

Optimal and fast confidence intervals for hypergeometric successes

JAY BARTROFF*, GARY LORDEN†, and LIJIA WANG‡

*Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA

†Department of Mathematics, Caltech, Pasadena, California, USA

‡Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, USA

April 29, 2022

Abstract

We present an efficient method of calculating exact confidence intervals for the hypergeometric parameter representing the number of “successes,” or “special items,” in the population. The method inverts minimum-width acceptance intervals after shifting them to make their endpoints nondecreasing while preserving their level. The resulting set of confidence intervals achieves minimum possible average size, and even in comparison with confidence sets not required to be intervals it attains the minimum possible cardinality most of the time, and always within 1. The method compares favorably with existing methods not only in the size of the intervals but also in the time required to compute them. The available R package `hyperMCI` implements the proposed method.

1 Introduction

Given integers $0 < n \leq N$ and $0 \leq M \leq N$, a random variable X has the *hypergeometric distribution* $\text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$ if

$$P_M(X = x) = \binom{M}{x} \binom{N-M}{n-x} / \binom{N}{n} \quad (1)$$

for all integer values of x such that the quotient (1) is defined, with $P_M(X = x) = 0$ otherwise. It is not hard to see that (1) is nonzero if and only if

$$x_{\min} := \max\{0, M + n - N\} \leq x \leq \min\{M, n\} =: x_{\max}. \quad (2)$$

The most common setting in which the hypergeometric distribution arises is when X counts the number of items with a certain binary “special” property, sometimes called a “success,” in a simple random sample (i.e., sampled uniformly without replacement) of size n from a population of size N containing M special items. But the hypergeometric arises in many other ways* not involving a simple random sample, such as the analysis of a 2×2 contingency table using Fisher’s Exact Test, and in other sampling schemes.

1.1 Summary of our approach

Our approach to constructing $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence intervals for M based on X is by inverting tests of the hypotheses $H : M = M_0$, which we denote as $H(M_0)$, for $M_0 = 0, 1, \dots, N$. For testing $H(M)$, we utilize acceptance intervals $[a_M, b_M]$ that *maximize* the acceptance probability $P_M(X \in [a_M, b_M])$ among all shortest possible level- α intervals, a property we call α *max optimal* which is discussed in Section 3, along with a novel method of shifting a set of α max optimal intervals so their endpoints a_M, b_M form nondecreasing sequences. This guarantees that the confidence sets that result from inversion are intervals, which is our goal here. After obtaining and shifting a set of α max optimal intervals, in Section 4 we discuss how to further modify them to make them symmetrical, and discuss the case $M = N/2$ when N is even, which needs separate handling. With our symmetrical and monotonic acceptance intervals in hand, in Section 5 we prove the size-optimality results for the confidence intervals that result from inversion. In Section 6 we present some numerical examples and compare with two existing methods, including the notable, recent method of W. Wang (2015). There we also apply our method to some data about the air quality in China.

1.2 Related previous work

For exact confidence sets, there is much more literature on the related problem of the Binomial success probability than for the hypergeometric, beginning with Clopper and Pearson (1934) who applied the method of pivoting the c.d.f. to the Binomial problem. Sterne’s (1954) method for the Binomial inverts hypothesis tests with the p -value as the test statistic, and he observed that the resulting intervals are “sometimes narrower” (Sterne, 1954, p. 278) than the Clopper-Pearson intervals. Sterne’s method can alternatively be

*For readers interested in aspects of the hypergeometric distribution not considered here, we refer them to Hald (1990) for its history and naming, Keilson and Gerber (1971) for log-concavity and other properties, and Chvátal (1979) and Skala (2013) for exponential tail bounds, to name a few.

described as inverting acceptance intervals with maximal acceptance probability, which is similar to the method we apply here to the hypergeometric. Crow (1956) showed that Sterne’s (1954) method yields intervals with minimal total (or average) width, but also pointed out some “irregularities” in the method, such as occasionally producing non-intervals, or giving longer intervals for *lower* confidence levels based on the same data. Crow (1956) proposed a modification of Sterne’s method eliminating these irregularities while maintaining minimal total width. Blyth and Still (1983) proposed a further modification of Sterne’s method giving intervals with more regular monotonic endpoint sequences than Sterne’s and Crow’s, while also achieving minimal total width. Blaker (2000, 2001) proposed an improvement of the Clopper-Pearson method giving shorter intervals, nested by confidence level, by choosing a more efficient partition of the error probabilities than the “equal tails” approach of the earlier method. A referee brought to our attention the recent method of Schilling and Doi (2014), which produces length-minimizing, exact intervals for the Binomial problem by shifting acceptance intervals to achieve monotonicity of endpoints before inverting; this is similar to our approach to the hypergeometric.

For the hypergeometric, pivoting the c.d.f. was proposed by Konijn (1973) and Buonaccorsi (1987), but length-optimality was not addressed until Wang (2015), who proposed a computationally-intensive method for both 1-and 2-sided intervals, and proved that the 1-sided intervals were length-minimizing. See Section 6 for a more detailed description and comparison of these methods.

Casella and Berger (2002, p. 463) give a summary of work on confidence sets for some other discrete distributions. One notable example is Crow and Gardner’s (1959) for the Poisson mean, a method similar to Crow’s (1956) for the Binomial.

2 Additional notation

Throughout the paper we treat the positive integers n and N , and the desired confidence level $1 - \alpha \in (0, 1)$, as fixed quantities, known to the statistician, and inference centers on the unknown value of M . Since the parameter M of interest is an integer, the *intervals* we consider are actually sets of consecutive integers, which we denote by $[a, b]$ but actually mean $\{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$. For an arbitrary set A we let $P_M(A)$ denote $P_M(X \in A)$ where $X \sim \text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$, which X will denote throughout unless otherwise specified. For a scalar x we let $P_M(x)$ denote $P_M(X = x)$. We let $\lfloor y \rfloor$ denote the largest integer $\leq y$ and $\lceil y \rceil$ the smallest integer $\geq y$. For sets A, B let $A \setminus B = \{a \in A : a \notin B\}$ denote the set difference and $|A|$ denote set cardinality, e.g., $|[a, b]| = b - a + 1$ for integers $a \leq b$. For a nonnegative integer j we let $[j] = \{0, 1, \dots, j\}$.

3 α max optimal acceptance sets and modifying intervals for monotonicity

In this section we establish properties of acceptance intervals that will guarantee that they still enjoy size optimality when they are appropriately shifted to make their endpoints monotonic. The next definition makes this precise, and we call the property α max optimal. Theorem 3.1 shows how to modify any set of α max optimal acceptance intervals to produce intervals whose endpoints a_M, b_M are nondecreasing in M , thus producing confidence *intervals* upon inversion rather than non-interval confidence *sets*; see also Section 5. It is not difficult to construct α max optimal acceptance intervals, and a simple and straightforward algorithm to do so which we call Algorithm 1 is given in Section 4.1, where we also prove that it is α max optimal.

For the next definition we more generally consider acceptance *sets* (not necessarily intervals): A *level- α acceptance set* for $H(M)$ is any subset $S_M \subseteq [n]$ such that

$$P_M(S_M) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Definition 3.1. Fix n, N , and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

1. Given $M \in [N]$, a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ is α optimal for M if $P_M(S) \geq 1 - \alpha$ and $P_M(S^*) < 1 - \alpha$ whenever $S^* \subseteq [n]$ with $|S^*| < |S|$. A collection $\{S_M : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$, $\mathcal{M} \subseteq [N]$, is α optimal (for \mathcal{M}) if, for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$, S_M is α optimal for M .
2. Given $M \in [N]$, a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ is P_M -maximizing if all elements of S have positive P_M -probability and $P_M(S) \geq P_M(S^*)$ whenever $|S^*| = |S|$. A collection $\{S_M : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$, $\mathcal{M} \subseteq [N]$, is $P_{\mathcal{M}}$ -maximizing if, for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$, S_M is P_M -maximizing.
3. A collection $\{S_M : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$, $\mathcal{M} \subseteq [N]$, is α max optimal (for \mathcal{M}) if it is α optimal and $P_{\mathcal{M}}$ -maximizing.

The next proposition shows the link between the more general probability-maximizing *sets* in the definition, and intervals; namely, that probability-maximizing sets are always intervals.

Proposition 3.1. If S is P_M -maximizing for some M then it is a subinterval of $[x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$, as defined in (2).

Proof. By definition $S \subseteq [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$, and by the (near-strict) unimodality of every P_M in Lemma A.2 there exists $[m_1, m_2] \subseteq [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$ with $m_2 - m_1 = 0$ or 1 such that $P_M(x)$ is strictly increasing on $[x_{\min}, m_1]$ and strictly decreasing on $[m_2, x_{\max}]$. Suppose $x_1, x_2 \in S$ and $x_1 < y < x_2$. Then $y \leq m_1$ implies $P_M(y) > P_M(x_1)$ and $y \geq m_2$ implies $P_M(y) > P_M(x_2)$.

Since m_1 and m_2 are equal or adjacent, at least one of these cases applies, and therefore $P_M(y) > \min\{P_M(x_1), P_M(x_2)\}$. By Lemma B.4 it follows that $y \in S$ and thus S is an interval. \square

Our main result concerning α max optimal acceptance intervals, stated in the next theorem, is that they can always be modified in order to make both sequences of endpoints nondecreasing in M while still being α optimal.

Theorem 3.1. *Fix $n, N, \alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq [N]$ be an arbitrary set of consecutive integers, and $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ a set of α max optimal acceptance intervals. For $M \in \mathcal{M}$ define*

$$\bar{a}_M = \max_{M' \leq M} a_{M'} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{b}_M = \min_{M' \geq M} b_{M'}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, define

$$\mathcal{M}_a = \{M \in \mathcal{M} : a_M < \bar{a}_M\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_b = \{M \in \mathcal{M} : b_M > \underline{b}_M\}. \quad (4)$$

Then the following hold.

1. The sets \mathcal{M}_a and \mathcal{M}_b are disjoint.
2. The adjusted intervals

$$[a_M^{adj}, b_M^{adj}] := \begin{cases} [\bar{a}_M, b_M + (\bar{a}_M - a_M)], & M \in \mathcal{M}_a \\ [a_M - (b_M - \underline{b}_M), \underline{b}_M], & M \in \mathcal{M}_b \\ [a_M, b_M], & \text{all other } M \in \mathcal{M}, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

are α optimal and have nondecreasing endpoint sequences.

The proof of the theorem and auxiliary results are given in Appendix B.

4 α optimal, symmetrical, nondecreasing acceptance intervals

We first present Algorithm 1 and verify that it is α max optimal in Section 4.1. This sets the stage to apply Theorem 3.1 to the Algorithm 1 acceptance intervals

$$\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [\lfloor N/2 \rfloor]\} \quad (6)$$

to obtain the modified intervals

$$\{[a_M^{adj}, b_M^{adj}] : M \in [\lfloor N/2 \rfloor]\}. \quad (7)$$

A set of acceptance intervals $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [N]\}$ is *symmetrical* if the intervals are equivariant with respect to the reflections $M \mapsto N - M$, $[a_M, b_M] \mapsto [n - b_M, n - a_M]$. That is, if

$$[a_{N-M}, b_{N-M}] = [n - b_M, n - a_M] \quad \text{for all } M \in [N]. \quad (8)$$

This can equivalently be stated as the intervals $[a_M, b_{N-M}]$, $M \in [N]$, all having midpoint $n/2$, or having endpoints summing to n . We seek symmetrical acceptance intervals because they will result in symmetrical confidence intervals (defined below analogously to (8)) upon inversion in Section 5. From (7), one way to achieve symmetry is to define $[a_M^{adj}, b_M^{adj}]$ for $M > \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$ as the reflection of the intervals (7) across $n/2$. This achieves symmetry everywhere except at $M = N/2$ when N is even and $[a_{N/2}^{adj}, b_{N/2}^{adj}]$ is not symmetric about $n/2$. This is the strategy taken in Theorem 4.1, with the $M = N/2$ interval taken to be (9), and the resulting intervals are α optimal, symmetrical, and have nondecreasing endpoint sequences. We call the result of applying Theorem 4.1 to Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2, which is also given in algorithmic form in Appendix D. However, Theorem 4.1 is general and applies to not just Algorithm 1 but starting from any α max optimal intervals (6).

4.1 α max optimal intervals: Algorithm 1

The following is a simple algorithm for producing α max optimal acceptance intervals. The algorithm starts from the endpoints $C = D = \arg \max_x P_M(x)$ equal to the mode, and moves the endpoints outward, incrementing the acceptance probability. An alternative is to begin from $[C, D] = [0, N]$ and move the endpoints inward, decrementing the probability, although this will be slower in most settings.

Lemma 4.1. *The acceptance intervals $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [\lfloor N/2 \rfloor]\}$ produced by Algorithm 1 are α max optimal.*

Proof. Fix $M \in [\lfloor N/2 \rfloor]$ and use P to denote P_M . Recall that $P(x) = 0$ for x outside $[x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$. Algorithm 1 builds up a nested sequence of acceptance intervals I, J, K, \dots by selecting at each stage a new point having maximum probability among the ones available. The first interval is $I = \{[m]\}$ where m is given by (21) and $\lfloor m \rfloor$, and thus I , have maximum probability; see Lemma A.2. At each successive stage, the current interval J is expanded to $K = J \cup \{x\}$, where x is y , the point adjacent to J on the left, or z , adjacent on the right, chosen to yield the maximum of their probabilities. Since y is to the left of $\{[m]\}$, the points further to the left have smaller probabilities by virtue of the unimodality property in Lemma A.2, and similarly z has the maximum probability to the right. Therefore the selected point x has

Algorithm 1 Given α , n , and N , produce a set of level α acceptance intervals $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [N]\}$.

Require: $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \leq N$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$

for $M = 0, \dots, \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$ **do**

$x_{\min} = \max\{0, M + n - N\}$

$x_{\max} = \min\{n, N\}$

$C, D = \lfloor \frac{(n+1)(M+1)}{N+2} \rfloor$

$P = P_M(C)$

if $C > x_{\min}$ **then** $PC = P_M(C - 1)$ **else** $PC = 0$ **end if**

if $D < x_{\max}$ **then** $PD = P_M(D + 1)$ **else** $PD = 0$ **end if**

while $P < 1 - \alpha$ **do**

if $PD > PC$ **then**

$D = D + 1$

$P = P + PD$

if $D < x_{\max}$ **then** $PD = P_M(D + 1)$ **else** $PD = 0$ **end if**

else

$C = C - 1$

$P = P + PC$

if $C > x_{\min}$ **then** $PC = P_M(C - 1)$ **else** $PC = 0$ **end if**

end if

end while

$a_M = C$

$b_M = D$

$a_{N-M} = n - b_M$

$b_{N-M} = n - a_M$

end for

return $\{[a_M, b_M]\}_{M=0}^N$

the maximum probability outside of the current interval J , and hence by the Definition 3.1 of P -maximizing sets, the next interval K preserves the P -maximizing property of J , using an obvious induction argument.

For the given M , the while loop in Algorithm 1 ends with the first interval V that is level α . Hence its predecessor is not level α , and since it is P -maximizing, no set with fewer points than V is level α . Thus V is α optimal as well as P -maximizing, and hence it is α max optimal. \square

4.2 Reflection and modification at $N/2$: Algorithm 2

Starting with a set of α max optimal intervals $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [\lfloor N/2 \rfloor]\}$ we will now define a new set of intervals $\{[a_M^*, b_M^*] : M \in [N]\}$ by (i) applying the adjustments in Theorem 3.1, (ii) reflecting across $n/2$ to obtain symmetrical intervals for $M > \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$, and (iii) if N is even setting $[a_{N/2}^*, b_{N/2}^*]$ to be the interval

$$[h_{\alpha/2}, n - h_{\alpha/2}], \quad \text{where} \quad h_{\alpha/2} = \max \{x \in [n] : P_{N/2}(X < x) \leq \alpha/2\}. \quad (9)$$

The next theorem establishes that the resulting intervals are α optimal, symmetrical, and have nondecreasing endpoint sequences.

Theorem 4.1. *Given a set of α max optimal intervals $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [\lfloor N/2 \rfloor]\}$, let $\{[a_M^{adj}, b_M^{adj}] : M \in [\lfloor N/2 \rfloor]\}$ denote the result of applying Theorem 3.1, and*

$$[a_M^*, b_M^*] = \begin{cases} [a_M^{adj}, b_M^{adj}], & \text{for } M = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor N/2 \rfloor - 1; \\ [n - b_{N-M}^{adj}, n - a_{N-M}^{adj}], & \text{for } M = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor + 1, \dots, N; \\ [h_{\alpha/2}, n - h_{\alpha/2}], & \text{for } M = N/2 \text{ if } N \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Then $\mathcal{A}^ := \{[a_M^*, b_M^*] : M \in [N]\}$ are level- α , symmetrical, have nondecreasing endpoint sequences, and are size-optimal except possibly for $M = N/2$ when N is even; in this case, $[a_{N/2}^*, b_{N/2}^*]$ is size-optimal unless $[a_{N/2}^*, b_{N/2}^* - 1]$ has probability $1 - \alpha$ or greater, in which case $[a_{N/2}^*, b_{N/2}^* - 1]$ is α optimal and \mathcal{A}^* is larger by one in total size than an α optimal collection. In any case, \mathcal{A}^* is α optimal among symmetrical collections.*

Note that if N is odd then the first two cases of (10) cover all $M \in [N]$.

Before the proof of the theorem, we make a few comments about the $M = N/2$ interval (9) when N is even. It is clearly the smallest symmetrical level- α acceptance interval for $H(N/2)$, and is α optimal. Also, we have $h_{\alpha/2} \leq n/2$ since

$$P_{N/2}(X < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1) = P_{N/2}(X \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor) \geq 1/2 > \alpha/2. \quad (11)$$

Finally, it is not necessary to use special calculations to get $h_{\alpha/2}$ since it is easily obtained from an α max optimal interval $[a_{N/2}, b_{N/2}]$ by $h_{\alpha/2} =$

$\min\{a_{N/2}, n - b_{N/2}\}$. Note that if $[a_{N/2}, b_{N/2}]$ is already symmetrical, then (9) is the same interval.

Proof. Symmetry is by construction, and monotonicity is proved in Lemma C.1. Theorem 3.1 establishes α -optimality in the first case of (10), and to establish it in the second case, let $M > \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$ and $X \sim \text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_M(X \in [a_M^*, b_M^*]) &= P_M(X \in [n - b_{N-M}^*, n - a_{N-M}^*]) \\ &= P_M(n - X \in [a_{N-M}^*, b_{N-M}^*]) \geq 1 - \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

this last by the first case of (10) and since $n - X \sim \text{Hyper}(N - M, n, N)$; see Lemma A.1. For size optimality, we will show that $P_M([c, d]) \geq 1 - \alpha$ implies that $d - c \geq b_M^* - a_M^*$. By an argument similar to the one above, $[n - d, n - c]$ is level- α for testing $H(N - M)$ and thus no shorter than $[a_{N-M}^*, b_{N-M}^*]$, so

$$d - c = (n - c) - (n - d) \geq b_{N-M}^* - a_{N-M}^* = (n - a_M^*) - (n - b_M^*) = b_M^* - a_M^*,$$

as claimed. For N even, the third case of (10) is clearly level- α , and any competing symmetrical interval for $H(N/2)$ must be of the form $[c, n - c]$. If this is level- α then $c \leq h_{\alpha/2}$, thus it can be no shorter than (9). \square

5 Optimal symmetrical confidence intervals

5.1 Confidence and acceptance sets

For a set \mathcal{S} let $2^{\mathcal{S}}$ denote the power set of \mathcal{S} , i.e., the set of all subsets of \mathcal{S} . A *confidence set with confidence level* $1 - \alpha$ is a function $\mathcal{C} : [n] \rightarrow 2^{[N]}$ such that the coverage probability satisfies

$$P_M(M \in \mathcal{C}(X)) \geq 1 - \alpha \quad \text{for all } M \in [N].$$

For short, we refer to such a \mathcal{C} as a $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence set. If a confidence set \mathcal{C} is interval-valued (i.e., for all $x \in [n]$, $\mathcal{C}(x)$ is an interval) we call it a *confidence interval*. A confidence set \mathcal{C} is *symmetrical* if

$$\mathcal{C}(x) = N - \mathcal{C}(n - x) \quad \text{for all } x \in [n]. \quad (12)$$

Here, for a set \mathcal{S} , the notation $N - \mathcal{S}$ means $\{N - s : s \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Symmetry (12) is an equivariance condition requiring that the confidence set is reflected about $N/2$ when the data is reflected about $n/2$. See also Section 6 for how this definition compares with the regularity conditions of W. Wang (2015).

Similarly, we shall denote a level- α acceptance set by a function $\mathcal{A} : [N] \rightarrow 2^{[n]}$ such that

$$P_M(X \in \mathcal{A}(M)) \geq 1 - \alpha \quad \text{for all } M \in [N],$$

and call an interval-valued (i.e., for all $M \in [N]$, $\mathcal{A}(M)$ is an interval) acceptance set an acceptance interval[†] and write $\mathcal{A}(M) = [a_M, b_M]$, or similar.

We also need to generalize the concept of symmetry from (8) to handle general sets, so we say that an acceptance set \mathcal{A} is *symmetrical* if

$$\mathcal{A}(M) = n - \mathcal{A}(N - M) \quad \text{for all } M \in [N].$$

This says that the set is equivariant with respect to reflections $M \mapsto N - M$, and specializes to (8) for intervals.

5.2 Inverted confidence sets

We will construct confidence sets that are inversions of acceptance sets, and vice-versa. If \mathcal{A} is a level- α acceptance set then

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \{M \in [N] : x \in \mathcal{A}(M)\} \quad (13)$$

is a $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence set. Conversely, given a $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence set \mathcal{C} ,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M) = \{x \in [n] : M \in \mathcal{C}(x)\}$$

is a level- α acceptance set; see, for example, Rice (2007, Chapter 9.3). Moreover, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}} = \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}} = \mathcal{A}$, which are immediate from the definitions. However, neither \mathcal{A} nor \mathcal{C} being interval-valued guarantees that its inversion is.

We will evaluate confidence and acceptance sets by their *total size*, which we define as the sum of the cardinalities of each set: Recalling that $|\cdot|$ denotes set cardinality, define the *total size* of acceptance and confidence sets to be

$$|\mathcal{A}| = \sum_{M=0}^N |\mathcal{A}(M)| \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{C}| = \sum_{x=0}^n |\mathcal{C}(x)|.$$

If $\mathcal{A}(M) = [a_M, b_M]$ is an acceptance interval then

$$|\mathcal{A}| = \sum_{M=0}^N |[a_M, b_M]| = \sum_{M=0}^N (b_M - a_M + 1),$$

and similarly for a confidence interval \mathcal{C} .

Lemma 5.1 records some basic facts about inverted confidence sets.

Lemma 5.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be an acceptance set. Then the following hold.*

[†]Note that whereas above we referred to an expression like (6) as a set of acceptance intervals, we will now call it *an* acceptance interval (singular). This is to coincide with our terminology for a confidence set, as well as avoid cumbersome phrases like “a set of acceptance sets.”

1.

$$|\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{A}|. \quad (14)$$

2. $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{A}$ is symmetrical if and only if \mathcal{A} is symmetrical.

3. If, in addition, $\mathcal{A}(M) = [a_M, b_M]$ is interval-valued and the endpoint sequences $\{a_M\}$ and $\{b_M\}$ are nondecreasing, then $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{A}$ is interval-valued.

Proof. Denote $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{A}$ simply by \mathcal{C} . For part 1, letting $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ denote the indicator function,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{C}| &= \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{C}(x)| = \sum_{x \in [n]} |\{M \in [N] : x \in \mathcal{A}(M)\}| \\ &= \sum_{x \in [n], M \in [N]} \mathbf{1}\{x \in \mathcal{A}(M)\} = \sum_{M \in [N]} |\{x \in [n] : x \in \mathcal{A}(M)\}| \\ &= \sum_{M \in [N]} |\mathcal{A}(M)| = |\mathcal{A}|. \end{aligned}$$

For part 2, if \mathcal{A} is symmetrical,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(x) &= \{M \in [N] : x \in \mathcal{A}(M)\} \\ &= \{M \in [N] : x \in n - \mathcal{A}(N - M)\} \\ &= \{M \in [N] : n - x \in \mathcal{A}(N - M)\} \\ &= \{N - M \in [N] : n - x \in \mathcal{A}(M)\} \\ &= N - \{M \in [N] : n - x \in \mathcal{A}(M)\} \\ &= N - \mathcal{C}(n - x). \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument shows the converse.

For part 3, fix arbitrary $x \in [n]$ and to show that $\mathcal{C}(x)$ is an interval, suppose that $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{C}(x)$ and we will show that $M \in \mathcal{C}(x)$ for all $M_1 < M < M_2$. Since $M_2 \in \mathcal{C}(x)$, $x \in [a_{M_2}, b_{M_2}]$ so $x \geq a_{M_2} \geq a_M$ by monotonicity. By a similar argument, $x \leq b_{M_1} \leq b_M$, thus $x \in [a_M, b_M]$ so $M \in \mathcal{C}(x)$. □

5.3 Size optimality

We say that a confidence set \mathcal{C} is *size-optimal* among a collection of confidence sets if it achieves the minimum total size in that collection. The results in this section establish size-optimality of $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$, where $\mathcal{A}^* = \{[a_M^*, b_M^*] : M \in [N]\}$ denotes the result of applying Theorem 4.1 to any α max optimal acceptance intervals $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [N]\}$. Thus, \mathcal{A}^* could

be the intervals given by Algorithm 2, or the result of starting with any other α max optimal intervals. Whatever the choice of \mathcal{A}^* , note that \mathcal{C}^* is a symmetrical, $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence interval by Lemma 5.1

Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, which follow, are the main results of the paper. Theorem 5.1 is the more powerful of the two in that it gives wide conditions under which \mathcal{C}^* is size-optimal among symmetrical confidence sets (not just intervals) and shows that, even in the worst case, the total size $|\mathcal{C}^*|$ is at most 1 point larger than the optimal set. Theorem 5.2 specializes to intervals and gives conditions for optimality there. In particular, it shows that \mathcal{C}^* is size-optimal among all symmetrical non-empty (i.e., $\mathcal{C}(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all x) intervals, which are usually preferred in practice.

Theorem 5.1. *Let \mathcal{C}^* be as defined above and \mathfrak{C}_S the class of all symmetrical, $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence sets. Then \mathcal{C}^* is size-optimal in \mathfrak{C}_S , i.e.,*

$$|\mathcal{C}^*| = \min_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S} |\mathcal{C}|,$$

if either of the following holds:

- (a) *n or N is odd;*
- (b) *n, N are even and there is no size-optimal $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S$ such that $|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)|$ is even. If n, N , and $|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)|$ are all even for some size-optimal $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S$, then*

$$|\mathcal{C}^*| \leq \min_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S} |\mathcal{C}| + 1. \quad (15)$$

In addition, \mathcal{C}^ is size-optimal among all $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S$ such that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$ are all intervals.*

The proofs of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 utilize some auxiliary lemmas, stated and proved in Appendix E. See also Example 6.3 for an instance of \mathcal{C}^* failing to be optimal under conditions satisfying part (b).

Proof of Theorem 5.1. First suppose N is odd, and let $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S$ be arbitrary; we will show that $|\mathcal{C}^*| \leq |\mathcal{C}|$. Since $N/2$ is not an integer, by Lemma E.1 we have $|\mathcal{A}^*(M)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)|$ for all $M \in [N]$ thus, using Lemma 5.1,

$$|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}| = \sum_{M=0}^N |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)| \geq \sum_{M=0}^N |\mathcal{A}^*(M)| = |\mathcal{A}^*| = |\mathcal{C}^*|, \quad (16)$$

as claimed.

Now suppose N is even and let $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S$ be size-optimal. By Lemma E.1 we have $|\mathcal{A}^*(M)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)|$ for all $M \in [N]$ other than $M = N/2$. If n or $|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)|$ is odd, then by Lemma E.2 there is an interval $[a, n - a]$ such that $n - 2a + 1 = |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)|$ and $P_{N/2}([a, n - a]) \geq P_{N/2}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2))$.

Since $\mathcal{A}^*(N/2) = [a_{N/2}^*, b_{N/2}^*] = [a_{N/2}^*, n - a_{N/2}^*]$ is the shortest symmetrical acceptance interval for $M = N/2$, we have

$$|\mathcal{A}^*(N/2)| = b_{N/2}^* - a_{N/2}^* + 1 \leq n - 2a + 1 = |\mathcal{A}_C(N/2)|.$$

This, with the above inequality for the $M \neq N/2$ cases, establishes (16) in this case.

The remaining case – when N , n , and $|\mathcal{A}_C(N/2)|$ are all even – is handled by Lemma E.3, recalling that \mathcal{C} was size-optimal to establish (15).

For the final statement in the theorem, for any such \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{A}_C is symmetrical and thus has total size at least $|\mathcal{A}^*|$, so $|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{A}_C| \geq |\mathcal{A}^*| = |\mathcal{C}^*|$. \square

Theorem 5.2. *Let \mathcal{C}^* be as defined above and \mathfrak{C}_I the class of all symmetrical, $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence intervals. Then \mathcal{C}^* is size-optimal in \mathfrak{C}_I , i.e.,*

$$|\mathcal{C}^*| = \min_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_I} |\mathcal{C}|,$$

if either of the following holds:

- (a) *n or N is odd;*
- (b) *n, N are even and there is no size-optimal $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_I$ such that*

$$\mathcal{C}(n/2) = \emptyset. \tag{17}$$

A sufficient condition for \mathcal{C}^ to be size-optimal in this case is that*

$$\alpha < \binom{N/2}{n/2}^2 / \binom{N}{n}. \tag{18}$$

In particular, \mathcal{C}^ is size-optimal among all nonempty $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_I$ regardless of the parity of n, N .*

We comment that the scenario (17) seems to be particularly rare since $\mathcal{C}(n/2)$ is typically the widest confidence interval. Thus, even allowing empty intervals, Theorem 5.2 establishes size optimality of \mathcal{C}^* among intervals for most intents and purposes, and (15) holds in any case. However, it may be possible to construct an adversarial example with that property.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Part (a) is a consequence of Theorem 5.1 since $\mathfrak{C}_I \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_S$.

Assume N and n are even, and there is no size-optimal \mathcal{C} satisfying (17). Let \mathcal{C} be any size-optimal interval and since $\mathcal{C}(n/2) \neq \emptyset$, there is some $M \in \mathcal{C}(n/2)$. Because $\mathcal{C}(n/2)$ is symmetrical, $N - M \in \mathcal{C}(n/2)$, and because $\mathcal{C}(n/2)$ is an interval, $N/2 \in \mathcal{C}(n/2)$ since it lies between M and $N - M$.

This implies that $n/2 \in \mathcal{A}_C(N/2)$, which is symmetrical about $n/2$. Using these facts,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_C(N/2)| &= 2|\{x \in \mathcal{A}_C(N/2) \mid x < n/2\}| + |\{n/2\}| \\ &= 2|\{x \in \mathcal{A}_C(N/2) \mid x < n/2\}| + 1, \end{aligned}$$

an odd number. We then have $|\mathcal{C}^*| \leq |\mathcal{C}|$ by Lemma E.3.

To see that (18) is sufficient, suppose there is a \mathcal{C} with $\mathcal{C}(n/2) = \emptyset$. Then for $M = N/2$, we have

$$\alpha \geq P_M(M \notin \mathcal{C}(X)) \geq P_M(X = n/2) = \binom{N/2}{n/2}^2 / \binom{N}{n}.$$

□

6 Examples and comparisons

In this section we show examples of our proposed method \mathcal{C}^* using Algorithm 2 as the acceptance interval \mathcal{A}^* , and give some comparisons with other methods. All calculations of our method were performed using the R package `hyperMCI`, available at github.com/bartroff792/hyper.

For comparisons we focus on *exact* methods with guaranteed coverage probability. A standard method for producing a $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence interval for M is the so-called *method of pivoting the c.d.f.*[‡] giving $\mathcal{C}_{Piv}(x) = [L_{Piv}(x), U_{Piv}(x)]$ where, for fixed nonnegative $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{Piv}(x) &= \min\{M \in [N] : P_M(X \geq x) > \alpha_1\}, \\ U_{Piv}(x) &= \max\{M \in [N] : P_M(X \leq x) > \alpha_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

See Buonaccorsi (1987), Casella and Berger (2002, Chapter 9), or Konijn (1973). Taking $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha/2$ is a common choice, and all our calculations of \mathcal{C}_{Piv} below use this.

W. Wang (2015) proposed a method producing a $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence interval for M , which we denote by \mathcal{C}_W , that cycles through the intervals $\mathcal{C}_{Piv}(x)$, shrinking the intervals where possible while checking that coverage probability is maintained. The algorithm can require multiple passes through the intervals, calculating the coverage probability for all $M \in [N]$ multiple times, and is therefore computationally intensive. We compare the computational times of \mathcal{C}_W and \mathcal{C}^* in Examples 6.1 and 6.2. All calculations of $\mathcal{C}_W(x)$ were performed using that author's R code.

[‡]We have heard this method alternatively called the *quantile method* and the *method of extreme tails*.

Although W. Wang proves that a 1-sided version of his algorithm produces size-optimal intervals (among 1-sided intervals), it is not claimed that \mathcal{C}_W is size-optimal. Since \mathcal{C}_W produces nonempty intervals we know that $|\mathcal{C}^*| \leq |\mathcal{C}_W|$ by Theorem 5.2. In the following example we compare \mathcal{C}^* with \mathcal{C}_W in terms of both size and computational time, and indeed exhibit a setting where $|\mathcal{C}^*| < |\mathcal{C}_W|$. We also note that the regularity conditions assumed in W. Wang’s results are slightly more restrictive than our symmetry condition (12), which W. Wang calls a “natural restriction,” by including two additional requirements that both sequences of endpoints of $\mathcal{C}_W(x)$ be non-decreasing in x , and any sub-interval of $\mathcal{C}_W(x)$ must have confidence level strictly less than $1 - \alpha$. Our \mathcal{C}^* satisfies these additional properties, and see also Figure 1 for an example of monotonicity of \mathcal{C}^* . However, we do not require them of the confidence sets considered so that our optimality results apply to a broader class.

Example 6.1. We compare \mathcal{C}^* , \mathcal{C}_{Piv} , and \mathcal{C}_W in the setting $\alpha = 0.05$, $N = 500$, and $n = 10, 20, 30, \dots, 490$. Figure 1 plots the \mathcal{C}^* intervals as vertical bars for the $n = 100$ case. The \mathcal{C}^* intervals are much shorter than the \mathcal{C}_{Piv} intervals in this setting, and Figure 2 shows the differences in size $|\mathcal{C}_{Piv}| - |\mathcal{C}^*|$ for $n = 10, 20, \dots, 490$ which are substantial; all the \mathcal{C}^* intervals are at least 200 points shorter than their corresponding \mathcal{C}_{Piv} intervals, and some are as many as 260 points shorter. These differences are also sizable fractions of the largest possible range $[0, N] = [0, 500]$.

The \mathcal{C}_W intervals are very similar to \mathcal{C}^* and so are not shown in Figures 1-2. In fact, the sizes $|\mathcal{C}_W| = |\mathcal{C}^*|$ are exactly equal for all values of n considered, except $n = 100$. To examine this case more closely, we give these confidence intervals explicitly in Tables 1 and 2. Examining these tables shows very similar, but slightly different intervals, with neither method dominating the other. For example, $|\mathcal{C}^*(0)| = |[0, 14]| < |[0, 16]| = |\mathcal{C}_W(0)|$ and


$$|\mathcal{C}^*(13)| = |[40, 102]| > |[40, 101]| = |\mathcal{C}_W(13)|. \quad (19)$$

Totalling the sizes gives $|\mathcal{C}^*| = 7129 < 7131 = |\mathcal{C}_W|$, showing that the \mathcal{C}_W intervals are indeed non-optimal. One property of our method is that it does not necessarily producing intervals that are sub-intervals of \mathcal{C}_{Piv} , which \mathcal{C}_W always does since it begins with these intervals before iteratively shrinking them. For example, in this setting $\mathcal{C}_{Piv}(13) = [39, 101]$ which, by (19), contains $\mathcal{C}_W(13)$ but not $\mathcal{C}^*(13)$.

In addition to the total sizes, Tables 1 and 2 also show the computational times[§] used by both methods, at the bottom of each table. Whereas \mathcal{C}^* took roughly 1/10th of a second (.0019 minutes) to fill the table, \mathcal{C}_W took more than 10 minutes. As mentioned above, this is due to the adjusting technique of \mathcal{C}_W which requires repeated updating of intervals, whereas \mathcal{C}^* just requires

[§]Computed using R’s `proc.time()` function

Figure 1: Confidence intervals $\mathcal{C}^*(x)$ for $\alpha = 0.05$, $N = 500$, $n = 100$, and $x = 0, 1, \dots, 100$.



one pass through the acceptance intervals for adjustment. Figure 3 gives a more complete comparison of computational times in this setting. The additional time required by \mathcal{C}_W is sizable, even exceeding 25 minutes for values of n near the middle of the range. A comparison of computational times of \mathcal{C}_{Piv} and \mathcal{C}^* is shown in Figure 4, which shows that the times are much faster overall compared to \mathcal{C}_W (the longest times being less than 1/3 of a second), and comparable between the two methods.

Figures 5 and 6 show the coverage probability for the $n = 100$ case of the three methods as a function of $M = 0, 1, \dots, 500$. Like their sizes, \mathcal{C}_W and \mathcal{C}^* have very similar coverage probabilities, whereas that of \mathcal{C}_{Piv} is overall higher (an undesirable property once it exceeds $1 - \alpha$), especially for values of M near the endpoints 0 and $N = 500$.

Example 6.2. We compare the computational time of \mathcal{C}^* and \mathcal{C}_W in the setting $\alpha = 0.05$, $N = 200, 400, \dots, 1000$, and $n = N/2$.

Wang's (2015) method is time-consuming especially when the sample size and the population size are large. A comparison of computational times of \mathcal{C}^* and \mathcal{C}_W are shown in Figure 7. When $N = 1000$, $n = 500$ and $\alpha = 0.05$, the computational time for \mathcal{C}_W reached 250 minutes, and \mathcal{C}^* only took 0.0111 minutes, which shows that our method is efficient.

Figure 2: The differences in total size $|\mathcal{C}_{Piv}| - |\mathcal{C}^*|$, for $N = 500$, $\alpha = 0.05$, and $n = 10, 20, \dots, 490$.





Figure 3: The computational time of the confidence intervals \mathcal{C}_W and \mathcal{C}^* for $N = 500$, $\alpha = 0.05$, and $n = 10, 20, \dots, 490$.



Example 6.3. In this example we show the necessity of part (b) of Theorem 5.1. That is, we exhibit a setting with n , N , and $\mathcal{A}(N/2)$ all even

Table 1: Confidence intervals given by $\mathcal{C}^*(x) = [L(x), U(x)]$ for $\alpha = 0.05$, $N = 500$, $n = 100$, and $x = 0, 1, \dots, 100$.

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
$L(x)$	0	1	3	5	8	12	15	16	22	25	29	32	37	40
$U(x)$	14	24	31	39	46	52	59	64	72	77	84	89	94	102
x	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
$L(x)$	45	47	53	56	60	65	69	73	78	82	85	90	95	100
$U(x)$	107	112	117	124	129	134	139	144	152	157	162	167	172	177
x	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41
$L(x)$	103	108	113	118	122	125	130	135	140	145	149	153	158	163
$U(x)$	182	188	194	199	204	209	214	219	224	229	234	239	244	250
x	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55
$L(x)$	168	173	178	183	187	191	195	200	205	210	215	220	225	230
$U(x)$	255	260	265	270	275	280	285	290	295	300	305	309	313	317
x	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69
$L(x)$	235	240	245	250	256	261	266	271	276	281	286	291	296	301
$U(x)$	322	327	332	337	342	347	351	355	360	365	370	375	378	382
x	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83
$L(x)$	306	312	318	323	328	333	338	343	348	356	361	366	371	376
$U(x)$	387	392	397	400	405	410	415	418	422	427	431	435	440	444
x	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97
$L(x)$	383	388	393	398	406	411	416	423	428	436	441	448	454	461
$U(x)$	447	453	455	460	463	468	471	475	478	484	485	488	492	495
x	98	99	100											
$L(x)$	469	476	486											
$U(x)$	497	499	500											
Computational time: 0.0019 min. Total size: 7129														

for a certain acceptance set \mathcal{A} whose inversion \mathcal{C} is size-optimal with $|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{C}^*| - 1$. Set $N = 20$, $n = 6$, and $\alpha = 0.6$. For $M \neq N/2 = 10$ define $\mathcal{A}(M) = [a_M^*, b_M^*]$ to be the same intervals given by Theorem 4.1 and inverted to create \mathcal{C}^* , and define $\mathcal{A}(10) = \{2, 4\}$. For all $M \neq 10$, $\mathcal{A}(M)$ is a level- α interval, and $\mathcal{A}(10)$ is as well since

$$P_{M=10}(2) = P_{M=10}(4) = .244$$

to 3 decimal places, thus $P_{M=10}(\{2, 4\}) > .4 = 1 - \alpha$. It can be shown that $\mathcal{A}^*(10) = [2, 4]$, thus the intervals \mathcal{A} have 1 fewer point than \mathcal{A}^* , so by (14) we have that $|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{C}^*| - 1$.

Example 6.4 (Air quality data). In this example we apply our confidence

Table 2: Confidence intervals given by W. Wang’s (2015) method \mathcal{C} for $N = 500$, $n = 100$, and $\alpha = 0.05$.

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
$L(x)$	0	1	3	5	8	12	15	17	22	25	29	33	37	40
$U(x)$	16	24	32	39	46	52	59	65	72	78	84	90	95	101
x	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
$L(x)$	45	47	53	56	60	66	69	73	79	82	85	91	96	100
$U(x)$	107	113	117	124	130	135	141	144	152	157	163	168	173	178
x	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41
$L(x)$	102	108	114	118	122	125	131	136	142	145	149	153	158	164
$U(x)$	182	188	194	200	205	210	215	220	225	231	236	241	246	250
x	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55
$L(x)$	169	174	179	183	187	191	195	201	206	211	216	221	226	232
$U(x)$	253	258	263	268	274	279	284	289	294	299	305	309	313	317
x	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69
$L(x)$	237	242	247	250	254	259	264	269	275	280	285	290	295	300
$U(x)$	321	326	331	336	342	347	351	355	358	364	369	375	378	382
x	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83
$L(x)$	306	312	318	322	327	332	337	343	348	356	359	365	370	376
$U(x)$	386	392	398	400	404	409	415	418	421	427	431	434	440	444
x	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97
$L(x)$	383	387	393	399	405	410	416	422	428	435	441	448	454	461
$U(x)$	447	453	455	460	463	467	471	475	478	483	485	488	492	495
x	98	99	100											
$L(x)$	468	476	484											
$U(x)$	497	499	500											
Computational time: 10.1792 min. Total size: 7131														

interval \mathcal{C}^* to data collected by China’s Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP) and discussed by [Liang et al. \(2016\)](#). The MEP collects data on particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) concentration, measured in $\mu g/m^3$, of fine inhalable particles with diameters less than 2.5 micrometers. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2012) classifies the air quality of a given day as “hazardous” if the day’s 24-hour average $PM_{2.5}$ measurement exceeds the set threshold 250.5. [Liang et al. \(2016\)](#) analyzed the 2013 to 2015 MEP data and concluded that it was consistent with measurements taken at nearby U.S. diplomatic posts, the U.S. Embassy in Beijing and four U.S. Consulates in other cities. However, a persistent problem with the MEP data is a high degree of missing days. For a given year, if the missing days

Figure 4: The computational time of the confidence intervals \mathcal{C}_{Piv} and \mathcal{C}^* for $N = 500$, $\alpha = 0.05$, and $n = 10, 20, \dots, 490$.





Figure 5: Coverage probability of \mathcal{C}^* and \mathcal{C}_{Piv} for $N = 500$, $n = 100$, and $\alpha = 0.05$.



are assumed to be missing at random with each day of the year equally likely, then the number X of remaining ‘hazardous’ days, conditioned on the number n of remaining days, follows a hypergeometric distribution with $N = 365$ and unknown actual number M of annual hazardous days, to be estimated as an indication of annual air quality.

We focus on the 2015 data from 3 MEP sites in Beijing: Dongsì, Dongsìhuan, and Nongzhanguan. For each of these sites, Table 3 shows the number n of days with complete measurements, the observed number x of days with complete measurements classified as hazardous, the point estimate Nx/n

Figure 6: Coverage probability of \mathcal{C}_W for $N = 500$, $n = 100$, and $\alpha = 0.05$.





Figure 7: The computational time of the confidence intervals \mathcal{C}_W and \mathcal{C}^* for $N = 200, 400, \dots, 1000$, and $n = N/2$.




(with $N = 365$) of the number M of annual hazardous days, and the 90% confidence interval $\mathcal{C}^*(x)$ for M , which are also plotted in Figure 8. The point estimates from the MEP sites are similar to and surround the estimate at the U.S. Embassy data, similar to the conclusions drawn by [Liang et al. \(2016\)](#). But the confidence intervals also show that the MEP estimates are

more variable, largely in the direction of indicating worse air quality, with two out of three upper confidence limits being much larger for the MEP sites than for the U.S. Embassy.

Table 3: For the Beijing air quality data (Liang et al., 2016), the number n of days with complete measurements, the number x of days with complete measurements classified as hazardous, the point estimate Nx/n (to 1 decimal place) of the number M of annual hazardous days, and the 90% confidence interval $\mathcal{C}^*(x)$ for M .

Site	n	x	Nx/n	90% CI for M
Dongsi	292	16	20.0	[17, 24]
Dongsihuan	166	7	15.4	[10, 24]
Nongzhanguan	290	11	13.8	[11, 17]
U.S. Embassy	332	15	16.5	[15, 18]

Figure 8: The 90% confidence interval $\mathcal{C}^*(x)$ for the number M of annual hazardous days at different locations in Beijing.



7 Discussion

We have presented an efficient method of computing exact hypergeometric confidence intervals. Compared to the standard pivotal method, our method requires similar computational time but produces much shorter intervals. Our method produces intervals with total size no larger than, and strictly smaller than in some cases, the existing nearly-optimal method of W. Wang (2015), which is computationally much more costly than our and the pivotal method. Therefore we hope our method can provide something near the “best of both worlds” for this problem in terms of computational time and interval size.

The key to our method is the novel shifting of acceptance intervals before inversion, developed in Sections 3 and 4. We have observed in the numerical examples included in Section 6, as well as extensive further computations not included in this paper, that the needed shifts in Theorem 3.1 seem to never exceed a single point. This is not needed in our theory but we close by mentioning it as a tantalizing conjecture.

A similar approach to the one here of shifting optimal acceptance regions before inverting can be used to produce optimal confidence intervals for the hypergeometric population size N when it is unknown, such as in capture-recapture problems (Bailey, 1951; Pollock et al., 1990; Wittes, 1972). A forthcoming work will cover this problem.

References

- Bailey, N. T. (1951). On estimating the size of mobile populations from recapture data. *Biometrika*, 38:293–306.
- Blaker, H. (2000). Confidence curves and improved exact confidence intervals for discrete distributions. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 28(4):783–798.
- Blaker, H. (2001). Corrigenda: Confidence curves and improved exact confidence intervals for discrete distribution. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 29(4):681–681.
- Blyth, C. R. and Still, H. A. (1983). Binomial confidence intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 78(381):108–116.
- Buonaccorsi, J. P. (1987). A note on confidence intervals for proportions in finite populations. *The American Statistician*, 41(3):215–218.
- Casella, G. and Berger, R. L. (2002). *Statistical Inference*. Duxbury Press.

- Chvátal, V. (1979). The tail of the hypergeometric distribution. *Discrete Mathematics*, 25(3):285–287.
- Clopper, C. J. and Pearson, E. S. (1934). The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika*, 26(4):404–413.
- Crow, E. L. (1956). Confidence intervals for a proportion. *Biometrika*, 43:423–435.
- Crow, E. L. and Gardner, R. S. (1959). Confidence intervals for the expectation of a Poisson variable. *Biometrika*, 46(3/4):441–453.
- Hald, A. (1990). *A History of Probability and Statistics and Their Applications Before 1750*. Wiley, New York.
- Johnson, N. L., Kotz, S., and Kemp, A. W. (1993). *Univariate Discrete Distributions*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, second edition.
- Keilson, J. and Gerber, H. (1971). Some results for discrete unimodality. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 66(334):386–389.
- Konijn, H. S. (1973). *Statistical Theory of Sample Survey Design and Analysis*. North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Liang, X., Li, S., Zhang, S., Huang, H., and Chen, S. X. (2016). PM_{2.5} data reliability, consistency, and air quality assessment in five Chinese cities. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121:10–220. Data sets available at <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/PM2.5+Data+of+Five+Chinese+Cities>.
- Pollock, K. H., Nichols, J. D., Brownie, C., and Hines, J. E. (1990). Statistical inference for capture-recapture experiments. *Wildlife Society Monographs*, 107:3–97.
- Rice, J. A. (2007). *Mathematical Statistics and Data Analysis*. Duxbury Press, Belmont, California, 3rd edition.
- Schilling, M. F. and Doi, J. A. (2014). A coverage probability approach to finding an optimal binomial confidence procedure. *The American Statistician*, 68(3):133–145.
- Skala, M. (2013). Hypergeometric tail inequalities: Ending the insanity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.5939*.
- Sterne, T. E. (1954). Some remarks on confidence or fiducial limits. *Biometrika*, 41:275–278.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2012). The National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particle Pollution Revised Air Quality Standards For Particle Pollution And Updates To The Air Quality Index (AQI). https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-04/documents/2012_aqi_factsheet.pdf.

Wang, W. (2015). Exact optimal confidence intervals for hypergeometric parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(512):1491–1499.

Wittes, J. T. (1972). Note: On the bias and estimated variance of Chapman’s two-sample capture-recapture population estimate. *Biometrics*, 28:592–597.

A Properties of the hypergeometric distribution and auxiliary lemmas

In this section, we first record some well known properties of the $\text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$ distribution in Lemmas A.1 and A.2, the latter covering unimodality of $P_M(x)$ in x . The content of Lemma A.1 is mentioned in Johnson et al. (1993, Chapter 6), so we do not prove that here, and Lemma A.2 follows from the expression

$$\frac{P_M(x)}{P_M(x-1)} = \frac{(M+1-x)(n+1-x)}{x(N-M-n+x)} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq x \leq n.$$

After that we state and prove some needed auxiliary results concerning other types of monotonicity and unimodality: monotonicity of density function ratios with respect to M in Lemma A.3, and unimodality of $P_M([a, b])$ with respect to M in Lemma A.4 and with respect to shifts in the interval $[a, b]$ in Lemma A.5. Throughout let $P_M(x)$ denote the density (1) of the $\text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$ distribution.

Lemma A.1. 1. We have

$$\begin{aligned} X \sim \text{Hyper}(n, M, N) &\Leftrightarrow X \sim \text{Hyper}(M, n, N) \\ &\Leftrightarrow n - X \sim \text{Hyper}(N - M, n, N). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

2. A useful coupling: For $n < N$, $X \sim \text{Hyper}(M, n+1, N)$ can be written $X = X' + Y$ where $X' \sim \text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$ and $Y|X' \sim \text{Bern}((M - X')/(N - n))$.
3. Monotone likelihood ratio: For every $M_1, M_2 \in [N]$ with $M_1 < M_2$, $P_{M_2}(x)/P_{M_1}(x)$ is nondecreasing in x (with the convention $c/0 = \infty$ for $c > 0$).

Lemma A.2 (Unimodality properties of the hypergeometric). *Let*

$$m = \frac{(n+1)(M+1)}{N+2}, \quad (21)$$

$m_1 = \lceil m - 1 \rceil$, and $m_2 = \lfloor m \rfloor$. *The following hold.*

1. $P_M(x)$ *increases strictly on* $[x_{\min}, m_1]$ *and decreases strictly on* $[m_2, x_{\max}]$, *where* $x_{\min} = \max\{0, M+n-N\}$ *and* $x_{\max} = \min\{n, M\}$ *are the smallest and largest, respectively, of the* x *values with positive* P_M *probability.*
2. $\arg \max_x P_M(x) = [m_1, m_2]$, *where* $[m_1, m_2] = [\lfloor m \rfloor, \lfloor m \rfloor]$, *unless* m *is an integer, in which case* $[m_1, m_2] = [m-1, m]$.

The next lemma establishes monotonicity in M of ratios $P_M(x_2)/P_M(x_1)$.

Lemma A.3. *For fixed* N *and* n , *let* x_1, x_2 *be distinct integers in* $[0, n]$ *such that* $0 < x_2 - x_1 < N - n$. *Then*

$$\frac{P_M(x_2)}{P_M(x_1)} < \frac{P_{M+1}(x_2)}{P_{M+1}(x_1)} \quad \text{for } x_2 \leq M \leq N - n + x_1. \quad (22)$$

Proof. We have

$$\frac{P_M(x_2)}{P_M(x_1)} = \prod_{x=x_1}^{x_2-1} \frac{(M-x)(n-x)}{(N-M-(n-x)+1)(x+1)} \quad (23)$$

$$< \prod_{x=x_1}^{x_2-1} \frac{(M+1-x)(n-x)}{(N-(M+1)-(n-x)+1)(x+1)} = \frac{P_{M+1}(x_2)}{P_{M+1}(x_1)}. \quad (24)$$

□

The next lemma establishes the unimodality of probabilities $P_M([a, b])$ as a function of M . It is helpful to define coupled random variables X and Y as the numbers of red and white balls, respectively, in a simple random sample of n from a box of N balls in which M balls are white, one is red, and the remaining $N - (M+1)$ balls are green. Then $X \sim \text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$ and $X+Y \sim \text{Hyper}(M+1, n, N)$. In the usual notation, $P_{M+1}(x) = P(X+Y = x)$ and $P_M(x) = P(X = x)$. Writing

$$\begin{aligned} P_{M+1}(x) - P_M(x) &= [P(X = x-1, Y = 1) + P(X = x, Y = 0)] \\ &\quad - [P(X = x, Y = 1) + P(X = x, Y = 0)] \\ &= P(X = x-1, Y = 1) - P(X = x, Y = 1), \end{aligned}$$

and summing over x from a to b yields

$$P_{M+1}([a, b]) - P_M([a, b]) = P(X = a-1, Y = 1) - P(X = b, Y = 1). \quad (25)$$

Note that for x such that $P(X = x) > 0$,

$$P(X = x, Y = 1) = P(X = x) \frac{n - x}{N - M} = P_M(x) \frac{n - x}{N - M} \quad (26)$$

since x white balls in the sample implies that $n - x$ of the $N - M$ colored (red or green) balls are in the sample, so that the red ball has conditional probability $(n - x)/(N - M)$ of being in the sample. Relation (26) is trivially true when $P(X = x) = 0$, so it is true for all $x \in [n]$. Using (25) and (26),

$$(N - M)(P_{M+1}([a, b]) - P_M([a, b])) = (n - (a - 1))P_M(a - 1) - (n - b)P_M(b). \quad (27)$$

This equation provides the basis for the following lemma.

Lemma A.4. *Assume $0 \leq a \leq b \leq n$ and $b - a < n$. Then $P_M([a, b])$ is nondecreasing for $M \leq M(a, b)$ and nonincreasing for $M \geq M(a, b)$, where*

$$M(a, b) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a = 0 \\ N & \text{if } b = n \\ \min\{M : (n - (a - 1))P_M(a - 1) < (n - b)P_M(b)\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

Proof. By (27),

$$\text{sgn}(P_{M+1}([a, b]) - P_M([a, b])) = \text{sgn}((n - (a - 1))P_M(a - 1) - (n - b)P_M(b)). \quad (29)$$

If $a = 0$, the first term on the right-hand side vanishes and $\{P_M([a, b])\}$ is therefore nonincreasing. Similarly if $b = n$, $\{P_M([a, b])\}$ is nondecreasing. It remains to consider only $1 \leq a \leq b \leq n - 1$, and it suffices to show that if M_1, M_2 are such that

$$\text{sgn}(P_{M+1}([a, b]) - P_M([a, b])) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } M = M_1 \\ -1 & \text{if } M = M_2, \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

then $M_1 < M_2$. Since the coefficients $n - (a - 1)$ and $n - b$ in (29) are positive, (29) and (30) imply that $P_{M_1}(a - 1)$ and $P_{M_2}(b)$ must be positive. Therefore, since by (2) $P_M(x)$ must be positive if and only if $x \leq M \leq x + N - n$, we have

$$M_1 \in I_1 := [a - 1, a - 1 + N - n] \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 \in I_2 := [b, b + N - n].$$

The endpoints of I_1 are less than the corresponding endpoints of I_2 , so that M_1 cannot be to the right of I_2 , and if it is to the left, $M_1 < M_2$ follows immediately. So assume that M_1 belongs to I_2 and similarly that M_2 belongs to I_1 . Then M_1 and M_2 both belong to $I_1 \cap I_2$, hence

$$b \leq M_1, M_2 \leq a - 1 + N - n.$$

Since $n - b$ is positive and $P_M(a - 1)$ is positive on this interval, (29) and (30) imply that

$$\operatorname{sgn}\left(\frac{P_M(b)}{P_M(a-1)} - \frac{n - (a-1)}{n - b}\right) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } M = M_1 \\ +1 & \text{if } M = M_2, \end{cases}$$

and the property (22) implies that $M_1 < M_2$. \square

Lemma A.5. *For fixed n, N , $0 \leq a \leq b < n$, and positive integer $d \leq n - b$, we have*

- (i) $M(a, b) \leq M(a + d, a + d)$, and
- (ii) $P_M([a, b]) \leq P_M([a + d, b + d])$ for all $M \geq M(a + d, b + d)$.

Proof. The lemma can be proved by induction on d as it is straightforward to verify using the definition (28) of $M(a, b)$ and the inequality (24). We omit the details. \square

B Proof of Theorem 3.1 and auxiliary results

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We first prove that \mathcal{M}_a and \mathcal{M}_b are disjoint. Take $M \in \mathcal{M}_a$, so that $a_M < \bar{a}_M$, and we will show that $M \notin \mathcal{M}_b$, i.e., $b_M \leq b_{M'}$ for all $M' > M$. Fix such an $M' \in \mathcal{M}$, and we will consider 2 cases, comparing $a_{M'}$ and \bar{a}_M . Case 1: $a_{M'} < \bar{a}_M$. In this case we have $a_{M'} < \bar{a}_M \leq \bar{a}_{M'}$. If equality holds in this last, then there exists $M'_\ell < M < M'$ such that $a_{M'_\ell} = \bar{a}_M = \bar{a}_{M'}$, so $b_{M'} \geq b_M$ by part 1(d)ii of Lemma B.1. Otherwise, $\bar{a}_M < \bar{a}_{M'}$, so it must be that a new maximum is achieved between M and M' , i.e., $\bar{a}_{M'} = a_{M'_\ell}$ for some $M < M'_\ell < M'$. Then $a_{M'_\ell} > \bar{a}_M$, so $b_M < b_{M'_\ell}$ by part 1 of Lemma B.2. We also have $a_{M'_\ell} = \bar{a}_{M'} > a_{M'}$, so $b_{M'_\ell} \leq b_{M'}$ by part (i) of Lemma B.5. Combining these inequalities gives $b_{M'} > b_M$. Case 2: $a_{M'} \geq \bar{a}_M$. We have $b_{M'} > b_M$ by part 1 of Lemma B.2, implying that $b_M = \underline{b}_M$, satisfying the claim.

The proof of that $M \in \mathcal{M}_b$ implies $M \notin \mathcal{M}_a$ is similar.

For monotonicity of the endpoints it suffices to show that $b_M^{adj} \leq b_{M+1}^{adj}$ for $M \leq N - 1$, since the corresponding result for the sequence $\{a_M^{adj}\}$ is proved similarly. For all $M \leq N - 1$, $b_{M+1}^{adj} \geq \underline{b}_{M+1} \geq \underline{b}_M$, and if $M \notin \mathcal{M}_a$ then $\underline{b}_M = b_M^{adj}$. Hence only the case $M \in \mathcal{M}_a$ remains to be considered. If also $M + 1 \in \mathcal{M}_a$, then Lemma B.1, part 1d, applies with $M^* = M + 1$, hence $b_M - a_M \leq b_{M+1} - a_{M+1}$, and since $\bar{a}_M \leq \bar{a}_{M+1}$, the result follows by adding the last two inequalities. If $M + 1 \notin \mathcal{M}_a \cup \mathcal{M}_b$, then $a_{M+1} = \bar{a}_{M+1} \geq \bar{a}_M$, and Lemma B.2 applies, yielding $b_{M+1} \geq b_M + \bar{a}_M - a_M$, which suffices. Finally, if $M + 1 \in \mathcal{M}_b$, then $M + 1 < N$ and

$$b_{M+1} > b_{M+1}^{adj} = \underline{b}_{M+1} = b_{M'} \quad \text{for some } M' > M + 1.$$

By Lemma B.5, $a_{M'} \geq a_{M+1} = \bar{a}_{M+1} \geq \bar{a}_M$, the equality holding since $M+1 \notin \mathcal{M}_a$ by the disjointness of \mathcal{M}_a and \mathcal{M}_b . Applying Lemma B.2 and the definition of M' , $b_M^{adj} \leq B_{M'} = \underline{b}_{M+1} = b_{M+1}^{adj}$.

That the adjusted intervals are level- α is handled in parts 1a and 2a of Lemma B.1, respectively, for the two nontrivial cases. Finally, note that the adjusted intervals have the same length as the original intervals, thus implying length optimality. \square

The next lemma establishes that anywhere a “gap” $a_M > \bar{a}_M$ occurs in the sequence of lower endpoints of α max optimal acceptance intervals, the gap may be “filled” by shifting the interval up the needed amount while maintaining the interval’s acceptance probability and without violating monotonicity in the upper endpoint b_M .

Lemma B.1. *Let $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ be α max optimal with $\mathcal{M} \subseteq [N]$ an interval, and $\bar{a}_M, \underline{b}_M, \mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{M}_b$ as defined in (3)-(4).*

1. *If $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_a$ then, letting $\delta = \bar{a}_{M^*} - a_{M^*}$, we have*
 - (a) $P_{M^*}([a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta]) \geq 1 - \alpha$,
 - (b) *there exists $M_\ell \in \mathcal{M}$ with $M_\ell < M^*$ such that $a_{M_\ell} = \bar{a}_{M^*}$,*
 - (c) $b_{M^*} + \delta > b_{M_\ell}$ *for any M_ℓ satisfying 1b,*
 - (d) *for any M_ℓ satisfying 1b, then for all $M \in [M_\ell, M^*]$ we have*
 - i. $b_M - a_M \leq b_{M^*} - a_{M^*}$,
 - ii. $b_M \leq b_{M^*}$.
2. *If $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_b$ then, letting $\delta = b_{M^*} - \underline{b}_{M^*}$, we have*
 - (a) $P_{M^*}([a_{M^*} - \delta, b_{M^*} - \delta]) \geq 1 - \alpha$,
 - (b) *there exists $M_u \in \mathcal{M}$ with $M_u > M^*$ such that $b_{M_u} = \underline{b}_{M^*}$,*
 - (c) $a_{M^*} - \delta < a_{M_u}$ *for any M_u satisfying 2b,*
 - (d) *for any M_u satisfying 2b, then for all $M^* \leq M \leq M_u$ we have*
 - i. $b_M - a_M \leq b_{M^*} - a_{M^*}$,
 - ii. $a_M \geq a_{M^*}$.

Proof of Lemma B.1. Part 1b follows from the definition of \bar{a}_M . For part 1c, $b_{M^*} \geq b_{M_\ell}$ by Lemma B.5, so $b_{M^*} + \delta > b_{M_\ell}$. Using this and the fact that $a_{M^*} + \delta = \bar{a}_{M^*} = a_{M_\ell}$, we have

$$[a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}] \subseteq [a_{M^*} + \Delta, b_{M^*} + \Delta] \quad \text{for all } \Delta \in [\delta],$$

and thus

$$P_M([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]) \leq P_M([a_{M^*} + \Delta, b_{M^*} + \Delta]) \quad \text{for all } M \in \mathcal{M}, \Delta \in [\delta]. \quad (31)$$

We know that

$$P_{M^*}([a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta]) \leq P_{M^*}([a_{M^*}, b_{M^*}]) \quad (32)$$

by Definition 3.1 since these intervals have the same width. If equality holds in (32) then part 1a is proved because the right-hand-side is $\geq 1 - \alpha$. Otherwise strict inequality holds in (32), which implies that $M^* < M(a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta)$ by Lemma A.5, part (ii). Then, using unimodality and (31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{M^*}([a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta]) &\geq P_{M_\ell}([a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta]) \\ &\geq P_{M_\ell}([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]) \\ &\geq 1 - \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof of part 1a. For part 1d, using unimodality we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{M^*}([a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta]) &\geq \\ \min(P_{M^*}([a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta]), P_{M_\ell}([a_{M^*} + \delta, b_{M^*} + \delta])) & \\ &\geq 1 - \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$b_M - a_M \leq b_{M^*} + \delta - (a_{M^*} + \delta) = b_{M^*} - a_{M^*}$$

by length optimality of $[a_M, b_M]$. By this inequality, if $a_{M^*} \geq a_M$ then $b_{M^*} \geq b_M$. Otherwise, $a_{M^*} < a_M$ so $b_{M^*} \geq b_M$ by Lemma B.5, completing the proof of 1d.

The proof of part 2 involves similar arguments, after reflecting the endpoint sequences $\tilde{a}_{N-M} = n - b_M$, $\tilde{b}_{N-M} = n - a_M$ and using Lemma B.3. We omit the rest of the details. \square

Parts 1-2 of next lemma establish that the adjusted acceptance intervals given in Theorem 3.1 have nondecreasing lower endpoints, and parts 3-4 show the same for the upper endpoints.

Lemma B.2. *Let $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ be α max optimal with $\mathcal{M} \subseteq [N]$ an interval, and $\bar{a}_M, \underline{b}_M, \mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{M}_b$ as defined in (3)-(4).*

1. *If $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_a$ and $M^* < M \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy $a_M \geq \bar{a}_{M^*}$, then $b_{M^*} < b_{M^*} + \bar{a}_{M^*} - a_{M^*} \leq b_M$.*
2. *The sequence $b_M + \bar{a}_M - a_M$ is nondecreasing in $M \in \mathcal{M}_a$.*
3. *If $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_b$ and $M^* > M \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy $b_M \leq \underline{b}_{M^*}$, then $a_{M^*} > a_{M^*} - (b_{M^*} - \underline{b}_{M^*}) \geq a_M$.*
4. *The sequence $a_M - b_M + \underline{b}_M$ is nondecreasing in $M \in \mathcal{M}_b$.*

Proof. For part 1, there must be $M_\ell < M^*$ such that $a_{M_\ell} = \bar{a}_{M^*} > a_{M^*}$. Then we have $b_{M_\ell} \leq b_{M^*}$ by Lemma B.5, part (i). Combining these two, we have $[a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}] \subsetneq [a_{M^*}, b_{M^*}]$, thus

$$P_{M^*}([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]) < 1 - \alpha \leq P_{M_\ell}([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]),$$

by length optimality of the latter. This implies that $M^* \geq M(a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell})$ by Lemma A.4. We also have that

$$P_M([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]) \leq P_{M^*}([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]) < 1 - \alpha \quad (33)$$

since $M > M^* \geq M(a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell})$. If it were that $b_M \leq b_{M_\ell}$, then we would have $[a_M, b_M] \subseteq [a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]$ and then (33) would imply that

$$P_M([a_M, b_M]) \leq P_M([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]) < 1 - \alpha,$$

a contradiction. Thus it must be that $b_M > b_{M_\ell}$. Then we have $[a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}] \subseteq [a_{M_\ell}, b_M]$ and $[a_M, b_M] \subseteq [a_{M_\ell}, b_M]$,

$$P_{M_\ell}([a_{M_\ell}, b_M]) \geq P_{M_\ell}([a_{M_\ell}, b_{M_\ell}]) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

and

$$P_M([a_{M_\ell}, b_M]) \geq P_M([a_M, b_M]) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Thus, by unimodality, $P_{M^*}([a_{M_\ell}, b_M]) \geq 1 - \alpha$, and so by length optimality we have

$$b_{M^*} - a_{M^*} \leq b_M - a_{M_\ell}. \quad (34)$$

Note that $b_{M^*} + \bar{a}_{M^*} - a_{M^*} = a_{M_\ell} + b_{M^*} - a_{M^*}$. By the inequality (34), we have

$$b_{M^*} + \bar{a}_{M^*} - a_{M^*} = a_{M_\ell} + b_{M^*} - a_{M^*} \leq a_{M_\ell} + b_M - a_{M_\ell} = b_M,$$

concluding the proof of part 1.

For 2, consider $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}_a$ with $M_1 < M_2$. We have $\bar{a}_{M_1} \leq \bar{a}_{M_2}$. If strict inequality holds then there is $M_{\ell,2} \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying that $M_1 < M_{\ell,2} < M_2$ and $a_{M_{\ell,2}} = \bar{a}_{M_2} > \bar{a}_{M_1}$. Then using part 1 and Lemma B.1, respectively, for the following inequalities,

$$b_{M_1} + \bar{a}_{M_1} - a_{M_1} \leq b_{M_{\ell,2}} < b_{M_2} + \bar{a}_{M_2} - a_{M_2}.$$

Otherwise $\bar{a}_{M_1} = \bar{a}_{M_2}$ whence there is $M_{\ell,1} \in \mathcal{M}$ with $M_{\ell,1} < M_1$ and $a_{M_{\ell,1}} = \bar{a}_{M_1} = \bar{a}_{M_2}$, thus $b_{M_1} - a_{M_1} \leq b_{M_2} - a_{M_2}$ by Lemma B.1. This establishes part 2.

The proof of parts 3-4 involves similar arguments, after reflecting the endpoint sequences $\tilde{a}_{N-M} = n - b_M$, $\tilde{b}_{N-M} = n - a_M$ and using Lemma B.3. We omit the rest of the details. \square

The next lemma shows that α max optimal intervals for \mathcal{M} can be reflected across $N/2$ to produce α max optimal intervals in the reflected set for $\mathcal{M}' = \{N - M : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$.

Lemma B.3. *If $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$ are α max optimal for \mathcal{M} , then $\{[\tilde{a}_M := n - b_{N-M}, \tilde{b}_M := n - a_{N-M}] : M \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}\}$ are α max optimal for $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} := \{N - M : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$.*

Proof of Lemma B.3. Fix $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and omit it from the notation. Let $X \sim \text{Hyper}(M, n, N)$ so that $\tilde{X} := n - X \sim \text{Hyper}(N - M, n, N)$ by (20). The three properties in Definition 3.1 are straightforward to verify using that $P(\tilde{X} \in [a, b]) = P(X \in [n - b, n - a])$. We omit the details. \square

The next lemma establishes the point masses inside a probability-maximizing (e.g., α max optimal) set have probabilities no less than those outside, and is used to prove that monotonicity can only be violated one endpoint at a time in α max optimal acceptance intervals, and that probability maximizing sets must be intervals.

Lemma B.4. *A set $S \subseteq [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$ is P_M -maximizing if and only if $x \in S$, $y \notin S$ implies that $P_M(x) \geq P_M(y)$.*

Proof of Lemma B.4. The condition is obviously necessary since otherwise replacing x in S by y would increase $P_M(S)$. The converse follows by summing over $x \in S \setminus S^*$ vs. $y \in S^* \setminus S$ for $|S^*| = |S|$. \square

The following lemma establishes that, in α max optimal intervals, monotonicity can only be violated one endpoint at a time. This property is used to prove that the sets \mathcal{M}_a and \mathcal{M}_b in Theorem 3.1 are disjoint.

Lemma B.5. *Suppose $[a, b]$ and $[a', b']$ are P_M and $P_{M'}$ maximizing, respectively, and $M' > M$.*

- (i) *If $a' < a$, then $b' \geq b$.*
- (ii) *If $b' < b$, then $a' \geq a$.*
- (iii) *$a' \geq a$ or $b' \geq b$.*

Proof of Lemma B.5. It suffices to prove part (i) since (i), (ii), and (iii) are logically equivalent.

Assume $a' < a$. Then a' is outside $[a, b]$, and hence $P_M(a') \leq P_M(b)$ by Lemma B.4. Then $P_{M'}(a') < P_{M'}(b)$ by Lemma A.3, the hypotheses of which follow from (2) and the fact that the intervals are probability maximizing, hence its points have positive probability. Since $[a', b']$ is $P_{M'}$ maximizing, it must contain b . \square

C Auxiliary results for Section 4

Lemma C.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, the intervals $\{[a_M^*, b_M^*] : M \in [N]\}$ defined by (10) have nondecreasing endpoint sequences.*

Proof. Monotonicity holds separately for M in the first and second cases of (10) by Theorem 3.1. We must show monotonicity “across” $N/2$, i.e.,

$$a_{N/2-1}^* \leq a_{N/2}^* \leq a_{N/2+1}^* \quad \text{and} \quad b_{N/2-1}^* \leq b_{N/2}^* \leq b_{N/2+1}^* \quad \text{if } N \text{ is even,} \quad (35)$$

and

$$a_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}^* \leq a_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor + 1}^* \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}^* \leq b_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor + 1}^* \quad \text{if } N \text{ is odd.} \quad (36)$$

For (35) take N even, and both sets of inequalities in (35) are equivalent to

$$a_{N/2-1}^{adj} \leq h_{\alpha/2} \leq n - b_{N/2-1}^{adj}. \quad (37)$$

By Lemma C.2 we have $a_{N/2} \geq h_{\alpha/2} \geq a_M$ for $M \in [N/2 - 1]$, so $a_{N/2} = \bar{a}_{N/2}$, i.e., $N/2 \notin \mathcal{M}_a$. Note that, by virtue of (3), the upper endpoint b_M for the largest M in the index set never gets adjusted. Here the index set is $[N/2]$ so $b_{N/2} = b_{N/2}$, thus $N/2 \notin \mathcal{M}_b$. Therefore $[a_{N/2}, b_{N/2}] = [a_{N/2}^{adj}, b_{N/2}^{adj}]$. By Lemma C.2 we also have that $b_{N/2} \leq n - h_{\alpha/2}$, and combining these last two gives

$$h_{\alpha/2} \leq n - b_{N/2} = n - b_{N/2}^{adj} \leq n - b_{N/2-1}^{adj},$$

giving the second inequality in (37).

For the first inequality in (37), if $a_{N/2-1} \geq a_{N/2-1}^{adj}$ then $a_{N/2-1}^{adj} \leq a_{N/2-1} \leq h_{\alpha/2}$, using Lemma C.2 for this last inequality. Otherwise, $a_{N/2-1} < a_{N/2-1}^{adj}$, meaning $N/2 - 1 \in \mathcal{M}_a$ so, in particular, there exists $M^* < N/2 - 1$ such that $a_{M^*} = \bar{a}_{N/2-1} = a_{N/2-1}^{adj}$. Then $a_{N/2-1}^{adj} = a_{M^*} \leq h_{\alpha/2}$, using Lemma C.2 for the inequality.

To prove (36) take N odd and let $M^* = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$. Both the inequalities in (36) are equivalent to

$$a_{M^*}^{adj} + b_{M^*}^{adj} \leq n.$$

If no adjustment is applied to $[a_{M^*}, b_{M^*}]$, i.e., $[a_{M^*}, b_{M^*}] = [a_{M^*}^{adj}, b_{M^*}^{adj}]$, then this holds by Lemma C.3. Otherwise M^* is in \mathcal{M}_a or \mathcal{M}_b . If the latter then $[a_{M^*}^{adj}, b_{M^*}^{adj}]$ is shifted down from $[a_{M^*}, b_{M^*}]$, i.e., $a_{M^*}^{adj} \leq a_{M^*}$ and $b_{M^*}^{adj} \leq b_{M^*}$, thus

$$a_{M^*}^{adj} + b_{M^*}^{adj} \leq a_{M^*} + b_{M^*} \leq n$$

using Lemma C.3.

Otherwise $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_a$ meaning there is $M' < M^*$ such that $a_{M'} = \bar{a}_{M^*} = a_{M^*}^{adj}$. By Lemma C.3 we know that

$$a_{M'} + b_{M'} \leq n. \quad (38)$$

Define

$$a'_M = \begin{cases} a_M, & \text{for } M \in [M^*] \\ n - b_{N-M}, & \text{for } M^* < M \leq N, \end{cases} \quad b'_M = \begin{cases} b_M, & \text{for } M \in [M^*] \\ n - a_{N-M}, & \text{for } M^* < M \leq N. \end{cases}$$

Then $\{[a'_M, b'_M] : M \in [N]\}$ are α max optimal since the $[a_M, b_M]$ are. We now apply part 1 of Lemma B.2 to this set, with $M := N - M' > M^*$. We have

$$a'_M = n - b_{M'} \geq a_{M'} = \bar{a}_{M^*} = \bar{a}'_{M^*},$$

where the inequality is by (38). Then using Lemma B.2 for the following inequality,

$$b_{M^*}^{adj} = b_{M^*} + \bar{a}_{M^*} - a_{M^*} = b'_{M^*} + \bar{a}'_{M^*} - a'_{M^*} \leq b'_M = n - a_{M'} = n - a_{M^*}^{adj},$$

the desired inequality. \square

Lemma C.2. *If N is even and $\{[a_M, b_M] : M \in [N/2]\}$ is any α max optimal set, then*

- (i) $[a_{N/2}, b_{N/2}] \subseteq [h_{\alpha/2}, n - h_{\alpha/2}]$,
- (ii) for all $M \in [N/2 - 1]$ we have $P_{N/2}([a_M, n - a_M]) \geq 1 - \alpha$ and $a_M \leq h_{\alpha/2}$.

Proof. For part (i), toward contradiction suppose that $a_{N/2} < h_{\alpha/2}$. Since $[a_{N/2}, b_{N/2}]$ is length-minimizing, it must also be that $b_{N/2} < n - h_{\alpha/2}$, hence $n - h_{\alpha/2} \notin [a_{N/2}, b_{N/2}]$. Then by Lemma B.4,

$$P_{N/2}(a_{N/2}) \geq P_{N/2}(n - h_{\alpha/2}) = P_{N/2}(h_{\alpha/2}), \quad (39)$$

this last by symmetry. On the other hand, recall that $h_{\alpha/2} \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$; see (11). The mode (21) in this case is $m = (n + 1)/2$. We have

$$a_{N/2} < h_{\alpha/2} \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq \begin{cases} \lfloor m \rfloor - 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd } (m = \lfloor m \rfloor), \\ \lfloor m \rfloor & \text{if } n \text{ is even } (m \neq \lfloor m \rfloor). \end{cases}$$

By this and Lemma A.2 we have that $P_{N/2}(h_{\alpha/2}) \geq P_{N/2}(a_{N/2})$. Moreover, this inequality is strict by part 1 of Lemma A.2 since the latter is positive, $a_{N/2}$ being an endpoint of an α max optimal interval, hence the former is positive too. The strict inequality contradicts (39).

If $b_{N/2} > n - h_{\alpha/2}$ then similar arguments apply.

For part (ii), for $M \in [N/2 - 1]$, using Lemma C.3 to show inclusion of the following intervals, we have

$$P_M([a_M, n - a_M]) \geq P_M([a_M, b_M]) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad \text{and} \\ P_{N-M}([a_M, n - a_M]) \geq P_{N-M}([n - b_M, n - a_M]) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

The first claim of part (ii) then follows from these inequalities and Lemma A.4, which says that $M' \mapsto P_{M'}([a_M, n - a_M])$ is unimodal, thus $P_{N/2}([a_M, n - a_M]) \geq 1 - \alpha$. This inequality is equivalent to

$$\alpha \geq P_{N/2}(X < a_M) + P_{N/2}(X > n - a_M) = 2P_{N/2}(X < a_M),$$

by symmetry, and thus $a_M \leq h_{\alpha/2}$ by definition of the latter, establishing the second claim. \square

Lemma C.3. *Let $\{[a_M, b_M] \mid M = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor\}$ be α max optimal. Then*

$$a_M + b_M \leq n \quad \text{for all } M < N/2. \quad (40)$$

Proof. Suppose this fails, so that $b_{M^*} > n - a_{M^*}$ for some $M^* \in \mathcal{M} := \lfloor (N-1)/2 \rfloor$. By Lemma B.3,

$$\{[\tilde{a}_M = n - b_{N-M}, \tilde{b}_M = n - a_{N-M}] : M \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} := N - \mathcal{M}\} \quad (41)$$

is α max optimal for $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Then, since

$$b_{M^*} \notin [n - b_{M^*}, n - a_{M^*}] = [\tilde{a}_{N-M^*}, \tilde{b}_{N-M^*}],$$

by Lemma B.4 we have that

$$P_{N-M^*}(b_{M^*}) \leq P_{N-M^*}(n - b_{M^*}). \quad (42)$$

By similar arguments, since $n - b_{M^*} \notin [a_{M^*}, b_{M^*}]$ we have that $P_{M^*}(b_{M^*}) \geq P_{M^*}(n - b_{M^*})$. Next we will apply Lemma A.3 with $x_1 = b_{M^*}$ and $x_2 = n - b_{M^*}$. We have

$$b_{M^*} \leq M^* < N/2 < N - M^* \leq N - n + n - b_{M^*},$$

so that lemma tells us that

$$\frac{P_{N-M^*}(b_{M^*})}{P_{N-M^*}(n - b_{M^*})} > \frac{P_{M^*}(b_{M^*})}{P_{M^*}(n - b_{M^*})} \geq 1,$$

which contradicts (42) and thus establishes (40). \square

D Algorithm 2

Algorithm 2 Given α , n , and N , calculate a set of level- α acceptance intervals $\{[a_M^*, b_M^*] : M \in [N]\}$.

Require: $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \leq N$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$

```

for  $M = 0, \dots, \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$  do
   $x_{\min} = \max\{0, M + n - N\}$ 
   $x_{\max} = \min\{n, N\}$ 
   $C, D = \lfloor \frac{(n+1)(M+1)}{N+2} \rfloor$ 
   $P = P_M(C)$ 
  if  $C > x_{\min}$  then  $PC = P_M(C - 1)$  else  $PC = 0$  end if
  if  $D < x_{\max}$  then  $PD = P_M(D + 1)$  else  $PD = 0$  end if
  while  $P < 1 - \alpha$  do
    if  $PD > PC$  then
       $D = D + 1, P = P + PD$ 
      if  $D < x_{\max}$  then  $PD = P_M(D + 1)$  else  $PD = 0$  end if
    else
       $C = C - 1, P = P + PC$ 
      if  $C > x_{\min}$  then  $PC = P_M(C - 1)$  else  $PC = 0$  end if
    end if
  end while
   $a_M = C, b_M = D$ 
end for
 $b_0^* = b_0, a_0^* = a_0$ 
for  $M = 1, \dots, \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$  do
  if  $a_M < a_{M-1}^*$  then
     $a_M^* = a_{M-1}^*, b_M^* = b_M + a_{M-1}^* - a_M$ 
  else
     $b_M^* = b_M, a_M^* = a_M$ 
  end if
end for
for  $M = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor - 1, \dots, 0$  do
  if  $b_M^* > b_{M+1}^*$  then
     $a_M^* = a_M^* + b_{M+1}^* - b_M^*, b_M^* = b_{M+1}^*$ 
  end if
   $a_{N-M}^* = n - b_M^*, b_{N-M}^* = n - a_M^*$ 
end for
if  $N$  is even then
   $a_{N/2}^* = \max\{a_{N/2}, n - b_{N/2}\}, b_{N/2}^* = n - a_{N/2}^*$ 
else
   $a_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor + 1}^* = n - b_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}^*, b_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor + 1}^* = n - a_{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}^*$ 
end if
return  $\{[a_M^*, b_M^*]\}_{M=0}^N$ 

```

E Auxiliary results for Section 5

Lemma E.1. *In the setting of Theorem 5.1, for any $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S$ and $M \neq N/2$,*

$$|\mathcal{A}^*(M)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)|.$$

Proof. Fix $M \in [N]$, $M \neq N/2$. By an argument similar to the proof of the converse part of Lemma B.4, there is an interval $[a_M, b_M]$ such that $b_M - a_M + 1 = |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)|$ and $P_M([a_M, b_M]) \geq P_M(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M))$. Since $M \neq N/2$, $\mathcal{A}^*(M) = [a_M^*, b_M^*]$ is size-optimal by Theorem 4.1 so

$$|\mathcal{A}^*(M)| = b_M^* - a_M^* + 1 \leq b_M - a_M + 1 = |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)|. \quad (43)$$

□

Lemma E.2. *For even N , assume $A \subseteq [n]$ is nonempty and such that $x \in A \Rightarrow n - x \in A$. Then there exists $c \in [n]$ such that*

$$P_{N/2}([c, n - c]) \geq P_{N/2}(A) \quad (44)$$

and

$$n - 2c + 1 = \begin{cases} |A|, & \text{if } n \text{ or } |A| \text{ is odd,} \\ |A| + 1, & \text{if } n \text{ and } |A| \text{ are even.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. If n is odd then $x \neq n - x$ for all $x \in [n]$, implying that $|A|$ is even. Let $c = (n - |A| + 1)/2$, an integer. If $|A| = 0$ then there is nothing to prove for (44), so assume $|A| \geq 2$, whence $c \leq (n - 1)/2 =: m$, which by (21) is the mode of the $\text{Hyper}(N/2, n, N)$ density. Thus $m \in [c, n - c]$ and by (20) this density takes the same value at the endpoints c and $n - c$. Combining these facts implies that $P_{N/2}(x_1) \geq P_{N/2}(x_2)$ for any $x_1 \in [c, n - c]$ and $x_2 \notin [c, n - c]$. Then $P_{N/2}([c, n - c]) \geq P_{N/2}(A)$ now follows from this and the fact that these two sets have the same number of points, $n - 2c + 1 = |A|$.

If n is even and $|A|$ is odd, then $c = (n - |A| + 1)/2$ is still an integer. If $|A| = 1$ then $[c, n - c] = \{n/2\}$, the point maximizing $P_{N/2}(\cdot)$ by Lemma A.1, hence (44) holds. Otherwise, $|A| \geq 3$ and $c < m$ so the argument in the previous paragraph applies.

If n and $|A|$ are both even, let $c = (n - |A|)/2$, an integer, and $B = [c, n - c - 1]$. By unimodality and symmetry of $P_{N/2}(\cdot)$ about $n/2$ we have that

$$\min_{x \in B} P_{N/2}(x) = P_{N/2}(c) = P_{N/2}(n - c) = \max_{x \notin B} P_{N/2}(x).$$

It follows from this and $|B| = n - 2c = |A|$ that $P_{N/2}(B) \geq P_{N/2}(A)$, thus $P_{N/2}([c, n - c]) \geq P_{N/2}(B) \geq P_{N/2}(A)$. □

Lemma E.3. *In the setting of Theorem 5.1, suppose n and N are even. Then, for $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_S$,*

$$|\mathcal{C}^*| \leq \begin{cases} |\mathcal{C}|, & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)| \text{ is odd,} \\ |\mathcal{C}| + 1, & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)| \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We have $|\mathcal{A}^*(M)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(M)|$ for all $M \neq N/2$ by Lemma E.1. $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)$ is symmetrical, so by Lemma E.2 there is an interval $[a, n - a]$ such that $P_{N/2}([a, n - a]) \geq P_{N/2}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2))$ and

$$n - 2a + 1 \leq \begin{cases} |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)|, & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)| \text{ is odd,} \\ |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)| + 1, & \text{if } |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}(N/2)| \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

Since $\mathcal{A}^*(N/2) = [a_{N/2}^*, b_{N/2}^*] = [a_{N/2}^*, n - a_{N/2}^*]$ is the shortest symmetrical acceptance interval for $M = N/2$, we have

$$|\mathcal{A}^*(N/2)| = b_{N/2}^* - a_{N/2}^* + 1 \leq n - 2a + 1,$$

which is thus \leq the right-hand-side of (45). This, with the above inequality for the $M \neq N/2$ cases, gives the desired result after summing in an argument like (16). \square