

# Some Finite Sample Properties of the Sign Test\*

Yong Cai<sup>†</sup>

May 2, 2021

## Abstract

This paper contains two finite-sample results about the sign test. First, we show that the sign test is unbiased against two-sided alternatives even when observations are not identically distributed. Second, we provide simple theoretical counterexamples to show that correlation that is unaccounted for leads to size distortion and over-rejection. Our results have implication for practitioners, who are increasingly employing randomization tests for inference.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we study two properties of the sign test in finite sample. The results have implications for practitioners who directly apply the sign test.<sup>1</sup> They are also relevant to those who employ approximate sign tests, in which the invariance condition needed for the test holds only asymptotically.<sup>2</sup>

The finite sample setting is of interest because practitioners are increasingly adopting randomization tests due to the fact that under appropriate assumptions, they yield exact  $p$ -values, even in finite sample. For example, [Athey and Imbens \(2017\)](#) advocate their use in policy evaluation for this reason. Relatedly, [Canay et al. \(2017\)](#) propose approximate randomization tests for clustered data. Importantly, their test is valid even when the number of clusters are assumed to be fixed. This approach relies on setting up tests that are asymptotically equivalent to randomization tests with a finite number of effective observations. They

---

\*I am grateful to Ivan Canay, Joel Horowitz and Azeem Shaikh for guidance and helpful comments.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Economics, Northwestern University. E-mail: yongcai2023@u.northwestern.edu

<sup>1</sup>Recent papers that apply this method include [Gneezy et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Young \(2019\)](#) among others.

<sup>2</sup>For theory, see [Canay et al. \(2017\)](#). For an example application see [Munyo and Rossi \(2015\)](#).

then exploit the exactness of randomization tests to control size. These applications motivate our focus on the finite sample setting. They justify contending with the combinatorial problems that arise in the absence of asymptotic approximations.

Our first result shows that the sign test is unbiased against two-sided alternatives, even when observations are not identically distributed. It complements a large literature on the properties of the sign test in finite sample. It is well-known since [Hoeffding \(1952\)](#) that the sign test for the median has exact size even with non-identically distributed random variables. It is also known – see for example Theorem 4.4.1 of [Lehmann and Romano \(2005\)](#) – that the sign test is the uniformly most powerful unbiased test for hypotheses about the median given identically distributed random variables. It is also straightforward to show that the sign test is unbiased against one-sided alternatives with observations that are not identically distributed.<sup>3</sup> Our result closes the current gap by showing unbiasedness in the two-sided case.

Allowing for non-identically distributed units is important in practical contexts. For example, in a recent field experiment, [Gneezy et al. \(2019\)](#) consider the effect of test performance incentives on students in Shanghai and in the US – two radically different groups. The importance of heterogeneity is even more apparent in the context of approximate randomization tests, since clusters are often assumed to be highly dissimilar. For this reason, recent theoretical work in cluster-robust inference (see for instance [Hansen and Lee \(2019\)](#)) emphasize accommodating non-identical clusters.

Our second result shows that sign tests with equicorrelated normal random variables strictly over-rejects. This provides a clear counterexample, showing that it is important to account for correlation within units when conducting sign tests and randomization tests more generally.

The result is of interest to practitioners, particularly those who employ approximate randomization tests for inference with clustered data. Approximate randomization tests for clustered data requires specifying cluster structures, which researchers rarely know ex ante. It is well known that the usual  $t$ - and Wald tests can experience significant size distortion

---

<sup>3</sup>We thank Azeem Shaikh for suggesting an argument based on that of Lemma 5.9.1 in [Lehmann and Romano \(2005\)](#). See also appendix [B](#).

when dependence is ignored (see for instance [Bertrand et al. \(2004\)](#) and [Cameron et al. \(2008\)](#)). Our result shows that same phenomenon arises with the (approximate) sign test as well.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents notation and describes the sign test. Section 3 contains our main results. Section 4 concludes. All proofs are contained in the appendix.

## 2 Set up and Notation

Let  $\mu = \text{Med}(X_1) = \dots = \text{Med}(X_q)$ . We want to test

$$H_0 : \mu = \mu_0 \quad \text{against} \quad H_A : \mu \neq \mu_0 .$$

First define  $Y = (X_1 - \mu_0, \dots, X_q - \mu_0)'$ . Next, define the test statistic

$$T(Y) = \left| \sum_{i=1}^q \text{sgn} \{Y_i\} \right| , \tag{1}$$

Next, denote by  $\mathbf{G}$  the set of sign changes.  $\mathbf{G}$  can be identified with the set of  $g \in \{-1, 1\}^q$  so that  $gY = (g_1 Y_1, \dots, g_q Y_q)'$ . The sign test  $\phi_n$  is the randomization test that rejects the null hypothesis when  $T(Y)$  takes on extreme value relative to  $T(gY)$ . It proceeds as follows.

Define  $M = |\mathbf{G}|$  and let:

$$T^{(1)}(Y) \leq T^{(2)}(Y) \leq \dots \leq T^{(M)}(Y)$$

be the ordered values of  $T(gY)$  as  $g$  varies in  $\mathbf{G}$ . For a fixed nominal level  $\alpha$ , let  $k$  be defined as

$$k = \lceil (1 - \alpha)M \rceil ,$$

where  $\lceil x \rceil$  denotes the smallest integer greater or equal to  $x$ . In addition, define:

$$M^+(Y) = \sum_{j=1}^M I\{T^{(j)}(Y) > T^{(k)}(Y)\}$$

$$M^0(Y) = \sum_{j=1}^M I\{T^{(j)}(Y) = T^{(k)}(Y)\}$$

and set

$$a(Y) = \frac{M\alpha - M^+(Y)}{M^0(Y)}.$$

We can then define the sign test as:

$$\phi_n(Y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } T(Y) > T^{(k)}(Y), \\ a(Y) & \text{if } T(Y) = T^{(k)}(Y), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In words, this test rejects the null hypothesis with certainty when  $T(Y) > T^{(k)}(Y)$ . When  $T(Y) = T^{(k)}(Y)$ , it rejects the null hypothesis with probability  $a(Y)$ . The test does not reject when  $T(Y) < T^{(k)}(Y)$ .

Because the set of sign changes forms a group, we also know that:

$$\text{Unif}(T^{(1)}(Y), T^{(2)}(Y), \dots, T^{(M)}(Y)) \sim \text{Binomial}\left(q, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

As such, the critical value for our test can equivalently be written in terms of the quantiles of the Binomial( $q, \frac{1}{2}$ ) distribution.

In the following sections,  $E_\mu[\cdot]$  denotes expectation evaluated with respect to the data-generating process with median  $\mu$ .

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Unbiasedness of the Sign Test

In this subsection, we show that the sign test is unbiased against two-sided alternatives in finite sample. Our result implies that the approximate sign test is asymptotically unbiased.

**Assumption 1.** Let  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^q$  be independent, not necessarily identical random variables that are symmetric around the common mean  $\mu$ .

It is well known that the sign test (and randomization tests more generally) has exact  $p$ -values in finite sample

**Theorem 1** (Hoeffding 1952). Given assumption 1, suppose  $\mu = \mu_0$ . Then  $E_{\mu_0}[\phi_n(Y)] = \alpha$ .

It is also known that the sign test against one-sided alternatives is unbiased even with random variables that are not identically distributed (see Lemma 5.9.1 in Lehmann and Romano (2005) and also Appendix B). Compared to one-sided alternatives, tests against two-sided alternatives are arguably more relevant, given the state of applied econometrics today. Our unbiasedness result for two-sided alternatives states that:

**Theorem 2.** Given assumption 1, suppose  $\mu \neq \mu_0$ .

- a.  $E_{\mu}[\phi_n(Y)] \geq \alpha$ .
- b. If  $\alpha < 1$  and at least one of  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is continuous around  $\mu$ , the inequality in (a) is strict.
- c. Furthermore, as  $|\mu - \mu_0| \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $E_{\mu}[\phi_n(Y)] \rightarrow 1$ .

To show that  $E_{\mu}[\phi_n(Y)] > \alpha$ , we need to avoid the case in which  $P_{\mu}(Y_i \leq \mu_0) = P_{\mu}(Y_i > \mu_0)$  for all  $i$ . This might occur if for instance all the random variables have zero density in a neighbourhood of  $\mu$ . This definitely cannot happen for continuous random variable, as is the case with approximate sign tests.

We note that power cannot be 1 for any finite parameter value. This is because we are conducting inference using finite number of “effective observations”.

The corollary below states that an approximate randomization test is unbiased as well. It follows immediately by the continuous mapping theorem.

**Corollary 1.** Suppose we have variables  $S_n \rightarrow N(\mu \cdot \iota, D)$ , where  $D$  is a  $q \times q$  diagonal matrix and  $\iota$  is the  $q$ -vector of 1's. Then

- a. If  $\alpha < 1$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[\phi_n(S_n)] > \alpha$
- b. As  $|\mu - \mu_0| \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\mu[\phi_n(S_n)] \rightarrow 1$

### 3.2 Size Distortion under Equicorrelation

Here, we study size distortion of the sign test with normal, equicorrelated random variables that wrongly assumed to be independent. This is a counterexample showing that over-rejection could be a consequence when a practitioner using approximate sign test gets the cluster structure wrong.

**Assumption 2.** Let  $Y \sim N(\mu, (1 - \rho)\mathbf{I}_q + \rho \cdot \iota \iota^T)$  be equicorrelated normal random variables.

Consider again test 2. We show that under  $H_0$ , when  $\mu = \mu_0$ , the test will over-reject:

**Theorem 3.** Given assumption 2, suppose that  $\mu = \mu_0$ ,  $\rho > 0$ ,  $q > 1$  and  $\alpha < 0.25$ . Then

$$E[\phi_n(Y)] > \alpha .$$

Furthermore, as  $\rho \rightarrow 1$ ,  $E[\phi_n(Y)] \rightarrow 1$ .

In other words, the sign test could mistake correlation for violation of the null. Intuitively, the sign test checks for balance of the signs around the mean. If the variables are positively correlated, there will be an unusually large number of random variables with the same sign relative to independence, so that the test wrongly rejects.

Our result complements a large literature showing that the usual  $t$ - and Wald tests can experience significant size distortion when dependence is ignored (see for instance [Bertrand et al. \(2004\)](#) and [Cameron et al. \(2008\)](#)).

To further understand size distortion under equicorrelation, we compute asymptotic power numerically. This is possible because the size (in particular equation 4 in appendix




Figure 1: Size of the 5%-level permutation test with the equicorrelated model under various values of  $\rho$ . Over-rejection rate test increases monotonically in the number of sub-clusters and in  $\rho$ , the amount of correlation within each cluster. Power is evaluated using Gauss-Hermite quadratures with 1000 nodes.

A.2) can be expressed as a scalar integral that can be quickly and accurately computed using Gauss-Hermite quadratures. We evaluate the power of the test at 5% and 10% levels of significance using 1000 nodes. The results are presented in figures 1 and 2 respectively.

For the test at 5%-level, we see that for the  $\rho$ 's considered, size starts at 5% when the number of sub-clusters is 1. It then monotonically increases as we increase the number of sub-clusters. Furthermore, fixing the number of sub-clusters, the size of the test increases also increases monotonically in the correlation across the sub-clusters. The test at 10%-level yields similar results. All in all, the numerical results concord with that of theorem 3.

### 3.2.1 Size Distortion under Minimal Correlation

Equicorrelation appears to be a strong assumption, since all of  $Y$  is assume to be correlated. Suppose only the first two entries of  $Y$  are correlated. In turns out that size distortion arises as well.



Figure 2: Size of the 10%-level permutation test with the equicorrelated model under various values of  $\rho$ . Over-rejection rate test increases monotonically in the number of sub-clusters and in  $\rho$ , the amount of correlation within each cluster. Power is evaluated using Gauss-Hermite quadratures with 1000 nodes.

**Assumption 3.** Let  $Y \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$ , where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \rho & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Our earlier result also applies to this case:

**Theorem 4.** Given assumption 2, suppose that  $\mu = \mu_0$ ,  $\rho > 0$ ,  $q > 1$  and  $\alpha < 0.25$ . Then

$$E[\phi_n(Y)] > \alpha.$$

## 4 Conclusion

We study some finite sample properties of the sign test. We show that it is unbiased against two-sided alternatives, even with non-identically distributed observations, but can experience



size distortion if the samples are positively correlated. In the context of approximate sign tests under fixed cluster asymptotics, the latter result shows that misspecifying the cluster structure will lead to over-rejection of the null. Our paper represents a first step towards a better theoretical understanding of popular randomization tests.

## References

- Athey, S. and G. W. Imbens (2017). The State of Applied Econometrics: Causality and Policy Evaluation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31(2), 3–32.
- Bertrand, M., E. Duflo, and M. Sendhil (2004). How Much Should We Trust Differences-in-Differences Estimates? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119, 249–275.
- Cameron, A. C., J. B. Gelbach, and D. L. Miller (2008). Bootstrap-Based Improvements for Inference with Clustered Errors. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(3), 414–427.
- Canay, I. A., J. P. Romano, and A. M. Shaikh (2017). Randomization Tests under an Approximate Symmetry Assumption. *Econometrica*, 85(3), 1013–1030.
- Canay, I. A., A. Santos, and A. M. Shaikh (2019). The wild bootstrap with a ”small” number of ”large” clusters. *Review of Economics and Statistics* (forthcoming).
- Genz, A. and F. Bretz (2009). *Computation of Multivariate Normal and t Probabilities*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Gneezy, U., J. A. List, J. A. Livingston, X. Qin, S. Sadoff, and Y. Xu (2019). Measuring Success in Education: The Role of Effort on the Test Itself. *American Economic Review: Insights* 1, 291–308.
- Hansen, B. E. and S. Lee (2019). Asymptotic Theory for Clustered Samples. *Journal of Econometrics* 210, 268–290.
- Hoeffding, W. (1952). The Large-Sample Power of Tests Based on Permutations of Observations. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 23(2), 169–192.
- Lehmann, E. and J. P. Romano (2005). *Testing Statistical Hypotheses*. Springer.
- Munyo, I. and M. A. Rossi (2015). First-day Criminal Recidivism. *Journal of Public Economics* 124, 81–90.

Young, A. (2019). Channelling Fisher: Randomization Tests and the Statistical Insignificance of Seemingly Significant Experimental Results. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 134(2), 557–598.

# Appendices

## A Proofs

We first state a simple proposition:

**Proposition 1.** Suppose  $2^{-(q-1)} \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \binom{q}{r} < \alpha \leq 2^{-(q-1)} \sum_{r=0}^m \binom{q}{r} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , where  $\sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \binom{q}{r}$  is understood to be 0 if  $m - 1 < 0$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi_n] = \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} P_Y(r) + \gamma P_Y(m)$$

where  $\gamma = \frac{\alpha 2^{q-1} - \sum_{r \leq m-1} \binom{q}{r}}{\binom{q}{m}}$  and  $P_Y(r)$  is the probability that  $Y - \mu \cdot \iota$  has exactly  $r$  positive or exactly  $r$  negative realisations.

*Proof.* Our randomization test rejects the null hypothesis with certainty if  $T(Y) > T^{(k)}(Y)$ . If  $\binom{q}{m-1} 2^{-(q-1)} < \alpha \leq \binom{q}{m} 2^{-(q-1)}$ ,  $T^{(k)}(S) = q - 2m$ . Accordingly,  $Y$ 's with fewer than  $m$  positive entries or fewer than  $m$  negative entries are considered extreme relative to the randomization distribution. We reject with certainty whenever  $T(Y) > (q - 2m)$ . When  $T(Y) = T^{(k)}(Y)$ , we reject the null hypothesis with probability  $a(Y)$ , which specializes in this context to  $\gamma = \frac{\alpha 2^q - \sum_{r \leq m-1} \binom{q}{r}}{\binom{q}{m}}$ . Summing these probabilities we have the above formula.  $\square$

Note that since we count both positive and negative realisations, WLOG,  $m \leq q/2$ .

### A.1 Proof for Theorem 2

WLOG, we prove the result assuming that  $\mu > \mu_0$ , since the problem is symmetric around  $\mu$ . Then  $p_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $i$ . Suppose also for now that  $q \geq 2m + 1$ .

Let  $C(A, r)$  be all the possible ways of choosing  $r$  elements of the set  $A$  and let

$$p_i = P(Y_i > -(\mu - \mu_0)) .$$

Then we can write:

$$P_Y(r) = \sum_{c \in C([q], q-r)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) + \sum_{c \in C([q], r)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i)$$

where it is understood that  $C([q], 0)$  is the empty set. This follows from simple counting.

Next, consider their first partial derivative with respect to  $p_j$ . For  $r \geq 1$ , this is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} P_Y(r) &= \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q-r-1)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) - \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q-r)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) \\ &+ \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, r-1)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) - \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, r)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) \end{aligned}$$

For  $r = 0$ , it is simply:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} P_Y(0) &= \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q-1)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) - \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, r)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) \\ &= \prod_{i \neq j} p_i - \prod_{i \neq j} (1 - p_i) \end{aligned}$$

Suppose for now that  $\gamma = 1$ . Then, given the telescoping nature of the above terms, we can write:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \sum_{r=0}^m P_Y(r) = \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q-m-1)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) - \sum_{c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, m)} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i)$$

We want to prove that the derivative is positive. Suppose for each  $c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q-m-1)$ , we can find a  $c' \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, m)$  such that  $i \notin c \Rightarrow i \notin c'$ . Then, using the fact that  $p_i \geq 1 - p_i$ , we must have that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i \in c} p_i \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) - \prod_{i \in c'} p_i \prod_{i \notin c'} (1 - p_i) &= \prod_{i \notin c} (1 - p_i) \left( \prod_{i \in c} p_i - \prod_{i \in c' \cap c} p_i \prod_{i \in c, i \notin c'} (1 - p_i) \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if at least one } p_i > 1/2 \\ = 0 & \text{if } p_i = 0 \forall i \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that because  $q \geq 2m + 1$ , for each  $c$ , there are  $\binom{q-m-1}{m} \geq 1$  potential  $c'$ . Similarly, for each  $c'$ , there are  $\binom{q-m-1}{m}$  potential  $c$ . Consider the (undirected) bipartite graph in which each  $c \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q - m - 1)$  is connected to eligible  $c' \in C([q] \setminus \{j\}, m)$ . Our problem is equivalent to finding a perfect matching in this  $\binom{q-m-1}{m}$ -regular bipartite graph.

By Hall's Marriage Theorem, it suffices to check that for all  $W \subseteq C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q - m - 1)$ ,  $|N(W)| \geq |W|$ , where  $N(W)$  is the set of 1-neighbours to  $W$ . Let  $E(W)$  be the set of edges from  $W$  to  $N(W)$  and let  $E(N(W))$  be the set of edges from  $N(W)$  to  $C([q] \setminus \{j\}, q - m - 1)$ . Next, note that  $E(W) \subset E(N(W))$  by definition of  $N(W)$ . As such, we write:

$$|E(W)| \leq E(N(W)) \Leftrightarrow \binom{q-m-1}{m} |W| \leq \binom{q-m-1}{m} |N(W)| \Leftrightarrow |W| \leq |N(W)|$$

where the first equivalence follows from regularity of the graph. Hence, by [1](#)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} E_\mu[\phi_n] = \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} P_Y(r) = \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial \mu} \cdot \left( \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} P_Y(r) \right) \geq 0.$$

Here, the inequality is strict as long as there is at least one  $i$  such that  $p_i > \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial \mu} > 0$ . The strict inequality obtains if at least one random variable is continuous with unbounded support. Finally, we have that

$$E_\mu[\phi_n] = E_{\mu_0}[\phi_n] + \int_{\mu_0}^{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} E_u[\phi_n] du \geq \alpha$$

since the first term is  $\alpha$  by exactness of the sign test and the second term is the integral of a non-negative function.

Finally, note that as  $\mu - \mu_0 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $p_i \rightarrow 1$ . Hence  $P_Y(r) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $r \neq 0$ .  $P_Y(0) \rightarrow 1$ .

Now suppose  $\gamma > 0$ . From [1](#), we see that the power of test with  $\gamma > 0$  is a linear combination of two tests each with power at least  $\alpha$ . Hence, we have that this test is unbiased as well. Furthermore, if either of the two test has power strictly greater than  $\alpha$ , so does the test with  $\gamma > 0$ .

We have shown our result for  $q \geq 2m + 1$ . Note that  $q \geq 2m$  by definition, since this is a 2-sided test. Suppose  $q = 2m$ . Then this is the trivial test that rejects 100% of the time for a significance level of 0. Our test can still have strictly increasing power, but this comes

from the  $(m - 1)$  term. As such, the theorem continues to hold as long as  $\alpha < 1$ .

## A.2 Proof for Theorem 3

Given proposition 1, we consider  $P_Y(r)$ .

When  $Y$  is an equi-correlated normal random variable,  $P_Y$  depends only on the parameters  $q$  and  $\rho$ . We denote it  $P_{q,\rho}(r)$  for convenience. First note if  $q = 2$ , we know by explicit formula that the power is

$$2\gamma\mathbb{P}(\text{sgn}(Y) = (1, 1)) = \frac{\gamma}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho \right] > \frac{\gamma}{2} = \alpha .$$

It is also immediate that power is strictly increasing in  $\rho$ .

Now, suppose  $q \geq 3$ . Under assumption 2, we have from equation (2.16) in [Genz and Bretz \(2009\)](#) that for  $\rho \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}P_{q,\rho}(r) &= \binom{q}{r} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \phi(y) \left( 1 - \Phi \left( -\frac{\sqrt{\rho}y}{\sqrt{1-\rho}} \right) \right)^r \Phi \left( -\frac{\sqrt{\rho}y}{\sqrt{1-\rho}} \right)^{q-r} dy \\ &= \binom{q}{r} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \phi(z) (1 - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z))^r \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r} dz \text{ by symmetry of } \phi \text{ and setting } z = -y \\ &= \binom{q}{r} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \phi(z) \sum_{a=0}^r \binom{r}{a} (-1)^a \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r-a} dz \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\tilde{\rho} = \frac{\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{1-\rho}}$ , with  $\frac{d\tilde{\rho}}{d\rho} > 0$ . Note again that as  $\rho \rightarrow 1$ , from equation 4 we see that  $P_{q,\rho}(r) \rightarrow 0$  if  $r \neq 0$ . On the other hand,  $P_{q,\rho}(0) \rightarrow 1$

To apply proposition (1), we first let  $\gamma = 1$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi_n] = \sum_{r=0}^m P_{q,\rho}(r) = 2 \int_{\mathbf{R}} \phi(z) \sum_{r=0}^m \binom{q}{r} \sum_{a=0}^r \binom{r}{a} (-1)^a \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r-a} dz$$

The inner sum is:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{q}{0} \left( \binom{0}{0} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^q \right) \\
& + \binom{q}{0} \left( \binom{1}{0} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-1} - \binom{1}{1} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^q \right) \\
& + \binom{q}{0} \left( \binom{2}{0} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-2} - \binom{2}{1} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-1} + \binom{2}{2} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^q \right) \\
& + \dots \\
& + \binom{q}{m} \left( \binom{m}{0} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-m} - \binom{m}{1} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-m+1} + \dots + \binom{m}{m} (-1)^q \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^q \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the coefficient of  $\Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r}$  is:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m-r} \binom{q}{r+k} \binom{r+k}{k} (-1)^k = \sum_{k=r}^m \binom{q}{k} \binom{k}{k-r} (-1)^{k-r}$$

where the equality follows from replacing the index  $k$  with  $k+r$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=r}^m \binom{q}{k} \binom{k}{k-r} (-1)^{k-r} &= \frac{(-1)^{m-r} (m-r+1)}{q-r} \binom{q}{m+1} \binom{m+1}{m-r+1} \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{m-r}}{q-r} \binom{q}{m+1} (m+1) \binom{m}{r}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows because  $k \binom{n}{k} = n \binom{n-1}{k-1}$  and  $\binom{m}{m-r} = \binom{m}{r}$ . The first step obtains by induction as follows. The base case with  $m=r$  is immediate. For the induction step, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=r}^{m+1} \binom{q}{k} \binom{k}{k-r} (-1)^{k-r} \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{m-r} (m-r+1)}{q-r} \binom{q}{m+1} \binom{m+1}{m-r+1} + \binom{q}{m+1} \binom{m+1}{m+1-r} (-1)^{m+1-r} \\
&= (-1)^{m-r} \binom{q}{m+1} \binom{m+1}{m+1-r} \frac{m+1-q}{q-r} \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{m+1-r} q-m-1}{q-r} \frac{1}{m+1} \binom{q}{m+1} \frac{m+2-r}{m-r} \binom{m+1}{m+1-r} \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{m+1-r} (m-r+2)}{q-r} \binom{q}{m+2} \binom{m+2}{m-r+2}.
\end{aligned}$$



This gives us the desired result. Substituting this into our expression for power,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r=0}^m P_{q,\rho}(r) &= 2 \int_{\mathbf{R}} \phi(z) \sum_{r=0}^m \binom{q}{r} \sum_{a=0}^r \binom{r}{a} (-1)^a \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r-a} dz \\
&= 2 \int_{\mathbf{R}} \phi(z) \binom{q}{m+1} (m+1) \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-1)^{m-r}}{q-r} \binom{m}{r} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r} dz \\
&= 2 \int_0^\infty \phi(z) \binom{q}{m+1} (m+1) \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-1)^{m-r}}{q-r} \binom{m}{r} \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r} dz \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^\infty \phi(z) \binom{q}{m+1} (m+1) \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-1)^{m-r}}{q-r} \binom{m}{r} (1 - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z))^{q-r} dz \\
&= 2 \int_0^\infty \phi(z) \binom{q}{m+1} (m+1) \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-1)^{m-r}}{q-r} \binom{m}{r} (\Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-r} + (1 - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z))^{q-r}) dz
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by a change of variable and the fact that  $\Phi(-\tilde{\rho}z) = 1 - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)$ .

Define the function:

$$f(\theta) := \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-1)^{m-r}}{q-r} \binom{m}{r} \theta^{q-r}$$

Suppose  $q \geq 3$ , we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
f'(\theta) &= \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-1)^{m-r}}{q-r} \binom{m}{r} (q-r) \theta^{q-r-1} \\
&= \theta^{q-m-1} \sum_{r=0}^m (-1)^{m-r} \binom{m}{r} \theta^{m-r} = \theta^{q-m-1} (1 - \theta)^m
\end{aligned}$$

Using this expression, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \sum_{r=0}^m P_{q,\rho}(r) &= 2 \int_0^\infty \phi(z) \binom{q}{m+1} (m+1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (f(\Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)) + f(1 - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z))) dz \\
&= 2 \int_0^\infty z \phi(z) \phi(\tilde{\rho}z) \frac{d\tilde{\rho}}{d\rho} \binom{q}{m+1} (m+1) \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^m (1 - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z))^m \\
&\quad \cdot (\Phi(\tilde{\rho}z)^{q-2m-1} - (1 - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}z))^{q-2m-1}) dz \\
&\geq 0 \text{ if } q - 2m - 1 > 0
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality is strict if  $\rho > 0$  and  $q - 2m - 1 > 0$ . This restriction requires that  $\alpha < 1 - \frac{1}{2^{q-1}} \binom{q}{\lfloor q/2 \rfloor}$ . It is easy to check that  $\lfloor 1 - \frac{1}{2^{q-1}} \binom{q}{\lfloor q/2 \rfloor} \rfloor$  attains its minimum value at 3/4 when

$q = 4$ . Hence, the bound applies if  $\alpha < 1/4$ . This gives us that power is strictly increasing in  $\rho$  for all  $\alpha \leq 1/4$  and  $q \geq 3$ . Finally, to show the size distortion, note that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\rho[\phi_n] &= E_0[\phi_n] + \int_0^\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \sum_{r=0}^m P_{q,\rho}(r) du \\ &> \alpha \quad \text{for } \rho > 0.5 \end{aligned}$$

This is because  $E_0[\phi_n] = \alpha$  by construction and the second term is an integral of a function that is almost everywhere strictly positive.

To complete the proof, note that when  $\gamma \neq 1$ , we are linearly interpolating  $\sum_{r=0}^m P_{q,\rho}(r)$  and  $\sum_{r=0}^{m-1} P_{q,\rho}(r)$ . As such, our result continues to hold.

## Proof of Theorem 4

To apply proposition 1, we compute  $P_{q,\rho}(r)$  under assumption 3. With  $q = 2$ , minimal correlation is the same as equi-correlation. Suppose  $q \geq 3$ . Then for  $r \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}P_{q,\rho}(r) &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^r \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{q-2-r} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho\right) \binom{q-2}{r} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{r-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{q-2-(r-1)} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho\right) \binom{q-2}{r-1} \cdot \binom{2}{1} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{r-2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{q-2-(r-2)} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho\right) \binom{q-2}{r-2} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^q \left[ \binom{q-2}{r} + \binom{q-2}{r-1} \cdot \binom{2}{1} + \binom{q-2}{r-2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \binom{q-2}{r} - \binom{q-2}{r-1} \cdot \binom{2}{1} + \binom{q-2}{r-2} \right) \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^q \left[ \binom{q}{r} + \left( \binom{q-2}{r} - \binom{q-2}{r-1} \cdot \binom{2}{1} + \binom{q-2}{r-2} \right) \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho \right] \end{aligned}$$

where we have simply enumerated the cases in which 0, 1 or 2 of the correlated sub-clusters land on heads respectively. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}P_{q,\rho}(1) &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^q \left[ \binom{q}{1} + \left( \binom{q-2}{1} - \binom{q-2}{0} \right) \cdot \binom{2}{1} \right] \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho \\ \frac{1}{2}P_{q,\rho}(0) &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^q \left[ \binom{q}{0} + \binom{q-2}{0} \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \rho \right]\end{aligned}$$

By proposition 1, we write:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\phi_n] &= \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} P_{q,\rho}(r) + \gamma P_{q,\rho}(m) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{q-1} \left[ \gamma \binom{q}{m} + \sum_{r=0}^{m-1} \binom{q}{r} \right] \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{q-1} \left( \frac{2 \arcsin \rho}{\pi} \right) \left( \gamma \left( \binom{q}{m} - 4 \binom{q-2}{m-1} \right) + 1 + \binom{q-2}{1} - 2 + \sum_{r=3}^{m-1} \left( \binom{q}{r} - 4 \binom{q-2}{r-1} \right) \right)\end{aligned}$$

The first term above is  $\alpha$  by construction. It remains to show that the second term is positive. To do, we first evaluate it when  $\gamma = 1$ . The sum is telescoping:

$$\begin{aligned}W(m) &:= 1 + \binom{q-2}{1} - 2 + \sum_{r=3}^m \left( \binom{q}{r} - 4 \binom{q-2}{r-1} \right) \\ &= \binom{q-2}{0} \\ &+ \binom{q-2}{1} - \binom{q-2}{0} - \binom{q-2}{0} \\ &+ \binom{q-2}{2} - \binom{q-2}{1} - \binom{q-2}{1} + \binom{q-2}{0} \\ &+ \binom{q-2}{3} - \binom{q-2}{2} - \binom{q-2}{2} + \binom{q-2}{1} \\ &+ \dots \\ &+ \binom{q-2}{m} - \binom{q-2}{m-1} - \binom{q-2}{m-1} + \binom{q-2}{m-2}\end{aligned}$$

Cancelling terms diagonally, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
W(m) &= \binom{q-2}{m} - \binom{q-2}{m-1} \\
&= \frac{(q-2)!}{m!(q-m-2)!} - \frac{(q-2)!}{(m-1)!(q-m-1)!} \\
&= \frac{(q-2)!}{(m-1)!(q-m-2)!} \left[ \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{q-m-1} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

which is positive if and only if  $m \leq \frac{q-1}{2}$ . Furthermore, the term is strictly positive if  $m < \frac{q-1}{2}$ . Since  $\arcsin \rho$  is strictly increasing in  $\rho$ , we have that size is strictly increasing in  $\rho$ . Our goal was to show that:

$$(1 - \gamma)W(m - 1) + \gamma W(m) > 0$$

By the above argument, for  $m \leq \frac{q-1}{2}$ , we have that  $W(m - 1) \geq 0$ ,  $W(m) \geq 0$ . The desired inequality obtains.

## B Unbiasedness against One-Sided Alternatives

In this section, we use an argument similar to Lemma 5.9.1 in [Lehmann and Romano \(2005\)](#) to show that the sign test is unbiased against one-sided alternatives for independent, not identical random variables. Recall that  $Y(\mu_0) = (X_1 - \mu_0, \dots, X_q - \mu_0)'$ . For the purposes of this discussion, we make the dependence on  $\mu_0$  explicit.

We are now interested in the test

$$H_0 : \mu = \mu_0 \quad \text{against} \quad H_A : \mu > \mu_0 .$$

Define the one-sided test statistic:

$$T(Y(\mu_0)) = \sum_{i=1}^q \text{sgn} \{Y_i(\mu_0)\} ,$$

Compared to the two-sided test (1), we omit the absolute signs around the sum. We also make dependence on  $\mu_0$  explicit for the subsequent discussion.

Next, denote by  $\mathbf{G}$  the set of sign changes.  $\mathbf{G}$  can be identified with the set of  $g \in \{-1, 1\}^q$  so that  $gY(\mu_0) = (g_1Y_1(\mu_0), \dots, g_qY_q(\mu_0))'$ . The sign test  $\phi_n$  is the randomization test that rejects the null hypothesis when  $T(Y(\mu_0))$  takes on extreme value relative to  $T(gY)$ . It proceeds as follows.

Define  $M = |\mathbf{G}|$  and let:

$$T^{(1)}(Y(\mu_0)) \leq T^{(2)}(Y(\mu_0)) \leq \dots \leq T^{(M)}(Y(\mu_0))$$

be the ordered values of  $T(gY(\mu_0))$  as  $g$  varies in  $\mathbf{G}$ . For a fixed nominal level  $\alpha$ , let  $k$  be defined as

$$k = \lceil (1 - \alpha)M \rceil ,$$

where  $\lceil x \rceil$  denotes the smallest integer greater or equal to  $x$ . In addition, define:

$$M^+(Y) = \sum_{j=1}^M I\{T^{(j)}(Y(\mu_0)) > T^{(k)}(Y(\mu_0))\}$$

$$M^0(Y) = \sum_{j=1}^M I\{T^{(j)}(Y(\mu_0)) = T^{(k)}(Y(\mu_0))\}$$

and set

$$a(Y(\mu_0)) = \frac{M\alpha - M^+(Y(\mu_0))}{M^0(Y(\mu_0))} .$$

We can then define the one-sided sign test as:

$$\phi_n(Y(\mu_0)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } T(Y(\mu_0)) > T^{(k)}(Y(\mu_0)), \\ a(Y) & \text{if } T(Y(\mu_0)) = T^{(k)}(Y(\mu_0)), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

In other words, we reject the test statistic only for extreme values on one side of the randomization distribution. As noted in the discussion in section 2,  $T^{(k)}(Y(\mu_0))$  is a quantile of the Binomial( $q, \frac{1}{2}$ ) distribution. It does not depend on the realization of  $Y$ .

Suppose that the alternative is true. Given  $\mu$ , we know that  $E[\phi_n(Y(\mu))] = \alpha$ . Further-

more, since  $\mu > \mu_0$ , it is clear that

$$T(Y(\mu_0)) = \sum_{i=1}^q \operatorname{sgn} \{X_i - \mu_0\} \geq \sum_{i=1}^q \operatorname{sgn} \{X_i - \mu\} .$$

As such, we have that

$$E_\mu[\phi_n(Y(\mu_0))] \geq E_\mu[\phi_n(Y(\mu))] = \alpha$$

as required.