

CONFIDENCE SET FOR MIXTURE ORDER SELECTION

Alessandro Casa¹ and Davide Ferrari¹

¹*Faculty of Economics and Management, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano*

Abstract

A fundamental challenge in the application of finite mixture models is selecting the number of mixture components, also known as order. Traditional approaches rely on selecting a single best model using information criteria. However, in the presence of noisy data, and when models with different orders yield similar fits, model selection uncertainty can be substantial, making it challenging to confidently identify the true number of components. In this paper, we introduce the Model Selection Confidence Set (MSCS) for order selection – a set-valued estimator that, with a predefined confidence level, includes the true mixture order across repeated samples. Rather than selecting a single model, our MSCS identifies all plausible orders by determining whether each candidate model is at least as plausible as the best-selected one, using a screening test based on a penalized likelihood ratio statistic. We provide theoretical guarantees for the asymptotic coverage of our confidence set and demonstrate its practical advantages through simulations and real data analysis.

Keywords: Finite mixture models, order selection, penalized likelihood ratio test, model selection confidence sets, model selection uncertainty.

1 Introduction

Finite mixture models are a powerful tool for approximating complex probability distributions and capturing heterogeneity in random phenomena; see [Frühwirth-Schnatter et al. \(2019\)](#) for a comprehensive review. They are widely used across scientific fields for semiparametric density estimation and model-based clustering. (see, e.g., [Roeder and Wasserman, 1997](#); [Bouveyron et al., 2019](#)). In both cases, selecting the correct mixture order is essential, as misestimation can induce identifiability issues and distort the assessment of underlying heterogeneity, ultimately affecting cluster estimation and model interpretation.

Traditionally, order selection is carried out according to the single-best-model paradigm, in which a single optimal number of components is chosen based on a predefined selection criterion. Existing strategies fall into three main categories: hypothesis testing ([McLachlan, 1987](#); [Lo et al., 2001](#)), penalized likelihood methods ([Chen and Khalili, 2009](#); [Manole and Khalili, 2021](#); [Huang et al., 2022](#)), and information criteria; see [Celeux et al. \(2019\)](#) for a review. Information criteria are unarguably the most widely used, with the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC, [Schwarz, 1978](#)) being a common choice. This popularity is due to its model-selection consistency ([Keribin, 2000](#)) and numerical studies highlighting its superior performance over other approaches ([Steele and Raftery, 2010](#)). However, with noisy data, selection uncertainty can be substantial, making it difficult to confidently identify a single best model. When multiple models fit the data similarly well, committing to one may obscure meaningful structural variations and lead to either overfitting or underfitting.

This paper addresses model selection uncertainty by introducing the Model Selection Confidence Set (MSCS) for order selection. Instead of relying on a single selected model, our approach acknowledges multiple plausible models, thus enhancing interpretability and providing a deeper understanding of the underlying phenomenon. The MSCS is a set-valued estimator that, with a given confidence level, contains the true mixture order under repeated sampling. Like confidence intervals for parameters, it accounts for multiple plausible explanations of the data rather than enforcing a single choice. Its size reflects

selection uncertainty: when data are highly informative, the MSCS is small, converging toward a single best model in the most extreme case; while with limited or noisy data, it expands, indicating greater uncertainty in model selection. As the sample size grows, the MSCS captures the true order with high probability, providing a principled framework for handling order selection uncertainty.

Our methodology builds on the confidence set framework of [Ferrari and Yang \(2015\)](#) for variable selection in linear models, which employs a screening approach based on the F-test, and later extended by [Zheng et al. \(2019\)](#) to more general settings using the likelihood ratio test. While the latter provides asymptotic coverage for a broad class of parametric models, its extension to mixture models is nontrivial. Violations of regularity conditions, particularly due to parameters lying on the boundary of the parameter space, invalidate standard likelihood ratio tests, necessitating an alternative approach. We address this by leveraging the distributional results of [Vuong \(1989\)](#) and [Lo et al. \(2001\)](#) to construct a rigorous confidence set for the estimated mixture order.

2 Confidence set construction

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be an i.i.d. sample from a univariate random variable X taking values in \mathbb{R} , with density belonging to a family of k -component Gaussian mixture distributions:

$$f(x; \theta_k) = \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j f_j(x; \mu_j, \sigma_j^2), \quad (1)$$

where $f_j(\cdot; \mu_j, \sigma_j^2)$ is the univariate Gaussian density with mean μ_j and variance σ_j^2 , $\theta_k = (\pi_1, \mu_1, \sigma_1^2, \dots, \pi_k, \mu_k, \sigma_k^2) \in \Theta$, and π_j represents the j th mixing proportion, with $\pi_j > 0$, for $j = 1, \dots, k$, and $\sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j = 1$. Throughout the paper, we use $p_k = 3k - 1$ to denote the number of distinguishable parameter elements in θ_k . We let k_0 be the number of mixture components of the true data generating process, and let $\theta_0 = \theta_{k_0}$ be the corresponding parameter. Because all components are Gaussian, the density (1) is invariant under permutations of the component labels in θ_k . To ensure identifiability, we assume $\mu_1 < \dots < \mu_k$; if $\pi_j^{(1)} \neq 0$ or 1, for $j = 1, \dots, k$, this ensures that $f(x; \theta_k^{(1)}) = f(x; \theta_k^{(2)})$ implies

$$\theta_k^{(1)} = \theta_k^{(2)}.$$

Our goal is to quantify the uncertainty in selecting the number of components by constructing a MSCS, starting from a reference estimate \hat{k} of k_0 , which represents the selected model using a given criterion. Given a user-specified confidence level $(1 - \alpha)$, with $0 < \alpha < 1$, we aim to construct a set of orders $\hat{\Gamma} = \{\hat{k}_L, \dots, \hat{k}_U\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(k_0 \in \hat{\Gamma}) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (2)$$

meaning that, asymptotically, the true order k_0 is included in $\hat{\Gamma}$ with high probability. The MSCS serves as a diagnostic tool for assessing model specification. If a model falls outside $\hat{\Gamma}$, it is likely either too simplistic, omitting essential components, or overly complex, incorporating unnecessary ones. The MSCS cardinality, $\text{card}(\hat{\Gamma})$, reflects selection uncertainty: when the data are highly informative and models with different orders distinguishable, $\text{card}(\hat{\Gamma})$ is small and, in the most extreme case $\hat{\Gamma}$ converges to the set $\{k_0\}$ containing the single optimal order, as n increases. Conversely, with limited or noisy data, $\text{card}(\hat{\Gamma})$ increases, signaling greater uncertainty in model selection.

Operationally, we start with a reference model containing \hat{k} components, selected using a given selection method, and include it by default in the MSCS. We then compare the model of order \hat{k} to models of varying orders in $\mathcal{K} = \{\mathcal{K}_L \cup \mathcal{K}_U\}$, where $\mathcal{K}_L = \{1, \dots, \hat{k} - 1\}$ and $\mathcal{K}_U = \{\hat{k} + 1, \hat{k} + 2, \dots, k_{\max}\}$, represent orders smaller and larger than \hat{k} , respectively, where $k_{\max} < \infty$. For each $k \in \mathcal{K}$, we test the null hypothesis that the model of order k is at least as close to the true unknown model as the model with \hat{k} components. The alternative hypothesis is that the model with k components is further from the truth compared to the selected model. To this end, we use the following Vuong type likelihood ratio statistic (Vuong, 1989):

$$\text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k) := \text{LRT}(\hat{k}, k) - \delta_n(\hat{k}, k) := 2 \left(\ell(\hat{\theta}_k) - \ell(\hat{\theta}_{\hat{k}}) \right) - \delta_n(\hat{k}, k), \quad (3)$$

where $\ell(\hat{\theta}_k)$ and $\ell(\hat{\theta}_{\hat{k}})$ denote the log-likelihoods of the mixture models with k and \hat{k} components, respectively, with $\hat{\theta}_k$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{k}}$ being their maximum likelihood estimators.

Here, $\delta_n(\hat{k}, k)$ represents a penalty term that accounts for the difference in complexity between the two models. We assume that $\delta_n > 0$ when $k > \hat{k}$, $\delta_n < 0$ if $k < \hat{k}$, and $\delta_n = 0$ if $\hat{k} = k$. Given $0 < \alpha < 1$, the MSCS is defined as the set of integers $\hat{\Gamma} = \{\hat{k}_L, \dots, \hat{k}_U\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+$, with

$$\hat{k}_L = \min\{k \in \mathcal{K}_L \mid \text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k) > q_\alpha(\hat{k}, k)\}, \quad \hat{k}_U = \max\{k \in \mathcal{K}_U \mid \text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k) > q_\alpha(\hat{k}, k)\},$$

where $q_\alpha(\hat{k}, k)$ denotes the α -quantile for the null distribution of the likelihood ratio test statistics $\text{LRT}(\hat{k}, k)$ given in (4). The MSCS is therefore constructed by retaining all models for which the null hypothesis is not rejected, ensuring that only models not worse than \hat{k} remain in the set.

While the penalty δ_n is allowed to grow with n , it must not affect the test statistic's asymptotic behavior under H_1 , which is $O_p(n)$. To ensure this, we impose $n^{-1/2}\delta_n(\hat{k}, k) = o_p(1)$, similarly to [Vuong \(1989, Eq. 5.10\)](#). This condition holds when using standard information criteria penalties, such as AIC and BIC, leading to $\delta_n(\hat{k}, k) = 2(p_k - p_{\hat{k}})$ and $\delta_n(\hat{k}, k) = \log(n)(p_k - p_{\hat{k}})$, respectively. For MSCS construction, either \hat{k} - or k -component models (or both) may be misspecified; in this case, the Takeuchi Information Criterion (TIC, [Takeuchi, 1976](#)) provides a robust alternative by explicitly accounting for misspecification. This yields $\delta_n(\hat{k}, k) = 2(\tilde{p}_k - \tilde{p}_{\hat{k}})$, where $\tilde{p}_k = \text{tr}\{A(\hat{\theta}_k)^{-1}B(\hat{\theta}_k)\}$ is the effective number of parameters, and $A(\theta_k)$ and $B(\theta_k)$ are the matrices defined in (6).

3 Null distribution and asymptotic coverage

The screening procedure in [Section 2](#) employs the likelihood ratio test to compare candidate models with a selected reference model. However, in mixture models, boundary issues violate regularity conditions, invalidating the standard chi-squared approximation for the test distribution ([Celeux et al., 2019](#)). [Vuong \(1989\)](#) derives the asymptotic null distribution of the likelihood ratio statistic for both nested and non-nested models under general conditions. Building on this, [Lo et al. \(2001\)](#) show that the likelihood ratio statistic for comparing mixture models of different orders converges to a weighted sum

of independent chi-squared variables. These distributional results are used in the present paper to guarantee that our MSCS achieves the correct coverage.

Consider two competing models with k_1 and k_2 components, where $k_2 > k_1$, and respective parameters $\theta_{k_1} \in \Theta_{k_1}$ and $\theta_{k_2} \in \Theta_{k_2}$ with dimensions p_{k_1} and p_{k_2} . To measure the discrepancy between the candidate mixture and the true data-generating distribution, consider the Kullback-Leibler divergence $\text{KL}(k) = \mathbb{E}[\log\{f(x; \theta_k)/f(x; \theta_{k_0})\}]$, where the expectation is taken with respect to the data generating process $f(x; \theta_{k_0})$. We consider testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \text{KL}(k_1) = \text{KL}(k_2)$, against the alternative $H_1 : \text{KL}(k_1) > \text{KL}(k_2)$. Results in [Lo et al. \(2001\)](#) show that, under H_0 , we have

$$\text{LRT}(k_1, k_2) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{i=1}^{p_{k_1}+p_{k_2}} \lambda_i Z_i^2, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4)$$

where Z_i^2 are independent chi-squared random variables with one degree of freedom, and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{p_{k_1}+p_{k_2}}$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} -B(\theta_{k_1})A^{-1}(\theta_{k_1}) & -C(\theta_{k_1}, \theta_{k_2})A^{-1}(\theta_{k_2}) \\ C(\theta_{k_2}, \theta_{k_1})A^{-1}(\theta_{k_1}) & B(\theta_{k_2})A^{-1}(\theta_{k_2}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

with matrices $A(\theta_k)$, $B(\theta_k)$, and $C(\theta_k, \theta_{k'})$ defined by

$$A(\theta_k) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log f(X; \theta_k)}{\partial \theta_k \partial \theta_k^\top} \right], \quad B(\theta_k) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial \log f(X; \theta_k)}{\partial \theta_k} \frac{\partial \log f(X; \theta_k)}{\partial \theta_k^\top} \right], \quad (6)$$

$$C(\theta_k, \theta_{k'}) = C(\theta_{k'}, \theta_k)^\top = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial \log f(X; \theta_k)}{\partial \theta_k} \frac{\partial \log f(X; \theta_{k'})}{\partial \theta_{k'}^\top} \right]. \quad (7)$$

To implement the procedure, we approximate the above matrices using sample averages, evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimators.

The penalty term $\delta_n(\hat{k}, k)$ in (3) plays a crucial role in balancing model complexity and goodness of fit in the likelihood ratio test. In particular, it corrects for the increased flexibility of models with a larger number of components, thus preventing overfitting. When comparing models with \hat{k} and $k > \hat{k}$ components, the penalty ensures that the larger model is only retained in the MSCS if it provides a significantly better fit to the

data. In the next theorem we show that, while preventing excessive width of the MSCS, the penalty does not interfere with the asymptotic coverage of the true order k_0 . The reason is that while the penalty modifies the likelihood ratio statistic, $n^{-1}\text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k)$ estimates $\text{KL}(\hat{k}) - \text{KL}(k)$ consistently as long as the penalty is asymptotically negligible, thus enabling us to discriminate \hat{k} and k .

Theorem 1. *Let $\hat{\Gamma}$ be the MSCS constructed using n i.i.d. observations from a univariate mixture $f(x; \theta_{k_0})$, with order $k_0 \in \mathcal{K}$. Let $\theta_k \in \Theta_k$ be the parameter vector associated with a k -component mixture. For all $k \in \mathcal{K}$, assume: (i) Θ_k is compact and $f(x; \theta_k)$ is continuous in θ_k for almost all x ; (ii) $\theta_k \in \Theta_k$, $f(x; \theta_k)$ is strictly positive for almost all x ; (iii) $|\log f(x; \theta_k)|$ is bounded above by an integrable function of x ; (iv) $\mathbb{E}\{\log f(x; \theta_k)\}$ has a unique maximum at θ_k^* in Θ_k . Moreover, assume (v) $n^{-1/2}\delta_n(k_1, k_2) = O_p(1)$ for all $k_1, k_2 \in \mathcal{K}$. Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(k_0 \in \hat{\Gamma}) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (8)$$

Proof. The total probability of not including the correct order k_0 in the MSCS is

$$\mathbb{P}(k_0 \notin \hat{\Gamma}) = \mathbb{P}(k_0 \notin \hat{\Gamma} | \hat{k} = k_0) \mathbb{P}(\hat{k} = k_0) + \mathbb{P}(k_0 \notin \hat{\Gamma} | \hat{k} \neq k_0) \mathbb{P}(\hat{k} \neq k_0). \quad (9)$$

Since \hat{k} is included in $\hat{\Gamma}$ by default, $\mathbb{P}(k_0 \notin \hat{\Gamma} | \hat{k} = k_0) = 0$ and the first term in (9) is zero.

When $\hat{k} \neq k_0$, since $0 = \text{KL}(k_0) \leq \text{KL}(k)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$, we have the worst-case bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(k_0 \notin \hat{\Gamma} | \hat{k} \neq k_0) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k_0) \leq q_\alpha(\hat{k}, k_0) | \hat{k} \neq k_0\right) \\ &\leq \max_{k: \text{KL}(k) \leq \text{KL}(\hat{k})} \mathbb{P}\left(\text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k) \leq q_\alpha(\hat{k}, k) | \hat{k} \neq k_0\right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Next, we note that $\text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k)$ is non-increasing in $\text{KL}(k)$ with probability going to 1.

Under our Assumptions (i)-(v), we have

$$n^{-1}\text{LRT}^*(\hat{k}, k) = n^{-1}\text{LRT}(\hat{k}, k) + n^{-1}\delta_n(\hat{k}, k) = \text{KL}(\hat{k}) - \text{KL}(k) + o_p(1), \quad (11)$$

since $n^{-1}\text{LRT}(\hat{k}, k)$ is consistent for $\text{KL}(\hat{k}) - \text{KL}(k)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$ (analogous to how Assumptions 1-3 of [Lo et al. \(2001\)](#) lead to their Equations 4 and 5), and $n^{-1/2}\delta_n(\hat{k}, k) =$

$O_p(1)$.

Therefore, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the worst-case bound in (10) is attained at k such that $\text{KL}(k) = \text{KL}(\hat{k})$. Under conditions (i)–(v), Theorem 1 of Lo et al. (2001) implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{LRT}(k_1, k_2) \geq q_\alpha(k_1, k_2) | \text{KL}(k_1) = \text{KL}(k_2)) \leq \alpha$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k_1, k_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, where the distribution of $\text{LRT}(k_1, k_2)$ is given in (4). Therefore, taking the limit in (9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(k_0 \notin \hat{\Gamma}) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\text{LRT}(\hat{k}, k^*) \leq q_\alpha(\hat{k}, k^*) | \text{KL}(\hat{k}) = \text{KL}(k^*), \hat{k} \neq k_0\right) \mathbb{P}(\hat{k} \neq k_0) \\ &\leq \alpha \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{k} \neq k_0) \leq \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Rearranging gives $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(k_0 \in \hat{\Gamma}) \geq 1 - \alpha$ and completes the proof. \square

Assumptions (i)–(iv) ensure that the regularity conditions in Lo et al. (2001) hold uniformly over \mathcal{K} , resulting in a well-defined null distribution for the likelihood ratio test. Remarkably, the MSCS achieves valid coverage even when the probability of missing the correct model remains substantial. This robustness sets MSCS apart from other approaches relying on selection consistency and is corroborated by the numerical results in Section 4. While the coverage probability is ensured by testing \hat{k} against neighboring models at level α , the power of the test depends on the distance between \hat{k} and k_0 . When \hat{k} is close to k_0 , the screening test is more powerful and is more likely to detect k_0 , resulting in a tighter MSCS. Conversely, if \hat{k} is far from k_0 , the test has lower power, leading to a wider MSCS. Despite this variability in size, the coverage guarantee remains intact, demonstrating the robustness of MSCS in quantifying uncertainty in the number of components, even when the initial selection fails to identify the correct model.

4 Numerical examples

To empirically evaluate the finite-sample performance of the proposed approach, we generate n i.i.d. samples from univariate Gaussian mixture densities employed in Casa et al. (2020). The density curves are illustrated in Figure 2, Appendix A, along with the corresponding parameter settings. These densities are selected to introduce a variety of

challenges in density estimation, reflecting different modality patterns and varying interactions between modes and components. We consider sample sizes $n = 100, 250, 1000$ and $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1$. For the reasons outlined at the end of Section 2, we consider the correction factor $\delta_n(\hat{k}, k) = 2\{\tilde{p}_k - \tilde{p}_{\hat{k}}\}$ corresponding to a difference in the TIC penalty, while the reference order \hat{k} is selected based on the BIC.

In Table 1, we present the Monte Carlo estimates of the MSCS coverage probabilities, the corresponding MSCS sizes, and the percentage of simulations where the BIC correctly selects \hat{k} being equal to k_0 . These results align with our theoretical expectations, showing that coverage probability approaches or exceeds the nominal level $1 - \alpha$ as n increases across all scenarios. However, different densities exhibit distinct behaviors: while Densities 1 and 4 achieve reasonable coverage even for $n = 100$, Densities 2 and 3 are more challenging.

These difficulties are also reflected in the MSCS size. In simpler cases, the MSCS is relatively small and tends to converge to the single true model as n increases. In more complex cases, even with $n = 1000$, the intervals widen to ensure inclusion of k_0 , reflecting the frequent failure of BIC to select the true mixture order. The comparison between the percentage of correct BIC selections ($\hat{k} = k_0$) and the MSCS coverage underscores the advantages of the proposed approach. The MSCS accounts for selection uncertainty, as evidenced by the sizes of the sets – an aspect entirely overlooked by the traditional single-best-model strategy. Moreover, it mitigates BIC selection errors in finite samples; this is particularly evident in complex settings where the BIC performs poorly even for large n , highlighting the benefits of a multi-model approach. Overall, our results underscore the importance of addressing selection uncertainty when choosing the number of components, especially in challenging scenarios where reliance on a single model might be misleading.

We conclude this section by analyzing the Galaxy dataset, which consists of 82 univariate observations of galaxy velocities. This dataset has become a benchmark for evaluating mixture modeling techniques in density estimation from both frequentist and Bayesian perspectives (see, e.g., Richardson and Green, 1997; Aitkin, 2001; Grün et al., 2022). Interest in this dataset stems from the ongoing debate on the number of components,

Table 1: Monte Carlo estimates of MSCS coverage probability and MSCS size (in parentheses) for α , and sample size n . The row $\hat{k} = k_0$ shows Monte Carlo estimates of the probability $\hat{k} = k_0$. Calculations are based on $B = 500$ Monte Carlo samples.

n	α		Density 1	Density 2	Density 3	Density 4
100	0.10	Coverage (%)	96.4 (2.4)	60.6 (2.3)	64.2 (2.1)	84.8 (2.7)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	55.0	3.0	2.2	24.8
	0.05	Coverage (%)	97.6 (2.8)	84.6 (3.0)	77.4 (2.5)	94.4 (3.3)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	52.4	3.4	3.2	20.2
	0.01	Coverage (%)	99.8 (3.8)	97.2 (4.1)	97.0 (3.7)	98.6 (4.5)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	53.6	2.2	3.0	26.0
250	0.10	Coverage (%)	99.6 (1.9)	70.0 (2.4)	69.8 (2.4)	96.8 (2.4)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	94.2	4.6	5.8	73.8
	0.05	Coverage (%)	99.8 (2.4)	86.0 (3.0)	83.6 (2.9)	97.8 (3.0)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	93.6	4.0	3.8	69.6
	0.01	Coverage (%)	99.6 (3.4)	97.0 (4.1)	95.6 (3.8)	99.4 (4.4)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	92.4	5.0	4.2	68.0
1000	0.10	Coverage (%)	99.8 (1.2)	95.0 (3.7)	96.6 (3.2)	97.0 (1.8)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	99.8	34.2	36.4	96.4
	0.05	Coverage (%)	99.8 (1.6)	97.4 (4.1)	98.6 (3.9)	98.8 (2.7)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	99.8	28.8	36.4	98.4
	0.01	Coverage (%)	99.8 (2.4)	98.6 (5.1)	99.0 (4.8)	99.0 (3.74)
		$\hat{k} = k_0$ (%)	99.6	32.6	33.2	99.0

with estimates typically ranging from three to four (Aitkin, 2001). However, results may depend on potential constraints on component variances or, from a Bayesian perspective, on prior specifications, warranting further investigation of robustness.

In our analysis, we construct a 95% MSCS. Consistent with the Monte Carlo experiments, we select \hat{k} using the BIC and use the TIC penalty to obtain the correction factor $\delta_n(\hat{k}, k)$. We allow component variances to vary across components. In line with the conclusions of Aitkin (2001), the BIC selects $\hat{k} = 4$, with the corresponding model being therefore automatically included in the MSCS. The procedure outlined in Section 2 yields $\hat{\Gamma} = \{4, 5, 6\}$; the three densities in the MSCS are shown in Figure 1. Our results confirm that, with unequal component variances, the model with $k = 3$ misses some important features of the underlying density. Moreover, due to the small sample size, which suggests limited informativeness in the data, we observe some uncertainty in model selection, which is overlooked when relying on the single BIC model. It is evident from the figure




Figure 1: Histogram of the galaxy velocities with overlaid estimated density functions for the models included in the MSCS.

that the models with $k = 4$ and $k = 5$ are practically indistinguishable, while the model with $k = 6$ differs by the addition of a component around 22×1000 km/second. Lastly, note that the same results are obtained when considering 90% and 99% MSCS, further emphasizing the robustness of our findings for these data.

5 Discussion and future directions

The proposed set estimator provides a principled approach to addressing uncertainty in mixture order selection, and offers a new approach to overcome the limitations of single-model selection. Our numerical studies highlight the risk of model misspecification, even for selection-consistent criteria like BIC in large-sample settings. The MSCS approach mitigates such a risk by identifying a set of plausible models, which remains small when BIC is used as the reference. As shown in the proof of Theorem 1, we establish that $\mathbb{P}(k_0 \in \hat{\Gamma}) \geq 1 - \alpha \mathbb{P}(\hat{k} \neq k_0)$ for sufficiently large n . This implies that the nominal coverage level $1 - \alpha$ tends to be conservative when \hat{k} is selected using a consistent method. The probability $\mathbb{P}(\hat{k} \neq k_0)$ is expected to influence the MSCS size by affecting the power of the likelihood ratio test. Future research should explore the extent of these effects. Additionally, extending our approach to broader model families, such as multivariate Gaussian, skewed, or finite mixture of regression models, would enhance its applicability but requires the derivation of novel distributional results or reliance on resampling methods to

approximate the null distribution of the likelihood ratio test.

References

- Aitkin, M. (2001). Likelihood and bayesian analysis of mixtures. *Statistical Modelling*, 1(4):287–304.
- Bouveyron, C., Celeux, G., Murphy, T. B., and Raftery, A. E. (2019). *Model-based clustering and classification for data science: with applications in R*. Cambridge University Press.
- Casa, A., Chacón, J., and Menardi, G. (2020). Modal clustering asymptotics with applications to bandwidth selection. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14(1):835–856.
- Celeux, G., Frühwirth-Schnatter, S., and Robert, C. P. (2019). Model selection for mixture models—perspectives and strategies. In *Handbook of mixture analysis*, pages 117–154. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Chen, J. and Khalili, A. (2009). Order selection in finite mixture models with a nonsmooth penalty. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(485):187–196.
- Ferrari, D. and Yang, Y. (2015). Confidence sets for model selection by F-testing. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1637–1658.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S., Celeux, G., and Robert, C. P. (2019). *Handbook of mixture analysis*. CRC press.
- Grün, B., Malsiner-Walli, G., and Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. (2022). How many data clusters are in the galaxy data set? bayesian cluster analysis in action. *Advances in data analysis and classification*, 16(2):325–349.
- Huang, M., Tang, S., and Yao, W. (2022). Statistical inference for normal mixtures with unknown number of components. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 16(2):5149–5181.

- Keribin, C. (2000). Consistent estimation of the order of mixture models. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 49–66.
- Lo, Y., Mendell, N. R., and Rubin, D. B. (2001). Testing the number of components in a normal mixture. *Biometrika*, 88(3):767–778.
- Manole, T. and Khalili, A. (2021). Estimating the number of components in finite mixture models via the group-sort-fuse procedure. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(6):3043–3069.
- McLachlan, G. J. (1987). On bootstrapping the likelihood ratio test statistic for the number of components in a normal mixture. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 36(3):318–324.
- Richardson, S. and Green, P. J. (1997). On bayesian analysis of mixtures with an unknown number of components (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 59(4):731–792.
- Roeder, K. and Wasserman, L. (1997). Practical Bayesian density estimation using mixtures of normals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 92(439):894–902.
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 461–464.
- Steele, R. J. and Raftery, A. E. (2010). Performance of Bayesian model selection criteria for gaussian mixture models. In *Frontiers of Statistical Decision Making and Bayesian Analysis*, volume 2, pages 113–130. Springer.
- Takeuchi, K. (1976). Distribution of informational statistics and a criterion of model fitting. *Suri-Kagaku (Mathematical Sciences)*, 153:12–18.
- Vuong, Q. H. (1989). Likelihood ratio tests for model selection and non-nested hypotheses. *Econometrica*, pages 307–333.
- Zheng, C., Ferrari, D., and Yang, Y. (2019). Model selection confidence sets by likelihood ratio testing. *Statistica Sinica*, 29(2):827–851.

A Parameter settings

Graphics and parameter settings for the densities used in the simulation study of Section 4:




Figure 2: Univariate density functions considered in the simulation study.

Density	Component 1			Component 2			Component 3		
	π_1	μ_1	σ_1^2	π_2	μ_2	σ_2^2	π_3	μ_3	σ_3^2
1	0.75	0.00	0.83	0.25	1.37	0.09	-	-	-
2	0.45	-0.93	0.22	0.45	0.93	0.22	0.10	0.00	0.04
3	0.50	-0.74	0.14	0.30	0.37	0.55	0.20	1.47	0.14
4	0.50	0.00	0.14	0.35	1.28	0.14	0.15	2.56	0.11