

Efficient implementation of median bias reduction with applications to general regression models

E. C. KENNE PAGUI, A. SALVAN and N. SARTORI

Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Padova

eulogeclovis.kennepagui@unipd.it, alessandra.salvan@unipd.it, nicola.sartori@unipd.it

Abstract

In numerous regular statistical models, median bias reduction (Kenne Pagui et al., 2017) has proven to be a noteworthy improvement over maximum likelihood, alternative to mean bias reduction. The estimator is obtained as solution to a modified score equation ensuring smaller asymptotic median bias than the maximum likelihood estimator. This paper provides a simplified algebraic form of the adjustment term for general regular models. With the new formula, the estimation procedure benefits from a considerable computational gain by avoiding multiple summations and thus allows an efficient implementation. More importantly, the new formulation allows to highlight how the median bias reduction adjustment can be obtained by adding an extra term to the mean bias reduction adjustment. Illustrations are provided through new applications of median bias reduction to two regression models not belonging to the generalized linear models class, extended beta regression and beta-binomial regression. Mean bias reduction is also provided here for the latter model. Simulation studies show remarkable componentwise median centering of the median bias reduced estimator, while variability and coverage of related confidence intervals are comparable with those of mean bias reduction. Moreover, empirical results for the beta-binomial model show that the method is successful in solving maximum likelihood boundary estimate problem.

Some key words: Beta-binomial regression; Beta regression; Bias reduction; Boundary estimate; Maximum likelihood; Median unbiasedness; Modified score.

1 Introduction

Consider estimation of a p -dimensional parameter θ in a regular parametric model based on a sample of size n . With moderate information, the maximum likelihood estimator can be highly inaccurate. Several proposals have been developed to correct the estimate or the estimating function, with the latter approach having the advantage of not requiring the finiteness of the maximum likelihood estimate. Adjusted score functions for mean bias reduction were proposed by Firth (1993) and in subsequent papers by Kosmidis and Firth (2009, 2010). Median bias reduction was developed in Kenne Pagui et al. (2017), and is such that each component of the estimator has, to third-order, the same probability of underestimating and overestimating the corresponding parameter component. Both mean and median bias reduction consist of adding a suitable adjustment term to the score function and then solving the resulting adjusted score equation.

While mean bias reduction is tied to a specific parameterization and only equivariance under linear transformations of the parameter is guaranteed, median bias reduction delivers estimators that are exactly invariant in terms of their improved median bias properties under monotone component-wise transformations of the parameters.

The median modified score function proposed by Kenne Pagui et al. (2017) is obtained by adding an adjustment term of order $O(1)$ to the score function. Such adjustment term was expressed in Kenne Pagui et al. (2017) using index notation, which is a tool that allows to write complex formulae in a compact form, but is not necessarily optimal for their implementation. In this paper, we give a new matrix expression of the adjustment term, similar to that of Kosmidis and Firth (2010, Section 3) for mean bias reduction. The benefit is twofold: the new expression allows a more efficient implementation for general parametric models, and it also highlights a general connection between mean and median bias reduction, thus extending results for generalized linear models in Kosmidis et al. (2020).

Illustrations are provided for two regression models not belonging to the generalized linear models class. In particular, in Section 3 the new formulation is applied to double index beta regression, while Section 4 is devoted to beta-binomial regression, where the expression for mean bias reduction is also derived. For both models, R packages are available. All methods are assessed and compared through simulation experiments. The results confirm that the median bias reduced estimator succeeds in achieving component-wise median centering. Moreover, both mean and median bias reduced are empirically found to solve the boundary estimate problem that may arise for maximum likelihood in beta-binomial regression.

2 Median modified score

Let us denote the vector parameter by $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p)^\top$ and a generic component of θ by θ_r . Let $U_r = \partial \ell(\theta) / \partial \theta_r$ ($r = 1, \dots, p$) be the elements of the score vector $U(\theta)$, where $\ell(\theta)$ is the log likelihood function for θ . Let $j(\theta) = -\partial U(\theta) / \partial \theta^\top$ be the observed information matrix and $i(\theta) = E\{j(\theta)\}$ be the Fisher information matrix. We assume that $i(\theta)$ and third-order cumulants of $U(\theta)$ are finite and of order $O(n)$, where n is the sample size or, more generally, an index of information in the data about the model parameters. We denote by i_{rs} a generic entry of $i(\theta)$ and i^{rs} an entry of its inverse, $i(\theta)^{-1}$ ($r, s = 1, \dots, p$). Let $P_r(\theta) = E\{U(\theta)U(\theta)^\top U_r(\theta)\}$ and $Q_r(\theta) = -E\{j(\theta)U_r(\theta)\}$ ($r = 1, \dots, p$) be $p \times p$ matrices of expected values of log likelihood derivatives. Let, in addition, $[C]_r$ be the r th column of matrix C .

The modified score equation proposed by Kenne Pagui et al. (2017, equation (10)) has the form

$$\tilde{U}(\theta) = U(\theta) + \tilde{A}(\theta) = 0, \quad (1)$$

with $\tilde{A}(\theta) = i(\theta)M_1(\theta)$, where $M_1(\theta)$ is an adjustment term of order $O(1)$ which requires multiple summation, whose direct implementation is computationally demanding, especially for large p .

We show that the r -th component of the p -dimensional vector $M_1(\theta)$ can be written as

$$M_{1r} = [i(\theta)^{-1}]_r^\top \left(\frac{1}{2}F_1 - F_{2,r} \right) \quad (r = 1, \dots, p), \quad (2)$$

where F_1 and $F_{2,r}$ are p -dimensional vectors having entries

$$\begin{aligned} F_{1s} &= \text{tr} [i(\theta)^{-1}\{P_s(\theta) + Q_s(\theta)\}], \\ F_{2s,r} &= \text{tr} [h_r(\theta)\{(1/3)P_s(\theta) + (1/2)Q_s(\theta)\}] \quad (s = 1, \dots, p), \end{aligned}$$

with $h_r(\theta) = [i(\theta)^{-1}]_r [i(\theta)^{-1}]_r^\top / i^{rr}(\theta)$ a $p \times p$ matrix.

The main steps for the derivation of (2) are as follows. Let $\nu_{s,t,u} = E(U_s U_t U_u)$ and $\nu_{s,tu} = E(U_s U_{tu})$ ($t, u = 1, \dots, p$), where $U_{tu} = \partial U_t / \partial \theta_u$. In the following, we adopt the Einstein summation convention, i.e., summation is implied over repeated indices a, b, c, d taking values in $\{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{r\}$, with r being any index in $\{1, \dots, p\}$. The Einstein summation convention does not affect the index r . The quantity $M_1(\theta)$ in (1) has r -th component M_r / κ_{2r} with

$$M_r = -\kappa_{1r} + \frac{1}{6} \frac{\kappa_{3r}}{\kappa_{2r}} \quad (r = 1, \dots, p), \quad (3)$$

where κ_{1r}, κ_{2r} and κ_{3r} are terms of order $O(1), O(n)$ and $O(n)$, respectively, and represent the approximate first three cumulants of the profile score for θ_r . These cumulants are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{1r} &= -\frac{1}{2}\nu^{ab}\{(\nu_{r,ab} - \gamma_d^r\nu_{d,ab}) + (\nu_{r,a,b} - \gamma_d^r\nu_{a,b,d})\}, & \kappa_{2r} &= i_{rr} - \gamma_a^r i_{ra}, \\ \kappa_{3r} &= \nu_{r,r,r} - 3\gamma_a^r\nu_{r,r,a} + 3\gamma_a^r\gamma_b^r\nu_{r,a,b} - \gamma_a^r\gamma_b^r\gamma_c^r\nu_{a,b,c},\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_a^r = i_{rb}\nu^{ab}$, with ν^{ab} a generic entry of the inverse of the matrix i with entries i_{ab} . In (3), all quantities are evaluated at θ . Using block matrix inversion of $i(\theta)$, we have $\gamma_a^r = -i^{ra}/i^{rr}$. After some algebra, the cumulants can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{1r} &= -\frac{1}{2}i^{rs}\nu_r^{tu}(\nu_{s,tu} + \nu_{s,t,u})/i^{rr}, & \nu_r^{tu} &= i^{tu} - i^{tr}i^{ru}/i^{rr}, \\ \kappa_{2r} &= 1/i^{rr}, & \kappa_{3r} &= i^{rs}i^{rt}i^{ru}\nu_{s,t,u}/(i^{rr})^3.\end{aligned}$$

In the above, the Einstein summation convention applies to indices s, t, u , taking values in $\{1, \dots, p\}$. Therefore, with some algebra, we can write $M_1(\theta) = K_1(\theta)/2 + K_2(\theta)/6$, where $K_1(\theta)$ and $K_2(\theta)$ are vectors with generic entries

$$K_{1r} = i^{rs}\text{tr}\{\nu_{\theta,r}(P_s(\theta) + Q_s(\theta))\}, \quad K_{2r} = i^{rs}\text{tr}\{h_r(\theta)P_s(\theta)\} \quad (r = 1, \dots, p),$$

where $\nu_{\theta,r} = i(\theta)^{-1} - h_r(\theta)$, with $h_r(\theta) = [i(\theta)^{-1}]_r[i(\theta)^{-1}]_r^\top/i^{rr}$. We note that P_s and Q_s are $p \times p$ matrices with (t, u) entries $\nu_{s,t,u}$ and $\nu_{s,tu}$, respectively. It is then straightforward to see that $M_1(\theta)$ has generic component (2).

Remark 1. The new expression of median bias adjustment based on (2) has already been applied in Kyriakou et al. (2019) in the particular case of normal meta regression models, but its general derivation is given here.

Remark 2. The adjustment term $\tilde{A}(\theta)$ can be written as

$$\tilde{A}(\theta) = A^*(\theta) - i(\theta)\tilde{F}_2,$$

where $A^*(\theta) = (1/2)F_1$, with the vector \tilde{F}_2 having entries $\tilde{F}_{2r} = [i(\theta)^{-1}]_r^\top F_{2,r}$ ($r = 1, \dots, p$). The term $A^*(\theta)$ equals the mean bias adjustment of Firth (1993) as given in Kosmidis and Firth (2010, formula (2.2)). The additional term $-i(\theta)\tilde{F}_2$ is required for median bias reduction. This highlights a general connection between mean and median bias reduction, that was noted for generalized linear models in Kosmidis et al. (2020). Indeed, in such models the general expression of the adjustment term $\tilde{A}(\theta)$ given above simplifies in

the compact form provided by Kosmidis et al. (2020, formula (9)). Details are given in the Appendix.

Remark 3. Letting $\hat{\theta}$ be the maximum likelihood estimate, $\hat{\theta}^*$ the mean bias-reduced estimate of Firth (1993) and $\tilde{\theta}$ the median bias-reduced estimate obtained as a solution of (1), a quasi-Fisher scoring-type algorithm has k th iteration

$$\theta^{(k+1)} = \theta^{(k)} + i^{-1}(\theta^{(k)})B(\theta^{(k)}) + i^{-1}(\theta^{(k)})U(\theta^{(k)}),$$

where $B(\theta)$ can be the null vector, $A^*(\theta)$ or $\tilde{A}(\theta)$, giving as a solution $\hat{\theta}$, $\hat{\theta}^*$ or $\tilde{\theta}$, respectively. In the light of Remark 2 above, the updating term for median bias reduction is the one for mean bias reduction with the additional term $-\tilde{F}_2(\theta^{(k)})$.

3 Double index beta regression

The double index beta regression model was introduced by Smithson and Verkuilen (2006) and Simas et al. (2010) as a generalization of beta regression (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004) in order to account for covariate effects both on the mean and on the precision parameter when modelling continuous rates and proportions. An R implementation of mean bias reduction was developed in Grün et al. (2012), while median bias reduction for the case with constant precision was considered in Kenne Pagui et al. (2017, Example 8). Simulation results in the latter paper show that both mean and median bias reduction have considerable success in achieving the respective goals, for estimation of the precision parameter, as compared to maximum likelihood. On the other hand, all methods show similar accurate behaviour for estimation of mean parameters, with mean and median bias reduction providing nevertheless improved coverage of confidence intervals. Here we extend median bias reduction to the double index case.

Let y_1, \dots, y_n be realizations of independent random variables Y_1, \dots, Y_n , each having a beta distribution with parameters $\phi_i \mu_i$ and $\phi_i(1 - \mu_i)$, i.e. with expected value μ_i and precision parameter ϕ_i . The density of Y_i is

$$f_{Y_i}(y_i; \mu_i, \phi_i) = \frac{\Gamma(\phi_i)}{\Gamma(\mu_i \phi_i) \Gamma\{(1 - \mu_i) \phi_i\}} y_i^{\mu_i \phi_i - 1} (1 - y_i)^{(1 - \mu_i) \phi_i - 1}, \quad (4)$$

where $0 < y_i < 1$, $0 < \mu_i < 1$, $\phi_i > 0$, and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function. Double index beta regression assumes a regression structure both for the expected value $\mu_i = g_1^{-1}(\eta_i)$ and for the precision $\phi_i = g_2^{-1}(\zeta_i)$, where $\eta_i = x_i \beta$ and $\zeta_i = z_i \gamma$, with $x_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})$ and $z_i = (z_{i1}, \dots, z_{iq})$ representing row vectors

of covariates. Above, $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_q)^\top$ are vectors of unknown regression parameters. Additionally, the link functions $g_1(\cdot)$ and $g_2(\cdot)$ are monotonic and should have the mapping property $g_1 : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g_2 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, respectively. Obvious choices for $g_1(\cdot)$ include the logit and probit; and for $g_2(\cdot)$ the log, the square root and the identity, with only the log satisfying the mapping property.

Here $\theta = (\beta^\top, \gamma^\top)^\top$ and the ingredients $P_s(\theta)$ and $Q_s(\theta)$ required for (2) are given in the Appendix. They are obtained along the lines of Grün et al. (2012, Section 2.3), who gave the quantities $P_s(\theta) + Q_s(\theta)$ for mean bias reduction.

We use Monte Carlo simulation to assess the performance of the median bias reduced estimator. For this purpose, we consider a model having a regression structure on both mean and precision, with logit and log link, respectively. In particular, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{\mu_i}{1 - \mu_i} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2}, \\ \log \phi_i &= \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 x_{i1} + \gamma_2 x_{i2} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the x_{i1} are n independent realizations of a standard normal and $x_{i2} = \log u_i$, with u_i generated from a uniform distribution on $(1, 2)$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$). The values of the parameters are $\beta_0 = 1.5$, $\beta_1 = 0.5$, $\beta_2 = 2$, $\gamma_0 = 1.7$, $\gamma_1 = 0.7$ and $\gamma_2 = 3$, chosen so as to have average simulated proportions around 0.9.

The sample sizes considered were $n = 20, 40$ and 60 . For each n , we run 10000 Monte Carlo replications, where the values of the explanatory variables x_{i1} and x_{i2} were held constant throughout the simulations. For each replication, the model was fitted using maximum likelihood, mean bias reduction and median bias reduction. We summarize the simulation results through the estimated percentage probability of underestimation (PU), estimated bias (BIAS), root mean square error (RMSE) and percentage estimated coverage probability of 95% Wald-type confidence intervals (WALD).

The maximum likelihood and mean bias reduced estimates were obtained from the R package `betareg` (Grün et al., 2012), while the median bias-reduced estimates were calculated from the R function `mbrbetareg` (Kenne Pagui and Sartori, 2019).

The results are presented in Table 1. Both median and mean bias reduced estimators are superior to the maximum likelihood estimator. In particular, $\tilde{\theta}$ is effective in median centering, especially for $n = 20, 40$. In terms of mean bias reduction, $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}^*$ are equivalent up to simulation error. The two estimators have comparable coverages of confidence intervals.

Table 1: Simulation results for double index beta regression.

			β_0	β_1	β_2	γ_0	γ_1	γ_2	
$n = 20$	PU	$\hat{\theta}$	45.9	50.5	52.0	31.7	46.9	54.8	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	54.7	49.9	47.2	57.5	49.8	44.5	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	51.3	50.4	49.1	52.6	50.6	47.5	
	BIAS	$\hat{\theta}$	0.07	-0.01	-0.07	0.54	0.03	-0.35	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	-0.04	0.00	0.05	-0.08	-0.01	0.16	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.04	-0.02	0.02	
	RMSE	$\hat{\theta}$	0.51	0.22	0.94	1.15	0.52	2.07	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	0.50	0.21	0.93	0.95	0.45	1.87	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.50	0.21	0.92	0.94	0.45	1.85	
	WALD	$\hat{\theta}$	82.9	82.4	83.3	80.5	79.8	84.0	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	90.3	88.8	90.7	86.7	85.0	86.9	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	89.5	88.5	90.0	87.5	85.1	87.3	
	$n = 40$	PU	$\hat{\theta}$	47.1	50.8	51.1	38.9	44.3	49.5
			$\hat{\theta}^*$	51.7	50.2	49.4	52.8	49.5	48.8
			$\tilde{\theta}$	50.3	50.2	49.9	50.5	49.7	49.0
BIAS		$\hat{\theta}$	0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.17	0.03	0.01	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.03	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02	
RMSE		$\hat{\theta}$	0.29	0.12	0.64	0.55	0.25	1.28	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	0.29	0.12	0.63	0.51	0.23	1.24	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.29	0.12	0.63	0.51	0.23	1.24	
WALD		$\hat{\theta}$	91.0	88.8	90.0	89.3	86.9	89.7	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	93.4	91.6	92.7	91.3	89.8	91.0	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	93.2	91.3	92.4	91.4	89.8	91.0	
$n = 60$		PU	$\hat{\theta}$	47.5	50.6	50.8	41.0	51.9	50.2
			$\hat{\theta}^*$	50.6	48.4	50.1	51.2	47.2	50.3
			$\tilde{\theta}$	49.4	49.0	50.6	49.5	48.5	50.9
	BIAS	$\hat{\theta}$	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.11	-0.02	-0.01	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.01	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.03	0.00	-0.02	
	RMSE	$\hat{\theta}$	0.27	0.12	0.53	0.45	0.23	0.96	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	0.26	0.12	0.53	0.43	0.22	0.94	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.27	0.12	0.53	0.43	0.22	0.94	
	WALD	$\hat{\theta}$	92.4	91.4	92.3	91.7	90.5	92.1	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	93.6	93.0	93.5	93.0	91.2	92.6	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	93.4	92.7	93.3	92.8	91.3	92.7	

Covariate effects on the dispersion parameter are typically expressed in the reparameterization $\exp(\gamma_1)$ and $\exp(\gamma_2)$. Estimated bias of estimators $\exp(\hat{\gamma}_j)$, $\exp(\hat{\gamma}_j^*)$ and $\exp(\tilde{\gamma}_j^*)$ ($j = 1, 2$) are given in Table 2. Bias reduction is not expected to be effective for the transformed estimator $\exp(\hat{\gamma}_j^*)$ and, indeed, in most cases $\exp(\hat{\gamma}_j^*)$ does not show the smallest bias.

Table 2: Estimated bias of estimators $\exp(\hat{\gamma}_j)$, $\exp(\hat{\gamma}_j^*)$ and $\exp(\tilde{\gamma}_j^*)$ in the model (5).

	$n = 20$			$n = 40$			$n = 60$		
	$\hat{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}^*$	$\tilde{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}^*$	$\tilde{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}^*$	$\tilde{\theta}$
$\exp(\gamma_1)$	0.355	0.185	0.166	0.128	0.051	0.050	0.015	0.072	0.055
$\exp(\gamma_2)$	68.505	91.987	75.348	25.734	24.185	23.869	11.190	10.763	10.322

4 Beta-binomial regression

The beta-binomial model is popular for analysing data in form of number of successes in a given number of trials, $y_i \in \{0, \dots, m_i\}$. It is suitable in situations where extra-binomial variability is present. The model is defined by assuming that Y_i conditionally on π_i is binomial with index m_i and success probability π_i and that π_i has a beta distribution with shape parameters α_i and β_i , with $\alpha_i > 0$, $\beta_i > 0$ so that $E(\pi_i) = \mu_i = \alpha_i/(\alpha_i + \beta_i)$, and $Var(\pi_i) = \mu_i(1 - \mu_i)\phi_i$, where $\phi_i = 1/(\alpha_i + \beta_i + 1)$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$). The random variable Y_i is marginally distributed as beta-binomial with mean $E(Y_i) = m_i\mu_i$ and variance $Var(Y_i) = m_i\mu_i(1 - \mu_i)\{1 + \phi_i(m_i - 1)\}$. The probability mass function of Y_i is

$$f_{Y_i}(y_i; \mu_i, \phi_i) = \binom{m_i}{y_i} \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{y_i-1} [(1 - \phi_i)\mu_i + j\phi_i] \prod_{j=0}^{m_i-y_i-1} [(1 - \mu_i)(1 - \phi_i) + j\phi_i]}{\prod_{j=0}^{m_i-1} [(1 - \phi_i) + j\phi_i]}, \quad (6)$$

where $y_i \in \{0, \dots, m_i\}$. We consider a regression structure both for the expected value and for the precision, i.e. $\mu_i = g_1^{-1}(\eta_i)$ and $\phi_i = g_2^{-1}(\zeta_i)$, where $\eta_i = x_i\beta$ and $\zeta_i = z_i\gamma$, with $x_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})$ and $z_i = (z_{i1}, \dots, z_{iq})$ representing row vectors of covariates and $g_1(\cdot)$, $g_2(\cdot)$ suitable link functions. The overall parameter is denoted by $\theta = (\beta^\top, \gamma^\top)^\top$, where $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_q)^\top$ are vectors of unknown regression parameters.

For model (6) we provide here mean and median bias reduction. With constant mean and precision, a bias corrected estimator was developed by Saha and Paul (2005). The quantities required for the calculation of (2) are reported in the Appendix.

As an example, we consider the low-iron rat teratology dataset analysed in Liang and McCullagh (1993) and available in the R package `VGAM`. The goal is to study the effects of dietary regimens on fetal development in laboratory rats. Fifty-eight female rats were put on iron-deficient diets and divided into four groups. Group 1 is the untreated (low-iron) group; group 2 received injections on day 7 or day 10 only; group 3 received injections on days 0 and 7 and group 4 received injections weekly. The rats were made pregnant, sacrificed 3 weeks later, and the total number of fetuses and the number of dead fetuses in each litter were counted along with the level of mother’s hemoglobin. We assume model (6) for the response Y_i in the i th litter, with

$$\log \frac{\mu_i}{1 - \mu_i} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \beta_4 x_{i4}, \quad \phi_i = \phi \quad (i = 1, \dots, 58). \quad (7)$$

The covariates x_{ij} ($j = 1, 2, 3$) are indicator variables for the $(j + 1)$ th group, while x_{i4} is the level of mother’s hemoglobin.

Estimates $\hat{\theta}$, $\hat{\theta}^*$ and $\tilde{\theta}$ of parameters of model (7) are displayed in Table 3, with (d1) corresponding to estimates computed on a subset of the data with litter size less or equal to 11, while (d2) corresponds to estimates obtained with the whole data set. The maximum likelihood estimates are obtained using the function `vglm` from the R package `VGAM`, while mean and median bias-reduced estimates were calculated using the R package `brbetabinomial`, available on GitHub (Kenne Pagui et al., 2019).

Table 3: Low-iron rat teratology data. Estimates (standard errors) of the parameters of model (6). The label (d1) indicates results obtained from the subset of the data with litter size less or equal to 11, while (d2) corresponds to the whole data set.

	(d1)			(d2)		
	$\hat{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}^*$	$\tilde{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}$	$\hat{\theta}^*$	$\tilde{\theta}$
β_0	0.866 (1.130)	0.870 (1.128)	0.882 (1.141)	2.129 (0.847)	2.039 (0.853)	2.055 (0.858)
β_1	-4.144 (1.441)	-3.793 (1.428)	-3.890 (1.449)	-2.440 (0.856)	-2.369 (0.867)	-2.394 (0.872)
β_2	-5.413 (2.070)	-4.803 (1.998)	-4.918 (2.028)	-2.837 (1.354)	-2.662 (1.343)	-2.716 (1.354)
β_3	-6.079 (2.978)	-5.402 (2.921)	-5.548 (2.963)	-2.287 (1.796)	-2.207 (1.809)	-2.244 (1.819)
β_4	0.172 (0.253)	0.151 (0.251)	0.157 (0.254)	-0.169 (0.173)	-0.157 (0.174)	-0.157 (0.175)
ϕ	0.226 (0.087)	0.268 (0.090)	0.269 (0.092)	0.236 (0.059)	0.260 (0.060)	0.261 (0.061)

To assess the properties of the estimators, we performed a simulation study with sample size and covariates as in the the two data sets (d1) and (d2) from the low-iron rat teratology data. For each of the two settings (d1) and (d2), we considered 10000 replications with parameter values equal to the maximum likelihood fit and covariates held fixed at the observed values. For each sample, we calculated the three estimates $\hat{\theta}$, $\hat{\theta}^*$ and $\tilde{\theta}$. Infinite

estimates occurred using maximum likelihood with percentage frequencies 58% for (d1) and 16% for (d2), respectively, so that results for $\hat{\theta}$ should be judged accordingly. For detecting infinite estimates the diagnostics in Lesaffre and Albert (1989) were adapted to the current model.

Table 4: Low-iron rat teratology data. Simulation of size 10^4 of the regression coefficient estimates with constant dispersion parameter under the maximum likelihood fit. The label (d1) indicates results obtained from the subset of the data with litter size less or equal to 11, while (d2) corresponds to the whole data. For maximum likelihood, the bias, root mean squared error and coverage are conditional upon finiteness of the estimates.

			β_0	β_1	β_2	β_3	β_4	ϕ	
(d1)	PU	$\hat{\theta}$	49.4	55.8	63.4	63.5	49.3	66.8	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	49.4	46.2	44.7	45.3	52.3	49.1	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	49.2	49.5	50.1	48.1	51.0	48.1	
	BIAS	$\hat{\theta}$	0.01	-0.32	0.13	-0.12	0.02	-0.04	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	0.01	0.01	0.17	0.12	0.00	0.01	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.01	-0.13	-0.08	-0.10	0.01	0.01	
	RMSE	$\hat{\theta}$	1.26	1.67	2.34	3.34	0.28	0.10	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	1.16	1.50	1.99	2.99	0.26	0.09	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	1.19	1.58	2.08	3.09	0.27	0.09	
	WALD	$\hat{\theta}$	92.4	92.8	93.3	93.3	92.6	81.6	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	94.8	94.8	95.4	95.4	95.0	90.0	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	94.8	94.9	95.6	95.4	94.8	91.2	
	(d2)	PU	$\hat{\theta}$	47.5	52.5	55.2	53.4	51.5	64.3
			$\hat{\theta}^*$	50.7	48.5	47.2	49.3	49.9	50.5
			$\tilde{\theta}$	50.0	49.7	50.0	50.6	49.9	49.7
BIAS		$\hat{\theta}$	0.06	-0.09	0.04	-0.10	-0.01	-0.02	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	-0.01	0.00	0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.00	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.01	-0.03	-0.12	-0.06	0.00	0.00	
RMSE		$\hat{\theta}$	0.89	0.92	1.31	1.89	0.18	0.06	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	0.85	0.87	1.35	1.83	0.17	0.06	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	0.86	0.89	1.48	1.87	0.18	0.06	
WALD		$\hat{\theta}$	93.8	93.7	95.2	94.0	93.7	88.6	
		$\hat{\theta}^*$	95.1	94.8	95.8	95.1	95.2	92.3	
		$\tilde{\theta}$	95.1	94.7	96.0	95.0	95.1	93.2	

The results are presented in Table 4. The estimated bias, root mean

squared error and coverage probability of confidence intervals based on $\hat{\theta}$ are conditional upon its finiteness. Although this favours $\hat{\theta}$, both $\hat{\theta}^*$ and $\tilde{\theta}$ are uniformly better. Especially for small samples (d1), the median bias reduced estimator is superior in achieving median centering, and also in terms of mean bias for some coefficients. In the larger sample sizes setting (d2), both mean and median bias reduced estimators achieve the desired goals and are uniformly preferable to maximum likelihood.

Appendix

$\tilde{A}(\theta)$ for generalized linear models

Let y_1, \dots, y_n be realizations of independent random variables Y_1, \dots, Y_n , each with probability density or mass function of the exponential dispersion family form

$$f_{Y_i}(y; \vartheta_i, \phi) = \exp \left\{ \frac{y\vartheta_i - b(\vartheta_i) - c_1(y)}{\phi/m_i} - \frac{1}{2}a \left(-\frac{m_i}{\phi} \right) + c_2(y) \right\}$$

for some sufficiently smooth functions $b(\cdot)$, $c_1(\cdot)$, $a(\cdot)$ and $c_2(\cdot)$, and fixed observation weights m_1, \dots, m_n . The expected value of Y_i is $E(Y_i) = \mu_i = b'(\vartheta_i)$ and its variance is $Var(Y_i) = \phi b''(\vartheta_i)/m_i = \phi V(\mu_i)/m_i$. Let X be a $n \times p$ model matrix where each column corresponds to a predictor variable. The model matrix X is linked to μ_i through the relation $g(\mu_i) = \eta_i$ with $\eta_i = \sum_{r=1}^p \beta_r x_{ir}$ the linear predictor, where x_{ir} is the (i, r) th element of X , $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$ the regression coefficients and $g(\cdot)$ a monotone link function. For some models, the dispersion parameter, ϕ may also be estimated along with β . We show below that the adjustment term (2) gives, as a special case, the closed form expression obtained in Kosmidis et al. (2020, Section 2.4) for median bias reduction in generalized linear models.

Let $\theta = (\beta^\top, \phi)^\top$ and $i_{\beta\beta}$ and $i_{\phi\phi}$ be the (β, β) and (ϕ, ϕ) blocks of $i(\theta)$. Let $\text{diag}\{\omega_i\}$ denote a diagonal matrix having $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$ as its main diagonal. Let, in addition, 0_p be a p -vector of zeros, 1_p a p -vector of ones and $0_{p \times p}$ a $p \times p$ matrix of zeros. The ingredients needed to calculate the adjustment

term in (2) are as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
i(\beta, \phi) &= \begin{bmatrix} i_{\beta\beta} & 0_p \\ 0_p^\top & i_{\phi\phi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\phi} X^\top W X & 0_p \\ 0_p^\top & \frac{1}{2\phi^4} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 a_i'' \end{bmatrix}, \\
P_s &= \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} X^\top W O_{1s} X & X^\top W O_{2s} 1_n \\ 1_n^\top O_{2s} W X & 0 \end{bmatrix} & (s = 1, \dots, p), \\ \begin{bmatrix} X^\top W X / \phi^2 & 0_p \\ 0_p^\top & \frac{1}{2\phi^6} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^3 a_i''' \end{bmatrix} & (s = p + 1), \end{cases} \\
Q_s &= \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} -X^\top W (O_{1s} - O_{3s}) X & -X^\top W O_{2s} 1_n \\ -1_n^\top O_{2s} W X & 0 \end{bmatrix} & (s = 1, \dots, p), \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0_{p \times p} & 0_p \\ 0_p^\top & -\frac{1}{\phi^5} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 a_i'' \end{bmatrix}, & (s = p + 1), \end{cases} \\
F_{1s} &= \begin{cases} 2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_{is} w_i \xi_i & (s = 1, \dots, p), \\ \frac{p-2}{\phi} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n m_i^3 a_i'''}{\phi^2 \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 a_i''} & (s = p + 1), \end{cases} \\
F_{2s,r} &= \begin{cases} -\sum_{i=1}^n x_{is} \tilde{h}_{r,i} \left(\frac{d_i v_i'}{6v_i} - \frac{d_i'}{2d_i} \right) & (r = 1, \dots, p, s = 1, \dots, p), \\ \frac{1}{3\phi} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{h}_{r,i} & (r = 1, \dots, p, s = p + 1), \\ 0 & (r = p + 1, s = 1, \dots, p), \\ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n m_i^3 a_i'''}{3\phi^2 \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 a_i''} - \frac{1}{\phi} & (r = p + 1, s = p + 1), \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where $W = \text{diag}\{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$, with $w_i = m_i d_i^2 / v_i$. Moreover, $O_{js} = \text{diag}\{o_{js1}, \dots, o_{jsn}\}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$), with $o_{1si} = x_{is} d_i v_i' / (v_i \phi)$, $o_{2si} = x_{is} / \phi^2$ and $o_{3si} = x_{is} d_i' / (d_i \phi)$, $a_i'' = a''(-m_i / \phi)$, $a_i''' = a'''(-m_i / \phi)$, with $a''(e) = d^2 a(e) / de^2$ and $a'''(e) = d^3 a(e) / de^3$, $d_i = d\mu_i / d\eta_i$, $d_i' = d^2 \mu_i / d\eta_i^2$, $v_i = V(\mu_i)$, $v_i' = V'(\mu_i) = dV(\mu_i) / d\mu_i$, $\xi_i = h_i d_i' / (2d_i w_i)$, h_i is the ‘hat’ value for the i th observation, obtained as the i th diagonal element of the matrix

$H = X(X^\top WX)^{-1}X^\top W$, $\tilde{h}_{r,i}$ is the i th diagonal element of $XG_rX^\top W$, with $G_r = [i_{\beta\beta}^{-1}]_r [i_{\beta\beta}^{-1}]_r^\top / (\phi i^{rr})$. Using all the above ingredients in (2), the adjustments for β and ϕ simplify to

$$\tilde{A}_\beta = X^\top W(\xi + Xu) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A}_\phi = \frac{p}{2\phi} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n m_i^3 a_i'''}{6\phi^2 \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 a_i''}, \quad (8)$$

respectively, where $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^\top$ and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_p)^\top$ with

$$u_r = [(X^\top WX)^{-1}]_r^\top X^\top \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{h}_{r,1} \{d_1 v'_1 / (6v_1) - d'_1 / (2d_1)\} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{h}_{r,n} \{d_n v'_n / (6v_n) - d'_n / (2d_n)\} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Expressions in (8) coincide with those in Kosmidis et al. (2020, Section 2.4).

Quantities for median bias reduction in double index beta regression (Section 3).

For the beta regression model (4), the log likelihood function based on n independent observations is

$$\ell(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n [\phi_i(1 - \mu_i)s_i + \phi_i\mu_i t_i + \log \Gamma(\phi_i) - \log \Gamma(\phi_i\mu_i) - \log \Gamma\{\phi_i(1 - \mu_i)\}],$$

where $s_i = \log(1 - y_i)$ and $t_i = \log y_i$. Basic likelihood quantities needed for median bias reduction are the same as those derived by Grün et al. (2012) for bias reduction. For ease of reference, they are given below. The derivatives of the log likelihood with respect to the β and γ are, respectively,

$$U_\beta = X^\top \Phi D_1(\tilde{T} - \tilde{S}) \quad \text{and} \quad U_\gamma = Z^\top D_2\{M(\tilde{T} - \tilde{S}) + \tilde{S}\}, \quad (9)$$

where $\Phi = \text{diag}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}$, $M = \text{diag}\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$, $D_1 = \text{diag}\{d_{1,1}, \dots, d_{1,n}\}$ and $D_2 = \text{diag}\{d_{2,1}, \dots, d_{2,n}\}$, with $d_{1,i} = \partial\mu_i/\partial\eta_i$ and $d_{2,i} = \partial\phi_i/\partial\zeta_i$. The quantities \tilde{T} and \tilde{S} are the vectors of centered sufficient statistics, with i th component $\tilde{T}_i = t_i - E(T_i)$ and $\tilde{S}_i = s_i - E(S_i)$, respectively, where $E(T_i) = \psi^{(0)}(\phi_i\mu_i) - \psi^{(0)}(\phi_i)$ and $E(S_i) = \psi^{(0)}\{\phi_i(1 - \mu_i)\} - \psi^{(0)}(\phi_i)$ with $\psi^{(l)}(a) = \partial^{l+1} \log \Gamma(a) / \partial a^{l+1}$ ($l = 0, 1, \dots, i = 1, \dots, n$). Moreover, X and Z denote the $n \times p$ and $n \times q$ design matrices with i th row x_i and z_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$), respectively. The Fisher information is given by

$$i(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} i_{\beta\beta} & i_{\beta\gamma} \\ i_{\beta\gamma}^\top & i_{\gamma\gamma} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\beta\beta} &= X^\top D_1 \Phi K_2 \Phi D_1 X, \quad i_{\beta\gamma} = X^\top D_1 \Phi (MK_2 - \Psi_1) D_2 Z, \\ i_{\gamma\gamma} &= Z^\top D_2 \{M^2 K_2 + (I_n - 2M)\Psi_1 - \Omega_1\} D_2 Z. \end{aligned}$$

Above, $K_2 = \text{diag}\{\kappa_{2,1}, \dots, \kappa_{2,n}\}$, with $\kappa_{2,i} = \text{Var}(\tilde{t}_i - \tilde{s}_i) = \psi^{(1)}(\phi_i \mu_i) + \psi^{(1)}\{\phi_i(1 - \mu_i)\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), $\Psi_l = \text{diag}\{\psi^{(l)}\{\phi_1(1 - \mu_1)\}, \dots, \psi^{(l)}\{\phi_n(1 - \mu_n)\}\}$, $\Omega_l = \text{diag}\{\psi^{(l)}(\phi_1), \dots, \psi^{(l)}(\phi_n)\}$ ($l = 0, 1, \dots$) and I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

Using the observed information available in Grün et al. (2012, formula (10)), we obtain the quantities involved in (2)

$$P_s = \begin{bmatrix} V_{\beta\beta,s} & V_{\beta\gamma,s} \\ V_{\gamma\beta,s} & V_{\gamma\gamma,s} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_s = \begin{bmatrix} V'_{\beta\beta,s} & V'_{\beta\gamma,s} \\ V'_{\gamma\beta,s} & V'_{\gamma\gamma,s} \end{bmatrix} \quad (s = 1, \dots, p),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\beta\beta,s} &= X^\top \Phi^3 D_1^3 K_3 [X]_s X, \\ V_{\beta\gamma,s} &= V_{\gamma\beta,s}^\top = X^\top \Phi^2 D_1^2 D_2 (MK_3 + \Psi_2) [X]_s Z, \\ V_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top \Phi D_1 D_2^2 (M^2 K_3 + 2M\Psi_2 - \Psi_2) [X]_s Z, \\ V'_{\beta\beta,s} &= X^\top \Phi^2 D_1 D_1' K_2 [X]_s X, \\ V'_{\beta\gamma,s} &= V'_{\gamma\beta,s}^\top = X^\top \Phi D_1^2 D_2 K_2 [X]_s Z, \\ V'_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top \Phi D_1 D_2' (MK_2 - \Psi_1) [X]_s Z, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$P_{p+t} = \begin{bmatrix} W_{\beta\beta,s} & W_{\beta\gamma,s} \\ W_{\gamma\beta,s} & W_{\gamma\gamma,s} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_{p+t} = \begin{bmatrix} W'_{\beta\beta,s} & W'_{\beta\gamma,s} \\ W'_{\gamma\beta,s} & W'_{\gamma\gamma,s} \end{bmatrix} \quad (t = 1, \dots, q),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\beta\beta,s} &= X^\top \Phi^2 D_1^2 D_2 (MK_3 + \Psi_2) [Z]_t X, \\ W_{\beta\gamma,s} &= W_{\gamma\beta,s}^\top = X^\top \Phi D_1 D_2^2 (M^2 K_3 + 2M\Psi_2 - \Psi_2) [Z]_t Z, \\ W_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top D_2^3 \{M^3 K_3 + (3M^2 - 3M + 1_n)\Psi_2 - \Omega_2\} [Z]_t Z, \\ W'_{\beta\beta,s} &= X^\top \Phi D_2 D_1' (MK_2 - \Psi_1) [Z]_t X, \\ W'_{\beta\gamma,s} &= W'_{\gamma\beta,s}^\top = X^\top D_1 D_2^2 (MK_2 - \Psi_1) [Z]_t Z, \\ W'_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top D_2 D_2' (M^2 K_2 + \Psi_1 - 2M\Psi_1 - \Omega_1) [Z]_t Z, \end{aligned}$$

$D_1' = \text{diag}\{d'_{1,1}, \dots, d'_{1,n}\}$, $D_2' = \text{diag}\{d'_{2,1}, \dots, d'_{2,n}\}$, with $d'_{1,i} = \partial^2 \mu_i / \partial \eta_i^2$ and $d'_{2,i} = \partial^2 \phi_i / \partial \zeta_i^2$, $K_3 = \text{diag}\{\kappa_{3,1}, \dots, \kappa_{3,n}\}$, with $\kappa_{3,i} = E\{(\tilde{t}_i - \tilde{s}_i)^3\} =$

$$\psi^{(2)}(\phi_i \mu_i) - \psi^{(2)}\{\phi_i(1 - \mu_i)\} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n).$$

Quantities for mean and median bias reduction in beta-binomial regression (Section 4).

For the beta-binomial model (6), the log likelihood function is

$$\ell(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta; y_i)$$

with

$$\ell(\theta; y_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{y_i-1} \log\{E_{ij}\} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-y_i-1} \log\{F_{ij}\} - \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \log\{G_{ij}\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ij} &= (1 - \phi_i)\mu_i + j\phi_i \\ F_{ij} &= (1 - \mu_i)(1 - \phi_i) + j\phi_i \\ G_{ij} &= (1 - \phi_i) + j\phi_i. \end{aligned}$$

With constant dispersion, $\phi_i = \phi$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), the log likelihood is the same as in Saha and Paul (2005, Appendix A), where, however, $G_{ij} = G_j$ should be equal to $(1 - \phi) + j\phi$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\mu_i} &= \frac{\partial \ell(\theta; y_i)}{\partial \mu_i} = \sum_{j=0}^{y_i-1} \frac{(1 - \phi_i)}{E_{ij}} - \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-y_i-1} \frac{(1 - \phi_i)}{F_{ij}}, \\ U_{\phi_i} &= \frac{\partial \ell(\theta; y_i)}{\partial \phi_i} = \sum_{j=0}^{y_i-1} \frac{(j - \mu_i)}{E_{ij}} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-y_i-1} \frac{(j + \mu_i - 1)}{F_{ij}} - \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \frac{(j - 1)}{G_{ij}}, \\ U_{\mu_i \mu_i} &= \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta; y_i)}{\partial \mu_i^2} = -(1 - \phi_i)^2 \left[\sum_{j=0}^{y_i-1} \frac{1}{E_{ij}^2} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-y_i-1} \frac{1}{F_{ij}^2} \right], \\ U_{\mu_i \phi_i} &= \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta; y_i)}{\partial \mu_i \partial \phi_i} = - \sum_{j=0}^{y_i-1} \frac{j}{E_{ij}^2} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-y_i-1} \frac{j}{F_{ij}^2}, \\ U_{\phi_i \phi_i} &= \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta; y_i)}{\partial \phi_i^2} = - \sum_{j=0}^{y_i-1} \frac{(\mu_i - j)^2}{E_{ij}^2} - \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-y_i-1} \frac{(\mu_i + j - 1)^2}{F_{ij}^2} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \frac{(j - 1)^2}{G_{ij}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The derivatives of the log likelihood function with respect to β and γ are $U_\beta = X^\top D_1^\mu U_\mu$ and $U_\gamma = Z^\top D_1^\phi U_\phi$, respectively, with $U_\mu = (U_{\mu_1}, \dots, U_{\mu_n})^\top$, $U_\phi =$

$(U_{\phi_1}, \dots, U_{\phi_n})^\top$ and $D_1^\mu = \text{diag}\{d_{1,1}^\mu, \dots, d_{1,n}^\mu\}$, $D_1^\phi = \text{diag}\{d_{1,i}^\phi, \dots, d_{1,n}^\phi\}$, where $d_{1,i}^\mu = \partial\mu_i/\partial\eta_{1i}$ and $d_{1,i}^\phi = \partial\mu_i/\partial\eta_{2i}$. The second order partial derivatives are

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta)}{\partial\beta_r \partial\beta_s} &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_{ir} [U_{\mu_i \mu_i} (d_{1,i}^\mu)^2 + U_{\mu_i} d_{2,i}^\mu] x_{is}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta)}{\partial\beta_r \partial\gamma_a} &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_{ir} [U_{\mu_i \phi_i} d_{1,i}^\mu d_{1,i}^\phi] z_{ia}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta)}{\partial\gamma_a \partial\gamma_b} &= \sum_{i=1}^n z_{ia} [U_{\phi_i \phi_i} (d_{1,i}^\phi)^2 + U_{\phi_i} d_{2,i}^\phi] z_{ib},\end{aligned}$$

where $d_{2,i}^\mu = \partial^2 \mu_i / \partial \eta_{1i}^2$ and $d_{2,i}^\phi = \partial^2 \mu_i / \partial \eta_{2i}^2$. The expected Fisher information is given by

$$i(\beta, \gamma) = \begin{bmatrix} i_{\beta\beta} & i_{\beta\gamma} \\ i_{\beta\gamma}^\top & i_{\phi\phi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -X^\top L_1 (D_1^\mu)^2 X & -X^\top L_2 D_1^\mu D_1^\phi Z \\ -Z^\top D_1^\phi D_1^\mu L_2 X & -Z^\top L_3 (D_1^\phi)^2 Z \end{bmatrix},$$

where, for a generic subscript j , we let $L_j = \text{diag}\{L_{j1}, \dots, L_{jn}\}$, and, in the formulae above,

$$L_{1i} = E(U_{\mu_i \mu_i}), \quad L_{2i} = E(U_{\mu_i \phi_i}), \quad L_{3i} = E(U_{\phi_i \phi_i}),$$

with $E(U_{\mu_i \mu_i}) = \sum_{y=0}^{m_i} U_{\mu_i \mu_i}(\theta, y) P(Y_i = y)$. Moreover, we let

$$\begin{aligned}L_{4i} &= E(U_{\mu_i}^3), & L_{5i} &= E(U_{\mu_i}^2 U_{\phi_i}), & L_{6i} &= E(U_{\mu_i} U_{\phi_i}^2), & L_{7i} &= E(U_{\phi_i}^3) \\ L_{8i} &= E(U_{\mu_i \mu_i} U_{\mu_i}), & L_{9i} &= E(U_{\mu_i}^2), & L_{10i} &= E(U_{\mu_i} U_{\mu_i \phi_i}), & L_{11i} &= E(U_{\mu_i} U_{\phi_i \phi_i}), \\ L_{12i} &= E(U_{\mu_i} U_{\phi_i}), & L_{13i} &= E(U_{\phi_i} U_{\mu_i \mu_i}), & L_{14i} &= E(U_{\phi_i} U_{\mu_i \phi_i}), \\ L_{15i} &= E(U_{\phi_i} U_{\phi_i \phi_i}), & L_{16i} &= E(U_{\phi_i}^2).\end{aligned}$$

The further ingredients for the calculation of (2) are

$$P_s = \begin{bmatrix} V_{\beta\beta,s} & V_{\beta\gamma,s} \\ V_{\gamma\beta,s} & V_{\gamma\gamma,s} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_s = \begin{bmatrix} V'_{\beta\beta,s} & V'_{\beta\gamma,s} \\ V'_{\gamma\beta,s} & V'_{\gamma\gamma,s} \end{bmatrix} \quad (s = 1, \dots, p),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}V_{\beta\beta,s} &= X^\top L_4 (D_1^\mu)^3 X_s^D X, & V_{\beta\gamma,s} &= V_{\gamma\beta,s}^\top = X^\top L_5 (D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi X_s^D Z, \\ V_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top L_6 D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2 X_s^D Z, & V'_{\beta\beta,s} &= X^\top [L_8 (D_1^\mu)^3 + L_9 D_1^\mu D_2^\mu] X_s^D X, \\ V'_{\beta\gamma,s} &= (V'_{\gamma\beta,s})^\top = X^\top L_{10} (D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi X_s^D Z, \\ V'_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top [L_{11} D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2 + L_{12} D_1^\mu D_2^\phi] X_s^D Z,\end{aligned}$$

where C_s^D denotes the diagonal matrix having the s -th column of a matrix C as its main diagonal and $D_2^\mu = \text{diag}\{d_{2,1}^\mu, \dots, d_{2,n}^\mu\}$, $D_2^\phi = \text{diag}\{d_{2,i}^\phi, \dots, d_{2,n}^\phi\}$.

Moreover,

$$P_{p+t} = \begin{bmatrix} W_{\beta\beta,t} & W_{\beta\gamma,t} \\ W_{\gamma\beta,t} & W_{\gamma\gamma,t} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_{p+t} = \begin{bmatrix} W'_{\beta\beta,t} & W'_{\beta\gamma,t} \\ W'_{\gamma\beta,t} & W'_{\gamma\gamma,t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (t = 1, \dots, q),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\beta\beta,t} &= X^\top L_5 (D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi Z_t^D X, \quad W_{\beta\gamma,t} = W_{\gamma\beta,t}^\top = X^\top L_6 D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2 Z_t^D Z, \\ W_{\gamma\gamma,t} &= Z^\top L_7 (D_1^\phi)^3 Z_t^D Z, \quad W'_{\beta\beta,t} = X^\top [L_{13} (D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi + L_{12} D_1^\phi D_2^\mu] Z_t^D X, \\ W'_{\beta\gamma,t} &= (W'_{\gamma\beta,t})^\top = X^\top L_{14} D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2 Z_t^D Z, \quad W'_{\gamma\gamma,t} = Z^\top [L_{15} (D_1^\phi)^3 + L_{16} D_1^\phi D_2^\mu] Z_t^D Z, \end{aligned}$$

Further needed simplifications are

$$\begin{aligned} P_s + Q_s &= \begin{bmatrix} V_{\beta\beta,s} + V'_{\beta\beta,s} & V_{\beta\gamma,s} + V'_{\beta\gamma,s} \\ V_{\gamma\beta,s} + V'_{\gamma\beta,s} & V_{\gamma\gamma,s} + V'_{\gamma\gamma,s} \end{bmatrix} \quad (s = 1, \dots, p), \\ P_s/3 + Q_s/2 &= \begin{bmatrix} V_{\beta\beta,s}/3 + V'_{\beta\beta,s}/2 & V_{\beta\gamma,s}/3 + V'_{\beta\gamma,s}/2 \\ V_{\gamma\beta,s}/3 + V'_{\gamma\beta,s}/2 & V_{\gamma\gamma,s}/3 + V'_{\gamma\gamma,s}/2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (s = 1, \dots, p), \\ P_{p+t} + Q_{p+t} &= \begin{bmatrix} W_{\beta\beta,t} + W'_{\beta\beta,t} & W_{\beta\gamma,t} + W'_{\beta\gamma,t} \\ W_{\gamma\beta,t} + W'_{\gamma\beta,t} & W_{\gamma\gamma,t} + W'_{\gamma\gamma,t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (t = 1, \dots, q), \\ P_{p+t}/3 + Q_{p+t}/2 &= \begin{bmatrix} W_{\beta\beta,t}/3 + W'_{\beta\beta,t}/2 & W_{\beta\gamma,t}/3 + W'_{\beta\gamma,t}/2 \\ W_{\gamma\beta,t}/3 + W'_{\gamma\beta,t}/2 & W_{\gamma\gamma,t}/3 + W'_{\gamma\gamma,t}/2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (t = 1, \dots, q), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\beta\beta,s} + V'_{\beta\beta,s} &= X^\top [(L_4 + L_8)(D_1^\mu)^3 + L_9 D_1^\mu D_2^\mu] X_s^D X, \\ V_{\beta\beta,s}/3 + V'_{\beta\beta,s}/2 &= X^\top [(L_4/3 + L_8/3)(D_1^\mu)^3 + L_9 D_1^\mu D_2^\mu/2] X_s^D X, \\ V_{\beta\gamma,s} + V'_{\beta\gamma,s} &= X^\top [(L_5 + L_{10})(D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi] X_s^D Z, \\ V_{\beta\gamma,s}/3 + V'_{\beta\gamma,s}/2 &= X^\top [(L_5/3 + L_{10}/2)(D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi] X_s^D Z, \\ V_{\gamma\gamma,s} + V'_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top [(L_6 + L_{11})D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2 + L_{12} D_1^\mu D_2^\mu] X_s^D Z, \\ V_{\gamma\gamma,s} + V'_{\gamma\gamma,s} &= Z^\top [(L_6/3 + L_{11}/2)D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2 + L_{12} D_1^\mu D_2^\mu/2] X_s^D Z, \\ W_{\beta\beta,t} + W'_{\beta\beta,t} &= X^\top [(L_5 + L_{13})(D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi + L_{12} D_1^\phi D_2^\mu] Z_t^D X, \\ W_{\beta\beta,t}/3 + W'_{\beta\beta,t}/2 &= X^\top [(L_5/3 + L_{13}/2)(D_1^\mu)^2 D_1^\phi + L_{12} D_1^\phi D_2^\mu/2] Z_t^D X, \\ W_{\beta\gamma,t} + W'_{\beta\gamma,t} &= X^\top [(L_6 + L_{14})D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2] Z_t^D Z, \\ W_{\beta\gamma,t}/3 + W'_{\beta\gamma,t}/2 &= X^\top [(L_6/3 + L_{14}/2)D_1^\mu (D_1^\phi)^2] Z_t^D Z, \\ W_{\gamma\gamma,t} + W'_{\gamma\gamma,t} &= Z^\top [(L_7 + L_{15})(D_1^\phi)^3 + L_{16} D_1^\phi D_2^\mu] Z_t^D Z, \\ W_{\gamma\gamma,t}/3 + W'_{\gamma\gamma,t}/2 &= Z^\top [(L_7/3 + L_{15}/2)(D_1^\phi)^3 + L_{16} D_1^\phi D_2^\mu/2] Z_t^D Z, \\ &(s = 1, \dots, p, t = 1, \dots, q). \end{aligned}$$

With constant dispersion, $\phi_i = \phi$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), the above quantities give the expected likelihood quantities in Saha and Paul (2005, Appendix A, p. 3511), where, however, C_{2i} should be equal to $-B_{2i}^{(1,2,0,1)} - B_{1i}^{(1,2,0,1)} + B_{4i}^{(1,2,0,1)} + B_{4i}^{(2,1,1,0)}$ and C_{7i} should be equal to $-B_{2i}^{(1,1,0,0)} - B_{1i}^{(1,1,0,0)} + 2B_{4i}^{(1,1,0,0)}$, with the correction $G_j = (1 - \phi) + j\phi$ in all terms.

A Acknowledgements

Nicola Sartori and Alessandra Salvan were supported by the University of Padova under grant BIRD185955.

References

- Ferrari, S. and F. Cribari-Neto (2004). Beta regression for modelling rates and proportions. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 31, 799–815.
- Firth, D. (1993). Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. *Biometrika* 80, 27–38.
- Grün, B., I. Kosmidis, and A. Zeileis (2012). Extended beta regression in R: Shaken, stirred, mixed, and partitioned. *Journal of Statistical Software* 48, 1–25.
- Kenne Pagui, E. C., A. Salvan, and N. Sartori (2017). Median bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. *Biometrika* 104, 923–938.
- Kenne Pagui, E. C. and N. Sartori (2019). *mrbetareg*. GitHub repository. Available at <https://github.com/eulogepagui/mrbetareg>.
- Kenne Pagui, E. C., N. Sartori, and A. Salvan (2019). *brbetabinomial*. GitHub repository. Available at <https://github.com/eulogepagui/brbetabinomial>.
- Kosmidis, I. and D. Firth (2009). Bias reduction in exponential family non-linear models. *Biometrika* 96, 793–804.
- Kosmidis, I. and D. Firth (2010). A generic algorithm for reducing bias in parametric estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 4, 1097–1112.
- Kosmidis, I., E. C. Kenne Pagui, and N. Sartori (2020). Mean and median bias reduction in generalized linear models. *Statistics and Computing* 30, 43–59.

- Kyriakou, S., I. Kosmidis, and N. Sartori (2019). Median bias reduction in random-effects meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 28, 1622–1636.
- Lesaffre, E. and A. Albert (1989). Partial separation in logistic discrimination. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 51, 109–116.
- Liang, K.-Y. and P. McCullagh (1993). Case studies in binary dispersion. *Biometrics* 49, 623–630.
- Saha, K. K. and S. R. Paul (2005). Bias-corrected maximum likelihood estimator of the intraclass correlation parameter for binary data. *Statistics in Medicine* 24, 3497–3512.
- Simas, A. B., W. Barreto-Souza, and A. V. Rocha (2010). Improved estimators for a general class of beta regression models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 54, 348–366.
- Smithson, M. and J. Verkuilen (2006). A better lemon squeezer? Maximum-likelihood regression with beta-distributed dependent variables. *Psychological Methods* 11, 54–71.