

MML is not Consistent for Neyman-Scott

Michael Brand*

Abstract—Strict Minimum Message Length (SMML) is an information-theoretic statistical inference method widely cited (but only with informal arguments) as providing estimations that are consistent for general estimation problems. It is, however, almost invariably intractable to compute, for which reason only approximations of it (known as MML algorithms) are ever used in practice. Using novel techniques that allow for the first time direct, non-approximated analysis of SMML solutions, we investigate the Neyman-Scott estimation problem, an oft-cited showcase for the consistency of MML, and show that even with a natural choice of prior neither SMML nor its popular approximations are consistent for it, thereby providing a counterexample to the general claim. This is the first known explicit construction of an SMML solution for a natural, high-dimensional problem.

Index Terms—consistent estimation, convergence, estimation theory, Ideal Group, inference algorithms, MML, Neyman-Scott, SMML, statistical learning

EDICS Category: MAL-d

I. INTRODUCTION

IN the context of statistical inference and point estimation, the term *consistency* refers to the ability of an estimator to converge with probability 1 to the correct value of the parameter it is estimating (whatever that parameter’s true value may be) as the number of observations grows to infinity. (See [1] for a formal definition.) Typically, this property is discussed in the context of a specific estimation problem or when estimating a specific statistic (e.g., in determining whether or not the average of independent observations is a consistent estimator for the expectation of the distribution generating them).

An estimator is said to be consistent (without specifying the estimation problem) when its consistency property is universal, i.e. holds for any choice of estimation problem. Most popular estimators are not consistent in this universal sense. For example, [1] lists explicit conditions for Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation to be consistent, and provides examples of estimation problems for which it is not.

One estimator long believed to be (universally) consistent, however, [2]–[5] is *Minimum Message Length* (MML), and particularly the Strict MML (SMML) estimator. In [6], this property is even considered one of MML’s defining characteristics.

MML is a general name for any member of the family of Bayesian statistical inference methods based on the information-theoretic minimum message length principle, which, in turn, is closely related to the family of Minimum Description Length (MDL) estimators [7]–[9], but predates it.

The minimum message length principle was first introduced in [10], and the estimator that follows the principle directly, which was first described in [11], is known as Strict MML (SMML). We describe it formally in Section II-B.

One estimation problem of particular interest in the context of consistency is the Neyman-Scott problem [12]. This is defined as follows.

Definition 1. Let μ be the vector (μ_1, \dots, μ_N) .

The Neyman-Scott problem is the problem of jointly estimating the tuple (σ^2, μ) after observing $(x_{nj} : n = 1, \dots, N; j = 1, \dots, J)$, each element of which is independently distributed $x_{nj} \sim N(\mu_n, \sigma^2)$, where $N(\mu_n, \sigma^2)$ is the normal distribution with mean μ_n and variance σ^2 .

It is assumed that $J \geq 2$.

If we let

$$m_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{nj}}{J}$$

and

$$s^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J (x_{nj} - m_n)^2}{NJ},$$

and if we also let m be the vector (m_1, \dots, m_N) , then (s^2, m) is a sufficient statistic for this problem, which is why the observables used for estimating (σ^2, μ) can be taken to be (s^2, m) , rather than the x values directly.

The interesting case for Neyman-Scott is to observe the behaviour of the estimate for σ^2 when this estimate is part of the larger joint estimation problem, while taking N to infinity and fixing J .

Importantly, this set-up is beyond the standard asymptotic regime for consistency. In standard consistency, one would require the estimator to estimate σ^2 , and its consistency in doing so would be determined based on whether this estimate converges to any true value of σ^2 with probability 1. In the Neyman-Scott set-up, the estimator is required to estimate all of (σ^2, μ) , but then only the convergence properties of the first element are investigated.

This is ostensibly a harder case than standard consistency, because it creates an *inconsistent posterior* [13], a situation where even with unlimited data, the uncertainty regarding the true value of (σ^2, μ) remains high, even though the value of σ^2 is known with high confidence.

If we describe a (prior) distribution of μ given σ^2 , and thus likelihood functions of the observed variables x as a function of σ^2 , rather than of the tuple (σ^2, μ) , the problem of estimating σ^2 (alone) is a standard consistency problem, and for this alternate set-up standard estimators such as ML are, indeed, consistent. In the special form of consistency required for standard Neyman-Scott, however (which is sometimes referred to as “internal consistency”), many of the popular

M. Brand is with Otzma Analytics Pty Ltd and with the Faculty of IT, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia. e-mail: research@OtzmaAnalytics.com

estimation methods fail to return a consistent estimate for σ^2 . Maximum Likelihood, as a case in point, returns the (inconsistent) estimate s^2 , rather than $\frac{J}{J-1}s^2$.

MML, on the other hand, has long been believed to be consistent even for the Neyman-Scott problem [14]–[17], and, more generally, for the wider class of problems of a “Neyman-Scott nature” [3], making the Neyman-Scott problem a powerful and oft-cited showcase for MML’s superior consistency properties.

The reasons for the belief in MML’s consistency, both in the standard scenario and in the Neyman-Scott one, are due to MML’s theoretical underpinnings [3], [4], which we describe in Section II-B. Importantly, MML has never been formally proved to exhibit universal consistency in either scenario. In fact, there has not been any case for which the SMML estimate is known, is known to be consistent, and the ML estimate is not.

This lack of “empirical” evidence is due to the fact that SMML is computationally and analytically intractable in all but a select few single-parameter cases [18]. It was proved to be NP-hard to compute in general [19].

SMML is for this reason only ever used on natural problems by means of one of its computationally-feasible approximations, known as *MML algorithms*, the most widely used of which perhaps being the Wallace-Freeman approximation (WF-MML) [20]. In this approximated form, while still not as popular as ML or Maximum A Posteriori (MAP), MML enjoys a wide following, with over 90 papers published regarding it in 2018 alone, including [21]–[24]. However, the strong consistency properties attributed to SMML are not believed to be as universal for its approximations, for which reason they cannot be used to provide counterexamples to the general claim.

Nevertheless, as a demonstration of MML’s consistency, [3] calculated the Wallace-Freeman MML estimate for the Neyman-Scott problem, and [25, Sections 4.2–4.9] expanded on this by using another MML approximation, due to Dowe and Wallace, known as “Ideal Group” (IG), which is in some ways a more direct approximation to SMML but often as intractable as SMML itself. In both cases, the estimates proved to be consistent.

In this paper, we develop novel methods that allow for the first time direct, non-approximated analysis of a high-dimensional SMML solution. Inevitably, given the hardness results regarding SMML, it is not possible for such methods to be universally applicable to any estimation problem. However, they can be used in a known, broad class of problems, that we refer to as *regular* problems. This class includes, among others, natural problems, including high-dimensional ones. In particular, we prove that the Neyman-Scott problem is regular, and use our techniques to analyse the behaviour of SMML on it, without any assumptions or approximations.

This is done, however, with one caveat. The Neyman-Scott problem is a frequentist problem, defined by its likelihoods. To put any Bayesian method, including any of the MML variants discussed, to use on an estimation problem, one must also define a prior distribution for the estimated parameters. Bayesian methods accept such priors as part of the problem description,

i.e. as given. Without a specified prior, the “Neyman-Scott problem” is, from a Bayesian viewpoint, an entire family of estimation problems.

The Neyman-Scott problem has been investigated in the literature with many priors, proper and improper, informative and uninformative. The investigations of both [3] and [25] are of the Neyman-Scott problem over the prior function $1/\sigma$, which we will refer to as the *Wallace prior*. This is a standard, improper, uninformative prior for the problem. However, it is not the only such prior. Four such priors that are in common use for the Neyman-Scott problem are listed, for example, in [26]. In this paper we analyse a different one of the four, $1/\sigma^{N+1}$, which we refer to as the *scale free* prior. Both are commonly-used priors that are in no way considered pathological for the problem.¹

The reason we require this alternate prior is that it is the only prior for which the Neyman-Scott problem is regular. We refer to the Neyman-Scott problem under the scale-free prior as the *Scale-free Neyman-Scott problem*. (See Section IV-A for an explanation of the name “scale free”).

By applying our method, we show that SMML is not consistent for the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem, thus giving a counterexample to the general claim regarding SMML’s universal consistency properties in Neyman-Scott-like scenarios.²

More generally, our results serve as a strong indication that there is no reason to assume SMML holds consistency properties that are superior to those of ML, because our methods relate SMML to ML not just for Neyman-Scott but also for the general class of regular problems. It is in this context that our finding that MML is, in fact, no better than ML for Neyman-Scott becomes highly significant for MML at large.

For completion, in Appendix A we demonstrate that the MML approximations used by [3] and [25] converge, for this estimation problem, to the same limit as SMML, and are therefore also not consistent for this problem.

II. DEFINITIONS

A. Notation

This paper deals with the problem of statistical inference: from a set of observations, x , taken from X (the observation space) we wish to provide a point estimate, $\hat{\theta}(x)$, to the value,

¹In terms of the properties exhibited by the two priors discussed, both have an improper scale-free (i.e., $1/\sigma$) distribution on σ and both have an improper uniform distribution on μ given σ , but in the scale-free prior the μ_n are individually scale free (i.e., have a $1/|\mu_n|$ distribution), whereas in the Wallace prior they are individually uniformly distributed and are independent of σ .

It should be noted that the scale-free prior’s dependence on N (which, at first sight, might seem suspect to readers more familiar with the Wallace prior, especially in the context of consistency analysis) is merely an artefact of the problem’s parameterization. If, instead of using the parameters (σ, μ) , we define the problem over the parameters (σ, ζ) , where $\mu = \zeta\sigma$, the scale-free prior becomes $1/\sigma$, identical to the Wallace prior in the original parameterization. Because both SMML and all MML approximations discussed are invariant to parameterization, all our conclusions regarding the consistency of these algorithms are equally applicable for either parameterization.

²The paper’s title, “MML is not consistent for Neyman-Scott”, should be interpreted as the logical opposite to this general claim, i.e. “It is not true that MML is consistent for a general member of the Neyman-Scott estimation problem family; it will be inconsistent for some Neyman-Scott cases.”

θ , of a random variable, θ , drawn from Θ (parameter space). When speaking about statistical inference in general, we use the symbols introduced above. For a specific problem, such as in discussing the Neyman-Scott problem, we use problem-specific names for the variables. However, in all cases Latin characters refer to observables, Greek to unobservables that are to be estimated, boldface characters to random variables, non-boldface characters to values of said random variables, and hat-notation to estimates. Boldface is used for the observations, too, when considering the observations as random variables.

All point estimates discussed in this paper are defined using an argmin or an argmax. We take these functions as, in general, returning sets. Nevertheless, we use “ $\hat{\theta}(x) = \theta$ ”, as shorthand for “ $\theta \in \hat{\theta}(x)$ ”, because in typical usage the maxima/minima are unique, and the sets returned are therefore singletons. This is what makes the estimates discussed point estimates.

To be consistent with the notation of [25], we use $h(\theta)$ to indicate the prior and

$$r(x) = \int_{\Theta} h(\theta) f(x|\theta) d\theta \quad (1)$$

as the marginal. The integral of $h(\theta)$ over Θ may be 1 (in which case it is a *proper prior* and the problem is a *proper estimation problem*) but it may also integrate to other positive values (in which case it is a *scaled prior*) or diverge to infinity (in which case it is an *improper prior*). Our analysis will reject a prior as *pathological* only if it does not allow computation of a marginal using (1).

When speaking of events that have positive probability, we will use the $\text{Prob}()$ notation. However, in calculating over a scaled or improper prior some probabilities will be correspondingly scaled when computed as an integral over the prior or the marginal. For these we use the $\text{ScaledProb}()$ notation.

For reasons of mathematical convenience, we take both the observation space, X , and the parameter space, Θ , as complete metric spaces, and assume that priors, likelihoods, posterior probabilities and marginals are all continuous, differentiable, everywhere-positive functions. This allows us to take limits, derivatives, argmins, argmaxs, etc., freely, without having to prove at every step that these are well-defined and have a value.

B. MML

Minimum Message Length (MML) [25] is an inference method that attempts to codify in information-theoretic terms the principle of Occam’s Razor.

Consider $F : X \rightarrow \Theta$ as a candidate point estimation function. To evaluate the suitability of F , consider an observer wanting to communicate x . Such an observer may do so using a two-part message, first communicating $F(x)$ as an estimate to the value of θ , and then communicating x on the assumption that θ equals the communicated $F(x)$. The first part of the message is, in expectation, shorter the “simpler” F is (in the sense of having lower entropy), the second part is, in expectation, shorter the more representative F ’s estimations.

The F with the shortest total expected message length is therefore, under this model, the one best fitting Occam’s ideal of choosing the simplest hypothesis that still adequately fits the available data.

When X has only countably many elements, an F can be chosen such that both message parts are finite. In this case, F necessarily maps to only countably many distinct θ values. We label these $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$

The expected length of the first part of the message is

$$\begin{aligned} L_E(F) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i -\text{Prob}(F(\mathbf{x}) = \theta_i) \log \text{Prob}(F(\mathbf{x}) = \theta_i) \\ &= H(F(\mathbf{x})), \end{aligned}$$

where H is the Shannon entropy.³

Consider \mathbf{i} , the random variable such that $F(\mathbf{x}) = \theta_i$. The expected length of the second part of the message is the expectation, over $i = \mathbf{i}$, of the message length of an x value taken from the distribution of \mathbf{x} given $F(\mathbf{x}) = \theta_i$, when x is encoded optimally for its distribution under $\theta = \theta_i$, i.e. the cross entropy of these two distributions. In a formula, this is

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_i \text{Prob}(F(\mathbf{x}) = \theta_i) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}|F(\mathbf{x})=\theta_i} [-\log \text{Prob}(\mathbf{x}|\theta = \theta_i)] \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} \text{Prob}(\mathbf{x} = x) \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Prob}(\mathbf{x} = x|\theta = F(x))} \right), \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{E} signifies expectation.

Unfortunately, this method does not work when X is uncountable, because then the second part of the message becomes infinite and cannot be minimised. The way to solve this problem is to subtract from (2) the prior entropy of \mathbf{x} , $H(\mathbf{x})$, which is clearly independent of the choice of F . The remainder is known as the *excess message length*. This is guaranteed to be finite, even when X is uncountable.

Returning now to our notation for continuous variables, if we define

$$R_{\theta}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \left(\frac{r(x)}{f(x|\theta)} \right), \quad (3)$$

then an equivalent way to express the expected excess message length for the second message part is

$$L_P(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(R_{F(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x})) = \int_X r(x) R_{F(x)}(x) dx,$$

and by minimising the total,

$$L(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_E(F) + L_P(F),$$

the optimal F can be found.

Necessarily, the optimal F must have a finite $H(F(\mathbf{x}))$. It must therefore map to only a countable subset of Θ . Functions $F : X \rightarrow \Theta$ that take only countably many values are known in the MML literature as *code-books*. The code-books that minimise L are the *SMML code-books*, and are traditionally taken to provide the SMML estimate.⁴

³Here and everywhere in the paper, all logs are natural logs, and information is measured in nits.

⁴Some sources define “code-book” as merely the collection of θ values taken by F , rather than as the function F itself, but this is not the sense in which we use the term here.

Note, however, that SMML code-books may not be unique, and two equally optimal F functions may lead to distinct estimates. To resolve this, we define the SMML estimator here more generally as

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{SMML}}(x) = \text{closure} \left(\bigcup_{F \in \arg\min_{F'} L(F')} F(x) \right),$$

where $\text{closure}(\cdot)$ is the set closure function.

C. The Ideal Point

We introduce the notion of an “ideal point” which will be central to our analysis. This is built on an approximation for SMML known in the MML literature as Ideal Group [25].

The Ideal Group estimator is defined in terms of its functional inverse, mapping θ values to (sets of) x values. We refer to such functions as *reverse estimators* and denote them $\tilde{x}(\theta)$. The Ideal Group reverse estimator is defined as

$$\tilde{x}_{\text{IG}}(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X | R_{\theta}(x) \leq t(\theta)\}, \quad (4)$$

where $t(\theta)$ is a threshold whose value is given in [25], and which is computed in a way that guarantees that the ideal group is a non-empty set for each $\theta \in \Theta$.

Because the ideal group is always non-empty, it must include

$$\tilde{x}_{\text{IP}}(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg\min_{x \in X} R_{\theta}(x).$$

We refer to this as the *Ideal Point* approximation (a notion and a name that, unlike Ideal Group, are new to this paper).

We denote the inverse functions of reverse estimators, e.g.

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\theta \in \Theta | x \in \tilde{x}_{\text{IP}}(\theta)\},$$

by the same hat notation as estimators, but stress that these are only true estimators (albeit, perhaps, multi-valued) if the reverse estimator is a surjection.

To motivate the ideal point estimator independently of the ideal group, consider that $R_{\theta}(x)$ is a representation-invariant value that measures the joint probability density of (x, θ) at (x, θ) , as normalised by the individual marginal densities of x at x and θ at θ . (One can think of it as the negative of the portion of the mutual information of x and θ , $I(x; \theta)$, relating to their distributions at $x = x$ and $\theta = \theta$.) The reverse estimator $\tilde{x}_{\text{IP}}(\theta)$ is therefore the estimator that chooses for any given θ the x values that are, in this sense, most “representative”—or, otherwise stated, are “prototypical examples”—of θ ; they are the x values that would have maximised the likelihood function $f(x|\theta)$ had x been reparameterised so that its marginal distribution were to become uniform.

The (forward) estimator $\hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x)$ can by this be understood to select for any x the θ value(s) for which this x is a prototypical example.

As the observation space is typically much larger (has higher dimensionality) than the parameter space, it is usually the case that typical θ values map to many x values that can serve as prototypical examples of them. However, optimally we would hope the inverse relationship, being the IP estimator, is a

functional relationship, mapping each example back to a single antecedent: optimally, an observation is prototypical of exactly one choice of parameter values. When this is the case, the IP estimator is, at least at face value, an appealing choice for an estimator. Conversely, in cases where the relationship is more complicated we might consider the estimator less justified, and the farther from functional the relationship is the weaker the justification.

III. CONTEXT, HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, AND AIMS

Before delving into proofs, it is illuminating to place our present results within their proper context.

A. The operational significance of MML

In classical (frequentist) statistics, a key tenet is the likelihood principle [27]. This idea, whose origins go back as far as [28], states that all evidence relevant for the modelling of parameters from observations is contained in the likelihood function. This is the philosophical justification behind likelihood maximisation.

In practice, however, when comparing between qualitatively different models, such as between models whose number of degrees of freedom are different, relying solely on likelihood maximisation is biased towards the more expressive models, leading to overfitting. This gives rise to multiple types of penalised maximum likelihood, some, based on likelihood-regularisation, of the form

$$\hat{\theta}(x) = \arg\max_{\theta \in \Theta} [f(x|\theta) - \lambda(\theta)],$$

and some, based on information theory, of the form

$$\hat{\theta}(x) = \arg\min_{\theta \in \Theta} [-\log f(x|\theta) + \lambda(\theta)], \quad (5)$$

where different methods use different $\lambda(\theta)$ functions to encode a penalty for the choice of θ .

This method has proved itself useful in regularisation [29], [30], variable selection [31], model selection [32], [33] and elsewhere.

While all information-based methods rely on the principles of algorithmic and statistical information theory, in some cases, such as with the Akaike Information Criterion [32] and the Bayes Information Criterion [33], the choice of $\lambda(\theta)$ function is a generic one, based on generic assumptions, whereas in others, such as in Solomonoff induction [34] and MDL [35], the idea is to use the full problem description to create a specific $\lambda(\theta)$ function. The latter outlook lends itself naturally to describing (5) as representing the length of a two-part message with an explicit structure.

MML, while structurally similar to these methods in advocating for a two-part message whose optimality is rooted in statistical information theory, is nevertheless distinct in its approach and aims. While the methods above can be categorised as either frequentist (make no use of a prior) or objective Bayesian (make use of a prior that is universal, or otherwise is systematically-derived as a function of the likelihood function), MML is purely (subjective) Bayesian, relying on a user-provided prior, and rejects the likelihood principle

entirely. Unlike MDL, which can be viewed as related to this family of penalised maximum likelihood estimators, and is therefore of importance mainly in model selection and similar tasks fitting for this family (as can be seen, e.g., in how it is framed by its own inventor in [36]), MML is painted by its originator in a vastly different light, namely as the one, singularly best systematic method for inductive inference (as evidenced in [25]), and as a do-all-end-all solution.

Accordingly, while MDL has progressed and evolved in order to address new problem fields and problem types (for example, from the “old MDL” of [35] to the newer MDL and the Normalised Maximum Likelihood of [36]), MML has not, with the minimum message length principle retaining precisely its original form since its inception in 1968 [10] and SMML since its introduction in [11].

The MML literature, at large, has followed in this spirit, and much of it revolves pitting MML in specific tasks against methods such as the ones listed above, as well as against ML, MAP and other alternatives, demonstrating MML’s distinctive power as a single, unified framework within which to make all types of statistical decisions.

Examples of such use begin already at MML’s inception in [10], where MML was used for non-parametric clustering and unsupervised, non-parametric mixed-modelling, producing an algorithm that can handle seamlessly both discrete and continuous attributes, and where the minimum message length criterion is used to determine how finely one can confidently separate clusters. The program developed implementing this algorithm, SNOB, is still in use [37], [38], despite now being over 50 years old.

Elsewhere, MML was used to tackle the problem of learning from small samples, and in particular short time series [39], to handle spike-and-slab priors [40] (as well as generalisations thereof, such as the gap problem of [4]), in situations where the topology of observation- or parameter-space is not trivial (such as when using phase parameters [41]–[43] or when the observation- and parameter-spaces have a complex internal structure [44]), for single and multiple factor analysis [45], [46] and more.

In practical settings, too, MML has been used in a wide variety of domains, demonstrating empirically its versatility and strength, with recent examples including [22]–[24], [47], [48].

Throughout, MML was used in its original formulation (up to approximations that allow its practical computation), cementing within the MML community its reputation as a statistical Swiss army knife for all occasions.

B. Importance of the consistency question

Consistency was first introduced by Fisher [28], though its meaning has since evolved [49]. While it was arguably a property of only limited interest upon its initial introduction, in the modern world of Big Data its impact has increased exponentially: as part of the present standard practice of machine learning, we bombard our algorithms with as much data as we can possibly give them, often at extremely high costs relating to data collection, management, storage, cleansing,

safe-keeping, matching, re-formatting and governance. Accordingly, it has now become imperative to ascertain whether the algorithms we use can make good use of this additional data, or whether their learning curve will at some point level off. For an inconsistent algorithm, we would like to know when such saturation occurs, whereas for a consistent algorithm, we would like to know how efficient it is, i.e. how quickly it converges with data. In both cases, these answers determine how much data can be used effectively, providing a bound for our collection needs.

Determining whether MML is consistent for the Neyman-Scott scenario, specifically, is important for two reasons.

Firstly, the importance of the Neyman-Scott problem stems simply from the fact that it is a commonly-encountered statistical situation for which solutions are required in practice. It is the perhaps-simplest statistical example of a wider class of problems in which additional parameters are added as more observations become available, a situation that is common and of practical importance. For example, it is encountered regularly in the analysis of panel data [50], where it can appear due to the presence of individual effects, confounders and intermediate variables. The general problem has been given many names such as the problem of nuisance variables or the problem of incidental parameters. Basu [51] describes it as “The big question in statistics”, remarking that “During the past seven decades an astonishingly large amount of effort and ingenuity has gone into the search for reasonable answers to this question”.

Second, analysis of the Neyman-Scott scenario is important specifically in the context of MML because of how it was handled elsewhere in statistics. Lancaster [52], which provides a full review of the topic, summarises the state of the art by stating that solution approaches “are advanced on a case by case basis, typically these involve differencing, or conditioning, or use of instrumental variables”.

From an MML perspective, such case-by-case solutions are inadequate, in that MML purports to be a single, systematic method that should be able to handle all statistical situations without requiring any “tweaking” for special cases of interest. Thus, the question of whether Strict MML, in its plain-vanilla form, is robust enough to handle a Neyman-Scott scenario becomes of interest.

C. Is consistency for Neyman-Scott feasible?

Maximum likelihood has known good consistency properties [53]–[56], but they are not absolute. In cases where ML is not consistent, surely, it would be difficult for penalised ML methods to guarantee consistency. However, the same logic cannot be applied to methods that use additional information, e.g. in the form of a Bayesian prior. As an example, in the context of proper estimation problems with a discrete parameter space, MAP has been shown to be consistent for every estimation problem that has a consistent posterior, which, in turn, is every estimation problem for which any consistent estimator exists, and is, by this, therefore strictly superior to

ML in its consistency properties over this domain [57].⁵

The Neyman-Scott problem, being neither discrete nor (in the cases discussed here) with a proper prior, and having, additionally, an inconsistent posterior, does not guarantee MAP’s consistency, and, in fact, MAP returns for it estimates that are even more biased than those of ML. This, however, does not mean that consistent estimation of σ is not possible in this case.

While in classical, frequentist statistics the likelihood principle suggests that no estimation method can do better than (penalised) maximum likelihood, in Bayesian statistics no equivalent principle exists. Different methods, operating on different principles, are free to use the prior information in different ways and each method may have strengths and weaknesses related to its choices, in a way that makes them in general incomparable. Consider, for example, the estimator returning the posterior expectation of θ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{PE}}(x) = \mathbf{E}[\theta | x = x].$$

This estimator does not have, in general, strong consistency properties. It can be inconsistent even on proper, discrete estimation problems with independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) observables, even in cases where the posterior is consistent and both MAP and ML return consistent estimates.⁶ Nevertheless, it displays remarkable consistency properties in Neyman-Scott-like situations. For the Neyman-Scott problem itself, posterior expectation is a consistent estimator under all priors that are not pathological (in the sense defined in Section II-A).

Thus, because MML is distinct from other popular information-based estimation methods in that it is wholly (subjective) Bayesian, it is not, itself, an instance of penalised maximum likelihood. Any consistency or inconsistency results regarding maximum likelihood cannot, therefore, be used to infer directly regarding MML’s consistency. The only way to determine the consistency of MML is to consider its properties specifically, and there is no reason to assume, without such MML-specific evidence, whether it is likely to be consistent on a problem such as Neyman-Scott, or, in fact, in general.

D. The history of MML’s consistency analysis

Surprisingly, perhaps, SMML was not initially introduced as part of statistical information theory. Its introduction, in 1975 [11], was as an attempt to create a new estimator, primarily for estimation problems with a continuous hypothesis space, that will extend the good properties exhibited by MAP in the discrete domain also to the continuous domain. The typical continuous-domain analogue to discrete MAP, i.e. the maximisation of the posterior probability density, was deemed

unsatisfactory in this context, because it leads to estimations that are not invariant to the representation of the parameter space, which loses some of discrete MAP’s key properties.

Two properties that are explicitly mentioned in [11] as part of this intended goal, which are purposefully preserved by SMML, are its Bayesian nature and its invariance to representation. However, implicitly, the hope was to preserve as many other of MAP’s good properties as well. In particular, as discussed, MAP in the discrete space has optimal consistency properties, and it was therefore reasonable to intuitively expect (or at least hope for) such properties to extend also to SMML in the continuous domain.

Wallace and Boulton conclude [11] by demonstrating that SMML, as derived, can be equivalently—and more elegantly—described in information-theoretic terms, thus linking SMML to the statistical information theory literature, where it has resided ever since. Over the following years additional results, such as Solomonoff’s [58] proofs of convergence, provided additional evidence regarding the consistency powers of the wider family of information-theoretic methods, and by this also indirectly regarding MML.

The most persuasive affirmation of this fact came in [5], where it was proved regarding general information-theoretic estimation methods, including Solomonoff induction, MDL, MML and others, that they satisfy certain general consistency properties simply by virtue of their structure.

The question remained, however, whether in the ostensibly more difficult case of a Neyman-Scott scenario, not covered by the proofs of [5], it would still be the case that Strict MML retains its consistency properties.

The intuition that it should is one that can equally be applied to the entire two-part-message information-theoretic estimator family. In all cases, the idea is that any information about the observation, x , that can be meaningfully formulated as a pattern is encoded in the first part of the message, and therefore reflected by the choice of $\hat{\theta}(x)$, whereas the second part of the message encodes the noise. Given enough observations, it is argued (e.g., in [4]), any pattern that can be discerned will ultimately be captured by the first part of the message and therefore reflected in $\hat{\theta}(x)$, ensuring its consistency.

Specifically, one can think of this two-part message structure as a built-in protection against over-fitting, with the method continuously weighing how much of the information it receives is salient and how much is not. The Neyman-Scott problem is, in this context, an optimal test to showcase the powers of MML, in that at its core it is a problem regarding over-fitting: at any given point, the uncertainty regarding μ is high, but point estimation methods following a maximum likelihood principle will choose to estimate its value as equal to m ; this is an over-fit for μ that results in an underestimated σ . If MML’s protection against over-fitting is absolute however, it can be argued, such biases should not occur in its estimations.

When [3] and [25] showed theoretically regarding two of SMML’s approximations that they are consistent for a certain Neyman-Scott problem, and when [43] and [59] further showed empirically that WF-MML converges properly, while other estimation methods do not, in other Neyman-Scott-like scenarios, this provided significant theoretical and empirical

⁵When discussing estimation problems with a discrete parameter space, MAP, or *discrete MAP*, is taken to be the estimator maximising the posterior probability for $\theta = \theta_{\text{MAP}}(x)$. This is in contrast to the more popular use of the term MAP, which is used in the context of continuous estimation problems (estimation problems with a continuous hypothesis space) to indicate the estimator maximising the posterior *probability density*, $f(\theta|x)$.

⁶As an example, consider the case where for any natural k we have $\theta = k!$ as a parameter choice, with prior probability $h(\theta) = 1/2^k$ and the distribution of each observation given θ being independent and uniform over $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

validation for the overarching theory regarding MML’s capabilities. Because SMML is NP-hard in general, and no efficient algorithm to compute it is known even in the simplest of multidimensional cases⁷, such validation was the best that MML researchers could hope for, and the results were therefore understandably accepted at face value.

Over the years since these results began to emerge, MML’s consistency properties were, consequently, repeatedly cited without any form of caveat, and were firmly believed among the MML community. A particularly striking example of this is [6], where Dowe observes that while some estimation methods, like posterior expectation, provide consistency in Neyman-Scott-like scenarios, and while other methods, like maximum likelihood, provide an estimate that is invariant to the representation of both parameter space and observation space, no method other than MML is known to provide both absolute consistency and such invariance. Dowe conjectured that only MML and very closely-related Bayesian methods are in general both statistically consistent and invariant, adding a back-up conjecture that if there are (hypothetically) any such non-Bayesian methods, they will be far less efficient than MML. SMML’s own consistency was, throughout, never in question, and this reflects the views of the MML community at large.

It is in light of these facts that proving that SMML is, in fact, not consistent even for the original and much-showcased Neyman-Scott problem becomes highly significant: it changes our understanding of MML’s place in statistical theory, proving that it is not the universally applicable (albeit computationally intractable) statistical tool that it was thought to be, and that it does require case-specific tweaking in order to handle real-world scenarios of interest, even under conditions of unlimited data.

This new understanding regarding the true powers and the true limitations of SMML opens up entirely new research questions, or, more precisely, reawakens old research questions that have remained untouched since the introduction of the minimum message length principle over 50 years ago, and which can now once again be investigated.

For example, there is no known result, not even among the results of [5], that proves that SMML is consistent even in the ostensibly simplest case of proper, discrete estimation problems with a consistent posterior, even where both MAP and maximum likelihood are consistent. Determining the answer to this question, one way or another, would be a significant result for MML theory.

E. Aims of this paper

Despite the fact that this paper’s main technical proof is regarding MML’s consistency for the Neyman-Scott problem, and despite the fact that the wider context was presented, correspondingly, along these lines, it should be noted that neither the paper’s main contribution nor its main aim has to do with either the Neyman-Scott problem or consistency.

⁷In [19], for example, the problem of determining the SMML estimate to the parameters of a trinomial distribution is investigated; the authors write that they have not found any polynomial-time algorithm for this problem, have no non-trivial bounds on its complexity, and suspect it to be NP-hard.

To explain, consider this.

Due to its unique theoretical underpinnings, Strict MML is widely believed to hold many good properties that set it apart from other point estimation methods, and much of the MML literature, both theoretical and experimental, deals with comparing MML with other, more commonly-used solutions to the same problems, and reporting on MML’s advantages.

Unfortunately, because MML is almost invariably computationally intractable, papers demonstrating SMMLs good properties typically do so by relying on approximations, additional assumptions and analysis of specific, narrow cases.

Where these demonstrations are successful, they can provide further evidence for SMML’s power, but not conclusive proofs, as the additional assumptions remain suspect. Where they are unsuccessful, they cannot prove any deficiency in SMML, as the problem may well be in the approximations used. Thus, the inability to generate exact SMML solutions has been a great hindrance for the study of the true properties and power of MML.

This paper’s main contribution is that it develops, for the first time, means to analyse SMML directly, without approximations or assumptions, on a wide range of problems, including high-dimensional natural ones.

Some of our conclusions, such as Lemma 7, prove certain basic good properties regarding SMML estimates. However, by and large the methods we use define problem scenarios in which SMML coincides with more standard estimation methods, particularly maximum likelihood estimation. As such, these methods are not usable to demonstrate SMML’s edge over competing methods.

Where our main aim lies, and is the main impact of our contribution, is in providing systematic new tools that can, at least, provide *negative* results regarding the power of MML: where prior methods have used assumptions and approximations to differentiate MML from its competitors, and by this provided evidence (but not proof) of MML’s power, we can test these claims rigorously, and potentially negate them, if we find a problem satisfying our required conditions within the domain regarding which MML’s superiority is claimed, because for this domain we know that no such differentiation exists.

Our result regarding MML’s lack of consistency in the Neyman-Scott scenario, however central and influential for MML, is in this light merely a first demonstration of the power of this new, general tool.

IV. SMML ANALYSIS

In this section we describe our SMML analysis methods.

Because of SMML’s inherently NP-hard nature, it is not possible to describe exact SMML solutions for arbitrary estimation problems, and so, instead, we focus on defining properties of estimation problems, such that the SMML solution for problems exhibiting these properties can be analysed exactly. These properties, defined below, include *transitivity*, *homogeneity*, *concentration* and *locality*. Our various theorems require estimation problems to exhibit various subsets of these. (The intersection of all properties required for all our

results we've named *regularity*.) Thus, these properties have no operational justification of their own, nor can they be individually motivated. Their definitions relate only to what is needed for the sake of the various proofs.

Within a Bayesian point estimation setting, estimation problems, including their priors, are considered inputs. They are given, and therefore do not need to be motivated. The properties listed above should therefore be taken as descriptive, not prescriptive.

Nevertheless, our aim was to find properties that are exhibited by a wide range of interesting and/or natural problems, and so the main criterion for a good property was that it should exclude as few of these as possible.

Some of our properties (concentration, locality) attain these ideals directly, by only excluding problems exhibiting certain pathological behaviours. The definition of locality, for example, does not exclude any proper estimation problem at all. Others (transitivity, homogeneity) rely on internal symmetries within the estimation problem. They exclude more. However, because of the aesthetics of such symmetries, it is still the case that many interesting and relevant problems satisfy them.

We begin by defining these properties.

A. Some special types of inference problems

The first few properties we require of estimation problems describe symmetries, i.e. automorphisms, which we will exploit in constructing the SMML solution.

Definition 2. An automorphism for an estimation problem (\mathbf{x}, θ) , with $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, is a pair (U, T) of diffeomorphisms, $U : X \rightarrow X$ and $T : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta$, such that

- 1) For every $A \subseteq X$,

$$\text{ScaledProb}(\mathbf{x} \in A) = \text{ScaledProb}(\mathbf{x} \in U(A)), \quad (6)$$

and

- 2) For every $A \subseteq X$ and every θ ,

$$\text{Prob}(\mathbf{x} \in A | \theta) = \text{Prob}(\mathbf{x} \in U(A) | T(\theta)), \quad (7)$$

where $U(A) = \{U(y) | y \in A\}$.

Note that we assume that U and T are such that the Jacobians of these bijections, $\frac{dU(x)}{dx}$ and $\frac{dT(\theta)}{d\theta}$, are defined everywhere, and their determinants, $\left| \frac{dU(x)}{dx} \right|$ and $\left| \frac{dT(\theta)}{d\theta} \right|$, are positive everywhere. This allows us to restate condition (6) as

$$r(x) = r(U(x)) \left| \frac{dU(x)}{dx} \right|,$$

and condition (7) as

$$f(x | \theta) = f(U(x) | T(\theta)) \left| \frac{dU(x)}{dx} \right|.$$

An estimation problem will be called *observation transitive* if for every $x_1, x_2 \in X$ there is an automorphism (U, T) for which $U(x_1) = x_2$.

An estimation problem will be called *parameter transitive* if for every $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ there is an automorphism (U, T) for which $T(\theta_1) = \theta_2$.

An estimation problem will be called *transitive* if it is both *observation transitive* and *parameter transitive*.

Here, we borrow the term “transitivity” from graph theory, where it is used, in the context of vertex-transitive and edge-transitive graphs, to describe graph properties defined by analogous automorphisms.

Lemma 1. The scale free Neyman-Scott problem with fixed N and J and with observable parameters (s, m) is transitive.

Proof. Consider $U(s, m) = (\alpha s, \alpha m + \Delta)$ and $T(\sigma, \mu) = (\alpha \sigma, \alpha \mu + \Delta)$ with $\alpha > 0$. It is straightforward to verify that (U, T) is an automorphism. Furthermore, for any (s, m) and (s', m') it is straightforward to find parameters α and Δ that would map (s, m) to (s', m') , and similarly for (σ, μ) and (σ', μ') .⁸ \square

Transitivity is a strong condition on the symmetry of a problem: any two possible observables must be symmetric to each other (i.e., have automorphisms mapping one to the other) and any two parameter choices must be symmetric to each other. We will, for the most part, only require weaker conditions, relating to all parameter choices/observations being in some sense “similar” to each other specifically with respect to the $R_\theta(x)$ function.

Formally, we define the weaker conditions that we need as follows.

Definition 3. Let

$$R_\theta^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{x \in X} R_\theta(x).$$

An estimation problem (\mathbf{x}, θ) , with $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, will be called *parameter-homogeneous* if the value of R_θ^* is a constant, R^* , for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

Let

$$R_{\text{opt}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{\theta \in \Theta} R_\theta(x).$$

An estimation problem (\mathbf{x}, θ) , with $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, will be called *observation-homogeneous* if the value of $R_{\text{opt}}(x)$ is a constant, R_{opt} , for all $x \in X$.

An estimation problem will be called *homogeneous* if it is both *parameter-homogeneous* and *observation-homogeneous*.

Lemma 2. Every parameter-transitive estimation problem is parameter-homogeneous.

More generally, for any $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, if there exists an automorphism (U, T) such that $T(\theta_1) = \theta_2$, then $R_{\theta_1}^* = R_{\theta_2}^*$.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that for some such $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, the inequality $R_{\theta_1}^* > R_{\theta_2}^*$ holds.

Let (U, T) be an automorphism on (X, Θ) such that $T(\theta_1) = \theta_2$, and let $x \in X$ be a value such that $R_{\theta_2}(\cdot)$ attains its minimum at $U(x)$.

⁸We refer to estimation problems as *scale free* if they admit an automorphism (U, T) such that $U(x) = \alpha x$, i.e. if the description of the problem's likelihoods and prior would not have changed if all x values had been given in different units of scale, assuming that we make a corresponding change also to the representation of θ . As can be seen, the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem with observables (x_{nj}) admits such an automorphism, and hence its name.

This, however, is not a property we will use in this paper, and its definition appears here solely to explain the naming choice for the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem and its prior.

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\theta_1}^* &\leq R_{\theta_1}(x) = \log \left(\frac{r(x)}{f(x|\theta_1)} \right) \\ &= \log \left(\frac{r(U(x)) \left| \frac{dU(x)}{dx} \right|}{f(U(x)|T(\theta_1)) \left| \frac{dU(x)}{dx} \right|} \right) \\ &= R_{\theta_2}(U(x)) = R_{\theta_2}^*, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the assumption.

The option $R_{\theta_1}^* < R_{\theta_2}^*$ also cannot hold, because (U^{-1}, T^{-1}) is also an automorphism, this one mapping θ_2 to θ_1 . \square

Similarly:

Lemma 3. *Every observation-transitive estimation problem is observation-homogeneous.*

More generally, for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$ for which there exists an automorphism (U, T) such that $U(x_1) = x_2$, $R_{opt}(x_1) = R_{opt}(x_2)$.

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Lemma 2, except that instead of choosing (U, T) such that $T(\theta_1) = \theta_2$ we now choose an automorphism such that $U(x_1) = x_2$, and instead of choosing $x \in X$ such that $R_{\theta_2}(\cdot)$ attains its minimum at $U(x)$, we choose $\theta \in \Theta$ such that $R_{\theta}(x_2)$ attains its minimum over all θ at $T(\theta)$. \square

We now introduce two other properties, which are expectable of typical, natural problems. These are properties that we require merely to exclude potential pathological behaviours of the problem (and of estimators on it). The first of these is *concentration*.

Define for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X | R_\theta(x) - R_\theta^* < \epsilon\},$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}_\epsilon(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\theta \in \Theta | x \in \tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta)\}.$$

Definition 4. *An estimation problem (\mathbf{x}, θ) will be called concentrated if for every $x \in X$ there is an $\epsilon > 0$ for which $\hat{\theta}_\epsilon(x)$ is a bounded set.*

The \tilde{x}_ϵ reverse estimator and its inverse are generalisations of the ideal point and ideal group concepts, considering an observation x to be a good representative for θ if $R_\theta(x)$ equals its optimal value, R_θ^* , up to a difference of some predetermined margin, ϵ .

To motivate the definition of concentration and to understand it intuitively, consider the following.

As discussed in Section II-C, the justification for the use of the Ideal Point estimator is strongest when the inverse of the relationship between θ values and their “prototypical examples” (in the sense of $\tilde{x}_{IP}(\theta)$) is functional, each x value mapping to exactly one θ value. A weakening of this condition would have required the relationship between θ values and their “good representatives” (which in this context we understand as the set $\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta)$, for some choice of ϵ) to be such that any observation x can only be a good representative to some “closely-related” set of θ . The property of being

concentrated can be understood as the weakest form of this condition. It stipulates that for each x neither the θ values for which it is a prototypical example nor the θ values for which it is an arbitrarily good representative (i.e., $\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta)$, for an arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$) can be unbounded sets. If an estimation problem is not concentrated, there is little reason to advocate for it the use of the Ideal Point estimator, as it may return either unbounded sets as estimates, or its estimates will be arbitrarily far from other almost equally good parameter choices.

The scale free Neyman-Scott problem, however, meets the ideal requirement for IP estimation, namely that the relationship between θ values and their prototypical examples is, for this problem, a bijection, as is demonstrated by the following lemma and its proof.

Lemma 4. *The scale free Neyman-Scott problem with fixed N and J and with observable parameters (s, m) is concentrated.*

Proof. In the (x_{nj}) observation space, the probability density of a given set of observations, x , assigned in the Neyman-Scott problem to a particular choice of σ^2 and μ , is

$$f(x|\sigma^2, \mu) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^{NJ}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J (x_{nj} - \mu_n)^2}{2\sigma^2}}. \quad (8)$$

Under the scale-free prior, this results in the marginal probability density of the observations being

$$\begin{aligned} r(x) &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sigma^{N+1}} \int_{-\infty}^\infty f(x|\sigma^2, \mu) d\mu_1 \cdots d\mu_n d\sigma \\ &= 2^{N/2-1} J^{-N/2} \pi^{-\frac{N(J-1)}{2}} (NJs^2)^{-\frac{NJ}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{NJ}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Note that (s, m) is a sufficient statistic for this problem, because both $f(x|\sigma^2, \mu)$ and $r(x)$ can be calculated based on it, where for $f(x|\sigma^2, \mu)$ we use the relation

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J (x_{nj} - \mu_n)^2 = (NJs^2) + J \sum_n (m_n - \mu_n)^2.$$

For this reason, we can present the equations above solely in terms of (s, m) .

Substituting now (8) and (9) into (3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} R_{(\sigma^2, \mu)}(x) &= -\frac{N}{2} \log J + \frac{NJ + N - 2}{2} \log 2 + \frac{N}{2} \log \pi \\ &\quad + \log \left(\Gamma\left(\frac{NJ}{2}\right) \right) + \frac{NJ}{2} \log(\sigma^2) + \frac{NJs^2}{2\sigma^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{J}{2\sigma^2} \sum_n (m_n - \mu_n)^2 - \frac{NJ}{2} \log(NJs^2). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

This is a strictly convex function of (s^2, m) , with a unique minimum, for any $(\sigma^2, \mu) \in \Theta$. As such, $\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta)$ is bounded for any ϵ .

Note regarding the definition of R in (3) that it is invariant to both the representation of the parameter space and the representation of the observation space. For this reason, the calculated $R_{(\sigma^2, \mu)}(x)$ would be exactly the same as $R_{(\sigma^2, \mu)}(s^2, m)$ under the parameterization of interest to us.

Consider, now, the Neyman-Scott problem under the parameterization $(\log \sigma, \mu/\sigma)$ and $(\log s, m/s)$. In this

re-parameterization, it is easy to see that for any translation function, $T_\Delta(a) = a + \Delta$, (T_Δ, T_Δ) is an automorphism. In particular, this means that for any θ_0 ,

$$\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta_0) = \{x + \theta_0 - \theta | x \in \tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta)\}.$$

All such sets are translations of each other, having the same volume, shape and bounding box dimensions.

It follows regarding the inverse function, $\hat{\theta}_\epsilon(x)$, that for any x it maps to a set of the same volume and bounding box dimensions as each $\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta)$, albeit with an inverted shape.

In particular, it is bounded.

Being bounded under the new parameterization is tantamount to being bounded under the native problem parameterization. \square

The last property we wish to mention, also relating to avoidance of pathological behaviour, is the following.

Definition 5. An estimation problem (\mathbf{x}, θ) will be called local if there exist values V_0 and $\gamma > 1$ such that for every $\theta \in \Theta$ there exist $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$, such that for all x outside a subset of X of total scaled probability at most V_0 ,

$$\gamma k f(x|\theta) < \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} f(x|\theta_i). \quad (11)$$

The exact operational justification for the definition of locality is that provided by Lemma 7. Intuitively, however, one can think of locality as a property complementary to concentration: whereas concentration requires all θ that have a certain x as a good representative to be bounded in parameter space, locality requires all x which are (in a somewhat different sense) good representatives for a given θ to be bounded in terms of their total probability.

Essentially, a problem is local if for each θ one can find a finite number of surrogates, $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$, such that the set of x values more closely associated with θ than with any of its surrogates is bounded in its total probability. In this way, the surrogates can be thought of as “localising” the impact of θ . In an estimation problem with a non-pathological parameterization, one can expect to be able to find such surrogates simply by surrounding the chosen θ . Moreover, as demonstrated by Lemma 5, non-locality does not arise at all in problems that do not have an improper prior.

Lemma 5. Every proper estimation problem is local.

Proof. Consider any estimation problem over a normalised (unscaled) prior, and consequently also a normalised (unscaled) marginal.

The total probability over all X is, by definition, 1, so choosing $V_0 = 1$ satisfies the conditions of locality. \square

Lemma 6. The scale free Neyman-Scott problem is local.

The proof of Lemma 6 is given in Appendix B.

Definition 6. An estimation problem is called regular if it is observation-transitive, parameter-homogeneous, concentrated and local.

B. Relating SMML to IP

We will now show that for regular problems one can infer from the IP solution to the SMML solution.

Our first lemma proves for a family of estimation problems that the SMML solutions to these problems do not diverge entirely, in the sense of allocating arbitrarily high (scaled) probabilities to single θ values. Although a basic requirement for any good estimator, no such result was previously known for SMML.

For a code-book F , let

$$\text{region}_F(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x | F(x) = \theta\}$$

be known as the region of θ in F .

Lemma 7. For every local estimation problem there is a V_{\max} such that no SMML code-book F for the problem contains any $\theta \in \Theta$ whose region has scaled probability greater than V_{\max} in the marginal distribution of X .

Proof. Let V_0 and γ be as in Definition 5. Note that V_0 can always be increased without violating the conditions of the definition, so it can be assumed to be positive.

Assign $V_{\max} = (\beta_0^{-1} + 1)V_0$ for a constant $\beta_0 > 0$ to be computed later on, and assume for contradiction that F contains a θ whose region, X_θ , has scaled probability V greater than V_{\max} . By construction, X_θ contains a non-empty, positive scaled probability region X' wherein (11) is satisfied.

Let V_b be the scaled probability of X' , and let V_a be $V - V_b$.

Also, define $\beta = V_a/V_b$, noting that

$$\beta < \beta_0, \quad (12)$$

because, by assumption, $V_a + V_b > V_{\max}$ and $V_a \leq V_0$, so

$$\beta^{-1} = \frac{V_b}{V_a} > \frac{V_{\max}}{V_0} - 1 = \beta_0^{-1}.$$

We will design a code-book F' such that $L(F') < L(F)$, proving by contradiction that F is not optimal.

Our definition of F' is as follows. For all $x \notin X'$, $F'(x) = F(x)$. Otherwise, $F'(x)$ will be the value among $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ for which the likelihood of x is maximal.

Recall that

$$L(F) - L(F') = (L_E(F) - L_E(F')) + (L_P(F) - L_P(F')).$$

Because, by construction, the set X' , of scaled probability V_b , satisfies that for any $x \in X'$,

$$\log f(x|F'(x)) - \log f(x|F(x)) > \log(\gamma k),$$

we have

$$L_P(F) - L_P(F') > V_b \log(\gamma k). \quad (13)$$

On the other hand, the worst-case addition in (scaled) entropy caused by splitting the set X' into k separate θ_i values is if each θ_i receives an equal probability. We can write this worst-case addition as

$$\begin{aligned} L_E(F') - L_E(F) &\leq \left[-V_a \log V_a - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{V_b}{k} \log \left(\frac{V_b}{k} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - [-(V_a + V_b) \log(V_a + V_b)]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

This is in the case that $V_a > 0$. If $V_a = 0$, the expression $V_a \log V_a$ is dropped from (14). This change makes no difference in the later analysis, so we will, for convenience, assume for now that $V_a > 0$.

Under the assumption $V_a > 0$, we can subtract (14) from (13) to get

$$\begin{aligned} L(F) - L(F') &> V_b \log(\gamma k) - V_b \log k - V_a \log \left(\frac{V_a + V_b}{V_a} \right) \\ &\quad - V_b \log \left(\frac{V_a + V_b}{V_b} \right) \\ &= V_b \log \gamma - V_a \log \left(\frac{V_a + V_b}{V_a} \right) \\ &\quad - V_b \log \left(\frac{V_a + V_b}{V_b} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

To reach a contradiction, we want $L(F) > L(F')$. If $V_a = 0$, equation (15) degenerates to $L(F) - L(F') > V_b \log \gamma \geq 0$ for an immediate contradiction. Otherwise, contradiction is reached if

$$V_b \log \gamma - V_a \log \left(\frac{V_a + V_b}{V_a} \right) - V_b \log \left(\frac{V_a + V_b}{V_b} \right) \geq 0,$$

or equivalently if

$$\beta \log(\beta^{-1} + 1) + \log(\beta + 1) \leq \log \gamma. \quad (16)$$

A small enough β value can bring the left-hand side of (16) arbitrarily close to 0, and in particular to a value lower than $\log \gamma$ for any $\gamma > 1$.

By choosing a small enough β_0 , we can ensure that any β satisfying (12) will also satisfy (16), creating a contradiction and proving our claim. \square

Lemma 7 now allows us to draw a direct connection between SMML and $\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta)$.

Theorem 1. *In every local, parameter-homogeneous estimation problem (\mathbf{x}, θ) , for every SMML code-book F and for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ for which the set*

$$\text{region}_F(\theta_0) \cap \tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta_0)$$

is a set of positive scaled probability in the marginal distribution of X .

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that for some ϵ , no element $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ is mapped from a positive scaled probability of x values from its respective $\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta_0)$.

Let $\Theta^* \subseteq \Theta$ be the set of θ values with positive scaled probability regions in F , and let G be the directed graph whose vertex set is Θ^* and which contains an edge from θ_1 to θ_2 if the intersection

$$\tilde{x}_{\epsilon/2}(\theta_1) \cap \text{region}_F(\theta_2)$$

has positive scaled probability. By assumption, G has no self-loops.

Let

$$V(\theta) = \text{ScaledProb}(\mathbf{x} \in \text{region}_F(\theta)).$$

We claim that for any (θ_1, θ_2) that is an edge in G ,

$$\log V(\theta_2) - \log V(\theta_1) \geq \epsilon/2, \quad (17)$$

an immediate consequence of which is that $V(\theta_2) > V(\theta_1)$ and therefore G cannot have any cycles.

To prove (17), note first that because of our assumption that all likelihoods are continuous, $\tilde{x}_{\epsilon/2}(\theta)$, for every θ and any choice of $\epsilon > 0$, has positive measure in the space of X , and because of our assumption that all likelihoods are positive, a positive measure in the space of X translates to a positive scaled probability. This also has the side effect that all vertices in G must have an outgoing edge (because this positive scaled probability must be allocated to some edge).

Next, consider how transferring a small subset of X , of size Δ , in $\tilde{x}_{\epsilon/2}(\theta_1) \cap \text{region}_F(\theta_2)$ from θ_2 to θ_1 changes $L()$. Given that Δ can be made arbitrarily small, we can consider the rate of change, rather than the magnitude of change: for F to be optimal, we must have a non-negative rate of change, or else a small-enough Δ can be used to improve $L()$. Given that L_E is the sum of $-V(\theta^*) \log V(\theta^*)$ over all $\theta^* \in \Theta^*$, by transferring probability from θ_2 to θ_1 , the rate of change to L_E is $\log V(\theta_2) - \log V(\theta_1)$.

Consider now the rate of change to L_P . By transferring probability from θ_2 , where it is outside of $\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta_2)$ (and therefore by definition assigned an R value of at least $R^* + \epsilon$) to θ_1 , where it is assigned into $\tilde{x}_{\epsilon/2}(\theta_1)$ (and therefore by definition assigned an R value that is smaller than $R^* + \epsilon/2$) the difference is a reduction rate greater than $\epsilon/2$.

The condition that the rate of change of $L = L_E + L_P$ is nonnegative therefore translates simply to (17), thus proving the equation's correctness.

However, if G contains no self-loops and no cycles, and every one of its vertices has an outgoing edge, then it contains arbitrarily long paths starting from any vertex. Consider any such path starting at some θ_1 of length greater than $2[\log(V_{\max}) - \log V(\theta_1)]/\epsilon$, where V_{\max} is as in Lemma 7. By (17), we have that the scaled probability assigned to the θ value ending the path is greater than V_{\max} , thereby reaching a contradiction. \square

We can now present our main theorem, formalising the connection between the SMML estimator and the ideal point.

Theorem 2. *In any regular estimation problem, for every $x \in X$,*

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{SMML}}(x) \cap \hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x) \neq \emptyset. \quad (18)$$

In particular, $\hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}$ is a true estimator, in the sense that $\hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x) \neq \emptyset$ for every $x \in X$.

Proof. Let x be a value for which we want to prove (18).

From Theorem 1 we know that for all ϵ there exists an SMML code-book F' and a $\theta^* \in \Theta$ for which $\text{region}_{F'}(\theta^*) \cap \tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta^*)$ is non-empty. Let x_0 be a value inside this intersection.

By observation transitivity, there is an automorphism (U, T) such that $x = U(x_0)$. Let $\theta_\epsilon = T(\theta^*)$.

Let us define F by $F = U^{-1} \circ F' \circ T$. It is easy to verify that by the definition of automorphism $L(F) = L(F')$, so F is also an SMML code-book, and furthermore

$$\tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta_\epsilon) = \{U(x) | x \in \tilde{x}_\epsilon(\theta^*)\},$$

so $F(x) = \theta_\epsilon \in \hat{\theta}_\epsilon(x)$.

Consider now a sequence of such θ_ϵ for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The set Θ is a complete metric space, by construction the θ_ϵ reside inside the nested sets $\hat{\theta}_\epsilon(x)$, and by our assumption that the problem is concentrated, for a small enough ϵ , $\hat{\theta}_\epsilon(x)$ is bounded. We conclude, therefore, that the sequence θ_ϵ has a converging sub-sequence. Let θ be a bound for one such converging sub-sequence.

We claim that θ is inside both $\hat{\theta}_{\text{SMML}}(x)$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x)$, thus proving that their intersection is non-empty.

To show this, consider first that we know $\theta \in \hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x)$ because R is a continuous function, and by construction $R_\theta(x) = R_\theta^*$.

Lastly, for every ϵ in the sub-sequence, $\theta_\epsilon \in \hat{\theta}_{\text{SMML}}(x)$, so $\theta \in \hat{\theta}_{\text{SMML}}(x)$ follows from the closure of the SMML estimator (which is guaranteed by definition). \square

Corollary 2.1. *For the scale free Neyman-Scott problem with fixed N and J , $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{SMML}}^2(s, m) = s^2$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\text{SMML}}(s, m) = m_n$.*

In particular, this is true when N approaches infinity, leading SMML to be inconsistent for this problem.

Proof. Recall that the ideal point is defined as the x value minimising $R_{(\sigma^2, \mu)}(x)$.

The general formula for R in the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem was derived in Section IV-A and is given in (10). Differentiating R according to s^2 and according to each m_n we reach the following single-valued solution.

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{IP}}^2(x) = s^2, \quad \hat{\mu}_{\text{IP}}(x) = m_n. \quad (19)$$

This is identical to the Maximum Likelihood estimate, and well known to be inconsistent. The value of the SMML estimator therefore follows from Theorem 2.

As a consistent estimator for σ^2 is $\frac{J}{J-1}s^2$ and not s^2 , the SMML estimator is inconsistent. \square

At first glance, this result may seem impossible, because, as established, an SMML code-book can only encode a countable number of θ values. Corollary 2.2 resolves this seeming paradox.

Corollary 2.2. *The scale free Neyman-Scott problem with fixed N and J admits uncountably many distinct SMML code-books, and for every (s, m) value there is a continuum of SMML estimates.*

Proof. Uncountably many distinct code-books can be generated by arbitrarily scaling and translating any given code-book, which, as we have seen, does not alter $L(F)$.

To show that for every (s, m) value there are uncountably many distinct SMML estimates, recall from our proof of Lemma 4 that if we consider the problem in $(\log s, m/s)$ observation space and $(\log \sigma, \mu/\sigma)$ parameter space, then both scaling and translation in the original parameter space are translations under the new representation. If any x belongs to a region of volume V in this space that is mapped to a particular θ by a particular F , one can create a new code-book, F' , which is a translation of F in both $(\log s, m/s)$ and $(\log \sigma, \mu/\sigma)$, which would still be optimal.

As long as the translation in observation-space is such that x is still mapped into its original region, its associated θ' will

be the correspondingly-translated θ . As such, the volume of θ values associated with a single x is at least as large the volume of the region of x (and, by observation-transitivity of the problem, at least as large as the volume of the largest region in the code-book's partition). \square

SMML is therefore not a point estimator for this problem at all.

C. Relating IP to ML

Beyond the connections between the SMML solution and the Ideal Point approximation, there is also a direct link to the Maximum Likelihood estimate.

Theorem 3. *If (\mathbf{x}, θ) is a homogeneous estimation problem, then $\hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}} = \hat{\theta}_{\text{ML}}$.*

Proof. By definition,

$$\tilde{x}_{\text{IP}}(\theta) = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} R_\theta(x) = \{x \in X | R_\theta(x) = \min_{x' \in X} R_\theta(x')\}.$$

By assumption, the estimation problem is parameter-homogeneous, so $\min_{x \in X} R_\theta(x)$ is a constant, R^* , independent of θ . Substituting R^* into the definition of \tilde{x}_{IP} and calculating the functional inverse, we get

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x) = \{\theta \in \Theta | R_\theta(x) = R^*\}.$$

For an arbitrary choice of θ_0 , let x_0 be such that $x_0 \in \tilde{x}_{\text{IP}}(\theta_0)$. The value of $R_{\theta_0}(x_0)$ is R^* , and there certainly is no $\theta' \in \Theta$ for which $R_{\theta'}(x_0) < R^*$ (or this would contradict parameter-homogeneity), so, using the notation of Definition 3, $R_{\text{opt}} = R_{\text{opt}}(x_0) = R^*$.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{\text{IP}}(x) &= \{\theta \in \Theta | R_\theta(x) = R^*\} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} R_\theta(x) \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \log \left(\frac{r(x)}{f(x|\theta)} \right) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta \in \Theta} f(x|\theta) = \hat{\theta}_{\text{ML}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Corollary 3.1. *In any regular estimation problem, for every $x \in X$,*

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{SMML}}(x) \cap \hat{\theta}_{\text{ML}}(x) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. From Lemma 3 we know every observation-transitive problem is observation-homogeneous, so we can apply both Theorem 2, equating the SMML estimator with the IP one, and Theorem 3, equating the IP one with ML. \square

APPENDIX A ANALYSIS OF MML APPROXIMATIONS

We show regarding the MML approximations used by [3] and [25], respectively, that on the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem, i.e. the Neyman-Scott problem under a scale-free prior, both converge to the ML estimate, and are therefore also, like SMML, not consistent for the problem.

While not satisfying consistency, the fact that all three algorithms converge to the same limit does suggest that, at least for this problem, the two MML algorithms studied are good approximations, adequately modelling the limit behaviour of SMML.

A. The Wallace-Freeman approximation

Perhaps the most widely used variant of MML is the Wallace-Freeman approximation.

Definition 7. The Wallace-Freeman estimator (WF-MML) is

$$\hat{\theta}_{WF}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{f(\theta|x)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}(\theta)|}} = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} f(x|\theta) \frac{h(\theta)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}(\theta)|}}, \quad (20)$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ indicates the Fisher information [1], [60].

This was derived in [20] by use of a quadratic approximation to the message length.

Proving that WF-MML is not consistent for the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem is a direct corollary of the following (straightforward) theorem. We list it as folkloric because, although we could not find it proved explicitly in the literature, it is clearly a known result. For example, it is alluded to in [25, p. 412].

It details the behaviour of WF-MML on problems that have a *Jeffreys prior* [61], [62]. A Jeffreys prior is a prior satisfying for all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$h_{\text{Jeffreys}}(\theta) \propto \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}(\theta)|}.$$

It is one of the canonical non-informative priors computable for any frequentist estimation problem, and is routinely used, e.g., by objective Bayesians, in lieu of other information.

Theorem 4 (folklore). *In any estimation problem (\mathbf{x}, θ) , where θ is distributed according to the problem's Jeffreys prior, the estimate of the Wallace-Freeman approximation coincides with ML.*

Proof. By definition, the Jeffreys prior is proportional to the square root of the determinant of the Fisher information matrix. Hence, when substituting this prior for $h(\theta)$ in (20), the only part of the expression that remains dependent on θ is $f(x|\theta)$, the likelihood. Thus, it becomes a Maximum Likelihood estimator. \square

An immediate corollary is therefore

Corollary 4.1. *For any frequentist estimation problem over which ML is inconsistent, there exists a (possibly improper) prior such that the Wallace-Freeman approximation is also inconsistent over the same problem under said prior.*

Proof. The Jeffreys prior is an example of such a prior, because, by Theorem 4, under this prior the Wallace-Freeman approximation coincides with ML. \square

Corollary 4.2. *WF-MML is not consistent over the Neyman-Scott problem with a scale-free prior. Its asymptotic behaviour for this problem is identical to that of ML.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the previous results, because the scale-free prior is a Jeffreys prior for this problem, as can be ascertained directly by computing the Fisher information matrix. \square

B. Ideal Group

In this section, we analyse the Ideal Group MML approximation, and show that it is inconsistent for the Neyman-Scott problem under the scale-free prior, by utilising our notion of an ideal point, defined in Section II-C.

Theorem 5. *The Ideal Group estimator is not consistent for the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem. In particular, it contains for (σ, μ) the point (s, m) , which is the (inconsistent) Maximum Likelihood estimate, as the Ideal Point.*

Proof. Recall that the ideal point is defined as the x value minimising $R_\theta(x)$, and for this reason guarantees that the ideal group for θ necessarily includes it.

The Ideal Point estimate for the scale-free Neyman-Scott problem was given in (19), in the proof of Corollary 2.1 in Section IV-B. This estimate is identical to the Maximum Likelihood estimate,

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{ML}}(\sigma, \mu) = (s, m),$$

and is well known to be inconsistent, for which reason the Ideal Group solution is also inconsistent. \square

APPENDIX B

PROOF THAT NEYMAN-SCOTT IS LOCAL

We prove Lemma 6, stating that the scale free Neyman-Scott problem is local.

Proof. Set $k = 2N + 1 + c^N$, for a c value to be chosen later on. Importantly, k , c and all other constants introduced later on in this proof (e.g., T , Δ and Δ') depend solely on N and J and are not dependent on θ . As such, they are constants of the construction.

Let $T = N \log(c + 1)$, and for $n = 1, \dots, N$ let μ^{n+} be the vector identical to μ except that its n 'th element equals $\mu_n + \sigma\sqrt{2T}$. Let μ^{n-} be the vector identical to μ except that its n 'th element equals $\mu_n - \sigma\sqrt{2T}$.

For $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2N}$, we use all (σ, μ^{n+}) and all (σ, μ^{n-}) . Next, we pick $\theta_{2N+1} = (e\sigma, \mu)$, where e is Euler's constant.

This leaves a further c^N values of $\{\theta_i\}$ to be assigned. To assign these, divide for each $n = 1, \dots, N$ the range between μ^{n-} and μ^{n+} into c equal-length segments, and let Ω_n be the set containing the centres of these segments. We define our remaining θ values as

$$\Theta' = \left\{ \left(\frac{\sqrt{2NJ}}{c} \sigma, \mu'_1, \dots, \mu'_N \right) \middle| \forall n, \mu'_n \in \Omega_n \right\}.$$

We will show that, for a constant V_0 to be chosen later on, outside a subset of X of total scaled probability V_0 ,

$$e^T f(x|\theta) < \max_i f(x|\theta_i).$$

Equivalently:

$$\max_i \log f(x|\theta_i) - \log f(x|\theta) > T. \quad (21)$$

Showing this is enough to prove the lemma, because for a sufficiently large c ,

$$e^T = (c+1)^N \geq c^N + Nc^{N-1} > c^N + 2N + 2 = k + 1,$$

so by choosing $\gamma = \frac{k+1}{k}$ the conditions of Definition 5 are satisfied. (Recall that k is a constant of the construction, and therefore γ can depend on k .)

To prove (21), let us divide the problem into cases. First, let us show that this holds true for any $x = (s, m)$ value for which, for any n , $|m_n - \mu_n| > \sigma\sqrt{2T}$. To show this, assume without loss of generality that for a particular n the equation $m_n - \mu_n > \sigma\sqrt{2T}$ holds true.

$$\begin{aligned} \log \max_i f(x|\theta_i) - \log f(x|\theta) &\geq \log f(s, m|\sigma, \mu^{n+}) - \log f(s, m|\sigma, \mu) \\ &= -JT + \frac{J\sqrt{2T}}{\sigma}(m_n - \mu_n) \\ &> -JT + 2JT > T. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we claim that there is a Δ value such that if $s/\sigma > \Delta$, (21) holds. This can be demonstrated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \log \max_i f(x|\theta_i) - \log f(x|\theta) &\geq \log f(s, m|e\sigma, \mu) - \log f(s, m|\sigma, \mu) \\ &= -NJ + \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^2}\right) \frac{NJs^2 + J \sum_{n=1}^N (m_n - \mu_n)^2}{2\sigma^2} \\ &> -NJ + \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^2}\right) \frac{NJ}{2} \Delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing a high enough value of Δ , this lower bound can be made arbitrarily large. In particular, it can be made larger than T , making (21) hold.

Our last case is one where $s/\sigma < \Delta'$, for some Δ' to be computed. In considering this case, we can assume that for every n , $|m_n - \mu_n| \leq \sigma\sqrt{2T}$, or else (21) holds due to our first claim. With this assumption, the value of $|m_n - \mu'_n|$ for every n is at most $\sigma\sqrt{2T}/c$ for some $\mu'_n \in \Omega_n$. Let $(\frac{\sqrt{2NJ}}{c}\sigma, \mu')$ be the element of Θ' with μ' closest to m in every coordinate.

$$\begin{aligned} \log \max_i f(x|\theta_i) - \log f(x|\theta) &\geq \log f\left(s, m \left| \frac{\sqrt{2NJ}}{c}\sigma, \mu' \right.\right) - \log f(s, m|\sigma, \mu) \\ &\geq \log \left[\frac{c^{NJ}}{(2\sqrt{\pi NJ}\sigma)^{NJ}} e^{-\frac{c^2}{2NJ} \frac{NJs^2 + 2NJ\sigma^2/c^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right] \\ &\quad - \log \left[\frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^{NJ}} e^{-\frac{NJ\sigma^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right] \\ &= NJ \log \left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{2NJ}} \right) + \left(1 - \frac{c^2}{2NJ}\right) \frac{NJs^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{T}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Because for a large enough value of c , the expression $1 - c^2/2NJ$ is negative, the value of (22) is minimised when s/σ is maximal. Therefore,

$$\left(1 - \frac{c^2}{2NJ}\right) \frac{NJs^2}{2\sigma^2} > \left(1 - \frac{c^2}{2NJ}\right) \frac{NJ\Delta'^2}{2},$$

which, together with (22), leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \log \max_i f(x|\theta_i) - \log f(x|\theta) &> NJ \log \left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{2NJ}} \right) + \left(1 - \frac{c^2}{2NJ}\right) \frac{NJ\Delta'^2}{2} - \frac{T}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The value of Δ' can be made arbitrarily small. For example, we may set Δ' to satisfy

$$\left(\frac{c^2}{2NJ} - 1 \right) \frac{NJ\Delta'^2}{2} \leq \frac{T}{4}.$$

If we set Δ' in this way, it only remains to be proved that

$$NJ \log \left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{2NJ}} \right) - \frac{T}{4} - \frac{T}{2} \geq T.$$

Substituting in the definition of T and simplifying, we get

$$\frac{1}{(2NJ)^{2J}} c^{4J} \geq (c+1)^7.$$

Considering that $J \geq 2 > 7/4$, the left-hand side is a polynomial of higher degree than the right-hand side. Therefore, for a large-enough c , the equation holds.

We have therefore shown that (21) holds for every $x \in X$, except within a bounding box of size $V = \left(2\sqrt{2T}\right)^N \log \frac{\Delta}{\Delta'}$ in $(\log s, m/\sigma)$ -space, a size that is independent of θ . Because this bounding box bounds s/σ from below by a constant Δ' , its volume is also bounded by $V_0 = V/\Delta'^N$ in $(\log s, m/s)$ -space, and this value is also independent of θ .

Recall, however, that volume in $(\log s, m/s)$ -space equals (or is proportional to) scaled probability in X . Equation (21) holds, therefore, everywhere except in a subset whose scaled probability is bounded by a constant independent of θ . \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank Graham Farr for his extensive comments on multiple drafts of the paper.

Thank you also to David L. Dowe for his considerable help in preparing this manuscript, and especially for pointing out that the scale free prior we use coincides with the problem's Jeffreys prior.

Additionally, thank you to this paper's editor, Ioannis Kontoyiannis, and to two anonymous reviewers for their substantial suggestions which considerably improved the paper's presentation.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. L. Lehmann and G. Casella, *Theory of point estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [2] D. L. Dowe, R. A. Baxter, J. J. Oliver, and C. S. Wallace, "Point estimation using the Kullback-Leibler loss function and MML," in *Research and Development in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Second Pacific-Asia Conference, PAKDD-98, Melbourne, Australia, April 15-17, 1998, Proceedings*, ser. LNAI, vol. 1394. Berlin: Springer, Apr. 15-17 1998, pp. 87-95.
- [3] D. L. Dowe and C. S. Wallace, "Resolving the Neyman-Scott problem by Minimum Message Length," *Computing Science and Statistics*, pp. 614-618, 1997.
- [4] D. L. Dowe, S. Gardner, and G. Oppy, "Bayes not bust! Why simplicity is no problem for Bayesians," *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 709-754, 2007.

- [5] A. R. Barron and T. M. Cover, "Minimum complexity density estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 37, pp. 1034–1054, 1991.
- [6] D. L. Dowe, "MML, hybrid Bayesian network graphical models, statistical consistency, invariance and uniqueness," in *Handbook of the Philosophy of Science – Volume 7: Philosophy of Statistics*, P. S. Bandyopadhyay and M. R. Forster, Eds. Elsevier, 2011, pp. 901–982.
- [7] J. Rissanen, *Minimum Description Length principle*. Wiley Online Library, 1985.
- [8] —, "Stochastic complexity and the MDL principle," *Econometric Reviews*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 85–102, 1987.
- [9] —, "Hypothesis selection and testing by the MDL principle," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 260–269, 1999.
- [10] C. S. Wallace and D. M. Boulton, "An information measure for classification," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 185–194, 1968.
- [11] —, "An invariant Bayes method for point estimation," *Classification Society Bulletin*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 11–34, 1975.
- [12] J. Neyman and E. L. Scott, "Consistent estimates based on partially consistent observations," *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 1–32, 1948.
- [13] S. Ghosal, "A review of consistency and convergence of posterior distribution," in *Varanashi Symposium in Bayesian Inference*, Banaras Hindu University, 1997.
- [14] E. Makalic and D. F. Schmidt, "MML logistic regression with translation and rotation invariant priors," in *Australasian Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2012, pp. 878–889.
- [15] —, "Minimum Message Length shrinkage estimation," *Statistics & Probability Letters*, vol. 79, no. 9, pp. 1155–1161, 2009.
- [16] Y. G. Yatracos, "MLE's bias pathology, model updated MLE, and Wallace's Minimum Message Length method," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 1426–1431, 2015.
- [17] M. R. Laskar and M. L. King, "Modified likelihood and related methods for handling nuisance parameters in the linear regression model," *Data Analysis from Statistical Foundations*, pp. 119–142, 2001.
- [18] J. G. Dowty, "SMML estimators for 1-dimensional continuous data," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 126–133, 2015.
- [19] G. E. Farr and C. S. Wallace, "The complexity of Strict Minimum Message Length inference," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 285–292, 2002.
- [20] C. S. Wallace and P. R. Freeman, "Estimation and inference by compact coding," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society series B*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 240–252, 1987, see also Discussion on pp. 252–265.
- [21] P. Cheeseman, "On Bayesian model selection," in *The mathematics of generalization*. CRC Press, 2018, pp. 315–330.
- [22] N. Zamzami and N. Bouguila, "MML-based approach for determining the number of topics in EDCM mixture models," in *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 31st Canadian Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Canadian AI 2018, Toronto, ON, Canada, May 8–11, 2018, Proceedings 31*. Springer, 2018, pp. 211–217.
- [23] B. Li, H. Lu, Y. Zhang, Z. Lin, and W. Wu, "Subspace clustering under complex noise," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2018.
- [24] I. Channoufi, S. Bourouis, N. Bouguila, and K. Hamrouni, "Color image segmentation with bounded generalized Gaussian mixture model and feature selection," in *Advanced Technologies for Signal and Image Processing (ATSIP), 2018 4th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [25] C. S. Wallace, *Statistical and Inductive Inference by Minimum Message Length*, ser. Information Science and Statistics. Springer Verlag, May 2005.
- [26] R. Yang and J. O. Berger, *A catalog of noninformative priors*. Institute of Statistics and Decision Sciences, Duke University, 1996.
- [27] A. Birnbaum, "On the foundations of statistical inference," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 57, no. 298, pp. 269–306, 1962.
- [28] R. A. Fisher, "On the mathematical foundations of theoretical statistics," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, vol. 222, no. 594–604, pp. 309–368, 1922.
- [29] A. N. Tikhonov, A. V. Goncharsky, V. V. Stepanov, and A. G. Yagola, *Numerical methods for the solution of ill-posed problems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 328.
- [30] A. E. Hoerl and R. W. Kennard, "Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems," *Technometrics*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 55–67, 1970.
- [31] R. Tibshirani, "The lasso method for variable selection in the Cox model," *Statistics in Medicine*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 385–395, 1997.
- [32] H. Akaike, "Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle," in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium on Information Theory*, B. N. Petrov and F. Csaki, Eds., 1973, pp. 267–281.
- [33] G. Schwarz, "Estimating the dimension of a model," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 461–464, 1978.
- [34] R. J. Solomonoff, "A formal theory of inductive inference. Part I," *Information and Control*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 1964.
- [35] J. Rissanen, *Stochastic complexity in statistical inquiry*. World Scientific, 1989.
- [36] —, *Information and complexity in statistical modeling*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [37] P. Dale and P. Dale, "Environmental change over 28 years in a subtropical salt marsh: Optimal classification and pictures from the exposition," *Community Ecology*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 198–204, 2016.
- [38] L. Allison, *Coding Ockham's Razor*. Springer, 2018.
- [39] D. F. Schmidt and E. Makalic, "Minimum Message Length analysis of multiple short time series," *Statistics & Probability Letters*, vol. 110, pp. 318–328, 2016.
- [40] Z. Xu, D. F. Schmidt, E. Makalic, G. Qian, and J. L. Hopper, "Bayesian sparse global-local shrinkage regression for selection of grouped variables," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.04333*, 2017.
- [41] C. S. Wallace and D. L. Dowe, "MML clustering of multi-state, Poisson, von Mises circular and Gaussian distributions," *Statistics and Computing*, vol. 10, pp. 73–83, Jan 2000.
- [42] P. Kasarapu and L. Allison, "Minimum message length estimation of mixtures of multivariate Gaussian and von Mises-Fisher distributions," *Machine Learning*, vol. 100, no. 2–3, pp. 333–378, 2015.
- [43] D. L. Dowe, J. J. Oliver, and C. S. Wallace, "MML estimation of the parameters of the spherical Fisher distribution," in *International Workshop on Algorithmic Learning Theory*. Springer, 1996, pp. 213–227.
- [44] J. W. Comley and D. L. Dowe, "Minimum message length and generalized Bayesian nets with asymmetric languages," in *Advances in Minimum Description Length: Theory and Applications*, P. Grünwald, M. A. Pitt, and I. J. Myung, Eds. M.I.T. Press, April 2005, pp. 265–294.
- [45] R. T. Edwards and D. L. Dowe, "Single factor analysis in MML mixture modelling," in *Research and Development in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Second Pacific-Asia Conference, PAKDD-98, Melbourne, Australia, April 15–17, 1998, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, X. Wu, K. Ramamohanarao, and K. B. Korb, Eds., vol. 1394. Springer, 1998, pp. 96–109.
- [46] C. S. Wallace, "Multiple factor analysis by MML estimation," in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Biennial Australian Statistical Conference (ASC-14)*, 1995, p. 144.
- [47] R. Subramanian, L. Allison, P. J. Stuckey, M. G. de la Banda, D. Abramson, A. M. Lesk, and A. S. Konagurthu, "Statistical compression of protein folding patterns for inference of recurrent substructural themes," in *2017 Data Compression Conference (DCC)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 340–349.
- [48] A. S. Konagurthu, R. Subramanian, L. Allison, D. Abramson, M. G. de la Banda, P. J. Stuckey, and A. M. Lesk, "Information-theoretic inference of an optimal dictionary of protein supersecondary structures," in *Protein Supersecondary Structures*. Springer, 2019, pp. 123–131.
- [49] K. Gerow, "Fisher consistency – the evolution of a concept: It's hard to get it right the first time," Cornell University, New York, Tech. Rep. BU-1022-M, 1989.
- [50] B. Baltagi, *Econometric analysis of panel data*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- [51] D. Basu, "On the elimination of nuisance parameters," in *Selected Works of Debabrata Basu*. Springer, 2011, pp. 279–290.
- [52] T. Lancaster, "The incidental parameter problem since 1948," *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 95, no. 2, pp. 391–413, 2000.
- [53] J. L. Doob, "Probability and statistics," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 759–775, 1934.
- [54] A. Wald, "Note on the consistency of the maximum likelihood estimate," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 20, pp. 595–601, 1949.
- [55] M. D. Perlman, "On the strong consistency of approximate maximum likelihood estimates," in *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium of Mathematical Statistical Probability*, vol. 1, 1972, pp. 263–281.
- [56] S. Byungtae and L. Bruce, "Nearly universal consistency of maximum likelihood in discrete models," *Statistics & Probability Letters*, vol. 83, pp. 1699–1702, 2013.
- [57] M. Brand and T. Hendrey, "A taxonomy of estimator consistency on discrete estimation problems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05582*, 2019.

- [58] R. J. Solomonoff, "Complexity-based induction systems: Comparisons and convergence theorems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. IT-24, no. 4, pp. 422–432, 1978.
- [59] C. S. Wallace and D. L. Dowe, *MML estimation of the von Mises concentration parameter*. Monash University, Department of Computer Science, 1993, technical Report No. 93/193.
- [60] L. J. Savage, "On rereading R. A. Fisher," *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 441–500, 1976.
- [61] H. Jeffreys, "An invariant form for the prior probability in estimation problems," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 186, no. 1007, pp. 453–461, 1946.
- [62] —, *The theory of probability*. OUP Oxford, 1998.

Michael Brand received a Ph.D. in Information Technology from Monash University, Australia, in 2013, an M.Sc. in Mathematics and Computer Science (specialising in Applied Mathematics) from The Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel, in 2006, and a B.Sc. in Industrial Engineering from Tel-Aviv University, Israel, in 1995. He is an Adjunct A/Prof in Data Science and Artificial Intelligence at Monash University, where he also headed the Monash Centre for Data Science, and is the head and founder of analytics consultancy firm Otzma Analytics. He previously served as Chief Data Scientist at Telstra Corporation, Chief Scientist at Verint Systems, Senior Principal Data Scientist at Pivotal and CTO Group Algorithm Leader at PrimeSense. His research interests include theoretical machine learning, the theory of computation, signal modelling, Big Data computing, and combinatorics, and he holds 16 patents in computer vision, natural language processing and database algorithms.