Semiparametric robust mean estimations based on the orderliness of quantile averages

Tuban Lee

As one of the most fundamental problem in statistics, robust location estimation has many prominent solutions, such as the symmetric trimmed mean, symmetric Winsorized mean, Hodges–Lehmann estimator, Huber M-estimator, and median of means. Recent studies suggest that their maximum biases concerning the mean can be quite different in asymmetric distributions, but the underlying mechanisms and average performance remain largely unclear. This study establishes several forms of orderliness among quantile averages, similar to the mean-median-mode inequality, within a wide range of semiparametric distributions. From this, a sequence of advanced robust mean estimators emerges, which also explains why the Winsorized mean and median of means typically have smaller biases compared to the trimmed mean. Building on the U-orderliness, the superiority of the median Hodges–Lehmann mean is discussed.

semiparametric | mean-median-mode inequality | asymptotic | unimodal | Hodges–Lehmann estimator

In 1823, Gauss [1] proved that for any unimodal distribution, $|m - \mu| \leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}}\omega$ and $\sigma \leq \omega \leq 2\sigma$, where μ is the population mean, m is the population median, ω is the root mean square deviation from the mode, and σ is the population standard deviation. This pioneering work revealed that despite potential bias in robust mean estimates, the deviation remains bounded in units of a scale parameter under certain assumptions. Bernard, Kazzi, and Vanduffel (2020) [2] further derived asymptotic bias bounds of any quantile for unimodal distributions with finite second moments, by reducing this optimization problem to a parametric one, which can be solved analytically. They showed that m has the smallest maximum distance to μ among all symmetric quantile averages (SQA$_\epsilon$). Daniell, in 1920, [3] analyzed a class of estimators, linear combinations of order statistics, and identified that ϵ-symmetric trimmed mean (STM$_\epsilon$) belongs to this class. Another popular choice, the ϵ-symmetric Winsorized mean (SWM$_\epsilon$), named after Winsor and introduced by Tukey [4] and Dixon [5] in 1960, is also an L-estimator. Bieniek (2016) derived exact bias upper bounds of the Winsorized mean based on Danielak and Rychlik's work (2003) on the trimmed mean for any distribution with a finite second moment and confirmed that the former is smaller than the latter [6, 7]. In 1963, Hodges and Lehmann [8] proposed a class of nonparametric location estimators based on rank tests and, from the Wilcoxon signed-rank statistic [9], deduced the median of pairwise means as a robust location estimator for a symmetric population. Both L-statistics and R-statistics achieve robustness essentially by removing a certain proportion of extreme values. In 1964, Huber [10] generalized maximum likelihood estimation to the minimization of the sum of a specific loss function, which measures the residuals between the data points and the model's parameters. Some L-estimators are also M-estimators, e.g., the sample mean is an M-estimator with a squared error loss function, the sample median is an M-estimator with an absolute error loss function

[10]. The Huber M-estimator is obtained by applying the Huber loss function that combines elements of both squared error and absolute error to achieve robustness against gross errors and high efficiency for contaminated Gaussian distributions [10]. Sun, Zhou, and Fan (2020) examined the concentration bounds of Huber M-estimator [11]. Mathieu (2022) [12] further derived the concentration bounds of M-estimators and demonstrated that, by selecting the tuning parameter which depends on the variance, Huber M-estimator can also be a sub-Gaussian estimator. The concept of median of means (MoM$_{k,b=\frac{n}{k}}$, k is the number of size in each block, b is the number of blocks) was implicitly introduced several times in Nemirovsky and Yudin (1983) [13], Jerrum, Valiant, and Vazirani (1986), [14] and Alon, Matias and Szegedy (1996) [15]'s works. Given its good performance even for distributions with infinite second moments, MoM has received increasing attention over the past decade [16–18]. Devroye, Lerasle, Lugosi, and Oliveira (2016) showed that MoM nears the optimum of sub-Gaussian mean estimation with regards to concentration bounds when the distribution has a heavy tail [17]. For a comparison of concentration bounds of trimmed mean, Huber M-estimator, median of means and other relavent estimators, readers are directed to Gobet, Lerasle, and Métivier's paper (2022) [19]. Laforgue, Clemencon, and Bertail (2019) proposed the median of randomized means (MoRM$_{k,b}$) [18], wherein, rather than partitioning, an arbitrary number, b, of blocks are built independently from the sample, and showed that MoRM has a better non-asymptotic sub-Gaussian property compared to MoM. In fact, asymptotically, the Hodges-Lehmann (H-L) estimator is equivalent to MoM$_{k=2,b=\frac{n}{k}}$ and MoRM$_{k=2,b}$, and they can be seen as the pairwise mean distribution is approximated by the sampling without replacement and bootstrap, respectively. For the asymptotic validity, readers are referred to the foundational works of Efron (1979) [20], Bickel and Freedman (1981, 1984) [21, 22], and Helmers, Janssen, and

---

Significance Statement

In 1964, van Zwet introduced the convex transformation order for comparing the skewness of two distributions. This paradigm shift played a fundamental role in defining robust measures of distributions, from spread to kurtosis. Here, instead of examining the stochastic ordering between two distributions, the orderliness of quantile averages within a distribution is investigated. By classifying distributions through the signs of derivatives, a series of sophisticated robust mean estimators is deduced. Nearly all common nonparametric robust location estimators are found to be special cases thereof.

---

71 Veraverbeke (1990) [23].

Here, the ϵ,b-stratified mean is defined as

$$\mathrm{SM}_{\epsilon,b,n} := \frac{b}{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\frac{b-1}{2b\epsilon}} \sum_{i_j = \frac{(2bj-b-1)n\epsilon}{b-1}+1}^{\frac{(2bj-b+1)n\epsilon}{b-1}} X_{i_j} \right),$$

72 where $X_1 \leq \ldots \leq X_n$ denote the order statistics of a sample
73 of n independent and identically distributed random variables
74 $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. $b \in \mathbb{N}, b \geq 3$. The definition was further refined to
75 guarantee the continuity of the breakdown point by incorporat-
76 ing an additional block in the center when $\lfloor \frac{b-1}{2b\epsilon} \rfloor \bmod 2 = 0$,
77 or by adjusting the central block when $\lfloor \frac{b-1}{2b\epsilon} \rfloor \bmod 2 = 1$ (SI
78 Text). If the subscript n is omitted, only the asymptotic
79 behavior is considered. If b is omitted, $b = 3$ is assumed.
80 $\mathrm{SM}_{\epsilon,b=3}$ is equivalent to STM_ϵ, when $\epsilon > \frac{1}{6}$. When $\frac{b-1}{2\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$,
81 $b \bmod 2 = 1$, the basic idea of the stratified mean is to dis-
82 tribute the data into $\frac{b-1}{2\epsilon}$ equal-sized non-overlapping blocks
83 according to their order, then further sequentially group these
84 blocks into b equal-sized strata and compute the mean of the
85 middle stratum, which is the median of means of each stratum.
86 In situations where $i \bmod 1 \neq 0$, a potential solution is to
87 generate multiple smaller samples that satisfy the equality by
88 sampling without replacement, and subsequently calculate the
89 mean of all estimations. The details of determining the sample
90 size and sampling times are provided in the SI Text. Although
91 the principle resembles that of the median of means, $\mathrm{SM}_{\epsilon,b,n}$
92 is different from $\mathrm{MoM}_{k=\frac{n}{b},b}$ as it does not include the random
93 shift. Additionally, the stratified mean differs from the mean
94 of the sample obtained through stratified sampling methods,
95 introduced by Neyman (1934) [24] or ranked set sampling [25],
96 introduced by McIntyre in 1952, as these sampling methods
97 aim to obtain more representative samples or improve the
98 efficiency of sample estimates, but the sample means based
99 on them are not robust. When $b \bmod 2 = 1$, the stratified
100 mean can be regarded as replacing the other equal-sized strata
101 with the middle stratum, which, in principle, is analogous to
102 the Winsorized mean that replaces extreme values with less
103 extreme percentiles. Furthermore, while the bounds confirm
104 that the Winsorized mean and median of means outperform
105 the trimmed mean [6, 7, 17, 19] in worst-case performance,
106 the complexity of bound analysis makes it difficult to achieve a
107 complete and intuitive understanding of these results. Also, a
108 clear explanation for the average performance of them remains
109 elusive. The aim of this paper is to define a series of semi-
110 parametric models using the signs of derivatives, reveal their
111 elegant interrelations and connections to parametric models,
112 and show that by exploiting these models, a set of sophisti-
113 cated mean estimators can be deduced, which exhibit strong
114 robustness to departures from assumptions.

Quantile average and weighted average

The symmetric trimmed mean, symmetric Winsorized mean,
and stratified mean are all L-estimators. More specifically,
they are symmetric weighted averages, which are defined as

$$\mathrm{SWA}_{\epsilon,n} := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} \frac{X_i + X_{n-i+1}}{2} w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} w_i},$$

116 where w_is are the weights applied to the symmetric quantile
117 averages according to the definition of the corresponding L-
118 estimators. For example, for the ϵ-symmetric trimmed mean,

119 $w_i = \begin{cases} 0, & i < n\epsilon \\ 1, & i \geq n\epsilon \end{cases}$, provided that $n\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$. The mean and
120 median are indeed two special cases of the symmetric trimmed
121 mean.

122 To extend the symmetric quantile average to the asym-
123 metric case, two definitions for the ϵ,γ-quantile average
124 $(\mathrm{QA}(\epsilon, \gamma, n))$ are proposed. The first definition is:

$$\frac{1}{2}(\hat{Q}_n(\gamma\epsilon) + \hat{Q}_n(1-\epsilon)), \qquad [1]$$

126 and the second definition is:

$$\frac{1}{2}(\hat{Q}_n(\epsilon) + \hat{Q}_n(1-\gamma\epsilon)), \qquad [2]$$

128 where $\hat{Q}_n(p)$ is the empirical quantile function, γ is used to
129 adjust the degree of asymmetry, $\gamma \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$. For
130 trimming from both sides, [1] and [2] are essentially equivalent.
131 The first definition is assumed in the remainder of this article
132 unless otherwise specified, since many common asymmetric
133 distributions are right-skewed, and [1] allows trimming only
134 from the right side by setting $\gamma = 0$.

Analogously, the weighted average can be defined as

$$\mathrm{WA}_{\epsilon,\gamma,n} := \frac{\int_{\epsilon_0=0}^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} \mathrm{QA}\left(\epsilon_0, \gamma, n\right) w_{\epsilon_0}}{\int_{\epsilon_0=0}^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} w_{\epsilon_0}}.$$

135 For any weighted average, if γ is omitted, $\gamma = 1$ is assumed.
136 The ϵ,γ-trimmed mean $(\mathrm{TM}_{\epsilon,\gamma,n})$ is a weighted average with
137 a left trim size of $\gamma\epsilon n$ and a right trim size of ϵn, where
138 $w_{\epsilon_0} = \begin{cases} 0, & \epsilon_0 < \epsilon \\ 1, & \epsilon_0 \geq \epsilon \end{cases}$. Using this definition, the TM compu-
139 tation remains the same, regardless of whether $\gamma\epsilon n \notin \mathbb{N}$ or
140 $\epsilon n \notin \mathbb{N}$, since this definition is based on the empirical quantile
141 function. However, in this article, considering the compu-
142 tational cost in practice, the non-asymptotic definitions of
143 various types of weighted averages are essentially based on
144 order statistics in most cases. Unless stated otherwise, the
145 solution to their decimal issue is the same as that in SM.

Classifying distributions by the signs of derivatives

Let $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$ denote the set of all continuous distribution over $\mathbb{R}$.
Without loss of generality, the discussion of all the classes out-
lined below is restricted to the intersection with the nonpara-
metric class of distributions, $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$. Besides fully and smoothly
parameterizing by a Euclidean parameter or just assuming
regularity conditions, there are many ways to classify distri-
butions. In 1956, Stein initiated the problem of estimating
parameters in the presence of an infinite dimensional nuisance
shape parameter [26]. A notable example discussed in his
groundbreaking work was the estimation of the center of sym-
metry for an unknown symmetric distribution. In 1993, Bickel,
Klaassen, Ritov, and Wellner published an influential semi-
parametrics textbook [27] which systematically categorized
many common models into three classes: parametric, non-
parametric, and semiparametric. Yet, there is another old
and commonly encountered class of distributions that receives
little attention in semiparametric literature: the unimodal dis-
tribution. It is a very unique semiparametric model because
its definition is based on the signs of derivatives, i.e., for a
continuous distribution, $(f'(x) > 0$ for $x \leq M) \wedge (f'(x) < 0$

for $x \geq M$), where $f(x)$ is the probability density function (pdf) of a random variable X, M is the mode. Let $\mathcal{P}_U$ denote the set of all unimodal distributions. There was a widespread misbelief that the median of an arbitrary unimodal distribution always lies between its mean and mode until Runnenburg (1978) and van Zwet (1979) ([28], [29]) endeavored to determine sufficient conditions for the inequality to hold, thereby implying the possibility of its violation. The class of distributions that satisfy the mean-median-mode inequality constitutes a subclass of $\mathcal{P}_U$. By analogy, a right-skewed distribution is called γ-ordered, if and only if

$$\forall 0 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2 \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}, \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon_1,\gamma} \geq \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon_2,\gamma}.$$

The necessary and sufficient condition below hints at the relation between the mean-median-mode inequality and the γ-orderliness.

Theorem .1. *Let P_Υ represent an arbitrary distribution in the set $\mathcal{P}_\Upsilon$. P_Υ is γ-ordered if and only if the pdf satisfies the inequality $f(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) \geq f(Q(1-\epsilon))$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$ or $f(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) \leq f(Q(1-\epsilon))$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$, where $\gamma \geq 0$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, consider the case of right-skewed continuous distribution. From the definition of γ-orderliness, it is deduced that $\frac{Q(\gamma\epsilon-\delta)+Q(1-\epsilon+\delta)}{2} \geq \frac{Q(\gamma\epsilon)+Q(1-\epsilon)}{2} \Leftrightarrow Q(\gamma\epsilon-\delta)-Q(\gamma\epsilon) \geq Q(1-\epsilon)-Q(1-\epsilon+\delta) \Leftrightarrow Q'(1-\epsilon) \geq Q'(\gamma\epsilon)$, where δ is an infinitesimal positive quantity. Observing that the quantile function is the inverse function of the cumulative distribution function (cdf), $Q'(1-\epsilon) \geq Q'(\gamma\epsilon) \Leftrightarrow F'(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) \geq F'(Q(1-\epsilon))$, thereby completing the proof, given that the derivative of cdf is pdf. $\quad\square$

According to Theorem .1, if a probability distribution is right-skewed and monotonic, it will always be γ-ordered, provided $\gamma \geq 0$. For a right-skewed continuous unimodal distribution, if $Q(\gamma\epsilon) > M$, the inequality $f(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) \geq f(Q(1-\epsilon))$ holds. The principle is extendable to unimodal-like distributions. Suppose there is a right-skewed continuous multimodal distribution following the mean-γ-median-first mode inequality with several smaller modes on the right side, with the first mode, M_1, having the greatest probability density, and the γ-median, $Q(\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma})$, falling within the first dominant mode (i.e., if $x > Q(\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma})$, $f(Q(\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma})) \geq f(x)$), then if $Q(\gamma\epsilon) > M_1$, the inequality $f(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) \geq f(Q(1-\epsilon))$ also holds. In other words, while a distribution following the mean-γ-median-mode inequality may not be strictly γ-ordered, the inequality that defines γ-orderliness remains valid for most quantile averages. The mean-γ-median-mode inequality can also indicate possible bounds for γ in practice, e.g., for any distributions, when $\gamma \to \infty$, the γ-median will be greater than the mean and the mode, when $\gamma \to 0$, the γ-median will be smaller than the mean and the mode.

Consider the sign of the derivative of the quantile average with respect to the breakdown point; the above definition of γ-orderliness can also be expressed as

$$\forall 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}, \frac{\partial \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon} \leq 0.$$

The left-skewed case can be obtained by reversing the inequality $\frac{\partial \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon} \leq 0$ to $\frac{\partial \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon} \geq 0$ and employing the second definition of QA, as given in [2]. For simplicity, it will be omitted in the following discussion. If $\gamma = 1$, the γ-ordered distribution is referred to as ordered.

Furthermore, many common right-skewed distributions are partial bounded, indicating a convex behavior of the QA function when $\epsilon \to 0$. By further assuming convexity, the second γ-orderliness can be defined for a right-skewed distribution as follows,

$$\forall 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}, \frac{\partial^2 \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon^2} \geq 0 \wedge \frac{\partial \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon} \leq 0.$$

Analogously, the νth γ-orderliness of a right-skewed distribution can be defined as $(-1)^\nu \frac{\partial^\nu \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon^\nu} \geq 0 \wedge \ldots \wedge -\frac{\partial \mathrm{QA}_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon} \geq 0$. If $\gamma = 1$, the νth γ-orderliness is referred as νth orderliness. Let $\mathcal{P}_O$ denote the set of all distributions that are ordered and $\mathcal{P}_{O_\nu}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma O_\nu}$ represent the sets of all distributions that are νth ordered and νth γ-ordered, respectively. When the shape parameter of the Weibull distribution, α, is smaller than 3.258, it can be shown that the Weibull distribution belong to $\mathcal{P}_U \cap \mathcal{P}_O \cap \mathcal{P}_{O_2} \cap \mathcal{P}_{O_3}$ (SI Text). At $\alpha \approx 3.602$, the Weibull distribution is symmetric, and as $\alpha \to \infty$, the skewness of the Weibull distribution reaches 1. Therefore, the parameters that prevent it from being included in the set correspond to cases when it is near-symmetric, as shown in the SI Text. Nevertheless, computing the derivatives of the QA function is often intricate and, at times, challenging. The following theorems establish the relationship between $\mathcal{P}_O$, $\mathcal{P}_{O_\nu}$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma O_\nu}$, and a wide range of other semi-parametric distributions. They can be used to quickly identify some parametric distributions in $\mathcal{P}_O$, $\mathcal{P}_{O_\nu}$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma O_\nu}$.

Theorem .2. *For any random variable X whose probability distribution function belongs to a location-scale family, the distribution is νth γ-ordered if and only if the family of probability distributions is νth γ-ordered.*

Proof. Let Q_0 denote the quantile function of the standard distribution without any shifts or scaling. After a location-scale transformation, the quantile function is $Q(p) = \lambda Q_0(p) + \mu$, where λ is the scale parameter and μ is the location parameter. According to the definition of the νth γ-orderliness, the signs of derivatives of the QA function are invariant after this transformation. As the location-scale transformation is reversible, the proof is complete. $\quad\square$

Theorem .2 demonstrates that in the analytical proof of the νth γ-orderliness of a parametric distribution, both the location and scale parameters can be regarded as constants. It is also instrumental in proving other theorems, as illustrated below.

Theorem .3. *Any symmetric distribution with a finite second moment is νth ordered.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assuming continuity and $m = 0$. A symmetric distribution is a probability distribution such that for all x, $f(x) = f(-x)$. Its cdf satisfies $F(x) = 1 - F(-x)$. Let $x = Q(p)$, then, $F(Q(p)) = p = 1 - F(-Q(p))$ and $F(Q(1-p)) = 1 - p \Leftrightarrow p = 1 - F(Q(1-p))$. Therefore, $F(-Q(p)) = F(Q(1-p))$. Since the cdf is monotonic, $-Q(p) = Q(1-p) \Leftrightarrow Q(p) + Q(1-p) = 0$. As a result, all symmetric quantile averages coincide; the νth order derivative is zero. The case of $m \neq 0$ follows directly from Theorem .2. $\quad\square$

Lee

PNAS | **May 26, 2023** | vol. XXX | no. XX | **3**

As a consequence of Theorem .3 and the fact that generalized Gaussian distribution is symmetric around the median, it is νth ordered. A γ-symmetric continuous distribution can be defined as $Q(\gamma\epsilon) + Q(1 - \epsilon) = Q(\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma})$ is valid for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$, and it is obvious that a γ-symmetric distribution is always νth γ-ordered.

Theorem .4. *Any continuous right-skewed distribution whose quantile function Q satisfies $Q^{(\nu)}(p) \geq 0 \wedge \ldots Q^{(i)}(p) \geq 0 \ldots \wedge Q^{(2)}(p) \geq 0$, $i \bmod 2 = 0$, is νth γ-ordered, provided that $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$.*

Proof. Since $(-1)^i \frac{\partial^i QA_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon^i} = \frac{1}{2}((-\gamma)^i Q^i(\gamma\epsilon) + Q^i(1 - \epsilon))$, for $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$ and $1 \leq i \leq \nu$, when $i \bmod 2 = 0$, $(-1)^i \frac{\partial^i QA_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon^i} \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \geq 0$. When $i \bmod 2 = 1$, if further assuming $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, $(-1)^i \frac{\partial^i QA_{\epsilon,\gamma}}{\partial \epsilon^i} \geq 0$, since $Q^{(i+1)}(p) \geq 0$. □

It is now straightforward to show that the Pareto distribution follows the νth γ-orderliness, provided that $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, since the quantile function of the Pareto distribution is $Q(p) = x_m(1 - p)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, where $x_m > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, and so $Q^{(\nu)}(p) \geq 0$ for all $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ according to the chain rule.

Theorem .5. *A right-skewed continuous distribution with a monotonic decreasing pdf is second γ-ordered.*

Proof. A monotonic decreasing pdf implies $f'(x) = F^{(2)}(x) \leq 0$. Since $Q'(p) \geq 0$, let $x = Q(F(x))$, then by differentiating both sides of the equation twice, one can obtain $0 = Q^{(2)}(F(x))(F'(x))^2 + Q'(F(x))F^{(2)}(x) \Leftrightarrow Q^{(2)}(F(x)) = -\frac{Q'(F(x))F^{(2)}(x)}{(F'(x))^2} \geq 0$. The desired result is derived from Theorem .1 and .4. □

Theorem .5 provides valuable insights into the relation between modality and orderliness. The conventional definition states that a distribution with a monotonic pdf is still considered unimodal. However, within its supported interval, the mode number is zero. The number of modes and their magnitudes within a distribution are closely related to the possibility of orderliness being valid, although counterexamples can always be constructed for non-monotonic distributions. It can be easily established that the gamma distribution is second γ-ordered, if $\gamma > 0$, when $\alpha \leq 1$ as the pdf of the gamma distribution is $f(x) = \frac{\lambda^{-\alpha}x^{\alpha-1}e^{-\frac{x}{\lambda}}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}$, where $x \geq 0$, $\lambda > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, Γ is the gamma function, it is a product of two monotonic decreasing functions under constraints. For $\alpha > 1$, an analytical analysis becomes challenging. Numerical results show that the orderliness is valid until $\alpha > 140$, the second orderliness is valid until $\alpha > 78$, and the third orderliness is valid until $\alpha > 55$ (SI Text). It is instructive to consider that when $\alpha \to \infty$ the gamma distribution converges to a Gaussian distribution with mean $\mu = \alpha\lambda$ and variance $\sigma = \alpha\lambda^2$. The skewness of the gamma distribution, $\frac{\alpha+2}{\sqrt{\alpha(\alpha+1)}}$, is monotonic with respect to α, since $\frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_3(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{-3\alpha-2}{2(\alpha(\alpha+1))^{3/2}} < 0$. When $\alpha = 55$, $\tilde{\mu}_3(\alpha) = 1.027$. Theorefore, similar to the Weibull distribution, the parameters that let the distribution not be included in $\mathcal{P}_U \cap \mathcal{P}_O \cap \mathcal{P}_{O_2} \cap \mathcal{P}_{O_3}$ also correspond to cases when it is near-symmetric.

Theorem .6. *Consider a γ-symmetric random variable X. Let it be transformed using a function $\phi(x)$ such that $\phi^{(2)}(x) \geq 0 \wedge \phi'(x) \geq 0$ over the interval supported, the resulting convex transformed distribution is γ-ordered if $\gamma \geq 0$. Moreover, if the quantile function of X satifies $Q^{(2)}(p) \leq 0$, the convex transformed distribution is second γ-ordered, provided that $\gamma \geq 0$.*

Proof. Let $\phi QA(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}(\phi(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) + \phi(Q(1 - \epsilon)))$, $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{1+\gamma}$. Then, $\frac{\partial \phi QA}{\partial \epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma\phi'(Q(\gamma\epsilon))Q'(\gamma\epsilon) - \phi'(Q(1 - \epsilon))Q'(1 - \epsilon)) = \frac{1}{2}\gamma Q'(\gamma\epsilon)(\phi'(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) - \phi'(Q(1 - \epsilon))) \leq 0$, since for a γ-symmetric distribution, $Q(\frac{1}{1+\gamma}) - Q(\gamma\epsilon) = Q(1 - \epsilon) - Q(\frac{1}{1+\gamma})$, differentiating both sides, $-\gamma Q'(\gamma\epsilon) = -Q'(1 - \epsilon)$, where $Q'(\epsilon) \geq 0, \phi^{(2)}(x) \geq 0$, $\gamma \geq 0$. If further differentiating the equality, $\gamma^2 Q^{(2)}(\gamma\epsilon) = -Q^{(2)}(1 - \epsilon)$. Since $\frac{\partial^{(2)}\phi QA}{\partial \epsilon^{(2)}} = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^2\phi^2(Q(\gamma\epsilon))(Q'(\gamma\epsilon))^2 + \phi^2(Q(1 - \epsilon))(Q'(1 - \epsilon))^2) + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^2\phi'(Q(\gamma\epsilon))(Q^2(\gamma\epsilon)) + \phi'(Q(1 - \epsilon))(Q^2(1 - \epsilon))) = \frac{1}{2}((\phi^{(2)}(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) + \phi^{(2)}(Q(1 - \epsilon)))(\gamma Q'(\gamma\epsilon))^2) + \frac{1}{2}((\phi'(Q(\gamma\epsilon)) - \phi'(Q(1 - \epsilon)))\gamma^2 Q^{(2)}(\gamma\epsilon))$. If $Q^{(2)}(p) \leq 0$, $\frac{\partial^{(2)}\phi QA}{\partial \epsilon^{(2)}} \geq 0$. □

The mean-median-mode inequality for distributions of the powers and roots of the variates of a given distribution was investigated by Henry Rietz in 1927 (30), but the most straightforward solution is the exponential transformation since the derivatives are invariably positive. An application of Theorem .6 is that the lognormal distribution is ordered as it is exponentially transformed from the Gaussian distribution. The quantile function of the Gaussian distribution meets the condition $Q^{(2)}(p) = -2\sqrt{2}\pi\sigma e^{2\mathrm{erfc}^{-1}(2p)^2}\mathrm{erfc}^{-1}(2p) \leq 0$, where σ is the standard deviation of the Gaussian distribution and erfc denotes the complementary error function. Thus, the lognormal distribution is second ordered. Numerical results suggest that it is also third ordered, although analytically proving this result is challenging.

Data Availability. Data for Figure **??** are given in SI Dataset S1. All codes have been deposited in GitHub.

1. CF Gauss, *Theoria combinationis observationum erroribus minimis obnoxiae.* (Henricus Dieterich), (1823).
2. C Bernard, R Kazzi, S Vanduffel, Range value-at-risk bounds for unimodal distributions under partial information. *Insur. Math. Econ.* **94**, 9–24 (2020).
3. P Daniell, Observations weighted according to order. *Am. J. Math.* **42**, 222–236 (1920).
4. JW Tukey, A survey of sampling from contaminated distributions in *Contributions to probability and statistics.* (Stanford University Press), pp. 448–485 (1960).
5. WJ Dixon, Simplified Estimation from Censored Normal Samples. *The Annals Math. Stat.* **31**, 385 – 391 (1960).
6. K Danielak, T Rychlik, Theory & methods: Exact bounds for the bias of trimmed means. *Aust. & New Zealand J. Stat.* **45**, 83–96 (2003).
7. M Bieniek, Comparison of the bias of trimmed and winsorized means. *Commun. Stat. Methods* **45**, 6641–6650 (2016).
8. J Hodges Jr, E Lehmann, Estimates of location based on rank tests. *The Annals Math. Stat.* **34**, 598–611 (1963).
9. F Wilcoxon, Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biom. Bull.* **1**, 80–83 (1945).
10. PJ Huber, Robust estimation of a location parameter. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **35**, 73–101 (1964).
11. Q Sun, WX Zhou, J Fan, Adaptive huber regression. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **115**, 254–265 (2020).
12. T Mathieu, Concentration study of m-estimators using the influence function. *Electron. J. Stat.* **16**, 3695–3750 (2022).
13. AS Nemirovskij, DB Yudin, *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization.* (Wiley-Interscience), (1983).
14. MR Jerrum, LG Valiant, VV Vazirani, Random generation of combinatorial structures from a uniform distribution. *Theor. computer science* **43**, 169–188 (1986).

Lee

15. N Alon, Y Matias, M Szegedy, The space complexity of approximating the frequency moments in *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. pp. 20–29 (1996).
16. PL Bühlmann, Bagging, subagging and bragging for improving some prediction algorithms in *Research report/Seminar für Statistik, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH)*. (Seminar für Statistik, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH), Zürich), Vol. 113, (2003).
17. L Devroye, M Lerasle, G Lugosi, RI Oliveira, Sub-gaussian mean estimators. *The Annals Stat.* **44**, 2695–2725 (2016).
18. P Laforgue, S Clémençon, P Bertail, On medians of (randomized) pairwise means in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. (PMLR), pp. 1272–1281 (2019).
19. E Gobet, M Lerasle, D Métivier, Mean estimation for Randomized Quasi Monte Carlo method. working paper or preprint (2022).
20. B Efron, Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jackknife. *The Annals Stat.* **7**, 1–26 (1979).
21. PJ Bickel, DA Freedman, Some asymptotic theory for the bootstrap. *The annals statistics* **9**, 1196–1217 (1981).
22. PJ Bickel, DA Freedman, Asymptotic normality and the bootstrap in stratified sampling. *The annals statistics* **12**, 470–482 (1984).
23. R Helmers, P Janssen, N Veraverbeke, *Bootstrapping U-quantiles*. (CWI. Department of Operations Research, Statistics, and System Theory [BS]), (1990).
24. J Neyman, On the two different aspects of the representative method: The method of stratified sampling and the method of purposive selection. *J. Royal Stat. Soc.* **97**, 558–606 (1934).
25. G McIntyre, A method for unbiased selective sampling, using ranked sets. *Aust. journal agricultural research* **3**, 385–390 (1952).
26. CM Stein, Efficient nonparametric testing and estimation in *Proceedings of the third Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*. Vol. 1, pp. 187–195 (1956).
27. P Bickel, CA Klaassen, Y Ritov, JA Wellner, *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models*. (Springer) Vol. 4, (1993).
28. JT Runnenburg, Mean, median, mode. *Stat. Neerlandica* **32**, 73–79 (1978).
29. Wv Zwet, Mean, median, mode ii. *Stat. Neerlandica* **33**, 1–5 (1979).
30. H Rietz, On certain properties of frequency distributions of the powers and roots of the variates of a given distribution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **13**, 817–820 (1927).

Lee

PNAS | **May 26, 2023** | vol. XXX | no. XX | **5**