

f -divergence estimation and two-sample homogeneity test under semiparametric density-ratio models

Takafumi Kanamori
Nagoya University
kanamori@is.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Taiji Suzuki
University of Tokyo
s-taiji@stat.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Masashi Sugiyama
Tokyo Institute of Technology
sugi@cs.titech.ac.jp

Abstract

A density ratio is defined by the ratio of two probability densities. We study the inference problem of density ratios and apply a semi-parametric density-ratio estimator to the two-sample homogeneity test. In the proposed test procedure, the f -divergence between two probability densities is estimated using a density-ratio estimator. The f -divergence estimator is then exploited for the two-sample homogeneity test. We derive the optimal estimator of f -divergence in the sense of the asymptotic variance, and then investigate the relation between the proposed test procedure and the existing score test based on empirical likelihood estimator. Through numerical studies, we illustrate the adequacy of the asymptotic theory for finite-sample inference.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the two-sample homogeneity test under semiparametric density-ratio models. The estimator of the density ratio is exploited to obtain a test statistic. For two probability densities, $p_n(x)$ and $p_d(x)$, over a probability space $\mathcal{X}$, the density ratio $r(x)$ is defined as the ratio of

these densities, that is,

$$r(x) = \frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)},$$

in which p_n (p_d) denotes the “numerator” (“denominator”) of the density ratio. For statistical examples and motivations of the density ratio model, see Qin [17], Cox and Ferry [5] and Kay and Little [10] and the references therein. Qin [17] has studied the inference of the density ratio under retrospective sampling plans, and proved that the estimating function obtained from the prospective likelihood is optimal in a class of unbiased estimating functions under the semiparametric density ratio models. As a similar approach, Cheng and Chu [4] have studied a semiparametric density ratio estimator based on logistic regression.

The density ratio is closely related to the inference of divergences. The divergence is a discrepancy measure between pairs of multivariate probability densities, and the f -divergence [1, 6] is a class of divergences based on the ratio of two probability densities. For a strictly convex function f satisfying $f(1) = 0$, the f -divergence between two probability densities $p_d(x)$ and $p_n(x)$ is defined by

$$D_f(p_d, p_n) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} p_d(x) f\left(\frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)}\right) dx. \quad (1)$$

Since f is strictly convex, the f -divergence is non-negative and takes zero if and only if $p_n = p_d$ holds. Popular divergences such as Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence [13], Hellinger distance, and Pearson divergence are included in the f -divergence class. In statistics, machine learning, and information theory, the f -divergence is often exploited as a metric between probability distributions, even though the divergence does not necessarily satisfy the definition of the metric.

A central topic in this line of research is to estimate the divergence based on samples from each probability distribution. A typical approach is to exploit non-parametric estimators of the probability densities, and then estimate, say, KL-divergence based on the estimated probability densities [18].

In order to estimate the f -divergence between two probabilities, Keziou [11] has exploited the conjugate expression of the f -divergence. Based on the conjugate expression, Keziou and Leoni-Aubin [12], and Broniatowski and Keziou [3] have developed f -divergence estimators for semiparametric density-ratio models. Keziou and Leoni-Aubin [12] have applied the f -divergence estimator to the one-sample test. Recently, Nguyen et al. [16]

has developed a kernel-based estimator of the f -divergence using a non-parametric density-ratio model.

Once the divergence between two probability densities is estimated, the homogeneity test can be conducted. In the homogeneity test, the null hypothesis is represented as $H_0 : p_n = p_d$ against the complementary alternative $H_1 : p_n \neq p_d$. If an estimate of $D_f(p_d, p_n)$ is beyond some positive value, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative is accepted. Keziou [12] has studied the homogeneity test using f -divergence estimator for semiparametric density-ratio models. On the other hand, Fokianos et al. [7] adopted a more direct approach. They have proposed the score test derived from the empirical likelihood estimator of density ratios. In our paper, we consider the optimality of f -divergence estimators, and investigate the relation between the test statistic using the f -divergence estimator and the score test derived from the empirical likelihood estimator.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we introduce unbiased estimators of density ratios for semiparametric density-ratio models. We also define some notation which is used throughout this paper. In Section 3, we consider the asymptotics of an f -divergence estimator. The main results of this paper are presented in Section 4 and Section 5. We present the optimal estimator for the f -divergence, which is then exploit for two-sample homogeneity test. Broniatowski and Keziou [3] proposed the estimator exploiting the conjugate expression of the f -divergence, but they argued neither its optimality nor its efficiency. A main contribution of this paper is to present the optimal estimator of the f -divergence in the sense of asymptotic variance under the semiparametric density-ratio models. Then, we propose a test statistic based on the optimal f -divergence estimator, and investigate its power function. Numerical studies are provided in Section 6, illustrating the adequacy of our asymptotic theory for finite-sample inference. Section 7 is devoted to concluding remarks. Some calculations are deferred to Appendix.

2 Estimation of density ratio

We introduce the method of estimating density ratios according to Qin [17]. Let $p_n(x)$ and $p_d(x)$ be two probability densities on probability space $\mathcal{X}$. Their density ratio is defined as

$$r(x) = \frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)}$$

for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Two sets of samples are independently generated from each probability:

$$x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_{m_n}^{(n)} \sim_{i.i.d.} p_n, \quad x_1^{(d)}, \dots, x_{m_d}^{(d)} \sim_{i.i.d.} p_d.$$

The model for the density ratio is defined by $r(x; \theta)$ with the parameter $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We assume that the true density ratio is represented as

$$r(x) = \frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)} = r(x; \theta^*)$$

with some $\theta^* \in \Theta$. The model for the density ratio $r(x; \theta)$ is regarded as a semiparametric model for probability densities. That is, even if $r(x; \theta^*) = p_n(x)/p_d(x)$ is specified, there are yet infinite degrees of freedom for the probability densities p_n and p_d .

The moment matching estimator for the density ratio has been proposed by Qin [17]. Let $\eta(x; \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a vector-valued function from $\mathcal{X} \times \Theta$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$, and the estimation function Q_η is defined as

$$Q_\eta(\theta) := \frac{1}{m_d} \sum_{i=1}^{m_d} r(x_i^{(d)}; \theta) \eta(x_i^{(d)}; \theta) - \frac{1}{m_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \eta(x_j^{(n)}; \theta).$$

Since $p_n(x) = r(x; \theta^*) p_d(x)$ holds, the expectation of $Q_\eta(\theta)$ over the observed samples vanishes at $\theta = \theta^*$. In addition, the estimation function $Q_\eta(\theta)$ converges to its expectation in the large sample limit. Thus, the estimator $\hat{\theta}$ defined as a solution of the estimating equation

$$Q_\eta(\hat{\theta}) = 0$$

has the statistical consistency under the mild assumption, see [17] for details.

The moment matching estimation of the density ratio contains a wide range of estimators. Several authors such as Nguyen et al. [16], Keziou and Leoni-Aubin [12], Sugiyama et al. [21] and Kanamori et al. [9] have proposed various density-ratio estimators. These estimators with a finite-dimensional model $r(x; \theta)$ can all be represented as a moment matching estimator. These existing methods, however, are intended to be applied with kernel methods which have been developed in machine learning [20, 23]. As another approach to density ratio estimation, Kwik and Miłniczuk [14], Jacoba and Oliveirab [8], and Bensaid and Fabre [2] have exploited the kernel density estimator, and studied convergence properties of estimators under several theoretical assumptions.

Before we present the asymptotic results, we prepare some notation. Let $N_d(\mu, \Sigma)$ be the d -dimensional normal distribution with the mean vector μ and the variance-covariance matrix Σ . The dimension d may be dropped if there is no confusion. $E_n[\cdot]$ and $V_n[\cdot]$ denote the expectation and the variance (or the variance-covariance matrix for multi-dimensional random variables) under the probability p_n , and $E_d[\cdot]$ and $V_d[\cdot]$ are defined in the same way for the probability p_d . The expectation and the variance under all samples, $x_i^{(n)}$ ($i = 1, \dots, m_n$), $x_j^{(d)}$ ($j = 1, \dots, m_d$) are denoted as $E[\cdot]$ and $V[\cdot]$, respectively. The covariance matrix between two random variables under all samples are also denoted as $\text{Cov}[\cdot, \cdot]$. The first and the second derivative of the function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are denoted as f' and f'' , respectively. Let ∂_i be the partial differential operator with respect to the parameter θ , that is $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}$. The gradient column vector of the function g with respect to the parameter θ is denoted as ∇g , i.e., $\nabla g = (\partial_1 g, \dots, \partial_d g)^T$. For a vector-valued function $\eta(x; \theta) = (\eta_1(x; \theta), \dots, \eta_d(x; \theta))$, let $\mathcal{L}[\eta(x; \theta)]$ be the linear space

$$\mathcal{L}[\eta(x; \theta)] := \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^d a_k \eta_k(x; \theta) \mid a_1, \dots, a_d \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

In this paper, the linear space $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)] := \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^d a_k \partial_k \log r(x; \theta) \mid a_1, \dots, a_d \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

plays the central role.

We introduce the asymptotics of density ratio estimation. Let ρ and m be

$$\rho := \frac{m_n}{m_d}, \quad m := \left(\frac{1}{m_n} + \frac{1}{m_d} \right)^{-1} = \frac{m_n m_d}{m_n + m_d},$$

respectively, and the d by d matrix U_η be

$$U_\eta = E_n[\eta(x; \theta) \nabla \log r(x; \theta)^T],$$

where $\eta(x; \theta)$ is a d -dimensional vector-valued function. Suppose that U_η is non-degenerate in the vicinity of $\theta = \theta^*$. Below, the notation $\rho = m_n/m_d$ is also used as the large sample limit of m_n/m_d , and we assume that $0 < \rho < \infty$ holds even in the limit. The asymptotic expansion of the estimating equation

$Q_\eta(\hat{\theta}) = 0$ around $\theta = \theta^*$ yields the following convergence in law,

$$\sqrt{m}(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) = -\sqrt{m}U_\eta^{-1}Q_\eta + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} N_d\left(0, U_\eta^{-1}\frac{\rho V_d[r\eta] + V_n[\eta]}{\rho + 1}(U_\eta^T)^{-1}\right), \quad (2)$$

in which θ is set to θ^* . The formula above is derived from the equalities

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_\eta] = 0, \quad m \cdot \mathbb{E}[Q_\eta Q_\eta^T] = \frac{\rho V_d[r\eta] + V_n[\eta]}{\rho + 1}.$$

Qin [17] has shown that the prospective likelihood minimizes the asymptotic variance in the class of moment matching estimators. More precisely, for the density ratio model

$$r(x; \theta) = \exp\{\alpha + \phi(x; \beta)\}, \quad \theta = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, \quad (3)$$

the vector-valued function η_{opt} defined by

$$\eta_{\text{opt}}(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{1 + \rho r(x; \theta)} \nabla \log r(x; \theta) \quad (4)$$

minimizes the asymptotic variance of (2).

3 Estimation of f -divergence

We consider the estimation of f -divergence. As shown in (1), the f -divergence is represented as the expectation of the transformed density ratio $f(r(x))$, that is,

$$D_f(p_d, p_n) = \int p_d(x) f\left(\frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)}\right) dx = \int p_d(x) f(r(x)) dx,$$

for $r(x) = p_n(x)/p_d(x)$. Once the density ratio is estimated by $r(x; \hat{\theta})$, the f -divergence is also estimated by the empirical mean of $f(r(x; \hat{\theta}))$ over the samples from p_d . Here we consider an extended estimator. Suppose that the convex function f is decomposed into two terms,

$$f(r) = f_d(r) + r f_n(r). \quad (5)$$

Then the f -divergence is represented as

$$\int p_d(x) f(r(x)) dx = \int p_d(x) f_d(r(x)) dx + \int p_n(x) f_n(r(x)) dx \quad (6)$$

since $r(x) = p_n(x)/p_d(x)$ holds. Note that the decomposition (5) includes the conjugate representation $f(r) = -f^*(f'(r)) + rf'(r)$ with the conjugate function f^* [19]. Keziou [11] has exploited the conjugate representation for the estimation of the f -divergence. The empirical variant of (6) provides an estimate of the f -divergence,

$$\hat{D}_f = \frac{1}{m_d} \sum_{i=1}^{m_d} f_d(r(x_i^{(d)}; \hat{\theta})) + \frac{1}{m_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} f_n(r(x_j^{(n)}; \hat{\theta})), \quad (7)$$

where the parameter $\hat{\theta}$ is estimated by the estimation function Q_η . Using the estimator $\hat{D}_f$, we can conduct the homogeneity test with hypotheses

$$H_0 : p_n = p_d, \quad H_1 : p_n \neq p_d. \quad (8)$$

When the null hypothesis is true, the f -divergence $D_f(p_d, p_n)$ is equal to zero and otherwise $D_f(p_d, p_n)$ takes a positive real value. Thus, the null hypothesis will be rejected when $\hat{D}_f > t$ holds, where t is a positive constant determined from the significance level of the test.

We consider the statistical properties of the estimator $\hat{D}_f$. The estimator (7) depends on two choices: one is the vector-valued function η for the estimation of the density ratio, and the other is the decomposition of f , i.e., f_d and f_n . For the decomposition $f(r) = f_d(r) + rf_n(r)$, let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}f := & \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_d}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_d} [f_d(r(x_i^{(d)}; \theta) - \mathbb{E}_d[f_d(r(x; \theta))]) \\ & + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} [f_n(r(x_j^{(n)}; \theta) - \mathbb{E}_n[f_n(r(x; \theta))])], \end{aligned}$$

and the d -dimensional vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be

$$c := \mathbb{E}_n[\{f'(r(x; \theta)) - f_n(r(x; \theta))\} \nabla \log r(x; \theta)].$$

Then, the first order asymptotic expansion of $\hat{D}_f$ with $f(r) = f_d(r) + rf_n(r)$ yields that

$$\sqrt{m}(\hat{D}_f - D_f) = \mathbb{P}f - \sqrt{m}c^T U_\eta^{-1} Q_\eta + o_p(1), \quad (9)$$

in which D_f denotes $D_f(p_d, p_n)$ and the functions are evaluated at $\theta = \theta^*$. Based on the above formula, we derive the estimator attaining the minimum asymptotic variance of (9).

4 Optimal Estimator of f -divergence

We consider the optimal estimator of the f -divergence in the sense of the asymptotic variance. Some assumptions to be imposed are shown below.

Assumption 1. *The density ratio model $r(x; \theta)$ and the function f of the f -divergence satisfy the following conditions.*

- (a) *The model $r(x; \theta)$ includes the constant function 1.*
- (b) *For any $\theta \in \Theta$, $1 \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ holds.*
- (c) *$f(1) = f'(1) = 0$.*

As shown in Remark 1 below, standard models of density ratios satisfy (a) and (b) of Assumption 1.

Remark 1. *Let $\phi(x) = (\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_d(x))^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a vector-valued function defined on $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\phi_1(x) = 1$. The exponential model $r(x; \theta) = \exp\{\theta^T \phi(x)\}$, that is, the model (3) satisfies (a) and (b) in Assumption 1. In the same way, we see that the linear model $r(x; \theta) = \theta^T \phi(x)$ also meets the conditions. Indeed, the linear space $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ is spanned by $\{\phi_1/r, \dots, \phi_d/r\}$ and the equality $\theta^T \phi/r(x; \theta) = 1$ holds for all $\theta \in \Theta$.*

We compare the asymptotic variance of two estimators for the f -divergence; one is the estimator $\hat{D}_f$ derived from the moment matching estimator using $\eta(x; \theta)$ and the decomposition $f(r) = f_d(r) + r f_n(r)$, and the other is the estimator $\bar{D}_f$ defined by the density ratio estimator $\bar{\eta}(x; \theta)$ and the decomposition $f(r) = \bar{f}_d(r) + r \bar{f}_n(r)$. For each estimator, the asymptotic expansion of $\hat{D}_f$ is given as

$$\sqrt{m}(\hat{D}_f - D_f) = \mathbb{P}f - \sqrt{m} c^T U_\eta^{-1} Q_\eta + o_p(1)$$

and

$$\sqrt{m}(\bar{D}_f - D_f) = \bar{\mathbb{P}}f - \sqrt{m} \bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} Q_{\bar{\eta}} + o_p(1),$$

respectively, where $\bar{\mathbb{P}}f$ and $\bar{c}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbb{P}}f &:= \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_d}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_d} [\bar{f}_d(r(x_i^{(d)}; \theta) - \mathbb{E}_d[\bar{f}_d(r(x; \theta))]) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} [\bar{f}_n(r(x_j^{(n)}; \theta) - \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta))])], \\ \bar{c} &:= \mathbb{E}_n[\{f'(r(x; \theta)) - \bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta))\} \nabla \log r(x; \theta)], \end{aligned}$$

and the functions are evaluated at $\theta = \theta^*$. In order to compare the variances of these estimators, we consider the following inequality,

$$0 \leq \mathbb{V}[\widehat{D}_f - \bar{D}_f] = \mathbb{V}[\widehat{D}_f] - \mathbb{V}[\bar{D}_f] - 2 \text{Cov}[\widehat{D}_f - \bar{D}_f, \bar{D}_f].$$

Suppose that the covariance above vanishes for any $\widehat{D}_f$. Then we have the inequality

$$\mathbb{V}[\bar{D}_f] \leq \mathbb{V}[\widehat{D}_f]$$

This implies that the estimator $\bar{D}_f$ is the asymptotically optimal estimator for the f -divergence.

Under Assumption 1, some calculation of the covariance yields the equality

$$\begin{aligned} & m_d \text{Cov}[\widehat{D}_f - \bar{D}_f, \bar{D}_f] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{\bar{f}_n(r) - f_n(r) + \bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} \bar{\eta} - c^T U_{\eta}^{-1} \eta\} \{f(r) - (r + \rho^{-1})(\bar{f}_n(r) + \bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} \bar{\eta})\}], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

in which r denotes the density ratio $r(x)$ and the functions are evaluated at $\theta = \theta^*$. We study the sufficient condition that the above covariance vanishes.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumption 1, suppose that $\bar{f}_d(r(x; \theta))$, $\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta))$, and $\bar{\eta}(x; \theta)$ satisfy*

$$f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})(\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) + \bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} \bar{\eta}(x; \theta)) \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)] \quad (11)$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Then the estimator $\bar{D}_f$ using $\bar{\eta}$ and the decomposition $f(r) = \bar{f}_d(r) + r \bar{f}_n(r)$ uniformly attains the minimum asymptotic variance.

Proof. For any p_n and p_d such that $p_n(x)/p_d(x) = r(x; \theta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_n[\{\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) - f_n(r(x; \theta)) + \bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} \bar{\eta}(x; \theta) - c^T U_f^{-1} \eta(x; \theta)\} \nabla \log r(x; \theta)^T] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_n[(\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) - f_n(r(x; \theta))) \nabla \log r(x; \theta)^T] + \bar{c}^T - c^T \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, when (11) holds, the covariance (10) vanishes for any η and any decomposition of f . $\square$

Clearly, any optimal estimator of the f -divergence achieves the same asymptotic variance. In the following corollaries, we present some sufficient conditions of (11).

Corollary 2. *Under Assumption 1, suppose that*

$$f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)] \quad (12)$$

holds for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Then, the function $\bar{\eta} = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ defined in (4) with the decomposition $\bar{f}_d(r), \bar{f}_n(r)$ satisfies the condition (11).

Proof. For $r(x; \theta)$, $\eta_{\text{opt}}(x; \theta)$, and $\bar{f}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})(\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) + \bar{c}^T U_{\eta_{\text{opt}}}^{-1} \eta_{\text{opt}}(x; \theta)) \\ &= f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) - \rho^{-1} \bar{c}^T U_{\eta_{\text{opt}}}^{-1} \nabla \log r(x; \theta). \end{aligned}$$

Under the condition (12), we see that the above expression is included in the linear space $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$. $\square$

Based on Corollary 2 we see that the estimator defined from

$$f_d(r) = \frac{f(r)}{1 + \rho r}, \quad f_n(r) = \frac{\rho f(r)}{1 + \rho r}, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(x; \theta) = \eta_{\text{opt}}(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{1 + \rho r(x; \theta)} \nabla \log r(x; \theta) \quad (13)$$

leads to an optimal estimator of the f -divergence.

We show another sufficient condition.

Corollary 3. *Under Assumption 1, suppose that*

$$\begin{aligned} & f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})f'(r(x; \theta)) \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)], \\ \text{and} \quad & f'(r(x; \theta)) - \bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) \in \mathcal{L}[\bar{\eta}(x; \theta)] \end{aligned}$$

hold for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Then the decomposition $f(r) = \bar{f}_d(r) + r\bar{f}_n(r)$ and the vector-valued function $\bar{\eta}(x; \theta)$ satisfy (11).

Proof. When $f'(r(x; \theta)) - \bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) \in \mathcal{L}[\bar{\eta}(x; \theta)]$ holds, there exists a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$f'(r(x; \theta)) - \bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) = b^T \bar{\eta}(x; \theta),$$

and thus

$$\bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} = \mathbb{E}_n[(f'(r(x; \theta)) - \bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta))) \nabla \log r(x; \theta)^T] \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{\eta} \nabla \log r^T]^{-1} = b^T$$

holds. Then we have $\bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} \bar{\eta}(x; \theta) = b^T \bar{\eta}(x; \theta) = f'(r(x; \theta)) - \bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})(\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) + \bar{c}^T U_{\bar{\eta}}^{-1} \bar{\eta}(x; \theta)) \\ &= f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})f'(r(x; \theta)) \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)] \end{aligned}$$

is satisfied, and thus (11) holds. $\square$

We consider the conjugate representation $f(r) = -f^*(f'(r)) + rf'(r)$, that is, $f_d(r) = -f^*(f'(r))$ and $f_n(r) = f'(r)$, where $f^*(r) = \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{rs - f(s)\}$. Then, Corollary 3 implies that the decomposition based on the conjugate representation leads to an optimal estimator when the model $r(x; \theta)$ and the f -divergence satisfy

$$f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})f'(r(x; \theta)) \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]. \quad (14)$$

If (14) does not hold, the optimality of the estimator based on the conjugate representation is not guaranteed. On the other hand, the decomposition (13) leads to an optimal estimator without specific conditions on the model and the f -divergence. In addition, when $f_n(r)$ is defined as $f_n(r) = f'(r)$, the moment matching estimator using $\bar{\eta}(x; \theta)$ does not affect the asymptotic variance of the f -divergence estimator. Indeed, the equality $f'(r(x; \theta)) - f_n(r(x; \theta)) = 0$ holds and the vector c in (9) vanishes. As a result, the variance of the estimator $\hat{D}_f$ depends only on the decomposition of f up to the order $O_p(1)$.

We show some examples for which Corollary 2 and Corollary 3 are applicable to construct the optimal estimator.

Example 1 (exponential density-ratio models and KL-divergence). *Let the model be $r(x; \theta) = \exp\{\theta^T \phi(x)\}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\phi(x) = (\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_d(x))^T$ and $\phi_1(x) \equiv 1$. Then $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ is spanned by $1, \phi_2(x), \dots, \phi_d(x)$ and clearly $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ includes the constant 1. The f -divergence with $f(r) = -\log r + r - 1$ leads to KL-divergence. Let $f_d(r) = -\log r - 1$ and $f_n(r) = 1$, then (12) is satisfied, since*

$$f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})\bar{f}_n(r(x; \theta)) = -\theta^T \phi(x) - 1 - \rho^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$$

holds. Then, we see that the function $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ and the decomposition $f_d(r) = -\log r - 1$ and $f_n(r) = 1$ lead to an optimal estimator of the KL-divergence. We see that there is redundancy for the decomposition of f . Indeed, for any constants $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $c_0 + c_1 \log r(x; \theta)$ is included in $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r]$. Hence the decomposition

$$f_n(r) = \frac{r + c_1 \log r + c_0}{r + \rho^{-1}}, \quad f_d(r) = r - \log r - 1 - rf_n(r)$$

with $\bar{\eta} = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ also leads to an optimal estimator. The decomposition in (13) is realized by setting $c_0 = -1$, $c_1 = -1$.

Example 2 (power-model and power-divergence). *Let the model be $r(x; \theta) = (1 + \alpha \theta^T \phi(x))^{1/\alpha}$ with $\phi_1(x) = 1$, where α is the parameter to specify the*

divergence such that $\alpha > -1$. Then $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ is the linear space spanned by $\phi_1(x)/r^\alpha, \dots, \phi_d(x)/r^\alpha$. We see that $1 = (e_1 + \alpha\theta)^T \nabla \log r(x; \theta)$ holds, where e_1 is the unit vector $(1, 0, \dots, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The convex function $f(r) = r - 1 + (r^{-\alpha} - 1)/\alpha$ leads to the power divergence [1, 6],

$$\int p_d(x) f\left(\frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)}\right) dx = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\int \frac{p_d(x)^{\alpha+1}}{p_n(x)^\alpha} dx - 1 \right).$$

Hellinger distance is given by setting $\alpha = -1/2$, and Pearson divergence is realized by setting $\alpha = 1$. In the limit of $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, KL-divergence is recovered. Letting $f_d(r) = -1 + (r^{-\alpha} - 1)/\alpha$ and $f_n(r) = 1$, we have

$$f(r(x; \theta)) - (r(x; \theta) + \rho^{-1})f_n(r(x; \theta)) = -\frac{\theta^T \phi(x)}{r^\alpha} - 1 - \rho^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$$

and thus, due to Corollary 2 the decomposition $f_d(r) = -1 + (r^{-\alpha} - 1)/\alpha$, $f_n(r) = 1$ and the moment matching estimator using $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ lead to an optimal estimator of the power divergence under the power model. Also, the decomposition (13) leads to another optimal estimator.

Example 3 (exponential density-ratio model and mutual information). Let the model be $r(x; \theta) = \exp\{\theta^T \phi(x)\}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\phi(x) = (\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_d(x))^T$ and $\phi_1(x) \equiv 1$. Then, the linear space $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ is spanned by $\{\phi_1(x), \dots, \phi_d(x)\}$ and thus $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x; \theta)]$ includes the function of the form $c_0 + c_1 \log r(x; \theta)$ for $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let the convex function $f(r)$ be

$$f(r) = \frac{1}{1+\rho} \log \frac{1+\rho}{1+\rho r} + r \frac{\rho}{1+\rho} \log \frac{r(1+\rho)}{1+\rho r} \quad (15)$$

for $\rho > 0$. Then the corresponding f -divergence is reduced to mutual information:

$$\int p_d(x) f\left(\frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)}\right) dx = \int \sum_{y=n,d} p(x, y) \log \frac{p(x, y)}{p(x)p(y)} dx,$$

in which the joint probability is defined as

$$p(x, n) = p_n(x) \frac{\rho}{1+\rho}, \quad p(x, d) = p_d(x) \frac{1}{1+\rho}.$$

The equality $p_d = p_n$ implies that the conditional probability $p(x|y)$ is independent of y . Thus, mutual information becomes zero if and only if $p_d = p_n$

holds. For any moment matching estimator, the following decomposition satisfies the condition in Corollary 3:

$$f_d(r) = \frac{1}{1+\rho} \log \frac{1+\rho}{1+\rho r}, \quad f_n(r) = \frac{\rho}{1+\rho} \log \frac{r(1+\rho)}{1+\rho r}. \quad (16)$$

Indeed, the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} f(r(x;\theta)) - (r(x;\theta) + \rho^{-1})f'(r(x;\theta)) &= \frac{-\log(r(x;\theta))}{1+\rho} \in \mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x;\theta)], \\ f'(r(x;\theta)) - f_n(r(x;\theta)) &= 0 \in \mathcal{L}[\eta(x;\theta)] \end{aligned}$$

hold for any $\eta(x;\theta)$. The estimator derived from the decomposition above with $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ has also been proposed by Keziou and Leoni-Aubin [12]. In their work, the estimator is derived as the conjugate expression of the prospective likelihood. In this example, we present another characterization, that is, the optimal estimator for mutual information.

Example 4 (linear model). Let $r(x;\theta) = 1 + \theta^T \phi(x)$ and $\phi_1(x) \equiv 1$. The subspace $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x;\theta)]$ is spanned by $\{\phi_1/r, \dots, \phi_d/r\}$, and thus $\mathcal{L}[\nabla \log r(x;\theta)]$ includes the function of the form $c_0 + c_1/r$ for $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let the convex function f be

$$f(r) = \frac{1}{\rho+1} \left[r - 1 + (1+\rho r) \log \frac{1+\rho r}{r(1+\rho)} \right]$$

for $\rho > 0$. Then the corresponding f -divergence is expressed as

$$\int p_d(x) f\left(\frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)}\right) dx = \text{KL}\left(\frac{p_d + \rho p_n}{1+\rho}, p_n\right),$$

where KL is the Kullback-Leibler divergence. The f -divergence vanishes if and only if $p_n = p_d$ holds. Using Corollary 2, we see that the decomposition

$$f_d(r) = \frac{1}{\rho+1} \left[\frac{r-1}{1+\rho r} + \log \frac{1+\rho r}{r(1+\rho)} \right], \quad f_n(r) = \frac{\rho}{\rho+1} \left[\frac{r-1}{1+\rho r} + \log \frac{1+\rho r}{r(1+\rho)} \right],$$

and the moment matching estimator using $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ lead to an optimal estimator for the above f -divergence. On the other hand, due to Corollary 3, we see that the decomposition

$$f_d(r) = \frac{1}{1+\rho} \log \frac{1+\rho r}{r(1+\rho)}, \quad f_n(r) = f'(r) = \frac{1}{r(1+\rho)} \left[r - 1 + \rho r \log \frac{1+\rho r}{r(1+\rho)} \right]$$

leads to another optimal estimator.

5 Homogeneity test exploiting f -divergence estimator

For the homogeneity test of p_n and p_d , we need to know the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{D}_f$ under the null hypothesis of (8). In this section, we assume

$$\frac{p_n(x)}{p_d(x)} = r(x; \theta^*) \equiv 1$$

and $1 \in \mathcal{L}[\eta(x; \theta^*)]$. Then we see that $\mathbb{P}f = 0$ holds for any decomposition of f , and thus the asymptotic expansion of $\hat{D}_f$ around $\theta = \theta^*$ satisfies

$$\sqrt{m}(\hat{D}_f - D_f) = o_p(1),$$

where $D_f = D_f(p_d, p_n) = 0$. For $p_n = p_d$, the variance covariance matrix $(\rho V_n[\eta] + V_n[\eta]) / (\rho + 1)$ in (2) is degenerate. This is the reason why the probabilistic order of $\sqrt{m}(\hat{D}_f - D_f)$ becomes $o_p(1)$. On the other hand, for $p_n \neq p_d$, $\sqrt{m_d}(\hat{D}_f - D_f)$ is of the order $O_p(1)$.

Below, we consider the optimal estimator $\hat{D}_f$ defined from (13). The asymptotic distribution of the optimal estimator is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Let Assumption 1 hold, and we assume $p_n(x)/p_d(x) = r(x; \theta^*) = 1$. Suppose that the ratio of the sample size, $\rho = m_n/m_d$, converges to a positive value, and that the d by d symmetric matrix U_η with $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ is non-degenerate in the vicinity of $\theta = \theta^*$. Let $\hat{D}_f$ be the estimator defined from (13). Then, in terms of the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{D}_f$, we obtain*

$$\frac{2m}{f''(1)} \hat{D}_f \xrightarrow{d} \chi_{d-1}^2,$$

where χ_ℓ^2 is the chi-square distribution with ℓ degrees of freedom.

The proof is deferred to Appendix 1. For the homogeneity test of p_n and p_d , the null hypothesis $p_n = p_d$ is rejected if

$$\hat{D}_f \geq \frac{f''(1)}{2m} \chi_{d-1}^2 (1 - \alpha) \quad (17)$$

is satisfied, where $\chi_{d-1}^2 (1 - \alpha)$ is the chi-square $100(1 - \alpha)$ percent point function with $d - 1$ degrees of freedom. The homogeneity test based on (17) with the optimal choice (13) is referred to as $\hat{D}_f$ -based test.

We consider the power function of the homogeneity test, and compare the proposed method to the other method. A standard approach for the homogeneity test is exploiting the asymptotic distribution of the empirical likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}$. Under the model

$$r(x; \theta) = \exp\{\alpha + \phi(x; \beta)\}, \quad \theta = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, \quad (18)$$

Fokianos et al. [7] pointed out that the asymptotic distribution of the empirical likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ under the null hypothesis $p_n = p_d$ is given as

$$\sqrt{m}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} N_{d-1}(0, V_n[\nabla_{\beta}\phi]^{-1}),$$

where $\theta^* = (\alpha^*, \beta^*)$ and $\nabla_{\beta}\phi$ is the $d - 1$ dimensional gradient vector of $\phi(x; \beta)$ at $\beta = \beta^*$ with respect to the parameter β . Then the null hypothesis is rejected if the test statistic

$$S = m(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \hat{V}_n[\nabla_{\beta}\phi](\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \quad (19)$$

is larger than $\chi_{d-1}^2(1 - \alpha)$, where $\hat{V}_n[\nabla_{\beta}\phi]$ is a consistent estimator of $V_n[\nabla_{\beta}\phi]$. In this paper, the homogeneity test based on the statistic S is referred to as *empirical likelihood test*. Fokianos et al. [7] studied statistical properties of empirical likelihood test through numerical experiments, and reported that the power of empirical likelihood test is comparable to standard t -test and F -test.

Below, we show that the power of $\hat{D}_f$ -based test is the same as empirical likelihood test under the setup of local alternative, where the distributions p_n and p_d vary according to the sample size. To compute the power function, we assume the following conditions.

Assumption 2. Let the density ratio model $r(x; \theta)$ be represented as (18). Let $r(x; \theta^*) = 1$ and $\theta_m = \theta^* + h_m/\sqrt{m}$, where $h_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} h_m = h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose $p_d(x) = p(x)$ for a fixed probability density $p(x)$ and that the probability density $p_n^{(m)}$ is represented as $p_n^{(m)}(x) = p_d(x)r(x; \theta_m)$. For each sample size m_n and m_d , the samples $x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_{m_n}^{(n)}$ are generated from $p_n^{(m)}$, and $x_1^{(d)}, \dots, x_{m_d}^{(d)}$ are generated from p_d . The limit of the ratio m_n/m_d is denoted as ρ . Let the matrix-valued function $M(\theta)$ and $U(\theta)$ be

$$M(\theta) = \int p(x) \nabla \log r(x; \theta) \nabla \log r(x; \theta)^T dx,$$

$$U(\theta) = \int p(x) \frac{1}{1 + \rho r(x; \theta)} \nabla \log r(x; \theta) \nabla \log r(x; \theta)^T dx,$$

and assume that these are continuous and non-degenerate in the vicinity of θ^* . Let $V[\nabla r]$ be the variance-covariance matrix of $\nabla \log r(x; \theta^*) = \nabla r(x; \theta^*)$ under $p(x)$. We assume

$$\frac{1}{m_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \nabla r(x_j^{(n)}; \theta^*) \nabla r(x_j^{(n)}; \theta^*)^T \xrightarrow{p} M(\theta^*), \quad (20)$$

$$\sqrt{m} U(\theta_m)(\hat{\theta} - \theta_m) \xrightarrow{\theta_m} N\left(0, \frac{1}{(1 + \rho)^2} V[\nabla r]\right), \quad (21)$$

where (20) implies the convergence in probability, that is, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the probability such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{m_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \nabla r(x_j^{(n)}; \theta^*) \nabla r(x_j^{(n)}; \theta^*)^T - M(\theta^*) \right| > \varepsilon$$

under the samples from $p_d^{(m)}$ converges to zero when m_n tends to infinity. The notation $X_m \xrightarrow{\theta_m} P$ in (21) denotes that the distribution function of X_m depending on $p_n^{(m)}$ and p_d converges to P in law, when m tends to infinity. See Section 14 in [22] and Section 11.4.2 in [15] for details of the asymptotic theory under the local alternative. For $h_m = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the condition on $\sqrt{m} U(\theta_m)(\hat{\theta} - \theta_m)$ is reduced to (2) with $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$.

In the above, one can make the assumption weaker such that the probability p_d also varies according to the sample size. We adopt the simplified assumption above to avoid technical difficulties.

Theorem 5. *Under Assumption 1 and Assumption 2, the power function of $\hat{D}_f$ -based test is asymptotically given as $\Pr\{Y \geq \chi_{d-1}^2(1 - \alpha)\}$, where Y is the random variable whose distribution function is the non-central chi-square distribution with $d-1$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $h^T M(\theta^*) h$. Moreover, the asymptotic power function of empirical likelihood test is the same.*

The proof is given in Appendix 2. Theorem 5 implies that, under the local alternative, the power function of $\hat{D}_f$ -based test does not depend on choice of the f -divergence and that empirical likelihood test has the same power as $\hat{D}_f$ -based test.

Next, we consider the power function under the misspecification case.

Theorem 6. We assume that the density ratio $p_n^{(m)}/p_d$ is not realized by the model $r(x; \theta)$, and that $p_n^{(m)}$ is represented as

$$p_n^{(m)}(x) = p_d(x) \left(r(x; \theta_m) + \frac{s_m(x) + \varepsilon_m}{\sqrt{m}} \right),$$

where $s_m(x)$ satisfies $E[s_m(x)] = 0$ under the probability $p_d(x) = p(x)$, and assume $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_m = \varepsilon$. Suppose Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 except the definition of $p_n^{(m)}(x)$. Then, under the setup of the local alternative, the power function of $\hat{D}_f$ -based test is larger than or equal to that of empirical likelihood test.

The proof is given in Appendix 3. Even in the misspecification case, the assumption (20) and (21) will be valid, since eventually the limit of $p_n^{(m)}/p_d$ is realized by the model $r(x; \theta^*) = 1$. Theorem 5 and Theorem 6 indicate that $\hat{D}_f$ -based test is more powerful than empirical likelihood test regardless of whether the model $r(x; \theta)$ is correct or slightly misspecified.

6 Numerical Studies

In this section, we report numerical results for illustrating the adequacy of the asymptotic theory for finite-sample inference.

We examine two f -divergences for the homogeneity test. One is KL-divergence defined by $f(r) = r - 1 - \log(r)$ as shown in Example 1, and the test statistic is derived from (13). This is referred to as *KL-based test*. The other is mutual information defined by (15), and the estimator $\hat{D}_f$ is derived from the decomposition (16) and the moment matching estimator $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$. This is referred to as *MI-based test*. These tests are compared to empirical likelihood test (19) proposed by Fokianos et al. [7] and Hotelling T^2 -test. The null hypothesis of the testing is $H_0 : p_n = p_d$ and the alternative is $H_1 : p_n \neq p_d$. The type-I error and the power function of these tests are computed. In all numerical studies, the sample x is 10-dimensional vector, and the semiparametric model for density ratio is defined as

$$r(x; \theta) = \exp \left\{ \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{10} \beta_i x_i + \sum_{j=1}^{10} \beta_{10+j} x_j^2 \right\} \quad (22)$$

with the 21-dimensional parameter $\theta = (\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{20})$.

First we assume that the null hypothesis $p_n = p_d$ is correct, and we compute the type-I error. We consider three cases: in the first case, the distributions of p_n and p_d are given as the 10-dimensional normal distribution

Table 1: Averaged Type-I errors over 300 runs are shown as functions of the number of samples. Normal distribution, t -distribution with 10 degrees of freedom, and t -distribution with 5 degrees of freedom are examined as p_n and p_d . Below, “MI”, “KL” and “emp.” denote MI-based test, KL-based test and empirical likelihood test, respectively.

$m_n(=m_d)$	10-dim Normal			10-dim. t -dist. (df=10)			10-dim. t -dist. (df=5)		
	MI	KL	emp.	MI	KL	emp.	MI	KL	emp.
100	0.080	0.117	0.183	0.133	0.217	0.297	0.100	0.210	0.377
500	0.070	0.083	0.080	0.070	0.090	0.107	0.060	0.107	0.187
1000	0.053	0.057	0.060	0.073	0.070	0.093	0.070	0.103	0.170
1200	0.047	0.050	0.067	0.073	0.087	0.097	0.067	0.093	0.170

$N_{10}(0, I_{10})$; in the second case, each element of $x \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ is independent and identically distributed from the t -distribution with 10 degrees of freedom; and in the third case, each element of $x \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ is independent and identically distributed from the t -distribution with 5 degrees of freedom. The sample size is set to $m_n = m_d$ and varies from 100 to 1200, and the significance level is set to 0.05. The type-I errors are averaged over 300 runs. For each case, the averaged type-I errors of KL-based test, MI-based test, and empirical likelihood test are shown in Table 1. In the normal case, the type-I error of three tests converges to the significance level with modest sample size. In the case of t -distribution, the type-I error of empirical likelihood test is larger than the significance level even with large sample size. On the other hand the type-I error of MI-based test is close to the significance level with moderate sample size even for the case of t -distribution.

Next, we compute the power function of KL-based test, MI-based test, empirical likelihood test, and Hotelling T^2 -test. In the numerical simulations, $p_n(x)$ is fixed and $p_d(x)$ is varied by changing the mean parameter or the scale parameter. In the same way as the computation of the type-I error, $p_n(x)$ is fixed to one of the three probabilities: 10-dimensional normal distribution $N_{10}(0, I_{10})$, 10-dimensional t -distortion with 10 or 5 degrees of freedom. The probability $p_d(x)$ is defined by changing the mean or the variance of the probability $p_n(x)$. In the first setup, the sample $x^{(d)} = (x_1^{(d)}, \dots, x_{10}^{(d)})$ from p_d is computed such that

$$x_\ell^{(d)} = x_\ell + \mu, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 10, \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_{10}) \sim p_n, \quad (23)$$

that is, the mean parameter $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is added to each element of x . Hence,

$p_n = p_d$ holds for $\mu = 0$. In the second setup, the sample $x^{(d)} = (x_1^{(d)}, \dots, x_{10}^{(d)})$ from p_d is computed such that

$$x_\ell^{(d)} = \sigma \times x_\ell, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 10, \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_{10}) \sim p_n, \quad (24)$$

that is, the scale parameter $\sigma > 0$ is multiplied to each element of x . Hence, $p_n = p_d$ holds for $\sigma = 1$. In all simulations, the sample size is set to $m_n = m_d = 500$ or 1000 and the significance level is 0.05 . When both p_n and p_d are the multi-dimensional normal distribution, the density ratio model (22) includes the true ratio. For the t -distribution, however, the true ratio $r(x)$ resides outside of the model (22). The power functions are averaged over 300 runs.

Table 2 shows the averaged power functions over 300 runs for the setup (23). The mean parameter μ varies from -0.1 to 0.1 . When both p_n and p_d are the normal distribution, the power functions of KL-based test, MI-based test, and empirical likelihood almost coincide with each other. The power of Hotelling T^2 -test is slightly larger than the others. This result is obvious, since Hotelling T^2 -test works well under the normal distribution. Under the t -distribution with 5 degree of freedom, the power of empirical likelihood test around $\mu = 0$ is much larger than the significance level. That is, empirical likelihood test is not conservative, and will lead false positive with high probability. In MI-based test, the power around $\mu = 0$ is close to the significance level and the power is comparable to Hotelling T^2 -test outside of the vicinity of $\mu = 0$.

Table 3 shows the averaged power functions over 300 runs when the scale parameter σ in (24) varies from 0.9 to 1.1 . In this case, the means of p_n and p_d are the same, and hence Hotelling T^2 -test fails to detect the difference of p_n and p_d . In addition, we see that the power function of empirical likelihood test is biased, that is, the power function takes the minimum value at σ less than 1 . This is because the estimated variance, $\hat{V}_n$, based on empirical likelihood estimator tends to take slightly small values than the true variance. In MI-based test, the power around $\sigma = 1$ is close to the significance level, while the power of KL-based test is slightly larger than the significance level around $\sigma = 1$.

As shown above, when the model $r(x; \theta)$ is correct, the power of KL-based test, MI-based test, and empirical likelihood test is almost the same. Thus, the numerical simulations meet the theoretical results in Theorem 5. Empirical likelihood test has large type-I error and the power is slightly biased especially when the samples are generated from the t -distribution. Throughout the simulations, MI-based test has the comparable power to

the other methods, while the type-I error is well controlled. In the simulations, we see that the null distribution of MI-based test is approximated by the asymptotic distribution more accurately than that of KL-based test, although the first-order asymptotic theory provided in Section 5 does not explain the difference between MI-based test and KL-based test. We expect that higher order asymptotic theory is needed to better understand the difference among f -divergences for the homogeneity test.

7 Conclusion

We have addressed the inference problem of density ratios and its application to homogeneity test under the semiparametric models. We showed that the estimator introduced by Qin [17] provides an optimal estimator of the f -divergence with appropriate decomposition of the function f , and proposed a test statistic for homogeneity test using the optimal f -divergence estimator. It is revealed that the power function of $\hat{D}_f$ -based test does not depend on the choice of the f -divergence up to the first order under the local alternative setup. Additionally, $\hat{D}_f$ -based test and empirical likelihood test [7] were shown to have asymptotically the same power. For misspecified density-ratio models, we showed that $\hat{D}_f$ -based test usually has greater power than empirical likelihood test. In numerical studies, mutual information based test provided the most reliable results than the others, that is, the null distribution was well approximated by the asymptotic distribution with moderate samples size, and the power was comparable to Hotelling T^2 -test even under the normal case.

The choice of the f -divergence is an important open problem for the homogeneity test. In our first-order asymptotic theory, the choice of the f -divergence does not affect the power function. Hence, higher order asymptotic theory may be necessary to make clear the difference among f -divergences for the homogeneity test.

8 Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Dr. Hironori Fujisawa and Dr. Masayuki Henmi of Institute of Statistical Mathematics, and Dr. Fumiyasu Komaki of University of Tokyo for their helpful comments. T. Kanamori was partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (20700251), and M. Sugiyama was supported by SCAT, AOARD, and the JST PRESTO program.

Appendix 1

Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Let $\widehat{\delta\theta} = \widehat{\theta} - \theta^*$. Then, due to (2), we have

$$\sqrt{m}\delta\widehat{\theta} = -\sqrt{m}U_{\eta}^{-1}Q_{\eta} + o_p(1),$$

where $\eta = \eta_{\text{opt}}$ defined in (4). Let $f_d(r) = f(r)/(1 + \rho r)$ and $f_n(r) = \rho f(r)/(1 + \rho r)$. Then we have $f_d(1) = f_d'(1) = f_n(1) = f_n'(1) = 0$ and $f_d''(1) + f_n''(1) = f''(1)$, since $f(1) = f'(1) = 0$ is assumed. Hence, the asymptotic expansion of $m\widehat{D}_f$ around $\theta = \theta^*$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned} m\widehat{D}_f &= \frac{f_d''(1)}{2}\sqrt{m}\delta\widehat{\theta}^T E_d[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)\nabla r(x; \theta^*)^T]\sqrt{m}\delta\widehat{\theta}, \\ &\quad + \frac{f_n''(1)}{2}\sqrt{m}\delta\widehat{\theta}^T E_n[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)\nabla r(x; \theta^*)^T]\sqrt{m}\delta\widehat{\theta} + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{(1 + \rho)^2 f''(1)}{2}\sqrt{m}Q_{\eta}^T (E_n[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)\nabla r(x; \theta^*)^T])^{-1}\sqrt{m}Q_{\eta} + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

since $p_n = p_d$ and $r(x; \theta^*) = 1$ hold. The asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{m}Q_{\eta}$ is the Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix $V_n[\nabla r]/(1 + \rho)^2$, since the equality $\eta_{\text{opt}}(x; \theta^*) = \nabla \log r(x; \theta^*)/(1 + \rho) = \nabla r(x; \theta^*)/(1 + \rho)$ holds. Let M be the d by d matrix defined as

$$M = E_n[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)\nabla r(x; \theta^*)^T],$$

and $\sqrt{V}$ be a d by d matrix such that $\sqrt{V}\sqrt{V}^T = V_n[\nabla r]$. Then asymptotically

$$\frac{2m}{f''(1)}\widehat{D}_f \xrightarrow{d} Z_d^T \sqrt{V}^T M^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d$$

holds, where Z_d is the d -dimensional random vector whose distribution is the d -dimensional standard Gaussian distribution, that is, $Z_d \sim N_d(0, I_d)$. Let $\sqrt{M}$ be the symmetric positive definite matrix such that $M = \sqrt{M}\sqrt{M}^T$, and the vector μ be $\mu = E_n[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)]$. Note that $\sqrt{M}$ is well-defined, since M is a positive definite matrix. Let P be the d by d matrix $P = I - \sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu\mu^T\sqrt{M}^{-1}$, then P is the projection matrix along the vector $\sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu$. Indeed, we have

$$\|\sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu\|^2 = E_n[\nabla r]^T E_n[\nabla r \nabla r^T]^{-1} E_n[\nabla r] = E_n[\nabla r]^T b = 1,$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the vector such that $\nabla \log r(x; \theta^*)^T b = \nabla r(x; \theta^*)^T b = 1$. We can choose $\sqrt{V} = \sqrt{M}P$, since $\sqrt{V}\sqrt{V}^T = M - \mu\mu^T$ holds. As a result, we have $Z_d^T \sqrt{V}^T M^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d = Z_d P Z_d$, and the distribution of $Z_d P Z_d$ is the chi-square distribution with $d - 1$ degrees of freedom. $\square$

Appendix 2

Proof of Theorem 5

First, we calculate the power function of $\hat{D}_f$ -based test.

Proof. Let $E[\cdot]$ be the expectation under the probability $p_d(x) = p(x)$. The equality $p_n^{(m)}(x) = p_d(x)r(x; \theta_m)$ leads to $E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)]^T h = 0$. Indeed

$$\int p_n^{(m)}(x) dx = \int p_d(x)r(x; \theta_m) dx \implies 1 = 1 + E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)]^T \frac{h_m}{\sqrt{m}} + o(1/\sqrt{m})$$

holds, and thus we have $E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)]^T h = 0$ when m tends to infinity. Let M be $M(\theta^*) = E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*) \nabla r(x; \theta^*)^T]$, μ be $E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)]$, and $\sqrt{V}$ be a matrix such that $\sqrt{V}\sqrt{V}^T = V[\nabla r]$. Let $\delta\hat{\theta}_m$ be $\hat{\theta} - \theta_m$. Under Assumption 1 and Assumption 2, the asymptotic expansion provides

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2m}{f''(1)} \hat{D}_f \\ &= (\sqrt{m}\delta\theta_m + h_m)^T M (\sqrt{m}\delta\theta_m + h_m) + o_p(1) \\ &= (\sqrt{m}U(\theta_m)\delta\theta_m + U(\theta_m)h)^T U(\theta_m)^{-1} M U(\theta_m)^{-1} (\sqrt{m}U(\theta_m)\delta\theta_m + U(\theta_m)h) + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{\theta_m} \|\sqrt{M}^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d + \sqrt{M}h\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way as the proof of Theorem 4, we see that $\sqrt{M}^{-1} \sqrt{V}$ is the projection matrix along the vector $\sqrt{M}^{-1} \mu$. Moreover, $\sqrt{M}h$ is orthogonal to the vector $\sqrt{M}^{-1} \mu$ since $\mu^T h = 0$ holds. As a result, we see that the distribution function of $\|\sqrt{M}^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d + \sqrt{M}h\|^2$ is the non-central chi-square distribution with $d - 1$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $h^T M(\theta^*) h$. $\square$

Next, we calculate the power function of empirical likelihood test. The notations M and μ are the same as the proof above.

Proof. From the definition of the statistic S , we have

$$S = m(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \hat{V}_n[\nabla_{\beta}\phi](\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) = m(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^T V(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + o_p(1),$$

where $V = V[\nabla r]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & m(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^T V(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + o_p(1) \\ &= (\sqrt{m}U(\theta_m)\delta\theta_m + U(\theta_m)h)^T U(\theta_m)^{-1} V U(\theta_m)^{-1} (\sqrt{m}U(\theta_m)\delta\theta_m + U(\theta_m)h) + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{\theta_m} \|\sqrt{V}^T \sqrt{M}^{-1} (\sqrt{M}^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d + \sqrt{M}h)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The matrix $\sqrt{V}^T \sqrt{M}^{-1}$ is the projection matrix along the vector $\sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu$ and $\mu^T h = 0$ holds. Then we see that the vector $\sqrt{M}^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d + \sqrt{M}h$ is orthogonal to $\sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu$. This implies

$$\|\sqrt{V}^T \sqrt{M}^{-1} (\sqrt{M}^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d + \sqrt{M}h)\|^2 = \|\sqrt{M}^{-1} \sqrt{V} Z_d + \sqrt{M}h\|^2.$$

Thus, under the local alternative setup, the limit distribution of the test statistic S is the non-central chi-square distribution with the same parameter as $\hat{D}_f$ -based test. $\square$

Appendix 3

Proof of Theorem 6

Below, the notations $M = E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*) \nabla r(x; \theta^*)]$ and $\mu = E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)]$ are used.

Proof. From the definition of the density $p_n^{(m)}(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int p_n^{(m)}(x) dx &= \int p_d(x) \left(r(x; \theta_m) + \frac{s_m(x) + \varepsilon_m}{\sqrt{m_d}} \right) dx \\ \implies 1 &= 1 + E[\nabla r(x; \theta^*)]^T \frac{h_m}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{\varepsilon_m}{\sqrt{m}} + o(1/\sqrt{m}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus, the equality $\mu^T h + \varepsilon = 0$ holds when m tends to infinity. Let the random vector W be

$$W = PZ_d + \sqrt{M}h, \quad Z_d \sim N_d(0, I_d),$$

where P is the projection matrix along the vector $\sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu$ as defined in the proof of Theorem 4. According to the proof in Theorem 5 in Appendix 2. the

power of $\widehat{D}_f$ -based test is asymptotically equal to $\Pr \{ \|W\|^2 \geq \chi_{d-1}^2(1-\alpha) \}$, and that of empirical likelihood test is equal to $\Pr \{ \|PW\|^2 \geq \chi_{d-1}^2(1-\alpha) \}$. We have the equality $W = PW + c\sqrt{M}^{-1}h$ with some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that generally $\sqrt{M}h$ is not orthogonal to $\sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu$ in the misspecified case, since

$$(\sqrt{M}^{-1}\mu)^T \sqrt{M}h = \mu^T h = -\varepsilon$$

holds. For $\varepsilon \neq 0$, we have $c \neq 0$ and then the inequality $\|W\|^2 > \|PW\|^2$ holds. As a result, the power of $\widehat{D}_f$ -based test is larger than or equal to that of empirical likelihood test under the misspecified setup. $\square$

References

- [1] S. M. Ali and S. D. Silvey. A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 28(1):131–142, 1966.
- [2] N. Bensaid and J. P. Fabre. Optimal asymptotic quadratic error of kernel estimators of radonvnikodym derivatives for strong mixing data. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 19(2):77–88, 2007.
- [3] M. Broniatowski and A. Keziou. Parametric estimation and tests through divergences and the duality technique. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 100:16–26, 2009.
- [4] K. F. Cheng and C. K. Chu. Semiparametric density estimation under a two-sample density ratio model. *Bernoulli*, 10(4):583–604, 2004.
- [5] T. F. Cox and G. Ferry. Robust logistic discrimination. *Biometrika*, 78(4):841–849, 1991.
- [6] I. Csiszár. Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observation. *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*, 2:229–318, 1967.
- [7] K. Fokianos, B. Kedem, J. Qin, and D. A. Short. A semiparametric approach to the one-way layout. *Technometrics*, 43:56–64, 2001.
- [8] P. Jacoba and P. E. Oliveirab. Kernel estimators of general radon-nikodym derivatives. *Statistics*, 30:25–46, 1997.

- [9] T. Kanamori, S. Hido, and M. Sugiyama. Efficient direct density ratio estimation for non-stationarity adaptation and outlier detection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 21*. MIT Press, 2009.
- [10] R. Kay and S. Little. Transformation of the explanatory variables in the logistic regression model for binary data. *Biometrika*, 74(3):495–501, 1987.
- [11] A. Keziou. Dual representation of ϕ -divergences and applications. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I*, 336(10):857–862, 2003.
- [12] A. Keziou and S. Leoni-Aubin. Test of homogeneity in semiparametric two-sample density ratio models. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 340(12):905–910, 2005.
- [13] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22:79–86, 1951.
- [14] J. Kwik and J. Mielniczuk. Estimating density ratio with application to discriminant analysis. *Commun. Statist. –Theory Meth.*, 18(8):3057–3069, 1989.
- [15] E. L. Lehmann and J. P. Romano. *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, New York, third edition, 2005.
- [16] X. Nguyen, M. J. Wainwright, and M. I. Jordan. Estimating divergence functions and the likelihood ratio by penalized convex risk minimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, Cambridge, MA, 2008. MIT Press.
- [17] J. Qin. Inferences for case-control and semiparametric two-sample density ratio models. *Biometrika*, 85(3):619–639, 1998.
- [18] W. Qing, S. R. Kulkarni, and S. Verdu. A nearest-neighbor approach to estimating divergence between continuous random vectors. In *IEEE Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 242–246, 2006.
- [19] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [20] B. Schölkopf and A. J. Smola. *Learning with Kernels*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2002.

- [21] M. Sugiyama, S. Nakajima, H. Kashima, P. von Büna, and M. Kawanaabe. Direct importance estimation with model selection and its application to covariate shift adaptation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, pages 1433–1440, Cambridge, MA, 2008. MIT Press.
- [22] A W Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge Ser. Stat. Probab. Math. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [23] G. Wahba. *Spline Model for Observational Data*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, 1990.

Table 2: Averaged power functions over 300 runs are shown as functions of the mean parameter of the probability $p_d(x)$, where $p_d(x)$ is defined by (23) through the probability p_n . Normal distribution, t -distribution with 10 degrees of freedom, and t -distribution with 5 degrees of freedom are examined as p_n . Below, “MI”, “KL”, “emp.” and “Hote.” denote MI-based test, KL-based test, empirical likelihood test and Hotelling T^2 -test, respectively.

$m_n = m_d = 500$												
μ	10-dim Normal				10-dim. t -dist. (df=10)				10-dim. t -dist. (df=5)			
	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.
-0.1	0.894	0.902	0.898	0.964	0.812	0.826	0.822	0.886	0.680	0.724	0.746	0.750
-0.08	0.650	0.662	0.654	0.778	0.538	0.572	0.608	0.714	0.472	0.532	0.592	0.562
-0.06	0.362	0.388	0.384	0.510	0.302	0.328	0.360	0.418	0.236	0.296	0.408	0.258
-0.04	0.184	0.190	0.214	0.226	0.132	0.156	0.200	0.176	0.130	0.186	0.284	0.134
-0.02	0.084	0.100	0.104	0.074	0.080	0.104	0.148	0.080	0.082	0.132	0.216	0.072
0	0.046	0.058	0.062	0.036	0.062	0.082	0.098	0.046	0.054	0.090	0.170	0.056
0.02	0.072	0.080	0.092	0.070	0.064	0.076	0.104	0.044	0.090	0.150	0.218	0.074
0.04	0.196	0.206	0.212	0.210	0.138	0.160	0.186	0.158	0.138	0.200	0.304	0.130
0.06	0.374	0.398	0.424	0.490	0.314	0.348	0.372	0.388	0.260	0.332	0.380	0.274
0.08	0.658	0.688	0.698	0.760	0.528	0.554	0.586	0.632	0.470	0.536	0.578	0.528
0.1	0.866	0.878	0.870	0.954	0.796	0.810	0.814	0.878	0.672	0.740	0.750	0.760

$m_n = m_d = 1000$												
μ	10-dim Normal				10-dim. t -dist. (df=10)				10-dim. t -dist. (df=5)			
	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.
-0.1	0.996	0.998	0.998	1.000	0.996	0.996	0.998	0.994	0.958	0.964	0.968	0.990
-0.08	0.952	0.954	0.954	0.986	0.902	0.906	0.906	0.960	0.790	0.816	0.824	0.864
-0.06	0.694	0.698	0.698	0.794	0.616	0.634	0.652	0.784	0.470	0.516	0.550	0.594
-0.04	0.320	0.336	0.336	0.422	0.258	0.278	0.304	0.340	0.208	0.246	0.316	0.232
-0.02	0.096	0.110	0.122	0.132	0.080	0.090	0.102	0.110	0.094	0.128	0.220	0.100
0	0.058	0.060	0.064	0.044	0.058	0.068	0.102	0.052	0.074	0.100	0.166	0.068
0.02	0.088	0.090	0.098	0.100	0.112	0.120	0.142	0.114	0.092	0.128	0.194	0.078
0.04	0.308	0.322	0.324	0.472	0.296	0.318	0.324	0.396	0.222	0.258	0.314	0.248
0.06	0.724	0.730	0.728	0.836	0.622	0.640	0.652	0.752	0.474	0.500	0.538	0.586
0.08	0.956	0.960	0.958	0.978	0.890	0.900	0.904	0.962	0.770	0.790	0.818	0.856
0.1	0.998	0.996	0.998	1.000	0.992	0.990	0.988	0.998	0.966	0.970	0.980	0.988

Table 3: Averaged power functions over 300 runs are shown as functions of the scale parameter of the probability $p_d(x)$, where $p_d(x)$ is defined by (24) through the probability p_n . Normal distribution, t -distribution with 10 degrees of freedom, and t -distribution with 5 degrees of freedom are examined as p_n . Below, “MI”, “KL”, “emp.” and “Hote.” denote MI-based test, KL-based test, empirical likelihood test and Hotelling T^2 -test, respectively.

$m_n = m_d = 500$												
σ	10-dim Normal				10-dim. t -dist. (df=10)				10-dim. t -dist. (df=5)			
	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.
0.9	1.000	0.998	0.994	0.042	0.986	0.978	0.912	0.070	0.846	0.788	0.484	0.044
0.92	0.976	0.976	0.948	0.046	0.850	0.786	0.638	0.058	0.592	0.492	0.204	0.036
0.94	0.750	0.714	0.554	0.044	0.552	0.486	0.282	0.034	0.328	0.272	0.110	0.042
0.96	0.354	0.328	0.184	0.054	0.240	0.186	0.096	0.048	0.208	0.172	0.094	0.054
0.98	0.112	0.096	0.054	0.050	0.078	0.070	0.054	0.042	0.084	0.114	0.142	0.060
1	0.064	0.078	0.080	0.048	0.052	0.074	0.098	0.042	0.066	0.086	0.170	0.030
1.02	0.102	0.146	0.212	0.044	0.104	0.164	0.248	0.056	0.090	0.182	0.338	0.054
1.04	0.334	0.406	0.516	0.046	0.218	0.316	0.490	0.050	0.158	0.314	0.514	0.050
1.06	0.666	0.744	0.840	0.050	0.516	0.670	0.818	0.060	0.324	0.528	0.780	0.054
1.08	0.946	0.976	0.992	0.044	0.806	0.876	0.948	0.038	0.538	0.716	0.862	0.060
1.1	0.992	0.994	0.998	0.064	0.966	0.992	0.998	0.032	0.774	0.868	0.974	0.046

$m_n = m_d = 1000$												
σ	10-dim Normal				10-dim. t -dist. (df=10)				10-dim. t -dist. (df=5)			
	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.	MI	KL	emp.	Hote.
0.9	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.062	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.046	0.992	0.986	0.914	0.056
0.92	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.074	0.998	0.996	0.984	0.052	0.892	0.854	0.638	0.054
0.94	0.982	0.980	0.968	0.054	0.912	0.892	0.766	0.074	0.620	0.532	0.294	0.054
0.96	0.648	0.608	0.502	0.052	0.464	0.412	0.278	0.040	0.264	0.214	0.118	0.058
0.98	0.148	0.132	0.104	0.042	0.118	0.104	0.072	0.054	0.108	0.098	0.080	0.058
1	0.046	0.050	0.058	0.030	0.054	0.060	0.074	0.040	0.066	0.088	0.164	0.048
1.02	0.170	0.200	0.256	0.058	0.120	0.158	0.256	0.040	0.096	0.158	0.310	0.046
1.04	0.678	0.732	0.806	0.060	0.416	0.532	0.650	0.070	0.272	0.424	0.612	0.058
1.06	0.978	0.984	0.988	0.048	0.870	0.910	0.958	0.052	0.516	0.722	0.856	0.056
1.08	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.048	0.992	0.998	1.000	0.054	0.850	0.934	0.970	0.060
1.1	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.066	0.998	1.000	1.000	0.056	0.968	0.982	0.996	0.046