

Comparison of Efficiencies of some Symmetry Tests around an Unknown Center

Bojana Milošević*, Marko Obradović †

Faculty of Mathematics, University of Belgrade, Studentski trg 16, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

In this paper, some recent and classical tests of symmetry are modified for the case of an unknown center. The unknown center is estimated with its α -trimmed mean estimator. The asymptotic behavior of the new tests is explored. The local approximate Bahadur efficiency is used to compare the tests to each other as well as to some other tests.

keywords: U-statistics with estimated parameters; α -trimmed mean; asymptotic efficiency

MSC(2010): 62G10, 62G20

1 Introduction

The problem of testing symmetry has been popular for decades, mainly due to the fact that many statistical methods depend on the assumption of symmetry. The well-known examples are the robust estimators of location such as trimmed means that implicitly assume that the data come from a symmetric distribution. Another example are the bootstrap confidence intervals, that tend to converge faster when the corresponding pivotal quantity is symmetrically distributed.

Probably the most famous symmetry tests are the classical sign and Wilcoxon tests, as well as the tests proposed following the example of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramer-von Mises statistics (see. [37, 13, 34]). Other examples of papers on this topic include [23, 1, 10, 11, 6, 12, 31, 27, 2].

All of these symmetry tests are designed for the case of a known center of distribution. They share many nice properties such as distribution-freeness under the null symmetry hypothesis.

There have been many attempts to adapt these tests to the case of an unknown center. Some modified Wilcoxon tests can be found in [9, 3, 4] and a modified sign test in [17].

There also exist some symmetry tests originally designed for testing symmetry around an unknown center. The famous $\sqrt{b_1}$ test is one of the examples. Some other tests have been proposed in [29, 14, 26].

The goal of our paper is to compare some symmetry tests around an unknown center. Instead of commonly used power comparison (see e.g. [26, 38, 29, 15]),

*bojana@matf.bg.ac.rs

†marcone@matf.bg.ac.rs

here we compare the tests using the local asymptotic efficiency. We opt for the approximate Bahadur efficiency since it is applicable to asymptotically non-normally distributed test statistics. The Bahadur efficiency of symmetry tests has been considered in, among others, [8, 25, 19, 28].

Consider the setting of testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \theta \in \Theta_0$ against the alternative $H_1 : \theta \in \Theta_1$. Let us suppose that for a test statistic T_n , under H_0 , the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P\{T_n \leq t\} = F(t)$, where F is non-degenerate distribution function, exists. Further, suppose that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-2} \log(1 - F(t)) = -\frac{a_T}{2}$, and that the limit in probability $P_\theta \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = b_T(\theta) > 0$, exists for $\theta \in \Theta_1$. The relative approximate Bahadur efficiency with respect to another test statistic V_n is

$$e_{T,V}^*(\theta) = \frac{c_T^*(\theta)}{c_V^*(\theta)},$$

where

$$c_T^*(\theta) = a_T b_T^2(\theta) \quad (1)$$

is the approximate Bahadur slope of T_n . Its limit when $\theta \rightarrow 0$ is called the local approximate Bahadur efficiency.

The tests we consider may be classified into two groups according to their limiting distributions: asymptotically normal ones; and those whose asymptotic distribution coincides with the supremum of some Gaussian process.

For the first group of tests, the coefficient a_T is the inverse of the limiting variance. For the second, it is the inverse of the supremum of the covariance function of the limiting process (see [24]).

2 Test statistics

Most of considered tests are obtained by modifying the symmetry tests around known location parameter. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be an i.i.d. sample with distribution function F . The tests are applied to the sample shifted by the value of the location estimator. Typical choices of location estimators are the mean and the median. Here we take a more general approach, using α -trimmed means

$$\mu(\alpha) = \frac{1}{1 - 2\alpha} \int_{F^{-1}(\alpha)}^{F^{-1}(1-\alpha)} x dF(x), \quad 0 < \alpha < 1/2,$$

including their boundary cases $\mu(0)$ – the mean and $\mu(1/2)$ – the median. The estimator is

$$\hat{\mu}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{1 - 2\alpha} \int_{F_n^{-1}(\alpha)}^{F_n^{-1}(1-\alpha)} x dF_n(x), \quad 0 < \alpha < 1/2. \quad (2)$$

In the case of $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1/2$, the estimators are the sample mean and the sample median, respectively.

The modified statistics we consider in this paper are:

- Modified sign test

$$S = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I\{X_j - \hat{\mu}(\alpha) > 0\} - \frac{1}{2};$$

- Modified Wilcoxon test

$$W = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbf{I}\{X_i + X_j - 2\hat{\mu}(\alpha) > 0\} - \frac{1}{2};$$

- Modified Kolmogorov-Smirnov symmetry test

$$KS = \sup_t |F_n(t + \hat{\mu}(\alpha)) + F_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha) - t) - 1|;$$

- Modified tests based on the Baringhaus-Henze characterization (see [7, 22])

$$\begin{aligned} BH^I &= \frac{1}{n \binom{n}{2}} \sum_{i_3=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{C}_2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}\{|X_{i_1} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_3} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}\{|X_{i_2} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_3} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbf{I}\{|X_{2;X_{i_1},X_{i_2}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_3} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} \right); \\ BH^K &= \sup_{t>0} \left| \frac{1}{n \binom{n}{2}} \sum_{\mathcal{C}_2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}\{|X_{i_1} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_3} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}\{|X_{i_2} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_3} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \mathbf{I}\{|X_{2;X_{i_1},X_{i_2}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < t\} \right) \right|; \end{aligned}$$

- Modified tests based on the Ahsanullah's characterization (see [31])

$$\begin{aligned} NA^I(k) &= \frac{1}{n \binom{n}{k}} \sum_{i_{k+1}=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{C}_k} \left(\mathbf{I}\{|X_{1;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_k}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_{k+1}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbf{I}\{|X_{k;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_k}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_{k+1}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} \right); \\ NA^K(k) &= \sup_{t>0} \left| \frac{1}{n \binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\mathcal{C}_k} \left(\mathbf{I}\{|X_{1;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_k}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < t\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \mathbf{I}\{|X_{k;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_k}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < t\} \right) \right|; \end{aligned}$$

- Modified tests based on the Milošević-Obradović characterization (see [27])

$$\begin{aligned} MO^I(k) &= \frac{1}{n \binom{n}{2k}} \sum_{i_{2k+1}=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{C}_{2k}} \left(\mathbf{I}\{|X_{k;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_{2k}}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_{2k+1}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbf{I}\{|X_{k+1;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_{2k}}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < |X_{i_{2k+1}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)|\} \right); \\ MO^K(k) &= \sup_{t>0} \left| \frac{1}{n \binom{n}{2k}} \sum_{\mathcal{C}_{2k}} \left(\mathbf{I}\{|X_{k;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_{2k}}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < t\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \mathbf{I}\{|X_{k+1;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_{2k}}} - \hat{\mu}(\alpha)| < t\} \right) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where $X_{k;X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_m}}$ stands for the k th order statistic of the subsample X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_m} , and $\mathcal{C}_m = \{(i_1, \dots, i_m) : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq n\}$.

Note that $\text{NA}^I(2)$ and $\text{MO}^I(1)$ coincide. The same holds for $\text{NA}^K(2)$ and $\text{MO}^K(1)$.

Among the tests originally intended for testing symmetry around an unknown mean, the most famous is classical $\sqrt{b_1}$ test, based on the sample skewness coefficient, with test statistic

$$\sqrt{b_1} = \frac{\hat{m}_3}{s^3}, \quad (3)$$

where \hat{m}_3 is the sample third central moment and s is sample standard deviation. The test is applicable if the sample comes from a distribution with finite sixth moment.

We also consider the class of tests based on so-called Bonferoni measure. In [14] the following test statistic is proposed:

$$\text{CM} = \frac{\bar{X} - \hat{M}}{s},$$

where \hat{M} is the sample median and s is the sample standard deviation. Similar tests are proposed in [29] and [26], with the following statistic

$$\gamma = 2(\bar{X} - \hat{M})$$

$$\text{MGG} = \frac{\bar{X} - \hat{M}}{J}, \text{ where } J = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |X_i - \hat{M}|.$$

These tests are applicable if the sample comes from a distribution with finite second moment.

For the supremum-type tests, we consider large values of test statistic to be significant. For others, which are asymptotically normally distributed, we consider large absolute values of tests statistic to be significant.

3 Bahadur approximate Slopes

We can divide the considered test statistics into three groups based on their structure:

- non-degenerate U-statistics with estimated parameters;
- the suprema of families of non-degenerate (in sense of [30]) U-statistics with estimated parameters;
- other statistics with limiting normal distribution.

Since we are dealing with U-statistics with estimated location parameters, we shall examine their limiting distribution using the technique from [33]. With this in mind, we give the following definition.

Definition 3.1 *Let \mathcal{U} be the family of U-statistics $U_n(\mu)$, with bounded symmetric kernel $\Phi(\cdot; \mu)$, that satisfy the following conditions:*

- $EU_n(\mu) = 0$;

- $\sqrt{n}U_n$ converges to normal distribution whose variance does not depend on μ ;
- For $K(\mu, d)$, a neighbourhood of μ of a radius d , there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that, if $\mu' \in K(\mu, d)$ then

$$E\left(\sup_{\mu' \in K(\mu, d)} |\Phi(\cdot; \mu') - \Phi(\cdot; \mu)|\right) \leq Cd.$$

All our U-statistics belong to this family due to unbiasedness, non-degeneracy and uniform boundness of their kernels.

Since our comparison tool is the local asymptotic efficiency, we are going to consider alternatives close to some symmetric distribution. Therefore, we define the family of close alternatives that satisfy some regularity conditions (see also [32]).

Definition 3.2 Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G(x; \theta)\}$ be the family of absolutely continuous distribution functions, with densities $g(x; \theta)$, satisfying the following conditions:

- $g(x; \theta)$ is symmetric around some location parameter μ if and only if $\theta = 0$;
- $g(x; \theta)$ is twice continuously differentiable along θ in some neighbourhood of zero;
- all second derivatives of $g(x; \theta)$ exist and are absolutely integrable for θ in some neighbourhood of zero.

For brevity, in what follows, we shall use the following notation:

$$F(x) := G(x, 0); \quad f(x) := g(x, 0); \quad H(x) := G'_\theta(x, 0); \quad h(x) := g'_\theta(x, 0).$$

The null hypothesis of symmetry can now be expressed as: $H_0 : \theta = 0$. To calculate the local approximate slope (1), we need to find the variance of the limiting normal distribution under the null hypothesis, as well as the limit in probability under a close alternative. We achieve this goal using the following two theorems.

Theorem 3.3 Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ be an i.i.d. sample from an absolutely continuous symmetric distribution, with distribution function F . Let $U_n(\mu)$ with kernel $\Phi(\mathbf{X}; \mu)$ be a U-statistic of order m from the family \mathcal{U} ; and let $\hat{\mu}(\alpha)$, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1/2$, be the α -trimmed sample mean (2). Then $\sqrt{n}U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha))$ converges in distribution to a zero mean normal random variable with the following variance:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{U,F}^2(\alpha) = & m^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^2(x) f(x) dx + \frac{2}{(1-2\alpha)^2} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f'(x) dx \right)^2 \right. \\ & \cdot \left(\int_0^{q_{1-\alpha}} x^2 f(x) dx + \alpha(q_{1-\alpha})^2 \right) + \frac{4}{1-2\alpha} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f'(x) dx \right) \\ & \cdot \left. \left(\int_0^{q_{1-\alpha}} \varphi(x) x f(x) dx + q_{1-\alpha} \int_{q_{1-\alpha}}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f(x) dx \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, where $\varphi(x) = E(\Phi(\mathbf{X}; \mu) | X_1 = x)$ is the first projection of the kernel $\Phi(\mathbf{X}; \mu)$ on a basic observation, and $q_{1-\alpha} = F^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$ th quantile of F .

In the case of boundary values of α , the expression above becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{U,F}^2(0) = & m^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^2(x) f(x) dx + 2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f'(x) dx \right)^2 \left(\int_0^{\infty} x^2 f(x) dx \right) \right. \\ & \left. + 4 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f'(x) dx \right) \cdot \left(\int_0^{\infty} \varphi(x) x f(x) dx \right) \right),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{U,F}^2(1/2) = & m^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^2(x) f(x) dx + \frac{1}{4f^2(0)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f'(x) dx \right)^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{2}{f(0)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f'(x) dx \right) \cdot \left(\int_0^{\infty} \varphi(x) f(x) dx \right) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove only the case $0 < \alpha < 0.5$. The rest are analogous and simpler.

Notice that $\hat{\mu}(\alpha)$ has its Bahadur representation [35]

$$\hat{\mu}(\alpha) - \mu(\alpha) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_{\alpha,F}(X_j) + R_n, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\psi_{\alpha,F}(x) = \frac{1}{1-2\alpha} \int_{\alpha}^{1-\alpha} \frac{t - I\{x < F^{-1}(t)\}}{f(F^{-1}(t))} dt$$

is the influence curve of $\mu(\alpha)$, and $\sqrt{n}R_n$ converges in probability to zero.

Using the multivariate central limit theorem for U-statistics we conclude that the joint limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}U_n$ and $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu}(\alpha) - \mu(\alpha))$ is bivariate normal $\mathcal{N}_2(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} m^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^2(x) dF(x) & m \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{\alpha,F}(x) \varphi(x) dF(x) \\ m \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{\alpha,F}(x) \varphi(x) dF(x) & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{\alpha,F}^2(x) dF(x) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, the conditions 2.3 and 2.9B of [33, Theorem 2.13] are satisfied.

Hence we have $\sqrt{n}U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{U,F}^2(\alpha))$ where

$$\sigma_{U,F}^2(\alpha) = [1, A]^T \Sigma [1, A], \text{ and } A = E_{\gamma} \Phi(\cdot; \mu)_{\mu}' \Big|_{\mu=\gamma} = m \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) f'(x) dx.$$

□

Theorem 3.4 Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.3, the limit in probability of the modified statistic $U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha))$ under alternative $g(x; \theta) \in \mathcal{G}$ is

$$b(\theta, \alpha) = m \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) (h(x) + \mu'_{\theta}(0, \alpha) f'(x)) dx \cdot \theta + o(\theta),$$

where $\mu'_{\theta}(0, \alpha) = \frac{1}{1-2\alpha} \left(-q_{1-\alpha} \left(H(q_{1-\alpha}) + H(-q_{1-\alpha}) \right) + \int_{-q_{1-\alpha}}^{q_{1-\alpha}} x h(x) dx \right)$, for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, $\mu'_{\theta}(0, 1/2) = -H(0)/f(0)$, and $\mu'_{\theta}(0, 0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x h(x) dx$.

Proof. Let $L(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ be the likelihood function of the sample. Using the law of large numbers for U -statistics with estimated parameters (see [20]), the limit in probability of $U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha))$ is

$$\begin{aligned} b(\theta, \alpha) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(\mathbf{x} - \mu(\theta, \alpha)) L(\mathbf{x}; \theta) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(\mathbf{x}) L(\mathbf{x} + \mu(\theta, \alpha); \theta) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(\mathbf{x}) \prod_{i=1}^n g(x_i + \mu(\theta, \alpha); \theta) d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

The first derivative with respect to θ at $\theta = 0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} b'(0, \alpha) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(\mathbf{x}) \left[\sum_{j=1}^n (\mu'(0, \alpha) f'(x_j) + h(x_j)) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^n f(x_i) \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &= m \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x) ((\mu'(0, \alpha) f'(x) + h(x))) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding $b(\theta, \alpha)$ in the Maclaurin series we complete the proof. \square

In the case of supremum-type statistics, the following two theorems, analogous to the Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4, are used.

Theorem 3.5 *Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ be an i.i.d. sample from an absolutely continuous symmetric distribution, with function F . Let $\{U_n(\mu; t)\}$ be a non-degenerate family of U -statistics of order m with kernel $\Phi(\cdot; t)$, that belong to the family \mathcal{U} ; and let $\hat{\mu}(\alpha)$, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 0.5$, be the α -trimmed sample mean (2). Then the family $\{U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t)\}$ is also non-degenerate with the variance function*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{U,F}^2(\alpha; t) &= m^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^2(x; t) f(x) dx + \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f'(x) dx \right)^2 \frac{2}{(1-2\alpha)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_0^{q_{1-\alpha}} x^2 f(x) dx + \alpha (q_{1-\alpha})^2 \right) + \frac{4}{1-2\alpha} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f'(x) dx \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left. \left(\int_0^{q_{1-\alpha}} \varphi(x; t) x f(x) dx + q_{1-\alpha} \int_{q_{1-\alpha}}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f(x) dx \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. In the case of boundary values of α , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{U,F}^2(0; t) &= m^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^2(x; t) f(x) dx \right. \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f'(x) dx \right)^2 \left(\int_0^{\infty} x^2 f(x) dx \right) \\ &\quad \left. + 4 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f'(x) dx \right) \cdot \left(\int_0^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) x f(x) dx + \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{U,F}^2(1/2; t) &= m^2 \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^2(x; t) f(x) dx \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4f^2(0)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f'(x) dx \right)^2 \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2}{f(0)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f'(x) dx \right) \cdot \left(\int_0^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) f(x) dx \right) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\sqrt{n} \sup |U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t)|$ converges in distribution to the supremum of a certain centered Gaussian process.

Proof. The asymptotic behaviour of $\sqrt{n}U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t)$ for a fixed t is established in Theorem 3.3.

From [33, Theorem 2.8] we have

$$U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t) \stackrel{d}{=} U_n(\mu; t) + \eta_0(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t) + R'_n, \quad (5)$$

where $\sqrt{n}R'_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and $\eta_0(\mu; t) = EU_n(\mu; t)$.

Next, using the mean value theorem and the Bahadur representation (4), we get

$$\eta_0(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \eta_0(\mu(\alpha); t) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_{\alpha, F}(X_j) + R''_n, \quad (6)$$

where $\sqrt{n}R''_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

Combining (5) and (6) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t) &\stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{n} \left(U_n(\mu; t) + \eta_0(\mu(\alpha); t) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \eta_0(\mu(\alpha); t) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_{\alpha, F}(X_j) \right) + \sqrt{n}(R'_n + R''_n) \\ &= \sqrt{n}U_n^*(\mu(\alpha); t) + \sqrt{n}R_n.\end{aligned}$$

$U_n^*(\mu(\alpha); t)$ is asymptotically equivalent to a family of U-statistics with symmetrized kernel

$$\Xi(\mathbf{X}; \mu(\alpha), t) = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \eta_0(\mu(\alpha); t) \sum_{j=1}^m \psi_{\alpha, F}(X_j) + \Phi(\mathbf{X}; \mu(\alpha), t).$$

Using the result from [36], we have that $\sqrt{n}U_n^*$ converges in distribution to a zero mean Gaussian process. Then, since $\sqrt{n}R_n$ converges to zero in probability, using the Slutsky theorem for stochastic processes [21, Theorem 7.15], we complete the proof. \square

Theorem 3.6 *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.5, the limit in probability of the modified statistic $\sup_t |U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t)|$, under alternative $g(x; \theta) \in \mathcal{G}$, is*

$$b(\theta, \alpha) = m \sup_t \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(x; t) (h(x) + \mu'_\theta(0, \alpha) f'(x)) dx \right| \cdot \theta + o(\theta),$$

Proof. The limit in probability of $U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t)$ for a fixed t is established in Theorem 3.4. Denote $\eta(\mu; t) = E_\theta(U_n(\mu; t))$ and let $\eta(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t)$ be its estimator. From [20, Theorem 2.9] we have that $U_n(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t) - \eta(\mu; t) = U_n(\mu; t) - \eta(\mu; t) + \eta(\hat{\mu}(\alpha); t) - \eta(\mu; t)$ with probability one. Then using Glivenko-Cantelli theorem for U-statistics [18] we complete the proof. \square

Finally, the following two theorems give us the Bahadur approximate slopes of the tests based on the Bonferoni measure and $\sqrt{b_1}$, respectively.

Theorem 3.7 *Let (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) be an i.i.d. sample with distribution function $G(x, \theta) \in \mathcal{G}$. Then the Bahadur approximate slopes of test statistics CM, γ , and MGG are equal to*

$$c(\theta) = \frac{\left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} xh(x)dx + \frac{H(0)}{f(0)} \right)^2}{\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{4f^2(0)} - \frac{\tau}{f(0)}} \cdot \theta^2 + o(\theta^2), \theta \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\sigma^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 f(x)dx$ and $\tau = 2 \int_0^{\infty} xf(x)dx$.

Proof. We shall prove the theorem in the case of statistic CM. The other cases are completely analogous.

Denote $D = \bar{X} - \hat{M}$. Notice that D is ancillary for the location parameter μ . Hence, we may suppose that $\mu = 0$. Using the Bahadur representation we have

$$D = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i - \frac{\text{sgn}(X_i)}{2f(0)} \right) + R_n,$$

where $\sqrt{n}R_n$ converges to zero in probability. Using the central limit theorem we have that the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}D$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$ is normal with zero mean and the variance

$$\text{Var} \left(X_1 - \frac{\text{sgn}(X_1)}{2f(0)} \right) = \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{4f^2(0)} - \frac{\tau}{f(0)}. \quad (7)$$

Using the Slutsky theorem we obtain that the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}\text{CM}$ is zero mean normal with the variance

$$\left(\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{4f^2(0)} - \frac{\tau}{f(0)} \right) \sigma^{-1}.$$

Next, using the law of large numbers and the Slutsky theorem, we have that the limit in probability under a close alternative $G(x, \theta) \in \mathcal{G}$ is

$$b(\theta) = \frac{m(\theta) - \mu(\theta)}{\sigma(\theta)},$$

where $m(\theta)$, $\mu(\theta)$ and $\sigma(\theta)$ are the mean, the median and the standard deviation, respectively. Expanding $b(\theta)$ in the Maclaurin series, and combining with (7) into (1), we complete the proof. \square

Theorem 3.8 *Let (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) be an i.i.d. sample with distribution function $G(x, \theta) \in \mathcal{G}$. Then the Bahadur approximate slope of test statistic $\sqrt{b_1}$ is*

$$c(\theta) = \frac{\left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^3 h(x) dx - 3\sigma^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x h(x) dx \right)^2}{m_6 - 6\sigma^2 m_4 + 9\sigma^6} \cdot \theta^2 + o(\theta^2), \theta \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\sigma^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 f(x) dx$, and m_j is the j th central moment of F .

The proof goes along the same lines as in the previous theorem, so we omit it here.

4 Comparison of the Tests

Since no test is distribution free, we need to choose the null variance in order to calculate the local approximate slope. Since we deal with the alternatives close to symmetric, it is natural to choose the closest symmetric distribution for the null.

4.1 Null and Alternative Hypotheses

We consider the normal, the logistic and the Cauchy as null distributions. Using Theorem 3.3 we calculated the asymptotic variances of all our integral-type statistics, as well as the suprema of variance functions of the supremum-type statistics. In Figure 4.1 we present the limiting variances of some integral-type statistics as function of the trimming coefficient α . It can be noticed that for some values of α the variances are very close to each other. This "asymptotic quasi distribution freeness" might be of practical importance providing an alternative to standard bootstrap procedures.




Figure 1: Limiting variances of integral test statistics — green line — normal; blue line — logistic; red line — Cauchy;

For each null distribution, we consider two types of close alternatives from \mathcal{G} :

- a skew alternative in the sense of Fernandez-Steel [16], with the density

$$g(x; \theta) = \frac{2}{1 + \theta + \frac{1}{1+\theta}} \left(g\left(\frac{x}{1+\theta}; 0\right) I\{x < 0\} + g((1+\theta)x; 0) I\{x \geq 0\} \right) \quad (8)$$

- a contamination alternative with the density

$$g(x; \theta) = (1 - \theta)g(x; 0) + \theta g(x - 1; 0). \quad (9)$$

Another popular family of alternatives are the Azzalini skew alternatives (see [5]). However, in the case of the skew-normal distribution, all our test have zero efficiencies, while in the skew-Cauchy case, the Bahadur efficiency is not defined. Hence, these alternatives are not suitable for comparison, and we decided not to include them.

4.2 Bahadur equivalence

It turns out that some tests have identical Bahadur approximate slopes. With this in mind, we say that two tests are Bahadur equivalent if their Bahadur local approximate slopes coincide. It is then sufficient to consider just one representative from each equivalence class for comparison purposes.

We have the following Bahadur equivalence classes:

- $BH^I \sim MO^I(1) \sim NA^I(2) \sim NA^I(3)$ for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1/2$;
- $BH^K \sim MO^K(1) \sim NA^K(2) \sim NA^K(3)$ for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1/2$;
- $CM \sim \gamma \sim MGG \sim S(\hat{\mu}(0))$;
- $KS(\hat{\mu}(\alpha)) \sim S(\hat{\mu}(\alpha))$ (up to a certain value of α).

The first three equivalence classes can be easily obtained from the expressions for the corresponding Bahadur approximate slopes. For the fourth equivalence, notice that the term which is maximized in the KS statistic, for $t = 0$, is twice the absolute value of the S statistic. So, these tests are equivalent whenever both the supremum of the asymptotic variance and the supremum of the limit in probability, are reached for $t = 0$ (see Figure 4.2 as an example). This is the case for small α , from zero up to certain point that depends on the underlying null and alternative distributions.

4.3 Discussion

Using Theorems 3.3-3.8 we calculated the local approximate Bahadur slopes for all statistics, all null and all alternative distributions.

Taking into account the Bahadur equivalence, we choose the following tests: BH^I and BH^K ; $NA^I(4)$ and $NA^K(4)$ (denoted as $NA - I$ and $NA - K$); $MO^I(2)$ and $MO^K(2)$ (denoted as $MO - I$ and $MO - K$); S ; W ; and KS . For the convenience in presentation, we display the Bahadur approximate indices graphically




Figure 2: Asymptotic variance functions $\sigma_{KS,F}^2(t)$ for $\alpha = 0.1$ (left) and for $\alpha = 0.4$ (right)




Figure 3: Comparison of Bahadur approximate indices – normal distribution




Figure 4: Comparison of Bahadur approximate indices – logistic distribution

as functions of α . We also present the indices of CM and $\sqrt{b_1}$ (denoted as b1). Since they are not functions of α , we show them as horizontal lines.

It is visible from all the figures that in the case of the integral-type statistics, the efficiencies vary significantly with α . In particular, for all the tests exist




Figure 5: Comparison of Bahadur approximate indices – Cauchy distribution

a value of α for which they have zero efficiencies. On the other hand, the supremum-type tests are much less sensitive to the change of α . The exception is the classical KS test which is by its definition inefficient for $\alpha = 0.5$.

A natural way to compare tests, for a fixed null distribution, would be to compare the maximal values of their Bahadur indices over $\alpha \in [0, 0.5]$. It can be noticed that, in most cases, the integral-type tests outperform the supremum-type ones. The only exception is the contamination alternative to the Cauchy distribution. This is in concordance with the previous results (see e.g. [27, 31]).

In the case of normal distribution, the best of all tests are $\sqrt{b_1}$, and W for $\alpha = 0$. In the case of the contamination alternative, $MO^I(2)$ test for $\alpha = 0$ is also competitive. As far as the logistic distribution is concerned, $NA^I(4)$ and BH^I are most efficient. In the case of the Cauchy null, the situation is different. The tests CM and $\sqrt{b_1}$ are not applicable, and neither are the other tests for $\alpha = 0$. Also, the “order” of the tests is much different for the two considered alternatives. In case of the Fernandez-Steel alternative, the best tests are $MO^I(2)$, $NA^I(4)$ and BH^I , while in the case of the contamination alternative, $MO^K(2)$ test is the most efficient.

As a conclusion, it is hard to recommend which test, and for which α , is the best to use in general, when the underlying distribution is completely unknown. The integral-type tests for small values of α could be the right choice, but they could also be calamities. In contrast, the supremum-type tests with α close or equal to 0.5 are quite reasonable, and, most importantly, never a bad choice.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the referees for their useful remarks. This work was supported by the MNTRS, Serbia under Grant No. 174012 (first author).

References

- [1] I.A. Ahmad and Q. Li. Testing symmetry of an unknown density function by kernel method. *J. Nonparametr. Stat.*, 7(3):279–293, 1997.

- [2] M. Amiri and B.E. Khaledi. A new test for symmetry against right skewness. *J. Stat. Comput. Simul.*, 86(8):1479–1496, 2016.
- [3] A. Antille and G. Kersting. Tests for symmetry. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 39(3):235–255, 1977.
- [4] A. Antille, G. Kersting, and W. Zucchini. Testing symmetry. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 77(379):639–646, 1982.
- [5] A Azzalini. with the collaboration of A. Capitanio. *The Skew-Normal and Related Families*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [6] A. Baklizi. Testing symmetry using a trimmed longest run statistic. *Aust. N. Z. J. Stat.*, 49(4):339–347, 2007.
- [7] L. Baringhaus and N. Henze. A characterization of and new consistent tests for symmetry. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods*, 21(6):1555–1566, 1992.
- [8] L. Beghin and Ya. Yu. Nikitin. Approximate asymptotic Bahadur efficiency of independence tests with random sample size. *Stat. Methods Appl.*, 8(1):1–23, 1999.
- [9] P.K. Bhattacharya, J.L. Gastwirth, and A.L. Wright. Two modified Wilcoxon tests for symmetry about an unknown location parameter. *Biometrika*, 69(2):377–382, 1982.
- [10] G. Burgio and Ya. Yu. Nikitin. The combination of the sign and Wilcoxon tests for symmetry and their Pitman efficiency. In *Asymptotic Methods in Probability and Statistics with Applications*, pages 395–407. Birkhäuser Boston, 2001.
- [11] G. Burgio and Ya. Yu. Nikitin. On the combination of the sign and Maesono tests for simmetry and its efficiency. *Statistica*, 63(2):213–222, 2007.
- [12] G. Burgio and S. Patrì. The most efficient linear combination of the sign and the Maesono tests for p-normal distributions. *Statistica*, 71(4):411, 2011.
- [13] C.C. Butler. A test for symmetry using the sample distribution function. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 40(6):2209–2210, 1969.
- [14] P. Cabilio and J. Massaro. A simple test of symmetry about an unknown median. *Canad. J. Statist.*, 24(3):349–361, 1996.
- [15] P.J. Farrell and K. Rogers-Stewart. Comprehensive study of tests for normality and symmetry: extending the Spiegelhalter test. *J. Statist. Comput. Simul.*, 76(9):803–816, 2006.
- [16] C. Fernandez and M. F. J. Steel. On Bayesian modeling of fat tails and skewness. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 93(441):359–371, 1998.
- [17] J.L. Gastwirth. On the sign test for symmetry. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 66(336):821–823, 1971.

- [18] R. Helmers, P. Janssen, and R. Serfling. Glivenko-Cantelli properties of some generalized empirical df's and strong convergence of generalized L-statistics. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 79(1):75–93, 1988.
- [19] N. Henze, Ya. Yu. Nikitin, and B. Ebner. Integral distribution-free statistics of Lp-type and their asymptotic comparison. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*, 53(9):3426–3438, 2009.
- [20] H.K. Iverson and R.H. Randles. The effects on convergence of substituting parameter estimates into U-statistics and other families of statistics. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 81(3):453–471, 1989.
- [21] Michael R Kosorok. *Introduction to empirical processes and semiparametric inference*. Springer, 2008.
- [22] V. V. Litvinova. New nonparametric test for symmetry and its asymptotic efficiency. *Vestnik-St Petersburg University mathematics C/C of Vestnik-Sankt-Peterburgskii Univerzitet Matematika*, 34(4):12–14, 2001.
- [23] Y. Maesono. Competitors of the Wilcoxon signed rank test. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 39(1):363–375, 1987.
- [24] M.B. Marcus and L.A. Shepp. Sample behavior of Gaussian processes. In *Proc. of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Math. Statist. and Prob.*, volume 2, pages 423–441, 1972.
- [25] S.G. Meintanis, Ya. Yu. Nikitin, and A.V. Tchirina. Testing exponentiality against a class of alternatives which includes the RNBUE distributions based on the empirical Laplace transform. *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)*, 145(2):4871–4879, 2007.
- [26] W. Miao, Y.R. Gel, and J.L. Gastwirth. A new test of symmetry about an unknown median. In Y. S. Chow and A. Chao, editors, *Random Walk, Sequential Analysis and Related Topics—A Festschrift in Honor of Yuan-Shih Chow*, pages 199–2014. Singapore, World Scientific Pub, 2006.
- [27] B. Milošević and M. Obradović. Characterization based symmetry tests and their asymptotic efficiencies. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 119:155–162, 2016.
- [28] B. Milošević and M. Obradović. New class of exponentiality tests based on U-empirical Laplace transform. *Statist. Papers*, 57(4):977–990, 2016.
- [29] A. Mira. Distribution-free test for symmetry based on Bonferroni's measure. *J. Appl. Stat.*, 26(8):959–972, 1999.
- [30] Ya. Yu. Nikitin. Large deviations of U-empirical Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests and their efficiency. *J. Nonparametr. Stat.*, 22(5):649–668, 2010.
- [31] Ya. Yu. Nikitin and M. Ahsanullah. New U-empirical tests of symmetry based on extremal order statistics, and their efficiencies. In M. Hallin, D. M. Mason, D. Pfeifer, and J. G. Steinebach, editors, *Mathematical Statistics and Limit Theorems, Festschrift in Honour of Paul Deheuvels*, pages 231–248. Springer International Publishing, 2015.

- [32] Ya. Yu. Nikitin and I. Peaucelle. Efficiency and local optimality of non-parametric tests based on U- and V-statistics. *Metron*, LXII(2):185–200, 2004.
- [33] R.H. Randles. On the asymptotic normality of statistics with estimated parameters. *Ann. Statist.*, 10(2):462–474, 1982.
- [34] E.D. Rothman and M. Woodroffe. A Cramér von-Mises type statistic for testing symmetry. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 43(6):2035–2038, 1972.
- [35] R. J. Serfling. *Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, 1980.
- [36] B.W. Silverman. Convergence of a class of empirical distribution functions of dependent random variables. *Ann. Probab.*, 11(3):745–751, 1983.
- [37] N. V. Smirnov. On the test of symmetry for the distribution of random variable. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 56(1):13–16, 1947. (In Russian).
- [38] T. Zheng and J.L. Gastwirth. On bootstrap tests of symmetry about an unknown median. *J. Data Sci.*, 8(3):413, 2010.