

Bootstrap Bartlett correction in inflated beta regression

Laís H. Loose*

Fábio M. Bayer†

Tarciana L. Pereira‡

Abstract

The inflated beta regression model aims to enable the modeling of responses in the intervals $(0, 1]$, $[0, 1)$ or $[0, 1]$. In this model, hypothesis testing is often performed based on the likelihood ratio statistic. The critical values are obtained from asymptotic approximations, which may lead to distortions of size in small samples. In this sense, this paper proposes the bootstrap Bartlett correction to the statistic of likelihood ratio in the inflated beta regression model. The proposed adjustment only requires a simple Monte Carlo simulation. Through extensive Monte Carlo simulations the finite sample performance (size and power) of the proposed corrected test is compared to the usual likelihood ratio test and the Skovgaard adjustment already proposed in the literature. The numerical results evidence that inference based on the proposed correction is much more reliable than that based on the usual likelihood ratio statistics and the Skovgaard adjustment. At the end of the work, an application to real data is also presented.

Keywords: bootstrap Bartlett correction, improvements in small samples, inflated beta regression, likelihood ratio test.

1 Introduction

The beta regression model proposed by Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004) is appropriate when the dependent variable assumes values in the standard unit interval $(0, 1)$, such as rates, proportions or indexes. It is assumed that the response follows a beta law with constant precision parameter and mean parameter modeled by a regression structure. This regression structure is similar to the generalized linear model (GLM) (McCullagh and Nelder, 1989). The mean response is related to a linear predictor through a link function and the linear predictor involves known covariates and unknown regression parameters (Ospina et al., 2006; Bayer and Cribari-Neto, 2013). In Parker et al. (2014) the authors present a discussion about the origins of beta regression models.

In rates and proportions data, zeros and/or ones values can often be observed. For example, when the mortality rate for a given disease, child labor rate, proportion of hospital admissions for certain cause, among other situations, are to be evaluated. In such cases the seminal model proposed in Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004) is not suitable. The

*L. H. Loose is with the Departamento de Estatística, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, RN, Brazil, E-mail: laisloose@gmail.com

†F. M. Bayer is with the Departamento de Estatística and LACESM, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, RS, Brazil, E-mail: bayer@ufsm.br

‡T. L. Pereira is with the Departamento de Estatística, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, PB, Brazil, E-mail: tarciana@de.ufpb.br

log-likelihood function of the beta regression model becomes non-limited, and it's not possible to assume that data come from an absolutely continuous distribution. For these cases, Ospina and Ferrari (2012) propose the inflated beta regression model, based on mixture of beta and bernoulli degenerate at zero and/or one distributions. It is important to mention that a degenerate distribution is the probability distribution of a discrete random variable that assumes probability 1, to a single point (Sundarapandian, 2009). These inflated distributions allow users to model data that assume values in $(0, 1)$, $[0, 1)$ or $[0, 1]$ (Ospina and Ferrari, 2010). In this work it will be addressed the model of inflated beta regression in zero or one.

The probability density function of the inflated beta distribution at zero or one has three parameters: conditional mean (μ_i), precision (ϕ_i) and the mixture parameter (α_i). The latter determines the probability that the dependent variable is equal to one of the limits of the unit interval. In the inflated beta regression model, each one of these parameteres is assumed to be variable along the observations, being modeled using regression structures that involve link functions, covariates and unknown parameters. The presence of regression structures for the three parameters that index the inflated beta density makes the problem of inferences in small samples more severe, given the large number of parameters to be estimated.

The estimation of the inflated beta regression model's parameters is based on maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), in which the inferential procedures are similar to GLM. After the point estimation, another important aspect in the modeling are the hypothesis testing on the parameters of the model. One of the usual test statistics to perform hypothesis testing is the likelihood ratio (LR) (Neyman and Pearson, 1928). This is an approximate test and is characterized by the use of critical values from approximations that are valid in large samples. However, these asymptotic approximations can be poor in small samples, resulting in considerable distortion of the probability of type I error (size) of the tests. Inferential improvements in small samples may be achieved by analytical or numerical/computational adjustments. Two important works on hypotheses testing and finite corrections to asymptotic tests are, respectively, Buse (1982) and Cribari-Neto and Cordeiro (1996).

Several studies have been developed to improve the performance of the likelihood ratio test in small samples. Among the proposals for inferencial improvement stands out the Bartlett correction (Bartlett, 1937), in which its analytical derivation involves cumulants and mixed cumulants up to fourth order of the log-likelihood function. In Cysneiros and Ferrari (2006), the Bartlett correction is presented in non-linear models of the exponential family. For improvements of the heteroscedasticity test in the normal linear regression model, Ferrari et al. (2004) use this correction. In Melo et al. (2009b), the Bartlett correction is derived from the class of linear mixed models. Also, in Bayer and Cribari-Neto (2013), the Bartlett correction in the beta regression model with constant dispersion is considered. However, the derivation of the Bartlett correction can be costly, or even impossible to obtain (Ferrari and Pinheiro, 2011; Bayer and Cribari-Neto, 2013), especially when the parameters are not orthogonal, as in the inflated beta regression model.

Another alternative is the Skovgaard adjustment (Skovgaard, 2001). Some recent papers consider this adjust-

ment were developed in the class of nonlinear models of the exponential family (Ferrari and Cysneiros, 2008), in a new class of models for proportions (Melo et al., 2009a), in the beta regression model with variable dispersion (Ferrari and Pinheiro, 2011) and for the model of inflated beta regression (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b). Despite the Skovgaard adjustment being less analytical costly than the Bartlett correction, it still requires second-order derivatives of the log-likelihood function, being that a limitation primarily to inferential improvements in applied works.

With the same objective of the Skovgaard and Bartlett adjustments, which is to improve the approximation of the chi-squared distribution to the exact null distribution of the likelihood ratio statistic in small samples, it can be considered the bootstrap Bartlett correction (Rocke, 1989). In this second-order correction, the Bartlett correction factor (Lawley, 1956) is determined by the bootstrap method (Efron, 1979). The bootstrap Bartlett correction becomes a good numerical alternative to analytical determination of the Bartlett correction factor, requiring only the use of a simple Monte Carlo simulation. The bootstrap Bartlett correction still has computational advantages over the usual bootstrap procedure for the determination of exact quantiles for the null distribution of the test statistic. While the usual bootstrap method requires a large number of resamples (usually above 1000), the numerical Bartlett correction requires a smaller number of bootstrap iterations (around 200 resamples) (Bayer and Cribari-Neto, 2013). Despite extensive advantages in using the bootstrap Bartlett correction versus other analytical and numerical approaches, this approach is rarely explored in the literature. One of the few studies that consider the bootstrap Bartlett correction was developed by Bayer and Cribari-Neto (2013), evidencing similar results between the analytical and bootstrap Bartlett corrections.

In order to improve the inferences in small samples in the inflated beta regression model, this work proposes the bootstrap Bartlett correction to the likelihood ratio statistic. The performance in small samples of the proposed test statistic is compared with the Skovgaard adjustment (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b) and the usual likelihood ratio statistics, via Monte Carlo simulations. The approximations of statistics' distributions by chi-squared distribution in samples of finite size are evaluated, and the influences of these approximations on the performance of hypothesis testing are verified, in terms of size and power of the tests.

This paper is organized as following. Section 2 introduces the inflated beta regression model at zero or one, as well as link functions, log-likelihood function and inferential details. In Section 3, the likelihood ratio test for the inflated beta regression model, the proposed bootstrap Bartlett correction and Skovgaard adjustment for small samples are presented. Section 4 describes the experiment of Monte Carlo simulation for finite samples and presents the numerical results and its discussion. In Section 5, an application to real data is presented and discussed. Finally, Section 6 presents the conclusions.

2 Zero-or-one inflated beta regression model

The beta regression model proposed in Ferrari and Cribari-Neto (2004) is based on a reparametrization of the beta density, indexed by parameters of mean μ and precision ϕ . The parameter ϕ is considered constant and μ is modeled by a regression structure. The beta density is given as follows:

$$f(y; \mu, \phi) = \frac{\Gamma(\phi)}{\Gamma(\mu\phi)\Gamma((1-\mu)\phi)} y^{\mu\phi-1} (1-y)^{(1-\mu)\phi-1}, \quad 0 < y < 1, \quad (1)$$

where $0 < \mu < 1$, $\phi > 0$ and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function, i.e. $\Gamma(u) = \int_0^\infty t^{u-1} e^{-t} dt$. Thus, if y is a random variable with density given by Equation (1), we have:

$$E(y) = \mu,$$

$$\text{Var}(y) = \mu(1-\mu)/(1+\phi).$$

For the inflated beta regression model a distribution for the dependent variable in which its density involves three parameters is assumed. Let y_1, \dots, y_n independent random variables, in which y_t , $t = 1, \dots, n$, have inflated beta distribution at the point c ($c = 0$ or $c = 1$), for which the density is given by (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b):

$$bi_c(y_t; \alpha_t, \mu_t, \phi_t) = \{\alpha_t^{\mathbf{1}_{\{c\}}(y_t)} (1 - \alpha_t)^{1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{c\}}(y_t)}\} \{f(y_t; \mu_t, \phi_t)^{1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{c\}}(y_t)}\}, \quad (2)$$

in which $\mathbf{1}_{\{c\}}(y_t)$ is an indicator function that assumes value 1 if $y_t = c$ and 0 otherwise, $0 < \alpha_t < 1$ is the mixture parameter of the distribution specified by $\alpha_t = \Pr(y_t = c)$, ($c = 0$ or $c = 1$), $0 < \mu_t < 1$ is the mean of y_t conditional on $y_t \in (0, 1)$, $\phi_t > 0$ is the precision parameter and $f(y_t; \mu_t, \phi_t)$ is the beta density function given in Equation (1). If $c = 1$, the function given in Equation (2) is the density of a random variable with inflated beta distribution at one, $y \sim \text{BEOI}(\alpha, \mu, \phi)$. On the other hand, if $c = 0$, we have an inflated beta distribution at zero, $y \sim \text{BEZI}(\alpha, \mu, \phi)$. For y_t with inflated beta distribution in c , where $c = 0$ or $c = 1$, expectancy and variance y_t are given by (Ospina and Ferrari, 2010, 2012):

$$E(y_t) = \alpha_t c + (1 - \alpha_t) \mu_t,$$

$$\text{Var}(y_t) = (1 - \alpha_t) \mu_t (1 - \mu_t) / (\phi_t + 1) + \alpha_t (1 - \alpha_t) (c - \mu_t)^2.$$

Thus, in the zero-or-one inflated beta regression model with varying dispersion, we have the following relations (Ospina and Ferrari, 2012; Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b):

$$g(\mu_t) = \sum_{i=1}^m x_{it} \beta_i = \eta_t,$$

$$b(\phi_t) = \sum_{i=1}^p s_{it} \lambda_i = \kappa_t,$$

$$h(\alpha_t) = \sum_{i=1}^M z_{it} \gamma_i = \zeta_t,$$

with $t = 1, \dots, n$, in which $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)^\top$, $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)^\top$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_M)^\top$ are vectors with unknown parameters, where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^M$, x_{1t}, \dots, x_{mt} , s_{1t}, \dots, s_{pt} and z_{1t}, \dots, z_{Mt} represent the fixed and known covariates ($m + p + M < n$), $g(\cdot)$, $b(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$ are strictly monotonic and twice differentiable link functions, such that $g : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $b : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b). Different link functions can be used: the logit, $g(\mu) = \log[\mu/(1 - \mu)]$; the probit, $g(\mu) = \Phi^{-1}(\mu)$, in which $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the normal distribution function; the complementary log-log, $g(\mu) = \log[-\log(1 - \mu)]$; the log-log, $g(\mu) = \log[-\log(\mu)]$; and the Cauchy, $g(\mu) = \tan(\pi(\mu - 0.5))$; both for μ and α . For the structure of ϕ , we have: the logarithmic function, $b(\phi) = \log(\phi)$; and the square root, $b(\phi) = \sqrt{\phi}$. For details on link functions see McCullagh and Nelder (1989) and Koenker and Yoon (2009).

To obtain the maximum likelihood estimators of the parametric vector $\theta = (\beta^\top, \lambda^\top, \gamma^\top)^\top$ is necessary to maximize the logarithm of the likelihood function. The log-likelihood function for $\theta = (\beta^\top, \lambda^\top, \gamma^\top)^\top$ can be written in the following way (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b):

$$\ell(\theta) = \{(y^c - \mu^c)^\top \alpha^* + a^\top + [(y^* - \mu^*)^\top (\Phi \mathcal{M} - \mathcal{J}) + (y^\dagger - \mu^\dagger)^\top (\Phi - 2\mathcal{J}) + b^\top] H\} \iota, \quad (3)$$

in which $y^c = (y_1^c, \dots, y_n^c)^\top$, $y^* = (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*)^\top$, $y^\dagger = (y_1^\dagger, \dots, y_n^\dagger)^\top$, $\mu^c = (\mu_1^c, \dots, \mu_n^c)^\top$, $\mu^* = (\mu_1^*, \dots, \mu_n^*)^\top$, $\mu^\dagger = (\mu_1^\dagger, \dots, \mu_n^\dagger)^\top$, $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)^\top$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)^\top$, $a_t = \log(1 - \alpha_t) + \mu_t^c \alpha_t^*$ and $b_t = \log \Gamma(\phi_t) - \log \Gamma(\mu_t \phi_t) - \log \Gamma((1 - \mu_t) \phi_t) + (\mu_t \phi_t - 1) \mu_t^* + (\phi_t - 2) \mu_t^\dagger$. Moreover $\alpha^* = \text{diag}\{\alpha_1^*, \dots, \alpha_n^*\}$, $\mathcal{M} = \text{diag}\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$, $H = \text{diag}\{1 - y_1^c, \dots, 1 - y_n^c\}$ and $\Phi = \text{diag}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}$ are diagonal matrices $n \times n$, \mathcal{J} is the identity matrix $n \times n$ and ι is the column vector n -dimensional of 1s, where $\alpha_t^* = \log(\alpha_t/(1 - \alpha_t))$,

$$y_t^c = \begin{cases} 1, & y_t = c, \\ 0, & y_t \in (0, 1), \end{cases}, \quad y_t^* = \begin{cases} \log\left(\frac{y_t}{1 - y_t}\right), & y_t \in (0, 1), \\ 0, & y_t = c, \end{cases}$$

$$\text{and } y_t^\dagger = \begin{cases} \log(1 - y_t), & y_t \in (0, 1), \\ 0, & y_t = c. \end{cases}$$

For details on inferences in large samples and matrix expressions of the score vector and the Fisher information matrix, see Ospina and Ferrari (2012) and Pereira and Cribari-Neto (2014b). It is noteworthy that the maximum likelihood estimators do not have closed form, being necessary the use of iterative numerical methods for maximizing the log-likelihood function, such as Newton method or quasi-Newton methods such as BFGS (Press et al., 1992).

The inflated beta regression model is part of the class of generalized additive models for location, scale and

shape (GAMLSS) (Rigby and Stasinopoulos, 2005). Thus, adjustments of inflated beta regression models considered in this work are made using the `gamlss` package (Stasinopoulos and Rigby, 2007) available in the environment R (R Development Core Team, 2014). The log-likelihood maximizations were carried out using the RS algorithm, which is a generalization of the algorithm used by Rigby and Stasinopoulos (1996a,b) for fitting mean and dispersion additive models (MADAM) (Stasinopoulos et al., 2008). This algorithm is well suited for situations in which the parameters are orthogonal, and it does not require accurate starting values for the parameters to achieve convergence (the default starting values, often constants, are usually adequate) and handles large data sets quite efficiently (Stasinopoulos et al., 2008).

3 Likelihood ratio test and small sample corrections

Let y_1, \dots, y_n be independent random variables and assume that each y_t , $t = 1, \dots, n$, has density function given by (2). Additionally, let $\theta = (\beta^\top, \lambda^\top, \gamma^\top)^\top$ be the vector of unknown parameters that index the inflated beta regression model at zero or one. Consider the parameters vector $\theta = (v^\top, \tau^\top)^\top$, wherein $v = (v_1, \dots, v_q)^\top$ is the vector of parameters of interest and $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_s)^\top$ is the vector of nuisance parameters, where $m + p + M = q + s$. Suppose the interest is in testing the null hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0 : v = v_0$, where v_0 is a specified vector of constants of size q . The likelihood ratio statistic is given by:

$$\text{LR} = 2 \left[\ell(\hat{\theta}) - \ell(\tilde{\theta}) \right],$$

where $\ell(\theta)$ is the log-likelihood function given in Equation (3), evaluated at $\theta = (v^\top, \tau^\top)^\top$, $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{v}^\top, \hat{\tau}^\top)^\top$ is the unrestricted MLE of θ , $\tilde{\theta} = (v_0^\top, \tilde{\tau}^\top)^\top$ is the restricted MLE of θ (under the null hypothesis).

Under usual regularity conditions and under \mathcal{H}_0 , the LR statistic has approximately a distribution χ_q^2 with error of order n^{-1} (Casella and Berger, 2002; Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b; Bayer and Cribari-Neto, 2013), where q is the number of parameters tested in the null hypothesis. However, in samples of finite size these approximations can be poor, resulting in size distortions. In this context, analytical or numerical/computational adjustments may be considered for inferential improvements in small samples. Following the bootstrap Bartlett correction proposed in this paper for the likelihood ratio statistic in the inflated beta regression model is presented, as well as the Skovgaard adjustment for inflated beta model given in Pereira and Cribari-Neto (2014b).

3.1 Bootstrap Bartlett correction

In order to improve the performance of the likelihood ratio test in small samples, in Bartlett (1937) is introduced the Bartlett correction, later generalized by Lawley (1956). The Bartlett correction is given by:

$$\text{LR}_{\text{Bartlett}} = \frac{\text{LR}}{c},$$

where $c = E(\text{LR})/q$ is known as the Bartlett correction factor. The determination of c using Lawley's (1956) notation involves the product of cumulants and mixed cumulants up to fourth order that are not invariant by permutation (Cordeiro, 1993). In beta regression models the analytical obtaining of c can be costly or even impossible, especially for the non orthogonality of parameters (Ferrari and Pinheiro, 2011; Bayer and Cribari-Neto, 2013). For the inflated beta regression model with variable dispersion, considered in this work, the analytical derivation of the Bartlett correction becomes practically intractable.

As an numerical alternative to analytical derivation of the Bartlett correction, Rocke (1989) introduces the bootstrap Bartlett correction, where the correction factor c is determined via the bootstrap method (Efron, 1979). The bootstrap Bartlett correction becomes a viable alternative to inferential improvements in small samples when there are impeditive or too costly analytical difficulties, as in the model considered here.

The bootstrap Bartlett correction considering the expected value of LR, directly estimated from the observed sample $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$ using bootstrap, can be described by the following steps:

1. Generate, under \mathcal{H}_0 , B bootstrap resamples (y^{*1}, \dots, y^{*B}) of the model, replacing the model parameters by the estimates in \mathcal{H}_0 using the original sample (parametric bootstrap).
2. Obtain the bootstrap LR statistic for each pseudosample y^{*b} , with $b = 1, \dots, B$, calculated in the following way:

$$\text{LR}^{*b} = 2\{\ell(\hat{\theta}^{*b}; y^{*b}) - \ell(\tilde{\theta}^{*b}; y^{*b})\},$$

in which $\hat{\theta}^{*b}$ is the MLE of θ under the alternative hypothesis \mathcal{H}_1 , e $\tilde{\theta}^{*b}$ is the MLE under \mathcal{H}_0 .

3. Calculate the corrected LR statistic, given by:

$$\text{LR}_B = \frac{\text{LR}q}{\overline{\text{LR}^*}}, \quad (4)$$

in which $\overline{\text{LR}^*} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \text{LR}^{*b}$.

In the bootstrap Bartlett correction the LR statistic is corrected so its distribution in small samples can be better approximated by the reference null distribution, χ_q^2 (Bayer and Cribari-Neto, 2013). Meanwhile, the usual bootstrap correction consists of obtaining a bootstrap approximation for the null distribution of the test statistic (Cribari-Neto and Queiroz, 2014). Rocke (1989) states that the bootstrap Bartlett correction has computational ad-

vantages compared to the usual bootstrap scheme, and with $B = 100$, in general, there are results equivalent to the usual bootstrap method with $B = 700$. Also, through simulation studies, Bayer and Cribari-Neto (2013) conclude that B values larger than 200 lead to negligible improvements for bootstrap Bartlett correction. In this sense, the bootstrap Bartlett correction has good computational advantages over the usual bootstrap method for hypothesis testing correction.

3.2 Skovgaard adjustment

Another possible correction of the likelihood ratio statistic is the Skovgaard's adjustment, originally presented in Skovgaard (1996) and subsequently generalized in Skovgaard (2001). This adjustment, obtained analytically, is considerable simpler than the Bartlett correction (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b). The Skovgaard's adjustment only require first- and second- order log-likelihood cumulants and, different from the Bartlett correction, independent of the orthogonality of the parameters.

Skovgaard's approximation has been used in different models. Among them, in the non-linear models of exponential family (Ferrari and Cysneiros, 2008) and in the extreme values models (Ferrari and Pinheiro, 2014). In the class of beta regression models we have the Skovgaard adjustment for beta regression model with varying dispersion (Ferrari and Pinheiro, 2011) and in the inflated beta regression model with varying dispersion (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b). The results of these studies indicate that the test based on the Skovgaard statistic performs better than the test based on the uncorrected LR statistic.

The likelihood ratio statistic modified by Skovgaard Skovgaard (2001) is given by:

$$\text{LR}_{Sk_1} = \text{LR} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\text{LR}} \log \bar{\xi} \right),$$

in which

$$\bar{\xi} = |\tilde{I}|^{1/2} |\hat{I}|^{1/2} |\hat{Y}|^{-1} |\tilde{J}_{\tau\tau}|^{1/2} |[\tilde{I}\hat{Y}^{-1}\hat{I}\hat{Y}^{-1}\hat{Y}]_{\tau\tau}|^{-1/2} \frac{\{\tilde{U}^\top \hat{Y}^{-1} \hat{I} \hat{Y}^{-1} \tilde{U}\}^{q/2}}{\text{LR}^{q/2-1} \tilde{U}^\top \hat{Y}^{-1} \hat{I}},$$

where I is the expected information matrix, J is the observed information matrix, U is the total score function, $\hat{Y} = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\theta}}[U(\hat{\theta})U^\top(\tilde{\theta})]$, $\hat{I} = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\theta}}[U(\hat{\theta})(\ell(\hat{\theta}) - \ell(\tilde{\theta}))]$ and $J_{\tau\tau}$ is the observed information matrix $s \times s$ corresponding to the vector τ . Yet, "hat" denotes evaluation in the unrestricted MLE and "tilde" the evaluation in the restricted MLE.

An asymptotically equivalent version to LR_{Sk_1} is given by:

$$\text{LR}_{Sk_2} = \text{LR} - 2 \log \bar{\xi}.$$

Under the null hypothesis, the statistics LR_{Sk_1} and LR_{Sk_2} have approximately the distribution χ_q^2 with high precision (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b). For details on the analytical derivation of the Skovgaard adjustment in

inflated beta regression model, see Pereira and Cribari-Neto (2014b).

4 Numerical results

To evaluate the performance in small samples of the proposed statistic LR_B , given in (4), the usual likelihood ratio statistic (LR) and the two versions of the Skovgaard adjustment (LR_{Sk_1} and LR_{Sk_2}), a simulation study was performed. The number of Monte Carlo replications was 5000 and for the bootstrap Bartlett correction were considered $B = 200$ bootstrap resamples. The sample sizes used were 30, 40, 50. The entire computational implementation was developed in the language R (R Development Core Team, 2014), and for the estimation of the model parameters the package `gamLss` (Stasinopoulos and Rigby, 2007) was used.

Table 1: Null rejection rates (%); submodels for μ , ϕ and α

q	Stat	n	1%			5%			10%		
			30	40	50	30	40	50	30	40	50
Submodel for μ											
1	LR		3.16	2.20	2.02	9.84	7.94	7.26	16.84	13.62	13.66
	LR_B		0.80	0.90	1.18	4.80	4.84	5.34	9.22	9.52	10.20
	LR_{Sk_1}		1.10	1.18	1.48	5.08	5.26	5.22	9.98	10.42	10.50
	LR_{Sk_2}		0.76	0.88	1.22	4.50	4.94	4.92	8.90	9.82	10.18
2	LR		3.22	2.24	2.10	10.06	8.24	7.46	17.22	15.06	13.18
	LR_B		0.80	0.88	1.12	4.96	4.56	4.70	9.50	9.58	9.56
	LR_{Sk_1}		1.44	1.36	1.40	6.10	5.68	5.50	11.64	11.42	10.60
	LR_{Sk_2}		1.36	1.36	1.40	5.90	5.60	5.48	11.20	11.28	10.54
Submodel for ϕ											
1	LR		2.54	1.90	1.34	8.34	7.56	6.36	14.80	13.80	11.72
	LR_B		0.46	0.90	0.68	3.80	4.58	4.22	8.04	9.64	8.84
	LR_{Sk_1}		1.82	1.58	1.44	7.00	6.34	5.94	12.84	11.88	11.28
	LR_{Sk_2}		1.32	1.24	1.08	6.34	5.88	5.54	12.00	11.18	10.74
2	LR		2.62	2.24	1.92	9.68	8.78	7.50	16.86	14.62	13.66
	LR_B		1.00	0.94	1.10	4.62	5.38	5.08	9.74	10.20	10.42
	LR_{Sk_1}		1.54	1.22	1.16	6.74	6.20	5.58	12.80	11.24	11.22
	LR_{Sk_2}		1.40	1.20	1.14	6.30	6.04	5.56	12.44	11.00	11.08
Submodel for α											
1	LR		1.70	1.70	1.28	6.50	6.38	5.64	12.18	11.88	11.12
	LR_B		0.80	1.06	1.04	4.42	4.86	4.72	9.18	9.12	9.96
	LR_{Sk_1}		0.84	1.12	1.06	4.68	5.10	4.86	9.76	9.76	10.00
	LR_{Sk_2}		0.82	1.08	1.04	4.50	4.98	4.80	9.46	9.62	9.92
2	LR		1.96	2.04	1.90	8.46	7.80	6.62	14.22	14.02	11.70
	LR_B		0.62	0.80	1.16	3.60	4.80	4.52	8.06	9.54	8.90
	LR_{Sk_1}		1.34	0.96	1.12	4.80	5.28	4.78	9.60	10.46	9.54
	LR_{Sk_2}		0.58	0.76	1.08	3.90	4.88	4.68	8.64	10.04	9.50

All results for evaluating the null rejection rate (size) of the tests are shown in Table 1, considered the one-inflated

beta regression model. In this table the best results are highlighted. Nominal levels were considered equal to 1%, 5% and 10%. In the evaluation of the tests on the parameters of the mean submodel, it was considered the following regression structure for the mean, precision and mixture parameters :

$$\begin{aligned}g(\mu_t) &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1t} + \beta_2 x_{2t}, \\b(\phi_t) &= \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 s_{1t}, \\h(\alpha_t) &= \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 z_{1t},\end{aligned}$$

in which $t = 1, \dots, n$. For the structure of mean regression, $g(\mu_t)$, and mixture, $h(\alpha_t)$, the logit link function was used and for the structure of precision parameter, $b(\phi_t)$, the logarithmic link function.

In the Monte Carlo simulation, we consider two scenarios for the null hypothesis: (i) $q = 1$, in which $\mathcal{H}_0 : \beta_2 = 0$, fixing the parameters $\beta_0 = -1$, $\beta_1 = 3.5$, $\beta_2 = 0$, $\lambda_0 = 5.1$, $\lambda_1 = -2.8$, $\gamma_0 = -2$, $\gamma_1 = 1.5$; and (ii) $q = 2$, $\mathcal{H}_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, where $\beta_0 = 2$, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, with the same parameter values for ϕ and α submodels considered for $q = 1$. These values for the parameters in (i) imply the averages of y and ϕ to be equal, respectively, to 0.731 and 55.102, when $n = 50$. For (ii), the averages of y and ϕ are, respectively, equal to 0.908 and 55.102, with $n = 50$. The matrix of regressors is generated from a standard uniform distribution, $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)$, and kept constant during all Monte Carlo replications. For each replication, a sample y_1, \dots, y_n is generated with one-inflated beta distribution given by (2).

We also consider tests on the parameters of the submodel for precision (ϕ). In these cases we consider the one-inflated beta regression model given by:

$$\begin{aligned}g(\mu_t) &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1t}, \\b(\phi_t) &= \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 s_{1t} + \lambda_2 s_{2t}, \\h(\alpha_t) &= \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 z_{1t}.\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the null rejection rate of the tests, it was considered the following scenarios: (i) $q = 1$, $\mathcal{H}_0 : \lambda_2 = 0$, fixing the parameters $\beta_0 = -1$, $\beta_1 = 3.5$, $\lambda_0 = 5.1$, $\lambda_1 = -2.8$, $\lambda_2 = 0$, $\gamma_0 = -2$, $\gamma_1 = 1.5$; and (ii) $q = 2$, $\mathcal{H}_0 : \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$, considering $\lambda_0 = 5.1$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$. The average values of y and ϕ in this scenario are, respectively, equal to 0.728 and 54.865, for (i) with $n = 50$. For (ii), with $n = 50$, the averages of y and ϕ are, respectively, equal to 0.728 and 164.022.

Further, to evaluate the null rejection rate of the tests to make inferences about the parameters of the α submodel, we considered the following regression structure:

$$\begin{aligned}g(\mu_t) &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1t}, \\b(\phi_t) &= \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 s_{1t},\end{aligned}$$

Table 2: Estimated quantiles and moments of the test statistics for the submodel for μ , $q = 2$ and $n = 40$

Variate	Mean	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis	90th-perc	95th-perc	99th-perc
χ_q^2	2.000	4.000	2.000	9.000	4.605	5.991	9.210
LR	2.400	5.438	1.828	7.345	5.526	7.076	11.015
LR _B	1.963	4.028	1.831	7.365	4.558	5.827	9.000
LR _{Sk1}	2.105	4.456	1.819	7.262	4.884	6.236	9.604
LR _{Sk2}	2.089	4.431	1.818	7.260	4.859	6.213	9.592

$$h(\alpha_t) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 z_{1t} + \gamma_2 z_{2t}.$$

In this case, were considered: (i) $q = 1$, $\mathcal{H}_0 : \gamma_2 = 0$, fixing the parameters $\beta_0 = -1$, $\beta_1 = 3.5$, $\lambda_0 = 5.1$, $\lambda_1 = -2.8$, $\gamma_0 = -2$, $\gamma_1 = 1.5$; and (ii) $q = 2$, $\mathcal{H}_0 : \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$, considering $\gamma_0 = -2$. These values for the parameters in (i) imply averages of y and ϕ equal, respectively, to 0.728 and 55.001, when $n = 50$. For (ii), the averages of y and ϕ are, respectively, equal to 0.688 and 55.001, with $n = 50$.

Examining the Table 1, where are presented the results of tests' size, considering the μ submodel, it is found that the LR test is the most liberal, showing rejection rates well above nominal levels. For example, at the level of 5% and 10% for $n = 30$ and $q = 2$, the rejection rates for LR are, respectively, 10.06% and 17.22%. The corrected statistics, both the bootstrap Bartlett correction as well as the two versions of Skovgaard adjustment, have less size distortion than the test considering the usual uncorrected statistical. When imposed only one restriction, i. e., $q = 1$, the LR_B showed good performance, but the LR_{Sk1} statistic showed the best results for $n = 30$. For $q = 2$, the proposed LR_B statistic has the best performance in all sample sizes and significance levels. Still, among the corrected statistics, the more liberal is LR_{Sk1}, i. e., it has in general higher rejection rate than the nominal level. For this liberal characteristic of LR_{Sk1}, it is already expected that its results on the evaluation of tests' power will be higher.

For the results of tests' size on the submodel parameters of ϕ it can also be verified that the corrected statistics have better results. In particular, we highlight the performance of the proposed statistic LR_B when imposed two restrictions on the null hypothesis. Also, it can be seen that the versions corrected by Skovgaard are more liberal. For example, at the level of 10% the null rejection rates of the LR_{Sk1} are 12.80% ($n = 30$), 11.24% ($n = 40$) and 11.22% ($n = 50$).

For inferences about the submodel parameters of α , as shown in Table 1, the best results are also shown by the corrected statistics. As expected, tests on the parameters that index the mixture parameter submodel have very similar results to results for inferences about the regression structures μ and ϕ . In general, the Skovgaard adjustments show better performance in this case, however, the LR_B statistic still has similar and much higher performance than the usual likelihood ratio.

The objective of the second order corrections considered here is to improve the approximation of the LR test statistic distribution by the null chi-squared limit distribution. Table 2 presents quantiles and estimated moments




Figure 1: Quantile-Quantile graph for the submodel of μ , $q = 2$ and different sample sizes.

of the considered statistics, as well as the reference values of χ_q^2 . The scenario testing the submodel parameters of μ , under two restrictions, $q = 2$, and with $n = 40$ was considered for these results. It is verified that the statistic distribution of LR is the farthest from reference chi-squared distribution. Among the four statistics considered, those having moments and quantiles closer to χ_q^2 is the proposed LR_B . Still, it is observed that in general the corrected statistics present values of calculated measures closer to the reference values of χ_q^2 than the LR.

Figure 1 shows the QQ-plot graphs (exact quantiles versus asymptotic quantiles) for different sample sizes, given the same scenario of the results of Table 2. It's clear that the distribution of the proposed statistic is much closer to the reference null distribution, χ_q^2 . It was also observed that all the corrected statistics are closer to the reference null distribution of the usual LR statistic.

Table 3 presents the results of Monte Carlo simulations for non-null rejection rate (power) of the tests on the parameters of the submodels of μ , ϕ and α . Since the results of simulations of the test size using the LR statistic are pretty liberal, we present only the results for LR_B , LR_{Sk1} and LR_{Sk2} . For the mean submodel, we tested $\mathcal{H}_1 : \beta_2 = \delta$ ($q = 1$), where $\delta = -1, -0.5, 0.5, 1$. For the submodel of ϕ we tested $\mathcal{H}_1 : \lambda_2 = \delta$ ($q = 1$), where $\delta = -4, -3, 3, 4$. Also, about the regression structure of α , the tested hypotheses were $\mathcal{H}_1 : \gamma_2 = \delta$ ($q = 1$), where $\delta = 1, 2$.

Based on Table 3 it is noticed that the performances of the three statistics do not differ much for the three submodels. The corrected statistic LR_{Sk1} , in most scenarios, is slightly more powerful. However, this result was expected, for being the most liberal among the corrected statistics. Simulations of power under two constraints ($q = 2$) were also considered. However, the results for $q = 1$ and $q = 2$ are similar and the results for $q = 2$ were omitted for brevity.

Based on the results presented, it is verified the good performance of the bootstrap Bartlett statistic proposed here for inferences in small samples. LR_B was shown to be equivalent or superior (in some cases) to the Skovgaard analytical adjustment. Whereas the adjusted tests behave more accurately and obtaining the proposed corrected statistic is simpler because it does not require expensive analytical calculations, we recommend using the test based

Table 3: Non-null rejection rates (%), for the submodels for μ , ϕ and α , subject to a restriction ($q = 1$)

δ	Stat	n	1%		5%		10%	
			30	50	30	50	30	50
Submodel for μ								
-1	LR _B		84.92	96.62	96.68	99.56	98.40	99.82
	LR _{Sk1}		87.06	97.06	97.02	99.60	98.48	99.86
	LR _{Sk2}		85.62	96.96	96.48	99.60	98.36	99.84
-0.5	LR _B		28.18	38.36	56.02	64.20	69.56	75.68
	LR _{Sk1}		30.36	39.08	57.84	65.06	70.88	75.76
	LR _{Sk2}		28.48	38.76	56.12	64.80	69.48	75.44
0.5	LR _B		23.80	38.10	50.56	64.04	65.04	75.22
	LR _{Sk1}		26.50	39.32	52.78	64.56	70.88	75.78
	LR _{Sk2}		25.04	38.92	51.12	64.22	64.88	75.56
1	LR _B		78.12	92.90	93.48	98.28	96.90	99.32
	LR _{Sk1}		80.44	93.44	94.08	98.56	97.12	99.38
	LR _{Sk2}		79.18	93.24	93.54	98.48	96.88	99.38
Submodel for ϕ								
-4	LR _B		82.64	97.70	92.98	99.50	96.16	99.76
	LR _{Sk1}		88.68	98.18	96.02	99.58	97.96	99.84
	LR _{Sk2}		88.58	98.18	95.80	99.58	97.86	99.84
-3	LR _B		56.06	81.30	77.10	92.50	84.34	95.54
	LR _{Sk1}		65.74	83.24	82.48	93.08	88.82	96.00
	LR _{Sk2}		65.44	83.14	82.24	93.04	88.62	96.00
3	LR _B		46.02	70.24	70.40	86.92	80.70	92.22
	LR _{Sk1}		48.68	72.00	71.94	87.94	81.68	92.94
	LR _{Sk2}		47.64	71.90	70.48	87.78	80.76	92.80
4	LR _B		72.58	92.76	88.44	97.70	92.82	99.10
	LR _{Sk1}		74.60	93.74	88.62	98.00	92.86	99.10
	LR _{Sk2}		73.58	93.64	87.86	98.00	92.10	99.10
Submodel for α								
1	LR _B		2.40	5.84	8.62	17.28	15.10	26.33
	LR _{Sk1}		2.58	5.84	8.64	17.34	15.66	26.10
	LR _{Sk2}		2.42	5.76	8.42	17.22	15.48	26.02
2	LR _B		8.72	30.22	23.54	54.64	35.16	67.02
	LR _{Sk1}		8.72	30.18	23.10	55.14	35.28	66.88
	LR _{Sk2}		8.58	30.10	22.78	55.12	35.04	66.84

in the bootstrap Bartlett statistic.

5 An application

This section presents an application to real data of the likelihood ratio test corrected via bootstrap Bartlett, proposed in Section 3. The data used are part of the work presented in Sampaio de Souza et al. (2005) which estimates levels of efficiency for the Brazilian municipalities. These indexes take values in the range $(0, 1]$, where 1 corresponds to the fully efficient municipalities. In this application were considered the 26 Brazilian state capitals, referent to the

2000 year. The proportion of ones in this data is equal to 0.12.

The variables considered in the database were: number of inhabitants (x_1), information (x_2), which is a binary variable that assumes a value of 1 if the municipality is computerized, and 0 otherwise, personnel expenses (x_3), population density (x_4), percentage of households whose head earns up to 1 minimum wage (x_5), urbanization rate (x_6), index actualization of the real state register (x_7), a binary variable that receives values 1 if the municipality is located in areas of the drought polygon area and 0 otherwise (x_8) and average income (x_9). Further details on these and other related variables can be accessed at Sampaio de Souza et al. (2005).

For the mean submodel, the initial model has been obtained by the function `stepGAIC` of the `gamlss` package available at R (R Development Core Team, 2014). This function selects a model by a stepwise algorithm using the generalized Akaike information criteria. For the submodels of ϕ and α the same covariates presented in Pereira and Cribari-Neto (2014b) were considered. Thus, initially we consider the following model

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left(\frac{\mu_t}{1-\mu_t}\right) &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1t} + \beta_2 x_{2t} + \beta_3 x_{3t} + \beta_4 x_{4t}, \\ \log(\phi_t) &= \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 x_{9t}, \\ \log\left(\frac{\alpha_t}{1-\alpha_t}\right) &= \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 x_{9t}.\end{aligned}$$

The tests were performed at the 10% nominal level. When testing the exclusion of the covariate x_4 , $\mathcal{H}_0 : \beta_4 = 0$, we have the values of the statistics and (p -value in parenthesis) given by: $\text{LR} = 3.609$ ($p = 0.057$) and $\text{LR}_B = 2.177$ ($p = 0.140$). It is noticed that inferential conclusions using the corrected and non-corrected statistics are opposite. By the corrected LR_B statistic, the hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 is not rejected, then we decided to exclude the covariate x_4 of the submodel. To test the significance of x_3 , $\mathcal{H}_0 : \beta_3 = 0$, we have: $\text{LR} = 5.909$ ($p = 0.015$) and $\text{LR}_B = 3.837$ ($p = 0.050$); both tests reject the null hypothesis, so x_3 remains in the submodel. When testing $\mathcal{H}_0 : \beta_2 = 0$, it is obtained $\text{LR} = 2.054$ ($p = 0.152$) and $\text{LR}_B = 1.509$ ($p = 0.219$), the null hypothesis is not rejected, then we exclude the covariate x_2 of the submodel. Yet, for $\mathcal{H}_0 : \beta_1 = 0$, we have $\text{LR} = 8.287$ ($p = 0.004$) and $\text{LR}_B = 6.229$ ($p = 0.013$), in which both reject the null hypothesis. Based on the test corrected via bootstrap Bartlett, the adjusted model is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left(\frac{\mu_t}{1-\mu_t}\right) &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1t} + \beta_3 x_{3t}, \\ \log(\phi_t) &= \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 x_{9t}, \\ \log\left(\frac{\alpha_t}{1-\alpha_t}\right) &= \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 x_{9t}.\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the quality of the fitted model, based on the corrected test, we consider the proposed residual analysis in Ospina and Ferrari (2012). Figure 2 presents the quantile randomized residual graph and the half-normal probabil-




Figure 2: Randomized quantile residual plots.

ity graph with simulated envelope. In Figure 2(a), it is verified that all residual were within the range $(-2, 2)$. Yet, in Figure 2(b), it can be seen that all the points are within the confidence bands of the simulated envelope, indicating a good fit of the model.

To test whether the model is correctly specified, we consider the RESET test for the inflated beta model presented in Pereira and Cribari-Neto (2014a). In this test we obtained $p = 0.997$, not rejecting the null hypothesis that the model is correctly specified.

Therefore, it appears that the model selected based on hypothesis testing using the bootstrap Bartlett corrected test provides a good fit.

6 Conclusions

The likelihood ratio statistic is typically used to perform hypothesis testing in the inflated beta regression models. However, if the sample is not large enough to guarantee a good agreement between the distribution of the test statistic and the limiting χ^2 distribution, the approximate likelihood ratio test can be considerably oversized. In this paper we propose a bootstrap Bartlett correction of the likelihood ratio statistic for inferential improvements in the inflated beta regression model in small samples. Through Monte Carlo simulations we evaluated the proposed correction and compared it with the Skovgaard adjustments (Pereira and Cribari-Neto, 2014b) and with the non-corrected usual statistic. The simulation results indicate that the corrected statistics make the tests more accurated, reducing the problem of size distortion in small samples. Still, it is verified that the proposed correction via bootstrap Bartlett has results very close to or even better than the analytical Skovgaard adjustments. The latter requires second-order derivatives of the log-likelihood of the model, while the proposed correction requires only the use of a simple Monte

Carlo simulation. We believe that the proposed bootstrap Bartlett correction can be quite useful in practical situations and we recommend to practitioners to model data using inflated beta regressions and use it since it is easy to obtain and present accurate inferential results.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the financial support received by CAPES, FAPERGS and CNPq, Brazil. We also thank two referees for comments and suggestions.

References

- Bartlett, M. S. (1937). Properties of sufficiency and statistical tests. *Royal Society of London Proceedings Series A*, 160(901), 268–282.
- Bayer, F., Cribari-Neto, F. (2013). Bartlett corrections in beta regression models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 143(3), 531–547.
- Buse, A. (1982). The likelihood ratio, Wald, and Lagrange multiplier tests: An expository note. *The American Statistician*, 36(3a), 153–157.
- Casella, G., Berger, R. L. (2002). *Statistical Inference*, 2nd edn. Thomson Learning, Pacific Grove.
- Cordeiro, G. (1993). General matrix formulae for computing Bartlett corrections. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 16(1), 11–18.
- Cribari-Neto, F., Cordeiro, G. M. (1996). On Bartlett and Bartlett-type corrections. *Econometric Reviews*, 15(4), 339–367.
- Cribari-Neto, F., Queiroz, M. P. (2014). On testing inference in beta regressions. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 84(1), 186–203.
- Cysneiros, A. H. M. A., Ferrari, S. L. P. (2006). An improved likelihood ratio test for varying dispersion in exponential family nonlinear models. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 76(3), 255–265.
- Efron, B. (1979). Bootstrap methods: Another look at the Jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics*, 7(1), 1–26.
- Ferrari, S. L. P., Cribari-Neto, F. (2004). Beta regression for modelling rates and proportions. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 31(7), 799–815.
- Ferrari, S. L. P., Cysneiros, A. H. M. A. (2008). Skovgaard’s adjustment to likelihood ratio tests in exponential family nonlinear models. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 78(17), 3047–3055.
- Ferrari, S. L. P., Pinheiro, E. C. (2011). Improved likelihood inference in beta regression. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 81(4), 431–443.
- Ferrari, S. L. P., Pinheiro, E. C. (2014). Small-sample likelihood inference in extreme-value regression models. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 84(3), 582–595.
- Ferrari, S. L. P., Cysneiros, A. H. M. A., Cribari-Neto, F. (2004). An improved test for heteroskedasticity using adjusted modified profile likelihood inference. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 124(2), 423 – 437.
- Koenker, R., Yoon, J. (2009). Parametric links for binary choice models: A fisherian-bayesian colloquy. *Journal of Econometrics*, 152(2), 120–130.

- Lawley, D. N. (1956). A general method for approximating to the distribution of likelihood ratio criteria. *Biometrika*, 43(3/4), 295–303.
- McCullagh, P., Nelder, J. (1989). *Generalized linear models*, 2nd edn. Chapman and Hall.
- Melo, T., Vasconcellos, K., Lemonte, A. (2009a). Some restriction tests in a new class of regression models for proportions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 5, 53(12), 3972–3979.
- Melo, T. N. P., Ferrari, S. L. P., Cribari-Neto, F. (2009b). Improved testing inference in mixed linear models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(7), 2573–2582.
- Neyman, J., Pearson, E. S. (1928). On the use and interpretation of certain test criteria for purposes of statistical inference. *Biometrika*, 20A(1/2), 175–240.
- Ospina, R., Ferrari, S. L. P. (2010). Inflated beta distributions. *Statistical Papers*, 51(1), 111–126.
- Ospina, R., Ferrari, S. L. P. (2012). A general class of zero-or-one inflated beta regression models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 56(6), 1609–1623.
- Ospina, R., Cribari-Neto, F., Vasconcellos, K. L. P. (2006). Improved point and interval estimation for a beta regression model. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51(2), 960–981.
- Parker, A. J., Bandyopadhyay, D., Slate, E. H. (2014). A spatial augmented beta regression model for periodontal proportion data. *Statistical Modelling*.
- Pereira, T. L., Cribari-Neto, F. (2014a). Detecting model misspecification in inflated beta regressions. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 43(3), 631–656.
- Pereira, T. L., Cribari-Neto, F. (2014b). Modified likelihood ratio statistics for inflated beta regressions. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 84(5), 982–998.
- Press, W., Teukolsky, S., Vetterling, W., Flannery, B. (1992). *Numerical recipes in C: The art of scientific computing*. Cambridge University Press.
- R Development Core Team (2014). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, URL <http://www.R-project.org/>, ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
- Rigby, R. A., Stasinopoulos, D. M. (1996a). Mean and dispersion additive models. In: Härdle, W., Schimek, M. (Eds) *Statistical Theory and Computational Aspects of Smoothing*, Contributions to Statistics, Physica-Verlag HD, pp. 215–230.
- Rigby, R. A., Stasinopoulos, D. M. (1996b). A semi-parametric additive model for variance heterogeneity. *Statistics and Computing*, 6(1), 57–65.
- Rigby, R. A., Stasinopoulos, D. M. (2005). Generalized additive models for location, scale and shape. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C*, 54(3), 507–554.
- Rocke, D. M. (1989). Bootstrap Bartlett adjustment in seemingly unrelated regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(406), 598–601.
- Skovgaard, I. M. (1996). An explicit large-deviation approximation to one-parameter tests. *Bernoulli*, (2), 145–165.
- Skovgaard, I. M. (2001). Likelihood asymptotics. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 28(1), 3–32.
- Sampaio de Souza, M. C., Cribari-Neto, F., Stosic, B. D. (2005). Explaining dea technical efficiency scores in an outlier corrected environment: the case of public services in brazilian municipalities. *Brazilian Review of Econometrics*, 25(2), 289–315.
- Stasinopoulos, D. M., Rigby, R. A. (2007). Generalized additive models for location scale and shape (GAMLSS) in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 23(7).
- Stasinopoulos, M., Rigby, B., Akantziliotou, C. (2008). *Instructions on how to use the gamlss package in R*. STORM Research Centre, London Metropolitan University, London, second edition edn.
- Sundarapandian, V. (2009). *Probability, statistics and queuing theory*. Phi Learning.