Approximate MLEs for the location and scale parameters of the Poisson-half-logistic distribution

Leila. Esmaeili 1, Mehrdad. Niaparast2∗

*Corresponding author

1. Department of Statistics, Razi University, Iran, esmaily.laila@gmail.com
2. Department of Statistics, Razi University, Iran, niaparast@razi.ac.ir

Abstract

The application of compound distributions has recently increased due to the flexibility in fitting actual data in various fields such as economics, insurance, etc. Poisson-half-logistic distribution is one of these distributions with an increasing-constant hazard rate that can be used in parallel systems and complementary risk models. Because of the complexity of the form of this distribution, it is not possible to obtain classical parameter estimates (such as MLE) by the analytical method for the location and scale parameters. We present a simple way of deriving explicit estimators by approximating the likelihood equations appropriately. This paper presents the AMLE (Approximate Maximum Likelihood Estimator) method to estimate the location and scale parameters. Using simulation, we show that this method is as efficient as the maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs). We obtain the variance of estimators from the inverse of the observed Fisher information matrix, and we see that when sample size increases, bias and variance of these estimators, and hence MSEs of parameters, decrease. Some pivotal quantities are proposed for finding confidence intervals for location and scale parameters based on asymptotic normality. From the coverage probability, the MLEs do not work well, especially for the small sample sizes; thus, simulated percentiles based on the Monte Carlo method are used to improve the coverage probability. Finally, we present a numerical example to illustrate the methods of inference developed here.
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1. Introduction

The random variable X has a standard Poisson-half-logistic (PHL) distribution (Abdel-Hamid (2016)) if the cumulative distribution function (cdf) and probability density function (pdf) are,

\[ F(z) = \frac{e^{\theta G(z)} - 1}{e^\theta - 1}, \quad \text{for } z > 0, \quad (\theta > 0) \]

\[ f(z) = \frac{\theta g(z)e^{\theta G(z)}}{e^\theta - 1} = \frac{2\theta e^{-z+\theta G(z)}}{(e^\theta - 1)[1 + e^{-z}]^2}, \quad z > 0, \quad (\theta > 0), \]

\[ (1) \]

\[ (2) \]
respectively, where \( G(z) = \frac{1-e^{-z}}{1+e^{-z}} \) and \( g(z) = \frac{2e^{-z}}{(1+e^{-z})^2} \) are the cdf and pdf of standard half logistic distribution respectively. We consider a version of (2) with location \((\mu)\) and scale \((\sigma)\) parameters. If \( X = \sigma Z + \mu \), then \( X \) has the Poisson-half-logistic distribution with the following pdf,

\[
f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{\theta g(z) e^{\theta G(z)}}{\sigma (e^\theta - 1) z}, \quad x > \mu, \quad (\sigma, \theta > 0).
\]

We denote this distribution with \( PHL(\mu, \sigma, \theta) \). In this research, we consider estimating the location and scale parameters of the Poisson-half-logistic distribution. The contents of this paper are organized as follows. In Section (2), we discuss MLEs of the location and scale parameters of the Poisson-half-logistic distribution and provide explicit estimators by appropriately approximating the likelihood equations. Also, section (3), provides expressions for the observed Fisher information matrix. In section (4), some characteristics of the distribution are calculated. In Section (5), we provide the results of a simulation study to evaluate the performance of the approximate estimators and the MLEs determined by numerical methods. Finally, in Section (6), we present a numerical example to illustrate all the methods of inference discussed in the privies sections.

2. Estimation of the location and scale parameters

2.1. Maximum Likelihood Estimation

Let \( X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n \) be a random sample of size \( n \) from the \( PHL(\mu, \sigma, \theta) \), and let \( X_{(1)}, X_{(2)}, \ldots, X_{(n)} \) be the corresponding order statistics. The likelihood function based on this ordered sample is then

\[
L(\mu, \sigma) = n! \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(x_{(i)}; \mu, \sigma).
\]

Using the relation \( f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} f\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right) \), the likelihood function may be rewritten as

\[
L(\mu, \sigma) = n! \sigma^{-n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(z_{(i)}) = n! \sigma^{-n} \theta^n \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{g(z_{(i)}) e^{\theta G(z_{(i)})}}{e^\theta - 1},
\]

where \( z_{(i)} = (x_{(i)} - \mu)/\sigma \).

For simplicity, from now on, we will use \( z_i \) and \( x_i \) instead of \( z_{(i)} \) and \( x_{(i)} \). The log-likelihood function may then be written as

\[
\ell = \ln(L(\mu, \sigma)) \propto n \ln(\theta) - n \ln(\sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln(g(z_i)) + \theta \sum_{i=1}^{n} G(z_i) - n \ln(e^\theta - 1).
\]

Taking derivatives from (5) with respect to \( \mu \) and \( \sigma \) and simplified equations with replacing \( \frac{g(z)}{g(z_i)} = -G(z_i) \), \( \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial \mu} = -\frac{1}{\sigma} z_i \) we obtain the likelihood equations as

\[
\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \mu} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{n} G(z_i) - \theta \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(z_i) = 0, \quad (6)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \sigma} = -\frac{n}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i G(z_i) - \theta \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i g(z_i) = 0. \quad (7)
\]

Equations (6) and (7) do not yield explicit solutions and hence must be solved numerically to obtain the MLEs, say \( \hat{\mu} \) and \( \hat{\sigma} \). Such methods require a starting value near the global maximum.
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2.2. Approximate Maximum Likelihood Estimation

Equations (6) and (7) do not admit the explicit solutions for the $\mu$ and $\sigma$ so we will expand the function $G(z_i)$ and $g(z_i)$ in the Taylor series around the point $E(Z_i) = \nu_i$. See David and Nagaraja (2004) and Arnold and Balakrishnan (2012) for reasoning. Various authors have previously applied a similar method for different distributions, see, for example, Balakrishnan and Asgharzadeh (2005), Asgharzadeh (2006), Balakrishnan and Hossain (2007), Asgharzadeh et al. (2013), Gui and Guo (2018) and Rasekhi et al. (2022).

If $F(z_i)$ is the cdf in (4), then it is known that

$$F(Z_i) = U_i,$$

where $U_i$ is the $i$th order statistic from a sample of size $n$ from the uniform $U(0, 1)$ distribution. We then have

$$Z_i = F^{-1}(U_i),$$

and hence

$$\nu_i = E(Z_i) \approx F^{-1}(\alpha_i),$$

where $\alpha_i = E(U_i) = \frac{i}{n+1}$.

By expanding the function $G(z_i)$ and $g(z_i)$ around the point $\nu_i$ and keeping only the first two terms, we may then approximate this functions by

$$G(z_i) \approx G(\nu_i) + g(\nu_i)(z_i - \nu_i) = \alpha_i - \beta_i z_i, \quad (8)$$

$$g(z_i) \approx g(\nu_i) + g'(\nu_i)(z_i - \nu_i) = \gamma_i + \delta_i z_i, \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha_i = G(\nu_i) - \nu_i g(\nu_i)$, $\beta_i = -g(\nu_i) < 0$, $\gamma_i = g(\nu_i) - g'(\nu_i)\nu_i = g(\nu_i)(1 + \nu_i G(\nu_i)) > 0$ and $\delta_i = g'(\nu_i) = -G(\nu_i)g(\nu_i) < 0$.

Putting the equations (8) and (9) into the equations (6) and (7) and simplify, we obtain the following approximate likelihood equations

$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \mu} \approx \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\alpha_i - \beta_i z_i) - \theta \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\gamma_i + \delta_i z_i) = 0, \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \sigma} \approx -\frac{n}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i (\alpha_i - \beta_i z_i) - \frac{\theta}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i (\gamma_i + \delta_i z_i) = 0. \quad (11)$$

Upon solving equations (10) and (11) for $\mu$ and $\sigma$ with replacing $z_i = \frac{x_i - \mu}{\sigma}$, we drive the AMLE of $\mu$ and $\sigma$ as follows;

$$\hat{\mu} = K + L \hat{\sigma}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$K = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\beta_i + \theta \delta_i) x_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\beta_i + \theta \delta_i)},$$

$$L = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\alpha_i - \theta \gamma_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\beta_i + \theta \delta_i)}.$$

If in equation (11) we replace $\hat{\mu} = K + L \hat{\sigma}$ and simplified we obtain the quadratic equation

$$n \sigma^2 - A \sigma + B = 0, \quad (13)$$
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where
\[ A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\alpha_i - \theta \gamma_i) (x_i - K), \quad B = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\beta_i + \theta \delta_i) (x_i - K)^2. \]

Equation (13) is a quadratic equation in \( \sigma \), with the two roots given by
\[ \tilde{\sigma} = \frac{A \pm \sqrt{A^2 - 4nB}}{2n}, \]
Since \( B < 0 \), one of them drops out. Hence the ALME of \( \sigma \) is
\[ \tilde{\sigma} = \frac{A + \sqrt{A^2 - 4nB}}{2n}. \quad (14) \]
The AMLE method has an advantage over the MLE method because of an explicit solution to estimate the parameters. The AMLEs can be used as starting values for the iterative solution of the likelihood equations (6) and (7) to obtain the MLEs.

It should be mentioned that the approximate MLEs in equations (12) and (14) depend on the parameter \( \theta \). When the parameter \( \theta \) is unknown; we may use the profile likelihood function to obtain its estimate. For fixed \( \theta \), the approximate MLEs \( \tilde{\mu} = \tilde{\mu}(\theta) \) and \( \tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{\sigma}(\theta) \) are given by equations (12) and (14), respectively. Thus, the profile log-likelihood function is
\[ \ell_p(\theta) = \ln L_p(\tilde{\mu}(\theta), \tilde{\sigma}(\theta), \theta) \propto n \ln(\theta) - n \ln(\tilde{\sigma}(\theta)) + n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln(g(z_i)) + \theta n \sum_{i=1}^{n} G(z_i) - n \ln(e^\theta - 1), \]
where
\[ z_i = \frac{x_i - \tilde{\mu}(\theta)}{\tilde{\sigma}(\theta)}, \quad \tilde{\mu}(\theta) = K + L \tilde{\sigma}(\theta) \text{ and } \tilde{\sigma}(\theta) \text{ is given in equation (14).} \]

Now the maximum profile likelihood estimate \( \tilde{\theta}_p \) may be obtained by maximizing the log-likelihood \( \ell(\tilde{\mu}(\theta), \tilde{\sigma}(\theta), \theta) \) with respect to \( \theta \). Iterative numerical methods are required to obtain \( \tilde{\theta}_p \).

3. Observed Fisher information

In this section, the observed Fisher information matrix is computed based on the likelihood and the approximate likelihood equations, then, some pivotal quantities based on the limiting normal distribution are presented and the behavior of these quantities is examined based on a Monte Carlo simulation study.

To evaluate the accuracy of estimators, it is necessary to obtain the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of the estimators. This matrix is obtained from the inverse of the observed Fisher information matrix. We define the elements of the observed Fisher information matrix for maximum likelihood estimators (MLE) as follows
\[ J = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} -\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial \mu^2} & -\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma} \\ -\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial \mu^2} & -\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma} \end{array} \right]^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left( \begin{array}{cc} V_{11} & V_{12} \\ V_{12} & V_{22} \end{array} \right)^{-1} = \sigma^2 \left( \begin{array}{cc} V_{11} & V_{12} \\ V_{12} & V_{22} \end{array} \right), \]
where
\[ V_{11} = \frac{V_3}{V_1 V_3 - V_2^2}, \quad V_{22} = \frac{V_1}{V_1 V_3 - V_2^2}, \quad V_{12} = -\frac{V_2}{V_1 V_4 - V_2^2}. \]

and similarly, \( V_{11}, V_{12}, V_{22} \) can be obtained from the observed Fisher information for the approximate likelihood equations (AMLE).
Using equations (6) and (7), we obtain components of observed Fisher information matrix for the MLE estimators as below

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial^2 \mu} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(z_i) \left[ 1 + \theta G(z_i) \right],
\]
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( G(z_i)(1 + \theta z_i g(z_i)) + g(z_i)(z_i - \theta) \right),
\]
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial^2 \sigma} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left[ n + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( z_i(G(z_i) - \theta g(z_i)) + z_i^2 g(z_i)(1 + \theta G(z_i)) \right) \right].
\]

Similarly, from the equations (10) and (11) for the AMLE estimators we obtain

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial^2 \mu} \approx \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \beta_i + \theta \delta_i \right),
\]
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma} \approx \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ 2z_i(\beta_i + \theta \delta_i) - (\alpha_i - \theta \gamma_i) \right],
\]
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial^2 \sigma} \approx \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left[ n - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( (\alpha_i - \theta \gamma_i) z_i + 3(\beta_i + \theta \delta_i) z_i^2 \right) \right].
\]

The approximate asymptotic variance-covariance matrices are valid only if asymptotic normality holds. Moreover, certain regularity conditions must be satisfied, see, for example, Ferguson (1996).

These conditions are:

- \((\mu, \sigma) \neq (\mu_0, \sigma_0)\) if and only if \(L(\mu, \sigma) \neq L(\mu_0, \sigma_0)\);

- \(L(\mu, \sigma)\) is continuous in \((\mu, \sigma)\) for almost all \(y = (Y_1, Y_2, \cdots, Y_n)\);

- there exists and integrable function \(D(y)\) such that \(|\ln L| < D(y)\) for all \((\mu, \sigma)\);

- the MLEs of \((\mu, \sigma)\) must be in the interior of \((-\infty, \infty) \times (0, \infty)\);

- \(L(\mu, \sigma) > 0\) and is twice continuously differentiable in \((\mu, \sigma)\) in some neighborhood \(N\) of \((-\infty, \infty) \times (0, \infty)\);

- \(\int \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in N} \left\| \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma} \right) \right\| \, dy < \infty;\)

- \(\int \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in N} \left\| \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \mu^2} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \sigma^2} \right) \right\| \, dy < \infty;\)

- \(E \left[ \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \sigma} \right)^\top \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \sigma} \right) \right] \) at \((\mu, \sigma) = (\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})\) exists and is non-singular;

- \(E \left[ \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in N} \left\| \left( \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \mu^2} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \sigma^2} \right) \right\| \right] < \infty;\)
4. Coverage probability and percentage point

To compute confidence intervals (CIs) for the location and scale parameters, one has to obtain pivotal quantities. since \( \left( \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) \) are asymptotically normally distributed, we have

\[
P_1 = \frac{\hat{\mu} - \mu}{\sigma \sqrt{V^{11}}} \sim N(0, 1),
\]

\[
P_2 = \frac{\hat{\mu} - \mu}{\sigma \sqrt{V^{11}}} \sim N(0, 1),
\]

\[
P_3 = \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{V^{22}}} \sim N(0, 1).
\]

as \( n \to \infty \). Equations (15) and (17) holds because \( \hat{\mu} \to N(\mu, \sigma^2 V^{11}) \) and \( \hat{\sigma} \to \sigma \) in distribution and \( \hat{\sigma} \to \sigma \) in probability respectively, and also equation (16) establishes because \( \hat{\mu} \to N(\mu, \sigma^2 V^{11}) \) as \( n \to \infty \). Therefore \( P_i (i = 1, 2, 3) \) can be taken as pivotal quantities because their distributions do not depend on the unknown location and scale parameters. Through Monte Carlo simulations, we computed the coverage probabilities 95\% as bellow

\[
P(-1.96 < P_i < 1.96) = \gamma, \quad i = 1, 2, 3
\]

via a simulation study. Similarly, for the pivotal quantities \( Q_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \) based on the AMLES,

\[
Q_1 = \frac{\hat{\mu} - \mu}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{V^{11}}} , \quad Q_2 = \frac{\hat{\mu} - \mu}{\sigma \sqrt{V^{11}}} , \quad Q_3 = \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{V^{22}}}
\]

We can also easily determine the asymptotic \( \gamma \) percentage points of the distributions of \( P_i \) and \( Q_i \). These percentage points cannot be determined explicitly note that, for finite sample sizes. Hence, we used Monte Carlo simulations in order to determine the \( \gamma \) percentage point, \( m_\gamma \), where, for example, for the distribution of \( P_1 \), we have

\[
P \left( \frac{\hat{\mu} - \mu}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{V^{11}}} \leq m_\gamma \right) = \gamma.
\]

Using values of \( m_\gamma \), we obtain CIs for the parameters \( \sigma \). For example, using the values of \( m_{0.025} \) and \( m_{0.975} \), we have

\[
P \left\{ m_{0.025} \leq \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{V^{22}}} \leq m_{0.975} \right\} = 0.95,
\]

A 95\% confidence interval for a \( \sigma \) is

\[
(\hat{\sigma} - m_{0.975} \hat{\sigma} \sqrt{V^{22}}, \hat{\sigma} + m_{0.025} \hat{\sigma} \sqrt{V^{22}}).
\]

The above confidence intervals obtains for simulated data in section (5). Note, this confidence intervals depends on the value of \( \theta \), we apply profile likelihood function and methods based on moments to estimate \( \theta \).

5. Simulation results

In this section, we discuss the results of a simulation study comparing the performance of the AMLEs with the corresponding MLEs. We consider the simulation of the values of a random variable \( X \) with pdf (3). One way to simulate values of \( X \) is to use the following representations due to the inverse transformation method:

1. Generate \( U_i \sim Uniform(0, 1), \quad i = 1, \cdots, n \)

2. set

\[
X_i = \sigma \ln \left( \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\theta} \ln (U_i e^\theta + 1 - U_i)}{1 - \frac{1}{\theta} \ln (U_i e^\theta + 1 - U_i)} + \mu \right).
\]
We generated N=1000 sample form standard Poisson-half-logistic distribution of sample sizes n=(30, 40, 50, 100, 200) for \(\hat{\theta} = 3, 5, 10\). We computed the AMLEs from (12) and (14). The MLEs of the parameters were then obtained by solving the nonlinear Equations (6) and (7) using the Maple 14 package. Table (1) provides the average values of the estimates, their variances, and their MSEs. The values of the variances and covariances were determined by inverting the observed Fisher information matrix. Table(1) also provides the average values of the maximum profile likelihood estimates, \(\hat{\theta}_p\) and \(\tilde{\theta}_p\). From Table(1), we observe that the AMLEs and the MLEs are almost identical in terms of both bias and variance. The AMLEs are almost as efficient as the MLEs for all sample sizes. As the sample size n increases, the bias and variance of the estimators reduce appreciably. This is expected because of asymptotic normality. For more clarity, the MSEs of the MLEs and AMLEs computed over one thousand replications are plotted in Figure (1). From Figure (1) we observe that the MSEs for the AMLEs are only slightly less than those for MLEs. As expected, the MSEs for both estimators decrease with respect to n. Confidence intervals based on likelihood estimates, \(\tilde{\theta}_p\) and \(\tilde{\theta}_p\) for the above data. From Figure (2), we observe that the maximum profile likelihood estimate of \(\theta\) is 4.9783 is obtained, where \(\mu_X = E(X), \sigma_X = \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}\) and \(E(X^r), r = 1, 2, 3\) are the rth moment of X. Let \(\theta = 4.9783\) be the initial guess of \(\theta\), the MLE and AMLE of \(\mu\) and \(\sigma\) can be calculated. For \(n = 23\) and \(\theta = 4.9783\), we have

\[
\frac{A}{2n} = 25.61991, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{A}{2n} + B = -8879.58774.
\]

Then the equations (12) (14),

\[
\hat{\sigma} = \frac{A + \sqrt{A^2 - 4nB}}{2n}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\sigma} = 25.31358.
\]

The MLEs of \(\mu\) and \(\sigma\) are then computed by solving the nonlinear equations (6) and (7). Using the Newton–Raphson iterative procedure: \(\hat{\mu} = 0.713527\) and \(\hat{\sigma} = 25.3670\). Here, the AMLEs were used as the starting values. We observe that the AMLEs are very close to the MLEs.

When the parameter \(\theta\) is unknown, the maximum profile likelihood estimate \(\tilde{\theta}_p\) obtains by maximizing the loglikelihood \(\ell(\mu, \sigma, \theta)\) with respect to \(\theta\). Figure (2) provides the plot of the profile likelihood function with respect to \(\theta\) for the above data. From Figure (2), we observe that the maximum profile likelihood estimate of \(\theta\) should be \(\tilde{\theta}_p = 4.92139\).

6. Illustrative example

This section presents a numerical example to show the inference methods discussed in previous sections. As Lawless (2011, p. 98) indicated, the following data arise in tests on the endurance of deep groove ball bearings.

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_1 & = 55.56, \\
\theta_2 & = 67.80, \\
\theta_3 & = 68.64, \\
\theta_4 & = 68.64, \\
\theta_5 & = 68.88, \\
\theta_6 & = 84.12, \\
\theta_7 & = 93.12, \\
\theta_8 & = 98.64, \\
\theta_9 & = 105.12, \\
\theta_{10} & = 105.84, \\
\theta_{11} & = 127.92, \\
\theta_{12} & = 128.04, \\
\theta_{13} & = 128.00.
\end{align*}
\]

To obtain an initial guess value of \(\theta\), since the skewness is independent of the location and scale parameters, we obtain the MME of \(\theta\) by equating the sample skewness with the population skewness. Sample skewness is 0.92057 and \(\gamma_1 = E\left[\left(\frac{X - \mu_X}{\sigma_X}\right)^3\right]\) is population skewness. From a numerical solution of the following equation

\[
0.92057 = E[(X - \mu_X)^3] = \frac{E(X^3) - 3E(X^2)E(X) + 2E^3(X)}{[E(X^2) - E^2(X)]^2},
\]

\(\theta = 4.9783\) is obtained, where \(\mu_X = E(X), \sigma_X = \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}\) and \(E(X^r), r = 1, 2, 3\) are the rth moment of X. Let \(\theta = 4.9783\) be the initial guess of \(\theta\), the MLE and AMLE of \(\mu\) and \(\sigma\) can be calculated. For \(n = 23\) and \(\theta = 4.9783\), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
K & = 52.31358, \\
L & = -2.02135, \\
A & = 242.66860, \\
B & = -8879.58774.
\end{align*}
\]

Then the equations (12) (14),

\[
\tilde{\sigma} = \frac{A + \sqrt{A^2 - 4nB}}{2n}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\theta} = K + L\tilde{\sigma} = 0.52668.
\]

The MLEs of \(\mu\) and \(\sigma\) are then computed by solving the nonlinear equations (6) and (7). Using the Newton–Raphson iterative procedure: \(\hat{\mu} = 0.713527\) and \(\hat{\sigma} = 25.3670\). Here, the AMLEs were used as the starting values. We observe that the AMLEs are very close to the MLEs.

When the parameter \(\theta\) is unknown, the maximum profile likelihood estimate \(\tilde{\theta}_p\) obtains by maximizing the loglikelihood \(\ell(\mu, \sigma, \theta)\) with respect to \(\theta\). Figure (2) provides the plot of the profile likelihood function with respect to \(\theta\) for the above data. From Figure (2), we observe that the maximum profile likelihood estimate of \(\theta\) should be \(\tilde{\theta}_p = 4.92139\).

7. Conclusion

In this paper, the Poisson-half-logistic distribution is considered as a combination of distributions. Characteristics of this distribution have been concerned and analyzed by several researchers. Estimates of the maximum likelihood
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>$\theta_p$</th>
<th>$var(\mu)$</th>
<th>$var(\sigma)$</th>
<th>$MSE(\mu)$</th>
<th>$MSE(\sigma)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.33731</td>
<td>0.89011</td>
<td>2.46025</td>
<td>0.11211</td>
<td>0.01894</td>
<td>0.22589</td>
<td>0.03101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMLE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.33730</td>
<td>0.89010</td>
<td>2.46024</td>
<td>0.11210</td>
<td>0.01894</td>
<td>0.22587</td>
<td>0.03102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.31399</td>
<td>0.89347</td>
<td>2.39368</td>
<td>0.09277</td>
<td>0.01547</td>
<td>0.19135</td>
<td>0.02682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.31105</td>
<td>0.89784</td>
<td>2.45274</td>
<td>0.08571</td>
<td>0.01450</td>
<td>0.18246</td>
<td>0.02493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.31188</td>
<td>0.89181</td>
<td>2.38981</td>
<td>0.07392</td>
<td>0.01228</td>
<td>0.17118</td>
<td>0.02395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.29280</td>
<td>0.90390</td>
<td>2.45520</td>
<td>0.06969</td>
<td>0.01181</td>
<td>0.15542</td>
<td>0.02104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.29258</td>
<td>0.90328</td>
<td>2.40005</td>
<td>0.03745</td>
<td>0.00626</td>
<td>0.12305</td>
<td>0.01561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.28332</td>
<td>0.90866</td>
<td>2.44255</td>
<td>0.03534</td>
<td>0.00599</td>
<td>0.11561</td>
<td>0.01433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.28765</td>
<td>0.90565</td>
<td>2.39999</td>
<td>0.01878</td>
<td>0.00314</td>
<td>0.10152</td>
<td>0.01204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.28011</td>
<td>0.90950</td>
<td>2.43664</td>
<td>0.01777</td>
<td>0.00301</td>
<td>0.09623</td>
<td>0.01120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.15399</td>
<td>0.94779</td>
<td>4.85989</td>
<td>0.13062</td>
<td>0.02017</td>
<td>0.15758</td>
<td>0.02289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.14242</td>
<td>0.95597</td>
<td>4.90413</td>
<td>0.12675</td>
<td>0.01945</td>
<td>0.15012</td>
<td>0.02139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.11497</td>
<td>0.96047</td>
<td>4.86373</td>
<td>0.09972</td>
<td>0.01545</td>
<td>0.11294</td>
<td>0.01701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.10576</td>
<td>0.96715</td>
<td>4.89801</td>
<td>0.09748</td>
<td>0.01500</td>
<td>0.10867</td>
<td>0.01608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.10199</td>
<td>0.96429</td>
<td>4.86372</td>
<td>0.08027</td>
<td>0.01243</td>
<td>0.09067</td>
<td>0.01370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.09420</td>
<td>0.96978</td>
<td>4.89214</td>
<td>0.07859</td>
<td>0.01211</td>
<td>0.08746</td>
<td>0.01302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.08657</td>
<td>0.97144</td>
<td>4.86349</td>
<td>0.04055</td>
<td>0.00627</td>
<td>0.04804</td>
<td>0.00708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.08225</td>
<td>0.97434</td>
<td>4.87896</td>
<td>0.03994</td>
<td>0.00616</td>
<td>0.04671</td>
<td>0.00682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.07867</td>
<td>0.97456</td>
<td>4.86115</td>
<td>0.02038</td>
<td>0.00315</td>
<td>0.02657</td>
<td>0.00379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.07629</td>
<td>0.97608</td>
<td>4.86998</td>
<td>0.02015</td>
<td>0.00310</td>
<td>0.02597</td>
<td>0.00367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04689</td>
<td>0.98506</td>
<td>10.00923</td>
<td>0.17657</td>
<td>0.01986</td>
<td>0.19206</td>
<td>0.02106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04445</td>
<td>0.98537</td>
<td>10.06302</td>
<td>0.17675</td>
<td>0.01949</td>
<td>0.19486</td>
<td>0.02069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.04640</td>
<td>0.98069</td>
<td>10.01104</td>
<td>0.13597</td>
<td>0.01532</td>
<td>0.14008</td>
<td>0.01569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.04194</td>
<td>0.98455</td>
<td>10.04823</td>
<td>0.13616</td>
<td>0.01509</td>
<td>0.13999</td>
<td>0.01533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04689</td>
<td>0.98506</td>
<td>10.00923</td>
<td>0.17657</td>
<td>0.01986</td>
<td>0.19206</td>
<td>0.02106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04445</td>
<td>0.98537</td>
<td>10.06302</td>
<td>0.17675</td>
<td>0.01949</td>
<td>0.19486</td>
<td>0.02069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.04640</td>
<td>0.98069</td>
<td>10.01104</td>
<td>0.13597</td>
<td>0.01532</td>
<td>0.14008</td>
<td>0.01569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.04194</td>
<td>0.98455</td>
<td>10.04823</td>
<td>0.13616</td>
<td>0.01509</td>
<td>0.13999</td>
<td>0.01533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04689</td>
<td>0.98506</td>
<td>10.00923</td>
<td>0.17657</td>
<td>0.01986</td>
<td>0.19206</td>
<td>0.02106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMLE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04445</td>
<td>0.98537</td>
<td>10.06302</td>
<td>0.17675</td>
<td>0.01949</td>
<td>0.19486</td>
<td>0.02069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.04640</td>
<td>0.98069</td>
<td>10.01104</td>
<td>0.13597</td>
<td>0.01532</td>
<td>0.14008</td>
<td>0.01569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.04194</td>
<td>0.98455</td>
<td>10.04823</td>
<td>0.13616</td>
<td>0.01509</td>
<td>0.13999</td>
<td>0.01533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate MLEs for the location and scale parameters of the Poisson-half-logistic distribution
Table 2: (2.5,97.5) percentage points of the pivotal quantities based on the MLEs and AMLEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>θ</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$P_1$/Q_1</th>
<th>$P_2$/Q_2</th>
<th>$P_3$/Q_3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.1816, 3.3348)</td>
<td>(-0.1999, 2.2677)</td>
<td>(-3.8679, 0.7152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.2184, 2.9705)</td>
<td>(-0.2770, 2.1912)</td>
<td>(-3.2801, 0.8532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.3041, 2.8761)</td>
<td>(-0.3022, 2.2952)</td>
<td>(-3.2885, 0.9046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.3107, 2.9106)</td>
<td>(-0.3147, 2.3867)</td>
<td>(-3.3107, 0.9938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(-0.1326, 2.7729)</td>
<td>(-0.1431, 2.2713)</td>
<td>(-3.1388, 0.6077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.1376, 2.8396)</td>
<td>(-0.2023, 2.3413)</td>
<td>(-3.1165, 0.6654)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0771, 3.0656)</td>
<td>(0.0778, 2.4848)</td>
<td>(-3.1345, 0.5682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0715, 3.0913)</td>
<td>(0.0637, 2.5484)</td>
<td>(-3.0984, 0.6346)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4798, 3.8803)</td>
<td>(0.4491, 3.1976)</td>
<td>(-4.0742, 0.0701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4867, 3.9426)</td>
<td>(0.4552, 3.2664)</td>
<td>(-4.0813, 0.1640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(-1.0361, 2.7501)</td>
<td>(-1.1910, 1.9765)</td>
<td>(-2.6462, 1.1687)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.0647, 2.7953)</td>
<td>(-1.2018, 2.0435)</td>
<td>(-2.6432, 1.2289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.1985, 2.7306)</td>
<td>(-1.3766, 2.0914)</td>
<td>(-2.6562, 1.2734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.1925, 2.7439)</td>
<td>(-1.3808, 2.0989)</td>
<td>(-2.5757, 1.3644)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(-1.0533, 2.4424)</td>
<td>(-1.1297, 1.9828)</td>
<td>(-2.6737, 1.1311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.0473, 2.4267)</td>
<td>(-1.1713, 1.9830)</td>
<td>(-2.6886, 1.1621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.2655, 2.2032)</td>
<td>(-1.4267, 1.9011)</td>
<td>(-2.2756, 1.4007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.2457, 2.2005)</td>
<td>(-1.4451, 1.8921)</td>
<td>(-2.2589, 1.4441)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.2616, 2.6434)</td>
<td>(-1.3622, 2.3623)</td>
<td>(-2.8169, 1.3187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.2731, 2.6354)</td>
<td>(-1.3519, 2.3801)</td>
<td>(-2.8132, 1.3454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(-1.3329, 2.7519)</td>
<td>(-1.5948, 2.0755)</td>
<td>(-2.50230, 1.4446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.3245, 2.7563)</td>
<td>(-1.5885, 2.0599)</td>
<td>(-2.4942, 1.4847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.3854, 2.7667)</td>
<td>(-1.7322, 2.1365)</td>
<td>(-2.5664, 1.5163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.3976, 2.7724)</td>
<td>(-1.7496, 2.1578)</td>
<td>(-2.5589, 1.5252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(-1.3892, 2.3558)</td>
<td>(-1.5843, 1.9419)</td>
<td>(-2.4604, 1.3578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.3962, 2.3492)</td>
<td>(-1.5981, 1.9395)</td>
<td>(-2.4578, 1.4335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.7443, 2.0619)</td>
<td>(-2.0354, 1.7978)</td>
<td>(-2.1167, 1.6824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.7659, 2.0860)</td>
<td>(-2.0623, 1.8136)</td>
<td>(-2.0738, 1.7495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.9235, 2.4619)</td>
<td>(-2.1496, 2.1106)</td>
<td>(-2.4104, 1.7494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.9257, 2.4702)</td>
<td>(-2.1344, 2.1141)</td>
<td>(-2.4056, 1.7495)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of this distribution, whether the shape parameter is known or unknown, do not have an explicit form and need to use numerical methods to estimate the parameters. These numerical methods are sensitive to the initial value of the parameters, and the results might be changed with a slight change in initial values.

In this study, assuming the parameter $\theta$ is known, the approximate maximum likelihood method for estimating the parameters is proposed. This method's obtained AMLE of location and scale parameters have an explicit form, and their values can be obtained quickly.
Table 3: Coverage probabilities of 95% confidence intervals for the pivotal quantities based on the MLEs and AMLEs of parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>θ</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>P_1</th>
<th>Q_1</th>
<th>P_2</th>
<th>Q_2</th>
<th>P_3</th>
<th>Q_3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8510</td>
<td>0.8460</td>
<td>0.9450</td>
<td>0.9260</td>
<td>0.8400</td>
<td>0.8300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.8520</td>
<td>0.8440</td>
<td>0.9410</td>
<td>0.9299</td>
<td>0.8220</td>
<td>0.8310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>0.8310</td>
<td>0.9260</td>
<td>0.9220</td>
<td>0.8360</td>
<td>0.8330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7010</td>
<td>0.6980</td>
<td>0.8230</td>
<td>0.8100</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>0.7580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.4490</td>
<td>0.4480</td>
<td>0.5430</td>
<td>0.5370</td>
<td>0.5870</td>
<td>0.6040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8950</td>
<td>0.8950</td>
<td>0.9600</td>
<td>0.9550</td>
<td>0.9050</td>
<td>0.9050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.9200</td>
<td>0.9200</td>
<td>0.9560</td>
<td>0.9560</td>
<td>0.9160</td>
<td>0.9220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9260</td>
<td>0.9280</td>
<td>0.9540</td>
<td>0.9510</td>
<td>0.9210</td>
<td>0.9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9250</td>
<td>0.9250</td>
<td>0.9510</td>
<td>0.9480</td>
<td>0.9300</td>
<td>0.9330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.9060</td>
<td>0.9070</td>
<td>0.9330</td>
<td>0.9330</td>
<td>0.9190</td>
<td>0.9220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8880</td>
<td>0.8880</td>
<td>0.9400</td>
<td>0.9400</td>
<td>0.9140</td>
<td>0.9140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.9300</td>
<td>0.9310</td>
<td>0.9430</td>
<td>0.9430</td>
<td>0.9310</td>
<td>0.9320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9300</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>0.9540</td>
<td>0.9540</td>
<td>0.9360</td>
<td>0.9370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9360</td>
<td>0.9360</td>
<td>0.9420</td>
<td>0.9440</td>
<td>0.9450</td>
<td>0.9460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.9340</td>
<td>0.9330</td>
<td>0.9470</td>
<td>0.9460</td>
<td>0.9450</td>
<td>0.9460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Plot of profile likelihood function, $\ell_p(\theta)$
Data from the Poisson-half-logistic distribution were simulated to compare the AMLE and the MLE methods to estimate the parameters. The results presented in Table (1) showed that the estimates by the MLE and the AMLE methods are very close, and the values of variance and MSE parameters decrease with increasing sample size. A practical example was also provided to illustrate the efficiency of the proposed method. In this example, to obtain the parameter $\theta$, we used the equalizing of data skewness and distribution skewness. By placing it as the known value of $\theta$, we estimate the location and scale parameters. It is observed that the results are very close to each other, and distribution also fits convenient. The other methods of estimations, including percentile, least squares and weighted least squares can be suggested. The idea of this study can also be extended to many distributions.
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