

AN INTERPOLATING FAMILY OF SIZE DISTRIBUTIONS

CORINNE SINNER*, YVES DOMINICY[†], CHRISTOPHE LEY[‡],
JULIEN TRUFIN* AND PATRICK WEBER*

**Department of Mathematics, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium,
E-Mail: csinner@ulb.ac.be, julien.trufin@ulb.ac.be, pweber@ulb.ac.be.*

*[†]SBSEM, ECARES, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium,
E-Mail: yves.dominicy@ulb.ac.be.*

*[‡]Department of Applied Mathematics, Computer Science and Statistics,
Ghent University, Belgium,
E-Mail: christophe.ley@ugent.be.*

ABSTRACT. We introduce a new five-parameter family of size distributions on the semi-finite interval $[x_0, \infty)$, $x_0 \geq 0$, with two attractive features. First, it interpolates between power laws, such as the Pareto distribution, and power laws with exponential cut-off, such as the Weibull distribution. The proposed family is thus very flexible and spans over a broad range of well-known size distributions which are special cases of our family. Second, it has important tractability advantages over the popular five-parameter Generalized Beta distribution. We derive the hazard function, survival function, modes and quantiles, propose a random number generation procedure and discuss maximum likelihood estimation issues. Finally, we illustrate the wide applicability and fitting capacities of our new model on basis of three real data sets from very diverse domains, namely actuarial science, environmental science and survival analysis.

Keywords: Power Law, Exponential Cut-off, Generalized Beta Distribution, Flexible Modeling.

1. INTRODUCTION

Size distributions are probability laws designed to model data that only take positive values. Typical examples of such size-type data are claim sizes in actuarial science or wind speeds in meteorology. Nonetheless, the spectrum of application areas is much broader and positive observations appear naturally in survival analysis (Lawless, 2003; Lee and Wang, 2003), environmental science (Marchenko and Genton, 2010), network traffic modeling (Mitzenmacher, 2004), reliability theory (Rausand and Høyland, 2004), economics (Eeckhout, 2004; Luttmmer, 2007; Gabaix, 2016) and hydrology (Clarke, 2002). Parametric distributions are a simple and effective way to convey the information contained in those data. Given the range of distinct domains of application, it is not surprising that there exists a plethora of different size distributions and that the quest for the right size distribution in a given situation has developed into a very active research area over the past years (Ortega et al., 2015; Hong and Rubio, 2016; Asgharzadeh et al., 2016).

What desirable properties should a size distribution possess? Obviously, it should be quite flexible, meaning that it is able to model very diverse data shapes, yet it should ideally remain of a tractable form. Moreover, it should be parsimonious in terms of the parameters it uses, and each parameter should bear a clear interpretation. The latter points, tractability and interpretability, are especially important to practitioners from other domains.

A very popular size distribution is the Pareto distribution, also called Pareto type I distribution, with probability density function

$$x \mapsto \frac{\alpha x_0^\alpha}{x^{\alpha+1}}, \quad x \in [x_0, \infty),$$

where $x_0 \geq 0$ is a location parameter and $\alpha > 0$ is a shape parameter known as the tail or Pareto index. Vilfredo Pareto used this law to model the distribution of income as well as the allocation of wealth among individuals (Pareto, 1964). Over the years, the Pareto law has further been applied to city sizes, file size distribution of internet traffic, sizes of meteorites, or the sizes of sand particles (Reed and Jorgensen, 2004).

The Pareto distribution is a member of the power laws, which are typically of the form $x \mapsto kx^{-\alpha}$, with normalizing constant k and power exponent $\alpha > 0$. Power law distributions are employed in a vast range of situations, such as the modeling of the number of hits on web pages (Huberman and Adamic, 1999), income of top earners in areas of arts, sports and business (Rosen, 1981), and inequalities of income and wealth (Piketty and Zucman, 2014; Toda and Walsh, 2015). For further information and references, we refer the interested reader to Sornette (2003) and Mitzenmacher (2004).

A popular alternative to power laws are power laws with exponential cut-off, whose densities take the form $x \mapsto kx^{-\alpha}e^{-\beta x}$ with normalizing constant k , power exponent $\alpha > 0$ and rate parameter $\beta > 0$. A power law with exponential cut-off behaves like a power law for small values of x , while its tail behavior is governed by a decreasing exponential. A famous representative of this class of distributions is the Weibull distribution with density

$$x \mapsto \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right)^{\alpha-1} e^{-\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right)^\alpha}, \quad x \in [0, \infty),$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is a shape parameter regulating tail-weight and $\sigma > 0$ is a scale parameter. While the Weibull distribution already appeared in Rosin and Rammeler (1933) to describe the distribution of particle sizes, it gained its prominence and name after Waloddi Weibull who showed in 1951 that the distribution can be successfully applied to seven very different case studies. Nowadays, the Weibull distribution is widely used in various domains such as life data analysis (Nelson, 2005), wind speed modeling (Manwell et al., 2009) and hydrology (Clarke, 2002).

Given the wealth of different size distributions, the practitioner is often confronted to the question “Which distribution shall I use in what situation?”. The disparity between the Pareto and the Weibull, and more generally between power laws and power laws with exponential cut-off, renders this choice even more delicate. A solution to this dilemma has been proposed by McDonald and Xu (1995) who introduced the Generalized Beta (GB) distribution with density

$$\text{GB}(x; a, b, c, p, q) = \frac{|a|x^{ap-1}(1 - (1 - c)(\frac{x}{b})^a)^{q-1}}{b^{ap}B(p, q)(1 + c(\frac{x}{b})^a)^{p+q}}, \quad x^a \in \left(0, \frac{b^a}{1 - c}\right).$$

Here, $B(p, q)$ stands for the beta function, the parameter c satisfies $0 \leq c \leq 1$, the shape parameter a is non-zero whilst the scale parameter b , the shape parameter p as well as the skewness parameter q are all positive. The GB is extremely flexible and incorporates more than thirty known distributions as special cases, among which the Pareto and Weibull. In particular, it encompasses the already broad four-parameter subfamilies GB1 and GB2 suggested by McDonald (1984). These respectively correspond to $\text{GB1}(x; a, b, p, q) = \text{GB}(x; a, b, c = 0, p, q)$ and $\text{GB2}(x; a, b, p, q) = \text{GB}(x; a, b, c = 1, p, q)$. The GB distribution is attractive because of this versatility, as it enables different shapes (see Figure 1) and hence avoids the researcher or practitioner to try out various choices of distributions.




FIGURE 1. Density plots of the GB distribution for various choices of parameters.

However, this family of distributions also suffers from serious flaws such as the absence of a tractable cumulative distribution function, entailing a very intricate quantile structure and rendering random variable generation difficult. For further information about the GB and a general overview on size distributions, we refer the interested reader to McDonald and Xu (1995) and Kleiber and Kotz (2003).

In the present paper, we propose a viable alternative to the very popular GB distribution that shares many of its advantages but overcomes its major shortcomings. The new size distribution has the density

$$\text{IF}(x; p, b, c, q, x_0) = \frac{|b|q}{c} \left(\frac{x - x_0}{c} \right)^{b-1} G_p(x)^{-q-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} G_p(x)^{-q} \right)^p, \quad (1)$$

for $x \in [x_0, \infty)$, and with $p \in [0, \infty]$, $b \neq 0$, $c, q > 0$, $x_0 \geq 0$ and

$$G_p(x) = (p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x - x_0}{c} \right)^b.$$

The roles of the various parameters at play will be laid out in Section 2.2. The alerted reader will certainly already have recognized the densities of various size distributions in (1), including the Pareto and Weibull. The originality of our proposal rests on its construction: we are using a technique from statistical mechanics (see Section 2) that allows us to interpolate between the Pareto and Weibull distributions, even more generally, between power laws and power laws with exponential cut-off. Thus, we are precisely finding a path from one end of the spectrum to the other, and this moreover in a constructive way.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the new five-parameter family of size distributions, explain how it interpolates between power laws and power laws with exponential cut-off and elucidate the role of

each of the five parameters. In Section 3 we summarize some of the special cases belonging to the Interpolating Family of size distributions. Section 4 presents the main properties of the family such as the cumulative distribution function, survival function, quantile function, random number generation procedure, moments and mode, while Section 5 contains a discussion on inferential aspects. In Section 6 we analyze three real data sets from distinct areas, namely actuarial science, environmental science and survival analysis, to show the flexibility and effectiveness of the newly introduced family of size distributions. Section 7 concludes and technical derivations are presented in the Appendix.

2. THE INTERPOLATING FAMILY: CONSTRUCTION AND PARAMETER INTERPRETATION

In this section we present in detail our new five-parameter family of size distributions, which we call *Interpolating Family* for reasons that will become obvious through the construction described in Section 2.1. Section 2.2 expounds on the role of each of the five parameters.

2.1. Construction of the family. As announced in the Introduction, our goal is to build a size distribution which incorporates both power laws and power laws with exponential cut-off. To show that (1) indeed satisfies this requirement, we start by writing up power law distributions and power law distributions with exponential cut-off in a unified language.

2.1.1. Power laws. The probability density function (pdf) of a typical power law distribution corresponds to

$$x \mapsto q(1+x)^{-q-1}, \quad x \in [0, \infty),$$

where the tail behavior is governed by the shape parameter $q > 0$. To get a more flexible distribution, one may add various parameters, such as a scale parameter $c > 0$, a location parameter $x_0 \geq 0$ and/or a shape parameter $b > 0$, leading to

$$x \mapsto \frac{bq}{c} \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{b-1} \left(1 + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^b \right)^{-q-1}, \quad x \in [x_0, \infty).$$

Alternatively, in terms of the function $G_0(x) = 1 + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^b$, the pdf can be written under the form

$$f_0(x) = q g_0(x) G_0(x)^{-q-1}, \quad x \in [x_0, \infty),$$

where $g_0(x) = \frac{d}{dx} G_0(x) = \frac{b}{c} \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{b-1}$. We point out that the function $G_0(x)$ has been chosen such that the following boundary conditions are satisfied: $G_0(x_0) = 1$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} G_0(x) = \infty$.

2.1.2. Power laws with exponential cut-off. The pdf of a typical power law distribution with exponential cut-off reads

$$x \mapsto qx^{-q-1}e^{-x^{-q}}, \quad x \in [0, \infty).$$

The shape parameter $q > 0$ still controls the tail behavior and, just as for power laws, we may increase the flexibility of the model by adding scale, location and shape parameters to get

$$x \mapsto \frac{bq}{c} \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{-bq-1} e^{-\left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{-bq}}, \quad x \in [x_0, \infty).$$

Alternatively, we may write the pdf in terms of the function $G_\infty(x) = \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^b$ as

$$f_\infty(x) = q g_\infty(x) G_\infty(x)^{-q-1} e^{-G_\infty(x)^{-q}}, \quad x \in [x_0, \infty),$$

where $g_\infty(x) = \frac{d}{dx}G_\infty(x) = \frac{b}{c} \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^{b-1}$. Note that the function $G_\infty(x)$ has been chosen such that $G_\infty(x_0) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} G_\infty(x) = \infty$.

2.1.3. Interpolating Family. If we want a highly flexible distribution including both power laws and power laws with exponential cut-off, we need a way to build densities interpolating between $f_0(x)$ and $f_\infty(x)$. To this end, we introduce a mild variant of the one-parameter deformation of the exponential function popularized in the seminal paper Tsallis (1988) in the context of non-extensive statistical mechanics. A more detailed account can be found in the review paper Tsallis (2002).

For any $p \in [0, \infty]$, we define the p -exponential¹ by

$$e_p(x) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}x\right)^p, \quad x \in [0, p+1].$$

The extreme cases $p = 0$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$ respectively correspond to $e_0(x) = 1$ over $[0, 1]$ and $e_\infty(x) = e^{-x}$ over $[0, \infty)$. With this in mind, it is natural to consider densities of the type

$$f_p(x) = q g_p(x) G_p(x)^{-q-1} e_p(G_p(x)^{-q}), \quad x \in [x_0, \infty), \quad (2)$$

with $g_p(x) = \frac{d}{dx}G_p(x)$, where we have not defined the function $G_p(x)$ yet. Just as $e_p(x)$ interpolates between 1 and e^{-x} , the mapping G_p should also vary between G_0 and G_∞ . Hence, with the parameters $c > 0$, $b > 0$ and $x_0 \geq 0$ bearing the same interpretation as before, the map G_p could be chosen as $G_p(x) = k + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b$ for some constant k . A quick calculation shows that $k = (p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}}$ is the right choice for $f_p(x)$ to integrate to one over its domain. Consequently

$$G_p(x) = (p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b, \quad x \in [x_0, \infty).$$

Since $G_p(x)^{-q}$ with $q > 0$ maps $[x_0, \infty)$ onto $[0, p+1]$, the function $e_p(G_p(x)^{-q})$ is well-defined. The pointwise convergence of the resulting density f_p to f_0 as p tends to zero (respectively f_p to f_∞ as $p \rightarrow \infty$) can be shown by straightforward limit calculations which we omit here.

The density (2) now almost corresponds to the density announced in the Introduction. Relaxing the condition $b > 0$ into $b \in \mathbb{R}_0$, we finally end up with

$$\text{IF}(x; p, b, c, q, x_0) = \text{sign}(b)q g_p(x) G_p(x)^{-q-1} e_p(G_p(x)^{-q}), \quad x \in [x_0, \infty). \quad (3)$$

The relaxation on b only entails a minor change in the normalizing constant, which remains extremely simple. We call IF the *Interpolating Family* of size distributions. The density depends on five parameters p, b, c, q and x_0 , which we will discuss in more detail in the next section.

2.2. Interpretation of the parameters. For the sake of illustration, we provide density plots of the IF distribution in Figure 2. Except for the parameter we are varying, all the parameters remain fixed to $p = 1$, $b = 1$, $c = 200$, $q = 2$ and $x_0 = 0$.

¹We would like to point out that the classical q -exponential defined by Tsallis has the form $\tilde{e}_q(x) = (1 + (1-q)x)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$. We slightly modified the deformation path in order to simplify the calculations.




FIGURE 2. Density plots of the IF distribution where, except for the parameter we vary in each plot, the parameters remain fixed to $p = 1$, $b = 1$, $c = 200$, $q = 2$ and $x_0 = 0$.

Figure 2 provides a visual inspection of the roles endorsed by the five parameters: $x_0 \geq 0$ is a location parameter (smaller than the lowest value of the data), $c > 0$ a scale parameter, $q > 0$ a tail-weight parameter, and $b \in \mathbb{R}_0$ a shape parameter regulating the skewness. By changing the sign of b in IF, one gets the Inverse-IF distribution (such as, for instance, the Rayleigh and Inverse Rayleigh distribution, see below). A crucial role is played by $p \in [0, \infty]$ as it enables us to interpolate between power laws and power laws with exponential cut-off. We therefore name it *interpolation parameter*.

3. SPECIAL CASES AND THREE MAIN IF SUBFAMILIES

One major appeal of the IF distribution is that it contains a plethora of well-known size distributions as special cases. For a clearer structure, we define three four-parameter subfamilies:

- the IF1 distribution where $p = 0$,
- the IF2 distribution where $p \rightarrow \infty$,
- the IF3 distribution where $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $b = 1$.

Of course, there remain several other parameter combinations in the Interpolating Family, and perhaps in the future other interesting subfamilies will be given special attention.

The IF1 distribution. In the power law limit $p = 0$, the pdf of the resulting four-parameter family of distributions, called *Interpolating Family of the first kind (IF1)*, is given by

$$f_0(x) = \text{sign}(b)q g_0(x)G_0(x)^{-q-1} = \frac{|b|q}{c} \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{b-1} \left(1 + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^b \right)^{-q-1},$$

where $x \in [x_0, \infty)$. Special cases of the IF1 distribution are, in decreasing order of the number of parameters, the Lindsay–Burr type III distribution ($b < 0$), the Pareto type IV distribution ($b > 0$), the Dagum distribution ($b < 0$ and $x_0 = 0$), the Pareto type II distribution ($b = 1$), the Pareto type III distribution ($b > 0$ and $q = 1$), the Tadikamalla–Burr type XII distribution ($b > 0$ and $x_0 = 0$), the Pareto type I distribution ($b = 1$ and $c = x_0 > 0$), the Lomax distribution ($b = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$), the Burr type XII distribution ($b > 0, c = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$) and the Fisk distribution ($b > 0, q = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$).

The IF2 distribution. In the power law with exponential cut-off limit $p \rightarrow \infty$, the pdf of the resulting four-parameter family of distributions, called *Interpolating Family of the second kind (IF2)*, is given by

$$f_\infty(x) = \text{sign}(b)q g_\infty(x)G_\infty(x)^{-q-1}e^{-G_\infty(x)^{-q}} = \frac{|b|q}{c} \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{-bq-1} e^{-\left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^{-bq}},$$


where $x \in [x_0, \infty)$. Special cases of the IF2 distribution are, in decreasing order of the number of parameters, the Weibull distribution ($b = -1$; if moreover $x_0 = 0$, we find the two-parameter Weibull distribution), the Fréchet distribution ($b = 1$; if moreover $x_0 = 0$, we find the two-parameter Fréchet distribution), the Gumbel type II distribution ($b = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$), the Rayleigh distribution ($b = -1, q = 2$ and $x_0 = 0$), the Inverse Rayleigh distribution ($b = 1, q = 2$ and $x_0 = 0$), the Exponential distribution ($b = -1, q = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$), and the Inverse Exponential distribution ($b = 1, q = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$).

The IF3 distribution. The *Interpolating Family of the third kind (IF3)* is characterized by $0 < p < \infty$ and $b = 1$, resulting in the pdf

$$f_{p,1}(x) = \frac{q}{c} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{-q-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^{-q} \right)^p,$$

where $x \in [x_0, \infty)$. Special cases of the IF3 distribution are the Generalized Lomax distribution ($x_0 = 0$) and the Stoppa distribution ($x_0 = c(p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}}$).

Distribution tree. A visual summary of the structure inherent to the Interpolating Family of distributions with its various special cases is given in the *distribution tree* depicted below. Since the inverse of each distribution is obtained by switching the sign of the parameter b , we only give the tree for positive values of b .



4. MAIN PROPERTIES

In this section we present and discuss the main properties of the IF distribution. Since it contains so many special cases, the subsequent results provide in a single sweep those properties for the various distributions mentioned in Section 3.

4.1. Cumulative distribution function, survival function and hazard function. One major advantage of the IF distribution is that the cumulative distribution function (cdf) can be written under closed form:

$$F_p(x) = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} G_p(x)^{-q}\right)^{p+1} & \text{if } b > 0, \\ 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} G_p(x)^{-q}\right)^{p+1} & \text{if } b < 0. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Consequently, the survival or reliability function $S_p(x) = 1 - F_p(x)$ is extremely simple, too. The same holds true for the hazard function, defined as the quotient of the pdf and the survival function:

$$H_p(x) = \frac{f_p(x)}{S_p(x)} = \begin{cases} q g_p(x) G_p(x)^{-q-1} \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} G_p(x)^{-q}\right)^p}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} G_p(x)^{-q}\right)^{p+1}} & \text{if } b > 0, \\ -q g_p(x) G_p(x)^{-q-1} \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} G_p(x)^{-q}\right)} & \text{if } b < 0. \end{cases}$$

4.2. Quantile function and median. Very conveniently, the quantile function takes a nice form thanks to the simple expression of the cdf (4). Given the wide range of quantile-based statistical tools and methods such as QQ-plots, interquartile range or quantile regression, this is a very welcomed feature of the IF distribution. For $b > 0$, the quantile function is given by

$$Q_p^+(y) = F_p^{-1}(y) = \begin{cases} x_0 + c \left((1-y)^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{b}} & \text{if } p = 0, \\ x_0 + c(p+1)^{-\frac{1}{bq}} \left(\left((1-y^{\frac{1}{p+1}})^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{b}} \right) & \text{if } 0 < p < \infty, \\ x_0 + c \left(\ln \left(\frac{1}{y} \right) \right)^{-\frac{1}{bq}} & \text{if } p \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases}$$

for $y \in [0, 1]$. The expression for $b < 0$ is readily obtained via the relationship $Q_p^-(y) = Q_p^+(1-y)$, and we define the quantile function $Q_p(y)$ as $Q_p^+(y)$ if $b > 0$ and as $Q_p^-(y)$ if $b < 0$. The median is uniquely defined as

$$\text{Median} = \begin{cases} x_0 + c \left((2^{\frac{1}{q}} - 1) \right)^{\frac{1}{b}} & \text{if } p = 0, \\ x_0 + c(p+1)^{-\frac{1}{bq}} \left(\left((1 - 2^{-\frac{1}{p+1}})^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{b}} \right) & \text{if } 0 < p < \infty, \\ x_0 + c (\ln(2))^{-\frac{1}{bq}} & \text{if } p \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases}$$

4.3. Random variable generation. The closed form of the quantile functions entails a straightforward random variable generation process from the IF. Indeed, it suffices to generate a random variable U from a uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 1]$, and then apply Q_p to it. The resulting random variable $Q_p(U)$ follows the IF distribution. The simplicity of the procedure is particularly important for Monte Carlo simulation purposes.

4.4. Moments. Mean and variance of the IF1, IF2 and IF3 distributions can be written out explicitly in terms of the Gamma and Beta functions.

- Mean and variance of the IF1 distribution ($p = 0$) are given by

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = x_0 + cq B\left(q - \frac{1}{b}, 1 + \frac{1}{b}\right) \quad \text{if } \begin{cases} b > 0 \text{ and } 1 < bq, \\ b < 0 \text{ and } 1 < -b, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

and

$$\mathbb{V}(X) = c^2 \left[q B \left(q - \frac{2}{b}, 1 + \frac{2}{b} \right) - \left(q B \left(q - \frac{1}{b}, 1 + \frac{1}{b} \right) \right)^2 \right] \quad \text{if } \begin{cases} b > 0 \text{ and } 2 < bq, \\ b < 0 \text{ and } 2 < -b. \end{cases}$$

- Mean and variance of the IF2 distribution ($p \rightarrow \infty$) are given by

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = x_0 + c \Gamma \left(1 - \frac{1}{bq} \right) \quad \text{if } \begin{cases} b > 0 \text{ and } 1 < bq, \\ b < 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathbb{V}(X) = c^2 \left[\Gamma \left(1 - \frac{2}{bq} \right) - \left(\Gamma \left(1 - \frac{1}{bq} \right) \right)^2 \right] \quad \text{if } \begin{cases} b > 0 \text{ and } 2 < bq, \\ b < 0. \end{cases}$$

- Mean and variance of the IF3 distribution ($0 < p < \infty$ and $b = 1$) are

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = x_0 + c(p+1)^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \left(B \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}, p+1 \right) - \frac{1}{p+1} \right) \quad \text{if } 1 < q,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(X) &= c^2(p+1)^{1-\frac{2}{q}} \left[B \left(1 - \frac{2}{q}, p+1 \right) - \frac{1}{p+1} \right] \\ &\quad + c^2(p+1)^{2-\frac{2}{q}} \left[B \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}, p+1 \right) - \frac{1}{p+1} \right]^2 \quad \text{if } 2 < q. \end{aligned}$$

To get a flavor of the underlying calculations, we stress that, e.g., expression (5) is best obtained by first performing the change of variable $y = \left(1 + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c} \right)^b \right)^{-1}$. For higher-order moment expressions, we refer the interested reader to Sinner and Weber (2016), available on the ArXiv. That paper also discusses entropic properties of the Interpolating Family.

4.5. Modality. Determining the mode of a distribution is an important issue, which we tackle in this section. The detailed calculations are deferred to the Appendix. We study the derivative of $x \mapsto f_p(x)$, with particular emphasis on the three main subfamilies IF1, IF2 and IF3 described in Section 3.

The derivative of the pdf vanishes either at the boundary $x = x_0$ of the domain or at

$$x = x_0 + c(p+1)^{-\frac{1}{bq}} \left(t^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{b}},$$

where t is solution of the almost cyclic equation

$$(b-1)t^{-\frac{1}{q}}(1-t) - b(q+1)(t^{-\frac{1}{q}}-1)(1-t) + pbq(t^{-\frac{1}{q}}-1)t = 0. \quad (6)$$

This allows us to draw the following conclusions regarding the modality of the IF distribution.

- The mode of the IF1 distribution ($p = 0$) is given by

$$\begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } b = -\frac{1}{q} \text{ or } b = 1, \\ x_0 + c \left(\frac{b-1}{bq+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{b}} & \text{if } b < -\frac{1}{q} \text{ or } b > 1, \end{cases}$$

whereas in the remaining cases, i.e. $b \in]-\frac{1}{q}; 1[$, there is a vertical asymptote in $x = x_0$. We plot in Figure 3 a contour plot of the mode of the IF1 distribution.




FIGURE 3. Contour plot of the mode of the IF1 distribution with parameters $c = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$.

- The mode of the IF2 distribution ($p \rightarrow \infty$) is given by

$$\begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } b = -\frac{1}{q}, \\ x_0 + c \left(\frac{bq}{bq+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{bq}} & \text{if } b < -\frac{1}{q} \text{ or } b > 0, \end{cases}$$

whereas in the remaining cases, i.e. $b \in]-\frac{1}{q}, 0]$, there is a vertical asymptote in $x = x_0$. Figure 4 shows a contour plot of the mode of the IF2 distribution.




FIGURE 4. Contour plot of the mode of the IF2 distribution with parameters $c = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$.

- The mode of the IF3 distribution ($0 < p < \infty$ and $b = 1$) is given by

$$x_0 + c(p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \left(\left(\frac{q+1}{(p+1)q+1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1 \right).$$

A contour plot of the mode of the IF3 distribution can be seen in Figure 5.

We see that all three subfamilies are unimodal, which is coherent with the related special cases from the literature. Moreover, we have derived the exact expressions of the modes. This unimodality is a very attractive feature from an interpretability point of view: bimodal or multimodal distributions are arguably best modeled as a mixture of unimodal distributions. It is therefore not surprising that many new distributions are built with the target of being unimodal; for recent examples, see e.g. Jones (2014); Kato and Jones (2015); Fujisawa and Abe (2015).




FIGURE 5. Contour plot of the mode of the IF3 distribution with parameters $c = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$.

5. INFERRENTIAL ASPECTS

5.1. Parameter estimation. Let (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) be independent and identically distributed observations from a population with density (3). Then the log-likelihood function can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(p, b, c, q, x_0) &= n \ln \left(\frac{|b|q}{c^b} \right) + (b-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \ln(x_i - x_0) \\ &\quad - (q+1) \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x_i - x_0}{c} \right)^b \right) \\ &\quad + p \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x_i - x_0}{c} \right)^b \right)^{-q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Deriving the score functions is straightforward by differentiating the log-likelihood function with respect to each of the parameters p, b, c, q, x_0 . To estimate the parameter x_0 we impose the constraint that it is smaller than or equal to the lowest value of the data set. The related likelihood equations can readily be solved by any numerical root-finding algorithm. We carried out the calculations in Section 6 with *Wolfram Mathematica 10*. More precisely, we used the function *NMaximize* with the numerical maximization algorithm *Random search method* enhanced with the option *InteriorPoint* and we limited the maximum number of iterations to 10^6 .

5.2. Submodel testing. We have shown in Section 3 the many distinct submodels that the IF nests. Consequently, it is natural to propose tests for submodels within the IF. This can be done by likelihood ratio tests. For each parameter $\eta \in \{p, b, c, q, x_0\}$, we denote by $\hat{\eta}$ the unconstrained maximum likelihood estimate and by $\hat{\eta}_r$ the maximum likelihood estimate under the restricted submodel of interest. For example, testing for the Pareto type I distribution against the larger IF model can be achieved by the test statistic

$$T_{\text{Pareto}} = -2 \left(\ell(0, 1, \hat{c}_r, \hat{q}_r, \hat{c}_r) - \ell(\hat{p}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{q}, \hat{x}_0) \right)$$

rejecting $\mathcal{H}_0 : \{b = 1\} \cap \{x_0 = c\}$ at asymptotic level α whenever T_{Pareto} exceeds $\chi_{3,1-\alpha}^2$, the α -upper quantile of the chi-squared distribution with three degrees of freedom. Similarly, testing for the Weibull against the IF distribution leads to the test statistic

$$T_{\text{Weibull}} = -2 \left(\ell(\infty, -1, \hat{c}_r, \hat{q}_r, 0) - \ell(\hat{p}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{q}, \hat{x}_0) \right)$$

to be compared with $\chi_{3;1-\alpha}^2$. Similar submodel tests, against other families in which the Pareto and Weibull are respectively nested, are proposed in Falk et al. (2008) and Mudholkar et al. (1996), to cite but these.

5.3. Dealing with censored data. In survival analysis, the data are most often sampled from a population containing censored observations. Depending on when this phenomenon occurs, the observations can be attributed to one of the four following sets: Obs={the phenomenon occurs during the study and the observation is uncensored}, Left={the phenomenon occurs before the start of the study}, Int={the phenomenon occurs within a finite interval of time}, or Right={the phenomenon does not occur during the period of the study}. The contribution of censored observations to the likelihood function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(p, b, c, q, x_0) = & \prod_{j \in \text{Obs}} f_p(x_j) \prod_{j \in \text{Left}} F_p(x_j) \prod_{j \in \text{Right}} (1 - F_p(x_j)) \\ & \prod_{j \in \text{Int}} (F_p(x_j^R) - F_p(x_j^L)). \end{aligned}$$

The maximum likelihood estimates for the parameters are then derived in a similar fashion as for the non-censored data of Section 5.1. The very simple closed-form expression of the cdf, see Section 4, seems tailor-made for dealing with censored data, especially in comparison to the Generalized Beta family where the cdf needs to be computed numerically.

6. APPLICATIONS

We illustrate the new family of size distributions by three applications. In the first two applications, one on liability claims data and one on fire size data, we compare the fitting capacities of the Interpolating Family of size distributions to the Generalized Beta family. Our means of comparison shall be the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). Given that the Pareto and Weibull distributions are natural choices to model respectively the first and second data set, we shall test for these submodels within the IF model by means of the tests of Section 5.2. The third application on survival data shall illustrate how well the IF is suited for dealing with censored data.

6.1. Actuarial science. We will analyze $n = 139$ motor third party liability claims, recorded during the period 1998–2013. These data are provided by a European reinsurance company. Their values can be appreciated from Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. Histogram of the actuarial liability claims data (in Euro, and divided by 10^5) together with the best-fitting IF density.

Table 1 shows the results of the maximum log-likelihood (MLL) values as well as the AIC and BIC values obtained from all the models used in this analysis, while Tables 2 and 3 contain the corresponding parameter estimates. The IF distribution has lower AIC and BIC values than the GB distribution and thus fits best the data. This fit is illustrated on Figure 6.

Distribution	k	MLL	AIC	BIC
IF	5	-499.255	1006.510	1018.248
GB	5	-499.671	1009.342	1024.014
IF1	4	-500.200	1008.400	1020.138
IF2	4	-502.034	1012.068	1023.806
IF3	4	-500.069	1008.138	1019.876
GB1	4	-500.210	1008.420	1020.158
GB2	4	-500.186	1008.372	1020.110

TABLE 1. Maximum value of the log-likelihood function as well as the AIC and BIC values for the actuarial liability claims data set.

Distribution	\hat{p}	\hat{b}	\hat{c}	\hat{q}	\hat{x}_0
IF	28.593	-0.281	0.004	30.720	10.059
IF1	0	23.368	11.447	0.073	0
IF2	∞	0.310	7.108	4.469	8.106
IF3	0.261	1	25.199	2.931	10.250

TABLE 2. Parameter estimation values of the IF distribution and of its submodels for the actuarial liability claims data.

Distribution	\hat{a}	\hat{b}	\hat{c}	\hat{p}	\hat{q}
GB	-0.421	515.021	0.808	19.166	1.307
GB1	-0.034	10.164	0	68.525	1.651
GB2	-27.680	11.652	1	0.062	0.733

TABLE 3. Parameter estimation values of the GB distribution and of its submodels for the actuarial liability claims data.

A popular choice to model this kind of data is the Pareto distribution, see for example Benktander (1970). The MLL value of the Pareto type I model is -506.417 , and the likelihood ratio test statistic for this distribution with respect to the IF distribution equals $T_{\text{Pareto}} = -2(-506.417 + 499.255) = 14.324$, yielding a p -value of 0.0025. Consequently we clearly reject the Pareto submodel in favor of the IF distribution.

6.2. Environmental science. The second data set consists of $n = 102$ means of log-burned areas of 26870 wildfires, which were grouped by watersheds. These data were recorded in Portugal during the period 1985–2005. For more information about the data, we refer to Barros et al. (2012) and García-Portugués et al. (2014, 2015).

Table 4 shows the results of the maximum log-likelihood (MLL) values as well as the AIC and BIC values obtained from all the models used in this analysis, while Tables 5 and 6 contain the corresponding parameter estimates. As we can see, the IF1 distribution happens to coincide with the best possible IF model, hence

has lowest AIC and BIC values within the Interpolating Family. The IF1 also outperforms the best Generalized Beta model, namely the GB2.

Distribution	k	MLL	AIC	BIC
IF	5	-575.591	1161.182	1174.307
GB	5	-576.066	1162.132	1175.257
IF1	4	-575.591	1159.182	1169.682
IF2	4	-577.305	1162.610	1173.110
IF3	4	-576.051	1160.102	1170.602
GB1	4	-581.418	1170.836	1181.336
GB2	4	-576.270	1160.540	1171.040

TABLE 4. Maximum value of the log-likelihood function as well as the AIC and BIC values for the environmental data.

Distribution	\hat{p}	\hat{b}	\hat{c}	\hat{q}	\hat{x}_0
IF	0	-1.769	76.503	0.801	15.357
IF1	0	-1.769	76.503	0.801	15.357
IF2	∞	0.845	57.814	1.662	0
IF3	1.379	1	109.968	2.150	12.996

TABLE 5. Parameter estimation values of the IF distribution and of its submodels for the environmental data.

Distribution	\hat{a}	\hat{b}	\hat{c}	\hat{p}	\hat{q}
GB	-1.393	41.496	0.834	1.259	2.436
GB1	0.059	$8.791 \cdot 10^8$	0	248.824	392.153
GB2	0.875	0.416	1	198.305	2.355

TABLE 6. Parameter estimation values of the GB distribution and its submodels for the environmental data.

The classical choice to model environmental data is the Weibull distribution. The likelihood ratio test statistic for the Weibull distribution with respect to the IF distribution yields $T_{\text{Weibull}} = -2(-598.87 + 575.591) = 46.558$ and a p -value of 0.00, hence we reject the Weibull submodel in favor of the broader IF model.

6.3. Survival analysis. For the previous two data sets we have seen that our IF distribution outperforms the GB distribution as well as the classical choices, the Pareto Type I and Weibull distributions. We shall now investigate its fitting abilities on censored data, for which we have already argued in Section 5.3 that the IF presents important computational advantages over the GB distribution. Thus we only focus on the IF here and compare it to the Weibull, a popular choice in survival analysis.

The third data set consists of $n = 228$ survival data from the North Central Cancer Treatment Group. They measure the survival time, in days, of patients suffering from advanced lung cancer. These data are available in the ‘survival’-package in R. The phenomenon of interest is the death of the patients and we are consequently facing right-censored data whenever a patient has survived longer than the allocated study time. This results in $n_{\text{Obs}} = 165$ and $n_{\text{Right}} = 63$ data. The maximum log-likelihood value of the IF model is -1153.460 , whilst the one of the Weibull model is -1153.850 . This yields a likelihood ratio test value of

$T_{\text{Weibull}} = -2(-1153.850 + 1153.460) = 0.78$ and a p -value of 0.854. Thus in this case we do not reject the null hypothesis. In what follows, we shall therefore further compare the outcomes of the IF to those of the Weibull.

In survival analysis, a question of interest is to study the survival time of patients suffering from lung cancer. We computed the probability that a patient survives more than $t = 1, 2, 3$ and 4 years (with a daycount of 365) with both the IF model and the Weibull model. The results are given in Table 7 below.

t	IF	Weibull
1	0.4384	0.4330
2	0.1256	0.1243
3	0.0218	0.0285
4	0.0015	0.0055

TABLE 7. Probability to survive $t = 1, 2, 3$ and 4 years on basis of the lung cancer data.

A second quantity of interest is the probability to decrease before time $t + 1$ knowing that the patient was alive at time t . This can be computed as

$$\mathbb{P}(X < t + 1 \mid X > t) = \frac{F(t + 1) - F(t)}{1 - F(t)}$$

and is again readily computable from the IF. Table 8 shows the results. The Weibull model yields lower probabilities to decrease within one year starting from time $t = 2$.

	IF	Weibull
$\mathbb{P}(X < 1 \mid X > 0)$	0.5615	0.5670
$\mathbb{P}(X < 2 \mid X > 1)$	0.7134	0.7130
$\mathbb{P}(X < 3 \mid X > 2)$	0.8262	0.7704
$\mathbb{P}(X < 4 \mid X > 3)$	0.9292	0.8057
$\mathbb{P}(X < 5 \mid X > 4)$	0.9934	0.8304

TABLE 8. Probability to decrease before time $t + 1$ knowing that the patient was alive at time t with respect to the lung cancer data.

This third data set shows that, also in survival analysis, opting for the IF distribution is a good choice. The Weibull distribution is more parameter-parsimonious and cannot be significantly rejected in favor of the IF, nevertheless the latter has the higher MLL value and its probabilities from Tables 7 and 8 yield precious information about the data under investigation. In general, it is safer to bet on the IF as it yields an excellent fit for very diverse data sets.

7. CONCLUSION

In this paper we introduced the Interpolating Family of size distributions, and studied its stochastic and inferential properties. Three very distinct real data sets allowed to appreciate its excellent fitting abilities, also compared to the Generalized Beta distribution. We mentioned in the Introduction that this new distribution should be a viable alternative to the GB distribution. To help the reader choose his/her favorite distribution, we conclude the paper with a short comparison between the existing Generalized Beta distribution and the new Interpolating Family. A common feature is the high flexibility as they depend on five parameters and they both nest power laws as well as power laws with exponential cut-off as special cases. The GB distribution has the advantage to nest interesting special cases not covered

by the IF distribution as, for instance, Gamma-type distributions. Major advantages of the IF distribution over the GB distribution are the closed-form cumulative distribution function, very tractable quantile expressions and a simple random variable generation process. Consequently, the IF distribution can readily be applied to censored data in survival analysis. Moreover, the normalizing constant does not involve any special function. Finally, the construction of the IF distribution is very geometric as it arises naturally when interpolating between power laws and power laws with exponential cut-off.

APPENDIX: MODE CALCULATION

In this Appendix we detail some of the steps we skipped in Section 4.5 to calculate the mode of the Interpolating Family of size distributions. The derivative of the pdf (3) vanishes if and only if

$$0 = (b-1) \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^{b-2} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b\right)^{-q-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b\right)^{-q}\right)^p \\ - b(q+1) \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^{2b-2} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b\right)^{-q-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b\right)^{-q}\right)^p \\ + \frac{pbq}{p+1} \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^{2b-2} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b\right)^{-2q-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \left(\frac{x-x_0}{c}\right)^b\right)^{-q}\right)^{p-1}.$$

If we set $y = \frac{x-x_0}{c}$, then the above holds true if either

$$y^{b-2} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + y^b\right)^{-q-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + y^b\right)^{-q}\right)^{p-1} = 0$$

or

$$0 = (b-1) \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + y^b\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + y^b\right)^{-q}\right) \\ - b(q+1)y^b \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + y^b\right)^{-q}\right) + \frac{pbq}{p+1} y^b \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + y^b\right)^{-q}. \quad (7)$$

The only solution that the first equation can possibly admit is $y = 0$. This corresponds to $x = x_0$, i.e. to the boundary of the domain. On the other hand, equation (7) may admit interior solutions. We separate the analysis of equation (7) in two parts: first the case p finite from which we deduce the mode of the IF1 and IF3 subfamilies and second the case $p \rightarrow \infty$ which gives the mode of the IF2 distribution. If p is finite, then we set

$$t = \frac{1}{p+1} \left((p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + y^b\right)^{-q}$$

and equation (7) simplifies to the almost cyclic equation (6):

$$(b-1)t^{-\frac{1}{q}}(1-t) - b(q+1) \left(t^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1\right) (1-t) + pbq \left(t^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1\right) t = 0.$$

Solving this equation in all generality is possible numerically but we will restrict ourselves to show how to get closed-form solutions for the two subfamilies IF1 and IF3. For the IF1 distribution ($p = 0$), equation (6) further simplifies to

$$(b-1)t^{-\frac{1}{q}}(1-t) - b(q+1) \left(t^{-\frac{1}{q}} - 1\right) (1-t) = 0.$$

While we recover the boundary solution $x = x_0$ if $b > 0$, we also find an interior solution $x = x_0 + c \left(\frac{b-1}{bq+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{b}}$ if either $b < -\frac{1}{q}$ or $b > 1$. Repeating the procedure with the second derivative of the pdf (3), a straightforward but tedious calculation shows that the interior solution thus found indeed corresponds to a maximum and that the mode occurs on the boundary $x = x_0$ if either $b = -\frac{1}{q}$ or $b = 1$.

For the IF3 distribution ($0 < p < \infty$ and $b = 1$), equation (6) further simplifies to

$$-(q+1)\left(t^{-\frac{1}{q}}-1\right)(1-t)+pq\left(t^{-\frac{1}{q}}-1\right)t=0.$$

This equation admits two solutions: the boundary solution $x = x_0$ and the interior solution $x = x_0 + c(p+1)^{-\frac{1}{q}}\left(\left(\frac{q+1}{(p+1)q+1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{q}}-1\right)$. One can then check that the latter corresponds to the mode of the IF3 distribution and that this mode, and thus the interior solution, moves towards the boundary as p and q tend to zero.

On the other hand, for the IF2 distribution ($p \rightarrow \infty$), equation (7) simplifies to

$$0=(b-1)y^b-b(q+1)y^b+bqy^{b-bq}.$$

We deduce that the derivative of the pdf of the IF2 vanishes either at the boundary $x = x_0$ if $b > 0$ or at the interior point $x = x_0 + c\left(\frac{bq}{bq+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{bq}}$ if either $b < -\frac{1}{q}$ or $b > 0$. Similarly as for the IF1, tedious second derivative calculations reveal that the interior solution always corresponds to a maximum and that the mode occurs on the boundary if either $b = -\frac{1}{q}$ or $b = 0$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Yves Dominicy acknowledges financial support from the Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique, Communauté Française de Belgique, via a Mandat de Chargé de Recherche FNRS. Patrick Weber acknowledges financial support via an Aspirant grant from the FNRS.

REFERENCES

- Asgharzadeh, A., Nadarajah, S., and Sharafi, F. (2016). Generalized inverse Lindley distribution with application to Danish fire insurance data. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, to appear.
- Barros, A., Pereira, J., and Lund, U. (2012). Identifying geographical patterns of wildfire orientation: A watershed-based analysis. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 264:98–107.
- Benktander, G. (1970). Schadenverteilung nach Grösse in der Nicht-lebensversicherung. *Mitteilungen der Vereinigung schweizerischer Versicherungsmathematiker*, 7.
- Clarke, R. (2002). Estimating trends in data from the Weibull and a generalized extreme value distribution. *Water Resources Research*, 38:25–1–25–10.
- Eeckhout, J. (2004). Gibrat’s Law for (All) Cities. *American Economic Review*, 94:1429–1451.
- Falk, M., Guillou, A., and Toulemonde, G. (2008). A LAN based Neyman smooth test for Pareto distributions. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 138:2867–2886.
- Fujisawa, H. and Abe, T. (2015). A family of skew distributions with mode-invariance through transformation of scale. *Statistical Methodology*, 25:89–98.
- Gabaix, X. (2016). Power Laws in Economics: An Introduction. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30:185–206.
- García-Portugués, E., Barros, A., Crujeiras, R., González-Manteiga, W., and Pereira, J. (2014). A test for directional-linear independence, with applications to wildfire orientation and size. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, 28:1261–1275.
- García-Portugués, E., Crujeiras, R., and González-Manteiga, W. (2015). Central limit theorems for directional and linear data with applications. *Statistica Sinica*, 25:1207–1229.

- Hong, Y. and Rubio, J. (2016). Survival and lifetime data analysis with a flexible class of distributions. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 43:1794–1813.
- Huberman, B. and Adamic, L. (1999). Growth Dynamics of the World Wide Web. *Nature*, 401:131.
- Jones, M. (2014). Generating distributions by transformation of scale. *Statistica Sinica*, 24:749–772.
- Kato, S. and Jones, M. (2015). A tractable and interpretable four-parameter family of unimodal distributions on the circle. *Biometrika*, 102:181–190.
- Kleiber, C. and Kotz, S. (2003). *Statistical Size Distributions in Economics and Actuarial Sciences*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- Lawless, J. (2003). *Statistical Models and Methods for Lifetime Data*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- Lee, E. and Wang, J. (2003). *Statistical Methods for Survival Data Analysis*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- Luttmer, E. (2007). Selection, Growth, and the Size Distribution of Firms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122:1103–1144.
- Manwell, J., McGowan, J., and Rogers, A. (2009). *Wind Energy Explained : Theory, Design and Application*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Marchenko, Y. and Genton, M. (2010). Multivariate log-skew-elliptical distributions with applications to precipitation data. *Environmetrics*, 21:318–340.
- McDonald, J. (1984). Some Generalized Functions for the Size Distribution of Income. *Econometrica*, 52:647–665.
- McDonald, J. and Xu, Y. (1995). A generalization of the beta distribution with applications. *Journal of Econometrics*, 69:427–428.
- Mitzenmacher, M. (2004). A Brief History of Generative Models for Power Law and Lognormal Distributions. *Internet Mathematics*, 1:226–251.
- Mudholkar, G., Srivastava, D., and Kollia, G. (1996). A generalization of the Weibull distribution with application to the analysis of survival data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91:1575–1583.
- Nelson, W. (2005). *Applied Life Data Analysis*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- Ortega, E., Lemonte, A., Silva, G., and Cordeiro, G. (2015). New flexible models generated by gamma random variables for lifetime modeling. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 42:2159–2179.
- Pareto, V. (1964). *Cours d'économie politique: Nouvelle édition par G.-H. Bousquet et G. Busino*. Librairie Droz, Geneva.
- Piketty, T. and Zucman, G. (2014). Capital is Back: Wealth-Income Ratios in Rich Countries, 1700-2010. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129:1255–1310.
- Rausand, M. and Høyland, A. (2004). *System Reliability Theory: Models, Statistical Methods, and Applications*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- Reed, W. R. and Jørgensen, M. (2004). The Double Pareto-Lognormal Distribution – A New Parametric Model for Size Distributions. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 33:1733–1753.
- Rosen, S. (1981). The Economics of Superstars. *American Economic Review*, 71:845–858.
- Rosin, P. and Rammler, E. (1933). The laws governing the fineness of powdered coal. *Journal of the Institute of Fuel*, 7:29–36.
- Sinner, C. and Weber, P. (2016). Moments and entropy of the Interpolating Family of Size Distributions. arXiv:1606.04771.
- Sornette, D. (2003). *Critical Phenomena in Natural Sciences: Chaos, Fractals, Selforganization, and Disorder : Concepts and Tools (2nd edition)*. Springer, Heidelberg.

- Toda, A. and Walsh, K. (2015). The Double Power Law in Consumption and Implications for Testing Euler Equations. *Journal of Political Economy*, 123:1177–1200.
- Tsallis, C. (1988). Possible generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 52:479–487.
- Tsallis, C. (2002). Nonextensive statistical mechanics: a brief review of its present status. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências*, 74:393–414.