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Abstract. We develop a new non-parametric test for testing normal distribution using Stein’s characterization. We study asymptotic properties of the test statistic. We also develop jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test for testing normality. Using Monte Carlo simulation study, we evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed JEL based test. Finally, we illustrate our test procedure using two real data.
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1. Introduction

Test for normal distribution has great significance as most of the classical tests are developed on the assumption that the available data are generated from normal distribution. For goodness of fit test associated with normal distribution using different approaches we refer interested readers to Thode (2002), Zamanzade and Arghami (2012), Bera et al. (2016), Henze and Koch (2017), Nikitin (2018), Sulewski (2019) and Betsch and Ebner (2019a) and the references therein. Among these Betsch and Ebner (2019a) developed a test for normal distribution based on the distance between empirical zero-bias transformation and empirical distribution (Betsch and Ebner, 2020). Their test statistic has complicated expression which leads to the implementation of the test difficult. Motivated by Betsch and Ebner (2019a) we
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develop a simple non-parametric test for testing normal distribution based on Stein’s characterization.

Stein’s identity for normal distribution and its applications has been well studied in statistical literature. Let $X$ be a continuous random variable with finite mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^2$. Let $c(x)$ be a continuous function having first derivative. Then $X$ has normal distribution with mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^2$ if and only if

$$E(c(X)(X - \mu)) = \sigma^2 E(c'(X)),$$

provided the above expectations exist and the prime denotes the derivative with respect to $x$. Stein’s type identity for general class of probability distributions and related characterizations, we refer interested readers to Sudheesh (2009) and Sudheesh and Dewan (2016) and the references therein. Ross (2011) discussed approximation of the normal, Poisson, exponential and geometric distributions using Stein’s method. Using Stein’s characterization of normal random variable, we develop a new goodness of fit test for normal distribution.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2, based on Stein’s characterization we develop new non-parametric test for testing normality. We develop our test using the theory of U-statistics. We study asymptotic properties of the proposed test statistic. We also develop a jackknife empirical likelihood (JEL) ratio test for testing normality. A Monte Carlo simulation study is carried out to assess the finite sample performance of the JEL ratio test and the result is reported in Section 3. We compare the power of our test with that of Anderson-Darling and Jarque-Berra tests which shows the competitiveness of our test with these classical tests. We also give the illustration of our test procedure using two real data sets. Concluding remarks along with some open problems are given in Section 4.
2. Test statistics

Let $X$ be a continuous random variable with distribution function $F(.)$. Assume that the mean $\mu = E(X)$ is finite. Define

$$e_X(x) = E(X(X - x)I(X \leq x)),$$

where $I$ denotes the indicator function. We use the following characterization to develop a goodness of fit test for normal distribution.

**Theorem 1.** (Betsch and Ebner, 2019a). A continuous random variable $X$ with distribution function $F$, $\mu = 0$ and variance $\sigma^2 = 1$ has the standard normal distribution if and only if $F(x) = e_X(x)$, $\forall x \in R$.

2.1. **U-statistics based test.** Based on a random sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ from $F$, we are interested in testing the null hypothesis

$$H_0 : F \in \{ N(\mu, \sigma^2); (\mu, \sigma^2) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \}$$

against a general alternatives

$$H_0 : F \not\in \{ N(\mu, \sigma^2); (\mu, \sigma^2) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \}.$$

Due to affine invariance property of the normal distribution, we assume $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$. When $\mu$ and $\sigma^2$ are un-known, we can implement the test based on the transformation $Y_i = \frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{S_X}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, where $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ and $S_X^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2$ are the sample mean and sample variance, respectively. In Remark 1, we show that our test is invariant under the transformation $Y_i$.

For testing the above hypothesis first we define a departure measure which discriminate between null and alternative hypothesis. Consider $\Delta(F)$ given
by

\[
\Delta(F) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (e_X(x) - F(x))dF(x).
\]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

In view of Theorem 1, \(\Delta(F)\) is zero under \(H_0\) and not zero under \(H_1\). Hence \(\Delta(F)\) can be considered as a measure of departure from the null hypothesis \(H_0\) towards the alternative hypothesis \(H_1\).

As our test is based on U-statistics, we express \(\Delta(F)\) as an expectation of the function of random variables. Consider

\[
\Delta(F) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (e_X(x) - F(x))dF(x)
\]

\[
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (E(X(X - x)I(X \leq x)) - F(x))dF(x)
\]

\[
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{x} t(t - x)I(t \leq x)dF(t)dF(x) - \frac{1}{2}
\]

\[
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{x} t(t - x)dF(t)dF(x) - \frac{1}{2}.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

We observed that the probability density function of the random variable \(\min(X_1, X_2)\) is \(2\bar{F}(x)dF(x)\), where \(\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)\). Hence by Fubini's theorem, we have

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{x} t^2dF(t)dF(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dF(x)dF(t)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} 2t^2 \bar{F}(t)dF(t)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} E(\min(X_1, X_2)^2).
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Also

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{x} txdF(t)dF(x) = E(X_1X_2I(X_1 < X_2)).
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4)
Substituting the equations (3) and (4) in equation (2) we obtain

$$\Delta(F) = \frac{1}{2} E\left( \min(X_1, X_2)^2 - 2X_1X_2 I(X_1 < X_2) \right) - \frac{1}{2}.$$ 

$$= \Delta_1(F) - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5)$$

Let $h(X_1, X_2)$ be a symmetric kernel defined as

$$h(X_1, X_2) = \frac{1}{4} (2 \min(X_1, X_2)^2 - 2X_1X_2 I(X_1 < X_2) - 2X_1X_2 I(X_2 < X_1))$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (\min(X_1, X_2)^2 - X_1X_2).$$

A U-statistic given by

$$\hat{\Delta}_1 = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1, j<i}^{n} h(X_i, X_j),$$

is an unbiased estimator of $\Delta_1(F)$. Hence the test statistic is

$$\hat{\Delta} = \hat{\Delta}_1 - \frac{1}{2}.$$ 

We use the above representation to study the asymptotic properties of the test statistic. Let $X(i)_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ be the $i$-th order statistics based on a random sample $X_1 \ldots, X_n$ from $F$. Then $\hat{\Delta}$ can be expressed as a simple form

$$\hat{\Delta} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (n-i)X^2_{(i)} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1, j<i}^{n} X_iX_j - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (6)$$

Test procedure is to reject the null hypothesis $H_0$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_1$ for large values of $\hat{\Delta}$. We find the critical region of the test using the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\Delta}$.

**Remark 1.** Suppose $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are random sample from $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$. Test based on the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\Delta}$ is invariant under the transformation $Y_i = \frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{S_X}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Hence we construct the test using the
transformation \( Y_i = \frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{S_X} \). Under the transformation \( \frac{X_i}{S_X} \) we obtain the test statistics as \( \hat{\Delta} / S^2_X \). Since \( S^2_X \) is a consistent estimator of \( \sigma^2 \) it is easy to prove that the test is invariant. Next we show that the test is invariant under location. Let \( Z_i = X_i - \bar{X}, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \). Consider

\[
\tilde{\Delta}_1^* = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1,j<i}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \left( \min(Z_i, Z_j)^2 - Z_i Z_j \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1,j<i}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \left( \min(X_i, X_j) - \bar{X} \right)^2 - (X_i - \bar{X}) (X_j - \bar{X}) 
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1,j<i}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \left( \min(X_i, X_j)^2 - X_i X_j 
\right.

\left. - 2 \min(X_i, X_j) \bar{X} + \bar{X} X_i + \bar{X} X_j \right)
\]

\[
= \tilde{\Delta}_1 + \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1,j<i}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \left( \bar{X} X_i + \bar{X} X_j - 2 \min(X_i, X_j) \bar{X} \right)
\]

\[
= \tilde{\Delta}_1 + \bar{X} U_1,
\]

where \( U_1 = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|X_1 - X_2|}{2} \). Since \( U_1 \) is a U-statistic, \( \sqrt{n} U_1 \) is bounded in probability. Hence

\[
\sqrt{n} \tilde{\Delta}_1^* = \sqrt{n} \Delta_1 + \sqrt{n} \bar{X} \sqrt{n} U_1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{n} \Delta_1 + O_p(1) = \sqrt{n} \Delta_1 + o_p(1).
\]

Therefor the proposed test is invariant under the transformation \( Y_i \).

Next we prove the asymptotic properties of the test statistics. As the test statistic is based on U-statistics next result is immediate (Lehmann, 1951).

**Theorem 2.** \( \hat{\Delta} \) is a consistent estimator of \( \Delta(F) \) under the alternatives \( H_1 \).
Theorem 3. As \( n \to \infty \), \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{\Delta} - \Delta(F)) \) converges in distribution to Gaussian with mean zero and variance \( \sigma^2 \), where \( \sigma^2 \) is given by

\[
\sigma^2 = \text{Var} \left( X^2 \hat{F}(X) + \int_{-\infty}^{X} y^2 dF(y) - \mu X \right). \tag{7}
\]

Proof: The asymptotic distributions of \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{\Delta} - \Delta(F)) \) and \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{\Delta}_1 - \Delta_1(F)) \) are same. Using the central limit theorem on U-statistics, we have the asymptotic normality of \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{\Delta}_1 - \Delta_1(F)) \) and the asymptotic variance is \( \sigma^2 = 4\sigma^2_1 \), where \( \sigma^2_1 \) is given by (Lee, 1990)

\[
\sigma^2_1 = \text{Var} \left( E(h(X_1, X_2)|X_1) \right). \tag{8}
\]

Now, consider

\[
E(\min(X_1, X_2)^2|X_1 = x) = E(x^2 I(x < X_2) + X_2^2 I(X_2 \leq x)) = x^2 \hat{F}(x) + \int_{-\infty}^{x} y^2 dF(y). \tag{9}
\]

Also

\[
E(X_1 X_2|X_1 = x) = x\mu. \tag{10}
\]

Substituting the equations (9) and (10) in equation (8) we obtain the variance expression as specified in equation (7). Hence, we have the proof of the theorem.

We know that \( \Delta(F) = 0 \) under the null hypothesis \( H_0 \). Hence we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. Under \( H_0 \), as \( n \to \infty \), \( \sqrt{n}\hat{\Delta} \) converges in distribution to Gaussian with mean zero and variance \( \sigma^2_0 \), where \( \sigma^2_0 \) is given by

\[
\sigma^2_0 = \text{Var} \left( X^2 \hat{F}(X) + \int_{-\infty}^{X} y^2 dF(y) \right). \tag{11}
\]
Rejection region of the test based on $\hat{\Delta}$ can be constructed using Corollary 1. We reject the null hypothesis $H_0$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_1$ at a significance level $\alpha$, if

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}|\hat{\Delta}|}{\hat{\sigma}_0} > Z_{\alpha/2},$$

where $Z_{\alpha}$ is the upper $\alpha$-percentile point of the standard normal distribution and $\hat{\sigma}_0^2$ is a consistent estimator of the null variance $\sigma_0^2$.

As $F$ has no closed form for the normal distribution, it is difficult to evaluate the null variance specified in (11). Hence it is not easy to implement the normal based test in practice. Motivated by this fact, we develop a jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test for testing normal distribution.

2.2. JEL based test. For developing jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test, first we define the jackknife pseudo values using the test statistic given in equation (6). The jackknife pseudo values denoted by $\nu_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ are defined as

$$\nu_i = n\hat{\Delta} - (n - 1)\hat{\Delta}_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where $\hat{\Delta}_i$ is the value of the test statistic obtained using the equation (6) by deleting the $i$-th observation in the sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. Let $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be a probability vector. It is well-known that $\prod_{i=1}^n p_i$ subject to $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$ attain its maximum value $n^{-n}$ at $p_i = 1/n$. Hence the jackknife empirical likelihood ratio for testing normal distribution based on the departure measure $\Delta(F)$ defined in equation (1) is defined as

$$R(\Delta) = \max \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n np_i, \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1, \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \nu_i = 0 \right\},$$

where

$$p_i = \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda \nu_i}$$
and $\lambda$ satisfies
\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\nu_i}{1 + \lambda \nu_i} = 0.
\]
Hence the jackknife empirical log likelihood ratio is given by
\[
\log R(\Delta) = -\sum \log(1 + \lambda \nu_i).
\]

We reject the null hypothesis $H_0$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_1$ for large values of $\log R(\Delta)$. To find the critical region of the JEL based test we find the limiting distribution of the jackknife empirical log likelihood ratio. Using Theorem 1 of Jing et al. (2009) we have the following result as an analogue of Wilk’s theorem.

**Theorem 4.** If $E(h^2(X_1, X_2)) < \infty$ and $\sigma_1^2 > 0$, then as $n \to \infty$, $-2 \log R(\Delta)$ converges in distribution to $\chi^2$ with one degree of freedom.

**Proof:** In view of the Theorem 3, the assumptions $E(h^2(X_1, X_2)) < \infty$ and $\sigma_1^2 > 0$ always hold. Accordingly, by Lemma A1 of Jing et al. (2009) we have the condition
\[
\min_{1 \leq k \leq n} v_k < \hat{\Delta} < \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} v_k.
\]
Hence the proof follows from the Theorem 1 of Jing et al. (2009).

Using Theorem 4 we can obtain the critical region of the JEL based test. In jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test, we reject the null hypothesis $H_0$ against the alternatives hypothesis $H_1$ at a significance level $\alpha$, if
\[
-2 \log R(\Delta) > \chi^2_{1, \alpha},
\]
where $\chi^2_{1, \alpha}$ is the upper $\alpha$-percentile point of the $\chi^2$ distribution with one degree of freedom.
3. Empirical evidence and data analysis

To study the finite sample performance of the JEL based test, we conduct a Monte Carlo simulation using R package. The simulation is repeated ten thousand times. To show the competitiveness to existing test procedures we compare the power of our test with that of Anderson-Darling and Jarque-Bera tests. We illustrate our test procedure using two real data sets.

3.1. Monte Carlo Simulation. First we find the empirical type I error of the proposed test. For finding the empirical type I error, we generated samples from standard normal distribution and the results of the simulation study are given in Table 1. From the Table 1 we observe that the empirical type I error is a very good estimator of the size of the test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>5% level</th>
<th>1% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.1040</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0617</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.0585</td>
<td>0.0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0551</td>
<td>0.0140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.0524</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, based on empirical power we evaluate the performance of our test against various alternatives. For finding empirical power against different alternatives, we simulate observations from Gumbel \((\theta, 1)\), log normal \((0, \theta)\) and \(t\) distributions. The empirical powers obtained for the above mentioned alternatives are reported in the Tables 2-4. From Tables 2-3, we observe that empirical powers of the test approaches one for large values of \(n\). In the case of Gumbel distribution the empirical power is very high even for small sample sizes when the value of \(\theta\) is away from zero. From Table 4 we see that the power is very low when the degrees of freedom of the \(t\) distribution
increases. This may be due to the fact that the t distribution become closer to the normal distribution as degrees of freedom increases.

We also compare our test with two well-known tests of normal distribution. First we consider the Anderson-Darling test given by

\[ T_1 = -n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (2i-1) \{ \log(Z_i) + \log(1 - Z_{n-i+1}) \} }{n}, \]

where \( Z_i = \Phi\left( \frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{S_X} \right) \) with \( \bar{X} \) is the sample mean and \( S_X^2 \) is the sample variance. Here \( \Phi \) is the cumulative distribution function of standard normal random variable. We compare the test statistics value with the critical point 2.492 and 3.857 when the significance levels are 0.05 and 0.01, respectively (Anderson and Darling, 1954).

Next, we consider the Jarque-Berra test given by

\[ T_2 = \frac{n}{6} \left( S^2 + \frac{1}{4} (K - 3)^2 \right), \]

where

\[ S = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^3 / \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \right)^{3/2} \]

and

\[ K = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^4 / \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \right)^2. \]

Under \( H_0 \), the asymptotic distribution of \( T_2 \) is \( \chi^2 \) with two degrees of freedom.

We compare the empirical power of our test with Anderson-Darling and Jarque-Berra tests for standard Gumbel, standard log normal and Gamma (1,2) distributions. The results of the simulation study are reported in Tables 5-7. From Table 5, we observe that our test is comparable with Anderson-Darling test for large sample sizes and it is better than Jarque-Berra test for all values of \( n \). For standard log normal distribution, our test and Jarque-Berra test perform better than Anderson-Darling test. Our test
Table 2. Empirical Power: Gumbel distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\theta = 0$</th>
<th>$\theta = 0.5$</th>
<th>$\theta = 1$</th>
<th>$\theta = 2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4472</td>
<td>0.2568</td>
<td>0.9580</td>
<td>0.9089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.7108</td>
<td>0.4464</td>
<td>0.9989</td>
<td>0.9981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.9152</td>
<td>0.6914</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9678</td>
<td>0.8284</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

has very good power even for small values of $n$. From Table 7, we observe that the empirical power of the JEL ratio test and Anderson-Darling test perform better than Jarque-Berra test in case of gamma distribution.

Table 3. Empirical Power: Log normal distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\theta = 0.5$</th>
<th>$\theta = 1$</th>
<th>$\theta = 1.5$</th>
<th>$\theta = 2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9997</td>
<td>0.9592</td>
<td>0.8729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9958</td>
<td>0.9538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Empirical Power: $t$ distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>$df = 1$</th>
<th>$df = 2$</th>
<th>$df = 3$</th>
<th>$df = 4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.7494</td>
<td>0.6552</td>
<td>0.5777</td>
<td>0.4324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.8750</td>
<td>0.8248</td>
<td>0.7813</td>
<td>0.6437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.9048</td>
<td>0.8657</td>
<td>0.8922</td>
<td>0.8016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9139</td>
<td>0.8743</td>
<td>0.9448</td>
<td>0.8974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.9546</td>
<td>0.9304</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>0.9920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Empirical Power Comparison: Standard Gumbel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Proposed test</th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
<td>5% level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4604</td>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>0.6582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.7002</td>
<td>0.4286</td>
<td>0.9214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.8990</td>
<td>0.6682</td>
<td>0.9880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9676</td>
<td>0.8600</td>
<td>0.9975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Empirical Power Comparison: Standard log normal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Proposed test</th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
<td>5% level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Empirical Power Comparison: Gamma (1, 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Proposed test</th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% level</td>
<td>1% level</td>
<td>5% level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Histogram of the body temperature

3.2. Data Analysis. To discuss the application of our test procedure we consider two real data sets. First we consider the body temperature of 65
men measured in Fahrenheit scale which is reported in Villaseor-Alva and Gonzlez-Estrada (2015) and the details about the data can be found at [http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v4n2/datasets.shoemaker.html](http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v4n2/datasets.shoemaker.html). The calculated value of the test statistic $-2 \log R(\Delta)$ for the standardized data is 0.0766, which suggest that the underlying data follows normal distribution. This is evident from the histogram (Figure 1) of the data and the result is parallel with the results obtained by many others.

Next we consider the height of 99 five-year-old British boys in cm downloaded from [http://www.mas.ncl.ac.uk/~njnsm/medfac/docs/intro.pdf](http://www.mas.ncl.ac.uk/~njnsm/medfac/docs/intro.pdf). The value of JEL based test is 0.0247 and it suggest that the data follows normal distribution.

4. Concluding remarks

Stein’s identity for normal random variable and its applications in different areas have been explored by many researchers. Based on Stein’s characterization, we developed a goodness of fit test for normal distribution. We also developed a jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test for testing normal distribution. Using Monte Carlo simulation study, we have shown that the jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test has well controlled type I error rate and good power for various alternatives. The Simulation study also show that the proposed test is comparable with some well-known classical tests available in the literature. Finally, we illustrated our test procedure using two real data sets.

Sudheesh (2009) generalized the Stein’s identity to a general class of probability distributions. Using this generalized identity one can find Stein’s characterization for different distributions. Recently, based on Stein’s method, Betsch and Ebner (2020) provided characterization identities for a large class
of absolutely continuous probability distributions. Using these Stein’s type characterization identities one can develop goodness of fit tests for different univariate continuous distributions. This paper and recent works by Betsch and Ebner (2019a, 2019b) are good starting points in this direction.

References


