

## The shortest confidence interval for Poisson mean

Wojciech Zieliński

Department of Econometrics and Statistics  
Warsaw University of Life Sciences  
Nowoursynowska 159, 02-776 Warszawa, Poland  
e-mail: wojciech.zielinski@sggw.edu.pl

**Summary.** The existence of the shortest confidence interval for Poisson mean is shown. The method of obtaining such an interval is presented as well.

**Key words:** Poisson mean, confidence interval, shortest confidence intervals

**AMS 2000 Subject Classification:** 62F25

Consider the Poisson statistical model

$$(\{0, 1, \dots\}, \{Po(\lambda), \lambda > 0\}),$$

where  $Po(\lambda)$  denotes the Poisson distribution with pdf

$$\frac{\lambda^x}{x!} \exp(-\lambda), \quad x = 0, 1, \dots$$

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be a simple sample from Poisson distribution and let  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . The random variable  $X$  is distributed as  $Po(n\lambda)$ . A confidence interval for the mean  $\lambda$  at the confidence level  $\gamma$  is of the form (Garwood, 1936)

$$\frac{1}{2n} (F^{-1}(2X; \gamma_1); F^{-1}(2(X+1); \gamma_2)),$$

where  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, 1)$  are such that  $\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 = \gamma$  and  $F^{-1}(\nu; \alpha)$  is the  $\alpha$  quantile of the chi-square distribution with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom, i.e.

$$P_\lambda \left\{ \lambda \in \frac{1}{2n} (F^{-1}(2X; \gamma_1); F^{-1}(2(X+1); \gamma_2)) \right\} \geq \gamma, \quad \forall \lambda > 0.$$

For  $X = 0$  the left end is taken to be 0.

The above confidence interval with  $\gamma_1 = (1 - \gamma)/2$  was proposed by Garwood (1936) and was based on the confidence interval for binomial probability constructed by Clopper and Pearson (1934). Because at the time finding quantiles of chi-square distribution was numerically complicated, then there were given many other approximate confidence intervals for Poisson mean. A very exhaustive review of confidence intervals for Poisson mean may be found in Patil and Kulkarni (2012). A nice review of literature is given in Khurshid and Ageel (2010).

Garwood (1936) in his construction used  $\gamma_1 = (1 - \gamma)/2$ , i.e. he applied the rule of symmetric division of  $1 - \gamma$  to both sides of the interval. It seems that this rule was firstly applied by Clopper and Pearson (1934) and since then such confidence intervals are applied in standard statistical inference. The length of the confidence interval was not considered as a criterion. It is of interest to find the shortest confidence interval. So we want to find  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  such that the confidence interval is the shortest possible.

The problem of construction the shortest confidence intervals was seldom considered in the past (Casella and Robert 1989, Kabaila and Byrne 2000). However, a procedure refining a family of confidence intervals was proposed by those authors. Unfortunately, those proposed solutions are rather complicated. In what follows, a much simpler solution of the problem is presented. Zieliski (2010, 2012, 2014, 2017) similar approach applied to the problem of the interval estimation of a probability of success in a binomial and negative binomial models.

Consider the length of the confidence interval when  $X = x$  is observed (the multiplier  $\frac{1}{2n}$  is omitted),

$$d(\gamma_1, x) = F^{-1}(2(x+1); \gamma + \gamma_1) - F^{-1}(2x; \gamma_1).$$

Let  $x$  be given. We want to find  $0 < \gamma_1 < 1 - \gamma$  such that  $d(\gamma_1, x)$  is minimal.

**Theorem.** The shortest confidence interval is two-sided for  $x > 1$  and one-sided otherwise.

**Proof.** The derivative of  $d(\gamma_1, x)$  with respect to  $\gamma_1$  equals

$$\frac{\partial d(\gamma_1, x)}{\partial \gamma_1} = 2\Gamma(x) \left[ x \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2(x+1); \gamma + \gamma_1) \right\} \left( \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2(x+1); \gamma + \gamma_1) \right)^{-x} - \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2x; \gamma_1) \right\} \left( \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2x; \gamma_1) \right)^{(1-x)} \right]$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} LHS(\gamma_1, x) &= x \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2(x+1); \gamma + \gamma_1) \right\} \left( \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2(x+1); \gamma + \gamma_1) \right)^{-x}, \\ RHS(\gamma_1, x) &= \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2x; \gamma_1) \right\} \left( \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2x; \gamma_1) \right)^{(1-x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial d(\gamma_1, x)}{\partial \gamma_1} = 2\Gamma(x) [LHS(\gamma_1, x) - RHS(\gamma_1, x)].$$

Because

$$F^{-1}(2x; 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad F^{-1}(2x; 1) = +\infty,$$

for  $x > 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \gamma_1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ then } LHS(\gamma_1, x) &> 0 \text{ and } RHS(\gamma_1, x) \rightarrow +\infty, \\ \text{if } \gamma_1 \rightarrow 1 - \gamma \text{ then } LHS(\gamma_1, x) &\rightarrow +\infty \text{ and } RHS(\gamma_1, x) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the equation

$$\frac{\partial d(\gamma_1, x)}{\partial \gamma_1} = 0 \tag{*}$$

has a solution.

It is easy to see that  $LHS(\cdot, x)$  and  $RHS(\cdot, x)$  are concave on the interval  $(0, 1 - \gamma)$ . Hence, the solution of (\*) is unique. Let  $\gamma_1^*$  denote the solution. Because  $\frac{\partial d(\gamma_1, x)}{\partial \gamma_1} < 0$  for  $\gamma_1 < \gamma_1^*$  and  $\frac{\partial d(\gamma_1, x)}{\partial \gamma_1} > 0$  for  $\gamma_1 > \gamma_1^*$ , we have  $d(\gamma_1^*, x) = \inf\{d(\gamma_1, x) : 0 < \gamma_1 < 1 - \gamma\}$ .

For  $x = 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} LHS(\gamma_1, 1) &= \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(4; \gamma + \gamma_1) \right\} \left( \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(4; \gamma + \gamma_1) \right)^{-1}, \\ RHS(\gamma_1, 1) &= \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(2; \gamma_1) \right\} = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_1}. \end{aligned}$$

It is seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \gamma_1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ then } LHS(\gamma_1, 1) &\rightarrow \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(4; \gamma) \right\} \left( \frac{1}{2} F^{-1}(4; \gamma) \right)^{-1} > 1 \text{ and } RHS(\gamma_1, 1) \rightarrow 1, \\ \text{if } \gamma_1 \rightarrow 1 - \gamma \text{ then } LHS(\gamma_1, 1) &\rightarrow +\infty \text{ and } RHS(\gamma_1, 1) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$LHS(\gamma_1, 1) > RHS(\gamma_1, 1) \quad \text{for } 0 < \gamma_1 < 1 - \gamma.$$


So  $\frac{\partial d(\gamma_1, 1)}{\partial \gamma_1} > 0$  and hence  $d(\gamma_1, 1)$  achieves its minimal value for  $\gamma_1 = 0$ . For  $x = 1$  the shortest confidence interval is one-sided one.  $\square$

The value of  $\gamma_1^*$  for a given  $\gamma$  and  $x$  may be found numerically. Table 1 gives those values for  $\gamma = 0.95$  along with Garwood (i.e. standard) confidence intervals are also shown.

**Table 1.** Confidence intervals


$x$	$\gamma_1^*$	Shortest c.i.			Garwood c.i.		
		$left_{short}$	$right_{short}$	$length_{short}$	$left_{sym}$	$right_{sym}$	$length_{sym}$
0	0	0	2.99573	2.99573	0	3.68888	3.68888
1	0	0	4.74386	4.74386	0.02532	5.57164	5.54633
2	0.0006842	0.03745	6.31464	6.27718	0.24220	7.22469	6.98248
3	0.0032543	0.28932	7.85431	7.56498	0.61867	8.76727	8.14860
4	0.0055749	0.69364	9.34343	8.64979	1.08987	10.2416	9.15172
5	0.0073839	1.18586	10.7856	9.59974	1.62349	11.6683	10.0448
6	0.0088031	1.73592	12.1903	10.4544	2.20189	13.0595	10.8576
7	0.0099438	2.32761	13.5652	11.2376	2.81436	14.4227	11.6083
8	0.0108823	2.95111	14.9157	11.9646	3.45383	15.7632	12.3094
9	0.0116702	3.59994	16.2460	12.6461	4.11537	17.0848	12.9694
10	0.0123431	4.26955	17.5591	13.2896	4.79539	18.3904	13.5950
20	0.0160510	11.6397	30.1013	18.4615	12.2165	30.8884	18.6719
30	0.0177103	19.6443	42.0607	22.4164	20.2409	42.8269	22.5860
40	0.0186995	27.9689	53.7153	25.7464	28.5766	54.4686	25.8921
50	0.0193736	36.4960	65.1743	28.6782	37.1110	65.9188	28.8078
60	0.0198706	45.1662	76.4940	31.3278	45.7863	77.2319	31.4456
70	0.0202562	53.9444	87.7080	33.7636	54.5684	88.4408	33.8724
80	0.0205667	62.8079	98.8383	36.0305	63.4350	99.5669	36.1319
90	0.0208235	71.7409	109.900	38.1592	72.3706	110.625	38.2547
100	0.0210406	80.7322	120.905	40.1725	81.3640	121.627	40.2628

In Figure 1 the probability of coverage for the shortest confidence interval is shown. The nominal confidence level equals 0.95. There are true means of Poisson distribution and the probability of coverage given on the  $x$ - and  $y$ -axis, respectively.



**Figure 1.** Probability of coverage

In Figure 2 the comparison of lengths of the shortest and classical confidence intervals is shown. On  $y$ -axis the ratio of the lengths is given (length of the shortest c.i. vs length of Garwood c.i.). As in Figure 1, there are true means of Poisson distribution given on the  $x$ -axis.



**Figure 2.** Comparison of length

Note that for large observed values of random variable  $X$  the shortest confidence interval is the classical one, i.e.  $\gamma_1 = (1 - \gamma)/2$ . It follows from the fact that asymptotically chi-square distribution is a normal one. It is known that the shortest confidence interval for the mean of a normal distribution is symmetric about its mean and probabilities of under- and overestimation equal each other.

Below we give a short R program for calculating  $\gamma_1^*$  and the ends of the shortest confidence interval. Of course, one can also use other mathematical or statistical packages to find the values of  $\gamma_1^*$ .

```

Quintile=function(q,l){qchisq(q,l)} #quantile of chi-square with l df
Left=function(x,prob){if (x==0) 0 else Quintile(prob,2*x)/2}
Right=function(x,prob){Quintile(prob,2*(x+1))/2}

```

```

Leng=function(x,q,s){Right(x,q+s)-Left(x,s)}
FindMinimumLeng=
  function(x,q,s){optimize(Leng,interval=c(0,1-q),x=x,q=q,tol=1e-20)$minimum}
level=0.95; #confidence level
x=100; #observed value
ss = FindMinimumLeng(x,level)
Leftshort=Left(x,ss) #output left end
Rightshort=Right(x,level+ss) #output right end
cat("x=",x,"The shortest confidence interval:  (",Leftshort,";",Rightshort,")", "");

```

In Garwood's times calculating quantiles of a chi-square distribution was numerically complicated. Nowadays, it is very easy with the aid of computer software, so using the shortest confidence interval is recommended, especially for small sample values of  $X$ .

## References

- Garwood, F. (1936). Fiducial limits for the Poisson distribution, *Biometrika*, 28, 437-442.
- Casella, G., Robert, C. (1989). Refining Poisson confidence intervals. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 17, 45-57
- Clopper, C.J., Pearson, E.S. (1934). The Use of Confidence or Fiducial Limits Illustrated in the Case of the Binomial, *Biometrika*, 26, 404-413
- Kabaila, P., Byrne, J. (2000). Exact short Poisson confidence intervals. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 28, 1-9
- Khurshid, A., Ageel, M. (2010). Binomial and Poisson Confidence Intervals and its Variants A Bibliography. *Pak.J.Stat.Oper.Res.*, VI, 75-100
- Patil, V.V., Kulkarni, H.V. (2012). Comparison of confidence intervals for the Poisson mean: some new aspects. *REVSTAT - Statistical Journal*, 10, 211-227
- Zieliński, W. (2010). The shortest Clopper-Pearson confidence interval for binomial probability, *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 39, 188-193
- Zieliński, W. (2012). The shortest confidence interval for probability of success in a negative binomial model, *Applicationes Mathematicae*, 39(2), 143-149
- Zieliński, W. (2014). The shortest randomized confidence interval for probability of success in a negative binomial model, *Applicationes Mathematicae*, 41(1), 43-49
- Zieliński, W. (2017). The shortest Clopper-Pearson randomized confidence interval for binomial probability, *REVSTAT-Statistical Journal*, 15(1), 141-153