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Abstract

Existing nonparametric density estimators typically require individual-level data. For administrative data, individual-level information is difficult to access, but tabulated summaries are often publicly available. In this light, we propose a novel method of maximum entropy density estimation from tabulated summary data. We establish the strong uniform consistency property for this nonparametric estimator. Applying the proposed method to the tabulated summary data of the U.S. tax returns, we estimate the national income distribution.
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1 Introduction

A researcher can often access a tabulated summary of data more easily than its original data containing confidential information at the individual level. Examples include administrative tax data containing detailed information about individual-level records of income. Tax authorities often release summary statistics of the national income distributions, such as the number of tax payers and their average income, grouped by bins of income levels in a tabulated format. Despite their lack of details, such tabulated summary data are still useful for researchers in analyzing the distributions of national income, especially for historically old times for which micro data are no longer available.

A typical econometric or statistical method of estimating the cross-sectional distribution of a continuous random variable, such as the kernel density estimator and the empirical cumulative distribution function, requires individual-level information, and thus is not useful in circumstances in which a researcher only has access to a tabulated summary. In this paper, we propose a novel method of estimating the probability density function of an absolutely continuous distribution from tabulated summary data based on the maximum entropy (ME) principle. This ME density estimator enjoys a number of desirable properties, including piecewise exponentiality, which allows for analytic post-estimation integration to in turn calculate cumulative distribution estimates. We establish the strong uniform consistency for the ME density and cumulative distribution estimators under the asymptotic framework in which the resolution of bins in the table becomes finer at certain rates as the underlying sample size increases.

We are not the first to estimate the distribution of a continuous random variable from tabulated summary data. Piketty (2003) interpolates the income distribution by the Pareto distribution with the Pareto exponent estimated from a tabulated
summary; see also Piketty and Saez (2003) for an application to the U.S. income distribution. The Pareto interpolation may be certainly reasonable near the right tail of the income distribution. On the other hand, this distributional assumption is too strong and implausible for the interior of the income distribution. In contrast, our ME estimator postulates nonparametric distributions, and therefore does not rely on any parametric distribution family for interpolation. Furthermore, unlike the existing methods, we also provide rigorous econometric theories to guarantee that our proposed method behaves well in large sample as mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Applying the proposed method of ME estimation to tabulated summary data of the U.S. tax returns, we investigate the income distribution in the U.S. Our work complements that of Piketty and Saez (2003) who estimate tails of the income distributions using the aforementioned method of Pareto interpolation. Our proposed method further allows to consistently estimate the interior of the income distributions. We illustrate our method with the data sets from 1919 and 2019.

Relation to the literature The most closely related to this article are Piketty (2001, 2003) and Piketty and Saez (2003). The previous two paragraphs discuss details about the relation to these two papers. Historically, the ME principle was developed in physics to infer the population distribution (e.g., energy distribution of gas molecules) from macroscopic variables (e.g., temperature); see Jaynes (1957). The ME principle has been justified based on Bayesian inference in the sense that, if a decision maker has a prior and learns that some moment conditions must be satisfied, then the posterior minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence subject to these moment conditions (Van Campenhout and Cover, 1981). In econometrics, applications of the ME method include Bayesian method of moments (Zellner, 1971).

---

1Piketty (2001, Appendix B, Section 1.1, pp. 592–599) provides the details of the method. Since it is written in French, we describe the method in Appendix D for convenience of the readers.
1997; Zellner and Tobias, 2001) and generalized method of moments estimation (Kitamura and Stutzer, 1997). Closely related to this article in the econometrics literature in terms of an application of the ME density to income distributions is Wu (2003). While we focus on estimation from tabulated summary data, Wu (2003) considers individual-level observations rather than tabulated summary data. In economics, applications of the ME method include general equilibrium theory (Foley, 1994; Toda, 2010, 2015), diagnosis of asset pricing models (Stutzer, 1995), derivative pricing (Stutzer, 1996), discretization of probability distributions and stochastic processes (Tanaka and Toda, 2013, 2015; Farmer and Toda, 2017), among others.

Organization of the paper Section 2 introduces the tabulate data and previews the U.S. tax return data set. Section 3 sets up the ME problem with infeasible moment restrictions. Section 4 presents the feasible moment restrictions and derives the consistency of the estimator. Section 5 presents simulation studies. Section 6 applies the proposed method to the U.S. tax return data set. Section 7 concludes with all the mathematical proofs and additional details about our method and Piketty (2003)’s Pareto interpolation method in the Appendix.

2 Tabulated summary data

2.1 General data framework

Consider the latent sample \( \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n \), which is not directly observed by the researcher. Denote the order statistics in descending order by \( \{Y_{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n \) such that

\[ Y_{(1)} \geq Y_{(2)} \geq \cdots \geq Y_{(n)}. \]
For each \( m \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), define the partial sum of top \( m \) order statistics

\[
S_m := \sum_{i=1}^{m} Y_i.
\]  

(2.1)

Consider a positive number \( K \) of bins, where \( \{t_k\}_{k=0}^{K} \) denotes the sequence of bin threshold values such that

\[
\infty = t_0 > t_1 > t_2 > \cdots > t_K.
\]

Let \( n_k \) be the number of order statistics included in the top \( k \) bins, that is, \( n_k := \# \{ i : Y_i \geq t_k \} \). The tabulated data are summarized as \( \{(t_k, n_k, S_{n_k})\}_{k=1}^{K} \), which is observed by the researcher.

### 2.2 Example: summary of income data by tax authorities

As a concrete example of the data framework just described, consider the latent sample \( \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \) of the values \( Y_i \) of income, where \( i \) indexes potential taxpayers and \( n \) is the sample size. For privacy concerns, in general there is no public access to administrative data of income. Publicly available data on the income distribution released from tax authorities often take the form of the tabulated summary \( \{(t_k, n_k, S_{n_k})\}_{k=1}^{K} \).

Table 1 presents an example data set from the 2019 U.S. tax returns.\(^2\) In this example, the number of income groups is \( K = 18 \). Column (1) shows the lower threshold \( t_k \) of adjusted gross income (AGI) for each income group \( k \in \{1, \ldots, K\} \). Column (2) shows the number of taxpayers within each income group \( k \), which corresponds to \( n_k - n_{k-1} \) in our notations, where we set \( n_0 = 0 \) by convention.

\(^2\)Table 1 shows partial information from Internal Revenue Service, Statistics of Income (SOI) Individual Income Tax Returns Publication 1304 (https://www.irs.gov/statistics/soi-tax-stats-individual-income-tax-returns-complete-report-publication-1304), Table 1.4 under “Basic Tables”. Adjusted gross income (AGI) is AGI less deficit. We omit the row corresponding to negative income.
Column (3) shows the total income (AGI) accruing to taxpayers in each income group $k$ in units of 1,000 U.S. dollars, which corresponds to $(S_{n_k} - S_{n_{k-1}})/1,000$ in our notations, where we set $S_0 = 0$ by convention. We thus observe the tabulated summary data $\{(t_k, n_k, S_{n_k})\}_{k=1}^K$ of AGI, where $K = 18$.

Table 1: Income distribution in the United States, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group (1) AGI threshold</th>
<th>Adjusted gross income (AGI) # returns</th>
<th>Total income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 $1</td>
<td>9,866,880</td>
<td>24,439,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 $5,000</td>
<td>9,925,940</td>
<td>74,584,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 $10,000</td>
<td>11,087,737</td>
<td>138,230,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 $15,000</td>
<td>10,039,446</td>
<td>175,255,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 $20,000</td>
<td>9,493,968</td>
<td>213,660,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 $25,000</td>
<td>9,289,939</td>
<td>254,877,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 $30,000</td>
<td>16,090,602</td>
<td>560,073,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 $40,000</td>
<td>12,503,041</td>
<td>560,258,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 $50,000</td>
<td>22,238,948</td>
<td>1,366,892,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 $75,000</td>
<td>14,118,568</td>
<td>1,222,947,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 $100,000</td>
<td>21,997,582</td>
<td>3,004,363,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 $200,000</td>
<td>7,297,883</td>
<td>2,090,808,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 $500,000</td>
<td>1,162,371</td>
<td>781,920,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 $1,000,000</td>
<td>254,197</td>
<td>305,561,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 $1,500,000</td>
<td>103,075</td>
<td>176,961,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 $2,000,000</td>
<td>143,514</td>
<td>425,088,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 $5,000,000</td>
<td>34,738</td>
<td>237,781,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 $10,000,000</td>
<td>20,876</td>
<td>590,230,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “AGI threshold” is the lower threshold of adjusted gross income (AGI) that defines the income groups. “# returns” is the number of tax returns with income weakly above the lower AGI threshold and strictly below the upper AGI threshold. “Total income” is the total income (in units of 1,000 U.S. dollars) accruing to taxpayers in each income group.

3 Maximum entropy density

This section investigates a method to characterize a well-behaved density function of the distribution of $Y$ from the tabulated summary data $\{(t_k, n_k, S_{n_k})\}_{k=1}^K$ introduced in Section 2. Our proposed method is based on the maximum entropy
(ME) principle.

Let $F$ denote the true cumulative distribution function (CDF) of $Y$, which is assumed to be absolutely continuous with probability density function denoted by $f = F'$. Suppose that the thresholds satisfy

$$\infty = t_0 > t_1 > t_2 > \cdots > t_K =: \bar{t},$$

and let $I_k := [t_k, t_{k-1})$ denote the interval for the top $k$-th bin with top fractile denoted by $p_k = P(Y \geq t_k) = 1 - F(t_k)$. For each $k$, the bin probability and conditional mean are defined by

\begin{align*}
q_k &= P(Y \in I_k) = \int 1_{I_k}(y) \, dF(y) = p_k - p_{k-1}, \quad (3.1a) \\
y_k &= E[Y \mid Y \in I_k] = \frac{1}{q_k} \int 1_{I_k}(y) y \, dF(y), \quad (3.1b)
\end{align*}

where $1_I(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function indicating that the argument belongs to the set $I$.

Obviously, given only the finite tabulation $\{(p_k, y_k)\}_{k=1}^K$, we do not have sufficient moment restrictions to pin down the true density function $f$. The ME method is useful when only certain moment conditions are given. In our context of characterizing the distribution of $Y$ from a tabulation, we can proceed as follows.

Letting $g$ denote a generic density, the given moment conditions consistent with (3.1) are

\begin{align*}
\int 1_{I_k}(y) g(y) \, dy &= q_k, \quad (3.2a) \\
\int 1_{I_k}(y) yg(y) \, dy &= q_k y_k \quad (3.2b)
\end{align*}

for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. The ME density $f^*$ is defined by the density $g$ on
$I := [t, \infty)$ that minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence (with respect to the improper uniform density)

$$
\int_I g(y) \log g(y) \, dy
$$

subject to the moment restrictions (3.2). Below, we let $L^1_+(I)$ denote the equivalence class (identified by the $L^1$ norm) of nonnegative, measurable, and integrable functions $g : I \to \mathbb{R}$. The following proposition characterizes the solution to the ME problem.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $\infty = t_0 > t_1 > \cdots > t_K$ be the thresholds and $y_k \in (t_k, t_{k-1})$ be the average of $Y$ in group $k$. Then the function

$$
J_k(\lambda; t) := \begin{cases}
g_k \lambda - \log \left( \frac{e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} - e^{\lambda t_k}}{\lambda} \right) & (\lambda \neq 0) \\
- \log (t_{k-1} - t_k) & (\lambda = 0)
\end{cases}
$$

is strictly concave in $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and achieves a unique maximum $\lambda^*_k$, which satisfies

$$
\lambda^*_1 = -\frac{1}{y_1 - t_1} < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^*_k \begin{cases}
< 0 & \text{if } y_k < \frac{t_k + t_{k-1}}{2}, \\
= 0 & \text{if } y_k = \frac{t_k + t_{k-1}}{2}, \\
> 0 & \text{if } y_k > \frac{t_k + t_{k-1}}{2},
\end{cases} \quad k \geq 2.
$$

The ME problem has a unique solution $f^* \in L^1_+(I)$, which is piecewise exponential and satisfies

$$
f^*(y) = \begin{cases}
\frac{q_k \lambda^*_k e^{\lambda^*_k y}}{e^{\lambda^*_k t_{k-1}} - e^{\lambda^*_k t_k}} & (\lambda^*_k \neq 0) \\
\frac{q_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} & (\lambda^*_k = 0)
\end{cases}
$$

for $y \in I_k = [t_k, t_{k-1})$. The minimum value of the Kullback-Leibler divergence (3.3) is given by

$$
J^*(t_1, \ldots, t_K) := \sum_{k=1}^K q_k (J_k(\lambda^*_k; t) + \log q_k).
$$
4 Estimation

This section proposes a feasible analog of the ME density characterized in Section 3 for estimation of the true density function $f$ of $Y$. We then establish its strong uniform consistency.

We construct a feasible ME density estimator by replacing $q_k$ and $y_k$ with their empirical analogs $\hat{q}_k = (n_k - n_{k-1})/n$ and $\hat{y}_k = (S_{n_k} - S_{n_{k-1}})/(n_k - n_{k-1})$, respectively. Letting $t := \{t_k\}_{k=1}^K$ denote the vector of thresholds, we thus define the sample-analog ME estimator $\hat{f}$ of $f$ as the solution to the constrained optimization problem of minimizing (3.3) subject to (3.2) with $\hat{q}_k$ and $\hat{y}_k$ in place of $q_k$ and $y_k$, respectively.

We now establish the almost sure uniform consistency of $\hat{f}$ for the true density function $f$ over any compact subset of the domain of $f$ as $n \to \infty$. To this end, consider the following conditions.

**Assumption 1.** The following conditions hold.

(i) $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is IID with density $f$.

(ii) The domain $D := \{y \in \mathbb{R} : f(y) > 0\}$ is open and $f : D \to (0, \infty)$ is continuously differentiable.

(iii) There exist some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $r_1, r_2 \in (0, 1/4)$ with $r_2 \leq r_1 < 2r_2$ such that

\[
c_1 n^{-r_1} \leq \min_{2 \leq k \leq K} \{t_{k-1} - t_k\} \leq \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \{t_{k-1} - t_k\} \leq c_2 n^{-r_2}. \tag{4.1}
\]

Furthermore, $\limsup_{n \to \infty} t_K \leq \inf D$ and $\liminf_{n \to \infty} t_1 \geq \sup D$.

Condition (i) assumes a random sample. Condition (ii) requires that the true density is smooth. Condition (iii) requires that the length of any bin is neither too large nor too small, as well as that $[\limsup_{n \to \infty} t_K, \liminf_{n \to \infty} t_1]$ covers the
domain $D$ of $f$. With these conditions, the following theorem establishes the strong uniform consistency of the maximum entropy density estimator $\hat{f}$ for the true density function $f$ over any compact subset of the domain. The proof is non-trivial and postponed to Appendix A.

**Theorem 4.1.** Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and let $C \subset D$ be compact. Then, as $n \to \infty$, we have

\[
\sup_{y \in C} \left| \hat{f}(y) - f(y) \right| \overset{a.s.}{\to} 0. \tag{4.2}
\]

The strong uniform consistency for the density function immediately implies that for the cumulative distribution function $F$. Define the estimator $\hat{F}$ of $F$ by

\[
\hat{F}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{y} \hat{f}(y) \, dy.
\]

Theorem 4.1 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.2.** Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and let $C \subset D$ be compact. If $-\infty < \inf D$, then, as $n \to \infty$, we have

\[
\sup_{y \in C} \left| \hat{F}(y) - F(y) \right| \overset{a.s.}{\to} 0.
\]

5 Simulation studies

We consider four typical models for income distribution, namely lognormal, gamma, Weibull, and double Pareto. The lognormal density is given by

\[
f(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{(\log y - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \frac{1}{y},
\]
where $\mu, \sigma$ are the log mean and log standard deviation. The gamma density is given by
\[
f(y) = \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} y^{a-1} e^{-by},
\]
where $a, b$ are shape and scale parameters. The Weibull density is given by
\[
f(y) = bky^{k-1} e^{-by^k},
\]
where $k, b$ are shape and scale parameters. The double Pareto density is given by
\[
f(y) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\alpha \beta}{\alpha + \beta} M^{-\beta} y^{\beta-1}, & (0 \leq y \leq M) \\
\frac{\alpha \beta}{\alpha + \beta} M^{\alpha} y^{-\alpha-1}, & (M \leq y < \infty)
\end{cases}
\]
where $\alpha, \beta > 0$ are the upper and lower tail Pareto exponents and $M > 0$ is a scale parameter.

In each case we normalize the scale parameter so that the mean is 1, which implies that $\mu = -\sigma^2/2$ for lognormal, $b = a$ for gamma, $b = \Gamma(1 + 1/k)$ for Weibull, and $M = (\beta + 1)(\alpha - 1)/(\alpha \beta)$ for double Pareto. For the remaining parameter values, we set $\sigma = 1.5$ for lognormal, $a = 0.5$ for gamma, $k = 0.7$ for Weibull, and $(\alpha, \beta) = (1.5, 0.5)$ for double Pareto.

The simulation design is as follows. For each model, we generate a random sample $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with sample size $n = 10^7$. Such a large $n$ is coherent with the number of tax payers in our empirical data set; see Table 1. We set the top fractiles to
\[
(p_k)_{k=1}^K = (0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, \ldots, 0.9, 0.95, 0.99, 0.995, 0.999, 1)
\]
(so $K = 26$) and define the $k$-th threshold $t_k$ as the top $p_k$-th quantile of $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$. We then estimate the ME density $\hat{f}$ as in Section 4.
Figure 1 shows the population and estimated density for each model. Because the population densities are skewed, for visibility we plot the density of log $Y$. The two densities $f$ and $\hat{f}$ are nearly identical.

Figure 1: PDF of log $Y$ for each model.

6 Income distribution in the United States

As an empirical application, we consider the distribution of U.S. adjusted gross income (AGI) in 1919 and 2019. We use the nominal values in the U.S. dollars. The number of income groups is $K = 37$ for 1919 and $K = 18$ for 2019. Figure 2a shows the ME density estimates $\hat{f}(e^x)e^x$ of log income $x = \log y$ in a semi-log scale. Note that unlike in recent years, the tabulated summary data set is almost the only publicly available data set about tax returns in early years as 1919.
The findings can be summarized as follows. First, for 2019, the log income distribution is bell-shaped and roughly symmetric. For 1919, the log income distribution appears to be truncated from below because only very high income earners paid taxes (the number of tax filers is 156 million in 2019 compared to only 5.3 million in 1919.) Second, although the centers/means of the distributions are not comparable given that the price level is missing for early years, we can still compare the tail heaviness. The figure suggests that the income distribution in 2019 has a substantially heavier tail than that in 1919. Third, observe that although \( \hat{f} \) is piecewise exponential, it is not necessarily continuous at the bin thresholds. Finally, figure 2b shows the tail probability \( 1 - \hat{F}(y) \) in a log-log scale, which is continuous. The graph shows a straight-line pattern for high incomes, which is consistent with a Pareto upper tail.

(a) Probability density of log income. (b) Log-log plot of tail probability.

Figure 2: U.S. income distributions in 1919 and 2019.

Because the ME density \( \hat{f} \) is piecewise exponential, which is analytically tractable, it is straightforward to compute statistics such as top income shares; see Appendix B for concrete formulas. Figure 3 shows the top income shares, both in original and log-log scales.
7 Summary

Existing and standard nonparametric estimators of density and cumulative distribution functions require individual-level data. Even when individual-level information is difficult to access due to confidentiality concerns, tabulated summaries of such data are often publicly available. Administrative data of income are the leading examples. In this paper, we propose a novel method of maximum entropy density estimation from tabulated summary data. The estimator is piecewise exponential, which is analytically tractable. Using its functional form, it is straightforward to compute statistics such as top income shares. Furthermore, we establish the strong uniform consistency of the density and cumulative distribution estimators.

Appendix

Section A contains mathematical proofs of the uniform strong consistency. Section B provides the formula for the CDF and the expectation based on the proposed
density estimator. Section C solves some numerical issues in constructing the proposed estimator. Section D describes the details of Piketty (2003)’s Pareto interpolation method, which was originally written in French.

A Proofs

Proof of Proposition 3.1. To simplify notation, we suppress the dependence of $J_k$, $\lambda_k^*$, etc. on $t$. We use Fenchel duality (Borwein and Lewis, 1991) to solve the maximum entropy problem. The Lagrangian of the maximum entropy problem subject to the moment conditions (3.2) is

$$L(g, \mu, \lambda) = \int g \log g \, dy + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( \mu_k \left( q_k - \int 1_{I_k} g \, dy \right) + \lambda_k \left( q_k y_k - \int 1_{I_k} yg \, dy \right) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K} q_k (\mu_k + y_k \lambda_k) + \int \left( g \log g - \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\mu_k 1_{I_k} g + \lambda_k 1_{I_k} yg) \right) \, dy,$$

where $\mu_k$ and $\lambda_k$ are the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the moment conditions (3.2a) and (3.2b). The dual objective function is the minimum of $L$ over unconstrained $g \in L_+^1(I)$. Taking the first order condition (Gâteaux derivative) pointwise, for $y \in I_k$ we obtain

$$0 = \log g + 1 - (\mu_k + \lambda_k y) \iff g(y) = e^{\mu_k + \lambda_k y}.$$

Hence the dual objective function becomes

$$J(\mu, \lambda) := \min_{g \in L_+^1(I)} L(g, \mu, \lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} q_k (\mu_k + y_k \lambda_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \int_{I_k} e^{\mu_k + \lambda_k y} \, dy.$$
The dual problem maximizes $J$ with respect to $\mu, \lambda$, which is a concave maximization problem. The first order condition with respect to $\mu_k$ is

$$0 = \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mu_k} = q_k - \int_{l_k} e^{\mu_k + \lambda_k y - 1} \, dy \iff \mu_k = 1 + \log q_k - \log \left( \int_{l_k} e^{\lambda_k y} \, dy \right). \quad (A.2)$$

Then (with a slight abuse of notation) the objective function becomes

$$J(\lambda) := \max_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^K} J(\mu, \lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( q_k y_k \lambda_k + q_k \log q_k - q_k \log \left( \int_{l_k} e^{\lambda_k y} \, dy \right) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K} q_k \left( y_k \lambda_k + \log q_k - \log \left( \int_{l_k} e^{\lambda_k y} \, dy \right) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K} q_k (J_k(\lambda_k) + \log q_k), \quad (A.3)$$

where $J_k$ is given by (3.4). Since $J$ is additively separable, it suffices to maximize $J_k$ for each $k$.

Let us now show that $J_k(\lambda)$ achieves a unique maximum over $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. It is straightforward to show the strict concavity of $J_k$ by applying Hölder’s inequality to the function $\lambda \mapsto \log \left( \int_{l_k} e^{\lambda y} \, dy \right)$. As $\lambda \to \pm \infty$, it follows from (3.4) that

$$J_k(\lambda) = y_k \lambda - \log \left( \frac{e^{\lambda_{k-1}} - e^{\lambda_k}}{\lambda} \right) = \log \left( \frac{\lambda e^{\lambda y_k}}{e^{\lambda_{k-1} - 1} - e^{\lambda_{k-1} - y_k}} \right) \to -\infty$$

because $t_k < y_k < t_{k-1}$. Since $J_k$ is continuous and strictly concave on its domain, it achieves a unique maximum $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$. When $k = 1$, we have $J_1(\lambda) = -\infty$ for $\lambda \leq 0$, and analytically maximizing $J_1$ for $\lambda > 0$, we obtain the expression for $\lambda_1^*$ in (3.5). Differentiating $J_k$ under the integral sign, we obtain

$$J_k'(\lambda) = y_k - \frac{\int_{l_k} y e^{\lambda y} \, dy}{\int_{l_k} e^{\lambda y} \, dy} \quad \Rightarrow \quad J_k'(0) = y_k - \frac{\int_{l_k} y \, dy}{\int_{l_k} dy} = y_k - \frac{t_k + t_{k-1}}{2},$$

16
so $\lambda_k^*$ can be signed as in (3.5).

If $\lambda_k^* \neq 0$, using (A.1) and (A.2) and suppressing the asterisks, we obtain the solution

$$f^*(y) = g(y) = e^{\mu_k + \lambda_k y - 1} = \frac{q_k \lambda_k e^{\lambda_k y}}{e^{\lambda_k t_k - 1} - e^{-\lambda_k t_k}},$$

which is (3.6) and is exponential in $y$. The derivation for $\lambda_k^* = 0$ is similar. The minimum value (3.7) follows from (A.3).

**Lemma A.1.** Define the function $\phi : (0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\phi(x) = \frac{\cosh x}{\sinh x} - \frac{1}{x}, \quad (A.4)$$

where $\cosh x = \frac{e^x + e^{-x}}{2}$ and $\sinh x = \frac{e^x - e^{-x}}{2}$. Then $\phi'(x) > 0$, $\phi''(x) < 0$, $\phi(0+) = 0$, $\phi(\infty) = 1$, and $\phi'(0+) = 1/3$.

**Proof.** To simplify notation, let $c(x) = \cosh x$ and $s(x) = \sinh x$. $\phi(\infty) = 1$ is trivial since $c(x) \sim e^x/2 \sim s(x)$ as $x \to \infty$. Using the definition of $c$ and $s$, we have $c' = s$, $s' = c$, and $c^2 - s^2 = 1$. Taking the derivative of $\phi$, we have

$$\phi'(x) = \frac{c's - cs'}{s^2} + \frac{1}{x^2} = \frac{s^2 - c^2}{s^2} + \frac{1}{x^2} = \frac{1}{s^2} + \frac{1}{x^2}.$$

Noting that $s(x) = x + x^3/6 + o(x^3)$ as $x \to 0$ by Taylor’s theorem, a straightforward calculation yields $\phi'(0+) = 1/3$.

To show $\phi' > 0$, it suffices to show $s > x$. To this end, define $g(x) = s(x) - x$. Then $g(0) = 0$ and

$$g'(x) = s'(x) - 1 = c(x) - 1 = \frac{e^x + e^{-x}}{2} - 1 = \frac{(e^{x/2} - e^{-x/2})^2}{2} > 0$$

for $x > 0$, so $g(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$. This shows $\phi'(x) > 0$. Taking the derivative
Once again, we have

\[ \phi''(x) = \frac{2s'}{s^3} - \frac{2}{x^3} = 2 \left( \frac{c}{s^3} - \frac{1}{x^3} \right). \]

Therefore to show \( \phi'' < 0 \), it suffices to show \( s^3/c > x^3 \). To this end, define \( h(x) = s(x)^3/c(x) - x^3 \). Then

\[ h'(x) = \frac{3s^2s'c - s^3c'}{c^2} - 3x^2 = \frac{3s^2c^2 - s^4}{c^2} - 3x^2, \]
\[ h''(x) = 4sc' + \frac{2c'}{c^3} - 6x = 4sc + \frac{2s}{c^3} - 6x, \]
\[ h'''(x) = 8c^2 - 10 - \frac{4}{c^2} + 6 = \frac{2}{c^4}(c^2 - 1)^2(4c^2 + 3) > 0 \]

for \( x > 0 \), where the last inequality follows from \( c > 1 \) for \( x > 0 \). Noting that \( h'''(0) = h''(0) = h'(0) = h(0) = 0 \), it follows that \( h(x) > 0 \) for \( x > 0 \), implying \( s^3/c > x^3 \) and hence \( \phi'' < 0 \).

Below, extend the domain of \( \phi \) in (A.4) to the entire real line by setting \( \phi(0) = 0 \) and \( \phi(x) = -\phi(-x) \) for \( x < 0 \). Then \( \phi : \mathbb{R} \to (-1, 1) \), \( \phi \) is strictly increasing, and \( \phi \) is concave (convex) for \( x > 0 \) (\( x < 0 \)). Figure 4 shows its graph.

We need the following lemma to prove Theorem 4.1.

**Lemma A.2.** Let \( a < y < b \). Then the function

\[ J(\lambda) := \begin{cases} 
  y\lambda - \log\left(\frac{e^{\lambda b} - e^{\lambda a}}{\lambda}\right) & (\lambda \neq 0) \\
  -\log(b - a) & (\lambda = 0)
\end{cases} \]

is strictly concave in \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) and achieves a unique maximum \( \lambda^* \). Furthermore,
letting $c = (a + b)/2$ and $d = b - a > 0$, we have

$$\lambda^* = \frac{2}{d} \phi^{-1}\left(\frac{2(y - c)}{d}\right). \quad (A.5)$$

**Proof.** The strict concavity of $J$ and the existence and uniqueness of $\lambda^*$ follow from Proposition 3.1. If $y = c$, then by (3.5) we have $\lambda^* = 0$ and (A.5) is trivial. Suppose $y \neq c$. Then by (3.5) we have $\lambda^* \gtrless 0$ according as $y \gtrless c$.

When $\lambda \neq 0$, by definition

$$J(\lambda) = (y - c)\lambda - \log \left(\frac{e^{\lambda d/2} - e^{-\lambda d/2}}{\lambda}\right).$$

Since $J$ is differentiable and $\lambda^*$ maximizes $J$, taking the derivative we obtain

$$0 = J'(\lambda^*) = y - c + \frac{1}{\lambda^*} - \frac{d \cosh(\lambda^* d/2)}{2 \sinh(\lambda^* d/2)} \iff \frac{\cosh x}{\sinh x} - \frac{1}{x} = \frac{2(y - c)}{d},$$

where $x = \lambda^* d/2$. Noting that $y \in (a, b)$, $c = (a + b)/2$, and $d = b - a$, we have $2(y - c)/d \in (-1, 1)$. Therefore (A.5) follows from the definition of $\phi$ and Lemma A.1. \qed
Proof of Theorem 4.1. We divide our proof into four steps.

Step 1. Reduction to the case when $C$ is an interval.

Since $D$ is open and $C \subset D$, for each $y \in C$ we can take an open interval $(a_y, b_y)$ with $y \in (a_y, b_y)$ and $[a_y, b_y] \subset D$. Since $C$ is compact and $C \subset \bigcup_{y \in C} (a_y, b_y)$, we can take a finite subcover $C \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{J} (a_{y_j}, b_{y_j})$. Therefore $C \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{J} [a_{y_j}, b_{y_j}] \subset D$, so the uniform consistency on $C$ follows if we show the uniform consistency on each compact interval $[a, b] \subset D$.

Below, to simplify the argument, fix $C = [a, b]$ and $C' = [a', b']$ such that $C \subset C' \subset D$ and $a' < a < b < b'$. By relabeling the thresholds $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$ if necessary, without loss of generality we may assume $a' < t_K < a < b < t_1 < b'$ by Condition (iii).

Step 2. As $n \to \infty$, $\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{\hat{q}_k - q_k}{(t_k - t_{k-1})^2} \to 0$ and $\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{\hat{y}_k - y_k}{t_k - t_{k-1}} \to 0$ almost surely.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be the probability space over which the random variables $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ are defined. For any $\eta > 0$, define the event

$$E_n := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{\hat{q}_k - q_k}{(t_k - t_{k-1})^2} > \eta \right\}.$$

Let $1_{I_k}$ denote the indicator function of $I_k$. Using $\sum_{i=1}^{n} 1_{I_k}(Y_i) = n_k - n_{k-1} = n\hat{q}_k$, we obtain

$$P(E_n) \leq \sum_{k=2}^{K} P\left( \left| \frac{\hat{q}_k - q_k}{(t_k - t_{k-1})^2} \right| > \eta \right) = \sum_{k=2}^{K} P\left( \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1_{I_k}(Y_i) - q_k \right| > \eta \right) \leq \sum_{k=2}^{K} P\left( \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1_{I_k}(Y_i) - q_k) \right| > \eta c_1^2 n^{1-2r_1} \right),$$

where the last line follows from (4.1). Applying Hoeffding (1963)'s inequality to
the last term, we obtain
\[ P(E_n) \leq \sum_{k=2}^{K} 2 \exp(-2c_1^4 \eta^2 n^{2-4r_1}/n) = 2(K - 1) \exp(-2c_1^4 \eta^2 n^{1-4r_1}). \]

Since \( 1 - 4r_1 > 0 \) by Assumption 1(iii), it follows that \( \sum_{n=1}^\infty P(E_n) < \infty \). By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we have
\[ P(E_n \text{ infinitely often}) = P\left( \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} E_n \right) = 0. \]

Since \( \eta > 0 \) is arbitrary, we obtain \( \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{|\hat{q}_k - q_k|}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} \to 0 \) almost surely as \( n \to \infty \). Using
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i 1_{I_k}(Y_i) = S_{n_k} - S_{n_{k-1}} = (n_k - n_{k-1}) \hat{y}_k = n\hat{q}_k \hat{y}_k \]
and noting that \( Y_i \in C' \) (compact set) whenever \( 1_{I_k}(Y_i) > 0 \), a similar calculation yields \( \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{|\hat{q}_k y_k - q_k y_k|}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} \to 0 \) almost surely as \( n \to \infty \).

Using the triangle inequality and \( \hat{y}_k \in I_k \subset [t_K, t_1] \subset [a', b'] \), we obtain
\[ q_k |\hat{y}_k - y_k| \leq |\hat{q}_k \hat{y}_k - q_k y_k| + |\hat{y}_k| q_k - q_k| \leq |\hat{q}_k \hat{y}_k - q_k y_k| + b' |\hat{q}_k - q_k|. \] (A.6)

Assumption 1(ii) implies that we can take \( 0 < m \leq M < \infty \) such that \( f : C' \to [m, M] \). By the mean value theorem for integrals, for each \( k \in \{2, \ldots, K\} \), there exists some \( u_k \in [t_k, t_{k-1}) \) such that
\[ \frac{q_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} = \frac{f_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} f(y) dy}{t_{k-1} - t_k} = f(u_k) \in [m, M]. \] (A.7)

Therefore dividing (A.6) by \( (t_{k-1} - t_k)^2 \) and using (A.7), we obtain
\[ \frac{m}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \left| \frac{\hat{y}_k - y_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \right| \leq \frac{|\hat{q}_k \hat{y}_k - q_k y_k|}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} + b' \left| \frac{\hat{q}_k - q_k}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} \right|. \]
for each $k \in \{2, \ldots, K\}$. Taking the maximum over $k$, dividing by $m > 0$, and letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain $\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \left| \frac{y_k - y_{k-1}}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \right| \to 0$ almost surely.

**Step 3.** Let $\tilde{t}_k = (t_k + t_{k-1})/2$ be the midpoint of $I_k$, $m = \inf_{y \in C} f(y) > 0$, and $\|\cdot\|$ denote the supremum norm for functions defined on $C'$. Then

$$\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \left| \frac{y_k - \tilde{t}_k}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} \right| \leq \frac{\|f'\|}{6m}.$$ (A.8)

Using $q_k = \int_{I_k} f(y) \, dy$, $q_k y_k = \int_{I_k} y f(y) \, dy$, and integration by parts, we obtain

$$q_k(y_k - \tilde{t}_k) = \int_{I_k} (y - \tilde{t}_k) f(y) \, dy = \left[ \frac{1}{2} (y - \tilde{t}_k)^2 f(y) \right]_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} - \int_{I_k} \frac{1}{2} (y - \tilde{t}_k)^2 f'(y) \, dy = \frac{1}{8} (t_k - t_{k-1})^2 (f(t_{k-1}) - f(t_k)) - \int_{I_k} \frac{1}{2} (y - \tilde{t}_k)^2 f'(y) \, dy.$$

Therefore, for every $k \in \{2, \ldots, K\}$, we have

$$q_k |y_k - \tilde{t}_k| \leq \frac{1}{8} (t_k - t_{k-1})^2 |f(t_{k-1}) - f(t_k)| + \int_{I_k} \frac{1}{2} (y - \tilde{t}_k)^2 \|f'\| \, dy \leq \frac{1}{8} (t_k - t_{k-1})^3 \|f'\| + \frac{1}{24} (t_k - t_{k-1})^3 \|f'\| = \frac{1}{6} (t_k - t_{k-1})^3 \|f'\|.$$

Dividing both sides by $q_k (t_{k-1} - t_k)^2$ and using (A.7), we obtain

$$\left| \frac{y_k - \tilde{t}_k}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} \right| \leq \frac{\|f'\|}{6m}$$

uniformly over $k \in \{2, \ldots, K\}$, which shows (A.8).

**Step 4.** Strong consistency of the estimator $\hat{f}(y)$ for $f(y)$ uniformly over $y \in C$.

Letting $I_k = [t_k, t_{k-1})$, by assumption we have $C \subset \bigcup_{k=2}^{K} I_k \subset C'$. Therefore for any $y \in C$, we can take $k$ such that $y \in I_k$. Using the moment conditions and
the mean value theorem for the integrals, we can take \( u(y), v(y) \in I_k \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{q}_k &= \int_{I_k} \hat{f}(y) \, dy = (t_{k-1} - t_k)\hat{f}(u(y)), \quad \text{(A.9a)} \\
q_k &= \int_{I_k} f(y) \, dy = (t_{k-1} - t_k)f(v(y)). \quad \text{(A.9b)}
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore,

\[
\begin{align*}
\left| \hat{f}(y) - f(y) \right| &\leq \left| \hat{f}(y) - \hat{f}(u(y)) \right| + \left| \hat{f}(u(y)) - f(v(y)) \right| + \left| f(v(y)) - f(y) \right| \\
&=: A_1(y) + A_2(y) + A_3(y).
\end{align*}
\]

By Assumption 1(ii)–(iii), we can uniformly bound \( A_3 \) as

\[
\sup_{y \in C} A_3(y) = \sup_{y \in C} |f(v(y)) - f(y)| \leq \sup_{y \in C} |f'(y)| \sup_{y \in C} |v(y) - y| \\
\leq \|f'\| \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} (t_{k-1} - t_k) \leq \|f'\| c_2 n^{-r_2}.
\]

Using (A.9), Step 2, and Assumption 1(iii), we can uniformly bound \( A_2 \) as

\[
\sup_{y \in C} A_2(y) = \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \left| \frac{\hat{q}_k - q_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \right| \leq c_2 n^{-r_2} \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{\hat{q}_k - q_k}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} \to 0
\]

almost surely. Therefore it remains to uniformly bound \( A_1 \). Noting that \( \hat{f} \) is exponential on \( I_k \) and hence monotonic, it follows from the functional form in (3.6) that

\[
\begin{align*}
\sup_{y \in C} A_1(y) &= \sup_{y \in C} \left| \hat{f}(y) - \hat{f}(u(y)) \right| \leq \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \left| \hat{f}(t_{k-1}) - \hat{f}(t_k) \right| \\
&\leq \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \hat{q}_k |\lambda_k| = \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{\hat{q}_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} |\lambda_k| (t_{k-1} - t_k).
\end{align*}
\]
By Step 2 and (A.7), we can bound the first component as
\[
\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{\hat{q}_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \leq \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{q_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} + \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \left| \frac{\hat{q}_k - q_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \right| \leq M + o(1),
\]
so it is almost surely uniformly bounded as \( n \to \infty \). Therefore to show the convergence of \( \hat{f} \), it remains to show that
\[
\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} |\lambda_k| (t_{k-1} - t_k) \to 0.
\]

By Steps 2 and 3, we have
\[
\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \left| \frac{\hat{y}_k - \bar{t}_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \right| \leq \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \left| \frac{\hat{y}_k - y_k}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \right| + \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{y_k - \bar{t}_k}{(t_{k-1} - t_k)^2} (t_{k-1} - t_k) \\
\leq o(1) + \left\| f' \right\|_{\infty} \frac{n^{-1} c_2 n^{-r}}{6} \to 0.
\]

Therefore, by Lemma A.2, as \( n \to \infty \) we obtain
\[
\max_{2 \leq k \leq K} |\lambda_k| (t_{k-1} - t_k) \leq 2 \phi^{-1} \left( \max_{2 \leq k \leq K} \frac{2 \left| \hat{y}_k - \bar{t}_k \right|}{t_{k-1} - t_k} \right) \to 0
\]
almost surely, completing the proof. \( \square \)

**B  Formulas for CDF and tail expectation**

In this appendix, we collect some integral formulas that are useful when computing the CDF and top income shares when the density is piecewise exponential.

Consider the piecewise exponential density (3.6). To simplify the notation, let \( q_k = q \), \( \lambda_k^* = \lambda \), \( t_k = a \), and \( t_{k-1} = b \). Therefore for \( y \in [a, b) \), the density is
\[
f(y) = \begin{cases} 
q \lambda e^{\lambda y}, & (\lambda \neq 0) \\
q \frac{e^{\frac{y}{b-a}} - 1}{b-a}, & (\lambda = 0)
\end{cases}
\]
The counter CDF (tail probability) can be computed using

\[\int_y^b f(y) \, dy = \begin{cases} q \frac{e^{\lambda b} - e^{\lambda y}}{e^{\lambda b} - e^{\lambda a}}, & (\lambda \neq 0) \\ q \frac{b - y}{b - a}, & (\lambda = 0) \end{cases}\]

Applying integration by parts, the tail expectation can be computed using

\[\int_y^b y f(y) \, dy = \begin{cases} q \frac{e^{\lambda b} - y e^{\lambda y} - \frac{1}{\lambda} (e^{\lambda b} - e^{\lambda y})}{e^{\lambda b} - e^{\lambda a}}, & (\lambda \neq 0) \\ q \frac{b^2 - y^2}{2 (b - a)}, & (\lambda = 0) \end{cases}\]

Putting all the pieces together, we obtain the following closed-form expressions for the CDF and tail expectation. (We assume \(\lambda_k \neq 0\) for simplicity, and we use the notation \(y \vee t = \max \{y, t\}\).)

\[
1 - F(y) = \int_y^\infty f(y) \, dy = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}(y < t_{k-1}) q_k \frac{e^{\lambda_k t_{k-1}} - e^{\lambda_k (y \vee t_k)}}{e^{\lambda_k t_{k-1}} - e^{\lambda_k t_k}},
\]

\[
\int_y^\infty y f(y) \, dy = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}(y < t_{k-1}) q_k \left( (t_{k-1} - 1/\lambda_k) e^{\lambda_k t_{k-1}} - (y \vee t_k) - 1/\lambda_k e^{\lambda_k (y \vee t_k)} \right).
\]

C Numerical issues

Although conceptually straightforward, numerically maximizing \(J_k\) in (3.4) over \(\lambda\) can be unstable because the values of \(\{(t_k, y_k, t_{k-1})\}_{k=1}^K\) change by many orders of magnitude in typical data, for instance \(t_K = 1\) and \(t_1 = 10^7\) in Table 1. For this reason it is useful to choose some scaling factor \(s > 0\) and consider \((st_k, sy_k, st_{k-1})\).

Define

\[J_k(\lambda; s) := sy_k \lambda - \log \left( \frac{e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} - e^{\lambda t_k}}{\lambda} \right) = J_k(\lambda s) - \log s.\]
Maximizing both sides over $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and using the definition of $\lambda_k$ in Proposition 3.1, it follows that

$$\lambda_k = s \arg \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} J_k(\lambda; s) \quad \text{and} \quad J_k(\lambda_k) = \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} J_k(\lambda; s) + \log s.$$ 

Therefore to numerically compute $\lambda_k$ and $J_k(\lambda_k)$, we may maximize $J_k(\lambda, s)$ for some scaling factor $s > 0$ (say $s = 1/t_{k-1}$ so that $st_k < sy_k < st_{k-1} = 1$), multiply its maximizer by $s$, and add $\log s$ to its maximum value.

D Piketty (2003)’s Pareto interpolation method

Piketty (2003)’s Pareto interpolation method for constructing top income shares is widely used, for example in Piketty and Saez (2003) and the World Inequality Database.\(^3\) Because the detailed description of the method is relegated to Piketty (2001, Appendix B, Section 1.1, pp. 592–599), which is written in French, for completeness we describe the method here.

D.1 Piketty (2003)’s method

We use the same notation as in Section 3. For simplicity assume that we are interested in the income distribution and the top income shares of the taxpayers, so the sample size is $n = n_K$. Suppose we observe the lower income threshold for income group $k$, which we denote by $t_k := Y_{(n_k)}$. Let $p_k := n_k/n$ be the top fractile corresponding to the $k$-th income threshold $t_k$ and

$$s_k := \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} Y_{(i)} = \frac{S_{n_k}}{n_k}$$

be the average income of taxpayers with income above $t_k$.

\(^3\)https://wid.world/
Let \( b_k = s_k/t_k \) be the ratio between the average income of individuals exceeding \( t_k \) and the income threshold \( t_k \). If income \( Y \) is Pareto distributed (in the upper tail), then for large enough income level \( y \), the CDF takes the form \( F(y) = 1 - Ay^{-\alpha} \) for some \( A > 0 \) and Pareto exponent \( \alpha > 1 \). Therefore for any large enough income threshold \( t \), we have

\[
b(t) := \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y \mid Y \geq t]}{t} = \frac{\int_0^\infty yF'(y) \, dy}{t(1 - F(t))} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1}.
\] (D.1)

Piketty (2001) refers to \( b_k = s_k/t_k \) as the (local) Pareto coefficient. When the income distribution has a Pareto upper tail, the (local) Pareto exponent can be recovered from (D.1) as

\[
\alpha_k = \frac{b_k}{b_k - 1} = \frac{1}{1 - t_k/s_k}.
\] (D.2)

Let \( p \in (0, 1] \) and suppose we would like to construct the top \( p \) fractile income share. For example, \( p = 0.01 \) corresponds to the top 1% income share. Piketty (2001) proceeds as follows to construct the top \( p \) fractile income share. First, let \( p_k \) be the closest proportion to \( p \) directly observed in the data, and \( t_k \) and \( \alpha_k \) be the corresponding income threshold and local Pareto exponent. Then one supposes that the income distribution is locally exactly Pareto, and therefore the CDF is

\[
F(y) = 1 - p_k(y/t_k)^{-\alpha_k}.
\]

The income threshold corresponding to the top \( p \) fractile can be computed as

\[
1 - p = 1 - p_k(y/t_k)^{-\alpha_k} \iff y = t(p) := t_k(p_k/p)^{1/\alpha_k}.
\]

Noting that the sample size is \( n \), the total income of taxpayers in the top \( p \) fractile
can be computed as

\[ S(p) := n \int_{t(p)}^{\infty} y F'(y) \, dy = n \int_{t(p)}^{\infty} \alpha_k p_k(y/t_k)^{-\alpha_k} \, dy \]

\[ = n \frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_k - 1} p_k t_k^{\alpha_k} t(p)^{1-\alpha_k} = n \frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_k - 1} p t_k (p_k/p)^{1/\alpha_k} \]

\[ = n s_k p_k^{1/\alpha_k} p^{1-1/\alpha_k}. \]  

(D.3)

The top \( p \) fractile income share can then be computed as \( S(p)/S(1) \). If the researcher is interested in the top income share of all income earners (including those who do not report taxes), one would adjust the sample size \( n \) and the total income \( S(1) \) from other sources (e.g., population statistics and national accounts); see for example Piketty and Saez (2001, Appendix A).

D.2 Replication of Piketty and Saez (2003)

To illustrate Piketty (2003)’s method, we replicate the U.S. top income shares documented in Piketty and Saez (2003). We obtain the U.S. tax returns data for 2019 from IRS (Footnote 2). Figure 5 shows the local Pareto exponent (D.2) estimated from adjusted gross income (AGI). The local Pareto exponent beyond the income threshold \( $1,000,000 \) is relatively flat but slightly upward sloping, suggesting that the upper tail of the size distribution of AGI is approximately (but not exactly) Pareto.

We next replicate the top income shares. As the sample size \( n \) and total income \( S(1) \) (including those of non-taxpayers) are not contained in the IRS data set, we proceed as follows. First, given a guess of \( n \), we compute the theoretical top income relative shares within the top 10% (e.g., 1% share within the 10%), which does not depend on \( S(1) \). We then estimate \( n \) by minimizing the distance (Euclidean norm) between the logarithm of theoretical relative shares and those
Finally, we estimate $S(1)$ by forcing the top 10% income share to be identical. Figure 6 shows the top income share $S(p)/S(1)$ corresponding to each top fractile $p$. Our replicated top income shares are very close to those in Piketty and Saez (2003), although not exactly equal, possibly because the authors slightly adjust the numbers on a case-by-case basis as documented in Piketty and Saez (2001, Appendix A). The fact that the top income shares exhibit a straight-line pattern in log-log scale is consistent with a Pareto upper tail, as we can see from (D.3) (the slope should be $1 - 1/\alpha$). Note that at a few points the top income share is non-monotonic and discontinuous in the top fractile because Piketty (2001) chooses the closest threshold $p_k$ to the given fractile $p$, which changes discontinuously in $p$.
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Figure 6: Replicated top income shares.


