

1. (i) A test ϕ is *unbiased* if $E_\theta\phi(X) \leq \alpha$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_0$ and $E_\theta\phi(X) \geq \alpha$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_1$.
- (ii) A test ϕ is *uniformly most powerful unbiased* (UMPU) if $E_\theta\phi \geq E_\theta\phi_0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_1$ and for all other level α unbiased tests ϕ_0 .
- (iii) A test ϕ is *Similar On the Boundary* (SOB) if $E_\theta\phi(X) = \alpha$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_B \equiv \Theta_0 \cap \Theta_1$.
- (iv) A function $T(x)$ is a maximal invariant with respect to a group G if it is invariant ($T(gx) = T(x)$ for all $g \in G$ and all $x \in \mathbf{X}$), and maximal ($T(x) = T(x^*)$ implies that $x^* = g(x)$ for some $g \in G$).
- (v) A test ϕ is *invariant* ϕ with respect to a group G if $\phi(gx) = \phi(x)$ for all $g \in G$ and all $x \in \mathbf{X}$.

2. See Chapter 6 notes.

3. Suppose that X_1, \dots, X_m are i.i.d. exponential(λ), and that Y_1, \dots, Y_n are i.i.d. exponential(μ); thus the density of X_1 is $\lambda e^{-\lambda x} 1_{[0, \infty)}(x)$. Consider testing $H : \lambda \leq \mu$ versus $K : \lambda > \mu$ [or, equivalently, $H : E(X) \geq E(Y)$ versus $K : E(X) < E(Y)$].

A. Show that this testing problem is invariant with respect to the group of scale changes, G given by $g_c(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) = (c\underline{x}, c\underline{y})$ where $c > 0$.

Solution: If $X \sim \text{exponential}(\lambda)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} P_\lambda(cX > t) &= P_\lambda(X > t/c) = \exp(-\lambda t/c) \\ &= \exp(-(\lambda/c)t) = P_{\lambda/c}(X > t), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $Y \sim \text{exponential}(\mu)$. Hence the induced group on the parameter space is $\bar{g}(\lambda, \mu) = (\lambda/c, \mu/c)$. Note that for any $\bar{g} \in \bar{G}$ we have $\bar{g}\Theta_0 = \{(\lambda/c, \mu/c) : \lambda \leq \mu\} = \{(\lambda, \mu) : \lambda \leq \mu\} = \Theta_0$ and $\bar{g}\Theta = \{(\lambda/c, \mu/c) : (\lambda, \mu) \in R^+ \times R^+\} = \Theta$. Hence the testing problem is invariant under the group G .

B. Find the UMP G -invariant test of H versus K . [Hint: You may use the fact that the family of distributions $\{\delta^{-1}F_{r,s} : \delta > 0\}$ has monotone likelihood ratio.]

[I should have said *monotone decreasing likelihood ratio*.]

Solution: By sufficiency we may reduce to consideration of $(S, T) \equiv (\sum_1^m X_i, \sum_1^n Y_j)$. The induced group G^* on the space of the sufficient statistic is given by $G^* = \{g^*(s, t) = (cs, ct) : c > 0\}$, and the maximal invariant for the group G^* is $V \equiv S/T$; the corresponding \bar{G} maximal invariant is $\delta = \lambda/\mu$. Now $2\lambda X_i \sim \chi_2^2$, and similarly $2\mu Y_j \sim \chi_2^2$. hence $2\lambda S \sim \chi_{2m}^2$ and $2\mu T \sim \chi_{2n}^2$. Hence

$$\frac{n}{m} V = \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{(2\lambda S/2m)}{(2\mu T/2n)} = \delta^{-1} F_{2m,2n}$$

where $F_{2m,2n}$ has an F -distribution with degrees of freedom $2m, 2n$. Since the family $\delta^{-1} F_{r,s}$ has monotone decreasing monotone likelihood ratio, we conclude that the UMP G-invariant test of H versus K is given by "reject H if $nV/m < F_{2m,2n,\alpha}$ " where $P(F_{2m,2n} \leq F_{2m,2n,\alpha}) = \alpha$. (Alternatively, "reject H if $m/(nV) = (n^{-1}T/m^{-1}S) > F_{2m,2n,1-\alpha}$ " where $P(F_{2m,2n} \geq F_{2m,2n,1-\alpha}) = \alpha$.)

C. Specify as exactly as possible how you would carry out the test derived in B.

Solution: See part B above.

4. Suppose that X_1, \dots, X_m are i.i.d. exponential(λ), and that Y_1, \dots, Y_n are i.i.d. exponential(μ); thus the density of X_1 is $\lambda e^{-\lambda x} 1_{[0,\infty)}(x)$. Consider testing $H : \lambda \leq \mu$ versus $K : \lambda > \mu$.

A. What is a sufficient statistic for Θ_B ?

Solution: $\Theta_B = \{(\lambda, \lambda) : \lambda > 0\}$, and it is clear that the sufficient statistic for the resulting collection of distributions is $S + T$ where $S = \sum X_i$, $T = \sum Y_j$.

B. Find the UMP unbiased test of H versus K -- explaining the steps -- and leaving the test in a conditional form. What is the conditional distribution needed to carry out the test?

Solution: First we rewrite the joint density of the data as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\underline{x}, \underline{y}; \lambda, \mu) &= \lambda^m \mu^n \exp(-\lambda \sum x_i - \mu \sum y_j) \\ &= \lambda^m \mu^n \exp(-(\mu - \lambda) \sum y_j - \lambda(\sum x_i + \sum y_j)) \\ &= \lambda^m \mu^n \exp(\theta U + \xi V) \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta \equiv -(\mu - \lambda)$, $U \equiv \sum_1^n Y_j \equiv T$, $\xi = \lambda$, and $V \equiv S + T$. Since testing H versus K is equivalent to testing $\theta = (\lambda - \mu) \leq 0$ versus $\theta > 0$, we see that the UMP unbiased test of H versus K is of the form

$$\phi(\underline{X}, \underline{Y}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } T > c_\alpha(V) \\ \gamma(V) & \text{if } T = c_\alpha(V) \\ 0 & \text{if } T < c_\alpha(V) \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma(V)$ and $c_\alpha(V)$ are chosen so that $E\{\phi(X, Y) | V\} = \alpha$. The conditional distribution of T given $V = S + T$ is that of the n -th order statistic in a sample of $m + n - 1$ Uniform($0, V$) random variables; equivalently

$$(*) \quad T/V \stackrel{d}{=} U_{m+n-1:n},$$

the n -th order statistic in a sample of $m + n - 1$ Uniform($0, 1$) random variables.

C. Can the UMP unbiased test you found in B be carried out unconditionally? If so, how?

Solution: One way is via (*); since the conditional distribution of T/V given V does not depend on V this is the unconditional distribution, namely $\text{Beta}(n, m + n - 1 - n + 1) = \text{Beta}(n, m)$. Of course because of the fact that $T/V = (T/S)/(1 + (T/S))$ is a monotone increasing function of T/S , and $(T/n)/(S/m)$ has an $F_{2n, 2m}$ distribution under $\lambda = \mu$, this is the same as "reject if $(n^{-1}T/m^{-1}S) > F_{2n, 2m, 1-\alpha}$ ". Note that the UMP G-invariant test derived in problem 3 and the UMPU test derived in problem 4 are exactly the same.

5. Suppose that X_1 has continuous distribution function F and Y_1, Y_2 are independent of X_1 and themselves independent with distribution function $G = F^2$. Let $\underline{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2)$ denote the ordered Y ranks.

A. Is $G <_s F$?

Solution: No. $G(x) = F^2(x) \leq F(x)$ with strict inequality if $F(x) \in (0, 1)$. Hence $F <_s G$.

B. Compute the probabilities $P_{F,G}(\underline{Q} = \underline{q})$ for $\underline{q} \in \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)\}$.

Solution: Here $G = \psi(F)$ with $\psi(u) = u^2$. Hence $\psi'(u) = 2u$, and by Hoeffding's formula

$$P(\underline{Q} = \underline{q}) = \frac{1}{\binom{3}{2}} E \prod_{j=1}^2 \psi'(U_{(q_j)}) = \frac{4}{3} E[U_{(q_1)} U_{(q_2)}].$$

where $(U_{(1)}, U_{(2)}, U_{(3)})$ are the order statistics of a sample of 3 Uniform(0,1) random variables. Thus we compute

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_{(1)}U_{(2)}) &= 3! \int_0^1 \int_0^{u_1} \int_0^{u_2} u_1 u_2 du_1 du_2 du_3 \\ &= 3! \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^{u_3} u_2^3 du_2 du_3 = \frac{3!}{8} \int_0^1 u_3^4 du_3 = \frac{3}{20}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $P(\underline{Q} = (1, 2)) = 4/20 = 1/5 = 3/15$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_{(1)}U_{(3)}) &= 3! \int_0^1 \int_0^{u_1} \int_0^{u_3} u_1 u_3 du_1 du_2 du_3 \\ &= \frac{3!}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^{u_3} u_2^2 du_2 u_3 du_3 = \int_0^1 u_3^4 du_3 = \frac{1}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $P(\underline{Q} = (1, 3)) = 4/15$. Finally, for $\underline{q} = (2, 3)$,

$$E(U_{(2)}U_{(3)}) = 3! \int_0^1 \int_0^{u_2} \int_0^{u_3} u_2 u_3 du_1 du_2 du_3$$

$$= 3! \int_0^1 \int_0^{u_3} u_2^2 du_2 u_3 du_3 = 2 \int_0^1 u_3^4 du_3 = \frac{2}{5},$$

and this yields $P(\underline{Q} = (2, 3)) = 8/15$.

C. Use B to find the most powerful rank test of $F = G$ versus $G = F^2$ at level $\alpha = 1/3$.

Solution: Since $P(\underline{Q} = (2, 3)) > P(\underline{Q} = (1, 3)) > P(\underline{Q} = (1, 2))$, we conclude that the most powerful rank test of $F = G$ versus $G = F^2$ at level $\alpha = 1/3$ is given by "reject H if $\underline{Q} = (2, 3)$ ".

6. Suppose that $X \sim \text{Binomial}(m, p_1)$, $Y \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p_2)$ are independent. Consider testing $H : p_1 \leq p_2$ versus $K : p_1 > p_2$.

A. Show that the UMPU test ϕ of H versus K is of the form

$$\phi(X, Y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Y > c_\alpha(T) \\ \gamma(T) & \text{if } Y = c_\alpha(T) \\ 0 & \text{if } Y < c_\alpha(T) \end{cases}$$

where $T = X + Y$ and $c_\alpha(T)$, $\gamma_\alpha(T)$ are determined by the conditional distribution of Y given T under the null hypothesis, namely, $(Y|T) \sim \text{Hypergeometric}(T, m + n, n)$; i.e. the probability of drawing $Y = y$ white balls in T draws without replacement from an urn containing m black balls and n white balls.

Solution: It is clear that my statement of the solution is incorrect! Large values of Y relative to $T = X + Y$ would lead us to conclude $p_2 > p_1$ rather than the other way around. Hence we should be rejecting for large values of X ... or *small* values of Y . This falls out from the following solution in a direct way; note that I've organized it in terms of the "large values of X " approach, but it could be done equally well the other way. First we rewrite the joint density of X and Y as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{p_1, p_2}(X = x, Y = y) &= \binom{m}{x} \binom{n}{y} p_1^x (1 - p_1)^{m-x} p_2^y (1 - p_2)^{n-y} \\ &= \binom{m}{x} \binom{n}{y} q_1^m q_2^n \exp(x \log(p_1/q_1) + y \log(p_2/q_2)) \\ &= \binom{m}{x} \binom{n}{y} q_1^m q_2^n \exp(x \{ \log(p_1/q_1) - \log(p_2/q_2) \} + (x + y) \log(p_2/q_2)) \\ &= \binom{m}{x} \binom{n}{y} q_1^m q_2^n \exp(\theta U + \xi T) \end{aligned}$$

where $U \equiv X$, $T \equiv X + Y$,

$$\theta \equiv \log \frac{(p_1/q_1)}{(p_2/q_2)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \xi \equiv \log(p_2/q_2).$$

Now H versus K is equivalent to $\theta \leq 0$ versus $\theta > 0$ and $T = X + Y$ is

sufficient and complete for $\Theta_B = \{(p_1, p_2) : p_1 = p_2\} = \{(p_1, p_2) : \theta(p_1, p_2) = 0\}$. Thus the UMPU test of H versus K is given by

$$\phi(X, Y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X > c_\alpha(T) \\ \gamma(T) & \text{if } X = c_\alpha(T) \\ 0 & \text{if } X < c_\alpha(T) \end{cases}$$

where $c_\alpha(T)$ and $\gamma(T)$ are determined so that $E\{\phi(X, Y) | T\} = \alpha$ where $(X | T) \sim \text{Hypergeometric}(T, m + n, m)$.

B. The "Fisher exact test" is the conservative version of the above test which takes $\gamma(T) = 1$ and chooses $c_\alpha(T)$ as small as possible to still have $E\{\phi(X, Y) | T\} \leq \alpha$. This turns out to be quite conservative. A less conservative approach is to use the finite-sampling normal theory approximation to obtain an approximate critical point. Explain how to use the W-W-N-H CLT to obtain this approximate critical point.

Solution: Here the finite population is $\{z_1, \dots, z_N\} = \{1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0\}$ where there are m balls labelled with a 1 and n balls labelled with a zero. Hence $\bar{z}_N = m/n$, and

$$\sigma_z^2 = \frac{1}{N} \{m(1 - m/N)^2 + n(0 - m/N)^2\} = \frac{mn}{N^2}.$$

Since the Noether condition is satisfied trivially in this case, $\bar{Y} = X/T$ satisfies

$$\frac{X/T - m/N}{\sqrt{(1 - \frac{T-1}{N-1}) \frac{mn/N^2}{T}}} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1),$$

and this leads to choosing the approximate critical point

$$(\#) \quad \tilde{c}_\alpha(T) = T \left\{ \frac{m}{N} + z_\alpha \sqrt{(1 - \frac{T-1}{N-1}) \frac{mn/N^2}{T}} \right\};$$

now the test becomes "reject H if $X > \tilde{c}_\alpha(T)$ " with $\tilde{c}_\alpha(T)$ given by (#).