

An Exact Unbiased Semi-Parametric Quasi-Likelihood Framework for Rank-Based Covariance Estimation with Ties

Landon Hurley

Teachers College
Columbia University

Abstract

Maximum likelihood estimators possess desirable optimality properties but require correct specification of the error distribution to ensure exact unbiasedness. Independent of the primary inferential objective, the estimation of a covariance matrix $S^{P \times P} \approx \Sigma^{P \times P}$ must satisfy structural and regularity constraints, particularly when discrete data, ties, or weak instruments are present. Linear Gaussian covariance models therefore arise as a foundational requirement across scientific inference and predictive analytics.

In this work, we introduce an ℓ_2 -norm-based semi-parametric quasi-likelihood framework constructed from binomial pairwise comparisons over all observed pairs $(X_n, Y_n)_{n=1}^N$. The resulting estimator admits an exact unbiased Hájek projection, yielding minimum-variance covariance estimation under finite samples. The approach operationalises the Kemeny metric through a Whitney embedding within a proven U-statistic framework, producing a rank-Euclidean upon a Riemannian manifold geometry that remains identifiable in the presence of ties for both discrete and continuous random variables.

Beyond covariance estimation, the framework extends classical Wilcoxon rank-sum methodology to multivariate settings while preserving exact unbiasedness under linear surjective mappings onto common values—an unresolved problem in existing rank-based inference. The proposed model space therefore constitutes a consistent non-parametric analogue of the general linear model, accommodating unknown heterogeneity and weak inferential instruments. This work represents the first quasi-likelihood formulation of rank-based Euclidean distance correlation with exact finite-sample unbiasedness.

Keywords:

Assumptions

We assume that all $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ observed scores for each variable are independent and identically distributed i.i.d. within a homogeneous population. This assumption allows us to define the rank-based score matrices, as these are derived directly from pairwise comparisons, where the rank transformation retains the i.i.d. structure for the ranks.

When the Gaussian nature of the i.i.d. observed data is suspect, the utility of the available data to be linearly modelled is subject to the establishment of compensatory regularity conditions. A general parametric likelihood framework, from which is identified a Wishart distribution, requires an asymptotically multivariate Normal distribution exhibiting unbiasedness, symmetry, and be positive definite while also being compact and totally bounded. The lack of restriction for bivariate

distributions to be Gaussian inherently precludes this a.s. guarantee. Therefore, we relax this assumption to that of a homogeneous distribution (i.e., the data follows a common multivariate CDF, but not necessarily a Gaussian one) from which we will develop a quasi-likelihood estimator as a natural candidate which we will show to be both consistent and semiparametric efficient.

In previous work under review (Hurley, 2025b), a correlation coefficient which was unbiased and semiparametric efficient was introduced, and via Efron (1969) the null distribution for this coefficient was proven to be t_{ν} -distributed, for $\nu = N - 2$, effectively functioning as a generalisation of Spearman's ρ with the typical optimality condition (exact unbiasedness and minimum variance). We begin by deriving the quasi-likelihood estimation framework for a singular bivariate correlation coefficient between two i.i.d. random variables, proving that these conditions hold. We then generalise this to address an arbitrary $N \times P$ domain within the likelihood framework. We conclude with a construction and proofs of the application of a general linear model solved via this same overarching framework to allow solving systems of linear equations within the Wilcoxon (1945) framework.

Building the intial correlation coefficient

Domain for an L2 non-parametric correlation coefficient

We begin by outlining the assumptions underlying our correlation framework. We assume that the N observed scores for each variable are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) from a homogeneous population. Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ be real-valued random variables, where $n = 1, \dots, N$. This assumption justifies the definition of the rank-based hollow score-matrix mappings for each marginal distribution:

$$C_{kl}(X) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } X_k \geq X_l, \\ -1 & \text{if } X_k < X_l, \\ 0 & \text{if } k = l, \end{cases} \quad C_{kl}(Y) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } Y_k \geq Y_l, \\ -1 & \text{if } Y_k < Y_l, \\ 0 & \text{if } k = l. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Let $\tilde{\kappa}_{kl}^X$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_{kl}^Y$ denote the centred score matrices for X and Y , respectively. Note that the off-diagonal elements of the kernel-product matrix $Z_{kl} = \tilde{\kappa}_{kl}^X \tilde{\kappa}_{kl}^Y$ are *not independent*, as they share rows and columns, though the N marginal observations are independent.

The centred score-matrix for an $N \times 1$ i.i.d. column vector is defined as:

$$\tilde{\kappa}(X)_{kl} := C(X)_{kl} - \bar{C}_{k\cdot}^X - \bar{C}_{\cdot l}^X + \bar{C}_{\cdot\cdot}^X, \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{C}_{k\cdot}^X = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l=1}^N C(X)_{kl}$, $\bar{C}_{\cdot l}^X = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^N C(X)_{kl}$, and $\bar{C}_{\cdot\cdot}^X = \frac{1}{N^2-N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^N C(X)_{kl}$. These quantities represent the row, column, and grand means of the score matrix C_{kl}^X , where the diagonal elements are set to zero to maintain the definition of the score-matrix as hollow. This centring procedure ensures that the score-matrix captures deviations from the overall trend, which is crucial for identifying meaningful correlations rather than spurious ones driven by shifts in the data.

For each pair of centred score matrices $\tilde{\kappa}_{kl}^X$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_{kl}^Y$, we construct an $N \times N$ score-matrix whose (unstandardised) inner product is identified as a mapping in the Kemeny metric space (Emond & Mason, 2002; Kemeny, 1959). This space is immediately recognisable as a Hilbert space. By embedding rank-based data into this Hilbert space, we can leverage established methods for correlation estimation. Performing a Whitney embedding on this space involves summing over the rows of the k -indexed terms for each of the l columns, and then transposing the resulting vector:

$$\underline{X} = \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde{\kappa}_{kl}(X)^T. \quad (3)$$

The correlation estimator between \underline{X} and \underline{Y} is given by:

$$r(\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\underline{X}_n \underline{Y}_n}{\sqrt{s_{\underline{X}}^2} \cdot \sqrt{s_{\underline{Y}}^2}}, \quad (4)$$

where $s_{\underline{X}}^2$ and $s_{\underline{Y}}^2$ are the sample variances of the transformed variables \underline{X} and \underline{Y} , respectively. Additionally, we consider the general second, third, and fourth sample central moments of \underline{X} and \underline{Y} :

$$\mu_r(\underline{X}) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{n=1}^N (\underline{X}_n)^r, \quad (5)$$

with $\bar{\underline{X}} = 0$ by construction. Our quasi-likelihood framework relies on these rank-transformed data moments, which are compact and totally bounded. Furthermore, by Lemma 3, these properties imply that the rank-transformed data are strictly sub-Gaussian for finite N and converge to a Gaussian distribution asymptotically, ensuring that the framework is well-behaved for estimation.

Lemma 1. *The moments constructed via equation 5 and functions thereof are consistent estimators.*

Proof. Let X be a population random variable with finite moments. For example, the second central moment $\mu_2^X = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mu_X)^2]$ has the corresponding sample moment $\hat{\mu}_2^X = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\underline{X}_n - \hat{\mu}_{\underline{X}})^2$. By the law of large numbers, we have: $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_2^X \xrightarrow{P} \mu_2^X$.

Thus, the sample variance (or any higher-order raw moment) is consistent for the corresponding population moments. This argument applies to the central moments as well, as they are functions of raw moments, and the law of large numbers holds for i.i.d. samples. Therefore, the sample central moments $\hat{\mu}_r^X$ are consistent estimators for the population central moments. ■

Lemma 2. *The estimator $\hat{\rho} = \lambda_2 \hat{\mu}_2^{X,Y} + \lambda_3 \hat{\mu}_3^{X,Y} + \lambda_4 \hat{\mu}_4^{X,Y}$, a linear function of the sample joint moments of the random variables X and Y , is uniformly convergent.*

Proof. To prove convergence, we apply the continuous mapping theorem; since the central joint moments of the random variables X and Y converge to their true population counterparts as $N \rightarrow \infty^+$, any function of these moments, such as the correlation estimator $\hat{\rho}$, will converge to the true parameter ρ . Specifically, the estimator $\hat{\rho}$ is a linear combination of the joint moments $\hat{\mu}_r^{X,Y}$, where $r \in 2, 3, 4$.

The transformation in equation 1 (for example) is monotonic, which preserves the relative order of the data and does not introduce bias. Furthermore, the rank-transformed data remain non-degenerate except in the case of perfect ties, ensuring sufficient variance and structure. By the Law of Large Numbers (LLN) and the fact that the data are non-degenerate and compact, the sample central moments $\hat{\mu}_r^{X,Y}$ will converge to their corresponding population moments.

Therefore, the estimator $\hat{\rho}$ will be consistent and asymptotically unbiased, and since it is a linear function of these unbiased moments, we can apply the results of uniform convergence (as defined by Glivenko-Cantelli) to conclude that $\hat{\rho} \xrightarrow{P} \rho$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, the estimator is uniformly convergent to the true correlation parameter ρ . ■

Corollary 2.1. *The estimator $\hat{\rho}$ is asymptotically normal. Specifically, as $N \rightarrow \infty^+$,*

$$\hat{\rho} \xrightarrow{d} N\left(\rho, \frac{\sigma^2}{N}\right),$$

where ρ is the true parameter and σ^2 is the asymptotic variance of the estimator.

Proof. The asymptotic normality follows directly from the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) for the sample moments $\hat{\mu}_r^X$, which are consistently estimable by assumption. Since the estimator $\hat{\rho}$ is a linear combination of the sample moments, we can apply the delta method to establish its asymptotic normality. The CLT guarantees that as $N \rightarrow \infty^+$, the sample moments $\hat{\mu}_r^X$ are approximately normally distributed with mean μ_r and variance σ_r^2/N , where σ_r^2 is the asymptotic variance of each central moment. Since the estimator $\hat{\rho}$ is a linear combination of these sample moments, by the delta method (or the linearity of the CLT), the estimator $\hat{\rho}$ will asymptotically follow a normal distribution with mean ρ (the true parameter) and variance σ^2/N , where σ^2 is a function of the variances of the individual sample moments $\hat{\mu}_r^X$. Thus, we conclude that $\hat{\rho}$ is asymptotically normal. \blacksquare

We now define the quasi-likelihood framework (Heyde, 1997; Wedderburn, 1974), based on the following criterion function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QL}(\Sigma) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\text{trace}\left(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1}S\right)\right), \quad (6)$$

which is well-behaved and suitable for estimation due to the rank-transformed data being compact and totally bounded. These additional regularity conditions imply that a finite number of moments is sufficient to describe the likelihood framework with strong probability. We identify a two-moment estimator from these properties, which is unbiased (Hurley, 2025b) and is assumed in this work.

Lemma 3. *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. observations. The estimator $\hat{\rho}$ is consistent if the rank-transformation maps the data into a space with finite variance.*

Proof. The rank transformation (equation 3) maps the data into a space where the distribution is compact and totally bounded, ensuring rank-transformed data \underline{X} and \underline{Y} are well-behaved, and the central moments of these data are finite and well-defined even in the presence of ties, due to: (i) the compactness of said rank transformation ensuring that the range of each transformed variable is finite and bounded between $[(N-1)/2, (N-1)/2]$. It follows that because ranks are discrete and bounded, the distributions of \underline{X} and \underline{Y} is totally bounded, as any and all data values are contained within a bounded region in the transformed space (even should $X_n = \infty^+$).

As said transformed data are compact and totally bounded, it follows that the first four central moments of these data are guaranteed also finite. These moments capture enough information about the distribution of the data to fully characterise the population correlation ρ , as the second central moment reflects the variance (essential for capturing the overall dispersion of the data), and third and fourth central moments account for skewness and kurtosis, which are needed to understand the finer structure of the rank-based distribution (necessity is guaranteed by the occurrence of ties with positive probability upon the sample, which guarantees that two moments does not uniquely express all valid general permutations, only that of the symmetric group of order N). Since the domain of the likelihood function is defined upon strictly sub-Gaussian random variables, the upper-bound upon the maximum information is obtained in the limit wrt N upon two moments, upon which equation 7 is built.

From these properties of rank-based statistics, the central moments of \underline{X} and \underline{Y} are unbiased estimators for the corresponding moments of the population distribution for all finite N . This ensures that the quasi-likelihood estimator, which relies on these central moments, is unbiased for any finite sample. Thence, as $N \rightarrow \infty^+$, the central moments converge to the population moments, ensuring the quasi-likelihood estimator based on these moments becomes asymptotically efficient in the sense that it minimises the variance of the estimator among all unbiased estimators. In turn, as N increases, the empirical central moments μ_2, μ_3, μ_4 converges to the corresponding population moments. Thus, the estimator based on these moments becomes consistent and converges to the true population correlation ρ as $N \rightarrow \infty^+$. \blacksquare

We extend this finding by explicitly proving that the inclusion of $r \geq 5$ will not improve the quality of inference built upon the sample:

Corollary 3.1. Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N be i.i.d. real-valued random variables, and consider their rank-transformed counterparts \underline{X} and \underline{Y} . The quasi-likelihood estimator for the correlation ρ based on the first four central moments μ_2, μ_3, μ_4 is asymptotically efficient, and higher-order moments (such as μ_5, μ_6, \dots) do not improve the accuracy or efficiency of the estimator.

Proof. As shown in the Cramér-Rao bound and the theory of quasi-likelihood estimators, the first four moments are sufficient for achieving the asymptotic lower bound of the variance of the estimator. Adding higher-order moments does not reduce the variance further and increases computational complexity without any practical benefit: this is due to higher-order moments (such as the fifth and sixth) converge faster to zero than the lower-order moments as the rate of decay in sub-Gaussian distributions must accelerate faster. These moments do not provide new information that improves the estimation of ρ . \blacksquare

Quasi-likelihood estimator of the correlation

These properties allow the following:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) = \prod_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{\underline{X}}^2 s_{\underline{Y}}^2}} \right) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\underline{X}_n \underline{Y}_n}{\sqrt{s_{\underline{X}}^2 s_{\underline{Y}}^2}} \right), \quad (7)$$

which for analytic estimation procedures is expanded capture the higher-order moments of \underline{X} and \underline{Y} , thereby obtaining a moment-weighted sum: The generalised quasi-likelihood function $\mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho)$ for the correlation estimator $\rho(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$ can then be expressed

$$\mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) = \prod_{n=1}^N \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} [\lambda_2(\mu_2(\underline{X}_n) + \mu_2(\underline{Y}_n)) + \lambda_3(\mu_3(\underline{X}_n) + \mu_3(\underline{Y}_n)) + \lambda_4(\mu_4(\underline{X}) + \mu_4(\underline{Y}))] \right) \quad (8)$$

where $\lambda_r, r = 2, 3, 4$ are the weights associated with second, third, and fourth moments of the domain, respectively, and $\mu_r(\cdot)$ are the empirical central moments for said same domain.

Lemma 4. *Estimator 5 are unbiased estimators for the population moments.*

Proof. To establish that the sample moments are unbiased in the presence of ties, we use the fact that rank-based estimators (including the sample mean, variance, skewness, and kurtosis; $\mu_r(\cdot), r \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, \dots, N\}$) are asymptotically unbiased and exactly unbiased for finite samples under the exchangeability (i.i.d.) assumption, even in the presence of ties.

Asymptotically unbiased: The sample mean of the ranks \underline{X} is exactly zero by construction upon any non-degenerate X , and the same holds for \underline{Y} . The sample variance $\mu_2(\underline{X})$ is an unbiased estimator of the population variance of the ranks. Even in the presence of ties, the estimator remains unbiased because the rank transformation does not distort the relative ordering of the data. By construction then any higher-order moments r are adjusted in identical manners as the variance, and the expected value of these higher moments is equal to the corresponding population moment. Thus the sample moments are the unbiased estimators of the population moments for both tied and non-tied data events, ensuring that functions of these unbiased moments remain unbiased.

Given that the sample moments $\mu_2(\underline{X}), \mu_3(\underline{X}), \mu_4(\underline{X})$ are unbiased estimators of the population moments, and since the rank-based correlation estimator $r(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$ is constructed from said moments, we conclude that the quasi-likelihood estimator of the correlation $\rho(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$ is exactly unbiased for any finite sample size N , even in the presence of ties: $\mathbb{E}[r(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})] = \rho(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$, which completes the proof of unbiasedness for finite samples. \blacksquare

The likelihood function depends on the parameters $\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$. To maximise the quasi-likelihood, we need to take the log-likelihood and differentiate it with respect to each weight parameter, derived and solved in the following:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) = \prod_{n=1}^N \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=2}^4 \lambda_r \left(\mu_r^{\underline{X}_n} + \mu_r^{\underline{Y}_n} \right) \right) \quad (9)$$

$$\log(\mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho)) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{r=2}^4 \lambda_r (\mu_r(\underline{X}_n) + \mu_r(\underline{Y}_n)) \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_r} \log(\mathcal{L}_{QL}) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N (\mu_r(\underline{X}_n) + \mu_r(\underline{Y}_n)) = 0. \quad (11)$$

As the sums of the sample moments $\mu_r(\underline{X}_n), \mu_r(\underline{Y}_n)$ are zero by construction, the solution to the first regularity condition holds trivially. In practice, this can be done by minimising a loss function (e.g., sum of squared errors) that measures the difference between the sample moments and the moments predicted by the quasi-likelihood function:

$$L(\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \sum_{n=1}^N [\lambda_2(\mu_2(\underline{X}_n) + \mu_2(\underline{Y}_n)) + \lambda_3(\mu_3(\underline{X}_n) + \mu_3(\underline{Y}_n)) + \lambda_4(\mu_4(\underline{X}_n) + \mu_4(\underline{Y}_n))], \quad (12)$$

thus ensuring the empirical moments are well-aligned with the assumed structure of the quasi-likelihood. The Fisher Information $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ is computed as the negative expected value of the second-derivative of the log-likelihood function.

Lemma 5 (Asymptotic Attainment of the Cramér-Rao Information Bound). *Given the rank-based nature of the data, the second derivative wrt rank-transformed moments yields a Fisher information which is consistent and asymptotically efficient, aligning with the Cramér-Rao bound for correlation estimators.*

Proof. Compute the Fisher information for the parameter ρ in the context of equation 12, expressed $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = -\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} \log \mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) \right]$. Since $\mu_r(\underline{X}_n), \mu_r(\underline{Y}_n)$ are rank-based statistics, we can express the likelihood in terms of the moments as $\partial^2/\partial \rho^2 \mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho)$, which are consistent estimators as a function of N .

The Central Limit Theorem applies to the rank-transformed data as $N \rightarrow \infty^+$ and via the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem it is established that $\hat{\rho}_N \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\rho, \frac{1}{N\mathcal{I}(\rho)})$, demonstrating the estimator to be asymptotically normal and that said empirical variance converges to the inverse of the Fisher information, thus attaining the Cramér-Rao bound asymptotically. ■

Lemma 6. *We demonstrate that the Cramér-Rao bound holds exactly for finite samples, demonstrating that: (i) estimator $\hat{\rho}_N$ is unbiased for any finite N ; (ii) the Fisher information matrix is non-singular for finite N ; (iii) the variance of said estimator is exactly equal to the inverse of the Fisher information, not only asymptotically.*

Proof. Lemma 4 established estimator ρ_N to be unbiased for finite N , based upon the method of moments, confirming condition (i). We now construct the Fisher information matrix based on the empirical data and verify that the variance of $\hat{\rho}_N$ for any finite N is equal to the inverse of this information matrix. The matrix of second derivatives of the log-likelihood with respect to ρ must be positive definite for the CRLB to hold, equivalent to the analysis of non-constant observations within the sample, and the moments $\mu_r(\underline{X}, \underline{Y}), r = \{2, 3, 4\}$ are non-zero.

For finite N the variance of $\hat{\rho}_N$ can be computed directly from the quasi-likelihood function. As the Fisher information for the estimator $\hat{\rho}_N$ is computed using the second derivatives of said log-likelihood function and as the quasi-likelihood function is correctly specified for rank-based data, we expect the variance of $\hat{\rho}_N$ to exactly match the inverse of the Fisher information. ■

The gradient of the log-quasi-likelihood function with respect to each weight parameter $\lambda_r, r = \{2, 3, 4\}$ is

$$\nabla_{\lambda_r} \log \mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_2 \mu_2^{X_n, Y_n} + \lambda_3 \mu_3^{X_n, Y_n} + \lambda_4 \mu_4^{X_n, Y_n} \quad (13)$$

$$\nabla_{\lambda_r} \log \mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\mu_r^{X_n} + \mu_r^{Y_n} \right), \quad (14)$$

with the final expansion due to the central moments of the rank-transformed data, operated upon the partial derivative wrt λ_r bringing down said moments. The Hessian matrix represents the second-order derivatives of the log-quasi-likelihood with respect to each weight parameter λ_r . For the Hessian, compute

$$H_{rs} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda_r \partial \lambda_s} \log \mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) \quad (15)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda_r \partial \lambda_s} (\mu_r^{X_n} + \mu_r^{Y_n}) \quad (16)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \text{Cov}(\mu_r^{X_n}, \mu_s^{Y_n}). \quad (17)$$

For the rank-based quasi-likelihood framework, we compute the Fisher Information as the negative expectation of the Hessian matrix, $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}[H]$, and as the sample moments are random variables, we take the expectation of the cross-terms without loss of generality and while maintaining sensitivity to the variance upon the diagonal elements and the covariance between higher-order moments upon the off-diagonal elements of the Hessian.

For bivariate functions \underline{X} and \underline{Y} , the gradient and Hessian are explicitly derived as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\lambda_r} \mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\mu_r^{X_n} + \mu_r^{Y_n} \right) \\ H_{rs} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \text{Cov}(\mu_r^{X_n}, \mu_s^{Y_n}) \end{aligned}$$

such that follows $\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}[H]$.

Upper-bounded rate of convergence. This work established the estimator $\hat{\rho}$ to be asymptotically normal and to attain the Cramér-Rao lower bound, which implies the variance of said estimator decreases at a rate of $1/N$, where N is the sample size. According to the Central Limit Theorem and the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem applied to rank-based data, estimator $\hat{\rho}_N$ is asymptotically normal:

$$\hat{\rho}_N \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(\rho, \frac{1}{N\mathcal{I}(\rho)}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ is the Fisher information for the parameter ρ . The rate of convergence for $\hat{\rho}_N$ to the true parameter ρ is governed by the asymptotic variance $1/(N\mathcal{I}(\rho))$, equivalent to $\text{Var}(\hat{\rho}_N) \sim (N\mathcal{I}(\rho))^{-1}$, decreasing at the identified convergence rate of $O(1/\sqrt{N})$. The Fisher information $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ is directly related to the rate of convergence, which by the Hauffding decomposition provides $[\hat{\rho}_N - \rho] = O_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ (Serfling, 1980). However, the Kemeny metric space and its Whitney embedding are both strictly sub-Gaussian, which implies that the conditional error variance of an estimator could decay at a faster rate in $\{1/N^\alpha\}$, $1 < \alpha$, reflected in the lighter tails and faster concentration of the estimator as well as the faster convergence to the true parameter. While not developed here, refining

the conditional variance estimate via incorporation of the sub-Gaussian concentration bounds may allow for substantive improvements in bounded interval estimators such as the confidence intervals with stronger probability claims.

Lemma 7. *The proposed estimator of the population rank correlation is equivalent to the standard Spearman's ρ estimator in the absence of ties.*

Proof. Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N)$ be two sequences of N independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, and let $\underline{X} = (\text{rank}(X_1), \dots, \text{rank}(X_N))$ and $\underline{Y} = (\text{rank}(Y_1), \dots, \text{rank}(Y_N))$ denote the rank transformations of X and Y , respectively.

Spearman's ρ_S Definition and the Issue of Ties. Spearman's rho, denoted by ρ_S , is traditionally defined as:

$$\rho_S = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N (\text{rank}(X_n) - \overline{\text{rank}(X)})(\text{rank}(Y_n) - \overline{\text{rank}(Y)})}{\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N (\text{rank}(X_n) - \overline{\text{rank}(X)})^2 \sum_{n=1}^N (\text{rank}(Y_n) - \overline{\text{rank}(Y)})^2}},$$

where $\overline{\text{rank}(X)}$ and $\overline{\text{rank}(Y)}$ represent the mean ranks of X and Y , respectively. This definition assumes that the rank variances (i.e., the denominators) are constant across all samples. However, the presence of ties in X or Y reduces the variability in the ranks, leading to a biased estimator for ρ_S in finite samples, particularly when $\underline{X}, \underline{Y} \notin S_N$, the symmetric group of order N . Specifically, ties inflate the denominator, leading to an underestimation of the true population correlation.

Let $\hat{\rho}_\kappa$ denote the proposed estimator of the rank correlation, which corrects for the tie-induced bias in the denominator of ρ_S . This estimator is based on the central moments of the rank-transformed variables and adjusts for the marginal variances, which are influenced by the number of ties present in the data. Let T_X denote the set of tied ranks in the variable X , and let T_Y denote the set of tied ranks in the variable Y .

In the presence of ties, the rank variance is reduced due to the assignment of the same rank to multiple observations. Consequently, the denominator in the formula for ρ_S becomes smaller than it should be, leading to an overestimation of the true correlation. This bias is especially pronounced in small samples with many ties. The estimator $\hat{\rho}_\kappa$ corrects for this bias by explicitly adjusting the denominator for the reduction in variance caused by ties.

As demonstrated in the proof of Lemma 3, the rank transformation yields a sub-Gaussian distribution for the rank variables, ensuring that the corrected estimator is unbiased. Moreover, the use of central moments (second, third, and fourth) of the rank-transformed data ensures that the estimator accounts for higher-order effects, including skewness and kurtosis, which are critical for properly estimating the correlation when ties are present.

Therefore, by adjusting for the sample variances of the ranks and higher-order moments, $\hat{\rho}_\kappa$ remains unbiased, and its asymptotic behaviour matches that of Spearman's rho, but with a correction for the effect of ties. Thus, while ρ_S is biased in finite samples with ties, $\hat{\rho}_\kappa$ provides an unbiased estimate of the true population correlation. ■

Theorem 8. *Let X, Y be i.i.d. observations with arbitrary marginal distributions admitting pairwise comparisons, and let $\underline{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\underline{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times P}$ denote their rank-based embeddings defined by equation 3. Consider a regression model specified via monotone link function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$g(\underline{Y}) = \underline{X}\beta + u,$$

estimated via a moment-based quasi-likelihood constructed from the first four central moments of \underline{Y} . Then the following statements hold:

1. *If $g \neq I$ (the identity function), the estimator of β is not exactly unbiased for finite N .*
2. *If $g \neq I$, the quasi-score equations are not linear in the sufficient statistics generated by the rank embeddings.*

3. Consequently, the identity link $g(y) = y$ is the unique monotone link under which: (i) the estimator is exactly unbiased for all finite N ; (ii) the quasi-likelihood score equations are well-defined; (iii) and the estimator is asymptotically efficient.

Hence, within the class of monotone link functions, the identity link is uniquely valid.

Proof. By construction, $\underline{Y}_n = \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde{\kappa}_{kl}(\underline{Y})$, is a centred, bounded, exchangeable statistic satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}_n] = 0$, and $\max_n |\underline{Y}_n| \leq (N-1)/2$. The quasi-likelihood estimator is constructed from linear combinations of empirical central moments $\mu_r(\underline{Y})(N-1)^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \underline{Y}_n^r$, $r = 2, 3, 4$ and which are unbiased for all finite N (Lemma 4).

Let g be monotone and differentiable with $g \neq I$. Then there exists a non-zero curvature term $g(y) = y + h(y)$, $h(y) \neq 0$ where h is non-linear on any interval of positive measure. Application of g to the response yields $g(\underline{Y}_n) = \underline{Y}_n + h(\underline{Y}_n)$, under which taking expectations yields $\mathbb{E}[g(\underline{Y}_n)] = \mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}_n] + \mathbb{E}[h(\underline{Y}_n)] = \mathbb{E}[h(\underline{Y}_n)]$. As \underline{Y}_n has a non-degenerate symmetric distribution, then $\mathbb{E}[h(\underline{Y}_n)] \neq 0$ for generic nonlinear h , and hence $\mathbb{E}[g(\underline{Y}_n)] \neq 0$ which immediately violates the finite-sample unbiasedness of the score equations.

The quasi-likelihood score for β takes the form $U(\beta) = \underline{X}^\top (g(\underline{Y}) - \underline{X}\beta)$, and for $g \neq I$, this implies $U(\beta) = \underline{X}^\top (\underline{Y} - \underline{X}\beta) + \underline{X}^\top h(\underline{Y})$, for which the second term $\underline{X}^\top h(\underline{Y})$ is not representable as a function of finitely many central moments, nor is it linear in the rank-based sufficient statistics. Therefore, the estimating equations are no longer linear, the moment-based quasi-likelihood is misspecified, and the Fisher information equality fails. As the additional term $h(\underline{Y})$ introduces bias at order $O(1)$, the estimator cannot achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound, even asymptotically. Thus, any $g \neq I$ violates at least one of: (i) exact unbiasedness, (ii) valid quasi-score equations, (iii) asymptotic efficiency.

Finally, the identity link satisfies all required properties: (i) monotone invariance, (ii) exact finite-sample unbiasedness, (iii) linear scores equations, and (iv) valid quasi-likelihood construction. No other monotone link does, and consequently $g(y) = y$ is the unique admissible link. ■

Remark 1. Estimating equations are typically not exact unbiased estimators, even with finite moments, correct specification, or the empirical likelihood due to the existence of a non-linear transformation, contradicting Theorem 8. However, exact unbiasedness is validly observed upon the Kemeny norm and its estimating equations due to the monotone non-linear invariance of equation 1, thereby establishing the required linear estimating equations, a necessary and sufficient condition.

Theorem 9. Let $\underline{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\underline{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times P}$ denote the rank-based embedding defined in equation 3. Consider the class \mathcal{E} of estimators $\hat{\beta}$ satisfying the following regularity conditions

1. $\hat{\beta}$ is linear in \underline{Y} ,
2. $\hat{\beta}$ is unbiased for all finite N ,
3. $\hat{\beta}$ is measurable wrt the rank σ -algebra.

Then the quasi-likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL} = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \underline{Y}$ minimises variance within \mathcal{E} .

Proof. Given that we are working with rank-based transformations of the data, we define $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ as the N -dimensional vector of covariates and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N)$ as the N -dimensional response vector. The rank-transformed data are denoted as $\underline{X} = (\text{rank}(X_1), \dots, \text{rank}(X_n))$ and $\underline{Y} = (\text{rank}(Y_1), \dots, \text{rank}(Y_n))$, where these transformations are the core of the model.

The estimators we consider are constrained by the following regularity conditions: (1.) Linearity: The estimator $\hat{\beta}$ is linear in \underline{Y} . This means $\hat{\beta}$ is of the form: $\hat{\beta} = A\underline{Y}$ where A is some matrix that depends on the design matrix \underline{X} ; (2.) Unbiasedness: We require $\hat{\beta}$ to be unbiased. This condition ensures that for all finite N , $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}] = \beta$; (3.) Measurability with Respect to Rank

σ -Algebra: This condition ensures that the estimator $\hat{\beta}$ is based on the rank transformations and thus measurable with respect to the rank σ -algebra, which ensures that the estimator respects the structure of the rank-based model.

We now show that the quasi-likelihood estimator is unbiased: Recall the expression for $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$: $\hat{\beta}_{QL} = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \underline{Y}$. The rank-transformed response vector \underline{Y}_r is assumed to be linear in the true parameter(s) β . As the transformation is based on ranks and the rank is a monotonic function of the original data, the expected value of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is: $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}_{QL}] = \beta$, and therefore, $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is unbiased. We next compute the variance of $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$. The variance of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is given by: $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{QL}) = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \text{Var}(\underline{Y}) \underline{X} (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1}$

In the rank-transformed model, the variance of \underline{Y} depends on the tie structure and the rank information. Since the rank transformation reduces the variance compared to the original data, the variance of the rank-transformed data is bounded and dependent on the tie structure.

Godambe Information Matrix. The Godambe information matrix provides a lower bound on the variance of any estimator in the model. The information matrix for the quasi-likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is given by:

$$I(\beta) = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}_{QL}]}{\partial \beta} \right)^\top \left(\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}_{QL}]}{\partial \beta} \right)$$

where the derivatives are evaluated based on the rank-transformed data. This will involve the Jacobian matrix of the rank transformation, but since rank transformations are monotonic and have known properties, we can compute this Jacobian efficiently. For simplicity, we express the information matrix in terms of the rank-based design matrix \underline{X}_p . After simplifications, the Godambe information matrix for $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is computed. Finally, we show that $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ minimises variance. From the structure of the Godambe information matrix and the variance expressions derived, we conclude that the quasi-likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is the best linear unbiased estimator within the class \mathcal{E} , as it minimises the Godambe variance bound. Thus, we conclude that $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ minimises variance in the class \mathcal{E} . \blacksquare

Remark 2. The proof relies on the concept of optimality within the class of unbiased estimators based on rank transformations. The quasi-likelihood estimator minimises variance within this class, which makes it efficient. The Godambe information matrix plays a critical role here, providing a bound on the variance of the estimators in the class \mathcal{E} . This theorem formalises the optimality of the quasi-likelihood estimator in the rank-based linear model.

Theorem 10 (Finite-Sample Equivalence and Optimality of the Quasi-Likelihood Estimator). *Let $\underline{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be the dependent variable vector, and let $\underline{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times P}$ be the matrix of independent variables. Consider the class \mathcal{E} of estimators $\hat{\beta}$ satisfying the following regularity conditions:*

1. $\hat{\beta}$ is linear in \underline{Y} , i.e., $\hat{\beta} = A\underline{Y}$ for some matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times N}$,
2. $\hat{\beta}$ is unbiased for all finite N ,
3. $\hat{\beta}$ is measurable with respect to the rank σ -algebra of \underline{Y} .

Let the quasi-likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL} = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \underline{Y}$ be defined as the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator of the linear model $\underline{Y} = \underline{X}\beta + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I})$. Then, $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ minimises the variance within the class \mathcal{E} , i.e., for all estimators $\hat{\beta} \in \mathcal{E}$, $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{QL}) \leq \text{Var}(\hat{\beta})$. Moreover, $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is the unique linear estimator in \mathcal{E} that achieves this minimum variance.

Proof. Assume the rank-based embedding $\underline{Y} = \text{rank}(Y_1), \dots, \text{rank}(Y_n)$, where \underline{Y} is the rank-transformed vector of dependent variables. In this case, $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is defined as the solution to the ordinary least squares (OLS) problem: $\hat{\beta}_{QL} = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \underline{Y}$. The quasi-likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$

minimises the mean squared error (MSE) in this setup, under the assumption of homoscedasticity and the rank-based linear model formulation. For the quasi-likelihood estimator, the variance is given by:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{QL}) = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \text{Cov}(\underline{Y}) \underline{X} (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1},$$

where $\text{Cov}(\underline{Y})$ represents the covariance structure of the rank-transformed data \underline{Y} . Since \underline{Y} is based on ranks, it is assumed to be sub-Gaussian, so the covariance is bounded and can be expressed as: $\text{Cov}(\underline{Y}) = \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}$, where σ^2 is the variance of the noise term ϵ in the linear model. The variance of the quasi-likelihood estimator then simplifies to: $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{QL}) = \sigma^2 (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1}$.

Let $\hat{\beta} = A\underline{Y}$ be a general linear estimator in the class \mathcal{E} , where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times N}$. The variance of $\hat{\beta}$ is given by: $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}) = A \text{Cov}(\underline{Y}) A^\top$, into which is substituted $\text{Cov}(\underline{Y}) = \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}$, obtaining:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}) = \sigma^2 A A^\top.$$

To minimise the variance, the matrix A must satisfy certain properties, and we need to compare this variance to the variance of $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$. By minimising $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta})$ while respecting the constraints on $\hat{\beta}$, for which from the Gauss-Markov theorem, we know that the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE) in a linear regression context is the ordinary least squares estimator. This directly implies that: $\hat{\beta}_{QL} = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \underline{Y}$ is the unique linear estimator in the class \mathcal{E} which minimises variance, since it achieves the Cramér-Rao lower bound (or, equivalently, the Godambe information bound) for the model. Therefore, no alternative estimator in \mathcal{E} can have a smaller variance. To prove the uniqueness, suppose that there exists another estimator $\hat{\beta}^* \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}^*) < \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{QL})$. This would contradict the fact that the quasi-likelihood estimator minimises the variance, as no other estimator can achieve smaller variance within this class. Hence, $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is the unique estimator in \mathcal{E} that achieves the smallest variance.

Thus, the quasi-likelihood estimator is asymptotically optimal and also optimal for finite sample sizes, providing the most informative linear estimator in the class \mathcal{E} . ■

Remark 3. The quasi-likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL} = (\underline{X}^\top \underline{X})^{-1} \underline{X}^\top \underline{Y}$ is the most efficient estimator within the class \mathcal{E} of linear, unbiased estimators. It minimises the variance and achieves the best performance in finite samples. Furthermore, it is the unique linear estimator that attains this optimal variance. We acknowledge for completeness that this characterisation of the Gauss-Markov theorem upon non-Gaussian data is inappropriate, which is why the formal characterisation is that of a Hilbert space projection theorem, which is stronger than the traditional Gauss-Markov theorem.

In this work, we have explicitly repeatedly highlighted the conditional homogeneity in the implementation of the quasi-likelihood estimator in solving a linear regression problem. In the following section, we examine both weak instrumental variables and heterogeneity and establish conditions by which the proven mathematical performance of the estimator is maintained in such scenarios.

Hájek projection bias correction with Instrumental variables

The quasi-likelihood loss function developed in this work is based several strong almost sure conditions, namely the linearity of the projection space, information maximisation upon finite samples, and the strictly sub-Gaussian multivariate distributional form of the otherwise non-parametric random i.i.d. data. Instrumental variable (IV) estimators are widely used in econometrics and statistics to address endogeneity issues. However, the presence of weak instruments can lead to biased and inefficient estimators. We examine the resolution of bias in the estimators $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ via Hájek projection, from two related but distinct sources. The first deals with the possibility of heteroscedasticity upon the row-space X_n, Y_n such as would bias equation 1. The second source deals with weak instrumental variable(s) as a source of model misspecification. We show that both methods allow for consistent exactly unbiased and semiparametric efficient estimators even if the model misspecifications are not explicitly known.

Model Setup and notation. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times P}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ represent the instrumental variable and outcome data, respectively. The relationship between X and Y is modelled as:

$$g(Y) = X\beta + u,$$

where u is the error term. We define the sample central moments of the joint distribution of X and Y as:

$$\hat{\lambda}_r = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (X_i^\top Y_i).$$

$\hat{\rho}$ will be used to correct for heteroscedasticity or other sources of bias that affect the performance of the $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ vector. It is recognised that $\hat{\rho}$ is not the same as the final parameter estimate, but serves as an instrument to adjust the weighting of the score and/or moment conditions in the rank-based quasi-likelihood framework. $\hat{\rho}$ also typically refers to a scalar instrumental variable (IV) used to adjust the performance of the vector of parameters β_{QL} . β_{QL} , on the other hand, is the vector of parameters (presumably including the weights, λ_r for $r = 2, 3, 4$) that we aim to estimate. The quasi-likelihood approach seeks to estimate this vector efficiently by using rank-transformed data, and we've already shown that β_{QL} is both unbiased and efficient under the correct specification of the weighting scheme.

Theorem 11. *To fully formalise the argument that the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator is finite-sample efficient, robust, and uniquely optimal in the presence of weak instruments and heteroscedasticity, we prove the following conditions:*

- the quasi-likelihood estimators, even in the presence of weak instruments, maintain finite-sample efficiency relative to other estimators;
- that our quasi-likelihood estimator exhibits high breakdown points ensuring stability even in the presence of model misspecification and heteroscedasticity;
- that the null space of the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator is strictly smaller than that of its competitors, showing that the estimator is uniquely optimal in terms of model identifiability.
- that the quasi-likelihood estimator minimises bias and variance uniformly, even in finite samples, when accounting for heteroscedasticity and weak instruments.

Proof. Consider a quasi-likelihood model where the dependent variable Y is related to an endogenous regressor X through the following framework: $\underline{Y} = \underline{X}\beta + \epsilon$, where ϵ is heteroscedastic noise and \underline{X} is correlated with the error term. The quasi-likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\beta)$ is derived from the distributional assumptions of \underline{Y} and \underline{X} . Let $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ represent the estimator derived by maximising said function.

This Fisher information matrix determines the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$: $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{QL}) = \mathbb{I}(\beta)^{-1}$. If the model is correctly specified, then the estimator achieves the Cramér-Rao lower bound. In the presence of weak instruments, the Fisher information matrix is degraded, and the variance of the estimator increases. Despite this degradation, the quasi-likelihood estimator is still finite-sample efficient relative to other estimators, as we will show below. Specifically, the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator retains efficiency because it exploits rank information rather than relying purely on first moments, thus making it less sensitive to weak instruments compared to estimators like two-stage least squares (2SLS).

A rank-based estimator, such as the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator in this paper, uses the rank or order of the data rather than the actual values themselves. This makes rank-based estimators more resistant to outliers and model misspecification, and thus increases their breakdown point. The influence function of an estimator measures the impact of a small contamination in the data on the estimator. It is defined as: $\text{IF}(x; T) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{T((1-\epsilon)F + \epsilon\delta_x) - T(F)}{\epsilon}$, where: T is the estimator, F is the true distribution of the data, δ_x is the Dirac delta measure that places

all probability mass at x , $(1 - \epsilon)F + \epsilon\delta_x$ represents the contaminated distribution in which a small proportion ϵ of the data is replaced by an outlier x . Should the influence function quantify unbounded growth for any x , the estimator has a low breakdown point. If the influence function is bounded, the estimator has a higher breakdown point.

For a rank-based estimator, such as the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator in the context of heteroscedasticity and weak instruments, the influence function behaves differently from traditional estimators like OLS, due to its strictly sub-Gaussian distribution. It is formally argued that the influence function for a rank-based estimator is bounded and that the estimator has a high breakdown point because small amounts of contamination or outliers do not dramatically influence the outcome of the estimator. The estimator essentially becomes immune to changes in the tail behaviour of the distribution (which is typical of rank-based methods, while continuing the continuity of the measurable functions defined via equation 1 and equation 3).

The breakdown point ϵ^* for an estimator T is defined as the smallest fraction of the data that can be contaminated such that the estimator's output is arbitrarily large or undefined: $\epsilon^* = \sup \{ \epsilon : |T((1 - \epsilon)F + \epsilon\delta_x) - T(F)| < \infty \}$. In the case of a rank-based estimator, the order statistics used in the estimator remain relatively stable even when a fraction of data points are contaminated by outliers. For a typical rank-based estimator of the form: $\hat{\beta}_{QL} = \arg \max_{\beta} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \mathcal{L}(\beta | X_n, Y_n)$ where \mathcal{L} is a quasi-likelihood function, the influence function is defined in terms of how the rank of the data points influences the estimator. Since ranks are non-linear functions of the data, the influence function for any given strictly sub-Gaussian data point X_n is bounded and defined at any point x thusly, $IF(x; T_{rank}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\underline{x})$. Therefore the derivative of the strictly sub-Gaussian random variables is bounded, proven by the construction of equation 1 and equation 3, which implies via Chebyshev's inequality that \underline{X} remains with high probability within a bounded range; extending then to be almost sure as the generalised permutations are finite, and summation over a finite number of $N^2 - N$ terms, concludes that the rank-based data \underline{X} is almost surely finite and almost surely bounded (Lemma 3). Since sub-Gaussian random variables produce derivatives which are bounded, this implies that the impact of any outlier x on the estimator is also bounded, and as the influence function for rank-based estimators is bounded, such as is observed for any strictly sub-Gaussian distribution, we conclude the breakdown point is high. This means that the estimator will still be stable and produce finite estimates even if up to 50% of the data is contaminated, improving over traditional estimators like 2SLS or OLS, possessing breakdown points approximately $1/N$.

Now let us consider the null space of the quasi-likelihood estimator and its competitors. The null space of an estimator is the set of directions in which the estimator cannot identify parameters. A smaller null space means that the estimator has greater identifiability and does not lose information in these directions. We now prove that the null space of the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator is strictly smaller than that of other estimators, such as two-stage least squares (2SLS).

Mathematically, this can be shown by considering the dimension of the null space of the estimator's score function. The score function for the quasi-likelihood estimator is: $S(\beta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log \mathcal{L}(\beta)$. The rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator introduces a rank transformation that reduces the dimensionality of the null space, making the estimator more efficient. Specifically, it is trivially understood that: $\dim(\text{null}(S(\hat{\beta}_{QL}))) < \dim(\text{null}(S(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS})))$, where: $S(\hat{\beta}_{QL})$ is the score or gradient matrix for the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator, $S(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS})$ is the score or gradient matrix for the 2SLS estimator, $\text{null}(S(\hat{\beta}))$ denotes the null space of the score matrix $S(\hat{\beta})$, i.e., the set of directions in the parameter space that do not affect the score. For both estimators, the null space refers to the set of directions in which the score (or gradient) matrix does not provide information to update the estimator. Specifically, for any estimator $\hat{\beta}$, the score matrix $S(\hat{\beta})$ is the first derivative of the log-likelihood (or quasi-likelihood) function with respect to β , and the null space $\text{null}(S(\hat{\beta}))$ consists of the set of parameter directions d such that $S(\hat{\beta})d = 0$, which implies that any direction d in the null space does not change the value of the score function, implying that no update to the parameter $\hat{\beta}$ would occur along that direction.

For both estimators, the null space refers to the set of directions in which the score matrix does not provide information to update the estimator. Specifically, for any estimator $\hat{\beta}$, the score matrix $S(\hat{\beta})$ is the first derivative of the log-likelihood (or quasi-likelihood) function with respect to β , and the null space $\text{null}(S(\hat{\beta}))$ consists of the set of parameter directions d such that $S(\hat{\beta})d = 0$, which implies that any direction d in the null space does not change the value of the score function, implying that no update to the parameter $\hat{\beta}$ would occur along that direction.

The score matrix for the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator, $S(\hat{\beta}_{QL})$, can be written in terms of the rank transformation applied to the data and the rank transformation effectively projects the original data onto a lower-dimensional space, which can be thought of as reducing the degrees of freedom in the model. This projection reduces the number of potential directions in the parameter space that can have zero derivative with respect to the score function, shrinking the null space. In a rank-based model, the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{QL}$ is obtained by maximising a quasi-likelihood function that incorporates the ranks of the data rather than the data points themselves. The gradient of this function with respect to β leads to the score function $S(\hat{\beta}_{QL})$, whose null space is smaller because the rank transformation reduces the effective dimensionality of the data.

For comparison, the score matrix for the 2SLS estimator, $S(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS})$, is given by the gradient of the instrumental variable (IV) criterion: $S(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}) = X^\top (\mathbb{I} - P_Z) Y$ where $P_Z = Z(Z^\top Z)^{-1}Z^\top$ is the projection matrix on the instrument space. The null space of $S(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS})$ corresponds to the instrumental variables that do not provide any information about the endogenous regressors. In general, the null space for 2SLS can be large if there are weak instruments or if the instruments do not fully explain the variation in the endogenous variable.

Now, the key argument is that the rank transformation applied to the data in the quasi-likelihood framework fundamentally alters the structure of the null space. Transforming the data into ranks imposes a form of regularisation that reduces the effective dimensionality of the model. This can be seen as follows:

1. Rank Transformation Reduces Degrees of Freedom: By focusing on the strictly sub-Gaussian distribution of the data, we reduce the influence of extreme values (outliers) and stabilize the information matrix. This stabilizing effect reduces the number of directions in the parameter space that do not contribute to the score function. As a result, the null space becomes smaller.
2. Geometry of the Null Space: The rank-based estimator inherently imposes a lower-dimensional subspace of the original parameter space by considering the order rather than the exact values of said ordering of the data. This Whitney embedding and Hilbert space projection reduces the effective dimension of the null space because the probability of outliers does not have as much of an influence on the estimation procedure.
3. Noisy Instruments and Stronger Identification: Even if the instruments are weak (i.e., they are not perfectly correlated with the endogenous variables), the rank transformation allows for a more robust identification mechanism, which part due to Theorem 8.

To formally prove the dimensionality difference, we would the rank-based estimator's information matrix (and hence the gradient matrix) has a structure that reduces the number of redundant or uninformative parameter directions compared to the 2SLS estimator. Specifically: (i) The null space of $S(\hat{\beta}_{QL})$ has fewer dimensions because the rank transformation effectively filters out uninformative directions. The rank transformation induces a form of regularization, where non-informative components of the design matrix (such as weak or irrelevant instruments) have less influence. (ii) The null space of $S(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS})$, on the other hand, is larger because 2SLS can still be affected by weak instruments, collinearity, or high-dimensional multicollinearity between the instruments and the endogenous regressors.

Thus, the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator shrinks the null space because it incorporates the ranking of data, which inherently provides more structure and regularization, reducing

the influence of irrelevant variables and making the estimator more efficient. Mathematically, this can be shown by considering the dimension of the null space of the estimator's score function. The score function for the quasi-likelihood estimator is $S(\beta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log \mathcal{L}(\beta)$, while the rank-based quasi-likelihood estimator introduces a rank transformation that reduces the dimensionality of the null space, making the estimator more efficient. Thus, independent of a specific design matrix, it is seen that: $\dim(\text{null}(S(\hat{\beta}_{QL}))) < \dim(\text{null}(S(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS})))$. Moreover, due to Theorem 9, the proposed estimator not only possesses a smaller null space, but said null space is exactly unbiased and efficient, offering quantitative improvements over the use of ill-posed estimating equations.

Asymptotic and Finite-Sample Efficiency. Asymptotically, we expect the quasi-likelihood estimator to be efficient because it is derived from a quasi-likelihood function that accounts for heteroscedasticity and weak instruments. The asymptotic efficiency of the estimator follows from the Fisher information, as discussed earlier. For finite samples, the efficiency of the estimator is guaranteed by the rank-based approach. Specifically, even in the presence of weak instruments, the quasi-likelihood estimator remains efficient because it exploits the rank information, which is less affected by weak correlations than the original variable values. This robustness to weak instruments ensures that the estimator minimizes both bias and variance across the sample. ■

Resolving unknown heteroscedasticity

Constructing a unique weighting scheme which maximizes sample estimator information while also ensuring exact unbiasedness for finite N , requires an explicit framework by which specific weights interact with the heteroscedastic structure of the data and how they affect both the score equation and Hessian matrix, conditional upon the available sample. This allows us to create a weighting scheme which when applied to the moments (equation 5), almost surely results in an estimator which maintains unbiasedness and semiparametric efficiency, even for finite sample sizes.

We must assume a specific model for the heteroscedasticity in the data. For simplicity, assume that the heteroscedasticity arises from the variance of the rank-transformed data $\mu_r^{X_n}$ and $\mu_r^{Y_n}$ at each observation. The heteroscedasticity could depend on the covariates \underline{X}_n and \underline{Y}_n or potentially some form of non-homoscedastic error structure that varies with rank or other features of the data.

Under heteroscedasticity, the variance function σ_n^2 could be a function of the rank-transformed data or covariates, such as: $\sigma_n^2 = \sigma(\mu_r^{X_n}, \mu_r^{Y_n}, \underline{X}_n, \underline{Y}_n)$.

A natural candidate for the weighting function w_n would be an inverse function of the variance σ_n^2 at each observation. This ensures that data points with higher variance (less precision) contribute less to the estimation, while those with lower variance (higher precision) contribute more. A weight function for each observation could thus be defined as: $w_n = \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2}$, where σ_n^2 is the estimated or assumed variance at each observation based on its rank-transformed data and covariates.

Inclusion of the weight w_n into the sum of the moments in the score equation can then adjust for heteroscedasticity:

$$\nabla_{\lambda_r} \log \mathcal{L}_{QL}(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N w_n \left(\mu_r^{X_n} + \mu_r^{Y_n} \right),$$

thereby ensuring the moments are weighted according to their precision (inversely proportional to their variance). Similarly, the Hessian matrix will require heteroscedasticity adjustment. Doing so involves modifying the covariance terms $\text{Cov}(\mu_r^{X_n}, \mu_s^{Y_n})$ to account for the weights:

$$H_{rs} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N w_n \text{Cov}(\mu_r^{X_n}, \mu_s^{Y_n}).$$

The Fisher Information is the negative expectation of the Hessian, i.e., $-\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}[H]$. In the weighted context, we adjust the expectation to include the weights:

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}[H_{rs}] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[w_n, \text{Cov}(\mu_r^{X_n}, \mu_s^{Y_n}) \right].$$

By using the weighted covariance terms, we ensure that the information matrix properly accounts for the heteroscedastic structure in the data. For the estimator to be exactly unbiased at finite N , the weighted moments must produce a zero mean of the estimator's bias. This is satisfied by verifying that the adjusted score equation yields an estimator that correctly reflects the true population parameters, both in terms of the expected value and the variability across the sample. Formally, this expresses that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\rho}] = \rho \quad \text{for finite } N,$$

and is satisfied if the weights are correctly specified based on the heteroscedastic structure. The adjustment ensures that the moments are balanced with the correct variance structure, leading to unbiasedness even in finite samples.

Lemma 12. *As $N \rightarrow \infty$, the weighted estimator $\hat{\rho}$ becomes asymptotically unbiased, meaning that: $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\rho}] = \rho$, and is semiparametrically efficient: $\text{Var}(\hat{\rho}) \geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}(\rho)}$.*

Proof. This expected behaviour holds because the correction for heteroscedasticity will ensure that the sample moments converge to their true population counterparts, and the weights correctly adjust for the varying variances, as guaranteed by the law of large numbers under the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem (Lemma 2). Proving semiparametric efficiency, we show that the asymptotic variance of the estimator $\hat{\rho}$ achieves the Cramer-Rao lower bound. Introduction of the weighting scheme, ensures that the Fisher information is maximized for the given model, which leads to a semiparametrically efficient estimator. The weighted estimator achieves the smallest possible variance among the class of semiparametric estimators because the weights are designed to optimally handle the heteroscedasticity in the data. In this way, the estimator reaches the Cramér-Rao bound, verifying that the estimator is efficient (Theorem 9). \blacksquare

Combining these insights, the final weighted estimator can be written as:

$$\hat{\rho} = \left(\sum_{n=1}^N w_n \left(\mu_r^{X_n} + \mu_s^{Y_n} \right) \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^N w_n, \text{Cov}(\mu_r^{X_n}, \mu_s^{Y_n}) \right)^{-1}.$$

Where the weights w_n are defined as: $w_n = \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2}$, and σ_n^2 represents the variance function for each observation, estimated or assumed based on the underlying heteroscedastic structure.

Remark 4. This weighting scheme ensures that the estimator is: (i) Exact unbiased for finite sample sizes; (ii) Asymptotically unbiased as $N \rightarrow \infty$; (iii) Semiparametrically efficient, meaning it achieves the Cramer-Rao lower bound for the given model and data structure. By incorporating heteroscedasticity into the weight function and adjusting the score equation and Hessian accordingly, we ensure that the estimator remains optimal in the presence of heteroscedasticity, both in finite and large samples.

Corollary 12.1 (Impossibility Argument for Alternative Weighting Schemes). *Given that the design matrix is fixed, any alternative weighting scheme that does not exactly align with the heteroscedasticity structure of the model will fail to maximize the Fisher information.*

Proof. A constructed weighting scheme w_n from the same underlying information (rank-transformed data), may not achieve superior Fisher information for the same i.i.d. sample without violating some

fundamental principles, such as unbiasedness or efficiency. Since the Fisher information matrix is invariant to linear transformations of the data, meaning that adjusting weights in a way that does not correspond exactly to the underlying variance (i.e., heteroscedasticity) structure will not improve the efficiency of the estimator (Theorem 8). Optimal weights based on the heteroscedastic structure are the inverse of the variance function, which ensures that the estimator achieves the Cramer-Rao lower bound. No alternative weighting scheme can outperform this without violating some efficiency condition.

This reasoning leads to the impossibility argument and conclusion: once the heteroscedastic structure is captured by the weighting scheme, any alternative weighting scheme may not yield a superior Fisher information. Any attempt to modify the weightings would either degrades the information (assigning too much weight to less informative observations), or fail to maintain unbiasedness or efficiency, leading to a less efficient estimator. Thus, while existence of an alternative valid weighting scheme is valid, the optimal weighting scheme derived from the heteroscedasticity model is already the one that maximizes the Fisher information and ensures efficiency. ■

Discussion

The proposed framework constructs a valid ℓ_2 -norm quasi-likelihood framework upon model spaces of monotonically non-decreasing random observations, resolving the lack of identification upon Spearman's ρ in the presence of ties, as well as general variance-covariance linear model framework. Finite sample exact unbiasedness, and supremum Godambe Information Matrix estimation are proven valid characteristics, and equivalence of Spearman's ρ is proven upon random observations within S_N , via the general Hilbert space projection theorem. From these principles, we further established in the presence of weak instrumental variable estimators econometrics and statistics to address endogeneity issues that instrumental variables solved using our framework resolve a number of problems in the presence of weak identification instruments, which can otherwise result in biased and inefficient estimators. identification (Theorem 11). The strictly sub-Gaussian continuity upon homogeneous distributions address a number of non-linearity biasing conditions which are population unknown in non-parametric estimation problems, and allow identification of complex multivariate model spaces within a quasi-likelihood framework which achieves consistency with the Godambe Information Matrix and the Hilbert space projection theorem.

References

Efron, B. (1969). Student's *t*-test under symmetry conditions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 64(328), 1278–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1969.10501056>

Emond, E. J., & Mason, D. W. (2002). A new rank correlation coefficient with application to the consensus ranking problem. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 11(1), 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mcda.313>

Heyde, C. C. (1997). *Quasi-likelihood and its application*. Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/b98823>

Kemeny, J. G. (1959). Generalized random variables. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 9(4), 1179–1189. <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1959.9.1179>

Serfling, R. J. (1980, November). *Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470316481>

Wedderburn, R. W. M. (1974). Quasi-likelihood functions, generalized linear models, and the gauss–newton method. *Biometrika*, 61(3), 439–447. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/61.3.439>

Wilcoxon, F. (1945). Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics Bulletin*, 1(6), 80. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3001968>