



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL
SCIENCES

TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

The Matched Pairs Sign Test Using Bivariate Ranked Set
Sampling

by
Hani M. Samawi
Department of Mathematical Sciences
Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460-8093

Mohammad F. Al-Saleh
Department of Statistics
Yarmouk University, Irbid-Jordan 211-63

Obaid Al-Saidy
Sultan Qaboos University, P.O. Box 36
Al-khod 123, Sultanate of Oman

Number 2007-003
Submitted: February 28, 2007
© 2007

THE MATCHED PAIRS SIGN TEST USING BIVARIATE RANKED SET SAMPLING

¹Hani M. Samawi, ²Mohammad F. Al-Saleh and ³Obaid Al-Saidy

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences
Georgia Southern University
P.O.Box 8093
Statesboro, GA 30460, USA
hsamawi@georgiasouthern.edu

²Department of Statistics
Yarmouk University, Irbid-Jordan, 211-63
m-saleh@yu.edu.jo

³Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Sultan Qaboos University, P.o.Box 36
Al-khod 123, Sultanate of OMAN
obiad@squ.edu.om

Abstract

The matched pairs sign test using bivariate ranked set sampling (BVRSS) is introduced and investigated. We show that this test is asymptotically more efficient than its counterpart sign test based on a bivariate simple random sample (BVSRS). The asymptotic null distribution and the efficiency of the test are derived. The Pitman asymptotic relative efficiency is used to compare the asymptotic performance of the matched pairs sign test using BVRSS versus using BVSRS. For small sample sizes, the bootstrap method is used to estimate P-values. Numerical comparisons are used to gain insight about the efficiency of the BVRSS sign test compared to the BVSRS sign test. Our numerical and theoretical results indicate that using BVRSS for the matched pairs sign test is substantially more efficient than using BVSRS.

Key words: Bootstrap method; bivariate ranked set sample; power of the test, P-value of the test; Pitman's relative efficiency, sign test.

1. Introduction

In many epidemiological studies, it is necessary to use matched pairs for the two cohorts of a study subjects, based on their age, gender and/or other confounding factors, in order to compare the cohorts. “Matching as a technique for the control of confounding has great intuitive appeal and has been widely used over the years. Unlike randomization and restriction, which used to for control confounding in the design stage of a study, matching is a strategy that must include elements of both design and analysis”. See Hennekens and Buring 1987. For example, a two-year prospective study could be conducted to compare the effect of adding calcium supplements in manufactured milk for newborns to that in natural mother milk on baby’s heights. A large group of new born identical twins could be considered: in one of the twins, milk with added calcium is provided; for the other twin, mothers are encouraged with some incentives to breast feed their babies for two years. After the two years, a matched pair’s random sample could be drawn from the twins’ population of babies; their heights would be measured along with other factors of interest. These types of studies produce data consisting of observations in a bivariate random sample $\{(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$, where there are n pairs of observations. Within each pair (X_i, Y_i) a comparison is made, and the pair is classified as “+” if $X_i < Y_i$, “-” if $X_i > Y_i$ or “0” if $X_i = Y_i$. Here the measurement scale needs only to be ordinal. Other needed assumptions are (1) The bivariate variables $(X_i, Y_i), i=1, 2, \dots, n$, are mutually independent. (2) The pairs (X_i, Y_i) are internally consistent in that if $P(+)>P(-)$ for one pair (X_i, Y_i) , then $P(+)>P(-)$ for all pairs. The same is true for $P(+)<P(-)$ and $P(+)=P(-)$.

The types of null hypotheses that can be tested using the matched pairs sign test are:

$$(1) H_o : P(+)=P(-)=\frac{1}{2}.$$

(2) $H_o : E(X_i)=E(Y_i)$, for all i , which is interpreted as X_i and Y_i have the same location parameter.

(3) H_o : The median of X_i equals the median of Y_i for all i (see Conover 1980.)

The matched pairs sign test statistic which is denoted by T_{BVSRS} , for testing the above hypotheses, equals the number of “+” pairs, that is

$$T_{BVSRS} = \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i < Y_i) \quad (1.1)$$

where

$$I(X_i < Y_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X_i < Y_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

First, discard all tied pairs and let n equal the number of the remaining pairs. Depending on whether the alternative hypotheses is one-tailed or two-tailed, and if $n \leq 20$, then one can use the Binomial distribution with the values n and $p=1/2$ for finding the critical region of approximately size α . When n is larger than 20 and under the null hypothesis, then $T_{BVSRS} \sim N(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n}{4})$. Therefore, the critical region can be defined based on the normal distribution. It had been argued that T_{BVSRS} is unbiased and consistent test statistic when testing $H_o : P(+) = P(-)$. However, for testing $H_o : E(X_i) = E(Y_i)$, for all i and

H_o : The median of X_i equals the median of Y_i for all i , T_{BVSRS} is neither unbiased nor consistent (see Conover 1980.)

In most statistical applications the data used is assumed to consist of a simple random sample (SRS). Recently, it becomes obvious in many studies such as, agricultural, environmental and epidemiological studies; that quantification of sampling units with respect to the variable of interest is costly as compared with the physical acquisition of the unit. Cost savings of quantifying sampling units can be achieved by using ranked set sampling (RSS) method which was introduced first by McIntyre (1952) without any mathematical proof to estimate the population mean, and later called RSS by Halls and Dell (1966).

The RSS procedure can be described as follows: Randomly sample a group of sampling units from the target population. Then randomly partition the group into disjoint subsets each having a pre-assigned size r . In most practical situations, the size r will be 2, 3 or 4. Rank the elements in each subset by a suitable method of ranking such as prior information, visual inspection or by the subject-matter experimenter himself, ... etc. Then the i -th order statistic from the i -th subset, $X_{i(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, will be quantified (actual measurement). Therefore, $X_{1(1)}, X_{2(2)}, \dots, X_{r(r)}$ constitutes the RSS. This represents one cycle. The whole procedure can be repeated m -times as needed, to get a RSS of size $n=mr$. For the theoretical aspects of RSS, see Takahasi and Wakimoto (1968) or Dell and Clutter(1972).

Stokes and Sager (1988) used RSS to estimate the cumulative distribution functions (cdf) using the empirical distribution function (edf) based on RSS (F^*). The procedure based on ranked set

samples quantiles with applications was investigated by Chen (2000), Samawi (2001), Samawi and Al-Saleh (2004). An optimal ranked set sample scheme (ORSS) for inference on population quantiles was suggested by Chen (2001). Other authors have used the RSS sampling method to improve parametric and non-parametric statistical inference. For non-parametric methods, RSS was considered by Bohn and Wolfe (1992, 1994), Kvam and Samaniego (1994) and Hettmansperger (1995). Koti and Babu (1996) showed that the RSS sign test provides a more powerful test than the SRS sign test. Barabesi (1998) provided a simpler and faster method for computing the exact distribution of the RSS sign test.

The optimality of the RSS sign test has been established by several researchers in the literature via Pitman asymptotic efficacy. It was shown that the median ranked set sample (MRSS) is the best among all possible sampling schemes in the ranked set sampling environment for the sign test procedure; for example see Öztürk (1999) and Öztürk and Wolfe (2000). However, to our knowledge, the optimality of the MRSS for the sign test has only been shown asymptotically. Samawi and Abu-Dayyeh (2002) investigated the exact power and distribution function for finite sample sizes of the MRSS sign test. For more about univariate RSS and its variations, see Kaur et al. (1995) and Patil et al. (1999).

Estimation of bivariate characteristics using bivariate ranked set sampling (BVRSS) was introduced by Al-Saleh and Zheng (2002). They indicated that this BVRSS procedure can be easily extended to multivariate RSS. Based on their description, a BVRSS can be obtained as follows:

Suppose (X, Y) is a bivariate random vector with the joint probability density function (p.d.f.) $f(x, y)$.

1. A random sample of size r^4 is identified from the population and randomly allocated into r^2 pools each of size r^2 , where each pool is a square matrix with r rows and r columns.
2. In the first pool, identify the minimum value by judgment w.r.t. the first characteristic X , for each of the r rows.
3. For the r minima obtained in Step 2, choose the pair that corresponds to the minimum value of the second characteristic Y , identified by judgment, for actual quantification. This pair, which resembles the label $(1, 1)$, is the first element of the BVRSS sample.
4. Repeat Steps 2 and 3 for the second pool, but in step 3, the pair that corresponds to the second minimum value w.r.t. the second characteristic, Y , is chosen for actual quantification. This pair resembles the label $(1, 2)$.

5. The process continues until the label (r, r) is resembled from the r^2 -th (last) pool.

This will produce a BVRSS of size r^2 . The procedure can be repeated m times to obtain a sample of size $n=mr^2$. Although, the BVRSS procedure can be extended to multivariate RSS (MVRSS). Our proceeding discussion will only be applied to the bivariate case (BVRSS) in order to simplify the presentation of the method.

In this paper we introduce the matched pairs sign test using BVRSS. Numerical comparisons between the performance of the BVRSS sign test and the performance of the BVSRS sign test via Pitman's asymptotic efficacy and asymptotic power are investigated. The exact distribution and the asymptotic null distribution and power of the BVRSS sign test are derived. It will be shown that BVRSS substantially improves the efficiency and the power of the sign test in the case of a matched pairs sample. We also introduce a bootstrap method for finding the P-value of the matched pairs test for small sample sizes.

1.1. Characteristics of BVRSS and some useful results

Let $[(X_{ijk}^z, Y_{ijk}^z), i = 1, 2, \dots, r, j = 1, 2, \dots, r, k = 1, 2, \dots, m \ \& \ z = 1, \dots, r^2]$ be mr^4 *i.i.d* ordered pairs from a bivariate probability density function, say $f(x, y); (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Following the Al-Saleh and Zheng (2002) definition of BVRSS let

$\left[(X_{[i](j)k}^z, Y_{(i)[j]k}^z), i = 1, 2, \dots, r; j = 1, 2, \dots, r; z = (j-1)r + i \text{ and } k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right]$ denotes

such a sample from $f(x, y)$. Let $f_{X_{[i](j)}^z, Y_{(i)[j]}^z}(x, y)$ be the joint p.d.f. of $(X_{[i](j)k}^z, Y_{(i)[j]k}^z), k=1, 2,$

\dots, m . Then as in Al-Saleh and Zheng (2002),

$$f_{X_{[i](j)}^z, Y_{(i)[j]}^z}(x, y) = f_{Y_{(i)[j]}}(y) \frac{f_{X_{(j)}}(x) f_{Y|X}(y|x)}{f_{Y_{[j]}}(y)} \quad (1.2)$$

where $f_{X_{(j)}}$ is the density of the j^{th} order statistic for a SRS of size r with marginal density of f_X and $f_{Y_{[j]}}(y)$ be the density of the corresponding Y – value given by

$$f_{Y_{[j]}}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{X_{(j)}}(x) f_{Y|X}(y|x) dx,$$

while $f_{Y_{(i)[j]}}(y)$ is the density of the i^{th} order statistic of an i.i.d. sample of size r from $f_{Y_{[j]}}(y)$, i.e.

$$f_{Y_{(i)[j]}}(y) = c(F_{Y_{[j]}}(y))^{i-1}(1-F_{Y_{[j]}}(y))^{r-i}f_{Y_{[j]}}(y)$$

where $F_{Y_{(i)[j]}}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^y (\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{X_{(j)}}(x)f_{Y|X}(w|x)dx)dw$ and $c = \frac{r!}{(i-1)!(r-i)!}$.

Putting these together, (1.2) can be written for any z (the z notation will be dropped for simplicity) as

$$f_{X_{[i](j)}, Y_{(i)[j]}}(x, y) = c_1(F_{Y_{[j]}}(y))^{i-1}(1-F_{Y_{[j]}}(y))^{r-i}(F_X(x))^{j-1}(1-F_X(x))^{r-j}f(x, y) \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$c_1 = \frac{r!}{(i-1)!(r-i)!} \frac{r!}{(j-1)!(r-j)!}$$

Again from Al-Saleh and Zheng (2002) we have the following results:

$$(1) \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^r f_{X_{[i](j)}, Y_{(i)[j]}}(x, y) = f(x, y), \quad (1.4)$$

$$(2) \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^r f_{X_{[i](j)}}(x) = f_X(x), \quad (1.5)$$

$$(3) \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^r f_{Y_{(i)[j]}}(y) = f_Y(y). \quad (1.6)$$

2. Matched Pairs Sign Test Using BVRSS

Using the BVRSS sample,

$\left[(X_{[i](j)k}, Y_{(i)[j]k}), i = 1, 2, \dots, r; j = 1, 2, \dots, r; \text{ and } k = 1, 2, \dots, m \right]$, drawn from a

population with *p.d.f* $f(x,y)$, the BVRSS sign test statistic can be defined as T_{BVRSS} = the number of "+"; or; = $\#(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})$ for all i, j and k , that is

$$T_{BVRSS} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{k=1}^m I(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r T_{ij} \quad (2.1)$$

where $T_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^m I(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})$. Clearly, $T_{ij}, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ are stochastically independent and each T_{ij} has a binomial distribution with parameters m and $p_{ij} = P(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})$. Thus the exact distribution of T_{BVRSS} is given by

$$P(T_{BVRSS} = t) = \sum_{L_{xy}} \prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{j=1}^r \binom{m}{l_{ij}} p_{ij}^{l_{ij}} (1-p_{ij})^{m-l_{ij}} \quad (2.2)$$

for $t=0, 1, 2, \dots, mr^2$; where $L_{xy} = \{(l_{ij} : i, j = 1, 2, \dots, r) : \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r l_{ij} = t; 0 \leq l_{ij} \leq m, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, r\}$.

Unfortunately, the exact distribution in (2.2) depends on the given underlying bivariate distribution function even under the null hypothesis. Thus, finding the exact critical value and the P-value of the test requires knowledge of the underlying distribution function. Therefore, we will introduce a simple bootstrap algorithm for finding the P-value in the case of sample size $n < 20$. For larger n , an asymptotic test procedure is introduced.

Theorem 2.1: Assuming no tied pairs ($X_{[i](j)k} = Y_{(i)[j]k}$) for all i, j and k , under the null hypothesis

$H_o : P(+)=P(-)=\frac{1}{2}$ and for fixed r and large m , then T_{BVRSS} has approximately $N(\frac{n}{2}, V_o)$, where $n=mr^2$, $V_o = r^2m(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r p_{ij}^2)$ and $p_{ij} = P(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})$.

Proof: Discard all tied pairs and let n equal the number of pairs that are not ties. Then

$$E(T_{BVRSS}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{k=1}^m E[I(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})] = \iint I(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k}) \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{k=1}^m f_{X_{[i](j)k}, Y_{(i)[j]k}}(x, y) dx dy,$$

and by using (1.4), $E(T_{BVRSS}) = r^2m \iint I(x < y) f(x, y) dx dy = \frac{r^2m}{2} = \frac{n}{2}$.

Also,

$$Var(T_{BVRSS}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{k=1}^m Var[I(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})] = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{k=1}^m \{E[I^2(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})] - (E[I(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})])^2\}, \text{ thus}$$

$$V_o = Var(T_{BVRSS}) = r^2m(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r p_{ij}^2).$$

Using similar argument as in Hettmansperger (1995) the proof follows.

A consistent estimator for V is given by

$$\hat{V}_o = r^2m(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r \hat{p}_{ij}^2), \text{ where } \hat{p}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m I(X_{[i](j)k} < Y_{(i)[j]k})}{m}.$$

Depending on the alternative hypothesis whether it is one-tailed or two-tailed and if $n \geq 20$, then the asymptotic test procedure is to reject the null hypothesis $H_o : P(+)=P(-)$ in favor of the alternative {e.g. $H_a : P(+)>P(-)$ } if $Z_o = \frac{T_{BVRSS} - \frac{n}{2}}{\sqrt{\hat{V}_o}} > z_\alpha$, where z_α is the 100(1- α)% quantile of

the standard normal distribution.

3. The Asymptotic Relative Efficiency and Power

The performance of the matched pairs sign test using BVRSS will be compared with the matched pairs sign test using BVSRS based on the criterion of Pitman's asymptotic relative efficiency (ARE). The Pitman's regularity conditions are satisfied for both T_{BVRSS} and T_{BVSRS} because all moments of the tests are in terms of probabilities, and hence are bounded above by 1. The Pitman's ARE of T_{BVRSS} versus T_{BVSRS} is defined as

$$ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS}) = \frac{e^2(T_{BVRSS})}{e^2(T_{BVSRS})}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the efficiency of a test statistics T is given by $e(T)$ and $e(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{\partial E(T)}{\partial \theta}}{\sqrt{n \text{ var}(T)}} \Big|_{H_0}$.

Using the above definition and noting that $F_D(0) = P(X < Y) = P(X - Y < 0) = P(D < 0)$, the efficiencies of T_{BVRSS} and T_{BVSRS} are obtained as

$$e(T_{BVRSS}) = \frac{\sqrt{2}f_D(0)}{\sqrt{(1 - 2/r^2 \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r p_{ij}^2)}} \Big|_{H_0} \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$e(T_{BVSRS}) = 2f_D(0) \quad (3.3)$$

respectively. Note that θ could be the central parameter of D or the shifted parameter such that $P(X < Y + \theta) = 0.5$ under the null hypothesis.

Therefore, by (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3)

$$ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS}) = \frac{1}{2(1 - 2/r^2 \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r p_{ij}^2)} \Big|_{H_0} \geq 1.$$

Moreover, by Theorem 2.1, the asymptotic power of testing the hypothesis $H_0 : P(+) = P(-)$ versus the alternative {without loss of generality consider $H_a : P(+) > P(-)$ } for T_{BVRSS} and T_{BVSRS} are defined by $\beta_{BVRSS} = 1 - \Phi[(z_\alpha \sqrt{V_0} + n/2 - nP(X < Y)) / \sqrt{V_a}]$, where V_0 (as in Theorem 2.1) and V_a are the variance of T_{BVRSS} under the null and the alternative hypotheses respectively and

$\beta_{BVSRS} = 1 - \Phi[(z_\alpha \sqrt{n/4} + n/2 - nP(X < Y)) / \sqrt{nP(X < Y)(1 - P(X < Y))}]$. Therefore, under the null hypothesis $\beta_{BVRSS} = 1 - \Phi(z_\alpha) = \alpha$ and $\beta_{BVSRS} = 1 - \Phi(z_\alpha) = \alpha$. Note that

$$V_a = \text{Var}(T_{BVRSS} |_{H_a}) = r^2 m(P(X < Y) - \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^r p_{ij}^2).$$

3.1 Numerical comparisons

Assuming that the bivariate random variable (X, Y) has a bivariate normal distribution, $ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS})$ for $\{r=2 \text{ and } 3, \text{ and correlation coefficient } (\rho = \pm 0.5, \text{ and } \pm 0.9)\}$ is computed. Also, the asymptotic power for $\{(r=2, m=5), (r=2, m=6), (r=3, m=3) \text{ and } (r=3, m=4)\}$, shifted parameter of center of the two marginal distributions $(\theta = 0, 0.1, 0.5, \text{ and } 1)$, level of significance $\{\alpha = 0.05\}$ and correlation coefficient $(\rho = \pm 0.2, \pm 0.5, \text{ and } \pm 0.9)$ is computed.

Table 3.1 shows Pitman's asymptotic relative efficiency $ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS})$ and Table 3.2 and 3.3 show that asymptotic power of T_{BVSRS} and T_{BVRSS} respectively.

Table 3.1: Pitman's asymptotic relative efficiency $ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS})$. The results for negative correlation coefficients are in bold and parenthesis.

r	$\rho = \pm 0.5$	$\rho = \pm 0.9$
2	1.15 (1.43)	1.04 (1.59)
3	1.29 (1.77)	1.09 (2.38)

Assuming a bivariate normal underlying distribution function, Table 3.1 shows that the performance of T_{BVRSS} is superior to T_{BVSRS} via Pitman's asymptotic relative efficiency $ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS})$. Also, it is clear that the $ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS})$ increases as r increases. It is clear that $ARE(T_{BVRSS}, T_{BVSRS})$ is higher when the correlation coefficient ρ is negative and increases as ρ negatively decreases away from 0. In practice this slight draw back in efficiency, when the correlation is positive, is not a draw back of using the test, because BVRSS sign test still more efficient than BVSRS sign test.

Table 3.2 gives evidence towards T_{BVRSS} being unbiased and consistent in this case although such evidence is not a conclusive proof. The power of T_{BVRSS} increases as the sample size increases and the shift parameter on the variable Y increases away from 0.

Table 3.3 shows that T_{BVRSS} is more powerful than T_{BVSRS} for all studied sample sizes and shifted parameter values. The superiority of T_{BVRSS} over T_{BVSRS} increases as $|\rho|$ increases and the set size r increases. There is evidence towards T_{BVRSS} being unbiased and consistent in this case; such evidence is again not a conclusive proof. From Theorem 2.1 T_{BVRSS} has a similar asymptotic distribution as T_{BVSRS} but with smaller asymptotic variance. Therefore, it is safe to say that T_{BVRSS} has similar asymptotic properties as T_{BVSRS} for testing $H_0 : P(+) = P(-)$, i.e. T_{BVRSS} is also unbiased and a consistent test procedure. However, T_{BVRSS} is more efficient and more powerful than T_{BVSRS} .

Moreover, Table 3.3 shows that the asymptotic power of T_{BVRSS} increases when set and sample sizes increase. Also, the asymptotic power of T_{BVRSS} increases when $\rho > 0$ increases for all nonzero values of the shifted parameter θ and increases when $\rho < 0$ increases in absolute value for $\theta > 0.1$. However, it decreases slightly when $\rho < 0$ increases in absolute value for $\theta = -0.1$.

Table 3.2: Asymptotic power for T_{BVSRS} when $\alpha = 0.05$.

Shift parameter θ	$n=20$	$n=24$	$n=27$	$n=36$
0	0.0500	0.0500	0.0500	0.0500
0.1	0.0867	0.0911	0.0942	0.1032
0.5	0.3893	0.4431	0.4813	0.5845
1	0.8644	0.9187	0.9455	0.9846

Table 3.3: Asymptotic power for T_{BVRSS} when $\alpha = 0.05$. The results for negative correlation coefficients are in bold and are in parenthesis.

$n=r^2 m$	θ	$\rho = \pm 0.2$	$\rho = \pm 0.5$	$\rho = \pm 0.9$
$n=20$ ($r=2, m=5$)	0	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)
	0.1	0.0921 (0.0910)	0.0934 (0.0904)	0.0962 (0.0902)
	0.5	0.4521 (0.4462)	0.4660 (0.4510)	0.5045 (0.4744)
	1	0.9212 (0.9305)	0.9292 (0.9539)	0.9600 (0.9968)
$n=24$ ($r=2, m=6$)	0	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)
	0.1	0.0972 (0.0961)	0.0987 (0.0955)	0.1019 (0.0955)
	0.5	0.5127 (0.5078)	0.5276 (0.5153)	0.5705 (0.5471)
	1	0.9586 (0.9657)	0.9637 (0.9806)	0.9826 (0.9996)
$n=27$ ($r=3, m=3$)	0	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)
	0.1	0.1060 (0.1036)	0.1113 (0.1039)	0.1357 (0.1088)
	0.5	0.6095 (0.6101)	0.6535 (0.6609)	0.8529 (0.9966)
	1	0.9871 (1.0000)	0.9919 (1.000)	1.000 (1.000)
$n=36$ ($r=4, m=3$)	0	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)	0.0500 (0.0500)
	0.1	0.1177 (0.1152)	0.1241 (0.1161)	0.1551 (0.1252)
	0.5	0.7209 (0.7267)	0.7630 (0.7850)	0.9305 (1.0000)
	1	0.9980 (1.0000)	1.0000 (1.000)	1.000 (1.0000)

4. Bootstrap Algorithm for Estimating the P-value of the Test

The distribution of our nonparametric test, T_{BVRSS} , in (2.2) depends on the underlying bivariate distribution function. Thus, the exact P-value calculation for sample size $n < 20$ is not feasible without knowing the underlying distribution. In this section we introduce a simple bootstrap method for calculating the P-value of the sign test for any given bivariate data. For general description of the bootstrap method of estimation see Efron and Tibshirani (1993).

Suppose that a bivariate random sample of size $n < 20$ is drawn from a population using the BVRSS or BVSRS sampling method. This implies that $\{(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is a random sample. The bootstrap algorithm for approximating the bootstrap P-value of the test for testing the hypothesis $H_0 : P(+) = P(-)$ versus the alternative {e.g. $H_a : P(+) > P(-)$ } is :

- 1) Calculate the sample test statistic (say $T = \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i < Y_i)$) from the original sample.
- 2) Estimate θ from the data; say $\hat{\theta}$. Shift Y_i to $Y_i - \hat{\theta}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.
- 3) Define $\hat{F}(x, y)$ by placing a mass probability $p_i = \frac{1}{n}$ on (X_i, Y_i) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.
- 4) Generate a resample (X_i^*, Y_i^*) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ from $\hat{F}(x, y)$.
- 5) Find $T_b^* = \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i^* < Y_i^*)$.
- 6) Repeat steps 3 and 4 B times.

Then the bootstrap P-value, $P^* = P(T^* \geq T \mid \hat{F}(x, y))$, can be approximated by $P^* = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B I(T_b^* \geq T)$.

However, when the data is BVRSS, slight modification of the above algorithm is needed as follows:

- 1- Divide the sample into r mutually exclusive strata each contains m i.i.d order pairs label.
- 2- Independently from each stratum generate a resample with replacement of size m by placing a mass probability $(\frac{1}{m})$ on each original observation in that stratum.
- 3- Combine all r resamples and do similar steps like in (5) and (6) above.

In conclusion, whenever BVRSS can be obtained, it is recommended to be used instead of BVSRS for the bivariate matched pairs sign test.

References

- Al-Saleh M. F. and Zheng G. (2002). " Estimation of multiple characteristics using ranked set sampling. *Australian and New Zealand J. of Statistics*, 44, 221-232.

- Barabesi, L. (1998): The computation of the distribution of the sign test for ranked set sampling. *Commun. Statist. Simulation*, 27 (3), 833-842.
- Bohn, L. L., Wolfe, D. A. (1992): Nonparametric two-sample procedures for ranked-set samples data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 87, 522-561.
- Bohn, L. L., Wolfe, D. A. (1994): The effect of imperfect judgment on ranked-set samples analog of the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon statistics. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 89, 168-176.
- Chen, Z. (2000). On ranked-set sample quantiles and their application. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 83, 125-135.
- Chen, Z. (2001). Optimal ranked-set sampling scheme for inference on population quantiles. *Statistica Sinica*, 11, 23-37 .
- Conover, W. J. (1980). *Practical nonparametric statistics*. 2ed Jhon Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dell, T. R. and Clutter, J. L. (1972). Ranked set sampling theory with order statistics background. *Biometrics*, 28, 545-555.
- Efron B. and Tibshirani R. (1993). *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman and Hall.
- Halls, L. K. and Dell, T. R. (1966). Trial of ranked set sampling for forage yields. *Forest Science*, 12, 22-26.
- Hennekens, C. H. and Buring, J. E. (1987). *Epidemiology in Medicine*. Little, Brown and Company Boston/Toronto
- Hettmansperger, T. P. (1995). The ranked-set sample sign test. *J. of Nonparametric Statistics*, 4, 263-270.
- Kaur, A., Patil, G.P., Sinha A.K. and Taillie, C.: (1995): Ranked set sampling: An annotated bibliography. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 2, 25-54.
- Koti, K. M. and Babu, G.J. (1996): Sign test for ranked-set sampling. *Commun. in Statist. Theory and Methods*, 25, 1617-1630.
- Kvam, P. H. and Samaniego, F. J. (1994): Nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation based on ranked set samples. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 89, 526-537.
- McIntyre, G.A. (1952): A method for unbiased selective sampling, using ranked sets. *Australian Journal of Agriculture Research* 3, 385-90.
- Öztürk, Ö. (1999): One and two sample sign tests for ranked set samples with selective designs. *Commun. Statist. Theory and Methods*, 28, 1231-1245.
- Öztürk, Ö. and Wolfe, D. A. (2000): Alternative ranked set sampling protocols for the sign test. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 47, 15-23.
- Patil G. P., A. K. Sinha and Tillie C. (1999). Ranked set sampling: a bibliography. *Environmental Ecological Statistics* 6, 91-98.

- Samawi, H. M. (2001). On quantiles estimation using ranked samples with some applications. *JKSS*, 30 (4), 667-678.
- Samawi, H. M. and Abu-Dayyeh, W. (2002). More powerful sign test using median ranked set sample: Finite sample power comparison. *J. Statist. Comput. Simul.*, 73 (10), 697-708.
- Samawi, H. M., Al-Saleh M. F. (2004). On biavriate ranked set sampling for distribution and quantile estimation and quantile interval estimation using ratio estimator. *Commun. Statist. Theory and Methods*, 33 (8), 1801-1819.
- Stokes, S. L. and Sager, T. (1988). Characterization of a ranked set sample with application to estimating distribution functions. *Journal of Americal Statistical Association*. 83, 374-381.
- Takahasi, K. and Wakimoto, K. (1968). On unbiased estimates of the population mean based on the stratified sampling by means of ordering. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 20, 1-31.