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Abstract

In this paper, we develop a general approach for probabilistic estimation and optimization. An explicit formula and a computational approach are established for controlling the reliability of probabilistic estimation based on a mixed criterion of absolute and relative errors. By employing the Chernoff-Hoeffding bound and the concept of sampling, the minimization of a probabilistic function is transformed into an optimization problem amenable for gradient descendent algorithms.

1 Analytical Sample Size Formula for Estimation of Mean Values

Let $X$ be a random variable bounded in interval $[0, 1]$ with mean $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu \in (0, 1)$, which are defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \Pr)$. In many areas of sciences and engineering, it is desired to estimate $\mu$ based on samples $X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n$ of $X$. Frequently, the samples $X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n$ may not be identical and independent (i.i.d). Thus, it is a significant problem to estimate $\mu$ under the assumption that

\begin{align}
0 \leq X_k \leq 1 \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k, \\
\mathbb{E}[X_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = \mu \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k,
\end{align}

where $\{\mathcal{F}_k, k = 0, 1, \cdots, \infty\}$ is a sequence of $\sigma$-subalgebra such that $\{\emptyset, \Omega\} = \mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}$, with $\mathcal{F}_k$ being generated by $X_1, \cdots, X_k$.

Naturally, an estimator for $\mu$ is taken as

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}.$$ 

Since $\hat{\mu}$ is of random nature, it is crucial to control the statistical error. For this purpose, we have established the following result.
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Theorem 1 Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $\varepsilon_a \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_r \in (0, 1)$ be real numbers such that $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Assume that (1) and (2) are true. Then,

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \hat{\mu} - \mu \right| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } \left| \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\mu} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon_r \right\} > 1 - \delta \quad (4)$$

for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$ provided that

$$n > \frac{\varepsilon_r \ln 2}{(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r) \ln (1 + \varepsilon_r) + (\varepsilon_r - \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r) \ln \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r}{\varepsilon_r - \varepsilon_a} \right)}. \quad (5)$$

It should be noted that conventional methods for determining sample sizes are based on normal approximation, see [4] and the references therein. In contrast, Theorem 1 offers a rigorous method for determining sample sizes. In the special case that $X$ is a Bernoulli random variable, a numerical approach has been developed by Chen [2] which permits exact computation of the minimum sample size.

2 A Computational Approach for General Case

In this section, we shall investigate an exact computational sample size method for the case that $X \in [a, b]$ with $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu$. Assume that

$$a \leq X_k \leq b \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = \mu \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k, \quad (7)$$

where $\{\mathcal{F}_k, k = 0, 1, \cdots, \infty\}$ is a sequence of $\sigma$-subalgebra such that $\{\emptyset, \Omega\} = \mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}$, with $\mathcal{F}_k$ being generated by $X_1, \cdots, X_k$.

We wish to determine minimum sample size $n$ such that

$$\Pr \{ \left| \hat{\mu} - \mu \right| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } \left| \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\mu} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon_r \} > 1 - \delta \quad (8)$$

for any $\mu \in [a, b]$, where $\hat{\mu}$ is defined by (3). Unlike the special case that $X$ is bounded in interval $[0, 1]$, there is no explicit formula for the general case that $X$ is bounded in interval $[a, b]$. We will employ the branch and bound technique of global optimization. For this purpose, we need to derive a sample size formula and the associated bounding method.

To describe the relevant theory for computing sample sizes, define function

$$M(z, \theta) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{z \ln \theta}{z} + (1 - z) \ln \frac{1 - \theta}{1 - z} & \text{for } z \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \theta \in (0, 1), \\
\ln(1 - \theta) & \text{for } z = 0 \text{ and } \theta \in (0, 1), \\
\ln \theta & \text{for } z = 1 \text{ and } \theta \in (0, 1), \\
-\infty & \text{for } z \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \theta \notin (0, 1)
\end{cases}$$
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Define

\[ \vartheta(\mu) = \frac{\mu - a}{b - a}, \]
\[ g(\mu) = \vartheta(\mu) - \frac{\max\{\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_r|\mu|\}}{b - a}, \]
\[ h(\mu) = \vartheta(\mu) + \frac{\max\{\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_r|\mu|\}}{b - a}, \]
\[ W(\mu) = \max\{M(g(\mu), \vartheta(\mu)), M(h(\mu), \vartheta(\mu))\} \]

for \( \mu \in [a, b] \). By virtue of such functions, we have established theoretical results which are essential for the exact computation of sample sizes as follows.

**Theorem 2** Assume that (6) and (7) are satisfied. Then, (8) holds for any \( \mu \in [a, b] \) provided that

\[ n \geq \frac{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\max_{\nu \in [a, b]} W(\nu)}. \]  

(9)

Moreover,

\[ W(\nu) \leq \max\{M(g(d), \vartheta(c)), M(h(c), \vartheta(d))\}, \]  

(10)

\[ W(\nu) \geq \max\{M(g(c), \vartheta(d)), M(h(d), \vartheta(c))\} \]  

(11)

for \( \nu \in [c, d] \subseteq [a, b] \) such that \( g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(d) \leq h(c) \).

See Appendix 5 for a proof.

Since (10) and (11) of Theorem 2 provide computable upper and lower bounds of \( W(\nu) \), the maximum of \( W(\nu) \) over \([a, b]\) can be exactly computed with the Branch and Bound method proposed by Land and Doig [6].

### 3 Optimization of Probability

In many applications, it is desirable to find a vector of real numbers \( \theta \) to minimize a probability, \( p(\theta) \), which can be expressed as

\[ p(\theta) = \Pr\{Y(\theta, \Delta) \leq 0\}, \]

where \( Y(\theta, \Delta) \) is piece-wise continuous with respect to \( \theta \) and \( \Delta \) is a random vector. If we define

\[ \mu(\lambda, \theta) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda Y(\theta, \Delta)}], \]

then, applying Chernoff bound [3], we have

\[ p(\theta) \leq \inf_{\lambda > 0} \mu(\lambda, \theta). \]

This indicates that we can make \( p(\theta) \) small by making \( \mu(\lambda, \theta) \) small. Hence, we shall attempt to minimize \( \mu(\lambda, \theta) \) with respect to \( \lambda > 0 \) and \( \theta \).
To make the new objective function $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$ more tractable, we take a sampling approach. Specifically, we obtain $n$ i.i.d. samples $\Delta_1, \cdots, \Delta_n$ of $\Delta$ and approximate $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$ as

$$g(\lambda, \theta) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} e^{-\lambda Y(\theta, \Delta_i)}}{n}.$$ 

A critical step is the determination of sample size $n$ so that $g(\lambda, \theta)$ is sufficiently close to $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$. Since $0 < e^{-\lambda Y(\theta, \Delta)} < 1$, an appropriate value of $n$ can be computed based on (5) of Theorem 1.

Finally, we have transformed the problem of minimizing the probability function $p(\theta)$ as the problem of minimizing a piece-wise continuous function $g(\lambda, \theta)$. Since $g(\lambda, \theta)$ is a more smooth function, we can bring all the power of nonlinear programming to solve the problem. An extremely useful tool is the gradient descendentalgorithm, see, e.g. [1] and the references therein.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

To prove the theorem, we shall introduce function

$$\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) = (\mu + \varepsilon) \ln \frac{\mu}{\mu + \varepsilon} + (1 - \mu - \varepsilon) \ln \frac{1 - \mu}{1 - \mu - \varepsilon}$$

where $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \mu$. We need some preliminary results.

The following lemma is due to Hoeffding [5].

**Lemma 1** Assume that (1) and (2) hold for any positive integer $k$. Then,

$$\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq \mu + \varepsilon\} \leq \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \mu < 1,$$

$$\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \varepsilon\} \leq \exp(n \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < \varepsilon < \mu < 1.$$ 

**Lemma 2** Let $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. Then, $\psi(\varepsilon, \mu)$ is monotonically increasing with respective to $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon)$ and monotonically decreasing with respective to $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1 - \varepsilon)$. Similarly, $\psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)$ is monotonically increasing with respective to $\mu \in (\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2})$ and monotonically decreasing with respective to $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon, 1)$.

**Proof.** Tedious computation shows that

$$\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = \ln \frac{\mu(1 - \mu - \varepsilon)}{(\mu + \varepsilon)(1 - \mu)} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\mu} + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \mu}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mu^2(\mu + \varepsilon)} - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1 - \mu)^2(1 - \mu - \varepsilon)} < 0$$

for $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \mu < 1$. Note that

$$\left. \frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu = \frac{1}{2}} = \ln \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{1 + 2\varepsilon} + \varepsilon < 0$$
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because
\[
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \left[ \ln \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \right] = -\frac{4}{1-4\varepsilon^2} < 0.
\]
Moreover,
\[
\left. \frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} = \ln \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} > 0
\]
because
\[
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \left[ \ln \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} \right] = \frac{32\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} > 0.
\]
Similarly,
\[
\left. \frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} = \ln \frac{\mu(1-\mu+\varepsilon)}{(\mu-\varepsilon)(1-\mu)} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\mu} - \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\mu}
\]
and
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mu^2(\mu-\varepsilon)} - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1-\mu)^2(1-\mu+\varepsilon)} < 0
\]
for \(0 < \varepsilon < \mu < 1\). Hence,
\[
\left. \frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} = \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \varepsilon > 0
\]
because
\[
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \left[ \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \right] = \frac{4}{1-4\varepsilon^2} > 0;
\]
and
\[
\left. \frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} = \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} < 0
\]
as a result of
\[
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \left[ \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} \right] = -\frac{32\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} < 0.
\]
Since \( \left. \frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} < 0, \left. \frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} > 0 \) and \( \psi(\varepsilon, \mu) \) is concave with respect to \( \mu \), it must be true that \( \psi(\varepsilon, \mu) \) is monotonically increasing with respective to \( \mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon) \) and monotonically decreasing with respective to \( \mu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \). Since \( \left. \frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} > 0, \left. \frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} < 0 \) and \( \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) \) is concave with respect to \( \mu \), it must be true that \( \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) \) is monotonically increasing with respective to \( \mu \in (\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}) \) and monotonically decreasing with respective to \( \mu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1-\varepsilon) \).

\[\square\]

**Lemma 3** Let \(0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} \). Then,

\[
\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) > \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) \quad \forall \mu \in \left( \varepsilon, \frac{1}{2} \right),
\]

\[
\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) < \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) \quad \forall \mu \in \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1-\varepsilon \right).
\]
Proof. It can be shown that
\[
\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial \varepsilon} = \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2(1 - 2\mu)}{(\mu^2 - \varepsilon^2)(1 - \mu)^2} \right]
\]
for \(0 < \varepsilon < \min(\mu, 1 - \mu)\). Note that
\[
\frac{\varepsilon^2(1 - 2\mu)}{(\mu^2 - \varepsilon^2)(1 - \mu)^2} > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon < \mu < \frac{1}{2}
\]
and
\[
\frac{\varepsilon^2(1 - 2\mu)}{(\mu^2 - \varepsilon^2)(1 - \mu)^2} < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} < \mu < 1 - \varepsilon.
\]
Therefore,
\[
\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial \varepsilon} > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon < \mu < \frac{1}{2}
\]
and
\[
\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial \varepsilon} < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} < \mu < 1 - \varepsilon.
\]
So, we can complete the proof of the lemma by observing the sign of the partial derivative \(\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial \varepsilon}\) and the fact that \(\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) = 0\) for \(\varepsilon = 0\).

\[\blacksquare\]

Lemma 4 Let \(0 < \varepsilon < 1\). Then, \(\psi(\varepsilon \mu, \mu)\) is monotonically decreasing with respect to \(\mu \in \left(0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}\right)\). Similarly, \(\psi(-\varepsilon \mu, \mu)\) is monotonically decreasing with respect to \(\mu \in (0, 1)\).

Proof. Note that
\[
\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = (1 + \varepsilon) \ln \frac{1 - (1 + \varepsilon)\mu}{1 - \mu} - (1 + \varepsilon) \ln(1 + \varepsilon) + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \mu}
\]
and
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \psi(\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1 - \mu)^2[1 - (1 + \varepsilon)\mu]} < 0
\]
for any \(\mu \in \left(0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}\right)\).

Since \(\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu} |_{\mu = 0} = \varepsilon - (1 + \varepsilon) \ln(1 + \varepsilon) < 0\), we have
\[
\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu} < 0, \quad \forall \mu \in \left(0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}\right)
\]
and it follows that \(\psi(\varepsilon \mu, \mu)\) is monotonically decreasing with respect to \(\mu \in \left(0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}\right)\).

Similarly, since
\[
\frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu} |_{\mu = 0} = -\varepsilon - (1 - \varepsilon) \ln(1 - \varepsilon) < 0
\]
and
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \psi(\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1 - \mu)^2[1 - (1 - \varepsilon)\mu]} < 0, \quad \forall \mu \in (0, 1)
\]
we have
\[ \frac{\partial \psi (-\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu} < 0, \quad \forall \mu \in (0, 1) \]
and, consequently, \( \psi (-\varepsilon \mu, \mu) \) is monotonically decreasing with respect to \( \mu \in (0, 1) \).

\[ \blacksquare \]

**Lemma 5** Suppose \( 0 < \varepsilon_r < 1 \) and \( 0 < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2} \). Then,

\[ \Pr\{ \hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a \} \leq \exp \left( n \psi \left( -\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \right) \right) \tag{12} \]

for \( 0 < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \).

**Proof.** We shall show (12) by investigating three cases as follows. In the case of \( \mu < \varepsilon_a \), it is clear that

\[ \Pr\{ \hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a \} = 0 < \exp \left( n \psi \left( -\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \right) \right) . \]

In the case of \( \mu = \varepsilon_a \), we have

\[ \Pr\{ \hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a \} = \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_a} \Pr\{ \hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \eta \} \]

\[ \leq \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_a} \exp \left( n \psi \left( -\eta, \mu \right) \right) = \exp \left( n \psi \left( -\varepsilon_a, \mu \right) \right) \]

\[ = \exp \left( n \psi \left( -\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_a \right) \right) \]

\[ < \exp \left( n \psi \left( -\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \right) \right) , \]

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that \( \varepsilon_a < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_a \).

In the case of \( \varepsilon_a < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \), we have

\[ \Pr\{ \hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a \} \leq \exp (n \psi (-\varepsilon_a, \mu)) < \exp \left( n \psi \left( -\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \right) \right) , \]

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1 and the second inequality follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that \( \varepsilon_a < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_a \). So, (12) is established. \[ \blacksquare \]

**Lemma 6** Suppose \( 0 < \varepsilon_r < 1 \) and \( 0 < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2} \). Then,

\[ \Pr\{ \hat{\mu} \geq (1 + \varepsilon_r) \mu \} \leq \exp \left( n \psi \left( \varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \right) \right) \tag{13} \]

for \( \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} < \mu < 1 \).
Proof. We shall show (13) by investigating three cases as follows. In the case of $\mu > \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r}$, it is clear that
\[
\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq (1 + \varepsilon_r)\mu\} = 0 < \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right).
\]
In the case of $\mu = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r}$, we have
\[
\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq (1 + \varepsilon_r)\mu\} = \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_r} \Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq (1 + \eta)\mu\}
\leq \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_r} \exp(n \psi(\eta\mu, \mu)) = \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon_r\mu, \mu))
\leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right),
\]
where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4 and the fact that $\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r \leq \frac{1}{2}$ as a result of $0 < \varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

In the case of $\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r < \mu < \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r}$, we have
\[
\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \leq (1 + \varepsilon_r)\mu\} \leq \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon_r\mu, \mu)) < \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right),
\]
where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1 and the second inequality follows from Lemma 4.

So, (13) is established. \hfill \Box

We are now in a position to prove the theorem. We shall assume (5) is satisfied and show that (4) is true. It suffices to show that
\[
\Pr\{|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r, \mu\} < \delta.
\]
For $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}$, we have
\[
\Pr\{|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r, \mu\} = \Pr\{|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a\}
= \Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq \mu + \varepsilon_a\} + \Pr\{\hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a\}. \tag{14}
\]
Noting that $0 < \mu + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have
\[
\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq \mu + \varepsilon_a\} \leq \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon_a, \mu)) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right),
\]
where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1 and the second inequality follows from Lemma 2.

It can be checked that (5) is equivalent to
\[
\exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) < \frac{\delta}{2}.
\]
Therefore,
\[
\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq \mu + \varepsilon_a\} < \frac{\delta}{2}
\]
for $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}$.

On the other hand, since $\epsilon_a < \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r} < \frac{1}{\epsilon}$, by Lemma 5 and Lemma 3, we have

$$\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \epsilon_a\} \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\epsilon_a, \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\epsilon_a, \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}\right)\right) < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

for $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}$. Hence, by (14),

$$\Pr\{|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon_a, |\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon_r\mu\} < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta.$$

This proves (4) for $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}$.

For $\frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r} < \mu < 1$, we have

$$\Pr\{|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon_a, |\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon_r\mu\} = \Pr\{|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon_r\mu\} = \Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq \mu + \epsilon_r\mu\} + \Pr\{\hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \epsilon_r\mu\}.$$

Invoking Lemma 6, we have

$$\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq \mu + \epsilon_r\mu\} \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\epsilon_a, \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}\right)\right).$$

On the other hand,

$$\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \epsilon_r\mu\} \leq \exp(n \psi(-\epsilon_r\mu, \mu)) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\epsilon_a, \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\epsilon_a, \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}\right)\right)$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1, the second inequality follows from Lemma 4, and the last inequality follows from Lemma 3. Hence,

$$\Pr\{|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon_a, |\hat{\mu} - \mu| \geq \epsilon_r\mu\} \leq 2 \exp\left(n \psi\left(\epsilon_a, \frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r}\right)\right) < \delta.$$

This proves (4) for $\frac{\epsilon_a}{\epsilon_r} < \mu < 1$. The proof of Theorem 1 is thus completed.

5 Proof of Theorem 2

Define $Y_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$ with $Y_i = \frac{X_i - a}{b - a}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \vartheta(\mu)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Moreover,

$$\Pr\{|\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \epsilon_a, |\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \epsilon_r\mu|\} = \Pr\{|\overline{X}_n - \mu - \max(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_r|\mu|)\}$$

$$+ \Pr\{|\overline{X}_n - \mu + \max(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_r|\mu|)\} = \Pr\{\overline{X}_n \leq g(\mu)\} + \Pr\{\overline{Y}_n \geq h(\mu)\}. \quad (15)$$

It follows from (15) and Lemma 1 that

$$\Pr\{|\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \epsilon_a, |\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \epsilon_r\mu| \} \leq \exp(n \mathcal{M}(g(\mu), \vartheta(\mu))) + \exp(n \mathcal{M}(h(\mu), \vartheta(\mu))$$

$$\leq 2 \exp(n \mathcal{W}(\mu)),$$
from which it follows immediately that (8) holds for any $\mu \in [a, b]$ provided that (9) is true.

Now we shall show (10) and (11). For $\nu \in [c, d] \subseteq [a, b]$ with $g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(d) \leq h(c)$, it can be shown that

$$g(c) \leq g(\nu) \leq g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(\nu) \leq \vartheta(d) \leq h(c) \leq h(\nu) \leq h(d).$$

By differentiation, it can be shown that for any fixed $\mu \in (0, 1), M(z, \mu)$ is monotonically increasing with respect to $z \in (0, \mu)$. Since $g(\nu) \leq g(d) \leq \vartheta(\nu)$ for all $\nu \in [c, d]$, it follows that

$$M(g(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq M(g(d), \vartheta(\nu)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d].$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

By differentiation, it can be shown that for any fixed $z \in (0, 1), M(z, \mu)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $\mu \in (z, 1)$. Since $g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(\nu) \leq 1$ for all $\nu \in [c, d]$, we have

$$M(g(d), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq M(g(d), \vartheta(c)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d].$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

By virtue of (16) and (17), we have

$$M(g(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq M(g(d), \vartheta(c)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d].$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

Similarly, it can be shown that

$$M(h(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq M(h(c), \vartheta(\nu)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d].$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

$$M(g(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \geq M(g(c), \vartheta(d)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d].$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

$$M(h(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq M(h(d), \vartheta(c)) \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d].$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

for all $\nu \in [c, d]$. Combining (18), (19), (20) and (21) yields (10) and (11). Theorem 2 is thus established.
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