

CHAPTER : IV

COMPUTATIONAL STUDIES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In section 4.2 we describe the Stein's (1945) two-stage procedure for $N(\theta, \sigma^2)$ model. In section 4.3 we state the general two-stage procedure of Rattihalli and Shirke (unpublished) for $U(\theta, \theta)$ model and its performance with Cooke's (1973) two-stage procedure have studied in section 4.5. In section 4.4 we study the performance of Stein's (1945) and its modified form by reducing the second sample size by 1.

4.2 STEIN'S AND COOKE'S TWO-STAGE PROCEDURES

(1) Stein's two-stage procedure

Dantzig (1940) proved that there does not exist a fixed width confidence interval for the mean θ when the variance σ^2 is unknown in case of $N(\theta, \sigma^2)$ distribution. Later Stein (1945) obtained confidence interval for θ of width $2d$ by considering a two-stage sampling procedure and is described below :

Stage I : Take a sample of fixed size m (≥ 2) and compute

$$\bar{X}_m = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i/m \text{ and } S_m^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m (X_i - \bar{X}_m)^2/(m - 1).$$

Stage II : Take an additional sample of size $N - m$, where

$$N = \text{smallest integer} \geq S_m^2 t_{\alpha/2, m-1}^2 / d^2. \quad (4.1)$$

If $N < m$ then $(1-\alpha)$ level confidence interval is obtained on the basis of first sample itself namely $\left[\bar{X}_m - S_m t_{\alpha/2, m-1} / \sqrt{m}, \bar{X}_m + S_m t_{\alpha/2, m-1} / \sqrt{m} \right]$ whose width is $2S_m t_{\alpha/2, m-1} / \sqrt{m} \leq 2d$ else a $1 - \alpha$ level confidence interval for θ is given by,

$$\left[\bar{X}_N - S_m t_{\alpha/2, m-1} / \sqrt{N}, \bar{X}_N + S_m t_{\alpha/2, m-1} / \sqrt{N} \right] \quad (4.2)$$

where $\bar{X}_N = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i / N$. The length of this confidence interval is $2S_m t_{\alpha/2, m-1} / \sqrt{N}$. If we choose N to be smallest integer satisfying (4.1) then the confidence interval has width $\leq 2d$. For further details one may refer to Rohtagi (1986).

(II) Cooke's two-stage procedure

The Cooke's (1973) procedure is described in section 3.3.

4.3 A GENERAL TWO-STAGE PROCEDURE

We know that for various parametric models, well known two-stage sequential procedures for estimation of parameter of interest have been developed. A general two-stage sequential procedure is proposed by Rattihali and Shirke (unpublished).

Here we describe the proposed procedure for $U(\emptyset, \theta)$ model.

Let Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m (indicating first sample) and X_1, X_2, \dots (which are used for second sample) be i.i.d. r.v.s. from $U(\emptyset, \theta)$ and let $\hat{Y}_{(m)} = \max \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m\}$. Then a $(1-\alpha_1)$ -level confidence interval for θ is $(\hat{Y}_{(m)}, \alpha_1^{-1/m} \hat{Y}_{(m)})$.

From Rattihalli and Shirke (unpublished), the second sample size and $(1-\alpha)$ -level confidence interval for θ are given by,

$$N(\underline{y}_m) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \hat{Y}_m \alpha_1^{-1/m} \leq d \\ \lceil \log \alpha_2 / (\log (1 - d / \alpha_1^{-1/m} \hat{Y}_m)) \rceil + 1 & \text{if } \hat{Y}_m \alpha_1^{-1/m} > d \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

and $(\hat{X}_{N(\underline{y}_m)}, \hat{X}_{N(\underline{y}_m)} + d)$. (4.4)

where $1 - \alpha = (1 - \alpha_1)(1 - \alpha_2)$ and $\hat{X}_{N(\underline{y}_m)}$ is the maximum of the second sample.

4.4 PERFORMANCE STUDY OF STEIN'S AND IT'S MODIFIED VERSION

Here we are discussing the Stein's procedure and its modified version that is by decreasing the second sample size by one. The comparison is done in terms of the coverage and ASN function by simulating 1000 confidence intervals for $N(\emptyset, \sigma^2)$. For fixed σ^2 , α and d , we consider the following cases :

CASE (I) For $\sigma^2 = 2.5$, $\alpha = 0.1$ and $d = 1$

TABLE (4.1)

FIXED SAMPLE-SIZE = 6.724000

| SIZE OF FIRST SAMPLE | STEIN'S COVERAGE (%) | MODIFIED COVERAGE (%) | STEIN'S E(N) | MODIFIED E(N) |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|
| 4 | 0.970000 | 0.955000 | 24.782000 | 23.833000 |
| 5 | 0.984000 | 0.981000 | 7.867000 | 7.234000 |
| 6 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 6.226000 | 5.919000 |
| 7 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 7.011000 | 6.962000 |
| 8 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 8.000000 | 8.000000 |
| 9 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 9.000000 | 9.000000 |
| 10 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 10.000000 | 10.000000 |

CASE (II) For $\sigma^2 = 10$, $\alpha = 0.1$ and $d = 1$.

TABLE (4.2)

FIXED SAMPLE-SIZE = 26.89600

| SIZE OF FIRST SAMPLE | STEIN'S COVERAGE (%) | MODIFIED COVERAGE (%) | STEIN'S E(N) | MODIFIED E(N) |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|
| 24 | 0.962000 | 0.960000 | 42.695899 | 41.730899 |
| 25 | 0.973000 | 0.974000 | 42.202000 | 41.244899 |
| 26 | 0.979000 | 0.976000 | 43.528899 | 42.584899 |
| 27 | 0.972000 | 0.972000 | 42.764000 | 41.824001 |
| 28 | 0.968000 | 0.969000 | 42.661999 | 41.743000 |
| 31 | 0.963000 | 0.964000 | 43.394001 | 42.527000 |

Comments :- The following are some comments based on the simulation study.

(1) Both Stein's and its modified procedure attains the desired level. Further modified Stein's procedure has less ASN than Stein's procedure.

(2) The attained level for both Stein's and modified procedure is increasing with the first-sample size $(m) \geq n_0(\sigma^2)$.

(3) For $m \geq k \geq n_0(\sigma^2)$, we observe that $E_k(N) - E_m(N) \leq m - k$.

A C- program to obtain tables (4.1) and (4.2) is enclosed in Appendix - III.

4.5 PERFORMANCE STUDY OF COOKE'S AND GENERAL PROCEDURE

Consider Cooke's and general two-stage procedure described in section 3.2 and section 4.3 respectively. For fixed θ , α , d and α_1 , we observe the following cases :

CASE (I) For $\theta = 2.0$, $\alpha = 0.01$, $d = 1$ and $\alpha_1 = 0.005$

TABLE (4.3)
REQUIRED SECOND-SAMPLE COVERAGE = 0.994975

| FIRST SAMPLE SIZE | COOKE'S COVERAGE | GEN. METHOD COVERAGE | COOKE'S E(N) | GEN. METHOD E(N) |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 5 | 0.992000 | 1.000000 | 12.262000 | 28.396000 |
| 6 | 0.995000 | 1.000000 | 11.950000 | 25.666000 |
| 7 | 0.995000 | 1.000000 | 11.858000 | 24.511000 |

CASE (II) :- For $\theta = 2.0$, $\alpha = 0.05$, $\alpha_1 = 0.02$ and $d = 1.0$

TABLE (4.4)

REQUIRED SECOND-SAMPLE COVERAGE = 0.969388

| FIRST SIZE | COOKE'S COVERAGE | GEN. METHOD COVERAGE | COOKE'S E(N) | GEN. METHOD E(N) |
|------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 5 | 0.986000 | 1.001000 | 7.83700 | 16.302000 |
| 6 | 0.999000 | 1.000000 | 8.432000 | 16.214000 |
| 7 | 0.998000 | 1.000000 | 8.380000 | 16.351000 |
| 8 | 0.999000 | 1.000000 | 9.000000 | 16.761000 |
| 9 | 0.999000 | 0.999000 | 10.000000 | 17.262000 |
| 10 | 1.000000 | 1.000000 | 11.000000 | 17.995000 |

CASE (III) :- For $\theta = 3.0$, $\alpha = 0.01$, $\alpha_1 = 0.005$ and $d = 1.0$

TABLE (4.5)

REQUIRED SECOND-SAMPLE COVERAGE = 0.994975

| FIRST-SAMPLE SIZE | COOKE'S COVERAGE | GEN. METHOD COVERAGE | COOKE'S E(N) | GEN. METHOD E(N) |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 5 | 0.991000 | 1.000000 | 17.438000 | 24.251000 |
| 6 | 0.985000 | 0.999000 | 16.693000 | 36.286000 |

CASE (IV) :- For $\theta = 2.0$, $\alpha = 0.05$, $\alpha_1 = 0.02$ and $d = 1.0$

TABLE (4.6)

REQUIRED SECOND-SAMPLE COVERAGE = 0.969388

| FIRST SAMPLE SIZE | COOKE'S COVERAGE | GEN. METHOD COVERAGE | COOKE'S E(N) | GEN. METHOD E(N) |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 11 | 1.001000 | 1.001000 | 12.001000 | 18.706000 |
| 12 | 1.001000 | 1.001000 | 13.001000 | 19.527000 |
| 13 | 1.001000 | 1.001000 | 14.001000 | 20.398000 |

CASE (V) :- For given $\theta = 2.0$, $d = 1.0$, $\alpha = 0.05$ and the first sample size $(m) = 5$, we have the possible values of α_2 for the general two-stage procedure.

TABLE (4.7)

| First Sample Cov. | Second Sample Cov. | E(N) |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 0.951000 | 0.998948 | 22.654000 |
| 0.952000 | 0.997899 | 20.981000 |
| 0.953000 | 0.996852 | 20.037000 |
| 0.954000 | 0.995807 | 19.384000 |
| 0.955000 | 0.994764 | 18.904000 |
| 0.956000 | 0.993724 | 18.507000 |
| 0.957000 | 0.992685 | 18.182000 |
| 0.958000 | 0.991649 | 17.913000 |
| 0.959000 | 0.990615 | 17.662000 |
| 0.960000 | 0.989583 | 17.446000 |
| 0.961000 | 0.988554 | 17.311000 |
| 0.962000 | 0.987526 | 17.164000 |
| 0.963000 | 0.986501 | 17.040000 |
| 0.964000 | 0.985477 | 16.888000 |
| 0.965000 | 0.984456 | 16.769000 |
| 0.966000 | 0.983437 | 16.661000 |
| 0.967000 | 0.982420 | 16.599000 |
| 0.968000 | 0.981405 | 16.543000 |
| 0.969000 | 0.980392 | 16.498000 |
| 0.970000 | 0.979381 | 16.445000 |
| 0.971000 | 0.978373 | 16.401000 |
| 0.972000 | 0.977366 | 16.359000 |
| 0.973000 | 0.976362 | 16.321000 |
| 0.974000 | 0.975359 | 16.293000 |
| 0.975000 | 0.974359 | 16.275000 |
| 0.976000 | 0.973361 | 16.265000 |
| 0.977000 | 0.972364 | 16.265000 |
| 0.978000 | 0.971370 | 16.272000 |
| 0.979000 | 0.970378 | 16.288000 |
| 0.980000 | 0.969388 | 16.312000 |
| 0.981000 | 0.968400 | 16.350000 |
| 0.982000 | 0.967413 | 16.404000 |
| 0.983000 | 0.966429 | 16.457000 |
| 0.984000 | 0.965447 | 16.508000 |

* indicates smallest diff.

** indicates smallest ASN

**

| | | |
|----------|----------|-----------|
| 0.985000 | 0.964467 | 16.581000 |
| 0.986000 | 0.963489 | 16.656000 |
| 0.987000 | 0.962513 | 16.748000 |
| 0.988000 | 0.961538 | 16.866000 |
| 0.989000 | 0.960566 | 17.023000 |
| 0.990000 | 0.959596 | 17.195000 |
| 0.991000 | 0.958628 | 17.404000 |

Comments :- The following are some comments based on the simulation study.

(1) Both general and Cooke's procedure attains the desired level.

(2) The ASN for Cooke's procedure is much less than general procedure.

(3) Lastly we studied the best possible $1-\alpha_2$ indicated by (**) in the table (4.7), which minimizes ASN in case of general two-stage procedure.

The C - programs to obtain above tables (4.3) to (4.7) are enclosed in Appedix-IV (A) and IV (B).

■