

## STAT 801: Mathematical Statistics

### Unbiased Tests

**Definition:** A test  $\phi$  of  $\Theta_0$  against  $\Theta_1$  is unbiased level  $\alpha$  if it has level  $\alpha$  and, for every  $\theta \in \Theta_1$  we have

$$\pi(\theta) \geq \alpha.$$

When testing a point null hypothesis like  $\mu = \mu_0$  this requires that the power function be minimized at  $\mu_0$  which will mean that if  $\pi$  is differentiable then

$$\pi'(\mu_0) = 0$$

**Example:**  $N(\mu, 1)$ : data  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . If  $\phi$  is any test function then

$$\pi'(\mu) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \int \phi(x) f(x, \mu) dx$$

Differentiate under the integral and use

$$\frac{\partial f(x, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = \sum (x_i - \mu) f(x, \mu)$$

to get the condition

$$\int \phi(x) \bar{x} f(x, \mu_0) dx = \mu_0 \alpha_0$$

Minimize  $\beta(\mu)$  subject to two constraints

$$E_{\mu_0}(\phi(X)) = \alpha_0$$

and

$$E_{\mu_0}(\bar{X} \phi(X)) = \mu_0 \alpha_0.$$

Fix two values  $\lambda_1 > 0$  and  $\lambda_2$  and minimize

$$\lambda_1 \alpha + \lambda_2 E_{\mu_0}[(\bar{X} - \mu_0) \phi(X)] + \beta$$

The quantity in question is just

$$\int [\phi(x) f_0(x) (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 (\bar{x} - \mu_0)) + (1 - \phi(x)) f_1(x)] dx.$$

As before this is minimized by

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \frac{f_1(x)}{f_0(x)} > \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 (\bar{x} - \mu_0) \\ 0 & \frac{f_1(x)}{f_0(x)} < \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 (\bar{x} - \mu_0) \end{cases}$$

The likelihood ratio  $f_1/f_0$  is simply

$$\exp\{n(\mu_1 - \mu_0)\bar{X} + n(\mu_0^2 - \mu_1^2)/2\}$$

and this exceeds the linear function

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 (\bar{X} - \mu_0)$$

for all  $\bar{X}$  sufficiently large or small. That is,

$$\lambda_1 \alpha + \lambda_2 E_{\mu_0}[(\bar{X} - \mu_0) \phi(X)] + \beta$$

is minimized by a rejection region of the form

$$\{\bar{X} > K_U\} \cup \{\bar{X} < K_L\}$$

Satisfy constraints: adjust  $K_U$  and  $K_L$  to get level  $\alpha$  and  $\pi'(\mu_0) = 0$ . 2nd condition shows rejection region symmetric about  $\mu_0$  so test rejects for

$$\sqrt{n}|\bar{X} - \mu_0| > z_{\alpha/2}$$

Mimic Neyman Pearson lemma proof to check that if  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are adjusted so that the unconstrained problem has the rejection region given then the resulting test minimizes  $\beta$  subject to the two constraints.

A test  $\phi^*$  is a Uniformly Most Powerful Unbiased level  $\alpha_0$  test if

1.  $\phi^*$  has level  $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$ .
2.  $\phi^*$  is unbiased.
3. If  $\phi$  has level  $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$  and  $\phi$  is unbiased then for every  $\theta \in \Theta_1$  we have

$$E_{\theta}(\phi(X)) \leq E_{\theta}(\phi^*(X))$$

**Conclusion:** The two sided  $z$  test which rejects if

$$|Z| > z_{\alpha/2}$$

where

$$Z = n^{1/2}(\bar{X} - \mu_0)$$

is the uniformly most powerful unbiased test of  $\mu = \mu_0$  against the two sided alternative  $\mu \neq \mu_0$ .

### Nuisance Parameters

The  $t$ -test is UMPU.

Suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  iid  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . Test  $\mu = \mu_0$  or  $\mu \leq \mu_0$  against  $\mu > \mu_0$ . Parameter space is two dimensional; boundary between the null and alternative is

$$\{(\mu, \sigma); \mu = \mu_0, \sigma > 0\}$$

If a test has  $\pi(\mu, \sigma) \leq \alpha$  for all  $\mu \leq \mu_0$  and  $\pi(\mu, \sigma) \geq \alpha$  for all  $\mu > \mu_0$  then  $\pi(\mu_0, \sigma) = \alpha$  for all  $\sigma$  because the power function of any test must be continuous. (Uses dominated convergence theorem; power function is an integral.)

Think of  $\{(\mu, \sigma); \mu = \mu_0\}$  as parameter space for a model. For this parameter space

$$S = \sum (X_i - \mu_0)^2$$

is complete and sufficient. Remember definitions of both completeness and sufficiency depend on the parameter space.

Suppose  $\phi(\sum X_i, S)$  is an unbiased level  $\alpha$  test. Then we have

$$E_{\mu_0, \sigma}(\phi(\sum X_i, S)) = \alpha$$

for all  $\sigma$ . Condition on  $S$  and get

$$E_{\mu_0, \sigma}[E(\phi(\sum X_i, S)|S)] = \alpha$$

for all  $\sigma$ . Sufficiency guarantees that

$$g(S) = E(\phi(\sum X_i, S)|S)$$

is a statistic and completeness that

$$g(S) \equiv \alpha$$

Now let us fix a single value of  $\sigma$  and a  $\mu_1 > \mu_0$ . To make our notation simpler I take  $\mu_0 = 0$ . Our observations above permit us to condition on  $S = s$ . Given  $S = s$  we have a level  $\alpha$  test which is a function of  $\bar{X}$ .

If we maximize the conditional power of this test for each  $s$  then we will maximize its power. What is the conditional model given  $S = s$ ? That is, what is the conditional distribution of  $\bar{X}$  given  $S = s$ ? The answer is that the joint density of  $\bar{X}, S$  is of the form

$$f_{\bar{X}, S}(t, s) = h(s, t) \exp\{\theta_1 t + \theta_2 s + c(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}$$

where  $\theta_1 = n\mu/\sigma^2$  and  $\theta_2 = -1/\sigma^2$ .

This makes the conditional density of  $\bar{X}$  given  $S = s$  of the form

$$f_{\bar{X}|s}(t|s) = h(s, t) \exp\{\theta_1 t + c^*(\theta_1, s)\}$$

Note disappearance of  $\theta_2$  and null is  $\theta_1 = 0$ . This permits application of NP lemma to the conditional family to prove that UMP unbiased test has form

$$\phi(\bar{X}, S) = 1(\bar{X} > K(S))$$

where  $K(S)$  chosen to make conditional level  $\alpha$ . The function  $x \mapsto x/\sqrt{a-x^2}$  is increasing in  $x$  for each  $a$  so that we can rewrite  $\phi$  in the form

$$\phi(\bar{X}, S) = 1(n^{1/2}\bar{X}/\sqrt{n[S/n - \bar{X}^2]/(n-1)} > K^*(S))$$

for some  $K^*$ . The quantity

$$T = \frac{n^{1/2}\bar{X}}{\sqrt{n[S/n - \bar{X}^2]/(n-1)}}$$

is the usual  $t$  statistic and is exactly independent of  $S$  (see Theorem 6.1.5 on page 262 in Casella and Berger). This guarantees that

$$K^*(S) = t_{n-1, \alpha}$$

and makes our UMPU test the usual  $t$  test.

### Optimal tests

- A good test has  $\pi(\theta)$  large on the alternative and small on the null.
- For two sided or multiparameter families the best to be hoped for is UMP Unbiased or Invariant or Similar tests are found as follows in terms of a statistic whose definition does not depend on the specific alternative.
  1. Use the NP lemma to determine a good rejection region for a simple alternative.
  2. If this fails, impose an additional criterion such as unbiasedness. Then mimic the NP lemma and again try to simplify the rejection region.