Journal of Applied Statistics
Vol. 00, No. 00, Submitted February 2013, 1–19

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Unbiased Estimators for the Parameters of the Binomial and Multinomial Distributions

Jonathan M. Friedman[a]*

[a] *Can-Bas Ltd., 2-2-1 Otemachi, Numazu, Shizuoka 410-0801 Japan*;

(*21 February 2013*)

The exact expression is derived for the expected value, $\langle p_i \rangle$, for the parameter for any bin i of a histogram following a multinomial distribution derived by sorting N observations into bins of B classes, if n_i of the observations are found to be sorted into bin i. This expected value is found to be $\langle p_i \rangle = \frac{n_i+1}{N+B}$. The expected value for the variance is found to be $\frac{\langle p_i \rangle (1-\langle p_i \rangle)}{N+B+1}$. A general expression is derived to determine $\langle {p_i}^z \rangle$ for arbitrary values of B and z. These expressions hold provided there is no *a priori* reason for p_i associated with any bin to have a value that is exactly equal to 0. For the particular case of the binomial distribution ($B = 2$), these estimators are tested by examining how often the value of p_{true}, the value which is used to generate sets of pseudo-random binomial variates, falls within 1.96 estimated standard deviations of the estimated value $\langle p \rangle$. When compared with the results of identical, earlier reported tests for small sample sizes, the unbiased estimators derived here predictably outperform *asymptotically* unbiased estimators.

Keywords: binomial distribution; multinomial distribution; parametric estimators; confidence intervals; Bayesian estimation

1. Introduction

Methods for determining the confidence interval for the parameter p of the binomial distribution from experimentally determined data have been the topic of much discussion [3, 4]. Such estimates are important for analyzing data from clinical trials, from experiments assessing drug effectiveness, and from many other diverse experiments for which the *reliability* of estimated probability values, expressed as a quantitative confidence level, is desired for a binary outcome. The general conclusion has been that unbiased estimators for parameters of the binomial distribution do not exist and instead one must use estimators derived by maximization of likelihood that are *asymptotically* unbiased for large N to estimate either the parameter p or its confidence interval. For the multinomial distribution, estimates of the values of probability parameters and their associated variance values have been similarly problematic. Such estimates might be used, for example, to determine the likelihood that a set of dice is 'loaded' based on experimental observations, but they also play a role in histogram analysis, an important aspect of 'non-parametric' statistics and machine learning.

In this paper, it is shown that there are indeed simple expressions for expected values corresponding to the moments of parameters p for the binomial and multinomial distributions given values for n_i, for example if representative values for

---

*Corresponding author. Email: jmfriedman7@alum.mit.edu, Preprint Submitted 21 February 2013

ISSN: 0266-4763 print/ISSN 1360-0532 online

DOI: 10.1080/02664763.YYYY.XXXXXX
http://www.tandfonline.com

n_i have been determined for each bin by experiment. A recursive derivation, using some results from combinatorics, is used to evaluate appropriate integrals that yield Bayesian estimates of these parameters. These integrals for expectation values are based on a presumed *uniform* prior distribution; *i.e.* they presume that for each parameter p_i, any value on the interval $(0,1)$ is equally possible at the outset, in the absence of any experimental information. In this paper, to demonstrate the generality of the integration technique for multinomial distributions for an arbitrary number of histogram bins, B, the integration technique is repeated up to $B = 5$ at which point a recurring pattern becomes readily recognizable.

Tests of the reliability are examined that allow a direct comparison with earlier reported computational tests of the asymptotically unbiased estimators for the binomial distribution.

2. Expected Value of $\langle p_i \rangle$

In this paper, we derive Eq. (0) for $\langle p_i \rangle$, the expected value for the parameter p_i for any bin from an experimentally observed multinomial distribution:

$$\boxed{\langle p_i \rangle = \frac{n_i + 1}{N + B}} \tag{0}$$

This expected value is an estimator for the probability that an occurrence becomes sorted into histogram bin i in a histogram comprised of B bins, based on the experimental finding that n_i observations out of N total observations have been found to be sorted into bin i. A key presumption is that no bin in the histogram may have an associated parameter value that is expected to be exactly equal to 0.

3. Expected Value for the Variance of $\langle p_i \rangle$

The corresponding estimator for the square of the standard deviation is :

$$\boxed{\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle - \langle p_i \rangle^2 = \frac{\left(\frac{n_i+1}{N+B}\right)\left(1 - \frac{(n_i+1)}{N+B}\right)}{N+B+1} = \frac{\langle p_i \rangle \left(1 - \langle p_i \rangle\right)}{N+B+1}} \tag{00}$$

Again this holds so long there are no bins j in the histogram for which p_j has an *a priori* reason to be exactly equal to 0.

These identities, derived below for histograms comprised of up to 5 bins ($B = 5$), are inferred to hold for $B > 5$, since a predictably repetitive pattern is found to be shared by each derivation. The final equations are readily generalized to allow the calculation of $\langle p^z \rangle$ for more general z.

4. Computational Tests

As noted above, the case B=2 (the binomial distribution) is of particular importance in that the generally used estimators for the parameters of this distribution, derived by maximization of likelihood, had been considered by some to be *unbiased*, yet they differ markedly from the expected values presented here. Others [3, 4] have emphasized, more accurately, that the earlier used estimators for the binomial distribution are not *unbiased* but are instead *asymptotically unbiased* in the limit of large N. This restricted validity is no longer necessary for the estimators derived here, since they are the general expected values of p and its standard deviation for all values of N.

As others have noted, the generally used estimators for the parameters of the binomial distribution are problematic in that the calculated confidence levels do not accurately reflect the fraction of experiments that fall in the confidence interval in computational tests with pseudo-random binomial variates. This is particularly troublesome for computational tests that simulate experiments with small numbers of sampling points (fewer than 100). However in experimental science, experiments are often not repeated this many times and yet error must still be modeled using a binomial distribution. To see the extent to which similar problems with small numbers of experimental trials are encountered for the unbiased binomial estimators derived here, new test calculations were performed using pseudo-random binomial variates generated for known values of p (p_{true}, Figs. 1-4). To allow comparison with tests of earlier estimators for p_i of the binomial distribution, the new calculations are performed for the same confidence levels, numbers of trials, and values for p_{true} that had been used for the earlier calculations presented by [3, 4].

The new calculations using the estimators derived in this paper show that the expected Δp range of the zone limited by ± 1.96 standard deviations (the normal distribution's 95% confidence zone) is comparable to or smaller than the range specified by most of the earlier 'asymptotically' unbiased estimators for the parameters for a binomial distribution. However, the coverage (*i.e.* the percentage of time the true value p_{true} used to generate the distribution falls within 1.96 estimated standard deviates from the estimate, $\langle p \rangle$, derived from this generated distribution of random numbers) averages to near the anticipated value (95%) even for fairly small values of N and p. In the previously published comparison of different binomial estimators, the calculations for several "small" values of N (some of these "small values" in the range 15-25 observations) had to be omitted from the plots since they were well outside of the expected range. Here there was only one such outlier for one case with $n_{obs} \equiv N = 1$ and it is noted in the figure legend.

The impetus behind the work here was to obtain parameters for histograms used in computational methods to reduce model bias in predictive non-parametric statistical schemes. The result here has some possibly important bearings on the Hughes Phenomenon, [5], an often cited manifestation of the 'curse of dimensionality' [2] which relates to such statistical 'machine learning' schemes. These will be discussed in a subsequent paper.

5. Derivation of 0 and 00

The following combinatorial identities shall be needed for the derivation. Eq. (1) is partially derived at the bottom.

$$\sum_{k=0}^{L} (-1)^k \binom{L}{k} \frac{1}{Vk+U} = \frac{1}{U} \frac{(\frac{U}{V})!L!}{(\frac{U}{V}+L)!} \qquad , \left(\text{for integer } \frac{U}{V}\right) \tag{1}$$

which on setting $V = 1$ becomes:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{L}(-1)^k \binom{L}{k} \frac{1}{(k+U)} = \frac{1}{U}\frac{U!L!}{(U+L)!} = \frac{1}{U}\frac{1}{\binom{U+L}{L}} \tag{2}$$

The derivation of expressions for the expected values $\langle p \rangle$ and $\langle p^2 \rangle$ are presented for $B = 1$ through $B = 5$, the recursive procedure is summarized at $B = 5$, and the results are then generalized to $\langle p^z \rangle$.

5.1 *For B=1:*

The expected value $\langle p_i \rangle$ is trivial: with only one bin, it must be the case that $\langle p_i \rangle = 1$. Equation (0) is found to be consistent. Since $N = n_i$ when $B = 1$, expression (0) $\frac{n_i+1}{N+B}$ gives $\langle p_i \rangle = 1$.

5.2 *For B=2:*

If one presumes that the possible values for p are uniformly distributed over the range 0 to 1, then by Bayes equations the expectation value $\langle p_i \rangle$ is given by the *ratio of two integrals*, both of which may be represented by the following equation:

$$I_2 = \int_{p=0}^{1} \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} p^{n^*} (1-p)^{N-n} \; dp \tag{3}$$

where $n^* = n_i + 1$ in the numerator of the ratio of integrals, $n^* = n_i$ in the denominator of the ratio of integrals, and $p = p_i$ and $n = n_i$. This corresponds to a histogram with two bins having respective probabilities p and $(1-p)$. We wish to get the expected value for p given, n observations in the p-bin, and $N-n$ observations in the $(1-p)$-bin (N total observations).

Provided that the true value of p is never exactly equal to 0 (i.e. the integration limit originally written as 0 can be taken to be a limitingly small value ϵ), the quantity '$-p$' can be factored out and this can be rewritten:

$$I_2 = (-1)^{N-n} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp \; N!}{n!(N-n)!} p^{N+n^*-n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{N-n} \tag{4}$$

Expressing the polynomial term on the right as a series summation:

$$I_2 = (-1)^{N-n} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp \; N!}{n!(N-n)!} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n)} (-1)^i \binom{N-n}{i} p^{N+n^*-n-i} \right) \tag{5}$$

$$I_2 = \frac{(-1)^{N-n} \; N!}{n!(N-n)!} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n)} (-1)^i \; \frac{\binom{N-n}{i}}{N+n^*-n-i+1} \right) \tag{6}$$

In the above series summation $\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n)}$, the summation variable i can be replaced by the alternative $i' = (N-n) - i$. The binomial coefficients will be identical. Also, since the resulting sum runs backwards over the original limits, the limits on the series summation can be inverted to get the usual summation direction with an increasing index value. The term $(N + n^* - n + 1 - i)$ in the denominator of the fraction then becomes $((N + n^* - n + 1) - (N - n) + i')$. The $(-1)^i$ term becomes $(-1)^{N-n-i'}$, which can be written alternatively as $(-1)^{N-n}\ (-1)^{i'} = \sigma\ (-1)^{i'}$. Doing all of this, realizing that the σ cancels the leading $(-1)^{N-n}$ term and removing the primes:

$$I_2 = \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n)} (-1)^i \ \frac{\binom{N-n}{i}}{(n^* + 1 + i)} \right) \tag{7}$$

Recognizing the series summation:
1.) over i as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n$ and $U = n^* + 1$,

$$I_2 = \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} \left(\frac{1}{(n^* + 1)\binom{N+n^*-n+1}{N-n}} \right) \tag{8}$$

and writing the binomial coefficients out as factorials

$$I_2 = \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} \left(\frac{(N-n)!(n^*+1)!}{(N+n^*-n+1)!(n^*+1)} \right) \tag{9}$$

$$I_2 = \frac{N!}{n!} \left(\frac{n^*!}{(N+n^*-n+1)!} \right) \tag{10}$$

$$\boxed{I_2 = \frac{N!\ n^*!}{n!\ (N+n^*-n+1)!}}$$

Replacing the expression for I_2 into the numerator of the ratio-of-integrals expression for $\langle p_i \rangle$ with $n^* = n_i + 1$ and in the denominator of the ratio with $n^* = n_i$ gives:

$$\boxed{\langle p_i \rangle = \frac{\frac{N!(n_i+1)!}{n_i!(N+2)!}}{\frac{N!n_i!}{n_i!(N+1)!}} = \frac{n_i+1}{N+2}}\ ,$$

which is seen to be a form of (0) for B=2 .

The expected value $\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle$ can also be obtained from the above expression similarly by replacing $n^* = n_i + 2$ in the form of I_2 in the numerator. One may then subtract the square of the above expectation for $\langle p_i \rangle$ to get an expected value for the variance:

$$\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle = \frac{(n_i+2)(n_i+1)}{(N+3)(N+2)}$$

$$\boxed{\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle - \langle p_i \rangle^2 = \frac{\left(\frac{n_i+1}{N+2}\right)\left(\frac{[N-n_i]+1}{N+2}\right)}{(N+3)} = \frac{\left(\frac{n_i+1}{N+2}\right)\left(\frac{(N+2)-(n_i+1)}{N+2}\right)}{(N+3)}}$$

Note that these expected values for the parameter p and its standard deviation differ significantly from the usual estimators for binomial parameters obtained by maximizing the logarithm of the probability, but the two values approach each other asymptotically for large N. This suggests that the usual estimators for p and its standard deviation are biased estimators (unequal to the expected values for a given observation) contrary to prior assumptions based on maximization of likelihood. The estimators here may prove to be useful for finite N, as indicated by the test results shown above.

5.3 *For B=3:*

The Bayesian expectation value $\langle p_i \rangle$ is given again by the ratio of two integrals, both of which may represented by the following equation:

$$I_3 = \int_{p=0}^{1} \int_{q_1=0}^{1-p} \frac{N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} p^{n^*} {q_1}^{m_1} (1-p-q_1)^{N-n-m_1} dq_1 \ dp \tag{11}$$

where $n^* = n_i + 1$ in the numerator of the ratio of integrals, $n^* = n_i$ in the denominator of the ratio of integrals, and $p = p_i$ and $n = n_i$. This corresponds to a histogram with three bins having respective probabilities p , q_1 , and $(1-p-q_1)$. We wish to get the expected value for p given, n observations in the p-bin, m_1 observations in the q_1-bin, and $N-n-m_1$ observations in the $(1-p-q_1)$-bin (N total observations).

Provided that the true value of q_1 is never exactly equal to 0 (i.e. the integration limit originally written as 0 can be taken to be a limitingly small value ϵ; this is extended, in anticipation, to the other integration variable as well), and letting:

$$A_1 \equiv N - n - m_1$$

$$A_2 \equiv N - n + 1 \quad ,$$

this can be rewritten:

$$I_3 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_1=\epsilon}^{1-p} \frac{dq_1 \ dp \ N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} p^{n^*} {q_1}^{N-n} (1 - \frac{1-p}{q_1})^{N-n-m_1} \tag{12}$$

Expressing the polynomial term on the right as a series summation:

$$I_3 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_1=\epsilon}^{1-p} \frac{dq_1 \ dp \ N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \times \tag{13}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_1)} (-1)^i \ p^{n^*} \binom{N-n-m_1}{i} (1-p)^i {q_1}^{N-n-i} \right)$$

$$I_3 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp \ N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_1)} (-1)^i \ \frac{p^{n^*} \binom{N-n-m_1}{i} (1-p)^{N-n+1}}{N-n-i+1} \right) \tag{14}$$

$$I_3 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \times \tag{15}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_1)} (-1)^i \ \frac{\binom{N-n-m_1}{i} p^{N+n^*-n+1} (1-\frac{1}{p})^{N-n+1}}{N-n-i+1} \right)$$

$$I_3 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \times \tag{16}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j} \ \frac{\binom{N-n+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_1}{i} p^{N+n^*-n-j+1}}{N-n-i+1} \right)$$

$$I_3 = \frac{(-1)^{A_1+A_2}\ N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j} \ \frac{\binom{N-n+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_1}{i}}{(N+n^*-n-j+2)(N-n-i+1)} \right) \tag{17}$$

In each of the above series summations $\sum_{\mu_\kappa=0}^{(A_\kappa)}$, the summation variable μ_κ can be replaced by the alternative ${\mu_\kappa}' = A_\kappa - \mu_\kappa$. The binomial coefficients will be identical. Also, since the resulting sums run backwards over the original limits, the limits on the summations can be inverted to the usual direction with an increasing index value. Each term $(Q_\kappa - \mu_\kappa)$ in the denominator of the fraction then becomes $(Q_\kappa - A_\kappa + {\mu_\kappa}')$. The $(-1)^{\sum \mu_\kappa}$ term becomes $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa - \sum {\mu_\kappa}'}$, which can be written alternatively as $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa}\ (-1)^{\sum {\mu_\kappa}'} = \sigma\ (-1)^{\sum {\mu_\kappa}'}$. Doing all of this, realizing that the σ cancels the leading $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa}$ term and removing the primes:

$$I_3 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j} \ \frac{\binom{N-n+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_1}{i}}{(n^*+1+j)(m_1+1+i)} \right) \tag{18}$$

Recognizing the series summations:
1.) over j as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n + 1$ and $U = n^* + 1$,
2.) over i as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n - m_1$ and $U = m_1 + 1$,

$$I_3 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \left(\frac{1}{(n^*+1)\binom{N+n^*-n+2}{N-n+1}(m_1+1)\binom{N-n+1}{N-n-m_1}} \right) \tag{19}$$

and writing the binomial coefficients out as factorials

$$I_3 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!(N-n-m_1)!} \left(\frac{(N-n+1)!(n^*+1)!(N-n-m_1)!(m_1+1)!}{(N+n^*-n+2)!(N-n+1)!(n^*+1)(m_1+1)} \right) \tag{20}$$

$$I_3 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!} \left(\frac{(n^*+1)!(m_1+1)!}{(N+n^*-n+2)!(n^*+1)(m_1+1)} \right) \tag{21}$$

$$I_3 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!} \left(\frac{n^*!(m_1)!}{(N+n^*-n+2)!} \right) \tag{22}$$

$$\boxed{I_3 = \frac{N!\; n^*!}{n!\; (N + n^* - n + 2)!}}$$

Placing the expression for I_3 in the numerator of the ratio for $\langle p_i \rangle$ with $n^* = n_i{+}1$ and placing it in the denominator of the ratio for $\langle p_i \rangle$ with $n^* = n_i$ gives:

$$\boxed{\langle p_i \rangle = \frac{\frac{N!(n_i+1)!}{n_i!(N+3)!}}{\frac{N!n_i!}{n_i!(N+2)!}} = \frac{n_i + 1}{N + 3}} \;,$$

which is seen to be a form of (0) for B=3 .

Likewise replacing n^* in the numerator of the ratio of integrals with $n + 2$ gives:

$$\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle = \frac{(n_i + 2)(n_i + 1)}{(N + 4)(N + 3)}$$

$$\boxed{\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle - \langle p_i \rangle^2 = \frac{\left(\frac{n_i+1}{N+3}\right)\left(\frac{(N+3)-(n_i+1)}{N+3}\right)}{(N + 4)}}$$

5.4 *For B=4:*

The expectation value $\langle p_i \rangle$ is yet again given by the ratio of two integrals, both of which may represented by the following equation:

$$I_4 = \int_{p=0}^{1} \int_{q_2=0}^{1-p} \int_{q_1=0}^{1-p-q_2} \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N - n - m_2 - m_1)!} \times \tag{23}$$

$$p^{n^*} {q_2}^{m_2} {q_1}^{m_1} (1 - p - q_2 - q_1)^{N-n-m_2-m_1} dq_1 \; dq_2 \; dp$$

where $n^* = n_i + 1$ in the numerator of the ratio of integrals, $n^* = n_i$ in the denominator of the ratio of integrals, and $p = p_i$ and $n = n_i$. This corresponds to a histogram with four bins having respective probabilities p , q_2 , q_1 , and $(1 - p - q_2 - q_1)$. We wish to get the expected value for p given, n observations in the p-bin, m_2 observations in the q_2-bin, m_1 observations in the q_1-bin, and $N - n - m_2 - m_1$ observations in the $(1 - p - q_2 - q_1)$-bin (N total observations).

Provided that the true value of q_1 is never exactly equal to 0 (i.e. the integration limit originally written as 0 can be taken to be a limitingly small value ϵ; this is extended, in anticipation, to the other integration variables as well), and letting:

$$A_1 \equiv N - n - m_2 - m_1$$

$$A_2 \equiv N - n - m_2 + 1$$

$$A_3 \equiv N - n + 2 \;\;,$$

this can be rewritten:

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p} \int_{q_1=\epsilon}^{1-p-q_2} \frac{dq_1\ dq_2\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_2-m_1)!} \times \tag{24}$$

$$p^{n^*} {q_2}^{m_2} {q_1}^{N-n-m_2} \left(1 - \frac{1-p-q_2}{q_1}\right)^{N-n-m_2-m_1}$$

Expressing the polynomial term on the right as a series summation:

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p} \int_{q_1=\epsilon}^{1-p-q_2} \frac{dq_1\ dq_2\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{25}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^i\ p^{n^*} {q_2}^{m_2} \binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i} (1-p-q_2)^i {q_1}^{N-n-m_2-i} \right)$$

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p} \frac{dq_2\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{26}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^i\ \frac{p^{n^*} {q_2}^{m_2} \binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i} (1-p-q_2)^{N-n-m_2+1}}{N-n-m_2-i+1} \right)$$

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p} \frac{dq_2\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{27}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^i\ \frac{p^{n^*} \binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i} {q_2}^{N-n+1} (1 - \frac{1-p}{q_2})^{N-n-m_2+1}}{N-n-m_2-i+1} \right)$$

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p} \frac{dq_2\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{28}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j}\ \frac{p^{n^*} \binom{N-n-m_2+1}{j} \binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i} {q_2}^{N-n-j+1} (1-p)^j}{N-n-m_2-i+1} \right)$$

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{29}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j}\ \frac{p^{n^*} \binom{N-n-m_2+1}{j} \binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i} (1-p)^{N-n+2}}{(N-n-j+2)(N-n-m_2-i+1)} \right)$$

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{30}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j} \frac{\binom{N-n-m_2+1}{j} \binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i} p^{N+n^*-n+2} (1 - \frac{1}{p})^{N-n+2}}{(N-n-j+2)(N-n-m_2-i+1)} \right)$$

$$I_4 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{31}$$

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n+2)} \sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j+k} \frac{\binom{N-n+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i} p^{N+n^*-n-k+2}}{(N-n-j+2)(N-n-m_2-i+1)} \right)$$

$$I_4 = \frac{(-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3}\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{32}$$

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n+2)} \sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j+k} \frac{\binom{N-n+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i}}{(N+n^*-n-k+3)(N-n-j+2)(N-n-m_2-i+1)} \right)$$

In each of the above series summations $\sum_{\mu_\kappa=0}^{(A_\kappa)}$, the summation variable μ_κ can be replaced by the alternative $\mu_\kappa{}' = A_\kappa - \mu_\kappa$. The binomial coefficients will be identical. Also, since the resulting sums run backwards over the original limits, the limits on the summations can be inverted to the usual direction with an increasing index value. Each term $(Q_\kappa - \mu_\kappa)$ in the denominator of the fraction then becomes $(Q_\kappa - A_\kappa + \mu_\kappa{}')$. The $(-1)^{\sum \mu_\kappa}$ term becomes $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa - \sum \mu_\kappa{}'}$, which can be written alternatively as $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa}\ (-1)^{\sum \mu_\kappa{}'} = \sigma\ (-1)^{\sum \mu_\kappa{}'}$. Doing all of this, realizing that the σ cancels the leading $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa}$ term and removing the primes:

$$I_4 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n+2)} \sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j+k} \times \right. \tag{33}$$

$$\left. \frac{\binom{N-n+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_2-m_1}{i}}{(n^*+1+k)(m_2+1+j)(m_1+1+i)} \right)$$

Recognizing the series summations:
1.) over k as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n + 2$ and $U = n^* + 1$,
2.) over j as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n - m_2 + 1$ and $U = m_2 + 1$,
3.) over i as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n - m_2 - m_1$ and $U = m_1 + 1$,

$$I_4 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{34}$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{(n^*+1)\binom{N+n^*-n+3}{N-n+2}(m_2+1)\binom{N-n+2}{N-n-m_2+1}(m_1+1)\binom{N-n-m_2+1}{N-n-m_2-m_1}} \right)$$

and writing the binomial coefficients out as factorials

$$I_4 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!(N-n-m_1-m_2)!} \times \tag{35}$$

$$\left(\frac{(N+n^*-n+2)!(n^*+1)!(N-n-m_2+1)!(m_2+1)!(N-n-m_2-m_1)!(m_1+1)!}{(N+n^*-n+3)!(N-n+2)!(N-n-m_2+1)!(n^*+1)(m_2+1)(m_1+1)} \right)$$

$$I_4 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!}\left(\frac{(n^*+1)!(m_2+1)!(m_1+1)!}{(N+n^*-n+3)!(n^*+1)(m_2+1)(m_1+1)}\right) \tag{36}$$

$$I_4 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!}\left(\frac{n^*!(m_2)!(m_1)!}{(N+n^*-n+3)!}\right) \tag{37}$$

$$\boxed{I_4 = \frac{N!\ n^*!}{n!\ (N+n^*-n+3)!}}$$

Placing the expression for I_4 in the numerator of the ratio for $\langle p_i \rangle$ with $n^* = n_i+1$ and placing it in the denominator of the ratio for $\langle p_i \rangle$ with $n^* = n_i$ gives:

$$\boxed{\langle p_i \rangle = \frac{\frac{N!(n_i+1)!}{n_i!(N+4)!}}{\frac{N!n_i!}{n_i!(N+3)!}} = \frac{n_i+1}{N+4}}\ ,$$

which is seen to be a form of (0) for B=4 .

Likewise replacing n^* in the numerator of the ratio of integrals with $n+2$ gives:

$$\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle = \frac{(n_i+2)(n_i+1)}{(N+5)(N+4)}$$

$$\boxed{\langle {p_i}^2 \rangle - \langle p_i \rangle^2 = \frac{\left(\frac{n_i+1}{N+4}\right)\left(\frac{(N+4)-(n_i+1)}{N+4}\right)}{(N+5)}}$$

5.5 *For B=5:*

The expectation value $\langle p_i \rangle$ is given again by the ratio of two integrals, both of which may represented by the following equation:

$$I_5 = \int_{p=0}^{1}\int_{q_3=0}^{1-p}\int_{q_2=0}^{1-p-q_3}\int_{q_1=0}^{1-p-q_3-q_2} \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)!}\times \tag{38}$$

$$p^{n^*}{q_3}^{m_3}{q_2}^{m_2}{q_1}^{m_1}(1-p-q_3-q_2-q_1)^{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}dq_1\ dq_2\ dq_3\ dp$$

where $n^* = n_i + 1$ in the numerator of the ratio of integrals, $n^* = n_i$ in the denominator of the ratio of integrals, and $p = p_i$ and $n = n_i$. This corresponds to a histogram with five bins having respective probabilities p , q_3 , q_2 , q_1 , and $(1-p-q_3-q_2-q_1)$. We wish to get the expected value for p given, n observations in the p-bin, m_3 observations in the q_3-bin, m_2 observations in the q_2-bin, m_1 observations in the q_1-bin, and $N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1$ observations in the $(1-p-q_3-q_2-q_1)$-bin (N total observations).

Provided that the true value of q_1 is never exactly equal to 0 (i.e. the integration limit originally written as 0 can be taken to be a limitingly small value ϵ; this is extended, in anticipation, to the other integration variables as well), and letting:

$$A_1 \equiv N - n - m_3 - m_2 - m_1$$

$$A_2 \equiv N - n - m_3 - m_2 + 1$$

$$A_3 \equiv N - n - m_3 + 2$$

$$A_4 \equiv N - n + 3 \quad ,$$

this can be rewritten:

$$I_5 = \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_3=0}^{1-p} \int_{q_2=0}^{1-q_3-p} \int_{q_1=0}^{1-p-q_3-q_2} \frac{(-1)^{A_1}\ dq_1\ dq_2\ dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)!} \times \tag{39}$$

$$p^{n^*} {q_3}^{m_3} {q_2}^{m_2} {q_1}^{N-n-m_3-m_2} (1 - \frac{1-p-q_3-q_2}{q_1})^{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}$$

Expressing the polynomial term on the right as a series summation:

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_3=\epsilon}^{1-p} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p-q_3} \int_{q_1=0}^{1-p-q_3-q_2} \frac{dq_2\ dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!} \times \tag{40}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^i\ p^{n^*} {q_3}^{m_3} {q_2}^{m_2} \binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i} (1-p-q_3-q_2)^i {q_1}^{N-n-m_3-m_2-i} \right)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_3=\epsilon}^{1-p} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p-q_3} \frac{dq_2\ dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!} \times \tag{41}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^i\ \frac{p^{n^*} {q_3}^{m_3} {q_2}^{m_2} \binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i} (1-p-q_3-q_2)^{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}}{N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1} \right)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_3=\epsilon}^{1-p} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p-q_3} \frac{dq_2\ dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!} \times \tag{42}$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^i\ \frac{p^{n^*} {q_3}^{m_3} \binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i} {q_2}^{N-n-m_3+1} (1 - \frac{1-p-q_3}{q_2})^{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}}{N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1} \right)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2} \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1} \int_{q_3=\epsilon}^{1-p} \int_{q_2=\epsilon}^{1-p-q_3} \frac{dq_2\ dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!} \times \tag{43}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j} \quad \times \right.$$

$$\frac{p^{n^*}{q_3}^{m_3}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}{q_2}^{N-n-m_3-j+1}(1-p-q_3)^{j}}{N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1}\Bigg)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2}\ \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1}\int_{q_3=\epsilon}^{1-p}\frac{dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!}\times \tag{44}$$

$$\Bigg(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)}\ \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)}(-1)^{i+j}\ \times$$

$$\frac{p^{n^*}{q_3}^{m_3}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}(1-p-q_3)^{N-n-m_3+2}}{(N-n-m_3-j+2)(N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1)}\Bigg)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3}\ \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1}\int_{q_3=\epsilon}^{1-p}\frac{dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!}\times \tag{45}$$

$$\Bigg(\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)}\ \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)}(-1)^{i+j}\ \times$$

$$\frac{p^{n^*}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}{q_3}^{N-n+2}\left(1-\frac{1-p}{q_3}\right)^{N-n-m_3+2}}{(N-n-m_3-j+2)(N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1)}\Bigg)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3}\ \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1}\int_{q_3=\epsilon}^{1-p}\frac{dq_3\ dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!}\ \times \tag{46}$$

$$\Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n-m_3+2)}\ \sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)}\ \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)}(-1)^{i+j+k}\ \times$$

$$\frac{p^{n^*}\binom{N-n-m_3+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}{q_3}^{N-n-k+2}(1-p)^{k}}{(N-n-m_3-j+2)(N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1)}\Bigg)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3}\ \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1}\frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!}\ \times \tag{47}$$

$$\Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n-m_3+2)}\ \sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)}\ \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)}(-1)^{i+j+k}\ \times$$

$$\frac{p^{n^*}\binom{N-n-m_3+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}(1-p)^{N-n+3}}{(N-n-k+3)(N-n-m_3-j+2)(N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1)}\Bigg)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3+A_4}\ \int_{p=\epsilon}^{1}\frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!}\ \times \tag{48}$$

$$\Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n-m_3+2)}\ \sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)}\ \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)}(-1)^{i+j+k}\ \times$$

$$\left.\frac{\binom{N-n-m_3+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}p^{N+n^*-n+3}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)^{N-n+3}}{(N-n-k+3)(N-n-m_3-j+2)(N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1)}\right)$$

$$I_5 = (-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3+A_4}\int_{p=\epsilon}^{1}\frac{dp\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!}\times \tag{49}$$

$$\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{(N-n+3)}\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n-m_3+2)}\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)}\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)}(-1)^{i+j+k+\ell}\times\right.$$

$$\left.\frac{\binom{N-n+3}{\ell}\binom{N-n-m_3+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}p^{N+n^*-n-\ell+3}}{(N-n-k+3)(N-n-m_3-j+2)(N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1)}\right)$$

$$I_5 = \frac{(-1)^{A_1+A_2+A_3+A_4}\ N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!}\times \tag{50}$$

$$\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{(N-n+3)}\sum_{k=0}^{(N-n-m_3+2)}\sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)}\sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)}(-1)^{i+j+k+\ell}\times\right.$$

$$\left.\frac{\binom{N-n+3}{\ell}\binom{N-n-m_3+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}}{(N+n^*-n-\ell+4)(N-n-k+3)(N-n-m_3-j+2)(N-n-m_3-m_2-i+1)}\right)$$

To summarize the recursive procedure to this point, at each step in the integration one factors out the negative of the next integration variable from the polynomial term raised to the power, which also introduces a leading $(-1)^{A_\kappa}$ term. The leading constant '1' in the resulting polynomial is "eliminated" by using the binomial theorem to express the polynomial raised to a power as a series with binomial coefficients. This step also introduces a $(-1)^{\mu_\kappa}$ term. Integration with respect to the current integration variable introduces a term to the resulting denominator that contains the summation index from the new binomial expansion. The binomial series summation index that appears in the *exponent* of the term that contains the variables remaining to be integrated is cancelled upon multiplying this term by a new term, containing the same polynomial raised to a power. This new term arises upon substituting the upper integration limit into the most recently evaluated definite integral.

From the formula for the binomial expansion, the upper limit of each newly added series summation is identical to the term in the upper slot of the newly introduced binomial coefficient and the value of both of these is equal to the value of the exponent of the original polynomial term, prior to its expansion as a binomial series. Starting at the right, the upper limit to the first summation starts from the 'dependent' number of observations in the final bin $(N-n-\sum_i m_i)$. At each stage, the original exponent from the prior integrated variable, $m_{\kappa-1}$, is added to its negative in this expression, and so vanishes from the upper limit of the next series summation. The index-containing product-terms appearing in the denominator at each stage derive from the exponent of the integrand. Even at the first stage, the first exponent m_1 from the first integrand is canceled in this term in the denominator. At each stage κ, (save for the stage with n^*) the newly introduced denominator term has the current integration variable's original exponent, m_κ in the upper limit of the current summation, replaced by $(-\mu_\kappa + 1)$, where μ_κ is the new binomial series summation index that has been introduced at this stage (stage number κ). Since 1 is added at each stage, the numeric term in each denominator product term thus becomes κ. At the last stage, the multinomial exponent (n) is not similarly replaced in the denominator term but appears with an additional (n^*) term added, since we were paying special attention to the original exponent n^* of the p term.

To continue with the derivation for I_5, in each of the series summations $\sum_{\mu_\kappa=0}^{(A_\kappa)}$ in the last equation, the summation variable μ_κ can be replaced by the alternative ${\mu_\kappa}' = A_\kappa - \mu_\kappa$. The binomial coefficients will be identical. Also, since the resulting sums run backwards over the original limits, the limits on the summations can be inverted to the usual direction with an increasing index value. Each term $(Q_\kappa - \mu_\kappa)$ in the denominator of the fraction then becomes $(Q_\kappa - A_\kappa + {\mu_\kappa}')$. The $(-1)^{\sum \mu_\kappa}$ term becomes $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa - \sum {\mu_\kappa}'}$, which can be written alternatively as $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa}\ (-1)^{\sum {\mu_\kappa}'} = \sigma\ (-1)^{\sum {\mu_\kappa}'}$. Doing all of this, realizing that the σ cancels the leading $(-1)^{\sum A_\kappa}$ term and removing the primes:

$$I_5 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!} \times \tag{51}$$

$$\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{(N-n+3)} \sum_{k=0}^{(N-n-m_3+2)} \sum_{j=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)} (-1)^{i+j+k+\ell} \times \right.$$

$$\left. \frac{\binom{N-n+3}{\ell}\binom{N-n-m_3+2}{k}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{j}\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}{i}}{(n^*+1+\ell)(m_3+1+k)(m_2+1+j)(m_1+1+i)} \right)$$

Recognizing the series summations:
1.) over ℓ as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n + 3$ and $U = n^* + 1$,
2.) over k as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n - m_3 + 2$ and $U = m_3 + 1$,
3.) over j as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n - m_3 - m_2 + 1$ and $U = m_2 + 1$,
4.) over i as Eq (2) above with $L = N - n - m_3 - m_2 - m_1$ and $U = m_1 + 1$,

$$I_5 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!} \times \tag{52}$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{(n^*+1)\binom{N+n^*-n+4}{N-n+3}(m_3+1)\binom{N-n+3}{N-n-m_3+2}(m_2+1)\binom{N-n-m_3+2}{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}(m_1+1)\binom{N-n-m_3-m_2+1}{N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1}} \right)$$

and writing the binomial coefficients out as factorials

$$I_5 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!(N-n-m_1-m_2-m_3)!} \times \tag{53}$$

$$\left(\frac{(N-n+3)!(n^*+1)!(N-n-m_3+2)!(m_3+1)!(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)!(m_2+1)!(N-n-m_3-m_2-m_1)!(m_1+1)!}{(N+n^*-n+4)!(N-n+3)!(N-n-m_3+2)!(N-n-m_3-m_2+1)!(n^*+1)(m_3+1)(m_2+1)(m_1+1)} \right)$$

$$I_5 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!} \left(\frac{(n^*+1)!(m_3+1)!(m_2+1)!(m_1+1)!}{(N+n^*-n+4)!(n^*+1)(m_3+1)(m_2+1)(m_1+1)} \right) \tag{54}$$

$$I_5 = \frac{N!}{n!m_1!m_2!m_3!}\left(\frac{n^*!(m_3)!(m_2)!(m_1)!}{(N+n^*-n+4)!}\right) \tag{55}$$

Thus upon using Eq. 2 to simplify the series summations that result from integration, each binomial coefficient term in the original denominator after this simplification contributes two factorial terms to the numerator and one to the denominator. One of the numerator-factorial terms cancels the preceding denominator-factorial term. The other numerator-factorial term, when combined with the non-factorial $\left(\frac{1}{U}\right)$ term from Eq. 2, cancels a multinomial exponent-factorial term that appears in the denominator of the leading normalization constant term. The numerator-factorial term from the binomial coefficient for the first integration has no preceding term to cancel, but instead cancels the factorial term in the normalization constant derived from the multinomial exponent for the last bin (*i.e.* $N - n - \sum_i m_i$). The only remaining terms are the denominator-factorial term arising from the binomial coefficient from the last stage, the $n^*!$ and $n!$ terms, which would have canceled if we were not keeping track of n^*, and the $N!$ term from the numerator of the normalization coefficient.

$$\boxed{I_5 = \frac{N!\ n^*!}{n!\ (N+n^*-n+4)!}}$$

Placing the expression for I_5 in the numerator of the ratio for $\langle p_i\rangle$ with $n^* = n_i+1$ and placing it in the denominator of the ratio for $\langle p_i\rangle$ with $n^* = n_i$ gives:

$$\boxed{\langle p_i\rangle = \frac{\frac{N!(n_i+1)!}{n_i!(N+5)!}}{\frac{N!n_i!}{n_i!(N+4)!}} = \frac{n_i+1}{N+5}},$$

which is seen to be a form of (0) for B=5 .

Likewise replacing n^* in the numerator of the ratio of integrals with $n+2$ gives:

$$\langle {p_i}^2\rangle = \frac{(n_i+2)(n_i+1)}{(N+6)(N+5)}$$

$$\boxed{\langle {p_i}^2\rangle - \langle p_i\rangle^2 = \frac{\left(\frac{n_i+1}{N+5}\right)\left(\frac{(N+5)-(n_i+1)}{N+5}\right)}{(N+6)}}$$

In general then for B bins:

$$\boxed{I_B = \frac{N!\ n^*!}{n!\ (N+n^*-n+(B-1))!}}$$

Expectation values for higher integer powers of p, $\langle p^z\rangle$, can be obtained by replacing n^* in the numerator of the ratio of integrals with $n+z$ and leaving n^* in the denominator of this ratio at n. When z is not an integer, expected values may be calculated by similarly substituting for n^* using the more general form for I_B with gamma functions:

$$\boxed{I_B = \frac{N!\,\Gamma(n^*+1)}{n!\,\Gamma(N+n^*-n+B)}}$$

as the expression for the integral to be used in the numerator of the ratio of integrals.

6. Discussion and Conclusions

In conclusion, the expected value of the parameter $\langle p_i \rangle$ for each bin i of a typical histogram following the multinomial distribution is calculated as though each bin in the histogram starts with a single *(one)* 'phantom' observation. All such phantom observations from all histogram bins are included in both the numerator and denominator of the ratios used to estimate each p_i and its standard deviation. The expected values of the square of the *standard deviation* for p_i is calculated using similar phantom observations in each bin, but requires an extra "+1" in the outer denominator similar to the "−1" which appears when calculating the square of the standard deviation for an average. For large values of B (many bins) and typical sub-infinite numbers of measurements, the difference between the expected value estimate and the maximum likelihood estimate for both $\langle p_i \rangle$ and its standard deviation is significant, particularly for those bins of the histogram for which few observations have been found to occur.

The appearance of the number of histogram bins in the expression for $\langle p \rangle$ is unusual, in that it means that the expected value for p for the same experiment will vary depending on the model that is chosen. For example, imagine an experiment being modeled as a binomial one (2 histogram bins) for which the number of observations in Bin A is 6 and the number of observations in Bin B is 4. The value of $\langle p \rangle$ for Bin A would be $\frac{7}{12}$ (or 0.58 ± 0.27, at ± 1.96 standard deviations). Suppose instead that the model is switched to a trinomial one by splitting Bin B into Bin B' and Bin C' with 3 of the original 4 observations from Bin B in Bin B', 1 of them in Bin C', and with all 6 original observations still in Bin A. In this case, the value of $\langle p \rangle$ for Bin A would change to $\frac{7}{13}$ (or 0.54 ± 0.26) even though Bin A had not changed and the total number of observations had not changed. If Bin B were randomly split so that the total number of bins including bin A was 100 without changing A, then the expected value for Bin A, still having 6 out of 10 actual observations, would switch to $\frac{7}{110}$ (or 0.064 ± 0.045)!

One must also remember, however, that assumptions were made about no histogram bin having an *a priori* reason for its probability being exactly equal to zero, as must be the case when the number of bins greatly exceeds the number of observations. When the number of bins is 10 in the previous example, the same as the number of observations and the worst case for which no bin has an *a priori* reason to have a p value of 0, then $\langle p \rangle$ for bin A would be $\frac{7}{20}$ (or 0.35 ± 0.21). Note, however, that for the alternative particular case of a single observation "modeled" into a binomial distribution (2 bins, 1 observation), despite the fact that one bin is expected to have zero observations, perhaps due to fortunate happenstance, $\langle p \rangle$ still apparently falls into the 'coverage range' a large fraction of the time. Clearly the issue at play here is the measurement to parameter – *i.e.* measurement to number of bins – ratio. This is related to the probabilities calculated in [5] and will be addressed in a subsequent paper. The net conclusion here, is that it is not sufficient to give the expected value $\langle p \rangle$ for a bin of a multinomial distribution, but for clarity, one must specify the total number of bins in the model from which this expected value was calculated. Whereas the estimators presented here are *unbiased* in the statistical sense, since they are precisely equal to the expected values, some might consider them to be *biased* in the practical sense because of their dependence on the model.

Appendix A. Appendix: Binomial Identity Eq. 1

Equation (1) can be derived by integrating both sides of the expression for the binomial expansion of $(1 - x^{\frac{V}{U}})^L$:

$$\int_0^r (1 - x^{\frac{V}{U}})^L dx = \int_0^r \sum_{k=0}^{L} (-1)^k \binom{L}{k} x^{\frac{Vk}{U}} dx$$

$$\int_0^r (1 - x^{\frac{V}{U}})^L dx = \sum_{k=0}^{L} (-1)^k \binom{L}{k} \frac{r^{\left(\frac{Vk}{U}+1\right)}}{\frac{Vk}{U}+1}$$

Factoring out the U and taking $\lim\limits_{r\to 1}$ gives:

$$I_{00} = \frac{1}{U} \int_0^1 (1 - x^{\frac{V}{U}})^L dx = \sum_{k=0}^{L} (-1)^k \binom{L}{k} \frac{1}{Vk + U}$$

Using the Wolfram on-line integrator [10] the integral on the left is found to be:

$$I_{00} = \left[\frac{x}{U} \; {}_2F_1\left(\frac{U}{V}, -L, \frac{V+U}{V}; x^{\frac{V}{U}}\right) \right]_{x=0}^{1}$$

For $x = 1$, Formula 15.1.20 from Abramowitz & Stegun [7] gives:

$${}_2F_1\left(\frac{U}{V}, -L, \frac{V+U}{V}; 1\right) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{V+U}{V})\Gamma(\frac{V+U}{V} - \frac{U}{V} + L)}{\Gamma(\frac{V+U}{V} - \frac{U}{V})\Gamma(\frac{V+U}{V} + L)} = \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{U}{V})\Gamma(1 + L)}{\Gamma(1)\Gamma(1 + \frac{U}{V} + L)}$$

which holds whenever $L \geq 0$. The ratio of gamma functions simplifies to the form shown in (1) when $\frac{U}{V}$ is an integer, however more generally, when neither of U or V is zero, or necessarily an integer:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{L} (-1)^k \binom{L}{k} \frac{1}{Vk + U} = \left(\frac{1}{U}\right) \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{U}{V})\Gamma(1 + L)}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{U}{V} + L)}$$

References

[1] A. Agresti and B.A. Coull, *Approximate is better than "exact" for interval estimation of binomial proportions*, Amer. Statist. 52 (1998), pp. 119–126.
[2] R.E. Bellman, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ 1957.
[3] L.D. Brown, T.T. Cai, and A. DasGupta, *Interval estimation for a binomial proportion*, Statist. Sci. 16 (2001), pp. 101–133.
[4] L.D. Brown, T.T. Cai, and A. DasGupta, *Confidence intervals for a binomial proportion and asymptotic expansions*, Ann. Statist. 30 (2002), pp. 160–201.
[5] G.G. Hughes, *On the mean accuracy of statistical pattern recognizers*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 14 (1968), pp. 55–63.
[6] P.S. Laplace, Courcier, Paris 1812.
[7] F. Oberhettinger, *Hypergeometric functions*, in *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas Graphs and Mathematical Tables*, M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun, eds., chap. 15, Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, New York, 1972, pp. 555–566.
[8] A. Wald, *Some examples of asymptotically most powerful tests*, Ann. Math. Statist. 12 (1941), pp. 396–408.
[9] E.B. Wilson, *Probable inference, the law of succession and statistical inference*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 22 (1927), pp. 209–212.
[10] Wolfram Research Inc., *Wolfram mathematica online integrator*, `http://integrals.wolfram.com/index.jsp` (1996).



Figure 1. Tests of the unbiased estimators for the binomial p and its standard deviation using pseudo-random binomial variates. Compare with Fig. 1 from either of [3, 4]. The percentage of trials with p_{true} found within 1.96 estimated standard deviations of the estimate of the mean is fairly close to the asymptotically expected value of 0.950 for nearly all values of n_{obs} from 1 to 100. This is in contrast with some of the earlier estimators for which coverage was variable and inconsistent for smaller values of n_{obs}. The point for $n = 1$ for the plot with $p_{true} = 0.200$ had a fractional "coverage" value of 0.800, which was outside of the range; this point was omitted for clarity.



Figure 2. Tests of the unbiased estimators for the binomial p and its standard deviation for a small value of p_{true} using pseudo-random binomial variates. Compare with Fig. 2 of [3]. The percentage of trials with p_{true} found within 1.96 estimated standard deviations of the estimate of the mean is fairly close to the asymptotically expected value of 0.950 for all values of n_{obs} from 1 to 2000. The oscillatory transitions for the unbiased estimators occur for values of n_{obs} that are 2 less than the earlier observed transition points for the standard estimators, but the coverage for the unbiased estimators remains near or above 95%.



Figure 3. Tests of the unbiased estimators for the binomial p and its standard deviation, varying p for 4 relatively small fixed values of n_{obs}, the number of observations per trial. Compare with Figs. 3, 5, & 11 of [3]. The percentage of trials with p_{true} found within 1.96 estimated standard deviations of the estimate of the mean is fairly close to the asymptotically expected value of 0.950 for all values of n_{obs}. As the value of n_{obs} increases, the coverage tends to approach the 95% level, particularly for values of p near 0.5. Coverage tends to be greater than 95% for very high and very low values of p, with the smaller values of n_{obs} transitioning first to this high-coverage tendency near the point: $\min(p_{true}, 1 - p_{true}) \approx 1.96\ \sigma_{est}$, where σ_{est} is based on p_{true}.



Figure 4. A comparison between expected lengths for the '95% confidence intervals' (*i.e.* zones of ±1.96 estimated standard deviations) for different estimators of p and its standard deviation [1, 6, 8, 9] for the particular case $n_{obs} = 25$. Compare with Fig. 8 of [3]. The calculations do not confirm earlier plots [3, 4] demonstrating a marked increase in the length of the expected confidence interval for the Agresti-Coull estimators [1] relative to that for the Wilson estimators [9]. The gnu Fortran programs for our calculation of this expected length, for different assumptions about how the confidence intervals near boundaries at $p = 0$ and $p = 1$ may have been treated, is available on request.