

A GEOMETER'S VIEW OF THE THE CRAMÉR-RAO BOUND ON ESTIMATOR VARIANCE

ANTHONY D. BLAOM

ABSTRACT. The classical Cramér-Rao inequality gives a lower bound for the variance of a unbiased estimator of an unknown parameter, in some statistical model of a random process. In this note we rewrite the statment and proof of the bound using contemporary geometric language.

The Cramér-Rao inequality gives a lower bound for the variance of a unbiased estimator of a parameter in some statistical model of a random process. Below is a restatement and proof in sympathy with the underlying geometry the problem. While our presentation is mildly novel, its mathematical content is very well-known.

Assuming some very basic familiarity with Riemannian geometry, and that one has reformulated the bound appropriately, the essential parts of the proof boil down to half a dozen lines. For completeness we explain the connection with log-likelihoods, and show how to recover the more usual statement in terms of the Fisher information matrix. We thank Jakob Ströhl for helpful feedback.

1. THE CRAMÉR-RAO INEQUALITY

The mathematical setting of statistical inference consists of: (i) a smooth¹ manifold \mathcal{X} , the *sample space*, which we will suppose is finite-dimensional; and (ii) a set \mathcal{P} of probability measures on \mathcal{X} , called the *space of models* or *parameters*. The objective is to make inferences about an unknown model $p \in \mathcal{P}$, given one or more observations $x \in \mathcal{X}$, drawn at random from \mathcal{X} according to p .

Under certain regularity assumptions detailed below, this data suffices to make \mathcal{X} into a Riemannian manifold, whose geometric properties are related to problems of statistical inference. It seems that Calyampudi Radhakrishna Rao was the first to articulate this connection between geometry and statistics [2].

In formulating the Cramér-Rao inequality, we suppose that \mathcal{P} is a smooth *finite-dimensional* manifold (i.e., we are doing so-called parametric inference). We say that \mathcal{P} is *regular* if the probability measures $p \in \mathcal{P}$ are all Borel measures on \mathcal{X} , and if there exists some positive Borel measure μ on \mathcal{X} , hereafter called a *reference measure*, such that

$$(1) \quad p = f_p \mu,$$

for some collection of smooth functions f_p , $p \in \mathcal{P}$, on \mathcal{X} . The definition of regularity furthermore requires that we may arrange $(x, p) \mapsto f_p(x)$ to be jointly smooth.

¹In this note ‘smooth’ means C^2 .

An *unbiased estimator* of some smooth function $\theta: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (the “parameter”) is a smooth function $\hat{\theta}: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose expectation under each $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is precisely $\theta(p)$:

$$(2) \quad \theta(p) = \mathbb{E}(\hat{\theta} | p) := \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{\theta}(x) dp; \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Theorem (Rao-Cramér [2, 1]). *The space of models \mathcal{P} determines a natural Riemannian metric on \mathcal{X} , known as the Fisher-Rao metric, with respect to which there is the following lower bound on the variance of an unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}$ of θ :*

$$(3) \quad \mathbb{V}(\hat{\theta} | p) \geq |\nabla \theta(p)|^2; \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

More informally: The parameter space \mathcal{P} comes equipped with a natural way of measuring distances, leading to a well-defined notion of steepest rate of ascent, for any function θ on \mathcal{P} . The square of this rate is precisely the lower bound for the variance of an unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}$.

2. OBSERVATION-DEPENDENT ONE-FORMS ON THE SPACE OF MODELS

It is fundamental to the present geometric point of view that each observation $x \in \mathcal{X}$ determines a one-form λ_x on the space \mathcal{P} of models in the following way: Let $v \in T_{p_0} \mathcal{P}$ be a tangent vector, understood as the derivative of some path $t \mapsto p_t \in \mathcal{P}$ through p_0 :

$$(4) \quad v = \left. \frac{d}{dt} p_t \right|_{t=0}.$$

Then, recalling that each p_t is a probability measure on \mathcal{X} (and \mathcal{P} is regular) we may write $p_t = g_t p_0$, for some smooth function $g_t: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and define

$$\lambda_x(v) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} g_t(x) \right|_{t=0}.$$

The proof of the following is straightforward:

Lemma. $\mathbb{E}(\lambda_x(v) | p) = 0$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and $v \in T_p \mathcal{P}$.

Now if $v \in T_{p_0} \mathcal{P}$ is a tangent vector as in (4), and if (2) holds, then

$$d\theta(v) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{\theta}(x) dp_t \right|_{t=0} = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{\theta}(x) g_t(x) dp_0 \right|_{t=0} = \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{\theta}(x) \lambda_x(v) dp_0,$$

giving us:

Proposition. *For any unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $\theta: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, one has*

$$d\theta(v) = \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{\theta}(x) \lambda_x(v) dp; \quad v \in T_p \mathcal{P}.$$

3. LOG-LIKELIHOODS

As an aside, we shall now see that the observation-dependent one-forms λ_x are exact, and at the same time give their more usual interpretation in terms of log-likelihoods.

Choosing a reference measure μ , and defining f_p as in (1), one defines the *log-likelihood* function $(x, p) \mapsto L_x(p): \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$L_x(p) = \log f_p(x).$$

While the log-likelihood depends on the reference measure μ , its derivative dL_x (a one-form on \mathcal{P}) does not, for in fact:

Lemma. $dL_x = \lambda_x$.

Proof. With a reference measure fixed as in (1), we have, along a path $t \mapsto p_t$, $p_t = g_t p_0$, where $g_t = f_{p_t}/f_{p_0}$. Applying the definition of λ_x , we compute

$$\lambda_x \left(\frac{d}{dt} p_t \Big|_{t=0} \right) = \frac{d}{dt} \frac{f_{p_t}(x)}{f_{p_0}(x)} \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d}{dt} \frac{e^{L_x(p_t)}}{e^{L_x(p_0)}} \Big|_{t=0} = dL_x \left(\frac{d}{dt} p_t \Big|_{t=0} \right).$$

□

In particular, local maxima of L_x (points of so-called maximum likelihood) do not depend on the reference measure.

4. THE METRIC AND DERIVATION OF THE BOUND

With the observation-dependent one-forms in hand, we may now define the Fisher-Rao Riemannian metric on \mathcal{P} . It is given by

$$\mathbb{I}(u, v) = \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_x(u) \lambda_x(v) dp, \text{ for } u, v \in T_p \mathcal{P}.$$

Now that we have a metric, it is natural to consider $\nabla \theta$ instead of $d\theta$ in Proposition 2. By the definition of gradient, we have

$$|\nabla \theta(p)|^2 = d\theta(\nabla \theta(p)).$$

This equation and Proposition 2 now gives, for any $v \in T_p \mathcal{P}$,

$$|\nabla \theta(p)|^2 = \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{\theta}(x) \lambda_x(\nabla \theta(p)) dp = \int (\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta(p)) \lambda_x(\nabla \theta(p)) dp.$$

The second equality holds because $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_x(\nabla \theta(p)) dp = 0$, by Lemma 2. Applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to the right-hand side gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \theta(p)|^2 &\leq \left(\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (\hat{\theta}(x) - \theta(p))^2 dp \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_x(\nabla \theta(p)) \lambda_x(\nabla \theta(p)) dp \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbb{V}(\hat{\theta} | p)} \sqrt{\mathbb{I}(\nabla \theta(p), \nabla \theta(p))} = \sqrt{\mathbb{V}(\hat{\theta} | p)} |\nabla \theta(p)|. \end{aligned}$$

The Cramér-Rao bound now follows.

5. THE BOUND IN TERMS OF FISHER INFORMATION

Theorem 1 is coordinate-free formulation. To recover the more usual statement of the Cramér-Rao bound, let ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_k be local coordinates on \mathcal{P} , the space of models on \mathcal{X} , and $\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_k}$ the corresponding vector fields on \mathcal{P} , characterised by

$$d\phi_i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_j} \right) = \delta_i^j.$$

Here $\delta_i^j = 1$ if $i = j$ and is zero otherwise. Applying Lemma 3, the coordinate representation I_{ij} of the Fisher-Rao metric \mathbb{I} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{ij}(p) &= \mathbb{I} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_i}(p), \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_j}(p) \right) = \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d\lambda_x \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \right) d\lambda_x \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_j}(p) \right) dp \\ &= \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{\partial L_x}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \right) \left(\frac{\partial L_x}{\partial\phi_j}(p) \right) dp, \end{aligned}$$

where $L_x(p) = \log f_p(x)$ is the log-likelihood. In statistics I_{ij} is known as the *Fisher information matrix*.

For the moment we continue to let θ denote an arbitrary function on \mathcal{P} , and $\hat{\theta}$ an unbiased estimate. Now $\nabla\theta$ is the gradient of θ , with respect to the metric \mathbb{I} . Since the coordinate representation of the metric is I_{ij} , a standard computation gives the local coordinate formula

$$\nabla\theta = \sum_{i,j} I^{ij} \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_j},$$

where $\{I^{ij}\}$ is the inverse of $\{I_{ij}\}$. Regarding the lower bound in Theorem 1, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla\theta(p)|^2 &= \mathbb{I}(\nabla\theta(p), \nabla\theta(p)) = \sum_{i,j,m,n} \mathbb{I} \left(I^{ij}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_j}(p), I^{mn}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_m}(p) \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_n}(p) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j,m,n} I^{ij}(p) I^{mn}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_m}(p) \mathbb{I} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_j}(p), \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_n}(p) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j,m,n} I^{ij}(p) I_{jn}(p) I^{mn}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_m}(p) \\ &= \sum_{i,m,n} \delta_i^n I^{mn}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_m}(p) = \sum_{i,m} I^{mi}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_m}(p). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1 now reads

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{\theta} | p) \geq \sum_{i,m} I^{mi}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_i}(p) \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\phi_m}(p).$$

In particular, if we suppose θ is one of the coordinate functions, say $\theta = \phi_j$, then we obtain

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{\phi}_j | p) \geq \sum_{i,m} I^{mi}(p) \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial \phi_i}(p) \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial \phi_m}(p) = \sum_{i,m} I^{mi} \delta_j^i \delta_j^m = I^{jj}(p),$$

the version of the Cramér-Rao bound to be found in statistics textbooks.

REFERENCES

- [1] Harald Cramér. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*. Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 9. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1946.
- [2] C. Radhakrishna Rao. Information and the accuracy attainable in the estimation of statistical parameters. *Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc.*, 37:81–91, 1945.

E-MAIL: anthony.blaom@gmail.com