

Gaussian credible intervals in Bayesian nonparametric estimation of the unseen

Claudia Contardi
Department of Mathematics
University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

Emanuele Dolera
Department of Mathematics
University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

Stefano Favaro
Department of Economics and Statistics
University of Torino and Collegio Carlo Alberto, Torino, Italy

January 28, 2025

Abstract

The unseen-species problem assumes $n \geq 1$ samples from a population of individuals belonging to different species, possibly infinite, and calls for estimating the number $K_{n,m}$ of hitherto unseen species that would be observed if $m \geq 1$ new samples were collected from the same population. This is a long-standing problem in statistics, which has gained renewed relevance in biological and physical sciences, particularly in settings with large values of n and m . In this paper, we adopt a Bayesian nonparametric approach to the unseen-species problem under the Pitman-Yor prior, and propose a novel methodology to derive large m asymptotic credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$, for any $n \geq 1$. By leveraging a Gaussian central limit theorem for the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, our method improves upon competitors in two key aspects: firstly, it enables the full parameterization of the Pitman-Yor prior, including the Dirichlet prior; secondly, it avoids the need of Monte Carlo sampling, enhancing computational efficiency. We validate the proposed method on synthetic and real data, demonstrating that it improves the empirical performance of competitors by significantly narrowing the gap between asymptotic and exact credible intervals for any $m \geq 1$.

Keywords: *Bayesian nonparametrics; central limit theorem; coverage; Dirichlet prior; Gaussian credible intervals; Mittag-Leffler credible intervals; Pitman-Yor prior; unseen-species problem.*

1 Introduction

The estimation of the number of unseen species is a long-standing problem in statistics, dating back to the seminal work of [Fisher et al. \(1943\)](#) on “species extrapolation”. It assumes that $n \geq 1$ random samples (X_1, \dots, X_n) are collected from an unknown discrete distribution P on \mathbb{S} , with \mathbb{S} being a space of species’ labels or symbols, and calls for estimating

$$K_{n,m} = |\{X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m}\} \setminus \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}|,$$

namely the number of hitherto unseen species that would be observed if $m \geq 1$ additional samples $(X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m})$ were collected from the same distribution P . First introduced in ecology ([Chao, 1984](#); [Chao and Lee, 1992](#); [Bunge and Fitzpatrick, 1993](#)), the unseen-species problem has more recently found applications in biological and physical sciences, where it poses significant challenges in handling large values of n and m ([Kroes et al., 1999](#); [Gao et al., 2007](#); [Ionita-Laza et al., 2009](#); [Daley and Smith, 2013](#)). See [Deng et al. \(2019\)](#) for an overview with emphasis on large-scale biological data. Further applications include, e.g., information theory and theoretical computer science ([Haas et al., 1995](#); [Motwani and Vassilvitskii, 2006](#); [Florencio and Herley, 2007](#); [Bubeck et al., 2013](#); [Cai et al., 2018](#)), empirical linguistics and natural large language modeling ([Efron and Thisted, 1976](#); [Thisted and Efron, 1987](#); [Orlitsky et al., 2004](#); [Ohannessian and Dahleh, 2012](#); [Ben-Hamou et al., 2018](#); [Kalai and Vempala, 2024](#)), and forensic DNA analysis ([Cereda, 2017](#); [Favaro and Naulet, 2024](#)).

1.1 Background and motivation

A frequentist nonparametric approach to the unseen-species problem was proposed by [Good and Toulmin \(1956\)](#) and [Efron and Thisted \(1976\)](#), then developed rigorously by

Orlitsky et al. (2016). This is a distribution-free approach, in the sense that it does not rely on any assumption on P , leading to estimates of $K_{n,m}$ that are minimax optimal for any n and $m \leq n \log n$, with such a range being the best (largest) possible (Orlitsky et al., 2016; Wu and Yang, 2016, 2019). From a Bayesian nonparametric (BNP) perspective, it is natural to specify a prior distribution for P , an approach that was first investigated in Lijoi et al. (2007) by focussing on the Pitman-Yor prior (Pitman and Yor, 1997), which is a prior indexed by $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, with $\alpha = 0$ being the celebrated Dirichlet prior (Ferguson, 1973). Under the Pitman-Yor prior, Lijoi et al. (2007) showed that the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, given (X_1, \dots, X_n) , depends on the sampling information only through the sample size n and the number K_n of species in (X_1, \dots, X_n) . Such a distribution is in closed-form, with the posterior mean estimate $\hat{K}_{n,m}$ that can be easily evaluated for any value of n and m (Favaro et al., 2009). See Balocchi et al. (2025) for an up-to-date overview.

Uncertainty quantification for estimates of $K_{n,m}$ has been addressed under the BNP approach, but remains an open problem under the distribution-free approach, especially when $m > n$ (Orlitsky et al., 2016). For $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, exact credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$ can be derived, for any n and m , by Monte Carlo sampling the posterior distribution through the predictive distributions of the Pitman-Yor prior (Balocchi et al., 2025). Further, if $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ then large m asymptotic credible intervals can be derived using the method proposed by Favaro et al. (2009). Denoting by $K_m^{(n)}$ a random variable whose distribution is the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$ given $K_n = j$, Favaro et al. (2009) showed that, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\frac{K_m^{(n)}}{(\theta + n + m)^\alpha - (\theta + n)^\alpha} \xrightarrow{w} S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n,j)},$$

where $S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n,j)}$ is a scaled Mittag-Leffler random variable (Pitman, 2006, Chapter 0). Given

values of (n, j) and (α, θ) , with (α, θ) estimated by means of empirical or fully Bayes procedures, for m sufficiently large the distribution of $K_m^{(n)}$ is approximated by the distribution of $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m)S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n, j)}$, with $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m) = (\theta + n + m)^\alpha - (\theta + n)^\alpha$. Mittag-Leffler credible intervals for $K_{n, m}$ are then derived by Monte Carlo sampling $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m)S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n, j)}$. In particular, the scaling $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m)$ is determined in such a way that $\hat{K}_{n, m}$ coincides with the expected value of $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m)S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n, j)}$, ensuring that intervals are centered on the BNP estimator $\hat{K}_{n, m}$ for any $m \geq 1$.

While the method proposed by Favaro et al. (2009) addresses uncertainty quantification for large values of m , it comes with notable limitations. Firstly, Monte Carlo sampling $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m)S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n, j)}$ is computationally expensive, despite the recent advances on sampling scaled Mittag-Leffler distributions (Qu et al., 2021), which limits the practical (computational) benefits of asymptotic credible intervals over exact ones derived by sampling the posterior distribution, unless m is extremely large. Secondly, empirical analyses by Favaro et al. (2009) show that Mittag-Leffler credible intervals are shorter than the exact intervals, with the gap decreasing when m enters the regime $m \gg \theta + n$, namely m is much larger than $\theta + n$. Thirdly, the method of Favaro et al. (2009) fails to extend to the case $\alpha = 0$ due to a degenerate behaviour of the limiting posterior distribution (Balocchi et al., 2025). These theoretical and empirical limitations highlight the motivation for this paper, which introduces an alternative methodology to uncertainty quantification for BNP estimates of $K_{n, m}$.

1.2 Preview of our contributions

We propose a novel method to derive large m asymptotic credible intervals for $K_{n, m}$, which allows to deal with $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and avoids the use of Monte Carlo sampling. Under the

Pitman-Yor prior, for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, we rely on the large m asymptotic behaviour of $K_m^{(n)}$ assuming that both the sampling information (n, j) and the parameter θ are large. In particular, we set $n = \nu m$, $j = \rho m$ and $\theta = \tau m$, with $\nu, \rho, \tau > 0$, and show that, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\frac{K_m^{(n)} - m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho}}{\sqrt{m\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho}}} \xrightarrow{w} N(0, 1),$$

where

$$\mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}] = m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho} + O(1)$$

and

$$\text{Var} (K_m^{(n)}) = m\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho}^2 + O(1),$$

for some (explicit) functions $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho}$ of $(\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho)$, respectively, and where $N(0, 1)$ is the standard Gaussian random variable. Given values of $(\nu m, \rho m)$ and $(\alpha, \tau m)$, with $(\alpha, \tau m)$ estimated by means of empirical or fully Bayes procedures, for m sufficiently large the distribution of $K_m^{(n)}$ is approximated by a Gaussian distribution with mean $m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho}$ and variance $m\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \rho}^2$. Gaussian credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$, with a prescribed (asymptotic) level, are then derived from the Gaussian quantiles, enhancing computational efficiency.

Given the sampling information (n, j) and the parameter (α, θ) , the proposed methodology and that of Favaro et al. (2009) employ different approximations of the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, for m sufficiently large. Both approximations lead to large m asymptotic credible intervals that are centered on the BNP estimator $\hat{K}_{n,m}$. Figure 1 shows that our method outperforms that of Favaro et al. (2009) on synthetic data generated from various natural distributions, namely Zipf, Dirichlet-Multinomial and Uniform distributions; the same synthetic datasets were analyzed in Orlitsky et al. (2016, Figure 3). In particular, compared to Mittag-Leffler credible intervals, Gaussian credible intervals provide greater

coverage of the exact credible intervals, for any $m \geq 1$. A comprehensive empirical validation of our methodology is presented in the paper, encompassing both synthetic and real datasets. For real data, we present an application to the Expressed Sequence Tags (ESTs) data considered in Favaro et al. (2009, Section 3), confirming the behaviour displayed in Figure 1.




Figure 1: BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ (solid line $-$) with 95% exact credible intervals (dashed line $- -$), Mittag-Leffler credible intervals (violet) and Gaussian credible intervals (pink), as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$. Synthetic datasets generated from the following discrete distributions: A) Zipf distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 300\}$ with parameter 2, $n = 977$, $j = 300$, and estimated $(\alpha, \theta) = (0.54, 26.67)$; B) Zipf distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 100\}$ with parameter 1.5, $n = 1877$, $j = 100$, and estimated $(\alpha, \theta) = (0.38, 4.66)$; C) Pólya distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 500\}$ with parameter $(2, 2, 500, 500, \dots, 500)$, $n = 2,000$, $j = 227$, and estimated $(\alpha, \theta) = (0.69, 1.80)$; D) Uniform distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 500\}$, with $n = 2,000$, $j = 447$, and estimated $(\alpha, \theta) = (0, 178.48)$. The parameter (α, θ) is estimated through an empirical Bayes procedure (Favaro et al., 2009, Section 3).

1.3 Outline of the paper

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the BNP approach to the unseen-species problem, including the modeling assumptions and posterior inferences. Section 3 contains the Gaussian CLT for $K_m^{(n)}$, with corresponding large m asymptotic credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$. The empirical performance of our methodology is investigated in Section 4. Section 5 concludes with a discussion and some directions for future research. Technical preliminary results, proofs and additional numerical illustrations are deferred to the Appendix.

2 The BNP approach to the unseen-species problem

Following the BNP approach of Lijoi et al. (2007), we consider $n \geq 1$ observations with values in the space of species' labels or symbols \mathbb{S} , modeled as random samples $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} X_1, \dots, X_n | P &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P, \\ P &\sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$ is the Pitman-Yor prior indexed by $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$. For short, we say that \mathbf{X}_n is a random sample from $\text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$. A simple and intuitive definition of $P \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$ follows from its stick-breaking construction (Perman et al., 1992). Specifically, let: i) $(V_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be independent random variables, with each V_i following a Beta distribution with parameter $(1 - \alpha, \theta + i\alpha)$; ii) $(S_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be random variables following a non-atomic distribution ν on \mathbb{S} and independent of each other as well as of the V_i 's. If $P_1 = V_1$ and $P_j = V_j \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j-1} (1 - V_i)$ for $j \geq 1$, so that $P_j \in (0, 1)$ for any $j \geq 1$ and $\sum_{j \geq 1} P_j = 1$ almost surely, then $P = \sum_{j \geq 1} P_j \delta_{S_j} \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$, with the Dirichlet prior corresponding to $\alpha = 0$.

Remark 1. If $(P_{(j)})_{j \geq 1}$ are the decreasingly ordered stick-breaking random probabilities P_j 's of $P \sim PYP(\alpha, \theta)$, then, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, as $j \rightarrow +\infty$ the $P_{(j)}$'s follow a power-law distribution of exponent $c = \alpha^{-1}$ (Pitman and Yor, 1997). The parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ controls the power-law tail of P through the small $P_{(j)}$'s: the larger α , the heavier the tail of P . As $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, the Dirichlet prior features geometric tails (Pitman, 2006, Chapter 4). We refer to Appendix B.3 for an alternative description of the power-law behaviour driven by $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

2.1 Estimates

Under the model (1), Lijoi et al. (2007, Proposition 1) computes the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, given \mathbf{X}_n . For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, this is expressed in terms of the generalized factorial coefficient

$$\mathcal{C}(u, v; a, b) := \frac{1}{v!} \sum_{i=0}^v (-1)^i \binom{v}{i} (-ia - b)_{(u)}$$

for $a > 0$, $b \geq 0$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $v \leq u$, where $(a)_{(u)}$ denotes the u -th rising factorial of a , i.e. $(a)_{(u)} := \prod_{0 \leq i \leq u-1} (a + i)$; see Appendix A.2. If the sample \mathbf{X}_n features $K_n = j$ species with (empirical) frequencies $(N_{1,n}, \dots, N_{1,K_n}) = (n_1, \dots, n_j)$ then for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$

$$\Pr[K_m^{(n)} = k] = \Pr[K_{n,m} = k \mid \mathbf{X}_n] = \frac{\binom{j + \frac{\theta}{\alpha}}{(k)} \mathcal{C}(m, k; \alpha, -n + j\alpha)}{(\theta + n)_{(m)}}. \quad (2)$$

From (2), Favaro et al. (2009, Proposition 1) provides a BNP estimator of $K_{n,m}$ as posterior expectation, i.e.,

$$\hat{K}_{n,m} = \mathbb{E}[K_m^{(n)}] = \mathbb{E}[K_{n,m} \mid \mathbf{X}_n] = \left(j + \frac{\theta}{\alpha} \right) \left(\frac{(\theta + n + \alpha)_{(m)}}{(\theta + n)_{(m)}} - 1 \right). \quad (3)$$

While the estimator (3) can be easily evaluated for any n and m , the computational burden for evaluating (2) becomes overwhelming as m increases, due the generalized factorial

coefficients.

For $\alpha = 0$, the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, given \mathbf{X}_n , follows from (2) by taking the limit as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ (Lijoi et al., 2007). The resulting distribution is expressed in terms of Stirling numbers, whose evaluation remains computationally unfeasible for large values of m ; see Appendix A.1. The corresponding BNP estimator of $K_{n,m}$ as posterior expectation is

$$\hat{K}_{n,m} = \mathbb{E}[K_m^{(n)}] = \mathbb{E}[K_{n,m} | \mathbf{X}_n] = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\theta}{\theta + n + i - 1}, \quad (4)$$

which can be easily evaluated for any n and m . See Balocchi et al. (2025) for further details on the case $\alpha = 0$.

2.2 Exact credible intervals

Exact credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$ are derived by Monte Carlo sampling the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, given \mathbf{X}_n . By exploiting the closed-form expression of the posterior distribution (2), as well as the corresponding expression for $\alpha = 0$, one may implement the inverse transform algorithm to sample $K_m^{(n)}$. However, due to the evaluation of the distribution of $K_m^{(n)}$, the inverse transform algorithm becomes computationally unfeasible for large values of m . As an alternative approach, one may consider to sample $K_m^{(n)}$ by relying on the predictive distribution, or generative scheme, of the Pitman-Yor prior (Pitman, 1995); see Appendix B.1. The use of the predictive distribution reduces the problem of Monte Carlo sampling $K_m^{(n)}$ to the problem of sampling m Bernoulli random variables, which can be easily performed for any value of n and m (Balocchi et al., 2025); in particular, for $\alpha = 0$ the Bernoulli random variables are independent. This approach is reported in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Monte Carlo sampling $K_m^{(n)}$

Require: $n, K_n, m, \alpha, \theta$

function MONTECARLOK($n, K_n, m, \alpha, \theta$)

$K \leftarrow K_n$

for $i \leftarrow 0$ to $m - 1$ **do**

$b \leftarrow$ Random sample from Bernoulli $\left(\frac{\theta + \alpha K}{\theta + n + i}\right)$

$K \leftarrow K + b$

end for

return $K_m^{(n)} = K - K_n$

end function

2.3 Large m asymptotic credible intervals

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Favaro et al. (2009) proposed a method to derive large m asymptotic credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$. In particular, Favaro et al. (2009, Proposition 2) shows that, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\frac{K_m^{(n)}}{(\theta + n + m)^\alpha - (\theta + n)^\alpha} \xrightarrow{w} S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n,j)} \stackrel{d}{=} B_{j+\theta/\alpha, n/\alpha-j} S_{\alpha, (\theta+n)/\alpha}, \quad (5)$$

where $B_{j+\theta/\alpha, n/\alpha-j}$ and $S_{\alpha, (\theta+n)/\alpha}$ are independent random variables such that: i) $B_{a,b}$ is Beta distributed with parameter $a, b > 0$; ii) $S_{\alpha,q}$ is Mittag-Leffler distributed with parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $q > 0$, i.e. with density function $f_{S_{\alpha,q}}(s) \propto s^{q-1/\alpha-1} f_\alpha(y^{1/\alpha})$, where f_α is the positive α -Stable density (Zolotarev, 1986). From (5), if $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m) = (\theta + n + m)^\alpha - (\theta + n)^\alpha$ then

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{\approx} c_{\alpha, \theta, n} S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n,j)}, \quad (6)$$

namely for m sufficiently large the distribution of $K_m^{(n)}$ is approximated by means of the distribution of $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m) S_{\alpha, \theta}^{(n,j)}$. In particular, the scaling $c_{\alpha, \theta, n}(m)$ is determined in such a

way that

$$\hat{K}_{n,m} = \mathbb{E}[K_m^{(n)}] = \mathbb{E}[c_{\alpha,\theta,n} S_{\alpha,\theta}^{(n,j)}].$$

Mittag-Leffler credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$, centered on the BNP estimator $\hat{K}_{n,m}$, are then derived by Monte Carlo sampling $c_{\alpha,\theta,n}(m) S_{\alpha,\theta}^{(n,j)}$. We refer to [Qu et al. \(2021\)](#) for recent developments on (exact) sampling $S_{\alpha,(\theta+n)/\alpha}$, improving over the original strategy of [Favaro et al. \(2009\)](#).

Instead, for $\alpha = 0$, it follows from [Korwar and Hollander \(1973, Theorem 2.3\)](#) that, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\frac{K_m^{(n)}}{\log m} \xrightarrow{w} \theta, \tag{7}$$

namely the posterior distribution has a large m limiting behaviour that is degenerate at $\theta > 0$. See also [Balocchi et al. \(2025\)](#) for details. Such a degenerate limiting behaviour prevents from extending the Monte Carlo sampling procedure of [Favaro et al. \(2009\)](#) to the case $\alpha = 0$.

3 Gaussian credible intervals

For the BNP approach to the unseen-species problem, we present a new method to derive large m asymptotic credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$, which improves over the method of [Favaro et al. \(2009\)](#): firstly, it allows to deal with $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, thus including the case $\alpha = 0$; secondly, it avoids the use of Monte Carlo sampling, enhancing computational efficiency. Following the notation of [Section 2](#), for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$ let \mathbf{X}_n be a collection of $n \geq 1$ random samples from $\text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$, namely the model [\(1\)](#), such that \mathbf{X}_n features $K_n = j$ species with (empirical) frequencies $(N_{1,n}, \dots, N_{1,K_n}) = (n_1, \dots, n_j)$. Our methodology relies on a large m approximation of the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, given \mathbf{X}_n , which is obtained assuming that both the sampling information (n, j) and the parameter θ

are large. In particular, we set $n = \nu m$, $j = \rho m$ and $\theta = \tau m$, with $\nu, \rho, \tau > 0$, and provide a (weak) law of large numbers (LLN) and a Gaussian central limit theorem (CLT) for $K_m^{(n)}$, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$. The CLT is then applied to derive a large m Gaussian approximation of the distribution of $K_m^{(n)}$. Here, we describe the approach that leads to the Gaussian credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$.

3.1 Preliminary results

For $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, let K_m^* be the (random) number of species in $m \geq 1$ random samples from $\text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta + n)$, such that $K_m^* \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and let $B_{a,b}$ be a Beta random variable with parameter $a, b > 0$. If we denote by $Q(n, p)$ a Binomial random variable with parameter $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in (0, 1)$, then according to [Balocchi et al. \(2025, Proposition 1\)](#) there hold:

i) for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Q\left(K_m^*, B_{\frac{\theta}{\alpha+j}, \frac{n}{\alpha-j}}\right); \quad (8)$$

ii) for $\alpha = 0$

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Q\left(K_m^*, \frac{\theta}{\theta + n}\right). \quad (9)$$

As discussed in [Balocchi et al. \(2025\)](#), the compound Binomial representations (8)-(9) follow from the quasi-conjugacy and conjugacy properties of the Pitman-Yor and Dirichlet priors, respectively. See also [Dolera and Favaro \(2020, 2021\)](#) for a more detailed account on (8).

The next theorem from [Contardi et al. \(2024\)](#) provides a LLN and a Gaussian CLT for K_m^* , as $m \rightarrow +\infty$, under the assumption that $\theta + n$ increases linearly in m , i.e. $\theta + n = \lambda m$, with $\lambda > 0$.

Theorem 3.1. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let $K_m^* \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be the (random) number of species in m random samples from $PYP(\alpha, \theta + n)$, such that: $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta + n = \lambda m$, for some $\lambda > 0$.

If

$$\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^\alpha - 1 \right] & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ \lambda \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) & \text{for } \alpha = 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}^2 = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^{2\alpha} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{1+\lambda}\right) - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^\alpha \right] & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ \lambda \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+1} & \text{for } \alpha = 0, \end{cases}$$

then, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ there hold:

i)

$$\mathbb{E}[K_m^*] = m\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} + O(1)$$

and

$$\text{Var}(K_m^*) = m\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}^2 + O(1); \quad (10)$$

ii)

$$\frac{K_m^*}{m} \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}; \quad (11)$$

iii)

$$\frac{K_m^* - m\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{m\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}^2}} \xrightarrow{w} N(0, 1). \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, for any $\lambda > 0$ there hold that $\mathbf{m}_{0, \lambda} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ and also that $\mathfrak{s}_{0, \lambda}^2 = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}^2$.

3.2 Main result

By relying on the compound Binomial representations (8)-(9) and Theorem 3.1, the next theorem provides a LLN and a Gaussian CLT for $K_m^{(n)}$. See Appendix C and Appendix D for the proof.

Theorem 3.2. *For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ let $K_m^{(n)} \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ be distributed according to the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, given \mathbf{X}_n from PYP(α, θ), with \mathbf{X}_n featuring $K_n = j$ species, such that: $n = \nu m$, $j = \varrho m$ and $\theta = \tau m$, for some $\nu, \rho, \tau > 0$, and $\tau + \nu = \lambda$, for some $\lambda > 0$. If*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} = \begin{cases} \frac{\tau + \varrho \alpha}{\alpha} [-1 + (\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda})^\alpha] & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ \tau \log(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}) & \text{for } \alpha = 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}^2 = \begin{cases} \frac{\tau + \varrho \alpha}{\lambda} (\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda})^\alpha \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} [-1 + (\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda})^\alpha] - \frac{\tau + \varrho \alpha}{\lambda+1} (\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda})^\alpha \right\} & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ \tau \log(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}) - \frac{\tau^2}{\lambda(\lambda+1)} & \text{for } \alpha = 0, \end{cases}$$

then, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ there hold:

i)

$$\mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}] = m \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} + O(1)$$

and

$$\text{Var} (K_m^{(n)}) = m \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}^2 + O(1); \tag{13}$$

ii)

$$\frac{K_m^{(n)}}{m} \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}; \tag{14}$$

iii)

$$\frac{K_m^{(n)} - m \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}}{\sqrt{m \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}^2}} \xrightarrow{w} N(0, 1). \tag{15}$$

Furthermore, for any $\lambda > 0$ there hold that $\mathcal{M}_{0,\tau,\nu,\varrho} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}$ and also that $\mathcal{S}_{0,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2 = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2$.

3.2.1 Sketch of the proof of Theorem 3.2

The asymptotic expansions (13) follow by combining (8) and (9), the asymptotic expansions (10) and standard properties of conditional expectation; see sections C.1 and C.2 for details. The proof of the LLN (14) relies on (13) and Chebychev inequality; see section C.3 for details.

The proof of the CLT (15) relies on Theorem 3.1, in combination with Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 below. In particular, the structure of the proof is the same for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and for $\alpha = 0$, with some differences that are of technical nature, and can be appreciated in the proof of Proposition 1, which is deferred to Appendix D.1 (for $\alpha = 0$) and to Appendix D.2 (for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$). From (8) and (9), which in the regime $\theta = \tau m$, $n = \nu m$, $j = \varrho m$, become

i) for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{=} Q \left(K_m^*, B_{\left(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho\right)m} \right)$$

ii) for $\alpha = 0$,

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{=} Q \left(K_m^*, \frac{\tau}{\lambda} \right),$$

define

$$Q_m(z) = \begin{cases} Q \left(\lfloor mz \rfloor, B_{\left(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho\right)m} \right) & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ Q \left(\lfloor mz \rfloor, \frac{\tau}{\tau + \nu} \right) & \text{if } \alpha = 0 \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $\lfloor mz \rfloor := \max(k \in \mathbb{N} : k \leq mz)$.

The next propositions are critical for the proof of Theorem 3.2, showing how Theorem 3.1 interplay with the asymptotic expansions (13). The proof is deferred to Appendix D.1 and to Appendix D.2.

Proposition 1 (Berry-Esseen theorem for $Q_m(z)$). *Let $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $z > 0$. Further, let $\mu : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be functions defined as*

$$\mu(z) = z \cdot \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}$$

and

$$\sigma^2(z) = z \cdot \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \left[1 + \frac{\alpha z}{\tau + \nu} \right]$$

Then, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_m(z)] = m\mu(z) + O(1) \tag{17}$$

$$\text{Var}(Q_m(z)) = m\sigma^2(z) + O(1) \tag{18}$$

If

$$V_m(z) := \frac{Q_m(z) - m\mu(z)}{\sqrt{m\sigma^2(z)}}.$$

then, for every $0 < \zeta_0 < \mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} < \zeta_1 < +\infty$ there exist $\bar{m} = \bar{m}(\zeta_0, \zeta_1) \in \mathbb{N}$, and a continuous function $C = C_{\zeta_0, \zeta_1} : [\zeta_0, \zeta_1] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, such that for every $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$ and every $m \geq \bar{m}$

$$\|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \leq C(z)\phi(m). \tag{19}$$

where

$$\phi(m) = \begin{cases} m^{-\frac{1}{6}} & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ m^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } \alpha = 0 \end{cases}$$

This implies in particular that for every $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$, $V_m(z) \xrightarrow{w} N(0, 1)$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proposition 2. *For any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, the following two equalities hold:*

$$\mu(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}) = \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} \tag{20}$$

and

$$\sigma^2(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}) + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\lambda}^2 \cdot (\mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}))^2 = \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2. \quad (21)$$

Now, we conclude the proof of the CLT (15). The line of reasoning is the same as in Contardi et al. (2024, Section 2.3), with K_m^* playing the role of Z_n and $Q_m(z)$ that of $R_n(z)$. Denoting by F_m the cumulative distribution function of the random variable $\frac{K_m^{(n)} - m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}}{\sqrt{m}\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}}$, our aim is to prove

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} F_m(x) := \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} P[K_m^{(n)} \leq m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} + \sqrt{m}\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}x] = \Phi(x),$$

where Φ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. By resorting to the compound Binomial representations (8) (for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$) and (9) (for $\alpha = 0$), and by means standard properties of conditional probability (see Appendix D for details), we write

$$F_m(x) = \mathcal{I}_1^{(m)}(x) + \mathcal{I}_2^{(m)}(x), \quad (22)$$

with

$$\mathcal{I}_1^{(m)}(x) := \int_0^{+\infty} \Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{m}[\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} - \mu(z)] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}x}{\sigma(z)}\right) \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2^{(m)}(x) := & \int_0^{+\infty} \left\{ F_{V_m(z)}\left(\frac{\sqrt{m}[\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} - \mu(z)] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}x}{\sigma(z)}\right) \right. \\ & \left. - \Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{m}[\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} - \mu(z)] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}x}{\sigma(z)}\right) \right\} \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz). \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, the proof of the CLT (15) is completed by showing that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ there hold

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{I}_1^{(m)}(x) = \Phi(x) \quad (23)$$

and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{I}_2^{(m)}(x) = 0. \quad (24)$$

This is done in Proposition 3 (for Equation (23)) and Proposition 4 (for Equation (24)) below.

Proposition 3. *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{I}_1^{(m)}(x) := \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{m} \left[\mu \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right) - \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} \right] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x}{\sigma \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right)} \right) \right] = \Phi(x).$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 2 and (12) of Theorem 3.1, through Lemma D.2, that as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\sqrt{n} \left[\mu \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right) - \mu(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}) \right] \xrightarrow{w} \mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}) Y.$$

Further, since σ is a continuous function, by means of (11), as $m \rightarrow +\infty$, it holds

$$\sigma \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right) \xrightarrow{p} \sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}).$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} = \mu(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda})$ by Proposition 2, by means of Slutsky's theorem, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\frac{\sqrt{m} \left[\mu \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right) - \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} \right] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x}{\sigma \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right)} \xrightarrow{w} \frac{\mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}) Y + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x}{\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda})}.$$

Since Φ is a bounded and continuous function, the proof is completed by Portmanteau theorem. \square

Proposition 4. *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\left| \mathcal{I}_2^{(m)}(x) \right| \leq \int_0^{+\infty} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_{\infty} \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $\Phi(\delta) = 1 - \varepsilon/2$. Now, let

$$\tilde{m} = \tilde{m}(\varepsilon, \zeta_0, \zeta_1) := \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N} : z_0 - \frac{\delta \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{m}} > \zeta_0, \text{ and } z_0 - \frac{\delta \Sigma}{\sqrt{m}} < \zeta_1, \right\},$$

which exists because $\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$. We set $\tilde{\zeta}_0 := z_0 - \frac{\delta \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{\tilde{m}}}$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_1 := z_0 + \frac{\delta \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{\tilde{m}}}$, and write

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_{\infty} \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \tag{25}$$

$$= \int_{\tilde{\zeta}_0}^{\tilde{\zeta}_1} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [\tilde{\zeta}_0, \tilde{\zeta}_1]} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz)$$

and treat the terms on the right-hand side of (25) separately. For the first term on the right-hand side of (25), by means of (19), for every $m \geq \bar{m}$ it holds

$$\int_{\tilde{\zeta}_0}^{\tilde{\zeta}_1} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \leq \phi(m) \int_{\tilde{\zeta}_0}^{\tilde{\zeta}_1} C(z) \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \leq \phi(m) \mathcal{M}_C, \quad (26)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_C := \max_{z \in [\tilde{\zeta}_0, \tilde{\zeta}_1]} C(z)$ exists because C is continuous; in particular, \mathcal{M}_C is bounded on $[\tilde{\zeta}_0, \tilde{\zeta}_1]$. For the second term on the right-hand side of (25),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [\tilde{\zeta}_0, \tilde{\zeta}_1]} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [\tilde{\zeta}_0, \tilde{\zeta}_1]} \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \\ &= P \left[\frac{K_m^*}{m} \notin \left[\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \frac{\delta \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{\tilde{m}}}, \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} + \frac{\delta \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{\tilde{m}}} \right] \right] \\ &\leq P \left[\frac{K_m^*}{m} \notin \left[\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} - \frac{\delta \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{m}}, \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} + \frac{\delta \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{m}} \right] \right] \\ &= P \left[\frac{K_m^* - m \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{m \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}} \notin [-\delta, \delta] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

From (25), with (26) and (27), we obtained that, for every $n \geq \max(\bar{m}, \tilde{m})$ it holds

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \leq \phi(m) \mathcal{M}_C + P \left[\frac{K_m^* - m \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{m \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}} \notin [-\delta, \delta] \right].$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \\ &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \left\{ \phi(m) \mathcal{M}_C + P \left[\frac{K_m^* - m \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}}{\sqrt{m \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}}} \notin [-\delta, \delta] \right] \right\} \\ &= 0 + 2 - 2\Phi(\delta) \\ &= \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the last identities follows from (12) and the definition of δ such that $\Phi(\delta) = 1 - \varepsilon/2$, respectively. The proof is completed by the arbitrariness of ε . \square

This completes the proof of the CLT (15), and the proof of Theorem 3.2. See Appendix C and Appendix D.

3.3 Credible intervals

Theorem 3.2 provides a large m Gaussian approximation of the distribution of $K_m^{(n)}$; in particular the approximation is centered on the BNP estimator $\hat{K}_{n,m}$. From (15),

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{\approx} N\left(m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}, m\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2\right)$$

namely for m sufficiently large the distribution of $K_m^{(n)}$ is approximated by a Gaussian distribution with mean $m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}$ and variance $m\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2$. This approximation is applied to construct Gaussian credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$ with a prescribed (asymptotic) probability level for $K_m^{(n)}$. Given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, a $(1 - \delta)$ -level symmetric credible interval centered at the mean is

$$\Pr\left[K_m^{(n)} \in \left[m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} - q_{\frac{\delta}{2}}\sqrt{m\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2}, m\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} - q_{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\sqrt{m\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2}\right]\right] \approx 1 - \delta, \quad (28)$$

where $q_\varepsilon := \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ is the ε -quantile of the standard Gaussian distribution. The Gaussian credible interval (28) is fully analytical, thus avoiding the use of Monte Carlo sampling algorithms.

4 Numerical illustrations

We validate our methodology on synthetic and real data, comparing its performance with that of state-of-the-art procedures for the construction of exact and asymptotic credible intervals for $K_{m,n}$.

Under the Pitman-Yor prior, the BNP approach to estimate $K_{n,m}$ requires the specification of the prior's parameters $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$. Here, we adopt an empirical Bayes approach to estimate (α, θ) , which relies on the marginal distribution of $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ from PYP(α, θ) (Favaro et al., 2009, Section 3). For \mathbf{X}_n featuring K_n distinct species with

(empirical) frequencies $\mathbf{N}_n = (N_{1,n}, \dots, N_{K_n,n})$, such a distribution is Ewens-Pitman's formula (Pitman, 1995),

$$Pr [K_n = j, \mathbf{N}_n = \mathbf{n}] = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (\theta + i\alpha)}{(\theta + 1)_{(n-1)}} \prod_{j=1}^k (1 - \alpha)_{(n_j-1)}. \quad (29)$$

The empirical Bayes approach estimates the parameters (α, θ) with the values $(\hat{\alpha}_n, \hat{\theta}_n)$ that maximizes the distribution (marginal likelihood) (29) corresponding to the observed sample (j, n_1, \dots, n_j) , i.e.,

$$(\hat{\alpha}_n, \hat{\theta}_n) = \arg \max_{\{(\alpha, \theta) : \alpha \in [0, 1], \theta > -\alpha\}} \left\{ \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (\theta + i\alpha)}{(\theta + 1)_{(n-1)}} \prod_{j=1}^k (1 - \alpha)_{(n_j-1)} \right\}. \quad (30)$$

Alternatively, one may specify a prior on (α, θ) and pursue fully Bayes estimates of prior's parameters. Due to the large sample size of the datasets considered, we do not expect substantial differences between empirical Bayes and fully Bayes. See Balocchi et al. (2025, Section 6) for a discussion of the estimation of (α, θ) and issues thereof, especially with respect to $\theta > 0$.

4.1 Synthetic data

We test our method on synthetic data generated from a collection of discrete distributions taken from Orlicsky et al. (2016, Figure 3). More precisely, we generate four datasets, which correspond to the four panels of Figure 1: A) Zipf distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 300\}$ with parameter 2; B) Zipf distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 100\}$ with parameter 1.5; C) Pólya distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 500\}$ with parameter $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{500})$ with $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 2$ and $\beta_i = 500$ for all $i \geq 3$; D) Uniform distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 500\}$. For each dataset, Table 1 collects the sample size n , the number of distinct species j , and the empirical Bayes estimates $(\hat{\alpha}_n, \hat{\theta}_n)$ of (α, θ) .

For datasets A, B, C and D, Figure 1 displays the BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ with the 95% exact credible intervals, Mittag-Leffler credible intervals and Gaussian credible intervals

Dataset	n	j	$\hat{\alpha}_n$	$\hat{\theta}_n$
A) Zipf	977	300	0.54	26.67
B) Zipf	1877	100	0.38	4.66
C) Pólya	2000	215	0.64	2.39
D) Uniform	2000	447	0	178.48

Table 1: Sample size n , number of distinct species j in the sample, and empirical Bayes estimates of (α, θ) for datasets A, B, C and D.

as a function of m , for $m \in [0, 5n]$. Table 2 contains the BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ for $m = 2, 2n, 3, 4n, 5n$, and the corresponding 95% exact credible intervals, Mittag-Leffler credible intervals with their coverages of exact intervals, and Gaussian credible intervals with their coverages of exact intervals. The coverage is defined as the ratio between the length of the intersection of the (rounded to the nearest integer) exact credible interval with the (rounded) approximate credible interval, and the length of the (rounded) exact interval. Table 3 contains the same quantities as Table 2, for larger values of m . We refer to Appendix E for figures displaying the coverage of Mittag-Leffler and Gaussian credible intervals as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$. Exact intervals in Table 2 are derived by Monte Carlo sampling, through the inverse transform algorithm, the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}$, given \mathbf{X}_n . Instead, due to the larger values of m , the exact intervals in Table 3 are derived by Monte Carlo sampling, through Algorithm 1. In both algorithms, we applied 2000 Monte Carlo samples.

Figure 1, as well as from Table 2 and the rows of Table 3 corresponding to $m = 10n$ and $m = 50n$, show that Mittag-Leffler credible intervals have a smaller coverage than Gaussian credible intervals. As expected, the performance of Mittag-Leffler credible intervals improves as m grows. In particular, for $m = 100n$ and $m = 1000n$ the coverage of the Mittag-Leffler credible intervals eventually matches or outperforms that of the Gaussian

Dataset	m	$\hat{K}_{n,m}$	95% Exact C.I.	Mittag-Leffler C.I.		Gaussian C.I.	
				95% C.I.	Coverage (%)	95% C.I.	Coverage (%)
A) Zipf, $n = 977$	n	156	(130, 184)	(141, 173)	59.3	(129, 183)	98.1
	$2n$	280	(241, 321)	(252, 309)	71.3	(239, 320)	98.8
	$3n$	386	(335, 439)	(348, 426)	75.0	(334, 437)	98.1
	$4n$	480	(423, 541)	(433, 530)	82.2	(419, 541)	100
	$5n$	566	(501, 638)	(511, 625)	83.2	(496, 636)	98.5
B) Zipf, $n = 1877$	n	33	(22, 47)	(28, 40)	48.0	(21, 46)	96.0
	$2n$	57	(40, 77)	(47, 69)	59.5	(39, 76)	97.3
	$3n$	77	(57, 102)	(63, 92)	64.4	(55, 99)	93.3
	$4n$	93	(69, 119)	(77, 112)	70.0	(68, 119)	100
	$5n$	108	(80, 137)	(89, 129)	70.2	(80, 136)	98.2
C) Pólya, $n = 2000$	n	122	(98, 149)	(107, 139)	62.7	(96, 149)	100
	$2n$	224	(185, 265)	(195, 254)	73.8	(183, 264)	98.8
	$3n$	313	(263, 369)	(273, 356)	78.3	(261, 366)	97.2
	$4n$	395	(334, 460)	(344, 449)	83.3	(332, 458)	98.4
	$5n$	471	(398, 549)	(410, 535)	82.8	(398, 544)	96.7
D) Uniform, $n = 2000$	n	116	(96, 137)	–	–	(96, 137)	100
	$2n$	186	(160, 211)	–	–	(160, 212)	100
	$3n$	236	(206, 265)	–	–	(207, 266)	98.3
	$4n$	275	(244, 309)	–	–	(243, 307)	96.9
	$5n$	307	(274, 341)	–	–	(273, 341)	100

Table 2: Additional sample m , BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$, 95% exact C.I., Mittag-Leffler C.I. with their coverages (of the exact C.I.) and Gaussian credible intervals with their coverages (of the exact C.I.). All values are rounded to the nearest integer.

credible intervals, which in any case maintain a coverage of at least 97%. Such a behaviour provides a further indication on the magnitude of the additional sample size m for which the Mittag-Leffler regime of approximation may be more suited than the Gaussian regime. Furthermore, the Gaussian intervals appear to be near-to-optimal, in the sense that their length is always comparable to that of the exact intervals even when they are larger. For the Uniform dataset, where the empirical Bayes estimate for α is 0, Gaussian credible intervals still work, preserving their good performance in terms of coverage of the exact interval. Instead, the method of Favaro et al. (2009) does not apply for $\alpha = 0$, as discussed in Section 2.3.

Dataset	m	$\hat{K}_{n,m}$	95% Exact C.I.	Mittag-Leffler C.I.		Gaussian C.I.	
				95% C.I.	Coverage (%)	95% C.I.	Coverage (%)
A) Zipf, $n = 977$	$10n$	923	(813, 1030)	(834, 1019)	85.3	(817, 1029)	97.7
	$50n$	2582	(2299, 2863)	(2332, 2851)	92.0	(2311, 2854)	96.3
	$100n$	3904	(3519, 4304)	(3526, 4311)	99.1	(3501, 4307)	100
	$1000n$	14493	(13064, 16031)	(13088, 16002)	98.2	(13038, 15949)	97.2
B) Zipf, $n = 1877$	$10n$	165	(127, 205)	(134, 196)	79.5	(125, 204)	98.7
	$50n$	381	(304, 467)	(309, 453)	88.3	(301, 460)	95.7
	$100n$	525	(421, 636)	(427, 625)	92.1	(419, 632)	98.1
	$1000n$	1400	(1131, 1667)	(1137, 1664)	98.1	(1132, 1668)	99.8
C) Pólya, $n = 2000$	$10n$	799	(685, 913)	(701, 908)	90.8	(682, 915)	100
	$50n$	2502	(2171, 2857)	(2195, 2845)	94.8	(2165, 2839)	97.4
	$100n$	3998	(3491, 4547)	(3508, 4547)	98.4	(3467, 4529)	98.3
	$1000n$	18139	(15824, 20559)	(15915, 20629)	98.1	(15776, 20501)	98.8
D) Uniform, $n = 2000$	$10n$	414	(375, 457)	–	–	(375, 453)	95.1
	$50n$	687	(636, 739)	–	–	(636, 738)	99.0
	$100n$	809	(757, 864)	–	–	(753, 864)	100
	$1000n$	1218	(1150, 1286)	–	–	(1150, 1286)	100

Table 3: Additional sample m , BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$, 95% exact C.I., Mittag-Leffler C.I. with their coverages (of the exact C.I.) and Gaussian credible intervals with their coverages (of the exact C.I.). All values are rounded to the nearest integer.

4.2 Real data

For real data analysis, we consider the same Expressed Sequence Tags (EST) datasets previously analyzed in Favaro et al. (2009). These datasets are generated by sequencing cDNA libraries consisting of millions of genes and one of the main quantities of interest is the number of distinct genes. Due to the cost of the sequencing procedure, only a small portion of the cDNA library is typically sequenced. Given the resulting sequenced sample of size n , it is required to estimate the number of new genes $K_{m,n}$ to appear in an additional sample of size m . On the basis of such estimates, geneticists decide whether it is worth proceeding with sequencing and, if so, up to which additional sample size. The five libraries considered are: i) tomato flower cDNA library (Quackenbush et al., 2000); ii) two cDNA libraries of the amitochondriate protist *Mastigamoeba balamuthi*, one of which has undergone a normalization protocol (Susko and Roger, 2004); iii) two *Naegleria gruberi* cDNA libraries from cells grown respectively in aerobic and anaerobic conditions (Susko and Roger, 2004).

For each EST dataset, Table 4 collects the sample size n , the number of distinct species j , and the empirical Bayes estimates $(\hat{\alpha}_n, \hat{\theta}_n)$ of (α, θ) ; Table 4 coincides with Favaro et al. (2009, Table 1), where the same datasets are analyzed. For these datasets, Table 5 contains the BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ for $m = 2, 2n, 3, 4n, 5n$, and the corresponding 95% exact credible intervals, Mittag-Leffler credible intervals with their coverages of exact intervals, and Gaussian credible intervals with their coverages of exact intervals. Table 6 contains the same quantities as Table 5, for larger values of m . We refer to Appendix E for figures displaying the coverage of Mittag-Leffler and Gaussian credible intervals as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$.

Library	n	j	$\hat{\alpha}_n$	$\hat{\theta}_n$
Tomato flower	2586	1825	0.612	741.0
<i>Mastigamoeba</i>	715	460	0.770	46.0
<i>Mastigamoeba</i> -normalized	363	248	0.700	57.0
<i>Naegleria</i> aerobic	959	473	0.670	46.3
<i>Naegleria</i> anaerobic	969	631	0.660	155.5

Table 4: Sample size n , number of distinct species j in the sample, and empirical Bayes estimates of (α, θ) for the five EST datasets.

For the *Naegleria* aerobic dataset, Figure 2 displays BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ with 95% exact credible intervals, Mittag-Leffler credible intervals and Gaussian credible intervals as a function of m , for $m \in [0, 5n]$. See Appendix E for similar plots for the other datasets described in Table 4.

Tables 5 and 6 confirm the behavior already observed on synthetic data, with Gaussian credible intervals providing a better coverage than Mittag-Leffler credible intervals for values of m corresponding to $m = n, 2n, 3n, 4n, 5n, 10n$ and $50n$, and displaying near-to-optimal length. Again, the Mittag-Leffler credible intervals display a substantial improvement in performance as m grows, with their coverage eventually matching or outperforming

Library	m	$\hat{K}_{n,m}$	95% Exact C.I.	Mittag-Leffler C.I.		Gaussian C.I.	
				95% C.I.	Coverage (%)	95% C.I.	Coverage (%)
Tomato flower $n = 2586$	n	1281	(1223, 1339)	(1244, 1321)	66.4	(1222, 1340)	100
	$2n$	2354	(2264, 2446)	(2287, 2427)	76.9	(2262, 2445)	99.5
	$3n$	3305	(3184, 3424)	(3211, 3409)	82.5	(3185, 3425)	99.6
	$4n$	4173	(4031, 4318)	(4054, 4304)	87.1	(4028, 4319)	100
	$5n$	4980	(4815, 5146)	(4838, 5136)	90.0	(4811, 5148)	100
<i>Mastigamoeba</i> $n = 715$	n	346	(312, 379)	(323, 369)	68.7	(312, 379)	100
	$2n$	654	(596, 706)	(610, 697)	79.1	(599, 708)	97.3
	$3n$	939	(866, 1014)	(875, 1001)	85.1	(865, 1012)	98.6
	$4n$	1208	(1119, 1301)	(1126, 1288)	89.0	(1116, 1299)	98.9
	$5n$	1465	(1357, 1578)	(1366, 1562)	88.7	(1356, 1573)	97.7
<i>Mastigamoeba</i> -norm. $n = 363$	n	180	(157, 202)	(164, 197)	73.3	(157, 203)	100
	$2n$	336	(299, 371)	(306, 367)	84.7	(299, 372)	100
	$3n$	477	(429, 525)	(435, 522)	90.6	(428, 526)	100
	$4n$	608	(546, 671)	(555, 666)	88.8	(548, 668)	96.0
	$5n$	732	(660, 803)	(668, 801)	93.0	(662, 803)	98.6
<i>Naegleria aerobic</i> $n = 959$	n	307	(272, 343)	(284, 331)	66.2	(272, 342)	98.6
	$2n$	566	(514, 621)	(524, 611)	81.3	(511, 622)	100
	$3n$	798	(730, 873)	(739, 861)	85.3	(726, 871)	98.6
	$4n$	1012	(921, 1099)	(937, 1091)	86.5	(923, 1101)	98.9
	$5n$	1212	(1108, 1319)	(1122, 1307)	87.7	(1109, 1315)	97.6
<i>Naegleria anaerobic</i> $n = 969$	n	439	(402, 476)	(415, 465)	67.6	(402, 476)	100
	$2n$	812	(753, 871)	(767, 860)	78.8	(754, 870)	98.3
	$3n$	1146	(1065, 1219)	(1083, 1213)	84.4	(1069, 1223)	97.4
	$4n$	1454	(1365, 1550)	(1373, 1538)	89.2	(1360, 1547)	98.4
	$5n$	1741	(1635, 1855)	(1645, 1843)	90.0	(1632, 1851)	98.2

Table 5: Additional sample m , BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$, 95% exact C.I., Mittag-Leffler C.I. with their coverages (of the exact C.I.) and Gaussian credible intervals with their coverages (of the exact C.I.). All values are rounded to the nearest integer.

that of the Gaussian credible intervals for values of $m = 100n, m = 1000n$. It shall be mentioned that, also when outperformed, the Gaussian intervals maintain in any case a coverage of at least 96%.

5 Discussion

The unseen-species problem is arguably the most popular example of “species-sampling” problem. Given $n \geq 1$ observed sample $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ from a population of individuals belonging to different species \mathbb{S} , a broad class of “species-sampling” (extrapolation) problems call for estimating features of the unknown species composition of $m \geq 1$ additional

Library	m	$\hat{K}_{n,m}$	95% Exact C.I.	Mittag-Leffler C.I.		Gaussian C.I.	
				95% C.I.	Coverage (%)	95% C.I.	Coverage (%)
Tomato flower $n = 2586$	$10n$	8432	(8171, 8705)	(8188, 8687)	93.4	(8164, 8700)	99.1
	$50n$	25926	(25137, 26706)	(25176, 26712)	97.5	(25154, 26698)	98.4
	$100n$	40888	(39690, 42082)	(39705, 42128)	99.4	(39684, 42092)	100
	$1000n$	113848	(110620, 117142)	(110555, 117300)	100	(110540, 117157)	100
<i>Mastigamoeba</i> $n = 715$	$10n$	2634	(2442, 2825)	(2463, 2809)	90.3	(2448, 2819)	96.9
	$50n$	9718	(9010, 10370)	(9089, 10367)	94.0	(9063, 10372)	96.1
	$100n$	16797	(15664, 17928)	(15711, 17920)	97.6	(15674, 17921)	99.2
	$1000n$	58889	(54962, 62878)	(55079, 62824)	97.8	(54976, 62803)	98.9
<i>Mastigamoeba</i> -norm. $n = 363$	$10n$	1280	(1158, 1392)	(1169, 1393)	95.3	(1163, 1397)	97.9
	$50n$	4344	(3951, 4707)	(3966, 4729)	98.0	(3969, 4720)	97.6
	$100n$	7203	(6581, 7809)	(6576, 7840)	100	(6585, 7820)	99.7
	$1000n$	22759	(20826, 24856)	(20779, 24774)	98.0	(20825, 24694)	96.0
<i>Naegleria</i> aerobic $n = 959$	$10n$	2084	(1920, 2253)	(1926, 2246)	96.1	(1917, 2252)	99.7
	$50n$	6781	(6260, 7299)	(6265, 7306)	99.5	(6270, 7293)	98.5
	$100n$	11030	(10209, 11923)	(10190, 11883)	97.7	(10207, 11852)	95.9
	$1000n$	33286	(30777, 35851)	(30752, 35862)	100	(30833, 35740)	96.7
<i>Naegleria</i> anaerobic $n = 969$	$10n$	2994	(2809, 3175)	(2826, 3161)	91.5	(2817, 3171)	96.7
	$50n$	9679	(9145, 10213)	(9135, 10218)	100	(9140, 10218)	100
	$100n$	15671	(14809, 16530)	(14791, 16544)	100	(14807, 16535)	100
	$1000n$	46683	(44226, 49260)	(44062, 49283)	100	(44137, 49229)	99.4

Table 6: Additional sample m , BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$, 95% exact C.I., Mittag-Leffler C.I. with their coverages (of the exact C.I.) and Gaussian credible intervals with their coverages (of the exact C.I.). All values are rounded to the nearest integer.

unobservable samples $\mathbf{X}_m = (X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m})$ from the same population. If $(N_{s,n})_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$ and $(N_{s,m})_{s \in \mathbb{S}}$ denote the (empirical) frequencies of species in \mathbf{X}_n and \mathbf{X}_m , respectively, for $u, v \geq$ we set

$$K_{n,m}(u, v) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} I(N_{s,n} = u) I(N_{s,m} = v), \quad (31)$$

with $I(\cdot)$ being the indicator function, namely the number of species with frequency u in \mathbf{X}_n and with frequency v in \mathbf{X}_m . The number of unseen species is recovered from (31) by taking

$$K_{n,m} = \sum_{v=1}^m K_{n,m}(0, v).$$

We refer to Balocchi et al. (2025) for an up-to-date overview on “species-sampling” problems of the form (31), with applications to biological data. While the emphasis is on the BNP approach, Balocchi et al. (2025) also discusses the most recent advances in the




Figure 2: BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ (solid line $-$) with 95% exact credible intervals (dashed line $- -$), Mittag-Leffler credible intervals (violet) and Gaussian credible intervals (pink), as a function of m , for $m \in [0, 5n]$.

distribution-free approach.

5.1 Gaussian credible intervals for $K_{n,m}(0, v)$

Among “species-sampling” problems of the form (31), the number of unseen rare species certainly stands out (Deng et al., 2019), with a rich literature under the distribution-free and BNP approach (Favaro et al., 2013; Hao and Li, 2020). It calls for estimating $K_{n,m}(0, v)$, namely the number of hitherto unseen species that would be observed with frequency $v \geq 1$ in the m additional samples. Under the BNP approach with a Pitman-Yor prior, with $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, Balocchi et al. (2025, Proposition 1) provides a compound Binomial representation of the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}(0, v)$, given \mathbf{X}_n . In particular, let $K_{n,m}^{(n)}(0, v)$ be random variable with such a distribution. Following the notation of

(8)-(9), and denoting by $K_m^*(v)$ the (random) number of species with frequency v in $m \geq 1$ random samples from PYP($\alpha, \theta + n$), such that $K_m^*(v) \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$, there hold

i) for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$K_{n,m}^{(n)}(0, v) \stackrel{d}{=} Q \left(K_m^*(v), B_{\frac{\theta}{\alpha}+k, \frac{n}{\alpha}-k} \right); \quad (32)$$

ii) for $\alpha = 0$

$$K_{n,m}^{(n)}(0, v) \stackrel{d}{=} Q \left(K_m^*(v), \frac{\theta}{\theta + n} \right). \quad (33)$$

The representations (32)-(33) lead to posterior mean estimates of $K_{n,m}(0, v)$ that can be easily evaluated for any value of any n and m (Favaro et al., 2013, Equation 24 and Equation 30).

Exact credible intervals for $K_{n,m}(0, v)$ can be derived by Monte Carlo sampling the posterior distribution of $K_{n,m}(0, v)$, given \mathbf{X}_n . One may exploit the representations (32)-(33), as well as the predictive distributions of the Pitman-Yor prior, to sample $K_{n,m}^{(n)}(0, v)$, though with a computational burden that becomes overwhelming as m increases. In particular, Algorithm 1 does not extend to $K_{n,m}^{(n)}(0, v)$; see Balocchi et al. (2025) for details. Large m asymptotic credible intervals for $K_{n,m}(0, v)$ can be derived by relying on the large m asymptotic behaviour of $K_{n,m}^{(n)}(0, v)$ in Favaro et al. (2013, Theorem 4), still involving the scaled Mittag-Leffler distribution. However, this approach would suffer from the same limitations as the approach of Favaro et al. (2009) for $K_{n,m}$. Alternatively, one may consider to extend our approach in order to derive Gaussian credible intervals for $K_{n,m}(0, v)$, which is a promising direction for future work. This would require to extend Theorem 3.1 to $K_m^*(v)$, and then combine it with the representations (32)-(33) along the same lines of Theorem 3.2.

5.2 More directions for future work

Beyond the extension of our approach to other “species-sampling”, this work opens several opportunities for future research. For example, one may consider the problem of deriving exact credible intervals for $K_{n,m}$, namely for any n and m , by avoiding the use of Monte Carlo sampling the posterior distribution. By relying on the representations (32)-(33), this problem would require to refine the CLT (12) with a Berry-Eseen type inequality or, better, to develop a concentration inequality for K_m^* . See Contardi et al. (2024, Equation 11) for a preliminary result in this direction, though limited to the case $\alpha = 0$. Another research direction could involve the use of the Gaussian credible interval (28) as a confidence interval under the semi-parametric approach of Favaro and Naulet (2023), which assumes the tail of P to be regularly varying of index $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. This problem would open to the study of frequentist properties of our approach to construct Gaussian credible intervals under regular variation.

Acknowledgments

Emanuele Dolera and Stefano Favaro received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 817257. Stefano Favaro also gratefully acknowledges the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR), “Dipartimenti di Eccellenza” grant 2013-2027. Stefano Favaro is also affiliated to IMATI-CNR “Enrico Magenes” (Milan, Italy).

References

- BALOCCHI, C., FAVARO, S. AND NAULET, Z. (2025). Bayesian nonparametric inference for “species-sampling” problems. *Statistical Science*, to appear.
- BEN-HAMOU, A., BOUCHERON, S. AND GASSIAT, E. (2018). Pattern coding meets censoring: (almost) adaptive coding on countable alphabets. *Preprint arXiv:1608.08367*.
- BUBECK, S., ERNST, D., AND GARIVIER, A. (2013). Optimal discovery with probabilistic expert advice: finite time analysis and macroscopic optimality. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **14**, 601–623.
- BUNGE, J. AND FITZPATRICK, M. (1993) Estimating the number of species: a review. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **88**, 364-373.
- CAI, D., MITZENMACHER, M. AND ADAMS, R.P. (2018). A Bayesian nonparametric view on count–min sketch. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- CEREDA, G. (2017) Impact of model choice on LR assessment in case of rare haplotype match (frequentist approach). *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **44**, 230-248.
- CHAO, A. (2017) Nonparametric estimation of the number of classes in a population. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **11**, 256–270.
- CHAO, A. AND LEE, S. (1992) Estimating the number of classes via sample coverage. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **87**, 210–217.
- CONTARDI, C., DOLERA, E. AND FAVARO, S. (2024). Law of large numbers and central limit theorem for Ewens-Pitman model. *Preprint arXiv:2412.11493*.

- DALEY, T. AND SMITH, A.D. (2013). Predicting the molecular complexity of sequencing libraries. *Nature Methods* **10**, 325–327.
- DENG, C. DALEY, T., DE SENA BRANDINE, G. AND SMITH, A.D. (2019). Molecular heterogeneity in large-scale biological data: techniques and applications. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science* **2**, 39–67.
- DOLERA, E. AND FAVARO, S. (2020a). A Berry-Esseen theorem for Pitman’s α -diversity. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **30**, 847–869.
- DOLERA, E. AND FAVARO, S. (2021). A compound Poisson perspective of Ewens-Pitman sampling model. *Mathematics* **9**, 2820.
- EFRON, B. AND THISTED, R. (1976). Estimating the number of unseen species: How many words did Shakespeare know? *Biometrika* **63**, 435–447.
- FAVARO, S., LIJOI, A., MENA, R.H. AND PRÜNSTER, I. (2009). Bayesian nonparametric inference for species variety with a two parameter Poisson-Dirichlet process prior. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* **71**, 992–1008.
- FAVARO, S., LIJOI, A. AND PRÜNSTER, I. (2013). Conditional formulae for Gibbs-type exchangeable random partitions. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **23**, 1721–1754.
- FAVARO, S., NAULET, Z. (2023). Near-optimal estimation of the unseen under regularly varying tail populations. *Bernoulli* **29**, 3423–3442.
- FAVARO, S., NAULET, Z. (2024). Optimal estimation of high-order missing masses, and the rare-type match problem. *Preprint arXiv:2306.14998*.
- FERGUSON, T.S. (1973). A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *The Annals of Statistics* **1**, 209–230.

- FISHER, R.A., CORBET, A.S. AND WILLIAMS, C.B. (1943). The relation between the number of species and the number of individuals in a random sample of an animal population. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **12**, 42–58.
- FLORENCIO, D. AND HERLEY, C. (2007). A large-scale study of web password habits. *Proceedings of the International Conference on World Wide Web*.
- GAO, Z., TSENG, C.H., PEI, Z. AN BLASER, M.J. (2007). Molecular analysis of human forearm superficial skin bacterial biota. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of USA* **104**, 2927–2932.
- GOOD, I.J. AND TOULMIN, G.H. (1956). The number of new species, and the increase in population coverage, when a sample is increased. *Biometrika* **43**, 45–63.
- HAAS, P.J., NAUGHTON, J.F., SESHADRI, S. AND STOKES, L. (1995). Sampling-based estimation of the number of distinct values of an attribute. *Proceedings of the Very Large Data Bases Conference*.
- HAO, Y. AND LI, P. (2020). Optimal prediction of the number of unseen species with multiplicity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- IONITA-LAZA, I., LANGE, C. AND LAIRD, N.M. (2009). Estimating the number of unseen variants in the human genome. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of USA* **106**, 5008–5013.
- KALAI, A.T. AND VEMPALA, S.S. (2024). Calibrated language models must hallucinate. *Proceeding of the Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*.
- KROES, I., LEPP, P.W. AND RELMAN, D.A. (1999). Bacterial diversity within the human

- subgingival crevice. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of USA* **96**, 14547–14552.
- KORWAR, R.M. AND HOLLANDER, M. (1973). Contributions to the theory of Dirichlet processes. *The Annals of Probability* **1**, 705–711.
- LIJOI, A., MENA, R.H. AND PRÜNSTER, I. (2007). Bayesian nonparametric estimation of the probability of discovering new species. *Biometrika* **94**, 769–786.
- MOTWANI, S. AND VASSILVITSKII, S. (2006) Distinct value estimators in power law distributions. *Proceedings of Analytic Algorithms and Combinatorics*, **8**.
- OHANNESSIAN, M.I. AND DAHLEH, M.A. (2012). Rare probability estimation under regularly varying heavy tails. *Proceedings of the Conference on Learning Theory*.
- ORLITSKY, A., SANTHANAM, N.P. AND ZHANG, J. (2004). Universal compression of memoryless sources over unknown alphabets. *IEEE Transaction on Information Theory* **50**, 1469–1481.
- ORLITSKY, A., SURESH, A.T. AND WU, Y. (2017). Optimal prediction of the number of unseen species. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of USA* **113**, 13283–13288.
- PERMAN, M., PITMAN, J. AND YOR, M. (1992). Size-biased sampling of Poisson point processes and excursions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **92**, 21–39.
- PITMAN, J. (1995). Exchangeable and partially exchangeable random partitions. *Probability Theory Related Fields* **102**, 145–158.
- PITMAN, J. AND YOR, M. (1997). The two parameter Poisson-Dirichlet distribution derived from a Stable subordinator. *The Annals of Probability* **25**, 855–900.

- PITMAN, J. (2006). *Combinatorial stochastic processes*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer Verlag.
- QU, Y., DASSIOS, A. AND ZHAO, H. (2021). Random variate generation for exponential and Gamma tilted stable distributions. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* **31**, 19.
- QUACKENBUSH, J., CHO, J., LEE, D., LIANG, F., HOLT, I., KARAMYCHEVA, S., PARVIZI, B., PERTEA, G., SULTANA, R. AND WHITE, J. (2000). The TIGR Gene Indices: analysis of gene transcript sequences in highly sampled eukaryotic species. *Nucleic Acids Research* **29**, 159–164.
- SUSKO, E. AND ROGER, A.J. (2004). Estimating and comparing the rates of gene discovery and expressed sequence tag (EST) frequencies in EST surveys. *Bioinformatics* **20**, 2279–2287.
- THISTED, R. AND EFRON, B. (1987). Did Shakespeare write a newly-discovered poem? *Biometrika* **74**, 445–455.
- WU, Y. AND YANG, P. (2016). Minimax rates of entropy estimation on large alphabets via best polynomial approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62**, 3702–3720.
- WU, Y. AND YANG, P. (2019). Chebyshev polynomials, moment matching, and optimal estimation of the unseen. *The Annals of Statistics* **47**, 857–883.
- ZOLOTAREV, V.M. (1986). *One-dimensional Stable distributions*. American Mathematical Society.

A Non-central generalized factorial coefficients

We recall some definitions and basic results on signless Stirling numbers of the first type and on generalized factorial coefficients. We refer to the monograph by [Charalambides \(2005, Chapter 2\)](#) for a comprehensive account on these combinatorial numbers and generalizations thereof.

A.1 Stirling numbers

For $t > 0$, the (u, v) -th (central or centered) signless Stirling number of the first type, denoted by $|s(u, v)|$, is defined as the v -th coefficient in the expansion of $(t)_{(u)}$ into powers, i.e.,

$$(t)_{(u)} = \sum_{v=0}^u |s(u, v)| t^v. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

It is assumed that $|s(0, 0)| = 1$, $|s(u, 0)| = 0$ for $u > 0$ and $|s(u, v)| = 0$ for $v > u$. As a generalization of (A.1), for any $b > 0$ let us consider the expansion of $(t + b)_{(u)}$ into powers, i.e.,

$$(t + b)_{(u)} = \sum_{v=0}^u |s(u, v; b)| t^v. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

It is assumed that $|s(0, 0; b)| = 1$, $|s(u, 0; b)| = (b)_{(u)}$ for $u > 0$ and $|s(u, v; b)| = 0$ for $v > u$. The v -th coefficient $|s(u, v; b)|$ in the expansion (A.2) is defined as the non-central (u, v) -th signless Stirling number of the first type. The following identity shows a relationship between Stirling numbers of the first type and their corresponding non-central Stirling numbers, i.e.,

$$|s(u, v; b)| = \sum_{i=v}^u \binom{u}{i} (b)_{(u-i)} |s(i, v)|. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

See [Charalambides \(2005, Chapter 2\)](#) for the proof of Equation (A.3), and for generalizations thereof.

A.2 Generalized factorial coefficients

For $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let us consider the rising factorial of at of order u , i.e., $(at)_{(u)} = \prod_{0 \leq i \leq u-1} (at + i)$. The (u, v) -th (centered) generalized factorial coefficient, denoted by $\mathcal{C}(u, v; a)$, is defined as the v -th coefficient in the expansion of $(at)_{(u)}$ into rising factorials, i.e.,

$$(at)_{(u)} = \sum_{v=0}^u \mathcal{C}(u, v; a) (t)_{(v)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

It is assumed that $\mathcal{C}(0, 0; a) = 1$, $\mathcal{C}(u, 0; a) = 0$ for $u > 0$, $\mathcal{C}(u, v; a) = 0$ for $v > u$. As a generalization of (A.4), for any $b > 0$ let us consider the expansion of $(at - b)_{(u)}$ into rising factorials, i.e.,

$$(at - b)_{(u)} = \sum_{v=0}^u \mathcal{C}(u, v; a, b) (t)_{(v)}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It is assumed that $\mathcal{C}(0, 0; a, b) = 1$, $\mathcal{C}(u, 0; a, b) = (-b)_{(u)}$ for $u > 0$, $\mathcal{C}(u, v; a, b) = 0$ for $v > u$. The v -th coefficient $\mathcal{C}(u, v; a, b)$ in the expansion (A.5) is defined as the non-central (u, v) -th generalized factorial coefficient. In particular, an explicit expression for the v -th coefficient is

$$\mathcal{C}(u, v; a, b) = \frac{1}{v!} \sum_{j=0}^v (-1)^j \binom{v}{j} (-ja - b)_{(u)}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The following identity shows an asymptotic relationships, as $a \rightarrow 0$, between the non-central generalized factorial coefficients and the non-central signless Stirling numbers of the first type:

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{C}(u, v; a, b)}{a^k} = |s(u, v; -b)|; \quad (\text{A.7})$$

See Charalambides (2005, Chapter 2) for the proof of Equation (A.6) and the proof of Equation (A.7).

B Sampling properties of the Pitman-Yor prior

B.1 Predictive distributions

Due to the discreteness of the Pitman-Yor prior, a random sample \mathbf{X}_n from $P \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$ induces a random partition of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ into $K_n = j \leq n$ blocks, labelled by $\{S_1^*, \dots, S_{K_n}^*\}$, with frequencies $(N_{1,n}, \dots, N_{K_n,n}) = (n_1, \dots, n_k)$ such that the n_i 's are positive and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j} n_i = n$. The distribution of the random partition is determined by the predictive distribution, or generative scheme, of the Pitman-Yor prior (Pitman, 1995, Proposition 9), i.e.,

$$\Pr[X_1 \in \cdot] = \nu(\cdot),$$

and, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\Pr[X_{n+1} \in \cdot | \mathbf{X}_n] = \frac{\theta + j\alpha}{\theta + n} \nu(\cdot) + \frac{1}{\theta + n} \sum_{i=1}^j (n_i - \alpha) \delta_{S_i^*}(\cdot). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The expression in (B.1) provides the conditional distribution of the random partition of $[n+1]$ obtained after sampling one additional point X_{n+1} , given the previous partition of $[n]$. This is a linear combination of: i) the probability $(\theta + j\alpha)/(\theta + n)$ that X_{n+1} belongs to a new species, i.e., creating a new block in the partition of the set $[n]$; ii) the probability $(n_i - \alpha)/(\theta + n)$ that X_{n+1} is of species S_i^* , i.e., increasing by 1 the size of the block S_i^* in the partition of the set $[n]$, for $i = 1, \dots, j$. A larger value of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ corresponds to a higher probability of observing new species in the sample. If $\alpha = 0$, i.e. the Dirichlet prior, the probabilities in (B.1) become proportional to the empirical frequencies of species, and the probability of generating a new one no longer depends on the number of observed species.

B.2 Sampling formula

For any $r \in [n]$ let $M_{r,n}$ be the number of distinct species with frequency r in a random sample \mathbf{X}_n from $P \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$, such that $M_{r,n} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq K_n} I(N_{i,n} = r)$ such that $\sum_{1 \leq r \leq n} M_{r,n} = K_n$ and $\sum_{1 \leq r \leq n} r M_{r,n} = n$. In particular, let us consider the (partition) set

$$\mathcal{M}_{n,j} = \left\{ j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } (m_1, \dots, m_n) : m_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n m_i = j, \sum_{i=1}^n i m_i = n \right\}.$$

The distribution of the random variable $\mathbf{M}_n = (M_{1,n}, \dots, M_{n,n})$ is referred to as the Ewens-Pitman sampling formula (Pitman, 1995, Proposition 9), and it is such that for $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathcal{M}_{n,j}$

$$\Pr[\mathbf{M}_n = (m_1, \dots, m_n)] = n! \frac{\left(\frac{\theta}{\alpha}\right)_{(\sum_{i=1}^n m_i)}}{(\theta)_{(n)}} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)_{(i-1)}}{i!} \right)^{m_i} \frac{1}{m_i!}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The Ewens-Pitman sampling formula generalizes the Ewens sampling formula, which corresponds to $\alpha = 0$. The distribution K_n follows by marginalizing (B.2). For $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ then

$$\Pr[K_n = j] = \frac{\left(\frac{\theta}{\alpha}\right)_{(j)}}{(\theta)_{(n)}} \mathcal{C}(n, j; \alpha), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

whereas if $\alpha = 0$ then

$$\Pr[K_n = j] = \frac{\theta^j}{(\theta)_{(n)}} |s(n, j)|. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

We refer to the monograph by Pitman (2006, Chapter 2 and Chapter 3) for a detailed account on distributional properties of the random partition induced by sampling from $P \sim \text{PYP}(\alpha, \theta)$.

B.3 Large n asymptotics

At the sampling level, the power-law tail behaviour of the PYP prior emerges from the analysis of the large n asymptotic behaviour of K_n and $M_{r,n}$. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$

let $S_{\alpha, \theta/\alpha}$ be a Mittag-Leffler random variable [Pitman \(2006, Theorem 3.8\)](#) shows that, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\frac{K_n}{n^\alpha} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} S_{\alpha, \theta/\alpha} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and

$$\frac{M_{r,n}}{n^\alpha} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)_{(r-1)}}{r!} S_{\alpha, \theta/\alpha}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

See also [Dolera and Favaro \(2020a\)](#) and [Dolera and Favaro \(2020b\)](#) for refinements of [\(B.5\)](#).

For $\alpha = 0$, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, [Korwar and Hollander \(1973, Theorem 2.3\)](#) shows that, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\frac{K_n}{\log n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \theta \quad (\text{B.7})$$

and

$$M_{r,n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} P_{\theta/r}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where $P_{\theta/r}$ is a Poisson random variable with parameter θ/r . From [\(B.5\)](#), for large n , K_n grows as n^α . This is precisely the growth of the number of distinct species in $n \geq 1$ random samples from a power-law distribution of exponent $c = \alpha^{-1}$. Also, from [\(B.5\)](#) and [\(B.6\)](#), $p_{\alpha,r} = \alpha(1-\alpha)_{(r-1)}/r!$ is the large n asymptotic proportion of the number of distinct species with frequency r . Then, $p_{\alpha,r} \propto r^{-\alpha-1}$ for large r , which is the distribution of the number of distinct species with frequency r arising from a power-law distribution of exponent $c = \alpha^{-1}$.

C Proof of [\(13\)](#) and of the LLN [\(14\)](#)

The proof of [\(13\)](#) follows the same lines when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ or $\alpha = 0$, relying on representations [\(8\)](#) and [\(9\)](#) respectively; we split the two cases for the sake of clarity. The LLN [\(14\)](#) follows directly from [\(13\)](#) and its proof is carried out at the end of the section.

C.1 Proof of (13) in the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

We resort to representation (8) which, in the regime $\theta = \tau m$, $n = \nu m$, $j = \varrho m$, becomes

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{=} Q \left(K_m^*, B_{\left(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho\right)m} \right)$$

By the law of total expectation and recalling the expression for the mean of the beta-binomial distribution, the asymptotics for the mean of K_m^* in (10) and the definitions of $\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}$ in the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Q \left(K_m^*, B_{\left(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho\right)m} \right) \mid K_m^* \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[K_m^* \cdot \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} \right] \\ &= m \cdot \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} + O(1) \\ &= m \cdot \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

By the law of total variance, and recalling the expression for the moments of the beta-binomial distribution, the asymptotics in (10) and the definitions of $\mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}$, $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}$ in the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} (K_m^{(n)}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left(Q \left(K_m^*, B_{\left(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho\right)m} \right) \mid K_m^* \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \text{Var} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[Q \left(K_m^*, B_{\left(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho\right)m} \right) \mid K_m^* \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[K_m^* \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{(\tau + \nu)m + \alpha} \right) + \frac{(K_m^*)^2}{m} \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \frac{\alpha m}{(\tau + \nu)m + \alpha} \right] \\ &\quad + \text{Var} \left(K_m^* \cdot \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} \right) \\ &= [m \cdot \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} + O(1)] \cdot \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \left[1 + O \left(\frac{1}{m} \right) \right] + m \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \lambda} \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)^2}{(\tau + \nu)^2} + O(1) \\ &\quad + \frac{m^2 \cdot \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda}^2 + O(m)}{m} \cdot \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \left[\frac{\alpha}{(\tau + \nu)} + O \left(\frac{1}{m} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= m \left[\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)} + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\lambda} \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)^2}{(\tau + \nu)} + \mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}^2 \frac{\alpha(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^3} \right] + O(1) \\
&= m \cdot \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} + O(1)
\end{aligned}$$

C.2 Proof of (13) in the case $\alpha = 0$

We resort to representation (9) which, in the regime $\theta = \tau m$, $n = \nu m$, becomes

$$K_m^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{=} Q \left(K_m^*, \frac{\tau}{\lambda} \right)$$

By the law of total expectation, and recalling the expression for the mean of the binomial distribution, the asymptotics for the mean of K_m^* in (10) and the definitions of $\mathbf{m}_{0,\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{0,\tau,\nu,\varrho}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Q \left(K_m^*, \frac{\tau}{\lambda} \right) \mid K_m^* \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[K_m^* \cdot \frac{\tau}{\lambda} \right] \\
&= m \cdot \mathbf{m}_{0,\lambda} \frac{\tau}{\lambda} + O(1) \\
&= m \cdot \mathcal{M}_{0,\tau,\nu,\varrho} + O(1)
\end{aligned}$$

By the law of total variance, and recalling the expression for the moments of the binomial distribution, the asymptotics in (10) and the definitions of $\mathbf{m}_{0,\lambda}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{0,\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{0,\tau,\nu,\varrho}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var} (K_m^{(n)}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left(Q \left(K_m^*, \frac{\tau}{\lambda} \right) \mid K_m^* \right) \right] + \text{Var} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[Q \left(K_m^*, \frac{\tau}{\lambda} \right) \mid K_m^* \right] \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[K_m^* \cdot \frac{\tau\nu}{\lambda^2} \right] + \text{Var} \left(K_m^* \cdot \frac{\tau}{\lambda} \right) \\
&= m \cdot \mathbf{m}_{0,\lambda} \cdot \frac{\tau\nu}{\lambda^2} + O(1) + m \cdot \mathfrak{s}_{0,\lambda} \frac{\tau^2}{\lambda^2} + O(1) \\
&= m \cdot \mathcal{S}_{0,\tau,\nu,\varrho} + O(1)
\end{aligned}$$

C.3 Proof of the LLN (14)

To prove the LLN (14), we fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and combine Chebychev inequality with the (variance) asymptotic expansion (13). In particular, we write

$$\begin{aligned} P \left[\left| \frac{K_m^{(n)} - \mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}]}{m} \right| > \varepsilon \right] &= P \left[|K_m^{(n)} - \mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}]| > m\varepsilon \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\text{Var} \left(K_m^{(n)} \right)}{m^2 \varepsilon^2} \\ &= O \left(\frac{1}{m} \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $m \rightarrow +\infty$. Since the asymptotic expansion (13) of $\mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}]$ implies that $m^{-1} \mathbb{E} [K_m^{(n)}] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho}$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$, the proof is concluded by means of Slutsky's theorem.

D Proof of the CLT (15)

We begin by providing some detail on the sketch of proof presented in section 3. Equality (22) follows from the chain of equalities

$$\begin{aligned} F_m(x) &= \int_0^{+\infty} P [Q_m(z) \leq m \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} + \sqrt{m} \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x] \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} P \left[V_m(z) \leq \frac{\sqrt{m} [\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} - \mu(z)] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x}{\sigma(z)} \right] \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{m} [\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} - \mu(z)] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x}{\sigma(z)} \right) \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{+\infty} \left\{ F_{V_m(z)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{m} [\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} - \mu(z)] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x}{\sigma(z)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. - \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{m} [\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} - \mu(z)] + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha, \tau, \nu, \varrho} x}{\sigma(z)} \right) \right\} \mu_{\frac{K_m^*}{m}}(dz) \\ &=: \mathcal{I}_1^{(m)}(x) + \mathcal{I}_2^{(m)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The following two lemmas make use Proposition 2 and the CLT for K_m^* , i.e. (12) of theorem 3.1, and are instrumental to the proof of (23) through Proposition 3.

Lemma D.1. *If Y is a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\lambda}$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\frac{\mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})Y + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} x}{\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})} \right) \right] = \Phi(x)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We introduce a standard Gaussian random variable Z , with Z independent from the random variable Y . By a standard property of conditional probability,

$$\Phi \left(\frac{\mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})Y + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} x}{\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})} \right) = P \left[Z \leq \frac{\mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})Y + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} x}{\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})} \mid Y \right],$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left(\frac{\mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})Y + \mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho} x}{\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})} \right) \right] = P \left[\frac{\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})Z - \mu'(\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\lambda})Y}{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}} \leq x \right].$$

To conclude, notice that $\frac{\sigma(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda})Z - \mu'(\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\lambda})Y}{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}}$ is a linear combination of independent Gaussian random variables, hence it is Gaussian with mean 0 and variance

$$\frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}) + \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\lambda}^2 \cdot (\mu'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}))^2}{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha,\tau,\nu,\varrho}^2} = 1,$$

where the last identity follows from Proposition 2. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma D.2. *Let $\psi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $\psi \in C^1((0, +\infty))$.*

If the function ψ has bounded (first) derivative, then as $n \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\sqrt{n} \left[\psi \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right) - \psi(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}) \right] \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N} \left(0, (\psi'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}))^2 \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,\lambda}^2 \right)$$

Proof. By means of the fundamental theorem of calculus, we can write that

$$\sqrt{n} \left[\psi \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} \right) - \psi(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}) \right] = \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} - \mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} \right) \int_0^1 \psi' \left(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} + t \left[\frac{K_m^*}{m} - \mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} \right] \right) dt. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

By (11), we have that $m^{-1}K_m^* - \mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} \xrightarrow{p} 0$, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$. Since ψ' is bounded, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\int_0^1 \psi' \left(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} + t \left[\frac{K_m^*}{m} - \mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda} \right] \right) dt \xrightarrow{p} \psi'(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha,\lambda}) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

and, by (12), as $m \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\frac{K_m^*}{m} - \mathbf{m}_{\alpha, \lambda} \right) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha, \lambda}^2 \right). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

From (D.1), with (D.2) and (D.3), the proof completed by means of Slutsky's theorem. \square

D.1 Proof of Proposition 1 in the case $\alpha = 0$

Proof of (17) and (18). By a simple computation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Q_m(z)] &= \lfloor mz \rfloor \cdot \frac{\tau}{\tau + \nu} \\ &= mz \cdot \frac{\tau}{\tau + \nu} - (mz - \lfloor mz \rfloor) \cdot \frac{\tau}{\tau + \nu} \end{aligned}$$

Since $mz - \lfloor mz \rfloor < 1$ by definition, this proves the first equality. For the second equality,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Q_m(z)) &= \lfloor mz \rfloor \cdot \frac{\tau\nu}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \\ &= mz \cdot \frac{\tau\nu}{(\tau + \nu)^2} - (mz - \lfloor mz \rfloor) \cdot \frac{\tau\nu}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \\ &= m\sigma^2(z) + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

so that the $O(1)$ again accounts for the fact that we are discarding the floor function. \square

Proof of (19). This is the standard Berry-Essen bound for the binomial distribution - see (Petrov, 1975, Chapter V, Theorem 4). \square

D.2 Proof of Proposition 1 in the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

Proof of (17) and (18). By the law of total expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Q_m(z)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Q_m(z) \mid B_{\left(\frac{\tau+\varrho}{\alpha}\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu-\varrho}{\alpha}\right)m} \right] \right] \\ &= \lfloor mz \rfloor \mathbb{E} \left[B_{\left(\frac{\tau+\varrho}{\alpha}\right)m, \left(\frac{\nu-\varrho}{\alpha}\right)m} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$= mz \cdot \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} - (mz - \lfloor mz \rfloor) \cdot \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}$$

Since $mz - \lfloor mz \rfloor < 1$ by definition, this proves the first equality. By the law of total variance,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Q_m(z)) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var} \left(Q_m(z) \mid B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m} \right) \right] + \text{Var} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[Q_m(z) \mid B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m} \right] \right) \\ &= \lfloor mz \rfloor \mathbb{E} \left[B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m} - B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m}^2 \right] + \lfloor mz \rfloor \text{Var} \left(B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m} \right) \\ &= mz \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} \left[1 - \frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} + \alpha z \frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{(\tau + \nu)^2} \right] + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the $O(1)$ accounts for the fact that we are discarding the floor function and that we are substituting the exact expression for the variance of $B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m}$ with its asymptotic principal part:

$$\begin{aligned} m \text{Var} \left(B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m} \right) &= \frac{\alpha(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^2(\tau + \nu + \alpha/m)} \\ &= \frac{\alpha(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^3 [1 + \alpha/(\tau m + \nu m)]} \\ &= \frac{\alpha(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^3} \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of (19). The outline of the proof is as follows: fix $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ and a constant \mathcal{C} and start with the well-known inequality (Petrov, 1975, Chapter V, Theorem 2)

$$\|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \leq \int_{|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C}\sigma(z)m^\delta} \left| \frac{\varphi_{V_m(z)}(\xi) - e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}}}{\xi} \right| d\xi + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}m^{-\delta}$$

where $\varphi_{V_m(z)}$ denotes the characteristic function of $V_m(z)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \max_{z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]} \sigma(z)\mathcal{C}$. For notational convenience, let $B_m = B_{(\frac{\tau}{\alpha} + \varrho)m, (\frac{\nu}{\alpha} - \varrho)m}$ and define, for $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$,

$$G_m(z) = \sqrt{m} [\mu(z) - zB_m]$$

$$S_m(z) = \frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)} [B_m - B_m^2]$$

and

$$S(z) = \frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)} \cdot \frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^2}.$$

Further, let $G(z)$ denote a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance

$$s^2(z) = z^2 \cdot \frac{\alpha(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^3},$$

independent of B_m . In steps 1–3 we rewrite the right-end side of the inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \\ & \leq \int_{|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i \frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S_m(z)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i \frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right]}{\xi} \right| d\xi \\ & \quad + \tilde{C}_2 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{C} m^{-\delta} \end{aligned}$$

Then, making use of the triangular inequality, we further split the problem in two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \\ & \leq \int_{|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i \frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S_m(z)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i \frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right]}{\xi} \right| d\xi \\ & \quad + \int_{|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i \frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i \frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right]}{\xi} \right| d\xi \\ & \quad + \tilde{C}_2 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{C} m^{-\delta} \\ & = \mathcal{I}_m^{(1)}(z) + \mathcal{I}_m^{(2)}(z) + \tilde{C}_2 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{C} m^{-\delta} \end{aligned}$$

In steps 4 and 5 we bound $\mathcal{I}_m^{(1)}(z)$ and $\mathcal{I}_m^{(2)}(z)$ for every $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$ respectively by

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(1)}(z) \leq c_1 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} + c m^{-3/2}$$

for some suitable constants $c_1, c > 0$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(2)}(z) \leq c_2 m^{-\gamma}$$

for any $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and some constant $c_2 > 0$ depending only on γ . Thus,

$$\|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \leq c_1 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} + cm^{-3/2} + c_2 m^{-\gamma} + \tilde{C}_2 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{C} m^{-\delta}.$$

To conclude, it is easy to check that for every $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and every $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$\min\left(\frac{3}{2}, \delta, -2\delta + \frac{1}{2}, \gamma\right) \geq \frac{1}{6},$$

whence for every $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$ it holds

$$\|F_{V_m(z)} - \Phi\|_\infty \leq \bar{C} m^{-\frac{1}{6}}$$

for some constant $\bar{C} > 0$. This concludes the proof of (19).

Step 1. Let f_{B_m} denote the density of B_m and write

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{V_m(z)}(\xi) &= e^{-i\xi\sqrt{m}\frac{\mu(z)}{\sigma(z)}} \cdot \varphi_{Q_m(z)}\left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{m}\sigma(z)}\right) \\ &= e^{-i\xi\sqrt{m}\frac{\mu(z)}{\sigma(z)}} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi_{Q(\lfloor mz \rfloor, B_m)}\left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{m}\sigma(z)}\right)\right] \\ &= \int_0^1 \exp\left\{-i\xi\sqrt{m}\frac{\mu(z)}{\sigma(z)} + \lfloor mz \rfloor \log\left[1 + p\left(e^{i\xi\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}\sigma(z)}} - 1\right)\right]\right\} f_{B_m}(p) dp \end{aligned}$$

If ξ satisfies

$$|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta, \tag{D.4}$$

then (Petrov, 1975, Chapter IV, Lemma 5) guarantees that, for every $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\left|p\left(e^{\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m}\sigma(z)}} - 1\right)\right| \leq p \left|\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{m}\sigma(z)}\right| \leq C m^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, we can apply Taylor's formula to $\log\left[1 + p\left(e^{\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m}\sigma(z)}} - 1\right)\right]$ and then to $\left(e^{\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m}\sigma(z)}} - 1\right)$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{V_m(z)}(\xi) &= \int_0^1 \exp\left\{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)}\sqrt{m}[\mu(z) - zp] - \frac{\xi^2}{2}\frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)}[p - p^2]\right\} \mathfrak{R}_m(p, z, \xi) f_{B_m}(p) dp \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)}G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2}S_m(z)} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_m(B_m, z, \xi)\right] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_m(p, z, \xi) = & \exp \left\{ (mz - \lfloor mz \rfloor) \log \left[1 + p \left(e^{i\xi \frac{1}{\sqrt{m\sigma(z)}}} - 1 \right) \right] \right. \\ & + mzp \left[\left(e^{\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m\sigma(z)}}} - 1 \right) - \left(\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m\sigma(z)}} - \frac{\xi^2}{2m\sigma^2(z)} \right) \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2} mzp^2 \left[\left(e^{\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m\sigma(z)}}} - 1 \right)^2 + \frac{\xi^2}{m\sigma^2(z)} \right] \\ & \left. + mzp^3 \left(e^{\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m\sigma(z)}}} - 1 \right)^3 \int_0^1 \left(2 + tp \left(e^{\frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{m\sigma(z)}}} - 1 \right) \right)^{-2} (1-t)^2 dt \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Making use of elementary properties of the exponential together with (Petrov, 1975, Chapter IV, Lemma 5), we can prove that there exists a constant \tilde{C}_1 such that for every $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$, every $p \in [0, 1]$ and every ξ satisfying (D.4)

$$|\mathfrak{R}_m(p, z, \xi) - 1| \leq \tilde{C}_1 |\xi| m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}}.$$

It follows that

$$\varphi_{V_m(z)}(\xi) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)}G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2}S_m(z)} \right] + \mathcal{R}_1(m) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_1(m)| &= \left| \varphi_{V_m(z)}(\xi) - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)}G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2}S_m(z)} \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)}G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2}S_m(z)} \cdot [\mathfrak{R}_m(B_m, z, \xi) - 1] \right] \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \left| \exp \left\{ -i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)}\sqrt{m}[\mu(z) - zp] - \frac{\xi^2}{2}\frac{z}{\sigma^2(z)}[p - p^2] \right\} \right| \cdot |\mathfrak{R}_m(p, z, \xi) - 1| f_{B_m}(p) dp \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \tilde{C}_1 |\xi| m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} f_{B_m}(p) dp = \tilde{C}_1 |\xi| m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Now note that

$$s^2(z) = \sigma^2(z) \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\alpha z + \tau + \nu}$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)}G(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2}S(z)} \right] = \varphi_{G(z)} \left(\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} \right) \cdot e^{\frac{\xi^2}{2}S(z)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \exp \left\{ -\frac{\xi^2}{2} \cdot \left[\frac{\alpha z}{\alpha z + \tau + \nu} + \frac{\tau + \nu}{\alpha z + \tau + \nu} \right] \right\} \\
&= e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}}
\end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

Step 3. Using (D.5) and (D.6), write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \left| \frac{\varphi_{V_m(z)}(\xi) - e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}}}{\xi} \right| d\xi \\
&= \int_{|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S_m(z)} \right] + \mathcal{R}_1(m) - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right]}{\xi} \right| d\xi \\
&\leq \int_{|\xi| \leq \mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G_m(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S_m(z)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G(z) - \frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right]}{\xi} \right| d\xi + \tilde{C}_2 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C}_2 = 2\mathcal{C} \tilde{C}_1 \max_{z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]} \sigma(z)$.

Step 4. By definition of $\mathcal{I}_m^{(1)}(z)$, Jensen's inequality and the triangular inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_m^{(1)}(z) &= \int_{-\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta}^{\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-i\frac{\xi}{\sigma(z)} G_m(z)} \left(e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2} S_m(z)} - e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right) \right]}{\xi} \right| d\xi \\
&\leq \int_{-\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta}^{\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2} S_m(z)} - e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right| \right]}{|\xi|} d\xi
\end{aligned}$$

Now note that, for every $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$, $S_m(z) \geq 0$ a.s., and $S(z) \geq 0$. Since the function $[0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]; x \mapsto e^{-x}$ is 1-Lipschitz, the last term of the above inequality can be

bounded by

$$\int_{-\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta}^{\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2} S_m(z)} - e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2} S(z)} \right| \right]}{|\xi|} d\xi \leq \int_{-\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta}^{\mathcal{C} \sigma(z) m^\delta} \frac{|\xi|}{2} \mathbb{E} [|S_m(z) - S(z)|] d\xi,$$

such that

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(1)}(z) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(S_m(z) - S(z))^2]} \cdot \mathcal{C}^2 \sigma^2(z) m^{2\delta}. \tag{D.7}$$

A simple computation shows

$$\mathbb{E}[S_m(z)] = S(z) [1 + O(m^{-1})],$$

which in turn entails

$$\mathbb{E} [(S_m(z) - S(z))^2] = [\mathbb{E} [S_m^2(z)] - S^2(z)] \cdot [1 + O(m^{-2})].$$

The second moment of $S_m(z)$ can be written as follows

$$\mathbb{E} [S_m^2(z)] = \frac{z^2}{\sigma^4(z)} \cdot \{\mathbb{E} [B_m^2] - 2\mathbb{E} [B_m^3] + \mathbb{E} [B_m^4]\},$$

reducing the problem to the study of the moments of B_m . By standard results regarding the beta distribution it is known that, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E} [B_m^k] = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\tau+\varrho\alpha}{\alpha} m + k\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\tau+\nu}{\alpha} m\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\tau+\varrho\alpha}{\alpha} m\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\tau+\nu}{\alpha} m + k\right)},$$

so that, for $m \rightarrow +\infty$, a straightforward application of ([Tricomi and Erdelyi, 1951](#), formula (1)) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [B_m^k] &= \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} m\right)^k \left[1 + \frac{k(k-1)\alpha}{2(\tau + \varrho\alpha)m} + O(m^{-2})\right] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} m\right)^k \left[1 - \frac{k(k-1)\alpha}{2(\tau + \nu)m} + O(m^{-2})\right] \\ &= \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^k \left[1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{m} \eta + O(m^{-2})\right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta = \eta(\tau, \nu, \varrho, \alpha) := \frac{\alpha(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{2(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\tau + \nu)}$ is a constant not depending on k or m . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [S_m^2(z)] &= \frac{z^2}{\sigma^4(z)} \cdot \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^2 \cdot \left\{ \left[1 + \frac{2\eta}{m}\right] - 2\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} \left[1 + \frac{6\eta}{m}\right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^2 \left[1 + \frac{12\eta}{m}\right] + O(m^{-2}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{z^2}{\sigma^4(z)} \cdot \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^2 \cdot \left\{ \left(\frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{m} \cdot \left[2\eta - 12\eta\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} + 12\eta\left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^2\right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + O(m^{-2}) \right\} \\ &= S^2(z) + \frac{1}{m} g(z, \tau, \nu, \varrho, \alpha) + O(m^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

with $g(z, \tau, \nu, \varrho, \alpha) := \frac{z^2}{\sigma^4(z)} \cdot \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^2 \cdot \left[2\eta - 12\eta\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} + 12\eta\left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu}\right)^2\right]$. We can conclude that

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(S_m(z) - S(z))^2]} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} g(z, \tau, \nu, \varrho, \alpha) [1 + r_m]$$

with $r_m = O(m^{-1})$. Since all the asymptotic expansions above hold uniformly on compact sets, in the sense of (Contardi et al., 2024, Definition A.9), and the function $z \rightarrow g(z, \tau, \nu, \varrho, \alpha)$ is continuous, one can resort to (Contardi et al., 2024, Lemma A.11) to obtain

$$|R_m| := \left| \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(S_m(z) - S(z))^2]} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} g(z, \tau, \nu, \varrho, \alpha) \right| \leq \frac{c}{m^{3/2}}$$

for some suitable positive constant c . To conclude, plug the above result in (D.7) to obtain that for all $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$,

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(1)}(z) \leq c_1 m^{2\delta - \frac{1}{2}} + \frac{c}{m^{3/2}}$$

for some suitable constant $c_1 > 0$.

Step 5. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_m^{(2)}(z) &= \int_{-C\sigma(z)m^\delta}^{C\sigma(z)m^\delta} e^{-\frac{\xi^2 S(z)}{2}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{i\xi x} - 1}{\xi} [f_{G_m(z)}(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)] dx \right| d\xi \\ &\leq \int_{-C\sigma(z)m^\delta}^{C\sigma(z)m^\delta} e^{-\frac{\xi^2 S(z)}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{e^{i\xi x} - 1}{\xi} \right| |f_{G_m(z)}(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| dx d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{-C\sigma(z)m^\delta}^{C\sigma(z)m^\delta} e^{-\frac{\xi^2 S(z)}{2}} \left| \frac{e^{i\xi x} - 1}{\xi} \right| d\xi \right] |f_{G_m(z)}(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| dx \end{aligned}$$

Making use of (Petrov, 1975, Chapter IV, Lemma 5) and of the elementary properties of the Gaussian density write the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-C\sigma(z)m^\delta}^{C\sigma(z)m^\delta} e^{-\frac{\xi^2 S(z)}{2}} \left| \frac{e^{i\xi x} - 1}{\xi} \right| d\xi &\leq \int_{-C\sigma(z)m^\delta}^{C\sigma(z)m^\delta} e^{-\frac{\xi^2 S(z)}{2}} |x| d\xi \\ &\leq |x| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{\xi^2 S(z)}{2}} d\xi \\ &= |x| \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{S(z)}} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, letting $c(z) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{S(z)}}$,

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(2)} \leq c(z) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x| \cdot |f_{G_m(z)}(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| dx \quad (\text{D.8})$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f_{G_m(z)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin [-\sqrt{m}\mu(z), \sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))] \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{mz}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\tau+\nu}{\alpha} m)}{\Gamma(\frac{\tau+\rho\alpha}{\alpha} m) \Gamma(\frac{\nu-\rho\alpha}{\alpha} m)} \cdot \left(\frac{\tau+\rho\alpha}{\tau+\nu} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{mz}}\right)^{\frac{\tau+\rho\alpha}{\alpha} m-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu-\rho\alpha}{\tau+\nu} + \frac{x}{\sqrt{mz}}\right)^{\frac{\nu-\rho\alpha}{\alpha} m-1} & \text{if } x \in [-\sqrt{m}\mu(z), \sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))] \\ =: \psi_m(x) & \text{if } x \notin [-\sqrt{m}\mu(z), \sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))] \end{cases}$$

and

$$f_{G(z)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s^2(z)}} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2s^2(z)}\right\}.$$

Introduce $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and let $A_m = c m^\gamma$, with c a positive constant such that $-\mu(z)\sqrt{m} < -A_m < 0 < A_m < (z - \mu(z))\sqrt{m}$ for all $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$, and write the integral in the RHS of (D.8) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x| \cdot |f_{G_m(z)}(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| \, dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{-\sqrt{m}\mu(z)} -x f_{G(z)}(x) \, dx + \int_{-\sqrt{m}\mu(z)}^{-A_m} |x| \cdot |\psi_m(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| \, dx \\ & \quad + \int_{A_m}^{-A_m} |x| \cdot |\psi_m(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| \, dx \\ & \quad + \int_{A_m}^{\sqrt{m}(z-\mu(z))} |x| \cdot |\psi_m(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| \, dx + \int_{\sqrt{m}(z-\mu(z))}^{+\infty} x f_{G(z)}(x) \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{-A_m} -x f_{G(z)}(x) \, dx + \int_{-\sqrt{m}\mu(z)}^{-A_m} |x| \psi_m(x) \, dx \\ & \quad + \int_{A_m}^{-A_m} |x| \cdot |\psi_m(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| \, dx \\ & \quad + \int_{A_m}^{\sqrt{m}(z-\mu(z))} |x| \psi_m(x) \, dx + \int_{\sqrt{m}(z-\mu(z))}^{+\infty} x f_{G(z)}(x) \, dx \\ &= \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)} + \text{(IV)} + \text{(V)} \end{aligned}$$

The terms (I) and (V) vanish exponentially fast as $m \rightarrow +\infty$, in fact for any $\zeta > 0$

$$\int_{\zeta}^{+\infty} x f_{G(z)}(x) \, dx = \frac{s(z)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{\zeta^2}{s^2(z)}},$$

whence

$$\text{(I)} = \frac{s(z)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{c^2 m^{2\gamma}}{s^2(z)}}$$

and

$$(V) = \frac{s(z)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{c^2 m^{2\gamma}}{s^2(z)}}.$$

We now study (II) and (IV). By a straightforward application of Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (II) &= \mathbb{E} \left[|G_m(z)| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{G_m(z) \in [-\sqrt{m}\mu(z), -A_m]\}} \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\text{Var}(G_m(z))} \cdot \sqrt{P[G_m(z) \in [-\sqrt{m}\mu(z), -A_m]]}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\text{Var}(G_m(z)) = mz^2 \text{Var}(B_m) = z^2 \frac{\alpha(\tau + \rho\alpha)(\nu - \rho\alpha)}{(\tau + \nu)^3} \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \right] \leq z^2 \tilde{c}_1$$

for some suitable constant \tilde{c}_1 . By Chebichev's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} P(G_m(z) \in [-\sqrt{m}\mu(z), -A_m]) &\leq P(G_m(z) \leq -A_m) + P(G_m(z) \geq A_m) \\ &\leq \frac{\text{Var}(G_m(z))}{A_m^2} \\ &\leq z^2 \tilde{c}_2 m^{-2\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

for a suitable constant \tilde{c}_2 . Combining these results we obtain

$$(II) \leq z^2 \tilde{c} m^{-\gamma}$$

for $\tilde{c} = \sqrt{\tilde{c}_1 \tilde{c}_2}$. The same argument allows to prove

$$(IV) \leq z^2 \tilde{c} m^{-\gamma}$$

To assess the behavior of (III), use the well-known asymptotic expansion of the Gamma function for large argument (DLMF, 2024, Equation (5.11.3)) and some simple algebraic rearrangements to write that, as $m \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\psi_m(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{z^2\alpha(\tau + \nu)}} \cdot \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}z}\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} + \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}z}\right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \cdot \left\{ \left(\frac{\tau + \nu}{\tau + \varrho\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha}} \left(\frac{\tau + \nu}{\nu - \varrho\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}z}\right)^{\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha}} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} + \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}z}\right)^{\frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\alpha}} \right\}^m \\
&\quad \cdot \mathfrak{R}_1^{(m)} \\
&= \exp \left\{ m \cdot \left[\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \log \left(1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}\mu(z)} \right) + \frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \log \left(1 + \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))} \right) \right] \right\} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \Psi_m(z, x) \cdot \mathfrak{R}_1^{(m)}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Psi_m(z, x) = \sqrt{\frac{(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}{z^2\alpha(\tau + \nu)}} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}z}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\tau + \nu} + \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}z}\right)}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{R}_1^{(m)} = \frac{\Gamma^* \left(\frac{\tau + \nu}{\alpha} m \right)}{\Gamma^* \left(\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} m \right) \Gamma^* \left(\frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} m \right)}.$$

We focus first on the behavior of these last two terms as $m \rightarrow +\infty$; simple algebraic rearrangements allow to write

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_m(z, x) &= \sqrt{\frac{\alpha(\tau + \nu)^3}{z^2(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{x(\tau + \nu)}{\sqrt{m}z} \left(\frac{1}{\nu - \varrho\alpha} - \frac{1}{\tau + \varrho\alpha} \right) - \frac{x^2(\tau + \nu)^2}{mz(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)}} \\
&= \frac{1}{s(z)} \left[1 + O \left(\frac{x}{m^{1/2}} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$. Resorting again to (DLMF, 2024, Equations (5.11.3) and (5.11.4)), we also obtain

$$\mathfrak{R}_1^{(m)} = \frac{1 + \frac{\alpha}{12(\tau + \nu)m} + O(m^{-2})}{1 + \frac{\alpha(\tau + \nu)}{12(\tau + \varrho\alpha)(\nu - \varrho\alpha)m} + O(m^{-2})} = 1 + O(m^{-1}).$$

uniformly for $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$. For the exponential term, use Taylor's expansion of the logarithm around 1 to write

$$\exp \left\{ m \cdot \left[\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \log \left(1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}\mu(z)} \right) + \frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \log \left(1 + \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))} \right) \right] \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \exp \left\{ m \cdot \left[\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \left(-\frac{x}{\sqrt{m}\mu(z)} - \frac{x^2}{2m\mu^2(z)} \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))} - \frac{x^2}{2m(z - \mu(z))^2} \right) \right] \right\} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_2^{(m)}(x, z) \\
&= \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{s^2(z)} \right\} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_2^{(m)}(x, z)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{R}_2^{(m)}(x, z) = \exp \left\{ m \cdot \left[\frac{\tau + \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \left(\log \left(1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}\mu(z)} \right) + \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}\mu(z)} + \frac{x^2}{2m\mu^2(z)} \right) \right. \right. \\
\left. \left. + \frac{\nu - \varrho\alpha}{\alpha} \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))} \right) - \frac{x}{\sqrt{m}(z - \mu(z))} + \frac{x^2}{2m(z - \mu(z))^2} \right) \right] \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

As $m \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\mathfrak{R}_2^{(m)}(x, z) = 1 + O\left(\frac{x^3}{m^{1/2}}\right)$$

uniformly for $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$. Combining all the above results we can write

$$\psi_m(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}s(z)} \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{s^2(z)} \right\} [1 + \mathcal{R}_m(x, z)] = f_{G(z)}(x) [1 + \mathcal{R}_m(x, z)]$$

with

$$\mathcal{R}_m(x, z) = O\left(\frac{x^3}{m^{1/2}}\right)$$

uniformly for $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$. Resorting again to (Contardi et al., 2024, Lemma A.11), this in turn implies

$$|\psi_m(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| \leq \frac{C x^3}{m^{1/2}}$$

for every $x \in [-A_m, A_m]$ and $z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]$, for some constant $C > 0$, whence

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(III)} &= \int_{A_m}^{-A_m} |x| \cdot |\psi_m(x) - f_{G(z)}(x)| \, dx \\
&\leq \int_{A_m}^{-A_m} |x| \cdot \frac{C x^3}{m^{1/2}} \, dx \\
&\leq \frac{C \mathbb{E}[G(z)^4]}{m^{1/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion,

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(2)}(z) \leq \frac{s(z)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left[e^{-\frac{c^2 m^{2\gamma}}{s^2(z)}} + e^{-\frac{c^2 m^{2\gamma}}{s^2(z)}} \right] + 2z^2 c m^{-\gamma} + \mathcal{C} \mathbb{E} [G(z)^4] m^{-1/2}$$

Recalling that $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we conclude

$$\mathcal{I}_m^{(2)}(z) \leq C_2(z) m^{-\gamma} \leq c_2 m^{-\gamma}$$

for some continuous function $C_2 : [\zeta_0, \zeta_1] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ depending only on γ and $c_2 = \max_{z \in [\zeta_0, \zeta_1]} C_2(z)$. \square

E Additional numerical illustrations

This section collects additional figures displaying the performance gap between the Mittag-Leffler credible intervals and the Gaussian confidence intervals, and its behavior with respect to the additional sample size m on the datasets, both synthetic and real, considered in Section 4.

E.1 Synthetic data

Figure E.1 complements the analysis of the synthetic datasets in Section 4 (Table 2 and Table 3); in particular, it displays the coverage of the Mittag-Leffler credible interval (blue) and of the Gaussian credible interval (red) as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$. The coverages are evaluated at a uniform mesh of 50 points over $[0, 5n]$, as for Figure 1. Monte Carlo algorithms to obtain exact credible intervals and Mittag-Leffler credible intervals apply 2000 Monte Carlo samples.

Figure E.1 confirms the behavior of the coverage observed in Table 2: the coverage of the Gaussian credible intervals is nearly constant in m , with values oscillating between 95%




Figure E.1: Coverage of the Mittag-Leffler credible interval (blue) and of the Gaussian credible interval (red) as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$.


and 100%. Instead, the coverage of the Mittag-Leffler credible intervals is, for all values of m , lower than that of the corresponding Gaussian credible intervals; such a coverage increases in m .

E.2 Real data


Figure E.2 complements the analysis of the real EST datasets in Section 4 (Table 5 and Table 6); in particular, for the tomato flower, *Mastigamoeba*, *Mastigamoeba* normalized, and *Naegleria* anaerobic EST datasets, it displays BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ with 95% exact credible intervals, Mittag-Leffler credible intervals and Gaussian credible intervals as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$. Credible intervals are evaluated at a uniform mesh of 50 points

over $[0, 5n]$, as for Figure 2. Monte Carlo algorithms to obtain exact credible intervals and Mittag-Leffler credible intervals apply 2000 Monte Carlo samples.

Tomato flower




Mastigamoeba



For the tomato flower, *Mastigamoeba*, *Mastigamoeba* normalized, *Naegleria* aerobic and

Mastigamoeba, normalized



Naegleria anaerobic




Figure E.2: BNP estimates of $K_{n,m}$ (solid line $-$) with 95% exact credible intervals (dashed line $- -$), Mittag-Leffler credible intervals (violet) and Gaussian credible intervals (pink), as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$.

Naegleria anaerobic EST datasets, Figure E.3 shows the coverage of the Mittag-Leffler credible interval (blue) and of the Gaussian credible interval (red) as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$. The coverages are evaluated at a uniform mesh of 50 points over $[0, 5n]$, the same values of m considered for Figure 2 and Figure E.2.




Figure E.3: Coverage of the Mittag-Leffler credible interval (blue) and of the Gaussian credible interval (red) as a function of $m \in [0, 5n]$.

Figure E.3 confirms the behavior of the coverage observed in Table 5: the coverage of the Gaussian credible intervals is nearly constant in m , with values oscillating between 95% and 100%. Instead, the coverage of the Mittag-Leffler credible intervals is, for all values of m , lower than that of the corresponding Gaussian credible intervals; such a coverage increases in m .

References

- CHARALAMBIDES (2005) *Combinatorial methods in discrete distributions*. Wiley.
- CONTARDI, C., DOLERA, E. AND FAVARO, S. (2024). Law of large numbers and central limit theorem for Ewens-Pitman model. *Preprint arXiv:2412.11493*.
- DOLERA, E. AND FAVARO, S. (2020a). A Berry-Esseen theorem for Pitman's α -diversity. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **30**, 847–869.
- DOLERA, E. AND FAVARO, S. (2020b). Rates of convergence in de Finetti's representation theorem, and Hausdorff moment problem. *Bernoulli* **26**, 1294–1322.
- KORWAR, R.M. AND HOLLANDER, M. (1973). Contributions to the theory of Dirichlet processes. *The Annals of Probability* **1**, 705–711.
- NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <https://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.2.1.
- PETROV, V.V. (1975). *Sums of independent random variables*. Springer.
- PITMAN, J. (1995). Exchangeable and partially exchangeable random partitions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **102**, 145–158.
- PITMAN, J. (2006). *Combinatorial stochastic processes*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer Verlag.

TRICOMI, F.G. AND ERDÉLYI, A. (1951). The asymptotic expansion of a ratio of Gamma functions. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **1**, 133–142.