

# The zero & $N$ -inflated binomial distribution with applications

BY JAMES SWEENEY

*School of Business, University College Dublin,  
Dublin 4, Ireland*

james.sweeney@ucd.ie

JOHN HASLETT

*Department of Statistics, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.*

john.haslett@tcd.ie

AND ANDREW C PARNELL

*School of Mathematics & Statistics and Insight Centre for Data Analytics,  
University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland.*

andrew.parnell@ucd.ie

## SUMMARY

In this article we consider the distribution arising when two zero-inflated Poisson count processes are constrained by their sum total, resulting in a novel zero &  $N$ -inflated binomial distribution. This result motivates a general class of model for applications in which a sum-constrained count response is subject to multiple sources of heterogeneity, principally an excess of zeroes and  $N$ 's in the underlying count generating process. Two examples from the ecological regression literature are used to illustrate the wide applicability of the proposed model, and serve to detail its substantial superiority in modelling performance as compared to competing models. We also present an extension to the modelling framework for more complex cases, considering a gender study dataset which is overdispersed relative to the new likelihood, and conclude the article with the description of a general framework for a zero &  $N$ -inflated multinomial distribution.

*Some key words:* Binomial; Excess zeroes; Excess  $N$ 's; Hurdle models; Overdispersion; Presence/absence

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A common feature in research applications involving count data is an excess of zeroes. Numerous applications include: the analysis of adverse reactions to vaccines (Rose et al., 2006), modelling defects in manufacturing (Lambert, 1992), statistical climatology (Haslett et al., 2006), and repeated measures studies in biology (Hall, 2000). Ridout et al. (1998) highlight examples in sexual behaviour and species abundance, and provide a detailed discussion on generating mechanisms for the occurrence of zero-inflated counts as well as suitable modelling frameworks.

More generally, standard exponential family count models such as the Poisson or binomial have difficulty in capturing the extra variability in datasets subject to an excess of zeroes. The use of overdispersed distributions such as the negative binomial fare no better, or are inappropriate, if the extra source of variation in the data is not attributable to an underlying process captured

by the overdispersed parameters of the likelihood. As a result, much work has been carried out on developing a body of models to specifically account for the excess zeroes themselves, leading to the formulation of a class of widely accepted and implemented zero-inflated likelihoods (also known as *hurdle* models) such as the zero-inflated Poisson model of Lambert (1992), and the zero-inflated binomial model of Hall (2000). However, in datasets where the counts are subject to a sum constraint  $N$ , a further frequent feature is their tendency to concurrently contain both an excess of zeroes and  $N$ 's. The count generating mechanism leading to such data is relatively subtle - if two independent count generating processes subject to an excess of zeroes are constrained to a sum total, then the resulting sum constrained process will be subject to an excess of both zeroes and  $N$ 's.

As an illustration of this problem we present two examples. The first concerns data from the Swiss Monitoring bureau of a survey of breeding habits of the Swiss willow tit (Royle & Dorazio, 2008). A geographical region is divided up into 237 quadrants and each visited on three separate occasions during the breeding season. We treat this as a presence/absence problem, where for each visit the quadrant is awarded a 1 if the bird is observed, 0 otherwise, leading to a maximum score of 3 overall. However, as we observe in Fig 1 (a), the dataset exhibits signs of both zero &  $N$ -inflation, which existing zero-inflated models will struggle to deal with. The second example concerns a pollen dataset sourced from Huntley (1993). Pollen counts are available for a number of plant taxa at 61 sites, with the pollen counts separated into the categories of either warmer or cooler climate-preferring types. Figure 1 (b) illustrates that the data exhibit signs of both zero &  $N$ -inflation; this is clearly seen via a histogram of the cooler pollen proportions, which exhibit an excess of observations at 0% and 100%. Neither the standard binomial model nor a zero-inflated model will be able to account for the additional source of variance in the counts due to the excess of  $N$ 's, as will be explicitly seen in Section 4.1.




Fig. 1: (a) Willow tit dataset of Royle & Dorazio (2008) and (b) Pollen dataset of Huntley (1993)

We structure the article as follows, in Section 2.1 we detail the origins of a novel zero &  $N$ -inflated binomial likelihood in the zero-inflated Poisson count setting, and in Section 2.2 present the moments of the distribution. In Section 2.3 we detail that a specific submodel of the proposed likelihood is the well known asymmetric zero-inflated binomial distribution of Hall (2000), and identify where the utilisation of this likelihood can lead to issues of consistency in model outputs. In Section 2.4 we propose a number of options for linking the zero &  $N$ -inflation probabilities

to underlying model covariates, outlining methods of inference in Section 3. In Section 4 we illustrate the superiority of the developed methodology via its application in a number of data studies and detail an overdispersed version of the likelihood. Finally, in Section 5 we conclude the article with the description of a zero &  $N$ -inflated multinomial equivalent.

## 2. BASIC FORMULATION, MOMENTS & PARAMETERISATION

### 2.1. The zero & $N$ -inflated binomial likelihood

Suppose that  $Y_1 + Y_2 = N$ , where both  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are counts which independently arise from two separate zero-inflated Poisson processes (Lambert, 1992), i.e.  $Y_1 \sim \text{ZIP}(\mu_{Y_1}, q_{Y_1})$  and  $Y_2 \sim \text{ZIP}(\mu_{Y_2}, q_{Y_2})$  such that:

$$Y_1 \sim \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } (1 - q_{Y_1}) \\ \text{Poisson}(\mu_{Y_1}) & \text{with probability } q_{Y_1} \end{cases} \quad Y_2 \sim \begin{cases} 0 & \text{w. p. } (1 - q_{Y_2}) \\ \text{Poisson}(\mu_{Y_2}) & \text{w. p. } q_{Y_2} \end{cases}$$

Now  $Y_1 + Y_2 = N$  is a mixture containing four different components:

$$N \sim \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } (1 - q_{Y_1})(1 - q_{Y_2}) \\ \text{Poisson}(\mu_{Y_1}) & \text{with probability } (1 - q_{Y_2})q_{Y_1} \\ \text{Poisson}(\mu_{Y_2}) & \text{with probability } (1 - q_{Y_1})q_{Y_2} \\ \text{Poisson}(\mu_{Y_1} + \mu_{Y_2}) & \text{with probability } q_{Y_1}q_{Y_2} \end{cases}$$

The conditional distribution  $Y_1|N$  is now considered for all possible options. First, for  $Y_1 = 0|N = 0$ ,  $\pi_{Y_1|N}(Y_1 = 0|N = 0) = 1$ . Now, suppose that  $p = \mu_{Y_1}/(\mu_{Y_1} + \mu_{Y_2})$ , namely that the probability parameter for success,  $p$ , in an  $N$  constrained binomial trial, is the rate parameter of the  $Y_1$  process divided by the sum of the rate parameters for the  $Y_1$  &  $Y_2$  processes. Then for  $Y_1 = 0$  and  $N > 0$ :

$$\pi_{Y_1|N}(Y_1 = 0|N) = \frac{(1 - q_{Y_1})q_{Y_2}e^{\mu_{Y_1}}(1 - p)^N + q_{Y_1}q_{Y_2}(1 - p)^N}{(1 - q_{Y_1})q_{Y_2}e^{\mu_{Y_1}}(1 - p)^N + (1 - q_{Y_2})q_{Y_1}e^{\mu_{Y_2}}p^N + q_{Y_1}q_{Y_2}}$$

The next case is when  $N > 0$  and  $Y_1 = N$ :

$$\pi_{Y_1|N}(Y_1 = N|N) = \frac{(1 - q_{Y_2})q_{Y_1}e^{\mu_{Y_2}}p^N + q_{Y_1}q_{Y_2}p^N}{(1 - q_{Y_1})q_{Y_2}e^{\mu_{Y_1}}(1 - p)^N + (1 - q_{Y_2})q_{Y_1}e^{\mu_{Y_2}}p^N + q_{Y_1}q_{Y_2}}$$

The final case is for  $1 < Y_1 < N$  and  $N > 0$ :

$$\pi_{Y_1|N}(Y_1|N) = \binom{N}{Y_1} \frac{q_{Y_1}q_{Y_2}p^{Y_1}(1 - p)^{N - Y_1}}{(1 - q_{Y_1})q_{Y_2}e^{\mu_{Y_1}}(1 - p)^N + (1 - q_{Y_2})q_{Y_1}e^{\mu_{Y_2}}p^N + q_{Y_1}q_{Y_2}}$$

Taken together we obtain a zero &  $N$ -inflated binomial (ZNIB) distribution:

$$Y_1 \sim \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } q_0 \\ N & \text{with probability } q_N \\ \text{bin}(N, p) & \text{with probability } 1 - q_0 - q_N \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where:

$$q_0 = \frac{\left(\frac{1-q_{Y_1}}{q_{Y_1}}\right)e^{\mu_{Y_1}}(1-p)^N}{\left(\frac{1-q_{Y_1}}{q_{Y_1}}\right)e^{\mu_{Y_1}}(1-p)^N + \left(\frac{1-q_{Y_2}}{q_{Y_2}}\right)e^{\mu_{Y_2}}p^N + 1}, \quad q_N = \frac{\left(\frac{1-q_{Y_2}}{q_{Y_2}}\right)e^{\mu_{Y_2}}p^N}{\left(\frac{1-q_{Y_1}}{q_{Y_1}}\right)e^{\mu_{Y_1}}(1-p)^N + \left(\frac{1-q_{Y_2}}{q_{Y_2}}\right)e^{\mu_{Y_2}}p^N + 1}$$

A reparameterisation of  $q_0$  and  $q_N$  in terms of zero/ $N$ -inflation parameters  $\theta_0$  and  $\theta_N$  benefits the notation as well as simplifying inference procedures by imposing  $q_0 + q_N \leq 1 \forall \theta_0, \theta_N \in \mathfrak{R}$ .

$$q_0 = \frac{e^{\theta_0}}{1 + e^{\theta_0} + e^{\theta_N}}, \quad q_N = \frac{e^{\theta_N}}{1 + e^{\theta_0} + e^{\theta_N}}$$

A convenient reformulation of the model in (1) is as a mixture of three binomial distributions  $\{\text{bin}(N, 0), \text{bin}(N, 1), \text{bin}(N, p)\}$  with weights  $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (q_0, q_N, 1 - q_0 - q_N)$  and  $\mathbf{p} = (0, 1, p)$ . The probability mass function can then be written as:

$$\text{pr}(Y = k | \boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \tau_j \text{pr}_j(Y = k | p_j) \quad (2)$$

Here  $\text{pr}_j$  is the probability mass function of the binomial distribution with proportion  $p_j$ .

## 2.2. Moments of the distribution

The reformulation of the likelihood as a mixture of binomial components leads to a simple expression for the moments of the distribution. Let  $(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) = (q_0, q_N, q = 1 - q_0 - q_N)$ . The expected value of each binomial component is  $\mu_0 = 0$ ,  $\mu_N = N$ , and  $\mu' = Np$  resulting in  $\mu = qN[p + q_N/q]$ . It follows that  $(\mu_0 - \mu) = -\mu$ ;  $(\mu' - \mu) = N[p(1 - q) - q_N]$ , and  $(\mu_N - \mu) = N[(1 - qp) - q_N]$ . We note also that for the degenerate first and last components all moments are zero. It follows that the  $j^{\text{th}}$  central moment for the distribution is:

$$E[(X - \mu)^j] = q_0[-\mu]^j + q_N(N[(1 - qp) - q_N])^j + q \sum_k \binom{j}{k} (Np - \mu)^{j-k} m^{(k)}$$

where  $m^{(k)}$  denotes the  $k^{\text{th}}$  central moment for the binomial distribution. Here  $E[Y] = \mu = q_N N + (1 - q_0 - q_N)Np$  and  $\text{Var}(Y) = q_N N^2 + (1 - q_0 - q_N)(Np)(1 - p + Np) - E[Y]^2$ . Further moments can be obtained as necessary.

## 2.3. A specific submodel: the asymmetric zero-inflated binomial distribution of Hall (2000)

We extend the notation to consider a data process  $y_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , with variable sum constraints  $N_i$ . The probability of zero or  $N$ -inflation becomes observation specific, i.e.  $q_0 = q_{0i}$  and  $q_N = q_{Ni}$ . If  $q_{Ni} = 0$  then we obtain the zero-inflated binomial model of Hall (2000):

$$y_i \sim \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } q_{0i} \\ \text{bin}(N_i, p_i) & \text{with probability } 1 - q_{0i} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Given Hall's model (3),  $\text{pr}(y_i = 0) = q_{0i} + (1 - q_{0i})(1 - p_i)^{N_i}$ . However, if the  $y_i$  are also  $N$ -inflated then the  $z_i = N_i - y_i$  will be zero-inflated. Given probability of failure  $1 - p_i$ , if  $y_i = 0$  then  $z_i = N_i$  and Hall's model provides  $\text{pr}(z_i = N_i) = q_{0i}(1 - p_i)^{N_i}$ . Thus, if the zero-inflation present in both  $y_i$  &  $z_i$  is modelled via zero-inflated only likelihoods then  $\text{pr}(y_i = 0) \neq \text{pr}(z_i = N_i)$  and  $\text{pr}(y_i = N_i) \neq \text{pr}(z_i = 0)$ ; parameter inferences given this asymmetric likelihood will depend on the response variable chosen. The primary implications of this result are erroneously inflated  $p_i$  due to the excess  $N_i$ 's, observed in both data applications in Section 4.

#### 2.4. Linking zero & $N$ -inflation probabilities to model covariates

In a *hurdle* model (Mullahy, 1986)  $q_{0i}$  and  $q_{N_i}$  are considered as unknown constant static values, i.e.  $\theta_{0i} = \theta_0$  and  $\theta_{N_i} = \theta_N$ . Such an approach may be appropriate in the biological sciences where the probability of a zero is regarded as constant and independent of model covariates (Ridout et al., 1998). We utilise this approach in the gender study considered in Section 4.3. In problems where the  $q_{0i}$  and  $q_{N_i}$  are considered variable non-static presence/absence indicators for competing species, one approach is to link them to the  $k$  available model covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ik})$ , i.e.  $\theta_{0i} = f(\mathbf{X}_i)$ ,  $\theta_{N_i} = g(\mathbf{X}_i)$ . This provides flexibility in the model framework and recognises the possibility that the mechanisms which determine presence or absence can be different to those that determine abundance (Royle & Dorazio, 2008). If it is reasonable to assume the the probabilities of presence or absence are a direct function of the underlying abundance, they can be linked via a power link function, i.e.  $\theta_{0i} = \log_e(p_i^\alpha) \implies q_{0i} \propto p_i^\alpha$ . This is the approach taken by both Lambert (1992) and Salter-Townshend & Haslett (2012), and in this article, with the benefit of substantially reducing the number of additional model parameters. We defer further discussion of each modelling approach to Section 4.

### 3. PARAMETER ESTIMATION

#### 3.1. Maximum likelihood

Where limited amounts of data are available it can be difficult to separate out the zero-inflated,  $N$ -inflated, and binomial success components, and simple models should be used. In the following we discuss maximum likelihood methods for parameter inference with a focus on the Expectation Maximisation (EM)(Dempster et al., 1977) and Newton-Raphson algorithms. This is due to the relative simplicity in their fitting, as well as their good performance in previous zero-inflated only studies (Hall (2000)).

#### 3.2. $q_{0i}, q_{N_i}$ unrelated to $p_i$

Consider count  $y_i$ , with sum constraint  $N_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where each data point follows a zero &  $N$ -inflated binomial distribution with probabilities of zero &  $N$ -inflation,  $q_{0i}$  and  $q_{N_i}$ , and  $p_i$  is the binomial probability of trial success, i.e.  $y_i \sim \text{ZNIB}(N_i, q_{0i}, q_{N_i}, p_i)$ . Typically we link the zero/ $N$ -inflation and binomial trial probabilities to available covariate information. Here we describe a general model framework for the setting where the  $q_{0i}$  and  $q_{N_i}$  are not functionally related to the underlying probability of trial success  $p_i$ .

The probability mass function is  $\text{pr}(y_i = k | q_{0i}, q_{N_i}, p_i) = I(k = 0)q_{0i} + I(k = N_i)q_{N_i} + (1 - q_{0i} - q_{N_i})\binom{N_i}{k}p_i^k(1 - p_i)^{N_i - k}$ . As per (2), this can be re-expressed as:  $\text{pr}(y_i = k | q_{0i}, q_{N_i}, p_i) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \tau_{ij} \text{pr}_j(y_i = k | p_{ij})$  where  $\{\tau_{i1}, \tau_{i2}, \tau_{i3}\} = \{q_{0i}, q_{N_i}, (1 - q_{0i} - q_{N_i})\}$ ,  $\{p_{i1}, p_{i2}, p_{i3}\} = \{0, 1, p_i\}$  and  $\{\text{pr}_1, \text{pr}_2, \text{pr}_3\} = \{\text{bin}(N_i, 0), \text{bin}(N_i, 1), \text{bin}(N_i, p_i)\}$ . As  $p_{i1}, p_{i2}$  are known we simplify  $p_{i3} = p_i$ . Using the mixture EM formulation of Fraley & Raftery (2002), we introduce indicator variables  $z_{ij}$ , which are 1 if observation  $i$  is in mixture group

$j$  and zero otherwise. The log-likelihood contribution of observation  $y_i$  and indicator variables  $\mathbf{Z}_i = (z_{i1}, z_{i2}, z_{i3})$  is:

$$l(p_i, \tau_{i1}, \tau_{i2} | \mathbf{Z}_i, y_i) = \sum_{j=1}^3 z_{ij} \log(\tau_{ij} \text{pr}_j(y_i | p_{ij}))$$

Inference procedures are simplified by rewriting the  $\tau_{ij}$  as  $(e^{\theta_{0i}}, e^{\theta_{Ni}}, 1)/(1 + e^{\theta_{0i}} + e^{\theta_{Ni}})$  and  $p_i = e^{\theta_i}/(1 + e^{\theta_i})$  resulting in  $l(p_i, \tau_{i1}, \tau_{i2} | \mathbf{Z}_i, y_i) = l(\theta_{0i}, \theta_{Ni}, \theta_i | \mathbf{Z}_i, y_i)$ . Grouping parameters together,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \{\theta_{01}, \dots, \theta_{0n}\}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_N = \{\theta_{N1}, \dots, \theta_{Nn}\}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$ , the log-likelihood with the complete data  $(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y})$  can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N, \boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \{z_{i1}\theta_{0i} + z_{i2}\theta_{Ni} - \log(1 + e^{\theta_{0i}} + e^{\theta_{Ni}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - z_{i1} - z_{i2})(y_i\theta_i - N_i \log(1 + e^{\theta_i}) + \log\binom{N_i}{y_i})\} \quad (4) \\ &= l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}) + l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}) \end{aligned}$$

The log likelihood is easy to maximise because  $l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y})$  and  $l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y})$  can be maximised separately. This suggests that an EM framework for inference will work well here - the  $z_{ij}$  are the missing data in this problem and at the  $r^{\text{th}}$  iteration of the algorithm each are estimated by their conditional expectation given  $y_i, \hat{\tau}_{i1}^{(r)}, \hat{\tau}_{i2}^{(r)}, \hat{p}_i^{(r)}$ , yielding an E-step:

$$\hat{z}_{ij}^{(r+1)} = \frac{\hat{\tau}_{ij}^{(r)} \text{pr}_j(y_i | \hat{p}_{ij}^{(r)})}{\sum_{j=1}^3 \hat{\tau}_{ij}^{(r)} \text{pr}_{ij}(y_i | \hat{p}_{ij}^{(r)})} \quad (5)$$

$l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N, \boldsymbol{\theta} | \hat{\mathbf{Z}}^{(r)}, \mathbf{Y})$  is easily maximised with respect to the  $\{\theta_{0i}, \theta_{Ni}, \theta_i\}$  as it is equal to the log-likelihood for an unweighted multinomial logistic regression of  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^{(r)}$  on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N$ , and separately, the log-likelihood for a weighted log-linear binomial regression of  $\mathbf{Y}$  on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , with weights  $w_i = 1 - \hat{z}_{i1}^{(r)} - \hat{z}_{i2}^{(r)}$ . Computational efficiency can be improved by harnessing existing GLM routines to perform these steps. The iterative process of calculating expectations and maximisations is repeated until convergence is achieved, with convergence of the EM algorithm in this problem following from arguments given in Appendix A.1 in Lambert (1992). A typical simplification of the overparameterised model in (4) is to express the  $\theta_i$  as a function of covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , for example  $\theta_i = \beta^T \mathbf{X}_i$ , and similarly for  $\theta_{0i}, \theta_{Ni}$ . This substantially reduces the number of model parameters, and this approach utilised in the ecological study in Section 4.2.

### 3.3. $q_{0i}, q_{Ni}$ as a function of $p_i$

In applications where the data is scarce, it may no longer be possible to separately model the zero &  $N$ -inflation processes. The typical solution is to express  $q_{0i}, q_{Ni}$  as a function of  $p_i$ , i.e.  $q_{0i} \propto p_i^\alpha$ . As noted by Lambert (1992) the EM algorithm is no longer useful in this setting, as the complete data log-likelihood does not split into simple separate parts which are easily maximised. In such situations the Newton-Raphson algorithm provides an alternative however, and performs well in the example considered in Section 4.1. Our experience in terms of inference procedures tallies with that of Lambert (1992) and Hall (2000) in these types of problems, with both algorithms working well in the examples considered in Section 4.

#### 4. APPLICATIONS

##### 4.1. Modelling pollen production as a function of a climate covariate

The pollen dataset (Huntley, 1993) consists of pollen counts for a number of plant taxa, obtained from the top 10mm of lake sediment, with a measure of local climate,  $GDD5$  (a proxy variable for the length of growing season), also recorded at each site. Our primary interest is the construction of a model relating pollen abundance to local  $GDD5$ , with the 61 available pollen counts separated into the categories of either warmer or cooler climate-preferring types. Let  $\mathbf{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_{61}\}$ , represent the pollen counts of the cooler type,  $\mathbf{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_{61}\}$  the counts of the warmer type, with sum constraints  $\mathbf{N} = \{N_1, \dots, N_{61}\} = \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{Z}$ . Here the  $N_i$  are variable due to the differing number of pollen samples counted at each specific site, typically less than 400, in order to save time in pollen counting. In Fig 2 it appears that the proportion of pollen observed for plants preferring cooler type climates ( $y_i/N_i$ ) declines linearly for increasing  $GDD5$ , save for the occurrence of a large number of zero's and  $N$ 's. We specify a simple logistic-linear model for the proportions ( $y_i/N_i$ ) as a function of  $GDD5$  ( $c_i$ ),  $\text{logit}(p_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 c_i = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i$ . In the absence of further covariates to aid in modelling the zero &  $N$ -inflation we link the probabilities to the underlying count generating process. Here we model  $\theta_{0i} = \log(p_i^{\alpha_0})$  and  $\theta_{Ni} = \log((1 - p_i)^{\alpha_N})$ , with zero &  $N$  specific parameters  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_N$ . This results in zero-inflation probabilities that are a power link of the underlying response, i.e.  $q_{0i} \propto p_i^{\alpha_0}$  and  $q_{Ni} \propto (1 - p_i)^{\alpha_N}$ . The rationale for this modelling choice is that the proportion  $p_i$  of each pollen type is intrinsically related to the the probability of zero occurrence; when  $p_i$  is *large*, the probability ( $\propto (1 - p_i)^{\alpha_N}$ ) of a structural  $N_i$  should be *small* and any observed zeroes are very likely ( $\propto p_i^{\alpha_0}$ ) to be structural zeroes. The final model is:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &\sim \text{ZNIB}(N_i, p_i, q_{0i}, q_{Ni}) \\ \text{logit}(p_i) &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 c_i \\ q_{0i} &\propto p_i^{\alpha_0} \\ q_{Ni} &\propto (1 - p_i)^{\alpha_N} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The log-likelihood for the model in (6) is, up to a constant,

$$\begin{aligned} l(\alpha_0, \alpha_N, \beta_0, \beta_1; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{N}) &\propto \tag{7} \\ &\sum_{y_i=0} \log \left( \frac{e^{\alpha_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i})^{\alpha_0}} + \frac{e^{N_i \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i})^{N_i}} \right) + \sum_{y_i=N_i} \log \left( \frac{1}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i})^{\alpha_N}} + \frac{1}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i})^{N_i}} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{y_i \neq 0, N_i} (N_i - y_i) \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i - N_i \log(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i}) - \sum_{y_i} \log \left( 1 + \frac{e^{\alpha_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i})^{\alpha_0}} + \frac{1}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{C}_i})^{\alpha_N}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $l(\alpha_0, \alpha_N, \beta_0, \beta_1; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{N}) = l(\alpha_N, \alpha_0, -\beta_0, -\beta_1; \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{N})$ , the log-likelihood is invariant to the choice of  $\mathbf{Y}$  or  $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{N} - \mathbf{Y}$  as the response variable. Due to the small number of model parameters  $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_N, \beta_0, \beta_1\}$  a simple Newton-Raphson method is used to explore the parameter space. The algorithm converges quickly for reasonable starting values, indicating that the log likelihood is well behaved in the neighbourhood of the maximum. The maximised parameter values are presented in Table 1, as well as the estimates produced for the ZIB model of Hall (2000) where both  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$  ( $N$ -inflated binomial) are separately modelled as the response.

In Table 1 we observe that the AIC for the ZNIB model is vastly lower than for the best competing models, highlighting its superiority in describing the data generating mechanism. As

Table 1: Maximum likelihood estimates for model parameters  $\pm$  standard errors obtained from the inverse observed information matrix, as well as AIC values for each model. The largest standard error for the estimates of  $\beta_1$  is 0.002.

	<b>ZNIB</b>	<b>ZIB</b>	<b>NIB</b>	<b>binomial</b>
$\log(\alpha_0)$	$-18.18 \pm 950.6$	$-0.667 \pm 0.21$	—	—
$\log(\alpha_N)$	$1.117 \pm 0.29$	—	$0.189 \pm 0.41$	—
$\beta_0$	$110.64 \pm 0.07$	$81.07 \pm 0.06$	$106.29 \pm 0.08$	$175.63 \pm 13.9$
$\beta_1$	$-0.016$	$-0.011$	$-0.015$	$-0.025$
AIC	487.21	1523.09	1506.08	3876

the high *GDD5* site locations should favour the warmer pollen types, the zeroes observed for the warmer pollen counts have a large impact on model fit - this is reflected in the AIC for the *N*-inflated fit of this model being superior to that of the zero-inflated cooler pollen equivalent. More generally, the parameter estimates in Table 1 and predicted proportions in Fig 2 reveal the impact of not simultaneously modelling the excess zero's and *N*'s. Figure 2 (a) displays that the binomial model fit (AIC = 3876) appears to seriously overestimate the magnitude of the slope and the intercept term, as well as containing significant uncertainty in the prediction interval. Conversely, as observed in Fig 2 (b), the ZIB model underestimates the magnitude of these parameters - the excess of *N*'s are not explained by model features resulting in erroneous over prediction of the proportions of the cooler pollen counts. For the *N*-inflated model in Fig 2 (c), the excess zeroes result in an underestimation of the predicted proportions. As we observe in Fig 2 (d), the ZNIB model provides a more natural fit to the data, and consistently smaller uncertainty in proportion prediction.  $\alpha_0$  is approximately zero ( $e^{-18.18}$ ) for the ZNIB model, and weakly identifiable ( $se = 950.6$ ), implying  $q_{0i} \approx 1/(2 + (1 - p_i)^{e^{1.117}})$ . For the optimal parameter estimates, the probability of observing a structural zero decreases with increasing *GDD5*. This result is reasonable - the *GDD5* values are towards the higher end of the range of this covariate, preferred by the warmer plant species, and thus counts should naturally be low. As would be expected, the *N*-inflation probabilities for the cooler pollen counts increase with increasing *GDD5*,  $q_{Ni} \approx (1 - p_i)^{e^{1.117}} / (2 + (1 - p_i)^{e^{1.117}})$ , indicating that the *N*'s observed as a function of increasing *GDD5* are more likely to be structural zeroes for the warmer pollen counts. A final point to note regards the predicted proportions of the cooler pollen produced by the ZNIB model - the parameter inferences produced are consistent irrespective of the choice of *Y* or *Z* as the response variable. Conversely, it is apparent that the inferences obtained by the zero or *N*-inflated models are statistically incompatible, with over prediction of proportions for the ZIB model when *N*-inflation is present and conversely for the *N*-inflated model.

#### 4.2. Modelling the occurrence of Swiss willow tit

The dataset concerns counts of willow tit and is sourced from Table 3.1 in Royle & Dorazio (2008). Each quadrant of a Swiss geographical region is visited three times by observers and a count of 1 awarded on each visit the willow tit is observed; this is similar to a presence/absence type problem where abundance information is typically ignored or unavailable. Complete counts information is available for 193 sites, as well as standardised site values including date, time, elevation and forest cover. As observed in Fig 1 (a), the dataset contains elements of both zero & *N*-inflation with sources of this extra heterogeneity possibly including competing species, unfavourable topography, or other important unknown features of sites uncaptured in the data collection process. Royle & Dorazio (2008) considers each of the site visits as an independent




Fig. 2: (a)-(d) the circles represent the proportion of cooler pollen ( $y_i/N_i$ ) for each recorded  $GDD5$  value. Solid line is the expected proportion of cooler pollen counts and the dashed lines represent 95% bootstrapped uncertainty bounds when a (a) binomial, (b) zero-inflated binomial, (c)  $N$ -inflated binomial or (d) zero &  $N$ -inflated binomial model is fit to the  $y_i$ .

zero-inflated Bernoulli trial, and models the binary count outcomes in this manner. The best fitting model, as judged by AIC, consists of a constant probability of presence with the influential covariates in the zero-inflated probabilities being elevation and forest cover of individual sites. Here we adopt a slightly different approach, considering the sum of the three individual Bernoulli detections as a binomial process with a fixed probability parameter,  $p$ , and  $N = 3$ . As per Royle & Dorazio (2008), our model for the zero-inflation probabilities includes linear effects in both elevation and forest cover, and a quadratic elevation. Due to an absence of other explanatory variables or intuition we assign the same model for the  $N$ -inflation probabilities. Let  $\mathbf{X}_i = \{1, elev_i, elev_i^2, forest_i\}$ . The complete model is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_i &\sim \text{ZNIB}(N = 3, p, q_{0i}, q_{Ni}) \\
 \text{logit}(q_{0i}) &= \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i \\
 \text{logit}(q_{Ni}) &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \mathbf{X}_i
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We utilise the EM scheme outlined in Section 3.2 for parameter optimisation. Here  $\{\tau_{i1}, \tau_{i2}, \tau_{i3}\} = (e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i}, e^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \mathbf{X}_i}, 1) / (1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i} + e^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \mathbf{X}_i})$  and constant  $p = e^\theta / (1 + e^\theta)$ . The complete data log-likelihood can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
l(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \theta | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{N}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \{z_{i1} \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i + z_{i2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \mathbf{X}_i - \log(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i} + e^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \mathbf{X}_i}) \\
&\quad + (1 - z_{i1} - z_{i2})(y_i \theta - N_i \log(1 + e^\theta) + \log \binom{N_i}{y_i})\} \\
&= l(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{N}) + l(\theta | \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{N})
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

In terms of inference, the E step is as in (5), with the M step, as previously, involving an unweighted multinomial logistic regression of the  $\mathbf{Z}^{(r)}$  on  $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ , and a weighted binomial log-linear regression of  $\mathbf{Y}$  on  $\theta$  with weights  $w_i = 1 - z_{i1}^{(r)} - z_{i2}^{(r)}$ . The parameters quickly converge to their optimised values, and are robust to initial starting points; our results are presented in Table 2. For the ZIB model the most statistically relevant parameter in predicting absences is a substantially negative ( $-2 \cdot 487$ ) linear effect for elevation ( $\beta_1$ ). This suggests that the probability of an observed zero being a structural zero decreases for increasing altitude, indicating that the species prefers mid to lower altitude nesting sites. For the ZNIB model increasing elevation is also linked with a reduced probability of an structural zero being observed, with a negative linear elevation effect of  $-1 \cdot 793$ . In terms of the  $N$ -inflated probabilities, there appears to be a strong linear effect ( $\gamma_1 = 1 \cdot 243$ ) for elevation. The positive sign on the linear elevation effect for the  $N$ -inflation aspect of the model indicates that observations of  $N = 3$  for the species for high elevations are most likely to be structural, i.e. due to an absence of other species, or site specific topographical effects, as opposed to being sites more generally preferred by the willow tits. Interestingly, given the incorporation of a specific  $N$ -inflation effect into the model the constant binomial probability of observing the bird in a visit reduces from approximately 80% for the zero-inflated model to around 50%, indicating an over-inflation of observation probabilities. For both models forest cover was not found to substantially impact on presence/absence of the species. This is perhaps due to the elevation covariate acting as a proxy for forest cover - the elevation gradient in Switzerland is severe and this substantially affects vegetation growth. The most compelling argument for the ZNIB model is perhaps via the AIC's for model performance, illustrating its superiority in comparison to a ZIB model. Unsurprisingly the worst performing model is the binomial model due to its great difficulty in accounting for the excess of zeroes and  $N$ 's observed.

#### 4.3. Gender study: the zero & $N$ -inflated beta-binomial distribution

Here we sketch a natural extension of the ZNIB model for situations where the likelihood does not sufficiently capture the variability, additional to the excess of zeroes, in the observed counts. Suppose that  $Y_1 + Y_2 = N$ , where both  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are counts which independently arise from two separate zero-inflated negative binomial processes with matching probability parameter  $p$ , i.e  $Y_1 \sim 0$  with probability  $(1 - q_{Y_1})$  and negative binomial( $r_1, p$ ) with probability  $q_{Y_1}$ , and  $Y_2 \sim 0$  with probability  $(1 - q_{Y_2})$  and negative binomial( $r_2, p$ ) with probability  $q_{Y_2}$ . Generically, if  $Y_1 \sim NB(r_1, p)$  and  $r$  is real, then  $Pr(Y_1 = k) = \frac{\Gamma(k+r_1)}{k! \Gamma(r_1)} p^p (1-p)^{r_1}$ . In terms of the sum constraint:

$$\begin{aligned}
Pr(Y_1 = k | Y_1 + Y_2 = N) &= \frac{\Gamma(k+r_1) \Gamma(N-k+r_2)}{\Gamma(N+r_1+r_2)} \frac{\Gamma(r_1+r_2)}{\Gamma(r_1) \Gamma(r_2)} \frac{N!}{k!(N-k)!} \\
&\sim \text{beta-binomial}(N, r_1, r_2)
\end{aligned}$$

Table 2: Willow tit dataset: maximum likelihood estimates for model parameters  $\pm$  standard errors obtained from the inverse observed information matrix, as well as AIC values for each model.

	<b>ZNIB</b>	<b>ZIB</b>	<b>binomial</b>
$\text{logit}(p)$	$-0.033 \pm 0.204$	$1.423 \pm 0.175$	$-0.895 \pm 0.091$
$\beta_0$	$0.705 \pm 0.370$	$0.266 \pm 0.326$	-
$\beta_1$	$-1.793 \pm 0.445$	$-2.487 \pm 0.373$	-
$\beta_2$	$0.566 \pm 0.606$	$-0.032 \pm 0.507$	-
$\beta_3$	$-0.236 \pm 0.297$	$-0.419 \pm 0.258$	-
$\gamma_0$	$-0.563 \pm 0.452$	-	-
$\gamma_1$	$1.243 \pm 0.518$	-	-
$\gamma_2$	$0.764 \pm 0.633$	-	-
$\gamma_3$	$0.377 \pm 0.353$	-	-
AIC	277.23	297.99	642.32

Thus, sum constrained negative binomial random variables with matching  $p$  follow a beta-binomial distribution. Replacing the Poisson likelihoods in the steps outlined in Section 2.1 with negative binomial likelihoods with matching  $p$ , it is straightforward to show that two sum - constrained zero-inflated negative binomial distributed variables with matching  $p$  follow a zero &  $N$ -inflated beta-binomial distribution (ZNIBB), i.e.

$$Y \sim \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } q_0 \\ N & \text{with probability } q_N \\ \text{beta - binomial}(N, r_1, r_2) & \text{with probability } 1 - q_0 - q_N \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

An illustrative example for application of the new likelihood model is sourced from Table 2.2 in Lindsey (1995), relating to a study in Saxony, Germany, which seeks to identify the number of male children in 53,680 sibships of size 8. Considering each child’s sex determination as independent across parents, the number of male births in each family may be considered as a binomial random variable with constant probability of a male,  $p$ , and number of trials  $N = 8$ . However, as noted by Lindsey (1995), and observed in Table 3, a binomial model fit to the dataset substantially underestimates the number of families with 0, 1, 7 or 8 male children.

This poor performance in the tail regions hints at an excess of variability in the observed counts over that expected by the simple binomial model framework. There are a myriad of sources for this heterogeneity, for example a region specific effect, or genetic effects. In any case, the variability in the dataset implies that the assumption of a constant probability of male births across sibships is an unreasonable one, particularly given the paucity of further explanatory variables. A solution is to model the counts via the beta-binomial likelihood, where in each sibship the probability of a male birth is not fixed but random and modelled via the beta distribution - in Table 3, we observe that this results in an improvement in model prediction but there remains an underestimation of the number of sibships in the extreme tail regions, in particular those families comprised of either 0 or 8 males.

The presence of an excess of sibships with either zero or 8 males indicates that a model which specifically accounts for this occurrence may provide superior predictive performance. In this particular instance we will assume that an excessive presence or absence of males cannot be linked to some underlying covariates, or indeed to the probability of a male birth. This is due to the non-constant probability of a male birth for each family implying that the broad power

law relationship utilised in earlier examples is not appropriate. We utilise the likelihood in (10) with  $N = 8$ , and propose a zero &  $N$ -inflated hurdle model for the number of male births per sibship, where the probability of zero or  $N$ -inflation are fixed parameters to be estimated from the data. Maximum likelihood methods are used to estimate model parameters  $(r_1, r_2, q_0, q_N)$ , with model predictions presented in Table 3. Note for the ZNIBB model that the expected number of 0's attributable to the hurdle process estimated as approximately  $42 \cdot 14$  ( $\hat{q}_0 \approx 0.0008$ ), and the number of 8's attributable to  $N$ -inflation as  $64 \cdot 10$  ( $\hat{q}_N \approx 0 \cdot 0012$ ).

Table 3: Maximum likelihood estimates for the number of males in each category for a sibship of size 8 across all 53,680 families, as well as AIC values for each model fit.

# Males	Obs. Count	binomial	beta-binomial	ZNIBB
0	215	165 · 22	189 · 78	219 · 05
1	1,485	1,401 · 69	1,503 · 16	1,451 · 48
2	5,331	5,202 · 65	5,310 · 82	5,257 · 51
3	10,649	11,034 · 65	10,932 · 30	10,981 · 59
4	14,959	14,627 · 60	14,340 · 87	14,467 · 21
5	11,929	12,409 · 87	12,276 · 00	12,309 · 51
6	6,678	6,580 · 24	6,696 · 72	6,605 · 92
7	2,092	1,993 · 78	2,128 · 54	2,044 · 34
8	342	264 · 30	301 · 80	343 · 41
AIC		191,178	191,144	191,137
Total	$n = 53,680$			

The AIC value of the ZNIBB model is substantially the lowest, with the difference of 7 compared to the beta-binomial highlighting the benefit of incorporating zero and  $N$ -inflated components into the model fit. Both models perform substantially better than binomial model. Though not shown here, the performance of the ZNIB model is approximately equivalent to that of the beta-binomial model as measured on the basis of AIC values.

## 5. DISCUSSION: THE ZERO & $N$ -INFLATED MULTINOMIAL DISTRIBUTION

We conclude the article by noting that the zero &  $N$ -inflated multinomial distribution naturally arises as the distribution of  $k$  zero-inflated Poisson processes conditioned on their sum total. For simplicity, consider the setting  $k = 3$ , i.e three zero-inflated Poisson processes  $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$  are constrained to their sum total  $N$ . In this setting there are seven possible combinations of the zero-inflated processes - any of the  $y_j$  can be  $N$ -inflated with probability  $q_{Nj}$ , zero-inflated with probability  $q_{0j}$ , or alternatively none of the  $y_j = 0$ . The distribution can thus be written as a weighted mixture of multinomial likelihoods. Let  $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} = \{q_{N1}, q_{N2}, q_{N3}, q_{01}, q_{02}, q_{03}\}$ ,  $\mathbf{p} = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ . Say  $q' = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^3 (q_{0j} + q_{Nj})$ . The probability mass function is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) &= q' \text{multinom}(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}) + \sum_{j=1}^3 q_{Nj} \text{multinom}\left(\{y_j, \mathbf{y}_{\neq j}\}, \{1, 0, 0\}\right) + \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^3 q_{0j} \text{multinom}\left(\{y_j, \mathbf{y}_{\neq j}\}, \left\{0, \frac{\mathbf{p}_{\neq j}}{\sum \mathbf{p}_{\neq j}}\right\}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Presentation of a general framework for the  $k$  dimensional setting follows from (2), with the number of distinct terms  $M = \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j}$  increasing exponentially in  $k$ .

$$\text{pr}(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{j=1}^M \tau_j \text{pr}_j(\mathbf{y}|p_1, \dots, p_k) \quad (12)$$

Here  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  is the set of  $(q_1, \dots, q_M)$  and the  $\text{pr}_j$  are multinomial likelihoods of dimension  $k$  with the degenerate versions having (possible multiple) zero probabilities. Rescaling of the non-zero probabilities is required as in (11). In terms of an EM framework for inference on the parameters of (12), the E step will remain simple as before, however, the M step, due to rescaling, will involve the joint maximisation of a series of non-trivial mixtures of weighted multinomial likelihoods. We do not explore this subject further, but include this comment for completeness.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Support of Science Foundation Ireland [11/PI/1027] and the Royal Irish Academy is gratefully acknowledged. Further thanks to Professor Brendan Murphy of the UCD School of Mathematics & Statistics for constructive comments in terms of the final manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- DEMPSTER A. P., LAIRD, N., & RUBIN, D. B. (1977). Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via the EM algorithm (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (Series B)* **39**, 1–38.
- FRALEY, C., RAFTERY, A. (2002). Model-based Clustering, Discriminant Analysis and Density Estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. **97**, 611–631.
- HALL, D. B. (2000). Zero-inflated Poisson and Binomial Regression with Random Effects: A Case Study. *Biometrics* **56**, 1030–1039.
- HASLETT, J., BHATTACHARYA, S., SALTER-TOWNSHEND, M., WILSON, S., ALLEN, J. R. M., HUNTLEY, B. & MITCHELL, F. J. G. (2006). Bayesian palaeoclimate reconstruction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A*. **169(3)**, 1–36.
- HUNTLEY, B. (1993). The Use of Climate Response Surfaces to Reconstruct Palaeoclimate from Quaternary Pollen and Plant Microfossil Data. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Statistical Society* **341**, 215–224.
- LAMBERT, D. (1992). Zero-Inflated Poisson Regression, with an Application to Defects in Manufacturing. *Technometrics* **34**, 1–14.
- LINDSEY, B. G. (1995). *Mixture Models: Theory, Geometry and Applications*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- MULLAHY, J. (1986). Specification and testing of some modified count data models. *Journal of Econometrics* **33**, 341–365.
- RIDOUT, M., DEMETRIO, C. G.B. & HINDE, J. (1998). Models for count data with many zeros. *Proceedings of the International Biometric Conference*. **19**, 179–192.
- ROSE C. E., MARTIN, S. W., WANNEMUEHLER, K. A. & PLIKAYTIS, B. D. (2006). On the use of zero-inflated and hurdle models for modelling vaccine adverse event count data. *J. Biopharm. Stat.* **16(4)**, 463–481.
- ROYLE, J. A. & DORAZIO, R. M. (2008). *Hierarchical Modeling and Inference in Ecology: The Analysis of Data from Populations, Metapopulations and Communities*. Elsevier Academic Press.
- SALTER-TOWNSHEND, M. & HASLETT, J. (2012). Fast Inversion of a flexible regression model for multivariate pollen counts data. *Environmetrics* **23**, 595–605.