

Gaiffee (2005) proposes the following test of

$$H_0: \mu \leq 1$$

$$H_A: \mu > 1$$

with $\mu := \mathbb{E}X$ and $X \geq 0$:

Given a sample x_1, \dots, x_n , reject the null at nominal level α when $K(x_1, \dots, x_n) < \alpha$, where $K(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is given (eqn (10)) by

$$(1) \quad K(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j \leq z_0 \right), \text{ and } z_0, \dots, z_n \text{ are iid exponential, i.e., } F_{Z_j}(x) = 1 - e^{-x}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So, } K(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j \right) \right\} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left\{ \exp \left(- (x_j - 1) Z_j \right) \right\} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n \int_0^\infty \exp \left(- (x_j - 1) z \right) e^{-z} dz \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n \int_0^\infty e^{-x_j z} dz \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{x_j} \quad (H_0: \mathbb{E}X_j \leq 1) \end{aligned}$$

The false positive rate is $\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(K(x_1, \dots, x_n) < \alpha)$,

Gaiffee says it is unknown whether

$$(*) \quad \text{FPR} = \mathbb{P}(K(x_1, \dots, x_n) < \alpha) \leq \alpha \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{Gaiffee} \\ \text{eqn (14)} \end{array} \right)$$

except for distributions supported on 2 points (where it holds - his Lemma 2.2).

Suppose $(*)$ does not hold, i.e., there

exists $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 &< \mathbb{P}(K(x_1, \dots, x_n) < \alpha_0) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{-1} < \alpha_0 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n x_j > \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \right). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n x_j \right) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n x_j > u \right) du \\ &\geq \int_0^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0}} \mathbb{P} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n x_j > u \right) du \\ &> \int_0^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0}} \alpha_0 du = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Just assuming x_1, \dots, x_n are uncorrelated

(not necessarily iid), $\mathbb{E}(\prod x_j) = \prod (\mathbb{E}x_j)$,

so $\mathbb{E}(\prod x_j) > 1$ implies $\mathbb{E}x_j > 1$ for at least 1 of the x_j . So the null doesn't hold.

----- 0 -----

$$\text{eqn (1): } K(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j \leq z_0 \right)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j \leq z_0 \mid \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j \right) \right\} \quad \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{law of total} \\ \text{probability} \end{array} \right.$$

$$(2) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P}(u \leq z_0) \mid u = \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j \right\}$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left\{ 1 - F_{z_0}(u) \mid u = \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j \right\}$$

$F_{z_0}(u) = 1 - e^{-u}$
is the CDF
of z_0

$$= \mathbb{E} \left(e^{-\sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j} \right)$$

Equation (2) is this rule: If X and Y are independent, then for any (integrable) f ,

$$\mathbb{E}(f(X, Y) \mid Y) = \mathbb{E}(f(X, y)) \mid_{y=Y} \text{ i.e.,}$$

compute $\mathbb{E}(f(X, y))$ treating y as a constant,

then substitute Y for y (eg, Durrett

Example 4.1.7). In our setting,

$$X = z_0, \quad Y = \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - 1) Z_j, \text{ and } f: (u, v) \mapsto$$

$\mathbb{I}\{v < u\}$. Also I used the notation "P" instead

of "E" as in the rule since the argument

f is an indicator.