



## MAJORIZATION ALGORITHMS FOR PROBIT MODELS: THE R PACKAGE PROBIT

JAN DE LEEUW

ABSTRACT. The Expectation-Maximization algorithm is derived as a special case of the Majorization Method. We specialize this general derivation to both univariate and multivariate discrete normal distributions, latent variable models, and missing data imputation. The corresponding algorithms, with **R** code, are also given.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The *majorization method* is a general approach, or family of approaches, to construct optimization methods. Some general publications about majorization are Kiers [1990]; De Leeuw [1994]; Heiser [1995]; Lange et al. [2000]; Hunter and Lange [2004]; De Leeuw and Lange [2009].

---

*Date:* Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> June, 2009 — 13h 26min — Typeset in LUCIDA BRIGHT.

*Key words and phrases.* Missing Data, Multivariate Normal, EM Algorithm, Majorization.

Suppose the problem is to minimize  $f : \mathcal{X} \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  over  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ . A function  $F : \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{X} \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a *majorization function* if  $f(x) \leq F(x, y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $f(x) = F(x, x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

The iterative *majorization algorithm* finds the update of  $x^{(k)}$  by computing

$$\mathcal{X}^{(k)} \triangleq \mathbf{argmax}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} F(x, x^{(k)}).$$

If  $x^{(k)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$  we stop. Else we select  $x^{(k+1)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ . The *sandwich inequality*

$$f(x^{(k+1)}) \leq F(x^{(k+1)}, x^{(k)}) < F(x^{(k)}, x^{(k)}) = f(x^{(k)})$$

shows that the algorithm either stops, or produces a decreasing sequence of function values. Under compactness and continuity conditions this implies convergence [Zangwill, 1969].

Of course if we are maximizing  $f$ , then we can construct a suitable minorization function and maximize that in each iterative step. To cover both minorization and majorization Lange et al. [2000] propose the name *MM algorithm*, where the first  $M$  stands for either majorization or minorization, and the second  $M$  stands for either maximization or minimization.

Majorization and minorization functions are usually derived from classical inequalities, for Taylor's Theorem, or from convexity considerations. The *Expectation-Maximization* or *EM algorithm* is a family of MM algorithms based on Jensen's Inequality, usually applied in the statistical context of computing maximum likelihood estimates [Dempster et al., 1977; McLachlan and Krishnan, 2008]. The general idea of using MM algorithms in data analysis came about by realizing that the EM algorithm, based on Jensen's Inequality, and the SMACOF method for multidimensional scaling [De Leeuw, 1977; De Leeuw and Heiser, 1977, 1980], based on the Cauchy-Schwartz Inequality, were both examples of a more general approach to algorithm construction.

1.1. **EM as MM.** Suppose that  $g : X \otimes Y \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , where  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ . Define  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  by

$$f(x) \triangleq \log \int_Y g(x, y) dy.$$

The problem we study in this paper is maximization of  $f$  over  $X$ .

Suppose  $x, \tilde{x} \in X$ . We assume that if  $x \neq \tilde{x}$  then  $g(x, y) \neq g(\tilde{x}, y)$  for all  $y \in Y$ . Now

$$f(x) - f(\tilde{x}) = \log \frac{\int_Y g(x, y) dy}{\int_Y g(\tilde{x}, y) dy} = \log \frac{\int_Y g(\tilde{x}, y) \frac{g(x, y)}{g(\tilde{x}, y)} dy}{\int_Y g(\tilde{x}, y) dy}.$$

Let

$$h(x, y) \triangleq \frac{g(x, y)}{\int_Y g(x, y) dy}.$$

Then  $\int_Y h(x, y) dy = 1$  for all  $x$  and

$$f(x) - f(\tilde{x}) = \log \int_Y h(\tilde{x}, y) \frac{g(x, y)}{g(\tilde{x}, y)} dy.$$

Applying Jensen's Inequality to the right hand side gives

$$f(x) > f(\tilde{x}) + k(x, \tilde{x}) - k(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}),$$

where we use the abbreviation

$$k(x, \tilde{x}) \triangleq \int_Y h(\tilde{x}, y) \log g(x, y) dy.$$

The function  $F(x, \tilde{x}) = f(\tilde{x}) + k(x, \tilde{x}) - k(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x})$  is the required minorization function.

This leads to the MM algorithm in which

$$\mathcal{X}^{(k)} \triangleq \mathop{\text{argmax}}_{x \in X} F(x, x^{(k)}) = \mathop{\text{argmax}}_{x \in X} k(x, x^{(k)}),$$

and  $x^{(k+1)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ .

## 2. PROBIT ANALYSIS

**2.1. The Discrete Normal.** In our first example we want to maximize

$$(1) \quad f(\mu, \sigma^2) = \sum_{j=1}^m n_j \log \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{\alpha_{j-1}}^{\alpha_j} \phi\left(\frac{y-\mu}{\sigma}\right) dy,$$

where

$$\phi(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}y^2\right\},$$

Moreover the  $-\infty = \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_{m-1} < \alpha_m = +\infty$  are known *knots*, and the  $n_j$  are observed *frequencies*.

Alternatively, writing  $n$  for the sum of the  $n_j$  and  $p_j = n_j/n$ ,

$$f(\mu, \sigma^2) = n \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \log \pi_j(\mu, \sigma^2),$$

where

$$\pi_j(\mu, \sigma^2) = \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \mu}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \mu}{\sigma}\right)$$

and

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \phi(y) dy.$$

Maximizing (1) means maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters of a *discretized normal distribution*. The problem is important, because in actual data analysis so-called “continuous distributions” are always observed in a discretized form.

We now apply the theory in subsection 1.1 to each of the  $m$  terms in equation (1). In this case, for  $\alpha_{j-1} < y < \alpha_j$ ,

$$h_j(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}, y) = \frac{\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}} \phi\left(\frac{y-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)},$$

i.e.  $h$  is the doubly-truncated normal [Johnson et al., 1994, section 10.1, p. 156-162].

In the majorization algorithm we must minimize in each step

$$\ell(\mu, \sigma^2, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}^2) = \log \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \int_{\alpha_{j-1}}^{\alpha_j} h_j(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}, y) (y - \mu)^2 dy.$$

Define the conditional means and variances

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}_j &\triangleq \int_{\alpha_{j-1}}^{\alpha_j} h_j(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}, \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{y} d\mathbf{y}, \\ \tilde{\sigma}_j^2 &\triangleq \int_{\alpha_{j-1}}^{\alpha_j} h_j(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}, \mathbf{y}) (\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mu}_j)^2 d\mathbf{y}.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma^2, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^2) = \log \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \tilde{\sigma}_j^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m p_j (\tilde{\mu}_j - \boldsymbol{\mu})^2 \right\}.$$

It follows that

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(k+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_j^{(k)},$$

and

$$(\sigma^2)^{(k+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j (\tilde{\sigma}_j^2)^{(k)} + \sum_{j=1}^m p_j (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_j^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(k+1)})^2.$$

This can be worked out in more detail by using the formulas for the mean and the variance of the doubly-truncated normal distribution [Johnson et al., 1994, formulas 13.134 and 13.135]. Specifically

$$(2a) \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_j = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \left[ \frac{\phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)} \right] \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}.$$

and

$$(2b) \quad \tilde{\sigma}_j^2 = \left[ 1 - \frac{\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) \phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - \left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) \phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)} - \left\{ \frac{\phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{\tilde{\sigma}}\right)} \right\}^2 \right] \tilde{\sigma}^2$$

The **R** code is in Appendix A.1.

**2.2. Limiting Case.** Suppose we have  $n$  observations  $y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_n$ , without ties. Define  $\epsilon < \min_{i,k} (y_i - y_{i-1})$ , and let  $\alpha_{i-1} = y_i - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$  and  $\alpha_i = y_i + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ . Then each of the  $n$  open intervals  $(\alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_i)$  of length  $\epsilon$ , contains exactly one observation. Let us now study what happens if  $\epsilon$  is small.

If  $a$  and  $b$  are any two functions of  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^+$  that are sufficiently many times differentiable, then

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{a(\delta + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon) - a(\delta - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon)}{b(\delta + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon) - b(\delta - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon)} &= \frac{a'(\delta) + \frac{1}{24}\epsilon^2 a'''(\delta) + o(\epsilon^2)}{b'(\delta) + \frac{1}{24}\epsilon^2 b'''(\delta) + o(\epsilon^2)} = \\ &= \frac{a'(\delta)}{b'(\delta)} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{24} \left\{ \frac{a'''(\delta)}{a'(\delta)} - \frac{b'''(\delta)}{b'(\delta)} \right\} \epsilon^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $y_i = \frac{y_i - \mu}{\sigma}$ . Then  $\frac{\alpha_i - \mu}{\sigma} = y_i + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma}$  and  $\frac{\alpha_{i-1} - \mu}{\sigma} = y_i - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma}$ . Now use

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'(x) &= \phi(x), \\ \Phi''(x) &= \phi'(x) = -x\phi(x), \\ \Phi'''(x) &= \phi''(x) = (x^2 - 1)\phi(x), \\ \Phi''''(x) &= \phi'''(x) = -(x^3 - 3x)\phi(x), \\ \Phi'''''(x) &= \phi''''(x) = (x^4 - 6x^2 + 3)\phi(x). \end{aligned}$$

From (3) with  $a = \phi$  and  $b = \Phi$  we find

$$\mu_i - \mu = (y_i - \mu) \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{12} \frac{\epsilon^2}{\sigma^2} \right\} + o(\epsilon^2),$$

and with  $a = -\phi'$  and  $b = \Phi$  we find

$$\sigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{12} \epsilon^2 + o(\epsilon^2).$$

The **R** code in the Appendix A.2 has an example with 1000 standard normals categorized in 8000 equal-length intervals between -4 and +4.

**2.3. Probit Regression.** Suppose  $F = \{f_{ij}\}$  is an  $n \times m$  table of frequencies. We suppose that row  $i$  is a sample from a discrete normal with mean  $\mu_i$  and variance  $\sigma_i^2$  and that the discretization

points are the same for each row. To make this a regression problem we suppose that  $\mu_i = \mathbf{x}'_i \beta$ .

The log-likelihood is  $\sum_{i=1}^n f_{i\bullet} \sum_{j=1}^m p_{ij} \log \pi_{ij}$ , where the  $f_{i\bullet}$  are the row marginals,  $p_{ij} = f_{ij} / f_{i\bullet}$ , and

$$\pi_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sigma_i} \int_{\alpha_{j-1}}^{\alpha_j} \phi\left(\frac{y - \mathbf{x}'_i \beta}{\sigma_i}\right) dy = \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \mathbf{x}'_i \beta}{\sigma_i}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \mathbf{x}'_i \beta}{\sigma_i}\right).$$

Exactly as before we define

$$h_{ij}(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\sigma}, y) = \frac{\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_i} \phi\left(\frac{y - \mathbf{x}'_i \tilde{\beta}}{\tilde{\sigma}_i}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \mathbf{x}'_i \tilde{\beta}}{\tilde{\sigma}_i}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \mathbf{x}'_i \tilde{\beta}}{\tilde{\sigma}_i}\right)}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_{ij} &\triangleq \int_{\alpha_{j-1}}^{\alpha_j} h_{ij}(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\sigma}, y) y dy, \\ \tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^2 &\triangleq \int_{\alpha_{j-1}}^{\alpha_j} h_{ij}(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\sigma}, y) (y - \tilde{\mu}_{ij})^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\beta, \sigma^2, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\sigma}^2) &= \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n f_{i\bullet} \left\{ \log \sigma_i^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m p_{ij} \tilde{\sigma}_{ij}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m p_{ij} (\tilde{\mu}_{ij} - \mathbf{x}'_i \beta)^2 \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus a majorization step involves solving the equations

$$(\sigma_i^2)^{(k+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^m p_{ij} (\sigma_{ij}^2)^{(k)} + \sum_{j=1}^m p_{ij} (\mu_{ij}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}'_i \beta^{(k+1)})^2,$$

and

$$\beta^{(k+1)} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{f_{ij}}{(\sigma_i^2)^{(k+1)}} (\mu_{ij}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}'_i \beta)^2.$$

In the special case in which we assume that all  $\sigma_i^2$  are equal, we can solve these equations directly, but in the general case a simple block relaxation algorithm is needed. The [R](#) code is in Appendix A.3.

2.3.1. *Variable Knots.* There is a further elaboration incorporated in most probit regression programs. It treats the  $\alpha_j$  as unknowns and computes them along with the  $\sigma$  and  $\beta$ . We treat this as a separate optimization problem, not using MM, but the method of scoring.

In order to improve the  $\alpha_j$  for given  $\sigma$  and  $\beta$  we write the loss function in the form

$$f(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m f_{ij} \log \left\{ \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \mu_i}{\sigma_i}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\alpha_{j-1} - \mu_i}{\sigma_i}\right) \right\}.$$

Remember that  $\alpha_0 = -\infty$  and  $\alpha_m = +\infty$ , so only  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}$  are variable. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{ij} &\triangleq \frac{f_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} - \frac{f_{ij+1}}{\pi_{ij+1}}, \\ \phi_{ij} &\triangleq \frac{1}{\sigma_i} \phi\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \mu_i}{\sigma_i}\right) \end{aligned}$$

We find

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha_j} = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{ij} \delta_{ij}.$$

For scoring we need the expected value of the cross product of the partials. Thus

$$\mathbf{E} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha_j} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha_\ell} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{ij} \phi_{i\ell} \mathbf{E}(\delta_{ij} \delta_{i\ell}).$$

Now

$$\mathbf{E}(\delta_{ij} \delta_{i\ell}) = f_i \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi_j} + \frac{1}{\pi_{j+1}} & \text{if } j = \ell, \\ -\frac{1}{\pi_{\max(j,\ell)}} & \text{if } |j - \ell| = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This is enough to do the actual computations. Again the **R** code is in Appendix A.3.



## REFERENCES

- J. De Leeuw. Correctness of Kruskal's Algorithms for Monotone Regression with Ties. *Psychometrika*, 42:141-144, 1977.
- J. De Leeuw. Block Relaxation Methods in Statistics. In H.H. Bock, W. Lenski, and M.M. Richter, editors, *Information Systems and Data Analysis*, Berlin, 1994. Springer Verlag.
- J. De Leeuw and W. J. Heiser. Multidimensional Scaling with Restrictions on the Configuration. In P.R. Krishnaiah, editor, *Multivariate Analysis, Volume V*, pages 501-522, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1980. North Holland Publishing Company.
- J. De Leeuw and W.J. Heiser. Convergence of Correction Matrix Algorithms for Multidimensional Scaling. In J.C. Lingoes, editor, *Geometric Representations of Relational Data*, chapter 32. Mathesis Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1977.
- J. De Leeuw and K. Lange. Sharp Quadratic Majorization in One Dimension. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 53:2471-2484, 2009.
- A.P. Dempster, N.M. Laird, and D.B. Rubin. Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via the EM algorithm (with Discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 39:1-38, 1977.
- W.J. Heiser. Convergent Computing by Iterative Majorization: Theory and Applications in Multidimensional Data Analysis. In W.J. Krzanowski, editor, *Recent Advantages in Descriptive Multivariate Analysis*, pages 157-189. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
- D.R. Hunter and K. Lange. A Tutorial on MM Algorithms. *American Statistician*, 58(30-37), 2004.
- N.L. Johnson, S. Kotz, and N. Balakrishnan. *Continuous Univariate Distributions, Volume I*. Wiley, second edition, 1994.
- H. Kiers. Majorization as a Tool for Optimizing a Class of Matrix Functions. *Psychometrika*, 55:417-428, 1990.
- K. Lange, D.R. Hunter, and I. Yang. Optimization Transfer Using Surrogate Objective Functions. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 9:1-20, 2000.

G.J. McLachlan and T. Krishnan. *The EM Algorithm and Extensions*.

Wiley, New York, second edition, 2008.

W. I. Zangwill. *Nonlinear Programming: a Unified Approach*.

Prentice-Hall, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J., 1969.

## APPENDIX A. CODE

## A.1. Discrete Normal Fitting: pDiscrete.R.

```

1  source("pUtilities.R")
2
3  pDiscrete<-function(a, f, eps=1e-10, itmax=100, verbose=TRUE) {
4  n<-sum(f); p<-f/n; r<-length(f); itel<-1; k<-length(a)
5  lw<-c(-Inf, a); up<-c(a, Inf); fmax<-sum(x*logx(p))
6  z<-qbNorm(cumsum(p))
7  mv<-qr.solve(cbind(1, a), butLast(z))
8  m<-mv[1]/mv[2]; v<-(1/mv[2])^2
9  pp<-diff(pnorm(addInf(a), m, sqrt(v)))
10 fold<-2*(fmax-sum(p*log(pp)))
11 repeat {
12   sm<-sapply(1:r, function(i) msTruncate(m, v, lw[i], up[i]))
13   mm<-unlist(sm[1,]); ms<-unlist(sm[2,])
14   m<-sum(p*mm); v<-sum(p*ms)+sum(p*(mm-m)^2)
15   pp<-diff(pnorm(a, m, sqrt(v)))
16   fnew<-2*(fmax-sum(p*log(pp)))
17   if (verbose) cat("Iteration: ", formatC(itel, width=3, format="d"),
18     " fold: ", formatC(n*fold, digits=8, width=12, format="f"),
19     " fnew: ", formatC(n*fnew, digits=8, width=12, format="f"),
20     " mean: ", formatC(m, digits=8, width=12, format="f"),
21     " vari: ", formatC(v, digits=8, width=12, format="f"),
22     "\n")
23   if (((fold-fnew) < eps) || (itel == itmax)) break()
24   itel<-itel+1; fold<-fnew
25 }
26 return(list(m=m, v=v, f=n*fnew, drf=r-3, p=1-pchisq(n*fnew, r-3)))
27 }
28
29 msTruncate<-function(m, v, a, b) {
30 if (!(a<b)) stop("smallest truncation point first")
31 s<-sqrt(v); aa<-(a-m)/s; bb<-(b-m)/s
32 da<-dnorm(aa); db<-dnorm(bb)
33 pa<-pnorm(aa); pb<-pnorm(bb)
34 r1<-(db-da)/(pb-pa)
35 if (is.finite(a)) ada<-aa*da else ada<-0
36 if (is.finite(b)) bdb<-bb*db else bdb<-0
37 r2<-(bdb-ada)/(pb-pa)
38 mm<-m-s*r1
39 vv<-v*abs((1-r2-(r1^2)))

```

```
40 return(list(m=mm,v=vv))
41 }
```

## A.2. Discrete Normal Examples: pDiscExamp.R.

```
1 set.seed(12345)
2 fnorm<-as.vector(table(round(rnorm(1000))))
3 anorm<-c(-Inf,-2.5,-1.5,-.5,.5,1.5,2.5,Inf)
4
5 asmall<-c(-Inf,-1,1,Inf)
6 fsmall<-c(2,7,1)
7
8 fquetelet<-c(28620,11580,13990,14410,11410,8780,5530,3190,2490)
9 aquetelet<-c(-Inf,1.570,1.597,1.624,1.651,1.678,1.705,1.752,1.759,Inf)
10
11 set.seed(12345)
12 x<-rnorm(1000)
13 acont<-c(-Inf,seq(-4,4,by=.001),Inf)
14 fcont<-rep(0,length(acont)-1)
15 tab<-table(apply(x,function(z) which.max(z<acont)-1))
16 fcont[as.integer(names(tab))]<-as.vector(tab)
```

## A.3. Probit Regression Fitting: pReg.R.

```
1 source("pUtilities.R")
2
3 pRegres<-function(f,x,a=NULL,eps=1e-6,ops=1e-6,itmax=100,jtmax=1,verouter
  =TRUE,verinner=!verouter,sigeq=FALSE) {
4 nn<-rowSums(f); p<-f/nn; n<-nrow(f); m<-ncol(f)
5 itel<-1; k<-length(a)
6 lw<-a[-k]; up<-a[-1]; fmax<-sum(nn*x*logx(p)); mn<-ms<-f
7 z<-qbNorm(apply(p,1,cumsum))
8 mv<-qr.solve(cbind(1,up[-(k-1)]),z[-(k-1),])
9 mn<-mv[1,]/mv[2,]; vr<-(1/mv[2,])^2
10 bb<-qr.solve(x,mn); mn<-drop(x%*%bb)
11 ps<-pnorm(outer(1/sqrt(vr),a,"*")-mn/sqrt(vr))
12 pp<-t(apply(ps,1,diff))
13 fold<-2*(fmax-sum(f*log(pp)))
14 repeat {
15   for (i in 1:n) for (j in 1:m) {
16     mv<-msTruncate(mn[i],vr[i],lw[j],up[j])
17     mm[i,j]<-mv[[1]]; ms[i,j]<-mv[[2]]
18   }
```

```

19  jtel<-1; finn<-fold
20  repeat {
21    vr<-rowSums(p*ms)+rowSums(p*(mm-mn)^2)
22    bb<-qr.solve(x,rowSums((p*mm)/vr)); mn<-drop(x%*%bb)
23    ps<-pnorm(outer(1/sqrt(vr),a,"*")-mn/sqrt(vr))
24    pp<-t(apply(ps,1,diff))
25    fmid<-2*(fmax-sum(f*log(pp)))
26    if (verinner) cat("Iteration: ",paste(formatC(ite1,width=3,
27      format="d"),letters[jtel],sep=""),
28      " finn: ",formatC(finn,digits=8,width=12,format="f"),
29      " fmid: ",formatC(fmid,digits=8,width=12,format="f"),
30      "\n")
31    if (((finn-fmid) < ops) || (jtel == jtmax)) break()
32    jtel<-jtel+1; finn<-fmid
33  }
34  fnew<-fmid
35  if (verouter) cat("Iteration: ",formatC(ite1,width=3, format="d"),
36    " fold: ",formatC(fold,digits=8,width=12,format="f"),
37    " fnew: ",formatC(fnew,digits=8,width=12,format="f"),
38    "\n")
39  if (((fold-fnew) < eps) || (ite1 == itmax)) break()
40  ite1<-ite1+1; fold<-fnew
41  }
42  return(list(m=mn,v=vr,f=n*fnew,drf=r-3,p=1-pchisq(n*fnew,r-3)))
43  }
44  adjustA<-function(f,mn,vr,ktmax=100,pps=1e-6,veradj=TRUE) {
45    ss<-sqrt(vr); nn<-rowSums(f); n<-nrow(f); m<-ncol(f)
46    a<-c(-Inf,apply(mn+ss*qnorm(colCums(f/nn))[, -m],2,mean),Inf)
47    fmax<-sum(nn*x*logx(f/nn)); fold<-Inf; kte1<-1
48    repeat{
49      ps<-pnorm(outer(1/sqrt(vr),a,"*")-mn/ss)
50      pp<-colDiff(ps)
51      fnew<-2*(fmax-sum(nn*x*logx(pp)))
52      aa<-dropFirst(dropLast(a))
53      mm<-length(aa)
54      ds<-dnorm(outer(1/sqrt(vr),aa,"*")-mn/ss)/ss
55      dt<-colDiff(f/pp)
56      g<-colSums(ds*dt)
57      gepts<-max(abs(g))
58      if (veradj) cat("Iteration: ",formatC(kte1,width=3, format="d"),
59        " grad: ",formatC(gepts,digits=8,width=12,format="f"),
60        " fold: ",formatC(fold,digits=8,width=12,format="f"),

```

```

61     " fnew: ", formatC(fnew,digits=8,width=12,format="f"),
62     "\n")
63     if ((geps < pps) || (kte1 == ktmx)) break()
64     h<-matrix(0,mm,mm)
65     for (i in 1:n) {
66         pn<-pp[i,]; di<-ds[i,]
67         v<-diag(1/dropLast(pn)+1/dropFirst(pn))
68         w<-1/dropLast(dropFirst(pn))
69         upDiag(v)<-w; lwDiag(v)<-w
70         h<-h+nn[i]*outer(di,di)*v
71     }
72     a<-c(-Inf,aa+solve(h,g),Inf)
73     fold<-fnew; kte1<-kte1+1
74 }
75 }
76
77 pRegInitial<-function(f,x,a=NULL) {
78 nn<-rowSums(f); p<-f/nn; n<-nrow(f); m<-ncol(f)
79 zz<-qbNorm(colCums(p)[,-m])
80 if (!is.null(a)) {
81     a<-dropInf(a)
82     mv<-qr.solve(cbind(1,a),t(zz))
83     mn<-mv[1,]/mv[2,]; vr<-(1/mv[2,])^2
84 }
85 if (is.null(a)) {
86     ms<-apply(zz,1,mean)
87     zm<-t(apply(zz,1,function(x) x-mean(x)))
88     rz<-rankOne(zm); sg<-sign(sum(rz$left))
89     ss<-sg/rz$left; a<-sg*rz$right
90     mn<-ms*ss; vr<-ss^2
91 }
92 bb<-qr.solve(x,mn); mn<-drop(x%*%bb)
93 return(m=mn,v=vr,b=bb,a=a)
94 }

```

#### A.4. Utilities: pUtilities.R.

```

1
2 xlogx<-function(x) ifelse(x==0,0,x*log(x))
3
4 qbNorm<-function(x){
5 z<-qnorm(x)
6 z[which(x==0)]<-5; z[which(x==1)]<-5

```

```

7  return(z)
8  }
9
10 rankOne<-function(z) {
11  sz<-svd(z,nu=1,nv=1)
12  return(list(left=drop(sz$u),right=drop((sz$v)*(sz$d[1])))
13  }
14
15 "upDiag<-"<-function(x,p=1,value) {
16  n<-nrow(x); m<-ncol(x)
17  if (p > m-1) return(x)
18  q<-min(n,m-p)-1
19  x[(p*n+1)+(0:q)*(n+1)]<-value
20  return(x)
21  }
22
23 "lwDiag<-"<-function(x,p=1,value) {
24  n<-nrow(x); m<-ncol(x)
25  if (p > n-1) return(x)
26  q<-min(m,n-p)-1
27  x[(p+1)+(0:q)*(n+1)]<-value
28  return(x)
29  }
30
31 colDiff<-function(x) t(apply(x,1,diff))
32
33 colCums<-function(x) t(apply(x,1,cumsum))
34
35 dropLast<-function(x,p=1) x[1:(length(x)-p)]
36
37 dropFirst<-function(x,p=1) x[-(1:p)]
38
39 dropInf<-function(x) x[is.finite(x)]
40
41 addInf<-function(x) c(-Inf,x,Inf)

```

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA  
90095-1554

*E-mail address*, Jan de Leeuw: [deleeuw@stat.ucla.edu](mailto:deleeuw@stat.ucla.edu)

*URL*, Jan de Leeuw: <http://gifi.stat.ucla.edu>