

Asymptotic Normality and Variance Estimation For Supervised Ensembles

Zhengze Zhou,^{*} Lucas Mentch[†] and Giles Hooker[‡]

December 4, 2019

Abstract

Ensemble methods based on bootstrapping have improved the predictive accuracy of base learners, but fail to provide a framework in which formal statistical inference can be conducted. Recent theoretical developments suggest taking subsamples without replacement and analyze the resulting estimator in the context of a U-statistic, thus demonstrating asymptotic normality properties. However, we observe that current methods for variance estimation exhibit severe bias when the number of base learners is not large enough, compromising the validity of the resulting confidence intervals or hypothesis tests. This paper shows that similar asymptotics can be achieved by means of V-statistics, corresponding to taking subsamples with replacement. Further, we develop a bias correction algorithm for estimating variance in the limiting distribution, which yields satisfactory results with moderate size of base learners.

1 Introduction

Ensemble methods are a machine learning paradigm where multiple base learners are trained and aggregated for prediction purposes. An ensemble can usually achieve better generalization performance than individual base learners, with bagged trees (Breiman, 1996) and random forest (Breiman, 2001) being two successful examples.

Despite the widespread application of these methods, theoretical developments are somewhat limited with many results focusing on the consistency of tree-based ensembles. Biau et al. (2008) provide theorems that establish the universal consistency of averaging rules in classification. Scornet et al. (2015) prove a consistency result for random forest in the context of additive regression models. A uniform consistency of random survival forest is introduced in Ishwaran and Kogalur (2010), and extended in Cui et al. (2017).

Another line of research lies in quantifying sampling uncertainty for ensemble predictions. Sexton and Laake (2009) consider estimating the standard error of bagged learners and random forest using jackknife and bootstrap estimators. Wager et al. (2014) propose applying jackknife (Efron, 1992) and infinitesimal jackknife (Efron, 2014) for constructing confidence intervals of random forest. However, these results lack a statistical formulation of the asymptotic distribution.

The conventional procedure for building ensembles is to use bootstrap samples, where the high correlation between base learners prevents the averaging process from producing a limiting normal distribution. Mentch and Hooker (2016) and Wager and Athey (2018) propose a variant of bagging and random forest by randomly choosing subsamples without replacement to build base learners.

^{*}PhD Candidate, Department of Statistics and Data Science, Cornell University, zz433@cornell.edu.

[†]Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Pittsburgh, lkm31@pitt.edu.

[‡]Associate Professor, Department of Statistics and Data Science, Cornell University, gjh27@cornell.edu.




Figure 1: Variance estimation by three different methods: IM, BM and IJ under a simple setting: X is $20 \times \text{unif}(0, 1)$ and $Y = 2X + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The variance shown is for prediction at test point $x = 0.5$. Three methods shown in the figure are: Internal Variance Estimation Method (IM), Balanced Variance Estimation Method (BM) and Infinitesimal Jackknife (IJ), with details in Sections 5 and 6. The red line denotes true (log) variance. Model is built under the framework of U-statistics: each tree is constructed using subsamples *without* replacement.

The resulting estimator can fit into the statistical framework of U-statistics (Hoeffding, 1992) and can be analyzed using the tools of Hájek projections (Hájek et al., 1968) and the Hoeffding decomposition (Hoeffding, 1948).

In particular, Mentch and Hooker (2016) show that under minimal regularity conditions, ensemble predictions are asymptotically normally distributed; these results have been further refined in Peng et al. (2019). They further demonstrate that the corresponding variance has an explicit expression and can be estimated at no additional computational cost by Internal Variance Estimation Method (see Algorithm 1 in Section 5.1). As a comparison, Wager and Athey (2018) apply infinitesimal jackknife for variance estimation, but without a closed-form expression for the variance term directly. We should emphasize that the result in Mentch and Hooker (2016) takes into account the relative size between the number of base learners B and the number of training samples n . Thus the asymptotic variance varies under different scenarios. On the other hand Wager and Athey (2018) assumes that B is large enough for Monte Carlo effects not to matter.

For valid statistical inference in practice, accurate estimation of the limiting variance is crucial. However, we observe that all current methods exhibit severe bias when B is not large enough, as shown in Figure 1, where we build an ensemble of decision trees for a simple supervised learning task and estimate the variance of prediction at test point $x = 0.5$, see Section 6 for details. We can see that the estimated variance decreases as B increases, and it usually requires a prohibitive number of base learners before the values to stabilize. A biased estimate of variance can result in conservative confidence intervals or decrease the power of hypothesis testing (Mentch and Hooker, 2016; Zhou et al., 2018). This phenomenon poses a challenge to any inference tasks as building a large ensemble requires both longer training time and more storage capacity.

In this paper, we first demonstrate that similar asymptotics to U-statistics can be achieved by subsampling with replacement, which acts more like the original bootstrap procedure. Our analysis is based on V-statistics (von Mises, 1947), a class of statistics closely related to U-statistics. Asymptotic results for V-statistics are usually derived by Taylor expansion using differential method (Chapter 6 in Serfling (2009)). We show that V-statistic can be reformulated as U-statistic with a well-designed kernel and thus all previous asymptotic results regarding U-statistics can be applied.

In particular, [Shieh \(1994\)](#) demonstrates that V-statistic is asymptotically equivalent to its corresponding U-statistic when the order of the kernel grows at the rate of $o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$. Our construction extends this result to produce a general central limit theorem. We believe this work is meaningful in its own right as V-statistics have not attracted much attention previously in statistical literature, but it plays a significant role in analyzing ensemble models.

In terms of variance estimation, we propose an improved version of Internal Variance Estimation Method (IM; [Mentch and Hooker, 2016](#)) named Balanced Variance Estimation Method (BM). BM enjoys lower bias under the same ensemble size. We also point out that these two methods are essentially computing the variance of a conditional expectation, a problem which has been studied by several other researchers ([Sun et al., 2011](#); [Goda, 2017](#)). The infinitesimal jackknife (IJ) employed in [Wager and Athey \(2018\)](#) has a long history in statistical literature ([Efron, 1982, 2014](#)) and is developed from a different perspective by approximating sampling distribution. It turns out that a close connection exists between BM and IJ, and we prove their equivalence under a natural condition.

To estimate variance in the limiting distribution in finite sample case, we develop a bias corrected version of BM through an ANOVA-like framework ([Sun et al., 2011](#)). The new estimator is shown to produce much more reliable results with moderate size of B .

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces mathematical notations and related work. In Section 3 we analyze the ensemble models in the framework of V-statistics. Section 4 extends the results to randomized ensembles. Section 5 is dedicated to a detailed discussion of variance estimation methods. The proposed bias correction algorithm is derived in Section 6. We end with some discussions and future directions in Section 7.

2 Related Work

We first give a brief introduction on the notion of U-statistics, and then illustrate how it can be utilized in the analysis of ensemble models.

Assume that we have a training set $\mathcal{D} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ of i.i.d. observations of the form $Z_i = (\mathbf{X}_i, Y_i)$ drawn from an underlying distribution F_Z , where $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p) \in \mathcal{X}$ are p covariates. We want to estimate a parameter of interest θ . Suppose there exists an unbiased estimator h of θ that is a function of $k \leq n$ arguments (we call h a kernel of size k):

$$\theta = \mathbb{E}h(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)$$

and without loss of generality we further assume h is permutation symmetric in its arguments. Then the minimum variance unbiased estimator for θ is given by

$$U_n = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_i h(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_k}) \quad (1)$$

where $\{Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_k}\}$ consists of k distinct elements from $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ and the sum is taken over all $\binom{n}{k}$ subsamples of size k . (1) is referred to as a *complete* U-statistic with kernel h of degree k .

There are some natural extensions of (1). We would like k to grow with n so the kernel will have access to more information from the data, thereby presumably producing more accurate estimations. This results in a kernel that varies with n , and an *Infinite Order* U-statistic ([IOUS Frees, 1989](#)):

$$U_{n,k_n} = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k_n}} \sum_i h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}). \quad (2)$$

Further, evaluating all $\binom{n}{k_n}$ kernels is computationally infeasible for even moderately sized n or k_n and thus an estimate can be achieved by averaging only $B_n < \binom{n}{k_n}$ set of subsamples. Incorporating this, the estimator becomes an *Incomplete Infinite Order* U-statistic:

$$U_{n,k_n,B_n} = \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_i h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}). \quad (3)$$

In (2) and (3) we use subscripts to denote that values of k and B may depend on n , and the degree of kernel h is k_n .

U-statistics of form (1) were first studied in [Halmos \(1946\)](#) and [Hoeffding \(1948\)](#), where the latter also shows that these statistics are asymptotically normally distributed. [Sen \(1992\)](#) provides a review of Hoeffding’s seminal paper and outlines the importance U-statistics have in statistical theory. Certain basic properties, such as almost sure consistency and asymptotic normality, are proved to hold in the case of (2) and (3) in [Frees \(1989\)](#). A comprehensive treatment of the topic can be found in [Lee \(1990\)](#) and Chapter 5 of [Serfling \(2009\)](#). The connection between U-statistics and ensemble methods had not been observed until very recently in the work of [Mentch and Hooker \(2016\)](#) and [Wager and Athey \(2018\)](#).

For simplicity we will focus on the regression setting, where Y_i is assumed to be continuous. Given a test point x , we are interested in estimating the conditional mean function

$$\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x].$$

Suppose we also have access to a base learner h , ensemble methods generate resamples R_1, \dots, R_B of the original data, apply h to each resample, and produce final point estimates by averaging over those generated by each model, yielding estimates of the form

$$\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B h(x; \omega_i, R_i).$$

Here, the ω_i denotes an auxiliary randomization parameter as is used in randomized ensembles like random forest, but which may be dropped for simpler (non-randomized) estimation procedures like bagging; [Peng et al. \(2019\)](#) refers to this case as generalized U-statistics. For simplicity, ω is dropped in the rest of paper except in Section 4, which is designated to show that under some conditions, similar results still hold with the presence of ω .

The conventional procedure in random forest is to take R_1, \dots, R_B to be bootstrap samples, which turns out very difficult to analyze statistically. [Mentch and Hooker \(2016\)](#) propose the following procedure to construct an ensemble. Given a training set \mathcal{D} of size n from which an ensemble consisting of B_n base learners is constructed using subsamples of size k_n :

$$U_{n,k_n,B_n}(x) = \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} h_{k_n}(x; Z_{i_1}^*, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}^*) \quad (4)$$

where $\{Z_{i_1}^*, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}^*\}$ is drawn *without* replacement from $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$. This fits into the statistical framework of U-statistics and asymptotic properties can be demonstrated under some regularity conditions. In particular, the explicit expression for the variance of predictions at any given point can be written in closed-form (see [Peng et al. \(2019\)](#) for refined results):

$$\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n,k_n}. \quad (5)$$

For a given c , $1 \leq c \leq k_n$, the variance parameters are defined as

$$\zeta_{c,k_n} = \text{cov} \left(h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n}), h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_c, Z'_{c+1}, \dots, Z'_{k_n}) \right) \quad (6)$$

where $Z'_{c+1}, \dots, Z'_{k_n}$ are i.i.d. copies from the same distribution F_Z and independent of the original data Z_1, \dots, Z_n . For notational simplicity, we drop the test point x in (6).

We should mention that the asymptotic distribution is centered at $\theta_k = \mathbb{E}h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n})$ instead of the true conditional mean $\mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$. This means that any inferential statements must, in general, be made about the sampling structure of the ensemble rather than the underlying data generating process. A careful analysis of specific choices of the base learner h and the relationship between covariates X and response Y are central in achieving consistent predictions and is not the focus of this paper. Some work along these lines includes [Wager and Athey \(2018\)](#) which focus on particular tree-building methods, and [Scornet et al. \(2015\)](#) which demonstrate the \mathbb{L}^2 consistency for random forest in when the underlying response corresponds to an additive regression model.

Also note that the asymptotic normality result in [Wager and Athey \(2018\)](#) can be viewed as a special case of (5). The authors assume that ensemble size B is large enough for Monte Carlo effects not to matter, in which case (5) reduces to $\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n}$.

3 V-statistics

V-statistics are closely related to U-statistics with one difference: the data used in each kernel is sampled *with* replacement. Similar to (1), a *complete* V-statistic with kernel h of degree k is defined as

$$V_n = n^{-k} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \dots \sum_{i_k=1}^n h_k(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_k}) \quad (7)$$

where $\{Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_k}\}$ consists of k elements (possibly with duplicates) from $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ and the sum is taken over all n^k subsamples of size k . An *Infinite Order* V-statistic (IOVS) is defined analogously to (2):

$$V_{n, k_n} = n^{-k_n} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \dots \sum_{i_{k_n}=1}^n h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}). \quad (8)$$

3.1 Asymptotic Equivalence to U-statistics

We first show that the asymptotic behavior of V_{n, k_n} is the same as that of U_{n, k_n} , provided $k_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$. The following important lemma relates V_{n, k_n} to a family of U-statistics, which is a simple extension from Theorem 1 in [Lee \(1990\)](#) page 183 to the case where the kernel size k_n is changing with n .

Lemma 1. *Let V_{n, k_n} be a complete, infinite order V-statistic based on a symmetric kernel h_{k_n} of degree k_n as defined in (8). Then we may write*

$$V_{n, k_n} = n^{-k_n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} j! S_{k_n}^{(j)} \binom{n}{j} U_n^{(j)}$$

where $U_n^{(j)}$ is a U-statistic of degree j . The kernel $\phi_{(j)}$ of $U_n^{(j)}$ is given by

$$\phi_{(j)}(z_1, \dots, z_j) = (j! S_{k_n}^{(j)})^{-1} \sum_{(j)}^* h_{k_n}(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_{k_n}})$$

where the sum $\sum_{(j)}^*$ is taken over all k_n -tuples (i_1, \dots, i_{k_n}) formed from $\{1, 2, \dots, j\}$ having exactly j indices distinct, and where the quantities $S_{k_n}^{(j)}$ are Stirling numbers of the second kind ([Rennie and Dobson, 1969](#)).

Intuitively, as n grows and if k_n grows slowly enough, V_{n, k_n} should behave like U_{n, k_n} , as the difference brought by sampling *with* or *without* replacement becomes negligible. Theorem 2 extends a result in [Shieh \(1994\)](#) which makes this argument rigorous.

Theorem 2. Suppose $k_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\sqrt{n}U_{n,k_n}) > 0$, then V_{n,k_n} and U_{n,k_n} have the same asymptotic distribution.

Remark. The assumption $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\sqrt{n}U_{n,k_n}) > 0$ simply indicates that the rate of convergence for U_{n,k_n} is \sqrt{n} . Theorem 2 could hold under other (degenerated) regimes where the convergence rate is not \sqrt{n} , but this is out of the scope of this paper.

As in Equation (3), by averaging only $B_n < n^{k_n}$ set of subsamples we have an *incomplete, infinite order* V-statistic:

$$V_{n,k_n,B_n} = \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_i h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) \quad (9)$$

where $\{Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}\}$ is again drawn *with* replacement from $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$. Under some regularity conditions, similar asymptotic result as Theorem 1 in Mentch and Hooker (2016); Peng et al. (2019) can be shown:

Theorem 3. Let $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F_Z$ and let V_{n,k_n,B_n} be an *incomplete, infinite order* V-statistic with kernel h_{k_n} . Let $\theta_{k_n} = \mathbb{E}h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n})$ such that $Eh_{k_n}^2(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n}) < \infty$. Then under the assumptions that $k_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^2 \zeta_{1,k_n} > 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta_{k_n,k_n}}{n \zeta_{1,k_n}} \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\frac{(V_{n,k_n,B_n} - \theta_{k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n,k_n}}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

In the complete case where $B_n = n^{k_n}$:

$$\frac{(V_{n,k_n} - \theta_{k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Remark. Note that the first two assumptions $k_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^2 \zeta_{1,k_n} > 0$ ensure that we can apply Theorem 2. The proof requires an additional lemma and is collected together in Appendix A.2.

3.2 Representation As U-statistics

This section develops a broader connection between V- and U-statistics to show that the former automatically achieve almost all the properties of the latter. A complete, infinite order V-statistic V_{n,k_n} with kernel h_{k_n} can be written as a corresponding U-statistic but with a more complicated kernel derived from $h_{k_n}(\cdot)$.

Let Ω denote the set of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We use $B^{k_n}(\Omega)$ to denote all size k_n permutations of Ω with replacement. And let $S^{k_n}(\Omega)$ denote subsamples of size k_n without replacement. Then $|B^{k_n}(\Omega)| = n^{k_n}$ and $|S^{k_n}(\Omega)| = \binom{n}{k_n}$. We can write V_{n,k_n} as

$$V_{n,k_n} = n^{-k_n} \sum_{b \in B^{k_n}(\Omega)} h_{k_n}(Z_b)$$

where b has k_n elements and Z_b are those Z 's with index in b .

Equivalently, V_{n,k_n} can be expressed as:

$$V_{n,k_n} = n^{-k_n} \sum_{s \in S^{k_n}(\Omega)} \phi_{k_n}(Z_s)$$

with composite kernel ϕ_{k_n} defined by:

$$\phi_{k_n}(Z_s) = \sum_{b \in B^{k_n}(s)} \omega_b h_{k_n}(Z_b)$$

where ω_b is the weight associated with each evaluation of h_{k_n} to account for the multiplicity in sampling the same b from $B^{k_n}(s)$ for different s .

For $b = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{k_n}\}$, we use $u(b) \in \{1, 2, \dots, k_n\}$ to denote the number of unique elements in b . Then we have

$$\omega_b = \frac{1}{\binom{n-u(b)}{k_n-u(b)}}.$$

However in practice, it is computationally infeasible to evaluate ϕ_{k_n} .

Thus, we can express V_{n,k_n} as a U-statistic:

$$V_{n,k_n} = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k_n}} \sum_{s \in S^{k_n}(\Omega)} \phi_{k_n}^*(Z_s)$$

where the kernel $\phi_{k_n}^*$ is defined as:

$$\phi_{k_n}^*(Z_s) = \frac{\binom{n}{k_n}}{n^{k_n}} \sum_{b \in B^{k_n}(s)} \omega_b h_{k_n}(Z_b).$$

Here ω_b is defined as before, and we have

$$\sum_{b \in B^{k_n}(s)} \omega_b = \frac{n^{k_n}}{\binom{n}{k_n}}.$$

A more general result for the asymptotics of V-statistics is stated in the following theorem, where the restriction $k_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$ in Theorem 3 can be discarded.

Theorem 4. *Let $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F_Z$ and let V_{n,k_n,B_n} be an incomplete, infinite order V-statistic with kernel h_{k_n} . Let $\theta_{k_n} = \mathbb{E}h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n})$ such that $Eh_{k_n}^2(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n}) < \infty$. Then under the assumption that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta_{k_n,k_n}^*}{n\zeta_{1,k_n}^*} \rightarrow 0$, we have*

$$\frac{(V_{n,k_n,B_n} - \theta_{k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}^* + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n,k_n}^*}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

In the complete case where $B_n = n^{k_n}$:

$$\frac{(V_{n,k_n} - \theta_{k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}^*}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Here, the variance parameter ζ_{1,k_n}^* is defined as in Equation (6) by replacing kernel h_{k_n} with $\phi_{k_n}^*$:

$$\zeta_{c,k_n}^* = \text{cov}\left(\phi_{k_n}^*(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n}), \phi_{k_n}^*(Z_1, Z_2', \dots, Z_{k_n}')\right)$$

and ζ_{k_n,k_n} is still the variance across individual kernels:

$$\zeta_{k_n,k_n} = \text{var}(h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n})).$$

Remark. *This theorem provides a more general result for the asymptotics of V-statistics. It is essentially a reduction to U-statistics by constructing a new kernel representation. The variance expression $\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}^* + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n,k_n}$ again can be viewed as two parts: the first part $\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}^*$ comes from the complete case; the second part $\frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n,k_n}$ is the additional Monte Carlo variance introduced due to incomplete case, which is why ζ_{k_n,k_n} only involves the original kernel h_{k_n} instead of the composite kernel $\phi_{k_n}^*$.*

The introduction of new kernel $\phi_{k_n}^$ facilitates theoretical analysis, but it brings challenges in estimating variance component ζ_{1,k_n}^* directly: it is not feasible to calculate $\phi_{k_n}^*(Z_s)$ for any $s \in S^{k_n}(\Omega)$. We will see in Section 5 that as a general variance estimation method, infinitesimal jackknife (IM) can be applied. And based on Theorem 6, Balanced Variance Estimation Method is equivalently valid without resorting to $\phi_{k_n}^*(Z_s)$ directly.*

4 Randomized Ensembles

As we briefly mentioned before, randomized ensembles are widely used in practice. A general principle to achieve good performances in ensembles is to make individual learners both accurate and diverse (Zhou, 2012). To increase diversity, randomization is added to each base learner. For example in random forest (Breiman, 2001), each split is chosen from a randomly select subset of all possible features.

A *randomized* V-statistic is written as:

$$V_{n,k_n,\omega} = n^{-k_n} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \dots \sum_{i_{k_n}=1}^n h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega). \quad (10)$$

Note that for each kernel h_{k_n} we consider an i.i.d. sample of random ω_i but the subscript is dropped for notational convenience.

Similarly define the incomplete statistic as:

$$V_{n,k_n,B_n,\omega} = \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_i h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega). \quad (11)$$

Following the same idea developed in Mentch and Hooker (2016) and Wager and Athey (2018), consider the expected version of (10):

$$V_{n,k_n,\omega}^* = \mathbb{E}_\omega V_{n,k_n,\omega} = n^{-k_n} \sum_{i_1=1}^n \dots \sum_{i_{k_n}=1}^n E_\omega h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega) \quad (12)$$

where the expectation is taken over the randomization parameter ω . In this case, $V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*$ can be viewed as a non-randomized V-statistic with kernel $h_{k_n}^E = \mathbb{E}_\omega h_{k_n}$ where Theorem 4 applies. We state this result as a corollary:

Corollary 4.1. *Let $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F_Z$ and let $V_{n,k_n,\omega}$ be a complete, infinite order randomized V-statistic defined in (10) and the corresponding expected version $V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*$ in (12). Under the same conditions as Theorem 4, we have*

$$\frac{(V_{n,k_n,\omega}^* - \theta_{k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}^*}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where all parameters $\theta_{k_n}, \zeta_{1,k_n}^*, \zeta_{k_n,k_n}^*$ are defined using new non-randomized kernel $h_{k_n}^E$ instead of h_{k_n} .

Given this, in order to retain the asymptotic normality of the corresponding randomized case (11), there are two steps: first we show that $\frac{V_{n,k_n,\omega} - V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*}{\text{Var}(V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*)} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and thus $V_{n,k_n,\omega}$ has the same asymptotic distribution as $V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*$. Then the asymptotics of $V_{n,k_n,B_n,\omega}$ can be derived from that of $V_{n,k_n,\omega}$. This is formalized in the following theorem:

Theorem 5. *Let $V_{n,k_n,B_n,\omega}$ be a randomized V-statistic of the form defined in (11). Further assume the corresponding statistic $V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*$ in (12) satisfies Corollary 4.1 and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^2 \zeta_{1,k_n}^* > 0$. Then as long as*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega) - \mathbb{E}_\omega h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega)) \neq \infty,$$

we have:

$$\frac{(V_{n,k_n,B_n,\omega} - \theta_{k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}^* + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n,k_n}}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Here, ζ_{k_n, k_n} is the variance across individual randomized kernels:

$$\zeta_{k_n, k_n} = \text{var}(h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n}, \omega)).$$

and all parameters $\theta_{k_n}, \zeta_{1, k_n}^*, \zeta_{k_n, k_n}^*$ are defined using new kernel $h_{k_n}^E$ instead of h_{k_n} as in Corollary 4.1.

The analysis for randomized ensembles in Peng et al. (2019) directly treats the randomized kernel, rather than first establishing a result for the expectation over ω . This is easier in the framework of U-statistics; in the case of V-statistics, the new kernel $\phi_{k_n}^*$ constructed as in Section 3.2 no longer has independent randomization parameters, since different $\phi_{k_n}^*$ might share the same kernel h_{k_n} .

5 Variance Estimation

This section addresses how to estimate variance in the limiting distribution. Three methods will be examined in detail. Mentch and Hooker (2016) propose Internal Variance Estimation Method (IM) based on a two-level sampling procedure. Inspired from this, we design Balanced Variance Estimation Method (BM) which is shown to have lower bias compared to IM. Unlike IM and BM, the infinitesimal jackknife (IJ) employed in Wager and Athey (2018) does not depend on an explicit expression for the variance term.

IM and BM operate by directly estimating ζ_{1, k_n} and ζ_{k_n, k_n} as defined in (6). Notice that $\zeta_{k_n, k_n} = \text{var}(h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n}))$, which can be simply estimated as the variance across all base learners. The estimation for ζ_{1, k_n} is much more involved. The sample covariance between predictions may serve as a consistent estimator, but in practice it is numerically unstable and often results in negative variance estimate (Mentch and Hooker, 2016). Thus we will work on an equivalent expression for ζ_{1, k_n} (Lee, 1990):

$$\zeta_{1, k_n} = \text{var}(\mathbb{E}(h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n}) | Z_1 = z_1)). \quad (13)$$

Expressions of form (13) belongs to an important theme in statistics: estimating the variance of a conditional expectation. It is usually related to uncertainty quantification and has been studied intensively in a number of fields (Zouaoui and Wilson, 2003; Staum, 2009). For a more detailed review, we refer readers to Sun et al. (2011)

In what follows, assume we have data $\mathcal{D} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ of i.i.d. observations of the form $Z_i = (\mathbf{X}_i, Y_i)$, and a kernel function $h_{k_n}(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_n})$. For simplicity, we depress notations by dropping the test point x in the kernel expression.

5.1 Internal Variance Estimation Method

IM is first developed in Mentch and Hooker (2016) wherein the estimates are obtained as a result of restructuring the ensemble building procedure. It can be viewed as a nested two-level Monte Carlo, where we need to choose n_{OUT} and n_{IN} for the number of outer and inner iterations respectively. See Algorithm 1 for details.

We use shorthand $h_{i,j}$ to denote $h_{k_n}(\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(i)}, j})$. The average across inner level is calculated as $\bar{h}_i = \frac{1}{n_{\text{IN}}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\text{IN}}} h_{i,j}$. Further we use $\bar{h} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{OUT}}} \bar{h}_i$ to denote the average across outer level i . Then the estimates for ζ_{1, k_n} and ζ_{k_n, k_n} could be expressed as:

$$\hat{\zeta}_{1, k_n}^{\text{IM}} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{OUT}} - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{OUT}}} (\bar{h}_i - \bar{h})^2,$$

Algorithm 1 Internal Variance Estimation Method

for i in 1 to n_{OUT} **do**
 Select initial fixed point $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(i)}$
 for j in 1 to n_{IN} **do**
 Select subsample $\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(i)},j}$ of size k_n from training set that includes $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(i)}$
 Build base learner and evaluate $h_{k_n}(\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(i)},j})$
 end for
 Record average of the n_{IN} predictions
end for
Compute the variance of the n_{OUT} averages to estimate ζ_{1,k_n}
Compute the variance of all predictions to estimate ζ_{k_n,k_n}
Compute the mean of all predictions to obtain final ensemble prediction

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{k_n,k_n}^{\text{IM}} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{IN}} \times n_{\text{OUT}} - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{OUT}}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\text{IN}}} (h_{i,j} - \bar{h})^2.$$

5.2 Balanced Variance Estimation Method

As show in Figure 1, the estimator for $\hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{IM}}$ given by IM is biased upwards severely when n_{IN} and n_{OUT} are not large enough ($B_n = n_{\text{IN}} \times n_{\text{OUT}}$). IM is not optimal in the sense that it does not utilize all the information in the ensemble. $h_{i,j}$ is only used once in the outer iteration i when conditioned on $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^{(i)}$. Ideally we could also utilize $h_{i,j}$ by conditioning on the rest $k_n - 1$ inputs. Further, we need to choose two hyperparameters n_{OUT} and n_{IN} instead of fixing the number of base learners B_n . It is not clear what combination will yield optimal performance under the same computational budget, and this trade-off will likely differ depending on whether we wish to optimize predictive performance or variance estimation.

Algorithm 2 Balanced Variance Estimation Method

for b in 1 to B_n **do**
 Select subsample \mathcal{S}_b of size k_n from training set \mathcal{D} of size n .
 Build base learner and evaluate $h_{k_n}(\mathcal{S}_b)$
end for
for i in 1 to n **do**
 Calculate m_i as the average of $h_{k_n}(\mathcal{S}_b)$ where the i^{th} training sample appears in \mathcal{S}_b , weighted by the number of appearance.
end for
Compute the variance of m_i to estimate ζ_{1,k_n}
Compute the variance of all predictions to estimate ζ_{k_n,k_n}
Compute the mean of all predictions to obtain final ensemble prediction

To address these issues, we design the Balanced Variance Estimation Method (Algorithm 2) as an improvement to IM. In the following, we use h_b to represent $h_{k_n}(\mathcal{S}_b)$ if there is no ambiguity. Let $N_{i,b}$ denote the number of times i^{th} training sample appears in subsample \mathcal{S}_b . Taking sum over b gives $N_i = \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} N_{i,b}$ and the averaged version $\bar{N}_i = \frac{N_i}{B_n}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, define

$$m_i = \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \omega_{i,b} h_b$$

where $\omega_{i,b} = \frac{N_{i,b}}{N_i}$. Further define the average of m_i as $\bar{m} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$ and the overall average of h_b as $\bar{h} = \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} h_b$. The estimates for ζ_{1,k_n} and ζ_{k_n,k_n} could be written as:

$$\hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_i - \bar{m})^2,$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{k_n,k_n}^{\text{BM}} = \frac{1}{B_n-1} \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} (h_b - \bar{h})^2$$

Notice that BM can be viewed as a special case of IM, where $n_{\text{OUT}} = n$ and $n_{\text{IN}} = N_i$ varies depending on the occurrence of i^{th} training sample.

5.3 Infinitesimal Jackknife

The infinitesimal jackknife was first studied by [Jaeckel \(1972\)](#) as an extension for the jackknife to estimate variance. The basic idea of the jackknife is to omit one observation and recompute the estimate using the remaining samples. Alternatively, if we assign a weight to each observation, omitting one is equivalent to setting the corresponding weights to zero. More generally, we can give each observation a weight slightly less than one every time. IJ is the limiting case as this deficiency in the weight approaches zero. [Efron \(1982\)](#) provided a more detailed treatment of these resampling plans. More recently, IJ was found to be a powerful tool for estimating standard errors in bagging ([Efron, 2014](#)). [Wager et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Wager and Athey \(2018\)](#) applied IJ in the context of random forest.

In our setting, the infinitesimal jackknife estimate of variance can be expressed as:

$$\hat{V}_{\text{IJ}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(N_{i,b}, h_b)^2$$

where $\text{cov}(N_{i,b}, h_b) = \frac{\sum_{b=1}^{B_n} (N_{i,b} - \bar{N}_i)(h_b - \bar{h})}{B_n}$ and \bar{N}_i is defined in [Section 5.2](#).

IJ does not rely on an explicit expression of variance term and is targeted at estimating the limiting variance assuming B_n is large enough. That is, \hat{V}_{IJ} is essentially estimating $\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}$. A nice connection exists between BM and IJ, which we will show below.

Definition 5.1. Balanced Subsample Structure

We call a subsample structure is balanced if: $B_n \times k_n$ is a multiple of n , and each training sample appears exactly in $r_n = \frac{B_n \times k_n}{n}$ subsamples.

Theorem 6. *If we have balanced subsample structure, the Balanced Variance Estimation Method and the infinitesimal jackknife estimator satisfy*

$$\frac{k_n^2}{n} \hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} = \frac{n}{n-1} \hat{V}_{\text{IJ}}.$$

Remark. *The scaling factor $\frac{n}{n-1}$ is a result of how we calculate the empirical variance: if instead we define $\hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_i - \bar{m})^2$, then the two estimators are equal: $\frac{k_n^2}{n} \hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} = \hat{V}_{\text{IJ}}$.*

6 Bias Corrections for Variance Estimates

BM (and thus IJ) is shown to exhibit severe bias when the number of base learners B_n is not large enough. The bias mainly arises from an overestimate of ζ_{1,k_n} . We use an ANOVA-like estimation of variance components similar to [Sun et al. \(2011\)](#).

Following notation from Section 5.2, define

$$SS_\tau = \sum_{i=1}^n N_i (m_i - \bar{m})^2,$$

and

$$SS_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} N_{i,b} (h_b - m_i)^2.$$

Then a bias-corrected form is given as:

$$\hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n} = \frac{SS_\tau - (n-1)\hat{\sigma}_\epsilon^2}{C - \sum_{i=1}^n N_i^2 / C}$$

where $C = \sum_{i=1}^n N_i = B_n k_n$ and $\hat{\sigma}_\epsilon^2 = \frac{SS_\epsilon}{C-n}$.

As a special case for the *Balanced Subsample Structure*, we have $N_1 = N_2 = \dots = N_i = r_n$, then

$$\hat{\sigma}_\epsilon^2 = \frac{SS_\epsilon}{C-n} = \frac{1}{n(r_n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} N_{i,b} (h_b - m_i)^2,$$

and

$$\hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_i - \bar{m})^2 - \frac{1}{r_n} \hat{\sigma}_\epsilon^2.$$

We conducted a simple simulation to demonstrate the extent of bias in variance estimation and the effectiveness of our bias corrected estimator. Suppose $X \sim 20 \times \text{unif}(0, 1)$ and $Y = 2X + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. An ensemble model is built to predict Y from X , and we calculated the variance of prediction for test point $x = 10$. In our simulation, we fix the number of training data $n = 500$ and kernel size $k_n = 100$. The number of base learners B_n is varied among 100, 1000, 10000.

Figure 1 shows the result for U-statistics. That is, each tree is built using subsamples without replacement. Notice that although larger B_n indicates lower variance (see Equation 5), but the influence is almost negligible as the dominating part is $\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n}$ in our case. And for fair comparison, the variance shown in the figure is for $\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1,k_n} + \frac{1}{1000} \zeta_{k_n,k_n}$. Different values of B_n only have effect on the estimation for ζ_{1,k_n} and ζ_{k_n,k_n} .

We can easily observe that all three methods (IM, BM, IJ) badly over estimate the variance (notice the log scale on y-axis). However, BM and IJ are better than IM since they utilize more information. The plot also corroborates Theorem 6: BM and IJ are exactly the same up to a scaling factor.

In Figure 2 we show similar results under the framework of V-statistics. Here we no longer display IM since it's a systematically worse estimator, but include the bias corrected version (denoted by color blue). We can see that even with only 100 base learners, the bias corrected estimator still achieves relatively accurate estimation of variance. The bias corrected term may introduce some instability when B_n is very small, but for a moderate size B_n it has much lower bias compared to BM and IJ.

It is worth pointing out that this bias correction method does not work for U-statistics. We include a similar plot as Figure 3 in Appendix B under the framework of U-statistics. The blue box plot shows that the bias-corrected estimator over-corrects the variance. As the number of base learners B_n gets larger, the estimated values are close to the true variance as the bias correction term becomes negligible. This is a result of how we construct U-statistics: sampling without replacement. When sampling without replacement we restrict the possible sample overlap, resulting in a derail from empirical distribution. When drawing subsamples with replacement as in the case of V-statistics, we are essentially estimating ζ_{1,k_n} (13) by sampling from the empirical distribution.




Figure 2: Variance estimation by three different methods: bias corrected BM, BM and IJ under a simple setting: X is $20 \times \text{unif}(0, 1)$ and $Y = 2X + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The variance shown is for prediction at test point $x = 0.5$. Red line denotes true (log) variance. Model is built under the framework of V-statistics: each tree is constructed using subsamples *with* replacement.

In [Athey et al. \(2019\)](#), the authors developed a method called the bootstrap of little bags to estimate variance based on the work of [Sexton and Laake \(2009\)](#). They also encountered the challenge of negative variance when B_n is small. In their software, an improper uniform prior over $[0, \infty)$ was employed. We conjecture that the phenomenon also stems from the mechanism of sampling without replacement.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we theoretically analyze the asymptotics of supervised ensembles under the framework of V-statistics. It is shown that a central limit theorem can be established similar to the work in [Mentch and Hooker \(2016\)](#), [Wager and Athey \(2018\)](#) and [Peng et al. \(2019\)](#), which focus on the case of U-statistics.

We also observe that existing methods for estimating limiting variance exhibit severe bias and would require a prohibitively large number of base learners to achieve accurate results, hindering any practical applications such as constructing confidence intervals or conducting hypothesis tests. To this end, we propose a new method called Balanced Variance Estimation Method (BM), and carefully analyze its connection to other methods. In particular, we demonstrate an equivalence between BM and Infinitesimal Jackknife. Additionally, a bias correction method is developed which is shown to produce more accurate variance estimation with a moderate size of base learners.

The condition $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^2 \zeta_{1, k_n} > 0$ required in both [Theorem 3](#) and [5](#) does not appear in previous literature. However, we believe it is generally satisfied with many base learners including trees, see [Peng et al. \(2019\)](#) for an in-depth analysis for the behavior of ζ_{1, k_n} . We leave it as a future work to study the scenario when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^2 \zeta_{1, k_n} \rightarrow 0$.

From another theoretical point of view, the analysis we provide here is essentially a reduction to U-statistics. It might be interesting to see whether other approaches like Taylor expansion using differential method ([Serfling, 2009](#)) could be applied to attain similar results.

References

- Athey, S., Tibshirani, J., Wager, S., et al. (2019). Generalized random forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(2):1148–1178.
- Biau, G., Devroye, L., and Lugosi, G. (2008). Consistency of random forests and other averaging classifiers. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(Sep):2015–2033.
- Breiman, L. (1996). Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24(2):123–140.
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1):5–32.
- Cui, Y., Zhu, R., Zhou, M., and Kosorok, M. (2017). Some asymptotic results of survival tree and forest models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09631*.
- Efron, B. (1982). *The jackknife, the bootstrap, and other resampling plans*, volume 38. Siam.
- Efron, B. (1992). Jackknife-after-bootstrap standard errors and influence functions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 54(1):83–111.
- Efron, B. (2014). Estimation and accuracy after model selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(507):991–1007.
- Frees, E. W. (1989). Infinite order u-statistics. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 29–45.
- Goda, T. (2017). Computing the variance of a conditional expectation via non-nested monte carlo. *Operations Research Letters*, 45(1):63–67.
- Hájek, J. et al. (1968). Asymptotic normality of simple linear rank statistics under alternatives. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 39(2):325–346.
- Halmos, P. R. (1946). The theory of unbiased estimation. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 34–43.
- Hoeffding, W. (1948). A class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 293–325.
- Hoeffding, W. (1992). A class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution. In *Breakthroughs in Statistics*, pages 308–334. Springer.
- Ishwaran, H. and Kogalur, U. B. (2010). Consistency of random survival forests. *Statistics & probability letters*, 80(13-14):1056–1064.
- Jaeckel, L. A. (1972). *The infinitesimal jackknife*. Bell Telephone Laboratories.
- Lee, J. (1990). U-statistics: Theory and practice.
- Mentch, L. and Hooker, G. (2016). Quantifying uncertainty in random forests via confidence intervals and hypothesis tests. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):841–881.
- Peng, W., Coleman, T., and Mentch, L. (2019). Asymptotic distributions and rates of convergence for random forests and other resampled ensemble learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10651*.
- Rennie, B. C. and Dobson, A. J. (1969). On stirling numbers of the second kind. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 7(2):116–121.

- Scornet, E., Biau, G., Vert, J.-P., et al. (2015). Consistency of random forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(4):1716–1741.
- Sen, P. (1992). Introduction to hoeffding (1948) a class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution. In *Breakthroughs in statistics*, pages 299–307. Springer.
- Serfling, R. J. (2009). *Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*, volume 162. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sexton, J. and Laake, P. (2009). Standard errors for bagged and random forest estimators. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(3):801–811.
- Shieh, G. S. (1994). Infinite order v-statistics. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 20(1):75–80.
- Staum, J. (2009). Monte carlo computation in finance. In *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2008*, pages 19–42. Springer.
- Sun, Y., Apley, D. W., and Staum, J. (2011). Efficient nested simulation for estimating the variance of a conditional expectation. *Operations research*, 59(4):998–1007.
- von Mises, R. (1947). On the asymptotic distribution of differentiable statistical functions. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 18(3):309–348.
- Wager, S. and Athey, S. (2018). Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1228–1242.
- Wager, S., Hastie, T., and Efron, B. (2014). Confidence intervals for random forests: The jackknife and the infinitesimal jackknife. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1625–1651.
- Zhou, Y., Zhou, Z., and Hooker, G. (2018). Approximation trees: Statistical stability in model distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.07573*.
- Zhou, Z.-H. (2012). *Ensemble methods: foundations and algorithms*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Zouaoui, F. and Wilson, J. R. (2003). Accounting for parameter uncertainty in simulation input modeling. *Iie Transactions*, 35(9):781–792.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. By Slutsky's theorem, we only need to show $\frac{(V_{n,k_n} - U_{n,k_n})}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(U_{n,k_n})}} \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\sqrt{n}U_{n,k_n}) > 0$, it suffices to prove $\sqrt{n}(V_{n,k_n} - U_{n,k_n}) \xrightarrow{P} 0$. We seek to prove L^1 convergence, which implies convergence in probability. According to Lemma 1, V_{n,k_n} could be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n,k_n} &= \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} U_n^{(j)} \\ &= \frac{k_n! S_{k_n}^{(k_n)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} U_{n,k_n} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} U_n^{(j)} \\ &= \frac{n(n-1)\dots(n-k_n+1)}{n^{k_n}} U_{n,k_n} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} U_n^{(j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since both $U_n^{(j)}$ and $V_n^{(j)}$ could be bounded by a constant $C < \infty$ (which essentially is an integrability condition with respect to the underlying kernels), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\sqrt{n}(V_{n,k_n} - U_{n,k_n})| &= \sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}\left|\left(\frac{n(n-1)\dots(n-k_n+1)}{n^{k_n}} - 1\right)U_{n,k_n} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} U_n^{(j)}\right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}\left|\left(\frac{n(n-1)\dots(n-k_n+1)}{n^{k_n}} - 1\right)U_{n,k_n}\right| + \mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} U_n^{(j)}\right| \\ &\leq C\left(\left|\sqrt{n}\left(\frac{n(n-1)\dots(n-k_n+1)}{n^{k_n}} - 1\right)\right| + \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

First it's easy to see

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\frac{n(n-1)\dots(n-k_n+1)}{n^{k_n}} - 1\right) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$. An upper bound for $S_{k_n}^{(j)}$ is provided in [Rennie and Dobson \(1969\)](#):

$$S_{k_n}^{(j)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{k_n}{j} j^{k_n-j}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} &= \frac{j! \binom{n}{j} S_{k_n}^{(j)}}{n^j n^{k_n-j}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{j! \binom{n}{j} \binom{k_n}{j} j^{k_n-j}}{n^j n^{k_n-j}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{j! \binom{n}{j} k_n^{k_n-j} k_n^{k_n-j}}{n^j n^{k_n-j}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{j! \binom{n}{j} k_n^2}{n} k_n^{-j} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{k_n^2}{n}\right) k_n^{-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $a_n = \frac{k_n^2}{\sqrt{n}}$, and we know $a_n \rightarrow 0$. Taking the sum yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \frac{j! S_{k_n}^{(j)}(n)}{n^{k_n}} &\leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \left(\frac{k_n^2}{n}\right)^{k_n-j} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} \left(\frac{k_n^2}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{k_n-j} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k_n-1} a_n^{k_n-j} \\
&\leq \frac{a_n}{1-a_n} \\
&\rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We could conclude that $\mathbb{E}|\sqrt{n}(V_{n,k_n} - U_{n,k_n})| \rightarrow 0$. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3

Since $k_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^2 \zeta_{1,k_n} > 0$, the complete case follows directly from Theorem 2 and Theorem 1 in Peng et al. (2019). we will need the following lemma for the incomplete case.

Lemma 7. *Let a_1, a_2, \dots be a sequence of constants such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 = \sigma^2$ and let random variables M_1, \dots, M_n have a multinomial distribution, $\text{multinomial}(B_n; \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n})$. Then as $B_n, n \rightarrow \infty$, the limiting distribution of*

$$B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n})$$

is $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$.

Proof. The characteristic function of (M_1, \dots, M_n) is $(\frac{1}{n} e^{it_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{n} e^{it_n})^{B_n}$ since it's multinomial $(B_n; \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n})$. Thus the characteristic function of $B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(e^{it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n})}) &= e^{-it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{B_n}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i} \mathbb{E}(e^{it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i M_i}) \\
&= e^{-it \bar{a}_n B_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(\frac{1}{n} e^{it a_1 B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}} + \dots + \frac{1}{n} e^{it a_n B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^{B_n} \\
&= e^{-it \bar{a}_n B_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(\frac{1}{n} (n + it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i + \frac{1}{2} (it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}})^2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 + \dots) \right)^{B_n} \\
&= e^{-it \bar{a}_n B_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(1 + it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{a}_n + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n^2 (it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}})^2 + o(B_n^{-1}) \right)^{B_n}
\end{aligned}$$

where $a_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ and $\sigma_n^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$. Taking the logarithm gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathbb{E}(e^{it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n})}) &= -it \bar{a}_n B_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + B_n \log(1 + it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{a}_n + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n^2 (it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}})^2 + o(B_n^{-1})) \\
&= -it \bar{a}_n B_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + B_n (it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{a}_n + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_n^2 - \bar{a}_n^2) (it B_n^{-\frac{1}{2}})^2) + o(1) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} (\sigma_n^2 - \bar{a}_n^2) t^2 + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Since we assume that $\bar{a}_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sigma_n^2 \rightarrow \sigma^2$, the above quantity converges to $-\frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 t^2$, which is the logarithm of the characteristic function of $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. \square

Now we could prove the major part of Theorem 3.

Proof. Without loss of generality we will assume $\theta_{k_n} = 0$. Suppose $(M_1, \dots, M_{n^{k_n}})$ have a multinomial distribution, multinomial $(B_n; \frac{1}{n^{k_n}}, \dots, \frac{1}{n^{k_n}})$. We could rewrite V_{n, k_n, B_n} as:

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{n, k_n, B_n} &= \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_i h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n^{k_n}} M_i h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n^{k_n}} (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}} + \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}}) h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{B_n} (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}}) h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) + \frac{1}{n^{k_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n^{k_n}} h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{B_n} (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}}) h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) + V_{n, k_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

To show $\frac{V_{n, k_n, B_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, it is equivalent to prove:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{V_{n, k_n, B_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}})] = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2).$$

From the above decomposition of V_{n, k_n, B_n} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{V_{n, k_n, B_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}})] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{(\frac{1}{B_n} (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}}) h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) + V_{n, k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}})] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{(\frac{1}{B_n} (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}}) h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}) + V_{n, k_n})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}}) | Z_1, \dots, Z_n]] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{V_{n, k_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}}) \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{\frac{1}{B_n} (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}}) h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}}) | Z_1, \dots, Z_n]]
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{V_{n, k_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n}}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ any by Lemma 7,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{V_{n, k_n, B_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}})] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{V_{n, k_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}}) \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{\frac{1}{B_n} (M_i - \frac{B_n}{n^{k_n}}) h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}})}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}}) | Z_1, \dots, Z_n]] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\exp(it \frac{V_{n, k_n}}{\sqrt{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}}) \exp(-\frac{\frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}{2(\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n})} t^2)] \\
&= \exp(-\frac{\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n}}{2(\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n})} t^2) \exp(-\frac{\frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n}}{2(\frac{k_n^2}{n} \zeta_{1, k_n} + \frac{1}{B_n} \zeta_{k_n, k_n})} t^2) \\
&= \exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.3 Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. The assumption $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n^2 c_{1,k_n}^* > 0$ implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\sqrt{n}V_{n,k_n,B_n,\omega}^*) > 0$. We first show the complete case. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2 in [Mentch and Hooker \(2016\)](#), we have:

$$\mathbb{E}(V_{n,k_n,\omega} - V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*)^2 = \frac{1}{n^{k_n}} \mathbb{E}(h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega) - \mathbb{E}_\omega h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega))^2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(V_{n,k_n,\omega} - V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\sqrt{n}V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*)}} \right)^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \frac{n}{n^{k_n} \text{Var}(\sqrt{n}V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*)} \mathbb{E}(h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega) - \mathbb{E}_\omega h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega))^2 \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega) - \mathbb{E}_\omega h_{k_n}(Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_{k_n}}; \omega)) \neq \infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{n^{k_n}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\sqrt{n}V_{n,k_n,\omega}^*) > 0$.

The incomplete case follows exactly as in [Mentch and Hooker \(2016\)](#). \square

A.4 Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. In the case of *Balanced Subsample Structure* where $r_n = \frac{B_n \times k_n}{n}$, we have $\bar{m} = \bar{h}$ and $N_i = r_n$ for all i .

First we can rewrite $\hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_i - \bar{m})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \omega_{i,b} h_b - \bar{h} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \frac{N_{i,b}}{N_i} h_b - \bar{h} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{1}{r_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{b=1}^{B_n} N_{i,b} (h_b - \bar{h}) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then for $\hat{V}_{\text{IJ}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(N_{i,b}, h_b)^2$, we look at each individual term:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(N_{i,b}, h_b) &= \frac{\sum_{b=1}^{B_n} (N_{i,b} - \bar{N}_i)(h_b - \bar{h})}{B_n} \\ &= \frac{1}{B_n} \left(\sum_{b, x_i \in b} (N_{i,b} - \bar{N}_i)(h_b - \bar{b}) + \sum_{b, x_i \notin b} (N_{i,b} - \bar{N}_i)(h_b - \bar{b}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{B_n} \left(\sum_{b, x_i \in b} (N_{i,b} - \frac{k_n}{n})(h_b - \bar{b}) + \sum_{b, x_i \notin b} (0 - \frac{k_n}{n})(h_b - \bar{b}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{B_n} \left(\sum_{b, x_i \in b} N_{i,b}(h_b - \bar{b}) - \frac{k_n}{n} \sum_b (h_b - \bar{b}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_{b, x_i \in b} N_{i,b}(h_b - \bar{b}) \\ &= \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} N_{i,b}(h_b - \bar{b}) \end{aligned}$$

Combining two previous identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{V}_{IJ} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(N_{i,b}, h_b)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{B_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{b=1}^{B_n} N_{i,b} (h_b - \bar{b}) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{(n-1)r_n^2}{B_n^2} \hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} \\
&= (n-1) \frac{r_n^2}{B_n^2 k_n^2} k_n^2 \hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} \\
&= (n-1) \frac{k_n^2}{n^2} \hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}} \\
&= \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{k_n^2}{n} \hat{\zeta}_{1,k_n}^{\text{BM}}
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

B Bias Correction for U-statistics




Figure 3: Variance estimation by three different methods: bias corrected BM, BM and IJ under a simple setting: X is $20 \times \text{unif}(0, 1)$ and $Y = 2X + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The variance shown is for prediction at test point $x = 0.5$. The red line denotes true (log) variance. Model is built under the framework of U-statistics: each tree is constructed using subsamples *without* replacement.