arXiv:1704.06787v1 [math.ST] 22 Apr 2017

A new simple and powerful normality test for progressively Type-II censored data

Hamzeh Torabi, Sayyed Mahmoud Mirjalili, Hossein Nadeb
Department of Statistics, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran,

Abstract

In this paper, a new goodness-of-fit test for a location-scale family based on progressively Type-II censored order statistics is proposed. Using Monte Carlo simulation studies, the present researchers have observed that the proposed test for normality is consistent and quite powerful in comparison with existing goodness-of-fit tests based on progressively Type-II censored data. Also, the new test statistic for a real data set is used and the results show that our new test statistic performs well.

Keywords Goodness-of-fit testing; location-scale family; Monte Carlo simulation; order statistics; progressive Type-II censoring, spacings.
MSC 2010: 62F03, 62F10.

1 Introduction

One of the most interesting problems in statistics is finding a distribution which fits to a given set of data. In other words, it is desired to test whether a specific distribution coincides with given data or not. To review the classical goodness-of-fit test problem, let $X_1, ..., X_n$ be random sample from an absolutely continuous population with cumulative distribution function (CDF) $F(.)$, and probability density function (PDF) $f(.)$. Based on the observed sample $x_1, ..., x_n$, hypotheses testing of interest is

$$\begin{cases} H_0 : \ f = f_0 \\ H_1 : \ f \neq f_0, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $f_0(x) = f_0(x; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ is a k-vector parameter for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For more overview on the topic of goodness-of-fit test, refer to the books by D'Agostino and Stephens [10] and Huber-Carol et al. [14].

Most of goodness-of-fit tests are based on the distance between empirical distribution function (EDF) and theoretical distribution functions over the interval $(0, 1)$, the null hypothesis is rejected if the distance is too large in some metrics. However, one can construct a goodness-of-fit test based

on order statistics in terms of the deviation of each order statistic $U_{i:n}$ from its expected value $i/(n+1)$, say, $V_i = U_{i:n} - i/(n+1)$. Statistics that can be considered in this regard are as follows:

$$C_n^+ = \max_{1\le i\le n}(V_i), C_n^- = \max_{1\le i\le n}(-V_i), C_n = \max(C_n^-, C_n^+),$$

$$K_n = C_n^- + C_n^+, T^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{V_i^2}{n}, T^{(2)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|V_i|}{n}$$

For the suitability of uniformity, the upper tail of the appropriate null distribution is usually used to test. One may refer to Brunk [8], Stephens [27] and Hegazy and Green [13], for more discussion on these statistics.

Goodness-of-fit testing can also be done based on the spacings $D_i = U_{i:n} - U_{i-1:n}$, $i = 1, ..., n+1$, where $U_{0:n} = 0$ and $U_{n+1:n} = 1$. However, several statistics based on spacings have been reported in the literature, including Greenwood's [11] statistic $G_{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} D_i^2$, Quesenberry and Miller's [24] statistic $Q = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} D_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} D_i D_{i+1}$ and Moran's [18] statistic $M(n) = -2\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \ln\big((n+1)D_i\big)$. The null hypothesis will be rejected for large values of these statistics. Also Torabi [28, 29] has introduced a new and general method for estimation and hypotheses testing using spacing.

The classical goodness-of-fit tests for complete data can no longer be used for progressively Type-II censored data, Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21] employed a modification to the aforementioned statistics based on order statistics and spacings including the class of C statistics, Greenwood's statistic, and Quesenberry and Miller's statistic, making them suitable for progressively Type-II censored data.

For progressive Type-II censoring, we refer to the recent survey paper by Balakrishnan [6] and the monograph by Balakrishnan and Aggarwala [2]. In progressive Type-II censoring, it is assumed that the removals of still operating units are carried out at observed failure times and that the censoring scheme $(r_1, r_2, ..., r_m)$ is known in advance. Moreover, the number of units (n) and the number of observed failure times (m) are prefixed. Starting all n units at the same time, the first progressive censoring step takes place at the observation of the first failure time $X_{1:m:n}$, at this time, r_1 units are randomly chosen from the still operating units and withdrawn from the experiment. Then, the experiment continues with the reduced sample size $n - r_1 - 1$. After observing the next failure at time $X_{2:m:n}$, r_2 units are randomly removed from $n - r_1 - 2$ active units. This process continued until the mth failure is observed. Then, the experiment ends. The failure times $X_{1:m:n}, ..., X_{m:m:n}$ are called progressively Type-II censored order statistics and $x_{1:m:n}, ..., x_{m:m:n}$ are the corresponding observations. For their relation to order statistics and other related models of order random variables, one may refer to Balakrishnan [6].

Goodness-of-fit test for the exponential distribution based on spacings from progressively Type-II censored data introduced by Balakrishnan et al. [3], then they extended their method to general location–scale families of distributions [4]. Also Wang [31] proposed another goodness-of-fit test for

the exponential distribution under progressively Type-II censored samples. Recently, Pakyari and Balakrishnan [20] proposed a modification to the EDF goodness-of-fit statistics under progressively Type-II censored data. One may also refer to [1, 5, 7, 16, 17, 23, 25, 27] for some other developments in this regard.

In Section 2, we review the test statistics based on spacings that are modification to the previously defined $C^+, C^-, C, K, T^{(1)}, T^{(2)}$, modification to the Greenwood's statistic and modification to the Quesenberry and Miller's statistic for the progressively Type-II censored data that proposed by Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21]. In Section 3, we propose a new test statistic that will be used for test of normality under the progressively Type-II censored data. In Section 4, we investigate consistency of our test statistic using a simulation study under five progressively Type-II censored schemes. The power of the proposed test is then assessed through Monte Carlo simulations in Section 5, and its performance is compared with those of the test procedures introduced earlier by Balakrishnan et al. [4] and Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21]. It is shown that the proposed goodness-of-fit test to be more powerful than or at least as good as the tests of Balakrishnan et al. [4] and Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21] for different choices of sample sizes and progressive censoring schemes. In Section 6, we illustrate the application of proposed goodness-of-fit procedure with a real data set.

2 Review on the test statistics based on spacings

In Section 1, some several test statistics based on the deviation between order statistics and the corresponding expected value in the case of a complete sample were presented. These statistics were extended to progressively Type-II censored data by Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21] as follows

$$C^+_{m:n} = \max_{1\le i\le m}(V_{i:m:n}), C^-_{m:n} = \max_{1\le i\le m}(-V_{i:m:n}), C_{m:n} = \max(C^-_{m:n}, C^+_{m:n}),$$

$$K_{m:n} = C^-_{m:n} + C^+_{m;n}, T^{(1)}_{m:n} = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{V^2_{i:m:n}}{m}, T^{(2)}_{m:n} = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{|V_{i:m:n}|}{m},$$

where in this case, $V_{i:m:n} = U_{i:m:n} - \mu_{i:m:n}$, which $U_{i:m:n}$ is the ith order statistic from uniform (0,1) distribution base on Type-II Progressive censored data and $\mu_{i:m:n}$ is its expected value, i.e

$$\mu_{i:m:n} = 1 - \prod_{k=m-i+1}^{m}\frac{k+\sum_{j=m-i+1}^{m} r_j}{1+k+\sum_{j=m-i+1}^{m} r_j}, \quad i = 1,\dots,m.$$

It is easy to show that all the above statistics are location–scale invariant. If the null hypothesis is true, we expect that $V_{i:m:n}$ to be small and consequently the above test statistics to be small. If the above test statistics exceed the corresponding upper-tail null critical values, the null hypothesis may be rejected. Recently, several goodness-of-fit statistics based on spacings have been developed. The one-step spacings are defined by

$$S_i = (n - r_1 - r_2 - ... - r_{i-1} - i + 1)(U_{i:m:n} - U_{i-1:m:n}), \quad i = 1, 2, ...m,$$

where $U_{0:m:n} = 0$. It was shown by Balakrishnan and Aggarwala [2] and Viveros and Balakrishnan [2] that if the underlying distribution is exponential, then $S_1, S_2, ..., S_m$ are independent and identically distributed as exponential with the scale parameter σ.

The following statistics are based on the spacings that generalized by Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21] under the progressively Type-II censored data:

- Statistics based on the sum of squares of the spacings, which are the generalization of Greenwood's statistic for progressively Type-II censored samples, are simply of the form

$$G_{m:n} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} S_i^2.$$

- The generalization of Quesenberry and Miller's statistic for progressively Type-II censored samples will be of the form

$$Q_{m:n} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} S_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} S_i S_{i+1}.$$

  The exact distributions of $G_{m:n}$ and $Q_{m:n}$ are not available explicitly but by Monte Carlo simulations the percentage points will be determined.

- The above statistics can also be defined in terms of higher order spacings. The overlapping k-step spacings, for integer k, are defined as

$$S_i^{(k)} = (n - r_1 - r_2 - ... - r_{i-1} - i + 1)(U_{i+k-1:m:n} - U_{i-1:m:n}), i = 1, 2, ...m,$$

  with $U_{l:m:n}$ for $l > m$. Hartley and Pfaffenberger [12] presented that the higher order spacings could be useful for testing large complete samples. The extensions of Greenwood's statistic and Quesenberry and Miller's statistic in terms of overlapping k-spacings take the forms

$$G_{m:n}^{(k)} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (S_i^{(k)})^2.$$

  The null hypothesis of uniformity is rejected if these statistics are too large.

- Balakrishnan et al's[4] test statistic was defined as below:

$$T = \frac{\sum_{i=2}^{m-1} (m-i) G_i}{(m-2) \sum_{i=2}^{m} G_i}$$

  where

$$G_i = \frac{S_i}{E(s_i)} = \frac{U_{i:m:n} - U_{i-1:m:n}}{\mu_{i:m:n} - \mu_{i-1:m:n}}$$

  In the next section, we propose a new test statistic and in Section 5 compare it with the test statistics reviewed in this section.

3 Proposed test

In this section, we propose a new approach for goodness-of-fit testing for normality under progressively Type-II censored data. Consider again the goodness-of-fit testing problem (1) based on $X_{1:m:n}, ..., X_{m:m:n}$, where $f_0(x; \mu, \sigma) = 1/\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}e^{-(x-\mu)^2/2\sigma^2}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, in which $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma > 0$ are both unknown. Suppose $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ are the MLEs of μ and σ based on $X_{1:m:n}, ..., X_{m:m:n}$. Because of consistency of the ML estimators, we expect $F_0(X_{i:m:n}, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$ has the same distribution as $U_{i:m:n}$; so it is justifiable that $\frac{F_0(X_{i:m:n},\hat{\mu},\hat{\sigma})}{\mu_{i:m:n}} \simeq 1$. Our proposed test is based on this ratio. More precisely, define

$$\mathrm{H}_{m:n} = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} h\left(\frac{F_0(X_{i:m:n}, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})}{\mu_{i:m:n}}\right),$$

where $h : (0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is assumed to be continuous, decreasing on $(0, 1)$ and increasing on $(1, \infty)$ with the absolute minimum at $x = 1$ such that $h(1) = 0$. In the simulation study for comparison of powers, by trying some different choices of h, the best choice is

$$h(x) = \frac{(x-1)^2}{x^2+1},$$

that has the maximal power. Plot of the function h is given in *Figure* 1.




Figure 1: Plot of the function $h(x)$.

We know that MLE of μ and σ are location-scale invariant for μ and σ, respectively. Therefore under a location-scale transformation, the distribution of $\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$ does not depend on the parameters μ and σ under location-scale transformations.

It is expected that the null hypothesis of normality is rejected if the statistic $\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$ is too large; Thus the critical region is of the form $\mathrm{H}_{m:n} > c$, for some $c > 0$. But for finding c for a test of size α, the exact distribution of $\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$ could not be explicitly obtained, fortunately using Monte Carlo

simulations, the critical points can be determined. In Section 4, the consistency of our proposed test has checked and in Section 5 critical values of our test statistic has gained and its power has compared with the power of existence test statistics based on Monte Carlo simulations against Student's t, Logistic and Double Exponential models.

An adequate test statistic for a goodness-of-fit test problem should be consistent, i.e, with increasing sample size, it is expected that the statistic tends to a finite value, especially under H_0 tends to zero. We cannot prove consistency of our test statistic but using a Monte Carlo simulation study, is proved and discussed in Section 4.

4 Consistency of the new statistic using a simulation study

In this section, we investigate consistency of our test statistic using a simulation study under five progressively Type-II censored schemes. To illustrate the goal, we consider 5 various censoring schemes as follows:

- **Scheme 1**: a progressive Type-II censoring scheme with constant removal, $\boldsymbol{r} = (1, 1, ..., 1)$, in this case $n = 2m$;
- **Scheme 2**: a progressive Type-II censoring scheme with increasing removal, $r_i = i$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., m$, in this case $n = m(m + 3)/2$;
- **Scheme 3**: a progressive Type-II censoring scheme with decreasing removal, $r_i = m - i + 1$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., m$, thus $n = m(m + 3)/2$;
- **Scheme 4**: a Type-II censoring, $r_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., m - 1$, $r_m = m/5$, hence $n = 1.2m$;
- **Scheme 5**: complete data, i.e., $r_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., m$, thus $n = m$;

As it is stated, the normal model is considered as the parent model in H_0 but it can be changed with any location-scale model because of the structure of test statistic. Against this model, we consider some alternative models as follows:

- Student's t distribution with ν degrees of freedom ($t_{(\nu)}$) with the density function

$$f(x;\nu) = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+1)/2)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi}\Gamma(\nu/2)}(1 + \frac{x^2}{\nu})^{-(\nu+1)/2}, \quad \nu > 0.$$

- Logistic distribution with parameters μ and σ ($L(\mu, \sigma)$) with the density function

$$f(x;\mu,\sigma) = \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma}\exp\left[\frac{-(x-\mu)}{\sigma}\right]}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma}\exp\left[\frac{-(x-\mu)}{\sigma}\right]\right)^2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma > 0.$$

- Double exponential distribution with parameters μ and σ ($DE(\mu, \sigma)$) with the density function

$$f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2\sigma} \exp\left[\frac{-|x-\mu|}{\sigma}\right], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma > 0.$$

For more details of these distributions refer to Casella and Berger [9].

Results that are given in Tables 1-5, show that under the standard normal distribution the values of our new statistic tend to zero when m increases (and hence m increases), but under the alternative distributions such as $t_{(3)}$, $t_{(4)}$, $L(0,1)$ and $DE(0,1)$ the values of our new statistic does tend to a non zero value for all five schemes.

Table 1: Consistency of $H_{m:n}$ using the Monte Carlo simulations for Scheme 1.

n	m	$N(0,1)$	$t_{(3)}$	$t_{(4)}$	$DE(0,1)$	$L(0,1)$
50	25	0.0301	0.0617	0.0518	0.0580	0.0405
100	50	0.0184	0.0541	0.0426	0.0470	0.0292
200	100	0.0112	0.0501	0.0366	0.0406	0.0223
300	150	0.0084	0.0481	0.0345	0.0384	0.0195
400	200	0.0067	0.0475	0.0334	0.0375	0.0180
500	250	0.0057	0.0459	0.0325	0.0368	0.0169
600	300	0.0050	0.0397	0.0314	0.0364	0.0134

Table 2: Consistency of $H_{m:n}$ using the Monte Carlo simulations for Scheme 2.

n	m	$N(0,1)$	$t_{(3)}$	$t_{(4)}$	$DE(0,1)$	$L(0,1)$
65	10	0.0639	0.0951	0.0865	0.0789	0.07356
230	20	0.0391	0.0818	0.0695	0.0535	0.0504
430	40	0.0241	0.0737	0.0594	0.0365	0.0346
1890	60	0.0178	0.0682	0.0546	0.0293	0.0280
3320	80	0.0144	0.0630	0.0525	0.0246	0.0244
5150	100	0.0123	0.0471	0.0464	0.0224	0.0217

5 Simulation Study

In this section, we assess the power of the our new statistic by comparing the simulated power values with those of the test of Balakrishnan et al. [4] and Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21]. We calculated the power of the proposed test for testing of normality against some different alternatives with simulating 10,000 random samples for some different choices of sample sizes and progressive

Table 3: Consistency of $H_{m:n}$ using the Monte Carlo simulations for Scheme 3.

n	m	$N(0,1)$	$t_{(3)}$	$t_{(4)}$	$DE(0,1)$	$L(0,1)$
65	10	0.0665	0.1124	0.0994	0.0949	0.0812
230	20	0.0449	0.1128	0.0924	0.0785	0.0636
430	40	0.0295	0.1191	0.0922	0.0647	0.0522
1890	60	0.0230	0.1251	0.0957	0.0579	0.0452
3320	80	0.0188	0.1249	0.0974	0.0540	0.0425
5150	100	0.0160	0.1195	0.0978	0.0503	0.0408

Table 4: Consistency of $H_{m:n}$ using the Monte Carlo simulations for Scheme 4.

n	m	$N(0,1)$	$t_{(3)}$	$t_{(4)}$	$DE(0,1)$	$L(0,1)$
60	50	0.0170	0.0429	0.0343	0.0397	0.0247
120	100	0.0104	0.0391	0.0291	0.0343	0.0185
180	150	0.0077	0.0379	0.0269	0.0323	0.0158
240	200	0.0064	0.0369	0.0258	0.0318	0.0145
300	250	0.0051	0.0361	0.0247	0.0312	0.0135
360	300	0.0046	0.0350	0.0243	0.0305	0.0130
420	350	0.0041	0.0313	0.0239	0.0300	0.0101
480	400	0.0037	0.0215	0.0193	0.0274	0.0097

censoring schemes. For comparative purposes, all 27 censoring schemes used by Balakrishnan et al. [4] and Pakyari and Balakrishnan [21] in their studies are considered again here, and these are listed in Table 6. Also the simulated critical values of $H_{m:n}$ for every 27 censoring scheme has listed in Table 7. All the simulations were carried out in R software.

In Table 8, we present the estimated power of the our proposed test, Balakrishnan et al.'s [4] T-statistic and Pakyari and Balakrishnan's [21] test statistics when the null hypothesis stipulates normal and the alternative hypothesis corresponds to Student's t with three and four degrees of freedom, Logistic distribution and double exponential distribution. From this table it is apparent that for a symmetric heavy-tailed alternative while testing for normality, the test statistic, $H_{m:n}$, that we have proposed, has possessed better power than Balakrishnan et al.'s [4] T-statistic and Pakyari and Balakrishnan's [21] test statistics in 78 out of 108 situations. Also, when $n = 20$ in the Student's t distribution with three degrees of freedom in 4 out of 9 situations, in the Student's t distribution with four degrees of freedom in 5 out of 9, in the Logistic $(0, 1)$ in 6 out of 9 situations and in the double exponential $(0, 1)$ in 7 out of 9 situations, in the case $n = 40$ in the Student's t distribution with three degrees of freedom in 7 out of 9 situations, in the Student's t distribution

Table 5: Consistency of $H_{m:n}$ using the Monte Carlo simulations for Scheme 5.

n	m	$N(0,1)$	$t_{(3)}$	$t_{(4)}$	$DE(0,1)$	$L(0,1)$
50	50	0.0165	0.0371	0.0297	0.0467	0.0215
100	100	0.0103	0.0351	0.0250	0.0265	0.0159
200	200	0.0063	0.0334	0.0225	0.0235	0.0121
400	400	0.0037	0.0335	0.0206	0.0218	0.0095
800	800	0.0022	0.0334	0.0196	0.0208	0.0083
1600	1600	0.0013	0.0334	0.0189	0.0203	0.0075
3200	3200	0.0007	0.0334	0.0189	0.0203	0.0075

with four degrees of freedom in 7 out of 9, in the Logistic $(0,1)$ in 7 out of 9 situations and in the double exponential $(0,1)$ in 7 out of 9 situations and in the cases $n = 60$ in the Student's t distribution with three degrees of freedom in 6 out of 9 situations, in the Student's t distribution with four degrees of freedom in 8 out of 9, in the Logistic $(0,1)$ in 8 out of 9 situations and in the double exponential $(0,1)$ in 6 out of 9 situations our test statistic possessed better power than Balakrishnan et al.'s [4] T-statistic and Pakyari and Balakrishnan's [21] test statistics. Also, in early censoring schemes ([1],[4],[7],[10],[13],[16],[19],[22],[25]), the $G^{(2)}_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 6 out 36 situations, the $G^{(3)}_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 11 out 36 situations, the $Q_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 1 out 36 situations, the $T^{(2)}_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 4 out 36 situations, the T-statistic has the most power in 4 out 36 situations and the $H_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 10 out 36 situations. In addition, in non-early censoring schemes ([2],[3],[5],[6],[8],[9],[11],[12],[14],[15],[17],[18],[20],[21],[23],[24],[26],[27]), the $G^{(3)}_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 1 out 72 situations, the $Q_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 1 out 72 situations, the T-statistic has the most power in 2 out 72 situations and the $H_{m:n}$ statistic has the most power in 68 out 72 situations. Also note that, as one would normally expect, it can be observed from the values in the Table 8 that the power increases as the degree of censoring $(1 - m/n)$ decreases. Finally, based on this results and comprative findings, we recomend the use of $G^{(3)}_{m:n}$ and $H_{m:n}$ statistics for the case of early censoring and the use of $H_{m:n}$ statistic for the case of non-early censoring.

6 Illustrative data analyses

In this section, the wire connection strength data from Nelson [19], (Table 5.1, p. 111) are considered. these data, originally studied by King [15], concern the breaking strength of 23 wire connections. The wires were bonded at one end to a semiconductor wafer and at the other end to a terminal post. The first two and the last one of the observations were eliminated from the analysis due to validity suspection of the data; see Nelson [19], for more details. Pakyari and Balakrishnan

Table 6: Progressive censoring schemes used in the Monte Carlo simulations.

Scheme no.	n	m	$\boldsymbol{r} = (r_1, r_2, ..., r_m)$
[1]	20	8	$r_1 = 12, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[2]	20	8	$r_8 = 12, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 8$
[3]	20	8	$r_1 = r_8 = 6, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1, 8$
[4]	20	12	$r_1 = 8, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 8$
[5]	20	12	$r_{12} = 8, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 12$
[6]	20	12	$r_3 = r_5 = r_7 = r_9 = 2, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 3, 5, 7, 9$
[7]	20	16	$r_1 = 4, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[8]	20	16	$r_{16} = 4, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 16$
[9]	20	16	$r_5 = 4, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 5$
[10]	40	10	$r_1 = 30, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[11]	40	10	$r_{10} = 30, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 10$
[12]	40	10	$r_1 = r_5 = r_{10} = 10, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1, 5, 10$
[13]	40	20	$r_1 = 20, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[14]	40	20	$r_{20} = 20, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 20$
[15]	40	20	$r_i = 1$, for $r_i = 1, 2, ..., 20$
[16]	40	30	$r_1 = 10, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[17]	40	30	$r_{30} = 10, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 30$
[18]	40	30	$r_1 = r_{30} = 5, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1, 30$
[19]	60	20	$r_1 = 40, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[20]	60	20	$r_{20} = 40, r_i = 0 for i \neq 20$
[21]	60	20	$r_1 = r_{20} = 10, r_{10} = 20 r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1, 10, 20$
[22]	60	40	$r_1 = 20, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[23]	60	40	$r_{40} = 20, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 40$
[24]	60	40	$r_{2i-1} = 1, r_{2i} = 0$, for $i = 1, 2, ..., 20$
[25]	60	50	$r_1 = 10, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[26]	60	50	$r_{50} = 10, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$
[27]	60	50	$r_1 = r_{50} = 5, r_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1, 50$

Table 7: Simulated critical values of $H_{m:n}$

Scheme no.	$H_{m:n}$	Scheme no.	$H_{m:n}$	Scheme no.	$H_{m:n}$
[1]	0.1069	[10]	0.1033	[19]	0.0633
[2]	0.1062	[11]	0.0941	[20]	0.0595
[3]	0.1060	[12]	0.0971	[21]	0.0621
[4]	0.0802	[13]	0.0588	[22]	0.0351
[5]	0.0793	[14]	0.0573	[23]	0.0358
[6]	0.0846	[15]	0.0602	[24]	0.0370
[7]	0.0646	[16]	0.0424	[25]	0.0296
[8]	0.0661	[17]	0.0431	[26]	0.0300
[9]	0.0671	[18]	0.0425	[27]	0.0298

[21] randomly generated a progressively Type-II censored sample of size $m = 10$ from $n = 20$ observations. Table 9 presents the data and the corresponding progressive censoring scheme. The possibility of fitting a normal model to the data was done by Nelson [19], and we, therefore, tested for normality. Table 10 presents the test statistics and their corresponding p-values. The normal model is strongly supported by all the test statistics for describing the wire connection strength data. Results in Table 9 show that the p-value of the our test statistic, $H_{m:n}$, is greater than other p-values.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a simple and powerful test for normality based on progressively Type-II censored order statistics and compared this new test with all previous tests proposed for normality. Using a simulation study, consistency of our test was illustrated and also power of the test for some various alternatives were obtained and summarized. It was apparent from Table 6 that none of the tests considered performs better than all other tests against all alternatives. Comparing with other tests, however, the proposed test $H_{m:n}$, was the most powerful with respect to approximately all censoring schemes. Then, the performance of our test was examined for a real data set and the results were completely coincided with the other tests.

References

[1] Aho, M., Bain, L.J., and Engelhardt, M., (1983). Goodness-of-fit tests for the Weibull distribution with unknown parameters and censored sampling, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **18**, 59–69.

Table 8: Estimated powers for Student's t distribution with three and four degrees of freedom, Logistic and double exponential distribution with parameters $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$ with $\alpha = 0.1$.

Scheme no.	dist.	$C^{+}_{m:n}$	$C^{-}_{m:n}$	$C_{m:n}$	$K_{m:n}$	$T^{(1)}_{m:n}$	$T^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G_{m:n}$	$Q_{m:n}$	$G^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G^{(3)}_{m:n}$	T	$\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$
[1]	$t_{(3)}$	0.2224	0.1112	0.2251	0.1681	0.2266	0.2158	0.2438	0.2528	**0.2676**	0.2341	0.2567	0.2638
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1807	0.1016	0.1770	0.1303	0.1738	0.1661	0.1946	0.2043	**0.2211**	0.1920	0.2056	0.2172
	$L(0,1)$	0.1232	0.1003	0.1114	0.0944	0.1199	0.1122	0.1369	0.1376	**0.1509**	0.1305	0.1217	0.1408
	$DE(0,1)$	0.1912	0.0943	0.1803	0.1251	0.1725	0.1668	0.2188	0.2322	**0.2377**	0.2216	0.1909	0.2286
[2]	$t_{(3)}$	0.2450	0.0507	0.1463	0.1459	0.1541	0.1554	0.2057	0.2272	0.1579	0.0754	0.2461	**0.2895**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1988	0.0616	0.1221	0.1234	0.1254	0.1257	0.1678	0.1839	0.1335	0.0766	0.1965	**0.2380**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1440	0.0682	0.0937	0.0985	0.1069	0.0989	0.1330	0.1321	0.1039	0.0956	0.1330	**0.1585**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2222	0.0489	0.1198	0.1313	0.1310	0.1317	0.1827	0.2078	0.1236	0.0694	0.1746	**0.2555**
[3]	$t_{(3)}$	0.2592	0.0471	0.1887	0.1288	0.1802	0.1771	0.2316	0.2541	0.2883	0.2570	0.2543	**0.3000**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2066	0.0572	0.1480	0.1098	0.1433	0.1385	0.1871	0.2004	0.2276	0.2085	0.2018	**0.2382**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1458	0.0715	0.1094	0.0920	0.1157	0.1092	0.1279	0.1345	0.1577	0.1364	0.1297	**0.1654**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2438	0.0402	0.1671	0.1210	0.1774	0.1673	0.2116	0.2423	0.2569	0.2372	0.1833	**0.2902**
[4]	$t_{(3)}$	0.2233	0.1464	0.2510	0.2000	0.2598	0.2583	0.2523	0.2716	0.3036	0.2802	**0.3071**	0.3008
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1772	0.1200	0.1879	0.1505	0.1921	0.1916	0.2021	0.2161	0.2424	0.2234	**0.2490**	0.2364
	$L(0,1)$	0.1235	0.0972	0.1318	0.1017	0.1180	0.1199	0.1416	0.1471	**0.1748**	0.1669	0.1411	0.1673
	$DE(0,1)$	0.1915	0.1195	0.2149	0.1647	0.2148	0.2029	0.2332	0.2661	**0.2904**	0.2734	0.2340	0.2702
[5]	$t_{(3)}$	0.2630	0.0448	0.1848	0.1526	0.1892	0.1873	0.2579	0.2807	0.3003	0.2657	0.3190	**0.3526**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2036	0.0546	0.1442	0.1229	0.1462	0.1438	0.2038	0.2227	0.2335	0.2112	0.2484	**0.2797**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1463	0.0721	0.1083	0.0929	0.1066	0.1136	0.1393	0.1591	0.1585	0.1380	0.1311	**0.1927**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2783	0.0343	0.1835	0.1485	0.1819	0.1890	0.2483	0.3087	0.3112	0.2776	0.1980	**0.3682**
[6]	$t_{(3)}$	0.0952	0.2467	0.1784	0.1908	0.2123	0.2259	0.2703	0.2895	0.2732	0.2211	**0.3386**	0.3367
	$t_{(4)}$	0.0819	0.1906	0.1373	0.1491	0.1626	0.1693	0.2159	0.2277	0.2173	0.1803	0.2727	**0.2748**
	$L(0,1)$	0.0767	0.1309	0.1092	0.1013	0.1064	0.1076	0.1497	0.1541	0.1435	0.1391	0.1434	**0.1826**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.0843	0.2266	0.1560	0.1698	0.1807	0.1941	0.2406	0.2847	0.2605	0.2406	0.2051	**0.3234**
[7]	$t_{(3)}$	0.2183	0.1881	0.2718	0.2332	0.2894	0.2865	0.2694	0.2832	0.2942	0.2586	**0.3407**	0.3193
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1698	0.1433	0.2018	0.1629	0.2102	0.2080	0.2119	0.2216	0.2364	0.2076	**0.2755**	0.2645
	$L(0,1)$	0.1205	0.1086	0.1183	0.0984	0.1231	0.1249	0.1484	0.1557	0.1540	0.1518	0.1539	**0.1707**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.1926	0.1646	0.2253	0.1824	0.2353	0.2485	0.2507	0.2738	0.2740	0.2617	0.2668	**0.2850**

Table 8: Continued

Scheme no.	dist.	$C^{+}_{m:n}$	$C^{-}_{m:n}$	$C_{m:n}$	$K_{m:n}$	$T^{(1)}_{m:n}$	$T^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G_{m:n}$	$Q_{m:n}$	$G^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G^{(3)}_{m:n}$	T	$\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$
[8]	$t_{(3)}$	0.2533	0.0740	0.2055	0.1652	0.2048	0.2021	0.2799	0.3089	0.3164	0.2917	0.3309	**0.3684**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1963	0.0701	0.1581	0.1251	0.1564	0.1558	0.2216	0.2406	0.2464	0.2266	0.2607	**0.2987**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1374	0.0761	0.1137	0.0954	0.1071	0.1090	0.1505	0.1650	0.1668	0.1400	0.1391	**0.1900**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2665	0.0625	0.2117	0.1632	0.2106	0.2097	0.2842	0.3321	0.3240	0.3061	0.2100	**0.3941**
[9]	$t_{(3)}$	0.1531	0.2330	0.2292	0.2185	0.2621	0.2663	0.2839	0.2997	0.2805	0.2255	**0.3479**	0.3204
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1178	0.1722	0.1679	0.1584	0.1911	0.2226	0.2381	0.2216	0.1805	**0.2810**	0.2607	0.2681
	$L(0,1)$	0.0944	0.1156	0.1169	0.1058	0.1124	0.1225	0.1594	**0.1632**	0.1523	0.1300	0.1447	0.1620
	$DE(0,1)$	0.1326	0.1940	0.2005	0.1843	0.2153	0.2279	0.2756	0.2964	0.2940	0.2189	0.2237	**0.2992**
[10]	$t_{(3)}$	0.3111	0.1037	0.3002	0.2300	0.3094	0.2918	0.3258	0.3457	0.3408	**0.3507**	0.3098	0.3380
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2386	0.0880	0.2204	0.1637	0.2253	0.2111	0.2521	0.2640	0.2750	**0.2759**	0.2432	0.2577
	$L(0,1)$	0.1514	0.0746	0.1295	0.1096	0.1328	0.1269	0.1585	0.1581	0.1691	**0.1960**	0.1477	0.1584
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2549	0.0782	0.2242	0.1646	0.2329	0.2091	0.2691	0.2883	0.2814	**0.3279**	0.2313	0.2556
[11]	$t_{(3)}$	0.3057	0.0404	0.1832	0.1939	0.1881	0.1952	0.2153	0.2417	0.0773	0.0473	0.03170	**0.3527**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2384	0.0488	0.1411	0.1539	0.1462	0.1520	0.1728	0.1920	0.0753	0.0589	0.2646	**0.2847**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1541	0.0704	0.1024	0.1173	0.0967	0.1101	0.1180	0.1301	0.0745	0.0855	0.1312	**0.1800**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2041	0.0484	0.1156	0.14434	0.1178	0.1268	0.1489	0.1594	0.0640	0.0540	0.1545	**0.2384**
[12]	$t_{(3)}$	0.1814	0.0720	0.1291	0.1465	0.1715	0.1835	0.2912	0.3369	0.3318	0.2963	0.3703	**0.4090**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1413	0.0594	0.1048	0.1082	0.1263	0.1393	0.2261	0.2566	0.2577	0.2303	0.2819	**0.3171**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1091	0.0614	0.0841	0.0842	0.897	0.0875	0.1341	0.1686	0.1528	0.1483	0.1453	**0.2013**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.1527	0.0372	0.0987	0.0914	0.1201	0.1205	0.2096	0.2754	0.2429	0.2413	0.2469	**0.3116**
[13]	$t_{(3)}$	0.1363	0.2004	0.3627	0.3282	0.3897	0.3860	0.3567	0.3866	0.4212	**0.4415**	0.3797	0.4318
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2544	0.1407	0.2617	0.2208	0.2738	0.2725	0.2689	0.2940	0.3319	**0.3501**	0.3018	0.3369
	$L(0,1)$	0.1415	0.1015	0.1456	0.1200	0.1407	0.1471	0.1645	0.1700	0.1828	**0.2236**	0.1651	0.2040
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2980	0.1557	0.2974	0.2668	0.3148	0.3241	0.2969	0.33276	0.3497	**0.3984**	0.2635	0.3751
[14]	$t_{(3)}$	0.4075	0.0375	0.2934	0.2543	0.3087	0.3124	0.3095	0.3592	0.3960	0.3913	0.4820	**0.5050**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.3070	0.0395	0.2076	0.1807	0.2100	0.2145	0.2359	0.2706	0.3071	0.3049	0.3729	**0.3886**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1848	0.0623	0.1267	0.1070	0.1177	0.1229	0.1504	0.1612	0.1758	0.1968	0.1374	**0.2325**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.4194	0.0186	0.2619	0.2113	0.2737	0.2944	0.2724	0.3205	0.3443	0.3652	0.2506	**0.4484**
[15]	$t_{(3)}$	0.1300	0.3242	0.2457	0.2549	0.2921	0.3088	0.3628	0.4177	0.4143	0.4054	0.4822	**0.5062**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.0962	0.2350	0.1700	0.1765	0.2003	0.2096	0.2773	0.3184	0.3150	0.3109	0.3797	**0.3987**
	$L(0,1)$	0.0751	0.1377	0.1073	0.1152	0.1136	0.1211	0.1723	0.1905	0.1932	0.1932	0.1624	**0.2454**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.1071	0.2996	0.2098	0.2307	0.2793	0.2967	0.3308	0.4087	0.3884	0.4057	0.2597	**0.4997**

Table 8: Continued

Scheme no.	dist.	$C^{+}_{m:n}$	$C^{-}_{m:n}$	$C_{m:n}$	$K_{m:n}$	$T^{(1)}_{m:n}$	$T^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G_{m:n}$	$Q_{m:n}$	$G^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G^{(3)}_{m:n}$	T	$\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$
[16]	$t_{(3)}$	0.3546	0.2936	0.4107	0.3990	0.4461	0.4501	0.3786	0.4153	0.4316	0.4186	0.4152	**0.4737**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2499	0.2000	0.2784	0.2635	0.3096	0.3087	0.2802	0.3084	0.3285	0.3197	0.3281	**0.3666**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1411	0.1157	0.1412	0.1272	0.1521	0.1467	0.1626	0.1852	0.1987	0.2013	0.1903	**0.2168**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.3175	0.2432	0.3443	0.3455	0.3900	0.3992	0.3292	0.3717	0.3921	0.4011	0.2906	**0.4573**
[17]	$t_{(3)}$	0.3961	0.0941	0.3201	0.2794	0.3346	0.3410	0.3847	0.4430	0.4615	0.4671	0.4998	**0.5470**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2920	0.0661	0.2259	0.1878	0.2373	0.2387	0.2865	0.3333	0.3481	0.3508	0.3894	**0.4317**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1695	0.0586	0.1278	0.1057	0.1246	0.1386	0.1648	0.1950	0.2115	0.2326	0.1632	**0.2567**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.4396	0.0527	0.3429	0.2903	0.3656	0.3753	0.3772	0.4531	0.4757	0.5266	0.2870	**0.5688**
[18]	$t_{(3)}$	0.3741	0.1213	0.3201	0.2835	0.3379	0.3416	0.3863	0.4400	0.4490	0.4538	0.4439	**0.5330**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.2769	0.0849	0.2244	0.1925	0.2365	0.2402	0.2889	0.3318	0.3426	0.3452	0.3461	**0.4115**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1582	0.0726	0.1246	0.1061	0.1395	0.1321	0.1864	0.1985	0.2037	0.2036	0.1576	**0.2479**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.3883	0.0976	0.3167	0.2919	0.3603	0.3329	0.3677	0.4269	0.4321	0.4699	0.2503	**0.5099**
[19]	$t_{(3)}$	0.4230	0.1869	0.4158	0.3865	0.4521	0.4469	0.4163	0.4513	0.4404	**0.5027**	0.3904	0.4785
	$t_{(4)}$	0.3098	0.1264	0.2962	0.2576	0.3154	0.3087	0.3096	0.3428	0.3365	**0.3904**	0.3073	0.3710
	$L(0,1)$	0.1777	0.0845	0.1550	0.1286	0.1536	0.1423	0.1826	0.1988	0.2162	**0.2221**	0.1680	0.2102
	$DE(0,1)$	0.3499	0.1380	0.3285	0.2934	0.3425	0.3261	0.3390	**0.3982**	0.3413	0.3860	0.2666	0.3971
[20]	$t_{(3)}$	0.4547	0.0220	0.3208	0.2860	0.3392	0.3472	0.2853	0.3377	0.2925	0.2383	0.5208	**0.5308**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.3478	0.0312	0.2229	0.2003	0.2332	0.2406	0.2152	0.2517	0.2161	0.1713	0.4021	**0.4154**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1985	0.0512	0.1223	0.1136	0.1235	0.1286	0.1461	0.1599	0.1195	0.1085	0.1399	**0.2434**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.3416	0.0224	0.2026	0.1761	0.2149	0.2176	0.2058	0.2468	0.1533	0.1207	0.2026	**0.3815**
[21]	$t_{(3)}$	0.1537	0.2744	0.2065	0.2770	0.2871	0.3231	0.3994	0.4680	0.4739	0.4303	0.5826	**0.6001**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1051	0.1762	0.1354	0.1757	0.1839	0.2116	0.2988	0.3540	0.3527	0.3163	0.4496	**0.4700**
	$L(0,1)$	0.0830	0.0999	0.0826	0.0891	0.1023	0.1047	0.1772	0.2033	0.1978	0.1796	0.1595	**0.2718**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.1355	0.1732	0.1407	0.1974	0.2154	0.2346	0.3432	0.4297	0.4373	0.4069	0.2931	**0.5277**

Table 8: Continued

Scheme no.	Dis.	$C^{+}_{m:n}$	$C^{-}_{m:n}$	$C_{m:n}$	$K_{m:n}$	$T^{(1)}_{m:n}$	$T^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G_{m:n}$	$Q_{m:n}$	$G^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G^{(3)}_{m:n}$	T	$\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$
[22]	$t_{(3)}$	0.4571	0.3707	0.5185	0.5201	0.5653	**0.5719**	0.4529	0.5039	0.5243	0.5370	0.4446	0.5715
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1963	0.0701	0.1581	0.1251	0.1564	0.1558	0.2216	0.2406	0.2464	0.2266	0.2607	**0.4462**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1503	0.1237	0.1621	0.1491	0.1786	0.1764	0.1805	0.2000	0.2090	0.2298	0.1911	**0.2441**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.3981	0.2911	0.4360	0.4678	0.5049	**0.5090**	0.3715	0.4322	0.4402	0.4912	0.3024	0.4984
[23]	$t_{(3)}$	0.5234	0.1172	0.4238	0.3831	0.4550	0.4567	0.4385	0.5148	0.5779	0.5981	0.6351	**0.6714**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.3841	0.0652	0.2840	0.2454	0.3064	0.3083	0.3228	0.3847	0.4409	0.4929	0.2607	**0.5298**
	$L(0,1)$	0.2163	0.0518	0.1472	0.1265	0.1473	0.1502	0.1886	0.2124	0.2422	0.2622	0.1712	**0.3148**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.6119	0.0461	0.4696	0.4136	0.5146	0.5225	0.4309	0.5162	0.6080	0.6556	0.4060	**0.6967**
[24]	$t_{(3)}$	0.3141	0.4451	0.4329	0.4479	0.4833	0.4927	0.4523	0.5161	0.5161	0.5193	0.5263	**0.6261**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.1950	0.3175	0.2862	0.2975	0.3233	0.3324	0.3371	0.3890	0.3876	0.3912	0.4167	**0.4838**
	$L(0,1)$	0.0990	0.1656	0.1488	0.1408	0.1557	0.1548	0.1984	0.2225	0.2316	0.2301	0.1749	**0.2938**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.2946	0.4103	0.4173	0.4244	0.4865	0.4846	0.4079	0.4856	0.4971	0.5211	0.3063	**0.5832**
[25]	$t_{(3)}$	0.4838	0.4407	0.5496	0.5684	0.6065	**0.6245**	0.4657	0.5189	0.5224	0.5280	0.4634	0.5940
	$t_{(4)}$	0.3296	0.2879	0.3724	0.3788	0.4189	0.4261	0.3361	0.3809	0.3902	0.3910	0.36369	**0.4659**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1552	0.1360	0.1606	0.1605	0.1834	0.1788	0.1849	0.1992	0.2157	0.2224	0.1977	**0.2639**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.4304	0.3850	0.4865	0.5501	0.5685	**0.5850**	0.3942	0.4436	0.4715	0.4904	0.3039	0.5128
[26]	$t_{(3)}$	0.4908	0.1752	0.4140	0.4005	0.4492	0.4552	0.4645	0.5355	0.5497	0.5744	0.5754	**0.6567**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.3548	0.1029	0.2788	0.2605	0.3021	0.3077	0.3456	0.3989	0.4124	0.4333	0.4447	**0.5107**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1839	0.0697	0.1562	0.1206	0.1558	0.1527	0.1997	0.2219	0.2333	0.2504	0.1666	**0.3074**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.5219	0.1568	0.4641	0.4382	0.5160	0.4952	0.4495	0.5341	0.5499	0.6007	0.3264	**0.6580**
[27]	$t_{(3)}$	0.4670	0.2110	0.4169	0.4109	0.4574	0.4616	0.4619	0.5236	0.5275	0.5526	0.4998	**0.6217**
	$t_{(4)}$	0.3330	0.1286	0.2819	0.2719	0.3149	0.3146	0.3428	0.3917	0.3980	0.4155	0.3871	**0.4983**
	$L(0,1)$	0.1796	0.0861	0.1443	0.1315	0.1537	0.1545	0.1905	0.2172	0.2170	0.2393	0.1635	0.**2842**
	$DE(0,1)$	0.4800	0.2140	0.4486	0.4521	0.5073	0.5037	0.4226	0.4995	0.5100	0.5325	0.2744	**0.6037**

Table 9: Wire connection strength data and the progressive Type-II censoring scheme.

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$x_{i:m:n}$	550	750	950	1150	1150	1150	1350	1450	1550	1850
r_i	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	2	0	2

Table 10: Test statistics and the corresponding p-values for the data given in Table 9 when testing for the normal distribution.

Criterion	$C^+_{m:n}$	$C^-_{m:n}$	$C_{m:n}$	$K_{m:n}$	$T^{(1)}_{m:n}$	$T^{(2)}_{m:n}$
Test statistic	0.0946	0.0893	0.0946	0.1839	0.0021	0.0352
p-value	0.6576	0.3809	0.7057	0.5364	0.8020	0.8735

Criterion	$G_{m:n}$	$Q_{m:n}$	$G^{(2)}_{m:n}$	$G^{(3)}_{m:n}$	T	$\mathrm{H}_{m:n}$
Test statistic	6.8499	10.9208	26.7465	63.8562	0.4568	0.3220
p-value	0.7152	0.6476	0.6879	0.6689	0.6450	0.8091

1

[2] Balakrishnan, N. and Aggarwala, R., (2000). *Progressive Censoring: Theory, Methods, and Applications*, Birkhäuser, Boston.

[3] Balakrishnan, N., Ng, H.K.T. and Kannan, N., (2002). A test of exponentiality based on spacings for progressively Type-II censored data, in*Goodness-of-Fit Tests and Model Validity*, Huber-Carol, C., Balakrishnan, N., Nikulin, M.S. and Mesbah, M., eds., Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 89–111.

[4] Balakrishnan, N., Ng, H.K.T. and Kannan N., (2004). Goodness-of-fit tests based on spacings for progressively Type-II censored data from a general location-scale distribution, *IEEE Transaction on Reliability*, **53**, 349-356.

[5] Balakrishnan, N., Habibi Rad, A. and Arghami, N.R., (2007). Testing exponentiality based on Kullback–Leibler information with progressively Type-II censored data, *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, **56**, 301–307.

[6] Balakrishnan, N., (2007). Progressive censoring methodology: an appraisal (with discussions), *Test*, **16**, 211-296.

[7] Barr, D.R. and Davidson, T., (1973). A Kolmogorov–Smirnov test for censored samples, *Technometrics*, 15, 739–757.

[8] Brunk, H.D., (1962). On the range of difference between hypothetical distribution function and Pyke's modified empirical distribution function, *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **33**, 525–532.

[9] Casella, G. and Berger, R.L., (2002). *Statistical Inference*, 2nd Edition, Duxbury Press.

[10] D'Agostino, R.B. and Stephens, M.A., (eds.), (1986). Goodness-of-Fit Techniques, Marcel Dekker, NewYork.

[11] Greenwood, M., (1964). The statistical study of infectious diseases, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A*, **109**, 85–110.

[12] Hartley, H.O. and Pfaffenberger, R.C., (1972). Quadratic forms in order statistics used as goodness-of-fit criteria, *Biometrika*, **59**, 605–611.

[13] Hegazy, Y.A.S. and Green, J.R., (1975). Some new goodness-of-fit tests using order statistics, *Journal of Applied Statistics*, **24**, 299–308.

[14] Huber-Carol, C., Balakrishnan, N., Nikulin, M.S. and Mesbah, M., (eds.), (2002). *Goodness-of-Fit Tests and Model Validity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA.

[15] King, J.R., (1971). *Probability Charts for Decision Making*, Industrial Press, New York.

[16] Lin, C.T., Huang, Y.L. and Balakrishnan, N., (2008). A new method for goodness-of-fit testing based on Type-II right censored samples, *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, **75**, 633–642.

[17] Lurie, D., Hartley, H.O. and Stroud, M.R., (1974). A goodness-of-fit test for censored data, *Communications in Statistics*, **3**, 745–753.

[18] Moran, P.A.P., (1951). The random division of an interval–Part I, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **9**, 92–98.

[19] Nelson, W., (1982). *Applied Life Data Analysis*, John Wiley Sons New York.

[20] Pakyari, R. and Balakrishnan, N., (2012). A general purpose approximate goodness-of-fit for progressively Type-II censored data, to appear in IEEE Transactions on Reliability.

[21] Pakyari, R. and Balakrishnan, N., (2013). Goodness-of-fit tests for progressively Type-II censored data from location–scale distributions, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **83** (1), 167–178.

[22] Pearson, K., (1900). On the criterion that a given system of deviations from the probable in the case of a correlated system of variables is such that it can be reasonably supposed to have arisen from random sampling, *Philosophical Magazine Series*, **5(50)**, 157–175.

[23] Pettitt, A.N. and Stephens, M.A., (1976). Modified Cramér-von Mises statistics for censored data, *Biometrika*, **63**, 291–298.

[24] Quesenberry, C.P. and Miller, F.L. Jr, (1975). Power studies of some tests for uniformity, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **5**, 169–191.

[25] Smith, R.M., and Bain, L.J., (1976). Correlation type goodness-of-fit statistics with censored samples, *Communications in Statistics-theory and Methods*, **5**, 119–132.

[26] Stephens, M.A., (1969). Results from the relation between two statistics of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov type, *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **40**, 1833–1837.


[27] Stephens, M.A., (1986). Tests based on EDF statistics, in *Goodness-of-Fit Techniques*, D'Agostino, R.B. and Stephens, M.A., eds., Marcel Dekker, NewYork, 97–193.

[28] Torabi, H., (2006). A new method for hypotheses testing using spacing, *Statistical and Probability Letters*, **76**, 1345-1347.

[29] Torabi, H., (2008). A general method for estimating hypotheses testing using spacing, *Journal of Statistical Theory and Applications*, **8(2)**, 163-168.

[30] Viveros, R. and Balakrishnan, N., (1994). Interval estimation of life characteristics from progressively censored data. *Technometrics*, **36**, 84-91.

[31] Wang, B., (2008). Goodness-of-fit test for the exponential distribution based on progressively Type-II censored sample, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, **78**, 125–132.


x^2
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
x

This figure "h.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

http://arxiv.org/ps/1704.06787v1