

Near-consistent robust estimations of moments for unimodal distributions

Tuban Lee

This manuscript was compiled on May 15, 2023

Descriptive statistics for parametric models currently heavily rely on the accuracy of distributional assumptions. Here, leveraging the invariant structures of unimodal distributions, a series of sophisticated, yet efficient estimators, robust to both gross errors and departures from parametric assumptions, are proposed for estimating mean and central moments with insignificant asymptotic biases for common unimodal distributions. This article also illuminates the understanding of the common nature of probability distributions and the measures of them.

orderliness | invariant | unimodal | adaptive estimation | U -statistics

The asymptotic inconsistencies between sample mean (\bar{x}) and nonparametric robust location estimators in asymmetric distributions on the real line have been noticed for more than two centuries (1), yet remain unsolved. Strictly speaking, it is unsolvable as by trimming, some information about the original distribution is removed, making it impossible to estimate the values of the removed parts without distributional assumptions. Newcomb (1886, 1912) provided the first modern approach to robust parametric estimation by developing a class of estimators that gives "less weight to the more discordant observations" (2, 3). In 1964, Huber (4) used the minimax procedure to obtain M -estimator for the contaminated normal distribution, which has played a pre-eminent role in the later development of robust statistics. However, as previously demonstrated, under growing asymmetric departures from normality, the bias of the Huber M -estimator increases rapidly. This is a common issue in parameter estimations. For example, He and Fung (1999) constructed (5) a robust M -estimator for the two-parameter Weibull distribution, from which all moments can be calculated. Nonetheless, it is inadequate for the gamma, Perato, lognormal, and the generalized Gaussian distributions (SI Dataset S1). Another interesting approach is based on L -estimators, such as percentile estimators. Examples of percentile estimators for the Weibull distribution, the reader is referred to Menon (1963) (6), Dubey (1967) (7), Hassanein (1971) (8), Marks (2005) (9), and Boudt, Caliskan, and Croux (2011) (10)'s works. At the outset of the study of percentile estimators, it was known that they arithmetically utilize the invariant structures of probability distributions (6, 11, 12). Maybe such estimators can be named as I -statistics. Formally, an estimator is classified as an I -statistic if it asymptotically satisfies $I(LE_1, \dots, LE_l) = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_q)$ for the distribution it is consistent, where LE s are calculated with the use of LU -statistics, I is defined using arithmetic operations and constants but may also incorporate transcendental functions and quantile functions, and θ s are the population parameters it estimates. A subclass of I -statistics, arithmetic I -statistics, is defined as LE s are LU -statistics, I is solely defined using arithmetic operations and constants. Since some percentile estimators use the logarithmic function to transform all random variables before

computing the L -estimators, a percentile estimator might not always be an arithmetic I -statistic (7). In this article, two subclasses of I -statistics are introduced, arithmetic I -statistics and quantile I -statistics. Examples of quantile I -statistics will be discussed later. Based on LU -statistics, I -statistics are naturally robust. Compared to probability density functions (pdfs) and cumulative distribution functions (cdfs), the quantile functions of many parametric distributions are more elegant. Since the expectation of an L -estimator can be expressed as an integral of the quantile function, I -statistics are often analytically obtainable. However, the performance of the aforementioned examples is often worse than that of the robust M -statistics when the distributional assumption is violated (SI Dataset S1). Even when distributions such as the Weibull and gamma belong to the same larger family, the generalized gamma distribution, a misassumption can still result in substantial biases for central moments, rendering the approach ill-suited.

The majority of robust location estimators commonly used are symmetric, i.e., they are consistent for any symmetric distributions with finite second moments, owing to the prevalence of symmetric distributions. An asymmetric weighted L -statistic can achieve consistency for a semiparametric class of skewed distributions; but the lack of symmetry makes it suitable only for certain applications. From semiparametrics to parametrics, consider an estimator with a non-zero asymptotic breakdown point that is simultaneously consistent for both a semiparametric class of distributions and a distinct parametric distribution with finite moments, such a robust location estimator is called an invariant mean. Based on the mean-weighted L -statistic- γ -median inequality, the recombined mean is defined as

$$rm_{d,\epsilon,\gamma,n} := \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n} + c)^{d+1}}{(\gamma m_n + c)^d} - c \right),$$

where d is the key factor for bias correction, γm_n is the sample γ -median, $WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}$ is the weighted L -statistic. If γ is

Significance Statement

Bias, variance, and contamination are the three main errors in statistics. Consistent robust estimation is unattainable without parametric assumptions. Here, invariant moments are proposed as a means of achieving near-consistent and robust estimations of moments, even in scenarios where moderate violations of distributional assumptions occur, while the variances are sometimes smaller than those of the sample moments.

T.L. designed research, performed research, analyzed data, and wrote the paper.

The author declares no competing interest.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: tl@biomathematics.org

omitted, $\gamma = 1$ is assumed. The subsequent theorem shows the significance of this arithmetic I -statistic.

Theorem .1. *Let $BM_{\epsilon,n}$ be the WL, $rm_{d \approx 0.103, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ is a consistent mean estimator for the exponential distribution, any symmetric distributions and the Pareto distribution with quantile function $Q(p) = x_m(1-p)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, $x_m > 0$, when $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, provided that the second moments are finite.*

Proof. Finding d and ϵ that make $rm_{d,\epsilon}$ a consistent mean estimator is equivalent to finding the solution of $E[rm_{d,\epsilon,n}] = E[X]$. The quantile function of the exponential distribution is $Q(p) = \ln(\frac{1}{1-p})\lambda$. $E[X] = \lambda$. $E[m_n] = Q(\frac{1}{2}) = \ln 2\lambda$. For the exponential distribution, $E[BM_{\epsilon=\frac{1}{24},n}] = \lambda \left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{\pi}{247}} \sqrt[3]{11}}{391^{5/6} 101898752449325 \sqrt{5}}\right)\right)$, the detailed formula is given in the SI Text. Since $rm_{d,\epsilon} = \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{(BM_{\epsilon}+c)^{d+1}}{(m+c)^d} - c\right) = (d+1)BM_{\epsilon} - dm = \mu$. So,

$$d = \frac{\mu - BM_{\epsilon}}{BM_{\epsilon} - m} = \frac{\lambda - \lambda \left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{\pi}{247}} \sqrt[3]{11}}{391^{5/6} 101898752449325 \sqrt{5}}\right)\right)}{\lambda \left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{\pi}{247}} \sqrt[3]{11}}{391^{5/6} 101898752449325 \sqrt{5}}\right)\right) - \ln 2\lambda} =$$

$$- \frac{\ln\left(\frac{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{\pi}{247}} \sqrt[3]{11}}{391^{5/6} 101898752449325 \sqrt{5}}\right)}{1 - \ln(2) + \ln\left(\frac{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{\pi}{247}} \sqrt[3]{11}}{391^{5/6} 101898752449325 \sqrt{5}}\right)} \approx 0.103. \text{ The proof}$$

of the second assertion follows directly from the coincidence property. For any symmetric distribution with a finite second moment, $E[BM_{\epsilon,n}] = E[m_n] = E[X]$. Then $E[rm_{d,\epsilon,n}] = \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{(E[X]+c)^{d+1}}{(E[X]+c)^d} - c\right) = E[X]$. The proof for the Pareto distribution is more general. The mean of the Pareto distribution is given by $\frac{\alpha x_m}{\alpha-1}$. Since any weighted L -statistic can be expressed as an integral of the quantile function as shown in Theorem A.1, the γ -median is also a percentile, replacing the WL and γm in the d value with two arbitrary percentiles p_1 and p_2 , for the Pareto distribution,

$$d_{Pareto} = \frac{\mu - Q(p_1)}{Q(p_1) - Q(p_2)} = \frac{\frac{\alpha x_m}{\alpha-1} - x_m(1-p_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{x_m(1-p_1)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} - x_m(1-p_2)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}}. \text{ } x_m \text{ can be canceled out. For the exponential distribution, } d_{exp} =$$

$$\frac{\mu - Q(p_1)}{Q(p_1) - Q(p_2)} = \frac{\lambda - \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p_1}\right)\lambda}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p_1}\right)\lambda - \ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p_2}\right)\lambda} = -\frac{\ln(1-p_1)+1}{\ln(1-p_1)-\ln(1-p_2)}.$$

Since $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{\alpha-1}{(1-p_1)^{-1/\alpha} - (1-p_2)^{-1/\alpha}}}{-\frac{\ln(1-p_1)+1}{\ln(1-p_1)-\ln(1-p_2)}} = -\frac{\ln(1-p_1)+1}{\ln(1-p_1)-\ln(1-p_2)}$, the d value for the Pareto distribution approaches that of the exponential distribution, as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, regardless of the type of weighted L -statistic used. This completes the demonstration. \square

Theorem .1 implies that for the Weibull, gamma, Pareto, lognormal and generalized Gaussian distribution, $rm_{d \approx 0.103, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ is consistent for at least one particular case. The biases of $rm_{d \approx 0.103, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ for distributions with skewness between those of the exponential and symmetric distributions are tiny (SI Dataset S1). $rm_{d \approx 0.103, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ exhibits excellent performance for all these common unimodal distributions (SI Dataset S1).

Besides introducing the concept of invariant mean, the purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that, in light of previous works, the estimation of central moments can be transformed into a location estimation problem by using U -statistics, the central moment kernel distributions possess desirable properties, and a series of sophisticated yet efficient robust estimators

can be constructed whose biases are typically smaller than the variances (as seen in Table ?? for $n = 4096$) for unimodal distributions.

Background and Main Results

A. Invariant mean. It is well established that a theoretical model can be adjusted to fit the first two moments of the observed data. A continuous distribution belonging to a location-scale family, parametrized by a location parameter μ and a scale parameter λ , takes the form $F(x) = F_0\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\lambda}\right)$, where F_0 is a standard distribution without any shifts or scaling. Therefore, $F(x) = Q^{-1}(x) \rightarrow x = Q(p) = \lambda Q_0(p) + \mu$. Thus, for a location-scale distribution, any $WA(\epsilon, \gamma)$ can be expressed as $\lambda WA_0(\epsilon, \gamma) + \mu$, where $WA_0(\epsilon, \gamma)$ is an integral of $Q_0(p)$ according to the definition of the weighted average. The following theorem shows that the whl_k kernel distribution is always a location-scale distribution if the original distribution is a location-scale distribution with the same location and scale parameters. The proof is given in the SI Text.

Theorem A.1. $whl_k(x_1 = \lambda x_1 + \mu, \dots, x_k = \lambda x_k + \mu) = \lambda whl_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) + \mu$.

Let $WeHLM_0(\epsilon, \gamma)$ denote the expected value of a weighted Hodges-Lehmann mean for the standard distribution, then for a location-scale family of distributions parametrized by a location parameter μ and a scale parameter λ , the $WeHLM$ can also be expressed as $\lambda WeHLM_0(\epsilon, \gamma) + \mu$. Since Theorem A.1 also proved the $w_i \neq 1$ case, this form is valid for all weighted L -statistics. The simultaneous cancellation of μ and λ in $\frac{(\lambda\mu_0 + \mu) - (\lambda WeHLM_0(\epsilon, \gamma) + \mu)}{(\lambda WeHLM_0(\epsilon, \gamma) + \mu) - (\lambda\gamma m_0 + \mu)}$ assures that d is always a constant for a location-scale distribution.

The performance in heavy-tailed distributions can be further improved by constructing the quantile mean as

$$qm_{d,\epsilon,\gamma,n} := \hat{Q}_n \left(\left(\hat{F}_n(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}) - \frac{1}{1+\gamma} \right) d + \hat{F}_n(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}) \right),$$

provided that $\hat{F}_n(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}) \geq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$, where $\hat{F}_n(x)$ is the empirical cumulative distribution function of the sample, \hat{Q}_n is the sample quantile function. When $\hat{F}_n(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}) < \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$, $qm_{d,\epsilon,\gamma,n}$ is defined as $\hat{Q}_n \left(\hat{F}_n(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}) - \left(\frac{1}{1+\gamma} - \hat{F}_n(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}) \right) d \right)$. Without loss of generality, in the following discussion, only the case where $\hat{F}_n(WL_{\epsilon,\gamma,n}) \geq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$ is considered. Moreover, in extreme right-skewed heavy-tailed distributions, the calculated percentile can exceed $1 - \epsilon$, the percentile will be modified to $1 - \epsilon$ if this occurs. A widely used method for calculating the sample quantile function involves employing linear interpolation of modes corresponding to the order statistics of the uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 1]$, i.e., $\hat{Q}_n(p) = X_{[h]} + (h - [h])(X_{[h]} - X_{[h]})$, $h = (n-1)p + 1$. To minimize the finite sample bias, here, the inverse function of \hat{Q}_n is deduced as $\hat{F}_n(x) := \frac{1}{n-1} \left(cf - 1 + \frac{x - X_{cf}}{X_{cf+1} - X_{cf}} \right)$, where $cf = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{X_i \leq x}$, $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator of event A . The quantile mean uses the location-scale invariant in a different way as shown in the following proof.

Theorem A.2. *Let $BM_{\epsilon,n}$ be the WL, $qm_{d \approx 0.088, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ is a consistent mean estimator for the exponential, Pareto ($\alpha \rightarrow \infty$) and any symmetric distributions provided that the second moments are finite.*

163 *Proof.* The cdf of the exponential distribution is $F(x) =$
 164 $1 - e^{-\lambda^{-1}x}$, $\lambda \geq 0$, $x \geq 0$, the expectation of
 165 $\text{BM}_{\epsilon,n}$ can be expressed as $\lambda \text{BM}_0(\epsilon)$, so $F(\text{BM}_{\epsilon})$ is free
 166 of λ , same for $F(\mu)$ and $F(m)$. When $\epsilon = \frac{1}{24}$, $d =$

$$167 \frac{F(\mu) - F(\text{BM}_{\epsilon})}{F(\text{BM}_{\epsilon}) - \frac{1}{2}} = \frac{-e^{-1} + e^{-\left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{247}{247}} \sqrt[3]{\frac{11}{11}}}\right)}\right)}{-\left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{247}{247}} \sqrt[3]{\frac{11}{11}}}\right)}\right)} =$$

$$168 \frac{\frac{101898752449325 \sqrt[6]{\frac{247}{247}} \sqrt[3]{\frac{11}{11}}}{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{247}{247}} \sqrt[3]{\frac{11}{11}}} - \frac{1}{e}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{101898752449325 \sqrt[6]{\frac{247}{247}} \sqrt[3]{\frac{11}{11}}}{26068394603446272 \sqrt[6]{\frac{247}{247}} \sqrt[3]{\frac{11}{11}}}} \approx 0.088.$$

169 The proof of the sym-
 170 metric case is similar. Since for any symmetric distribution
 171 with a finite second moment, $F(E[\text{BM}_{\epsilon,n}]) = F(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}$.
 172 Then, the expectation of the quantile mean is $qm_{d,\epsilon} =$
 $F^{-1}\left(\left(F(\mu) - \frac{1}{2}\right)d + F(\mu)\right) = F^{-1}\left(0 + F(\mu)\right) = \mu$.

173 For the assertion related to the Pareto distribu-
 174 tion, the cdf of it is $1 - \left(\frac{x_m}{x}\right)^{\alpha}$. Similarly to
 175 Theorem .1, replacing the $F(\text{WL}_{\epsilon,\gamma})$ and $\frac{1}{1+\gamma}$ in the
 176 d value with two arbitrary percentiles p_1 and p_2 ,

$$177 d_{\text{Pareto}} = \frac{1 - \left(\frac{x_m}{\frac{x_m}{\alpha-1}}\right)^{\alpha} - \left(1 - \left(\frac{x_m}{x_m(1-p_1) - \frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha}\right)}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{x_m}{x_m(1-p_1) - \frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha}\right) - \left(1 - \left(\frac{x_m}{x_m(1-p_2) - \frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha}\right)} =$$

$$178 \frac{1 - \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{p_1-p_2}\right)^{\alpha} - p_1}{p_1-p_2}.$$

179 When $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, $\left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha} = \frac{1}{e}$, so in this case,
 d_{Pareto} is identical to that of the exponential distribution, since

$$180 d_{\text{exp}} = \frac{(1-e^{-1}) - \left(1 - e^{-\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p_1}\right)}\right)}{\left(1 - e^{-\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p_1}\right)}\right) - \left(1 - e^{-\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p_2}\right)}\right)} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{e} - p_1}{p_1 - p_2}.$$

181 All results are now proven. \square

182 The definitions of location and scale parameters are such
 183 that they must satisfy $F(x; \lambda, \mu) = F\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\lambda}; 1, 0\right)$. By recalling
 184 $x = \lambda Q_0(p) + \mu$, it follows that the percentile of any weighted
 185 L -statistic is free of λ and μ , which guarantees the validity of
 186 the quantile mean. The quantile mean is a quantile I -statistic.
 187 Specifically, an estimator is classified as a quantile I -statistic
 188 if LEs are percentiles of a distribution obtained by plugging
 189 LU -statistics into a cumulative distribution function and I
 190 is defined with arithmetic operations, constants and quantile
 191 functions. $qm_{d \approx 0.088, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ works better in the fat-tail scenarios
 192 (SI Dataset S1). Theorem .1 and A.2 show that $rm_{d \approx 0.103, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$
 193 and $qm_{d \approx 0.088, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ are both consistent mean estimators for
 194 any symmetric distribution and a skewed distribution with
 195 finite second moments. It's obvious that the breakdown points
 196 of $rm_{d \approx 0.103, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ and $qm_{d \approx 0.088, \epsilon = \frac{1}{24}}$ are both $\frac{1}{24}$. Therefore
 197 they are all invariant means.

198 To study the impact of the choice of WAs in rm and
 199 qm , it is constructive to recall that a weighted average is a
 200 linear combination of quantile averages. While using a less-
 201 biased weighted average can generally enhance performance
 202 (SI Dataset S1), there is a greater risk of violation in the semi-
 203 parametric framework. However, the mean- $\text{WA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}$ -median
 204 inequality is robust to slight fluctuations of the QA function
 205 of the underlying distribution. Suppose the QA function is
 206 generally decreasing in $[0, u]$, but increasing in $[u, \frac{1}{1+\gamma}]$, since
 207 $1 - \epsilon - \gamma\epsilon$ of the quantile averages will be included in the
 208 computation of $\text{WA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}$, as long as $\frac{1}{1+\gamma} - u \ll 1 - \epsilon - \gamma\epsilon$, and
 209 other portions of the QA function satisfy the inequality con-

straints that define the ν th orderliness on which the $\text{WA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}$ 210
 is based, the mean- $\text{WA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}$ -median inequality will still hold. 211
 This is due to the violation being bounded (13) and therefore 212
 cannot be extreme for unimodal distributions. For instance, 213
 the SQA function is non-monotonic when the shape parameter 214
 of the Weibull distribution $\alpha > \frac{1}{1-\ln(2)} \approx 3.259$ as shown 215
 in the previous article, the violation of the third orderliness 216
 starts near this parameter as well, yet the mean- $\text{BM}_{\frac{1}{24}}$ -median 217
 inequality is still valid when $\alpha \leq 3.387$. Another key factor in 218
 determining the risk of violation is the skewness of the distri- 219
 bution. Previously, it was demonstrated that in a family of 220
 distributions differing by a skewness-increasing transformation 221
 in van Zwet's sense, the violation of orderliness, if it happens, 222
 often only occurs when the distribution is nearly symmetrical 223
 (14). When $\gamma = 1$, the over-corrections in rm and qm are 224
 dependent on the SWA_{ϵ} -median difference, which can be a 225
 reasonable measure of skewness (15, 16), implying that the 226
 over-correction is often tiny with a moderate d . The same logic 227
 can be applied to WeHLM. This qualitative analysis provides 228
 another perspective, in addition to the bias bounds (13), that 229
 rm and qm based on the mean- $\text{WL}_{\epsilon,\gamma}$ -median inequality are 230
 generally safe. 231

B. Robust estimations of the central moments. In 1979, Bickel 232
 and Lehmann, in their final paper of the landmark series 233
Descriptive Statistics for Nonparametric Models (17), general- 234
 ized a class of estimators called "measures of spread," which 235
 "does not require the assumption of symmetry." From that, a 236
 popular efficient scale estimator, the Rousseeuw-Croux scale 237
 estimator (18), was derived in 1993, but the importance of 238
 tackling the symmetry assumption has been greatly underes- 239
 timated. While they had already considered one version of 240
 the trimmed standard deviation in the third paper of that 241
 series (19), in the final section of the fourth paper (17), they 242
 explored another two possible versions, which were modified 243
 here for comparison, 244

$$245 \left[n \left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \right) \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[\sum_{i=\frac{n}{2}}^{n(1-\epsilon)} [X_i - X_{n-i+1}]^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad [1]$$

and 246

$$247 \left[\binom{n}{2} (1 - \epsilon - \gamma\epsilon) \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[\sum_{i=\binom{n}{2}\gamma\epsilon}^{\binom{n}{2}(1-\epsilon)} (X - X')_i^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad [2]$$

Data Availability. Data for Table ?? are given in SI Dataset S1. 248
 All codes have been deposited in [GitHub](#). 249

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. I gratefully acknowledge the construc- 250
 tive comments made by the editor which substantially improved 251
 the clarity and quality of this paper. 252

- 253 1. CF Gauss, *Theoria combinationis observationum erroribus minimis obnoxiae*. (Henricus
 254 Dieterich), (1823).
- 255 2. S Newcomb, A generalized theory of the combination of observations so as to obtain the best
 256 result. *Am. journal Math.* **8**, 343–366 (1886).
- 257 3. S Newcomb, Researches on the motion of the moon. part ii, the mean motion of the moon and
 258 other astronomical elements derived from observations of eclipses and occultations extending
 259 from the period of the babylonians until ad 1908. *United States. Naut. Alm. Off. Astron. paper*;
 260 v. 99, 1 (1912).
- 261 4. PJ Huber, Robust estimation of a location parameter. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **35**, 73–101 (1964).
- 262 5. X He, WK Fung, Method of medians for lifetime data with weibull models. *Stat. medicine* **18**,
 263 1993–2009 (1999).

- 264 6. M Menon, Estimation of the shape and scale parameters of the weibull distribution. *Techno-*
265 *metrics* **5**, 175–182 (1963).
- 266 7. SD Dubey, Some percentile estimators for weibull parameters. *Technometrics* **9**, 119–129
267 (1967).
- 268 8. KM Hassanein, Percentile estimators for the parameters of the weibull distribution. *Biometrika*
269 **58**, 673–676 (1971).
- 270 9. NB Marks, Estimation of weibull parameters from common percentiles. *J. applied Stat.* **32**,
271 17–24 (2005).
- 272 10. K Boudt, D Caliskan, C Croux, Robust explicit estimators of weibull parameters. *Metrika* **73**,
273 187–209 (2011).
- 274 11. SD Dubey, *Contributions to statistical theory of life testing and reliability*. (Michigan State
275 University of Agriculture and Applied Science. Department of statistics), (1960).
- 276 12. LJ Bain, CE Antle, Estimation of parameters in the weibull distribution. *Technometrics* **9**,
277 621–627 (1967).
- 278 13. C Bernard, R Kazzi, S Vanduffel, Range value-at-risk bounds for unimodal distributions under
279 partial information. *Insur. Math. Econ.* **94**, 9–24 (2020).
- 280 14. WR van Zwet, *Convex Transformations of Random Variables: Nebst Stellingen*. (1964).
- 281 15. AL Bowley, *Elements of statistics*. (King) No. 8, (1926).
- 282 16. RA Groeneveld, G Meeden, Measuring skewness and kurtosis. *J. Royal Stat. Soc. Ser. D*
283 *(The Stat.* **33**, 391–399 (1984).
- 284 17. PJ Bickel, EL Lehmann, Descriptive statistics for nonparametric models iv. spread in *Selected*
285 *Works of EL Lehmann*. (Springer), pp. 519–526 (2012).
- 286 18. PJ Rousseeuw, C Croux, Alternatives to the median absolute deviation. *J. Am. Stat. associa-*
287 *tion* **88**, 1273–1283 (1993).
- 288 19. PJ Bickel, EL Lehmann, Descriptive statistics for nonparametric models. iii. dispersion in
289 *Selected works of EL Lehmann*. (Springer), pp. 499–518 (2012).

DRAFT