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A sequential test with three possible decisions for comparing two unknown probabilities, based on groups of observations

by<br>Constance van Eeden

1. Introduction.

We consider two series of independent trials, e.g. two processes $A$ and $B$, each trial resulting in a success or a failure with probabilities $p, 1-p$ and $p^{\prime}, 1-p$ for the two processes respectively.

A sequential test with two possible decisions for the comparison of $p$ and $p$, developed by WALD [6], may be used if the trials are executed in pairs, each pair consisting of one trial for each process.

For groups of trials of both processes a sequential test with two possible decisions for comparing $p$ and $p$ has been described in [8]. This test is carried out as follows.

Suppose the group of trials, constituting the $i$-th stage of the test, consists of $n_{i}$ trials for process $A$ and $m_{i}$ for process $B$. If the numbers of successes are $a_{i}$ and $\left.b_{i}\right)^{1}$ respectively, $\underline{a}_{i}$ and $b_{i}$ both possess a binomial probability distribution with parameters $m_{i}, p$ and $m_{i}, p^{\prime}$ respectively.

The following transformation is then used: if $\underline{n}^{\prime}$ possesses a binomial probability distribution with parameters $n$ and $p$ the random variable
(1.1)

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{lr}
y=2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{n^{\prime}}{n}} & 0<\underline{\underline{n}}^{\prime}<n \\
y=\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} & \underline{x}^{\prime}=0 \\
y=\pi-\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} & \underline{n}^{\prime}=n
\end{array}\right.
$$

is, for large $n$, approximately normally distributed with mean

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu=2 \arcsin \sqrt{p} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and variance

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\sigma^{2}=\frac{1}{n}+\frac{1}{n^{2}} \cdot 2\right) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The transformation (1.1) is applied to $\underline{a}_{i}$ and $\underline{b}_{i}$; after this transformation, these random variables will be denoted by $\underline{u}_{i}$ and $\underline{v}_{i}$ respectively.

1) Random variables are denoted by underined symbols; the same symbols, not underlined, are used to denote values assumed by these random variables.
2) Tables of $y$ (in radians) and $\sigma^{2}$ are given in [8] for $n=10(1) 50$ and $0 \leqq n \leqq n$.

The sequential test of WALD [6] with two possible decisions for the mean of a normal distribution with known variance is then applied to

$$
\underline{x}_{2}=\underline{u}_{2}-\underline{v}_{i} \quad(i=1,2, \ldots) .
$$

Both abovementioned tests are tests with two possible decisions, i.e. the tests result in one of the decisions $p>p$ or $p<p^{\prime}$.

The sequential test for comparing $p$ and $p$ for the case of pairs of trials may be generalized to a test with three possible decisions, i.e. a test resulting in one of the decisions $p>p^{\prime}$, $p<p^{\prime}$ or $p \approx p^{\prime}$, by means of a test developed by DE BOER [2]. This case will not be considered here.

In this paper the abovementioned test for comparing $p$ and p' for groups of trials will be generalized by means of a sequential test for the mean of a normal distribution with known variance developed by SOBEL and WALD [7].

The sequential test of WAID with two and the test of SOBEL and WALD with three possible decisions for the mean of a normal distribution with known variance will be described first.
2. Sequential test for the mean of a normal distribution with known variance.
2.1. Two possible decisions.

For the case that the successive observations $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots \ldots$ are idependent observations of one random variablex, possessing a normal probability distribution with mean $\mu$ and known variance $\sigma^{2}$, WALD's sequential test with two possible decisions for $\mu$ has been described in [6] (p. 117-124). This test will be described here for the case that the variance is not constant. This results in a small change in WALD's test; the proof of the validity of this test follows at once from WALD's own proofs.

For the test a value $\mu_{0}$ of $\mu$ must be chosen, the two possible decisions being: $\mu<\mu_{0}$ and $\mu>\mu_{0}$, where we may substitute § resp. $\geqq$ for < resp.>.

Furthermore two values $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ must be chosen with

$$
\mu_{1}<\mu_{0}<\mu_{2}
$$

such that the decision $\mu>\mu_{0}$ is considered an incorrect decision if $\mu \leqslant \mu_{0}$ and the decision $\mu<\mu_{0}$ is considered incorrect if $\mu \geqq \mu_{2}$; for values of $\mu$ between $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ it is not important which decision is taken.

The concepts "correct" and "incorrect decision" are thus

Table I
Correct and incorrect decisions

| value of $\mu$ | correct |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | decision |  |
| $\mu \leqslant \mu_{1}$ | $\mu<\mu_{0}$ | $\mu>\mu_{0}$ |
| $\mu z \mu_{2}$ | $\mu>\mu_{0}$ | $\mu<\mu_{0}$ |
| $\mu_{1}<\mu<\mu_{2}$ | $\begin{cases}\mu<\mu_{0} & \text { and } \\ \mu>\mu_{0} & - \\ \hline\end{cases}$ |  |

The interval $\left(\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}\right)$ is called the indifference region. If:
$\alpha=$ the probability of acceptance of $\mu>\mu_{0}$ if $\mu=\mu_{1}$
$\beta=$ the probability of acceptance of $\mu<\mu_{0}$ if $\mu=\mu_{2}$,
and if $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are chosen both $<\frac{1}{2}$ the probability of an incorrect decision is $\leqq \alpha$ for $\mu \leqq \mu_{1}$ and $\leqq \beta$ for $\mu \geqq \mu_{2}$.

The value $\mu_{0}$ is of no further importance for the performance of the test.

The test is carried out as follows ( $\sigma_{i}^{2}$ is the known variance of $x_{i}$ ):

Additional observations are taken as long as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\ln B}{\mu_{2}-\mu_{1}}<\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_{i}-\frac{\mu_{1}+\mu_{2}}{2}}{\sigma_{i}^{2}}<\frac{\ln A}{\mu_{2}-\mu_{1}}, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}>1 \\
& B=\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}<1
\end{aligned}
$$

The test is terminated as soon as (2.1) does not hold and the decision $\mu>\mu_{0}$ is then taken if

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_{i}-\frac{\mu_{1}+\mu_{2}}{2}}{\sigma_{i}^{2}} \geqq \frac{\ln A}{\mu_{2}-\mu_{1}}
$$

and the decision $\mu<\mu_{0}$ if

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_{i}-\frac{\mu_{1}+\mu_{2}}{2}}{\sigma_{i}^{2}} \leqq \frac{\ln B}{\mu_{2}-\mu_{1}} .
$$

If the random variables $x_{i}$ all have the same variance $\sigma^{2}$ the test may be carried out graphically, as indicated by WALD [6] (p. 118-121).

### 2.2. Three possible decisions.

The sequential test with three possible decisions for the mean $\mu$ of a normal distribution with known variance, developed by SOBEL and WALD has been described in [7] for the case that the variance of $x_{i}$ is a constant. This restriction is again dropped here.

For the test two values $\mu_{0}$ and $\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ and four values $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}$, $\mu_{3}$ and $\mu_{4}$ must be chosen such that

$$
\mu_{1}<\mu_{0}<\mu_{2}<\mu_{3}<\mu_{0}^{\prime}<\mu_{4}
$$

the three possible decisions being:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1. } \mu<\mu_{0} \\
& \text { 2. } \mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime} \\
& \text { 3. } \mu_{0} \leq \mu \leq \mu_{0}^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The intervals $\left(\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}\right)$ and $\left(\mu_{3}, \mu_{4}\right)$ are the indifference regions.

The concepts "correct" and "incorrect decision" are defined as follows:

Table II
Correct and incorrect decisions

| value of $\mu$ | correct | incorrect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | decision |  |
| $\mu \leqq \mu_{1}$ | $\mu<\mu_{0}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{r}\mu_{0} \equiv \mu \leqq \mu_{0}^{\prime} \\ \mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}\end{array}\right.$ |
| $\mu_{1}<\mu<\mu_{2}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{r}\mu<\mu_{0} \\ \mu_{0} \leqslant \mu \leqslant \mu_{0}^{\prime}\end{array}\right.$ | $\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ |
| $\mu_{2} \leq \mu \leq \mu_{8}$ | $\mu_{0} \leqq \mu \leqq \mu_{0}^{0}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime} \\ \mu<\mu_{0}\end{array}\right.$ |
| $\mu_{3}<\mu<\mu_{4}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{r}\mu_{0} \leqq \mu \leqq \mu_{0}^{\prime} \\ \mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}\end{array}\right.$ | $\mu<\mu_{0}$ |
| $\mu \geqq \mu_{4}$ | $\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{r}\mu<\mu_{0} \\ \mu_{0} \leq \mu \leq \mu_{0}^{\prime}\end{array}\right.$ |

The values $\mu_{0}$ and $\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ are of no further importance for the performance of the test.

Suppose $T$ is the sequential test of section 2.1 for testing $\mu=\mu_{1}$ against $\mu=\mu_{2}$, then this test leads to a decision as soon as
does not hold, where

$$
A=\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} \quad, \quad B=\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \text {. }
$$

$\alpha=$ the probability of accepting $\mu \geqq \mu_{0}$ according to $T$ if $\mu_{=} \mu_{4}$, $\beta=$ the probability of accepting $\mu<\mu_{0}$ according to $T$ if $\mu=\mu_{2}$. Suppose furthermore that $T^{\prime}$ is the analogous sequential test for testing $\mu=\mu_{3}$ against $\mu=\mu_{4}$ then $T^{\prime}$ leads to decision as soon as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\ln B^{\prime}}{\mu_{4}-\mu_{3}}<\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_{i}-\frac{\mu_{3}+\mu_{4}}{2}}{\sigma_{i}^{2}}<\frac{\ln A^{\prime}}{\mu_{4}-\mu_{3}} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

does not hold, where

$$
A^{\prime}=\frac{1-\beta^{\prime}}{\alpha^{\prime}} \quad, \quad B^{\prime}=\frac{\beta^{\prime}}{1-\alpha^{\prime}} .
$$

$\alpha^{\prime}=$ the probability of accepting $\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ according to $T^{\prime}$ if $\mu_{=} \mu_{0}$ $\beta^{\prime}=$ the probability of accepting $\mu s \mu_{0}^{\prime}$ according to $T^{\prime}$ if $\mu_{=} \mu_{4}$. We introduce the following notation
(2.4)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{\begin{array}{c}
a=\frac{\ln A}{\mu_{2}-\mu_{1}} \\
b=\frac{\ln B}{\mu_{2}-\mu_{1}} \\
\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\alpha_{i}-\frac{\mu_{1}+\mu_{2}}{\sigma_{i}^{2}}}{2}=y_{n}
\end{array}\right. \\
& a^{\prime}=\frac{\ln A^{\prime}}{\mu_{4}-\mu_{5}} \\
& b^{\prime}=\frac{\ln B^{\prime}}{\mu_{4}-\mu_{3}} \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_{i}-\frac{\mu_{r}+\mu_{4}}{\sigma_{i}^{2}}}{\sigma^{2}}=y_{n}^{i} .
\end{aligned}
$$

then according to $T$ a decisions is taken as soon as (2.2a)

$$
b<y_{n}<a
$$

does not hold and according to $T^{\prime}$ as soon as
(2.3a)
$b^{\prime}<y_{n}^{\prime}<a^{\prime}$
does not hold.

From (2.4) it follows that $a$ and $a$ are positive, $b$ and $b$ negative and
(2.5) $\quad y_{n}>y_{n}^{\prime}$

If now the inequalities

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
b \leq b^{\prime}  \tag{2.6}\\
a \leq a^{\prime}
\end{array}\right.
$$

are fulfilled, it follows from (2.5) and (2.6) that $T^{\prime}$ cannot lead to the decision $\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ before the decision $\mu \geqq \mu_{0}$ has been found according to $T$ and that $T$ cannot give the decision
$\mu<\mu_{0}$ before the decision $\mu \mathbf{~} \mu_{0}^{\prime}$ has been given by $T^{\prime}$.
In that case only the following decision according to $T$ and $T^{\prime}$ are possible:

1. T' gives the decision $\mu \mu_{0}^{\prime}$ and $T$ gives (at the same or a later step) the decision $\mu<\mu_{0}$ or the decision $\mu_{*} \mu_{0}$.
2. T gives the decision $\mu \geqslant \mu_{0}$ and $T^{\prime}$ gives (at the same or a later step) the decision $\mu \leqslant \mu_{0}^{\prime}$ or the decision $\mu>\mu_{0}$.

The sequential test with three possible decisions is then defined as follows:

Additional observations are taken as long as not both tests $T$ and $T$ have given a decision. As soon as both tests are terminated a decision is taken according to the following rules:

1. $\mu<\mu_{0}$ if $T^{\prime}$ has given the decision $\mu \leq \mu_{0}^{\prime}$ and $T$ the decision $\mu<\mu_{0}$,
2. $\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ if $T$ has given the decision $\mu \geqslant \mu_{0}$ and $T^{\prime}$ the decision $\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}$,
3. $\mu_{0} \leq \mu \leq \mu_{0}^{\prime}$ if $T$ has given the decision $\mu \geq \mu_{a}$ and $T^{\prime}$ the decision $\mu \leqslant \mu_{0}$.
If (2.6) does not hold there exists the possibility of accepting $\mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ according to $T^{\prime}$ and of afterwards accepting $\mu<\mu_{0}\left(<\mu_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ according to $T$. This kind of contradictory result is excluded by (2.6).

If the random variables $x_{i}$ all have the same variance $\sigma^{2}$ the test may be carried out graphically, cf. [7].
3. Sequential test with three possible decisions for the comparison of two probabilities.
On the basis of the test of section 2.2 a sequential test with three possible decisions for comparing two unknown probabilities $p$ and $p$ may be developed as follows.

To the variables $a_{i}$ and $b_{i}$ (see section 1) one of the for lowing transformations is applied
(3.1) $\quad y=2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{n}{n}} 3$ )
(3.2) $\begin{cases}y^{\prime}=2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{n^{\prime}}{n}} & 0<n^{\prime}<n \\ y^{\prime}=2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 n}} & n^{\prime}=0 \\ y^{\prime}=\pi-2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 n}} & n^{\prime}=n\end{cases}$
(3.3) $\left\{\begin{array}{lr}y^{\prime \prime}=2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{n^{\prime}}{n}} & 0<n^{\prime}<n \\ y^{\prime \prime}=\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} & n^{\prime}=0 \\ y^{\prime \prime}=\pi-\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} & n^{\prime}=n\end{array}\right.$
where $n^{\prime}$ possesses a binomial probability distribution with parameters $n$ and $p$.

The transformation (3.1) is introduced by FISHER [4], the transformation (3.2) by BARTLETT [1] and (3.3) is given in [8]. For further information about the transformations we refer to [3] (p. 395-416).

Denoting the variables $\underline{q}_{i}$ and $\underline{b}_{i}$, after their transformation, by $\underline{u}_{i}$ and $\underline{v}_{i}$ the sequential test of section 2.2 is applied to the random variables

$$
\underline{x}_{i}=\underline{u}_{i}-\underline{w}_{i} \quad(i=1,2,3, \ldots \ldots)
$$

which possess, for large $n_{i}$ and $m_{i}$, approximately a normal probability distribution with mean

$$
\mu=2 \arcsin \sqrt{p}-2 \arcsin \sqrt{p^{\prime}}=2 \arcsin (\sqrt{p q}-\sqrt{p q}) \quad \begin{align*}
& q=1-p  \tag{3.4}\\
& q=1-p^{\prime}
\end{align*}
$$

and variance

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{i}^{2}=\frac{1}{m_{i}}+\frac{1}{n_{i}^{2}}+\frac{1}{m_{i}}+\frac{1}{m_{i}^{2}} . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Two values $\mu_{0}$ and $\mu_{0}^{\prime}$ and four values $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{4}$ of $\mu$ must be chosen, with:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{1}<\mu_{0}<\mu_{2}<\mu_{1}<\mu_{0}<\mu_{4} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

3) Tables of $y=2 \arcsin \sqrt{x}$ are given in [5] for $x=$ $=0,000(0,001) 1,000$, p. 70-71, with $y$ in radians.
4) Tables of $y=2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 x}}$ and $y=\pi-2 \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 x}}$ are given in [3], p. 406 for $n=10(1) 50$.
and four values $\alpha, \alpha^{\prime}, \beta$ and $\beta^{\prime}\left(\right.$ all $\left.<\frac{1}{2}\right)$ with (see (2.6))

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{\ln B}{\mu_{x}-\mu_{1}} \leq \frac{\ln B^{\prime}}{\mu_{4}-\mu_{3}}  \tag{3.7}\\
\frac{\ln A}{\mu_{2}-\mu_{1}} \leq \frac{\ln A^{\prime}}{\mu_{4}-\mu_{3}},
\end{array}\right.
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
A=\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} & B=\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \\
A^{\prime}=\frac{1-\beta^{\prime}}{\alpha^{\prime}} & B^{\prime}=\frac{\beta^{\prime}}{1-\alpha^{\prime}} .
\end{array}
$$

Having chosen these values the abovementioned test may be applied, leading to one of the decisions:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { 1. } \mu<\mu_{0} \\
& \text { 2. } \mu>\mu_{0}^{\prime}  \tag{3.8}\\
& \text { 3. } \mu_{0} \leq \mu \leq \mu_{0} .
\end{align*}
$$

We shall translate these decisions in terms of $p$ and $p^{\prime}$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{p q^{\prime}}-\sqrt{p^{\prime} q}=\delta \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

then
(3.10)

$$
\mu=2 \arcsin \delta \quad|\delta| \leqslant 1 .
$$

The functional relationship (3.9) between $p$ and $p^{\prime}$ for given $\delta^{2}$ consists (see fig. 1) of the arcs $P Q$ and $R S$ of the ellipse:

$$
\begin{equation*}
p^{2}+p^{\prime 2}-2 p p^{\prime}\left(1-2 \delta^{2}\right)-2 \delta^{2}\left(p+p^{\prime}\right)+\delta^{4}=0 \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$


fig. 1.
Functional relationship between $p$ and $p^{\prime}$ for given value of $\delta^{2}$. Choosing two values $\delta_{0}$ and $\delta_{0}$ and four values $\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \delta_{1}$ and $\delta_{i}$ of $\delta$ with
(3.12)

$$
\delta_{1}<\delta_{0}<\delta_{2}<0<\delta_{3}<\delta_{0}^{\prime}<\delta_{4}
$$

the decisions ( 1.8 ) are equipalent with the following deci sions for $\delta(\operatorname{see}(3.10))$ :
(3.13)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1 . \delta<\delta_{0} \\
& \text { 2. } \delta>\delta_{0}^{0} \\
& \text { 3. } \delta_{0} \leqslant \delta_{0}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence with the following decisions for $p$ and $p^{\circ}$ :

1. the point ( $p, p$ ) lies above the arc RS of figure with $\delta=\delta_{0}$,
(3.14) 2. the point $\left(p, p^{\circ}\right)$ lies below the $\operatorname{arc} P Q$ with $\delta=\delta_{0}^{\prime}$, 3. the point $\left(p, p^{\prime}\right)$ lies on or between the $\operatorname{arcs} P Q$ and RSwith $\delta=\delta_{0}^{\prime}$ and $\delta=\delta_{0}$ respectively.
The values $\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \delta_{3}$ and $\delta_{4}$ may be chosen by means of fig. 2, where the arcs $P Q$ and RS are given for several values of $\delta$.

One may also choose these values as follows:

1. WALD [6] uses the ratio

$$
u=\frac{p q^{\prime}}{p^{\prime} q} .
$$

On the line $p+p^{\prime}=1 \quad \delta$ can be expressed in terms of $u$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\left(\frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}\right)^{2} \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is equivalent to

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\delta=0 & \text { if } u=1  \tag{3.16}\\
\delta=\frac{u+1-2 \sqrt{u}}{u-1} & \text { if } u \neq 1
\end{array}\right.
$$

Choosing four values for $u$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{1}<u_{2}<1<u_{3}<u_{4} \tag{.317}
\end{equation*}
$$

one finds four values for $\delta$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{1}<\delta_{2}<0<\delta_{3}<\delta_{4} . \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

2. On the line $p+p^{\prime}=1$ the equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta=p-p^{\prime} \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds.
Choosing four values for $p-p^{\prime}$ one finds four values for $\delta$. The four values of $\delta$ (or $u$ respectively) must furthermore be chosen such that ( 3.7 ) holds.

Usually one will choose these values symmetrically, i.e. such that

Figure 2


Functional relationship between $p$ and $p^{\prime}$ for several values of $\delta$.
(3.20) $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\mu_{4}=-\mu_{1} \\ \mu_{3}=-\mu_{2}\end{array}\right.$
which is equivalent to

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\delta_{4}=-\delta_{1}  \tag{3.21}\\
\delta_{3}=-\delta_{2}
\end{array}\right.
$$

and to

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{1} u_{4}=u_{2} u_{2}=1 \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

If (3.20) holds, (3.7) is equivalent to

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
B \equiv B^{\prime}  \tag{3.23}\\
A \equiv A^{\prime}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Remark
It is not necessary that $p$ and $p^{\prime}$ are constants. We only need a constant $\delta$.
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