend to be relatively similar in shape, but user ratings differ heavily in their preference orders for items.

## 8.2 Evaluating recommendations derived from ratings

To attempt to quantify the efficacy of different rating aggregation rules—and in particular to compare our rating estimator to the equal-weights average—we need to specify a problem that aggregating ratings is supposed to solve. This is difficult to do in general, owing to the subjective nature of ratings. In the case of MyAnimeList, the website publishes the aggregate ratings of each item (calculated by averaging) with a ranking that all users can see<sup>1</sup>; these rankings effectively serve as global recommendations for users, so we attempt to answer the question “Which aggregation rule produces a ranking which recommends items that users prefer more?”

An ideal setup for answering this question would be the following type of randomized controlled trial: For a period of time, show some users the ratings and rankings given by the rating estimator  $R$  (the treatment group) and other users the ratings given by the average  $A$  (the control group). After obtaining the user ratings, we compare the average “utility” between the treatment and control groups, for various notions of utility calculated from the user ratings.

Here are some examples of utility functions one can calculate to compare the resulting scores; we apply a utility function  $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to scores and return the average of a user’s scores to obtain the utility for that user. So if  $I_k$  is the set of items user  $k$  rates (with ratings  $r_{k,j}$ , the average utility of user  $k$  is  $\frac{1}{|I_k|} \sum_{j \in I_k} u(r_{k,j})$ .

- Rating utility: Apply  $u_1(x) := x$  to the ratings and then average them per user for the treatment group and for the control group. This utility function allows us to compare the average ratings for items watched by the treatment group vs the control group.
- Quantile utility: In a randomized controlled trial with matched pairs, apply  $u_2(x) := \frac{|\{j:r_{k,j} \leq x\}|}{|I_k^{\text{treatment}}| + |I_k^{\text{control}}|}$ , where  $I_k^{\text{treatment}}, I_k^{\text{control}}$  are the set of items the users in matched pair  $k$  rate. This utility function allows us to compare the average quantiles for items watched by the treatment group vs the control group.
- Binary utility: Apply  $u_3(x) := \mathbf{1}\{x \geq \frac{1}{|I_k|} \sum_{j \in I_k} r_{k,j}\}$  to the ratings and then average them per user for the treatment group and for the control group. This utility function allows us to compare the number of above-average ratings for items watched by the treatment group vs the control group.

The choice of what notions of utility are relevant is context-dependent, but if the treatment aggregation rule performs better than the control with respect to a variety of notions of utility, this provides qualitative evidence in favor of the treatment.

Unfortunately, we do not have access to the data of such a randomized controlled trial, so we attempt to mimic this type of analysis by calculating the average per-user utility with respect to the top 50 and top 100 anime<sup>2</sup> in each ranking with respect to the aforementioned example notions of utility. Note that for the quantile utility, we calculated the quantile of items with respect to the distribution of a users’ ratings for items in the top 50/top 100 in *either* ranking, counting twice any ratings for items which were present in both rankings’ top 50/top 100.

Top 50 ranking	Equal-weights average	Rating estimator
Average rating utility	8.89	8.98
Average quantile utility	0.755	0.778
Average binary utility	0.649	0.700

Top 100 ranking	Equal-weights average	Rating estimator
Average rating utility	8.80	8.88
Average quantile utility	0.723	0.748
Average binary utility	0.618	0.644

<sup>1</sup>Our data is from 2018, but the current ratings and rankings can be seen at <https://MyAnimeList.net/topanime.php>.

<sup>2</sup>MyAnimeList provides the scores for anime in page lengths of 50 anime at a time. Looking at the top 50 or top 100 anime corresponds to looking at the first page and first two pages for recommendations, respectively.

In all cases, the rating estimator performs better than the equal-weights average. Of particular note is that the rating estimator outperforms the equal-weights average in average rating utility, which the equal-weights average explicitly attempts to optimize. A more compelling analysis may require the aforementioned randomized controlled trial.

### 8.3 Comparing ranked preference orders between aggregation rules

How different are the ranked preference orders produced from different aggregation rules? One metric between preference orders on the same set of items is the *normalized average change in ranking*, which we define as follows: If  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_M)$  gives the rankings of items  $1, \dots, M$ , then

$$d_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') := \frac{1}{M(M-1)} \sum_{k=1}^M |r_k - r'_k|.$$

We compare the distances between the preference orders gleaned from using  $A$  (the equal-weights average),  $R$  (the rating estimator), and the BTL Markov chain estimator (first proposed in [NOS16]). While the data was not obtained in terms of pairwise comparisons (as is needed for the BTL model), we can nevertheless attempt to obtain proxy pairwise comparison data by counting a “win” of item  $i$  vs item  $j$  every time a user rates both items, with item  $i$  rated higher than item  $j$ .

$d_1(\text{Avg, Rat})$	$d_1(\text{Avg, BTL})$	$d_1(\text{Rat, BTL})$
11.17%	33.29%	33.42%

For a frame of reference, note that if  $\mathbf{U}$  is a uniformly random ranking of the items, then  $\mathbb{E}[d_1(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{r})] = 1/3$  for any ranking  $\mathbf{r}$ . The ranked preference orders we obtain from the equal-weights average  $A$  and the rating estimator  $R$  are moderately different, and the BTL ranked preference order appears to be quite different from both of the others—as one might expect, given that the BTL estimator is not at all designed with this type of input data in mind.

### 8.4 Agreement with pairwise winners

Our next experiment measures how often different aggregation rules agree with the majority opinion in pairwise comparisons. Here, the pairwise winner between items  $i$  and  $j$  is specified by the majority opinion among all users who rated both items  $i$  and  $j$ . Note that we should not necessarily expect the results from either  $A$  or  $R$  to match up completely with pairwise winners because they are designed to take into account the *degree* to which each user prefers one item to another.

Average	Rating Estimator	BTL
85.47%	85.15%	49.79%


The equal-weights average and the rating estimator, despite having an 11% average difference in rankings, provide almost identical levels of agreement with pairwise winners. On the other hand, the BTL ranking, despite being derived from the pairwise comparison data, performs about as well as a random ranking would.

This experiment and the experiment in Section 8.3 suggest that it may be inappropriate to attempt to apply the BTL model to numerical rating data and that numerical aggregation rules such as our rating estimator may be more effective in constructing a notion of population consensus.

### 8.5 Application on simulated data

We now analyze simulated data corresponding to Example 5.1. In our example,  $\mu$  is the uniform distribution on  $[1/4, 3/4]$ , and  $\phi_k = \varepsilon_k Z_k(x - 1/2) + 1/2$ , where  $Z_k \sim N(1, 1/16)$ ,  $\varepsilon_k$  equals  $+1$

with probability  $3/4$  and  $-1$  with probability  $1/4$ , and all the  $Z_k, \varepsilon_k$  are mutually independent. In other words, we apply a Gaussian random scaling and a biased random reversal of preferences.



As predicted by Example 5.1 and Theorem 5.1, the rating estimator significantly outperforms the average for the  $L_2$  loss.

**Acknowledgments.** The author would like to thank Elsa Cazelles, Sinho Chewi, Persi Diaconis, Steve Evans, Shirshendu Ganguly, Ryan Giordano, and Aditya Guntuboyina for many helpful comments. While writing this paper, the author was supported by a Two Sigma PhD Fellowship and a research contract with Sandia National Laboratories, a U.S. Department of Energy multimission laboratory.

## A Glivenko–Cantelli theorems in Wasserstein space

Here, we provide the proof of Lemma 5.2.

**Lemma 5.2** (Glivenko–Cantelli-type theorem for inverse CDFs of Wasserstein barycenters on  $[0, 1]$ ). *Let  $\Lambda$  be a random measure on  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $\lambda$  be the population  $W_2$ -barycenter of the law of  $\Lambda$ . Draw iid samples  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots$  according to the law of  $\Lambda$ , and let  $\lambda_n$  be the empirical  $W_2$ -barycenter of  $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$ . Denote the cumulative distribution functions of  $\lambda_n$  and  $\lambda$  as  $F_{\lambda_n}, F_\lambda$ , respectively, and define the generalized inverse cumulative distribution functions as*

$$F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) := \inf\{t : F_{\lambda_n}(t) \geq x\}, \quad F_\lambda^{-1}(x) := \inf\{t : F_\lambda(t) \geq x\}.$$

Then

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_\lambda^{-1}(x)| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, if  $\text{supp } \lambda = [0, 1]$ , then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_\lambda^{-1}(x)| \right] \leq 4 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}.$$

for all  $n \geq 3$ .

The key ingredient is the following pointwise convergence lemma for inverse CDFs of Fréchet means.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a random measure in  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\mathbb{E}[W_2(\Lambda, \mu)] < \infty$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ . Then the population Fréchet mean  $\lambda$  of the law of  $\Lambda$  satisfies  $F_\lambda^{-1}(x) = \mathbb{E}[F_\Lambda^{-1}(x)]$  for all  $x \in (0, 1)$ .*

The proof can be found in Chapter 3 of [PZ20]. The idea is that, since we know that  $\|F_{\lambda_n}^{-1} - F_\lambda^{-1}\|_{L^2(dx)} = W_2(\lambda_n, \lambda) \rightarrow 0$ , we can upgrade the  $L^2$  convergence into pointwise convergence to an everywhere well-defined function by leveraging the fact that these functions are all nondecreasing and left continuous.

The proof of the a.s. convergence in Lemma 5.2 follows from an application of the following deterministic lemma, which is usually used to provide a simple analytic proof of the classical Glivenko–Cantelli theorem.

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $G, G_1, G_2, \dots$  be non-decreasing functions  $[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , which are all right continuous (resp. left continuous). If*

- (i)  $G_n(x) \rightarrow G(x)$  at each rational  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,
- (ii)  $G_n(x^-) \rightarrow G(x^-)$  (resp.  $G_n(x^+) \rightarrow G(x^+)$ ) for all discontinuity points  $x \in [0, 1]$  of  $G$ ,

then  $\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |G_n(x) - G(x)| \rightarrow 0$ .

We will not provide a full proof of this deterministic lemma because the proof of the quantitative bound we presently prove for Lemma 5.2 uses essentially the same argument (with some more bookkeeping for the a.s. convergence if  $G$  has any discontinuity points).

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* Since  $\text{supp } \lambda = [0, 1]$ ,  $F_\lambda^{-1}$  is continuous (and nondecreasing),  $F_\lambda^{-1}(0) = 0$ , and  $F_\lambda^{-1}(1) = 1$ . Thus, there exist points  $0 = t_1 < \dots < t_N = 1$  such that  $F_\lambda^{-1}(t_{k+1}) - F_\lambda^{-1}(t_k) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{2n}}$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq N-1$ . Necessarily,  $N \leq \sqrt{\frac{2n}{\log n}}$ . By Lemma A.1 and Hoeffding's inequality for bounded random variables, for each  $k$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_k) - F_\lambda^{-1}(t_k)| > \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{2n}} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -2n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{2n}} \right)^2 \right) = \frac{2}{n}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_k) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_k)| > \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{2n}} \text{ for any } k\right) \leq N \frac{2}{n} \leq \frac{2^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n \log n}}.$$

We now show that if  $|F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_k) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_k)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{2n}}$  for all  $k$ , then we have  $\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}}$ , so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)| > \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}}\right) \leq \frac{2^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n \log n}}.$$

Indeed, for a point  $x$  with  $t_{j-1} < x < t_j$ , given this event for all  $j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)| \\ & \leq \begin{cases} F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_j) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_{j-1}) & \text{if } F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) \geq F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x) \\ F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_j) - F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_{j-1}) & \text{if } F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) < F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x) \end{cases} \\ & \leq \begin{cases} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_j) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_j)| + |F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_j) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_{j-1})| & \text{if } F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) \geq F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x) \\ |F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_j) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(t_{j-1})| + |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_{j-1}) - F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(t_j)| & \text{if } F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) < F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x) \end{cases} \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{2n}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now get the  $L^1$  bound by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)| \right] \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}} \cdot \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}} \right) \\ & \quad + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(x) - F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)| > \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}} \right) \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}} + \frac{2^{3/2}}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \\ & \leq \left( \sqrt{2} + \frac{2^{3/2}}{\log 3} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \\ & \leq 4\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality holds for all  $n \geq 3$ .  $\square$

The constant factor in the bound can be decreased to any value  $> \sqrt{2}$ , at the cost of increasing the minimum value of  $n$  to which the inequality applies.

We can, without much extra work, leverage this uniform convergence of inverse CDFs to obtain uniform convergence of the actual CDFs. The following result will not be used in this paper but is interesting in its own right.

**Theorem A.1** (Glivenko–Cantelli-type theorem for Wasserstein barycenters on  $[0, 1]$ ). *Let  $\Lambda$  be a random measure on  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $\lambda$  be the population  $W_2$ -barycenter of the law of  $\Lambda$ . Draw iid samples  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots$  according to the law of  $\Lambda$ , and let  $\lambda_n$  be the empirical  $W_2$ -barycenter of  $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$ . Denote the cumulative distribution functions of  $\lambda_n$  and  $\lambda$  as  $F_{\lambda_n}, F_{\lambda}$ , respectively. Assume that  $\lambda$  has no atoms and that  $\text{supp } \Lambda = [0, 1]$  a.s. Then*

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |F_{\lambda_n}(x) - F_{\lambda}(x)| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .



We will use our previous results, along with the following deterministic lemma.

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $f_1, f_2, \dots : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a sequence of functions with right inverses  $f_n^{-1}$  (i.e.  $f_n \circ f_n^{-1} = \text{id}$ ) converging uniformly to a function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with continuous left inverse  $f^{-1}$  (i.e.  $f^{-1} \circ f = \text{id}$ ). Then  $f_n^{-1} \rightarrow f^{-1}$  uniformly, as well.*

*Proof of Lemma A.3.* Since  $f^{-1}$  is continuous on a compact domain, it is uniformly continuous. So, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $\delta > 0$  be such that  $|x - y| < \delta \implies |f^{-1}(x) - f^{-1}(y)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ . Then if  $n$  is large enough such that  $\sup_{y \in [0, 1]} |f_n(y) - f(y)| < \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n^{-1}(x) - f^{-1}(x)| &= |f^{-1}(f(f_n^{-1}(x))) - f^{-1}(x)| \\ &= |f^{-1}(f(f_n^{-1}(x)) - f^{-1}(f_n(f_n^{-1}(x))))|. \end{aligned}$$

$|f(f_n^{-1}(x)) - f_n(f_n^{-1}(x))| < \delta$ , so the above is  $< \varepsilon$ . □

*Proof of Theorem A.1.* We will apply Lemma A.3 to  $f_n = F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}$  and  $f = F_{\lambda}^{-1}$  (verifying the uniform convergence of the  $F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}$  via Lemma 5.2) to get that  $F_{\lambda_n} \rightarrow F_{\lambda}$  uniformly  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. We now verify the conditions of the lemma.

First, the atomless condition on  $\lambda$  guarantees that  $F_{\lambda}$  is continuous. It is also true by definition that  $F_{\lambda}(F_{\lambda}^{-1}(x)) = x$ . In general,  $F_{\lambda_n}^{-1}(F_{\lambda_n}(x)) = \inf\{y : F_{\lambda_n}(y) = F_{\lambda_n}(x)\} \leq x$ , but we have equality if  $F_{\lambda_n}$  is strictly increasing, i.e.  $\text{supp } \lambda_n = [0, 1]$ . This follows from the fact that  $\text{supp } \Lambda = 1$  a.s., as in general,

$$F_{\mu} \text{ is strictly increasing} \iff \text{supp } \mu = [0, 1] \iff F_{\mu}^{-1} \text{ is continuous.}$$

Averaging continuous functions yields a continuous function. So  $F_{\lambda_n}^{-1} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F_{\lambda_k}^{-1}$  is continuous, meaning  $F_{\lambda_n}$  is strictly increasing. □

## References

- [ACLGP20] Adil Ahidar-Coutrix, Thibaut Le Gouic, and Quentin Paris. Convergence rates for empirical barycenters in metric spaces: curvature, convexity and extendable geodesics. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 177(1-2):323–368, 2020.
- [AV01] Paul CH Albers and Han de Vries. Elo-rating as a tool in the sequential estimation of dominance strengths. *Animal Behaviour*, pages 489–495, 2001.
- [AW00] Rakesh Agrawal and Edward L Wimmers. A framework for expressing and combining preferences. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 297–306, 2000.
- [Ber20] Arthur Berg. Statistical analysis of the elo rating system in chess. *Chance*, 33(3):31–38, 2020.
- [BGL15] Emmanuel Boissard, Thibaut Le Gouic, and Jean-Michel Loubes. Distribution’s template estimate with Wasserstein metrics. *Bernoulli*, 21(2):740 – 759, 2015.
- [BK11] Anja Belz and Eric Kow. Discrete vs. continuous rating scales for language evaluation in nlp. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 230–235, 2011.
- [BL<sup>+</sup>07] James Bennett, Stan Lanning, et al. The netflix prize. In *Proceedings of KDD Cup and Workshop*, volume 2007, page 35. New York, 2007.
- [BPSS08] Giuseppe Buttazzo, Aldo Pratelli, Sergio Solimini, and Eugene Stepanov. *Optimal urban networks via mass transportation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [Bre91] Yann Brenier. Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 44(4):375–417, 1991.
- [BT52] Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- [CD14] Marco Cuturi and Arnaud Doucet. Fast computation of wasserstein barycenters. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 685–693. PMLR, 2014.
- [CMRS20] Sinho Chewi, Tyler Maunu, Philippe Rigollet, and Austin J Stromme. Gradient descent algorithms for bures-wasserstein barycenters. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1276–1304. PMLR, 2020.
- [EH13] Paul Embrechts and Marius Hofert. A note on generalized inverses. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 77:423–432, 2013.
- [Fie05] Andy P Field. Kendall’s coefficient of concordance. *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*, 2:1010–11, 2005.
- [Fri40] Milton Friedman. A comparison of alternative tests of significance for the problem of m rankings. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 11(1):86–92, 1940.
- [GBSS13] Amanda Gearhart, D Terrance Booth, Kevin Sedivec, and Christopher Schauer. Use of kendall’s coefficient of concordance to assess agreement among observers of very high resolution imagery. *Geocarto International*, 28(6):517–526, 2013.
- [GG04] Daniel Gervini and Theo Gasser. Self-modelling warping functions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 66(4):959–971, 2004.
- [GK95] Theo Gasser and Alois Kneip. Searching for structure in curve samples. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(432):1179–1188, 1995.
- [GM00] Wilfrid Gangbo and Robert J McCann. Shape recognition via wasserstein distance. *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, pages 705–737, 2000.
- [HOS20] Julien Hendrickx, Alex Olshevsky, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Minimax rate for learning from pairwise comparisons in the btl model. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4193–4202. PMLR, 2020.

- [JKO98] Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the fokker–planck equation. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- [Kan42] Leonid V Kantorovich. On the translocation of masses. In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. USSR (NS)*, volume 37, pages 199–201, 1942.
- [Kor09] Yehuda Koren. The bellkor solution to the netflix grand prize. *Netflix prize documentation*, 81(2009):1–10, 2009.
- [KS39] Maurice G Kendall and B Babington Smith. The problem of m rankings. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 10(3):275–287, 1939.
- [Leg05] Pierre Legendre. Species associations: the kendall coefficient of concordance revisited. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 10:226–245, 2005.
- [LGL17] Thibaut Le Gouic and Jean-Michel Loubes. Existence and consistency of wasserstein barycenters. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 168:901–917, 2017.
- [Lik32] Rensis Likert. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 1932.
- [LSR22] Wanshan Li, Shamindra Shrotriya, and Alessandro Rinaldo.  $\ell_\infty$ -bounds of the mle in the btl model under general comparison graphs. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1178–1187. PMLR, 2022.
- [Mon81] Gaspard Monge. Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais. *Mem. Math. Phys. Acad. Royale Sci.*, pages 666–704, 1781.
- [MR11] BD McCullough and Darrell Radson. Analysing student evaluations of teaching: Comparing means and proportions. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 24(3):183–202, 2011.
- [MT18] BD McCullough and Raluca Teodorescu. Using student evaluations of teaching to support faculty: Use proportions instead of means to analyze sets. *Journal of Higher Education Theory & Practice*, 18(2), 2018.
- [NB18] Rachel J Nesbit and Victoria J Bourne. Statistics anxiety rating scale (stars) use in psychology students: A review and analysis with an undergraduate sample. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 24(2):101–110, 2018.
- [NOS16] S Negahban, S Oh, and D Shah. Rank centrality: Ranking from pairwise comparisons. *Operations Research*, 65(1):266–287, 2016.
- [Pel16] Radek Pelánek. Applications of the elo rating system in adaptive educational systems. *Computers & Education*, 98:169–179, 2016.
- [PZ16] Victor M. Panaretos and Yoav Zemel. Amplitude and phase variation of point processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):771 – 812, 2016.
- [PZ20] Victor M Panaretos and Yoav Zemel. *An invitation to statistics in Wasserstein space*. Springer Nature, 2020.
- [RPDB12] Julien Rabin, Gabriel Peyré, Julie Delon, and Marc Bernot. Wasserstein barycenter and its application to texture mixing. In *Scale Space and Variational Methods in Computer Vision: Third International Conference, SSVM 2011, Ein-Gedi, Israel, May 29–June 2, 2011, Revised Selected Papers 3*, pages 435–446. Springer, 2012.
- [RR98] Svetlozar T Rachev and Ludger Rüschendorf. *Mass Transportation Problems: Volume I: Theory*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [Ryf65] John V Ryff. Orbits of  $L^1$ -functions under doubly stochastic transformations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 117:92–100, 1965.
- [San15] Filippo Santambrogio. Optimal transport for applied mathematicians. *Birkhäuser, NY*, 55(58-63):94, 2015.

- [SDL80] Frank E Saal, Ronald G Downey, and Mary A Lahey. Rating the ratings: Assessing the psychometric quality of rating data. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(2):413, 1980.
- [SF14] P Stark and R Freishtat. An evaluation of course evaluations. scienceopen. *Center for Teaching and Learning, University of California, Berkeley*, 2014.
- [Thu28] Louis L Thurstone. Attitudes can be measured. *American Journal of Sociology*, 33(4):529–554, 1928.
- [TJB09] Andreas Töschler, Michael Jahrer, and Robert M Bell. The bigchaos solution to the netflix grand prize. *Netflix prize documentation*, pages 1–52, 2009.
- [TLM21] Guang Tian, Liang Lu, and Christopher McIntosh. What factors affect consumers’ dining sentiments and their ratings: Evidence from restaurant online review data. *Food Quality and Preference*, 88:104060, 2021.
- [TS93] Amos Tversky and Itamar Simonson. Context-dependent preferences. *Management Science*, 39(10):1179–1189, 1993.
- [TSK90] Amos Tversky, Paul Slovic, and Daniel Kahneman. The causes of preference reversal. *The American Economic Review*, pages 204–217, 1990.
- [TSS88] Amos Tversky, Shmuel Sattath, and Paul Slovic. Contingent weighting in judgment and choice. *Psychological Review*, 95(3):371, 1988.
- [TT90] Amos Tversky and Richard H Thaler. Anomalies: preference reversals. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 4(2):201–211, 1990.
- [Tve69] Amos Tversky. Intransitivity of preferences. *Psychological review*, 76(1):31, 1969.
- [Uhe18] Jana Uher. Quantitative data from rating scales: An epistemological and methodological enquiry. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9:2599, 2018.
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.
- [Vil21] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
- [Wai19] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [Wan96] Xu-Jia Wang. On the design of a reflector antenna. *Inverse problems*, 12(3):351, 1996.
- [WPL<sup>+</sup>06] James Webster, Patricia Phalen, Lawrence Lichty, Lawrence W Lichty, and Patricia F Phalen. *Ratings analysis: Theory and practice*. Routledge, 2006.