

# Constructing likelihood functions for interval-valued random variables

X. Zhang\*, B. Beranger\* and S. A. Sisson\*<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

There is a growing need for flexible methods to analyse interval-valued data, which can provide efficient data representations for very large datasets. However, existing descriptive frameworks to achieve this ignore the process by which interval-valued data are typically constructed; namely by the aggregation of real-valued data generated from some underlying process. In this article we develop the foundations of likelihood based statistical inference for intervals that directly incorporates the underlying data generating procedure into the analysis. That is, it permits the direct fitting of models for the underlying real-valued data given only the interval-valued summaries. This generative approach overcomes several problems associated with existing methods, including the rarely satisfied assumption of within-interval uniformity. The new methods are illustrated by simulated and real data analyses.

Keywords: Aggregate data; Interval-valued data; Likelihood theory; Symbolic data analysis.

## 1 Introduction

As we move inevitably towards a more data-centric society, there is a growing need for the ability to analyse data that are constructed in non-standard forms, rather than represented as continuous points in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  (Billard and Diday 2003). The simplest and most popular of these is interval-valued data.

Interval-valued observations can arise naturally through the data recording process, and essentially result as a way to characterise measurement error or uncertainty of an observation. Examples include blood pressure, which is typically reported as an interval due to the inherent continual changes within an individual (Billard and Diday 2006); data quantisation, such as rounding or truncation, which results in observations being known to lie within some interval (McLachlan and Jones 1988; Vardeman and Lee 2005); and the expression of expert-elicited intervals that contain some quantity of interest (Lin et al. 2017; Fisher et al. 2015), among others.

---

\*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding Author: Email [Scott.Sisson@unsw.edu.au](mailto:Scott.Sisson@unsw.edu.au)

The use of intervals as a summary representation of a collection of classical real-valued data is also rapidly gaining traction. Here the aggregation of a large and complex dataset into a smaller collection of suitably constructed intervals can enable a statistical analysis that would otherwise be computationally unviable (Billard and Diday 2003). Where interest in the outcome of an analysis exists at the level of a group, rather than at an individual level, interval-valued data provide a convenient group-level aggregation device (Neto and Carvalho 2010; Noirhomme-Fraiture and Brito 2011). Similarly, aggregation of individual observations within an interval structure allows for some preservation of privacy for the individual (Domingues et al. 2010).

The earliest systematic study of interval-valued data is in numerical analysis, where Moore (1966) used intervals as a description for imprecise data. Random intervals are also special cases of random sets (Molchanov 2005), the theory of which brings together elements of topology, convex geometry, and probability theory to develop a coherent mathematical framework for their analysis. Matheron (1975) gave the first self-contained development of statistical models for random sets, including central limit theorems and a law of large numbers, and Beresteanu and Molinari (2008) derived these limit theorems specifically for random intervals. In this framework, interval-valued random variables  $[X] = [\underline{X}, \overline{X}] \subset \mathbb{R}$  are modelled as a bivariate real-valued random vector  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ , where  $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$ , using standard inferential techniques. This approach is also used for partially identified models, where the object of economic and statistical interest is a set rather than a point (Beresteanu et al. 2012; Molchanov and Molinari 2014). In probabilistic modelling, Lyashenko (1983) introduced normal random compact convex sets in Euclidean space, and showed that a normal random interval is simply a Gaussian displacement of a fixed closed bounded interval. Sun and Ralescu (2015) subsequently extended this idea to normal hierarchical models for random intervals.

A more popular framework for the analysis of interval-valued data, and one which we focus on here, is symbolic data analysis (Billard and Diday 2006). Symbols can be considered as distributions of real-valued data points in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , such as intervals and histograms, or more general structures including lists. They are typically constructed as the aggregation into summary form of real-valued data within some group, and so the symbol is interpreted as taking values as described by the summary distribution. As a result, symbols have

internal variations and structures which do not exist in real-valued data, and methods for analysing them must account for within-symbol variation in addition to between symbol variation. In practice, the most common form of symbol is the interval or its  $p$ -dimensional extension, the  $p$ -hyper-rectangle. See [Billard and Diday \(2003\)](#), [Billard and Diday \(2006\)](#) and [Noirhomme-Fraiture and Brito \(2011\)](#) for a review of recent results.

While many exploratory and descriptive data analysis techniques for symbolic data have been developed (see e.g. [Billard and Diday 2006](#) for an overview), there is a paucity of results for developing a robust statistical inferential framework for these data. The most significant of these ([Le-Rademacher and Billard 2011](#)) maps the parameterisation of the symbol into a real-valued random vector, and then uses the standard likelihood framework to specify a suitable model. In the random interval setting, this is equivalent to the random set theory approach, which models the interval-valued random variables  $[X] = [\underline{X}, \overline{X}] \subset \mathbb{R}$  by the constrained real-valued random vector  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  or, more commonly, a reparameterisation to the unconstrained interval centre and half-range  $(X_c, X_r) = ((\underline{X} + \overline{X})/2, (\overline{X} - \underline{X})/2)$ , which is then more easily modelled, e.g.  $(X_c, \log X_r) \sim N_2(\mu, \Sigma)$ . This likelihood framework has been used for the analysis of variance ([Brito and Duarte Silva 2012](#)), time series forecasting ([Arroyo et al. 2010](#)) and interval-based regression models ([Xu 2010](#)) among others.

While sensible, by nature the above methods for modelling real-valued random variables only permit descriptive modelling at the level of the real-valued random vector  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$  (or its equivalent for  $p$ -hyper-rectangles). However this descriptive approach completely ignores the data generating procedure commonly assumed and implemented for the construction of observed intervals; namely that the underlying real-valued data are produced from some data generating model  $X_1, \dots, X_m \sim f(x_1, \dots, x_m | \alpha)$ , and the interval is then constructed via some aggregation process, e.g.  $\underline{X} = \min\{X_k\}$  and  $\overline{X} = \max\{X_k\}$ . If interest is then in fitting the underlying data generating model  $f(x_1, \dots, x_m | \alpha)$  for inferential or predictive purposes, while only observing interval-valued data rather than the underlying real-valued dataset, or in having the interpretation of model parameters be independent of the form of the interval construction process, then the above descriptive models will be inadequate. Further, the existing descriptive models for random intervals typically assume that the distribution of latent data points within the interval is uniform. Under the above data

generating procedure, except in specific cases this will almost always be untrue. This assumption is generally accepted as a false in practice, but is typically ignored.

In this article we develop the methodological foundations of statistical models for interval-valued data that are directly constructed from an assumed underlying data generating model  $f(x_1, \dots, x_m | \alpha)$  and a data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$  that maps the space of real-valued data to the space of intervals.

To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first attempt to move beyond the restrictive descriptive models which are prevalent in the literature, and provide an inferential framework that aligns with the generative interval-construction process that is typical in practice. In addition to providing more directly interpretable parameters, it also provides a natural mechanism for departure from the uncomfortable uniformity-within-intervals assumption of descriptive models.

In Section 2, after establishing the containment distribution function,  $F_{[X]}(\cdot)$ , for random intervals  $[X]$  based on the idea of containment functionals (Molchanov 2005), we demonstrate the one-to-one mapping between  $F_{[X]}(\cdot)$  and  $f_{[X]}(\cdot)$ , which is the density function of the bivariate real-valued random vector  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ , thereby lending some support to the current best practice for modelling random intervals. All proofs are provided in the Supporting Information. In Section 3, these results naturally lead to the construction of likelihood functions for generative models that are directly constructed from likelihood functions for the underlying real-valued data. We demonstrate the recovery of existing results on the distribution of the order statistics of a random sample under certain conditions. We are also able to show that a limiting case of the derived generative models results in a valid descriptive model in the sense of Le-Rademacher and Billard (2011), implying that existing descriptive models in fact have a direct interpretation in terms of an underlying generative model.

All results are naturally extended from intervals to  $p$ -hyper-rectangles in Section 4. In Section 5, we contrast the performance of generative and descriptive models for interval-valued random variables on both simulated data, and for a reanalysis of a credit card dataset previously examined by Brito and Duarte Silva (2012). Here we establish that the use of existing descriptive models to analyse interval-valued data constructed under a data generating process (which is typical in practice), can result in misinterpretable and biased parameter estimates, and poorer overall fits to the observed interval-valued data than those

obtained under generative models. We also examine the robustness of the generative model to model and aggregation function mis-specification. Finally, we conclude with a discussion.

## 2 Distributions of Random Intervals

We first investigate the distribution for a random (closed) interval  $[X] = [\underline{X}, \overline{X}]$  defined on the space of  $\mathbb{I} = \{[x, y]: -\infty < x \leq y < +\infty\}$ . The current practice of constructing models for  $[X]$  is by constructing models for the two real-valued random variables  $\underline{X}$  and  $\overline{X}$  with  $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$  (Le-Rademacher and Billard 2011). We term this approach the *descriptive model*.

Throughout this article, we only consider closed intervals (hyper-rectangles). Results for other types of intervals (hyper-rectangles) can be obtained in a similar way. We denote a vector of  $m < \infty$  real-valued random variables by  $X_{1:m} = (X_1, \dots, X_m)'$ , where  $X_k \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , and  $x_k$  is a realisation of  $X_k$ . We can then define a data aggregation function  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{I}$  that maps a vector  $X_{1:m}$  to the space of intervals  $\mathbb{I}$  via  $[X] = \varphi(X_{1:m})$ , so that  $[X]$  is a random (closed) interval. For example, a useful specification for random intervals might construct the bivariate real-valued random variable  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$  from the minimum ( $\underline{X}$ ) and maximum ( $\overline{X}$ ) of the components of  $X_{1:m}$ .

### 2.1 Descriptive models

A descriptive model treats  $[X] = [\underline{X}, \overline{X}]$  as a bivariate real-valued random variable  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$  with  $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$ . We write  $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha) = f(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha)$  as the likelihood function of  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$ , where  $f(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha)$  is a valid density function and  $\alpha$  denotes the parameter vector of interest. Rather than construct models directly on  $(\underline{X}, \overline{X})$  with the awkward constraint  $\underline{X} \leq \overline{X}$ , a simpler approach is to remove this constraint through reparameterisation. For example, defining the interval centre  $X_c = \frac{\underline{X} + \overline{X}}{2}$  and half-range  $X_r = \frac{\overline{X} - \underline{X}}{2}$ , we obtain  $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \overline{x}|\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}g(\frac{\underline{x} + \overline{x}}{2}, \frac{\overline{x} - \underline{x}}{2}|\alpha)$ , where  $g(x_c, x_r|\alpha)$  is a density function for  $X_c$  and  $X_r$ .

Most existing methods to model random intervals (e.g. Arroyo et al. 2010; Le-Rademacher and Billard 2011; Brito and Duarte Silva 2012) can be classified as descriptive models. Their interpretation is simple and they are convenient to use. However, by construction they are only models for interval endpoints, and as a consequence have limitations in providing information about the distribution of the latent data points  $X_{1:m}$ .

In both symbolic data analysis (Billard and Diday 2006) and theory of random sets

(Molchanov 2005), the distribution of  $[X]$  can be uniquely identified by a density function for a bivariate real-valued random variables, i.e.  $f(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  with  $\underline{x} \leq \bar{x}$ .

## 2.2 Containment distribution functions

In the theory of random sets, two types of functionals, the capacity functional and the containment functional, are commonly used to identify a unique distribution for random sets. For random intervals, the capacity functional and the containment functional are  $T_{[X]}([x]) = P([X] \cap [x])$  and  $C_{[X]}^*([x]) = P([X] \subset [x])$ , respectively.

In the present setting, we consider a variant of the containment functional,  $C_{[X]}([x]) = P([X] \subseteq [x])$ , which is more convenient for model construction. Due to its similarity to  $C_{[X]}^*(\cdot)$  in both functionality and interpretation, we still refer to  $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$  as the containment functional throughout this article.

Similar to  $C_{[X]}^*(\cdot)$ , a *containment functional* of a random interval  $[X]$  is a functional  $C_{[X]}: \mathbb{I} \mapsto [0, 1]$  having the following properties:

- i)  $C_{[X]}([\underline{x}, \bar{x}]) \rightarrow 1$ , when  $\underline{x} \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $\bar{x} \rightarrow +\infty$ ;
- ii) If  $[x_1] \supseteq [x_2] \supseteq \dots \supseteq [x_n] \supseteq \dots$  and  $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} [x_n] \in \mathbb{I}$ , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{[X]}([x_n]) = C_{[X]}(\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} [x_n]);$$

- iii) For any  $[x] \subseteq [y]$ ,  $C_{[X]}([x]) \leq C_{[X]}([y])$  and

$$C_{[X]}([y]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{y}, \bar{x}]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{x}, \bar{y}]) + C_{[X]}([x]) \geq 0.$$

However, it is more convenient to work with functions defined on the real plane, so we equivalently define the *containment distribution function* as  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = C_{[X]}([\underline{x}, \bar{x}])$ .

**Definition 1.** The containment distribution function  $F_{[X]}: \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto [0, 1]$  of the random interval  $[X]$  has the following properties:

- i)  $F_{[X]}(-\infty, +\infty) = 1$  and  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = 0$  when  $\underline{x} > \bar{x}$ ;
- ii)  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  is left-continuous in  $\underline{x}$  and right-continuous in  $\bar{x}$ ;
- iii)  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  is non-increasing in  $\underline{x}$ , and non-decreasing in  $\bar{x}$ ;
- iv) For  $\underline{y} \leq \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} \leq \bar{y}$ ,  $F_{[X]}(\underline{y}, \bar{y}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{y}, \bar{x}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{y}) + F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) \geq 0$ .

The containment distribution function of  $[X]$  can be obtained by integration of a valid density function for random intervals.

**Theorem 1.** *Provided that  $f_{[X]}: \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is the density function of a random interval  $[X]$ , the containment distribution function of  $[X]$  can be derived as  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\bar{x}} \int_{\underline{x}}^{\bar{x}} f_{[X]}(\underline{x}', \bar{x}') d\underline{x}' d\bar{x}'$ .*

Conversely, the density function of  $[X]$  can be obtained by differentiation of a containment distribution function.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $F_{[X]}: \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto [0, 1]$  be the containment distribution function of a random interval  $[X]$ . If  $F_{[X]}(\cdot)$  is twice differentiable, then the density function of  $[X]$  is*

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x} \partial \bar{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}). \quad (1)$$

Given the data generating process,  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  can be naturally constructed from the generative framework, where  $[X] = \varphi(X_{1:m})$ , by noting that the two events,  $\{\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$  and  $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\}$ , are equal. If  $\varphi$  is measurable, we may compute the probability of  $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\}$  via  $P(\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x])$ , given the distribution of latent data points  $X_{1:m}$ . Accordingly, the containment distribution function of  $[X]$  can be constructed as

$$F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = P(\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]). \quad (2)$$

Note that  $[X]$  degenerates to a scalar random variable when it only contains a single point, i.e. when  $\underline{X} = \bar{X} = X$ , and so  $P([X] \subseteq [x]) = P(X \in [x])$  identifies the distribution of a univariate real-valued random variable. In the generative framework, a univariate real-valued random variable is produced when either  $m = 1$ , or when  $X_1 = \dots = X_m = X$  for  $m > 1$ . Accordingly, this theory for random intervals is consistent with standard statistical theory. For the following sections we assume that the data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$  is always measurable.

### 2.3 Density functions

We can formally establish the distribution of random intervals by constructing a measurable space of  $\mathbb{I}$ .

**Theorem 3.** *The containment distribution function  $F_{[X]}$  determines a unique distribution of  $[X]$ , such that  $P([X] \subseteq [x]) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  for all  $[x] \in \mathbb{I}$ .*

From the above,  $1 - F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, +\infty)$  and  $F_{[X]}(-\infty, \bar{x})$  are the marginal cumulative distribution functions of the lower bound  $\underline{X}$  and the upper bound  $\bar{X}$ , respectively.

The density function of  $[X]$  is formally defined as the Radon-Nikodym derivative (Durrett 2010) of a probability measure on  $\mathbb{I}$  over the uniform measure as the reference measure, as described in Theorem 2.

Note that a valid density function of  $[X]$  is also a density function for a bivariate real-valued random variable. Being able to express the density function  $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  of the random interval  $[X]$  as the joint density of two real-valued random variables,  $\underline{X}$  and  $\bar{X}$ , justifies those existing (descriptive) methods for modelling random intervals (e.g. Arroyo et al. 2010; Le Rademacher and Billard 2011; Brito and Duarte Silva 2012 – see Section 2.1) that directly specify a joint distribution for  $\underline{X}, \bar{X} | \underline{X} \leq \bar{X}$ , or some reparameterisation that circumvents bounding the parameter space.

### 3 Generative models

One approach for constructing models for  $[X]$  is by constructing models for the two real-valued random variables  $\underline{X}$  and  $\bar{X}$  with  $\underline{X} \leq \bar{X}$ , i.e. descriptive models. While it can describe the structure and variation between intervals, it is unable to model the distribution of latent data points within an interval, as it is simply a model for the interval endpoints. This approach is almost universal in the symbolic data analysis literature. As an alternative we develop the *generative model*, which is constructed directly at the level of the latent data points  $X_{1:m}$  through the data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$ . In the following, we use  $F_{[X]}(\cdot)$  and  $f_{[X]}(\cdot)$  for interval-valued random variables, and  $F(\cdot)$  and  $f(\cdot)$  for real-valued random variables.

A generative model of the random interval may be constructed bottom up from the distribution of latent data points  $X_{1:m}$  and the data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$ , based on (2). Here, the random interval  $[X]$  is constructed from  $X_{1:m}$  and  $\varphi(\cdot)$  via  $[X] = \varphi(X_{1:m})$ . If  $f(x_{1:m}|\alpha)$  is the likelihood function of the  $m$  data points, then from (2) we may form the containment distribution function of  $[X]$  as

$$F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\alpha, m) = \int_A f(x_{1:m}|\alpha) dx_{1:m}, \quad (3)$$

where  $A = \{\varphi(x_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$  denotes the collection of  $x_{1:m}$ , for which the corresponding interval is a subset of or equal to  $[x]$ . If  $\varphi(\cdot)$  is continuous, the containment distribution



function (3) is twice differentiable, and so from (1) its contribution to the likelihood function would be

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\alpha, m) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x} \partial \bar{x}} \int_A f(x_{1:m}|\alpha) dx_{1:m}. \quad (4)$$

Note that containment distribution functions (3) and density functions (4) of generative models contain a parameter  $m$  specifying the number of latent data points within  $[X]$ .

When  $m$  is large, the evaluation of (4) can be challenging as it involves a high dimensional integration. This integration can be simplified in the case where  $X_{1:m}$  is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with  $X_k \sim f(x|\theta)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ . We denote the likelihood function of  $[X]$  with the i.i.d. latent data points by

$$f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x} \partial \bar{x}} \int_A \prod_{k=1}^m f(x_k|\theta) dx_{1:m}, \quad (5)$$

and term it the *i.i.d. generative model*.

In practice, the data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$  will typically depend on the order statistics of the latent data points, so that  $\varphi_{l,u}(x_{1:m}) = [x_{(l)}, x_{(u)}]$ , where  $x_{(l)}$  and  $x_{(u)}$  are respectively the  $l$ -th (lower) and  $u$ -th (upper) order statistics of  $x_{1:m}$ . The region for integration in (3) and (4) then becomes  $A = \{x_{1:m} : \underline{x} \leq x_{(l)} \leq x_{(u)} \leq \bar{x}\}$  – the collection of  $x_{1:m}$  for which the  $l$ -th order statistic is no less than  $\underline{x}$  and the  $u$ -th order statistic is no greater than  $\bar{x}$ . In this case, and for i.i.d. random variables  $X_k \sim f(x|\theta)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , the likelihood function (5) becomes

$$f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m, l, u) = \frac{m!}{(l-1)!(u-l-1)!(m-u)!} [F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{l-1} \\ \times [F(\bar{x}|\theta) - F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{u-l-1} [1 - F(\bar{x}|\theta)]^{m-u} f(\underline{x}|\theta) f(\bar{x}|\theta), \quad (6)$$

where  $F(x|\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^x f(z|\theta) dz$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $X_k$ . That is, (5) reduces to (6), which is the joint likelihood function of the  $l$ -th and  $u$ -th order statistics of  $m$  i.i.d. samples. Consequently, if  $l/(m+1) \rightarrow \underline{p}$  and  $u/(m+1) \rightarrow \bar{p}$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the distribution of  $[X]$  converges to a point mass at  $[Q(\underline{p}; \theta), Q(\bar{p}; \theta)]$ , where  $Q(\cdot; \theta)$  is the quantile function of  $f(x|\theta)$ .

Further simplification is possible when  $[X]$  is constructed from the minimum and maximum values of  $X_{1:m}$  (so that  $l = 1$  and  $u = m$ ). Here  $A = \{x_{1:m} : \underline{x} \leq x_k \leq \bar{x}, k = 1, \dots, m\}$  is a hyper-rectangle in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with identical length in each dimension, and the likelihood func-

tion (6) becomes

$$f_{[X]}^{\star\star}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m) = m(m-1)[F(\bar{x}|\theta) - F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{m-2}f(\underline{x}|\theta)f(\bar{x}|\theta). \quad (7)$$

In this case, if the support of  $f(x|\theta)$  is bounded on  $[a, b]$ , then as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the distribution of  $[X]$  converges to a point mass at  $[a, b]$ . However, if  $f(x|\theta)$  has unbounded support, the distribution of  $[X]$  will diverge to  $(-\infty, +\infty)$ .

From the above we may conclude that for i.i.d. generative models, when  $m$  is large, all interval-valued observations will be similar. As in practice we may expect significant variation in interval-valued observations, even for large  $m$ , this indicates that the usefulness of an i.i.d. model may be restricted to specific settings.

### 3.1 Hierarchical generative models

Evaluating the likelihood function (4) of the generative model for general latent distributions  $f(x_{1:m}|\alpha)$  of latent data points is challenging, except in simplified settings. Here we consider a special class of the generative model for which the latent data points  $X_{1:m}$  are exchangeable. This exchangeability leads to a hierarchical generative model, which can capture both inter- and intra- interval structure and variability.

Suppose that  $X_{1:m}$  are exchangeable, i.e. their joint distribution is invariant to any permutations of  $X_{1:m}$ . From de Finetti's Theorem (Aldous 1985), the distribution of  $X_{1:m}$  may be represented as a mixture, i.e.

$$P(X_{1:m} \in A) = \int P_{\star}^{(m)}(X_{1:m} \in A) \mu_{P_{\star}}(dP_{\star}), \quad (8)$$

where  $\mu_{P_{\star}}$  is the distribution on the space of all probability measures of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $P_{\star}^{(m)} = \prod_m P_{\star}$  is the product measure on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . In other words, all  $X_k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , are i.i.d. from  $P_{\star}$  with  $P_{\star} \sim \mu_{P_{\star}}$ . By recalling from (3) and (4) that  $A = \{\varphi(x_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$ , then the mixture component  $P_{\star}^{(m)}(X_{1:m} \in A)$  equals  $P_{\star}^{(m)}([X] \subseteq [x])$ , which is the containment distribution function for an i.i.d. generative model of  $[X]$ , with  $X_k \sim P_{\star}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$  and the same data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$ . This means that  $P([X] \subseteq [x])$ , which equals  $P(X_{1:m} \in A)$ , may be represented as the mixture of  $P_{\star}^{(m)}([X] \subseteq [x])$  with  $P_{\star} \sim \mu_{P_{\star}}$ , i.e. as a mixture of i.i.d. generative models.

In the following we consider the case when  $P_{\star}$  belongs to some parametric family, so that  $dP_{\star} = f(x|\theta) dx$ . From (8), the joint density function of  $X_{1:m}$  is then given

by the mixture representation  $\int \prod_{k=1}^m f(x_k|\theta)\pi(\theta) d\theta$ , where the mixing distribution  $\pi(\theta)$  may be non-parametric or parametric  $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$  with parameter  $\alpha$ . The resulting containment distribution function of  $[X]$  is then the mixture of  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m)$  given in (3), with  $f(x_{1:m}|\theta) = \prod_{k=1}^m f(x_k|\theta)$ , w.r.t.  $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$ . If  $\varphi(\cdot)$  is continuous, we obtain the likelihood function of such a generative model as

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\alpha, m) = \int f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m)\pi(\theta|\alpha) d\theta, \quad (9)$$

where  $f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m)$  is the likelihood function of i.i.d. generative model (5).

In practice, the latent data points  $X_{1:m}$  may not be exchangeable. However the data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$  may be symmetric. Let  $\Gamma$  be the set of all permutations of the indices from 1 to  $m$ , and  $X_\gamma$  be the latent data points  $X_{1:m}$  permuted according to  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with density function  $f(x_\gamma)$ . As  $\varphi(\cdot)$  is symmetric,  $\varphi(x_\gamma) = \varphi(x_{1:m})$  and thus,  $[X_\gamma] = \varphi(X_\gamma)$  has the same containment distribution function as  $[X]$ . As a result, for the exchangeable random variables defined as  $Y_{1:m} \sim \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} f(X_\gamma)$ ,  $[Y] = \varphi(Y_{1:m})$  has the same containment distribution function as  $[X]$ .

The existence of such  $Y_{1:m}$  implies that when the latent data points  $X_{1:m}$  are aggregated into intervals  $[X]$  by symmetric data aggregation methods, information on the order-related dependence structure will vanish. As a result, it is unnecessary to model the distribution of  $X_{1:m}$  with a more complex dependence structure than exchangeability – modelling the exchangeable  $Y_{1:m}$  will be sufficient.

Accordingly, for random intervals  $[X_1], \dots, [X_n]$ , the generative model (9) can be directly interpreted as the hierarchical model

$$\begin{aligned} [X_i] &= \varphi(X_{i,1:m_i}), \\ X_{i,k} &\sim f(x|\theta_i), \quad k = 1, \dots, m_i, \\ \theta_i &\sim \pi(\theta|\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

with known  $m_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Thus, we term them *hierarchical generative models*. The contribution to the integrated likelihood (9) for the first two terms is given by  $f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i|\theta_i, m_i)$  – the likelihood function of the i.i.d. generative model (5) for the interval-valued observation  $[x_i]$ , with the density function of each (conditionally) i.i.d. latent data points  $X_{i,1:m_i}$  given by  $f(x_{i,k}|\theta_i)$  – and where  $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$  is the mixing distribution for  $\theta_i$  given the parameter  $\alpha$ .

Given such interpretation,  $f(x_{i,k}|\theta_i)$  (or  $\theta_i$ ) is the *local* density function (or parameter) for  $[X_i]$ , while  $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$  (or  $\alpha$ ) is the *global* density function (or parameter) among all intervals. Therefore, the intra-interval structure is described by the local density function and  $m$ , while the inter-interval variability is modelled by the global density function.

As a result, inference on this model permits direct analysis of the underlying distribution of data points  $X_{1:m}$  within each interval  $[X_i]$  and its model parameter  $\theta_i$  – an advantageous property of the generative model over the descriptive model. For example if the global density  $\pi(\theta|\alpha)$  works as the prior distribution, in the Bayesian framework, for the local parameter  $\theta_i$ ,  $\pi(\theta_i|\alpha, [x_i]) \propto f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i|\theta_i, m_i)\pi(\theta_i|\alpha)$  is the posterior distribution of the parameter of the local density  $f(x|\theta_i)$  underlying  $[x_i]$ . Similarly, the posterior predictive distribution of latent data points underlying  $[x_i]$  is directly available as  $\pi(x|\alpha, [x_i]) \propto \int f(x|\theta_i)\pi(\theta_i|\alpha, [x_i]) d\theta_i$ .

### 3.2 Asymptotic properties

Although they are constructed quite distinctly, it is possible to directly relate the descriptive and generative models under specific circumstances. In particular for standard (descriptive) symbolic analysis techniques, when there is no prior knowledge on the distribution of data within an interval, this distribution is commonly assumed to be uniform  $U(a, b)$  with  $a \leq b$  (e.g. [Le-Rademacher and Billard 2011](#)). Let  $I(\underline{x}, \bar{x}: a \leq \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} \leq b)$  be an indicator function of  $\underline{x}$  and  $\bar{x}$ , which equals 1 when  $a \leq \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} \leq b$ , and 0 elsewhere. Defining  $f(x|\theta)$  so that  $X_k \sim U(a, b)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , and constructing  $[X] = \varphi_{1,m}(X_{1:m})$  from the minimum and maximum values of these latent data points, then the density function of  $[X]$  given by (7) becomes

$$f_{[X]}^{**}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|a, b, m) = m(m-1)(\bar{x} - \underline{x})^{m-2}(b-a)^{-m}I(\underline{x}, \bar{x}: a \leq \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} \leq b),$$

which converges to a point mass at  $[a, b]$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  (Section 3). Then, by substituting  $f_{[X]}^{**}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|a, b, m)$  into (9), the hierarchical generative model becomes

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m) = \iint_{\{a \leq \underline{x}, b \geq \bar{x}\}} m(m-1) \frac{(\bar{x} - \underline{x})^{m-2}}{(b-a)^m} \pi(a, b) da db. \quad (10)$$

where  $\pi(a, b)$  describes the inter-interval parameter variability. When  $m$  is large, the following theorem states that this hierarchical generative model converges to  $\pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ , which is a valid descriptive model.

**Theorem 4.** Suppose that  $[X] = \varphi_{1,m}(X_{1:m})$  with  $X_k \sim U(a, b)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , and the global density function  $\pi(a, b)$  is bounded, continuous and equal to 0 when  $a > b$ . Then as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the density function of  $[X]$  (10) converges to  $\pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  pointwise, i.e.

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x} | m) = \pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x}).$$

This result is interesting in that it reveals that descriptive models for  $[X] \sim f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x} | \theta)$  described in Section 2.1 (e.g. Arroyo et al. 2010; Le-Rademacher and Billard 2011; Brito and Duarte Silva 2012) actually possess an underlying and implicit generative structure. Specifically, the sampling process of the descriptive model  $[X] \sim f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = \pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  can be expressed via the generative process

$$\begin{aligned} [X] &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{1,m}(X_{1:m}), \\ X_1, X_2 \dots &\sim U(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star), \\ (\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star) &\sim \pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

That is, to obtain a sample realisation of  $[X]$ , values of lower and upper bound parameters,  $(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star)$ , of local uniform distribution are first drawn from the descriptive model  $\pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ , which in this case is exactly equivalent to the global density for the associated underlying hierarchical generative model. As the resulting infinite collection of latent data points  $X_k \sim U(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star)$  fully identifies the local density, and  $\min\{X_k\} = \underline{X}_\star$ ,  $\max\{X_k\} = \overline{X}_\star$  are sufficient statistics for uniform distributions, the generated interval  $[X]$  is then determined as  $[X] = [\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star]$  with  $(\underline{X}_\star, \overline{X}_\star) \sim \pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ . As a result, there is no loss of information from the data aggregation procedure and the variation of  $[X]$  is completely due to the variation permitted in the distribution of local parameters, which is the global distribution. In this manner, the descriptive model is a special case of and directly interpretable as a particular generative model.

This idea can be extended to a more general class of hierarchical generative models in which the local distribution is only governed by location ( $\mu$ ) and scale ( $\tau > 0$ ) parameters, so that  $X_k \sim f(x | \mu, \tau)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ . Suppose  $\underline{x}$  and  $\bar{x}$  are the  $l$ -th and  $u$ -th order statistics, respectively. The associated values of  $\mu$  and  $\tau$  are available by solving

$$\begin{cases} Q(l/(m+1); \mu, \tau) &= \underline{x} \\ Q(u/(m+1); \mu, \tau) &= \bar{x}, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where  $Q(\cdot; \mu, \tau)$  is the quantile function of  $f(x|\mu, \tau)$ . If a unique solution exists for (11), then  $f(x|\mu, \tau)$  is an *interval-identifiable* local distribution.

We previously discussed that under the order statistic based data aggregation function, the i.i.d. generative model (6) will converge to a point mass as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Similar to Theorem 4, those hierarchical generative models (9) with interval-identifiable local density functions  $f(x|\mu, \tau)$  will also converge to descriptive models.

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose that  $[X] = \varphi_{l,u}(X_{1:m})$  with  $X_k \sim f(x|\mu, \tau)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , where the local density function  $f(x|\mu, \tau)$  is interval-identifiable with location parameter  $\mu$  and scale parameter  $\tau > 0$ . Further suppose that  $l/(m+1) \rightarrow \underline{p} > 0$  and  $u/(m+1) \rightarrow \bar{p} < 1$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , and*

- i) *the global density function  $\pi(\mu, \tau)$  is twice differentiable;*
- ii)  *$f(x|\mu, \tau)$  is positive and continuous in neighbourhoods of  $Q(\underline{p}; \mu, \tau)$  and  $Q(\bar{p}; \mu, \tau)$ ;*
- iii)  *$\iint |f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\mu, \tau, m, l, u)| \pi(\mu, \tau) d\mu d\tau < \infty$  for any  $0 < l < u < m$ .*

*Then as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the density function of  $[X]$  for the hierarchical generative model (9) converges pointwise to*

$$\pi_\star(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = \pi(\mu(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}), \tau(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p})) \times |J(\mu(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}), \tau(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}); \underline{p}, \bar{p})|^{-1},$$

*where  $\mu(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p})$  and  $\tau(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p})$  are the solution of (11) and*

$$J(\mu, \tau; \underline{p}, \bar{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q(\underline{p}|\mu, \tau) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q(\underline{p}|\mu, \tau) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q(\bar{p}|\mu, \tau) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q(\bar{p}|\mu, \tau) \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the specific case where  $f(x|a, b)$  is a  $U[a, b]$  local density function, with quantile function  $Q(p|a, b) = (1-p)a + pb$ , the hierarchical generative model (9) converges to the distribution of

$$[(1-\underline{p})\underline{X}_\star + \underline{p}\bar{X}_\star, (1-\bar{p})\underline{X}_\star + \bar{p}\bar{X}_\star],$$

where  $(\underline{X}_\star, \bar{X}_\star) \sim \pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ .

## 4 Multivariate Models for hyper-rectangles

The  $p$ -dimensional equivalent of the univariate interval-valued random variable  $[X]$  is the random  $p$ -hyper-rectangle, which corresponds to a  $p$ -tuple of random intervals. In specific,

we denote  $[\mathbf{x}] = ([x_1], \dots, [x_p]) \in \mathbb{I}^p$  as a hyper-rectangle in the space of  $p$ -hyper-rectangles, and  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$  as one  $p$ -dimensional latent data point. It is straightforward to extend the previous theory on containment distribution functions and likelihood functions for random intervals (Sections 2 and 3) to random hyper-rectangles.

#### 4.1 Containment distribution functions

Similar to Section 2.1, descriptive models for random  $p$ -hyper-rectangles may be constructed through direct specification of the  $2p$ -dimensional density function  $f_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p)$ . These models are easily constructed and simple to use, but have the same limitations as the descriptive models for random intervals discussed in Section 2.1.

The containment distribution function of  $[\mathbf{X}]$ , denoted  $F_{[\mathbf{X}]}: \mathbb{R}^{2p} \mapsto [0, 1]$ , is a function on the real hyperplane, having similar properties to those described in Definition 1 (not stated here for brevity). The following theorems show the connection between the containment distribution function and the density function for  $[\mathbf{X}]$ .

**Theorem 6.** *Provided that  $f_{[\mathbf{X}]}: \mathbb{R}^{2p} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is the density function of a random  $p$ -hyper-rectangle  $[\mathbf{X}]$ , the containment distribution function can be derived as follows,*

$$F_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p) = \int_{\underline{x}_p}^{\bar{x}_p} \cdots \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\bar{x}_1} f_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}'_1, \bar{x}'_1, \dots, \underline{x}'_p, \bar{x}'_p) d\underline{x}'_1 d\bar{x}'_1 \dots d\underline{x}'_p d\bar{x}'_p.$$

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $F_{[\mathbf{X}]}: \mathbb{R}^{2p} \mapsto [0, 1]$  be the containment distribution function of a random hyper-rectangle  $[\mathbf{X}]$ . If  $F_{[\mathbf{X}]}$  is  $2p$ -times differentiable, then the density function of  $[\mathbf{X}]$  is*

$$f_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p) = (-1)^p \frac{\partial^{2p}}{\partial \underline{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1 \dots \partial \underline{x}_p \partial \bar{x}_p} F_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p). \quad (12)$$

#### 4.2 Generative models

Containment distribution functions and likelihood functions of generative models may be formulated using the same ideas as in (3) and (4). However, due to the necessity of calculating  $2p$ -th order mixed derivatives in (12), although intuitive, the structure of the resulting likelihood functions would be highly complex, even for i.i.d. generative models of random rectangles. The full form of the likelihood function for an i.i.d. generative model in the bivariate case  $[\mathbf{X}] = [X_1] \times [X_2]$  is presented in the Supplementary Information.

The complex form of the likelihood function of an i.i.d. generative model accordingly induces a similarly complex hierarchical generative model. One option to produce more

tractable models is to impose a conditional independent structure within each  $p$ -dimensional latent data point, so that  $\mathbf{x}_k \sim f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_{1:p}) = \prod_{j=1}^p f(x_j|\theta_j)$ . Consequently, each random interval marginal distribution of the  $p$ -hyper-rectangle is conditionally independent of the others, i.e.

$$f_{[\mathbf{X}]}^*(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p | \theta_{1:p}) = \prod_{j=1}^p f_{[X_j]}^*(\underline{x}_j, \bar{x}_j | \theta_j),$$

where  $f_{[X_j]}^*(\underline{x}_j, \bar{x}_j | \theta_j)$  is the likelihood function of the i.i.d. generative model (5) for  $[X_j]$ . Although this choice will result in clear modelling consequences, the resulting likelihood function for the hierarchical generative model

$$f_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p | m, \alpha) = \int \prod_{j=1}^p f_{[X_j]}^*(\underline{x}_j, \bar{x}_j | \theta_j) \pi(\theta_{1:p} | \alpha) d\theta_{1:p} \quad (13)$$

will only then require  $p$  second-order mixed derivatives.

In this scenario, dependencies between the random interval marginal distributions of  $[\mathbf{X}]$ , such as temporal or spatial dependencies, are controlled only by the dependence among local parameters  $\theta_{1:p}$  as introduced by the global distribution  $\pi(\theta_{1:p} | \alpha)$ . As a result, beyond any *a priori* information on the joint distribution of the  $p$ -dimensional latent data points underlying construction of the random interval  $[\mathbf{X}]$  being incorporated within  $\pi(\theta_{1:p} | \alpha)$ , it will be impossible to identify any further dependence based on the observed  $p$ -hyper-rectangles. If this is inadequate for a given analysis, the full multivariate likelihood will need to be derived (see e.g. the Supplementary Information).

## 5 Applications

We illustrate our new models by firstly comparing the performance of the generative models to the existing descriptive models for simulated univariate (random interval) data. We then provide a generative model reanalysis of a real dataset of 5,000 credit card customers, as previously analysed by (Brito and Duarte Silva 2012) using a descriptive model. The size of this dataset does not merit the use of symbolic data methods for its analysis, however it does serve as a useful illustration of the benefits of generative models. We conclude with an examination of the robustness of the generative method to model mis-specification.






Figure 1: (a) Forms of the integrand in (15), with  $m = 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, 100$ , as a function of  $z_i$ , and (b) the negative log likelihood function as a function of  $m$ , when  $\underline{x}_i = -1$ ,  $\bar{x}_i = 1$ ,  $\mu_c = \mu_\tau = 0$  and  $\sigma_c^2 = \sigma_\tau^2 = 1$ .

## 5.1 Simulated data analysis

In order to provide a direct comparison between descriptive and generative models, we construct our observed random intervals under the generative model as  $[x_i] = [\underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i]$ , where  $\underline{x}_i$  and  $\bar{x}_i$  are respectively the observed minimum and maximum values of  $x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im_i}$  under the mixture model

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im_i} &\sim U(c_i - e^{\tau_i}, c_i + e^{\tau_i}), \\ c_i &\sim N(\mu_c, \sigma_c^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_i \sim N(\mu_\tau, \sigma_\tau^2), \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . From Theorem 4, this hierarchical model is asymptotically equivalent (as  $m_i \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $i$ ) to a descriptive model with  $[x_i^*] = [c_i^* - e^{\tau_i^*}, c_i^* + e^{\tau_i^*}]$ , where  $(c_i^*, \tau_i^*)$  follows the same joint distribution as  $(c_i, \tau_i)$ . While in practice random intervals will generally be constructed from different numbers of random samples,  $x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im_i}$  (e.g. see Section 5.2), here we specify  $m_i = m$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In this analysis we will compare the maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) of parameters for both generative and descriptive models obtained using data simulated from each model.

For each random interval  $[x_i]$  under the mixture model, the two-dimensional integration (9), with  $\theta = (c_i, \tau_i)$ , can be reduced to a one-dimensional integration by first integrating out  $c_i$ , and then reparameterising to  $z_i = m(\tau_i - \log \frac{1}{2}(\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i))$ . This leads to the likelihood




Figure 2: Differences between MLEs of the descriptive model and the generative hierarchical model, based on data generated from each model (left column = descriptive model data, right column = generative model data), as a function of  $m = 5, \dots, 100$ , the number of latent data points  $x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}$  in the generative model. Lines indicate the MLE means (solid lines) and 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles (dashed lines) based on 1,000 replicate datasets.

function of a single interval observation  $[x_i]$  given by

$$\int_0^\infty (\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i)^{-2} (m-1) e^{-z_i} \phi(m^{-1} z_i + \log \frac{\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{2}; \mu_\tau, \sigma_\tau^2) \times \\ \{ \Phi(\underline{x}_i + \frac{\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{2} e^{m^{-1} z_i}; \mu_c, \sigma_c^2) - \Phi(\bar{x}_i - \frac{\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{2} e^{m^{-1} z_i}; \mu_c, \sigma_c^2) \} dz_i, \quad (15)$$

where  $\phi$  and  $\Phi$  respectively denote the Gaussian density and distribution function. This form may be quickly and accurately approximated by Gauss-Laguerre quadrature methods (e.g. [Evans and Swartz 2000](#)). The form of the integrand in (15) for varying  $m$  and the resulting negative log-likelihood function is shown in Figure 1 for  $\underline{x}_i = -1$ ,  $\bar{x}_i = 1$ ,  $\mu_c = \mu_\tau = 0$  and  $\sigma_c^2 = \sigma_\tau^2 = 1$ . These plots illustrate the convergence of the generative model to the descriptive model as  $m$  gets large (Theorem 4), with only very minor differences observed for  $m > 30$ , and also suggest (panel (a)) that quadrature integration methods will be accurate with around 20 nodes.

We simulate 1,000 replicate datasets, each comprising  $n = 100$  intervals, from the descriptive model with  $c_i^*, \tau_i^* \sim N(0, 1)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  (i.e.  $\mu_c = \mu_\tau = 0$  and  $\sigma_c^2 = \sigma_\tau^2 = 1$ ). MLEs of the model parameters  $(\mu_c, \mu_\tau, \sigma_c^2, \sigma_\tau^2)$  are obtained from fitting both descriptive and generative models, with the latter assuming a specified number of latent variables,  $m$ . Note that in practice, the number of latent variables,  $m$ , will typically be known (and finite). The first column of Figure 2 illustrates the differences between the resulting descriptive and generative model parameter MLEs (e.g.  $\hat{\mu}_c^{(D)} - \hat{\mu}_c^{(G)}$ , where the superscripts indicate parameters of the descriptive ( $D$ ) and generative ( $G$ ) models), with the solid line indicating the mean and the dotted lines the central 95% interval, computed over the 1,000 replicates.

Firstly, we notice that the difference between the estimates is large for small  $m$ , and becomes gradually smaller as  $m$  increases. This is not surprising as in this model specification, the generative model approaches the descriptive mode as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . However, as both models are identically centred, the mean difference between the location parameter estimates  $\hat{\mu}_c^{(D)}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_c^{(G)}$  is zero, regardless of the number of latent variables.

An obvious area of difference is that the point estimates of the interval half-range (modelled by  $\mu_\tau$ ) are much smaller for the (correct) descriptive model than for the generative model. This occurs as, the expected range of  $x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}$  under a generative model is lower for small  $m$  than it is for large  $m$ . As a result, the generative model will determine that  $\mu_\tau$  should be sufficiently larger for small  $m$  than it would be for large  $m$ , given the same

observed  $[\underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i]$ . That is, if the data are truly generated from the descriptive model, parameters estimated from the generative model are effectively biased for any finite  $m$ , and overestimate the true model parameters, with the magnitude of the bias determined by the assumed value of  $m$ . Of course, this bias can be reduced by setting  $m$  to be large in this case.

The second area of difference is that the estimated variability of the point estimates of interval location and scale ( $\hat{\sigma}_c^2$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_\tau^2$ ) is higher under the descriptive model than under the generative model. This occurs as the generative model assumes that the variability of e.g.  $\frac{x_i + \bar{x}_i}{2}$  comprises both the variability of the latent data  $x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}$  within interval  $i$ , in addition to the variability of interval locations  $c_i$  between intervals. Under the descriptive model, this first source of variability is zero, and therefore  $\hat{\sigma}_c^{2(D)}$  will always be greater than  $\hat{\sigma}_c^{2(G)}$  for finite  $m$ . Similar reasoning explains why  $\hat{\sigma}_\tau^{2(D)}$  is always greater than  $\hat{\sigma}_\tau^{2(G)}$ .

The second column of Figure 2 shows the same output as the first column, but based on data simulated from the generative model with the same parameter settings as before, and for varying (true) numbers of latent data points  $m = 5, \dots, 100$ . The results are similar to before, except critically with the interpretation that the generative model with fixed  $m$  is now correct. This means that, for example, if intervals are constructed using the generative process (which is the most likely scenario in practice) but are then analysed with a descriptive model, the point estimates of interval range ( $\mu_\tau$ ) can be substantially underestimated by assuming  $m \rightarrow \infty$  under the descriptive model, when in fact  $m$  is small and finite. Similarly, the estimates of  $\sigma_c^2$  and  $\sigma_\tau^2$  will always be overestimated when assuming an incorrect descriptive model. These scenarios will obviously be problematic for data analysis in practice.

The takeaway message of this analysis is that it is important to fit the model (descriptive or generative) that matches the interval (or  $p$ -hyper-rectangle) construction process. Failure to do so can result in misinterpretation of model parameters, resulting in severe biases in parameter estimates, which can then detrimentally impact on an analysis. In practice, intervals tend to be constructed from underlying classical data (e.g. see Section 5.2), using a known process and where  $m$  is also known. This implies that the generative model is a more natural construction than the descriptive model, and with parameters that more directly relate to the observed data.




Figure 3: Log income and log credit card debt in thousands of US\$ for 5,000 customers. Panels illustrate rectangle-valued observations constructed from three groups of customers comprising (a)  $m_{i_a} = 5$ , (b)  $m_{i_b} = 28$  and (c)  $m_{i_c} = 56$  individuals. The contours in the last three panels indicate the predictive distributions of individuals for each group conditional on the corresponding rectangle-valued observations, based on the generative model.

While this analysis has assumed uniformity of the generative process (14) in order that the descriptive model is obtained as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , and hence that the parameter estimates between the two models can be directly compared, the same principles of interpretation and bias occur regardless of the generative model. The parameters are simply less directly comparable with each other.

## 5.2 Analysis of credit card data

The data (available in the SPSS package *customer.dbase*) comprise log income and log credit card debt in thousands of US\$ of 5,000 credit card customers. In a previous analysis using descriptive models by Brito and Duarte Silva (2012), these data were aggregated into random bivariate rectangles by stratifying individuals according to gender, age category (18-24, 25-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+ years old), level of education (did not complete high school, high-school degree, some college, college degree, undergraduate degree+), and designation

of primary credit card (none, gold, platinum, other). This leads to 192 non-empty groups, each producing a random rectangle  $[x_{i1}] \times [x_{i2}]$  constructed by the intervals bounded by the minimum and maximum observed values on log income and log credit card debt.

The data are illustrated in Figure 3, along with the underlying data and constructed random rectangles for three of the 192 groups, containing (a)  $m_{i_a} = 5$ , (b)  $m_{i_b} = 28$  and (c)  $m_{i_c} = 56$  individuals. The number of individuals in all groups varies greatly (from 5 to 56), and it is noticeable that the distribution of individuals within each group comes from a non-uniform distribution. As a result, the usual uniformity assumption of descriptive models for random rectangles is clearly inappropriate. The generative model is more suited to dealing with these heterogeneous rectangle-valued data containing complex intra-rectangle structures.

Given the clear non-uniformity within each group  $i$ , we assume that the underlying data are Gaussian with group-specific means and covariances. That is

$$(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) \sim N_2(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n = 192$ , where  $\mu_i = (\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2})$  and  $\Sigma_i = \text{diag}(\sigma_{i1}^2, \sigma_{i2}^2)$ . Note that we choose to model log income and log credit card debt as uncorrelated, despite there being some visual evidence of positive correlation in the data underlying each random rectangle. It is worth briefly explaining this decision in detail. For a small number of latent data points  $m_i$ , it is possible for a single point to determine both upper (or lower) ranges of the random rectangle, and the probability of this occurring increases as the correlation of the underlying data increases. So in principle, there is some information about the correlation structure of the underlying data available through the associated random rectangle. However, for groups with larger  $m_i$ , the upper and lower ranges of the random rectangles are more likely to be determined by four individual data points, in which case it is not then possible to discern the underlying correlation structure. Although we have several groups with small numbers of latent data points (e.g.  $m_{i_a} = 5$ ), in principle allowing their correlation to be estimated, note that the same random rectangles will arise whether the latent data are positively or negatively correlated. That is, the correlation parameter is non-identifiable from the observed rectangle data. As such, we proceed without attempting to estimate this parameter, despite information on the magnitude of the correlation being available in principle for some groups.

|             |        | $\theta_1$ | $\lambda_1^2$ | $\theta_2$ | $\lambda_2^2$ | $\rho_\mu$ | $\eta_1$ | $\epsilon_1^2$ | $\eta_2$ | $\epsilon_2^2$ |
|-------------|--------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| Generative  | MLE    | 3.76       | 0.13          | -0.36      | 0.21          | 0.90       | -1.20    | 0.48           | 0.41     | 0.09           |
|             | 95% CI | 3.70       | 0.10          | -0.44      | 0.13          | 0.83       | -1.31    | 0.35           | 0.34     | 0.04           |
|             |        | 3.82       | 0.17          | -0.26      | 0.29          | 0.98       | -1.09    | 0.61           | 0.48     | 0.13           |
| Descriptive | MLE    | 3.79       | 0.17          | -0.42      | 0.52          | 0.57       | 0.02     | 0.20           | 0.82     | 0.09           |
|             | 95% CI | 3.74       | 0.13          | -0.53      | 0.41          | 0.47       | -0.04    | 0.16           | 0.78     | 0.07           |
|             |        | 3.85       | 0.20          | -0.32      | 0.62          | 0.67       | 0.08     | 0.24           | 0.87     | 0.11           |

Table 1: Maximum likelihood estimates and 95% asymptotic confidence intervals for the parameters of the generative and descriptive models for the credit card dataset.

We model the group-specific (local) parameters as

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}) &\sim N_2(\theta_1, \theta_2, \lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2, \rho_\mu), \\
\log \sigma_{ij}^2 &\sim N(\eta_j, \epsilon_j^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for  $j = 1, 2$  and  $i = 1, \dots, 192$ . The integration in the generative model (13) is achieved using Gauss-Hermite quadratures with  $20^4$  nodes to integrate over the four parameters.

Maximum likelihood estimates and 95% confidence intervals for each model parameter are illustrated in Table 1 for both generative and descriptive models. Similar to the results for the simulated examples, the point estimates of location ( $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ ) are broadly insensitive to the choice of model, however the estimated values for many of other parameters differ between the two models. Most importantly, the estimated values of  $\rho_\mu$  are considerably larger for the generative model ( $\hat{\rho}_\mu = 0.9040$ ) compared to the descriptive model ( $\hat{\rho}_\mu = 0.5695$ ). While both of these indicate a positive relationship between income and credit card debt, which is evident in the underlying data in Figure 3, there is a clear difference in the strength of that relationship. The descriptive model results in a weaker estimated value in the correlation because it does not take the noisy data generating process into account. While we suspect that the generative model may be the more accurate of the two given the data generating procedure used to construct the random rectangles, in terms of drawing inferential conclusions about the underlying data, it is critical that we are certain in this regard.

For the generative models, the distribution of the local parameters  $(\mu_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}^2)$  for each rectangle-valued observation can be computed by empirical Bayesian methods (previously these parameters were integrated out for the optimisation in Table 1). The prior distribution




Figure 4: Estimated marginal posterior distributions of the local parameters  $\mu_{i1}$ ,  $\mu_{i2}$ ,  $\sigma_{i1}^2$  and  $\sigma_{i2}^2$  associated with the three groups (a)–(c) shown in Figure 3. Solid lines correspond to the prior distributions for local parameters






Figure 5: Posterior predictive distribution of a random rectangle  $[y_1] \times [y_2]$  for each of the groups (a)–(c) (left column to right) in Figure 3. Columns illustrate the marginal random intervals of log income ( $[y_1]$ , top row) and log debt ( $[y_2]$ , bottom row) with each interval  $[y_j] = [y_{j1}, y_{j2}]$  expressed in interval centre and half-range form  $(y_{jc}, y_{jr}) = ((y_{j1} + y_{j2})/2, (y_{j2} - y_{j1})/2)$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Solid and dashed lines indicate predictive distributions of generative and descriptive models, respectively. The dot indicates the observed interval  $[x_{i1}] \times [x_{i2}]$  used for model fitting.

for the local parameters is the global distribution (16) with its parameter values given by the estimates in Table 1, and the likelihood function is the local density function of one observed rectangle. The resulting marginal posterior distributions for the parameters of the observed rectangles (a)–(c) (Figure 3) are shown in Figure 4. Compared to the prior (solid line) the parameters are well informed, even for rectangle (a) with  $m_{i_a} = 5$  observations, with the level of precision increasing with the number of individuals within each rectangle.

Goodness-of-fit for both descriptive and generative models can be evaluated through model predictive distributions of random rectangles, in addition to predictive distributions for individual data points for the generative model. In the latter case, based on the posterior distributions of the local parameters in Figure 4, the predictive distributions of individual data points within the random intervals (a)–(c), conditional on observing the associated random interval, are shown in Figure 3. While the predictive distributions are marginally independent due to the model specification, their coverage describes the observed data well. For group (a) the predictive distribution covers a wider region than the observed rectangle, as this rectangle is constructed from only 5 individuals. As the number of individuals increases in groups (b) and (c), the predictive regions more closely represent the region of the observed rectangle, indicating that the generative model has the ability to correctly account for the different numbers of individuals used to construct each rectangle. The predictive distribution for group (b) individuals also indicates some robustness to the two outliers that completely define the observed rectangle. This occurs as the model correctly accounts for the fact that rectangle (b) is constructed from half the number of observations used to construct the rectangle of group (c), even though both rectangles are roughly the same size.

The predictive distributions of random rectangles for groups (a)–(c) are illustrated in Figure 5 for both descriptive (dashed lines) and generative (solid lines) models. Shown are the bivariate predictive distributions of interval centre and log half-range, for both log income (top row) and log debt (bottom row). The dot indicates the observed interval. Under the generative model, these distributions are obtained directly from the predictive distributions for individuals (Figure 3).

In all cases, the predictive distributions of the generative model more accurately, and more precisely identify the location of the observed data. This is particularly the case

in group (a) in which the descriptive model is clearly indicating a lack of model fit. The predicted interval for log debt in group (b) is not fully centred on the observed interval, as the model attempts to account for the unlikely (under the model) construction of the observed interval by outliers (Figure 3). However, the observed data are still well predicted under the generative model. The overall fit to the observed data is better under the generative model than the descriptive model, indicating that it more accurately describes the complexities of the observed data.

### 5.3 Robustness to model mis-specification

Until now we have focused on the setting where both the underlying model  $f(x|\theta)$  and the data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$  are known. When the true  $f(x|\theta)$  is not known, this is the standard setting of statistical model mis-specification. There are two possible mis-specification scenarios in which  $\varphi(\cdot)$  may not be known. Firstly,  $\varphi(\cdot)$  may have been mis-reported, so that e.g. different quantiles were used to construct intervals from data than were modelled in  $\varphi(\cdot)$ . Secondly,  $\varphi(\cdot)$  may simply be unknown, so that the task is to analyse data which has quantiles  $\underline{X}$  and  $\overline{X}$ , but where it is not known what quantiles these are. In this second scenario, at best the generative likelihood could be integrated over all possible  $\varphi(\cdot)$  with respect to some prior measure. It is possible that with informative prior information this could yield *some* viable inference, but this would likely be circumstantial and not ideal.

The following analysis aims to examine the effect of mis-specifying the fitted model and  $\varphi(\cdot)$ . We consider data  $x_{1:m}$ , with  $m = 1000$ , generated independently from either normal or uniform distributions, both with mean  $\mu = 0$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2$ . To evaluate the effect of outliers, we create additional datasets which replace 5% of each original dataset by observations drawn from the (normal or uniform) generating distribution with  $\mu = 0$  and  $\sigma = 5$ . For each dataset, observed intervals are constructed through the aggregation function  $\varphi_i := \varphi_{i,m-i+1}(x_{1:m}) = [x_{(i)}, x_{(m-i+1)}]$ , with  $i = 1$  and  $i = 250$  corresponding to constructing intervals based on sample minimum/maximum and the 1st/3rd quartiles. For each of these interval datasets, we fit both normal and uniform models, and assess the impact of knowing the aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$  by supposing the observed intervals are obtained from  $\varphi_i$  with  $i = 1, 50, 100, \dots, 450$ .

Figure 8 shows boxplots of 500 replicate maximum likelihood estimates of  $\mu$  (top row) and  $\log(\sigma)$  (middle row), when the true underlying data distribution is normal, as a function

of the aggregation function  $\varphi_i$  used to fit the model. The true interval aggregation function is  $\varphi_1$  ( $i = 1$ ; left two columns) and  $\varphi_{250}$  ( $i = 250$ ; right two columns), and use of this is indicated by the shaded boxplots. In each panel the horizontal line denotes the true parameter value and the rightmost boxplot shows the impact of using the true aggregation function with the outlier datasets.

The mean ( $\mu$ ; top row) is consistently well estimated, regardless of the model being fitted or the aggregation function. This is not surprising, as changing  $\varphi_i$  affects the scale of the intervals and not their location. However for  $\log \sigma$  (middle row), when the model being fitted is correct (columns 1 and 3), using generative model aggregation functions that use narrower (wider) quantiles than actually used to construct the empirical interval, leads to larger (smaller) estimates of  $\sigma$ . This observation also holds when fitting the uniform model, although the picture is distorted due to the model mis-specification (fitting a uniform model to normal data). That is, when the model is correctly specified under the true data aggregation process, the maximum likelihood estimates are accurate.

A goodness-of-fit check between predicted and observed intervals would not reveal problems in any of the above analyses: both models are in the location-and-scale family, and so each can describe all observed interval datasets well. However, differences can easily be seen by comparing to the original underlying data. The bottom row of Figure 8 denotes qq-plots of the fitted model ( $y$ -axis) against the original sample  $x_{1:m}$  (in practice, this would be constructed from a sub-sample of the data when dealing with very large datasets). In all cases, only when the model and aggregation function are correct does the qq-plot align on the  $y = x$  axis. Deviation away from this indicates that either model or  $\varphi(\cdot)$ , or both, are incorrect. As the data aggregation function will typically be known, this would usually suggest that it is the fitted model that needs further requirement. However, when the data aggregation function is mis-specified then it may be difficult to identify a fitted model that, in combination with the mis-specified  $\varphi(\cdot)$ , will fit the data well. A failure to improve on a model's goodness-of-fit when modifying the model, could therefore indicate that the data aggregation function is mis-specified.

In the presence of outliers in the original dataset (rightmost boxplots in each panel), as might be expected, constructing intervals that are robust to these (e.g. using the 1st/3rd quartiles) produce more sensible results than less robust intervals (e.g. using min/max).

Qualitatively similar conclusions to the above can be drawn when the true data generating process is uniform rather than normal (see Supplementary Information).




Figure 6: Boxplots of 500 replicate maximum likelihood estimates of  $\mu$  and  $\log \sigma$  under a  $N(0, 2^2)$  true data generating process with  $m = 1000$ , and assuming data aggregation function  $\phi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 50, 100, \dots, 450$ . The true aggregation functions are  $\phi_1$  (left two columns) and  $\phi_{250}$  (right two columns). The models fitted are the normal (columns 1 & 3) and uniform (columns 2 & 4) distributions. In each panel, the rightmost boxplot indicates the outcome using the dataset with 5% outliers. Bottom row shows quantile-quantile curves of the fitted model ( $y$ -axis) versus the empirical underlying data quantiles ( $x$ -axis). Grey curves indicate use of the correct  $\varphi(\cdot)$  function. Dashed line denotes  $y = x$ .

## 6 Discussion

Current techniques for modelling random intervals (*p-hyper-rectangles*) are based on constructing models directly at the level of the interval-valued data (e.g. [Arroyo et al. 2010](#); [Le-Rademacher and Billard 2011](#); [Brito and Duarte Silva 2012](#)). These approaches are additionally based on the assumption that the unobserved individual data points from which the interval is constructed are uniformly distributed within the interval. As we have demonstrated in [Section 5](#), using these descriptive methods when the data are constructed from underlying individual data points, which is typical in practical applications, can result in misleading and biased parameter estimates and therefore unreliable inferences.

In this article we have established the distribution theory for interval-valued random variables which are constructed bottom-up from distributions of latent real-valued data and aggregation functions used to construct the random intervals. These generative models explicitly permit the fitting of standard statistical models for latent data points through likelihood-based techniques, while accounting for the manner in which the observed interval-valued data are constructed. This approach directly accounts for the non-uniformity of latent individual data points within intervals, and provides a natural way to handle the differing number of latent data points  $m_i$  within each random interval, which is again typical in practice. The method as presented is fully parametric, although extending these ideas to the non-parametric framework would be of some interest (e.g. [Jeon et al. 2015](#)).

By deriving a descriptive model as the limiting case of a generative model (i.e. as  $m_i \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $i$ ), we have demonstrated that these descriptive models have an explicit underlying generative model interpretation. In turn this indicates why inferences from descriptive models may be potentially misleading in practice.

In order to evaluate the integrated generative likelihood function [\(13\)](#) for the unimodal distributions considered in [Section 5](#), we have used Gaussian quadrature methods. This technique will be less useful when integrating over more than 6 parameters ([Evans and Swartz 1995](#)), or when there are strong dependencies between local parameters. In these cases, approximate MLE's can be obtained using e.g. Monte Carlo maximum likelihood estimation ([Geyer and Thompson 1992](#)) or Monte Carlo expectation maximization techniques ([Wei and Tanner 1990](#)), or in the Bayesian framework, Gibbs sampling ([Geman and Geman 1984](#)) or pseudo-marginal and other likelihood-free Monte Carlo methods ([Andrieu](#)

and Roberts 2009; Sisson et al. 2018).

In order to construct the likelihood function (13) for  $p$ -hyper-rectangles we assumed independence among all margins in local distributions to avoid the  $2p$ -th order mixed-differentiation of  $F_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p)$ . Although this differentiation may be achieved using symbolic computation software, the resulting likelihood functions are complex even when  $p = 2$  (see the Supplementary Information), and the alternative of numerical differentiation would be highly computational. However, this independence assumption does not hold if there is priori information on the dependence structure within each latent data point  $\mathbf{x}$ . As pointed out by Billard and Diday (2006), this is often the case because the structure of symbolic data might determine inherent dependencies such as logical, taxonomic and hierarchical dependencies, but not statistical dependencies. In the generative model, those dependencies as well as statistical dependencies can be addressed simultaneously through the local distribution function  $f(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . However, without the marginal independence assumption, inference for these models can be challenging.

While our examples have primarily focused on minimum and maximum based data aggregation functions  $\varphi(x_{1:m})$ , there is clear interest in parameter estimation and inference for more robust order-based functions  $\varphi_{l,u}(x_{1:m})$ , as the resulting intervals will be less sensitive to outliers, as demonstrated in the study in Section 5.3. The procedures for constructing the associated likelihood functions are analogous to those presented here, and Theorem 5 provides their limiting descriptive model counterpart. An additional practical question for inference using order-based aggregation functions is which order-based statistics to use. As this choice will impact on the efficiency of the resulting inference, it is an open question to understand what method of random interval construction would be optimal for any given analysis (e.g. Beranger et al. 2018).

Finally, we have derived an approximation  $\hat{L}$  of the likelihood function of the underlying data,  $L(x_{1:m}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , based on constructing random intervals or  $p$ -hyper-rectangles through the data aggregation function  $\varphi(\cdot)$ , so that  $\hat{L}(\varphi(x_{1:m})|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \approx L(x_{1:m}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Clearly there can be some information loss when moving from  $x_{1:m}$  to  $\varphi(x_{1:m})$ . Understanding the quality of this approximation is important both for quantifying inferential accuracy, as well as guiding the design of the aggregation function (where possible) to increase the performance of an analysis. This is the focus of current research.



## Acknowledgements

XZ is supported by the China Scholarship Council. BB and SAS are supported by the Australian Research Council through the Discovery Project scheme (FT170100079) and the Australian Centre of Excellence for Mathematical and Statistical Frontiers in Big Data, Big Models and New Insights (CE140100049).

## Appendix

Detailed proofs to all lemmas and theorems are provided in the Supplementary Information. For [arXiv.org](https://arxiv.org) this is provided below.

## 7 Constructing a measurable space

We denote  $\Omega$  as a sample space equipped with a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  and a probability measure  $P(\cdot)$ . In order to construct a measurable space of  $\mathbb{I}$ , we identify those subsets of  $\mathbb{I}$ , which are equivalent to particular subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . A subset of interest is  $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\} = \{[x'] : [x'] \subseteq [x]\}$ , which corresponds to the collection of all intervals that are a subinterval of or equal to  $[x]$ . This subset is the image of the event  $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\} = \{\omega \in \Omega : [X](\omega) \subseteq [x]\}$  on  $\mathbb{I}$ . The subset  $\{[X] \subseteq [x]\}$  may also be written as  $\{\varphi(X_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\} = \{\omega \in \Omega : \varphi(X_{1:m}(\omega)) \subseteq [x]\}$ , of which the image on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  is  $\{\varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\} = \{x'_{1:m} : \varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$ , i.e. the subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  containing those  $x'_{1:m}$  that can generate an interval which is a subinterval of or equal to  $[x]$ . The two subsets  $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}$  and  $\{\varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$  are equivalent as their preimages on  $\Omega$  are identical. As a result, given a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , the probability of  $\{\varphi(x'_{1:m}) \subseteq [x]\}$ , and hence of  $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}$ , can be calculated if only if it is measurable. This implies that in a measurable space of  $\mathbb{I}$ ,  $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}$  should be measurable.

We construct the metric topology on  $\mathbb{I}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ , induced by the Hausdorff metric, which specifies the distance between elements  $[a]$  and  $[b]$  as

$$d_H([a], [b]) = \max \{ |\underline{a} - \underline{b}|, |\bar{a} - \bar{b}| \},$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes absolute value. If we consider the mapping  $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  from  $\mathbb{I}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , then we have  $d_2((\underline{a}, \bar{a}), (\underline{b}, \bar{b})) = d_H([a], [b])$  for any  $[a], [b] \in \mathbb{I}$ , where  $d_2(\cdot)$  is the square metric on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . That is,  $h$  is a distance preserving map, or isometry, and hence  $(\mathbb{I}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}})$  is isometrically embedded into the metric topological space on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  induced by  $d_2(\cdot)$ , which is

also known as the standard topology. The standard topology on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is generated by the open rectangles (?). This implies that  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$  inherits properties of the standard topology on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , such as completeness, local compactness and separability. See Section 8 for details.

Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{[x'] \subseteq [x] : [x] \in \mathbb{I}\}$  be the collection of subsets of interest. We can now construct a measurable space involving  $\mathcal{F}$  from the topology  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all open subsets  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}} = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}})$ , i.e. the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathbb{I}$ . The topology  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$  is the collection of all open subsets of  $\mathbb{I}$ , and the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all open subsets (?). This Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra contains  $\mathcal{F}$ , as all elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  are closures of some elements of  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$  (Section 8). The following lemma provides a stronger result that  $\mathcal{F}$  is sufficient to construct  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *The Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathbb{I}$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{F}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}} = \sigma(\mathcal{F})$ .*

This property indicates that  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$  is rich enough to ensure that all elements in  $\mathcal{F}$  are measurable. It also suggests that if we only define a proper non-negative function on  $\mathcal{F}$ , we can extend it to a measure on  $(\mathbb{I}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$ . In particular, if the induced measure is a probability measure, it would then be the distribution function of  $[X]$ .

Based on the isometry  $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  between  $\mathbb{I}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , we now construct a measure on  $(\mathbb{I}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$ , representing the uniform measure on  $\mathbb{I}$ , which gives equal weight to all intervals. Let the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  be  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ , and  $\mu : \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mapsto [0, +\infty)$  be the Lebesgue measure on  $(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^2})$ . Due to the isometry  $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ , we then have that  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}} = \mu \circ h$  is the uniform measure on  $(\mathbb{I}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$ . Consequently, the uniform measure of every Borel subset of  $\mathbb{I}$  can be calculated via  $\mu(\cdot)$  and  $h(\cdot)$ . Specifically, for every element of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we have

$$\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = \mu(h(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\})) = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{x} - \underline{x})^2,$$

as  $h(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = \{(\underline{x}', \bar{x}') : \underline{x} \leq \underline{x}' \leq \bar{x}' \leq \bar{x}\}$  is the region of an isosceles right triangle on the real plane. From Lemma 1, the uniform measure of all Borel subsets  $E \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$  is also available.

**Lemma 2.** *Define the infinitesimal neighbourhood of  $[x]$  as*

$$d[x] = \{[x'] \in \mathbb{I} \mid \underline{x} - d\underline{x} < \underline{x}' \leq \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} \leq \bar{x}' < \bar{x} + d\bar{x}\},$$

where  $d\underline{x}, d\bar{x} > 0$ . Its uniform measure is  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(d[x]) = d\underline{x} \times d\bar{x}$ .

From the above we note that  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\cdot)$  is a non-atomic measure, i.e.  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\{[x]\}) = 0$ , where  $\{[x]\}$  is a set containing a single interval  $[x]$ . Further, there is a convenient way to compute the value of  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\cdot)$  for any Borel subsets via the Lebesgue integration on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Namely, for any subsets  $E \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$

$$\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(E) = \int_E \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(d[x]) = \iint_{h(E)} d\underline{x} d\bar{x}.$$

Accordingly, through such isometry, the measurable space of intervals  $(\mathbb{I}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}})$  inherits the convenient structure and properties of the real plane. These results permit the construction of distribution and density functions of random intervals.

## 8 Topology

The basis of the standard topology on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is the collection of all open rectangles. Its subspace topology induced by  $\{(x, y) : x \leq y\}$ , as shown in Figure 7, has the basis of which each element is the remaining part of a open rectangle on the top-left half plane. Therefore, the collection of their counterparts on  $\mathbb{I}$  via the isometry,  $h([x]) = (\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ , is the basis of  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ .

The open subset of  $\mathbb{I}$  corresponding to the rectangle (a) in Figure 7 is

$$B([a], [b]) = \{[x] : \underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \bar{a} < \bar{x} < \bar{b}\}.$$

This is the collection of all intervals for which the lower bounds are bounded between  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$ , while the upper bounds are bounded between  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$ . The open subset of  $\mathbb{I}$  corresponding to the triangle (b) is

$$W([c]) = \{[x] : \underline{c} < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{c}\}.$$

This is the collection of all intervals for which the lower bounds are greater than  $\underline{c}$ , while the upper bounds are smaller than  $\bar{c}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{E}$  is the collection of all  $B([a], [b])$  and  $W([c])$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is a basis for  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ .*

**Lemma 4.**  $B([a], [b]) = W([b]) \setminus [\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]\}]$ .

**Lemma 5.**  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$  is the smallest topology containing all  $W([c])$  and  $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^c$ .




Figure 7:  $B([a], [b])$  and  $W\{[a], [b]\}$  are (a) and (b), respectively. (a), (b) and (c) constitute the basis of  $\mathcal{T}_1$ .

## 9 Hypercubes

Similarly, through the property of isometry,  $h_p([x]) = (\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p, \bar{x}_p)$ , it can be shown that a basis of the topology  $\mathcal{T}_p$  is the collection of the following two classes of subsets:

$$\begin{aligned} B_p([a], [b]) &= \{[x]: \underline{b}_j < \underline{x}_j < \underline{a}_j \leq \bar{a}_j < \bar{x}_j < \bar{b}_j, j = 1, \dots, p\}, \\ W_p([c]) &= \{[x]: \underline{c}_j < \underline{x}_j \leq \bar{x}_j < \bar{c}_j, j = 1, \dots, p\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma shows an analogous result of Lemma 4.

**Lemma 6.**  $B_p([a], [b]) = W_p([b]) \setminus \cup_{j=1}^p [\{[x] \subseteq [a_{j1}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [a_{j2}]\}]$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} [a_{j1}] &= ([a_1], \dots, [\underline{a}_j, \bar{b}_j], \dots, [a_p]), \\ [a_{j2}] &= ([a_1], \dots, [\underline{b}_j, \bar{a}_j], \dots, [a_p]). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 4. Based on the above lemma, the hypercube's version of Lemma 1 can be proved in a similar way.

## 10 Proofs

### 10.1 Proof of Lemma 1

As an isometric embedding to the standard topology of the real plane, the topology  $\mathcal{T}_1$  is separable, and thus it has a countable basis. We define rational intervals  $[q] \in \mathbb{I}$  where  $q, \bar{q}$  are rational numbers. Then, the collection of all rational intervals,  $\mathbb{I}_Q$ , is dense in  $\mathbb{I}$ .

We first show that  $\mathcal{E}_Q$  is a countable basis of  $\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{I}$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}_Q$  be the collection of all  $B([q_1], [q_2])$  and  $W([q])$ . As rational numbers are countable,  $\mathcal{E}_Q$  is countable. It can be shown that  $\mathcal{E}_Q$  is a basis of a topology and its generated topology is  $\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{I}$  in a similar way to Lemma 3. As a result,  $\mathcal{E}_Q$  is a countable basis of  $\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{I}$ .

Then we show that  $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) = \sigma(\mathcal{E}_Q)$ . For any  $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\} \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\} = W([x])^c$  and  $W([x]) \in \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{I}$  can be generated by set operations over countable elements from  $\mathcal{E}_Q$ , as  $\mathcal{E}_Q$  is a countable basis of  $\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{I}$ . So,  $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{E}_Q)$ . On the other hand, for any  $W([q]) \in \mathcal{E}_Q$ , we have  $W([q]) = \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} \{[q'] \subseteq [q + 1/n, \bar{q} - 1/n]\}$ , where  $\bar{q} - q \geq 2/k$ , and for any  $B([q_1], [q_2]) \in \mathcal{E}_Q$ , we have  $B([q_1], [q_2]) = W([q_2]) \setminus [\{[q] \subseteq [\underline{q}_1, \bar{q}_2]\} \cup \{[q] \subseteq [\underline{q}_2, \bar{q}_1]\}]$  (Lemma 4). So,  $\sigma(\mathcal{E}_Q) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{F})$ .

That is,  $\sigma(\mathcal{F}) = \sigma(\mathcal{E}_Q) = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{I})$ .

## 10.2 Proof of Lemma 2

We let

$$B^*([a], [b]) = \{[x] : \underline{b} < \underline{x} \leq \underline{a} \leq \bar{a} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{b}\}. \quad (17)$$

In a way analogous to Lemma 4, we have

$$B^*([a], [b]) = W([b]) \setminus [W([\underline{a}, \bar{b}]) \cup W([\underline{b}, \bar{a}])]. \quad (18)$$

By the continuity of the measure,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\mathbb{I}(W([x])) &= \mu_\mathbb{I}(\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} \{[x'] \subseteq [\underline{x} + 1/n, \bar{x} - 1/n]\}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\mathbb{I}(\{[x'] \subseteq [\underline{x} + 1/n, \bar{x} - 1/n]\}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2}(\bar{x} - \underline{x} - 2/n)^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{x} - \underline{x})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $W([\underline{a}, \bar{b}]) \cap W([\underline{b}, \bar{a}]) = W([a])$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\mathbb{I}(B^*([a], [b])) &= \mu_\mathbb{I}(W([b])) - \mu_\mathbb{I}(W([\underline{a}, \bar{b}])) - \mu_\mathbb{I}(W([\underline{b}, \bar{a}])) + \mu_\mathbb{I}(W([a])) \\ &= (\underline{a} - \underline{b})(\bar{b} - \bar{a}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\mu_\mathbb{I}(d[x]) = \mu_\mathbb{I}(B^*([x], [\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}])) = d\underline{x} \times d\bar{x}$ .

## 10.3 Proof of Lemma 3

We first show that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a basis for a topology. Note that for any  $[x] \in \mathbb{I}$ , there exists at least one  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  s.t.  $[x] \in E$ . Then, we show in the following that for any  $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ , if

$[x] \in E_1 \cap E_2$ , then there exists  $E_3 \in \mathcal{E}$  s.t.  $[x] \in E_3$  and  $E_3 \subset E_1 \cap E_2$ . Note that  $\vee$  and  $\wedge$  take the maximum and the minimum of two operands, respectively.

- i) Consider  $[x] \in B([a], [b]) \cap B([a'], [b']) \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\underline{b} \vee \underline{b}' < \underline{a} \wedge \underline{a}'$  and  $\bar{a} \vee \bar{a}' < \bar{b} \wedge \bar{b}'$ . From  $[x] \in B([a], [b])$ , we have that  $\underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \bar{a} < \bar{x} < \bar{b}$ . From  $[x] \in B([a'], [b'])$ , we have that  $\underline{b}' < \underline{x} < \underline{a}' \leq \bar{a}' < \bar{x} < \bar{b}'$ . Therefore,  $\underline{b} \vee \underline{b}' < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \wedge \underline{a}'$  and  $\bar{a} \vee \bar{a}' < \bar{x} < \bar{b} \wedge \bar{b}'$ . There exists  $[a''], [b''] \in \mathbb{I}$  s.t.  $\underline{b} \vee \underline{b}' < \underline{b}'' < \underline{x} < \underline{a}'' < \underline{a} \wedge \underline{a}'$  and  $\bar{a} \vee \bar{a}' < \bar{a}'' < \bar{x} < \bar{b}'' < \bar{b} \wedge \bar{b}'$ . That is  $[x] \in B([a''], [b''])$  and  $B([a''], [b'']) \subset B([a], [b]) \cap B([a'], [b'])$ .
- ii) Consider  $[x] \in W([c_1]) \cap W([c_2]) \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\underline{c}_1 \vee \underline{c}_2 < \bar{c}_1 \wedge \bar{c}_2$ . From  $[x] \in W([c_1])$ , we have that  $\underline{c}_1 < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{c}_1$ . From  $[x] \in W([c_2])$ , we have that  $\underline{c}_2 < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{c}_2$ . Therefore,  $\underline{c}_1 \vee \underline{c}_2 < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{c}_1 \wedge \bar{c}_2$ . There exists  $[c] \in \mathbb{I}$  s.t.  $\underline{c}_1 \vee \underline{c}_2 < \underline{c} < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{c} < \bar{c}_1 \wedge \bar{c}_2$ . That is  $[x] \in W([c])$  and  $W([c]) \subset W([c_1]) \cap W([c_2])$ .
- iii) Consider  $[x] \in B([a], [b]) \cap W([c]) \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\underline{c} < \underline{a}$  and  $\bar{c} > \bar{a}$ . From  $[x] \in B([a], [b])$ , we have that  $\underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \bar{a} < \bar{x} < \bar{b}$ . From  $[x] \in W([c])$ , we have that  $\underline{c} < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{c}$ . Therefore,  $\underline{c} \vee \underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \bar{a} < \bar{x} < \bar{c} \wedge \bar{b}$ . There exists  $[a'], [b'] \in \mathbb{I}$  s.t.  $\underline{c} \vee \underline{b} < \underline{b}' < \underline{x} < \underline{a}' < \underline{a}$  and  $\bar{a} < \bar{a}' < \bar{x} < \bar{b}' < \bar{c} \wedge \bar{b}$ . That is  $[x] \in B([a'], [b'])$  and  $B([a'], [b']) \subset B([a], [b]) \cap W([c])$ .

That is,  $\mathcal{E}$  is a basis for a topology. Next, we show  $\mathcal{E}$  is a basis for  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ . Figure 7 shows that the basis of  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$  consists of three types of subsets. As  $B([a], [b])$  is an (a)-type subset and  $W\{[c]\}$  is a (b)-type subset, the topology generated by  $\mathcal{E}$  is coarser than  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ . On the other hand, for any  $[x]$  in a (c)-type subset, we can find at least one (a)-type subset or (b)-type subset that contains that  $[x]$  and subsets of that (c)-type subset. Therefore, the topology generated by  $\mathcal{E}$  is finer than  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ . In conclusion, the topology generated by  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ .

#### 10.4 Proof of Lemma 4

For any  $[x] \in B([a], [b])$ , i.e.  $\underline{b} < \underline{x} < \underline{a} \leq \bar{a} < \bar{x} < \bar{b}$ , we have  $[x] \in W([b])$ . Also  $[x] \not\subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]$  and  $[x] \not\subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]$ , i.e.  $[x] \notin \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]\}$ . Therefore,  $B([a], [b]) \subseteq W([b]) \setminus \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]\}$ .

On the other hand, for any  $[x] \in W([b]) \setminus \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]\}$ , we have  $[x] \in W([b])$ , i.e.  $\underline{b} < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{b}$ . Also  $[x] \not\subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]$  and  $[x] \not\subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]$ , i.e.  $\underline{x} < \underline{a}$  and  $\bar{x} > \bar{a}$ . Hence  $\underline{b} <$

$\underline{x} < \underline{a}$  and  $\bar{a} < \bar{x} < \bar{b}$ , i.e.  $[x] \in B([a], [b])$ . Therefore,  $W([b]) \setminus [\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]\}] \subseteq B([a], [b])$ .

In conclusion,  $B([a], [b]) = W([b]) \setminus [\{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]\} \cup \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]\}]$ .

## 10.5 Proof of Lemma 5

$\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}$  is a closed subset, as it is the closure of  $W\{[c]\}$ . Accordingly its complement  $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^c$  is open, and thus  $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^c \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ . From Lemma 4,  $B([a], [b]) = W([b]) \cap \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{a}, \bar{b}]\}^c \cap \{[x] \subseteq [\underline{b}, \bar{a}]\}^c$ . So every element in  $\mathcal{E}$  can be generated by set operations over finite elements of  $W\{[c]\}$  and  $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^c$ . As  $\mathcal{E}$  is a basis of  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$ , every element in  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$  can be generated by set operations over finite elements of  $W\{[c]\}$  and  $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^c$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{I}}$  is the smallest topology containing  $W([c])$  and  $\{[x] \subseteq [c]\}^c$ .

## 10.6 Proof of Theorem 1

For any function  $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  satisfying the conditions in the theorem, we can construct its containment distribution function  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  as

$$F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\bar{x}} \int_{\underline{x}}^b f_{[X]}(a, b) da db \text{ or } F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\bar{x}} \int_a^{\bar{x}} f_{[X]}(a, b) db da.$$

It is easy to check that  $F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  satisfies the conditions in Definition 1.

## 10.7 Proof of Theorem 2

Let  $C_{[X]}([x]) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$  be the containment functional. From Theorem 3 and its proof, it determines a unique probability measure  $P_{[X]}: \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}} \mapsto [0, 1]$  on the space of intervals s.t.  $P_{[X]}([x]) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ . As  $d[x] = B_{\star}([x], [\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}])$ , from (17) and (18),

$$B_{\star}([x], [\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}]) = W([\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}]) \setminus [W([\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}]) \cup W([\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x}])].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[X]}(d[x]) &= P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}])) - P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}])) - \\ &\quad P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x}])) + P_{[X]}(W([\underline{x}, \bar{x}])). \end{aligned}$$

By the continuity of the measure and  $W([x]) = \cup_{n=k}^{\infty} \{[x]'\} \subseteq [\underline{x} + \frac{1}{n}, \bar{x} - \frac{1}{n}]$ ,

$$P_{[X]}(W([x])) = \lim_{\underline{x}' \rightarrow \underline{x}+} \lim_{\bar{x}' \rightarrow \bar{x}-} P_{[X]}([X] \subseteq [x]') = \lim_{\underline{x}' \rightarrow \underline{x}+} \lim_{\bar{x}' \rightarrow \bar{x}-} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}', \bar{x}').$$

As  $F_{[X]}$  is twice differentiable (thus continuous),  $P_{[X]}(W([x])) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ . Therefore,

$$P_{[X]}(d[x]) = F_{[X]}(\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x} + d\bar{x}) - F_{[X]}(\underline{x} - d\underline{x}, \bar{x}) + F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}).$$

Substituting second order Taylor expansions for the first three terms in the above equation, we obtain

$$P_{[X]}(d[x]) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x} \partial \bar{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) d\underline{x} d\bar{x} + o(d\underline{x} d\bar{x}).$$

Note that  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(d[x]) = d\underline{x} d\bar{x}$  (Theorem 2), and so

$$P_{[X]}(d[x]) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x} \partial \bar{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) \mu_{\mathbb{I}}(d[x]) + o(\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(d[x])).$$

In addition,  $P_{[X]}(d[x]) = 0$  when  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(d[x]) = 0$ , i.e.  $P_{[X]}(\cdot)$  is absolute continuous w.r.t.  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(\cdot)$ . Therefore the Radon-Nikodym derivative exists and

$$\frac{P_{[X]}(d[x])}{\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(d[x])} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \underline{x} \partial \bar{x}} F_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}).$$

## 10.8 Proof of Theorem 3

As  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}} = \sigma(\mathcal{F})$  (Lemma 1), any  $E \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$  can be generated by set operations over at most countable elements from  $\mathcal{F}$ . So, it's probability measure  $P([X] \in E)$  will be available if  $P([X] \subseteq [x])$  is known for any  $[x]$ . Therefore, the uniqueness has been proved.

Next, we prove the existence of a probability measure  $P_{[X]}: \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}} \mapsto [0, 1]$  on the space of intervals s.t.  $P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the collection of all  $B'([x], [y]) = \{[x'] : \underline{y} \leq \underline{x}' < \underline{x} \leq \bar{x} < \bar{x}' \leq \bar{y}\}$ . Similar to Lemma 4, we have  $B'([x], [y]) = \{[x]' \subseteq [y]\} \setminus \{[x]' \subseteq [\underline{x}, \bar{y}]\} \cup \{[x]' \subseteq [\underline{y}, \bar{x}]\}$ . Then, define  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G} \cup \{\emptyset, \mathbb{I}\}$ , and extend  $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$  to a function  $P_C(\cdot)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  s.t.  $P_C(\emptyset) = 0$ ,  $P_C(\mathbb{I}) = 1$ ,  $P_C(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$  and

$$P_C(B'([x], [y])) = C_{[X]}([y]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{x}, \bar{y}]) - C_{[X]}([\underline{y}, \bar{x}]) + C_{[X]}([x]) \geq 0,$$

by condition *iii*) of the definition of  $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$  in Section 2.2. That is  $P_C(\cdot)$  is non-negative.

In addition as  $\mathbb{I}$  is locally compact, for any  $A \subset \mathbb{I}$  and  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $E_1, \dots, E_N \in \mathcal{H}$  with all  $\mu_{\mathbb{I}}(E_i) \leq \delta$ , such that  $A \subset \cup_{i=1}^N E_i$ . Therefore, we can use Carathéodory construction (Durrett 2010) to define a metric outer measure. Let  $P_{[X]}^*(A) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} P_{\delta}(A)$ , where

$$P_{\delta}(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_C(E_i) : E_i \in \mathcal{H}, \text{diam}(E_i) \leq \delta, \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \supseteq A \right\},$$



where  $\text{diam}(E_i)$  is the diameter of  $E_i$ . So,  $P_{[X]}^*(\cdot)$  is a metric outer measure, and thus the Borel subsets on  $\mathbb{I}$  are measurable w.r.t.  $P_{[X]}^*(\cdot)$ . That is, there exists a probability measure  $P_{[X]}: \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}} \mapsto [0, 1]$ , such that  $P_{[X]}(E) = P_{[X]}^*(E)$  for any  $E \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{I}}$ .

Finally, we can check that  $P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$ . For any  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , there exists  $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , s.t.  $P_{\delta_n}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) \leq C_{[X]}([\underline{x} - \frac{1}{n}, \bar{x} + \frac{1}{n}])$ . Also  $P_{\delta}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) \geq C_{[X]}([x])$  by definition for any  $\delta > 0$ . Therefore

$$C_{[X]}([x]) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\delta_n}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{[X]}([\underline{x} - 1/n, \bar{x} + 1/n]).$$

By condition *ii*) of the definition of  $C_{[X]}(\cdot)$  in Section 2.2,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{[X]}([\underline{x} - 1/n, \bar{x} + 1/n]) = C_{[X]}(\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} [\underline{x} - 1/n, \bar{x} + 1/n]) = C_{[X]}([x]).$$

Therefore,

$$P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\delta_n}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x]).$$

As a result, given a random interval  $[X]: \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{I}$ , we obtain a probability measure  $P: \sigma([X]) \mapsto [0, 1]$ , s.t.  $P([X] \subseteq [x]) = P_{[X]}(\{[x'] \subseteq [x]\}) = C_{[X]}([x])$ .

## 10.9 Proof of Theorem 4

Let  $c = \frac{a+b}{2} \in (-\infty, +\infty)$  and  $r = \frac{b-a}{2} \geq 0$ . We can rewrite

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m) = \iint_{\{a \leq \underline{x}, b \geq \bar{x}\}} m(m-1) \frac{(\bar{x} - \underline{x})^{m-2}}{(b-a)^m} \pi(a, b) da db.$$

as

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m) = 2^{-m} m(m-1) (\bar{x} - \underline{x})^{m-2} \iint_A r^{-m} g(c, r) dc dr,$$

where  $g(c, r) = 2\pi(c-r, c+r)$  is the density function of  $(c, r)$  and  $A = \{(c, r): \bar{x}-r \leq c \leq \underline{x}+r, r \geq \frac{\bar{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\}$ . As  $\pi(\cdot)$  is bounded continuously,  $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g(c, r) dc < \infty$ . Let  $g(r) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g(c, r) dc$ ,  $B_0 = \{r: g(r) = 0\}$  and  $B_1 = \{r: g(r) \neq 0\}$ . When  $g(r) \neq 0$ , we have  $g(c|r) = \frac{g(c, r)}{g(r)}$ . The above integration can be decomposed into the following two cases. In the case that  $g(r) \neq 0$ , we replace  $g(c, r)$  with  $g(r)g(c|r)$  and integrate out  $c$ ,

$$\iint_{A \cap B_1} r^{-m} g(c, r) dc dr = \int_{\frac{\bar{x}-\underline{x}}{2}}^{\infty} r^{-m} g(r) \left\{ \int_{\bar{x}-r}^{\underline{x}+r} g(c|r) dc \right\} dr.$$

In the case that  $g(r) = 0$ , we have  $g(c, r) = 0$  and  $\iint_{A \cap B_0} r^{-m} g(c, r) dc dr = 0$ .

Then, writing  $z = (m-1)(\log r - \log \frac{\bar{x}-x}{2})$ , we have

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m) = \frac{1}{2}m(\bar{x}-\underline{x})^{-1} \times \int_0^\infty e^{-z} g\left(\frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z}\right) \left\{ \int_{\bar{x}-\frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z}}^{\underline{x}+\frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z}} g\left(c\left|\frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z}\right|\right) dc \right\} dz.$$

As  $\pi(\cdot)$  is bounded continuously,  $g(c, r) = 2\pi(c-r, c+r)$  is bounded continuously. Due to the mean value theorem, the above term can be simplified as

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty m \left\{ e^{(m-1)^{-1}z} - 1 \right\} e^{-z} g\left(\xi, \frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z}\right) dz,$$

where  $\underline{x} + \frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z} \leq \xi \leq \bar{x} - \frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z}$ . Let  $M(\xi) = \sup_{z \geq 0} g(\xi, \frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z})$ .

$M(\xi)$  is bounded as  $g(c, r)$  is bounded. When  $m \geq 3$ , we have

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m) \leq \frac{M(\xi)}{2} \int_0^\infty m \left\{ e^{(m-1)^{-1}z} - 1 \right\} e^{-z} dz = \frac{m}{2(m-2)} M(\xi) \leq \frac{3}{2} M(\xi).$$

Therefore,  $f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m)$  is bounded when  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|m) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m \left\{ e^{(m-1)^{-1}z} - 1 \right\} e^{-z} g\left(\xi, \frac{\bar{x}-x}{2}e^{(m-1)^{-1}z}\right) dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2} g\left(\frac{\underline{x}+\bar{x}}{2}, \frac{\bar{x}-\underline{x}}{2}\right) = \pi(\underline{x}, \bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

## 10.10 Proof of Theorem 5

Let  $f_{\mu,\tau} = f(\cdot|\mu, \tau)$ , and denote  $F_{\mu,\tau} = F(\cdot|\mu, \tau)$  and  $Q_{\mu,\tau} = Q(\cdot; \mu, \tau)$  as its cumulative distribution function and quantile function, respectively. As  $f_{\mu,\tau}$  is positive and continuous in the neighbourhoods of  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})$  and  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p})$  with  $\underline{p} > 0$  and  $\bar{p} < 1$ , the joint density function of

$$\begin{cases} (m+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}))(\underline{X} - Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})) \\ (m+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p}))(\bar{X} - Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p})) \end{cases}$$

converges pointwise to a bivariate normal density function, with zero mean and covariance matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \underline{p}(1-\underline{p}) & \underline{p}(1-\bar{p}) \\ \underline{p}(1-\bar{p}) & \bar{p}(1-\bar{p}) \end{pmatrix}$$

when  $m \rightarrow \infty$  (?). Thus when  $m$  is large, the density function of the i.i.d. generative model

$$\begin{aligned} f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m, l, u) &= \frac{m!}{(l-1)!(u-l-1)!(m-u)!} [F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{l-1} \\ &\quad \times [F(\bar{x}|\theta) - F(\underline{x}|\theta)]^{u-l-1} [1 - F(\bar{x}|\theta)]^{m-u} f(\underline{x}|\theta) f(\bar{x}|\theta), \end{aligned}$$

is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{m+1}{2\pi|\Sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}}} f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})) f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p})) \exp\{-(m+1)T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \mu, \tau)\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \mu, \tau) &= \frac{1}{2}(\underline{t}(\underline{x}; \mu, \tau), \bar{t}(\bar{x}; \mu, \tau))\Sigma^{-1}(\underline{t}(\underline{x}; \mu, \tau), \bar{t}(\bar{x}; \mu, \tau))^{\top}, \\ \underline{t}(\underline{x}; \mu, \tau) &= f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}))(\underline{x} - Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})), \\ \bar{t}(\bar{x}; \mu, \tau) &= f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p}))(\bar{x} - Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p})). \end{aligned}$$

That is, the density function of the hierarchical generative model

$$f_{[X]}(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\alpha, m) = \int f_{[X]}^*(\underline{x}, \bar{x}|\theta, m)\pi(\theta|\alpha) d\theta,$$

is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{m+1}{2\pi|\Sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \times H(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}, m) \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}, m) &= \\ &\iint f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p})) f_{\mu,\tau}(Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p})) \pi(\mu, \tau) \exp\{-(m+1)T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \mu, \tau)\} d\mu d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\Sigma$  is positive definite, and so  $T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \mu, \tau) \geq 0$ . Also  $T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}, m)$  reaches its minimum 0, when  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}) = \underline{x}$  and  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p}) = \bar{x}$ . As  $f_{\mu,\tau}$  is interval-identifiable, the system of equations,  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}) = \underline{x}$  and  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p}) = \bar{x}$ , has a unique solution, and thus  $T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}, m)$  is unimodal.

As  $\mu_{\star} = \mu(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p})$  and  $\tau_{\star} = \tau(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p})$  are the solution of  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\underline{p}) = \underline{x}$  and  $Q_{\mu,\tau}(\bar{p}) = \bar{x}$ , given conditions *i*) and *iii*) in the theorem, a Laplace approximation can be applied to  $H(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}, m)$  at the point  $(\mu_{\star}, \tau_{\star})$ , giving

$$\begin{aligned} H(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \underline{p}, \bar{p}, m) &\approx \\ &2\pi(m+1)^{-1} |\nabla^2 T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \mu_{\star}, \tau_{\star})|^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_{\mu_{\star}, \tau_{\star}}(\underline{x}) f_{\mu_{\star}, \tau_{\star}}(\bar{x}) \pi(\mu_{\star}, \tau_{\star}). \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

We let  $T = T(\underline{x}, \bar{x}; \mu, \tau)$ ,  $\underline{t} = \underline{t}(\underline{x}; \mu, \tau)$ ,  $\bar{t} = \bar{t}(\bar{x}; \mu, \tau)$  and  $\Sigma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ , so we have  $T = \frac{1}{2}(a_{11}\underline{t}^2 + 2a_{12}\underline{t}\bar{t} + a_{22}\bar{t}^2)$ . The first order partial derivatives of  $T$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \mu} &= a_{11}\underline{t} \frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \mu} + a_{12}\bar{t} \frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \mu} + a_{12}\underline{t} \frac{\partial \bar{t}}{\partial \mu} + a_{22}\bar{t} \frac{\partial \bar{t}}{\partial \mu}, \\ \frac{\partial T}{\partial \tau} &= a_{11}\underline{t} \frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \tau} + a_{12}\bar{t} \frac{\partial \underline{t}}{\partial \tau} + a_{12}\underline{t} \frac{\partial \bar{t}}{\partial \tau} + a_{22}\bar{t} \frac{\partial \bar{t}}{\partial \tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $T^*$ ,  $\underline{t}^*$  and  $\bar{t}^*$  denote the corresponding functions and their derivatives taking values at  $(\mu_*, \tau_*)$ . As  $\underline{t}^* = \bar{t}^* = 0$ , the second order partial derivatives at  $(\mu_*, \tau_*)$  are

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2 T^*}{\partial \mu^2} &= a_{11} \left( \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \right)^2 + 2a_{12} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} + a_{22} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \right)^2, \\ \frac{\partial^2 T^*}{\partial \tau^2} &= a_{11} \left( \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 + 2a_{12} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} + a_{22} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \right)^2, \\ \frac{\partial^2 T^*}{\partial \mu \partial \tau} &= a_{11} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} + a_{12} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau} + a_{12} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} + a_{22} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\nabla^2 T$  at  $(\mu_*, \tau_*)$  is

$$\nabla^2 T^* = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \\ \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \end{pmatrix}^\top \Sigma^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \\ \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} & \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \end{pmatrix},$$

and its determinant is  $|\nabla^2 g| = |\Sigma|^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} \right)^2$ .

The derivatives of  $\underline{t}$  and  $\bar{t}$  at  $(\mu^*, \tau^*)$  are

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \mu} &= -f_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\underline{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\underline{p}), \\ \frac{\partial \underline{t}^*}{\partial \tau} &= -f_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\underline{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\underline{p}), \\ \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \mu} &= -f_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\bar{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\bar{p}), \\ \frac{\partial \bar{t}^*}{\partial \tau} &= -f_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\bar{x}) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\bar{p}).\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$|\nabla^2 T^*| = |\Sigma|^{-1} f_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\underline{x})^2 f_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\bar{x})^2 |J(\mu^*, \tau^*; \underline{p}, \bar{p})|^2, \quad (21)$$

where

$$J(\mu^*, \tau^*; \underline{p}, \bar{p}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\underline{p}) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\underline{p}) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\bar{p}) & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} Q_{\mu^*, \tau^*}(\bar{p}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

From (20) and (21), we obtain that the density function of the hierarchical generative model (19) converges pointwise to  $\pi(\mu^*, \tau^*) |J(\mu^*, \tau^*; \underline{p}, \bar{p})|^{-1}$ .

### 10.11 Proof of Theorems 6 and 7

Similar to the proof of Theorems 1 and 2. Use Lemma 6 and Taylor expansions.

### 10.12 Likelihood function of two dimension i.i.d. generative model

Let  $[\mathbf{X}] = [X_1] \times [X_2]$  be the random rectangle generated from  $m$  i.i.d. bivariate latent data points from  $f(x_1, x_2 | \boldsymbol{\theta})$  with the data aggregation function taking the minimum and

maximum values at each margin. Let  $F(x_1, x_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})$  be the distribution function of  $f(x_1, x_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . The distribution function of  $[X_1] \times [X_2]$  is

$$F_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = [F(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})]^m.$$

This is the probability that all  $m$  latent data points fall within the rectangle  $[x_1] \times [x_2]$ . From Theorem 7, the likelihood function is the fourth order mixed derivative as shown below

$$\begin{aligned} f_{[\mathbf{X}]}(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= m(m-1)(m-2)(m-3) \times \\ &\{F(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^{m-4} \times \\ &\int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\bar{x}_1} f(y_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_1 \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\bar{x}_1} f(y_2, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_2 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\bar{x}_2} f(\underline{x}_1, y_3|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_3 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\bar{x}_2} f(\bar{x}_1, y_4|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_4 + \\ &m(m-1)(m-2) \{F(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^{m-3} \times \\ &\left\{ f(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\bar{x}_1} f(y_2, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_2 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\bar{x}_2} f(\bar{x}_1, y_4|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_4 + \right. \\ &f(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\bar{x}_1} f(y_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_1 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\bar{x}_2} f(\bar{x}_1, y_4|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_4 + \\ &f(\bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\bar{x}_1} f(y_2, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_2 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\bar{x}_2} f(\underline{x}_1, y_3|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_3 + \\ &\left. f(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int_{\underline{x}_1}^{\bar{x}_1} f(y_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_1 \int_{\underline{x}_2}^{\bar{x}_2} f(\underline{x}_1, y_3|\boldsymbol{\theta}) dy_3 \right\} + \\ &m(m-1) \{F(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - F(\bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + F(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^{m-2} \times \\ &\left\{ f(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + f(\underline{x}_1, \bar{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\bar{x}_1, \underline{x}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Although it is rather complex, in fact it has a similar intuitive interpretation to (7). The first term denotes the case that  $m-4$  points fall within  $[x_1] \times [x_2]$  while the remaining four points are  $(y_1, \underline{x}_2)$ ,  $(y_2, \bar{x}_2)$ ,  $(\underline{x}_1, y_3)$  and  $(\bar{x}_1, y_4)$ , where  $\underline{x}_1 \leq y_1, y_2 \leq \bar{x}_1$  and  $\underline{x}_2 \leq y_3, y_4 \leq \bar{x}_2$ . The second term represents the case that  $m-3$  points fall within  $[x_1] \times [x_2]$  while the remaining three points determine the boundary of the rectangle. The last terms is the case the boundary is formed by only two points.

### 10.13 Additional plots from simulation study




Figure 8: . As for Figure 6 in the Main Text, except that that the true data generating process is uniform. Boxplots of 500 replicate maximum likelihood estimates of  $\mu$  and  $\log \sigma$  under a uniform distribution with mean  $\mu = 0$  and standard deviation  $\sigma = 2$  as the true data generating process with  $m = 1000$ , and assuming data aggregation function  $\phi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 50, 100, \dots, 450$ . The true aggregation functions are  $\phi_1$  (left two columns) and  $\phi_{250}$  (right two columns). The models fitted are the normal (columns 1 & 3) and uniform (columns 2 & 4) distributions. In each panel, the rightmost boxplot indicates the outcome using the dataset with 5% outliers. Bottom row shows quantile-quantile curves of the fitted model ( $y$ -axis) versus the empirical underlying data quantiles ( $x$ -axis). Grey curves indicate use of the correct  $\varphi(\cdot)$  function. Dashed line denotes  $y = x$ .

## References

- Aldous, D. J. (1985). Exchangeability and related topics. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIII — 1983*, pp. 1–198. Berlin: Springer.
- Andrieu, C. and G. O. Roberts (2009). The pseudo-marginal approach for efficient Monte Carlo computations. *Ann. Stat.* *37*(2), 697–725.
- Arroyo, J., R. Espínola, and C. Maté (2010). Different approaches to forecast interval time series: A comparison in finance. *Comput. Econ.* *37*(2), 169–191.
- Beranger, B., H. Lin, and S. A. Sisson (2018). New models for symbolic data analysis. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.03659>.
- Beresteanu, A., I. Molchanov, and F. Molinari (2012). Partial identification using random set theory. *J. Econometrics* *166*(1), 17–32.
- Beresteanu, A. and F. Molinari (2008). Asymptotic properties for a class of partially identified models. *Econometrica* *76*(4), 763–814.
- Billard, L. and E. Diday (2003). From the statistics of data to the statistics of knowledge: Symbolic data analysis. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* *98*(462), 470–487.
- Billard, L. and E. Diday (2006). *Symbolic data analysis: Conceptual statistics and data mining*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brito, P. and A. P. Duarte Silva (2012). Modelling interval data with normal and skew-normal distributions. *J. Appl. Stat.* *39*(1), 3–20.
- Domingues, M. A. O., R. M. C. R. de Souza, and F. J. A. Cysneiros (2010). A robust method for linear regression of symbolic interval data. *Pattern Recogn. Lett.* *31*, 1991–1996.
- Durrett, R. (2010). *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, M. and T. Swartz (1995). Methods for approximating integrals in Statistics with special emphasis on Bayesian integration problems. *Statist. Sci.* *10*(3), 254–272.
- Evans, M. and T. Swartz (2000). *Approximating integrals via Monte Carlo and deterministic methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Fisher, R., R. A. O’Leary, S. Low-Choy, K. Mengersen, N. Knowlton, R. E. Brainard, and M. J. Caley (2015). Species richness on coral reefs and the pursuit of convergent global estimates. *Current Biol.* 25, 500–505.
- Geman, S. and D. Geman (1984). Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions, and the Bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 6(6), 721–741.
- Geyer, C. J. and E. A. Thompson (1992). Constrained Monte Carlo maximum likelihood for dependent data. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 54(3), 657–699.
- Jeon, Y., J. Ahn, and C. Park (2015). A nonparametric kernel approach to interval-valued data analysis. *Technometrics* 57, 566–575.
- Le-Rademacher, J. and L. Billard (2011). Likelihood functions and some maximum likelihood estimators for symbolic data. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* 141(4), 1593–1602.
- Lin, H., M. J. Caley, and S. A. Sisson (2017). Estimating global species richness using symbolic data meta analysis. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.03202>.
- Lyashenko, N. N. (1983). Statistics of random compacts in Euclidean space. *J. Soviet Math.* 21(1), 76–92.
- Matheron, G. (1975). *Random sets and integral geometry*. New York: Wiley.
- McLachlan, G. J. and P. N. Jones (1988). Fitting mixture models to grouped and truncated data via the EM algorithm. *Biometrics* 44, 571–578.
- Molchanov, I. (2005). *Theory of random sets*. London: Springer.
- Molchanov, I. and F. Molinari (2014). Applications of random set theory in Econometrics. *Annu. Rev. Econ.* 6(1), 229–251.
- Moore, R. E. (1966). *Interval analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Neto, E. A. L. and F. A. T. Carvalho (2010). Constrained linear regression models for symbolic interval-valued variables. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* 54, 333–347.
- Noirhomme-Fraiture, M. and P. Brito (2011). Far beyond the classical data models: Symbolic data analysis. *Stat. Anal. Data Min.* 4(2), 157–170.
- Sisson, S. A., Y. Fan, and M. A. Beaumont (Eds.) (2018). *Handbook of Approximate Bayesian Computation*. Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.



- Sun, Y. and D. Ralescu (2015). A normal hierarchical model and minimum contrast estimation for random intervals. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* 67(2), 313–333.
- Vardeman, S. B. and C.-S. Lee (2005). Likelihood-based statistical estimation from quantised data. *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.* 54, 409–414.
- Wei, G. C. G. and M. A. Tanner (1990). A Monte Carlo implementation of the EM algorithm and the poor man’s data augmentation algorithms. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 85(411), 699–704.
- Xu, W. (2010). *Symbolic data analysis: Interval-valued data regression*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Georgia, USA.