

Unbiased test and unbiased critical region

Let us consider the testing of $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ against $H_1: \theta = \theta_1$.

A test based on critical region W is said to be unbiased if the power of the test \geq size of the critical region.

$$\text{power} = 1 - \beta \geq \alpha$$

$$\Rightarrow P_{\theta_1}(W) \geq P_{\theta_0}(W)$$

For $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ against $H_1: \theta \neq \theta_0$

unbiasedness gives

$$P_{\theta}(W) \geq P_{\theta_0}(W) \quad \forall \theta (\neq \theta_0) \in \Theta$$

Result- Every most powerful or uniformly most powerful (UMP) critical region is necessarily unbiased.

Proof. Suppose W is MP critical region of size α for testing $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ against $H_1: \theta = \theta_1$, by N-P lemma.

$$\text{critical region} \rightarrow W = \{ \underline{x} : L(\underline{x}, \theta_1) \geq k L(\underline{x}, \theta_0) \}$$

$$\text{all region} \rightarrow A = \{ \underline{x} : L(\underline{x}, \theta_1) < k L(\underline{x}, \theta_0) \}$$

where k is determined from the size condition α .

$$\alpha = \int_W L_0 d\underline{x} = P(\underline{x} \in W / H_0)$$

To show $P_{\theta_1}(W) \geq \alpha$

$$P_{\theta_1}(W) = \int_W L_1 d\underline{x} \geq k \int_W L_0 d\underline{x} = k\alpha$$

[From N-P lemma.]

$$\therefore P_{\theta_1}(W) \geq k\alpha \quad \forall k > 0. \quad \text{--- (i)}$$

Also,

$$1 - P_{\theta_1}(W) = 1 - P(\underline{x} \in W / H_1) = P(\underline{x} \in A / H_1)$$

$$= \int_A L_1 d\underline{x}$$

$$< k \int_A L_0 d\underline{x} \quad \text{[From N-P lemma]}$$

$$= k [1 - P(\underline{x} \in W / H_0)]$$

$$\therefore 1 - P_{\theta_1}(W) < k(1 - \alpha) \quad \text{--- (ii)}$$

Case I We know k positive.

$$k > 1$$

Then ~~from~~ from (i) $P_{\theta_1}(W) \geq k\alpha > \alpha$
∴ W is unbiased.

Case II $0 < k < 1$, from (ii)

$$1 - P_{\theta_1}(W) < k(1 - \alpha) < 1 - \alpha$$

$$\Rightarrow P_{\theta_1}(W) > \alpha$$

∴ W is unbiased.

A similar logic leads to prove W is unbiased if θ_1 is uniformly most powerful.

Result. sufficient statistic and W .

Let T be suff. stat. for θ . Then

$$L(\underline{x}; \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i; \theta) \\ = g_{\theta}(t(\underline{x})) \cdot h(\underline{x})$$

By N-P lemma,

$$W = \left\{ \underline{x} : L(\underline{x}; \theta_1) \geq k L(\underline{x}; \theta_0) \right\} \quad \forall k > 0 \\ = \left\{ \underline{x} : g_{\theta_1}(t(\underline{x})) \cdot h(\underline{x}) \geq k \cdot g_{\theta_0}(t(\underline{x})) \cdot h(\underline{x}) \right\} \\ = \left\{ \underline{x} : g_{\theta_1}(t(\underline{x})) \geq k g_{\theta_0}(t(\underline{x})) \right\} \quad \forall k > 0$$

So a MP test based on $T(\underline{x})$ is same as MP test based on the joint distribution.

$L(\cdot)$.

Example $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ against $H_1: \theta = \theta_1 > \theta_0$. X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. r.v

$$\frac{L_1}{L_0} = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum (x_i - \theta_1)^2}}{e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum (x_i - \theta_0)^2}} \geq k.$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} [2 \sum x_i (\theta_1 - \theta_0) + n(\theta_1^2 - \theta_0^2)]} \geq k.$$

$$\Rightarrow 2 \sum x_i (\theta_1 - \theta_0) + n(\theta_1^2 - \theta_0^2) \leq \log k.$$

$\Rightarrow \bar{x} > k'$ [As \bar{x} is suff. stat for θ].

For right tail test CR will be $W = \{ \underline{x} : \bar{x} > k' \}$
For left tail test CR will be $W = \{ \underline{x} : \bar{x} < k'' \}$
 k' and k'' are constants.