arXiv:0707.2113v2 [math.ST] 2 Aug 2007

Exact Computation of Minimum Sample Size for Estimation of Binomial Parameters *

Xinjia Chen

July 2007

Abstract

It is a common contention that it is an "impossible mission" to exactly determine the minimum sample size for the estimation of a binomial parameter with prescribed margin of error and confidence level. In this paper, we investigate such a very old but also extremely important problem and demonstrate that the difficulty for obtaining the exact solution is not insurmountable. Unlike the classical approximate sample size method based on the central limit theorem, we develop a new approach for computing the minimum sample size that does not require any approximation. Moreover, our approach overcomes the conservatism of existing rigorous sample size methods derived from Bernoulli's theorem or Chernoff bounds.

Our computational machinery consists of two essential ingredients. First, we prove that the minimum of coverage probability with respect to a binomial parameter bounded in an interval is attained at a discrete set of finite many values of the binomial parameter. This allows for reducing infinite many evaluations of coverage probability to finite many evaluations. Second, a recursive bounding technique is developed to further improve the efficiency of computation.

1 Introduction

The estimation of a binomial parameter is a fundamental problem in probability and statistics. The practical importance of such estimation problem can be seen by its numerous applications in various fields of sciences and engineering. Specifically, the problem is formulated as follows.

Let X be a Bernoulli random variable defined in a probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \Pr)$ such that $\Pr\{X = 1\} = p$ and $\Pr\{X = 0\} = 1 - p$ with $p \in (0, 1)$. It is a frequent problem to estimate p based on n identical and independent samples $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ of X. The parameter p is referred to as a binomial parameter, since it defines a binomial experiment for a given sample size n.

An estimate of p is conventionally taken as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$. The nice property of such estimate is that it is of maximum likely-hood and possesses minimum variance among all unbiased estimates. A crucial question in the estimation is as follows:

*The author had been previously working with Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA, and is now with Department of Electrical Engineering, Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA 70813, USA; Email: chenxinjia@gmail.com

Given the knowledge that p belongs to interval $[a, b]$, what is the minimum sample size n that guarantees the difference between $\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n$ and p be bounded within some prescribed margin of error with a confidence level higher than a prescribed value?

It is generally believed that an exact answer to this fundamental question is not possible (see, e.g., [6] and the references therein). However, our recent investigation shows that an exact solution can be found by combining the power of mathematical analysis and modern computers. The main contribution of this paper is to provide an exact answer to this important question. In contrast to existing methods in the literature, we aim at finding rigorous solutions while avoiding unnecessary conservatism.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the techniques for computing the minimum sample size is developed with the margin of error taken as a bound of absolute error. In Section 3, we derive corresponding sample size method by using relative error bound as the margin of error. In Section 4, we develop techniques for computing minimum sample size with a mixed error criterion. Section 5 is the conclusion. The proofs are given in Appendices.

Throughout this paper, we shall use the following notations. The set of integers is denoted by $\mathbb{Z}$. The ceiling function and floor function are denoted respectively by $\lceil . \rceil$ and $\lfloor . \rfloor$ (i.e., $\lceil x \rceil$ represents the smallest integer no less than x; $\lfloor x \rfloor$ represents the largest integer no greater than x). For non-negative integer m, the combinatoric function $\binom{m}{z}$ with respect to integer z means

$$\binom{m}{z} = \begin{cases} \frac{m!}{z!(m-z)!} & \text{for } 0 \le z \le m, \\ 0 & \text{for } z < 0 \text{ or } z > m. \end{cases}$$

The binomial function is $B(n, k, p) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$, assuming value 0 for $k < 0$ or $k > n$. The summation of binomial function is denoted as $S(n, k, l, p) = \sum_{i=k}^{l} B(n, i, p)$. The left limit as η tends to 0 is denoted as $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0}$. The notation "$\Longleftrightarrow$" means "if and only if". The other notations will be made clear as we proceed.

2 Control of Absolute Error

In this section, we shall review the classical sample size problem and the existing solutions. In particular, we shall elaborate the difficulty that has been considered as insurmountable in the literature. We will demonstrate that such "seemingly" insurmountable difficulty can be made disappear by a careful analysis of the coverage probability.

Formally, the classical sample size problem is stated as follows. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be the margin of absolute error and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be the confidence parameter. In many applications, it is desirable to find the smallest sample size n such that

$$\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\} > 1 - \delta \tag{1}$$

for any $p \in [a, b]$. Here $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\}$ is referred to as the coverage probability. The interval $[a, b]$ is introduced to take into account the knowledge of p. If no knowledge of p is available, the interval $[a, b]$ can be taken as $[0, 1]$.

The classical sample size problem associated with (1) has been extensively studied in the literature. As pointed out in pages 83-84 of [6], it is commonly believed that the exact computation of the minimum sample size is impossible. This is due to the intuitive that, for suitably chosen k_1 and k_2,

$$\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\} = \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}, \tag{2}$$

where both the summand and k_1, k_2 depend on the unknown value p, making the direct use of (2) and therefore (1) "almost impossible in practice." Such argument is very typical and can be seen in page 84, lines 1-6 of [6]. In general, one tends to think that infinite many evaluations of the right-hand side of (2) is required to determine whether the coverage probability is greater than $1 - \delta$ for any p in interval $[a, b]$. Motivated by the "seemingly" prohibitive computational complexity, statisticians have been settled to finding approximation or conservative bounds for the minimum sample size associated with (1).

The conventional solution is based on the normal approximation (see, e.g., [3, 4] and the references therein). The drawback of such sample size method is that the coverage probability in (1) may be significantly below the prescribed confidence level $1 - \delta$. This can be an extremely severe problem in the case that the upper bound, b, of the binomial parameter is small. Such criticism is very usual as can be seen in [4, 5] and many other literatures. The issue of inaccuracy remains significant even for the case that no information of p is available, i.e., $[a, b] = [0, 1]$. In this case, the minimum sample size is approximated as

$$n_{\mathrm{G}} \approx \frac{Z_{\delta/2}^2}{4\varepsilon^2} \tag{3}$$

where $Z_{\delta/2}$ satisfies $\int_{Z_{\delta/2}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx = \frac{\delta}{2}$. Application of the approximate formula (3) must introduce unknown error in reporting the statistical accuracy of the estimation of p. In order to eliminate the inaccuracy of normal approximation, one can resort to the large deviation type inequalities to derive an upper bound for the minimum sample size. A well-known result is the Chernoff bound, which asserts that (1) is true for any $p \in [0, 1]$ provided that

$$n > \frac{\ln \frac{2}{\delta}}{2\varepsilon^2}. \tag{4}$$

The Chernoff bound significantly improves upon the sample size bound provided by the famous Bernoulli theorem, which states that (1) is ensured for any $p \in [0, 1]$ if

$$n > \frac{1}{4\varepsilon^2 \delta}. \tag{5}$$

The major problem of sample size formulas (4) and (5) is the unduly conservativeness. The sample size obtained from (4) or (5) can be substantially larger than the minimum sample size.

Since one of the fundamental goals of statistics is to provide rigorous and the least conservative quantification of uncertainty in statistical inference, it is a persistent concern of statisticians and practitioners to determine the exact value of minimum sample size associated with (1). After a thorough investigation, we discovered that the exact determination of minimum sample size is readily tractable with modern computational power by taking advantage of the behavior of the coverage probability characterized by Theorem 1 as follows.

Theorem 1 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $0 \le a < b \le 1$. Let $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ be identical and independent Bernoulli random variables such that, for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $\Pr\{X_i = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X_i = 0\} = p$ with $p \in [a, b]$. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$. Then, the minimum of $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\}$ with respect to $p \in [a, b]$ is achieved at the finite set $\{a, b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, which has less than $2n(b - a) + 4$ elements.*

See Appendix A for a proof. The application of Theorem 1 in the computation of minimum sample size is obvious. For a fixed sample size n, since the minimum of coverage probability with $p \in [a, b]$ is attained at a finite set, it can determined by a computer whether the sample size n is large enough to ensure (1) for any $p \in [a, b]$. Starting from $n = 2$, one can find the minimum sample size by gradually incrementing n and checking whether n is large enough.

By the fact of symmetry that $\Pr\{|(1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n) - (1 - p)| < \varepsilon\} = \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\}$, we can restrict p to a smaller range $[a', b']$ such that

$$\min_{p \in [a,b]} \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\} = \min_{p \in [a',b']} \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\}$$

where

$$a' = \begin{cases} a & \text{for } a + b \le 1, \\ 1 - b & \text{for } a + b > 1 \end{cases} \qquad b' = \begin{cases} b & \text{for } b \le \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{for } a < \frac{1}{2} < b, \\ 1 - a & \text{for } a \ge \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $0 \le a' < b' \le \frac{1}{2}$ and $b' - a' \le b - a$. Hence, without loss of any generality, we can assume $0 \le a < p < b \le \frac{1}{2}$.

As can be seen from Theorem 1, for $a = 0$ and $b = \frac{1}{2}$, the total number of binomial summations to be evaluated is no more than $n + 2$, since the coverage probability for $a = 0$ is one and no computation is needed.

For computational purpose, we have

Theorem 2 *Let $0 \le a < b \le \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{S} \;=\; & \{c_+(\ell) \mid 1 + \lfloor n(a - \varepsilon) \rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil n(b - \varepsilon) \rceil - 1\} \cup \{c_a,\, c_b\} \\ & \cup \{c_-(\ell) \mid 1 + \lfloor n(a + \varepsilon) \rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil n(b + \varepsilon) \rceil - 1\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_a = \textstyle\sum_{k=\lfloor n(a-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1}^{\lceil n(a+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1} B(n, k, a), \qquad c_b = \textstyle\sum_{k=\lfloor n(b-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1}^{\lceil n(b+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1} B(n, k, b),$$

$c_+(\ell) = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{\ell-1+\lceil 2n\varepsilon\rceil} B\left(n, k, \frac{\ell}{n}+\varepsilon\right)$, $\quad c_-(\ell) = \sum_{k=\ell+1-\lceil 2n\varepsilon\rceil}^{\ell-1} B\left(n, k, \frac{\ell}{n}-\varepsilon\right)$ *for* $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. *Define*

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\Delta}(n,\theta,r,s) &= B(n-1,r-1,\theta) + B\left(n,s+1,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right) - B(n,r-1,\theta) - B(n-1,s,\theta) \\
&\quad + \frac{n-1}{2n}\left[\overline{B}(n-2,r-2,\theta) + \overline{B}(n-2,s,\theta) - \underline{B}(n-2,r-1,\theta) - \underline{B}(n-2,s-1,\theta)\right], \\
\underline{\Delta}(n,\theta,r,s) &= B(n-1,r-1,\theta) + B\left(n,s+1,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right) - B(n,r-1,\theta) - B(n-1,s,\theta) \\
&\quad + \frac{n-1}{2n}\left[\underline{B}(n-2,r-2,\theta) + \underline{B}(n-2,s,\theta) - \overline{B}(n-2,r-1,\theta) - \overline{B}(n-2,s-1,\theta)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

with $\underline{B}(n,k,\theta) = \min\left\{B(n,k,\theta),\ B\left(n,k,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right)\right\}$ *and*

$$\overline{B}(n,k,\theta) = \begin{cases} \max\left\{B(n,k,\theta),\ B\left(n,k,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right)\right\} & \text{for } \frac{k}{n} \notin [\theta, \theta+\frac{1}{n}], \\ B\left(n,k,\frac{k}{n}\right) & \text{for } \frac{k}{n} \in [\theta, \theta+\frac{1}{n}]. \end{cases}$$

Then, the following statements hold true:

(I) The minimum of $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\}$ *with respect to* $p \in [a,b]$ *equals the minimum of* $\mathscr{S}$*, i.e.,* $\min_{p\in[a,b]} \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\} = \min \mathscr{S}$.

(II) For $\lfloor n(a-\varepsilon)\rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil n(b-\varepsilon)\rceil - 1$,

$$[1 - c_+(\ell)] + \underline{\Delta}(n, \theta_\ell, r_\ell, s_\ell) \le 1 - c_+(\ell-1) \le [1 - c_+(\ell)] + \overline{\Delta}(n, \theta_\ell, r_\ell, s_\ell), \tag{6}$$

where $\theta_\ell = \frac{\ell-1}{n} + \varepsilon$, $r_\ell = \ell + 1$ *and* $s_\ell = \ell - 2 + \lceil 2n\varepsilon\rceil$.

(III) For $\lfloor n(a+\varepsilon)\rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil n(b+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1$,

$$[1 - c_-(\ell)] + \underline{\Delta}(n, \theta'_\ell, r'_\ell, s'_\ell) \le 1 - c_-(\ell-1) \le [1 - c_-(\ell)] + \overline{\Delta}(n, \theta'_\ell, r'_\ell, s'_\ell) \tag{7}$$

where $\theta'_\ell = \frac{\ell-1}{n} - \varepsilon$, $r'_\ell = \ell + 1 - \lceil 2n\varepsilon\rceil$ *and* $s'_\ell = \ell - 2$.

See Appendix B for a proof.

For the purpose of reducing roundoff error, we shall evaluate the complementary probability $1 - c_+(\ell)$, $1 - c_-(\ell), 1 - c_a, 1 - c_b$ and compare them with δ to determine whether the sample size n is large enough. Since the comparison between $1 - c_+(\ell)$ and δ usually only requires bounds of $1 - c_+(\ell)$, a large amount of computation can be saved if we start from $\ell = \lceil n(b-\varepsilon)\rceil - 1$ and recursively build the bounds of $1 - c_+(\ell-1)$ from the bounds of $1 - c_+(\ell)$ by making use of (6). Similarly, we can apply (7) to reduce the computation for the comparison between $1 - c_-(\ell)$ and δ. This computational technique is especially useful when the sample size is large. Due to the recursive nature, we call it as the *recursive bounding* technique. It should be noted the bounds may become too conservative to be useful as the number of recursive steps increases. In that situation, the recursive process should be restarted with exact computation for the current index ℓ.

Table 1: Table of Sample Sizes

ε	δ	n	ε	δ	n	ε	δ	n
0.1	0.05	101	0.1	0.01	171	0.1	0.001	276
0.05	0.05	391	0.05	0.01	671	0.05	0.001	1091
0.01	0.05	9651	0.01	0.01	16601	0.01	0.001	27101
0.005	0.05	38501	0.005	0.01	66401	0.005	0.001	108301
0.001	0.05	960501	0.001	0.01	1659001	0.001	0.001	2707001

In order to reduce computational effort, the evaluation should be performed earlier for $\frac{\ell}{n} \pm \varepsilon$ closer to $\frac{1}{2}$ for the purpose of earlier determination of whether the sample size is sufficiently large. This computational trick is motivated by our computational experience that for many values of ℓ, $1 - c_+(\ell)$ is non-decreasing with respect to ℓ. The situation is similar for $1 - c_-(\ell)$.

To demonstrate the feasibility of our computational method, we provide some sample size values in Table 1 for the case that $[a, b] = [0, 1]$, i.e., no information for p is available. Actually, with a few hours of computer running time, we have produced a MATLAB data file for a large number of combinations of margin of absolute error and confidence level. Although the computational complexity of our approach is much higher than that of existing explicit formulas, the computer running time is not an issue since a large data file of sample size can be created and saved for forever use.

3 Control of Relative Error

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be the margin of relative error and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be the confidence parameter. It is interesting to determine the smallest sample size n so that

$$\Pr\left\{\frac{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p|}{p} < \varepsilon\right\} > 1 - \delta$$

for any $p \in [a, b]$. As has been pointed out in Section 2, an essential machinery is to reduce infinite many evaluations of the coverage probability $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon p\}$ to finite many evaluations. Such reduction can be accomplished by making use of Theorem 3 as follows.

Theorem 3 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $0 < a < b \leq 1$. Let $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ be identical and independent Bernoulli random variables such that, for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $\Pr\{X_i = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X_i = 0\} = p$ with $p \in [a, b]$. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$. Then, the minimum of $\Pr\left\{\frac{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p|}{p} < \varepsilon\right\}$ with respect to $p \in [a, b]$ is achieved at the finite set $\{a, b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, which has less than $2n(b - a) + 4$ elements.*

See Appendix C for a proof. For computational convenience, we have

Theorem 4 *Let $0 \le a < b \le 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{S}_{\rm rev} &= \{c_+(\ell) \mid 1 + \lfloor na(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil nb(1-\varepsilon)\rceil - 1\} \cup \{c_a,\ c_b\} \\ &\quad \cup \{c_-(\ell) \mid 1 + \lfloor na(1+\varepsilon)\rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil nb(1+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1\}\end{aligned}$$

where

$c_a = \sum_{k=\lfloor na(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor+1}^{\lceil na(1+\varepsilon)\rceil-1} B(n,k,a)$, $\quad c_b = \sum_{k=\lfloor nb(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor+1}^{\lceil nb(1+\varepsilon)\rceil-1} B(n,k,b)$,

$c_+(\ell) = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{\lceil \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\ell\rceil-1} B\left(n,k,\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)}\right)$, $\quad c_-(\ell) = \sum_{k=\lfloor \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\ell\rfloor+1}^{\ell-1} B\left(n,k,\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)}\right)$ *for* $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Then, the minimum of $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon p\}$ *with respect to* $p \in [a,b]$ *equals the minimum of* $\mathscr{S}_{\rm rev}$, *i.e.,* $\min_{p\in[a,b]} \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon p\} = \min \mathscr{S}_{\rm rev}$.

Actually, a similar type of recursive bounding technique as Theorem 2 can be developed to improve the computational efficiency. Theorem 4 can be proved by applying Theorem 3 and the following observations:

(i) $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon p\}$ assumes values c_a and c_b for $p = a$ and b respectively.

(ii) For $p = \frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \in \{\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, we have $\lceil np(1+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1 = \ell - 1$, $\lfloor np(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\ell \right\rfloor + 1$, $c_-(\ell) = \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon p\}$ and $1 + \lfloor na(1+\varepsilon)\rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil nb(1+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1$.

(iii) For $p = \frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \in \{\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, we have $\lfloor np(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1 = \ell + 1$ and $\lceil np(1+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1 = \left\lceil \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\ell \right\rceil - 1$, $c_+(\ell) = \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon p\}$ and $1 + \lfloor na(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor \le \ell \le \lceil nb(1-\varepsilon)\rceil - 1$.

4 Control of Absolute Error or Relative Error

Let $\varepsilon_a \in (0,1)$ and $\varepsilon_r \in (0,1)$ be respectively the margins of absolute error and relative error. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$ be the confidence parameter. In many situations, it is desirable to find the smallest sample size n such that

$$\Pr\left\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon_a \ \text{ or } \ \frac{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p|}{p} < \varepsilon_r\right\} > 1 - \delta \tag{8}$$

for any $p \in [a,b]$. To make it possible to compute exactly the minimum sample size associated with (8), we have Theorem 5 as follows.

Theorem 5 *Let $0 < \varepsilon_a < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon_r < 1$ and $0 \le a < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} < b \le 1$. Let $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ be identical and independent Bernoulli random variables such that, for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $\Pr\{X_i = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X_i = 0\} = p$ with $p \in [a,b]$. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$. Then, the minimum of $\Pr\left\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon_a \ \text{ or } \ \frac{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p|}{p} < \varepsilon_r\right\}$ with respect to $p \in [a,b]$ is achieved at the finite set $\{a, b, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon_a \in (a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon_a \in (\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon_r)} \in (a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon_r)} \in (\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, which has less than $2n(b-a) + 7$ elements.*

As can be seen from Theorem 5, for $a = 0$ and $b = 1$, the total number of evaluations of probability is no more than $2n + 4$. The detailed proof of Theorem 5 is omitted since it can

Table 2: Table of Sample Sizes ($\varepsilon_r = 0.1$)

ε_a	δ	n	ε_a	δ	n	ε_a	δ	n
0.05	0.05	391	0.05	0.01	671	0.05	0.001	1091
0.01	0.05	3501	0.01	0.01	6051	0.01	0.001	9801
0.005	0.05	7401	0.005	0.01	12701	0.005	0.001	20701
0.001	0.05	38501	0.001	0.01	66501	0.001	0.001	108001

deduced from Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 with the observation that

$$\Pr\left\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } \frac{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p|}{p} < \varepsilon_r\right\} = \begin{cases} \Pr\left\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon_a\right\} & \text{for } p \in \left[a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right], \\ \Pr\left\{\frac{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p|}{p} < \varepsilon_r\right\} & \text{for } p \in \left(\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}, b\right]. \end{cases}$$

Such observation also indicates that the sample size problem associated with (8) can be decomposed as the sample size problems for the cases of absolute error and relative error discussed previously.

To show the effectiveness of our sample size method, we present some sample size numbers in Table 2 for the case that no information for the binomial parameter is available, i.e., $[a, b] = [0, 1]$. We would like to remark that the computation can be easily managed by any personal computer.

Finally, we would like to point out that similar characteristics of the coverage probability can be shown for the problem of estimating a Poisson parameter or the proportion of a finite population, which allows for the exact computation of minimum sample size. For details, see our recent papers [1, 2].

5 Conclusion

Determining sample size is a very important issue because samples that are too large may waste time, resources and money, while samples that are too small may lead to inaccurate results. We have developed an exact method for the computation of minimum sample size for the estimation of binomial parameters, which is not computational demanding. Our sample size method permits rigorous control of statistical sampling error. Exact previously unavailable minimum sample sizes is obtained by implementing the new method on a personal computer. Specially, for the convenient use of practitioners, we have obtained a MATLAB data file of sample sizes for a very large number of combinations of margin of error and confidence level, which can be available upon request. It is hoped that our sample size method can be useful to improve the rigorousness and efficiency of statistical inference on the very old estimation problem of binomial parameters.

A Proof of Theorem 1

We denote the number of successes as $K = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$. Define

$$C(p) = \Pr\left\{\left|\frac{K}{n} - p\right| < \varepsilon\right\} = \Pr\left\{g(p) \le K \le h(p)\right\}$$

where

$$g(p) = \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1, \qquad h(p) = \lceil n(p+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1.$$

It should be noted that $C(p)$, $g(p)$ and $h(p)$ are actually multivariate functions of p, ε and n. For simplicity of notations, we drop the arguments n and ε throughout the proof of Theorem 1.

We need some preliminary results.

Lemma 1 *Let $p_\ell = \frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon$ where $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $h(p) = h(p_{\ell+1}) = \ell$ for any $p \in (p_\ell, p_{\ell+1})$.*

Proof. For $p \in (p_\ell,\ p_{\ell+1})$, we have $0 < n\,(p - p_\ell) < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
h(p) &= \lceil n(p+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1 \\
&= \lceil n(p_\ell + \varepsilon + p - p_\ell)\rceil - 1 \\
&= \left\lceil n\left(\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon + \varepsilon + p - p_\ell\right)\right\rceil - 1 \\
&= \ell - 1 + \lceil n\,(p - p_\ell)\rceil \\
&= \ell \\
&= \left\lceil n\left(\frac{\ell+1}{n} - \varepsilon + \varepsilon\right)\right\rceil - 1 = h(p_{\ell+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2 *Let $p_\ell = \frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon$ where $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $g(p) = g(p_\ell) = \ell + 1$ for any $p \in (p_\ell, p_{\ell+1})$.*

Proof. For $p \in (p_\ell,\ p_{\ell+1})$, we have $-1 < n\,(p - p_{\ell+1}) < 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
g(p) &= \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1 \\
&= \lfloor n(p_{\ell+1} - \varepsilon + p - p_{\ell+1})\rfloor + 1 \\
&= \left\lfloor n\left(\frac{\ell+1}{n} + \varepsilon - \varepsilon\right)\right\rfloor + \lfloor n(p - p_{\ell+1})\rfloor + 1 \\
&= \left\lfloor n\left(\frac{\ell+1}{n} + \varepsilon - \varepsilon\right)\right\rfloor - 1 + 1 \\
&= \ell + 1 \\
&= \left\lfloor n\left(\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon - \varepsilon\right)\right\rfloor + 1 = g(p_\ell).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3 *Let $\alpha < \beta$ be two consecutive elements of the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\{a, b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then, both $g(p)$ and $h(p)$ are constants for any $p \in (\alpha, \beta)$.*

Proof. Since α and β are two consecutive elements of the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of the set, it must be true that there is no integer ℓ such that $\alpha < \frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon < \beta$ or $\alpha < \frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon < \beta$. It follows that there exist two integers ℓ and ℓ' such that $(\alpha, \beta) \subseteq \left(\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon, \frac{\ell+1}{n} + \varepsilon\right)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \subseteq \left(\frac{\ell'}{n} - \varepsilon, \frac{\ell'+1}{n} - \varepsilon\right)$. Applying Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we have $g(p) = g\left(\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon\right)$ and $h(p) = h\left(\frac{\ell'+1}{n} - \varepsilon\right)$ for any $p \in (\alpha, \beta)$.

□

Lemma 4 *For any $p \in (0, 1)$, $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(p + \eta) \geq C(p)$ and $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(p - \eta) \geq C(p)$.*

Proof. Observing that $h(p + \eta) \geq h(p)$ for any $\eta > 0$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} g(p + \eta) &= \lfloor n(p + \eta - \varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 \\ &= \lfloor n(p - \varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 + \lfloor n(p - \varepsilon) - \lfloor n(p - \varepsilon) \rfloor + n\eta \rfloor \\ &= \lfloor n(p - \varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 = g(p) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1 + \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon) \rfloor - n(p-\varepsilon)}{n}$, we have

$$S(n, g(p + \eta), h(p + \eta), p + \eta) \geq S(n, g(p), h(p), p + \eta) \tag{9}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1 + \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon) \rfloor - n(p-\varepsilon)}{n}$. Since

$$h(p + \eta) = \lceil n(p + \eta + \varepsilon) \rceil - 1 = \lceil n(p + \varepsilon) \rceil - 1 + \lceil n(p + \varepsilon) - \lceil n(p + \varepsilon) \rceil + n\eta \rceil,$$

we have

$$h(p + \eta) = \begin{cases} \lceil n(p + \varepsilon) \rceil & \text{for } n(p + \varepsilon) = \lceil n(p + \varepsilon) \rceil \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{1}{n}, \\ \lceil n(p + \varepsilon) \rceil - 1 & \text{for } n(p + \varepsilon) \neq \lceil n(p + \varepsilon) \rceil \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{\lceil n(p+\varepsilon) \rceil - n(p+\varepsilon)}{n}. \end{cases}$$

It follows that both $g(p + \eta)$ and $h(p + \eta)$ are independent of η if $\eta > 0$ is small enough. Since $S(n, g, h, p + \eta)$ is continuous with respect to η for fixed g and h, we have that $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p + \eta), h(p + \eta), p + \eta)$ exists. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(p + \eta) &= \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p + \eta), h(p + \eta), p + \eta) \\ &\geq \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p), h(p), p + \eta) = S(n, g(p), h(p), p) = C(p), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (9).

Observing that $g(p-\eta) \le g(p)$ for any $\eta > 0$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} h(p-\eta) &= \lceil n(p-\eta+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1 \\ &= \lceil n(p+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1 + \lceil n(p+\varepsilon) - \lceil n(p+\varepsilon)\rceil - n\eta\rceil \\ &= \lceil n(p+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1 = h(p) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1+n(p+\varepsilon)-\lceil n(p+\varepsilon)\rceil}{n}$, we have

$$S(n, g(p-\eta), h(p-\eta), p-\eta) \ge S(n, g(p), h(p), p-\eta) \tag{10}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1+n(p+\varepsilon)-\lceil n(p+\varepsilon)\rceil}{n}$. Since

$$g(p-\eta) = \lfloor n(p-\eta-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1 = \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1 + \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon) - \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor - n\eta\rfloor,$$

we have

$$g(p-\eta) = \begin{cases} \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor & \text{for } n(p-\varepsilon) = \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{1}{n}, \\ \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1 & \text{for } n(p-\varepsilon) \ne \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{n(p-\varepsilon)-\lfloor n(p-\varepsilon)\rfloor}{n}. \end{cases}$$

It follows that both $g(p-\eta)$ and $h(p-\eta)$ are independent of η if $\eta > 0$ is small enough. Since $S(n, g, h, p-\eta)$ is continuous with respect to η for fixed g and h, we have that $\lim_{\eta\downarrow 0} S(n, g(p-\eta), h(p-\eta), p-\eta)$ exists. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta\downarrow 0} C(p-\eta) &= \lim_{\eta\downarrow 0} S(n, g(p-\eta), h(p-\eta), p-\eta) \\ &\ge \lim_{\eta\downarrow 0} S(n, g(p), h(p), p-\eta) = S(n, g(p), h(p), p) = C(p), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (10).

□

Lemma 5 *Let $0 < u < v < 1$ and $g \le h$. Then,*

$$\min_{p\in[u,v]} S(n, g, h, p) = \min\{S(n, g, h, u),\ S(n, g, h, v)\}.$$

Proof. It can be checked that

$$\frac{\partial B(n, k, p)}{\partial p} = n[B(n-1, k-1, p) - B(n-1, k, p)] \tag{11}$$

for any integer k. By (11), it is ready to show that

$$\frac{\partial S(n, 0, l, p)}{\partial p} = -nB(n-1, l, p). \tag{12}$$

To show the lemma, it suffices to consider 6 cases as follows.

Case (i): $g \le h < 0 < n$. In this case, $S(n, g, h, p) = 0$ for any $p \in [u, v]$.

Case (ii): $0 < g \le n \le h$. In this case, $S(n,g,h,p) = S(n,g,n,p) = 1 - S(n,0,g-1,p)$, which is increasing in view of (12).

Case (iii): $0 < n < g \le h$. In this case, $S(n,g,h,p) = 0$ for any $p \in [u,v]$.

Case (iv): $g \le 0 \le h < n$. In this case, $S(n,g,h,p) = S(n,0,h,p)$, which is decreasing as a result of (12).

Case (v): $g \le 0 < n \le h$. In this case, $S(n,g,h,p) = 1$ for any $p \in [u,v]$.

Clearly, the lemma is true for the above five cases.

Case (vi): $0 < g \le h < n$. By (12),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial C(p)}{\partial p} &= \frac{\partial S(n,0,h,p)}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial S(n,0,g-1,p)}{\partial p} \\
&= \frac{n!}{(g-1)!(n-g)!}\, p^{g-1}(1-p)^{n-g} - \frac{n!}{h!(n-h-1)!}\, p^{h}(1-p)^{n-h-1} \\
&= \left[\frac{h!(n-h-1)!}{(g-1)!(n-g)!} - \left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right)^{h-g+1}\right] \frac{n!}{h!(n-h-1)!}\, p^{g-1}(1-p)^{n-g} > 0
\end{aligned}$$

if $p < 1 - \left\{1 + \left[\frac{h!(n-h-1)!}{(g-1)!(n-g)!}\right]^{\frac{1}{h-g+1}}\right\}^{-1}$.

From such investigation of the derivative of $C(p)$ with respective to p, we can see that one of the following three cases must be true: (1) $C(\mu)$ decreases monotonically for $\mu \in [u,v]$; (2) $C(\mu)$ increases monotonically for $\mu \in [u,v]$; (3) there exists a number $\theta \in (u,v)$ such that $C(\mu)$ increases monotonically for $\mu \in [u,\theta]$ and decreases monotonically for $\mu \in (\theta,v]$. It follows that the lemma must be true for Case (vi).

□

Lemma 6 *Let $\alpha < \beta$ be two consecutive elements of the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\{a,b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then, $C(p) \ge \min\{C(\alpha),\ C(\beta)\}$ for any $p \in (\alpha,\beta)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3, $g(p)$ and $h(p)$ are constants for any $p \in (\alpha,\beta)$. Hence, we can drop the argument and write $g(p) = g,\ h(p) = h$ and $C(p) = S(n,g,h,p)$.

For $p \in (\alpha,\beta)$, define interval $[\alpha+\eta, \beta-\eta]$ with $0 < \eta < \min\left(p-\alpha, \beta-p, \frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)$. Then, $p \in [\alpha+\eta, \beta-\eta]$. By Lemma 5,

$$C(p) \ge \min_{\mu \in [\alpha+\eta, \beta-\eta]} C(\mu) = \min\{C(\alpha+\eta),\ C(\beta-\eta)\}$$

for $0 < \eta < \min\left(p-\alpha, \beta-p, \frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)$. By Lemma 4, both $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(\alpha+\eta)$ and $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(\beta-\eta)$ exist and are bounded from below by $C(\alpha)$ and $C(\beta)$ respectively. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
C(p) &\ge \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \min\{C(\alpha+\eta),\ C(\beta-\eta)\} \\
&= \min\left\{\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(\alpha+\eta),\ \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(\beta-\eta)\right\} \ge \min\{C(\alpha),\ C(\beta)\}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $p \in (\alpha, \beta)$. $\square$

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1. The statement about the minimum of the coverage probability follows immediately from Lemma 6. The number of elements of the discrete set described in Theorem 1 can be calculated as follows. Since

$$a < \frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon < b \Longleftrightarrow 1 + \lfloor n(a+\varepsilon) \rfloor \leq \ell \leq \lceil n(b+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1,$$

the number of elements in $\{\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is

$$\lceil n(b+\varepsilon) \rceil - \lfloor n(a+\varepsilon) \rfloor - 1 < n(b+\varepsilon) + 1 - [n(a+\varepsilon) - 1] - 1 = n(b-a) + 1.$$

Since

$$a < \frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon < b \Longleftrightarrow 1 + \lfloor n(a-\varepsilon) \rfloor \leq \ell \leq \lceil n(b-\varepsilon) \rceil - 1,$$

the number of elements in $\{\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is

$$\lceil n(b-\varepsilon) \rceil - \lfloor n(a-\varepsilon) \rfloor - 1 < n(b-\varepsilon) + 1 - [n(a-\varepsilon) - 1] - 1 = n(b-a) + 1.$$

Hence, the total number of elements of $\{a, b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is less than $2n(b-a) + 4$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

B Proof of Theorem 2

Clearly, $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\} = c_a$ for $p = a$ and $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\} = c_b$ for $p = b$.

For $p = \frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon \in \{\frac{\ell}{n} - \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, we have

$$\lceil n(p+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 = \ell - 1, \qquad \lfloor n(p-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 = \lfloor \ell - 2n\varepsilon \rfloor + 1 = \ell + 1 - \lceil 2n\varepsilon \rceil,$$

$c_-(\ell) = \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\}$ and $1 + \lfloor n(a+\varepsilon) \rfloor \leq \ell \leq \lceil n(b+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1$.

For $p = \frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon \in \{\frac{\ell}{n} + \varepsilon \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, we have

$$\lfloor n(p-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 = \ell + 1, \qquad \lceil n(p+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 = \lceil \ell + 2n\varepsilon \rceil - 1 = \ell - 1 + \lceil 2n\varepsilon \rceil,$$

$c_+(\ell) = \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}_n - p| < \varepsilon\}$ and $1 + \lfloor n(a-\varepsilon) \rfloor \leq \ell \leq \lceil n(b-\varepsilon) \rceil - 1$.

Hence, statement (I) of Theorem 2 can be shown by making use of the above observation and invoking Theorem 1.

To show statements (II) and (III), consider function $S(n,r,s,p) = \sum_{k=r}^{s} B(n,k,p)$ with $r \leq s$. Applying (12), we can show that $\frac{\partial S(n,r,s,p)}{\partial p} = n[B(n-1,r-1,p) - B(n-1,s,p)]$ and

$$\frac{\partial^2 S(n,r,s,p)}{\partial p^2} = n(n-1)[B(n-2,r-2,p) + B(n-2,s,p) - B(n-2,r-1,p) - B(n-2,s-1,p)].$$

Define $\Delta(n,\theta,r,s) = S\left(n,r,s+1,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right) - S(n,r-1,s,\theta)$. Then,

$$\Delta(n,\theta,r,s) = B\left(n,s+1,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right) - B(n,r-1,\theta) + S\left(n,r,s,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right) - S(n,r,s,\theta).$$

By Taylor's expansion formula,

$$\begin{aligned} S\left(n,r,s,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right) - S(n,r,s,\theta) &= \left.\frac{\partial S(n,r,s,p)}{\partial p}\right|_{p=\theta} \times \frac{1}{n} + \left.\frac{\partial^2 S(n,r,s,p)}{\partial p^2}\right|_{p=\zeta} \times \frac{1}{2n^2} \\ &= B(n-1,r-1,\theta) - B(n-1,s,\theta) \\ &\quad + \frac{n-1}{2n}\left[B(n-2,r-2,\zeta) + B(n-2,s,\zeta) - B(n-2,r-1,\zeta) - B(n-2,s-1,\zeta)\right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta \in (\theta, \theta+\frac{1}{n})$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(n,\theta,r,s) &= B(n-1,r-1,\theta) + B\left(n,s+1,\theta+\frac{1}{n}\right) - B(n,r-1,\theta) - B(n-1,s,\theta) \\ &\quad + \frac{n-1}{2n}\left[B(n-2,r-2,\zeta) + B(n-2,s,\zeta) - B(n-2,r-1,\zeta) - B(n-2,s-1,\zeta)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiation of $B(n,k,p)$ with respect to p shows that $B(n,k,p)$ increases for $p \in [0,\frac{k}{n}]$ and decreases for $p \in [\frac{k}{n},1]$. As a result,

$$\min_{p\in[\theta,\theta+\frac{1}{n}]} B(n,k,p) = \underline{B}(n,k,\theta), \qquad \max_{p\in[\theta,\theta+\frac{1}{n}]} p^k(1-p)^{n-k} = \overline{B}(n,k,\theta),$$

leading to $\underline{\Delta}(n,\theta,r,s) \le \Delta(n,\theta,r,s) \le \overline{\Delta}(n,\theta,r,s)$.

To bound $1-c_+(\ell-1)$ based on the bounds of $1-c_+(\ell)$, we can use the relationship

$$1-c_+(\ell-1) = [1-c_+(\ell)] + [c_+(\ell)-c_+(\ell-1)] = [1-c_+(\ell)] + \Delta(n,\theta_\ell,r_\ell,s_\ell).$$

Similarly, we can bound $1-c_-(\ell-1)$ in terms of the bounds of $1-c_-(\ell)$ by observing that

$$1-c_-(\ell-1) = [1-c_-(\ell)] + [c_-(\ell)-c_-(\ell-1)] = [1-c_-(\ell)] + \Delta(n,\theta'_\ell,r'_\ell,s'_\ell).$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

C Proof of Theorem 3

Define

$$C(p) = \Pr\left\{\left|\frac{K}{n} - p\right| < \varepsilon p\right\} = \Pr\left\{g(p) \le K \le h(p)\right\}$$

where

$$g(p) = \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1, \qquad h(p) = \lceil np(1+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1.$$

It should be noted that $C(p)$, $g(p)$ and $h(p)$ are actually multivariate functions of p, ε and n. For simplicity of notations, we drop the arguments n and ε throughout the proof of Theorem 3.

We need some preliminary results.

Lemma 7 *Let $p_\ell = \frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)}$ where $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $h(p) = h(p_{\ell+1}) = \ell$ for any $p \in (p_\ell, p_{\ell+1})$.*

Proof. For $p \in (p_\ell,\ p_{\ell+1})$, we have $0 < n(1+\varepsilon)\,(p - p_\ell) < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h(p) &= \lceil np(1+\varepsilon)\rceil - 1 \\ &= \lceil np_\ell(1+\varepsilon) + n(1+\varepsilon)(p-p_\ell)\rceil - 1 \\ &= \left\lceil n\left[\frac{\ell}{n} + (1+\varepsilon)(p-p_\ell)\right]\right\rceil - 1 \\ &= \ell - 1 + \lceil n(1+\varepsilon)\,(p-p_\ell)\rceil \\ &= \ell \\ &= \left\lceil n\left[\frac{\ell+1}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \times (1+\varepsilon)\right]\right\rceil - 1 = h(p_{\ell+1}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8 *Let $p_\ell = \frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)}$ where $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $g(p) = g(p_\ell) = \ell + 1$ for any $p \in (p_\ell, p_{\ell+1})$.*

Proof. For $p \in (p_\ell,\ p_{\ell+1})$, we have $-1 < n(1-\varepsilon)\,(p - p_{\ell+1}) < 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} g(p) &= \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon)\rfloor + 1 \\ &= \lfloor n[p_{\ell+1}(1-\varepsilon) + (1-\varepsilon)(p-p_{\ell+1})]\rfloor + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor n \times \frac{\ell+1}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \times (1-\varepsilon)\right\rfloor + \lfloor n(1-\varepsilon)(p-p_{\ell+1})\rfloor + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor n \times \frac{\ell+1}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \times (1-\varepsilon)\right\rfloor - 1 + 1 \\ &= \ell + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor n \times \frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \times (1-\varepsilon)\right\rfloor + 1 = g(p_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 9 *Let $\alpha < \beta$ be two consecutive elements of the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\{a, b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \in (a,b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then, both $g(p)$ and $h(p)$ are constants for any $p \in (\alpha, \beta)$.*

Proof. Since α and β are two consecutive elements of the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of the set, it must be true that there is no integer ℓ such that $\alpha < \frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} < \beta$ or $\alpha < \frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} < \beta$. It follows that there exist two integers ℓ and ℓ' such that $(\alpha, \beta) \subseteq \left(\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)}, \frac{\ell+1}{n(1-\varepsilon)}\right)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \subseteq \left(\frac{\ell'}{n(1+\varepsilon)}, \frac{\ell'+1}{n(1+\varepsilon)}\right)$. Applying Lemma 7 and Lemma 8, we have $g(p) = g\left(\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)}\right)$ and $h(p) = h\left(\frac{\ell'+1}{n(1+\varepsilon)}\right)$ for any $p \in (\alpha, \beta)$.

□

Lemma 10 *For any $p \in (0,1)$, $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(p+\eta) \geq C(p)$ and $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(p-\eta) \geq C(p)$.*

Proof. Observing that $h(p+\eta) \geq h(p)$ for any $\eta > 0$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} g(p+\eta) &= \lfloor n(p+\eta)(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 \\ &= \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 + \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) - \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor + n\eta(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor \\ &= \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 = g(p) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1+\lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor - np(1-\varepsilon)}{n(1-\varepsilon)}$, we have

$$S(n, g(p+\eta), h(p+\eta), p+\eta) \geq S(n, g(p), h(p), p+\eta) \tag{13}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1+\lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor - np(1-\varepsilon)}{n(1-\varepsilon)}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} h(p+\eta) &= \lceil n(p+\eta)(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 \\ &= \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 + \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) - \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil + n\eta(1+\varepsilon) \rceil, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$h(p+\eta) = \begin{cases} \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil & \text{for } np(1+\varepsilon) = \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{1}{n(1+\varepsilon)}, \\ \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 & \text{for } np(1+\varepsilon) \neq \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{\lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - np(1+\varepsilon)}{n(1+\varepsilon)}. \end{cases}$$

It follows that both $g(p+\eta)$ and $h(p+\eta)$ are independent of η if $\eta > 0$ is small enough. Since $S(n, g, h, p+\eta)$ is continuous with respect to η for fixed g and h, we have that $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p+\eta), h(p+\eta), p+\eta)$ exists. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(p+\eta) &= \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p+\eta), h(p+\eta), p+\eta) \\ &\geq \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p), h(p), p+\eta) = S(n, g(p), h(p), p) = C(p), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (13).

Observing that $g(p-\eta) \leq g(p)$ for any $\eta > 0$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} h(p-\eta) &= \lceil n(p-\eta)(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 \\ &= \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 + \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) - \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - n\eta(1+\varepsilon) \rceil \\ &= \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1 = h(p) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1+np(1+\varepsilon) - \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil}{n(1+\varepsilon)}$, we have

$$S(n, g(p-\eta), h(p-\eta), p-\eta) \geq S(n, g(p), h(p), p-\eta) \tag{14}$$

for $0 < \eta < \frac{1+np(1+\varepsilon) - \lceil np(1+\varepsilon) \rceil}{n(1+\varepsilon)}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} g(p-\eta) &= \lfloor n(p-\eta)(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 \\ &= \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 + \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) - \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor - n\eta(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$g(p-\eta) = \begin{cases} \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor & \text{for } np(1-\varepsilon) = \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{1}{n(1-\varepsilon)}, \\ \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor + 1 & \text{for } np(1-\varepsilon) \neq \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor \text{ and } 0 < \eta < \frac{np(1-\varepsilon) - \lfloor np(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor}{n(1-\varepsilon)}. \end{cases}$$

It follows that both $g(p-\eta)$ and $h(p-\eta)$ are independent of η if $\eta > 0$ is small enough. Since $S(n, g, h, p-\eta)$ is continuous with respect to η for fixed g and h, we have that $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p-\eta), h(p-\eta), p-\eta)$ exists. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} C(p-\eta) &= \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p-\eta), h(p-\eta), p-\eta) \\ &\geq \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} S(n, g(p), h(p), p-\eta) = S(n, g(p), h(p), p) = C(p), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (14).

□

By a similar argument as that of Lemma 6, we have

Lemma 11 *Let $\alpha < \beta$ be two consecutive elements of the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\{a, b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then, $C(p) \geq \min\{C(\alpha),\ C(\beta)\}$ for any $p \in (\alpha, \beta)$.*

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3. Clearly, the statement about the minimum of the coverage probability follows immediately from Lemma 11. It remains to calculate the number of elements of the discrete set described in Theorem 3. Since

$$a < \frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} < b \Longleftrightarrow 1 + \lfloor na(1+\varepsilon) \rfloor \leq \ell \leq \lceil nb(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - 1,$$

the number of elements in $\{\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is

$$\lceil nb(1+\varepsilon) \rceil - \lfloor na(1+\varepsilon) \rfloor - 1 < nb(1+\varepsilon) + 1 - [na(1+\varepsilon) - 1] - 1 = n(b-a)(1+\varepsilon) + 1.$$

Since

$$a < \frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} < b \Longleftrightarrow 1 + \lfloor na(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor \leq \ell \leq \lceil nb(1-\varepsilon) \rceil - 1,$$

the number of elements in $\{\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is

$$\lceil nb(1-\varepsilon) \rceil - \lfloor na(1-\varepsilon) \rfloor - 1 < nb(1-\varepsilon) + 1 - [na(1-\varepsilon) - 1] - 1 = n(b-a)(1-\varepsilon) + 1.$$

Hence, the total number of elements of $\{a, b\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{\ell}{n(1+\varepsilon)} \in (a, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is less than $2n(b-a) + 4$. The proof of Theorem 3 is thus completed.

References

[1] X. Chen, "Exact computation of minimum sample size for estimating proportion of finite population," arXiv:0707.2115v1 [math.ST], July 2007.

[2] X. Chen, "Exact computation of minimum sample size for estimation of Poisson parameters," arXiv:0707.2116v1 [math.ST], July 2007.

[3] M. M. Desu and D. Raghavarao, *Sample Size Methodology*, Academic Press, 1990.

[4] G. S. Fishman, *Monte Carlo – Concepts, Algorithms and Applications*, Spring-Verlag, 1996.

[5] F. Hampel, "Is statistics too difficult?" *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 497-513, 1998.

[6] E. Rahme and L. Joseph, "Exact sample size determination for binomial experiments," *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, vol. 66, pp. 83-93, 1998.