

Information in additional observations of a non-parametric experiment that is not estimable

Tilo Wiklund

Abstract

Given n independent and identically distributed observations and measuring the value of obtaining an additional observation in terms of Le Cam's notion of deficiency between experiments, we show for certain types of non-parametric experiments that the value of an additional observation decreases at a rate of $1/\sqrt{n}$. This is distinct from the known typical decrease at a rate of $1/n$ for parametric experiments and the non-decreasing value in the case of very large experiments. In particular, the rate of $1/\sqrt{n}$ holds for the experiment given by observing samples from a density about which we know only that it is bounded from below by some fixed constant. Thus there exists an experiment where the value of additional observations tends to zero but for which no estimator that is consistent (in total variation distance) exists.

1. Introduction

Much of traditional statistics is concerned with studying the performance of statistical procedures or the difficulty of statistical decision problems as a function of the number of observed independent repetitions of some experiment. Considering only the repetition of the experiment, without reference to a particular decision problem, leads one to study the deficiency of Le Cam[4] between experiments differing only in the number of independent repetitions. Roughly speaking, this corresponds to measuring the difference in risks with respect to the decision problem that makes this difference the greatest. This is contrary to the more common issue of determining how difficult a particular decision problem is, for example by establishing minimax bounds on risk, or determining the performance of a particular decision procedure or sequence of decision procedures. Rather, we are interested in the 'totality' of information

in the experiment. The rate at which this information changes tells us something of the inherent complexity of the experiment as well as indicating at what point further repetitions of an experiment yield diminishing returns.

Fairly little appears to be known concerning the possible rates at which the value, in the above sense, of having one more observation changes. Helgeland[3] and Mammen[8] have shown that for experiments that are, in an appropriate sense, finite-dimensional, the value decreases at a rate of $1/n$, where n is the number of observations. The result of Mammen covers, in particular, finite-dimensional exponential families. It is also known that when the parameter set is finite, the value of additional observations decreases at an exponential rate[14].

On the other hand, it is not too difficult to construct experiments where this difference does not decrease at all. This means that for every n there is some question that was impossible to solve based on n observations that becomes trivial based on $n+1$ observations. Examples of such experiments include the experiment given by observing a completely unknown density on the unit interval or the experiment given by observing a uniformly chosen element from an unknown finite subset of a fixed infinite set.

The strategy used by both Helgeland and Mammen assumes the existence of a sufficiently good estimator of the underlying, unknown, probability measure from which samples are drawn. An upper bound on the deficiency is constructed from the fact that it is then difficult to tell the difference between receiving a genuine sequence of $n + 1$ independent observations as opposed to receiving $n + 1$ observations out of which n are genuine independent and one, in a random position, is a synthetic value sampled according to this *estimate* of the underlying distribution. If the estimator is sufficiently good, the bound decays on the order $1/n$. This bound was recently used by the author to study the information content that is lost when re-sampling[16].

We will here consider what happens if this strategy is applied using the trivial estimator that always estimates the underlying probability measure to be some single, fixed, measure. Under some circumstances, this turns out to be enough to get an upper bound of order $1/\sqrt{n}$. Interestingly, this is precisely the factor by which the technique of Helgeland and Mammen improves the bound compared to a previous result of Le Cam[5].

We prove also that the rate $1/\sqrt{n}$ appears as a lower bound on the deficiency for experiments defined by observing samples according to an unknown measure from a class of potential densities that is very large in a sense similar to the *rich* classes of Devroye & Lugosi[1, Section 15.3]. In Devroye & Lugosi these classes appear as examples for which no consistent estimator, in total variation distance, can exist. There is thus

a certain parallel to the technique used to establish the upper bound, where the technique requires the existence of a non-trivial estimator to establish a faster rate.

Taking the class of all densities on the unit interval bounded from below by $1/r$ for some $r > 1$ defines such an appropriately large class of densities. That is to say, there cannot exist a consistent estimator and our result gives a lower bound on the order of $1/\sqrt{n}$. The experiment is also within the purview of the result establishing our upper bound. For this experiment, the rate of decay is therefore on the order of $1/\sqrt{n}$.

To our knowledge, this is the first time a non-trivial rate other than $1/n$ has been established. Since we are dealing with, in some sense, the ‘total information’ in the experiment, one might have an intuition that a rate tending to zero should be linked to the existence of good estimator of the underlying measure. The above example contradicts this intuition, at least if good estimator is taken to mean an estimator consistent in total variation distance.

The structure of the paper is as follows. After settling on some notation in Section 2, the two main bounds and their application to the example experiment discussed above are given in Section 3. In Sections 4 and 5 the proofs of the upper (Theorem 1) and lower (Theorem 2) bounds, respectively, are given. Some technical proofs and results of an auxiliary nature are postponed until Section 6. Appendix A recalls some basic facts necessary to follow the proofs.

2. Notation and Terminology

This section outlines conventions for notation used throughout the paper. Basic facts and definitions concerning these objects, that we may use without mention, are collected in Appendix A.

Throughout, let $\mathbf{N} = \{1, \dots\}$, \mathbf{Z} , and \mathbf{R} denote the (positive) natural numbers, integers, and real numbers, respectively, with $\mathbf{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbf{R} \mid x \geq 0\}$ the non-negative real numbers. For any natural number $n \in \mathbf{N}$ we will let Δ_n denote the standard $(n - 1)$ -simplex given by $\Delta_n = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{R}_+^n \mid x_1 + \dots + x_n = 1\}$. For any $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $(p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \Delta_n$ we will have $\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ refer to the Poisson-binomial distribution, that is to say the law of $I_1 + \dots + I_n$ for I_1, \dots, I_n independent Bernoulli with $\mathbb{P}(I_i = 1) = p_i$. Moreover, $\text{Bin}(n, p) = \text{PBin}(p, \dots, p)$ for $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_n)$ for $(p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \Delta_n$ will denote, respectively, the Binomial and Multinomial distributions.

Given a probability measure P , we will use a slight abuse of notation by writing the distribution function $P((-\infty, x])$ as $\mathbb{P}(P \leq x)$ and $P((-\infty, x))$ as $\mathbb{P}(P < x)$. For example, $\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_k) < l)$ is the probability of

any random variable following the Poisson-binomial law with parameters p_1, \dots, p_k being strictly smaller than l . Similarly, we will use the notation $\mathbb{P}(P = l)$ and even $\mathbb{P}(P \in A)$ for the probabilities $P(\{l\})$ and $P(A)$, in case it aids readability. That is to say, we will, for example, write $\mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(n, p) = l)$ for the probability of a Binomially distributed quantity with parameters n and p being equal to l .

An experiment \mathcal{E} on sample space X , with parameter space Θ , and Θ -indexed family of measures $(P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ will be compactly written as $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$. The restriction of \mathcal{E} to some subset $\Theta' \subset \Theta$ is the experiment $(X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta')$.

Whenever we say that a measurable space $X = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ on sample space \mathcal{X} with σ -algebra \mathcal{A} is partitioned into (a measurable partition) X_1, \dots, X_n we mean that $X_i = (\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{A}_i)$ are (measurable) subspaces of X such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{X}_i = \mathcal{X}$.

When a measure μ is absolutely continuous with respect to another measure ν we write $\mu \ll \nu$. Writing $d\mu = f d\nu$ for some measurable f means f is a density (Radon-Nikodym derivative or likelihood ratio) of μ with respect to ν . The integral of some μ -integrable f is written $\int f d\mu = \int f(x) \mu(dx)$. λ will always denote the Lebesgue measure on the unit interval.

For any set A , let $\mathcal{D}(A) = (A, \mathcal{A})$ denote the measurable space with underlying set A and the discrete σ -algebra $\mathcal{A} = 2^A$, the set of all subsets of A . For a measurable space $X = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ we denote by $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the (measurable) space of probability measures on X . The space $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is contained in a normed space of signed measures with the norm given by the total variation norm. For $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ the distance $\|P - Q\|$ will always refer to the total variation distance.

Given a measurable $f: X \rightarrow Y$, for two measurable spaces X and Y , we denote by f^* the corresponding (push-forward) map on measures. In other words, $(f^*\mu)(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A))$. The fact that K is a Markov-kernel from X to Y is written as $K: X \rightarrow_k Y$. We will not notationally distinguish K as a kernel acting on X from K as a map acting on $\mathcal{P}(X)$.

Products and direct sums of spaces, maps, kernels, measures, or experiments are denoted by $\cdot \otimes \cdot$ and $\cdot \oplus \cdot$ or by $\bigotimes_{i \in I} \cdot$ and $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \cdot$ for I -indexed families of spaces (maps, kernels, measures, or experiments). By analogy, we write $\cdot^{\otimes n}$ for the n :fold product of \cdot . For reasons of readability, we will implicitly use the fact that for any spaces X, Y , and Z we have natural canonical (bimeasurable) isomorphisms $(X \otimes Y) \otimes Z \cong X \otimes (Y \otimes Z) \cong X \otimes Y \otimes Z$, where the lattermost is interpreted as a space of triplets. Any reader concerned by this may wish to interpret expressions of the type $X^{\otimes n} \otimes Y^{\otimes m} \otimes Z^{\otimes r}$ as a shorthand for the space of $(n + m + r)$ -tuples $X \otimes \dots \otimes X \otimes Y \otimes \dots \otimes Y \otimes Z \otimes \dots \otimes Z$,

and similarly for measures.

The mixture experiment (convex combination) of an I -indexed family of experiments $(\mathcal{E}_i)_{i \in I}$ with respect to convex coefficients (probability mass function) p over I is denoted $\sum_{i \in I} p_i \mathcal{E}_i$.

A decision (A, L) problem on Θ with action space A and loss function $L: A \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is said to be finite if A is finite, normalised if the range is contained in $[0, 1]$, and 0-1 if the range is contained in $\{0, 1\}$. Saying ρ is a decision procedure for (A, L) on observing $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ means ρ is a Markov kernel $X \rightarrow_k A$. The risk $R_{\mathcal{E}}(\rho, \theta) = \int L(a, \theta) \rho_x(da) P_\theta(dx)$ will be expressed in words as ‘the risk of ρ for (L, A) at $\theta \in \Theta$ on observing \mathcal{E} ’. The average (Bayes) risk with respect to some prior π on Θ is expressed as ‘the risk of ρ for (L, A) with respect to prior π on observing \mathcal{E} ’. Similarly, the minimum Bayes risk will be referred to as ‘the (minimum) Bayes risk of (L, A) with respect to prior π on observing \mathcal{E} ’ and any procedure that achieves this risk is ‘Bayes for (L, A) with respect to prior π on observing \mathcal{E} ’. Any of (L, A) , θ , π , or \mathcal{E} that are understood from context may be suppressed.

The deficiency of an experiment $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ with respect to another experiment \mathcal{F} on the same parameter space is denoted by $\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. If $\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ then \mathcal{E} is said to be more informative than \mathcal{F} . If also \mathcal{F} is more informative than \mathcal{E} , they are said to be equivalent, denoted by $\mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{F}$. A measurable map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that \mathcal{E} is equivalent to $\mathcal{F} = (Y, f^*(P_\theta); \theta \in \Theta)$ is said to be sufficient for \mathcal{E} .

3. Main results

Let \mathcal{E} be an experiment such that for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$ we have an n :fold repetition $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}$, the experiment given by independently repeating \mathcal{E} independently n times. Our quantity of interest is the *value of an additional observation of \mathcal{E} when one already has n* , formalised as $\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1})$, the deficiency between the n :fold and $(n+1)$:fold repetition of \mathcal{E} .

The main contribution of this paper is an upper and a lower bound for this quantity for non-parametric experiments defined by sets of densities that are very *rich* in a sense that will be made precise.

Our upper bound holds for experiments that are contained in a certain

type of ball around a central probability measure.

Definition 1 ($((C, s)$ -indistinguishably). *For $C \geq 1$, $s > 0$ and measurable space X , we will say that a probability measure Q on X is (C, s) -indistinguishable from another probability measure P on X if there exists a density g on X such that $dQ = g dP$ (a likelihood ratio) and for independent $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots \sim P$ we have an exponential concentration of the form*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n g(\xi_i) - n \right| > nt \right) \leq C e^{-snt^2}. \quad (1)$$

Taking $n = 1$ in Equation (1) means a necessary condition is that $g(\xi_i)$ have a sub-Gaussian distribution. Conversely, to establish Equation (1) one may apply an appropriate concentration inequality for sub-Gaussian random variables[15, Theorem 2.6.2]. To satisfy Equation (1) for some $C > 0$ and $s > 0$ the condition of sub-Gaussianity is therefore both necessary and sufficient. The definition is given in the above form in order to make the constants explicit in a conceptually and notationally convenient way. One way the condition may be satisfied for some $C > 0$ and $s > 0$ is for the likelihood ratio g to be essentially bounded.

Conversely, it is immediately not satisfied if there exists some measurable A such that $Q(A) > 0$ but $P(A) = 0$, since then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(g(\xi_1) > t) \neq 0$. It is therefore necessary that Q be absolutely continuous with respect to P . This can be refined a bit further. Observing that since, in Equation (1), g is the likelihood ratio dQ/dP and $\xi_1 \sim P$ we have for any convex f with $f(1) = 0$ that $\int f(g(x)) P(dx) = \mathbb{E}(f(g(\xi_i)))$ is the so called f -divergence $D_f(Q, P)$. Taking $f(x) = x \log(x)$ or $f(x) = (x - 1)^2$ yields, for example, the Kullback-Leibler and χ^2 -divergences (see for example [6, Section III]).

Taking $t = 0$ in Equation 1 we see that, necessarily, $C \geq 1$. For $n = 1$ and $t \geq \sqrt{\log(C)/s}$ the right hand side of Equation 1 can be interpreted as the survival function of a distribution with density $x \mapsto 2sx C e^{-sx^2}$. This can be interpreted as the distribution of $|g(\xi_1) - 1|$ being smaller than this distribution in (the usual) stochastic (dominance) order[12]. Taking $f(x) = (x - 1)^2$ this gives the following bound on the χ^2 -divergence:

$$D_f(Q, P) = \mathbb{E}(f(g(\xi_i))) = \mathbb{E}(|g(\xi_i) - 1|^2) \leq \int_{\sqrt{\frac{\log(C)}{s}}}^{\infty} x^2 2sx C e^{-sx^2} dx.$$

The right-hand side is easily bounded in terms of the third moment of a Normal distribution and depends only on C and s . Thus the collection of Q that are (C, s) -indistinguishable from P are contained in some χ^2 -ball with a radius controlled by C and s . Similar, though somewhat messier,

arguments can be made for other divergences, such as Hellinger distance or Kullback-Leibler divergence.

An experiment defined by measures that have a ‘central’ measure indistinguishable from all of them is, in some sense, not too large. Such experiments exhibit a decay in the amount of information in additional observations at a rate of at least $1/\sqrt{n}$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ be an experiment such that for some $C \geq 1$ and $s > 0$ there exists a probability measure Q on X such that for each $\theta \in \Theta$, Q is (C, s) -indistinguishable from P_θ . Then*

$$\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4s}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}}.$$

This statement is essentially an application of Lemma 1 of Helgeland[3] and analogous to their Corollary 1 or to Theorem 1 of Mammen[8], but for a class of non-parametric experiments. The proof is given in Section 4.

A corresponding lower bound holds for experiments that are non-parametric in the following sense. Observing ξ from the unknown, underlying measure P of the experiment gives information about P only locally around ξ . For parametric experiments, by contrast, knowing some local structure of P may well uniquely determine it. Making an analogy to Devroye & Lugosi[1] we say such families are *rich*.

Definition 2 ((m, α, β) -richness). *For $m \in \mathbf{N}$, $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, and a measurable space X we say that a family of probability measures $(P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ on X indexed by a set Θ is (m, α, β) -rich if: there exists a partition $\{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$ of X ; a convex coefficients $(p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \Delta_m$ such that $p_1, \dots, p_m \geq \beta/m$; and pairs of distinct probability measures $(Q_{1,0}, Q_{1,1}), \dots, (Q_{m,0}, Q_{m,1})$ supported on X_1, \dots, X_m , respectively, such that $\|Q_{j,0} - Q_{j,1}\| \geq \alpha$ and for every $(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \{0, 1\}^m$ there exists $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfying $P_\theta = p_1 Q_{1,i_1} + \dots + p_m Q_{m,i_m}$.*

A typical example of such a family is given in the proof of Corollary 1 and can be seen in Figure 1. The choice of α representing the total variation distance is for concreteness. It holds more generally if replaced by $\min(p, 1-p) - r$ where $p \in (0, 1)$ and r is the Bayes risk of testing under a prior probability putting mass p on $Q_{j,0}$ and $1-p$ on $Q_{j,1}$. As given here the definition is the special case where $p = 1-p = 1/2$.

Taking $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ typical parametric families $(P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ will be (m, α, β) -rich only for $m = 1$. Consider for example, $\Theta = \mathbf{R}$ with $P_\theta = N(\theta, 1)$ the standard Gaussian shift family. Each P_θ is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure, meaning a set is a null set with respect to some P_θ if and only if it has Lebesgue measure zero. Let A be some measurable

set of positive Lebesgue measure. If $P_\theta(B) = P_{\theta'}(B)$ for each measurable $B \subset A$, then $\theta = \theta'$. That is to say, θ is uniquely determined by knowing P_θ restricted to any subspace of positive Lebesgue measure. This is most easily seen by the fact that the standard, continuous, Gaussian density is uniquely determined by knowing its value at three points and that the measure P_θ restricted to the subspace A has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure that is essentially equal on A to exactly one such continuous density.

Assume the family $(P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ were (m, α, β) -rich for some $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. The property is hereditary in the sense that if it holds for $m > 1$ it holds also for $m - 1$. If $m \geq 2$ there would therefore exist some partition X_1, X_2 of \mathbf{R} where both X_1 and X_2 have positive measure. Since P_θ restricted to X_1 determines it on X_2 there cannot exist measures $Q_{1,0}, Q_{1,1}, Q_{2,0}, Q_{2,1}$ such that for some $p \in (0, 1)$ both $pQ_{1,0} + (1-p)Q_{2,0}$ and $pQ_{1,1} + (1-p)Q_{2,1}$ are Gaussian. The family cannot therefore be (m, α, β) -rich for $m > 1$.

Indeed, having a certain degree of richness is sufficient to get a lower bound on the value of additional observations.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ be an experiment such that for some $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $\alpha > 0$, and $\beta > 0$ the family $(P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is $(2n, \alpha, \beta)$ -rich, then*

$$\frac{\alpha\beta}{12\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \leq \delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}).$$

This result is somewhat comparable to Proposition 2 of Helgeland[3] and Theorem 2 of Mammen[8], both of which concern experiments that are finite-dimensional in an appropriate sense. The proof is given in Section 5.

In particular, if for some $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ a family is (m, α, β) -rich for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$ then the value of additional observations from the corresponding experiment decreases at a rate of $1/\sqrt{n}$.

To construct an example of such an experiment, let X be the unit interval and consider the experiment

$$\mathcal{E} = (X, P_f; f \in \Theta) \quad \Theta = \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid 1/r \leq f, \lambda(f) = 1\} \quad (2)$$

for some $r > 1$ and where $dP_f = f d\lambda$. The choice of the unit interval with Lebesgue/uniform dominating measure is mostly for concreteness.

The experiment in Equation (2) is interesting, on the one hand, for being an experiment for which $\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1})$ will turn out to decay at a non-trivial rate other than the parametric one of $1/n$. On the other hand, it is interesting also because it is impossible to consistently estimate P_f in total variation distance (see Theorem 15.1 and succeeding remarks in

Devroye[1]). In other words, one is in some sense exhausting information, but doing so without being able to precisely determine the underlying distribution. Note that these statements are not in contradiction, since the deficiency distance takes into account only finite decision problems.

For the experiment described in Equation 2 we may use Theorems 1 and 2 to identify the rate at which the value of having one additional observation decays.

Corollary 1. *For the experiment \mathcal{E} in Equation (2) we have*

$$c \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \leq \delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}},$$

where $c = \frac{1-1/r}{12\sqrt{2}}$ and $C = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}r < 1.3r$.

Proof. To get the upper bound, apply Theorem 1 with $Q = \lambda$ the uniform (Lebesgue) measure on $[0, 1]$. By Hoeffding's inequality for bounded distributions we know that λ is $(2, 2/r^2)$ -indistinguishable from P_f for each $f \in \Theta$. Thus, by Theorem 1, we know $\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}r \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}}$.

In order to establish the lower bound using Theorem 2, we prove that the family $(P_f)_{f \in \Theta}$ is $(m, 1 - 1/r, 1)$ -rich for every $m \in \mathbf{N}$.

Take the partition given by the regular mesh X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}, X_m with underlying sets $[0, 1/m), \dots, [1 - 2/m, 1 - 1/m), [1 - 1/m, 1]$, uniform convex coefficients $p_1 = 1/m, \dots, p_m = 1/m$, and pairs of distributions $(Q_{1,0}, Q_{1,1}), \dots, (Q_{m,0}, Q_{m,1})$ specified by $dQ_{i,j} = g_{i,j}d\lambda$ for $g_{i,0}(x) = mg_0((i-1+x)/m)$ and $g_{i,1} = mg_1((i-1+x)/m)$ where

$$g_0(x) = \begin{cases} 1/r & x \leq 1/2 \\ 2 - 1/r & x > 1/2 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad g_1(x) = \begin{cases} 2 - 1/r & x \leq 1/2 \\ 1/r & x > 1/2 \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

For any $(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \{0, 1\}^m$ consider

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} g_{i_1}(x/m) & x \in X_1 \\ \vdots & \\ g_{i_m}((m-1+x)/m) & x \in X_m \end{cases},$$

such that we have $P_f = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j P_{j,i_j} = f d\lambda$. The densities are illustrated in Figure 1.

Since $f \in \Theta$ it remains only to realise that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ the total variation distance between $Q_{j,0}$ and $Q_{j,1}$ is $1 - 1/r$. \square

Note that the assumption that all densities are bounded away from 0 by some constant is fairly common. It appears, for example, in the classical result of Nussbaum[11] on the asymptotic equivalence to a white noise model when observing an unknown density from a certain smoothness class.




Figure 1: Plots of f in the proof of Corollary 1 differing only on i_2

4. Proof of upper bound (Theorem 1)

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 1, for which we use a technique due to Helgeland[3]. The main idea is to emulate $n + 1$ independent observations based on n independent observations by injecting, in a random position, a new, randomised, value. In Helgeland's proof the value is sampled from an estimate of the underlying distribution, based on the n truly independent and identically distributed observations. In our proof this estimated distribution will be replaced by a single, fixed distribution. To improve readability, we repeat the relevant parts from the proof of Helgeland's Lemma 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $C \geq 1$, $s > 0$, $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ and Q be as in the statement, such that $dQ = g_\theta P_\theta$ for a family of densities $(g_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$. By assumption these satisfy that for each $\theta \in \Theta$ and for $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots \sim P_\theta$ that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n g_\theta(\xi_i) - n \right| > nt \right) \leq C e^{-snt^2}.$$

Recall that the standard technique for bounding deficiencies from above follows from the fact that for any Markov-kernel $K : X^{\otimes n} \rightarrow_k X^{\otimes n+1}$ we have

$$\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) \leq \sup_{\theta} \|K P_\theta^{\otimes n} - P_\theta^{\otimes n+1}\|.$$

This is either immediate from the definition (for example in Le Cam[4, Definition 2.3.1]) or a Theorem (for example in Torgersen[13, Theorem 6.2.4]). Take as K a kernel that injects, in a random position, an additional randomised observation from Q . The idea is illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Illustration of kernel K in proof of Theorem 1

Formally for each $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^{\otimes n}$ define K by

$$K_x(A) = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \int \mathbf{1}_A(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y, x_i, \dots, x_n) Q(dy),$$

such that In particular,

$$KP_{\theta}^{\otimes n} = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} P_{\theta}^{\otimes i-1} \otimes Q \otimes P_{\theta}^{\otimes n-i+1}.$$

Using this kernel, bounding the deficiency turns into a question of controlling the absolute deviation of an average.

Fix some $\theta \in \Theta$ and let $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n+1} \sim P_{\theta}$ be independent. Rewriting the total variation distance between $KP_{\theta}^{\otimes n}$ and $P_{\theta}^{\otimes n+1}$ in terms of the L^1 -distance between their densities with respect to $P_{\theta}^{\otimes n+1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2\|KP_{\theta}^{\otimes n} - P_{\theta}^{\otimes n+1}\| &= 2\left\|\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} P_{\theta}^{\otimes i-1} \otimes Q \otimes P_{\theta}^{\otimes n-i+1} - P_{\theta}^{\otimes n+1}\right\| \\ &= \int \left|\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} g_{\theta}(x_i) - 1\right| P_{\theta}^{\otimes n+1}(dx) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} g_{\theta}(\xi_i) - 1\right|\right). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $g_{\theta}(\xi_1), \dots, g_{\theta}(\xi_{n+1})$ are independent and identically distributed. Moreover, g_{θ} is the density of Q with respect to P_{θ} so that $\mathbb{E}(g_{\theta}(\xi_i)) = 1$. We are thus reduced to bounding the mean absolute deviation of the average $\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} g_{\theta}(\xi_i)$ from its mean 1. Such a bound follows immediately from the assumption that Q is (C, s) -indistinguishable

from P_θ since then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}g_\theta(\xi_i)-1\right|\right) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}g_\theta(\xi_i)-1\right|>t\right)dt \\ &\leq C\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{(n+1)s}}\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^\infty\frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{(n+1)s}}}e^{-(n+1)st^2}dt \\ &= C\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4(n+1)s}},\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is exactly the concentration inequality in the definition of Q being (C, s) -indistinguishable from P_θ . Combining the above two inequalities, we get

$$\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) \leq \sup_\theta C\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4(n+1)s}} = C\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4s}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}}. \quad \square$$

With the method used here it would be impossible to establish a faster rate of decay with respect to n . This follows from a result by Mattner[9] which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}g_\theta(\xi_i)-1\right|\right) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(n+1)}}\mathbb{E}(|g_\theta(\xi_1)-1|).$$

In other words, the absolute mean deviation can, if finite, not decay more quickly than at a rate of $1/\sqrt{n}$.

5. Proof of lower bound (Theorem 2)

Establishing the lower bound in Theorem 2 is a bit more involved than was the case for the upper bound. The proof may be found at the end of this section. For clarity and readability, the proofs of some intermediate lemmas and technical results are postponed until Section 6.

Similarly, to certain techniques for establishing minimax bounds we will rely on the existence of appropriate hypercubes of parameters. These hypercubes will yield multiple testing problems that become significantly easier with additional observations and thus give a lower bound on the deficiency of interest.

These multiple testing problems can be thought of as consisting of many local hypotheses about the underlying distribution. An additional observation will allow one to make an informed guess about the shape of the underlying distribution in an additional small region of the sample space. The idea is illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Illustration of the proof of Theorem 2, observing x_{n+1} typically makes it viable to estimate the density in one additional cell of a partition X_1, \dots, X_m of the sample space X .

The relevant notion of locality is captured by re-parameterising the experiment in an appropriate way, as described by the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ be an experiment on a space X , and for some $m \in \mathbf{N}$ let $\{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$ be a partition of X such that for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\theta \in \Theta$ one has $P_\theta(X_i) > 0$. Also define for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\theta \in \Theta$*

$$P_{i,\theta}(A) = P_\theta(A \mid X_i) \quad \Theta_i = \{P_{i,\theta} \mid \theta \in \Theta\}$$

as well as $\psi: \Theta \rightarrow \Delta_m \times \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_m$ by

$$\psi(\theta) = ((P_\theta(X_1), \dots, P_\theta(X_m)), P_{1,\theta}, \dots, P_{m,\theta})$$

and let $\Psi = \psi(\Theta)$. Then the experiment

$$\mathcal{F} = \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^m X_i, \bigoplus_{i=1}^m p_i P_i; ((p_1, \dots, p_m), P_1, \dots, P_m) \in \Psi \right) \quad (4)$$

is such that for any pair $n, n' \in \mathbf{N}$ one has

$$\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n'}) = \delta(\mathcal{F}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{F}^{\otimes n'}).$$

The proof is theoretically trivial but in practice somewhat technical and can be found in Section 6. One may think of the new parameterisation in terms of $\Psi \subset \Delta_m \times \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_m$ specified by ψ as essentially nothing but the law of total probability. It makes explicit how each P_θ decomposes

into the coarse structure given by $(P_\theta(X_1), \dots, P_\theta(X_m)) \in \Delta_m$ and the local pieces $P_{\theta_1}, \dots, P_{\theta_m}$ within each cell X_1, \dots, X_m of the partition.

In particular, if $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \Delta_m$ is fixed the experiment in Equation (4) is a mixture $\mathcal{F} = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \mathcal{F}_i$ where $\mathcal{F}_i = (X_i, P_{i,\theta_i}; (\dots, \theta_i, \dots) \in \Psi)$ depends only on θ_i . For such a mixture \mathcal{F} , receiving a number of observations can be thought of as observing a randomised smaller number of observations for each one of $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_m$. This notion is formalised by the following lemma, which is nothing but a multinomial theorem for experiments.

Lemma 2. *For $n, m \in \mathbf{N}$ let*

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = (X_1, P_{1,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta), \dots, \mathcal{E}_m = (X_m, P_{m,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta)$$

be experiments on the same parameter space Θ , $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \Delta_m$, and denote $q(n_1, \dots, n_m) = \mathbb{P}(\text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_m) = (n_1, \dots, n_m))$. Then

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \mathcal{E}_i \right)^{\otimes n} \cong \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_m} q(n_1, \dots, n_m) \mathcal{E}_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{E}_m^{\otimes n_m}.$$

The proof is uninteresting but requires a bit of bookkeeping, and is therefore postponed until Section 6.

For such experiments we may derive a lower bound in terms of the difficulty of testing problems in the individual experiments.

Lemma 3. *Fix some $m \in \mathbf{N}$, parameter space $\Theta \subset \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_m$, a sequence of experiments*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1 &= (X_1, P_{1,\theta_1}; (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m) \in \Theta), \\ &\vdots \\ \mathcal{E}_m &= (X_m, P_{m,\theta_m}; (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m) \in \Theta), \end{aligned}$$

where each family $(P_{j,\theta_j})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ depends only on θ_j , and there exist pairs $\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{1,1} \in \Theta_1, \dots, \theta_{m,0}, \theta_{m,1} \in \Theta_m$ such that $\{\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{1,1}\} \times \dots \times \{\theta_{m,0}, \theta_{m,1}\} \subset \Theta$. For $q, q': \mathbf{N}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$ two probability mass functions on \mathbf{N}^m define experiments

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_m} q(n_1, \dots, n_m) \mathcal{E}_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{E}_m^{\otimes n_m}, \\ \mathcal{E}' &= \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_m} q'(n_1, \dots, n_m) \mathcal{E}_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{E}_m^{\otimes n_m}. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing some priors π_1, \dots, π_m supported on the pairs of parameters $\{\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{1,1}\}, \dots, \{\theta_{m,0}, \theta_{m,1}\}$ let $r_i(n)$ denote the minimum Bayes risks of testing $P_{i,\theta_{i,0}}^{\otimes n}$ against $P_{i,\theta_{i,1}}^{\otimes n}$ with respect to π_i .

If (N_1, \dots, N_m) and (N'_1, \dots, N'_m) are distributed according to q and q' , respectively, it then holds for any $l = 1, \dots, m$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}') &\geq \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(N_1), \dots, r_m(N_m)) \geq l)\right) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(N'_1), \dots, r_m(N'_m)) \geq l)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Due to its relative length, the proof is found in Section 6. Conceptually, it captures exactly what was illustrated in Figure 3, with each parameter $r_i(N_i)$ corresponding to the probability of making an incorrect decision about the underlying distribution within the cell X_i of a partition $\{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$ of the sample space X . If q' describes a distribution that is in some sense larger than the one described by q then N'_i will tend to be greater than N_i and the risk $r_i(N'_i)$ will tend to be smaller.

In our case, controlling the right-hand side in Equation 5 will boil down to proving that such mixtures of Poisson-Binomial distributions are concentrated enough for there to exist outcomes with probabilities at least on the order of $1/\sqrt{m}$. For this, we need the following two simple properties.

Lemma 4. *Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $p_1, \dots, p_i, p'_i, \dots, p_{n+1} \in [0, 1]$ where $p_i > p'_i$. Then for any $l = 1, \dots, n$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_i, \dots, p_{n+1}) \geq l) - \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p'_i, \dots, p_{n+1}) \geq l) = \\ = \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{n+1}) = (l-1))(p_i - p'_i). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is a simple calculation and can be found in Section 6.

Lemma 5. *For any $m \in \mathbf{N}$, $n > 0$, $(p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \Delta_m$, and any sequence of (all non-decreasing or all non-increasing) monotone functions $f_1, \dots, f_m : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ there exists a $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ such that for $(N_1, \dots, N_m) \sim \text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_m)$ one has*

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(f_1(N_1), \dots, f_m(N_m)) = k)) \geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{m}}.$$

Also this proof can be found in Section 6. We now have all the pieces necessary to prove our lower bound.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $\alpha > 0$, and $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ be as in the statement. By assumption there exists a partition X_1, \dots, X_{2n} of X ; $p = (p_1, \dots, p_{2n}) \in \Delta_{2n}$ with $p_1, \dots, p_{2n} > \beta/(2n)$; and probability measures $(Q_{1,0}, Q_{1,1}), \dots, (Q_{2n,0}, Q_{2n,1})$ supported on X_1, \dots, X_{2n} such that the total variation distances $\|Q_{1,0} - Q_{1,1}\|, \dots, \|Q_{2n,0} - Q_{2n,1}\|$ are

all at least α . Moreover, for each $(i_1, \dots, i_{2n}) \in \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ there exists a $\theta \in \Theta$ such that $P_\theta = p_1 Q_{1,i_1} + \dots + p_{2n} Q_{2n,i_{2n}}$.

By Lemma 1 we have $\delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) = \delta(\mathcal{F}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{F}^{\otimes n+1})$, where \mathcal{F} is as in Equation 4 with respect to the partition X_1, \dots, X_{2n} . Let \mathcal{F}_p be the restriction of \mathcal{F} to $\Psi' = \{(p', P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \Psi \mid p' = p\} \subset \Psi$. Since \mathcal{F}_p is a restriction of \mathcal{F} it follows that $\delta(\mathcal{F}_p^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{F}_p^{\otimes n+1}) \leq \delta(\mathcal{F}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{F}^{\otimes n+1})$.

By definition $\mathcal{F}_p = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} p_i \mathcal{F}_{p,i}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{p,1} &= (X_1, P_1; (p, P_1, \dots, P_{2n}) \in \Psi') \\ &\vdots \\ \mathcal{F}_{p,2n} &= (X_{2n}, P_{2n}; (p, P_1, \dots, P_{2n}) \in \Psi'). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2 this implies $\delta(\mathcal{F}_p^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{F}_p^{\otimes n}) = \delta(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}')$ where for

$$\begin{aligned} q(n_1, \dots, n_{2n}) &= \mathbb{P}(\text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_{2n}) = (n_1, \dots, n_{2n})), \\ q'(n_1, \dots, n_{2n}) &= \mathbb{P}(\text{Mult}(n+1, p_1, \dots, p_{2n}) = (n_1, \dots, n_{2n})), \end{aligned}$$

\mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}' are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} &= \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_{2n}} q(n_1, \dots, n_{2n}) \mathcal{F}_{p,1}^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{F}_{p,2n}^{\otimes n_{2n}}, \\ \mathcal{G}' &= \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_{2n}} q'(n_1, \dots, n_{2n}) \mathcal{F}_{p,1}^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{F}_{p,2n}^{\otimes n_{2n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally Lemma 3 lets us reduce the problem to one of basic probability. Let $r_1, \dots, r_n: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the Bayes risks as in Lemma 3 with respect to uniform priors. By assumption $2r_i(1) = 1 - \|P_{i,\theta_i} - P_{i,\theta'_i}\|$. Lemma 3 lets us conclude that for any $l = 0, \dots, 2n-1$, $N = (N_1, \dots, N_{2n}) \sim \text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_{2n})$, and $N' = (N'_1, \dots, N'_{2n}) \sim \text{Mult}(n+1, p_1, \dots, p_{2n})$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) &\geq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(N_1), \dots, r_{2n}(N_{2n})) \geq l+1)) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(N'_1), \dots, r_{2n}(N'_{2n})) \geq l+1))). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Let $I = (I_1, \dots, I_{2n}) \sim \text{Mult}(1, p_1, \dots, p_{2n})$ be independent of N and introduce the notations $R_i = r_i(N_i)$ and $R'_i = r_i(N_i + 1)$. The random vector $(N_1 + I_1, \dots, N_{2n} + I_{2n})$ has the same distribution as N' , so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(N'_1), \dots, r_{2n}(N'_{2n})) \geq l+1)) &= \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(N_1 + I_1), \dots, r_{2n}(N_{2n} + I_{2n})) \geq l+1)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2n} p_i \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, R'_i, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) \geq l+1)). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above into Equation 6 and using Lemma 4 gives a lower bound of

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2n} p_i \mathbb{E}((R_i - R'_i) \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) = l)).$$

Let $Z = \{i \in \{1, \dots, 2n\} \mid N_i = 0\}$ be the (random) set of indices of zeros in (N_1, \dots, N_{2n}) . By assumption of the family being rich one has for each $i = 1, \dots, 2n$ that $r_i(0) - r_i(1) \geq \alpha/2$ and $p_i > \beta/2n$. In particular, for $i \in Z$ one has $R_i = 1/2$ and $R_i - R'_i \geq \alpha/2$. Using these inequalities, moving the sum inside the expectation, and truncating the sum to indices in Z gives the following lower bound for $l = 0, \dots, 2n - 1$

$$\frac{\alpha\beta}{4n} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in Z} \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) = l) \right). \quad (7)$$

Note that for $l \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, 1/2, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) = l) &= \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) = l)/2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) = l - 1)/2. \end{aligned}$$

Using this and taking the average of the lower bound in Equation 7 with l as well as with l replaced by $l - 1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n+1}) &\geq \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha\beta}{4n} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in Z} \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, 1/2, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) = l) \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha\beta}{4n} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in Z} \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{i-1}, R_i, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{2n}) = l) \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha\beta}{4n} \mathbb{E}(|Z| \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{2n}) = l)) \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha\beta}{4} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(R_1, \dots, R_{2n}) = l)) \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality is due to the fact that $N_1 + \dots + N_{2n} = n$ implies that at least n out of N_1, \dots, N_{2n} must be 0. The statement now follows by Lemma 5 since the risks $r_1(n_1), \dots, r_m(n_m)$ are non-increasing in the number of observations n_1, \dots, n_m . \square

6. Remaining proofs

The following lemma formalises the notion that deficiency is invariant under (bijective) reparameterisation or relabelling of the underlying

measurable space. The implicit notion of isomorphism in the lemma is similar to the one used by McCullagh[10], but does not require, in their language, a common response scale as well as leaving implicit the category of statistical units and designs.

Lemma 6. *Let $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$, $\mathcal{E}' = (X', P'_\psi; \psi \in \Psi)$, $\mathcal{F} = (Y, Q_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$, and $\mathcal{F}' = (Y', Q'_\psi; \psi \in \Psi)$ be four experiments such that there exist a bijection $\alpha: \Psi \rightarrow \Theta$ and bimeasurable bijections $\beta_X: X \rightarrow X'$ and $\beta_Y: Y \rightarrow Y'$ making the following squares commute*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Theta & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \Psi \\ \downarrow P & & \downarrow P' \\ \mathcal{P}(X) & \xrightarrow{\beta_X^*} & \mathcal{P}(X') \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \Theta & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \Psi \\ \downarrow Q & & \downarrow Q' \\ \mathcal{P}(Y) & \xrightarrow{\beta_Y^*} & \mathcal{P}(Y'), \end{array}$$

where P , P' , Q , and Q' are used to denote that maps $\theta \mapsto P_\theta$, $\theta \mapsto P'_\theta$, $\theta \mapsto Q_\theta$, and $\theta \mapsto Q'_\theta$, respectively.

It then follows that $\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = \delta(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$.

Proof. Using the characterisation of deficiency in terms of transitions[13, Theorem 6.4.5] one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}') &= \min_T \sup_{\psi} \|TP'_\psi - Q'_\psi\| \\ &= \min_T \sup_{\theta} \|TP'_{\alpha(\theta)} - Q'_{\alpha(\theta)}\| \\ &= \min_T \sup_{\theta} \|T(\beta_X^* P_\theta) - \beta_Y^* Q_\theta\| \\ &= \min_T \sup_{\theta} \|((\beta_Y^* \circ (\beta_Y^*)^{-1} \circ T \circ \beta_X^*)(P_\theta) - \beta_Y^* Q_\theta\| \quad (8) \\ &= \min_T \sup_{\theta} \|((\beta_Y^*)^{-1} \circ T \circ \beta_X^*)(P_\theta) - Q_\theta\| \\ &= \min_{\substack{S \\ S}} \sup_{\theta} \|SP_\theta - Q_\theta\| \\ &= \delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}), \end{aligned}$$

where S and T range over the collections of transitions between the L -spaces of \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} (see Torgersen[Sections 4.5 and 5.6][13]). Readers not familiar with the general machinery of L -spaces can rest assured as, for our purposes, we need the statement only for experiments \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} sufficiently regular for the above computation to hold with T and S taken as Markov kernels (see the remark after Theorem 6.4.1 in Torgersen[13]).

The second equality in Equation 8 follows by α being a bijection, the third is commutativity of the diagrams, the fourth equality follows from the fact that for any μ and ν one has $\|\beta_Y^* \mu - \beta_Y^* \nu\| = \|\mu - \nu\|$ because β_Y is a bimeasurable bijection, and the fifth equality follows because we

claim that $T \mapsto (\beta_Y^*)^{-1} \circ T \circ \beta_X^*$ define bijections (of appropriate sets of L -space transitions or Markov-kernels) with inverses $S \mapsto \beta_Y^* \circ S \circ (\beta_X^*)^{-1}$. That these maps are inverse follows directly from the functoriality of the assignment $\beta \mapsto \beta^*$. It remains to see that they map L -space transitions to L -space transitions and/or maps induced by Markov kernels to maps induced by Markov kernels.

For the former we will prove that β_X^* maps the L -space of \mathcal{E} into the L -space of \mathcal{E}' . The same argument will prove the analogous statement for $(\beta_Y^*)^{-1}$. Together they imply the statement. Since the L -spaces are simply spaces of measures, this is well defined even though \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' have different parameter spaces. For any family $(a_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ such that $a_\theta \neq 0$ only on a countable sequence $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$ we need to show that if some $\mu \ll \sum_\theta a_\theta P_\theta$ then $f_X^*(\mu) \ll \sum_\psi b_\psi P'_\psi$ for some $(b_\psi)_{\psi \in \Psi}$ that is non-zero on at most a countable set. Since β_X^* preserves probability measures, it is bounded and therefore continuous. Letting $b_\psi = a_{\alpha^{-1}(\psi)}$ we have

$$\beta_X^*\left(\sum_\theta a_\theta P_\theta\right) = \sum_\theta a_\theta \beta_X^*(P_\theta) = \sum_\theta a_\theta P'_{\alpha(\theta)} = \sum_\theta a_\theta P'_{\alpha(\theta)} = \sum_\psi b_\psi P'_\psi.$$

But it is immediate from the definition of β_X^* that $\beta_X^*(\mu) \ll \beta_X^*(\sum_\theta a_\theta P_\theta)$, so the result follows.

In case one wishes to restrict to the case of Markov kernels we note that if $T(P)(A) = \int K_x(A) P(dx)$ for some Markov kernel K then

$$\begin{aligned} ((\beta_Y^*)^{-1} \circ T \circ \beta_X^*)(P)(A) &= (T(\beta_X^*(P)))(\beta_Y(A)) \\ &= \int K_x(\beta_Y(A)) \beta_X^*(P)(dx) \\ &= \int K_{\beta_X^{-1}(x)}(\beta_Y(A)) P(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Finally $(x, A) \mapsto K_{\beta_X^{-1}(x)}(\beta_Y(A))$ is measurable in x for each fixed A because β_X^{-1} is (bi)measurable and a Probability measure for each fixed x because β_Y is a (bi)measurable bijection. \square

Proof of Lemma 1. By Lemma 6 it suffices to produce for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$ a bimeasurable bijection $\beta = \beta_n: X^{\otimes n} \rightarrow (X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_k)^{\otimes n}$ such that $\beta_n^*(P_\theta^{\otimes n}) = P_{\vartheta(\theta)}^{\otimes n}$ where $P_{\vartheta(\theta)} = \sum_{i=1}^k P_\theta(X_i) P_{i,\theta}$. It is sufficient to do this for $n = 1$, the general case follows by applying the transformation to each component.

Define $\beta: X \rightarrow X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_k$ by, for each $i = 1, \dots, k$, $\beta(x) = \iota_i(x)$ when $x \in X_i$ where ι_i is the natural injection $X_i \rightarrow X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_k$. Measurability of β follows from ι_1, \dots, ι_k being measurable and X_1, \dots, X_k forming a measurable partition of X . Since ι_1, \dots, ι_k are injective and $\iota_1(X_1), \dots, \iota_k(X_k)$ are disjoint it follows that β is injective.

Since $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \iota_n(X_n) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k X_n$ it follows that β is surjective, and hence bijective.

For the inverse β^{-1} to be measurable we need that $\beta(A)$ be measurable for each measurable A . By definition $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^k (A \cap \iota_n(X_n))$ is measurable if and only if $A \cap \iota_1(X_1) = \iota_1(A_1), \dots, A \cap \iota_k(X_k) = \iota_k(A_k)$ for some measurable A_1, \dots, A_k . But then $\beta(A) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \beta(\iota_n(A_n)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_n$ which is measurable since A_1, \dots, A_k are all measurable.

It remains to prove that $\beta^*(P_\theta) = P_{\vartheta(\theta)}$. To be equal it is sufficient that they agree on $\iota_i(A)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and A being X_n -measurable, since these sets generate the measurable sets of $X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_k$. But

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^*(P_\theta)(\iota_i(A)) &= P_\theta(\beta^{-1}(\iota_i(A))) = P_\theta(A) \\ &= P(X_i)P_{i,\theta}(A) = P_{\vartheta(\theta)}(\iota_n(A)). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Define $I: \bigoplus_{i=1}^m X_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\{1, \dots, m\})$ by $I(\iota_i(x)) = i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, any $x \in X_i$, and where $\iota_i: X_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^m X_i$ is the natural injection. Since, by definition, $\iota_1(X_1), \dots, \iota_m(X_m)$ is a measurable partition of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^m X_i$ we have that I is measurable. For any natural number k let S_k denote the group of permutations on $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Given a vector of integers $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_k)$ there exists a unique stable sorting permutation $\sigma_\kappa \in S_k$ defined by $\kappa_{\sigma_\kappa(1)} \leq \kappa_{\sigma_\kappa(2)} \leq \dots \leq \kappa_{\sigma_\kappa(k)}$ and if $i \leq j$ and $\kappa_i = \kappa_j$ then $\sigma_\kappa(i) \leq \sigma_\kappa(j)$. Note that all maps $\mathcal{D}(\{1, \dots, k\})^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(S_m)$ are measurable. Combining the above gives that the map $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto \sigma_{(I(x_1), \dots, I(x_m))}$ is measurable. Moreover, define $c: \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Z})^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Z})^{\otimes m}$ by $c(l) = (c_1(l), \dots, c_m(l))$ where $c_i(l_1, \dots, l_n) = |\{j \mid l_j = i\}|$. Combining the above we may define the measurable map $\eta: (\bigoplus_{i=1}^m X_i)^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{n_1+\dots+n_m=n} X_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_m^{\otimes n_m}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(\iota_{i_1}(x_1), \dots, \iota_{i_n}(x_n)) &= \\ &= \iota'_{c(I(x_1), \dots, I(x_n))}(x_{\sigma_{I(x_1), \dots, I(x_n)}(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma_{I(x_1), \dots, I(x_n)}(n)}) \end{aligned}$$

where for any partition n_1, \dots, n_m of n we let ι'_{n_1, \dots, n_m} denote the injection $X_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_m^{\otimes n_m} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{n_1+\dots+n_m=n} X_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_m^{\otimes n_m}$. The map η simply sorts a vector in $(\bigoplus_{i=1}^m X_i)^{\otimes n}$ according to which subspace $\iota_1(X_1), \dots, \iota_m(X_m)$ each component lies in.

Fix some $\theta \in \Theta$, let $A = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ be a vector of jointly independent random variables such that $\mathbb{P}(A_i = j) = p_j$, $\xi_{1,1}, \dots, \xi_{1,n}$ be jointly independent $P_{1,\theta}$ -distributed, \dots , and $\xi_{m,1}, \dots, \xi_{m,n}$ be jointly independent $P_{m,\theta}$ -distributed, all jointly independent of each other. By construction $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = (\iota_{A_1}(\xi_{A_1,1}), \dots, \iota_{A_n}(\xi_{A_n,n}))$ is $(\sum_{i=1}^m p_i P_{i,\theta})^{\otimes n}$ -distributed so that $\eta(\xi)$ has law $\eta^*((\sum_{i=1}^m p_i P_{i,\theta})^{\otimes n})$. Since $I(\xi_i) = A_i$ it

immediately follows that

$$(c_1(I(\xi_1), \dots, I(\xi_n)), \dots, c_m(I(\xi_1), \dots, I(\xi_n))) = (c_1(A), \dots, c_m(A))$$

is distributed according to $\text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_m)$ so that $\sigma_{I(\xi_1), \dots, I(\xi_n)} = \sigma_A$

For some fixed vector $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \{1, \dots, m\}^n$ consider the conditional distribution ξ on the event $A = a$. Since A_1, \dots, A_n are mutually independent and independent of $\xi_{1,1}, \xi_{1,2}, \dots, \xi_{m,n-1}, \xi_{m,n}$ we have that $\iota_{A_1}(\xi_{A_1,1}), \dots, \iota_{A_n}(\xi_{A_n,n})$ are still mutually independent conditional on $A = a$ with the (conditional) marginal law of $\xi_{A_i,i}$ being $P_{a_i,\theta}$. Since $\eta(\xi) = \iota'_{c(A)}(\xi_{\sigma_A(1)}, \dots, \xi_{\sigma_A(n)})$ we have that the conditional law of $\eta(\xi)$ on $A = a$ is $(\iota'_{c(a)})^*(P_{a_{\sigma_a(1)},\theta} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{a_{\sigma_a(n)},\theta}) = (\iota'_{c(a)})^*(P_{1,\theta}^{\otimes c_1(a)} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{m,\theta}^{\otimes c_m(a)})$. By the law of total probability

$$\eta^*((\sum_{i=1}^m p_i P_{i,\theta})^{\otimes n}) = \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_m} q(n_1, \dots, n_m) (\iota'_{n_1, \dots, n_m})^*(P_{1,\theta}^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{m,\theta}^{\otimes n_m})$$

recalling that $q(n_1, \dots, n_m) = \mathbb{P}(\text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_m) = (n_1, \dots, n_m))$.

It follows that the left hand $(\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \mathcal{E}_i)^{\otimes n}$ is at least as informative as the right-hand $\sum_{n_1, \dots, n_m} q(n_1, \dots, n_m) \mathcal{E}_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{E}_m^{\otimes n_m}$.

For the converse, let

$$\eta': \bigoplus_{n_1 + \dots + n_m = n} X_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_m^{\otimes n_m} \rightarrow \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^m X_i \right)^{\otimes n}$$

be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'(\iota_{n_1, \dots, n_m}(x_1, \dots, x_n)) &= \\ &= (\iota_1(x_1), \dots, \iota_1(x_{n_1}), \dots, \iota_m(x_{n-n_m}), \dots, \iota_m(x_n)). \end{aligned}$$

η' is measurable on each part $\iota_{n_1, \dots, n_m}(X^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X^{\otimes n_m})$ since ι_1, \dots, ι_k are measurable, and hence measurable on all of $\bigoplus_{n_1 + \dots + n_m = n} X_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_m^{\otimes n_m}$.

It remains now only to note that $\eta'(\eta(\xi))$ is equal to

$$(\iota_1(\xi_{\sigma_A(1)}), \dots, \iota_1(\xi_{\sigma_A(m_1(A))}), \dots, \iota_m(\xi_{\sigma_A(n-m_k(A))}), \dots, \iota_k(\xi_{\sigma_A(n)}))$$

which is a permutation of ξ . In particular, $\eta'(\eta(\xi))$ and ξ have the same empirical measure. Since the empirical measure is a sufficient statistic for $(\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \mathcal{E}_i)^{\otimes n}$ the result follows. \square

In order to prove Lemma 3 we will need some basic results concerning the risks of a certain type of multiple decision problems.

Lemma 7. Let $\mathcal{E}_1 = (X_1, P_{1,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta_1), \dots, \mathcal{E}_m = (X_m, P_{m,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta_m)$ be a sequence of experiments on finite parameter spaces $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m$. Also let $(A_1, L_1), \dots, (A_m, L_m)$ be a sequence of finite 0-1-decision problems on $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_m$, respectively.

Fix some $l \in \mathbb{N}$, define the experiment $\mathcal{E} = (X_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_m, P_{1,\theta_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{m,\theta_m}; (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m) \in \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_m)$, and define a 0-1-decision problem (A, L) by $A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_m$ and

$$L(a, \theta) = \begin{cases} 0 & L_1(a_1, \theta_1) + \dots + L_m(a_m, \theta_m) < l \\ 1 & L_1(a_1, \theta_1) + \dots + L_m(a_m, \theta_m) \geq l \end{cases}.$$

Given decision procedures $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ for $(A_1, L_1), \dots, (A_m, L_m)$ on observing $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_m$, define the decision procedure $\varphi = \varphi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi_m$ for (A, L) on observing \mathcal{E} .

If $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ have risks r_1, \dots, r_m at some $\theta_1 \in \Theta_1, \dots, \theta_m \in \Theta_m$ on observing $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_m$ then φ has risk $\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1, \dots, r_m) \geq l)$ at $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m) \in \Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_m$ on observing \mathcal{E} .

If $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ are Bayes with respect to some priors π_1, \dots, π_m on $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m$ on observing $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_m$ then φ is Bayes with respect to the prior $\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \pi_m$ on $\Theta_1 \times \dots \times \Theta_m$ on observing \mathcal{E} .

Proof. Assume $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ have risk r_1, \dots, r_m at some $\theta_1 \in \Theta_1, \dots, \theta_m \in \Theta_m$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$ denote $B_i = \{a \in A_i \mid L_i(a, \theta_i) = 1\}$. Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m be independent random variables distributed according to $P_{1,\theta_1}, \dots, P_{m,\theta_m}$, respectively. By definition $r_i = \mathbb{E}(L(\varphi_i(\xi_i), \theta_i)) = \mathbb{P}(\varphi_i(\xi_i) \in B_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Since $L(\varphi_1(\xi_1), \theta_1), \dots, L(\varphi_m(\xi_m), \theta_m)$ are independent Bernoulli we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(L(\varphi_1(\xi_1), \dots, \varphi_m(\xi_m); \theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)) &= \\ &= \mathbb{P}(L(\varphi_1(\xi_1), \theta_1) + \dots + L_m(\varphi_m(\xi_m), \theta_m) \geq l) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1, \dots, r_m) \geq l). \end{aligned}$$

Assume, now, instead that $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ are Bayes with respect to priors π_1, \dots, π_m on $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m$, respectively. Let $(\theta_1, \xi_1), \dots, (\theta_m, \xi_m)$ be mutually independent pairs with $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)$ distributed according to $\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \pi_m$ and (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m) distributed according to $P_\theta = P_{1,\theta_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{m,\theta_m}$ conditional on $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$.

Denote by $P_{\pi_i} = \sum_{t_i} \pi_i(t_i) P_{i,t_i}$ the marginal distribution of ξ_i and $P_\pi = \sum_t \pi(t) P_t = P_{1,\pi_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{m,\pi_m}$ the marginal distribution of (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m) .

Since the parameter spaces are finite each family $(P_{i,\theta_i})_{\theta_i \in \Theta_i}$ is dominated and we may define posterior distributions π^x for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$

such that for any integrable f one has [7, Proposition 3.32]

$$\int f(x, t) P_t(dx) \pi(dt) = \int f(x, t) \pi^x(dt) P_\pi(dx).$$

Moreover, by independence it may be chosen such that $\pi^x = \pi_1^{x_1} \cdots \pi_m^{x_m}$ where for integrable f_i one has

$$\int f(x_i, t_i) P_{i,t_i}(dx_i) \pi_i(dt_i) = \int f_i(x_i, t_i) \pi_i^{x_i}(dt_i) P_{i,\pi_i}(dx_i).$$

Bayes procedures δ for π are given by $\delta(x)$ being minimisers of the posterior risks $a \mapsto \pi^x(t \mapsto L(a, x))$ for P_π -almost every x [7, Proposition 3.37].

The above factorisation implies that the distribution of $L_1(a_1, \theta_1) + \cdots + L_m(a_m, \theta_m)$ under π^x is given by $\text{PBin}(\rho_1^{x_1}(a_1), \dots, \rho_m^{x_m}(a_m))$ where $\rho_i^{x_i}(a_i) = \pi_i^{x_i}(\Theta_{a_i,i})$ and $\Theta_{a_i,i} = \{t_i \in \Theta_i \mid L_i(a_i, t_i) = 1\}$.

Since $\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_m)$ is monotone increasing in (the usual) stochastic (dominance) order (see for example [12, Chapter 1]) with respect to p_1, \dots, p_m it follows that minimising $\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_m) \geq l)$ can be done by minimising p_1, \dots, p_m separately. But by assumption $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ are Bayes for $(A_1, L_1), \dots, (A_m, L_m)$ with respect to π_1, \dots, π_m , respectively. This means exactly that they minimise $\rho_1^{x_1}(a_1), \dots, \rho_m^{x_m}(a_m)$, respectively, for $(P_{\pi_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_{\pi_m})$ -almost all (x_1, \dots, x_m) . The result follows. \square

We need a similar result for mixture experiments. This is essentially just the statement that Bayes decisions satisfy the so called conditionality principle, specialised to our situation.

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{E}_1 = (X_1, P_{1,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta), \dots, \mathcal{E}_m = (X_m, P_{m,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta)$ be a collection of experiments on some finite parameter space Θ . Let (A, L) be some finite decision problem with corresponding decision procedures $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ on observing $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_m$, respectively. For any convex coefficients $(p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \Delta_m$ define $\varphi = \varphi_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \varphi_m$ as a decision procedure for (A, L) on observing the mixture experiment $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \mathcal{E}_i$.*

If $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ have risks r_1, \dots, r_m at $\theta \in \Theta$ then φ has risk $\sum_i p_i r_i$ at θ .

If $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ are Bayes with respect to the same prior π then φ is Bayes with respect π .

Proof. That $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ have risk r_1, \dots, r_m for some particular $\theta \in \Theta$ then it is immediate from the definition of $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \mathcal{E}_i$ that φ has risk $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i r_i$ for the same $\theta \in \Theta$.

The fact that φ is Bayes for π whenever $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ are Bayes for π follows similarly to the proof of Lemma 7. There exists posterior

distributions π^x with the property that $\pi^{\iota_i(x)} = \pi_i^x$ where π_i^x is a posterior distribution on Θ on observing x from \mathcal{E}_i . Minimising the posterior risk is therefore equivalent to minimising the posterior with respect to π^x can therefore be done by minimising each of π_1^x, \dots, π_m^x separately. But by assumption, as in Lemma 7, this is what $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ do. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Let experiments $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_m, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}'$, with corresponding parameter pairs $\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{1,1}, \dots, \theta_{m,0}, \theta_{m,1}$, priors π_1, \dots, π_m , Bayes risks $r_1(n), \dots, r_m(n)$, and integer $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be as in the statement. For any $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $i = 1, \dots, m$ let $\varphi_{i,n}$ be Bayes procedures for testing $P_{i,0}^{\otimes n}$ against $P_{i,1}^{\otimes n}$ under the prior π_i , with the corresponding Bayes risks $r_i(n)$. Let also

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}'_1 &= (X_1, P_{1,\theta}; \theta \in \{\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{1,1}\}) \\ &\vdots \\ \mathcal{E}'_m &= (X_m, P_{m,\theta}; \theta \in \{\theta_{m,0}, \theta_{m,1}\}). \end{aligned}$$

For any n_1, \dots, n_m apply Lemma 7 to experiments $(\mathcal{E}'_1)^{\otimes n_1}, \dots, (\mathcal{E}'_m)^{\otimes n_m}$, procedures $\varphi_{1,n_1}, \dots, \varphi_{m,n_m}$, and the testing problems $(\{0, 1\}, L_1), \dots, (\{0, 1\}, L_m)$ where $L_i(j, \theta_{i,k})$ is 0 if $j = k$ and 1 otherwise. This gives that $\varphi_{1,n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \varphi_{m,n_m}$ is a Bayes procedure with respect to the prior $\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \pi_m$ on observing the experiment $(X_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_m^{\otimes n_m}, P_{1,\theta_1}^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{m,\theta_m}^{\otimes n_m}; (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m) \in \{\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{1,1}\} \times \dots \times \{\theta_{m,0}, \theta_{m,1}\})$ and that it has Bayes risk $\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(n_1), \dots, r_m(n_m)) \geq l)$. This experiment is exactly the restriction of $\mathcal{E}_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{E}_m^{\otimes n_m}$ to $\{\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{1,1}\} \times \dots \times \{\theta_{m,0}, \theta_{m,1}\}$.

Applying Lemma 8 it follows that for any probability mass function p on \mathbf{N}^m one has that $\varphi = \bigoplus_{n_1, \dots, n_m} \varphi_{n_1, \dots, n_m}$ is Bayes with respect to the prior π on observing $\sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_m} p(n_1, \dots, n_m)(\mathcal{E}_1^{\otimes n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{E}_m^{\otimes n_m})$ and that the corresponding Bayes risks are

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_m} p(n_1, \dots, n_m) \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(n_1), \dots, r_m(n_m)) \geq l) &= \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(r_1(N_1), \dots, r_m(N_m)) \geq l)) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where (N_1, \dots, N_m) are distributed according to p . In particular this holds for $p = q$ and $p = q'$.

It remains only to recall that the deficiency is bounded from below by any difference in achievable Bayes risk, for finitely supported priors and finite normalised decision problems. Applying this to Equation 9 with $p = q$ and $p = q'$ yields the result. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. Since $\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ is invariant under permutation of the parameters (p_1, \dots, p_n) we may assume without loss of generality that $i = n + 1$.

Let U_1, \dots, U_{n+1} be independent and uniform on $[0, 1]$ and $N = \mathbf{1}(U_1 < p_1) + \dots + \mathbf{1}(U_n < p_n) \sim \text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$, $M = N + \mathbf{1}(U_{n+1} < p_{n+1}) \sim \text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_n, p_{n+1})$, and $M' = N + \mathbf{1}(U_{n+1} < p'_{n+1}) \sim \text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_n, p'_{n+1})$. By the law of total probability we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(M \geq l) &= \mathbb{P}(N \geq l-1 \mid U_{n+1} < p'_{n+1})p'_{n+1} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(N \geq l-1 \mid p'_{n+1} < U_{n+1} < p_{n+1})(p_{n+1} - p'_{n+1}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(N \geq l \mid p_{n+1} < U_{n+1})(1 - p_{n+1}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(N \geq l-1)p'_{n+1} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(N \geq l-1)(p_{n+1} - p'_{n+1}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(N \geq l)(1 - p_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(M' \geq l) &= \mathbb{P}(N \geq l-1)p'_{n+1} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(N \geq l)(p_{n+1} - p'_{n+1}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(N \geq l)(1 - p_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_{n+1}) \geq l) - \mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p'_{n+1}) \geq l) &= \\ = \mathbb{P}(M \geq l) - \mathbb{P}(M' \geq l) &= \\ = (\mathbb{P}(N \geq l-1) - \mathbb{P}(N \geq l))(p_{n+1} - p'_{n+1}) &= \\ = \mathbb{P}(N = l-1)(p_{n+1} - p'_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $N \sim \text{PBin}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ this concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 5. This follows from a double concentration argument, first showing that the (random) mean is concentrated and then using that conditionally on the (random) parameters the Poisson-binomial quantity is concentrated around its mean.

For any *fixed* vector q_1, \dots, q_m we have by Hoeffding's inequality for any $t > 0$ and denoting $b_1 = \sqrt{t/m}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu - b_1 < \text{PBin}(q_1, \dots, q_m) < \mu + b_1) \geq 1 - 2e^{-2t}$$

where $\mu = \mathbb{E}(\text{PBin}(q_1, \dots, q_m)) = q_1 + \dots + q_m$.

Consider a random vector $N = (N_1, \dots, N_m) \sim \text{Mult}(n, p_1, \dots, p_m)$. Any multinomial vector is negatively associated[2]. Since the functions f_1, \dots, f_m are either all decreasing or all increasing we have that the vector $(f_1(N_1), \dots, f_m(N_m))$ is also negatively associated[2, Proposition 8].

This in turn implies that their sum $M = \sum_{i=1}^k f_i(N_i)$ satisfies the standard Hoeffding bounds[2, Proposition 7]. For any $s > 0$ denote $b_2 = \sqrt{s/m}$ so that we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu' - b_2 < M < \mu' + b_2) \geq 1 - 2e^{-2s}$$

where $\mu' = \mathbb{E}(M)$.

Let $K \sim \text{PBin}(f_1(N_1), \dots, f_m(N_m))$ conditional on (N_1, \dots, N_m) . Note that $\mathbb{E}(K | N) = M$, $\mathbb{E}(K) = \mathbb{E}(M) = \mu'$ and that for any event A we have that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(f_1(N_1), \dots, f_m(N_m)) \in A)) = \mathbb{P}(K \in A)$. Letting $b = b_1 + b_2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mu' - b < K < \mu' + b) &= \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\mu' - b < K < \mu' + b \mid N)) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\mu' - b < K < \mu' + b \mid N) \mid \mu' - b_2 < M < \mu' + b_2)) \\ &\quad \times (1 - 2e^{-2s}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(M - b_1 < K < M + b_1 \mid N) \mid \mu' - b_2 < M < \mu' + b_2)) \\ &\quad \times (1 - 2e^{-2s}) \\ &\geq (1 - 2e^{-2t})(1 - 2e^{-2s}) \end{aligned}$$

for any $s, t > \log(\sqrt{2})$. Taking $A = \mathbf{N} \cap (\mu' - b, \mu' + b)$ gives $|A| \leq 2(\sqrt{\frac{t}{m}} + \sqrt{\frac{s}{m}})$. There must therefore exist some $a \in A$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(f_1(N_1), \dots, f_m(N_m)) = a)) \geq \frac{(1 - 2e^{-2t})(1 - 2e^{-2s})}{2(\sqrt{t} + \sqrt{s})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Taking $s = t = 1.6$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\text{PBin}(f_1(N_1), \dots, f_m(N_m)) = a)) \geq \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}. \quad \square$$

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Silvelyn Zwanzig for critical remarks on an earlier version of this manuscript as well as Xing Shi Cai for discussions on how to handle maxima of multinomial vectors.

References

- [1] Luc Devroye and Gábor Lugosi. *Combinatorial Methods in Density Estimation*. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2001, pp. 1–3.

- [2] Devdatt Dubhashi and Desh Ranjan. ‘Balls and bins: A study in negative dependence’. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 13.2 (1998), pp. 99–124.
- [3] Jon Helgeland. ‘Additional observations and statistical information in the case of 1-parameter exponential distributions’. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 59.1 (Apr. 1982), pp. 77–100.
- [4] Lucien Le Cam. *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory*. New York, NY: Springer New York, 1986, pp. 1–15.
- [5] Lucien Le Cam. ‘On the Information Contained in Additional Observations’. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 2.4 (July 1974), pp. 630–649.
- [6] F. Liese and I. Vajda. ‘On Divergences and Informations in Statistics and Information Theory’. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 52.10 (2006), pp. 4394–4412.
- [7] Friedrich Liese and Klaus -J. Miescke. *Statistical Decision Theory: Estimation, Testing, and Selection*. New York, NY: Springer, 2008, pp. 1–52.
- [8] Enno Mammen. ‘The Statistical Information Contained in Additional Observations’. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 14.2 (June 1986), pp. 665–678.
- [9] Lutz Mattner. ‘Mean absolute deviations of sample means and minimally concentrated binomials’. In: *The Annals of Probability* 31.2 (Apr. 2003), pp. 914–925.
- [10] Peter McCullagh. ‘What is a statistical model?’ In: *The Annals of Statistics* 30.5 (2002), pp. 1225–1310.
- [11] Michael Nussbaum. ‘Asymptotic Equivalence of Density Estimation and Gaussian White Noise’. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 24.6 (1996), pp. 2399–2430.
- [12] Moshe Shaked and J. George Shanthikumar, eds. *Stochastic Orders*. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2007.
- [13] Erik Torgersen. *Comparison of statistical experiments*. Vol. 36. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [14] Erik Torgersen. ‘Measures of information based on comparison with total information and with total ignorance’. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 9.3 (1981), pp. 638–657.
- [15] Roman Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2018.

- [16] Tilo Wiklund. ‘The Deficiency Introduced by Resampling’. In: *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* 27.2 (Apr. 2018), pp. 145–161.

A. Basic facts and definitions

A statistical experiment \mathcal{E} is specified by a set Θ called the parameter space, a measurable space X that is the sample space of the experiment, and a Θ -indexed family of probability measures $(P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ on X .

For a measurable space $X = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ the space $\mathcal{P}(X)$ of probability measures on X is a measurable space with σ -algebras the coarsest such that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ the map $P \mapsto P(A)$ is measurable.

For two measurable spaces X and Y , any measurable $f: X \rightarrow Y$ lifts to the measurable push-forward $f^*: \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y)$ by assigning to $P \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ the composition $A \mapsto P(f^{-1}(A))$. The map has the property that if η is a P -distributed X -valued random variable, then $f(\eta)$ is a $f^*(P)$ -distributed Y -valued random variable.

The map f^* extends to a positive linear map from the space of signed measures on X to the space of signed measures of Y . The assignment is functorial in the sense that for any pair of composable measurable functions β_1 and β_2 one has $(\beta_1 \circ \beta_2)^* = \beta_1^* \circ \beta_2^*$ and $\text{id}^* = \text{id}$ for any identity map. In particular, any inverse β^{-1} is sent to the inverse of β^* .

Given two measurable spaces $X = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $Y = (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ a Markov-kernel $K: X \rightarrow_k Y$ is a measurable map from \mathcal{X} to the space of probability measures $\mathcal{P}(Y)$. This is equivalent to $x \mapsto K(x)(B) = K_x(B)$ being \mathcal{A} -measurable for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$. For any measure μ on X , define $K(\mu) = K_\mu$ on Y by $K_\mu(B) = \int K_x(B) \mu(dx)$. If $P \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ then $K(P) \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$. We will not distinguish in notation K from the map it induces on the space of (probability) measures.

The direct sum (disjoint union) of two spaces X and Y is denoted by $X \oplus Y$ and has σ -algebra generated by $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ after ensuring \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are disjoint. For (signed) measures μ and ν on X and Y , the (signed) measure $\mu \oplus \nu$ is defined by $(\mu \oplus \nu)(A) = \mu(A \cap \mathcal{X}) + \nu(A \cap \mathcal{Y})$ for any measurable A . Similarly, for μ on X and ν on Y we denote by $\mu \otimes \nu$ the product measure specified by $(\mu \otimes \nu)(A \times B) = \mu(A)\nu(B)$. The above generalise directly to a larger, possibly infinite, family of spaces $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ indexed by some set I . The direct sum is then denoted $\bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ and the product $\bigotimes_{i \in I} X_i$. For each $i \in I$ there is an associated injection $\iota_i: X_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $\{\iota_i(X_i) \mid i \in I\}$ is a measurable partition of $\bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i$ and ι_i restricts to a bimeasurable bijection onto $\iota_i(X_i)$.

For spaces X, X', Y, Y' and measurable maps $f: X \rightarrow X'$ and $g: Y \rightarrow Y'$ we denote by $f \otimes g: X \otimes Y \rightarrow X' \otimes Y'$ and $f \oplus g: X \oplus Y \rightarrow X' \oplus Y'$ the measurable maps defined by $(f \otimes g)(x, y) = (f(x), g(y))$, $(f \otimes g)(\iota_X(x)) = \iota_{X'}(f(x))$, and $(f \otimes g)(\iota_Y(y)) = \iota_{Y'}(g(y))$. If f and g are instead Markov kernels they are defined by $(f \otimes g)_{(x,y)}(A \times B) = f_x(A)g_y(B)$ and $(f \oplus g)_{\iota_X(x)}(\iota_{X'}(A)) = f_x(A)$ and $(f \oplus g)_{\iota_Y(y)}(\iota_{Y'}(B)) = f_y(B)$.

Given any pair of experiments $\mathcal{E}_0 = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ and $\mathcal{E}_1 = (Y, Q_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ on the same parameter space and any $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1]$ and denoting $\alpha_1 = 1 - \alpha_0$ this allows us to define the mixture experiment $\sum_i \alpha_i \mathcal{E}_i = (X \oplus Y, \alpha_0 P_\theta \oplus \alpha_1 Q_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$. Similarly, the infinite convex combination of some family of experiments $(\mathcal{E}_i)_{i \in I}$ where $\mathcal{E}_i = (X_i, P_{i,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta)$ with respect to some coefficients p given by $\sum_{i \in I} p_i \mathcal{E}_i = (\bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i, \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i P_{i,\theta}; \theta \in \Theta)$. See Torgersen[13, Chapter 1.3] for more details.

For a parameter space Θ a finite normalised decision problem on Θ is a tuple (A, L) of a finite set A (the action space) and a non-negative function $L: \Theta \times A \rightarrow [0, 1]$. If $L(\theta, a) \in \{0, 1\}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$ and $a \in A$ we say that L is a 0-1-decision problem. Given a space X or experiment $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ a decision procedure ρ for (A, L) on observing X (or \mathcal{E}) is a Markov kernel $\rho: X \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}(A)$. Given a parameter space Θ with a decision problem (A, L) , an experiment $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ and a decision procedure ρ on X the risk $R_\mathcal{E}(\rho, \theta)$ of ρ for (L, A) at $\theta \in \Theta$ on observing \mathcal{E} is the expectation $P_\theta(x \mapsto L(\rho(x), \theta))$. Given a finitely supported probability measure π on the parameter space Θ the expected risk $\sum_\theta \pi(\{\theta\}) R_\mathcal{E}(\rho, \theta)$ is called the Bayes risk of ρ for (L, A) with respect to the prior π on observing \mathcal{E} . The infimum over all ρ is the Bayes risk for (L, A) with respect to the prior π on observing \mathcal{E} .

Given two experiments $\mathcal{E} = (X, P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ and $\mathcal{F} = (Y, Q_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ on the same parameter space Θ the deficiency $\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is the smallest number $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that for any finite normalised decision problem on Θ and decision procedure ρ on Y there exists a decision procedure ρ' on X such that for all $\theta \in \Theta$ one has $R_\mathcal{E}(\rho', \theta) \leq R_\mathcal{F}(\rho, \theta) + \varepsilon$. The deficiency can be characterised in various other ways, most famously in terms of optimal transitions that map the family $(P_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ approximately onto the family $(Q_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ (see standard references [4, 13]). By construction, taking restrictions \mathcal{E}' and \mathcal{F}' of \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} to some subset $\Theta' \subset \Theta$ reduces the deficiency: $\delta(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}') \leq \delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. If $\delta(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E}) = 0$ we say \mathcal{E} is less informative than \mathcal{F} or that \mathcal{F} is more informative than \mathcal{E} . If \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} are both less informative than the other, they are equivalent and we write $\mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{F}$. For any third experiment \mathcal{G} the deficiency satisfies a triangle inequality $\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \leq \delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}) + \delta(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$. Being more/less informative is a transitive relation and being equivalent is an equivalence relation and if $\mathcal{E} \cong \mathcal{F}$ then $\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}) = \delta(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ and $\delta(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}) = \delta(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$.