

# Convex Polyhedra I: Estimation

## Statistics 710

October 3 & 10, 2006

**Polyhedral Cones.** Let  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\langle x, y \rangle = x'Wy$ , where  $W$  is symmetric and positive definite. Recall that a convex set  $\Omega$  is said to be cone if  $c\theta \in \Omega$  for all  $c > 0$  whenever  $\theta \in \Omega$ . If  $\Omega$  is a cone, then

$$\Omega^\circ = \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \theta, \omega \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in \Omega\}.$$

is again a closed convex cone, called *the polar cone*. A *convex polyhedral cone* is a set of the form

$$\Omega = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \gamma_i, \theta \rangle \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . For example, if  $W = I_n$ , then the set of non-decreasing sequences in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\Omega = \{\theta : -\infty < \theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_n < \infty\}$  is a polyhedral cone with  $\gamma_1 = (-1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)'$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $(0, \dots, -1, 1)'$ .

If  $m \leq n$  and  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$  are linearly independent, then it is possible to describe  $\Omega$  in a useful way. Let

$$L = \text{span}\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\}.$$

Then  $\Omega \supseteq L^\perp$ , the orthogonal complement of  $L$ . Let

$$\Gamma = [\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m] \quad (n \times m),$$

and

$$\Delta = \Gamma(\Gamma'W\Gamma)^{-1} = [\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m], \text{ say.}$$

Then  $\Gamma'W\Delta = I_m = \Delta'W\Gamma$ , so that  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$  and  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m$  are biorthogonal,  $\langle \gamma_j, \delta_k \rangle = \gamma_j'W\delta_k = 1$  or  $0$ , accordingly as  $j = k$  or  $j \neq k$ , and

$$L = \text{span}\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\},$$

since the relation between  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta$  is invertible. Let  $\delta_{m+1}, \dots, \delta_n$  be an orthonormal basis for  $L^\perp$ . If  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$  are linearly independent, then  $\Omega$  consists of all linear combinations

$$\theta = a_1\delta_1 + \dots + a_n\delta_n \quad (2)$$

for which  $0 \leq a_1, \dots, a_m < \infty$  and  $-\infty < a_{m+1}, \dots, a_n < \infty$ , and the polar cone consists of all

$$\omega = b_1\gamma_1 + \dots + b_m\gamma_m$$

for which  $-\infty < b_1, \dots, b_m \leq 0$ . To see this observe that any  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$  can be written in the form (2), since  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$  are a basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ; and if  $\theta$  is so written, then  $\theta \in \Omega$  iff  $a_i = \langle \gamma_i, \theta \rangle > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . The assertion about the polar cone may be established similarly, with slightly more detail.

**Example 1** If  $W = I_n$  and  $\Omega$  is the set of non-decreasing sequences, then clearly  $L^\perp = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\} = \{c\mathbf{1} : c \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . Write  $\gamma_k = (\gamma_{k,1}, \dots, \gamma_{k,n})'$  and  $\delta_k = (\delta_{k,1}, \dots, \delta_{k,n})'$ . Then  $\gamma_{k,i} = -1$  if  $i = k$ ,  $1$  if  $i = k+1$ , and  $0$  otherwise. In this case  $\delta_k = (0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1)' - (n-k)\mathbf{1}$ , where the first  $1$  appears in the  $(k+1)^{\text{st}}$  position. For with this definition,  $\langle \gamma_j, \delta_k \rangle = 1$  if  $j = k$  and  $0$  otherwise.

**Projections.** *The Characterization +.* Now let  $\Omega$  be as in (1); let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ; and let  $\hat{\theta} = \Pi_\Omega y$ . Thus,

$$\hat{\theta} \in \Omega, \quad \langle \hat{\theta}, y - \hat{\theta} \rangle = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle y - \hat{\theta}, \xi \rangle \leq 0 \quad (3)$$

for all  $\xi \in \Omega$ . Observe that if  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\hat{\theta} \pm \alpha\xi \in \Omega$  for all small  $\alpha$ , then  $\langle y - \hat{\theta}, \xi \rangle = 0$ , since  $\pm\alpha\langle y - \hat{\theta}, \xi \rangle = \langle y - \hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta} \pm \alpha\xi \rangle \leq 0$  for small  $\alpha > 0$ . In particular, if  $\langle \gamma_k, \hat{\theta} \rangle > 0$ , then  $\langle y - \hat{\theta}, \delta_k \rangle = 0$ . For, if  $j \neq k$ , then  $\langle \gamma_j, \hat{\theta} \pm \alpha\delta_k \rangle = \langle \gamma_j, \hat{\theta} \rangle \pm \alpha\langle \gamma_j, \delta_k \rangle = \langle \gamma_j, \hat{\theta} \rangle \geq 0$ ; and  $\langle \gamma_k, \hat{\theta} \pm \alpha\delta_k \rangle = \hat{a}_k \pm \alpha > 0$  for small  $\alpha$ .

*A Generalized CSD and GCM.* Let  $\hat{\Theta} = W\Delta'\hat{\theta}$  and  $Y = W\Delta'y$ . Then

$$(\Gamma'W\Gamma)\hat{\Theta} \geq 0 \quad (4)$$

and

$$\hat{\Theta}_k \geq Y_k \text{ for all } k \leq m \text{ with equality if } \langle \gamma_k, \hat{\theta} \rangle > 0. \quad (5)$$

To see (4) simply observe that  $(\Gamma'W\Gamma)\hat{\Theta} = \Gamma'W\theta \geq 0$  by (1), since  $[\Gamma'W\theta]_k = \langle \gamma_k, \hat{\theta} \rangle$ . For (5), observe that  $\hat{\Theta}_k - Y_k = \langle \delta_k, \hat{\theta} - y \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $k$ , since  $\delta_k \in \Omega$ , with equality if  $\langle \gamma_k, \hat{\theta} \rangle > 0$ , as just explained.

*Duality.* Clearly condition (3) implies that  $y - \hat{\theta} \in \Omega^\circ$ . Moreover, letting  $\hat{\xi} = y - \hat{\theta}$ ,  $\langle \hat{\xi}, y - \hat{\xi} \rangle = \langle y - \hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta} \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle y - \hat{\xi}, \xi \rangle = \langle \hat{\theta}, \xi \rangle \leq 0$  for all  $\xi \in \Omega^\circ$ . So,  $\hat{\xi} = y - \hat{\theta}$  is the projection of  $y$  onto  $\Omega^\circ$ , and

$$y = \hat{\theta} + \hat{\xi} = \Pi_\Omega y + \Pi_{\Omega^\circ} y. \quad (6)$$

To go further, write  $\hat{\theta} = \hat{a}_1\delta_1 + \cdots + \hat{a}_n\delta_n$ , where  $\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_m \geq 0$ , as in (2), and let

$$\hat{J} = \hat{J}(y) = \{j \leq m : \langle \gamma_j, \hat{\theta} \rangle > 0\}. \quad (7)$$

Then

$$\hat{\theta} = \sum_{j \in \hat{J}} \hat{a}_j \delta_j + \sum_{i=m+1}^n \hat{a}_i \delta_i,$$

For  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ , let

$$K_J = \text{span}\{\delta_j : j \in J\}$$

and

$$K_J = L_J \oplus L^\perp = \text{span}\{\delta_j : j \in J, \text{ or } j > m\}.$$

Then

$$K_J^\perp = \text{span}\{\gamma_j : j \in J^c\},$$

where  $J^c = \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Denote the right side of the last line by  $M$ . Then, clearly  $M \subseteq K_J^\perp$ ; and if  $z \in K_J^\perp$ , then  $z = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \gamma_i + \sum_{i=m+1}^n c_i \delta_i$ , where  $c_i = \langle \delta_i, z \rangle = 0$  if  $i \in J$  or  $i > m$ , so that  $z \in M$ . It follows easily that

$$\hat{\theta} = \Pi_{K_J} y \quad \text{and} \quad y - \hat{\theta} = \Pi_{K_J^\perp} y. \quad (8)$$

To see that  $\hat{\theta} = \Pi_{K_J} y$ , it suffices to show that  $\hat{\theta} \in K_J$  and that  $\langle y - \hat{\theta}, \xi \rangle = 0$  for all  $\xi \in K_J$ . That  $\hat{\theta} \in K_J$  is clear. If  $\xi \in K_J$ , then  $\hat{\theta} \pm \alpha \xi \in \Omega$  for all sufficiently small  $\alpha$ . For if  $j \in \hat{J}$ , then

$$\langle \gamma_j, \hat{\theta} \pm \alpha \xi \rangle = \langle \gamma_j, \hat{\theta} \rangle \pm \alpha \langle \gamma_j, \xi \rangle = \hat{a}_j \pm \alpha \langle \gamma_j, \xi \rangle$$

which is positive for all small  $\alpha$ ; and if  $j \notin \hat{J}$ , then  $\xi = \sum_{j \notin \hat{J}} c_j \delta_j + \sum_{j=m+1}^n c_j \delta_j$ , so that  $\langle \gamma_j, \xi \rangle = 0$ . So, from (3),  $\pm \alpha \langle y - \hat{\theta}, \xi \rangle = \langle y - \hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta} \pm \alpha \xi \rangle \leq 0$  and, therefore,  $\langle y - \hat{\theta}, \xi \rangle = 0$ .

**Problem 1** Show that  $y - \hat{\theta} = \Pi_{\Omega^\circ} = \Pi_{K_J^\perp}$ .

*Continuity and Differentiability.* First  $\hat{\theta}$  is Lipschitz continuous; that is  $\|\hat{\theta}(y) - \hat{\theta}(z)\| \leq \|z - y\|$ . To see this observe that

$$\langle y - \hat{\theta}(y), \hat{\theta}(z) - \hat{\theta}(y) \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle z - \hat{\theta}(z), \hat{\theta}(z) - \hat{\theta}(y) \rangle \geq 0,$$

by (3). Subtracting,

$$\langle y - z, \hat{\theta}(z) - \hat{\theta}(y) \rangle + \|z - y\|^2 \leq 0$$

and, therefore,  $\|z - y\|^2 \leq \langle z - y, \hat{\theta}(z) - \hat{\theta}(y) \rangle \leq \|z - y\| \times \|z - y\|$ , from which the assertion follows.

For  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ , let

$$B_J = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \hat{J}(y) = J\}, \quad (9)$$

so that  $\hat{\theta} = \Pi_{K_J} y$  for  $y \in B_J$ . Let  $\Pi_{K_J}$  denote (also) the projection matrix onto  $K_J$ . It follows that

$$\left[ \frac{\partial \hat{\theta}_j(y)}{\partial y_i} \right] = \Pi_{K_J} \quad (10)$$

on the interior of each  $B_J$ . In particular, the divergence of  $\hat{\theta}$  is just the dimension of  $K_J$ ,

$$D(y) = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \hat{\theta}_j(y)}{\partial y_j} = \text{tr}[\Pi_{K_J}] = \dim(K_J).$$

I now claim that  $\bar{B}_I \cap \bar{B}_J$  is of Lebesgue measure 0 for any two different subsets of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , so that (10) holds almost everywhere. To see this, simply observe that if  $y \in \bar{B}_I \cap \bar{B}_J$ , then  $\Pi_{K_J} y = \hat{\theta} = \Pi_{K_I} y$ , so that  $(\Pi_{K_J} - \Pi_{K_I})y = 0$ . Thus,  $\bar{B}_I \cap \bar{B}_J$  is contained in a linear subspace of dimension less than  $n$  and the assertion follows.

To understand the projection matrices in more detail, recall that  $K_J = L_J \oplus L^\perp$  so that  $\Pi_{K_J} y = \Pi_{L_J} y + \Pi_{L^\perp} y$  in (8); and if  $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$ , where  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq m$ , let  $\Delta_J = [\delta_{j_1}, \dots, \delta_{j_k}]$  and  $\Gamma_J = [\gamma_{j_1}, \dots, \gamma_{j_k}]$ , so that

$$\Pi_{L_J} = \Delta_J (\Delta_J' \Delta_J)^{-1} \Delta_J' \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{K_J^\perp} = \Gamma_J (\Gamma_J' \Gamma_J)^{-1} \Gamma_J'.$$

**Properties of the Estimator.** Suppose now that  $W = I_n$  and that  $y$  is normally distributed with mean  $\theta \in \Omega$  and covariance matrix  $\sigma^2 I_n$ , where  $\sigma^2 > 0$ . Then there are both an unbiased estimator and a bound on the mean squared error in terms of  $D$ :

$$E_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 = E_\theta(U), \quad (11)$$

where

$$U = \|y - \hat{\theta}\|^2 + 2\sigma^2 D - n\sigma^2,$$

and

$$E_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \leq \sigma^2 E_\theta(D) \quad (12)$$

for all  $\theta \in \Omega$ . For (11), write  $y - \hat{\theta} = y - \theta - (\hat{\theta} - \theta)$ ,  $\|y - \hat{\theta}\|^2 = \|y - \theta\|^2 - 2\langle y - \theta, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle + \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta \|y - \hat{\theta}\|^2 &= E \|y - \theta\|^2 - 2E_\theta \langle y - \theta, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle + E_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \\ &= n\sigma^2 - 2\sigma^2 E_\theta(D) + E_\theta \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses Stein's Identity. Equation (11) follows by rewriting the expression. To see (12) observe that by (3)

$$0 \leq \langle y - \hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle = \langle y - \theta, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle - \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2$$

so that

$$E_{\theta}\|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 \leq E_{\theta} \left[ \langle y - \theta, \hat{\theta} - \theta \rangle \right] = \sigma^2 E_{\theta}(D),$$

where the equality follows from Stein's Identity.

*Estimating  $\sigma^2$ .* As a corollary

$$n\sigma^2 - 2\sigma^2 E_{\theta}(D) \leq E\|y - \hat{\theta}\|^2 \leq n\sigma^2 - \sigma^2 E_{\theta}(D). \quad (13)$$

Under regularity conditions, Meyer and Woodroffe [3] showed that  $E\|y - \hat{\theta}\|^2 \approx n\sigma^2 - \kappa\sigma^2 E_{\theta}(D)$ , where  $\kappa \approx 1.6$  and suggested an estimator of the form

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\|y - \hat{\theta}\|^2}{n - \kappa D}$$

for the case of unknown  $\sigma^2$ .

**Remarks.** This material is adapted from [2] and [3]. Shrinkage estimation is considered in [4] and [1].

## References

- [1] Amirdjanova, A. and Michael Woodroffe (2004). Shrinkage estimation for convex polyhedral cones. *Stat. Prob. Ltrrs.*, **70**, 87-94.
- [2] Meyer, Mary (1996). Shape restricted estimation with applications to .. Ph. D. Thesis (Statistics), The University of Michigan.
- [3] Meyer, Mary and Michael Woodroffe (2000). On the degrees of freedom in shape restricted estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, **28**, 1083-1104.
- [4] Sengupta, D. and P.K. Sen (1991). Shrinkage estimation in a restricted parameter space. *Sankhya, A*, **53**, 389-411.