

# Random effects compound Poisson model to represent data with extra zeros

Marie-Pierre Étienne<sup>\*,a,b</sup>, Éric Parent<sup>a,b</sup>, Hugues Benoit<sup>c</sup>, Jacques Bernier<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*AgroParisTech, UMR 518, F-75000 Paris, France*

<sup>b</sup>*INRA, UMR 518, F-75000 Paris, France*

<sup>c</sup>*Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada*

---

## Abstract

This paper describes a compound Poisson-based random effects structure for modeling zero-inflated data. Data with large proportion of zeros are found in many fields of applied statistics, for example in ecology when trying to model and predict species counts (discrete data) or abundance distributions (continuous data). Standard methods for modeling such data include mixture and two-part conditional models. Conversely to these methods, the stochastic models proposed here behave coherently with regards to a change of scale, since they mimic the harvesting of a marked Poisson process in the modeling steps. Random effects are used to account for inhomogeneity. In this paper, model design and inference both rely on conditional thinking to understand the links between various layers of quantities : parameters, latent variables including random effects and zero-inflated observations. The potential of these parsimonious hierarchical models for zero-inflated data is exemplified using two marine macroinvertebrate abundance datasets from a large scale scientific bottom-trawl survey. The EM algorithm with a Monte Carlo step based on importance sampling is checked for this model structure on a simulated dataset : it proves to work well for parameter estimation but parameter values matter when re-assessing the actual coverage level of the confidence regions far from the asymptotic conditions.

*Key words:* EM algorithm, Importance Sampling, Compound Poisson Process, Random Effect Model, zero-inflated Data

*2008 MSC:* 62F12, 62P12, 62L12, 92D40, 92d50

---

\* Département MMIP - Team Morse. 16 rue Claude Bernard, 75231 Paris Cedex 5. FRANCE

*Email address:* [marie.etienne@agroparistech.fr](mailto:marie.etienne@agroparistech.fr) ()

*URL:* [www.agroparistech.fr/morse/etienne.html](http://www.agroparistech.fr/morse/etienne.html) ()

## 1. Introduction

Often data contain a greater number of zero observations than would be predicted using standard, unimodal statistical distributions. This currently happens in ecology (see [16]) when counting species (over-dispersion for discrete data) or recording biomasses (atoms at zero for continuous data). Such data are generally referred to as zero-inflated data and require specialized treatments for statistical analysis [12]. Common statistical approaches to modeling zero-inflated data make recourse either to mixture models, such as the Dirac function for the occurrence of extra zeros in addition to a standard probability distribution (see for instance [21]), or to two-part conditional models (a presence/absence Bernoulli component and some other distribution for non zero observations given presence such as in [25]). These models are well-known [4] and offer the advantages of separate fits and separate interpretations of each of their components. Parameters are well understood and interpreted as the probability of presence, and the average abundance of biomass if present.

However, a major flaw of those models is their non-additive behavior with regards to variation in within-experiment sampling effort [26]. Consider for instance the fishing effort measured by the ground surface swept by a bottom-trawl during a scientific survey of benthic marine fauna. If during experiment  $i$ , observation  $Y_i$  is made with some experimental effort corresponding to the harvesting of some area  $D_i$  and is assumed to stem from a stochastic model with parameters  $\theta(D_i)$ , then the additivity properties of coherence are naturally required: if we consider two (possibly subsequent) independent experiments  $i$  and  $i'$  on the different non overlapping areas  $D_i$  and  $D_{i'}$ , we would expect that the random quantity  $Y_i + Y_{i'}$  stems from the same stochastic model with parameters  $\theta(D_i \cup D_{i'})$ . A compound Poisson distribution is a sum of independent identically distributed random variables in which the number of terms in the sum has a Poisson distribution. Compound Poisson distributions are candidate models purposely tailored to verify the previous desired infinite divisibility property since the class of infinitely divisible distributions coincides with the class of limit distributions of compound Poisson distributions ([9], theorem 3 of chapter 27).

Depending on the nature of the term in the random sum, the compound distribution can be discrete or continuous. The construction of such a compound distribution with an exponential random mark for continuous data and with a geometric one for counts is recalled in section 2. This approach is worthwhile for two reasons. The first is parsimony : there is only one parameter for the Poisson distribution plus an additional one for the probability distribution function - *pdf* - of each component of the random sum. Secondly, the compound construction may assist our understanding in cases where the data collection can be interpreted in terms of sampling a latent marked Poisson field. That is to say that the data appear in latent "clumps"

39 that are "harvested" during the experiment, the Poisson parameter being the pres-  
40 ence intensity of such clumps. A random variable is used to mimic the quantity (or  
41 the number of individuals in the discrete case) independently in each clump. At  
42 the upper level of the hierarchy, random effects are added to depict heterogeneous  
43 conditions between blocks of experiments.

44 In section 3, we develop a stochastic version of the EM algorithm [7] with a  
45 Monte-Carlo step (using importance sampling) for this non Gaussian random effect  
46 model with zero-inflated data. Maximum likelihood estimates and the correspond-  
47 ing variance-covariance matrix are derived. The computational task remains rather  
48 tractable thanks to simplifying gamma-exponential conjugate properties in the con-  
49 tinuous case (and beta-geometric conjugacy in the discrete case).

50 In section 4, the hierarchical model [29] with compound Poisson distribution for  
51 zero-inflated data is exemplified using a real case study with two marine species,  
52 urchin and starfish abundance data from a scientific bottom-trawl survey of the  
53 southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada. The EM algorithm performs well in obtain-  
54 ing the maximum likelihood estimates of parameters, but for one of the two species  
55 we notice some discrepancy between the actual coverage of the confidence intervals  
56 and their theoretical levels (as given by the asymptotic normal approximation). Con-  
57 sequently, we further focus on variance covariance matrix estimation in section 5 and  
58 investigate via simulation the behavior of coverage level of confidence intervals for  
59 various experimental designs, in search of a practical fulfillment of the asymptotic  
60 conditions. Finally, we briefly discuss some inferential and practical issues encoun-  
61 tered when implementing such hierarchical models for zero-inflated data.

## 62 **2. Model construction**

63 We propose a hierarchical construction to represent data with extra zero collected  
64 over a non-homogeneous area. The model is divided into two main layers : in the  
65 first one, we model the sampling process within a homogeneous sub-area (strata)  
66 and in the second layer, we introduce heterogeneity between strata at the top of  
67 the hierarchy using random effects. The first subsections detail the hierarchical  
68 constructions for continuous data. In the last subsection 2.4, we sketch out an  
69 obvious modification to represent count data.

### 70 *2.1. Compound Poisson process to introduce extra zeros*

71 Imagine that data  $Y$  are obtained by harvesting an area  $D$  and that there are  
72 some clumps distributed according to an homogeneous Poisson process : clumps are  
73 uniformly distributed with a constant intensity, say  $\mu$ .

By harvesting an area  $D$ , we pick an integer-valued random variable  $N$  of clumps. According to Poisson process property  $N$  follows a Poisson distribution of parameter  $\mu D$ . For each clump  $i$  the independent random variables  $X_i$  or *marks* (with the same probability distribution) represent for instance the possible biomass in each clump to be collected.

The final return will consist of the sum over  $N$  clumps of the amount contained in each clump. With the convention that  $Y = 0$  if  $N = 0$ , the random sum :

$$Y = \sum_{i=0}^N X_i, \tag{2.1}$$

74 is said to follow a compound Poisson distribution. Figure 1 exemplifies a realization  
75 of the total amount of a collect (i.e., sum of the marks) in a sampled region  $D$ .

76

77 The Poisson-based additivity property avoids the drawback of classical models  
78 mentioned in the introduction. Generally,  $D$  is the area of the sampled area included  
79 in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . We assume an homogeneous region  $\mu(D) = \mu D$ , so that the expected number  
80 of collected clumps is proportional to the catching effort. The difficulty with the  
81 generalization to an inhomogeneous Poisson process lies in the inference step, not in  
82 the modeling step. Consequently we used another approach to deal with heterogeneity  
83 (see section 2.3). In the following, we mostly omit to index quantities with this  
84 catching effort for presentation clarity, explicitly mentioning it only when necessary.

85 Summary statistics about such compound distribution  $Y$  are easily obtained (the  
86 characteristic function is given in appendix A) :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y) &= \mu D \mathbb{E}(X) \\ \mathbb{V}ar(Y) &= \mu D \mathbb{E}(X^2) \end{aligned}$$

87 Parameter  $\mu$  rules the occurrence of zero values when assuming  $\mathbb{P}(X = 0) = 0$   
88 *i.e.* that the random mark is non atomic at 0 :

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 0) = \exp(-\mu D).$$

## 89 2.2. Choice of the random component $X$ for continuous data

For real-valued data with extra zeros, we will concentrate in this paper on the exponential distribution of parameter  $\rho$  for component  $X$  such that  $\mathbb{E}(X) = \rho^{-1}$ ,




Figure 1: Realization of a marked Poisson process on a region of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , the sample is conducted over a region  $D$ . Here the total catch is  $y = 7.7$ , the effective number of collected clumps is 8.

leading to

$$\mathbb{E}(Y) = \frac{\mu D}{\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}(Y) = 2\frac{\mu D}{\rho^2}.$$

90 To keep on with an ecological interpretation of the model, assuming that the mark  
 91  $X$  follows an exponential distribution of parameter  $\rho$ , means for the biologist that  
 92 the probability of finding a large amount of biomass within a clump is exponentially  
 93 decreasing and that the average quantity in each clump is  $\rho^{-1}$ . When no clump is  
 94 collected, there occurs a zero for the model  $Y$ . We choose the exponential distribution  
 95 because of parsimony and because of its interesting conjugate property detailed in  
 96 section 3.1.2.

This compound Poisson distribution was termed law of leaks (LOL) by [6], where  $X$  represents elementary unobserved leaks occurring at  $N$  holes (uniformly located) along a gas pipeline. In summary :

$$(Y \sim LOL(\mu, \rho)) \iff \left( \begin{array}{l} Y = \sum_{i=1}^N X_j, \\ N \sim \mathcal{P}(\mu), \\ (X_1, \dots, X_N) \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{E}(\rho) \end{array} \right) \quad (2.2)$$

97 For the discrete case, a similar definition holds with the corresponding geometric  
 98 distribution for the marks (see section 2.4).

99 *2.3. Random effects*

Although the previous compound construction could have formally been extended to non-homogeneous Poisson processes, it is easier but still quite realistic to relax the assumption of homogeneity by considering homogeneous blocks (or strata), modeling possible inter-block dispersion using random effects. We consider  $S$  blocks ; in a given block  $s$  there are  $I_s$  grouped observations. We denote by  $\underline{Y}_s = (Y_{s1}, \dots, Y_{sI_s})$  the random vector in block  $s$  and by  $\underline{\mathbf{Y}} = (\underline{Y}_1, \dots, \underline{Y}_S)$  the whole vector over the  $S$  blocks. The coefficients  $a$  and  $b$  of the gamma *pdf*  $\Gamma(a, b)$  for a random variable  $\mu$  are such that  $\mathbb{E}(\mu) = \frac{a}{b}$  and  $\text{Var}(\mu) = \frac{a}{b^2}$ . The random effect model  $RLOL(a, b, c, d)$  representing the occurrence of the sample  $\underline{\mathbf{Y}}$  is defined by the following set of equations.

$$\underline{\mathbf{Y}} \sim RLOL(a, b, c, d) \iff \begin{cases} (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_S) \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \Gamma(a, b), \\ (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_S) \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \Gamma(c, d), \\ Y_{s,1}, \dots, Y_{s,I_s} \mid \mu_s, \rho_s \stackrel{i}{\sim} LOL(\mu_s D_{s,k}, \rho_s) \quad \forall s \in \{1, \dots, S\}. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

100 The choice of a gamma distribution for the random effect is motivated by conjugate  
 101 properties which are useful in the inference of the model. Section 4.1.3 will show  
 102 that it may also be quite a realistic distribution for some datasets. The hierarchical  
 103 construction is summed up by the directed acyclic graph (DAG as termed by [23])  
 104 in Figure 2.




Figure 2: DAG of the RLOL model

105 *2.4. Compound Poisson process for count data*

106 A similar but discrete version to model count data, can be obtained by changing  
 107 the nature of the random marks of the Poisson process. In this paper, we study a  
 108 geometric distribution with parameter  $p = \mathbb{P}(X = 1)$ . The core of the model is thus  
 109 given by the following compound Poisson process with geometric marks :

$$(Y \sim DLLOL(\mu, p)) \iff \begin{pmatrix} Y = \sum_{i=1}^N X_j, \\ N \sim \mathcal{P}(\mu), \\ (X_1, \dots, X_N) \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{G}(p) \end{pmatrix}$$

To preserve conjugate properties, the gamma distribution for the random effect on the marks is replaced by a beta distribution so that the count data version of the model is given by :

$$\underline{\mathbf{Y}} \sim RDLOL(a, b, c, d) \iff \begin{cases} (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_S) \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \Gamma(a, b), \\ (p_1, \dots, p_S) \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \beta(c, d), \\ Y_{s,1}, \dots, Y_{s,I_s} \mid \mu_s, p_s \stackrel{i}{\sim} DLLOL(\mu_s D_{s,k}, p_s) \quad \forall s \in \{1, \dots, S\}. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

110 where *DLLOL* means Discrete version of Law of leaks and *RDLOL* discrete law of  
111 leaks with random effects.

112 In most of the paper, we will simply state the main results when technical aspects  
113 of the proofs are shared between discrete and continuous cases.

### 114 3. Estimation via the EM algorithm with importance sampling

115 Hierarchical models such as 2.3 or 2.4 cannot be straightforwardly estimated  
116 because of the latent variables. The random effects  $(\mu, \rho)$  and the unknown numbers  
117 of clumps  $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$  must be integrated out to obtain the likelihood. The likelihood has no  
118 closed form and estimators cannot be directly derived. In such a case, a classical  
119 strategy is to use Expectation Maximization algorithm ([7]) to derive max-likelihood  
120 estimates. In our case the E step is not analytically accessible. An alternative is to  
121 use a stochastic version of this EM algorithm such as Monte-Carlo EM (MCEM see  
122 [18] or [19]) or stochastic approximation of EM (SAEM see [8]).

123 We detail in this section how to implement a MCEM algorithm using Importance  
124 sampling to obtain the maximum likelihood estimation and its empirical variance  
125 matrix. Similar results concerning count data process are summed up in the last  
126 subsection. From this point onwards we will use brackets to denote *pdf*'s as many  
127 conditioning terms will appear in the probabilistic expressions derived from the model  
128 fully specified by the set of equations (2.3). The brackets denote either a density or a  
129 discrete probability distribution, as in [10]. Following Bayesian conventions, we will  
130 also allow the parameters to appear as conditioning terms (*i.e.*, instead of writing  
131  $\mathbb{P}(X)$  we will specify  $[X|a, b, c, d]$ ) so as to help the reader understand which layer of  
132 the hierarchical model (2.3) the probability expression refers to (see Fig 2).

133 *3.1. Implementation of the MCEM algorithm*

134 In this paper,  $\theta$  stands for the set of parameters  $(a, b, c, d)$  in the *RLOL* model.  
 135 Given the random effects, the data within a block are independent :

$$L(\theta; \underline{\mathbf{Y}}, \underline{\mathbf{N}}, \mu, \rho) = \sum_{s=1}^S L_s$$

136 where  $L_s$  denotes the *complete* log-likelihood in block  $s$ , i.e. :

$$L_s = L_s(\theta; \underline{Y}_s, \underline{N}_s, \mu_s, \rho_s) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} \ln ([Y_{s,i} | N_{s,i}, \rho_s] [N_{s,i} | \mu_s]) \right) + \ln ([\mu_s | a, b]) + \ln ([\rho_s | c, d]) \quad (3.1)$$

137 Following [28], the pivotal quantity in the EM algorithm (recalled in appendix  
 138 D) is the conditional expectation of the complete log-likelihood :

$$Q(\theta, \theta') = \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (L(\theta; \underline{\mathbf{Y}}, \underline{\mathbf{N}}, \mu, \rho) | \underline{\mathbf{Y}})$$

139 *3.1.1. Maximization step*

140 To maximize  $Q(\theta, \theta')$  with respect to  $\theta$ , we focus on the terms that involve  $\theta$  :

$$Q(\theta, \theta') = C_{-\theta}(Y) + (a - 1) \times \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln \mu_s | \underline{Y}_s) + Sa \ln b - b \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\mu_s | \underline{Y}_s) - S \ln(\Gamma(a)) \\ + (c - 1) \times \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln \rho_s | \underline{Y}_s) + Sc \ln d - d \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\rho_s | \underline{Y}_s) - S \ln(\Gamma(c)), \quad (3.2)$$

141 where  $C_{-\theta}(Y)$  denotes a constant which does not depend on  $\theta$ .

142 Differentiating with respect to  $\theta$ , we obtain the set of equations to be satisfied at  
 143 the maximum  $\underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(\theta, \theta')$ :

$$\frac{a}{b} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\mu_s | \underline{Y}_s)}{S} \quad (3.3)$$



$$\ln a - \psi(a) = \ln \left( \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\mu_s | \underline{Y}_s)}{S} \right) - \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln \mu_s | \underline{Y}_s)}{S} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\frac{c}{d} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\rho_s | \underline{Y}_s)}{S} \quad (3.5)$$

$$\ln c - \psi(c) = \ln \left( \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\rho_s | \underline{Y}_s)}{S} \right) - \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln \rho_s | \underline{Y}_s)}{S} \quad (3.6)$$

144  $\psi(x)$  denotes the digamma function defined as the first logarithmic derivative of  
 145  $\Gamma(x)$ . No analytical expression can be derived for  $\theta$  as the argument of the maximum  
 146 of  $Q(\theta, \theta')$ , but a Newton-Raphson algorithm is efficient and easy to implement with  
 147 a good empirical starting point as indicated in annex B.

### 148 3.1.2. Expectation step by conditioning onto the number of clumps

149 The right-hand side of equations 3.3 to 3.6 involves  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\mu_s | \underline{Y}_s)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln(\mu_s) | \underline{Y}_s)$ ,  
 150  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\rho_s | \underline{Y}_s)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln(\rho_s) | \underline{Y}_s)$ . To compute these expected values, we will proceed  
 151 by conditioning onto the hidden number of clumps  $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ . Proposition 3.1 shows that,  
 152 given  $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ , these four target quantities are simply marginal expectations of the sufficient  
 153 quantity  $N_{s+}$ , the only necessary function of  $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$  that needs to be evaluated within  
 154 each block  $s$ .

155 In a second step, integration over the number of clumps is performed by recourse  
 156 to importance sampling within a block  $s$  as detailed in proposition 3.3. Proofs of  
 157 propositions are given in appendix E

158 **Proposition 3.1.** *Assuming  $Y \sim RLOL(\theta')$  with  $\theta' = (a', b', c', d')$ ,  $S$  strata and  $I_s$   
 159 records in stratum  $s$  as in 2.3, then the complete conditional distributions of  $\mu_s$  and  
 160  $\rho_s$  in one particular stratum  $s$  are given by*

$$\mu_s | \underline{\mathbf{N}}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}, \theta' \sim \Gamma(a' + N_{s+}, b' + D_{s+}), \quad (3.7)$$

161 and

$$\rho_s | \underline{\mathbf{N}}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}, \theta' \sim \Gamma(a' + N_{s+}, b' + Y_{s+}), \quad (3.8)$$

162 where in stratum  $s$ ,  $N_{s+} = \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} N_{si}$  denotes the total number of clumps caught,  
 163  $Y_{s+} = \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} Y_{si}$  is the entire quantity harvested and  $D_{s+} = \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} D_{si}$  is the whole  
 164 catching effort.

165 The quantities involved in the E step are given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\mu_s | \underline{y}_s) = \frac{a' + \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (N_{s+} | \underline{y}_s)}{b' + D_{s+}}, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln(\mu_s) | \underline{y}_s) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\psi(a' + N_{s+}) | \underline{y}_s) - \ln(b' + D_{s+}), \quad (3.10)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\rho_s | \underline{y}_s) = \frac{c' + \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (N_{s+} | \underline{y}_s)}{d' + Y_{s+}}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln(\rho_s) | \underline{y}_s) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\psi(c' + N_{s+}) | \underline{y}_s) - \ln(d' + Y_{s+}). \quad (3.12)$$

166 This result merely comes from the conjugacy property between gamma and Pois-  
 167 son distributions for  $\mu$  (gamma and exponential distribution concerning  $\rho$ ). The  
 168 moments of gamma and log gamma, beta and log beta distributions are recalled in  
 169 appendix C.

170 In order to go one step further into the calculus, we have to perform the integra-  
 171 tion over  $N_+$ . Proposition 3.2 gives the distribution of  $N_+ | Y_+, \theta$  up to a constant.  
 172 Subsequently, the integration over  $N_+$  will make recourse to importance sampling as  
 173 proposed in [15]. This Monte Carlo algorithm is detailed in proposition 3.3.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Assuming  $Y \sim RLOL(a, b, c, d)$  with  $S$  strata, and  $I_s$  records in stratum  $s$ , the conditional distribution of  $\underline{N}_s | \theta, \underline{y}_s$  is given (up to a constant  $K$ ) by*

$$[\underline{N}_s | \theta', \underline{y}_s] = K \left( \frac{\Gamma(a' + N_{s+}) \Gamma(c' + N_{s+})}{(b' + D_{s+})^{N_{s+}} (d' + Y_{s+})^{N_{s+}}} \right) \prod_{i=1, y_i > 0}^{I_s} \left( \frac{y_{si}^{N_{si}}}{\Gamma(N_{si}) \Gamma(N_{si} + 1)} \right) \prod_{i=1, y_i = 0}^{I_s} \delta(N_{si}) \quad (3.13)$$

174 To draw a sample according to the rather intricate looking distribution 3.13, an  
 175 importance sampling based algorithm is detailed in the following proposition for one  
 176 replicate (often termed *particle*). In order to obtain a  $G$ -sample, this procedure is  
 177 repeated for each block  $G$  times.

178 **Proposition 3.3** (Generate one particle in one particular stratum  $s$  according to dis-  
179 tribution 3.13). A particle  $g$  is a vector  $(N_{s+}^{(g)}, N_{s1}^{(g)}, \dots, N_{sI_s}^{(g)})$  in a particular stratum  
180  $s$ . Omitting  $s$  to make the reading easier, we may assume with no loss of generality  
181 that the first  $I^+$  terms are non zero and the  $I - I^+$  followings are the zero ones. The  
182 algorithm to generate one particle  $g$  runs as follows:

- 183 1. Generate  $N_i^{(g)} = 0$  wherever  $y_{i=0}$  for  $i = I - I^+ + 1, \dots, I$ .
2. Generate the value of the random sum  $N_+^{(g)}$  according to the importance distri-  
184 bution :

$$f_{IS}(N^+) \propto \left( \frac{1}{b' + D_+} \right)^{N^+} \left( \frac{Y^+}{d' + Y^+} \right)^{N^+} \frac{\Gamma(a' + N^+) \Gamma(c' + N^+)}{\left( \prod_{i=1}^{I^+} \Gamma\left(\frac{y_i}{Y^+} N^+ + 1\right) \right) \Gamma(N_+ - I_+ + 1)}$$

184

185 As the one dimensional importance distribution  $f_{IS}$  is a quickly decreasing func-  
186 tion of  $N^+$ , its normalizing constant can be easily approximated and a bounded  
187 interval is used in practice as the support of  $N^+$ .

- 188 3. Generate each  $N_i^{(g)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, I^+$  so that the vector  $(N_1^{(g)} - 1, \dots, N_{I^+}^{(g)} - 1)$  is  
189 distributed according to a multinomial distribution  $\mathcal{M}(N_+^{(g)} - I_+, (y_1/Y_+, \dots, y_{I^+}/Y_+))$ .
4. Associate to the vector  $(N_+^{(g)}, N_1^{(g)}, \dots, N_{I^+}^{(g)})$  generated at the previous step, the  
190 importance weight :

$$w^{(g)} = \prod_{i=1}^{I_+} \frac{\Gamma\left(N_+^{(g)} \frac{y_i}{Y_+} + 1\right)}{\Gamma(N_i^{(g)} + 1)}$$

190 The proof of this proposition is straightforward from importance sampling theory  
191 (see for instance chapter 3 of [22]).

192

The weighted sample of  $N_+$  may be used to approximate the expected conditional  
value defined in equations 3.9 to 3.12. For instance, quantity 3.10 is approximated  
by :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln(\mu_s) | \underline{y}_s) \approx \left( \frac{1}{\sum_{g=1}^G \omega^{(g)}} \sum_{g=1}^G \omega^{(g)} \times \psi(a' + N_{s+}^{(g)}) \right) - \ln(b' + D_{s+}).$$

193 *3.1.3. Empirical Variance Matrix*

194 This section is devoted to the evaluation of the empirical variance matrix, so  
 195 as to provide confidence regions. Because of the EM principle, we assume that the  
 196 algorithm has converged to the maximum likelihood value  $\hat{\theta}$ . The empirical Fisher  
 197 information matrix is then given by proposition 3.4. To explicitly compute this  
 198 information matrix, we propose to numerically integrate over  $\mathbf{N}$  thanks to importance  
 199 sampling as performed for the point estimation step. Technical details are also given  
 200 in appendix F.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Assuming  $Y \sim RLOL(a, b, c, d)$  with  $S$  strata, and  $I_s$  records in stratum  $s$  as in 2.3. Let us denote  $I_e(\theta)$  the empirical information matrix defined by*

$$I_e(\theta) = -\frac{\partial^2 \ln [\mathbf{Y}|\theta]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \quad (3.14)$$

At the maximum likelihood estimator  $\hat{\theta}$ , the following equality holds :

$$I_e(\hat{\theta}, \mathbf{Y}) = S \begin{pmatrix} -\psi'(\hat{a}) & \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & -\frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{b}^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(\hat{c}) & \frac{1}{\hat{d}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\hat{d}} & -\frac{1}{\hat{d}^2} \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{s=1}^S (A_s + B_s) \quad (3.15)$$

201 with

$$A_s = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(\psi'(a_s^*)) & \frac{-1}{b_s^*} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-1}{b_s^*} & \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*)}{(b_s^*)^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(\psi'(c_s^*)) & \frac{-1}{d_s^*} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{-1}{d_s^*} & \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(c_s^*)}{(d_s^*)^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

202 and

$$B_s = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Var}_{\nu_s}(\psi(a_s^*)) & -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*, \psi(a_s^*))}{b_s^*} & \text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(\psi(a_s^*), \psi(c_s^*)) & -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(c_s^*, \psi(a_s^*))}{d_s^*} \\ -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*, \psi(a_s^*))}{b_s^*} & \frac{\text{Var}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*)}{b_s^{*2}} & -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*, \psi(c_s^*))}{b_s^*} & \frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*, c_s^*)}{b_s^* d_s^*} \\ \text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(\psi(a_s^*), \psi(c_s^*)) & -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*, \psi(c_s^*))}{b_s^*} & \text{Var}_{\nu_s}(\psi(c_s^*)) & -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(c_s^*, \psi(c_s^*))}{d_s^*} \\ -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(c_s^*, \psi(a_s^*))}{d_s^*} & \frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(a_s^*, c_s^*)}{b_s^* d_s^*} & -\frac{\text{Cov}_{\nu_s}(c_s^*, \psi(c_s^*))}{d_s^*} & \frac{\text{Var}_{\nu_s}(c_s^*)}{d_s^{*2}} \end{pmatrix},$$

203 where  $a_s^* = \hat{a} + N_{s+}$ ,  $b_s^* = \hat{b} + D_{s+}$ ,  $c_s^* = \hat{c} + N_{s+}$ ,  $d_s^* = \hat{d} + Y_{s+}$  and  $\nu_s$  stands for

204 the probability measure of  $N_{s+}|\hat{\theta}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}$ .

205 As for the first derivative phase of the EM algorithm detailed in section 3.3, the  
 206 operations  $\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\mathbf{N}}|\hat{\theta}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}}$  and  $\text{Var}_{\underline{\mathbf{N}}|\hat{\theta}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}}$ , needed to evaluate  $A_s$  and  $B_s$ , can be easily imple-  
 207 mented by recourse to the very same Monte-Carlo  $N_+$  sample that was previously  
 208 drawn by importance sampling.

### 209 3.1.4. Prediction of the random effects

210 It is of interest to predict the random effects in each stratum, for instance to  
 211 help illustrate the heterogeneity between units. In a linear mixed model context,  
 212 the *Best Linear Unbiased Estimator* is defined by the conditional expectation of the  
 213 random effect according to the data  $\underline{\mathbf{y}}$  and the point estimation. We follow the same  
 214 avenue of thought and define a predictor of the random effects by the conditional  
 215 expectation. Using formula 3.9 and 3.11, the random effect predictors are given by :

$$\mu_s^{(pred)} = \mathbb{E}(\mu_s|\underline{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\theta}) = \frac{\hat{a} + \mathbb{E}\left(N_{s+}|\underline{y}_s, \hat{\theta}\right)}{\hat{b} + D_{s+}}, \quad (3.16)$$

216 and

$$\rho_s^{(pred)} = \mathbb{E}(\rho_s|\underline{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\theta}) = \frac{\hat{c} + \mathbb{E}\left(N_{s+}|\underline{y}_s, \hat{\theta}\right)}{\hat{d} + Y_{s+}}, \quad (3.17)$$

217 The following section aims at highlighting the differences between the continuous  
 218 case detailed previously and the discrete one.

## 219 3.2. MCEM algorithm for RDLOL model

### 220 3.2.1. Straightforward transposition to the discrete case

221 The definition of the model designed for the discrete case and called RDLOL  
 222 model is given by equation 2.4, in this case the pivotal quantity  $Q(\theta, \theta')$  reads :

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\theta, \theta') = & C_{-\theta}(Y) + (a-1) \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'}(\ln \mu_s | \underline{Y}_s) + Sa \ln b - b \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'}(\mu_s | \underline{Y}_s) - S \ln(\Gamma(a)) \\ & + \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma(c+d)}{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(d)} \right) + (c-1) \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'}(\ln p_s | \underline{Y}_s) + (d-1) \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'}(\ln(1-p_s) | \underline{Y}_s) \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

223

The equations satisfied at the maximum for  $(a, b)$  are again 3.3 and 3.4. Due to the substitution of a gamma *pdf* into a beta *pdf* for the random effects governing

the geometric discrete marks in the random sum of counts, parameters  $c$  and  $d$  verify equations 3.19 and 3.20 (equivalent to equations 3.5 and 3.6 in the continuous data model) :

$$\psi(c + d) - \psi(c) = -\frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln p_s | \underline{Y}_s)}{S} \quad (3.19)$$

$$\psi(c) - \psi(d) = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} \left( \ln \left( \frac{p_s}{1 - p_s} \right) \middle| \underline{Y}_s \right)}{S} \quad (3.20)$$

224 The approach used for the continuous case is reproduced to obtain, in each stratum  $s$  the conjugate conditional density of  $\underline{\mu}, \underline{p}$ , so that the analog to propositions  
225 3.1 and 3.2 is :  
226

**Proposition 3.5.** *Assuming  $Y \sim RDLOL(\theta')$  with  $\theta' = (a', b', c', d')$ ,  $S$  strata and  $I_s$  records in stratum  $s$  as in 2.4, then the complete conditional distributions of  $\mu_s$  and  $p_s$  in one particular stratum  $s$  are given by*

$$\mu_s | N_{s+}, \theta' \sim \Gamma(a' + N_{s+}, b' + D_{s+}), \quad (3.21)$$

and

$$p_s | N_{s+}, \theta' \sim \beta(c' + N_{s+}, d' + Y_{s+} - N_{s+}). \quad (3.22)$$

227

Furthermore the conditional distribution function of  $\underline{N}_s$  is :

$$[\underline{N}_s | \theta', \underline{\mathbf{Y}}] \propto \left( \prod_{i=1}^{I^+} \frac{\binom{Y_{si} - 1}{N_{si} - 1} D_{si}^{N_{si}}}{N_{si}!} \right) \left( \prod_{i=I-I^++1}^I \delta(N_{si}) \right) \left( \frac{\Gamma(a' + N_{s+}) \Gamma(N_{s+} + c') \Gamma(Y_+ - N_{s+} + d')}{(b' + D_{s+})^{N_{s+}}} \right) \quad (3.23)$$

228 The choice of an efficient importance sampling distribution in the discrete case is  
229 not the straightforward adaptation of the continuous gives and a mixture has to be  
230 used to obtain an efficient and well behaved algorithm, detailed in appendix H.

### 231 3.2.2. The covariance matrix in the discrete case

232 The covariance matrix in the discrete case benefits from the same conditional  
233 independence decompositions and the adaptation of the continuous case is straight-  
234 forward given the moments of the beta distribution in appendix C; the result is

235 detailed in appendix G. The weighted sample of  $N_+$  is used to compute the expect-  
 236 tations and variance-covariance terms in the matrix components.

### 237 3.2.3. Prediction of the random effects

238 The predictions of the random effects are just given by the conditional expecta-  
 239 tions. Unsurprisingly, the predictions in the discrete case and in the continuous one  
 240 look very similar.  $\mu_s^{(pred)}$  is still given by formula 3.16 and

$$p_s^{(pred)} = \mathbb{E}(p_s | \underline{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\theta}) = \frac{\hat{c} + \mathbb{E}\left(N_{s+} | y_s, \hat{\theta}\right)}{\hat{c} + \hat{d} + Y_{s+}}, \quad (3.24)$$

## 241 4. Applications

242 In this section, we apply the EM estimation procedure to two real datasets of eco-  
 243 logical interest. We then study the validity of asymptotic assumptions by assessing  
 244 the coverage level of confidence regions.

### 245 4.1. Real dataset - Gulf of St.Lawrence survey

246 A multi-species bottom-trawl survey of the southern Gulf of St.Lawrence (NW  
 247 Atlantic) has been conducted each September since 1971. The purpose of this survey  
 248 is to estimate the abundance and characterize the geographic distribution of marine  
 249 biota. The survey follows a stratified random design, with 38 strata defined largely  
 250 as homogeneous habitats using depth, temperature and sediments properties. The  
 251 target fishing procedure at each fishing station is a 30-min straight-line tow at a speed  
 252 of 3.5 knots (i.e., 3.21km trawled distance). However the actual distance trawled can  
 253 vary due to winds, currents and the avoidance of damaging rough bottoms; sampling  
 254 effort is therefore variable among trawl tows, but this source of additional variability  
 255 is easily accommodated in the models presented here ( the  $D_{s,k}$  in eq 2.3). For our  
 256 case study, we use data on the abundance of sea urchins and Sunflower starfishes  
 257 collected during three survey years (1999-2001), in a total of 540 bottom-trawl sets.  
 258 The time period was chosen to minimize inter-annual changes in abundance while  
 259 ensuring a sufficient sample size. The species were selected because inter-annual  
 260 changes in their geographic distribution resulting from movements of individuals at  
 261 the scale of survey sampling can be assumed to be approximately nil.

262 The histograms of urchin and starfish catches in kg per survey tow clearly reflect  
 263 zero-inflated distributions (Fig 3 and 4). A large number of tows capture no urchin  
 264 (nor starfish) and catches in non-zero tows tend to follow a skewed distribution. At  
 265 the scale of the survey, sea urchins are distributed in patches of localized variable

266 abundance, interspersed by numerous and relatively large areas where the species is  
 267 absent (Fig 5). Such *patchy* distributions of organisms are prevalent in ecological  
 268 science. Data in two strata are always zero, thus rendering estimation impossible if  
 269 we were to fit one model per stratum or to consider  $\rho_s$  as fixed effects. Because the  
 270 hierarchical framework allows some transfer of information between strata, the other  
 271 data help to predict  $\rho$  in these two strata.




Figure 3: Histogram of urchin biomass (kg/tow) from individual tows in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, bottom-trawl surveys: 1999-2000-2001




Figure 4: Histogram of Sunflower Starfishes biomass (kg/tow) from individual tows in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, bottom-trawl surveys: 1999-2000-2001

272 *4.1.1. Maximum likelihood point estimation*

The estimation procedure follows the EM algorithm detailed in appendix D (with a stopping rule when the sixth decimal does not change between iterations) and gives values of

$$\hat{\theta}^{Urch} = (\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{d}) = (0.997797, 1.05107, 5.05733, 13.0312),$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}^{Sun} = (\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{d}) = (1.91879, 1.80704, 1.90002, 0.898734),$$

273 as a maximum likelihood point estimates respectively for Urchin and Sunflower  
 274 starfishes datasets.

275 A visual diagnosis of the goodness of fit is very informative. According to the  
 276 RLOL model, data are drawn from a mixture and we cannot add directly a density






Figure 5: Locations of urchin catches (symbols) and stratum boundaries (lines) in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence bottom-trawl surveys 1999-2000-2001. The radii of the circles are proportional to the biomass (in kg/tow) caught. The "\*" denote sites with no urchins caught. Starfishes are not plotted.

277 line on the histograms of figures 3 and 4 since the zero ordinate of these figures is  
 278 somewhat artificial : it depends on the width of the histogram bins and has been cho-  
 279 sen so that the overall cumulative greyed surface is 100%. The expected histograms  
 280 presented in figures 6 and 7 have been obtained using 1000 replications of the model  
 281 with the same design at  $\hat{\theta}$ , and averaging the 1000 generated histograms. Obviously  
 282 the obtained model histogram (averaging all the random effects) is smoother than  
 283 the empirical distribution. The observed number of zeros falls below the expected  
 284 number but within the 90% confidence interval for each species (as indicated by the  
 285 vertical line on figures 6 and 7) and the overall shape of the distribution fits quite  
 286 well the data in both cases.




Figure 6: Comparisons between urchins dataset and averaged histogram (1000 simulations of datasets at  $\hat{\theta}^{Urch}$ )




Figure 7: Comparisons between Sunflower Starfishes dataset and averaged histogram (1000 simulated datasets at  $\hat{\theta}^{Sun}$ )

287 4.1.2. Confidence intervals

Relying on proposition 3.4, the asymptotic covariance matrices are evaluated at those maximum likelihood arguments :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{var}(\hat{a}^{Urch}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \\ \text{var}(\hat{b}^{Urch}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \\ \text{var}(\hat{c}^{Urch}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \\ \text{var}(\hat{d}^{Urch}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0587 \\ 0.1020 \\ 1.6804 \\ 14.4793 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{Corr}(\hat{\theta}^{Urch}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.825 & 0.035 & 0.058 \\ 0.825 & 1 & 0.036 & 0.081 \\ 0.035 & 0.036 & 1 & 0.936 \\ 0.058 & 0.081 & 0.936 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{var}(\hat{a}^{Sun}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \\ \text{var}(\hat{b}^{Sun}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \\ \text{var}(\hat{c}^{Sun}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \\ \text{var}(\hat{d}^{Sun}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.2555 \\ 0.3003 \\ 0.2609 \\ 0.0894 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{Corr}(\hat{\theta}^{Sun}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.902 & -0.055 & -0.046 \\ 0.902 & 1 & -0.056 & -0.023 \\ -0.055 & -0.056 & 1 & 0.906 \\ -0.046 & -0.023 & 0.906 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

288 Essentially only  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{b}$  (resp  $\hat{c}$  and  $\hat{d}$ ) are correlated.

289 To evaluate the actual coverage of confidence regions in the present sampling  
 290 conditions (that may be far from asymptotics), 16000 simulations were launched,  
 291 assuming the same number of strata and the same number of data points per stratum  
 292 as the urchin catches (resp. sunflower starfishes) with  $\hat{\theta}$  as hypothetical true parameter,  
 293 thus disregarding possible bias. As a practical working conclusions, Figures 8 and  
 294 9 show how to correct theoretical asymptotical confidence intervals. The results are  
 295 quite different from one dataset to the other.

- 296 • On Urchins dataset, to get an actual 90% confidence region, we must expand as  
 297 far as the asymptotic ellipse corresponding to a 99.964% normal approximation  
 298 as shown in Figure 8.
- 299 • On Sunflower Starfish dataset, things work better and the 94% asymptotical  
 300 confidence interval is quite a good surrogate for an actual 90% confidence re-  
 301 gion!

302 To understand Table 1, we suggest to consider the median column as the reference  
 303 confidence interval (based on simulation/ EM re-estimation). The right column gives  
 304 bootstrap+ EM re-estimation. We notice that the Bootstrap approach is completely  
 305 unappropriate for our model. The estimation is clearly biased with a shift to the  
 306 right (verified on simulations not shown here) although we tried to correct bias as  
 307 proposed in [13]. The width of confidence intervals are underestimated for both  
 308 species and does not even contain the  $\hat{\theta}$ -value. The hierarchical structure of the  
 309 model may explain part of this bad behavior of bootstrap method but this would  
 310 need further investigations not in the scope of this paper. The left column of Table 1  
 311 exhibits two different behaviors according to the species considered.

- 312 • The asymptotic variance of maximum likelihood parameters under-estimate  
 313 strongly the true sampling characteristics in the Urchin case. This may be due

90% Confidence Intervals		
(asymptotic)	(via simulation)	(via bootstrap)
Urchins case		
$0.587 < a < 1.384$	$0.335 < a < 1.637$	$0.72 < a < 1.00$
$0.496 < b < 1.547$	$0.163 < b < 1.880$	$0.61 < b < 1.03$
$2.827 < c < 7.092$	$1.476 < c < 8.443$	$1.23 < c < 4.37$
$6.387 < d < 18.905$	$2.419 < d < 22.872$	$1.68 < d < 10.89$
Starfishes case		
$1.087 < a < 2.750$	$1.294 < a < 2.951$	$1.217 < a < 1.859$
$0.905 < b < 2.708$	$1.198 < b < 3.141$	$0.938 < b < 1.663$
$1.059 < c < 2.740$	$1.344 < c < 3.182$	$1.147 < c < 2.035$
$0.406 < d < 1.390$	$0.558 < d < 1.559$	$0.347 < d < 0.858$

Table 1: Comparison of the asymptotic 90% confidence interval with the one obtained by simulation for each parameter component for both species

314 to the large numbers of zero's for that species: consequently relatively less non  
315 zero data remain for the  $\rho$ 's (inverse of patch abundance) and the estimation  
316 of  $c$  and  $d$  that rule the between units variation of  $\rho$ 's may become difficult.

- 317 • The Sunflower Starfishes case exhibits much better properties regarding the  
318 approximation of the covariance matrix. For this species, less zeros data occur  
319 and we guess that enough information is made available in the sample to get  
320 correct estimations.

321 Figures 10 and 11 present the predictions for the random effects in each stratum.  
322

#### 323 4.1.3. Validation of the gamma assumption for random effects

324 We have assumed that the random effects  $\mu$  and  $\rho$  were distributed according  
325 to gamma distributions. This choice was essentially made for technical convenience  
326 because conjugate properties make the estimation easier. The validity of this as-  
327 sumption can be checked by considering random effects as fixed and estimate them  
328 independently in each stratum. Figures 12 and 13 present a pp-plot of empirical  
329 versus estimated probability distributions for  $\mu$  and  $\rho$ .

330 The pp-plot for  $\mu$  suggests that the gamma distribution is appropriate (Fig 12);  
331 this is not true of the gamma pp-plot for  $\rho$  (Fig 13). First there are only 36 points  
332 estimates because 2 strata are empty and  $\rho$ 's for these strata are not defined. Second  
333 the probability plot does not adjust to a straight 45 degrees line. Looking more




Figure 8: The lightest ellipse corresponds to 90% confidence ellipsoid and the darkest one is 99.96% and contains 90% of the simulated values.




Figure 9: The lightest ellipse corresponds to 90% confidence ellipsoid and the darkest one is 94% and contains 90% of the simulated values.

334 closely at four extreme points in the  $\rho$  pp-plot, we found that they come from strata  
 335 with less than two non-zero data points. Excluding these 4 points produces the much  
 336 more acceptable fit of Figure 14.

#### 337 4.2. Simulations Studies

338 The previous section showed different behaviors depending on the species : the  
 339 EM procedure provides rather reliable estimates for the starfish RLOL statistical  
 340 features but not for the Urchin ones. The purpose of this section is to check the role  
 341 of the sampling designs. Simulation studies are performed to explore the quality of  
 342 the EM estimation procedure and to check the actual coverage of the asymptotic  
 343 variance-covariance matrix approximation.

##### 344 4.2.1. Simulation design

345 For a given set of parameters  $\theta = (a, b, c, d)$ , we draw 1000 samples according to  
 346 RLOL model given in eq 2.3 with a number  $S$  of strata and  $M$  measured points per  
 347 each stratum.  $S$  has been chosen varying as  $k^2$  with  $k = 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15$  and  
 348  $M = 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40$ .

349 For each simulation, the estimation procedure depicted in section 3 yields one  
 350 point estimate and one estimation of the asymptotic covariance matrix. Assuming




Figure 10: Predictions of the random effects  $\mu_s$  in each stratum correspond to the expected number of clumps collected during a measurement with standardcatching effort.




Figure 11: Predictions of the inverse of  $\rho_s$  in each stratum. These quantities give the expected biomass to be collected within a clump.




Figure 12: pp-Plot with estimates of  $\mu_s$  versus a fitted gamma distribution.

351 that the asymptotic approximation holds and using a normal approximation, con-  
 352 fidence intervals can be given for the *true* value. As we work within a simulation  
 353 context, the *true* value is known and one can compute the actual proportion of  
 354 samples for which the asymptotic confidence interval covers the *true* value.




Figure 13: pp-Plot with estimates of  $\rho_s$  versus a fitted gamma distribution. The extremal points correspond to strat with at least 75% of zeros




Figure 14: pp-Plot with estimates of  $\rho_s$  against a fitted gamma distribution after excluding the four outliers.

#### 355 4.2.2. RLOL Results

356 The simulation study is achieved for two values of parameters  $\theta$  corresponding to  
 357 the two applications developed in section 4.1. We choose  $\theta^{Urchin} = (1, 1, 5, 13)$  and  
 358  $\theta^{Sunstars} = (1.9, 1.8, 1.9, 0.9)$  as *true* parameter references for the simulations. We  
 359 first present a study of the bias and then an investigation of the actual coverage of  
 360 confidence intervals.

#### 361 Bias study

362 We can study the bias by simulation according to the numbers of strata and the  
 363 number of measure points within strata. Figures 15 and 16 present the results for  
 364 relative bias obtained with 1000 simulations in each configuration. As expected  
 365 it decreases quickly with the number of strata and only marginal amelioration is  
 366 obtained as soon as the number of data per stratum becomes reasonable.

#### 367 Confidence intervals study

368 Using 1000 simulations in each cell, the empirical proportion of the asymptotic 90%  
 369 confidence ellipsoids that cover the *true* value is given in Figures 17 and 18. With  
 370 1000 trials in a binomial distribution with probability  $p$  of success, a confidence  
 371 interval for  $p = 0.90$  is approximatively [88%, 92%] : cells from Figures 17 and 18  
 372 that belongs to that interval have been colored in light grey. Results about confidence  
 373 intervals strongly depend on the value of  $\theta$ . The asymptotic approximation seems  
 374 quite satisfying for  $\theta^{Sunstars}$  : the asymptotical conditions are quickly fulfilled and the  
 375 design of the case study seems acceptable. For  $\theta^{Urchin}$  however, the present design  
 376 should be strongly re-enforced (up to 40 points per stratum with 36 strata!) before  
 377 yielding acceptable estimations, and confidence regions based on asymptotical theory  
 378 are definitely too optimistic.




Figure 15: Urchins : Average relative bias in log scale depending on the number of strata and the number of measure points.




Figure 16: Starfish : Average relative bias in log scale depending on the number of strata and the number os measure points.

379 These two sets of parameter recover two very different situations : the larger  
 380 number of zeros in the Urchin case may render the estimation procedure more difficult  
 381 than in the Starfish situation. However one should note that the difference is not



382 markedly pronounced : 34% instead of 24%! Such a simulation study shows that  
 383 the quality of variance covariance matrix estimation used to build an ellipsoid of  
 384 confidence behaves has to be checked through this simulation approach by instance  
 385 to verify whether the asymptotic conditions are fulfilled and that the analyst should  
 386 beware of overconfidence.

Urchin-like

N strata	Number of points per stratum (M)							
	S	5	10	15	20	25	30	40
9	54.5	56.9	61.3	65	66.4	68.5	75.2	
16	56	60.3	64.6	69.5	73.8	78.5	82.3	
25	58.45	62.45	66.8	75	75	83	86.6	
36	55.8	65.2	71.9	75	80.4	83.3	89.2	
64	60.8	64.3	74.8	78.3	84.7	85.7	88.9	
100	59	66.3	74.4	79.2	86.3	85.5	90	
144	57.3	68.2	75.6	83.1	86.7	86	91	
225	55.1	68.9	74.8	75	84.6	86.2	89.5	
400	51.7	68.9	78	83.2	83.9	88	88.9	

Urchin-like

N strata	Number of points per stratum (M)							
	S	5	10	15	20	25	30	40
9	63.8	78.9	79.7	86.2	88.1	89.3	89.3	
16	70.7	84.6	87.9	88.6	89.5	91.3	91.7	
25	78.5	87.8	89	91.5	90.6	92.4	91.9	
36	84.4	87.2	86.7	88.7	89.7	92.2	92.2	
64	87	89.6	89.6	88.8	90.5	92.1	91.2	
100	88	89.5	89.4	90.9	91.3	92.5	91.4	
144	86.6	85.9	90.7	90.9	90.1	89.9	90	
225	89.3	90.7	88.9	90	90.5	91.5	92	
400	89.9	89.8	91.3	90.8	88.7	92.1	89	

Figure 17: Urchin-like case. Effective proportion of 90% confidence intervals that cover the true value. Shading in particular cells reflects the degree of overlap: M-S combination that produces confidence intervals that are too liberal are in black whereas the lightest grey shade reflects confidence intervals that properly characterize parameter uncertainty

Figure 18: Sunstar-like case. Effective proportion of 90% confidence intervals that cover the true value. Shading in particular cells reflects the degree of overlap: M-S combination that produces confidence intervals that are too liberal are in black whereas the lightest grey shade reflects confidence intervals that properly characterize parameter uncertainty.

## 387 5. Conclusion and Perspectives

388 The following conclusions have been reached:

- 389 1. Compound Poisson distributions can conveniently represent the presence of a  
 390 large number of zeros and a skewed distribution of non-zero values. To deal  
 391 the occurrence of zero-inflated data, very parsimonious models can be designed  
 392 (with two parameters only) : a Poisson random sum of independent geometric  
 393 random variables in the discrete case and with exponential random variables in

394 the continuous one. They offer an alternative to the traditional delta gamma  
395 models and behave coherently when changing the scale of the catch effort,  
396 thanks to the Poisson process underpinning the model.

397 2. Compound Poisson distributions can be interpreted using a hierarchical frame-  
398 work. They describe the data collection involved in sampling individuals gath-  
399 ered in (latent) patches drawn from the homogeneous Poisson process with  
400 *abundance* tuned by the distributional parameter of the random components  
401 of the Poisson sum. The introduction of a random effect structure at the top  
402 of the hierarchy is straightforward and accommodates non homogeneity among  
403 strata that are themselves considered as homogeneous units. Such designs with  
404 random effects and data with extra zeros are commonly encountered in ecolog-  
405 ical analyzes, but gamma random effects are yet rarely advocated : variation  
406 between strata is typically modeled using a normal (or lognormal) distribu-  
407 tion because its sufficient statistics match the commonsense interpretation of  
408 mean and variance. However, gamma random effects allow for partial conjugate  
409 properties with the compound Poisson model for zero-inflated data. Beyond  
410 this theoretical convenience, the parameters of the gamma distribution are well  
411 estimated in the Starfish like simulation examples and they can describe the  
412 entire range of variability between units for the real case study.

413 3. Independence between the latent features  $\rho$  and  $\mu$  has been a priori assumed  
414 for the random effects between units. This absence of prior correlation is quite  
415 a stringent hypothesis as we might expect  $\rho$  and  $\mu$  to covary (e.g, low non-zero  
416 realized abundance could stem from either a small  $\mu$  or a large  $\rho$ ). Working  
417 with a gaussian copula for a joint bivariate distribution for the couple  $(\mu, \rho)$  is a  
418 bad remedy, because we would have lost the conjugate properties and increased  
419 computational load. To keep partial conjugacy , a better idea is considering  
420 the natural extension of the gamma family, but such bivariate distributions  
421 are rather restrictive since they can only take into account positive correlation  
422 and need that the two marginals share the same shape parameter. However  
423 such a model would remain parsimonious with 4 parameters: one is gained  
424 to depict correlation and one is lost to depict the marginals'shape. The issue  
425 of correlation has been addressed in [2] who proved via simulation that the  
426 correlation between  $\rho$  and  $\mu$  has little bearing on the property we are ultimately  
427 trying to predict in practice, i.e. the realized biomass in a tow. Finally, the  
428 correlation indicates that the latent variables  $\rho$  and  $\mu$  are model concepts that  
429 should themselves not be overinterpreted; they don't actually characterize the  
430 true size and number of organism patches.

- 431 4. Stochastic EM inferential techniques (with importance sampling for the non  
432 explicit expectation steps) require a modest computational effort since the ran-  
433 dom effects are taken partially conjugate with the compound Poisson distribu-  
434 tions. Auxiliary importance distributions can be proposed by careful inspection  
435 the structure of the joint distribution of the latent variables and integrating out  
436 as much as can analytically be done. Much advantage is taken from conditional  
437 independence, especially when computing the Fisher information matrix by re-  
438 sampling with the simulated missing data that have been previously generated  
439 to evaluate the maximum likelihood estimate. However, the value of results  
440 given here depends on the errors involved with the use of maximum likelihood  
441 asymptotic formula on one hand and on the precision of Monte Carlo sam-  
442 pling algorithms on the other hand. Due to the multidimensional nature of the  
443 latent variables to be simulated, the variability between several trials of the  
444 importance sampling techniques when evaluating the information matrix (and  
445 its inverse) can be important enough, especially when few data makes a rather  
446 flat likelihood function.
- 447 5. Asymptotic errors bounds need to be checked and corrected if necessary. We  
448 relied on a simulation study to get a more reliable idea of their ranges. The  
449 simulated sets of zero-inflated data show that, in the Starfish case, one can  
450 readily trust the confidence intervals based on the information matrix while in  
451 the Urchin case, one should beware of being overconfident. The asymptotic  
452 conditions may not be encountered rapidly. For the Starfish case study, the  
453 design allowed a reasonable estimation of the RLOL model features. For the  
454 other species with a 10% higher probability of getting zero values, satisfying  
455 precision estimates with 40 strata need at least collecting 40 data points per  
456 stratum before the confidence coverage gets reasonably close to its theoretically  
457 recommended approximate value. Because 1600 stations represents generally  
458 unrealistically large sampling effort for a marine bottom-trawl survey in that  
459 Urchin example, statisticians need to inform practitioners (before launching  
460 the data collection) about possible underestimation of uncertainty.
- 461 6. Covariates for the fixed effect of environmental variable (depth, temperature  
462 and habitat type) could be added to the model, potentially enhancing ecological  
463 interpretation of the observed patterns in organism abundance and distribu-  
464 tion. However, it may bring a lot of additional burden during the inferential  
465 computations since many of the conjugate properties would be lost. For the  
466 same reasons, non exchangeable strata (with for instance an intrinsic CAR  
467 structure on the top of the hierarchy as described in (author?) [3]) have not

468 been considered here. Simple (low dimensional) importance sampling should  
469 be replaced with brute force Hastings Metropolis techniques [11]. In such a  
470 context, it may be worthwhile to work on encoding prior knowledge [14] into  
471 probability distributions and switch the problem into a Bayesian framework  
472 [5], relying on ready-made tools such as WinBugs for inference [24].

473 7. In the case study, the random effect models with compound Poisson distribu-  
474 tion for the occurrence of zero-inflated data fit the data well and allow transfer  
475 of information between strata to help predict in data-poor units. Its hierarchi-  
476 cal structure favors discussion between ecologists and statisticians, and helps  
477 query its interpretation in term of ecological situations with extra zeros.

## 478 References

- 479 [1] M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with*  
480 *Formulas, Graphs and Mathematical Tables*. Chapman & Hall, 2004.
- 481 [2] Sophie Ancelet. *Exploiter l'approche hiérarchique bayésienne pour la*  
482 *modélisation statistique de structures spatiales*. PhD thesis, UMR 518 AgroParis-  
483 Tech/INRA Mathématiques et Informatique Appliquées, F-75231 Paris, France,  
484 2008.
- 485 [3] Sudipto. Banerjee, Bradley P. Carlin, and Alan E. Gelfand. *Hierarchical Mod-*  
486 *eling and analysis for spatial data*. Wiley, 2004.
- 487 [4] S.C. Barry and A.H. Welsh. Generalized additive modelling and zero inflated  
488 count data. *Ecological Modelling*, 157:179–188, 2002.
- 489 [5] J. O. Berger. *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis*. Springer-  
490 Verlag, New York, 1985.
- 491 [6] J. Bernier and D. Fandoux. Théorie du renouvellement - application à l'étude  
492 statistique des précipitations mensuelles. *Revue de Statistique Appliquée*,  
493 XVIII(2):75–87, 1970.
- 494 [7] A. Dempster, N. Laird, and D. Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete  
495 data via the EM algorithm. *Jour. Roy. Statist. Soc.*, 40:1–22, 1978.
- 496 [8] B. Deylon, M. Lavielle, and E. Moulines. Convergence of a stochastic approxi-  
497 mation version of EM algorithm. *Ann. Statist.*, 27:94–128, 1999.

- 498 [9] W. Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, volume 2.  
499 Wiley, second edition, 1971.
- 500 [10] A.E. Gelfand and A.F.M. Smith. Sampling based approach to calculating  
501 marginal densities. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 85:398–409,  
502 1990.
- 503 [11] W.K. Hastings. Monte Carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their  
504 applications. *Biometrika*, 57:97–109, 1970.
- 505 [12] D.C Heilbron. Zero-altered and other regression models for count data with  
506 added zeros. *Biometrical Journal*, 36:531–547, 1994.
- 507 [13] Tim C. Hesterberg. Unbiasing the bootstrap-bootknife sampling vs. smoothing.  
508 *Proceedings of the Section on Statistics and the Environment*, pages 2924–2930,  
509 2004.
- 510 [14] J.B. Kadane, L.J. Wolson, A. O’Hagan, and K. Craig. Papers on elicitation  
511 with discussions. *The Statistician*, pages 3–53, 1998.
- 512 [15] A. Richard Levine and George Casella. Implementations of the Monte Carlo EM  
513 algorithm. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 10(3):422–439,  
514 2001.
- 515 [16] B.A. Martin, T.G. and Wintle, J.R. Rhodes, P.M. Kuhnert, S.A. Field, S.J.  
516 Low-Choy, A.J. Tyre, and H.P. Possingham. Zero tolerance ecology: improving  
517 ecological inference by modelling the source of zero observations. *Ecology Letters*,  
518 8:1235–1246, 2005.
- 519 [17] P. McCullagh and J. A. Nelder. *Generalized Linear Models*. Chapman & Hall,  
520 1983.
- 521 [18] C. E. McCulloch. Maximum likelihood variance components estimation for bi-  
522 nary data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1994.
- 523 [19] C. E. McCulloch. Maximum likelihood algorithms for generalized linear mixed  
524 models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1997.
- 525 [20] M.K Pitt and N. Shephard. Filtering via simulation : auxiliary particle filters.  
526 *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94:590–599, 1999.

- 527 [21] M. Ridout, C. Demetrio, and J. Hinde. Models for count data with many zeros.  
528 *International Biometric Conference*, pages 1–13, 1998.
- 529 [22] C.P. Robert and G. Casella. *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods*. Springer-Verlag,  
530 1998.
- 531 [23] D.J. Spiegelhalter, A. Thomas, and N.G. Best. Computation on Bayesian graph-  
532 ical models (avec discussion). In J.M. Bernardo, J.O. Berger, A.P. Dawid, and  
533 A.F.M. Smith, editors, *Bayesian Statistics*, pages 407–425. Clarendon Press,  
534 1996.
- 535 [24] D.J. Spiegelhalter, A. Thomas, and N.G Best. *WinBUGS Version 1.3. User*  
536 *Manual*. MRC Biostatistics Unit, 2000.
- 537 [25] G. Stefansson. Analysis of groundfish survey abundance data: combining the  
538 glm and delta approaches. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 53:577–588, 1996.
- 539 [26] S.E Syrjala. Critique on the use of the delta distribution for the analysis of  
540 trawl survey data. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 57:831–842, 2000.
- 541 [27] M. H. Tanner. *Tools for Statistical Inference : Observed Data and Data Aug-*  
542 *mentation Methods*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992.
- 543 [28] Martin Abba Tanner. *Tools for statistical inference: Methods for the exploration*  
544 *of posterior distributions and likelihood functions*. Springer-Verlag, New York,  
545 1996.
- 546 [29] K. W. Wickle, L. M. Berliner, and N. Cressie. Hierarchical Bayesian space-time  
547 models. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 5:117–154, 1998.

548

## APPENDICES

549 **A. Compound Poisson process characteristic function**

When  $X$  is real valued, we denote by  $\hat{f}$  the Fourier transform<sup>1</sup> of  $f$  (i.e the characteristic function of  $X$ ) :

$$\hat{f}(\omega) = E(e^{i\omega X})$$

From equation 2.1, the compound Poisson distribution  $g$  is such that :

$$\hat{g}(\omega) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\mu} \frac{\mu^n}{n!} \left( \hat{f}(\omega) \right)^n = e^{-\mu(1-\hat{f}(\omega))} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

550 This equation exhibits the infinite divisibility property of  $Y$  with regards to pa-  
 551 rameter  $\mu$ , which offers a nice conceptual interpretation when returning to the marked  
 552 Poisson process underneath this stochastic construction : the resulting quantity  $Y$  is  
 553 obtained by collecting a random number of primarily (hidden) batches  $X_i$  distributed  
 554 at random with intensity  $\mu$ . Such a conceptual latent process of aggregates would be  
 555 intuitive for many ecologists. Conversely, one can easily check by writing the loga-  
 556 rithm of their characteristic functions, that traditional models for zero-inflated data  
 557 (think for instance of the delta-gamma model or the Zero-Inflated Poisson model such  
 558 as [21]) lack of coherence for adapting to a change of the scale in the experiment.

Among the many choices for the probability distribution  $f$  of the random mark of the sum, this paper focuses, for parsimony and realism, on the exponential distribution for  $X$  (continuous case) that is :

$$f(x) = \rho e^{-\rho x}$$

559 so that  $\hat{f}(\omega) = \frac{\rho}{\rho+i\omega}$  and  $\hat{g}(\omega) = e^{-\mu(\frac{i\omega}{\rho+i\omega})}$ . For the discrete case, we suggest the  
 560 corresponding geometric distribution :  $f(x) = 1_{x>0} \times (1-r) \times r^x e^{i\omega x}$  leading to  
 561  $\hat{f}(\omega) = \frac{1-r}{1-re^{i\omega}}$  and  $\hat{g}(\omega) = e^{-\mu\left(\frac{r(1-e^{i\omega})}{1-re^{i\omega}}\right)}$  for the exponential compound Poisson count  
 562 model.

---

<sup>1</sup>For non negative integer valued random variables  $X$  the probability generating function  $P(z) = \sum_0^{\infty} \Pr(X = n)z^n$  is the corresponding machinery for handling discrete distributions : the same results can be found in this case by setting the change of variables  $z = e^{i\omega}$

563 **B. Initialization of the Newton-Raphson algorithm**

The main point on Newton-Raphson algorithm consists in choosing a good initial point. In this paper we use this algorithm to find the zero of

$$\ln(a) - \psi(a) - C = 0$$

Note that function  $\psi$  verifies the following asymptotic series' expansion [1] :

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &\underset{x \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \ln(x) - \frac{1}{2x} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{B_{2n}}{2n x^{2n}} \\ &\underset{x \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \ln(x) - \frac{1}{2x} - \frac{1}{12 x^2} + \frac{1}{120 x^4} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

564 The convergence is very fast (see Figure 19) so that we choose to initiate Newton-Raphson algorithm with  $x_0 = \frac{1}{2C}$ .




Figure 19: Difference between  $\log(x) - \psi(x)$  and  $1/2x$

565

566 **C. Computation of the moments of gamma and log gamma, beta and log**  
 567 **beta distribution implied in the expectation step**

568 *C.1. First and second moments for the sufficient statistics of the gamma pdf*

Let  $Z$  be a random variable with gamma distribution,  $Z \sim \Gamma(s, t)$ . Using laplace transform it is easy to obtain the first moment of  $\ln(Z)$  :

$$\mathbb{E} (e^{\lambda \ln(Z)}) = \mathbb{E} (Z^\lambda) = \frac{t^s}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^{+\infty} y^\lambda y^{s-1} e^{-ty} dy = \frac{\Gamma(s + \lambda)}{\Gamma(s)t^\lambda}.$$



Differentiating this equation with respect to  $\lambda$ , we have the expected value of  $\ln(Z)$  (when  $\lambda = 0$ ) and  $Z \ln(Z)$  (when  $\lambda = 1$ ):

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}(Z^\lambda)}{\partial \lambda} \right|_{\lambda=0} = \mathbb{E}(\ln(Z)) = \psi(s) - \ln(t), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

and

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}(Z^\lambda)}{\partial \lambda} \right|_{\lambda=1} = \mathbb{E}(Z \ln(Z)) = \frac{s}{t} (\psi(s+1) - \ln(t)). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

569 Taking the second order derivative, we show :

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 \mathbb{E}(Z^\lambda)}{\partial \lambda^2} \right|_{\lambda=0} = \mathbb{E}(\ln(Z)^2) = \psi'(s) + \psi(s)^2 - 2 \ln(t) \psi(s) + \ln(t)^2. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Therefore the variance-covariance matrix between  $Z$  and  $\ln(Z)$  is :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{s}{t^2} & \frac{1}{t} \\ \frac{1}{t} & \psi'(s) \end{pmatrix}$$

570 *C.2. First and second moments for the sufficient statistics of the beta pdf*

Let  $S$  be a random variable with beta distribution  $S \sim \beta(s, t)$ .

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda \ln(S)}) = \frac{\Gamma(s+t)}{\Gamma(s+t+\lambda)} \frac{\Gamma(s+\lambda)}{\Gamma(s)}$$

So that, by first and second differentiation, one gets, (the derivation is quite straightforwardly performed if working with  $\ln \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda \ln(S)})$ ) :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\ln(S)) &= \psi(s) - \psi(s+t) \quad , \quad \mathbb{E}(\ln(1-S)) = \psi(t) - \psi(s+t) \\ \mathbb{E}(\ln(S)^2) &= \psi'(s) - \psi'(s+t) + (\psi(s) - \psi(s+t))^2 \end{aligned}$$

One can extend the properties of characteristic function by considering the function of the two arguments  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda \ln(S) + \mu \ln(1-S)}) = \frac{\Gamma(s+t)}{\Gamma(s+t+\lambda)} \frac{\Gamma(s+\lambda)}{\Gamma(s)} \frac{\Gamma(t+\mu)}{\Gamma(t)}$$

571 By cross-differentiation under regularity conditions (working with  $\ln \mathbb{E} (S^\lambda(1 - S)^\mu)$   
 572 makes things easier here also) , the joint moment can be analytically obtained :

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial^2 \mathbb{E} (S^\lambda(1 - S)^\mu)}{\partial \lambda \partial \mu} \right|_{\lambda=0, \mu=0} &= \mathbb{E} (\ln(S) \ln(1 - S)) \\ &= -\psi'(s + t) + \mathbb{E} (\ln(S)) \mathbb{E} (\ln(1 - S)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the variance-covariance matrix between  $\ln(S)$  and  $\ln(1 - S)$  reads :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \psi'(s) - \psi'(s + t) & -\psi'(s + t) \\ -\psi'(s + t) & \psi'(t) - \psi'(s + t) \end{pmatrix}$$

#### 573 D. EM algorithm principle

From a constructive point of view, one often writes

$$[x, z | \theta] = [x | \theta, z] \times [z | \theta],$$

but using Bayes rule, we may write the reverse logarithmic form :

$$\ln [x | \theta] = \ln [x, z | \theta] - \ln [z | \theta, x] \tag{D.1}$$

574 Let us remark that relation D.1 is valid whatever  $z$  represents.

##### 575 D.1. Recall about EM algorithm and control of the gradient

Under regularity conditions for the joint distribution  $[x, z | \theta]$  and the conditional one  $[z | \theta, x]$  , integrating relation D.1 with respect to the probability density  $[z | \theta', x]$  :

$$\begin{aligned} \ln [x | \theta] &= \int_z \ln [x, z | \theta] [z | \theta', x] dz - \int_z \ln [z | \theta, x] [z | \theta', x] dz \\ &= Q(\theta, \theta') - H(\theta, \theta') \end{aligned} \tag{D.2}$$

576 The maximum of  $\theta \mapsto H(\theta, \theta')$  is achieved in  $\theta = \theta'$  [27].  
 So  $H(\theta, \theta') < H(\theta', \theta')$ . Let us consider D.2 for  $\theta$  and  $\theta'$

$$\ln [x | \theta] - \ln [x | \theta'] = (Q(\theta, \theta') - Q(\theta', \theta')) + (H(\theta', \theta') - H(\theta, \theta'))$$

EM algorithm is based upon an iterative procedure which exhibits  $\theta$  such that  $Q(\theta, \theta') > Q(\theta', \theta')$ . The best  $\theta$  is obtained by

$$\theta = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(\theta, \theta')$$

During iteration we can monitor the value of the gradient for the log likelihood :

$$\frac{\partial \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial \ln [z | \theta, x]}{\partial \theta} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Integrating the right hand term with respect to conditional density  $[z | \theta, x]$ , and keeping in mind that, for any sufficiently regular *pdf*  $f(z; \theta)$  of variable  $z$  with parameter  $\theta$  one can write:  $\int_z \frac{\partial \ln f(z, \theta)}{\partial \theta} f(z; \theta) dz = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \int_z \frac{\partial \ln f(z, \theta)}{\partial \theta} f(z; \theta) dz = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta} &= \int_z \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial \theta} [z | \theta, x] dz - \int_z \frac{\partial \ln [z | \theta, x]}{\partial \theta} [z | \theta, x] dz \\ \frac{\partial \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta} &= \int_z \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial \theta} [z | \theta, x] dz \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

577 We may use this equality (computed by Monte Carlo method) to perform a gra-  
578 dient method to obtain the maximum likelihood or just to check along the iterations  
579 that the gradient is going to zero.

#### 580 D.2. Score function

From now on, let's call  $Sc(\theta, z, x) = \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial \theta}$  the score, i.e the complete loglikeli-  
hood gradient and  $Sc(\theta_i, z, x) = \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial \theta_i}$  its  $i^{th}$  component.  $\nabla \theta$ , equation D.4 proves  
that its conditional expectation (with respect to  $[z | \theta, x]$ ) is always equal to the like-  
lihood gradient. Pushing the derivation game one step further leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left\{ \frac{\partial \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta_i} \right\} &= \int_z \left\{ \frac{\partial Sc_i}{\partial \theta_j} [z | \theta, x] + Sc_i \frac{\partial [z | \theta, x]}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{[z | \theta, x]}{[z | \theta, x]} \right\} dz \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} &= \int_z \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} + Sc_i \left( Sc_j - \frac{\partial \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta_j} \right) \right\} [z | \theta, x] dz \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

581 *D.3. Information matrix*

To obtain the covariance matrix of the estimators at the maximum of likelihood, the empirical information matrix needs to be computed. The second order derivative is obtained by differentiating D.1:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} = \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} - \frac{\partial^2 \ln [z | \theta, x]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

At the maximum  $\theta = \hat{\theta}$ , formula D.3 implies  $\frac{\partial \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta_{jj}} = 0$  so that equation D.5 takes a more friendly aspect because the score term  $\frac{\partial \ln [x | \theta]}{\partial \theta_j}$  in the right hand side vanishes at  $\theta = \hat{\theta}$ . Equation D.6 becomes therefore much more handy because it only involves conditional expectations of first and second derivatives of the complete likelihood terms :

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ln ([x | \hat{\theta}])}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} = \int_z \left( \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \hat{\theta}]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} + \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \hat{\theta}]}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \hat{\theta}]}{\partial \theta_j} \right) [z | \hat{\theta}, x] dz \quad (\text{D.7})$$

582 As  $\int_z \left( \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \hat{\theta}]}{\partial \theta_j} \right) [z | \hat{\theta}, x] dz = \frac{\partial \ln [x | \hat{\theta}]}{\partial \theta_j} = 0$ , the second term in the right hand  
 583 side of eq D.7 can be considered as the conditional variance of the gradient of the  
 584 complete log-likelihood  $\ln [x, z | \hat{\theta}]$ . This expectation can be numerically computed  
 585 with the same techniques to which recourse was made for the EM algorithm.

586 **E. Detailed proofs of propositions**

587 *E.1. Proof of proposition 3.1*

Since we detail the computation for one particular  $s$ , we will omit to mention it in order to make the reading easier. We also note respectively  $\underline{y}$ ,  $\underline{D}$  and  $\underline{N}$  the vectors of data, catching efforts and corresponding number of clumps in one stratum. We define  $J$  as

$$J(\underline{N}, \rho, \mu) = [\rho, \mu, \underline{N} | a, b, c, d, \underline{y}, \underline{D}]. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Then  $J$  satisfies the following set of equations :

$$\begin{aligned} &\propto [\underline{y}, \rho, \mu, \underline{N} | a, b, c, d, \underline{D}] \\ &\propto \left( \prod_{i=1}^I [y_i | N_i, \rho] [N_i | \mu, D_i] \right) [\mu | a, b] [\rho | c, d] \\ &\propto \left( \prod_{i=1}^I [y_i | N_i, \rho, \mu] [N_i | \rho, \mu] \right) (\mu^{a-1} e^{-\mu b}) (\rho^{c-1} e^{-\rho d}) \end{aligned}$$

with the convention that  $[A|B] \propto f(A, B)$  means that the coefficient of proportionality only depends on  $B$ . We note  $I^*$  the number of zero value  $y$  and we reorder the vector  $y$  so that the  $I^+ = I - I^*$  non zero  $y_i$  are the first, so that  $J$  may be written as :

$$\begin{aligned} J(\underline{N}, \rho, \mu) &\propto \left( \prod_{i=1}^{I-I^*} \left( y_i^{N_i} e^{-\rho y_i} \frac{\rho^{N_i}}{\Gamma(N_i)} \right) \left( \frac{e^{-\mu D_i} (\mu D_i)^{N_i}}{\Gamma(N_i + 1)} \right) \right) \\ &\quad \left( \prod_{i^*=I-I^*+1}^I \delta(N_{i^*}) e^{-\mu D_{i^*}} \right) (\mu^{a-1} e^{-\mu b}) (\rho^{c-1} e^{-\rho d}) \end{aligned}$$

Defining  $Y_+ = \sum_{i=1}^I y_i$ ,  $N_+ = \sum_{i=1}^I N_i$  and  $D_+ = \sum_{i=1}^I D_i$ , we obtain :

$$J(\underline{N}, \rho, \mu) \propto \left( \prod_{i=1}^{I^+} \frac{y_i^{N_i}}{\Gamma(N_i) \Gamma(N_i + 1)} \right) e^{-\rho(Y_+ + d)} \rho^{N_+ + c - 1} e^{-\mu(D_+ + b)} \mu^{N_+ + a - 1}$$

Conditionally to the latent vector  $\underline{N}$ , the random effects  $\rho$  and  $\mu$  are independent. Isolating the terms which depend on  $\mu$  on one side and those depend on  $\rho$  on the other, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mu | \underline{N}, \theta, \underline{y}, \underline{D}] &\sim \Gamma(a + N_+, b + D_+) \\ [\rho | \underline{N}, \theta, \underline{y}] &\sim \Gamma(c + N_+, d + Y_+) \end{aligned}$$

For the expectation step we only need to compute  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\mu_s | \underline{Y}_s)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\ln(\mu_s) | \underline{Y}_s)$  and the same sufficient statistics concerning  $\rho$ .

Since  $\mu_s | \underline{N}_s, \theta, \underline{y}$  follows a gamma distribution  $\Gamma(a + N_{s+}, b + D_{s+})$ , the conditional expected value  $\mu_s$  given  $\underline{N}_s$  and  $\theta = (a, b, c, d)$  is  $(a + N_{s+}) / (b + D_{s+})$ .

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\mu_s | \underline{y}_s) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} \left( \frac{a' + N_{s+}}{b' + D_{s+}} | \underline{y} \right) = \frac{a' + \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (N_{s+} | \underline{y}_s)}{b' + D_{s+}}.$$

If  $Z$  follows gamma distribution  $\Gamma(s, t)$ , then  $\mathbb{E}(\ln(Z)) = \psi(s) - \ln(t)$  (see annex C), so that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln(\mu_s) | \underline{y}_s) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\psi(a' + N_{s+}) | \underline{y}_s) - \ln(b' + D_{s+}).$$

We have respectively for  $\rho_s$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\rho_s | \underline{y}_s) = \frac{c' + \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (N_{s+} | \underline{y}_s)}{d' + Y_{s+}},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\ln(\rho_s) | \underline{y}_s) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta'} (\psi(c' + N_{s+}) | \underline{y}_s) - \ln(d' + Y_{s+}).$$

### 588 E.2. Proof of proposition 3.2

589 Let us define  $J$  as the distribution of  $[\rho, \mu, \underline{N} | \theta', \underline{y}, \underline{D}]$  in one particular stratum  
 590  $s$ . We will write  $J$  in a bottom-up perspective and consider the distribution of  $\mu$  and  
 591  $\rho$  conditioned by  $N$ , because  $\mu$  and  $\rho$  are conditionally independant.

$J$  is given by :

$$\begin{aligned} J(\underline{N}, \rho, \mu) &= [\rho, \mu, \underline{N} | \theta', \underline{y}, \underline{D}] \\ &= [\rho | \underline{N}, \theta, \underline{y}] [\mu | \underline{N}, \theta', \underline{y}, \underline{D}] [\underline{N} | \theta, \underline{y}, \underline{D}] \end{aligned}$$

Using the independent conditional gamma distributions of  $\mu$  and  $\rho$  and integrating according to  $\mu$  and  $\rho$  given  $\underline{N}$ , we can exhibit all the terms depending on  $\underline{N}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\rho} \int_{\mu} J(\underline{N}, \rho, \mu) d\mu d\rho &= [\underline{N} | \theta, \underline{y}, \underline{D}] \\ &\propto \prod_{i=1}^{I^+} \left( \frac{y_i^{N_i}}{\Gamma(N_i) \Gamma(N_i + 1)} \right) \prod_{i^*=I-I^*+1}^I \delta(N_{i^*}) \left( \frac{(b' + D_+)^{N_+} (d + Y_+)^{N_+}}{\Gamma(a + N_+) \Gamma(c + N_+)} \right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

### 592 E.3. Proof of proposition 3.4

In the following  $Z$  will stand for all the hidden variables i.e  $\underline{Z} = (\underline{N}, \underline{\mu}, \underline{\rho})$ ,  $|M_{ij}|$  is another notation for matrix  $M$  that details the content of the  $i^{th}$  row and  $j^{th}$  column, and  $\frac{\partial F(\theta)}{\partial \theta}$  stands for the gradient of  $F$  written as a vector whose  $i^{th}$  component is the

scalar  $\frac{\partial F(\theta)}{\partial \theta_i}$ . The key equation involves rewriting equation D.7 as the expectation of the second order derivative of the complete log-likelihood and the variance of the score (its gradient) to be taken with regards to the conditional distribution  $[Z | x, \hat{\theta}]$  (see annex D.3)

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 \ln([x | \hat{\theta}])}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right| = \mathbb{E}_{Z|x} \left| \frac{\partial^2 \ln([x, Z | \hat{\theta}])}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right| + \text{Var}_{Z|x} \left( \frac{\partial \ln [x, Z | \theta]}{\partial \theta} \right) \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Computing the first term of the right hand side of equation E.2 is easy, since  $[x | z, \theta] = [x | z]$  (consequently the complete log-likelihood  $\ln([x, z | \theta])$  can be separated as  $\ln([x | z]) + \ln([z, | \theta])$ ) and the gamma random effects  $[z | \theta]$  belong to an exponential family. As a consequence, annex F shows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\partial^2 \ln([x, Z | \hat{\theta}])}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right| = \left| \frac{\partial^2 \ln([x, z | \hat{\theta}])}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right| = S \begin{pmatrix} -\psi'(\hat{a}) & \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & -\frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{b}^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(\hat{c}) & \frac{1}{\hat{d}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\hat{d}} & \frac{-\hat{c}}{\hat{d}^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

As shown in Figure 20., given  $Y_s, Y_{s'}$  and  $\theta$ , the latent variables  $Z_s$  and  $Z_{s'}$  of two stratum  $s$  and  $s'$  are conditionnaly independent, therefore :

$$\text{Var}_{Z|x} \left( \frac{\partial \ln [x, Z | \theta]}{\partial \theta} \right) = \sum_{s=1}^S \text{Var}_{Z_s|x} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix}$$

To evaluate the variance of the score in stratum  $s$ , we will take advantage of successive conditioning due to the hierarchical structure depicted in Figure 2. Recalling that the latent variable  $Z_s$  includes, in addition to  $(\mu_s, \rho_s)$ , the vector  $\underline{N}_s$ , i-e the latent number of clumps for each record, the variance conditional decomposition formula gives:

$$\text{Var}_{Z_s|x} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{N}_s|x} \left( \text{Var} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} \middle| \underline{N}_s \right) + \text{Var}_{\underline{N}_s|x} \left( \mathbb{E} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} \middle| \underline{N}_s \right)$$




Figure 20: The random effects in each stratum are conditionally independent given the data and the set of parameters

So that we have

$$I_e(\hat{\theta}, x) = S \begin{pmatrix} -\psi'(\hat{a}) & \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & -\frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{b}^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(\hat{c}) & \frac{1}{\hat{d}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\hat{d}} & -\frac{\hat{c}}{\hat{d}^2} \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{s=1}^S (A_s + B_s)$$

with

$$A_s = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{\mathbf{N}}|x} \left( \text{Var} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} \middle| \underline{\mathbf{N}} \right) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad B_s = \text{Var}_{\underline{N}_s|x} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} \middle| \underline{N}_s \right) \right).$$

Given  $\underline{N}_s$ ,  $\mu_s$  and  $\rho_s$  are independent. Moreover the *pdf*  $[\rho_s | \underline{N}_s, \underline{Y}_s, a, b, c, d]$  and  $[\mu_s | \underline{N}_s, \underline{Y}_s, a, b, c, d]$  are gamma and analytic expressions are available for the expectation and variance of the gamma sufficient statistics, as detailed in equations C.1 to



C.3. The key functions of  $N_{s+}$  are  $(a_s!, b_s!, c_s!, d_s!) = (a+N_{s+}, b+D_{s+}, c+N_{s+}, d+Y_{s+})$  such that :

$$\mathbb{E} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} | \underline{\mathbf{N}} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi(a'_s) - \ln(b'_s) \\ -\frac{a'_s}{b'_s} \\ \psi(c'_s) - \ln(d'_s) \\ -\frac{c'_s}{d'_s} \end{pmatrix}$$

and then  $B_s$  is obtained by taking the covariance of this vector :

$$B_s = \text{Var}_{N_{s+} | \hat{\theta}, x} \left( \mathbb{E} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} | \underline{\mathbf{N}}_{s+} \right)$$

Given  $\underline{N}_s$  additional advantage is taken from the conditional independence of  $\rho_s$  and  $\mu_s$  as shown in Figure 21, .




Figure 21: Given  $N$ ,  $\rho_s \perp \mu_s$

$$\text{Var} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} | \underline{\mathbf{N}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\psi'(a') & \frac{1}{b'} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{b'} & -\frac{a'}{b'^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(c') & \frac{1}{d'} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{d'} & \frac{-c'}{d'^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

593 and the expression for  $A_s$  follows easily.

594 **F. Second derivative of the complete log-likelihood**

Let us first recall the complete log likelihood of the model :

$$\begin{aligned} \ln [x, z | \theta] &= C_{-\theta} + (a - 1) \sum_{s=1}^S \ln \mu_s + Sa \ln b - b \sum_{s=1}^S \mu_s - S \ln \Gamma(a) \\ &+ (c - 1) \sum_{s=1}^S \ln \rho_s + Sc \ln d - d \sum_{s=1}^S \rho_s - S \ln \Gamma(c) \end{aligned}$$

In the first derivative, the latent variables  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\rho}$  appear not surprisingly only through their arithmetic or geometric means (sufficient statistics for the gamma *pdf*). Using standard notation  $\bar{\mu}$  for the arithmetic mean  $\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \mu_s$ , we have :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial a} &= S \left( \overline{\ln(\mu)} + \ln b - \psi(a) \right) & \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial c} &= S \left( \overline{\ln(\rho)} + \ln d - \psi(c) \right) \\ \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial b} &= S \left( \frac{a}{b} - \bar{\mu} \right) & \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial d} &= S \left( \frac{c}{d} - \bar{\rho} \right) \end{aligned}$$

595 The gradient of the complete log-likelihood (so-called the "score") may be split into  
 596 two parts : the first one  $\Delta_\theta$  does not depend on the latent variable  $z$  while the other  
 597 one  $\Delta_z$  gathers terms depending on  $z$  (and possibly of  $\theta$ ), i.e :

$$\left( \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \hat{\theta}]}{\partial \theta} \right) = \Delta_\theta + \Delta_z$$

with

$$\Delta_\theta = S \begin{pmatrix} \ln b - \psi(a) \\ \frac{a}{b} \\ \ln d - \psi(c) \\ \frac{c}{d} \end{pmatrix} \quad \Delta_z = S \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\ln(\mu)} \\ -\bar{\mu} \\ \overline{\ln(\rho)} \\ -\bar{\rho} \end{pmatrix}$$

In addition here,  $\Delta_z$  does not contain terms with  $\theta$ , consequently the second order

derivatives are easy to obtain and don't involve the latent variable :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial a \partial a} &= -S\psi'(a) & \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial c \partial c} &= -S\psi'(c) \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial a \partial b} &= \frac{S}{b} & \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial c \partial d} &= \frac{S}{d} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial b \partial b} &= -\frac{Sa}{b^2} & \frac{\partial^2 \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial d \partial d} &= \frac{-Sc}{d^2} \end{aligned}$$

## 598 G. Second derivative of the complete log-likelihood with discrete data

The complete log likelihood of the model, in the discrete case, reads :

$$\begin{aligned} \ln [x, z | \theta] &= C_{-\theta} + (a - 1) \sum_{s=1}^S \ln \mu_s + Sa \ln b - b \sum_{s=1}^S \mu_s - S \ln \Gamma(a) \\ S \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma(c + d)}{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(d)} \right) &+ (c - 1) \sum_{s=1}^S \ln p_s + (d - 1) \sum_{s=1}^S \ln(1 - p_s) \end{aligned}$$

In the first derivative, the latent variables  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{p}$  appear only through their arithmetic or geometric means (sufficient statistics for the gamma and beta *pdf*). Using standard notation  $\bar{\mu}$  for the arithmetic mean  $\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \mu_s$ , we have :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial a} &= S \left( \overline{\ln(\mu)} + \ln b - \psi(a) \right) & \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial c} &= S \left( \overline{\ln(p)} + \psi(c + d) - \psi(c) \right) \\ \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial b} &= S \left( \frac{a}{b} - \bar{\mu} \right) & \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \theta]}{\partial d} &= S \left( \overline{\ln(1 - p)} + \psi(c + d) - \psi(d) \right) \end{aligned}$$

599 The gradient of the complete log-likelihood (so-called the "score") may be split into  
600 two parts : the first one  $\Delta_\theta$  does not depend on the latent variable  $z$  while the other  
601 one  $\Delta_z$  gathers terms depending on  $z$  (and possibly of  $\theta$ ), i.e :

$$\left( \frac{\partial \ln [x, z | \hat{\theta}]}{\partial \theta} \right) = \Delta_\theta + \Delta_z$$

with

$$\Delta_\theta = S \begin{pmatrix} \ln b - \psi(a) \\ \psi(c+d) - \psi(c) \\ \psi(c+d) - \psi(d) \end{pmatrix} \quad \Delta_z = S \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\ln(\mu)} \\ \frac{-\overline{\mu}}{\ln(p)} \\ \frac{1}{\ln(1-p)} \end{pmatrix}$$

In addition here,  $\Delta_z$  does not contain terms with  $\theta$ , consequently the second order derivatives are easy to obtain and don't involve the latent variable; with  $Z$  standing for all the hidden variables i.e  $\underline{Z} = (\underline{N}, \underline{\mu}, \underline{p})$ :

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 \ln([x, z | \hat{\theta}])}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right| = S \begin{pmatrix} -\psi'(\hat{a}) & \frac{1}{b} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{b} & -\frac{\hat{a}}{b^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(\hat{c}) + \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) & \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) \\ 0 & 0 & \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) & -\psi'(\hat{d}) + \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) \end{pmatrix}$$

As shown in Figure 20 for the continuous case, given  $Y_s, Y_{s'}$  and  $\theta$ , the latent variables  $Z_s$  and  $Z_{s'}$  of two strata  $s$  and  $s'$  are conditionnally independent, therefore :

$$\mathbb{V}ar_{Z|x} \left( \frac{\partial \ln [x, Z | \theta]}{\partial \theta} \right) = \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbb{V}ar_{Z_s|x} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(p_s) \\ \ln(1-p_s) \end{pmatrix}$$

To evaluate the variance of the score in stratum  $s$ , we will take advantage from successive conditioning due to the hierarchical structure depicted in Figure 2 still true for the discrete case. The variance conditional decomposition formula gives:

$$\mathbb{V}ar_{Z_s|x} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(p_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{pmatrix} = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{N}_s|x} \left( \mathbb{V}ar \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(p_s) \\ \ln(1-p_s) \end{pmatrix} \middle| \underline{N}_s \right) + \mathbb{V}ar_{\underline{N}_s|x} \left( \mathbb{E} \begin{pmatrix} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(p_s) \\ \ln(1-p_s) \end{pmatrix} \middle| \underline{N}_s \right)$$

So that we have

$$I_e(\hat{\theta}, x) = S \begin{pmatrix} -\psi'(\hat{a}) & \frac{1}{b} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{b} & -\frac{\hat{a}}{b^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(\hat{c}) + \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) & \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) \\ 0 & 0 & \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) & -\psi'(\hat{d}) + \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{s=1}^S (A_s + B_s)$$

with

$$A_s = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{\mathbf{N}}|x} \left( \text{Var} \left( \begin{array}{c} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(p_s) \\ \ln(1-p_s) \end{array} \middle| \underline{\mathbf{N}} \right) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad B_s = \text{Var}_{\underline{N}_s|x} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( \begin{array}{c} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(p_s) \\ \ln(1-p_s) \end{array} \middle| \underline{N}_s \right) \right).$$

Given  $\underline{N}_s$ ,  $\mu_s$  and  $\rho_s$  are independent. Moreover the *pdf*  $[\rho_s | \underline{N}_s, \underline{Y}_s, a, b, c, d]$  and  $[p_s | \underline{N}_s, \underline{Y}_s, a, b, c, d]$  are gamma and beta so that analytic expressions are available for the expectation and variance of the gamma sufficient statistics, as detailed in equations C.1 to C.3. The key functions of  $N_{s+}$  are  $(a_s', b_s', c_s', d_s') = (a + N_{s+}, b + D_{s+}, c + N_{s+}, d + Y_{s+} - N_{s+})$  such that :

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \begin{array}{c} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(p_s) \\ \ln(1-p_s) \end{array} \middle| \underline{\mathbf{N}} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c} \psi(a_s') - \ln(b_s') \\ -\frac{a_s'}{b_s'} \\ \psi(c_s') - \psi(c_s' + d_s') \\ \psi(d_s') - \psi(c_s' + d_s') \end{array} \right)$$

and then the matrix  $B_s$  is obtained by taking the covariance of this vector. Given  $\underline{N}_s$  additional advantage is taken from the conditional independence of  $p_s$  and  $\mu_s$  (as shown on Figure 21 for the continuous case).

$$\text{Var} \left( \begin{array}{c} \ln(\mu_s) \\ -\mu_s \\ \ln(\rho_s) \\ -\rho_s \end{array} \middle| \underline{\mathbf{N}} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc} -\psi'(a_s') & \frac{1}{b_s'} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{b_s'} & -\frac{a_s'}{b_s'^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \psi'(c_s') - \psi'(c_s' + d_s') & -\psi'(c_s' + d_s') \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(c_s' + d_s') & \psi'(d_s') - \psi'(c_s' + d_s') \end{array} \right)$$

602 and the expectation to obtain  $A_s$  is performed via importance sampling.

To sum it up

$$I_e(\theta) = -\frac{\partial^2 \ln [\underline{\mathbf{Y}}|\theta]}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \quad (\text{G.1})$$

At the maximum likelihood estimator  $\hat{\theta}$ , the following equality occurs :

$$I_e(\hat{\theta}, \underline{\mathbf{Y}}) = S \left( \begin{array}{cccc} -\psi'(\hat{a}) & \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\hat{b}} & -\frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{b}^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\psi'(\hat{c}) + \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) & \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) \\ 0 & 0 & \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) & -\psi'(\hat{d}) + \psi'(\hat{c} + \hat{d}) \end{array} \right) + \sum_{s=1}^S (A_s + B_s) \quad (\text{G.2})$$

with

$$A_s = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(\psi'(a'_s)) & \frac{-1}{b'_s} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-1}{b'_s} & \frac{\mathbb{E}_{N_{s+}|\underline{Y}, \hat{\theta}}(a'_s)}{b'^2_s} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(\psi'(c'_s) - \psi'(c'_s + d'_s)) & -\mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(\psi'(c'_s + d'_s)) \\ 0 & 0 & -\mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(\psi'(c'_s + d'_s)) & \mathbb{E}_{\nu_s}(\psi'(d'_s) - \psi'(c'_s + d'_s)) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$B_s = \text{Var}_{N_{s+}|\hat{\theta}, x} \begin{pmatrix} \psi(a'_s) - \ln(b'_s) \\ -\frac{a'_s}{b'_s} \\ \psi(c'_s) - \psi(c'_s + d'_s) \\ \psi(d'_s) - \psi(c'_s + d'_s) \end{pmatrix}$$

603 where  $a'_s = \hat{a} + N_{s+}$ ,  $b'_s = \hat{b} + D_{s+}$ ,  $c'_s = \hat{c} + N_{s+}$  and  $d'_s = \hat{d} + Y_{s+} - N_{s+}$  ( $b'_s$   
604 is the only term that is not a function of  $N_{s+}$ , thus behaving like a constant with  
605 regards to the  $\text{Var}_{N_{s+}|\hat{\theta}, x}$  operator)

## 606 H. The discrete algorithm

607 If we adapt bluntly from the continuous version, the algorithm would write

- 608 1. Generate  $N_i^{(g)} = 0$  wherever  $y_{i=0}$  for  $i = I - I^+ + 1, \dots, I$ .
2. Generate a value of  $N_+$  according to

$$N_+ \propto \frac{\Gamma(a' + N_+) \Gamma(c' + N_+) \Gamma(d' + Y_+ - N_+) D_+^{N_+}}{(b' + D_+)^{a'+N_+} \prod_{j=1}^{I^+} \Gamma\left(N_+ \frac{Y_j D_j}{(YD)_+}\right)}$$

- 609 3. Generate each  $N_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, I^+$ , so that the vector  $\underline{N}$  is distributed according  
610 to a multivariate hypergeometric Fisher distribution [17] given by

$$[\underline{N}|N_+] = \frac{g(\underline{N}; N_+, \underline{Y}, \underline{D}/D_+)}{K_{N_+}}$$

with

$$g(\underline{N}; N_+, \underline{Y}, \underline{D}) = \prod_{i=I^*+1}^I \binom{Y_j}{N_j} (D_j/D_+)^{N_j},$$

$$K_{N_+} = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} g(\underline{y}; N_+, \underline{Y}, \underline{D}),$$

and

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ \underline{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{I^+} \mid \sum_{i=I^*+1}^I N_i = N_+ \right\}.$$

4. Associate to the vector the weight

$$w^{(g)} = K_{N_+^{(g)}} \prod_{i=I^*}^I \frac{\Gamma\left(N_+^{(g)} \frac{Y_j D_j}{(YD)_+}\right)}{\Gamma(N_j)}.$$

Importance Sampling relying this time on the multivariate hypergeometric distribution seems to stand naturally as the core of the algorithm to evaluate (3.23). But during our first trials, the above adaptation of the continuous version performed very badly, leading to a large variance of the importance weights, i.e. a degeneracy phenomenon that would put the all weight onto a very few contributing particles. In order to put more weight onto particles that have a good chance to efficiently attain the target distribution, a mixture was chosen as the importance distribution for a modified algorithm. The idea is similar in spirit to the auxiliary particle filtering of [20]. More precisely, the first step consists of determining an approximate mean of  $N_{s+}$  in stratum  $s$ , denoted  $N_{s+}^{(ref)}$ . One draws a L-sample of  $N_{s+}$  according to

$$g(N_+) \propto \frac{\Gamma(a' + N_+) \Gamma(c' + N_+) \Gamma(d' + y_+ - N_+) D_+^{N_+}}{\Gamma(b' + D_+)^{a' + N_+} \Gamma(N_+ + 1) \Gamma(N_+) \Gamma(Y_+ - N_+ + 1)}$$

The  $g$  distribution corresponds to the conditional distribution of  $N_+$  given the sum of the data collected in stratum  $s$  but ignoring the individual records.  $N_{s+}^{(ref)}$  is given by the mean over a sample that is

$$N_{s+}^{(ref)} = \frac{1}{L} \sum N_+^{(i)}$$

611 and provides a good estimation of the location of  $N_{s+}$ . As previously we omit the  
 612 index  $s$  to make the reading easier. Subsequently, the following algorithm relies on  
 613 independent but non identically distributed simulations :

- 614 1. Generate  $N_i^{(g)} = 0$  wherever  $y_i = 0$  for  $i = I - I^+ + 1, \dots, I$ .
- 615 2. Draw  $\mu^{(g)} \sim \Gamma(a' + N_+^{(ref)}, b' + D_+)$  and  $p^{(g)} \sim \beta(c' + N_{s+}^{(ref)}, d' + Y_{s+} - N_{s+}^{(ref)})$

3. Given  $\mu^{(g)}$  and  $\rho^{(g)}$ , draw  $N_{sk}^{(g)} \sim [N_{sk} | \mu^{(g)}, p^{(g)}, y_{sk}]$  that is :

$$[N_i^{(g)} = k] = K_i \left( \frac{\mu^{(g)} p^{(g)} D_i}{1 - p^{(g)}} \right)^{N_i} \frac{1}{\Gamma(N_i) \Gamma(Y_i - N_i + 1) \Gamma(N_i + 1)} \mathbb{1}_{\{0 < N_{sk} \leq Y_{si}\}},$$

616

where  $K_i$  denotes the normalizing constant.

4. Compute the weight of each particle  $g$  using

$$w^{(g)} = \prod_{i=1}^{I^+} \frac{\Gamma(N_i + 1)}{K_i (\mu^{(g)} p^{(g)})^{N_i}} \left( \frac{\Gamma(a' + N_{s+}) \Gamma(N_{s+} + c') \Gamma(Y_+ - N_{s+} + d')}{(b' + D_{s+})^{N_{s+}}} \right)$$