

Asymptotic bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates via penalized likelihoods with differential geometry

By

MASAYO Y. HIROSE ¹ and SHUHEI MANO ²

Abstract. A method for asymptotic bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates of generic estimands is developed. The estimator is realized as a plug-in estimator, where the parameter maximizes the penalized likelihood with a penalty function that satisfies a quasi-linear partial differential equation of the first order. The integration of the partial differential equation with the aid of differential geometry is discussed. Applications to generalized linear models, linear mixed-effects models, and a location-scale family are presented.

Key Words. Bias reduction, information geometry, Jeffreys prior, partial differential equation, plug-in estimator, shrinkage

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification Numbers.* Primary 62F12; Secondary 62B11, 62H12

1 Introduction

For a sample space \mathcal{X} , consider a parametric model M , or a family of probability densities $p(\cdot; \xi)$ with d -dimensional parameter $\xi = \{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d\} \in \Xi$, where the parameter space Ξ is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 1$. The indices follow those of tensors otherwise stated; the upper index should not be confused with power. We assume that $p(x; \xi)$ is a C^∞ -function, that is, an infinitely-differentiable function of ξ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

For a given real-valued function f of ξ , where $f : \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we call the parameterization, that is, the result of the mapping $f(\xi)$, an *estimand*, and f the *estimand function*. The function f may depend on quantities other than ξ , but such quantities are constants in estimating $f(\xi)$ and not shown explicitly. In this paper, we discuss the estimation of an estimand for a given estimand function. An estimator $\delta(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ of an estimand $f(\xi)$ is *unbiased* if $\mathbb{E}_\xi \delta(x) = f(\xi)$, $\forall \xi \in \Xi$, where the expectation \mathbb{E}_ξ is with respect to $p(\cdot; \xi)$.

¹Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan; E-mail: masayo@imi.kyushu-u.ac.jp

²The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo 190-8562, Japan; E-mail: smano@ism.ac.jp

If an unbiased estimator of $f(\xi)$ exists, the estimand $f(\xi)$ is said to be *U-estimable*. The unbiased estimator δ of $f(\xi)$ is the *uniform minimum variance unbiased estimator* (UMVUE) of $f(\xi)$ if $\text{var}_\xi \delta(x) \leq \text{var}_\xi \delta'(x)$, $\forall \xi \in \Xi$, where δ' is any other unbiased estimator of $f(\xi)$.

This paper presents a method for asymptotic bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates of generic estimands. The resulting estimator asymptotically coincides with the UMVUE if a complete sufficient statistic exists.

In a regular model with parameter ξ , the asymptotic bias of the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ can be expressed as

$$b(\xi) := \mathbb{E}_\xi \hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}} - \xi = \frac{b_1(\xi)}{n} + \frac{b_2(\xi)}{n^2} + \cdots, \quad (1)$$

where n is usually interpreted as the number of observations, or some other measure of the rate at which information accrues. The maximum likelihood estimate is derived as the solution to the system of score equations:

$$u_i(\xi; x) := \partial_i l(\xi; x) = 0, \quad \partial_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^i}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\},$$

where $l(\xi; x) = l(\xi; x_1, \dots, x_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(x_i; \xi)$ is the log-likelihood of a sample $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $u_i(\xi; x)$ are the log-likelihood and score functions, respectively. Firth [11] proposed a method to remove the $O(n^{-1})$ term from (1). His bias-reduced estimator is the solution to the modified score equations:

$$u_i^*(\xi; x) := u_i(\xi; x) - \sum_{j=1}^d \kappa_{i,j}(\xi) b_1^j(\xi) = 0, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (2)$$

where $\kappa_{i,j}(\xi) = n^{-1} \mathbb{E}_\xi [u_i u_j]$.

His proposal was inspired by a geometrical interpretation of the modified score equations (2) in one-dimensional exponential families with canonical parameterization. For the log-likelihood $l(\xi; t) = t\xi - \psi(\xi)$ with the canonical parameter ξ and sufficient statistic t , the score function is given by $u(\xi; t) = t - \psi'(\xi)$. The bias $b(\xi)$ of $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ arises from the combination of the unbiasedness of the score function $\mathbb{E}_\xi u(\xi; t) = 0$ and the curvature of the score function, $u''(\xi; t) \neq 0$. Because

$$0 = u(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}; t) = u(\xi; t) + u'(\xi; t)(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}} - \xi) + \frac{1}{2} u''(\xi; t)(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}} - \xi)^2 + \cdots,$$

if $u(\xi; t)$ is linear in ξ , then there is no bias. Otherwise, $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ subjects to bias. Firth's idea is to shift the score function downward at each point ξ

by an amount $i(\xi)b(\xi)$, where $-i(\xi) = u'(\xi; t) = -\psi''(\xi)$ is the gradient of the score function at ξ (see Figure 1 of [11]); this defines a modified score function $u^*(\xi; t) := u(\xi; t) - i(\xi)b(\xi)$. Hence, a modified estimate $\hat{\xi}$ is given as a solution to $u^*(\xi; t) = 0$. Here, $-i(\xi)b(\xi)$ corresponds to the second term on the right-hand side of (2) in one-dimensional exponential families.

Firth [11] argued that in multidimensional exponential families with canonical parameterization, his method may be regarded as a penalized maximum likelihood estimation with penalized likelihood $l^*(\xi; t) := l(\xi; t) + \tilde{l}(\xi)$, where the non-random penalty function $\tilde{l}(\xi)$ satisfies the following system of partial differential equations

$$\partial_i \tilde{l}(\xi) = - \sum_{j=1}^d \kappa_{i,j}(\xi) b_1^j(\xi) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \quad (3)$$

He obtained $\tilde{l}(\xi) = \log \sqrt{\det i(\xi)}$ as a solution of (3), where $i(\xi)$ is the information matrix. Firth pointed out that the penalty function coincides with the logarithm of the Jeffreys prior.

In practice, however, there often are cases in which we are interested in a function of the parameter rather than the parameter itself. A standard logistic regression has problems of stability when the event frequency is low, and Firth's bias-reduction method has been a tool to stabilize the logistic regression [19]. Firth's method is for estimates of regression coefficients. However, it is natural to ask what we should do when we are interested in the event frequency. Unfortunately, removing the bias in estimates of regression coefficients introduces bias in the plug-in estimator of the event frequency. Elgmami et al. [10] tackled this problem and proposed an approach intermediate between Firth and no penalty as a pragmatic compromise between stability and bias.

Another example in small-area estimation is to estimate the magnitude of shrinkage of a direct estimator of the mean of each area towards the synthetic estimator like a ground mean, where a direct estimator is constructed based on a sample only within each area. A measure of the magnitude is the proportion of the error variance to the marginal variance of the direct estimator. Based on a penalized likelihood approach, Hirose and Lahiri [15] successfully obtained a plug-in estimator of the measure when the variance is known. The bias of their estimator is asymptotically $o(n^{-1})$. Hirose and Lahiri [16] discussed a case of variance of the error variance is not known, but provided no solution.

In this paper, we address the following two questions. 1) How to obtain an asymptotically unbiased estimator for generic estimands? 2) In Firth's bias-reduction method for multidimensional models, the system of partial

differential equations (3) appears. However, a system of partial differential equations is not always integrable. Under what situations is the system integrable? To the best of the authors' knowledge, the system (3) appeared in the literature many years ago, such as [12], but the integrability has rarely been cared for. An exception is the result obtained by Kosmidis and Firth [20] for estimation of parameters in generalized linear models. Note that the multidimensional setting is essential; if a model is one-dimensional, we may apply Firth's method to the model reparameterized by $f(\xi)$. The system (3) reduces to an ordinary differential equation, and the integrability issue disappears.

We consider a generic estimand function f represented as a scalar function of a multidimensional parameter $\xi \in \Xi$. We employ the *plug-in estimator* $f(\hat{\xi}(x)) = f \circ \hat{\xi}(x)$, where $\hat{\xi}(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ maximizes the suitable penalized likelihood. Kosmidis [19] classified methods of bias reduction as explicit methods and implicit methods. The proposed method is an implicit method: we evaluate the bias of the estimator $f(\hat{\xi})$ at the solution $\hat{\xi}$ of an equation. Explicit methods, such as the jackknife, rely on a one-step procedure, where the bias of the estimator $f(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}})$ is evaluated at $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ and subtracted from $f(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}})$ to give the new estimate. Our method has practical advantages to explicit methods: the estimator may exist even if $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ does not exist, and the range is in that of f as long as $\hat{\xi} \in \Xi$. Explicit methods may suffer from giving an unrealistic estimate because it could be out of the range of f by the subtraction. See [15] for a discussion on positive f .

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our method for asymptotic bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates of generic models and estimands. The condition for *second-order asymptotic unbiasedness*, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\xi}[f(\hat{\xi})] - f(\xi) = o(n^{-1})$ for large n , requires that the penalty function satisfies a quasi-linear partial differential equation of the first order. We discuss the integration of the partial differential equation for generic models and estimands. For estimates of parameters, we show that our method reproduces Firth's bias-reduction method. In Section 3, we discuss cases of flat model manifolds. We reproduce Kosmidis and Firth's [20] result on the integrability of the system of partial differential equations that appear when we apply Firth's method to generalized linear models. Several applications of our bias-reduction method to problems involving various estimands, including the problems in logistic regression and small area estimation discussed above, are presented in Section 4. Section 5 provides a discussion.

2 Geometry of asymptotic bias reduction

This section presents the main results of this study. After preparing geometric concepts in Section 2.1, we give our method for asymptotic bias reduction in Section 2.2. The method reduces to integration of a quasi-linear partial differential equation for a suitable penalty function, as explained in Section 2.3. Section 2.4 presents a result in terms of the geodesic distances.

2.1 Differential geometric preliminaries

We can simplify multivariate statistical calculations with tensors in differential geometry [24]. In addition to tensors, some concepts in differential geometry help to display the following results in concise forms. In this subsection, we introduce the minimum of them in order to state our main results. For general background information on differential geometry, see [17]. A concise summary of the terminology in affine differential geometry is Chapter I of [27]. Differential geometry of statistical model manifolds, known as information geometry, is discussed in a book by Amari and Nagaoka [1] and a concise survey by Lauritzen [21].

For a parametric model $M = \{p(\cdot; \xi) : \xi \in \Xi\}$, mapping $p \mapsto \{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d\}$ for each point (i.e., a probability density) $p \in M$ can be regarded as a local coordinate of M . If we consider parameterizations that are C^∞ -diffeomorphic to each other as equivalent, then M may be considered as a C^∞ -differentiable manifold. In this sense, a parameterization of M is a local coordinate system of M .

For each point $\xi \in \Xi$, we define a Riemannian metric called the Fisher metric, which is a tensor with components

$$g_{ij}(\xi) := -\mathbb{E}_\xi[\partial_i \partial_j l(\xi; x)], \quad \partial_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^i}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (4)$$

in a local coordinate system, where $l(\xi; x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(x_i; \xi)$ is the log-likelihood of a sample $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and the expectation \mathbb{E}_ξ is with respect to the probability density $p(\cdot; \xi)$. The differential operator of a variable with an upper index has a lower index. We assume the Fisher metric tensor is an invertible matrix everywhere. The inverse matrix of g_{ij} is denoted by g^{ij} , where g_{ij} converts an upper index into a lower index, while g^{ij} converts a lower index into an upper index. The determinant of the matrix g_{ij} is denoted by g . The Fisher metric tensor is the null cumulant of derivatives of the log-likelihood denoted by $\kappa_{i,j}$ in Chapter 7 of [24].

A tangent vector (or simply, a vector) is represented as $X = \sum_i x^i \partial_i$, where x^i are components with respect to the local coordinate system $\{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d\}$.

The set of tangent vectors at $p \in M$, denoted by $T_p M$, is called the *tangent space* of M at p . The metric tensor defines the inner product of vector fields $X = \sum_i x^i \partial_i$ and $Y = \sum_i y^i \partial_i$, as in $\langle X, Y \rangle = \sum_{i,j} \langle \partial_i, \partial_j \rangle x^i y^j := \sum_{i,j} g_{ij} x^i y^j$.

An *affine connection* on a manifold M is a rule of covariant differentiation on M , denoted by ∇ (see Chapter III of [17] or Section I.3 of [27] for affine connections). We write

$$\nabla_i \partial_j = \sum_k \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k,$$

where the system of functions Γ_{ij}^k are the *Christoffel symbols* for the affine connection relative to the local coordinate system (see Proposition III.7.4 of [17]), and ∇ also refers to an affine connection. In this paper, we specifically consider a one-parameter family of affine connections called the α -connection [1] denoted by $\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(\alpha)}$, where

$$\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(\alpha)} := \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\partial_i \partial_j l) u_k] + \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} S_{ijk}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \quad (5)$$

for $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Here, $u_k(\xi; x) := \partial_k l(\xi; x)$ are the score functions, and $\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(\alpha)} = \sum_l g_{kr} \Gamma_{ij}^{(\alpha)r}$ are the symbols constructed by converting the upper index of the Christoffel symbols to a lower index. The covariant differentiation with respect to the α -connection is specifically denoted by $\nabla^{(\alpha)}$. Here, the symmetric tensor of order three, $S_{ijk} := \mathbb{E}_\xi[u_i u_j u_k]$ is called the *skewness tensor*. The skewness tensor is a null cumulant denoted by $\kappa_{i,j,k}$ in [24]. The vector obtained by the contraction $S_i = \sum_{j,k} g^{jk} S_{ijk}$ appears.

We discuss Riemannian manifolds identified with a parametric models equipped with the Fisher metric tensors (4) and α -connections (5). We call such manifolds *model manifolds*.

A useful relationship among α -connections is

$$\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(\alpha_1)} - \Gamma_{ij,k}^{(\alpha_2)} = \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} S_{ijk}, \quad \text{for all } \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6)$$

The covariant derivative of the metric tensor is as follows. The proof is in Appendix A.1.

Proposition 2.1. *The covariant derivative of the metric tensor with α -connection is*

$$\nabla_i^{(\alpha)} g_{jk} = \partial_i g_{jk} - \Gamma_{ij,k}^{(\alpha)} - \Gamma_{ik,j}^{(\alpha)} = \alpha S_{ijk}. \quad (7)$$

The Christoffel symbols of the 0-connection (also called the Levi-Civita connection or the Riemannian connection) are represented by the derivatives

of the metric tensors. Since the middle expression of (7) should be zero if $\alpha = 0$, we have

$$\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i g_{jk} + \partial_j g_{ki} - \partial_k g_{ij}). \quad (8)$$

In this paper, we define the operator $\Delta^{(\alpha)}$ acting on a scalar field given by a function $f(\xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$:

$$\Delta^{(\alpha)} f := \sum_i \nabla^{(\alpha)i} \nabla_i^{(\alpha)} f = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j f - \sum_{i,j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,i}^{(\alpha)} \partial_j f \quad (9)$$

and call it the α -Laplacian. The 0-Laplacian reduces to the conventional Laplacian, called the Laplace–Beltrami operator, that satisfies

$$\Delta^{(0)} f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_i \partial_i (\sqrt{g} \sum_j g^{ij} \partial_j f). \quad (10)$$

If a function f satisfies $\Delta^{(\alpha)} f = 0$ for some α , we say that f is α -harmonic. The authors did not find the notion of α -harmonicity in the literature, however, the α -Laplacian is an example of an extension of the Laplace–Beltrami operator proposed by Eguchi and Yanagimoto [9]. From the relationship among α -connections (6), we have a useful relationship among α -Laplacians:

$$(\Delta^{(\alpha_1)} - \Delta^{(\alpha_2)}) f = \sum_{i,j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} (\Gamma_{kr,i}^{(\alpha_2)} - \Gamma_{kr,i}^{(\alpha_1)}) \partial_j f = \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2} \sum_j S^j \partial_j f \quad (11)$$

for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.

2.2 The condition for asymptotic unbiasedness

The first assertion of the following lemma comes from the bias of the maximum likelihood estimator of a parameter. The result seems classic and can be found in the literature (e.g., Equation 20 of [6] and Section 7.3 of [24]), but the authors did not find a rigorous form. Therefore, we present the assertion with regularity conditions. The proof is in Appendix A.2.

Lemma 2.2. *Under the regularity conditions B1–B6 in Appendix A.2, for a penalty function $\tilde{l}(\xi) = O(1) \in C^4$ of parameters ξ for large n , where C^4 is the set of four-times differentiable functions, we have*

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i] = \sum_j g^{ij} (\partial_j \tilde{l} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,j}^{(-1)}) + o(n^{-1}), \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i (\hat{\xi} - \xi)^j] = g^{ij} + o(n^{-1}),$$

for large n , where $\hat{\xi}$ maximizes the penalized likelihood $l^*(\xi; x) = l(\xi; x) + \tilde{l}(\xi)$ in ξ , where $l(\xi; x)$ is the log-likelihood.

Remark 2.3. Adding the penalty function denormalizes the probability density, resulting in the density $p(\cdot; \xi)e^{\tilde{l}(\xi)/n}$. The maximization process is on the denormalized model (e.g., Fisher's scoring in (35)), but the expectations are with respect to the original model. Therefore, the Fisher metric tensors and α -connections appear below are of the original model manifolds.

Lemma 2.2 (i) reveals that the $O(n^{-1})$ term of the bias of the i -th component of the maximum likelihood estimator of the parameter $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ is $-\sum_j g^{ij}(\sum_{k,r} g^{kr}\Gamma_{kr,j}^{(-1)})/2$. Firth's [11] condition (3) is expressed as

$$\partial_i \tilde{l} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,i}^{(-1)} = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \quad (12)$$

The penalty function \tilde{l} satisfying (12) removes the biases of all components of $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ simultaneously.

Let us discuss bias reduction of generic estimands. Suppose an estimand function $f : \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given. Under the regularity conditions, the bias of the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\xi})$ of an estimand $f(\xi)$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\xi[f(\hat{\xi}) - f(\xi)] &= \sum_i \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i] \partial_i f + \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i (\hat{\xi} - \xi)^j] \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \partial_j f \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j,k} \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i (\hat{\xi} - \xi)^j (\hat{\xi} - \xi)^k] \frac{1}{3!} \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k f + o(n^{-4/3}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.2 (i) implies that if we expand the penalty function $\tilde{l}(\xi) = O(1)$ for large n in fractional powers of n and choose it to cancel out the bias of $f(\hat{\xi})$ for each order in n , then we can remove the bias up to the desired order. We demonstrate this scheme up to $O(n^{-1})$ in the following lemma. The proof is in Appendix A.1. The geometric meaning of the gradient of function f denoted by $\text{grad} f = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_j f \partial_i$ will appear in Section 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. *Consider a parametric model $M = \{p(\cdot; \xi) : \xi \in \Xi\}$ and an estimand function $f \in C^3$. Under the regularity conditions of Lemma 2.2, for a U -estimable estimand $f(\xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$, the bias of the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\xi})$ of $f(\xi)$, where $\hat{\xi}$ maximizes the penalized log-likelihood, is $o(n^{-1})$ if and only if \tilde{l} satisfies*

$$\langle \text{grad} f, \text{grad} \tilde{l} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \Delta^{(-1)} f = o(n^{-1}). \quad (13)$$

Remark 2.5. An estimator with an asymptotic bias of $o(n^{-1})$ is said to be second-order unbiased. Lemma 2.2 (ii) implies that any choice of the penalty function \tilde{l} makes the plug-in estimator second-order efficient (saturates the Cramér–Rao bound with error $o(n^{-1})$). Lemma 2.4 specifies second-order unbiased estimator within the class of the second-order efficient estimators. A stronger result is Theorem 2.6.

If we have a complete sufficient statistic, an optimality result of the plug-in estimator in terms of the asymptotic bias follows. The main results of this paper are stated in the following theorem. The proof is in Appendix A.1.

Theorem 2.6. *Let a sample be distributed according to a parametric model $M = \{p(\cdot; \xi) : \xi \in \Xi\}$, and suppose there exists a complete sufficient statistic for M . Then, under the assumptions of Lemma 2.4, the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\xi})$ of an estimand $f(\xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$, where $\hat{\xi}$ maximizes the penalized likelihood with \tilde{l} satisfying the condition (13), coincides with the UMVUE of $f(\xi)$ up to $O(n^{-1})$.*

For a given estimand function f , the condition (13) is fulfilled if we can find a penalty function \tilde{l} that satisfies the following first-order quasi-linear partial differential equation for \tilde{l} :

$$\langle \text{grad} f, \text{grad} \tilde{l} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \Delta^{(-1)} f = 0. \quad (14)$$

Hence, our task now is integrating (14) for \tilde{l} . Here, “quasi-linear” means that (14) is linear in the partial derivatives $\partial_i \tilde{l}$ with terms that do not depend on \tilde{l} . If f is (-1) -harmonic, $\Delta^{(-1)} f = 0$, and (14) is linear. In this case, we achieve asymptotic unbiasedness without a penalty.

Corollary 2.7. *If an estimand function f is (-1) -harmonic, then the bias of the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}})$ of an estimand $f(\xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$ is $o(n^{-1})$ and coincides with the UMVUE up to $O(n^{-1})$ given that a complete sufficient statistic for the parametric model M exists.*

Example 1. For an exponential family with canonical parameterization, the log-likelihood is $l(\xi; t) = \sum_i t_i \xi^i - \psi(\xi)$, where t is the sufficient statistic. We have $\mathbb{E}_\xi \eta_i(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}) = \eta_i(\xi)$, $\forall \xi \in \Xi$ for the expectation parameter $\eta_i(\xi) := \mathbb{E}_\xi t_i = \partial_i \psi$ (see Example 6.6.3 of [22]). We have $g_{ij} = \partial_i \partial_j \psi = \partial_i \eta_j$ and $\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(-1)} = 2\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(0)} = \partial_i g_{jk} + \partial_j g_{ik} - \partial_k g_{ij} = \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \psi = \partial_i g_{jk}$, because $\mathbb{E}_\xi[(\partial_i \partial_j l) u_k] = -\partial_i \partial_j \psi \mathbb{E}_\xi[u_k] = 0$ and the property (8). Then, η_{i_0} for an index $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ is a (-1) -harmonic function, because

$$\Delta^{(-1)} \eta_{i_0} = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j \eta_{i_0} - \sum_{i,j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \partial_k g_{ri} \partial_j \eta_{i_0} = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_i g_{j i_0} - \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \partial_k g_{r i_0} = 0$$

follows by $\sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_k g_{ri} \partial_j \eta_{i_0} = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_k g_{ri} g_{ji_0} = \partial_k g_{ri_0}$. Therefore, Corollary 2.7 concludes that the estimator $\eta_{i_0}(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}})$ of the estimand $\eta_{i_0}(\xi)$ coincides with the UMVUE up to $O(n^{-1})$. In fact, since $\eta_{i_0}(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}})$ is an unbiased estimator of $\eta_{i_0}(\xi)$ and is the complete sufficient statistic of the exponential family, the Lehmann-Scheffé theorem implies that $\eta_{i_0}(\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}})$ is the UMVUE of $\eta_{i_0}(\xi)$ exactly for any $n \geq 1$.

Before closing this subsection, we revisit the bias reduction of $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ discussed by Firth [11]. When we remove the biases of all the components of $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ with a single penalty function \tilde{l} , substituting (9) with $\alpha = -1$ into (14) yields

$$\sum_j g^{ij} (\partial_j \tilde{l} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,j}^{(-1)}) = 0, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \quad (15)$$

for $f = \xi^1, \dots, f = \xi^d$, respectively, and we obtain (12), because

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_i g_{mi} \sum_j g^{ij} (\partial_j \tilde{l} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,j}^{(-1)}) = \sum_j \delta_m^j (\partial_j \tilde{l} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,j}^{(-1)}) \\ &= \partial_m \tilde{l} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,m}^{(-1)} \end{aligned}$$

for $m \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Since (15) is the system of d partial differential equations for the single unknown function \tilde{l} , we have to consider the integration of an overdetermined system of partial differential equations, except for one-dimensional models ($d = 1$). An overdetermined system of partial differential equations is not always integrable. We will discuss this issue in Section 3.2.

Remark 2.8. We do not have to remove the biases of all the components of $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ with a single penalty function. We may consider the bias reduction for each component of $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ separately. In fact, if we consider the estimand function $f = \xi^{i_0}$ for an index $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, the condition (14) for the penalty function, say $\tilde{l}^{(i_0)}$, becomes $\sum_j g^{i_0 j} (\partial_j \tilde{l}^{(i_0)} - \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,j}^{(-1)} / 2) = 0$. The integrability issue disappears, because this is a single partial differential equation for $\tilde{l}^{(i_0)}$. See the bias reduction of the sample variance in Section 4.3 for an example.

2.3 Integration of the quasi-linear partial differential equation

In this subsection, we discuss the integration of the partial differential equation (14) for generic models and estimands. A generic quasi-linear partial differential equation of the first order is known to be equivalent to a system

of ordinary differential equations, and geometric interpretation makes this equivalence apparent (see Sections I.4, I.5, II.2 of [4] and Chapter 17 of [23]).

Solving a partial differential equation is finding an integral manifold. An r -dimensional *distribution* \mathcal{D} on a manifold M is an assignment to each point $p \in M$ a subspace \mathcal{D}_p of the tangent space T_pM . The distribution here is a collection of subspaces, and should not be confused with a probability distribution. A connected submanifold N of M is called an *integral manifold* of \mathcal{D} if $T_pN = \mathcal{D}_p$ for all $p \in N$. If an integral manifold exists through each point of M , \mathcal{D} is said to be *completely integrable*. The maximal integral manifolds do not intersect each other and completely cover the whole of M . We say that the maximal integral manifolds of \mathcal{D} form the *leaves* of a *foliation* of M (see Chapter 2 of [26] or Chapter 19 of [23]).

For each function $f \in C^1$, the total derivative of f at $p \in M$ is denoted as $Xf = \sum_i x^i \partial_i f$ for $X \in T_pM$. There exists a unique vector field denoted by $\text{grad}f$, called the *gradient* of f , satisfying $\langle \text{grad}f, X \rangle = Xf$. In a local coordinate system, $\text{grad}f = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_j f \partial_i$. The gradient of f is a normal vector field to each $(d-1)$ -dimensional hypersurface in the d -dimensional manifold M on which f is a constant. Such a hypersurface is called a *level surface* of f (see Section 4.1 of [26]).

We assume that $\text{grad}f$ in a model manifold M is not degenerated everywhere: $|\text{grad}f|^2 := \langle \text{grad}f, \text{grad}f \rangle > 0$. Consider an embedding of M in $M \times \mathbb{R}$ by introducing a local coordinate system $(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d, \xi^{d+1})$, where $\xi^{d+1} = \tilde{l}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)$. Suppose that a solution of the partial differential equation (14) for \tilde{l} is given as an implicitization of $\xi^{d+1} = \tilde{l}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)$ by the equation

$$\phi(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^{d+1}) = \phi_0 \quad (16)$$

for a constant ϕ_0 . This equation determines a d -dimensional level surface of ϕ in $M \times \mathbb{R}$, on which ϕ is the constant ϕ_0 , and is the integral manifold determined by the partial differential equation (14). In fact, the constancy gives $\partial_i \phi + \partial_{d+1} \phi \cdot \partial_i \tilde{l} = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and multiplying each equation by $(\text{grad}f)^i$ and summing them yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{grad}f)^i \partial_i \phi + \partial_{d+1} \phi \sum_i (\text{grad}f)^i \partial_i \tilde{l} &= \langle \text{grad}f, \text{grad}\phi \rangle + \partial_{d+1} \phi \langle \text{grad}f, \text{grad}\tilde{l} \rangle \\ &= \langle \text{grad}f, \text{grad}\phi \rangle - \partial_{d+1} \phi \Delta^{(-1)} f / 2 = \langle (\text{grad}f, -\Delta^{(-1)} f / 2), \text{grad}^* \phi \rangle = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\text{grad}^* \phi$ is the gradient of ϕ defined in $M \times \mathbb{R}$ with components $(\text{grad}^* \phi)^i = \sum_j g^{ij} \partial_j \phi$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $(\text{grad}^* \phi)^{d+1} = \partial_{d+1} \phi$. The second-last equality follows by (14). Here, $\text{grad}^* \phi$ is the normal vector field to each integral manifold determined by (16). The last equality of (17) requires that at each




Figure 1: An integral manifold $\phi = \phi_0$, which encodes the penalty function \tilde{l} by implicitization, and a characteristic curve on it. The normal vector field to the integral manifold, $\text{grad}^*\phi$, and the Monge axis $(\text{grad}f, -\Delta^{(-1)}f/2)$ at a point on the characteristic curve are orthogonal.

point tangent planes of all hypersurfaces through the point belong to a single pencil of planes whose axis is given by the direction field $(\text{grad}f, -\Delta^{(-1)}f/2)$ in $M \times \mathbb{R}$, called the *Monge axis* of the partial differential equation (14).

The integral curves along this direction field are defined by a system of ordinary differential equations and are called the *characteristic curves* of the partial differential equation (14) (see Figure 1). In other words, a d -parameter family of characteristic curves parameterized by s :

$$\{\xi^1(s), \dots, \xi^d(s), \xi^{d+1}(s) = \tilde{l}(\xi^1(s), \dots, \xi^d(s))\}, \quad s \geq 0$$

satisfies the system of ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{d\xi^i(s)}{ds} = (\text{grad}f)^i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\xi^{d+1}(s)}{ds} = \frac{d\tilde{l}(s)}{ds} = -\frac{\Delta^{(-1)}f}{2}, \quad (18)$$

where the initial values $\{\xi^1(0), \dots, \xi^d(0)\}$ and s are the parameters of the characteristic curves. These parameters should not be confused with statistical parameters. By virtue of the theory of ordinary differential equations, the unique solution exists if the right-hand sides of (18) are Lipschitz continuous. Eliminating the parameters from the expression yields an explicit expression for the penalty function $\tilde{l} = \tilde{l}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)$. This procedure is discussed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of [4]. As in (17), we see that

$$\langle \text{grad}f, \text{grad}\phi \rangle - \partial_{d+1}\phi \frac{\Delta^{(-1)}f}{2} = 0. \quad (19)$$

Thus, a solution of the system of ordinary differential equations (18) gives

$$\frac{d\phi}{ds} = \sum_i \partial_i \phi \frac{d\xi^i}{ds} + \partial_{d+1} \phi \frac{d\xi^{d+1}}{ds} = \langle \text{grad} f, \text{grad} \phi \rangle - \partial_{d+1} \frac{\Delta^{(-1)} f}{2} = 0,$$

which means that along each characteristic curve $\phi(\xi^1(s), \dots, \xi^{d+1}(s))$, $s \geq 0$ is a constant value, as expected from (16). In particular, if f is (-1) -harmonic, the Monge axis is always parallel to the model manifold M and $\xi^{d+1} = \tilde{l}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)$ has a constant value. This is a geometric interpretation of why we do not need a penalty, as seen in Corollary 2.7.

In principle, we can solve the partial differential equation (14) for generic model manifolds and estimand functions. To obtain an explicit expression, we have to eliminate parameters s and $\{\xi^1(0), \dots, \xi^d(0)\}$ from the solution of the system of the ordinary differential equations (18). However, this process is tedious in practice. In fact, elimination of parameters to obtain an implicit representation of a manifold is a topic in computational algebraic geometry and is called the *implicitization problem* (see Chapter 3 of [5]). Further investigation of the implicitization problem seems interesting, but in this study we developed the following trick to circumvent the implicitization problem.

Suppose that we seek a solution to the partial differential equation (19) for an integral of the system of ordinary differential equations (18) of the form

$$\phi(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^{d+1}) = \chi(f(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)) - \xi^{d+1} = \chi(f(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)) - \tilde{l}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)$$

with an injective map $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This form of ϕ has a geometric interpretation. Note that on an integral manifold, that is, $\phi = \text{const.}$, $f = \text{const.}$ if and only if $\tilde{l} = \text{const.}$ We have $(d-1)$ -dimensional level surfaces of the estimand function f in the d -dimensional model manifold M , namely, f gives a codimension-1 foliation of M , and the level surfaces of f are the leaves. Let the foliation be denoted by $\{N_w(f) : w \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with

$$N_w(f) = \{(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d) \in M : f(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d) = w\}.$$

On the other hand, on the d -dimensional integral surface $\phi = u$ for a constant $u \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $(d-1)$ -dimensional level surfaces of \tilde{l} . Let the foliation be denoted by $\{N_{u,v}^*(\tilde{l}) : u, v \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with

$$N_{u,v}^*(\tilde{l}) = \{(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d, v) \in M \times \mathbb{R} : \phi(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d, v) = u, \tilde{l}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d) = v\}.$$

We introduce a projection:

$$\pi(N_{u,v}^*(\tilde{l})) := \{(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d) : (\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d, \xi^{d+1}) \in N_{u,v}^*(\tilde{l})\}.$$




Figure 2: The foliation of the integral manifold $\phi = \phi_0$ by the level surfaces of \tilde{l} projected onto the model manifold M constitute the foliation of M by the level surfaces of f . The contours are the level surfaces.

Then, if we consider the integral manifold with $u = \chi(w) - v$, we have

$$\{N_w(f) : w \in \mathbb{R}\} = \{\pi(N_{\phi_0, \chi(w) - \phi_0}^*(\tilde{l})) : w \in \mathbb{R}\} = \{\pi(N_{\phi_0, v}^*(\tilde{l})) : v \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

which means that the foliation of the integral manifold $\phi = \phi_0$ by the level surfaces of \tilde{l} projected onto M constitutes the foliation of M by the level surfaces of f (Figure 2).

The condition under which ϕ is an integral of the system of ordinary differential equations (18) can be expressed as

$$\frac{d\phi}{ds} = \frac{d\chi}{df} \sum_i \partial_i f \frac{d\xi^i}{ds} - \frac{d\xi^{d+1}}{ds} = \frac{d\chi}{df} |\text{grad} f|^2 + \frac{\Delta^{(-1)} f}{2} = 0.$$

Therefore, by integrating the differential equation

$$\frac{d\chi}{df} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta^{(-1)} f}{|\text{grad} f|^2}, \quad (20)$$

we obtain the penalty function $\tilde{l}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d) = \chi(f(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d)) + \text{const}$. In particular, if the right-hand side of (20) is a function of f , the integration is straightforward. The constant can be chosen arbitrarily since the maximizer $\hat{\xi}$ of the penalized likelihood is our concern and does not depend on the constant. Therefore, the penalty function is not unique.

2.4 Functions of geodesic distances

We can obtain explicit results if an estimand is a function of the squared geodesic distance. Our result is the following theorem. The proof is in Ap-

pendix A.3. The lemma used appeared in Riesz's [28] work on constructing the fundamental solution of a partial differential equation as a convergent series in the squared geodesic distance associated with the Laplace-Beltrami operator (10). The definitions of the geodesic distance and the normal coordinate system are in Appendix A.3.

Theorem 2.9. *Consider a parametric model $M = \{p(\cdot; \xi) : \xi \in \Xi\}$. Fix a point $\zeta \in M$ and consider the geodesic joining ζ and point $\xi \in U_\zeta$ with the geodesic distance $t(\xi) := \text{dis}(\zeta, \xi)$. Suppose we have an estimand function of the squared geodesic distance $f(\xi) = \varphi(t^2(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d))$. Then, under the regularity conditions of Lemma 2.4, the bias of the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\xi})$ of the estimand $f(\xi)$, where $\hat{\xi}$ maximizes the penalized likelihood with the penalty function $\tilde{l}(\xi) = \chi(t^2(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d))$ satisfying*

$$\chi(t^2) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^d \int^t S_i \dot{\xi} d\tilde{t} - \frac{1}{2} \log \left\{ |\varphi'(t^2)| t^d \sqrt{h} \right\} \quad (21)$$

is $o(n^{-1})$ and coincides with the UMVUE up to $O(n^{-1})$ if a complete sufficient statistic for M exists. Here, h is the determinant of the Fisher metric tensor in the normal coordinate system at ζ , $\varphi'(x) = d\varphi/dx$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\dot{\xi} = d\xi/dt$, and \tilde{t} is the variable of integration.

The implication of this theorem becomes clear in the following example.

Example 2. If the estimand is the squared geodesic distance, i.e., φ is the identity map, the right-hand side of (20) becomes $-d/(4t^2) - d \log h/dt^2/4 + \sum_i S_i d\xi^i/dt^2/4$, where we used the relation between 0 and (-1) -Laplacians (11), expressions (A.6), (A.7), and Lemma A.3 (ii) in Appendix A.3. Subsequently, the solution to (20) coincides with that of Theorem 2.9. The foliation of M by the level surfaces of f is reduced to leaves consisting of equidistant points from the point $\zeta \in M$. For any point ξ in M , there exists a geodesic γ joining ζ and ξ , which is transverse to the foliation and diagonally intersects the leaves (see Figure 3).

3 Integrability and flat model manifolds

Let us discuss integration of the partial differential equation (14) for flat model manifolds. After introducing the notion of the α -flatness, we discuss one-dimensional models in Section 3.1, because one-dimensional C^∞ -manifold is always flat (Proposition A.4 in Appendix A.4). We discuss α -flat model manifolds in Section 3.2. We assume the assumptions of Lemma 2.4.




Figure 3: The foliation of a model manifold M by the equidistant points from the point $\zeta \in M$. A geodesic γ joining ζ and a point $\xi \in M$ is also shown.

An affine connection on a manifold M is said to be *flat* if and only if a local coordinate system exists around each point such that $\Gamma_{jk}^i = 0$ for all i , j , and k [27]. Moreover,

Definition 3.1 ([1]). A manifold with a flat α -connection is said to be α -*flat*. A local coordinate system such that $\Gamma_{jk}^{(\alpha)i} = 0$ for all i , j , and k is called an α -*affine coordinate system*.

Example 3. An exponential family with canonical parameterization is 1-flat because the log-likelihood is $l(\xi; t) = \sum_i t_i \xi^i - \psi(\xi)$ and the Christoffel symbols vanish: $\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(1)} = -\partial_i \partial_j \psi \mathbb{E}_\xi[t_k - \partial_k \psi] = 0$ for all i , j , and k . Here, ξ comprises a 1-affine coordinate system.

Suppose we seek a solution f for a system of linear first-order system of partial differential equations

$$\partial_i f(\xi) = h_i(\xi), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (22)$$

where h_i are smooth functions defined on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d . If $d > 1$, the system is *overdetermined*, indicating that there are more equations than unknown function f . An overdetermined system has a solution only if the partial differential equations satisfy certain compatibility conditions. In fact, because $\partial_i \partial_j f = \partial_j \partial_i f$ for all $i \neq j$, it is obvious that

$$\partial_j h_i(\xi) = \partial_i h_j(\xi) \quad \text{for all } i \neq j \quad (23)$$

is a necessary condition for (22) to have a solution in a neighborhood of any point with an arbitrary initial value. By virtue of the Frobenius theorem, we can show that (23) is sufficient (Proposition 19.17 of [23]). The condition of (23) is called the *integrability condition* for (22).

Lemma A.5 in Appendix A.4 shows that if a model manifold is α_0 -flat for non-zero α_0 , then the system of partial differential equations $\nabla^{(\alpha)} v = 0$

for a differential form v is integrable for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. We call the density of v satisfying $\nabla^{(\alpha)}v = 0$, that is,

$$v(\alpha; \alpha_0) := g^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2\alpha_0}}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (24)$$

the density of the α -parallel volume element with respect to the α_0 -flat manifold. Note that $v(0; \alpha_0) = \sqrt{g}$ is the Jeffreys prior irrespective of α_0 . α -parallel volume elements have appeared in the statistical literature including [29] (Remark A.7 in Appendix A.4).

3.1 One-dimensional model manifolds

For one-dimensional models, the partial differential equation (14) is reduced to an ordinary differential equation and can be integrated as in the following corollary of Theorem 2.6. The proof is in Appendix A.4.

Corollary 3.2. *Consider a one-dimensional model manifold M . The bias of the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\xi})$ of an estimand $f(\xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$ satisfying $f'(\xi) = df/d\xi \neq 0$, where $\hat{\xi}$ maximizes the penalized likelihood with the penalty function $l(\xi)$ satisfying*

$$e^{\bar{l}(\xi)} \propto \frac{\{g(\xi)\}^{1/4}}{\sqrt{|f'(\xi)|}} e^{\frac{1}{4} \int^\xi S_1(\bar{\xi}) d\bar{\xi}}, \quad (25)$$

is $o(n^{-1})$, and coincides with the UMVUE up to $O(n^{-1})$ if a complete sufficient statistic for M exists. Here, $S_1 = g^{11} S_{111}$, $g^{11} = g_{11}^{-1}$, and $g = g_{11}$. In particular, for an α -flat manifold of non-zero $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with an α -affine coordinate system ξ , the condition becomes

$$e^{\bar{l}(\xi)} \propto \frac{v((\alpha - 1)/2; \alpha)}{\sqrt{|f'(\xi)|}}, \quad (26)$$

where $v((\alpha - 1)/2; \alpha)$ is the density of the $(\alpha - 1)/2$ -parallel volume element with respect to an α -flat manifold defined in (24).

Remark 3.3. Any one-dimensional C^∞ -manifold is flat, and a curve in the manifold is always a geodesic. Therefore, any local coordinate is a normal coordinate, and the expression (21) with $d = 1$ should be consistent with the expression (58). In fact, using the facts that $g = g_{11}$ is a constant by the canonical parameterization of the geodesic: $g_{11} \{\dot{\xi}(0)\}^2 = 1$ and $f'(\xi) = d\varphi(t^2)/dt^2 \cdot dt^2/d\xi = 2\varphi'(t^2)t/\dot{\xi}(0)$, we confirm that (21) yields (58). Moreover, if ξ is an α -affine coordinate system, (58) reduces to (26), since $g' = \alpha S_{111}$ by (7) with $\Gamma_{11,1}^{(\alpha)} = 0$.

3.2 Flat model manifolds and generalization of Firth's method

We can obtain some explicit results for α -flat model manifolds. Using the relation between α and (-1) -Laplacians (11), we recast (14) into

$$\sum_i (\text{grad} f)^i \partial_i \tilde{l} = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta^{(\alpha)} f + \frac{1+\alpha}{4} \sum_i S_i (\text{grad} f)^i. \quad (27)$$

Obviously, a sufficient condition for the penalty function \tilde{l} satisfying (27) is the following overdetermined system of partial differential equations

$$\partial_i \tilde{l} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta^{(\alpha)} f}{(\text{grad} f)^i} + \frac{1+\alpha}{4} S_i \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \quad (28)$$

except for $d = 1$. The integration of this system gives the following corollary of Theorem 2.6. The proof is in Appendix A.4, in which we showed that the integrability condition for (28) is satisfied.

Corollary 3.4. *Consider an α -flat model manifold M for non-zero $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and an α -harmonic estimand function f . The bias of the plug-in estimator $f(\hat{\xi})$ of an estimand $f(\xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$, where $\hat{\xi}$ maximizes the penalized likelihood with the penalty function $\log v((\alpha - 1)/2; \alpha)$, is $o(n^{-1})$ and coincides with the UMVUE up to $O(n^{-1})$ if a complete sufficient statistic for M exists. Here, $v((\alpha - 1)/2; \alpha)$ is the density of the $(\alpha - 1)/2$ -parallel volume element with respect to the α -flat model manifold defined in (24), and ξ comprises an α -affine coordinate system.*

Corollary 3.4 is for estimands of scalar functions, nevertheless, it gives a generalization of Firth's bias-reduction method of maximum likelihood estimates of multidimensional parameters. For an α -flat manifold of non-zero α , a component of the α -affine coordinate system ξ , say ξ^{i_0} , $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, is α -harmonic, because $\Delta^{(\alpha)} \xi^{i_0} = \sum_i \partial^i \partial_i \xi^{i_0} = 0$. Applying Corollary 3.4 with setting $f = \xi^{(i)}$, we obtain the penalty function $\log v((\alpha - 1)/2; \alpha)$ irrespective of i_0 . Therefore, we have

Corollary 3.5. *For an α -flat model manifold of a non-zero $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the bias of the estimator $\hat{\xi}$ of the α -affine coordinate ξ that maximizes the penalized likelihood with the penalty function $\log v((\alpha - 1)/2; \alpha)$ is $o(n^{-1})$.*

The generalized linear model of generic link function is an example of an α -flat model manifold.

Example 4. For generalized linear models of generic link function, Theorem 1 of [20] says that the integrability condition for Firth’s method is equivalent to $h_i''/h_i' = \omega \kappa_{2i}'/\kappa_{2i}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and a constant $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, where h_i is the inverse link function, κ_{2i} is the variance of the response vector, and the derivatives are with respect to the linear predictor. They specified the suitable penalty function as $v(\omega - 1; 2\omega - 1)$ for $\omega \neq 1/2$. In fact, direct computation shows that $\Gamma_{rs,t}^{(\alpha)} = \{(\omega - 1) + (1 - \alpha)/2\} \sum_{i=1}^n h_i'^2 \kappa_{2i}'/\kappa_{2i}^2 x_r^i x_s^i x_t^i$ and it vanishes if $\alpha = 2\omega - 1$, where x_r^i is the design matrix. Here, we used $S_{rst} = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i'^2 \kappa_{2i}'/\kappa_{2i}^2 x_r^i x_s^i x_t^i$, which follows by the right equality of (7) with $\alpha = 1$. Further discussion on the canonical link ($\omega = 1$) is in Section 4.1.

4 Examples of estimands

In this section, several examples are presented with numerical results to illustrate how the developed bias-reduction method for generic estimands works for problems of statistical interest.

4.1 Generalized linear models

Generalized linear models constitute a class of exponential families that cover both discrete and continuous measurements. They share several common properties, and the bias reduction of the maximum likelihood estimate of a parameter has been actively studied (see Section 15.2 of [25] and [19] for a survey). Bias reduction of generic estimands is even more challenging. In this subsection, we apply our bias-reduction method to estimate the expected responses of generalized linear models. We will see that the ‘design dependent shrinkage’ property of our bias reduction works effectively.

For simplicity, we concentrate on a canonical link and a known dispersion ϕ . A vector of observations y with n components is assumed to be the realization of a random vector whose components are independently distributed with mean vector μ . The log-likelihood of a generalized linear model is expressed as

$$l(\xi; y) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i \xi^i - \psi(\xi)}{\phi} + c(y, \phi) \quad (29)$$

for some specific functions c and ψ . The linear predictor ξ^i is modeled by a linear combination of unknown parameters $\{\beta^1, \dots, \beta^d\}$:

$$\xi^i = \sum_{r=1}^d x_r^i \beta^r, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (30)$$

where x_r^i is the design matrix. By substituting (30) into (29), it can be observed that the model is an exponential family with canonical parameter $\{\beta^1, \dots, \beta^d\}$ and sufficient statistics $t_r = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_r^i$, $r \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. The score functions are

$$u_r = \partial_r l = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial l}{\partial \xi^i} \frac{\partial \xi^i}{\partial \beta^r} = \frac{1}{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mu_i) x_r^i, \quad \partial_r := \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^r}, \quad r \in \{1, \dots, d\},$$

with the means $\mu_i = \mathbb{E}_\beta[y] = \partial \psi / \partial \xi^i$. The *link function* of a generalized linear model relates the linear predictors ξ^i to the means μ_i . We assume that the link function is invertible, and let the inverse link be denoted by h , that is, $\mu_i = h(\xi^i)$. The Fisher metric tensor is given by

$$g_{rs} = -\partial_r \partial_s l = \frac{1}{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_s \mu_i x_r^i = \frac{1}{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d\mu_i}{d\xi^i} \partial_s \xi^i x_r^i = \frac{1}{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^n h'(\xi^i) x_r^i x_s^i.$$

It is convenient to use the following representation in matrices:

$$(g_{rs}) = \frac{1}{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_r^i)(w_{ii})(x_s^i) = \frac{1}{\phi} X^T W X, \quad (31)$$

where $W = \text{diag}(w_{11}, \dots, w_{nn})$ and $w_{ii} = h'(\xi^i)$. Since the model is an exponential family with canonical parameterization, the Christoffel symbols are $\Gamma_{rs,t}^{(1)} = 0$ for all r, s , and t (Example 3), and we have

$$\Gamma_{rs,t}^{(-1)} = S_{rst} = \mathbb{E}_\beta[u_r u_s u_t] = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_{3i}}{\phi^3} x_r^i x_s^i x_t^i, \quad (32)$$

where $\kappa_{3i} = \mathbb{E}_\beta(y_i - \mu_i)^3$ is the third cumulant of the response vector and the first equality follows by (5).

To discuss the expected response, we choose the inverse link function $h(\xi^{i_0})$ for the i_0 -th design as the estimand. The condition (14) for the design-specific penalty function $\tilde{l}^{(i_0)}$ is

$$\langle \text{grad} h(\xi^{i_0}), \text{grad} \tilde{l}^{(i_0)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \Delta^{(-1)} h(\xi^{i_0}) = 0. \quad (33)$$

Using the matrix representation (31), we obtain

$$\Delta^{(1)} h(\xi^{i_0}) = \sum_{r,s} g^{rs} \partial_r \partial_s h(\xi^{i_0}) = \phi \mathbf{x}_{i_0} (X^T W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top h''(\xi^{i_0}),$$

where \mathbf{x}_{i_0} is the i_0 -th row vector of X . It is evident that a linear link function is 1-harmonic. According to Corollary 3.4, our method reduces the bias to

be $o(n^{-1})$ by the Jeffreys prior. Incidentally, this conclusion is the same as that for the estimation of parameter β discussed by Firth [11]. Otherwise, by using the relation between α -Laplacians (11) and the expression (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{(-1)}h(\xi^{i_0}) &= \phi_{\mathbf{x}_{i_0}}(X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top h''(\xi^{i_0}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\kappa_{3j}}{\phi} \mathbf{x}_j (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top \mathbf{x}_j (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j^\top h'(\xi^{i_0}). \end{aligned}$$

If this expression is identically zero, or $h(\xi^{i_0})$ is (-1) -harmonic, asymptotic unbiasedness can be achieved without a penalty (Corollary 2.7). If the inverse link function is neither linear nor (-1) -harmonic, we have to solve the partial differential equation (33). Noting the expression

$$|\text{grad}h(\xi^{i_0})| = \phi_{\mathbf{x}_{i_0}}(X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top \{h'(\xi^{i_0})\}^2,$$

the differential equation (20) takes the form

$$\frac{d\chi}{dh} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{h''}{h'^2} + \frac{1}{2\phi^2} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \kappa_{3j} \mathbf{x}_j (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top \mathbf{x}_j (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j^\top}{\mathbf{x}_{i_0} (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top h'}.$$

Multiplying the right-hand side by $h'(\xi^{i_0})$ and integrating with respect to ξ^{i_0} yields

$$-\frac{1}{2} \log |h'(\xi^{i_0})| + \frac{1}{2\phi^2} \int^{\xi^{i_0}} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \kappa_{3j} \mathbf{x}_j (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top \mathbf{x}_j (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j^\top}{\mathbf{x}_{i_0} (X^\top W X)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i_0}^\top} d\tilde{\xi}. \quad (34)$$

If (34) is reduced to an injective function ψ of $h(\xi^{i_0})$, then it becomes the desired penalty function $\tilde{l}^{(i_0)}(\beta^1, \dots, \beta^d) = \chi(h(\xi^{i_0})) = \chi(h(x^{i_0}_r \beta^r))$. The penalized likelihood can be maximized with Fisher's scoring on the denormalized model (see Remark 2.3). By the Fisher metric tensor of the denormalized model manifold $\tilde{g}_{rs} := g_{rs} - \partial_r \partial_s \tilde{l}^{(i_0)}$, the updated rule for parameter β is represented as

$$\beta^r \leftarrow \sum_{s=1}^d \tilde{g}^{rs} \left(\sum_{t=1}^d \tilde{g}_{st} \beta^t + u_s + \partial_s \tilde{l}^{(i_0)} \right). \quad (35)$$

Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates of regression coefficients, or parameters, in logistic regressions has been actively studied, including [3] and [11]. In logistic regression, the expected response is the event frequency of each design, which is given by the logistic function of the linear predictor

$\pi_i = e^{\xi^i}/(1 + e^{\xi^i})$ for the i -th design. The maximum likelihood estimate of parameter β tends to be biased away from the origin $\beta = 0$. The ‘separation’ phenomenon, in which a parameter estimate diverges to infinity, causes instability of the logistic regression. This phenomenon occurs when the event occurs or not is determined by whether the linear predictor is positive or negative in a sample. Firth’s bias-reduction method has been a tool to avoid this separation phenomenon [19]. Therefore, a bias reduction requires some degree of ‘shrinkage’ of an estimate toward the origin.

In logistic regression, we are also interested in the event frequency. We can estimate it by the plug-in estimator with the estimates of β , but removing the bias of β introduces bias in the plug-in estimator. Since the logistic regression is an exponential family and the linear predictor is the canonical parameter, the penalty function of Firth is $\log g/2$, where g is the determinant of the Fisher metric tensor (see Introduction). Elgmati’s [10] proposal uses $\lambda \log g$ as the penalty function, where $\lambda \in [0, 1/2]$ is a tuning parameter. In practice, we do not know the optimal λ . Elgmati et al.’s proposed choices of λ for the case of two design points such that it minimizes the mean squared error under some a priori assumptions.

As an illustration, we discuss a variant of the univariate logistic regression used by Copus [3] with the severe setting considered by Firth [11]; that is, one observation is made at each of the five design points with $\xi^i = x^i_1 \beta^1 = i\beta$ for $i = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2$, where the indexing is changed from (30) such that the number indicates the design point of each observation. The Fisher metric tensor (31) is

$$g_{11} = 4\pi_{-2}(1 - \pi_{-2}) + \pi_{-1}(1 - \pi_{-1}) + \pi_1(1 - \pi_1) + 4\pi_2(1 - \pi_2).$$

The penalty function can be obtained by calculating (34); however, this model is one-dimensional, and the application of Corollary 3.2 is easier. Given that the 0-parallel volume element is the Jeffreys prior, we immediately obtain the penalty function

$$\tilde{l}^{(i_0)}(\beta) = \frac{1 - i_0}{2}\beta + \log(1 + e^{i_0\beta}) - \log(1 + e^\beta) - \log(1 + e^{2\beta}) + \frac{1}{2} \log\{(1 + e^\beta)^4 + 4e^{2\beta}\}.$$

The sufficient statistic $t_1 = \sum_{i=-2}^2 y_i x^i_1 = \sum_{i=-2}^2 i y_i$ has seven possible values. Table 1 is an extension of Table 1 in [11]. It displays the distribution of the estimates of parameter β for each value by the three methods: the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), the maximizer of the penalized likelihood proposed by Firth (Firth), and ours (asymptotic unbiased estimator, abbreviated as AUE). The AUE of β is design-specific since it is chosen to reduce the bias of the estimate of the event frequency of each design. The limiting behaviors with $\beta \rightarrow \pm\infty$ show that the maximum likelihood estimate

Table 1: Distribution of the estimates of the parameter in a logistic regression model.

t_1	MLE	Firth	AUE			Sampling probabilities		
			$\pi_{\pm 2}$	$\pi_{\pm 1}$	π_0	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 1$	$\beta = 1.5$
-3	$-\infty$	-1.383	$-\infty$	$-\infty$	-1.383	0.010	0.001	0.000
-2	-1.012	-0.683	-1.205	-0.771	-0.683	0.034	0.006	0.001
-1	-0.420	-0.307	-0.452	-0.335	-0.307	0.084	0.023	0.005
0	0	0	0	0	0	0.185	0.083	0.027
1	0.420	0.307	0.452	0.335	0.307	0.229	0.168	0.091
2	1.012	0.683	1.205	0.771	0.683	0.251	0.305	0.271
3	$+\infty$	1.383	$+\infty$	$+\infty$	1.383	0.207	0.415	0.607

$\hat{\beta}_{\text{MLE}}$ does not exist if $t_1 = \pm 3$ and the AUE of β for the event frequencies $\pi_{\pm 1}$ or $\pi_{\pm 2}$ does not exist if $t_1 = \pm 3$.

The results were obtained with Fisher's scoring, and the iterations were continued until the absolute value of the update of the estimate became smaller than 10^{-5} . The average number of required iterations was less than 50. Comparing the results of Firth with AUE, it can be noted that in AUE, shrinkage is weak, or even 'anti-shrinkage' occurs for large absolute values of the linear predictor. This is reasonable because estimating responses becomes easier with an increase in the absolute value of the predictor.

Table 2 summarizes the performance of the estimators of the event frequencies. The maximum likelihood estimates are in the rows of MLE. The plug-in estimates by the maximizer of Firth's penalized likelihood and Elgmati et al's extension of Firth's method are in the rows of Firth and Elgmati, respectively, and those of our penalized likelihood are in the rows of AUE. The mean squared errors are shown in the columns of MSE. In the Elgmati, we chose tuning parameter λ , which minimized the mean squared errors within $\{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$. For $\beta = 0.5$ and 1, $\lambda = 0.5$ (Firth) was optimal, so we omitted the rows for the Elgmati. The results showed that AUE has a significantly smaller bias than MLE. The mean squared errors were similar in magnitude. This finding is consistent with the second-order efficiency of both estimators (Remark 2.5). The bias of Firth increased with the increases in β , which comes from the non-linearity of the logistic function. Elgmati improved the bias but still had a bias for large absolute values of the linear predictor, even with the optimal λ .

Table 2: Biases and mean squared errors of the estimators of the success probabilities in a logistic regression model.

$\beta = 0.5$										
	$\pi_{-2} = 0.269$		$\pi_{-1} = 0.378$		$\pi_0 = 0.5$		$\pi_1 = 0.622$		$\pi_2 = 0.731$	
	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE
MLE	0.021	0.065	-0.042	0.048	0.098	0.054	0.042	0.048	-0.021	0.065
Firth	0.058	0.048	0.017	0.018	0	0	-0.017	0.018	-0.058	0.048
AUE	0.011	0.070	-0.028	0.044	0	0	0.028	0.044	-0.011	0.070
$\beta = 1$										
	$\pi_{-2} = 0.119$		$\pi_{-1} = 0.269$		$\pi_0 = 0.5$		$\pi_1 = 0.731$		$\pi_2 = 0.881$	
	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE
MLE	0.030	0.035	-0.061	0.041	0.207	0.104	0.061	0.041	-0.030	0.035
Firth	0.088	0.034	0.047	0.015	0	0	-0.047	0.015	-0.088	0.034
AUE	0.018	0.035	-0.043	0.043	0	0	0.043	0.043	-0.018	0.035
$\beta = 1.5$										
	$\pi_{-2} = 0.047$		$\pi_{-1} = 0.182$		$\pi_0 = 0.5$		$\pi_1 = 0.818$		$\pi_2 = 0.953$	
	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE
MLE	0.029	0.016	-0.058	0.030	0.303	0.152	0.058	0.030	-0.029	0.016
Firth	0.092	0.023	0.085	0.015	0	0	-0.085	0.015	-0.092	0.023
Elgmatti	0.062	0.020	0.040	0.014	0	0	-0.040	0.014	-0.062	0.020
AUE	0.018	0.015	-0.042	0.034	0	0	0.042	0.034	-0.018	0.015

4.2 Linear mixed-effects models

Linear mixed-effects models are among the most widely used classes of statistical models (see Section 3.4 of [22]). In this subsection, we explain how our bias reduction works for the estimation of the ‘shrinkage factor’ in linear mixed-effects models.

Efron and Morris [8] discussed an estimation of the mean vector z in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 3$ of a linear mixed-effects model with unknown variance $\sigma^2 > 0$:

$$x_i | z_i \sim N(z_i, 1), \quad z_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (36)$$

If we regard the normal distribution $N(0, \sigma^2)$ as the prior distribution for z_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the marginal log-likelihood is

$$l(\sigma^2; x) = -\frac{|x|^2}{2(1 + \sigma^2)} - \frac{n}{2} \log \{2\pi(1 + \sigma^2)\} \quad (37)$$

which is obtained by integrating out z from (36). The estimator of σ^2 which maximizes (37) is $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MLE}}^2 = |x|^2/n - 1$. The best predictor of the mean vector z under the squared error loss is (see Section 3.5 of [22]) $\hat{z}(\sigma^2) = \{1 - s(\sigma^2)\}x$,

where $s(\sigma^2) := 1/(1+\sigma^2)$ is called the *shrinkage factor*, because the predictor \hat{z} is shrunken toward the ground mean, 0, as the variance σ^2 decreases. In applications of the model we are interested in the shrinkage factor. The plug-in estimator $s(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MLE}}^2)$ has bias, $2/\{(1+\sigma^2)n\} + o(n^{-1})$, and our bias reduction can be applied to remove this bias as follows.

The log-likelihood (37) is a one-dimensional exponential family with the canonical parameter $\xi = -1/\{2(1+\sigma^2)\}$. The manifold is 1-flat, and the canonical parameter is a 1-affine coordinate. The Fisher metric tensor is $g_{11} = n/(2\xi^2)$. As $|x|^2$ is a complete sufficient statistic, Corollary 3.2 immediately provides the UMVUE of the shrinkage factor up to $O(n^{-1})$. By substituting $f(\xi) = s(\sigma^2) = -2\xi$ into (26), we obtain $\tilde{l}(\xi) = \log h(0; 1) + \text{const.} = \log(1+\sigma^2)$, which coincides with the Jeffreys prior.

A two-parameter family of linear mixed-effects models that generalizes the model expressed by (36) is

$$x_{ij}|z_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(z_i, \delta), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m_i\}, \quad z_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \alpha), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

where the variances $\alpha > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ are unknown. The parameter is denoted by $\xi = (\alpha, \delta)$. This model is a simplified version of the linear regression model discussed in [2]. Let us consider the asymptotics $n \rightarrow \infty$ under the assumption that $\sup_i m_i < \infty$. We exclude the case of $m_1 = \dots = m_n = 1$, which reduces to (36). The best predictor of each mean z_i is

$$\hat{z}_i = \{1 - s^{(i)}(\xi)\}\bar{x}_i, \quad s^{(i)}(\xi) := \frac{\delta}{\delta + m_i\alpha}, \quad \bar{x}_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} x_{ij}}{m_i}$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The log-likelihood is

$$l(\xi; x) = \frac{1}{2\delta} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(m_i \bar{x}_i)^2 \alpha}{\delta + m_i \alpha} - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} x_{ij}^2 \right\} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \{(\delta + m_i \alpha) \delta^{m_i-1}\} + \text{const.}$$

The model manifold is the orthant $\{\xi = (\alpha, \delta) : \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2\}$. The Fisher metric tensor is [16]

$$(g_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 (\delta + m_i \alpha)^{-2} & \sum_{i=1}^n m_i (\delta + m_i \alpha)^{-2} \\ \sum_{i=1}^n m_i (\delta + m_i \alpha)^{-2} & \sum_{i=1}^n (\delta + m_i \alpha)^{-2} + (m - n) \delta^{-2} \end{pmatrix}$$

with the determinant

$$g = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \sum_{i < j} \frac{(m_i - m_j)^2}{(\delta + m_i \alpha)^2 (\delta + m_j \alpha)^2} + \frac{m - n}{\delta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m_i^2}{(\delta + m_i \alpha)^2} \right\} > 0,$$

where $m := \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$. After some calculations, we obtain the skewness tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha\alpha\alpha} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m_i^3}{(\delta + m_i\alpha)^3}, & S_{\alpha\alpha\delta} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m_i^2}{(\delta + m_i\alpha)^3}, \\ S_{\alpha\delta\delta} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m_i}{(\delta + m_i\alpha)^3}, & S_{\delta\delta\delta} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(\delta + m_i\alpha)^3} + \frac{m-n}{\delta^3}. \end{aligned}$$

We can confirm that $\Gamma_{ij,k}^{(-1)} = 0$ for all i, j , and k . Therefore, the model manifold is (-1) -flat, and ξ is a (-1) -affine coordinate system. Corollary 3.5 implies that the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}}$ of parameter ξ is second-order unbiased without penalty.

The bias reduction of the shrinkage factor $s^{(i)}$ is as follows. The condition (14) for the penalty function $\tilde{l}^{(i)}$ becomes $\langle \text{grad}s^{(i)}, \text{grad}\tilde{l}^{(i)} \rangle + \Delta^{(-1)}s^{(i)}/2 = 0$. Since

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta^{(-1)}s^{(i)}}{|\text{grad}s^{(i)}|} = \frac{1}{s^{(i)}} \left(\frac{n}{m} - 1 \right),$$

the differential equation (20) can be integrated immediately and we have

$$\tilde{l}^{(i)}(\xi) = \chi(s^{(i)}) + \text{const.} = \left(1 - \frac{n}{m}\right) \log \left(1 + \frac{m_i\alpha}{\delta}\right), \quad m = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i.$$

Table 3 summarizes the performance of the estimators of the shrinkage factor $s^{(1)}$. The results for the plug-in estimator with the maximum likelihood estimate of the parameter $\xi = (\alpha, \delta)$ are shown in the row of MLE, whereas those with the maximizer of the penalized likelihood are shown in the row of AUE. The mean squared errors are in the columns of MSE. We set $n = 50$ and $m_1 = \dots = m_{50} = 10$. The results were obtained from 10,000 experiments. The estimates of parameter ξ were computed with Fisher's scoring, as described in Section 4.1. The average number of iterations until the absolute value of the update of the estimate of the shrinkage factor became smaller than 10^{-5} was equal to or less than seven. The results showed that AUE had a significantly smaller bias than MLE. The MSEs were in similar magnitude.

4.3 Location-scale family and hyperbolic space

The location-scale family is a group family whose group of transformations is $x \mapsto \sigma x + \mu \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma > 0$ are the location and scale parameter, respectively, and $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ denotes the projective special linear group in \mathbb{R}^2 (see Sections 3.3 and 4.4 of [22]). From a geometrical

Table 3: Biases and mean squared errors of the estimators of the shrinkage factor in a linear mixed-effects model.

	$(\alpha, \delta) = (1, 1)$		$(\alpha, \delta) = (1, 5)$		$(\alpha, \delta) = (1, 10)$	
	$s^{(1)} = 0.09090$		$s^{(1)} = 0.33333$		$s^{(1)} = 0.50000$	
	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE	Bias	MSE
MLE	0.00370	0.00044	0.01387	0.00602	0.02081	0.01337
AUE	-0.00007	0.00040	0.00004	0.00537	0.00011	0.01198

perspective, the family is represented as a two-dimensional hyperbolic space and is not α -flat for any α . The purpose of this subsection is to illustrate how our bias-reduction method works for non-flat manifolds. The Neyman–Scott model, in which the number of parameters increases with the number of observations and the maximum likelihood estimator is inconsistent, can also be discussed in a similar manner, because the model manifold is also a hyperbolic space.

First, we explain why the location-scale family is not flat. Let $p_0(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$ is a probability density symmetric about the origin. The location-scale family of the standard density p_0 is given by the density

$$p(x)dx = \frac{1}{\sigma} p_0\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right) dx, \quad (38)$$

where the parameter is denoted by $\xi = (\mu, \sigma)$. The one-sample log-likelihood is $l(\xi; x) = l_0\{(x - \mu)/\sigma\} - \log \sigma$, where $l_0(z) = \log p_0(z)$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial l}{\partial \mu} &= -\frac{l'_0}{\sigma}, & \frac{\partial l}{\partial \sigma} &= -\frac{zl'_0}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{\sigma}, & \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \mu^2} &= \frac{l''_0}{\sigma^2}, & \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \sigma^2} &= \frac{2zl'_0}{\sigma^2} + \frac{z^2 l''_0}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \sigma \partial \mu} &= \frac{l'_0}{\sigma^2} + \frac{zl''_0}{\sigma^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It can be seen that $\mathbb{E}_\xi[\partial_\mu l] = \mathbb{E}_\xi[\partial_\sigma l] = \mathbb{E}_\xi[\partial_\mu \partial_\sigma l] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}_\xi(-\partial_\mu^2 l) = -\mathbb{E}(l''_0)\sigma^{-2}$, and $\mathbb{E}_\xi(-\partial_\sigma^2 l) = 1 - \mathbb{E}(z^2 l''_0)\sigma^{-2}$, where expectations \mathbb{E}_ξ are taken with respect to the density of (38). For simplicity, we assume the standard density $p_0(z)$ satisfies the condition $\mathbb{E}(l''_0) = \mathbb{E}(z^2 l''_0) - 1 =: -R^2 < 0$, which is a choice of the scale. Then, the Fisher metric tensor becomes $g_{ij} = (R/\sigma)^2 \delta_{ij}$. This metric is known as the Poincaré metric of the upper half-plane model of the two-dimensional hyperbolic space of the sectional curvature $(-R^{-2})$. The skewness tensor has components $S_{\mu\mu\mu} = S_{\mu\sigma\sigma} = 0$, $S_{\mu\mu\sigma} = c_1 \sigma^{-3}$, and $S_{\sigma\sigma\sigma} = c_2 \sigma^{-3}$, where $c_1 := -\mathbb{E}(zl'_0 + l''_0)$, $c_2 := -\mathbb{E}(zl'_0 + 1)^3$. The vector derived by the contraction of the skewness tensor has components $S^\mu = 0$,

$S^\sigma = c\sigma R^{-4}$, $c := c_1 + c_2$. The Christoffel symbols are

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\sigma\sigma,\mu}^{(\alpha)} &= \Gamma_{\mu\sigma,\sigma}^{(\alpha)} = \Gamma_{\mu\mu,\mu}^{(\alpha)} = 0, & \Gamma_{\sigma\sigma,\sigma}^{(\alpha)} &= -\frac{R^2}{\sigma^3} - \frac{\alpha c_2}{2\sigma^3}, & \Gamma_{\mu\sigma,\mu}^{(\alpha)} &= -\frac{R^2}{\sigma^3} - \frac{\alpha c_1}{2\sigma^3}, \\ \Gamma_{\mu\mu,\sigma}^{(\alpha)} &= \frac{R^2}{\sigma^3} - \frac{\alpha c_1}{2\sigma^3},\end{aligned}$$

and the non-zero components of the Riemann curvature tensor are

$$\begin{aligned}R_{\mu\sigma\mu\sigma}^{(\alpha)} &= -\frac{R^2}{\sigma^4} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha c_1}{2R^2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha c_1 - c_2}{2R^2}\right), \\ R_{\sigma\mu\mu\sigma}^{(\alpha)} &= \frac{R^2}{\sigma^4} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha c_1}{2R^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\alpha c_1 - c_2}{2R^2}\right),\end{aligned}$$

which shows that the location-scale model is not α -flat for any α , because an affine connection is flat if and only if the curvature tensor field vanishes identically on M (see Theorem II.9.1 of [17] and Appendix A.4).

Section 4.2 of [11] discussed the bias reduction of the maximum likelihood estimate of the variance of the normal distribution with parameterization (μ, σ^2) . He solved a system of two partial differential equations for a single penalty function and found that the bias-reduced estimator is the unbiased sample variance. Our bias-reduction method reproduces his result.

Substituting $f(\xi) = \sigma^2$ into the condition (14) yields the partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{l}}{\partial \sigma} = -\left(1 - \frac{c}{2R^2}\right) \frac{1}{2\sigma},$$

and a solution is $\tilde{l}(\xi) = -\{1 - c/(2R^2)\} \log \sigma/2$. The system of estimating equations for an n -sample is

$$\frac{\partial l^*}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{2}{\sigma^3} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 - \frac{n}{\sigma} - \left(1 - \frac{c}{2R^2}\right) \frac{1}{2\sigma} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial l^*}{\partial \mu} = \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu) = 0,$$

where $l^*(\xi; x) := l(\xi; x_1, \dots, x_n) + \tilde{l}(\xi)$. The solution is $\hat{\mu} = \bar{x}$ and

$$\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{2} = \frac{n}{n + (1 - c/(2R^2))/2} s^2, \quad s^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2, \quad (39)$$

where \bar{x} and s^2 are the sample mean and variance, respectively. If we choose $p_0(z) = e^{-z^2}/\sqrt{\pi}$, where $c_1 = 4$, $c_2 = 8$, and $R^2 = 2$, (39) becomes the unbiased sample variance of the normal distribution.

Lauritzen [21] proposed hypothesis testing for the coefficient of variation $\gamma := \sigma/\mu$ for the normal distribution. He called s/\bar{x} the geometric ancillary

test statistic for the hypothesis that $\gamma = \gamma_0$ for certain γ_0 values. Here, \bar{x} and s are the maximum likelihood estimates of μ and σ , respectively, and the test statistic has a bias of $O(n^{-1})$. Our bias-reduction method can be applied to remove this bias as follows.

The condition of (14) for the penalty function \tilde{l} becomes $\langle \text{grad} \tilde{l}, \text{grad} \gamma \rangle + \Delta^{(-1)} \gamma / 2 = 0$. Since

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta^{(-1)} \gamma}{|\text{grad} \gamma|} = -\frac{\gamma^2 - c/(4R^2)}{\gamma + \gamma^3},$$

the differential equation (20) can be integrated immediately. If we choose $p_0(z) = e^{-z^2}/\sqrt{\pi}$, a solution is

$$\tilde{l}(\xi) = \chi(\gamma) + \text{const.} = \frac{c}{4R^2} \log \frac{\sigma}{\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{c}{4R^2}\right) \log \left\{1 + \left(\frac{\sigma}{\mu}\right)^2\right\},$$

and the system of estimating equations for $\hat{\xi} = (\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$ that maximizes the penalized likelihood is

$$\mu = \bar{x} + \frac{5}{4n} \frac{\sigma^4}{\mu(\mu^2 + \sigma^2)} - \frac{3}{4n} \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}, \quad \sigma^2 = 2(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 + 2s^2 - \frac{5}{2n} \frac{\sigma^4}{\mu^2 + \sigma^2} + \frac{3}{2n} \sigma^2. \quad (40)$$

Table 4 summarizes the performance of plug-in estimators of the coefficient of variation γ : the statistic s/\bar{x} and the plug-in estimator $\hat{\xi} = \hat{\sigma}/\hat{\mu}$. We set $n = 100$. The results were obtained from 10,000 experiments. The results for the estimator s/\bar{x} are in the row of MLE, whereas those for the estimator $\hat{\sigma}/\hat{\mu}$ are in the row of AUE. The system (40) was numerically solved by iteratively updating the estimates of μ and σ through the substitution of the current estimates into the right-hand side. This is repeated until the ratio of the estimates converged, which is equivalent to the gradient descent. The average number of iterations until the absolute value of the update became smaller than 10^{-5} was less than five. The results did not change when μ and σ were multiplied by a common positive number. The results indicate that $\hat{\xi} = \hat{\sigma}/\hat{\mu}$ has a significantly smaller bias than s/\bar{x} . The MSEs were of similar magnitudes for $\gamma = 0.2$ and 1, but the MSE of MLE was larger than AUE for $\gamma = 2$.

Let us discuss the estimation of squared geodesic distance t^2 from the standard density, where $t = \text{dis}((0, 1), (\mu, \sigma))$. For each point (μ, σ) , there exists the unique geodesic joining $(0, 1)$ and (μ, σ) , where the geodesic distance t is the length of the geodesic (see Section 2.4 and Appendix A.3). From a statistical perspective, the squared geodesic distance is a natural estimand of the deviation from a hypothesized density.




Figure 4: The geodesic distance between a point $\xi = (\mu, \sigma)$ and the point $(0, 1)$, which corresponds to the standard density, is the length of the curve shown in the Poincaré metric. Our task is to find the estimate $\hat{\xi}$ such that $t^2(\hat{\xi})$ is an asymptotically unbiased estimate of squared geodesic distance $t^2(\xi)$.

The geodesic equations ((A.5) in Appendix A.3) are $\ddot{\mu} - 2\dot{\mu}\dot{\sigma}/\sigma = 0$ and $\ddot{\sigma} + (\dot{\mu}^2 - \dot{\sigma}^2)/\sigma = 0$, where $\dot{\mu} = d\mu/dt$, $\dot{\sigma} = d\sigma/dt$, $\ddot{\mu} = d^2\mu/dt^2$, and $\ddot{\sigma} = d^2\sigma/dt^2$. The solution satisfying the initial condition $\xi(0) = (\mu(0), \sigma(0)) = (0, 1)$ and $\dot{\xi}(0) = (\dot{\mu}(0), \dot{\sigma}(0))$ is

$$\mu(t) = \frac{R\dot{\mu}(0) \tanh(t/R)}{1 - R\dot{\sigma}(0) \tanh(t/R)}, \quad \sigma(t) = \frac{1}{\cosh(t/R) - R\dot{\sigma}(0) \sinh(t/R)}. \quad (41)$$

As expected, the geodesic distance is $\text{dis}((0, 1), (\mu(t_0), \sigma(t_0))) = \int_0^{t_0} \frac{R}{\sigma} \sqrt{\dot{\mu}^2 + \dot{\sigma}^2} dt = t_0$. The geodesic is a portion of the semicircle on the upper half-plane (see Figure 4):

$$\left(\mu - \frac{\dot{\sigma}(0)}{\dot{\mu}(0)} \right)^2 + \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{(R\dot{\mu}(0))^2}, \quad \sigma > 0.$$

The normal coordinate system ζ at $(0, 1)$ is defined as $\zeta = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2) = (\dot{\mu}(0)t, \dot{\sigma}(0)t)$, where $(\zeta^1)^2 + (\zeta^2)^2 = (t/R)^2$. The relationship (41) can be regarded as a change of the basis between η and ξ , and the inverse is given by

$$\zeta^1 = \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{\nu^2 - 1}} \frac{\mu}{\sigma}, \quad \zeta^2 = \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{\nu^2 - 1}} \left(\nu - \frac{1}{\sigma} \right),$$

where $\nu = (\mu^2 + \sigma^2 + 1)/(2\sigma) \geq 1$ and $\rho = \log(\nu + \sqrt{\nu^2 - 1})$. The squared geodesic distance is expressed as a function of ξ :

$$t^2(\xi) = R^2 \rho^2 = R^2 \left[\log \left\{ \frac{\mu^2 + \sigma^2 + 1}{2\sigma} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\mu^2 + \sigma^2 + 1}{2\sigma} \right)^2 - 1} \right\} \right]^2. \quad (42)$$

Table 4: Biases and mean squared errors of the estimators of the coefficients of variation of the location-scale family.

	$\gamma = 0.2$		$\gamma = 1$		$\gamma = 2$	
	bias	MSE	bias	MSE	bias	MSE
MLE	-0.00294	0.00042	-0.00461	0.02080	0.06360	0.30433
AUE	-0.00000	0.00042	-0.00023	0.02006	-0.00301	0.20801

Theorem 2.9 provides us an asymptotic unbiased estimator of the squared geodesic distance of the bias of $O(n^{-1})$. The expression (21) contains the determinant of the Fisher metric tensor in the normal coordinate system η . Therefore, we have to calculate it and then express it in the original coordinate system ξ . By using the transformation rule of components of a tensor under the change of basis (see Section I.2 of [17]): $h_{ij}(\eta) = (\partial\xi^k/\partial\eta^i)(\partial\xi^l/\partial\eta^j)g_{kl}(\xi)$, we obtain

$$h(\eta(\xi)) = \left(\frac{R\mu(\nu\sigma - 1)}{\sigma^2(\nu^2 - 1)} \right)^4 \left(1 + \frac{\mu^2}{(\nu\sigma - 1)^2} + \frac{\sigma^2(\nu^2 - 1)^2}{\rho^2\mu^2} \right) \\ \times \left(1 + \frac{(\nu\sigma - 1)^2}{\mu^2} + \frac{\sigma^2(\nu^2 - 1)^2}{\rho^2(\nu\sigma - 1)^2} \right).$$

The penalty function is

$$\tilde{l}(\xi) = \frac{c}{4R^2} \log \sigma - \log \rho - \frac{1}{4} \log h(\eta(\xi)). \quad (43)$$

It is straightforward to obtain the system of estimating equations for $\hat{\xi}$ that maximizes the penalized likelihood. The explicit expressions are provided in Appendix B.

Table 5 summarizes the performance of the estimators of the squared geodesic distance: the one is by substituting (\bar{x}, s) for (μ, σ) (MLE), and the other is by substituting $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$ (AUE), where $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$ is the maximizer of the penalized likelihood. The density was specified to be $p(z) = e^{-z^2} \sqrt{\pi}$. We set $n = 100$, and the results were based on 10,000 experiments. The average number of iterations until the absolute value of the update of the estimate of the geodesic distance became smaller than 10^{-5} was less than of equal to four. The results showed that AUE had a significantly smaller bias than MLE. The MSEs were similar in magnitude. It might be surprising that we can reduce the bias of the maximum likelihood estimate for such a complicated estimand function as in (42).

Table 5: Biases and mean squared errors of the estimators of the geodesic distance.

	$(\mu, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ $t^2 = 1.85252$		$(\mu, \sigma) = (5, 1)$ $t^2 = 21.70696$		$(\mu, \sigma) = (0, 0.1)$ $t^2 = 10.60380$	
	bias	MSE	bias	MSE	bias	MSE
MLE	0.03610	0.07872	0.13328	0.91014	0.10132	0.44693
AUE	-0.00058	0.07568	-0.02003	0.88393	-0.00263	0.43295

	$(\mu, \sigma) = (5, 0.1)$ $t^2 = 61.85059$		$(\mu, \sigma) = (0, 5)$ $t^2 = 5.18058$		$(\mu, \sigma) = (5, 5)$ $t^2 = 10.69656$	
	bias	MSE	bias	MSE	bias	MSE
MLE	0.22886	2.57769	-0.01906	0.20499	0.03608	0.43819
AUE	-0.05227	2.51639	0.00126	0.20603	-0.00145	0.42903

5 Discussion

We have discussed the asymptotic bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates of generic estimands with parameter estimates obtained by maximizing suitable penalized likelihoods. The penalty slightly denormalizes the model, but no difficulty arises for explicit calculations. We have answered the two questions raised in Introduction.

The first question concerns bias reduction of generic estimands. We demonstrated that the problem of finding a penalty function that gives an estimator with an asymptotic bias of $o(n^{-1})$ can be boiled down to the integration of a quasi-linear partial differential equation (14). Since the partial differential equation has a solution, we can obtain the desired penalty function for generic model manifolds and estimands.

The second question concerns the system of partial differential equations (3) obtained by Firth [11]. For estimates of parameters, we show that our bias-reduction method reproduces Firth's bias-reduction method. We pointed out that the system is overdetermined, except for one-dimensional models. The integration of an overdetermined system requires an integrability condition. Flat model manifolds are exceptions; we could assess the integrability of the overdetermined system, and we obtained some explicit results.

Another natural question is asking what estimand is asymptotically unbiased for a given penalty, because a penalty function can be given a priori, for example, as a regularizer or a prior. This question would be studied in the context of integral geometry, because the partial differential equation for an estimand function is a variant of the Laplace equation and the integration relies on the group isometries of manifolds (see Chapter II of [14]). We left

this issue in future research.

Finally, we comment on the concept of α -Laplacians introduced in (9). We introduced this concept because it simplifies various arguments in this study. This simplification is not restricted to bias reduction. For a curved exponential family, Komaki [18] constructed an optimal predictive distribution in terms of the Kullback-Leibler loss by shifting the distribution in a direction orthogonal to the model manifold with the amount $\Delta^{(-1)}p(\cdot; \hat{\xi}_{\text{MLE}})/2$ (the last equation on page 307 of [18]). This expression implies that if the distribution function is (-1) -harmonic, optimality has already been achieved. Further investigation of α -Laplacians might be interesting.

A Proofs

In this appendix, we collect proofs and concepts in differential geometry used in the proofs. For general background information on differential geometry, see [17]. A concise summary of the terminology in affine differential geometry is in Chapter I of [27].

A.1 Sections 2.1-2.2

Proof of Proposition 2.1. By the rule of covariant differentiation of tensor fields (see Section III.7 of [17]), covariant derivative of the metric tensor is

$$\nabla_i^{(\alpha)} g_{jk} = \partial_i g_{jk} - \sum_r \Gamma_{ij}^{(\alpha)r} g_{rk} - \sum_t \Gamma_{ik}^{(\alpha)t} g_{jt}.$$

This expression is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i g_{jk} - \sum_{r,s} g^{rs} \Gamma_{ij,s}^{(\alpha)} g_{rk} - \sum_{t,u} g^{tu} \Gamma_{ik,u}^{(\alpha)} g_{jt} &= \partial_i g_{jk} - \sum_s \delta_k^s \Gamma_{ij,s}^{(\alpha)} - \sum_u \delta_j^t \Gamma_{ik,t}^{(\alpha)} \\ &= \partial_i g_{jk} - \Gamma_{ij,k}^{(\alpha)} - \Gamma_{ik,j}^{(\alpha)}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Differentiation of $\mathbb{E}_\xi[u_k] = 0$ leads to $g_{jk} = -\mathbb{E}_\xi[\partial_j u_k] = \mathbb{E}_\xi[u_j u_k]$, since

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_j \int_{\mathcal{X}^n} u_k(\xi; x) e^{l(\xi;x)} dx = \int_{\mathcal{X}^n} \{\partial_j u_k(\xi; x) e^{l(\xi;x)} + u_j(\xi; x) u_k(\xi; x) e^{l(\xi;x)}\} dx \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\xi[\partial_j u_k] + \mathbb{E}_\xi[u_j u_k]. \end{aligned}$$

In the same manner, $g_{jk} = \mathbb{E}_\xi[u_j u_k]$ gives

$$\partial_i g_{jk} = \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\partial_i \partial_j l) u_k] + \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\partial_i \partial_k l) u_j] + \mathbb{E}_\xi[u_i u_j u_k].$$

Substituting this expression into (44) and using the definition of the α -connection (5), we have $\nabla_i^{(\alpha)} g_{jk} = \alpha S_{ijk}$. \square

See Appendix A.2 for the proof of Lemma 2.2.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. By Lemma 2.2, the bias is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\xi[f(\hat{\xi}) - f(\xi)] &= \sum_i \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i] \partial_i f(\xi) + \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i (\hat{\xi} - \xi)^j] \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \partial_j f(\xi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j,k} \mathbb{E}_\xi[(\hat{\xi} - \xi)^i (\hat{\xi} - \xi)^j (\hat{\xi} - \xi)^k] \frac{1}{3!} \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k f(\tilde{\xi}) \\ &= \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \left\{ \left(\partial_j \tilde{l} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} \Gamma_{kr,j}^{(-1)} \right) \partial_i f + \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \partial_j f \right\} + o(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi}$ is a point between $\hat{\xi}$ and ξ . The assertion follows from the definitions of the (-1) -Laplacian (9). The evaluation of the last term of the middle expression is similar to that of $R_{1,i}$ in the proof of Lemma 2.2. \square

Recall the Lehmann-Scheffé theorem:

Theorem A.1 (Theorem 2.1.11, [22]). *Let a sample be distributed according to a parametric model $M = \{p(\cdot; \xi) : \xi \in \Xi\}$, and suppose that t is a complete sufficient statistic for M .*

- (i) *For every U -estimable estimand $f(\xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$, there exists a UMVUE.*
- (ii) *The UMVUE in (i) is the unique unbiased estimator that is a function of t .*

Proof of Theorem 2.6. By the factorization criterion (Theorem 1.6.5 of [22]), if we have a statistic t to be sufficient for a family of probability densities M of a sample x , there exist non-negative functions h_ξ and k such that the density of $p(\cdot; \xi)$ satisfy $p(x; \xi) = h_\xi(t(x))k(x)$. Since k does not depend on ξ , the maximum likelihood estimator is a function of t . On the other hand, since the penalty \tilde{l} does not depend on x , the maximizer of the penalized likelihood $e^{\tilde{l}(\xi)} h_\xi(t(x))$ modulo constant, is also a function of t . Let the maximizer be denoted by $\hat{\xi}(t)$. According to Theorem A.1, the UMVUE of $f(\xi)$ exists uniquely and is a function of t . Let the UMVUE be denoted by $\delta(t)$. Now, $\mathbb{E}_\xi[f(\hat{\xi}(t)) - \delta(t)] = \mathbb{E}_\xi f(\hat{\xi}(t)) - f(\xi) = o(n^{-1})$, otherwise $f(\hat{\xi}(t))$ should have bias of $O(n^{-1})$, which contradicts to Lemma 2.4. \square

A.2 Proof of Lemma 2.2

Consider a log-likelihood function $l(\xi; x_1, \dots, x_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(x_i; \xi)$ of a sample $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ with a parametric model $p(x; \xi)$, $\xi \in \Xi$. The

parameter space Ξ is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d for a fixed $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for large n . The true value of the parameter, ξ_0 , is assumed to be in the interior of Ξ . Expectations are taken with respect to the product probability measure $P_{\xi_0}(dx) = e^{l(\xi_0; x)} \prod_{i=1}^n dx_i$ and a derivative is denoted by $\partial_i := \partial/\partial\xi_i$.

We prepare regularity conditions:

- A1: The map $\mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto l(\xi; x)$ is measurable for each $\xi \in \Xi$;
- A2: The map $\Xi \ni \xi \mapsto l(\xi; x)$ is three times differentiable for each $\xi \in \Xi$;
- A3: $\partial_i l(\xi_0; x)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ are square integrable with respect to $P_{\xi_0}(dx)$;
- A4: Let $G = (g_{ij}(\xi_0))$, $g_{ij}(\xi_0) := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{k=1}^n \partial_i \log p(x_k; \xi_0) \partial_j \log p(x_k; \xi_0)]$. The largest eigenvalue of $-C^{-1}GC^{-1}$, λ_{\max} , for a matrix $C = (c_{ij}) = \text{diag}(c_1, \dots, c_d)$ with $c_i > 0$ such that $c_* := \min_i c_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ satisfies $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\max} \in (-\infty, 0)$;
- A5: For an $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the r -th moments of the following are bounded:

$$\frac{1}{c_i} |\partial_i l(\xi_0; x)|, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_i c_j}} |\partial_i \partial_j l(\xi_0; x) + g_{ij}(\xi_0)|, \quad \frac{c_*}{c_i c_j c_k} M_{ijk}(\xi_0),$$

where $M_{ijk}(\xi_0) := \sup_{\tilde{\xi} \in B_\delta(\xi_0)} |\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k l(\tilde{\xi}; x)|$ with a ball

$$B_\delta(\xi_0) := \{\tilde{\xi} : |\tilde{\xi} - \xi_0| \leq \delta c_*/c_i, i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}.$$

Under conditions A1-A5, Das et al. [7] proved, as their Theorem 2.1, the following theorem for an asymptotic representation of $\hat{\xi} - \xi_0$ to study the mean squared error of the empirical predictor of general linear mixed-effects models, where $\hat{\xi}$ is the solution of the system of score equations $u_i(\xi; x) = 0$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Theorem A.2 ([7]). *Under the regularity conditions A1-A5,*

- (i) *A $\hat{\xi} \in \Xi$ exists such that for any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ there is a set of events \mathcal{E} satisfying for large n and on \mathcal{E} , $\partial_i l(\hat{\xi}; x) = 0$, $|c_{ij}(\hat{\xi} - \xi_0)^j| < c_*^{1-\rho}$, and*

$$\hat{\xi}^i = \xi_0^i + \sum_j g^{ij}(\xi_0) \partial_j l(\xi_0; x) + R, \quad |R| \leq c_*^{-2\rho} u_*, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$$

with $\mathbb{E}u_^r$ bounded;*

- (ii) $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \leq c_0 c_*^{-\tau r}$ for some constant c_0 and $\tau := (1/4) \wedge (1 - \rho)$.

This theorem states that the solution of the system of score equations $u_i(\xi; x) = 0$ exists, and lies in the parameter space Ξ with probability tending to one.

Consider the penalized log-likelihood of a sample $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ with a penalty function $\tilde{l}(\xi) = O(1)$:

$$l^*(\xi; x_1, \dots, x_n) := l(\xi; x_1, \dots, x_n) + \tilde{l}(\xi), \quad \xi \in \Xi.$$

The maximizer of $l^*(\xi; x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is denoted by $\hat{\xi}_n$. Expectations are still taken with respect to the product probability measure, $P_{\xi_0}(dx) = e^{l(\xi_0; x)} \prod_{i=1}^n dx_i$, and we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^n \partial_i l^*(\xi_0; x_k) \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x_k)\right] = g_{ij}(\xi_0) + O(1).$$

Theorem A.2 is used in the following proof of Lemma 2.2.

We prepare the regularity conditions with some modifications. Das et al. [7] needed conditions A4 and A5 to treat multiple asymptotics. In contrast, a single asymptotic is sufficient for our purpose. Therefore, we set $c_1 = \dots = c_n = c_* = \sqrt{n}$, and the resulting conditions are conditions B4 and B5.

- B1: The map $\mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto l^*(\xi; x)$ is measurable for each $\xi \in \Xi$;
- B2: The map $\Xi \ni \xi \mapsto l^*(\xi; x)$ is four times differentiable for each $\xi \in \Xi$;
- B3: $\partial_i l(\xi_0; x)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ are square integrable with respect to $P_{\xi_0}(dx)$;
- B4: The smallest eigenvalue of G/n , λ_{\min} , satisfies $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\min} \in (0, \infty)$.
- B5: For an $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 9}$, the r -th moments of the following are bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |\partial_i l^*(\xi_0; x)|, \quad \frac{1}{n} |\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)|, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |\partial_i \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x) + g_{ij}(\xi_0)|, \\ & \frac{1}{n} |\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x)| \quad \frac{1}{n} |\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x) - \mathbb{E}[\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x)]|. \end{aligned}$$

- B6: $\max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} |\hat{\xi}_n^i| < d_0 n^s$ for some constant d_0 and $0 < s < r/16 - 1/2$.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. With setting $\rho \in (2/3, 3/4)$, Theorem A.2 concludes that

- (a) A $\hat{\xi}_n \in \Xi$ exists such that there is a set of events \mathcal{E} satisfying for large n and on \mathcal{E} , $\partial_i l^*(\hat{\xi}_n; x) = 0$, $|(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j| < n^{-\rho/2}$ and

$$\hat{\xi}_n^i = \xi_0^i + \sum_j g^{ij}(\xi_0) \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x) + R^i, \quad |R^i| \leq n^{-\rho} u_*, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$$
(45)

with $\mathbb{E}(u_*^r)$ bounded;

- (b) $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \leq c_0 n^{-r/8}$ for some constant c_0 .

For simplicity of expressions, in the following expressions, $g_{ij}(\xi_0)$ will be denoted by g_{ij} . In addition, $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}^c}(\cdot)$ will denote $\mathbb{E}(\cdot 1_{\mathcal{E}})$ and $\mathbb{E}(\cdot 1_{\mathcal{E}^c})$, respectively. By Taylor's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i l^*(\hat{\xi}_n; x) - \partial_i l^*(\xi_0; x) &= \sum_j (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j \partial_i \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^k \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_{1,i} \\ &= - \sum_j (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j g_{ij} + \sum_j (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j \{ \partial_i \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x) + g_{ij} \} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^k \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_{1,i}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_{1,i} = \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{j,k,r} (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^k (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^r \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\tilde{\xi}; x)$$

for a point $\tilde{\xi}$ between $\hat{\xi}_n$ and ξ_0 . Since $\partial_j l^*(\hat{\xi}_n; x) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i &= \sum_j g^{ij} \left\{ \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x) + \sum_k (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^k (\partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x) + g_{jk}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^k (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^r \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_1 \right\} = \sum_j g^{ij} \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_2^i. \end{aligned}$$
(46)

Here, $g^{ij} = O(n^{-1})$ holds by condition B4 and (45) gives $|R_2^i| \leq n^{-\rho} u_*$ with $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(u_*)$ bounded. Then, replacing every occurrence of $(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i$ in the middle expression of (46) by $\sum_j g^{ij} \partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_2^i$ and taking the expectation of the

first equality on \mathcal{E} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i &= \sum_j g^{ij} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x)] + \sum_j g^{ij} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(R_{1,j}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k} g^{ij} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}\left[\left(\sum_r g^{kr} \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_2^k\right)(\partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x) + g_{jk})\right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k,r,s,t} g^{ij} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}\left[(g^{ks} \partial_s l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_2^k)(g^{rt} \partial_t l^*(\xi_0; x) + R_2^r) \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)\right].\end{aligned}$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, condition B5, and $|R_2^k| \leq n^{-\rho} u_*$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j,k} g^{ij} |\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[R_2^k (\partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x) + g_{jk})]| &\leq \sum_{j,k} g^{ij} (\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(R_2^k)^2)^{1/2} \{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(\partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x) + g_{jk})^2\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(u_*^2)\}^{1/2} o(n^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we observe that

$$\sum_{j,k,r,s} g^{ij} g^{ks} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_s l^*(\xi_0; x) R_2^r \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)], \quad \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[R_2^r R_2^k \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)]$$

are $o(n^{-1})$. Condition B5 and $|(\hat{\xi} - \xi_0)^i| < n^{-\rho/2}$ lead to

$$\sum_j g^{ij} |\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(R_{1,j})| < \sum_{j,k,r,s} g^{ij} \frac{1}{3!} n^{-3\rho/2} |\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_j \partial_k \partial_r \partial_s l^*(\tilde{\xi}; x)]| = o(n^{-1}),$$

where $\rho > 2/3$ is demanded. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i &= 2 \sum_j g^{ij} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x)] + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x) \partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x)] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k,r,s,t} g^{ij} g^{ks} g^{rt} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_s l^*(\xi_0; x) \partial_t l^*(\xi_0; x) \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)] + o(n^{-1}) \\ &= 2 \sum_j g^{ij} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x)] + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x) \partial_j \partial_k l^*(\xi_0; x)] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)] + o(n^{-1}) \\ &= 2 \sum_j g^{ij} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x)] + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\{\partial_r l(\xi_0; x) + \partial_r \tilde{l}(\xi_0)\} \{\partial_j \partial_k (l(\xi_0; x) + \tilde{l}(\xi_0))\}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[\partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)] + o(n^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds from the fact which follows from condition B5:

$$\text{cov}^{\mathcal{E}}(\partial_s l^*(\xi_0; x) \partial_t l^*(\xi_0; x), \partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)) = o(n^2).$$

Since $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(\cdot) \leq \mathbb{E}(\cdot)$, the last expression is bounded from the above by

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_j g^{ij} \mathbb{E}[\partial_j l^*(\xi_0; x)] + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \mathbb{E}[\{\partial_r l(\xi_0; x) + \partial_r \tilde{l}(\xi_0)\} \{\partial_j \partial_k (l(\xi_0; x) + \tilde{l}(\xi_0))\}] \\ & + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l^*(\xi_0; x)] + o(n^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

On the other hand, by (b) and condition B6, we observe

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}^c}(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i \leq d_0 n^s \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \leq c_0 d_0 n^{s-r/8} = o(n^{-1}).$$

and thus $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i + o(n^{-1})$. Therefore, (47) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i &= 2 \sum_j g^{ij} \partial_j \tilde{l}(\xi_0) \\ &+ \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\partial_r l(\xi_0; x) \partial_j \partial_k l(\xi_0; x)] + \partial_r \tilde{l}(\xi_0) \mathbb{E}[\partial_j \partial_k l(\xi_0; x)] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l(\xi_0; x)] \right\} \\ &+ o(n^{-1}) \\ &= \sum_j g^{ij} \partial_j \tilde{l}(\xi_0) + \sum_{j,k,r} g^{ij} g^{kr} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\partial_r l(\xi_0; x) \partial_j \partial_k l(\xi_0; x)] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l(\xi_0; x)] \right\} + o(n^{-1}) \\ &= \sum_j g^{ij} \left\{ \partial_j \tilde{l}(\xi_0) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,r} g^{kr} (\Gamma_{jk,r}^{(1)} - \partial_r g_{jk}) \right\} + o(n^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

for large n , where the second equality follows by $\mathbb{E}[\partial_j \partial_k l(\xi_0; x)] = -g_{jk}$. The last equality follows by $\mathbb{E}[\partial_j \partial_k \partial_r l(\xi_0; x)] = -\partial_r g_{jk} - \Gamma_{jk,r}^{(1)}$, which can be obtained by differentiating $g_{jk} = -\mathbb{E}[\partial_j \partial_k l(\xi_0; x)]$ and the definition of the α -connection (5). Hence, assertion (i) is established. For assertion (ii), by using (45), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^i (\hat{\xi}_n - \xi_0)^j] = \sum_{k,r} g^{ik} g^{jr} \mathbb{E}[\partial_k l^*(\xi; x) \partial_r l^*(\xi; x)] + o(n^{-1}) = g^{ij} + o(n^{-1})$$

in a similar way as in the proof of assertion (i). \square

A.3 Section 2.4: Geodesic distances and normal coordinates

In a local coordinate system $\{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d\}$, consider a curve $\gamma = \xi(t)$, $a < t < b$, where $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$, of class C^1 in a manifold M . The *length* of γ is defined as $\int_a^b \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} g_{ij} \dot{\xi}^i \dot{\xi}^j} dt$, where $\dot{\xi}(t) = d\xi/dt$ denotes the vector tangent to γ at $\xi(t)$. A curve γ is called a *geodesic* if the vector field $X = \dot{\xi}(t)$ defined along γ is parallel along γ , that is, if $\nabla_X^{(0)} X$ exists and equals 0 for all t . In a local coordinate system, the geodesic equation is expressed as

$$\ddot{\xi}^i + \sum_{j,k} \Gamma_{jk}^i \dot{\xi}^j \dot{\xi}^k = 0, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (48)$$

where $\ddot{\xi} = d^2\xi/dt^2$. The parameter t is normalized such that we have

$$\sum_{i,j} g_{ij} \dot{\xi}^i \dot{\xi}^j = 1 \quad (49)$$

and called the *canonical parameter* of the geodesic γ . The canonical parameter of a geodesic should not be confused with that of an exponential family. The *distance* $\text{dis}(\zeta, \xi)$ on M is the infimum length of all piecewise differentiable curves of class C^1 joining ζ and ξ in M . Let the neighborhood of ζ in M be U_ζ . With the 0-connection, it can be shown that every point $\xi \in U_\zeta$ can be joined to ζ by the unique geodesic lying in U_ζ , and the length is equal to $\text{dis}(\zeta, \xi)$ (Proposition IV.3.4 of [17]). In this sense, we call this distance the *geodesic distance*. In an Euclidean manifold, the geodesic is the straight line joining ζ and ξ .

An orthonormal frame at $\zeta \in M$ defines a coordinate system in the tangent space $T_\zeta M$. The diffeomorphism of the neighborhood of ζ in $T_\zeta M$ to the neighborhood of ζ in M , U_ζ , defines a local coordinate system in U_ζ . We denote the local coordinate system by $\{\zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^d\}$ and call it a *normal coordinate system* at ζ . Note that $\{\partial/\partial\zeta^1, \dots, \partial/\partial\zeta^d\}$ forms an orthonormal frame at ζ , but may not be orthonormal at other points. If $\{\zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^d\}$ is a normal coordinate system at ζ , then the geodesic $\gamma = \zeta(t)$ with the initial condition $\zeta(0) = 0$ and $\dot{\zeta}(0) = c$ is expressed as $\zeta^i = c^i t$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ (see Proposition III.8.3 of [17]).

Formulas (i) and (ii) in the following lemma appear as equations (55) and (57), respectively, in Chapitre VII of [28]. Proofs are given for readers' convenience, because the proofs were not explicitly given in [28].

For a geodesic $\gamma = \xi(t)$, the length minimizing property of geodesics gives

the following useful relation

$$\frac{\partial t}{\partial \xi^i} = \sum_j g_{ij} \dot{\xi}^j, \quad (50)$$

which is derived as equation (52) in Chapitre VII of [28].

Lemma A.3. *For a function $\varphi(t^2)$, where $t = \text{dis}(\zeta, \xi)$ is the geodesic distance, we have*

$$(i) \quad \Delta^{(0)}\varphi(t^2) = \varphi'(t^2)\Delta^{(0)}(t^2) + 4t^2\varphi''(t^2), \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \quad \Delta^{(0)}(t^2) = 2d + t \frac{d}{dt} \{\log h(\zeta)\}, \text{ where } \zeta = \dot{\xi}(0)t \text{ is the normal coordinate system at } \zeta, \text{ and } h(\zeta) \text{ is the determinant of the Fisher metric tensor.}$$

Proof. For assertion (i), by the definition of the Laplace–Beltrami operator (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{(0)}\varphi(t^2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^i} \left(\sqrt{g} \sum_j g^{ij} \frac{\partial \varphi(t^2)}{\partial \xi^j} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^i} \left(\sqrt{g} \sum_j g^{ij} \frac{\partial t^2}{\partial \xi^j} \varphi'(t^2) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^i} \left(\sqrt{g} \sum_j g^{ij} \frac{\partial t^2}{\partial \xi^j} \right) \varphi'(t^2) + \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \frac{\partial t^2}{\partial \xi^i} \frac{\partial t^2}{\partial \xi^j} \varphi''(t^2) \\ &= \varphi'(t^2)\Delta^{(0)}(t^2) + 4 \sum_{i,j} g_{ij} \dot{\xi}^i \dot{\xi}^j t^2 \varphi''(t^2) = \varphi'(t^2)\Delta^{(0)}(t^2) + 4t^2\varphi''(t^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality follows by (50) and the last equality follows by (49). For assertion (ii), we work with the normal coordinate system at ζ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{(0)}(t^2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^i} \left(\sqrt{h} \sum_j h^{ij} \frac{\partial t^2}{\partial \zeta^j} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \sum_i \frac{\partial \sqrt{h}}{\partial \zeta^i} \sum_j h^{ij} \frac{\partial t^2}{\partial \zeta^j} + \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^i} h^{ij} \frac{\partial t^2}{\partial \zeta^j} \\ &= t \frac{d}{dt} \{\log h(\zeta)\} \sum_{i,j} h_{ij} \dot{\zeta}^i \dot{\zeta}^j + 2 \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^i} (t \dot{\zeta}^i) = t \frac{d}{dt} \{\log h(\zeta)\} + 2 \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^i} (t \dot{\zeta}^i), \end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality follows by (50). Because (49) and

$$\sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^i} (t \dot{\zeta}^i) = \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta^i} (\dot{\xi}^i(0)t) = \sum_i \frac{\partial \zeta^i}{\partial \zeta^i} = d,$$

the assertion holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.9. We work with the normal coordinate system at ζ denoted by $\zeta = \dot{\xi}(0)t$. By the relation between α -Laplacians (11), we have

$$\Delta^{(-1)}f = \Delta^{(0)}f - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i S^i \partial_i f.$$

In the normal coordinate system at ζ , the partial differential equation (14) is written as

$$\sum_{i,j} h^{ij} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \zeta^i} \frac{\partial l^*}{\partial \zeta^j} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta^{(0)}f = 0, \quad (51)$$

where

$$l^*(\zeta) := \tilde{l}(\zeta) - \frac{1}{4} \sum_i \int S_i \xi^i dt.$$

If the penalty function $\tilde{l}(\zeta)$ is a function of the squared geodesic distance, we may write $l^*(\zeta) = \chi^*(t^2(\zeta))$. Then, (51) becomes

$$4t^2 \sum_{i,j} h^{ij} \frac{\partial t}{\partial \zeta^i} \frac{\partial t}{\partial \zeta^j} \varphi'(t^2) \chi^{*'}(t^2) + \frac{1}{2} \{ \varphi'(t^2) \Delta^{(0)}(t^2) + 4t^2 \varphi''(t^2) \} = 0, \quad (52)$$

where $\varphi'(x) = d\varphi/dx$, $\varphi''(x) = d^2\varphi/dx^2$, and $\chi^{*'}(x) = d\chi^*/dx$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and we used Lemma A.3 (i). By using (49) and (50), (52) is recast into the ordinary differential equation for φ :

$$\chi^{*'}(t^2) = -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\varphi''(t^2)}{\varphi'(t^2)} + \frac{\Delta^{(0)}(t^2)}{4t^2} \right\}. \quad (53)$$

Noting that Lemma A.3 (ii) yields

$$\int \frac{\Delta^{(0)}(t^2)}{t^2} dt^2 = 2d \log t^2 + \int \frac{1}{t} \frac{d}{dt} \{ \log h \} dt^2 = 2d \log t^2 + 2 \log h + \text{const.},$$

we obtain $\chi^*(t^2) = -\log \left\{ |\varphi'(t^2)| t^d \sqrt{h} \right\} / 2 + \text{const.}$ by integrating (53). Hence, (21) follows. \square

A.4 Section 3: Flat manifolds

The Riemann curvature tensor field R is defined through

$$R(X, Y)Z := \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_{[X, Y]} Z,$$

where $\nabla_X = \sum_i x^i \nabla_i$ and $[X, Y] := \sum_{i,j} (x^i \partial_i y^j - y^i \partial_i x^j) \partial_j$ for vector fields $X = \sum_i x^i \partial_i$ and $Y = \sum_i y^i \partial_i$. The components are introduced by $R(\partial_j, \partial_k) \partial_i =: \sum_r R_{ijk}^r \partial_r$, where

$$R_{ijk}^r = \partial_j \Gamma_{ki}^r - \partial_k \Gamma_{ji}^r + \sum_s \Gamma_{ki}^s \Gamma_{js}^r - \sum_t \Gamma_{ji}^t \Gamma_{kt}^r \quad (54)$$

(see Proposition III.7.6 of [17]). The Riemann curvature tensor with respect to the α -connection, that is, the expression (54) with Christoffel symbols (6) is specifically denoted by $R^{(\alpha)r}_{ijk}$.

As stated before Definition 3.1 in the text, an affine connection on M is flat if and only if a local coordinate system exists around each point such that $\Gamma_{jk}^i = 0$ for all i, j , and k [27]. An equivalent condition is that the curvature tensor field vanishes identically on M (see Theorem II.9.1 of [17]).

Proposition A.4. *If a manifold M is one-dimensional, any affine connection on M is flat because the component (54) is anti-symmetric in indices j and k ; namely, $R_{111}^1 = -R_{111}^1 = 0$.*

Consider an affine connection ∇ on M . If there exists a *parallel volume element*, that is, a non-zero d -dimensional differential form v satisfying $\nabla v = 0$ around each point of the manifold M , then the affine connection ∇ is said to be *locally equiaffine* (see Section I.3 of [27]). In other words, if an affine connection ∇ on M is locally equiaffine, the system of partial differential equations $\nabla v = 0$ for v is integrable everywhere.

For the relationship between the α -flatness of a manifold M and the locally equiaffineness of the affine connection on M , we have a technical lemma. We do not use this lemma directly in this paper, but many fact appear in this paper relate to the following elementary proof.

Lemma A.5. *Consider a C^∞ -manifold M .*

- (i) *The 0-connection on M is locally equiaffine.*
- (ii) *If M is α_0 -flat for $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, then the α -connection on M is locally equiaffine for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.*
- (iii) *The converse of (ii) is not true.*

Proof. With a local coordinate system $\{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^d\}$, a d -dimensional differential form v is written as $v(\xi) = v_{i_1 \dots i_d}(\xi) d\xi^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge d\xi^{i_d}$, where the density $v_{i_1 \dots i_d}(\xi)$ is antisymmetric in indices, so $v_{i_1 \dots i_d}(\xi) \neq 0$ if and only if all indices

are distinct (see Section I.1 of [17] for differential forms). In the local coordinate system, the components of the condition $\nabla^{(\alpha)}v = 0$ gives the following system of partial differential equations (see Section III.7 of [17]):

$$\partial_i v_{1\dots d} - \sum_{j,k} \Gamma^{(\alpha)k}_{ij} v_{1\dots j-1kj+1\dots d} = \partial_i v_{1\dots d} - \sum_j \Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ji} v_{1\dots d} = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (55)$$

where the first equality follows by the antisymmetric property of $v_{i_1\dots i_d}$. For simplicity, let $v_{1\dots d}$ be denoted by v . If $\alpha = 0$, the differential from with $v = \sqrt{g}$ is called the volume element and satisfies the system (55) identically, because

$$\sum_j \Gamma^{(0)j}_{ij} = \sum_{j,k} g^{jk} \Gamma^{(0)}_{ij,k} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} g^{jk} \partial_i g_{jk} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \log g = \partial_i \log \sqrt{g},$$

where the second equality follows by the expression (8). Therefore 0-connection is locally equiaffine and assertion (i) holds. For assertion (ii), if M is α_0 -flat for a non-zero α_0 , we can take a local coordinate system satisfying $\Gamma^{(\alpha_0)j}_{ij} = 0$ around each point of M . By using (6), we have

$$\sum_j \Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ij} = \sum_j \Gamma^{(\alpha_0)j}_{ij} + \frac{\alpha_0 - \alpha}{2} \sum_{j,k} g^{jk} S_{ijk}$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, the second equality of (7) becomes

$$\partial_i g_{jk} = \alpha_0 S_{ijk}. \quad (56)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\sum_j \Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ji} = \frac{\alpha_0 - \alpha}{2\alpha_0} \sum_{j,k} g^{jk} \partial_i g_{jk} = \frac{\alpha_0 - \alpha}{2\alpha_0} \partial_i \log g$$

Then, the system (55) becomes

$$\partial_i v = \frac{\alpha_0 - \alpha}{2\alpha_0} \partial_i \log g \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

This system is integrable, because it satisfies the integrability conditions (23), i.e., $\partial_i \partial_j h = \partial_j \partial_i h$ for all $i \neq j$. We immediately obtain $\log v = (1/2 - \alpha/(2\alpha_0)) \log g + \text{const}$. For assertion (iii), since the integrability condition yields $\partial_j (\Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ik} v) = \partial_k (\Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ij} v)$, $\forall \alpha, j \neq k$, we have $\partial_j \Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ik} = \partial_k \Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ij}$, $\forall \alpha, j \neq k$. On the other hand, by the definition of α -connections (5), we have

$$\sum_j \Gamma^{(\alpha)j}_{ji} = \sum_j \Gamma^{(0)j}_{ji} - \frac{\alpha}{2} S_i = \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \log g - \frac{\alpha}{2} S_i.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\partial_i S_j = \partial_j S_i \quad \text{for all } i \neq j. \quad (57)$$

But we can construct a counter example, namely, there exists a manifold satisfying (57) but is not α -flat for any α (see Section 4.3). \square

Remark A.6. Equiaffiness is a fundermental concept in affine differential geometry. Proposition I.3.1 of [27] says that a torsion-free affine connection on M is locally equiaffine if and only if the Ricchi tensor is symmetric. Since the 0-connection has the latter property, assertion (i) follows immediately. Takeuchi and Amari [29] obtained assertion (ii) by using Corollary 3.12 of [21], but the proof above seems more straightforward.

Interestingly, α -parallel volume elements have already appeared in various contexts in the statistical literature.

Remark A.7. Section 6 of [12] defined the asymptotically locally invariant prior by v which solves the partial differential equation (55) for $\alpha = 1$, and satisfies $v(f(\xi))f'(\xi) \propto v(\xi)$ asymptotically and locally for any estimand function f , with assuming the existence. He proposed a one-parameter family of invariant priors, which is a solution of (55). An example of α -parallel volume elements with respect to an α_0 -flat manifold is $v(\alpha_0; \alpha_0) = 1$ for any non-zero α_0 , where the case of the exponential family ($\alpha_0 = 1$) was discussed in [13]. Another example is $v(\alpha; \pm 1)$, which appeared in [29]. Kosmidis and Firth [20] obtained $v(\alpha_0/2 - 1/2; \alpha_0)$ for any non-zero α_0 as the penalty function for Firth's bias reduction method for generalized linear models for generic link function (Example 4).

Proof of Corollary 3.2. Using the relation between (-1) and 0-Laplacian (11) with the expression of the 0-Laplacian (10), the partial differential equation (14) becomes

$$\langle \text{grad} \tilde{l}, \text{grad} f \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta^{(-1)} f = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_i \partial_i (\sqrt{g} (\text{grad} f)^i) + \frac{1}{4} \sum_i S_i (\text{grad} f)^i.$$

When $d = 1$, this reduces to the ordinary differential equation:

$$g^{-1} \tilde{l}' f' = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} (g^{-1/2} f')' + \frac{1}{4} g^{-1} S_1 f' = -\frac{f''}{2g} + \frac{f'}{4g^2} + \frac{f'}{4g} S_1,$$

where we used $g^{11} = g^{-1}$ and $g_{11} = g$, and we have

$$\tilde{l}' = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{f''}{f'} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{g'}{g} + \frac{1}{4} S_1 \quad (58)$$

and the integration yields (24). For the second assertion, if ξ is an α -affine coordinate system, (56) gives $(\log g)' = \alpha S_1$, and (58) becomes

$$\tilde{l}' = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{f''}{f'} + \frac{1 + \alpha}{4\alpha} \frac{g'}{g}.$$

Noting the definition of the $(\alpha - 1)/2$ -parallel volume element with respect to an α -flat manifold (25), the integration yields (26). \square

Proof of Corollary 3.4. The integrability condition (23) for the system of partial differential equations (28) is

$$\frac{1 + \alpha}{2} (\partial_i S_j - \partial_j S_i) = \partial_i \left\{ \frac{\Delta^{(\alpha)} f}{(\text{grad} f)^j} \right\} - \partial_j \left\{ \frac{\Delta^{(\alpha)} f}{(\text{grad} f)^i} \right\} \quad \text{for all } i \neq j.$$

If $\alpha \neq 0$, $S_i = \partial_i(\log g)/\alpha$ follows by (56). The condition reduces to a simpler form:

$$\partial_i \left\{ \frac{\Delta^{(\alpha)} f}{(\text{grad} f)^j} \right\} = \partial_j \left\{ \frac{\Delta^{(\alpha)} f}{(\text{grad} f)^i} \right\} \quad \text{for all } i \neq j.$$

An obvious class of estimand functions satisfying this integrability condition is the α -harmonic functions defined in Section 2.1, that is, $\Delta^{(\alpha)} f = 0$. The system of partial differential equations (28) becomes

$$\partial_i \tilde{l} = \frac{1 + \alpha}{4\alpha} \partial_i \log g \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$$

and can be immediately integrated. The solution coincides with the $(\alpha - 1)/2$ -parallel volume element with respect to an α -flat manifold. \square

B Estimating equations for the squared geodesic distance in the hyperbolic space

The system of estimating equations for $\hat{\xi} = (\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$ which maximizes the penalized likelihood (43) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \bar{x} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2n} \left(\frac{2\nu}{\nu^2 - 1} \frac{\mu}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{4f} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu} - \frac{1}{4g} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu} \right), \\ \sigma^2 &= 2(s^2 + (\bar{x} - \mu)^2) + \frac{\sigma^3}{n} \left\{ \left(\frac{c}{4R^2} + 2 \right) \frac{1}{\sigma} + \frac{2(\sigma - \nu)\nu}{(\nu^2 - 1)\sigma} - \frac{1}{4f} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma} - \frac{1}{4g} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \sigma} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= \mu^4 \rho^2 + \{\mu^2 \rho^2 + \sigma^2(\nu^2 - 1)^2\}(\sigma\nu - 1)^2, \\
g &= (\sigma\nu - 1)^4 \rho^2 + \{(\sigma\nu - 1)^2 \rho^2 + \sigma^2(\nu^2 - 1)^2\} \mu^2, \\
\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu} &= \frac{2\mu^3 \rho}{\sigma\sqrt{\nu^2 - 1}} \{\mu^2 + (\sigma\nu - 1)^2\} + 2\mu \{\mu^2(\sigma\nu + 1) + (\sigma\nu - 1)^2\} \rho^2 \\
&\quad + 2\mu\sigma(\sigma\nu - 1) \{\sigma(3\nu^2 - 1) - 2\nu\}(\nu^2 - 1), \\
\frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu} &= \frac{2\mu(\sigma\nu - 1)^2 \rho}{\sigma\sqrt{\nu^2 - 1}} \{\mu^2 + (\sigma\nu - 1)^2\} + 2\mu\sigma(\nu^2 - 1) \{2\mu^2\nu + \sigma(\nu^2 - 1)\} \\
&\quad + 2\mu(\sigma\nu - 1) \{\mu^2 + (2\sigma\nu - 1)(\sigma\nu - 1)\} \rho^2, \\
\frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma} &= \frac{2\mu^2(\sigma - \nu)\rho}{\sigma\sqrt{\nu^2 - 1}} \{\mu^2 + (\sigma\nu - 1)^2\} + 2\mu^2\sigma(\sigma\nu - 1)\rho^2 \\
&\quad + 2\sigma(\sigma\nu - 1) \{(\sigma\nu - 1)(2\sigma\nu - \nu^2 - 1) + \sigma^2(\nu^2 - 1)\}(\nu^2 - 1), \\
\frac{\partial g}{\partial \sigma} &= \frac{2(\sigma\nu - 1)^2(\sigma - \nu)\rho}{\sigma\sqrt{\nu^2 - 1}} \{\mu^2 + (\sigma\nu - 1)^2\} + 2\sigma(\sigma\nu - 1) \{\mu^2 + 2(\sigma\nu - 1)^2\} \rho^2 \\
&\quad + 2\mu^2(2\sigma\nu - \nu^2 - 1)\sigma(\nu^2 - 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Professors Shiro Ikeda, Tao Zou, and an anonymous referee for drawing their attention to preceding works. The first author was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant 18K12758. The second author was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grants 18H00835 and 20K03742.

References

- [1] AMARI, S., NAGAOKA, H. (2000). *Methods of Information Geometry*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- [2] BATTESE, G.E., HARTER, R.M., FULLER, W.A. (1988). An error-components model for prediction of county crop areas using survey and satellite data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **83** 28–36.
- [3] COPAS, J.B. (1988). Binary regression models for contaminated data. *J. R. Statist. Soc.* **B50** 225–65.
- [4] COURANT, R., HILBERT, D. (1962). *Methods of Mathematical Physics*. Vol II. Wiley-Interscience, New York.

- [5] COX, D., LITTLE, J., O'SHEA, D. (2007). *Ideals, Varieties, Algorithms*. 3rd Ed. Springer, New York.
- [6] COX, D.R., SNELL, E.J. (1968). A general definition of residuals. *J. R. Statist. Soc.* **B30** 248–275.
- [7] DAS, K., JIANG, J., RAO, J. N. K. (2004). Mean squared error of empirical predictor. *Ann. Statist.* **32** 818–840.
- [8] EFRON, B., MORRIS, C. (1972). Empirical Bayes on vector observations: an extension of Stein's method. *Biometrika* **59** 335–347.
- [9] EGUCHI, S. YANAGIMOTO, T. (2008). Asymptotical improvement of maximum likelihood estimators on Kullback-Leibler loss. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **138** 3502–3511.
- [10] ELGMATI, E., FIACCONE, R.L., HENDERSON, R., MATTHEWS, J.N.S. (2015). Penalized logistic regression and dynamic prediction for discrete-time recurrent event data. *Lifetime Data Anal.* **21** 542–560.
- [11] FIRTH, D. (1993). Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. *Biometrika* **80** 27–38.
- [12] HARTIGAN, J.A. (1964). Invariant prior distributions. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 836–845.
- [13] HARTIGAN, J.A. (1998). The maximum likelihood prior. *Ann. Statist.* **26** 2083–2103.
- [14] HELGASON, S. (1984). *Groups and Geometric Analysis: Integral Geometry, Invariant Differential Operators, and Spherical Functions*. Academic Press, Orlando.
- [15] HIROSE, Y.M., LAHIRI, P. (2018). Estimating variance of random effects to solve multiple problems simultaneously, *Ann. Statist.* **46** 1721–1741.
- [16] HIROSE, Y.M., LAHIRI, P. (2021). Multi-goal prior selection: a way to reconcile Bayesian and classical approaches for random effects models, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **116** 1487–1497.
- [17] KOBAYASHI, S., NOMIZU, K. (1963). *Foundations of Differential Geometry, Vol. I*. Wiley and Sons, New York.

- [18] KOMAKI, F. (1996). On asymptotic properties of predictive distributions. *Biometrika* **83** 299–313.
- [19] KOSMIDIS, I. (2014). Bias in parametric estimation: reduction and useful side-effects. *WIREs Comput Stat* **6** 185–196.
- [20] KOSMIDIS, I., FIRTH, D. (2009). Bias reduction in exponential family nonlinear models. *Biometrika* **96** 793–804.
- [21] LAURITZEN, S.L. (1987). Statistical manifolds. In *Differential Geometry in Statistical Inference*, IMS Lecture Notes-Monograph Series **10** 163–216. IMS, Hayward, CA.
- [22] LEHMANN, E.L., CASELLA, G. (1998). *Theory of Point Estimation, Second Edition*. Springer, New York.
- [23] LEE, J.M. (2002). *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*. Springer, New York.
- [24] MCCULLAGH, P. (1987). *Tensor Methods in Statistics*. Chapman and Hall, New York.
- [25] MCCULLAGH, P., NELDER, J.A. (1987). *Generalized Linear Models*. 2nd. ed. Chapman and Hall, New York.
- [26] MORITA, S. (2001). *Geometry of Differential Forms*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- [27] NOMIZU, K., SASAKI, T. (1994). *Affine Differential Geometry*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- [28] RIESZ, M. (1949). L'intégrale de Riemann-Liouville et le problème de Cauchy, *Acta Math.* **81** 1–223.
- [29] TAKEUCHI, J., AMARI, S. (2005). α -parallel prior and its properties. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory.* **51** 1011–1023.