

THE CRAMÉR-RAO INEQUALITY ON SINGULAR STATISTICAL MODELS I

JÜRGEN JOST, HÔNG VÂN LÊ, AND LORENZ SCHWACHHÖFER

ABSTRACT. We introduce the notion of the essential tangent bundle of a parametrized measure model and the notion of reduced Fisher metric on a (possibly singular) 2-integrable measure model. Using these notions and a new characterization of k -integrable parametrized measure models, we extend the Cramér-Rao inequality to 2-integrable (possibly singular) statistical models for general φ -estimations, where φ is a V -valued feature function and V is a topological vector space. Thus we derive an intrinsic Cramér-Rao inequality in the most general terms of parametric statistics.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. k -integrable parametrized measure models and reduced Fisher metric	4
2.1. A characterization of k -integrable parametrized measure models	4
2.2. Essential tangent space and reduced Fisher metric	11
3. Visible functions, their generalized gradient and pre-gradient	12
3.1. Visible functions and estimators	12
3.2. Generalized gradient and pre-gradient of visible functions	16
3.3. Application to the case of finite sample spaces	18
4. Cramér-Rao inequality on singular statistical models	20
4.1. Bias, mean square error and variance of an estimator	21
4.2. A general Cramér-Rao inequality	22
4.3. Classical Cramér-Rao inequalities	22
4.4. Janssen's nonparametric Cramér-Rao inequality	24
4.5. Comparing with other generalizations of Cramér-Rao inequality	25
4.6. Conclusion	26
Acknowledgement	27
References	27

Date: March 11, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 62F10, 62G07, 62H12.

Key words and phrases. singular k -integrable statistical model, reduced Fisher metric, Cramér-Rao inequality, φ -estimation.

H.V.L. is partially supported by RVO: 67985840.

1. INTRODUCTION

A statistical model, also called a learning machine, is a basic notion in mathematical statistics, statistical learning theory and their applications [Amari1987, Amari2016, AN2000, Vapnik1999, Watanabe2009].

The basic task is to infer the parameter of the model from observations of samples of the underlying distribution. For that purpose, the map taking the parameters of the model to probability distributions needs to be one-to-one. Furthermore, for applying the Cramér-Rao inequality, the Fisher information matrix of the model should be positive definite. These are considered as limitations of a statistical model, and a model not satisfying these requirements is called singular (the precise terminology varies somewhat in the literature, see e.g. [Watanabe2009, Definition 1.7, p. 10], [BKRW1998, p. 12]). Such singular statistical models appear in statistics ubiquitously, however, and we cannot ignore singular points for estimation problems [Watanabe2007, Watanabe2009]. Here, we deal with such possibly singular models. The simple starting observation is that, even if the model parameter cannot be fully inferred, the observations in general will still restrict its possibilities, and even if the Fisher information matrix is degenerate in some directions, there will be others in which it is positive definite, and these can still be used to control some of the variance. In this contribution, we shall set up a systematic mathematical framework to handle that issue, that is, derive estimates that cover cases where the Fisher information matrix is not strictly positive definite.

In this paper we call a point $\xi \in M$ *singular* if the Fisher information matrix at ξ is degenerate, and we call a point $\xi \in M$ *unidentifiable*, if $\#(\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\mathbf{p}(\xi))) \geq 2$, following the terminology of Amari and Watanabe. We should also point out that, in contrast to [BKRW1998], we do not require that a regular point must be an interior point. In particular, our statistical models include Banach manifolds with boundary, where the boundary can have singularities, i.e. the Fisher metric can be degenerate at boundary points. To be general, as in [Watanabe2009], we say *singular* when we really mean *possibly singular*, that is, we always implicitly include regular statistical models, in particular, when we don't specify the singular points.

Thus, here we shall deal with such singular statistical models, and our main achievement will be a corresponding version of the Cramér-Rao inequality. Until the present paper, see also [AJLS2016] for closely related results, the Cramér-Rao's inequality in the context of parametric statistics was known to hold only on statistical models where the Fisher information matrix is positive definite, see Subsection 4.6 for a more detailed comment. For that reason, the singular statistical models considered in [Watanabe2007, Watanabe2009] are supposed to be real analytic varieties so that parameter estimation problems can be simplified. In our paper we introduce the notions of essential tangent bundle, reduced Fisher metric, visible functions and their generalized gradient and pre-gradient. Using

these new notions and a new characterization of k -integrable parametrized measure models, we extend the Cramér-Rao inequality on singular statistical models for general φ -regular estimations, where φ is a V -valued feature and V is a topological vector space. The most complete treatment currently available of statistical models in the context of parametric statistics has been developed in [AJLS2015], [AJLS2016b], [AJLS2016], see Subsection 4.6 for more detailed comments. Our new treatment of the Cramér-Rao inequality is therefore a natural consequence of this new theory of parametric statistics.

In the subsequent paper [JLS2017b] we study conditions for the existence of efficient estimators on singular statistical models. In particular we prove the existence of (possibly biased) efficient estimators on a class of strictly singular finite dimensional statistical models and the existence of biased efficient estimators on a large class of Fukumizu's infinite dimensional exponential manifolds.

We are working within the context of parametric statistics. Note that, unlike the accepted convention in [BKRW1998], [Wasserman2006], our parametric statistical models may be infinite dimensional. Since nonparametric statistics is conceptually and methodologically different, naturally also the Cramér-Rao inequality takes a somewhat different form there. Nevertheless, also the nonparametric approach as in [Janssen2003] can deal with possibly singular situations. In that context, the most advanced version of the Cramér-Rao inequality seems to be that of Janssen [Janssen2003]. At the end of this paper, we shall compare his version with ours, to the extent that a comparison between a parametric and a nonparametric approach is feasible.

Our paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2 we recall the notion of parametrized measure (resp. statistical) model that has been introduced in [AJLS2015] and refined in [AJLS2016b]. We prove a new characterization of k -integrable parametrized measure models. Then we introduce the notion of the essential tangent space and reduced Fisher metric which are crucial for the extension of the Cramér-Rao inequality to singular statistical models.

In Section 3 we introduce a large class of visible functions on statistical models that encompass estimators considered in our general Cramér-Rao inequality. We also introduce the notion of the generalized gradient and a pre-gradient of a visible function. We prove that differentiation under the integral sign is valid for regular visible functions associated to estimators. This is a technical important point in the proof of the Cramér-Rao inequality in Section 4. At the end of Section 3 we illustrate our theory in the case of finite sample spaces, whose results shall be used in the second part of this paper [JLS2017b].

In Section 4 we prove a general Cramér-Rao inequality and derive from it classical Cramér-Rao inequalities. We also compare our results with other generalizations of the Cramér-Rao inequalities. Finally we summarize our main contributions at the end of the paper.

Notations. For a measurable space Ω and a finite measure μ_0 on Ω we denote

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}(\Omega) &:= \{\mu : \mu \text{ a probability measure on } \Omega\} \\ \mathcal{M}(\Omega) &:= \{\mu : \mu \text{ a finite measure on } \Omega\} \\ \mathcal{S}(\Omega) &:= \{\mu : \mu \text{ a signed finite measure on } \Omega\} \\ \mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mu_0) &= \{\mu = \phi \mu_0 : \phi \in L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{S}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space whose norm $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ is given by the total variation, and $\mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mu_0) \subset \mathcal{S}(\Omega)$ is a closed subspace whose norm is given by $\|\phi \mu_0\|_{TV} = \|\phi\|_1$, where the latter refers to the norm in $L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)$.

2. k -INTEGRABLE PARAMETRIZED MEASURE MODELS AND REDUCED FISHER METRIC

In this section we recall the notion of a k -integrable parametrized measure model (Definition 2.1) that has been introduced in [AJLS2016b]. The concept of 2-integrability (resp. 3-integrability) is required for the right concept of the Fisher metric (resp. the Amari-Chentsov tensor) on parametrized measure models, see [AJLS2015]. We prove the existence of a dominating measure under a mild condition (Proposition 2.3), which is important for our proof of the general Cramér-Rao inequality in later sections. Then we give a characterization of k -integrability (Theorem 2.7), which is important for later deriving the classical Cramér-Rao inequalities from our general Cramér-Rao inequality. Finally we introduce the notion of *essential tangent space* of a 2-integrable parametrized measure model (Definition 2.9) and the related notion of *reduced Fisher metric*.

2.1. A characterization of k -integrable parametrized measure models. Here is the definition of a parametrized measure model from [AJLS2016b, Definition 4.1].

Definition 2.1. Let Ω be a measurable space.

- (1) A *parametrized measure model* is a triple (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) where M is a (finite or infinite dimensional) Banach manifold and $\mathbf{p} : M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{S}(\Omega)$ is a Frechét- C^1 -map, which we shall call simply a C^1 -map.
- (2) The triple (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) is called a *statistical model* if it consists only of probability measures, i.e., such that the image of \mathbf{p} is contained in $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.
- (3) We call such a model *dominated by μ_0* if the image of \mathbf{p} is contained in $\mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mu_0)$. In this case, we use the notation $(M, \Omega, \mu_0, \mathbf{p})$ for this model.

Remark 2.2. In classical mathematical statistics the existence of a dominating measure for a statistical model is an essential requirement, see e.g.

Condition A_μ in [Borovkov1998, p. 67]. Under this condition important notions e.g. Fisher metric, Kullback-Leibler divergence, and MLE have been introduced and the estimation problem of probability measures is called the problem of probability density estimation.

The existence of a dominating measure μ_0 is not a strong restriction, as the following shows.

Proposition 2.3. *Let (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a parametrized measure model. If M contains a countable dense subset, e.g., if M is a finite dimensional manifold, then there is a measure $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ dominating all measures $\mathbf{p}(\xi)$.*

Proof. For the proof, we first observe that for a countable family $\{\nu_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathcal{S}(\Omega)$ of signed measures, the measure

$$\mu_0 := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n \|\nu_n\|_{TV}} |\nu_n|.$$

dominates all ν_n . Let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset M$ be a countable dense subset and let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ dominate all $\mathbf{p}(\xi_n)$. As the inclusion $\mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mu_0) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\Omega)$ is an isometry and hence has a closed image, we have $\mathbf{p}(M) \subset \overline{\mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mu_0)} = \mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mu_0)$ by the continuity of \mathbf{p} . \square

If the measures $\mathbf{p}(\xi)$, $\xi \in M$, are dominated by μ_0 , then we write

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{p}(\xi) = p(\xi)\mu_0 \text{ for some } p(\xi) \in L^1(\Omega, \mu_0).$$

Definition 2.4. ([AJLS2016b, Definition 4.2]) We say that the model (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) has a *regular density function* if the density function $p : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (2.1) can be chosen such that for all $v \in T_\xi M$ the partial derivative $\partial_v p(\cdot; \xi)$ exists and lies in $L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)$ for some fixed μ_0 .

For a parametrized measure model (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) , the differential $d_\xi \mathbf{p}(v)$ for $v \in T_\xi M$ is dominated by $\mathbf{p}(\xi)$ [AJLS2016b, Proposition 2.1], and we may thus define the *logarithmic derivative of \mathbf{p} at ξ in direction v* as

$$(2.2) \quad \partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) := \frac{d\{d_\xi \mathbf{p}(v)\}}{d\mathbf{p}(\xi)} \in L^1(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi)).$$

Remark 2.5. The standard notion of a statistical model always assumes that it is dominated by some measure and has a positive regular density function (e.g. [Borovkov1998, p. 140, p.147], [BKRW1998, p. 23], [AN2000, §2.1], [AJLS2015, Definition 2.4]). In fact, the definition of a parametrized measure model or statistical model in [AJLS2015, Definition 2.4] is equivalent to a parametrized measure model or statistical model with a positive regular density function in the sense of Definition 2.4.

If the model has a positive regular density function, then we have

$$(2.3) \quad \partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) = \partial_v \log p,$$

i.e., the logarithmic derivative from (2.2) coincides with the derivative of the logarithm of the density function p , justifying the notation from (2.2).

Next we recall the notion of k -integrability introduced in [AJLS2016b]. For this, we define for each $r \in (0, 1]$ the Banach lattice

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{S}^r(\Omega) := \varinjlim L^{1/r}(\Omega, \mu),$$

where the directed limit is taken over the directed set $(\mathcal{M}(\Omega), \leq)$, where $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ if μ_2 dominates μ_1 , using the isometric inclusions

$$\iota_{\mu_2}^{\mu_1} : L^{1/r}(\Omega, \mu_1) \longrightarrow L^{1/r}(\Omega, \mu_2), \quad \phi \longmapsto \phi \left(\frac{d\mu_1}{d\mu_2} \right)^r.$$

We denote the element of $\mathcal{S}^r(\Omega)$ represented by $\phi \in L^{1/r}(\Omega, \mu)$ as $\phi\mu^r$, which allows us to work within $\mathcal{S}^r(\Omega)$ in a very suggestive way, using the identity

$$\mu_1^r = \left(\frac{d\mu_1}{d\mu_2} \right)^r \mu_2^r$$

for $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$. Since $\iota_{\mu_2}^{\mu_1}$ is an isometry, $\mathcal{S}^r(\Omega)$ inherits a Banach norm, denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{S}^r(\Omega)}$, such that the inclusion $L^{1/r}(\Omega, \mu_0) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}^r(\Omega)$, $\phi \mapsto \phi\mu_0^r$ becomes an isometry, whose image is denoted by $\mathcal{S}^r(\Omega, \mu_0)$.

There is a bilinear continuous multiplication map

$$\cdot : \mathcal{S}^r(\Omega) \times \mathcal{S}^r(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}^{r+s}(\Omega), \quad (\phi\mu^r) \cdot (\psi\mu^r) := \phi\psi\mu^{r+s}$$

for $r, s, r+s \in (0, 1]$. Furthermore, for $r \in (0, 1]$ and $0 < k \leq 1/r$ we define the map

$$\pi^k : \mathcal{S}^r(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{rk}(\Omega), \quad \phi \cdot \mu^r \mapsto \text{sign}(\phi)|\phi|^k \mu^{rk}.$$

This map is continuous for all k , and it is Fréchet-differentiable for $k \geq 1$ with derivative

$$d_{\mu_r} \pi^k(\eta_r) = k\pi^{k-1}|\mu_r| \cdot \eta_r.$$

Definition 2.6. A parametrized measure model (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) (statistical model, respectively) is called k -integrable if the map

$$\pi^{1/k} \mathbf{p} =: \mathbf{p}^{1/k} : M \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{1/k}(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega)$$

is a Fréchet- C^1 -map.

Observe that $\mathbf{p} = \pi^k \mathbf{p}^{1/k}$, whence the chain rule for Fréchet differentiable maps implies that the Fréchet-derivative of $\mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ is given as

$$(2.5) \quad d_\xi \mathbf{p}^{1/k}(v) := \frac{1}{k} \partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \mathbf{p}^{1/k}(\xi) \in \mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi)).$$

The reader who is familiar with the references [AJLS2015] and [AJLS2016b] will observe that the definitions of k -integrability in those references are different from Definition 2.6. However, as we shall show now, all these notions are equivalent.

Theorem 2.7. *Let (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a parametrized measure model and $k > 1$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *The model is k -integrable.*

(2) For all $v \in T_\xi M$, $\partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \in L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$, and the map

$$d\mathbf{p}^{1/k} : TM \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega)$$

in (2.5) is continuous.

(3) For all $v \in T_\xi M$, $\partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \in L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$, and the map

$$(2.6) \quad v \longmapsto \|\partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi)\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))} = \|\partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \mathbf{p}^{1/k}(\xi)\|_{\mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega)}$$

is continuous.

Proof. Evidently, if $\mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ is Fréchet- C^1 , then its derivative $d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ is continuous by definition, whence the first statement implies the second. Moreover,

$$\|\partial_v \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \mathbf{p}^{1/k}(\xi)\|_{\mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega)} = k \|d_\xi \mathbf{p}(v)\|_{\mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega)},$$

by (2.5), so evidently, the second statement implies the third. Thus, we have to show the converse.

Suppose that the map (2.6) is continuous, let $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence, $v_n \in T_{\xi_n} M$ with $v_n \rightarrow v_0 \in T_{\xi_0} M$, and let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ be a measure dominating all $\mathbf{p}(\xi_n)$, which exists by Proposition 2.3. Multiplying μ_0 with a positive function in $L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)$, we may assume that there is a decomposition $\Omega = \Omega_0 \dot{\cup} \Omega_1$ such that

$$\mathbf{p}(\xi_0) = \chi_{\Omega_0} \mu_0.$$

Let $p_n, q_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)$ such that $\mathbf{p}(\xi_n) = p_n \mu_0$ and $d\mathbf{p}(v_n) = q_n \mu_0$, so that

$$(2.7) \quad d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}(v_n) = \frac{q_n}{k p_n^{1-1/k}} \chi_{\{p_n > 0\}} \mu_0^{1/k} =: q_{n;k} \mu_0^{1/k}.$$

In particular, $p_0 = \chi_{\Omega_0}$, and $\|d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}(v_n)\|_{\mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega)} = \|q_{n;k}\|_k$, and by the continuity of (2.6) it follows that

$$(2.8) \quad \lim \|q_{n;k}\|_k = \|q_{0;k}\|_k,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_k$ denotes the norm in $L^k(\Omega, \mu_0)$. On Ω_0 we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |q_{n;k} - q_{0;k}| &= \left| \frac{q_n}{k p_n^{1-1/k}} - \frac{q_0}{k} \right| \leq \frac{1}{k} |q_n - q_0| + |q_{n;k}| \left| 1 - p_n^{1-1/k} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k} |q_n - q_0| + |q_{n;k}| |1 - p_n|^{1-1/k}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $p_0 = \chi_{\Omega_0}$ and $q_0, q_{0;k}$ vanishes on Ω_1 , we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_{\Omega_0} q_{n;k} - q_{0;k}\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{k} \|q_n - q_0\|_1 + \|q_{n;k}\|_k \|p_n - p_0\|_1^{1-1/k} \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \|\partial_{v_n} \mathbf{p} - \partial_{v_0} \mathbf{p}\|_1 + \|q_{n;k}\|_k \|\mathbf{p}(\xi_n) - \mathbf{p}(\xi_0)\|_1^{1-1/k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{p} is a C^1 -map, both $\|\partial_{v_n} \mathbf{p} - \partial_{v_0} \mathbf{p}\|_1$ and $\|\mathbf{p}(\xi_n) - \mathbf{p}(\xi_0)\|_1$ tend to 0, whereas $\|q_{n;k}\|_k$ is bounded by (2.8). Thus, $\chi_{\Omega_0} q_{n;k} \rightarrow q_{0;k}$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)$, and as $\|\chi_{\Omega_0} q_{n;k}\|_k \leq \|q_{n;k}\|_k$ is bounded, this implies that

$$(2.9) \quad \chi_{\Omega_0} q_{n;k} \rightharpoonup q_{0;k} \quad \text{in } L^k(\Omega, \mu_0).$$

This weak convergence implies that

$$\|q_{0;k}\|_k \leq \liminf \|\chi_{\Omega_0} q_{n;k}\|_k \leq \limsup \|q_{n;k}\|_k \stackrel{(2.8)}{=} \|q_{0;k}\|_k,$$

so that we have equality in these estimates, and hence,

$$\lim \|\chi_{\Omega_0} q_{n;k}\|_k^k = \lim \|q_{n;k}\|_k^k = \lim \|\chi_{\Omega_0} q_{n;k}\|_k^k + \lim \|\chi_{\Omega_1} q_{n;k}\|_k^k$$

which means that $\chi_{\Omega_1} q_{n;k} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^k(\Omega, \mu_0)$. Thus, (2.9) now implies that $q_{n;k} \rightharpoonup q_{0;k}$ in $L^k(\Omega, \mu_0)$, and by the Radon-Riesz theorem, this together with (2.8) implies that $\|\partial_{v_n} \mathbf{p}^{1/k} - \partial_{v_0} \mathbf{p}^{1/k}\|_{S^{1/k}(\Omega, \mu_0)} = \|q_{n;k} - q_{0;k}\|_k \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $\lim \partial_{v_n} \mathbf{p}^{1/k} = \partial_{v_0} \mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ in $S^{1/k}(\Omega, \mu_0)$ and hence, the continuity of $d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ follows.

Thus, we have shown that the third statement of the theorem implies the second.

Now let us assume that the map $d\mathbf{p} : TM \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{1/k}(M)$ is continuous, and let $\xi : I \rightarrow M$ be a curve. By Proposition 2.3, there is a finite measure μ_0 dominating $\mathbf{p}(\xi_t)$ for all $t \in I$. In order to be able to divide by powers of our measures, we define $\mathbf{p}_\varepsilon(\xi) := \mathbf{p}(\xi) + \varepsilon\mu_0$ for $\varepsilon \geq 0$, so that $(M, \Omega, \mathbf{p}_\varepsilon)$ is again a parametrized measure model, and $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_0$. As before, we define $p_t^\varepsilon = p_t + \varepsilon$, $q_t^\varepsilon = q_t \in L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)$ such that $\mathbf{p}_\varepsilon(\xi_t) = p_t^\varepsilon \mu_0$ and $d\mathbf{p}_\varepsilon(\dot{\xi}_t) = q_t^\varepsilon \mu_0 = q_t \mu_0$, so that

$$d\mathbf{p}_\varepsilon^{1/k}(\dot{\xi}_t) = \frac{q_t}{k(p_t^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}} \mu_0^{1/k} =: q_{t;k}^\varepsilon \mu_0^{1/k}.$$

Furthermore, we define for each $l \geq 1$ and $t, t_0 \in I$ the remainder term

$$\begin{aligned} r_{t,t_0;l}^\varepsilon &:= (p_{t+t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1/l} - (p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1/l} - tq_{t_0;l}^\varepsilon \in L^l(\Omega, \mu_0) \\ \Rightarrow \quad r_{t,t_0;l}^\varepsilon \mu_0^{1/l} &= \mathbf{p}_\varepsilon^{1/l}(\xi_{t+t_0}) - \mathbf{p}_\varepsilon^{1/l}(\xi_{t_0}) - td\mathbf{p}_\varepsilon^{1/l}(\dot{\xi}_{t_0}). \end{aligned}$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, by the mean value theorem, there is an η_t between $p_{t+t_0}^\varepsilon$ and $p_{t_0}^\varepsilon$ (and hence, $\eta_t \geq \varepsilon$) for which

$$\begin{aligned} |r_{t,t_0;k}^\varepsilon| &= \left| (p_{t+t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1/k} - (p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1/k} - tq_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon \right| = \left| \frac{p_{t+t_0}^\varepsilon - p_{t_0}^\varepsilon}{k\eta_t^{1-1/k}} - tq_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|r_{t,t_0;1}^0|}{k\eta_t^{1-1/k}} + |t| \left| \frac{q_{t_0}}{k\eta_t^{1-1/k}} - q_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon \right| \\ &= \frac{|r_{t,t_0;1}^0|}{k\eta_t^{1-1/k}} + |t| |q_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon| \frac{|(p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k} - \eta_t^{1-1/k}|}{\eta_t^{1-1/k}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k\varepsilon^{1-1/k}} \left(|r_{t,t_0;1}^0| + k|t| |q_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon| |(p_{t_0}^\varepsilon) - \eta_t|^{1-1/k} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k\varepsilon^{1-1/k}} \left(|r_{t,t_0;1}^0| + k|t| |q_{t_0;k}| |p_{t_0} - p_{t+t_0}|^{1-1/k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Integration and Hölder's inequality yields

$$\|r_{t,t_0;k}^\varepsilon\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{k\varepsilon^{1-1/k}} \left(\|r_{t,t_0;1}^0\|_1 + k|t| \|q_{t_0;k}\|_k \|p_{t_0} - p_{t+t_0}\|_1^{1-1/k} \right).$$

Since $t^{-1}\|r_{t,t_0;1}^0\|_1 = t^{-1}\|\mathbf{p}(\xi_{t+t_0}) - \mathbf{p}(\xi_{t_0}) - td\mathbf{p}(\dot{\xi}_{t_0})\|_{S(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0$ and $\|p_{t_0} - p_{t+t_0}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{p}(\xi_{t+t_0}) - \mathbf{p}(\xi_{t_0})\|_{S(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0$, as \mathbf{p} is Fréchet differentiable, it follows that for $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \|r_{t,t_0;k}^\varepsilon\|_1 = 0.$$

Moreover, we can make the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} |q_{t;k}^\varepsilon - q_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon| &= \left| \frac{q_t}{k(p_t^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}} - \frac{q_{t_0}}{k(p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k(p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}} |q_t - q_{t_0}| + \left| \frac{1}{k(p_t^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}} - \frac{1}{k(p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}} \right| |q_t| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k(p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}} \left(|q_t - q_{t_0}| + k \left| (p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k} - (p_t^\varepsilon)^{1-1/k} \right| |q_{t;k}^\varepsilon| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k\varepsilon^{1-1/k}} \left(|q_t - q_{t_0}| + k|p_{t_0} - p_t|^{1-1/k} |q_{t;k}| \right) \end{aligned}$$

Integration and Hölder's inequality implies

$$\|q_{t;k}^\varepsilon - q_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{k\varepsilon^{1-1/k}} \left(\|q_t - q_{t_0}\|_1 + k\|p_{t_0} - p_t\|_1^{1-1/k} \|q_{t;k}\|_k \right),$$

and since both $\|p_t - p_{t_0}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{p}(\xi_t) - \mathbf{p}(\xi_{t_0})\|_{S(\Omega)}$ and $\|q_t - q_{t_0}\|_1 = \|d\mathbf{p}(\dot{\xi}_t) - d\mathbf{p}(\dot{\xi}_{t_0})\|_{S(\Omega)}$ tend to 0 for $t \rightarrow t_0$ as \mathbf{p} is a C^1 -map, it follows that

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} \|q_{t;k}^\varepsilon - q_{t_0;k}^\varepsilon\|_1 = 0.$$

For $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ consider the function $\tilde{f} : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\tilde{f}(t) := \int_{\Omega} (p_t^\varepsilon)^{1/k} f \, d\mu_0.$$

Then (2.10) implies that

$$\tilde{f}'(t) = \int_{\Omega} q_{t;k}^\varepsilon f \, d\mu_0,$$

and (2.11) implies that \tilde{f}' is continuous, so that by the fundamental theorem of calculus we have for all $t_0, t_1 \in I$

$$(2.12) \quad \tilde{f}(t_1) - \tilde{f}(t_0) = \int_{\Omega} ((p_{t_1}^\varepsilon)^{1/k} - (p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1/k}) f \, d\mu_0 = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \int_{\Omega} q_{s;k}^\varepsilon f \, d\mu_0 \, ds.$$

Since $|(p_{t_1}^\varepsilon)^{1/k} - (p_{t_0}^\varepsilon)^{1/k}| \leq |p_{t_1} - p_{t_0}|^{1/k}$ and $|q_{s;k}^\varepsilon| \leq |q_{s;k}|$, we may apply the dominated convergence theorem to (2.12) to conclude that

$$(2.13) \quad \int_{\Omega} (p_{t_1}^{1/k} - p_{t_0}^{1/k}) f \, d\mu_0 = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \int_{\Omega} q_{s;k} f \, d\mu_0 \, ds$$

for any $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Now both sides of (2.13) may be regarded as bounded linear functionals for $f \in L^{k/(k-1)}(\Omega, \mu_0)$, since $\|p_{t_1}^{1/k} - p_{t_0}^{1/k}\|_k \leq \|p_{t_1} - p_{t_0}\|_1^{1/k} < \infty$ and $\|q_{s;k}\|_k = \|d\mathbf{p}(\dot{\xi}_s)\|_{S^{1/k}(\Omega)}$ depends continuously on s by the continuity of $d\mathbf{p}$. Therefore, since $L^\infty(\Omega) \subset L^{k/(k-1)}$ is dense, it follows that (2.13) holds for all $f \in L^{k/(k-1)}(\Omega)$. Thus, for all such f we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} r_{t,t_0;k} f \, d\mu_0 \right| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} (p_{t+t_0}^{1/k} - p_{t_0}^{1/k} - tq_{t_0;k}) f \, d\mu_0 \right| \\ &\stackrel{(2.13)}{=} \left| \int_{t_0}^{t_0+t} \int_{\Omega} (q_{s;k} - q_{t_0;k}) f \, d\mu_0 \, ds \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{t_0}^{t_0+t} \|q_{s;k} - q_{t_0;k}\|_k \|f\|_{k/(k-1)} \, ds \right| \\ &\leq |t| \|f\|_{k/(k-1)} \sup_{|s-t_0| \leq t} \|q_{s;k} - q_{t_0;k}\|_k. \end{aligned}$$

Now by the Hahn-Banach theorem, we may choose $f \in L^{k/(k-1)}(\Omega, \mu_0)$ such that $\int_{\Omega} r_{t,t_0;k} f \, d\mu_0 = \|r_{t,t_0;k}\|_k$ and $\|f\|_{k/(k-1)} = 1$. Then we conclude from this estimate

$$\|r_{t,t_0;k}\|_k \leq |t| \sup_{|s-t_0| \leq t} \|q_{s;k} - q_{t_0;k}\|_k,$$

which translates into

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{p}(\xi_{t_0+t})^{1/k} - \mathbf{p}(\xi_{t_0})^{1/k} - t d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}(\dot{\xi}_{t_0})\|_{S^{1/k}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq |t| \sup_{|s-t_0| \leq t} \|d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}(\dot{\xi}_s) - d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}(\dot{\xi}_{t_0})\|_{S^{1/k}(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

for any curve (ξ_t) in M , and this together with the continuity of $d\mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ implies that $\mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ is Fréchet differentiable. That is, the second statement in Theorem 2.7 implies the first. \square

Remark 2.8. The Fisher metric \mathbf{g} on a parametrized measure model (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) is defined by

$$(2.15) \quad \mathbf{g}_{\xi}(v, w) := \langle \partial_v \log \mathbf{p}; \partial_w \log \mathbf{p} \rangle_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))} = \langle d\mathbf{p}^{1/2}(v); d\mathbf{p}^{1/2}(w) \rangle_{S^{1/2}(\Omega)}.$$

Thus the Fisher metric is well-defined and continuous iff (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) is 2-integrable.

2.2. Essential tangent space and reduced Fisher metric. Let (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a 2-integrable parametrized measure model. Formula (2.15) shows that the kernel of the Fisher metric \mathbf{g} at $\xi \in M$ coincides with the kernel of the map $\Lambda_\xi : T_\xi M \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi)), v \mapsto \partial_v(\log \mathbf{p})$. In other words, the degeneracy of the Fisher metric \mathbf{g} is caused by the non-effectiveness of the parametrization of the family $\mathbf{p}(\xi)$ by the map \mathbf{p} . The tangent cone $T_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}\mathbf{p}(M)$ of the image $\mathbf{p}(M) \subset \mathcal{S}(\Omega)$ is isomorphic to the quotient $T_\xi M / \ker \Lambda_\xi$. This motivates the following

Definition 2.9. The quotient $\hat{T}_\xi M := T_\xi M / \ker \Lambda_\xi$ will be called the *essential tangent space of M at ξ* .

Clearly, the Fisher metric \mathbf{g} descends to a non-degenerated metric $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ on $\hat{T}_\xi M$, which we shall call the *reduced Fisher metric*. Denote by $\hat{T}^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}M$ the fiberwise completion of $\hat{T}M$ w.r.t. the reduced Fisher metric $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$. Its inverse $\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}$ is a well-defined quadratic form on the fibers of the dual bundle $\hat{T}^{*, \hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}}M$ which we can therefore identify with $\hat{T}^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}M$.

Remark 2.10. The fiberwise completion $\hat{T}^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}M$ is different from $\hat{T}M$ only if M is infinite dimensional. Observe that the map $\hat{T}^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}M \rightarrow M$ is not a fiber bundle in general, as we do not define a topology on the total space $\hat{T}^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}M$. Nevertheless, we shall call the left inverses of this map *sections of $\hat{T}^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}M$* .

Example 2.11. One of the typical singular statistical models considered in [Watanabe2009, Example 1.2, p. 14] is the normal mixture family (W, \mathbb{R}, dx, p) where

$$W = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid a \in [0, 1], b \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

$$p(x|a, b) := \frac{(1-a)e^{-x^2/2} + ae^{-(x-b)^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

This family is a typical example of Gaussian mixture models which comprise also the changing time model (the Nile River model) and the ARMA model in time series [Amari2016, §12.2.6, p. 311]. We compute

$$\partial_a p(x|a, b) = \frac{-e^{-x^2/2} + e^{-(x-b)^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}},$$

$$\partial_b p(x|a, b) = \frac{a(x-b)e^{-(x-b)^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

Hence $\partial_a p(x|a, b) = 0 \forall x$ iff $b = 0$ and $\partial_b p(x|a, b) = 0 \forall x$ iff $a = 0$. Furthermore it is not hard to see that $(\partial_a p(x|a, b)$ and $\partial_b p(x|a, b))$ are linearly independent. Thus the singularity of (W, \mathbb{R}, dx, p) is $\{a = 0\} \cup \{b = 0\}$. Furthermore $\hat{T}_{(0,0)}W = \{pt\}$, $\hat{T}_{(a,0)}W = \mathbb{R}^2/(\mathbb{R}, 0)$ for $a \neq 0$, $\hat{T}_{(0,b)}W = \mathbb{R}^2/(0, \mathbb{R})$ for $b \neq 0$.

3. VISIBLE FUNCTIONS, THEIR GENERALIZED GRADIENT AND PRE-GRADIENT

Motivated by problems of parameter estimation in mathematical statistics and machine learning, we introduce the notion of a *regular function on* Ω (Definition 3.2), a visible function on M (Definition 3.4) and its generalized gradient and pre-gradient (Definitions 3.9, 3.10). Our main results in this section are Propositions 3.3, 3.12. The first one asserts the validity of differentiation under integral sign, which is important for the proof of the second one that asserts the existence of the pre-gradient of functions associated to φ -regular parameter estimators in statistical inference.

Finally, in Subsection 3.3 we apply the obtained results to the parametrized measure model of all measures (resp. probability measures) on a finite sample space.

3.1. Visible functions and estimators. Given an parametrized measure model (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) , we set for $k \geq 1$

$$L_M^k(\Omega) := \{\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \varphi \in L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi)) \text{ for all } \xi \in M\}.$$

For $\varphi \in L_M^k(\Omega)$ we obtain a map $\varphi \mathbf{p}^{1/k} : M \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{1/k}(\Omega)$, $\xi \mapsto \varphi \mathbf{p}(\xi)^{1/k}$. In general, we cannot expect $\varphi \mathbf{p}^{1/k}$ to be differentiable, not even continuous, as the following example illustrates.

Example 3.1. Let $\Omega := (-1, 1)$ and let $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^∞ -function with $h(x) > 0$ for $x \in (0, 1)$ and $h(x) = 0$ for $x \notin (0, 1)$, and such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x) dx = 1$. Let $\alpha > 1$ and $\beta > 0$ be fixed, and define the family $(\mathbf{p}(t))_{t \in (-1, 1)}$ on Ω by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}_t &= \left((1 - |t|^{\alpha+1}) \chi_{(-1, 0)} + |t|^\alpha h(|t|^{-1}x) \chi_{(0, 1)} \right) dx, \quad t \neq 0, \\ \mathbf{p}_0 &= \chi_{(-1, 0)} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The density function on $(-1, 0)$ is chosen such that \mathbf{p}_t is a probability measure on Ω for all t . Then $d\mathbf{p}_0 = 0$, and for $t \neq 0$,

$$d\mathbf{p}_t = \operatorname{sgn}(t) \left(-(\alpha + 1)|t|^\alpha \chi_{(-1, 0)} + |t|^{\alpha-1} g(|t|^{-1}x) \chi_{(0, 1)} \right) dx,$$

where

$$g(x) := \alpha h(x) - x h'(x),$$

and it is straightforward to see that $\|d\mathbf{p}_t - d\mathbf{p}_{t_0}\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow t_0$, so that \mathbf{p} is a parametrized measure model.

Observe that for any $l \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} l^l \|\partial_t \mathbf{p}^{1/l}\|_{\mathcal{S}^{1/l}(\Omega)}^l &\stackrel{(2.5)}{=} \left\| \frac{d\mathbf{p}_t}{\mathbf{p}_t^{1-1/l}} \right\|_{L^l(\Omega, dx)}^l \\ &= \int_{-1}^0 \frac{((\alpha+1)|t|^\alpha)^l}{(1-|t|^{\alpha+1})^{l-1}} dx + \int_0^1 \frac{(|t|^{\alpha-1}g(|t|^{-1}x))^l}{(|t|^\alpha h(|t|^{-1}x))^{l-1}} dx \\ &= \frac{(\alpha+1)^l |t|^{l\alpha}}{(1-|t|^{\alpha+1})^{l-1}} + |t|^{\alpha+1-l} \int_0^1 \frac{g(u)^l}{h(u)^{l-1}} du, \end{aligned}$$

using the substitution $u = t^{-1}x$. Observe that

$$\left| \int_0^1 \frac{g(u)^l}{h(u)^{l-1}} du \right|^{1/l} = \|\alpha h^{1/l} - lu(h^{1/l})'\|_{L^l(\Omega, dx)} < \infty,$$

since $h^{1/l}$ is smooth as h vanishes to infinite order at $u = 0$. Thus, if $l < \alpha+1$, then $\|\partial_t \mathbf{p}^{1/l}\|_{\mathcal{S}^{1/l}(\Omega)}$ depends continuously on t and therefore, by Theorem 2.7, \mathbf{p} is l -integrable for all $l < \alpha+1$.

Now let $\varphi(x) := \chi_{(0,1)} x^{-\beta}$. Then for any $k > 1$, $\|\varphi\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}_0)} = 0$, and for $t \neq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}_t)}^k &= \int_0^1 x^{-k\beta} |t|^\alpha h(|t|^{-1}x) dx \\ &= |t|^{\alpha+1-k\beta} \int_0^1 u^{-k\beta} h(u) du < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\varphi \in L_{(-1,1)}^k(\Omega) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}(\varphi) = \int_0^1 x^{-\beta} |t|^\alpha h(|t|^{-1}x) dx = |t|^{\alpha+1-\beta} \int_0^1 u^{-\beta} h(u) du,$$

so that for $\beta > \alpha+1$ we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}(\varphi) = \infty$.

That is, for a given $l > 1$ choosing the parameters such that $\beta > \alpha+1 > l$, $((-1,1), \Omega, \mathbf{p})$ is an l -integrable model, $\varphi \in L_{(-1,1)}^k(\Omega)$ for all $k \geq 1$, but the function $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}(\varphi)$ is discontinuous.

Observe that the failure of the map $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}(\varphi)$ in the preceding example to be continuous at $t = 0$ is due to the unboundedness of the map $t \mapsto \|\varphi\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(t))}$. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 3.2. Let (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a parametrized measure model. We call a function φ on Ω k -regular, if $\varphi \in L_M^k(\Omega)$ and moreover if the function $\xi \mapsto \|\varphi\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))}$ is locally bounded, i.e. if for all $\xi_0 \in M$

$$\limsup_{\xi \rightarrow \xi_0} \|\varphi\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))} < \infty.$$

If there is no danger of confusion, we shall call a k -regular function φ simply a *regular function*.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $k, k' > 1$ be dual indices, i.e. $k^{-1} + k'^{-1} = 1$, and let (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be an k' -integrable parametrized measure model. If $\varphi \in L_M^k(\Omega)$ is regular, then the map*

$$(3.1) \quad M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \xi \longmapsto \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi \, d\mathbf{p}(\xi)$$

is Gâteaux-differentiable, and for $X \in TM$ the Gâteaux-derivative is

$$(3.2) \quad \partial_X \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi \, \partial_X \log \mathbf{p}(\xi)) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi \, \partial_X \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \, d\mathbf{p}(\xi).$$

Proof. Let $X \in T_{\xi_0}M$, and let ξ_t be a differentiable curve in M with $\dot{\xi}_0 = X$. By Proposition 2.3, there is a measure $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ which dominates all $\mathbf{p}(\xi_t)$. In fact, when replacing μ_0 by $(\max\{|\varphi|^{k'}, 1\})^{-1} \mu_0$, we may assume w.l.o.g. that in addition $\varphi \in L^{k'}(\Omega, \mu_0)$.

As in the proof of Theorem 2.7, we define the functions $p_t, q_t \in L^1(\Omega, \mu_0)$ such that $\mathbf{p}(\xi_t) = p_t \mu_0$ and $d\mathbf{p}(\dot{\xi}_t) = \partial_t \mathbf{p}(\xi_t) = q_t \mu_0$. Also, let $\|\cdot\|_r$ denote the norm in $L^r(\Omega, \mu_0)$. Then by Hölder's inequality

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\varphi(p_t^{1/k} - p_0^{1/k})\|_1 &\leq \|\varphi\|_{k'} \|p_t^{1/k} - p_0^{1/k}\|_k \leq \|\varphi\|_{k'} \|(p_t - p_0)^{1/k}\|_k \\ &= \|\varphi\|_{k'} \|p_t - p_0\|_1^{1/k} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $\|p_t - p_0\|_1 = \|\mathbf{p}(\xi_t) - \mathbf{p}(\xi_0)\|_{\mathcal{S}(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\varphi p_t^{1/k}\|_k = \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\varphi\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi_t))} < \infty$$

by the regularity of φ , which together with (3.3) implies that $\varphi p_t^{1/k} \rightharpoonup \varphi p_0^{1/k}$ in $L^k(\Omega, \mu_0)$ and therefore,

$$(3.4) \quad \langle \varphi p_t^{1/k} - \varphi p_0^{1/k}; q_{0;k'} \rangle \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0,$$

where $\langle f; g \rangle := \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}(fg)$ stands for the canonical dual pairing of $L^k(\Omega, \mu_0)$ and $L^{k'}(\Omega, \mu_0)$, and where we define

$$q_{t;k'} := \frac{q_t}{k' p_t^{1/k}} \chi_{\{p_t > 0\}} \in L^{k'}(\Omega, \mu_0), \quad \text{so that } d\mathbf{p}^{1/k'}(\dot{\xi}_t) = q_{t;k'} \mu_0^{1/k'}$$

analogously to (2.7). Furthermore, again by Hölder's inequality,

$$(3.5) \quad \langle \varphi p_t^{1/k}; q_{t;k'} - q_{0;k'} \rangle \leq \|\varphi p_t^{1/k}\|_k \|q_{t;k'} - q_{0;k'}\|_{k'} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0,$$

since

$$\|q_{t;k'} - q_{0;k'}\|_{k'} = \|d\mathbf{p}^{1/k'}(\dot{\xi}_t) - d\mathbf{p}^{1/k'}(\dot{\xi}_0)\|_{\mathcal{S}^{1/k'}(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$$

by the k' -integrability of \mathbf{p} and hence the continuity of $d\mathbf{p}^{1/k'}$, and since $\|\varphi p_t^{1/k}\|_k = \|\varphi\|_{L^k(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi_t))}$ is bounded by the regularity of φ .

From (3.4) and (3.5) we now obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi p_t^{1/k}; q_{t;k'} \rangle - \langle \varphi p_0^{1/k}; q_{0;k'} \rangle &= \langle \varphi p_t^{1/k}; q_{t;k'} - q_{0;k'} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \varphi p_t^{1/k} - \varphi p_0^{1/k}; q_{0;k'} \rangle \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore from the definition of the dual pairing $\langle \cdot; \cdot \rangle$ and of $q_{t;k'}$, and as $q_t \mu_0 = \partial_t \log \mathbf{p} \mathbf{p}(t)$, we conclude

$$(3.6) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \varphi \partial_t \log \mathbf{p} \mathbf{p}(t) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi \partial_X \log \mathbf{p} d\mathbf{p}(\xi_0).$$

Also observe that

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{\Omega} \varphi d\mathbf{p}(\xi_t) - \int_{\Omega} \varphi d\mathbf{p}(\xi_0) = \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \varphi \partial_t \log \mathbf{p}|_{t=s} d\mathbf{p}(s) ds.$$

Indeed, (3.7) holds if $\varphi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is bounded, using (2.13) for $k = 1$, and an arbitrary $\varphi \in L_M^k(\Omega)$ can be monotonically approximated by bounded functions, so that (3.7) follows from the monotone convergence theorem. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \int_{\Omega} \varphi d\mathbf{p}(\xi_t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \varphi \partial_t \log \mathbf{p}|_{t=s} d\mathbf{p}(s) ds \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \varphi \partial_X \log \mathbf{p} d\mathbf{p}(\xi_0), \end{aligned}$$

using (3.6) in the last equation, and from this, (3.2) follows. \square

Let V be a topological real vector space, which may be infinite dimensional. We denote by V^M the vector space of all V -valued functions on M . A V -valued function φ will stand for the coordinate functions on M , or in general, a feature of M (cf. [BKRW1998]). Let V^* denote the dual space of V . For $l \in V^*$ we denote the composition $l \circ \varphi$ by φ^l . This should be considered as the l -th coordinate of φ .

Recall that an *estimator* is a map $\hat{\sigma} : \Omega \rightarrow M$. If $k, k' > 1$ are dual indices, i.e., $k^{-1} + k'^{-1} = 1$, and given a k' -integrable parametrized measure model (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) and a function $\varphi \in V^M$, we define

$$L_\varphi^k(M, \Omega) := \{ \hat{\sigma} : \Omega \rightarrow M \mid \varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} \in L_M^k(\Omega) \text{ for all } l \in V^* \}.$$

We call an estimator $\hat{\sigma} \in L_\varphi^k(M, \Omega)$ φ -regular if $\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} \in L_M^k(\Omega)$ is regular for all $l \in V^*$.

Any $\hat{\sigma} \in L_\varphi^k(M, \Omega)$ induces a V^{**} -valued function $\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}$ on M by computing the expectation of the composition $\varphi \circ \hat{\sigma}$ as follows

$$(3.8) \quad \langle \varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}(\xi), l \rangle := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma}) = \int_{\Omega} \varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} d\mathbf{p}(\xi)$$

for any $l \in V^*$. If $\hat{\sigma} \in L^k_\varphi(M, \Omega)$ is φ -regular, then Proposition 3.3 immediately implies that $\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}} : M \rightarrow V^{**}$ is Gâteaux-differentiable with Gâteaux-derivative

$$(3.9) \quad \langle \partial_X \varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}(\xi), l \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} \cdot \partial_X \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \mathbf{p}(\xi).$$

Definition 3.4. A V -valued Gateaux-differentiable function f on M is called *visible* if df vanishes on $\ker d\mathbf{p} \subset TM$.

For instance, the function from (3.8) is visible.

Example 3.5. If $\mathbf{p} : M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ is a C^1 -immersion, that is, $\ker d\mathbf{p} = 0$, then evidently, any Gâteaux-differentiable function $\varphi : M \rightarrow V$ into any topological vector space is visible.

A typical example of such a map is used in semi-parametric statistics, where one considers product manifolds $M = P_1 \times P_2$ with P_1 an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n and P_2 a subset of an infinite dimensional Banach space B , see e.g. [BKRW1998, p. 2]. In this case, one considers the canonical projection $\varphi_1 : M = P_1 \times P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

Example 3.6. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{S}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 -differentiable function. Then $f := \varphi \circ \mathbf{p} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a visible function.

Example 3.7. Most important visible functions are associated with estimators, which are defined as in (3.8) and whose Gâteaux-differentiability is established by Proposition 3.3.

Remark 3.8. Classically, one considers 2-integrable statistical models P which are open subsets in a vector space V with coordinates θ [BKRW1998, Borovkov1998, CT2006, WMS2008]. In this case θ is regarded as the parameter of P and φ is the identity mapping and hence omitted. Estimators then are denoted by θ^* , $\hat{\theta}$ or T . The function $\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}(\xi)$ in this case, denoted by $E_{\theta}(\theta^*)$, is the mean value (w.r.t. the measure θ) of the estimator θ^* regarded as an element in V^{**} .

3.2. Generalized gradient and pre-gradient of visible functions.

From this point onward, we shall assume that (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) is a 2-integrable parametrized measure model, so that in particular the Fisher metric \mathbf{g} on M is well defined.

Let f be a visible function on (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) . Since df vanishes on the kernel of \mathbf{p} , the derivative $\partial_X f$ depends only on the projection $pr(X) \in \hat{T}M$.

Definition 3.9. A section $\xi \mapsto \nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} f(\xi) \in \hat{T}_{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} M$ will be called the *generalized Fisher gradient* of a visible function f , if for all $X \in T_{\xi} M$ we have

$$df(X) = \hat{\mathbf{g}}(pr(X), \nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} f).$$

Clearly, if the generalized Fisher gradient $\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} f$ exists then it is unique, and by the Riesz representation theorem the generalized Fisher gradient of a

visible function f exists iff for all $\xi \in M$ the linear functional df_ξ is bounded w.r.t. the reduced Fisher metric. As in [Le2016] we denote

$$\mathcal{L}_1^k(\Omega) := \{(f, \mu) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \text{ and } f \in L^k(\Omega, \mu)\}.$$

For a map $\mathbf{p} : P \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ we denote by $\mathbf{p}^*(\mathcal{L}_1^k(\Omega))$ the pull-back “fibration” (also called the fiber product) $P \times_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \mathcal{L}_1^k(\Omega)$.

Definition 3.10. Let h be a visible function on M . A section

$$M \rightarrow \mathbf{p}^*(\mathcal{L}_1^2(\Omega)), \xi \mapsto \nabla h_\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi)),$$

is called a *pre-gradient* of h , if for all $\xi \in M$ and $X \in T_\xi M$ we have

$$dh(X) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}((\partial_X \log \mathbf{p}) \cdot \nabla h_\xi).$$

By definition, a pre-gradient of a visible function, if it exists, is only determined up to a term that is L^2 -orthogonal to the image $d\mathbf{p}(T_\xi P) \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$.

Lemma 3.11. *The existence of a pre-gradient of a visible function h implies the existence of the generalized gradient of h .*

Proof. For any $\xi \in P$ the map

$$(3.10) \quad e : \hat{T}_\xi P \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi)), X \mapsto \partial_X \log \mathbf{p}(\cdot; \xi),$$

is an embedding. Here $\partial_X \log \mathbf{p}$ denotes the value $\partial_{\tilde{X}} \log \mathbf{p}$ for some (and hence any) $\tilde{X} \in pr^{-1}(X) \in T_\xi P$. The embedding e is an isometric embedding w.r.t. the Fisher metric $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ on $\hat{T}_\xi P$ and the L^2 -metric in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$, according to the definition of the (reduced) Fisher metric. The isometric embedding e extends to an isometric embedding, also denoted by e , of the closure $\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} P$ by setting for any limiting sequence $\{v_k \in \hat{T}_\xi P\}$

$$e(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v_k) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e(v_k).$$

Now assume that ∇f is a pre-gradient of f . Denote by Π the orthogonal projection of $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$ onto the closed subspace $e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} M)$. Then

$$\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} f = e^{-1}(\Pi(\nabla f)).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.11. \square

Proposition 3.12. 1. *Let (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a 2-integrable parametrized measure model and $f \in L_M^2(\Omega)$ a regular function. Then the section of the pullback fibration $\mathbf{p}^*(\mathcal{L}_1^2(\Omega))$ defined by $\xi \mapsto f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$ is a pre-gradient of the visible function $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(f)$.*

2. *Let (M, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a 2-integrable statistical model and $f \in L_M^2(\Omega)$ a regular function. Then the section of the pullback fibration $\mathbf{p}^*(\mathcal{L}_1^2(\Omega))$ defined by $\xi \mapsto f - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(f) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$ is a pre-gradient of the visible function $E_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(f)$.*

Proof. Let $X \in T_\xi M$. Using Proposition 3.3 we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \partial_X \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(f)(\xi) = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot \partial_X \log \mathbf{p}(\xi) \mathbf{p}(\xi)$$

we obtain the first assertion of Proposition 3.12.

To prove the second assertion we use the following identity, which is a consequence of (3.11)

$$(3.12) \quad \int_{\Omega} \partial_X \log \mathbf{p}(x; \xi) d\mathbf{p}(x; \xi) = 0.$$

Multiplying (3.12) with $(-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(f))$, and plugging it into (3.11), we obtain

$$\partial_X \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(f) = \int_{\Omega} (f(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(f)) \cdot \partial_X \log \mathbf{p}(x; \xi) d\mathbf{p}(x; \xi),$$

which implies the second assertion of Proposition 3.12. \square

3.3. Application to the case of finite sample spaces. Let $\Omega_n := \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$ be a finite sample space of n elementary events. In this subsection we apply the formalism of visible functions and their (pre)-gradients to compute the Fisher metric, its inverse and the Fisher gradient of a function on $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$ and its restriction to $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$. Since the parametrization of $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$ is natural, we have $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = \mathbf{g}$.

Denote by $L(\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n), \mathbb{R})$ the space of \mathbb{R} -valued linear functions on $\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$. As in Example 3.7, we consider the following canonical linear map

$$E : \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_n} \rightarrow L(\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n), \mathbb{R})$$

$$\langle E(f), \mu \rangle := \mathbb{E}_\mu(f) = \int_{\Omega} f d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n f(\omega_i) \mu(\omega_i).$$

Here \mathbb{E}_μ stands for the expectation w.r.t. to the (signed) measure $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$.

Proposition 3.13. 1) For any $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_n}$ and any $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$ we have

$$dE(f)_\mu = E(f) \in L(\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n), \mathbb{R}) = T_\mu^* \mathcal{S}(\Omega_n).$$

2) For any $\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$ the space $\{dE(f)_\mu | f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_n}\}$ coincides with $T_\mu^* \mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$.

3) Denote by \mathbf{g} the Fisher metric on $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$. Then for any $f, g \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_n}$ we have

$$\mathbf{g}_\mu^{-1}(dE(f), dE(g)) = E_\mu(f \cdot g).$$

Proof. 1. The first assertion holds, because $E(f)$ is a linear functional on $\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$.

2. The second assertion follows from the first one, noting that $\dim(E(\mathbb{R}^{\Omega_n})) = n = \dim \mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$.

3. Let us prove the last assertion. Assume that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$. Then there exists a linear isomorphism

$$(3.13) \quad \Lambda_\mu : T_\mu(\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)) \rightarrow L_2(\Omega, \mu), \quad X \mapsto \partial_X \log \bar{\mu},$$

where $\mu = \bar{\mu} \cdot \mu_0$ for some $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$. It is known that the RHS of (3.13) does not depend on the choice of μ_0 and by (2.2) we also have $\partial_X \mu = \partial_X \log(\bar{\mu}) \cdot \mu$. Since Λ_μ is an isomorphism, Proposition 3.12.1 yields immediately

$$\Lambda_\mu(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} E(f)_\mu) = f \in L^2(\Omega_n, \mu).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{g}_\mu^{-1}(dE(f), dE(g)) &= \mathfrak{g}_\mu(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} E(f), \nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} E(g)) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_n} \Lambda_\mu(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} E(f)) \cdot \Lambda_\mu(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} E(g)) d\mu = E_\mu(f \cdot g). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the third assertion immediately. \square

For a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ denote by $c|_{\Omega_n}$ the constant function on Ω_n taking value c .

Proposition 3.14. *The induced (inverse) Fisher metric \mathfrak{g}^{-1} on $T^*\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$ has the following form*

$$\mathfrak{g}^{-1}(dE(f), dE(g)) = E_\mu[(f - E_\mu(f)|_{\Omega_n}) \cdot (g - E_\mu(g)|_{\Omega_n})].$$

Proof. Note that for any constant c the restriction of $dE(c|_{\Omega_n})$ to $T_\mu^*\mathcal{P}_+$ vanishes and hence

$$\Lambda_\mu(T_\mu\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)) = \{g \in L^2(\Omega_n, \mu) \mid E_\mu(g) = 0\},$$

we obtain easily

$$(3.14) \quad \Lambda_\mu(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} E(f)) = f - E_\mu(f)|_{\Omega_n} \in T_\mu^*(\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)) = j^*(T_\mu^*(\mathcal{P}(\Omega_n))).$$

This proves Proposition 3.14. \square

Remark 3.15. Let δ_i denote the Dirac function on $\Omega_n : \delta_i(\omega_j) = \delta_j^i$. The first assertion of Proposition 3.13 implies that $\{E(\delta_i) \mid i = \overline{1, n}\}$ form a basis of the C^∞ -algebra of smooth functions on $\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$ (and resp. on the open set $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Omega_n)$). In other words we can take $E(\delta_i)$ to be coordinates of $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$. Writing $\mu = \sum \mu_i \hat{\delta}_i$, where $\hat{\delta}_i$ denotes the Dirac measure concentrated at ω_i , we have

$$E(\delta_i)(\mu) = \mu_i.$$

So we can identify $E(\delta_i)$ with μ_i . Proposition 3.13 implies that

$$(3.15) \quad \mathfrak{g}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mu_i} d\mu_i^2.$$

By definition, the Fisher metric on $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$ equals the restriction of the Fisher metric on $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$ to $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$.

Proposition 3.16. *Let \tilde{f} be a function on $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$. Then*

$$(3.16) \quad \nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} \tilde{f}(\mu) = \sum_i \mu_i \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \mu_i} \partial \mu_i.$$

Let f be the restriction of \tilde{f} to $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$. Then

$$(3.17) \quad \nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} f(\mu) = \sum_i \mu_i \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \mu_i} - \lambda \right) \partial \mu_i,$$

where

$$\lambda = \sum_i \mu_i \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \mu_i}.$$

Proof. 1. The first equation follows immediately from (3.15).

2. Note that the Fisher gradient of the restriction f of a function \tilde{f} to $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$ is the projection of the gradient of \tilde{f} :

$$\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} f(\mu) = Pr(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} \tilde{f}),$$

where Pr denotes the (Fisher) orthogonal projection on the tangent space of $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$. Since the function $w(\mu) := \sum_i \mu_i$ is equal to 1 on $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega)$, its Fisher gradient $\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} w = \sum_i \mu_i \partial \mu_i$ is orthogonal to the tangent space $T_{\mu} \mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$. Thus the Fisher gradient of f on $\mathcal{P}_+(\Omega_n)$ has the form (3.17), where

$$\lambda = \frac{\mathfrak{g}(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} \tilde{f}, \nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} \tilde{f})}{\mathfrak{g}(\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} w, \nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} w)} = \frac{\mathfrak{g}^{-1}(d\tilde{f}, \sum_i d\mu_i)}{\mathfrak{g}^{-1}(\sum_i d\mu_i, \sum_i d\mu_i)} = \sum_i \mu_i \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \mu_i}.$$

The last equality follows from Proposition 3.13.3, taking into account $\sum_i \mu_i = 1$.

This completes the proof of Proposition 3.16. \square

Remark 3.17. Proposition 3.16 shows that the Fisher gradient of a C^1 -function f on $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega_n)$ extends smoothly to the whole space $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_n)$, if f is the restriction of a C^1 -function \tilde{f} on $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_n)$. Here the smooth structure of the manifold with corner $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_n)$ is defined by the natural inclusion $\mathcal{M}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}(\Omega) = \mathbb{R}^n$. This continuity holds because the inverse \mathfrak{g}^{-1} of the Fisher metric \mathfrak{g} on $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ is a continuous 2-vector on $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. This observation suggests that a certain blow-up type of the Fisher metric should also be considered when we generalize the classical Cramér-Rao inequality. We refer the reader to the next part of our paper for details [JLS2017b].

4. CRAMÉR-RAO INEQUALITY ON SINGULAR STATISTICAL MODELS

In this section we assume that (P, Ω, \mathbf{p}) is a 2-integrable statistical model, V a topological vector space and $\hat{\sigma} \in L_{\varphi}^2(P, \Omega)$ an estimator for a V -valued function φ on P . We prove a general Cramér-Rao inequality (Theorem 4.4) for φ -regular estimators $\hat{\sigma}$, using the notion of essential tangent space and reduced Fisher metric and results in the previous sections. At the end of the section, we derive from Theorem 4.4 classical Cramér-Rao inequalities,

compare our results with other generalizations of the Cramér-Rao inequality and summarize our main contributions in this paper.

4.1. Bias, mean square error and variance of an estimator. In this subsection we recall the notion of the bias, the mean square error and the variance of an estimator and their relation, which are generalized immediately in our proposed general setting.

Definition 4.1. The difference

$$(4.1) \quad b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi} := \varphi_{\hat{\sigma}} - \varphi \in V^P$$

will be called the *bias of the estimator $\hat{\sigma}$ w.r.t. the map φ* .

Definition 4.2. Given an estimator $\hat{\sigma} \in L_{\varphi}^2(P, \Omega)$ the estimator $\hat{\sigma}$ will be called *φ -unbiased*, if $\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}} = \varphi$, equivalently, $b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi} = 0$.

Given $\hat{\sigma} \in L_{\varphi}^2(P, \Omega)$, we define the *φ -mean square error* of an estimator $\hat{\sigma} : \Omega \rightarrow P$ to be the quadratic form $MSE_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}]$ on V^* such that for each $l, k \in V^*$ we have

$$(4.2) \quad MSE_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}](l, k) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}[(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \varphi^l \circ \mathbf{p}(\xi)) \cdot (\varphi^k \circ \hat{\sigma} - \varphi^k \circ \mathbf{p}(\xi))].$$

We also define the *variance of $\hat{\sigma}$ w.r.t. φ* to be the quadratic form $V_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}]$ on V^* such that for all $l, k \in V^*$ we have

$$(4.3) \quad V_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}](l, k) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}[(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma})) \cdot (\varphi^k \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^k \circ \hat{\sigma}))].$$

The RHSs of (4.2) and (4.3) are well-defined, since $\hat{\sigma} \in L_{\varphi}^2(P, \Omega)$.

We shall also use the following relation

$$(4.4) \quad MSE_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}](l, k) = V_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}](l, k) + \langle b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi}(\xi), l \rangle \cdot \langle b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi}(\xi), k \rangle$$

for all $\xi \in P$ and all $l, k \in V^*$. Since for a given $\xi \in P$ the LHS and RHS of (4.4) are symmetric bilinear forms on V^* , it suffices to prove (4.4) in the case $k = l$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \varphi^l \circ \mathbf{p}(\xi) &= (\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma})) + (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma}) - \varphi^l \circ \mathbf{p}(\xi)) \\ &= (\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma})) + \langle b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi}(\xi), l \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that $\mathbf{p}(\xi)$ is a probability measure, we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad MSE_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}](l, l) = V_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^{\varphi}[\hat{\sigma}](l, l) + \langle b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi}(\xi), l \rangle^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} (\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma})) \cdot \langle b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi}(\xi), l \rangle d\mathbf{p}(\xi).$$

Since $\langle b_{\hat{\sigma}}^{\varphi}(\xi), l \rangle$ does not depend on x , it can be taken out of the integral, and therefore the last term in the RHS of (4.5) vanishes. As we have noted this proves (4.4).

4.2. A general Cramér-Rao inequality.

Proposition 4.3. *Let (P, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a 2-integrable statistical model, φ - a V -valued function on P and $\hat{\sigma} \in L^2_\varphi(P, \Omega)$ - a φ -regular estimator. Then for any $l \in V^*$ and any $\xi \in P$ we have*

$$V_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^\varphi[\hat{\sigma}](l, l) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma}))^2 \geq \|d\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^l\|_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}}^2(\xi).$$

Proof. Recall that $e : \hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$ is an isometric embedding. Since $e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P)$ is a closed subspace in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$, we have the orthogonal decomposition

$$(4.6) \quad L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi)) = e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P) \oplus e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P)^\perp.$$

Denote by $\Pi_{e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P)}$ the orthogonal projection $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))$ to $e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P, \hat{\mathbf{g}})$ according to the above decomposition.

By Proposition 3.12.2, $\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma})$ is a pre-gradient of $\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^l$. Hence

$$(4.7) \quad \Pi_{e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma})) = e(\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} \varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^l),$$

for $\varphi \in L^2_\sigma(P, V)$. Using (4.3) and the decomposition (4.6), we obtain

$$(4.8) \quad V_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^\varphi[\hat{\sigma}](l, l) \geq \|\Pi_{e(\hat{T}_\xi^{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}P)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma}))\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(\xi))}^2.$$

Combining (4.8) with (4.7), we derive Proposition 4.3 immediately from the following obvious identity (see Def. 3.9)

$$\|\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}} \varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^l\|_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}^2(\xi) = \|d\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^l\|_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}}^2(\xi).$$

□

We regard $\|d\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^l\|_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}}^2(\xi)$ as a quadratic form on V^* and denote the latter one by $(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\hat{\sigma}}^\varphi)^{-1}(\xi)$, i.e.

$$(\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\hat{\sigma}}^\varphi)^{-1}(\xi)(l, k) := \langle d\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^l, d\varphi_{\hat{\sigma}}^k \rangle_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1}}(\xi).$$

Thus we obtain from Proposition 4.3 the following.

Theorem 4.4. *(Cramér-Rao inequality) Let (P, Ω, \mathbf{p}) be a 2-integrable statistical model, φ a V -valued function on P and $\hat{\sigma} \in L^2_\varphi(P, \Omega)$ a φ -regular estimator. Then the difference $V_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}^\varphi[\hat{\sigma}] - (\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{\hat{\sigma}}^\varphi)^{-1}(\xi)$ is a positive semi-definite quadratic form on V^* for any $\xi \in P$.*

This is the general Cramér-Rao inequality.

4.3. Classical Cramér-Rao inequalities. Our generalization of the Cramér-Rao inequality (Theorem 4.4) does not require the nondegeneracy of the (classical) Fisher metric nor the finite dimensionality of statistical models, nor positivity of the density functions of statistical model. When we make such additional assumptions, we regain the various versions of the inequality known in the literature. We shall list some important examples. After the initial work of Rao and Cramér on information lower bounds

[Cramer1946, Rao1945], many versions of Cramér-Rao inequalities have appeared in the literature see e.g. [Witting1985, p. 317] and the remainder of this paper, and the most general among them, as far as we are aware, is in [Borovkov1998].

(A) Assume that V is finite dimensional and φ is a coordinate mapping. Then $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = \mathbf{g}$ and $d\varphi^l = d\xi^l$, and with (4.1), abbreviating b_σ^φ as b , we write

$$(4.9) \quad (\mathbf{g}_\sigma^\varphi)^{-1}(\xi)(l, k) = \langle \sum_i (\frac{\partial \xi^l}{\partial \xi^i} + \frac{\partial b^l}{\partial \xi^i}) d\xi^i, \sum_j (\frac{\partial \xi^k}{\partial \xi^j} + \frac{\partial b^k}{\partial \xi^j}) d\xi^j \rangle_{\mathbf{g}^{-1}}(\xi).$$

Let $D(\xi)$ be the linear transformation of V whose matrix coordinates are

$$D(\xi)_k^l := \frac{\partial b^l}{\partial \xi^k}.$$

With (4.9), the Cramér-Rao inequality in Theorem 4.4 becomes

$$(4.10) \quad V_\xi[\hat{\sigma}] \geq (\mathbb{E} + D(\xi)) \mathbf{g}^{-1}(\xi) (\mathbb{E} + D(\xi))^T.$$

The inequality (4.10) coincides with the Cramér-Rao inequality in [Borovkov1998, Theorem 1.A, p. 147]. The condition (R) in [Borovkov1998, p. 140, 147] for the validity of the Cramér-Rao inequality is essentially equivalent to the 2-integrability of the (finite dimensional) statistical model with positive regular density function under consideration, more precisely Borovkov ignores/excludes the points $x \in \Omega$ where the density function vanishes for computing the Fisher metric. Since we do not assume the existence of a positive regular density function, our set-up is more general than that by Borovkov. Borovkov also uses the φ -regularity assumption, written as $\mathbb{E}_\theta((\theta^*)^2) < c < \infty$ for $\theta \in \Theta$, see also [Borovkov1998, Lemma 1, p. 141] for a more precise formulation.

(B) Specializing further and assuming that $V = \mathbb{R}$ and φ is a coordinate mapping. Then

$$(4.11) \quad \mathbb{E} + D(\xi) = 1 + b'_\sigma$$

where b_σ is short for b_σ^φ . Using (4.11) and (4.4), we derive from (4.10)

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{E}_\xi(\hat{\sigma} - \xi)^2 \geq \frac{[1 + b'_\sigma(\xi)]^2}{\mathbf{g}(\xi)} + b_\sigma(\xi)^2.$$

(4.12) is identical with the Cramér-Rao inequality with a bias term in [CT2006, (11.290) p.396, (11.323) p.402].

(C) Assume that V is finite dimensional, φ is a coordinate mapping and $\hat{\sigma}$ is φ -unbiased. Then the terms involving b_σ vanish, and the Cramér-Rao inequality in Theorem 4.4 becomes the well-known Cramér-Rao inequality for an unbiased estimator (see e.g. [AN2000, Theorem 2.2, p. 32])

$$V_\xi[\hat{\sigma}] \geq \mathbf{g}^{-1}(\xi).$$

(D) In [BKRW1998, Chapter 5] Bickel-Klaassen-Ritov-Wellner consider efficient estimations for infinite dimensional statistical models. They define the inverse information covariance function by looking at a variation $\partial_V \mathbf{p}$ in the Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega, \mathbf{p}(x))$, which is similar to our idea in the present paper. They did not derive an analogue of the Cramér-Rao inequality. They are mainly interested in the asymptotic behavior of estimators.

4.4. Janssen's nonparametric Cramér-Rao inequality. In this Subsection we compare our parametric Cramér-Rao inequality with Janssen's nonparametric Cramér-Rao inequality [Janssen2003], which, as far as we are aware of (Subsection 4.5), is the version closest to our work.

The nonparametric setting of Janssen's work follows, in particular, the line of Bickel et al. [BKRW1998]. Janssen considers a general measurable space Ω and a subset $P \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ of probability measures for which he defined the notion of a tangent space using the same method we define the tangent space for the subset $\mathcal{M}^r(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{S}^r(\Omega)$ in [AJLS2016b]. First for $\xi \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ Janssen calls elements of the set

$$L_2^{(0)}(\xi) := \{g \in L_2(\Omega, \xi) \mid \int_{\Omega} g d\xi = 0\}$$

tangents at ξ . In our language $T_{\xi}(\mathcal{P}^{1/2}(\Omega)) = L_2^{(0)}(\xi) \cdot \xi^{1/2}$.

Janssen calls a curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ *L_2 -differentiable* at $t = 0 \in I$, if there exists a tangent $g \in L_2^{(0)}(\gamma(0))$ such that for all sequences $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and each finite dominating measure μ of $\{\gamma(t_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \gamma(0)$ we have [Janssen2003, (2)]

$$\frac{2}{t_n} \left[\left(\frac{d\gamma(t_n)}{d\mu} \right)^{1/2} - \left(\frac{d\gamma(0)}{d\mu} \right)^{1/2} \right] - g \left(\frac{d\gamma(0)}{d\mu} \right)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0 \in L_2(\Omega, \mu)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In our language, using Proposition 2.3, a curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is L_2 -differentiable iff the composition $\pi^{1/2} \circ \gamma : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{1/2}(\Omega)$ is differentiable. By Theorem 2.7 the curve $\gamma(t)$ is 2-integrable. Moreover Theorem 2.7 asserts that the L_2 -differentiability is equivalent to the seemingly weaker condition of weak continuity of the Fisher metric. Thus Theorem 2.7 also clarifies the general set-up of Janssen's work.

Janssen's statistical functional $\kappa : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (particular) version of our feature function $\varphi : P \rightarrow V$. (We shall discuss Janssen's general statistical functional $\kappa : P \rightarrow M$ below.) In our notations, P stands for a parameter space, and therefore its image $\mathbf{p}(P)$ corresponds to Janssen's subset P of probability measures on Ω . Thus the composition $\varphi := \kappa \circ \mathbf{p}$ is a feature function. The difference is that Janssen wants to estimate a probability measure $\xi \in P$ and we want to estimate *the parameter* of a probability measure ξ .

In our work, an estimator is a map $\hat{\sigma} : \Omega \rightarrow P$. In Janssen's work an estimator is a map $\hat{\sigma} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. So the composition $\varphi \circ \hat{\sigma}$ in our work corresponds to an estimator in Janssen's work. Note that taking the composition $\varphi \circ \hat{\sigma}$ is specially important for estimators on a singular statistical model, since only in this form, the function $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}(\xi)}(\varphi^l \circ \hat{\sigma})$ is visible, and therefore in our setting, we can use the reduced Fisher metric, which is not present (and not necessary) in nonparametric setting. This is the most important difference between our work and Janssen's work.

In Janssen's work the rule of differentiation under the integral sign [Janssen2003, Lemma 1, p. 349] is a partial case of our Proposition 3.3, namely for $k = k' = 2$, and it was known before Janssen's work, see loc. cit. Once we have this rule, the Cramér-Rao inequality for an estimator T is derived by Janssen in a similar way as in the proof of Proposition 4.3. Janssen also considers the general nonparametric Cramér-Rao inequality for an arbitrary statistical functional $\kappa : P \rightarrow M$, which is expressed in terms of a non-negative quadratic form on a linear space W of functions on M (so his setting formally is slightly larger than ours, where we assume M is a topological vector space V (and $W = V^*$) but essentially equivalent, since the Cramér-Rao inequality depends on *the linear space* W (resp. V^*).

4.5. Comparing with other generalizations of Cramér-Rao inequality. In this paper, using and developing our theory for (possibly infinite dimensional) parametric measure models in [AJLS2015, AJLS2016b], we are concerned with a generalization of the Cramér-Rao inequality in a parametric setting where the Fisher metric may be degenerate, the statistical measure model under consideration may be infinite dimensional and does not need to consist of dominated measures, and moreover, estimators do not need to be unbiased.

We would like to stress that there are many different generalizations of the original Cramér-Rao inequality [Rao1945, Cramer1946]. We searched in the database of Math.Sci.Net under the key word "Cramer-Rao" in the title of the papers reviewed or indexed by Mat. Sci. Net. The query returns 209 matched items on May 08, 2017. A large amount of papers from the 209 matched items are devoted to applications and refinements of the Cramér-Rao in special situations.

Many generalizations from the 209 items are particular cases of our generalization in the present paper. Other generalizations concern Cramér-Rao type inequality w.r.t. to a generalized Fisher metric (e.g. in a quantum information setting or the q -Fisher-metric, or the Fisher metric derived from other convex functions), or w.r.t. the generalized covariance of an estimator. There are also a few papers discussing generalizations of the Cramér-Rao inequality in the presence of a singular Fisher metric, see the item (4) below. We refer the reader to the paper by Cianchi-Lutwak-Yang-Zhang [CLYZ2014] and the references therein as the best recent short

survey on generalizations of Cramér-Rao inequalities. Note that the paper by Cianchi-Lutwak-Yang-Zhang is exclusively concerned with *regular 1-dimensional* statistical models. Though the Cramér-Rao inequality generally boils down to an equality depending on a given tangent vector, a good formulation for multi-dimensional (possibly infinite dimensional) statistical models is important; in fact, we don't know of any example of an infinite dimensional exponential model that admits an efficient unbiased estimator [JLS2017b, SFKGH2013]. The regularity assumption has been discussed in [AJLS2016b], see also Remark 2.5. Among results that have not been discussed in [CLYZ2014] we would like to mention the original paper by Espinasse [Espinasse2012], whose generalization drops the smoothness assumption of the statistical model.

Our results are most closely related to Janssen's nonparametric Cramér-Rao inequality, which we reviewed above.

4.6. Conclusion. To sum up, the most important contributions in our paper are the following.

- (1) Our Cramér-Rao lower bound is defined in the most general terms based on our theory of parametrized measure models developed in [AJLS2015, AJLS2016b] that encompasses many partial cases which use more complicated terminology, e.g. regarding separate case of Riemannian submanifolds as in [Boumal2013]. We spell out properties of estimators and estimations that do not depend on the parametrization of the statistical models under consideration. In particular, our theory covers the intrinsic Cramér-Rao lower bound introduced by S.T. Smith in 2005 [Smith2005] and developed later in [Boumal2013]. (The intrinsic estimate setting in [Smith2005] is not completely intrinsic: it is a *density estimation problem* and therefore depends on the choice of a dominant measure. Furthermore, Smith chooses a special feature function φ using the exponential map, which is not always globally defined.)
- (2) The Fisher metric in our setting is defined without any assumption on the existence of a dominating measure. The closest treatment by Janssen [Janssen2003] is technically more complicated and less complete than ours.
- (3) We clarified the relation between different sufficient regularity conditions (in our language - 2-integrability) on the statistical models.
- (4) We treat the case of a singular Fisher metric using the reduced metric. The classical remedy for singularities of the Fisher metric is to use the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, hereafter referred to as the pseudoinverse, of the Fisher information matrix, see e.g. [Boumal2013, BHE2009]. Geometrically our approach is simpler and geometrically clearer, which is particularly important for the consideration of the case when our Cramér-Rao inequality is optimal, see

our subsequent paper [JLS2017b]. Our formulation has an advantage over the use of the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, since the later one is defined *with the help of another non-degenerate metric*. It is not hard to see that the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse is equal to the inverse of the reduced Fisher metric.

Finally we remark that our theory can be coherently and straightforward extended to other natural statistical models with different types of singularities, including important compactifications of open statistical models, e.g. the statistical model $\mathcal{P}(\Omega_n)$ of all nonnegative probability measures on a finite set Ω_n [JLS2017b, JLS2017c].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A part of this paper has been discussed during extended visits by HVL and LS to the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, and they thank the institute for its hospitality and providing excellent working conditions.

REFERENCES

- [AJLS2015] N. AY, J. JOST, H. V. LÊ, AND L. SCHWACHHÖFER, Information geometry and sufficient statistics, *Probability Theory and related Fields*, 162 (2015), 327-364, arXiv:1207.6736.
- [AJLS2016] N. AY, J. JOST, H. V. LÊ, AND L. SCHWACHHÖFER, Information geometry, Springer 2017 (in press).
- [AJLS2016b] N. AY, J. JOST, H. V. LÊ, AND L. SCHWACHHÖFER, Parametrized measure models, (accepted for Bernoulli Journal), arXiv:1510.07305.
- [Amari1987] S. AMARI, Differential Geometrical Theory of Statistics, in: *Differential geometry in statistical inference*, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Lecture Note-Monograph Series, Volume 10, California, 1987.
- [Amari2016] S. AMARI, *Information Geometry and Its Applications*, Springer, Applied Mathematical Sciences, Volume 194, 2016.
- [AN2000] S. AMARI, H. NAGAOKA, *Methods of information geometry*, Translations of mathematical monographs; v. 191, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.
- [BHE2009] Z. BEN-HAIM, Y.C. ELDAR, On the Constrained Cramér- Rao Bound With a Singular Fisher Information Matrix, *IEEE Signal Processing Letter*, 16(2009), 453-457.
- [Bercher2012] J.-F. BERCHER, On generalized Cramér-Rao inequalities, generalized Fisher information and characterizations of generalized q -Gaussian distributions, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 45(2012), 255-303.
- [BKRW1998] P. BICKEL, C. A. J. KLAASSEN, Y. RITOV, J. A. WELLNER, *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*, Springer, 1998.
- [Borovkov1998] A. A. BOROVKOV, *Mathematical statistics*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1998.
- [Boumal2013] N. BOUMAL, On intrinsic Cramér-Rao bounds for Riemannian submanifolds and quotient manifolds, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* 61 (2013), no. 7, 1809-1821.
- [Chentsov1982] N. CHENTSOV, *Statistical decision rules and optimal inference*, Moscow, Nauka, 1972 (in Russian), English translation in: *Translation of Math. Monograph* 53, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1982).

- [CLYZ2014] A. CIANCHI, E. LUTWAK, D. YANG, G. ZHANG, A unified approach to Cramér-Rao inequalities. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 60 (2014), no. 1, 643-650.
- [CT2006] T. M. COVER AND J. A. THOMAS, *Elements of Information theory*, Wiley and Sons, second edition, 2006.
- [Cramer1946] H. CRAMÉR, *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1946.
- [Espinasse2012] T. ESPINASSE, P. ROCHET, A Cramér-Rao inequality for non-differentiable models. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 350 (2012), no. 13-14, 711-715.
- [Janssen2003] A. JANSSON, A nonparametric Cramér-Rao inequality, *Statistics & Probability letters*, 64(2003), 347-358.
- [JLS2017b] J. JOST, H. V. LÊ AND L. SCHWACHHÖFER, The Cramér-Rao inequality on singular statistical models II (in preparation).
- [JLS2017c] J. JOST, H. V. LÊ AND L. SCHWACHHÖFER, In preparation.
- [Le2016] H.V. LÊ, The uniqueness of the Fisher metric as information metric, *AIMS*, 69 (2017), arXiv:math/1306.1465.
- [Rao1945] C. R. RAO, Information and the accuracy attainable in the estimation of statistical parameters, *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society* 37 (1945), 81-89.
- [SFKGH2013] B. K. SRIPERUMBUDUR, K. FUKUMIZU, R. KUMAR, A. GRETTON AND A. HYVÄRINEN, *Density Estimation in Infinite Dimensional Exponential Families*, arXiv:1312.3516.
- [Smith2005] S.T. SMITH, Covariance, subspace, and intrinsic Cramér-Rao bounds, *IEEE-Transactions on Signal Processing*, 53(5):1610-1629, 2005.
- [Vapnik1999] V. N. VAPNIK, *The nature of statistical learning theory*, Springer, 1999.
- [Wasserman2006] L. WASSERMAN, *All of Nonparametric Statistics*, Springer, 2006.
- [WMS2008] D. WACKERLY, W. MENDENHALL, R. L. SCHEAFFER, *Mathematical Statistics with Applications*, Thomson Higher Education, Belmont, CA, USA (2008).
- [Watanabe2007] S. WATANABE, Almost all learning machines are singular, In the *Proceedings of the IEEE Int. Conf. FOCI*, pages 383-388, 2007.
- [Watanabe2009] S. WATANABE, *Algebraic Geometry and Statistical Learning Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [Witting1985] H. WITTING, *Mathematische Statistik I. Parametrische Verfahren bei festem Stich-probenumfang*. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1985. Volume 18, Number 4, 2005, 779-822.

MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES, LEIPZIG, GERMANY
E-mail address: jjost@mis.mpg.de

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS CAS, ŽITNA 25, 11567 PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC
E-mail address: hvle@math.cas.cz

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DORTMUND, VOGELPOTH-SWEG 87, 44221 DORTMUND, GERMANY
E-mail address: Lorenz.Schwachhoefer@math.uni-dortmund.de