

# Parameter Estimation for Grouped Data Using EM and MCEM Algorithms

Zahra A. Shirazi<sup>a</sup>, João Pedro A. R. da Silva<sup>b</sup> and Camila P. E. de Souza<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The University of Western Ontario, ON, Canada; <sup>b</sup> University of São Paulo, SP, Brazil

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled June 10, 2022

## ABSTRACT

Nowadays, the confidentiality of data and information is of great importance for many companies and organizations. For this reason, they may prefer not to release exact data, but instead to grant researchers access to approximate data. For example, rather than providing the exact income of their clients, they may only provide researchers with grouped data, that is, the number of clients falling in each of a set of non-overlapping income intervals. The challenge is to estimate the mean and variance structure of the hidden ungrouped data based on the observed grouped data. To tackle this problem, this work considers the exact observed data likelihood and applies the Expectation-Maximization (EM) and Monte-Carlo EM (MCEM) algorithms for cases where the hidden data follow a univariate, bivariate, or multivariate normal distribution. The results are then compared with the case of ignoring the grouping and applying regular maximum likelihood. The well-known Galton data and simulated datasets are used to evaluate the properties of the proposed EM and MCEM algorithms.

## KEYWORDS

EM Algorithm; MCEM Algorithm; Grouped data; Normal distribution; Maximum likelihood estimation.

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays, protecting data confidentiality, security, and integrity is of great importance for governments, organizations, and companies [3, 10, 13, 20]. For these reasons, these institutions might not release exact raw data to researchers, analysts, or even the public. Rather, they prefer to release data such as household income, house prices, insurance losses, profits, and age in an interval format. The interval format can contain either grouped data [18] or symbolic data [1]. This work focuses on grouped data, where for a particular variable, only the intervals and the frequency of observations falling into each interval are known. Table 1 shows how univariate grouped data can be represented.

**Table 1.** Univariate grouped data representation

Interval	Frequencies
$[a_0, a_1)$	$n_1$
$[a_1, a_2)$	$n_2$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$[a_{k-1}, a_k)$	$n_k$
Total	$n$

As can be seen from the grouped data representation in Table 1, these data are histogram-based and; therefore; continuous. Continuous data can follow different distributions, including normal, log-normal, and Weibull. Many studies have been conducted on grouped data from different perspectives. McLachlan and Krishnan in [12] have studied the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm [4] for estimating the parameters of univariate normal grouped data where some of the interval counts were missing. Teimouri in [17] has applied the EM algorithm on univariate grouped data arising from a mixture of skew-normal distributions. Tallis [16] has obtained the approximate maximum likelihood estimates (MLE) of the parameters for grouped data under both equal and unequal grouping. Stewart [15] has dealt with the problem of estimating the parameters of a linear model using data in which the dependent variable is only observed to fall in certain intervals on a continuous scale, with its actual values remaining unobserved. McLachlan and Jones [11] have considered the fitting of finite mixture models to grouped and truncated data using the EM algorithm. Heitjan [8] has considered Bayesian methods to analyze this type of data. In another study, Heitjan [9] has applied Newton-Raphson’s method and the EM algorithm to find parameter estimates of bivariate regression analysis for grouped data. Chanseok Park [14] has proposed a quantile variant of the EM (QEM) algorithm for parameter estimation of interval-valued data (grouped data with one interval) and demonstrated that their proposed algorithm is more efficient than Monte-Carlo EM (MCEM) [12]. Wengrzik and Timm [19] have studied the fitting of two-component Gaussian mixtures to grouped data. Velez and Correa [18] have estimated the mean, variance, and coefficient of variation for grouped data using their proposed bootstrap method.

The aim of this study is to find the parameter estimates for grouped data when they are normally distributed for the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate cases using the exact form of the likelihood. Therefore, the estimation approach of [12] and [11] for univariate grouped data with missing counts is considered and extended to the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate cases without missing counts using both the EM and MCEM algorithms. To the authors’ knowledge, no other study has yet presented

the exact formulae of EM parameter estimates for the bivariate and multivariate normal grouped data, as is done in this work. This work also describes how to obtain the parameter estimates by numerical optimization of the exact grouped data likelihood. In summary, four possible approaches for parameter estimation of grouped data are presented: 1) ignoring the grouping and finding the parameter estimates using interval midpoints and maximum likelihood, 2) maximum likelihood estimation based on the exact grouped data distribution (Exact MLE), 3) maximizing the exact likelihood using the EM algorithm, and 4) same as (3), but using the MCEM algorithm.

All four methods described above for univariate, bivariate, and multivariate normal grouped data are implemented as an R package and available at <https://github.com/desouzalab/infgrouped>.

This study is organised as follows. In Section 2, the estimation methods for grouped data are presented. In Section 2.1, the univariate normal grouped data are considered, and parameter estimates are provided for the four methods described in the previous paragraph. In Section 2.2, the proposed methods are applied to bivariate grouped data and extended to multivariate normal grouped data. Section 3 deals with numerical applications. In Section 3.1, the proposed methods are applied to the well-known Galton data [6]. Simulation studies for univariate and bivariate normal grouped data are described in Section 3.2. Finally, in Section 4, results and conclusions are discussed.

## 2. Methods

In this section, the four parameter estimation approaches for normally distributed grouped data are presented for univariate, bivariate and multivariate scenarios.

### 2.1. Univariate normal grouped data

For simplicity, this section starts with estimating the parameters for the univariate normal grouped data.

#### 2.1.1. Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) ignoring the grouping

This first method finds the parameter estimates for the grouped data by ignoring the grouping and using the midpoints ( $\tilde{x}_i$ ) of the  $k$  intervals shown in Table 1 as observed values for each variable. In this case, by considering normally distributed random variables and the MLE of the parameters  $\mu$  and  $\sigma^2$ , the following expressions are obtained:

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \tilde{x}_i \quad (1)$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i (\tilde{x}_i - \hat{\mu})^2. \quad (2)$$

### 2.1.2. Exact MLE

It is assumed that the unobserved data  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  come from a normal distribution with parameters  $\theta = \{\mu, \sigma\}$  and denoted by  $N(\mu, \sigma)$ . Let  $f(x; \theta)$  be the density function of  $N(\mu, \sigma)$ . According to  $k + 1$  pre-established partitioned points  $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_{k-1} < a_k$ , let  $n_i$  be the number of observations that fall into the interval  $\mathcal{X}_i = [a_{i-1}, a_i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $a_0 = -\infty$  and  $a_k = +\infty$ . Furthermore, it is assumed that the observed data  $y = \{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$  follow a multinomial distribution with  $n = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$  draws over  $k$  categories (intervals), with the probability of being in category  $i$  equal to  $\frac{P_i(\theta)}{P(\theta)}$ , where

$$P_i(\theta) = \int_{a_{i-1}}^{a_i} f(x; \theta) dx,$$

with  $P(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i(\theta) = 1$ . Therefore, the log-likelihood function for the observed data  $y$  (also called the incomplete data log-likelihood) can be written as:

$$\log L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \log P_i(\theta) + C. \quad (3)$$

Let  $\phi(\cdot)$  and  $\Phi(\cdot)$  be the density and the CDF; respectively; of a standard normal distribution. Therefore, the density of  $N(\mu, \sigma)$  can be written as:

$$f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right),$$

where  $-\infty < \mu < \infty$  and  $\sigma > 0$ . By applying the reparametrization  $\theta_1 = \frac{\mu}{\sigma}$  and  $\theta_2 = \frac{1}{\sigma}$ , the parameters are changed from  $(\mu, \sigma)$  to  $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ . Now let the CDF of  $N(\mu, \sigma)$  be  $\Phi(\theta_2 t - \theta_1)$ . Then the log-likelihood in (3) can be written as a function of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  as follows (see also [21]):

$$\begin{aligned} \log L(\theta) = & n_1 \ln \left[ \Phi(\theta_2 a_1 - \theta_1) \right] + n_k \ln \left[ 1 - \Phi(\theta_2 a_{k-1} - \theta_1) \right] + \\ & \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} n_i \ln \left[ \Phi(\theta_2 a_i - \theta_1) - \Phi(\theta_2 a_{i-1} - \theta_1) \right] + C \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The parameter estimates  $\hat{\theta}_1$  and  $\hat{\theta}_2$  can be obtained by maximizing (4) with respect to  $\theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$  using Newton-Raphson numerical methods such as those implemented in the *optim()* function in R.

### 2.1.3. Parameter estimation by the EM algorithm

In a similar manner to [11, 12, 14], to find  $\hat{\theta}$  that maximizes  $\log L(\theta)$  in (3) within the EM framework, the vector of  $x_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{i, n_i})^T$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , should be introduced as missing (unobservable) data. In fact, for each interval  $\mathcal{X}_i = [a_{i-1}, a_i)$ ,  $x_i$  consists of  $n_i$  unobservable data points falling into that interval. Hence, the complete-data vector can be written as:  $W = (Y^T, X_1^T, \dots, X_k^T)^T$ , where  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  are independent draws with  $n_i$  observations of  $x_{il}$  ( $l = 1, \dots, n_i$ ). Furthermore, given  $Y = y$ ,

each  $X_i$  has a density function  $(x_i|Y = y) \sim \frac{f(x_i; \theta)}{P_i(\theta)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . Therefore, the density function of  $W$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} f(W) &= f(X|Y = y)P(Y) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{l=1}^{n_i} \frac{f(x_{il}; \theta)}{P_i(\theta)} \times \prod_{i=1}^k (P_i(\theta))^{n_i} \times C \\ &\propto \prod_i \prod_l f(x_{il}; \theta) \end{aligned}$$

and its corresponding log-likelihood as

$$\log L_c(\theta) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \log f(x_{il}; \theta) + C. \quad (5)$$

Using the above complete-data log-likelihood function, the EM algorithm can be used to iteratively estimate the parameters in  $\theta$ . The following describes the E and M steps of the proposed EM approach.

**E-Step:**

The E-step calculates the expectation of the complete-data log-likelihood in (5) conditional on  $y$  and the current parameter estimates  $(\theta^{(p)})$ . Disregarding the constant term, the expectation of the log  $L_c(\theta)$  conditional on  $y$  and  $\theta^{(p)}$  is given by:

$$Q(\theta, \theta^{(p)}) \equiv E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ \log L_c(\theta) | Y \right\} \equiv E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ \log f(X; \theta) | X \in \mathcal{X}_i \right\}$$

with the expectation taken with respect to the density  $\frac{f(x; \theta^{(p)})}{P_i(\theta^{(p)})}$ .

Therefore, for the normally distributed grouped data:

$$Q(\theta, \theta^{(p)}) = -\frac{1}{2}n\{\log(2\pi) + \log \sigma^2\} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^k n_i E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ (X - \mu)^2 | X \in \mathcal{X}_i \right\}.$$

**M-Step:**

The M-step of the EM algorithm maximizes  $Q(\theta, \theta^{(p)})$  with respect to  $\theta$  at iteration  $p + 1$  to produce new estimates  $\theta^{(p+1)} = (\mu^{(p+1)}, \sigma^{(p+1)})^T$ . By using the idea of interchanging the differentiation and the expectation (the Leibniz integral rule),  $Q(\theta, \theta^{(p)})$  can be differentiated with respect to  $\theta = (\mu, \sigma)$  to obtain the following updated estimates:

$$\mu^{(p+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k n_i E_{\theta^{(p)}}(X | X \in \mathcal{X}_i)}{n} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\sigma^{2(p+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k n_i E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left[ (X - \mu^{(p+1)})^2 | X \in \mathcal{X}_i \right]}{n}, \quad (7)$$

where  $n = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$ . The derivation of the expectations in (6) and (7) can be found in Section 1.1 of the Supplementary Material.

#### 2.1.4. Parameter estimation by the MCEM Algorithm

Calculating the exact form of the expectations in (6) and (7) can be seen as a tedious and difficult task. In this case, an alternative way is to use the Monte-Carlo EM (MCEM) algorithm, in which the required expectations are replaced with an average over simulations [12, 14]. The unobserved data  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  can be simulated from the distribution  $\frac{f(x; \theta^{(p)})}{P_i(\theta^{(p)})}$  over each specific interval. Now, considering  $M$  as the number of observations generated for each interval in the Monte-Carlo simulation, the simulated sample for the  $i$ -th interval can be written as  $(x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,M})$ , and the MCEM updates are:

$$\mu^{(p+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M x_{i,m}$$

and

$$\sigma^{2(p+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M (x_{i,m} - \mu^{(p+1)})^2,$$

where  $n = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$ .

## 2.2. Bivariate and Multivariate Normal grouped data

### 2.2.1. MLE of bivariate and multivariate normal distributions

As for the univariate case, in this approach, the grouping form of the data is ignored, and the regular maximum likelihood estimates (MLEs) for regular (not grouped) bivariate and multivariate data are used, considering the midpoints of the intervals as the observations.

**Table 2.** Bivariate grouped data representation.

$X_1 \setminus X_2$	$[b_0, b_1)$	$[b_1, b_2)$	$\dots$	$[b_{s-1}, b_s)$	Total
$[a_0, a_1)$	$n_{11}$	$n_{12}$	$\dots$	$n_{1s}$	$n_{1.}$
$[a_1, a_2)$	$n_{21}$	$n_{22}$	$\dots$	$n_{2s}$	$n_{2.}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$[a_{r-1}, a_r)$	$n_{r1}$	$n_{r2}$	$\dots$	$n_{rs}$	$n_{r.}$
Total	$n_{.1}$	$n_{.2}$	$\dots$	$n_{.s}$	$n$

Let  $\theta = (\mu_{x_1}, \mu_{x_2}, \sigma_{x_1}^2, \sigma_{x_2}^2, \rho)$  be the parameters of a bivariate normal distribution. Using the bivariate representation of grouped data in Table 2 and the midpoint of each interval ( $\tilde{x}_{1i}$  and  $\tilde{x}_{2j}$  corresponding to variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , respectively), the formulae of the MLEs for regular (not grouped) bivariate normal data are as follows. More details about their derivation can be found in [2] and in the Supplementary Material, Section 1.2:

$$\hat{\mu}_{x_1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^r n_i \tilde{x}_{1i},$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{x_2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^s n_j \tilde{x}_{2j},$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{x_1}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^r n_i (\tilde{x}_{1i} - \hat{\mu}_{x_1})^2,$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{x_2}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^s n_j (\tilde{x}_{2j} - \hat{\mu}_{x_2})^2, \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} \frac{(\tilde{x}_{1i} - \hat{\mu}_{x_1})(\tilde{x}_{2j} - \hat{\mu}_{x_2})}{\hat{\sigma}_{x_1} \hat{\sigma}_{x_2}}.$$

In a manner much like the bivariate case, the parameter estimates ignoring the grouping for multivariate normal data ( $N(\underline{\mu}, \underline{\Sigma})$ ) are given by:

$$\underline{\hat{\mu}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}_{x_d} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{\underline{\Sigma}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{x_1}^2 & \hat{\sigma}_{x_1 x_2} & \cdots & \hat{\sigma}_{x_1 x_d} \\ \hat{\sigma}_{x_1 x_2} & \hat{\sigma}_{x_2}^2 & \cdots & \hat{\sigma}_{x_2 x_d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{\sigma}_{x_1 x_d} & \hat{\sigma}_{x_2 x_d} & \cdots & \hat{\sigma}_{x_d}^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_{x_k} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i_k=1}^{r_k} n_{\dots i_k \dots} \tilde{x}_{k i_k}, \\ \hat{\sigma}_{x_k} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i_k=1}^{r_k} n_{\dots i_k \dots} \left( \tilde{x}_{k i_k} - \hat{\mu}_{x_k} \right)^2, \text{ and} \\ \hat{\sigma}_{x_{k-1} \cdot x_k} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{r_{k-1}} \sum_{i_k=1}^{r_k} n_{\dots i_{k-1} \dots} n_{\dots i_k \dots} \left( \tilde{x}_{k-1} - \hat{\mu}_{x_{k-1}} \right) \left( \tilde{x}_k - \hat{\mu}_{x_k} \right).\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{x}_{k i_k}$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, d$ , are the midpoints of the surfaces corresponding to variables  $X_1, \dots, X_d$ , and  $n_{\dots i_k \dots}$  is the summation over all frequencies for  $i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_d$  corresponding to the variable  $X_k$ . For more details, see Section 1.3 of the Supplementary Material. Note that the parameter estimates resulting from multivariate normal data can also be used for bivariate data in the case  $d = 2$ .

### 2.2.2. Exact MLE for Bivariate Normal

The derivation of the exact MLE for bivariate normal grouped data is much like that for the univariate case, except that the multinomial probabilities depend on the bivariate normal CDF calculated over rectangles instead of intervals. The probability of a bivariate random variable  $X = (X_1, X_2)$  belonging to a rectangle  $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$  of the form  $[a_{i-1}, a_i] \times [b_{j-1}, b_j]$ ; for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $j = 1, \dots, s$ , is

$$\begin{aligned}P_{ij}(\theta) &\equiv P(a_{i-1} \leq X_1 < a_i, b_{j-1} \leq X_2 < b_j) = \\ &= \int_{a_{i-1}}^{a_i} \int_{b_{j-1}}^{b_j} f(x_1, x_2; \theta) dx_1 dx_2 \\ &= F_\theta(a_i, b_j) - F_\theta(a_{i-1}, b_j) - F_\theta(a_i, b_{j-1}) + F_\theta(a_{i-1}, b_{j-1}),\end{aligned}$$

where  $f(\cdot; \theta)$  and  $F_\theta(\cdot)$  are the bivariate normal density function and cumulative distribution function, respectively; with parameters  $\theta = (\mu_{x_1}, \mu_{x_2}, \sigma_{x_1}, \sigma_{x_2}, \rho)$ .

For each rectangle (or cell in Table 2), the frequencies  $n_{ij}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $j = 1, \dots, s$ , are known, and therefore the following multinomial likelihood can be assumed for them:

$$L(\theta) = \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{j=1}^s n_{ij}} \prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{j=1}^s \left[ \frac{P_{ij}(\theta)}{P(\theta)} \right]^{n_{ij}},$$

where  $n = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij}$  and  $P(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s P_{ij}(\theta) = 1$ . Hence, the exact log-likelihood function is:

$$\begin{aligned}\log L(\theta) &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} \log P_{ij}(\theta) + C \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} \log \left[ F_\theta(a_i, b_j) - F_\theta(a_{i-1}, b_j) - F_\theta(a_i, b_{j-1}) + F_\theta(a_{i-1}, b_{j-1}) \right] + C \quad (8)\end{aligned}$$



To find the MLEs of the parameters in  $\theta$ , the log-likelihood function in (8) is maximized using numerical methods implemented by the  $nlm()$  function in R.

### 2.2.3. Parameter Estimation by the EM Algorithm

Extending the ideas of the univariate case, the goal is to maximize the exact log-likelihood for bivariate grouped data (see Equation (8)); using the EM approach. Therefore, the first step is to introduce the random variables  $(X_1, X_2)$  as missing observations in array form:

$$(x_1, x_2) = \{(x_{11n_{11}}, x_{21n_{11}}), \dots, (x_{1ik}, x_{2jk}), \dots, (x_{1rn_{rs}}, x_{2sn_{rs}})\}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ ;  $j = 1, \dots, s$  and  $k = n_{11}, \dots, n_{ij}, \dots, n_{rs}$ . Then the complete-data  $W = (Y^T, (X_1, X_2))$  can be defined over the rectangles, and their log-likelihood can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \log L_c(\theta) &= \log L(\theta) + \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{k=1}^{n_{ij}} \log \frac{f(x_{1ik}, x_{2jk}; \theta)}{P_{ij}(\theta)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} \log P_{ij}(\theta) + C + \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{k=1}^{n_{ij}} \log \frac{f(x_{1ik}, x_{2jk}; \theta)}{P_{ij}(\theta)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{k=1}^{n_{ij}} \log f(x_{1ik}, x_{2jk}; \theta) + C \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The following presents the proposed E and M steps of the EM algorithm.

#### E-Step:

The E-step calculates the expected value of (9) given  $y$  and the current  $\theta^{(p)}$ , that is,

$$Q(\theta, \theta^{(p)}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} Q_{ij}(\theta, \theta^{(p)}), \quad (10)$$

where

$$Q_{ij}(\theta, \theta^{(p)}) = E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ \log f((X_1, X_2); \theta) | (X_1, X_2) \in (\mathcal{X}_{i1} \times \mathcal{X}_{2j}) \right\},$$

with the expectation taken with respect to the density  $\frac{f((x_1, x_2); \theta^{(p)})}{P_{ij}(\theta^{(p)})}$ .

#### M-Step:

The M-step aims to find the parameter updates that maximize (10). Using a similar framework as in Section 2.2.1, the results are:

$$\mu_{x_1}^{(p+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left( X_{1i} | (X_1, X_2) \in (\mathcal{X}_{i1} \times \mathcal{X}_{2j}) \right)}{n} \quad (11)$$

$$\mu_{x_2}^{(p+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left( X_{2j} | (X_1, X_2) \in (\mathcal{X}_{i1} \times \mathcal{X}_{2j}) \right)}{n} \quad (12)$$

$$\sigma_{x_1}^{2(p+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left( (X_{1i} - \mu_{x_1}^{(p+1)})^2 | (X_1, X_2) \in (\mathcal{X}_{i1} \times \mathcal{X}_{2j}) \right)}{n} \quad (13)$$

$$\sigma_{x_2}^{2(p+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left( (X_{2j} - \mu_{x_2}^{(p+1)})^2 | (X_1, X_2) \in (\mathcal{X}_{i1} \times \mathcal{X}_{2j}) \right)}{n} \quad (14)$$

$$\rho^{(p+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^s n_{ij} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left( (X_{1i} - \mu_{x_1}^{(p+1)})(X_{2j} - \mu_{x_2}^{(p+1)}) | (X_1, X_2) \in (\mathcal{X}_{i1} \times \mathcal{X}_{2j}) \right)}{n} \quad (15)$$

The expectations in (11) to (15) are the moments of a truncated bivariate normal distribution  $(\frac{f(x_1, x_2; \theta^{(p)})}{P_{ij}(\theta^{(p)})})$ , and therefore the results of [5] can be used to calculate them (for details, see Section 1.4 of the Supplementary Material).

#### 2.2.4. MCEM for bivariate grouped data

The MCEM algorithm can be used to replace the expectations in (11) to (15) by the average of simulated values. That means that  $M$  random samples of  $(X_1, X_2)$  are simulated from the density  $\frac{f((x_1, x_2); \theta^{(p)})}{P_{ij}(\theta^{(p)})}$  over the rectangles, and then their averages are used to replace the expectations in the EM parameter updates, obtaining the following MCEM-based parameter estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{x_1}^{(p+1)} &= \frac{\sum_i \sum_j n_{ij} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M X_{1ih}}{n}, \\ \mu_{x_2}^{(p+1)} &= \frac{\sum_i \sum_j n_{ij} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M X_{2jh}}{n}, \\ \sigma_{x_1}^{2(p+1)} &= \frac{\sum_i \sum_j n_{ij} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M (X_{1ih} - \mu_{x_1}^{(p+1)})^2}{n}, \\ \sigma_{x_2}^{2(p+1)} &= \frac{\sum_i \sum_j n_{ij} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M (X_{2jh} - \mu_{x_2}^{(p+1)})^2}{n}, \text{ and} \\ \rho^{(p+1)} &= \frac{\sum_i \sum_j n_{ij} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M (X_{1ih} - \mu_{x_1}^{(p+1)})(X_{2jh} - \mu_{x_2}^{(p+1)})}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

### 2.2.5. Extension of EM and MCEM to Multivariate Normal Grouped Data

By extending the ideas of univariate and bivariate normal grouped data, it is possible to find the parameter estimates (mean vector and covariance matrix) for multivariate normal grouped data using a matrix notation. Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be the unobservable data arising from a  $d$ -dimensional multivariate normal distribution with parameters  $\Theta = (\underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ . Considering  $d$ -dimensional surfaces  $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_d$ , let  $n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}$  be the observed number (count) of data points falling in each surface. These observed counts form a multinomial likelihood as follows:

$$L(\Theta) = \frac{n!}{\prod_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \dots \prod_{i_d=1}^{r_d} (n_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d})!} \prod_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \dots \prod_{i_d=1}^{r_d} \left( \frac{P_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d}(\Theta)}{P(\Theta)} \right)^{n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}}$$

where  $n = \sum_{i_1} \dots \sum_{i_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}$ ,

$$P_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d}(\Theta) = \int_{a_{1, i_1-1}}^{a_{1, i_1}} \dots \int_{a_{d, i_d-1}}^{a_{d, i_d}} f(x_1, \dots, x_d) dx_d \dots dx_1$$

and

$$P(\Theta) = \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \dots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} P_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d}(\Theta) = 1,$$

with  $f(x_1, \dots, x_d)$  being the probability density function of a multivariate normal distribution. Representing the observed data as  $y = (n_{1, \dots, 1}, \dots, n_{i_1, \dots, i_d})$ , for  $i_1 = 1, \dots, r_1$ ;  $\dots$ ;  $i_d = 1, \dots, r_d$ , the goal is to maximize

$$\log L(\Theta) = \sum_{i_1} \dots \sum_{i_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \log P_{i_1, \dots, i_d}(\Theta) + C$$

using the EM framework. Random variables  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  are introduced in array form with dimension  $r_1 \times \dots \times r_d$ . For a particular cell of  $(x_{1, i_1, k}, x_{2, i_2, k}, \dots, x_{d, i_d, k})$ ; for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}$ , the number of observation (counts) equals  $n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}$ . Now, considering the complete data as  $W = (Y^T, (X_1, \dots, X_d))$ , then the complete-data log-likelihood function can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \log L_c(\Theta) &= \log L(\Theta) + \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \dots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}} \log \frac{f((x_{1, i_1, k}, x_{2, i_2, k}, \dots, x_{d, i_d, k}); \Theta)}{P_{i_1, \dots, i_d}(\Theta)} \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \dots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \log P_{i_1, \dots, i_d}(\Theta) + C \\ &+ \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \dots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}} \log \frac{f((x_{1, i_1, k}, x_{2, i_2, k}, \dots, x_{d, i_d, k}); \Theta)}{P_{i_1, \dots, i_d}(\Theta)} \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \dots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{i_1, \dots, i_d}} \log f((x_{1, i_1, k}, x_{2, i_2, k}, \dots, x_{d, i_d, k}); \Theta) + C \end{aligned}$$

The E-step and M-step of the EM algorithm can be described as follows.

**E-Step:**

The E-step calculates:

$$Q(\theta, \theta^{(p)}) = \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \cdots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ \log f\left((X_1, \dots, X_d); \Theta\right) \middle| (X_1, \dots, X_d) \in (\mathcal{X}_{1, i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_{d, i_d}) \right\}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\Theta, \Theta^{(p)}) &= \sum_{i_1} \cdots \sum_{i_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ \left[ -\frac{d}{2} \log(2\pi) + \frac{1}{2} \log(|\Sigma|^{-1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2} (x_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x_i - \mu) \right] \middle| (X_1, \dots, X_d) \in (\mathcal{X}_{1, i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_{d, i_d}) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i_1} \cdots \sum_{i_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \left\{ -\frac{d}{2} \log(2\pi) + \frac{1}{2} \log(|\Sigma|^{-1}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \Sigma^{-1} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left( (x_i - \mu)(x_i - \mu)^T \middle| (X_1, \dots, X_d) \in (\mathcal{X}_{1, i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_{d, i_d}) \right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**M-Step:**

The M-step maximizes  $Q(\Theta, \Theta^{(p)})$  w.r.t  $\Theta$ , obtaining:

$$\underline{\mu}^{(p+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \cdots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ X_i \middle| (X_1, \dots, X_d) \in (\mathcal{X}_{1, i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_{d, i_d}) \right\} \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{(p+1)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i_1=1}^{r_1} \cdots \sum_{i_d=1}^{r_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \times \\ &\quad E_{\theta^{(p)}} \left\{ \left( (X_i - \mu^{(p+1)})(X_i - \mu^{(p+1)})^T \right) \middle| (X_1, \dots, X_d) \in (\mathcal{X}_{1, i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_{d, i_d}) \right\}. \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

The expectations in (16) and (17) are the moments of a truncated multivariate normal  $\frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_d; \Theta)}{P_{i_1, \dots, i_d}(\Theta)}$  and as in the bivariate case, the results in [5] are used to calculate these moments, as shown in the Supplementary Material, Section 1.4.

The calculations of the expectations for the multivariate normal case, particularly for  $d > 2$ , are complex and error-prone. To avoid such calculations, an alternative approach is to use the MCEM algorithm to find the parameter estimates. The MCEM approach first simulates  $M$  multivariate random samples of  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  from the density  $\frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_d; \Theta)}{P_{i_1, \dots, i_d}(\Theta)}$  over all surfaces and then replaces the expectations in (16) and (17) with the averages of the simulated sample vectors to obtain the following

parameter updates:

$$\underline{\mu}^{(p+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i_1} \cdots \sum_{i_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M X_{hi} \right]$$

and

$$\Sigma^{(p+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i_1} \cdots \sum_{i_d} n_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M (X_{hi} - \mu^{(p+1)})(X_{hi} - \mu^{(p+1)})^T \right].$$

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Galton Data

The Galton dataset was first introduced by Francis Galton in 1886 [6, 7] and consists of a two-way frequency table containing the number of parents and children falling into different possible height intervals. The individual height observations are not available; only the frequencies (grouped data) are available. Moreover, for each interval, the midpoints (as the averages of the lower and upper limits of the intervals) are also available. This data set is a well-known example of normally distributed grouped data. The Galton data are electronically and publicly available in the R package *HistData* and are presented as a frequency table in Section 2.3 of the Supplementary Material. In this study, each of the variables (parent’s height and children’s height) was first analyzed separately as univariate normal grouped data before considering the bivariate case. The results are provided in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 respectively.

##### 3.1.1. Univariate Case

First, the MLE of the parameters ignoring grouping with the assumption of normal distribution of both parent height and child height data were obtained using Eqs. (1) and (2) in Section 2.1.1; the results are shown in Table 3 (see MLEungpr).

Next, as described in Section 2.1.2, when considering the grouped form of the data, exact likelihood estimation was conducted numerically using the R function *Optim* (L-BFGS-B method); the results are shown in Table 3 under MLEExact. Note that the numerical maximization of the exact likelihood is highly sensitive to initial values. The parameter estimates using the EM algorithm to maximize the exact likelihood were then found, along with those using the MCEM algorithm. The results for both EM and MCEM algorithms are also presented in Table 3. As can be expected by the convergence properties of the EM algorithm [12], its estimates were close to those obtained by direct maximization of the exact likelihood (mean absolute relative difference (MARD) across parameters = 0.005672%). The MCEM estimates were close to the MLE Exact results (MARD = 0.020222%), but not as close as the EM results, which was also expected from the properties of the MCEM [12]. Ignoring the grouping resulted in the highest MARD (0.485855%) compared to the exact MLE results.

##### 3.1.2. Bivariate Case

In this case, the Galton data were considered as bivariate grouped data, rather than considering each of the variables separately and applying the methods proposed in

	Mean parent	Var parent	Mean children	Var children
MLEunggrp	68.30280	3.28116	68.09332	6.45737
MLEExact	68.30030	3.24432	68.09834	6.50924
EM	68.30026	3.24482	68.09834	6.50971
MCEM	68.30286	3.24410	68.09604	6.50488

**Table 3.** Estimates of the mean and variance (Var) of parent and children height variables (considering the univariate case) from the Galton data using the four methods.

Section 2.2 to find the parameter estimates. The results of the four methods for all five parameters (including mean of parents, mean of children, variance of parents, variance of children, and correlation of heights between parents and children) are shown in Table 4. Note that as mentioned in Section 2.2.2, for parameter estimates using the exact MLE method for bivariate data, the *nlm* function in R was used. The EM estimates were closest to those from the exact MLE method, with mean absolute relative difference over the five parameters of 0.0012%.

	Mean parent	Mean children	Var parent	Var children	Corr
MLEUngrouped	68.302802	68.093319	3.281156	6.457369	0.460128
MLEExact	68.300475	68.098651	3.243895	6.513746	0.470162
EM	68.300495	68.098736	3.243960	6.513621	0.470171
MCEM	68.302157	68.098961	3.248326	6.514850	0.469763

**Table 4.** Estimates of mean, variance (Var) and correlation (Corr) parameters for bivariate Galton data using the four methods.

### 3.2. Simulation Studies

In this section, the parameter estimation methods for normally distributed grouped data are applied to simulated data for both the univariate and bivariate cases. Resulting tables and plots are displayed at the end of this manuscript.

#### 3.2.1. Univariate Simulation

In this study, we conducted simulations on 15 different scenarios obtaining by varying the sample size  $n$  (50, 100, 300, 600 and 1000) and the number of equal-sized intervals (or bins,  $k = 8, 15,$  and  $30$ ). For each scenario, 500 univariate data sets (in total 7500 data sets) are simulated. All simulated data are from the univariate normal distribution with parameters  $\mu = 68$  and  $\sigma = 1.8$  ( $\sigma^2 = 3.24$ ).

The parameters ( $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ ) are estimated using the four methods described in Section 2.1: MLE ignore the grouping, Exact MLE, EM algorithm and MCEM algorithm. For Exact MLE, EM and MCEM methods, we set the initial values of the parameters as  $\mu = 67, \sigma = 2$ . The root mean squared error (RMSE) of  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  over 500 samples are presented in Tables 5 and 6. Box plots of the parameter estimates obtained across all different scenarios and are shown in Figures 1 and 2. We can observe that for all parameters and all bin sizes the bias and the variance of the estimates based on the exact likelihood (MLEExact, EM, and MCEM) decrease as the sample size  $n$  increases. Ignoring the group led to an overestimation of the variance parameter for  $k = 8$  and  $15$ .

### 3.2.2. Bivariate Simulation

For bivariate data we simulated 30 datasets for each sample size  $n$  of 50, 150, 500 and 1000 with 10 equal intervals for each variable ( $X_1$  and  $X_2$ ) resulting in 100 rectangles. Data sets are simulated from a bivariate normal with parameters  $\mu = (68, 68)$  and

$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 6 \end{bmatrix}$ . The initial values selected for exact MLE, EM and MCEM methods are

$$\mu = (67, 67) \text{ and } \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 3.1 & 2.16 \\ 2.16 & 6.05 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Figures 3 to 7 present the box plots of the parameter estimates for each sample size  $n$  (see also the supplementary tables in Section 2 of the Supplementary Material). We can observe that for all parameters and methods both bias and variance of the estimates decrease as the sample size  $n$  increases, except for MLE ignoring the grouping (MLEungrp), which resulted in the underestimation of  $\sigma_{x_2}^2$  even when  $n = 1000$ . Our results also show that the exact MLE, EM and MCEM yielded very similar estimates as expected even for the smaller  $n$  of 50.

## 4. Discussion on Conclusion

We have proposed four approaches, namely, MLE ignoring the grouping, exact MLE, EM and MCEM algorithm to estimate the parameters of normally distributed grouped data. The cases of univariate, bivariate and multivariate normal were considered and parameter estimates using each method were presented. When we ignore the grouping form of data, the midpoints of the intervals are considered as observed data and the MLE ignoring the grouping can be calculated using the midpoints. For the exact MLE approach, by considering the distribution of the counts to be multinomial, with probabilities based on the normal CDFs, the exact data log-likelihood could be formulated and the MLE values could be found using numerical methods. For EM and MCEM algorithms, using the exact observed data log-likelihood, the complete data log-likelihood was computed and the parameter estimates obtained in closed forms using the formulas in Sections 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 and 2.2.5.

To compare the methods, first we have used the well-known Galton data and the parameter estimates were found for the cases of univariate and bivariate grouped data. From the results, the mean absolute relative differences between the estimates obtained by MLE exact and each of the other methods (MLE ignoring, EM and MCEM) were calculated and showed that EM led to the closest results to the exact MLE. In addition, simulation studies were implemented for the univariate and bivariate cases for different scenarios. For most of the parameter estimates, the results of EM and MCEM algorithms were closer to the exact MLE and to the true values than MLE ignoring the grouping.

Based on the results, we conclude that there are some advantages and drawbacks regarding the four methods. For MLE ignoring the grouping, as the midpoints are used as observed values, the resulted estimates in most cases are the furthest from the exact MLE method particularly for larger sample sizes and non-equal intervals. The exact MLE method leads to efficient and unbiased estimates; however, there is no closed form for the parameter estimates and they are found using numerical optimization methods. Moreover, this method is sensitive to the optimization method and its initial values. In comparison, for both EM and MCEM algorithms, there are specific and closed formulae for the parameter estimates. Their results are similar to the exact

MLE as expected by their convergence properties shown in Chapters 1 and 3 of [12]. In our analyses, these two approaches were not as sensitive to initial values as the exact MLE method. Another point about EM is its speed which is faster than the exact MLE and MCEM. In fact, MCEM is the slowest method; however, it avoids complicated integral calculations.

## Supporting Information

The file supplement.pdf contains the supplementary material with calculation details and additional tables with simulation results.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## References

- [1] H.H. Bock and E. Diday, *Analysis of Symbolic Data*, Springer, 2000.
- [2] G. Casella and R. L. Berger, *Statistical Inference*, 2001.
- [3] Y.J. Chen and T. Miljkovic, *From grouped to de-grouped data: A new approach in distribution fitting for grouped data*, *Statistical Computation and Simulation* 89(2) (2018), pp. 272–291.
- [4] A.P. Dempster, N.M. Laird, and D.B. Rubin, *Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm*, *Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 39(1) (1977), pp. 1–38.
- [5] M.B. G and S. Wilhelm, *Moments calculation for the doubly truncated multivariate normal density*, arXiv:1206.5387v1, arXiv preprint (2012).
- [6] F. Galton, *Natural Inheritance*, Macmillan and Co, 1889.
- [7] J.A. HANLEY, *Transmuting women into men: Galton’s family data on human stature*, *The American Statistician* 58(3) (2004), pp. 237–243.
- [8] D.F. Heitjan, *Inference from grouped continuous data: A review*, *Statistical Science* 4(2) (1989), pp. 164–179.
- [9] D.F. Heitjan, *Regression with bivariate grouped data*, *Biometrics* 47(2) (1991), pp. 549–562.
- [10] J.Z. Huang, X. Wang, X. Wu, and L. Zhou, *Estimation of a probability density function using interval aggregated data*, *Statistical Computation and Simulation* 86(15) (2016), pp. 1–13.
- [11] G.J. McLachlan and P.N. Jones, *Fitting mixture models to grouped and truncated data via the em algorithm*, *Biometrics* 44(2) (1988), pp. 571–578.
- [12] G.J. McLachlan and T. Krishnan, *The EM algorithm and extensions*, Vol. 382, John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- [13] C. Minoiu and S.G. Reddy, *Estimating poverty and inequality from grouped data: How well do parametric methods perform?*, *Income Distribution* 18(2) (2009), pp. 160–178.
- [14] C. Park, *A quantile implementation of the em algorithm and applications to parameter estimation with interval data*, In Technical Report TR2006-05-CP, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Clemson, SC: Clemson University (2006).
- [15] M.B. Stewart, *On least squares estimation when the dependent variable is grouped*, *The Review of Economic Studies* 50(4) (1983), pp. 737–753.



- [16] G.M. Tallis, *Approximate maximum likelihood estimates from grouped data*, Technometrics 599-606 (1967), p. 9(4).
- [17] M. Teimouri, *Em algorithm for mixture of skew-normal distributions fitted to grouped data*, Journal of Applied Statistics (2020), p. DOI: 10.1080/02664763.2020.1759032.
- [18] J.I. Velez and J.C. Correa, *Bootstrap-based inference for grouped data*, Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias 4(2) (2015), pp. 74–82.
- [19] J. Wengrzik and J. Timm, *Comparing several methods to fit finite mixture models to grouped data by the em algorithm*, Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering I (2011), pp. 958–966.
- [20] X. Wu and J.M. Perloff, *Gmm estimation of a maximum entropy distribution with interval data*, Econometrics 138 (2007), pp. 532–546.
- [21] J. Xia, J. Mi, and Y. Zhou, *On the existence and uniqueness of the maximum likelihood estimators of normal and lognormal population parameters with grouped data*, Probability and Statistics 2009, Article ID 310575 (2009), p. 16 pages.


RMSE for Means				
Method	$n$	$k = 8$	$k = 15$	$k = 30$
MLE ignore grouping	50	0.27155	0.26354	0.25342
	100	0.18661	0.1769	0.17663
	300	0.10894	0.1019	0.10579
	600	0.07768	0.07097	0.07484
	1000	0.06211	0.0598	0.05851
MLE Exact	50	0.27222	0.2636	0.25342
	100	0.18689	0.17691	0.17666
	300	0.10925	0.10194	0.10579
	600	0.07781	0.07098	0.07484
	1000	0.06233	0.05981	0.05852
EM	50	0.27223	0.2636	0.25342
	100	0.18689	0.17691	0.17666
	300	0.10925	0.10194	0.10579
	600	0.07781	0.07098	0.07484
	1000	0.06232	0.05981	0.05852
MCEM	50	0.27138	0.26332	0.25329
	100	0.1865	0.17706	0.17647
	300	0.10929	0.10184	0.10567
	600	0.07812	0.07124	0.07475
	1000	0.06311	0.05982	0.05857

**Table 5.** *Simulation results: univariate case.* RMSE of mean estimates of 500 simulated samples for  $n = 50, 100, 300, 600,$  and  $1000$  and number of intervals (bins)  $k = 8, 15,$  and  $30$  over four estimation methods.


RMSE for Variances				
Method	$n$	$k = 8$	$k = 15$	$k = 30$
MLE ignore grouping	50	0.68842	0.66044	0.64547
	100	0.55098	0.45855	0.46888
	300	0.4378	0.27272	0.27004
	600	0.36907	0.21852	0.17568
	1000	0.35482	0.16141	0.14487
MLE Exact	50	0.66904	0.66078	0.6474
	100	0.50653	0.45967	0.47076
	300	0.29613	0.25981	0.27028
	600	0.20009	0.19893	0.17447
	1000	0.16304	0.13859	0.14374
EM	50	0.66885	0.66069	0.64725
	100	0.50642	0.45958	0.47072
	300	0.29609	0.25977	0.27026
	600	0.19981	0.19889	0.17447
	1000	0.16269	0.13855	0.14374
MCEM	50	0.6698	0.66047	0.64718
	100	0.50749	0.4591	0.47082
	300	0.29585	0.26011	0.27043
	600	0.20143	0.19903	0.17453
	1000	0.16382	0.13819	0.14392

**Table 6.** *Simulation results: univariate case.* RMSE of variance estimates of 500 simulated samples for  $n = 50, 100, 300, 600,$  and  $1000$  and number of intervals (bins)  $k = 8, 15,$  and  $30$  over four estimation methods.


**Figure 1.** *Simulation results: univariate case.* Mean estimates for  $k = 8, 15$  and  $30$  intervals (bins) for sample sizes  $n = 50, 100, 300, 600, 1000$ .




**Figure 2.** *Simulation results: univariate case.* Variance estimates for  $k = 8, 15$  and  $30$  intervals (bins) for sample sizes  $n = 50, 100, 300, 600, 1000$ .




**Figure 3.** *Simulation results: bivariate case.* Estimates of  $\mu_{x_1}$  for sample sizes of  $n = 50, 150, 500, 1000$ . The horizontal solid line corresponds to the true value of  $\mu_{x_1}$ .



**Figure 4.** *Simulation results: bivariate case.* Estimates of  $\mu_{x_2}$  for sample sizes of  $n = 50, 150, 500, 1000$ . The horizontal solid line corresponds to the true value of  $\mu_{x_2}$ .




**Figure 5.** *Simulation results: bivariate case.* Estimates of  $\sigma_{x_1}^2$  for sample sizes of  $n = 50, 150, 500, 1000$ . The horizontal solid line corresponds to the true value of  $\sigma_{x_1}^2$ .





**Figure 6.** *Simulation results: bivariate case.* Estimates of  $\sigma_{x_2}^2$  for sample sizes of  $n = 50, 150, 500, 1000$ . The horizontal solid line corresponds to the true value of  $\sigma_{x_2}^2$ .



**Figure 7.** *Simulation results: bivariate case.* Estimates of  $\rho$  for sample sizes of  $n = 50, 150, 500, 1000$ . The horizontal solid line corresponds to the true value of  $\rho_{x_1, x_2}$ .

