# INSTITUTE OF POLICY AND PLANNING SCIENCES

## Discussion Paper Series

No. 1004

A Comment on Section 4 of D.P.1002

by

Yoshiko Nogami

August 2002

UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8573 JAPAN

筑波大学図書館

#### A comment on Section 4 of D. P. 1002.

### Yoshiko Nogami

Abstract. In this paper the author considers the same problem as that in Section 4 of D. P. 1002 (Nogami(2002)) and shows an improved procedure of testing the hypothesis  $H_0: \ell=\ell_0$  and the alternative hypothesis  $H_1: \ell\neq\ell_0$  with some constant  $\ell_0$ .

Comment. Let us consider the same problem as that in Section 4 of Nogami(2002). Let  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  be a sample of size n taken from (1) of Nogami(2002). Let  $\delta_0 = \delta_1 + \delta_2$  and  $c = \delta_2 - \delta_1$  (>0) as in p. 2 of Nogami(2002). Let  $X_{(1)}$  be the i-th smallest observation of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  and define  $Y = 2^{-1} (X_{(1)} + X_{(n)} - \delta_0)$ .

Instead of T in (6) of Nogami(2002) we use

(1) 
$$S=(Y-\theta)/\{(n+1)(n-1)^{-1}Z/\sqrt{2(n+1)(n+2)}\}$$

where  $(n+1)(n-1)^{-1}Z$  is an unbiased estimate for c. Making a variable transformation  $S=\sqrt{2(n+1)(n+2)}T$  for  $h_T(t)$  in p. 7 of Nogami(2002) we obtain

$$h_s(s) = \sqrt{(n+1)/(2(n+2))} \{(n-1)^{-1}/(2(n+1)/(n+2)) | s|+1\}^{-n}, \quad \text{for } 0 \le |s| < \infty.$$

Let  $\mathfrak g$  be a real number such that  $0 < \mathfrak g < 1$ . We call  $(U_1, U_2)$  a  $(1-\mathfrak g)$  interval estimate for the parameter  $\mathfrak g$  if  $P_{\mathfrak g}[U_1 < \mathfrak g < U_2] = 1-\mathfrak g$ . To get the conditional (or restricted) minimum-length  $(1-\mathfrak g)$  interval estimate for  $\mathfrak g$  we shall find real numbers  $r_1$  and  $r_2$   $(r_1 < r_2)$  which minimize  $r_2 - r_1$  subject to

(2) 
$$P\{r_1 < S < r_2\} = \begin{cases} h_S(s) & ds = 1-a. \end{cases}$$

Letting ) be a real number we define

$$r_2$$
L= $r_2$ - $r_1$ - $\lambda$ {}  $h_s$ (s) ds -1+ $\alpha$ }.
 $r_1$ 

By Lagrange's method,  $\partial L/\partial r_1=0=\partial L/\partial r_2$ , which leads to

(3) 
$$h_s(r_1) = h_s(r_2)(=\lambda^{-1}).$$

we have

$$r=(n-1)/(n+2)/(2(n+1))(a^{-1/(n-1)}-1).$$

Thus, in view of (1) and (2) the conditional minimum-length (1-a) interval estimate for  $\emptyset$  is as follows:

(4) 
$$(Y-r[\{n+1, Z/\{(n-1)\}\}], Y+r[\{n+1, Z/\{(n-1)\}\}]).$$

Therefore, to test the hypothesis  $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$  versus the alternative hypothesis  $H_1: \theta \neq \theta_0$  we invert (4) with respect to  $\theta = \theta_0$  and get the following acceptance region of our two-sided test.

(5) 
$$-r < (Y-\ell_0)/[(n+1)Z/((n-1)/2(n+2))] < r.$$

Here, since  $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{(x+3)/\{2(x+2)\}}{2(x+2)} = 2^{-1/2}$  and  $\lim_{x\to\infty} x(\mathfrak{q}^{-1/x}-1) = -\log_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}$ , it follows that as  $n\to\infty$   $r\to -2^{-1/2}\log_{\mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{q}$ . Hence, the acceptance region (5) is more natural than that with  $\mathfrak{t}_0$  appeared on the 5-th line from the bottom in p. 7 of Nogami(2002).

## REFERENCES.

Nogami, Y. (2002). Hypothesis testing based on Lagrange's method: Application to the uniform distribution (II)., Discussion Paper Series No. 1002, Institute of Policy and Planning Sciences, University of Tsukuba, August.