

Testing Homogeneity of Proportion Ratios for Stratified Bilateral Correlated Data

Wanqing Tian^a and Chang-Xing Ma^{*b}

^{a,b}Department of Biostatistics, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York, USA

March 24, 2023

Abstract

Intraclass correlation in bilateral data has been investigated in recent decades with various statistical methods. In practice, stratifying bilateral data by some control variables will provide more sophisticated statistical results to satisfy different research proposed in random clinical trials. In this article, we propose three test statistics (likelihood ratio test, score test, and Wald-type test statistics) to evaluate the homogeneity of proportion ratios for stratified bilateral correlated data under an equal correlation assumption. Monte Carlo simulations of Type I error and power are performed, and the score test yields a robust outcome based on empirical Type I error and power. Lastly, a real data example is conducted to illustrate the proposed three tests.

Introduction

In random clinical trials, bilateral data frequently occurs in patients who receive the treatment based on paired body parts or organs (such as eyes, ears, kidneys, and so on). Since the outcome of bilateral data has been naturally split into three kinds: no response, unilateral response, and bilateral responses, considering the intraclass correlation in the bilateral data is a natural way to avoid misleading results [1–5]. Intraclass correlation in bilateral data has been investigated in the recent decades with various statistical methods [1–3, 5–9]. Rosner proposes that a conditional probability of response at one side of paired body parts or organs gives a response at the other body parts or organs is a positive constant R time the response rate [1]. Tang et al. provide a statistical inference for correlated data in binary paired data under R model,

*CONTACT Chang-Xing Ma: cxma@buffalo.edu, Department of Biostatistics, University at Buffalo, 3435 Main St., Buffalo, NY 14214, USA

and also evaluate the asymptotic test with Type I error and power [10]. Ma, Shan, and Liu develop an asymptotic testing method under homogeneity assumption for Rosner's R model [5]. Donner assumes that all treatment groups share one intra-class correlation coefficient ρ [2], and Thompson evaluates the robustness of Donner's ρ model in pair data by adopting simulations [11]. Liu et al. test equality of correlation coefficients based on Donner's ρ model for paired binary data with multiple groups [12]. Later, Liu et al. explore the exact methods of testing the homogeneity of prevalence for correlated binary data under Donner's ρ model [8]. However, Dallal criticizes Rosner's assumption and points out that "the constant R model will give a poor fit if the characteristic is almost certain to occur bilaterally with widely varying group-specific prevalence" [3]. Dallal believes the conditional probability of response at one side of paired body parts or organs, giving a response at the other body parts or organs is a constant γ [3]. Li et al. develop asymptotic and exact methods following the Dallal's model [13]. Then, Chen et al. propose multiple test statistics of response rates in the different groups under the Dallal's model [14].

The homogeneity test for the appropriate effect size measure between different groups equals to test the common value of the measure of effect. Moreover, there are three popular methods to evaluate the effect size in random clinical trials: odds ratio, risk difference, and relative risk [15]. Indeed, relative risk is more informative than risk difference in some cases [16]. Compared with odds ratio, the relative risk can process sparse data better. The stratifying of bilateral data by some control variables (e.g. disease phases, age, etc.) will provide more sophisticated statistical results to satisfy different research proposed in random clinical trials [17–19]. For example, evaluating the appropriate effect size across strata of disease phases between treatment and control groups equals to test the effect size of homogeneity across the strata. Zhuang et al. investigate the homogeneity test of ratio of two proportions in the stratified bilateral data based on the Donner's ρ model [20]. Shen et al. conduct the testing homogeneity of difference of two proportions for stratified correlated paired binary data under Donner's ρ model [21]. Xue and Ma propose interval estimation of proportion ratios for stratified bilateral correlated binary data under Rosner's constant R model [22].

The primary goal of this article is to investigate the proportion ratios to clinical trial design with stratified bilateral data under Dallal's model. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: section 2 presents the data structure and hypotheses, and section 3 introduces the maximum-likelihood estimation under homogeneity. We propose three tests to examine the homogeneity of proportions across strata under Dallal's model in section 4. Accordingly, we investigate the performance and robustness of three tests by using simulation studies in section 5. In section 6, we use a real example of the OME study to illustrate our proposed methods. Conclusions and future works are in section 7.

2 Data structure and Hypotheses

2.1 Notation

Let m_{lij} be the number of patients in the i^{th} group of the j^{th} stratum with l^{th} responses, where $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, $l = 0, 1, 2$. $m_{+ij} = m_{0ij} + m_{1ij} + m_{2ij}$ represent the number of patients in the i^{th} group of the j^{th} stratum. The p_{lij} is corresponding to the probability of patients in i^{th} group of the j^{th} stratum with l^{th} responses. Define Z_{ijkh} as the indicator of the response of k^{th} eyes of the h^{th} patient in the i^{th} group from j^{th} stratum, where $k = 1, 2$ and $h = 1, 2, \dots, m_{+ij}$. If $Z_{ijkh} = 1$ then the improvement response occurs, and $Z_{ijkh} = 0$ otherwise. Therefore, denote $\Pr(Z_{ijkh} = 1) = \pi_{ij}$, ($0 \leq \pi_{ij} \leq 1$) as probability of having response on one site.

Number of Responses (l)	Group		Total
	1	2	
0	$m_{01j} (p_{01j})$	$m_{02j} (p_{02j})$	m_{0+j}
1	$m_{11j} (p_{11j})$	$m_{12j} (p_{12j})$	m_{1+j}
2	$m_{21j} (p_{21j})$	$m_{22j} (p_{22j})$	m_{2+j}
Total	m_{+1j}	m_{+2j}	m_{++j}

We explore the intraclass correlation based on Dallal's model that is conditional probability of response at one side of paired body parts or organs, giving a response at the other body parts or organs is a constant γ . Therefore, we assume $P(Z_{ijk} = 1 | Z_{hij(3-k)} = 1) = \gamma_j$, and the probabilities of eye with none, one or both can be express as following:

$$p_{0ij} = 1 - (2 - \gamma_j) \pi_{ij},$$

$$p_{1ij} = 2\pi_{ij} (1 - \gamma_j),$$

$$p_{2ij} = \pi_{ij} \gamma_j,$$

and $p_{0ij} + p_{1ij} + p_{2ij} = 1$ for any fixed i and j . The joint likelihood function for the observed data $\mathbf{m}_{ij} = (m_{0ij}, m_{1ij}, m_{2ij})^T$ is given by

$$f(\mathbf{m}_{ij} | \mathbf{p}_{ij}) = \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_{+ij}!}{m_{0ij}! m_{1ij}! m_{2ij}!} p_{0ij}^{m_{0ij}} p_{1ij}^{m_{1ij}} p_{2ij}^{m_{2ij}},$$

where $\mathbf{p}_{ij} = (p_{0ij}, p_{1ij}, p_{2ij})^T$. The corresponding log-likelihood function can be expressed as:

$$l(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^2 \{m_{0ij} \log [1 - (2 - \gamma_j) \pi_{ij}] + m_{1ij} \log [2\pi_{ij} (1 - \gamma_j)] + m_{2ij} \log [\pi_{ij} \gamma_j]\} + \log C,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i = (\pi_{i1}, \dots, \pi_{iJ})^T$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_J)^T$, and $C = \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_{+ij}!}{m_{0ij}! m_{1ij}! m_{2ij}!}$ is a constant.

2.2 Hypotheses for the proportion ratio across strata

Assuming there is a common ratio of proportions between two groups across J strata, i.e., the ratio of proportions between two groups in the j^{th} stratum is $\delta_j = \pi_{2j}/\pi_{1j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$, the hypotheses are given as

$$H_0 : \delta_1 = \delta_2 = \dots = \delta_J \quad \text{versus} \quad H_a : \delta_1 \neq \delta_2 \neq \dots \neq \delta_J.$$

3 Maximum-likelihood estimation (MLE) under homogeneity

3.1 The unconstrained MLEs

Since we assume $\delta_j = \pi_{2j}/\pi_{1j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$, then $\pi_{2j} = \delta_j \pi_{1j}$. Under the null hypothesis with common δ , the log-likelihood ratio can be express as:

$$l(\boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \delta, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{j=1}^J l_j(\pi_{1j}, \delta, \gamma_j),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} l_j(\pi_{1j}, \delta, \gamma_j) &= \{m_{01j} \log [1 - (2 - \gamma_j) \pi_{1j}] + m_{11j} \log [2\pi_{1j} (1 - \gamma_j)] + m_{21j} \log [\pi_{1j} \gamma_j] \\ &\quad + m_{02j} \log [1 - (2 - \gamma_j) \pi_{1j} \delta] + m_{12j} \log [2\pi_{1j} \delta (1 - \gamma_j)] + m_{22j} \log [\pi_{1j} \delta \gamma_j]\} \\ &\quad + \log C. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating $l(\boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \delta, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, we have

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \pi_{1j}} = \frac{m_{1+j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{2+j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{01j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta m_{02j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \gamma_j} = \frac{m_{21j}}{\gamma_j} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\gamma_j} + \frac{m_{11j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{12j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{01j} \pi_{1j}}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta m_{02j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1}.$$

We can set $\frac{\partial l}{\partial \pi_{1j}} = 0$ with $\frac{\partial l}{\partial \gamma_j} = 0$ to get MLEs $\hat{\pi}_{1j}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_j$. Indeed, MLE of γ_j has closed-form solution.

Meanwhile, MLE of π_{1j} is a function of m and δ . For the MLE of δ , we will update by using Fisher scoring iterative algorithm, and

$$\hat{\delta} = \delta^{(t+1)} = \delta^{(t)} + I^{-1}(\delta^{(t)}) \left(\frac{\partial l}{\partial \delta} \right) \Big|_{\delta=\delta^{(t)}, \hat{\pi}_{1j}, \hat{\gamma}_j},$$

where

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \delta} = \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{m_{12j}}{\delta} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\delta} + \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} \right),$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \delta^2} = \sum_{j=1}^J \left(-\frac{m_{12j}}{\delta^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\delta^2} - \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I &= -E\left(\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \delta^2}\right) = -E\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \left(-\frac{m_{12j}}{\delta^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\delta^2} - \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{m_{+2j} p_{12j}}{\delta^2} + \frac{m_{+2j} p_{22j}}{\delta^2} + \frac{m_{+2j} p_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

3.2 The Global MLEs

Under the global hypothesis, $H_a : \delta_1 \neq \delta_2 \neq \dots \neq \delta_J$, the log-likelihood can be presenting as:

$$l(\boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{j=1}^J l_j(\pi_{1j}, \delta_j, \gamma_j),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} l_j(\pi_{1j}, \delta_j, \gamma_j) &= \sum_{j=1}^J \{m_{01j} \log [1 - (2 - \gamma_j) \pi_{1j}] + m_{11j} \log [2\pi_{1j} (1 - \gamma_j)] + m_{21j} \log [\pi_{1j} \gamma_j] \\ &\quad + m_{02j} \log [1 - (2 - \gamma_j) \pi_{1j} \delta_j] + m_{12j} \log [2\pi_{1j} \delta_j (1 - \gamma_j)] + m_{22j} \log [\pi_{1j} \delta_j \gamma_j]\} + \log C, \end{aligned}$$

and the MLEs of three parameters π_{1j} , δ_j , γ_j can be derived by setting the partial differentiation equal to zero, then the MLEs as following:

$$\tilde{\pi}_{1j} = \frac{(m_{11j} + m_{21j})(m_{11j} + m_{12j} + 2m_{21j} + 2m_{22j})}{2(m_{01j} + m_{11j} + m_{21j})(m_{11j} + m_{12j} + m_{21j} + m_{22j})},$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_j = \frac{2m_{2+j}}{m_{1+j} + 2m_{2+j}},$$

$$\tilde{\delta}_j = -\frac{(m_{12j} + m_{22j})(m_{01j} - m_{12j} + m_{1+j} - m_{22j} + m_{2+j})}{(m_{02j} + m_{12j} + m_{22j})(m_{12j} - m_{1+j} + m_{22j} - m_{2+j})}.$$

4 Testing methods

4.1 Likelihood Ratio Test (T_L)

The likelihood ratio test statistic is given by

$$T_L = 2 \sum_{j=1}^J \left[l_j \left(\tilde{\delta}_j, \tilde{\pi}_{1j}, \tilde{\gamma}_j \right) - l_j \left(\hat{\delta}, \hat{\pi}_{1j}, \hat{\gamma}_j \right) \right],$$

Moreover, T_L is asymptotically distributed as a Chi-square distribution with $J - 1$ degree of freedom under the null hypothesis.

4.2 Score Test (T_{SC})

Under the assumption that each stratum has the same ratio of proportions δ_j ($\delta = \delta_j$), the score test statistic is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{SC} &= \sum_{j=1}^J U_j I_j^{-1} U_j^T \mid \delta = \hat{\delta}, \pi_{1j} = \hat{\pi}_{1j}, \gamma_j = \hat{\gamma}_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \delta_j} \right)^2 \frac{1}{D_j} I_j^{-1}(1, 1) \mid \delta = \hat{\delta}, \pi_{1j} = \hat{\pi}_{1j}, \gamma_j = \hat{\gamma}_j, \end{aligned}$$

$$I_j^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{D_j} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \left(I_{22}^{(j)} I_{33}^{(j)} - I_{23}^{(j)} I_{32}^{(j)} \right) & -\left(I_{12}^{(j)} I_{33}^{(j)} - I_{13}^{(j)} I_{32}^{(j)} \right) & \left(I_{12}^{(j)} I_{23}^{(j)} - I_{13}^{(j)} I_{22}^{(j)} \right) \\ -\left(I_{21}^{(j)} I_{33}^{(j)} - I_{23}^{(j)} I_{31}^{(j)} \right) & \left(I_{11}^{(j)} I_{33}^{(j)} - I_{13}^{(j)} I_{31}^{(j)} \right) & -\left(I_{11}^{(j)} I_{23}^{(j)} - I_{13}^{(j)} I_{21}^{(j)} \right) \\ \left(I_{21}^{(j)} I_{32}^{(j)} - I_{22}^{(j)} I_{31}^{(j)} \right) & -\left(I_{11}^{(j)} I_{32}^{(j)} - I_{12}^{(j)} I_{31}^{(j)} \right) & \left(I_{11}^{(j)} I_{22}^{(j)} - I_{12}^{(j)} I_{21}^{(j)} \right) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$D_j = I_{11}^{(j)} I_{22}^{(j)} I_{33}^{(j)} - I_{11}^{(j)} I_{23}^{(j)} I_{32}^{(j)} - I_{12}^{(j)} I_{21}^{(j)} I_{33}^{(j)} + I_{12}^{(j)} I_{23}^{(j)} I_{31}^{(j)} + I_{13}^{(j)} I_{21}^{(j)} I_{32}^{(j)} - I_{13}^{(j)} I_{22}^{(j)} I_{31}^{(j)},$$

where the score function for j th stratum $U_j = \left(\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \delta}, 0, 0 \right)$, and $I_j^{-1}(1, 1) = \left(I_{22}^{(j)} I_{33}^{(j)} - I_{23}^{(j)} I_{32}^{(j)} \right)$ is the first diagonal element of the inverse of fisher information matrix (See Appendix for more detail).

4.3 Wald-type Test (T_W)

An alternative way to express the null hypothesis is in matrix form as $\mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\beta}^T = 0$, where

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\delta_1, \pi_{11}, \gamma_1, \delta_2, \pi_{12}, \gamma_2, \dots, \delta_J, \pi_{1J}, \gamma_J)$$

and

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The global information matrix for this Wald-type test I_W is a $3J \times 3J$ block diagonal matrix, with each block being a 3×3 information matrix of parameter vector $(\delta_j, \pi_{1j}, \gamma_j)$ within each stratum. We used the same derivation approach as we derive information matrix for the score test in previous.

$$I_W = \begin{bmatrix} I_W^{(1)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & I_W^{(2)} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & I_W^{(J)} \end{bmatrix}_{3J \times 3J},$$

with

$$I_W^{(j)} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{W11}^{(j)} & I_{W12}^{(j)} & I_{W13}^{(j)} \\ I_{W21}^{(j)} & I_{W22}^{(j)} & I_{W23}^{(j)} \\ I_{W31}^{(j)} & I_{W32}^{(j)} & I_{W33}^{(j)} \end{bmatrix}_{3 \times 3},$$

the explicit form of each element $(I_{W_{ik}}^{(j)})$ being exactly the same as (I_{ik}^j) derived in previous for unconstrained score test. Then the Wald-type test statistic can be express as:

$$T_W = (\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{C}^T) (\mathbf{C} I_W^{-1} \mathbf{C}^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{C} \boldsymbol{\beta}^T) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\tilde{\delta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\delta}_J, \tilde{\pi}_{11}, \dots, \tilde{\pi}_{1J}, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_J)}$$

$$I_W^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_W^{(1)})^{-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & (I_W^{(2)})^{-1} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & (I_W^{(J)})^{-1} \end{bmatrix}_{J \times J},$$

where

$$(I_W^{(j)})^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{D_W^{(j)}} \right) \begin{pmatrix} (I_{W22}^{(j)} I_{W33}^{(j)} - I_{W23}^{(j)} I_{W32}^{(j)}) & -(I_{W12}^{(j)} I_{W33}^{(j)} - I_{W13}^{(j)} I_{W32}^{(j)}) & (I_{W12}^{(j)} I_{W23}^{(j)} - I_{W13}^{(j)} I_{W22}^{(j)}) \\ -(I_{W21}^{(j)} I_{W33}^{(j)} - I_{W23}^{(j)} I_{W31}^{(j)}) & (I_{W11}^{(j)} I_{W33}^{(j)} - I_{W13}^{(j)} I_{W31}^{(j)}) & -(I_{W11}^{(j)} I_{W23}^{(j)} - I_{W13}^{(j)} I_{W21}^{(j)}) \\ (I_{W21}^{(j)} I_{W32}^{(j)} - I_{W22}^{(j)} I_{W31}^{(j)}) & -(I_{W11}^{(j)} I_{W32}^{(j)} - I_{W12}^{(j)} I_{W31}^{(j)}) & (I_{W11}^{(j)} I_{W22}^{(j)} - I_{W12}^{(j)} I_{W21}^{(j)}) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$D_W^{(j)} = I_{W11}^{(j)} I_{W22}^{(j)} I_{W33}^{(j)} - I_{W11}^{(j)} I_{W23}^{(j)} I_{W32}^{(j)} - I_{W12}^{(j)} I_{W21}^{(j)} I_{W33}^{(j)} + I_{W12}^{(j)} I_{W23}^{(j)} I_{W31}^{(j)} + I_{W13}^{(j)} I_{W21}^{(j)} I_{W32}^{(j)} - I_{W13}^{(j)} I_{W22}^{(j)} I_{W31}^{(j)}.$$

5 Simulation Studies

This section investigates the empirical performances of three proposed test statistics in the previous section by three Monte Carlo simulation studies to evaluate the quality of relative risk in terms of the empirical Type I error rate and the power.

5.1 Empirical Type I error rates

In the first Monte Carlo simulation study, we investigate the behavior of empirical Type I rate for three proposed tests under various procedures, where $m = 25, 50, \text{ or } 100$ in strata $J = 2, 4, 6, \text{ or } 8$. By considering π_{1j} and γ_j are either common or different cross strata, we provide the parameter settings under different sample sizes and various sets of parameters in Table 1. For each configuration, 50,000 samples are randomly generated under null hypothesis $H_0 : \delta = 1, 1.2, 0.8$, and the empirical Type I error rates are calculated by dividing the number of rejections by 50,000. According to the previous study [22], the robustness of empirical Type 1 error rates is in the range of 0.04 to 0.06. As shown in Table 2-5, we observe that the Wald-type test has poor performance, and the likelihood ratio test does not work well under a small sample with multiple strata. However, the score test is more robust than the likelihood ratio and Wald-type test.

Table 1: Parameter setups for computing empirical Type I error rates and powers.

Parameter	Cases	Number of strata			
		J=2	J=4	J=6	J=8
γ	I	(0.2,0.4)	(0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4)	(0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4)	(0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4)
	II	(0.3,0.3)	(0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3)	(0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3)	(0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3)
	III	(0.3,0.5)	(0.3,0.5,0.3,0.5)	(0.3,0.5,0.3,0.5,0.3,0.5)	(0.3,0.5,0.3,0.5,0.3,0.5,0.3,0.5)
	IV	(0.6,0.6)	(0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6)	(0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6)	(0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6,0.6)
π_1	a	(0.2,0.4)	(0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4)	(0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4)	(0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4,0.2,0.4)
	b	(0.3,0.3)	(0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3)	(0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3)	(0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3)
	c	(0.2,0.3)	(0.2,0.3,0.2,0.3)	(0.2,0.3,0.2,0.3,0.2,0.3)	(0.2,0.3,0.2,0.3,0.2,0.3,0.2,0.3)

Table 2: Simulation results of the empirical sizes for 2 strata.

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	5.46	5.28	3.76	5.28	5.17	3.97	5.06	5.03	4.41
		b	5.39	5.37	2.04	5.28	5.23	3.40	5.09	5.07	4.20
		c	5.31	5.25	1.71	5.19	5.15	2.99	5.13	5.11	4.02
	II	a	5.65	5.43	4.68	5.35	5.23	4.45	5.27	5.22	4.73
		b	5.42	5.42	1.92	5.39	5.33	3.33	4.94	4.92	4.05
		c	5.54	5.46	2.39	5.22	5.16	3.23	5.10	5.08	4.00
	III	a	5.36	5.21	3.42	5.33	5.24	3.92	5.14	5.10	4.27
		b	5.50	5.47	1.83	5.21	5.15	3.14	5.07	5.04	4.12
		c	5.41	5.29	1.52	5.14	5.11	2.79	5.11	5.09	3.87
	IV	a	5.51	5.21	3.95	5.12	5.01	3.77	5.03	4.97	4.23
		b	5.49	5.44	1.20	5.22	5.20	2.79	4.94	4.90	3.78
		c	5.48	5.34	1.70	5.32	5.20	2.71	5.24	5.18	3.73
1.2	I	a	5.37	5.22	3.66	5.24	5.15	4.00	4.98	4.95	4.29
		b	5.54	5.48	1.70	5.16	5.10	3.15	5.06	5.04	4.08
		c	5.56	5.47	1.48	5.25	5.18	2.76	5.12	5.11	3.87
	II	a	5.42	5.29	4.47	5.11	5.06	4.28	5.14	5.10	4.70
		b	5.19	5.15	1.51	5.05	5.00	3.03	5.00	4.98	4.01
		c	5.49	5.44	2.17	5.11	5.07	3.15	5.07	5.04	3.91
	III	a	5.25	5.13	3.32	5.08	4.99	3.63	5.09	5.05	4.27
		b	5.28	5.24	1.46	5.14	5.09	2.99	5.13	5.10	4.00
		c	5.53	5.46	1.31	5.29	5.25	2.56	4.88	4.86	3.65
	IV	a	5.37	5.12	3.76	5.17	5.05	3.87	5.20	5.12	4.29
		b	5.62	5.57	1.05	5.12	5.09	2.48	5.26	5.24	3.84
		c	5.64	5.50	1.44	5.14	5.09	2.46	5.17	5.14	3.55
0.8	I	a	5.31	5.13	3.81	5.16	5.07	4.14	5.15	5.09	4.47
		b	5.36	5.33	2.49	5.15	5.10	3.60	5.10	5.06	4.34
		c	5.54	5.39	2.08	5.17	5.12	3.12	5.08	5.04	4.10
	II	a	5.40	5.14	4.63	5.20	5.08	4.34	5.09	5.03	4.63
		b	5.41	5.36	2.30	5.30	5.24	3.68	5.10	5.08	4.29
		c	5.29	5.14	2.45	5.25	5.18	3.39	4.99	4.95	4.00
	III	a	5.45	5.28	3.77	5.20	5.11	3.95	5.12	5.06	4.42
		b	5.31	5.28	2.02	5.25	5.22	3.49	5.00	4.99	4.14
		c	5.29	5.18	1.75	5.26	5.17	2.95	5.19	5.12	3.98
	IV	a	5.72	5.43	4.07	5.23	5.12	3.99	5.12	5.08	4.39
		b	5.43	5.34	1.55	5.30	5.26	3.02	5.01	4.98	3.84
		c	5.51	5.19	1.95	5.23	5.12	2.82	5.34	5.29	3.86

Table 3: Simulation results of the empirical sizes for 4 strata.

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	5.82	5.45	4.33	5.33	5.17	4.35	5.07	5.03	4.59
		b	5.41	5.20	2.44	5.21	5.09	3.29	5.13	5.08	4.04
		c	5.73	5.46	2.49	5.31	5.20	3.19	5.11	5.05	4.00

Table 3: Simulation results of the empirical sizes for 4 strata. (*continued*)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.2	II	a	5.52	5.13	4.96	5.23	5.10	4.78	5.12	5.03	4.92
		b	5.54	5.28	2.41	5.23	5.12	3.27	5.12	5.07	4.06
		c	5.63	5.31	2.89	5.29	5.15	3.30	5.13	5.04	4.09
	III	a	5.75	5.41	3.79	5.26	5.08	4.11	5.06	5.01	4.53
		b	5.52	5.30	2.39	5.05	4.93	3.14	5.05	5.01	3.91
		c	5.69	5.35	2.22	5.35	5.20	3.20	5.15	5.10	3.81
	IV	a	5.59	5.16	4.05	5.23	5.00	4.55	5.19	5.10	4.64
		b	5.55	5.30	1.84	5.23	5.12	2.85	5.16	5.09	3.72
		c	5.77	5.33	2.43	5.36	5.18	3.01	5.15	5.08	3.75
	I	a	5.67	5.34	3.67	5.26	5.10	4.16	5.17	5.08	4.51
		b	5.65	5.40	2.05	5.23	5.13	3.18	5.12	5.07	3.90
		c	5.65	5.35	1.96	5.26	5.13	2.90	5.21	5.14	3.74
II	a	5.77	5.41	4.60	5.19	5.09	4.55	4.97	4.89	4.70	
	b	5.54	5.32	1.92	5.34	5.19	2.96	5.20	5.17	4.02	
	c	5.71	5.37	2.37	5.32	5.18	3.33	5.04	4.95	3.96	
III	a	5.56	5.24	3.56	5.21	5.03	3.85	5.27	5.17	4.41	
	b	5.45	5.21	1.86	5.41	5.26	3.07	5.17	5.11	3.85	
	c	5.53	5.22	1.82	5.32	5.20	2.74	5.38	5.32	3.81	
IV	a	5.72	5.26	4.00	5.30	5.13	4.11	4.96	4.88	4.38	
	b	5.47	5.19	1.56	5.15	5.04	2.48	5.23	5.18	3.61	
	c	5.78	5.37	1.92	5.29	5.13	2.84	5.41	5.30	3.65	
0.8	I	a	5.56	5.23	4.86	5.24	5.03	4.66	5.16	5.07	4.71
		b	5.50	5.21	2.98	5.03	4.92	3.59	5.09	5.01	4.25
		c	5.77	5.34	2.98	5.24	5.06	3.37	5.24	5.16	4.18
	II	a	5.60	5.14	5.68	5.21	5.04	5.18	4.94	4.88	4.84
		b	5.53	5.23	2.87	5.37	5.23	3.64	5.14	5.08	4.22
		c	5.73	5.33	3.47	5.20	5.01	3.73	5.24	5.17	4.37
	III	a	5.64	5.19	4.57	5.42	5.25	4.60	5.04	4.95	4.62
		b	5.63	5.34	2.96	5.43	5.27	3.76	5.09	5.04	4.19
		c	5.80	5.36	2.82	5.39	5.20	3.46	5.19	5.10	4.04
	IV	a	5.83	5.24	5.10	5.38	5.15	4.90	5.15	5.06	4.78
		b	5.66	5.30	2.35	5.41	5.23	3.24	5.13	5.06	3.96
		c	5.75	5.12	3.02	5.33	5.07	3.36	5.02	4.89	3.79

Table 4: Simulation results of the empirical sizes for 6 strata.

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	5.90	5.47	4.77	5.30	5.11	4.55	5.06	4.99	4.63
		b	5.56	5.25	2.67	5.32	5.17	3.39	5.23	5.15	4.19
		c	5.89	5.49	2.80	5.37	5.17	3.31	5.17	5.07	3.95
	II	a	5.72	5.20	5.61	5.33	5.10	5.00	5.03	4.92	4.85
		b	5.57	5.27	2.54	5.50	5.32	3.45	5.11	5.05	3.97
		c	5.58	5.15	3.07	5.33	5.12	3.63	5.25	5.16	4.33
	III	a	5.66	5.19	4.50	5.31	5.08	4.37	5.29	5.20	4.71

Table 4: Simulation results of the empirical sizes for 6 strata. (*continued*)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100			
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	
1.2	IV	b	5.79	5.41	2.57	5.33	5.17	3.40	5.14	5.05	4.00	
		c	6.03	5.59	2.73	5.45	5.23	3.30	5.08	4.98	3.88	
		a	5.98	5.38	5.21	5.38	5.13	4.72	5.14	5.01	4.73	
		b	5.97	5.58	2.38	5.26	5.07	3.06	5.18	5.09	3.87	
		c	5.91	5.27	2.93	5.31	5.04	3.40	5.26	5.15	3.91	
		a	5.79	5.34	4.14	5.28	5.04	4.24	5.22	5.13	4.55	
	I	b	5.75	5.39	2.27	5.40	5.24	3.23	5.13	5.07	4.01	
		c	5.56	5.19	2.32	5.60	5.44	3.24	5.24	5.16	3.78	
		II	a	5.93	5.43	4.87	5.27	5.00	4.59	5.12	4.98	4.75
			b	5.83	5.47	2.11	5.14	4.97	3.02	5.11	5.03	3.92
			c	5.79	5.37	2.74	5.54	5.32	3.55	5.30	5.19	4.08
		III	a	5.81	5.32	3.92	5.36	5.14	4.13	5.25	5.10	4.35
b	5.68		5.33	2.15	5.37	5.23	3.05	5.15	5.10	3.81		
c	5.79		5.36	2.06	5.28	5.08	2.96	5.31	5.20	3.72		
IV	a	5.96	5.42	4.48	5.21	4.92	4.37	5.27	5.17	4.62		
	b	5.77	5.42	1.77	5.36	5.16	2.81	5.27	5.19	3.66		
	c	5.74	5.21	2.28	5.58	5.32	3.17	5.36	5.26	3.84		
0.8	I	a	5.97	5.44	5.71	5.23	4.99	5.01	5.21	5.11	5.17	
		b	5.81	5.41	3.51	5.41	5.24	4.04	5.21	5.11	4.32	
		c	6.06	5.46	3.69	5.21	4.99	3.65	5.15	5.06	4.29	
	II	a	5.88	5.29	6.69	5.29	5.07	5.64	5.00	4.87	5.15	
		b	5.69	5.32	3.41	5.28	5.09	3.83	5.02	4.93	4.21	
		c	5.93	5.38	4.21	5.36	5.13	4.17	5.18	5.09	4.53	
	III	a	6.00	5.39	5.73	5.29	5.09	4.87	5.31	5.22	4.99	
		b	5.90	5.52	3.49	5.25	5.07	3.67	5.32	5.21	4.41	
		c	6.05	5.44	3.63	5.26	5.06	3.62	5.26	5.16	4.22	
	IV	a	6.24	5.46	6.31	5.43	5.09	5.45	5.35	5.19	5.09	
		b	5.93	5.44	3.03	5.35	5.15	3.46	5.10	4.98	4.10	
		c	6.14	5.34	4.21	5.43	5.11	3.93	5.24	5.10	4.18	

Table 5: Simulation results of the empirical sizes for 8 strata.

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	5.87	5.39	5.01	5.40	5.15	4.72	5.02	4.91	4.68
		b	5.66	5.28	2.79	5.37	5.16	3.58	5.17	5.08	4.08
		c	6.04	5.51	3.06	5.40	5.19	3.68	5.16	5.06	4.03
	II	a	5.98	5.33	5.96	5.47	5.16	5.43	5.11	4.97	5.02
		b	5.62	5.19	2.64	5.36	5.19	3.54	5.13	5.04	3.99
		c	5.67	5.08	3.61	5.40	5.16	3.78	5.03	4.94	4.06
	III	a	5.81	5.31	4.85	5.42	5.19	4.65	5.11	4.98	4.52
		b	5.80	5.38	2.83	5.13	4.94	3.24	5.24	5.15	4.06
		c	5.97	5.48	2.96	5.44	5.21	3.44	5.31	5.21	4.11
	IV	a	5.90	5.21	5.68	5.53	5.23	5.07	5.31	5.16	4.90
		b	6.07	5.62	2.38	5.23	5.02	3.10	5.19	5.10	3.90

Table 5: Simulation results of the empirical sizes for 8 strata. (*continued*)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.2	I	c	6.19	5.45	3.45	5.44	5.18	3.63	5.20	5.08	4.04
		a	5.95	5.37	4.26	5.37	5.12	4.38	5.27	5.14	4.72
		b	5.76	5.27	2.31	5.50	5.28	3.27	5.31	5.21	3.97
	II	c	5.84	5.36	2.35	5.39	5.15	3.15	5.43	5.33	4.06
		a	6.09	5.40	5.15	5.49	5.20	5.09	5.19	5.06	4.95
		b	5.72	5.29	2.12	5.20	4.98	3.02	5.13	5.03	3.90
	III	c	6.03	5.49	3.03	5.43	5.23	3.40	5.21	5.11	4.07
		a	5.86	5.22	3.99	5.34	5.01	4.19	5.30	5.15	4.52
		b	5.71	5.28	2.18	5.40	5.26	3.11	5.18	5.10	4.00
	IV	c	5.80	5.31	2.37	5.49	5.29	3.02	5.33	5.23	3.93
		a	5.82	5.22	4.93	5.43	5.15	4.62	5.12	4.98	4.63
		b	5.59	5.17	1.80	5.30	5.11	2.80	5.38	5.30	3.75
0.8	I	c	6.01	5.38	2.58	5.52	5.23	3.30	5.25	5.10	3.83
		a	6.10	5.48	6.34	5.39	5.12	5.46	5.16	5.01	5.15
		b	5.85	5.43	3.84	5.40	5.19	4.12	5.14	5.02	4.47
	II	c	5.83	5.23	4.21	5.35	5.08	4.11	5.04	4.94	4.23
		a	5.92	5.28	7.28	5.47	5.24	5.95	5.30	5.19	5.45
		b	5.77	5.32	3.69	5.33	5.14	3.94	5.20	5.11	4.25
	III	c	6.12	5.41	4.79	5.42	5.17	4.40	5.18	5.07	4.61
		a	5.94	5.33	5.89	5.45	5.18	5.44	5.08	4.99	4.92
		b	5.79	5.28	3.77	5.56	5.32	4.04	5.23	5.13	4.43
	IV	c	6.03	5.32	4.22	5.45	5.13	3.99	5.44	5.28	4.36
		a	6.30	5.38	7.31	5.48	5.12	5.70	5.20	5.04	5.29
		b	5.77	5.25	3.46	5.46	5.23	3.73	5.33	5.23	4.25
		c	6.35	5.36	4.69	5.48	5.14	4.36	5.37	5.18	4.51

To obtain completed and robust empirical performances of three proposed tests, we propose the second simulation by randomly choosing parameter configurations. We randomly generate 1000 parameter configurations within parameter space for different sample sizes $m = 15, 25, 50, 100$ and variety of strata $J = 2, 4, 6$ and 8 for 50,000 replications. Same as the first simulation, the empirical Type I error rates can be calculated as the number of rejections divided by 50,000. Furthermore, the corresponding boxplots and violin plots are shown in Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4. Comparing empirical Type I error rates among three tests, the score and likelihood ratio tests are stable and robust under all conditions. Still, the Wald-type test performs poorly compared to the other two tests.

5.2 Power

The third Monte Carlo simulation aims to investigate power performance among three proposed tests. Based on the hypothesis $H_0 : \delta_0 = 0.5$, and $H_a : \delta_a = 1, 1.2, 1.4$, we consider the same strata, sample size and parameter setting (Table 1) as the first Monte Carlo simulation of empirical Type I error. As the




Figure 1: Violin-plots and Boxplots of empirical sizes ($J=2$)




Figure 2: Violin-plots and Boxplots of empirical sizes ($J=4$)




Figure 3: Violin-plots and Boxplots of empirical sizes ($J=6$)




Figure 4: Violin-plots and Boxplots of empirical sizes ($J=8$)

sample size increases, the powers of the three proposed tests increase for all strata settings (Table 6-9). In addition, as the strata increase, the powers increase for the three proposed tests. Considering empirical Type I error, using the score test is highly recommended.

Table 6: Part of simulation results of the empirical powers for 2 strata. (where $H_0 : \delta_0 = 0.5$, $H_a: \delta_a = 1, 1.2, 1.4$)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	26.63	25.19	36.64	46.61	45.74	56.84	75.30	74.88	81.43
		b	32.29	31.93	24.19	56.07	55.79	53.09	84.84	84.69	84.30
		c	24.28	23.35	24.54	41.41	40.68	45.16	68.70	68.31	72.44
	II	a	25.87	24.38	37.96	45.10	44.27	57.17	73.99	73.62	81.19
		b	32.08	31.55	27.87	55.93	55.55	55.66	84.31	84.13	84.89
		c	23.44	22.45	26.93	40.58	39.72	46.79	68.19	67.73	73.30
	III	a	24.79	23.33	33.68	43.01	42.11	52.49	71.06	70.55	77.60
		b	29.94	29.61	20.35	51.70	51.39	47.95	80.88	80.74	80.12
		c	22.11	21.14	20.92	38.30	37.49	41.13	65.22	64.72	68.89
	IV	a	21.20	19.58	30.15	35.71	34.62	46.56	61.68	61.09	70.18
		b	25.05	24.45	16.95	43.35	42.84	40.82	71.46	71.21	71.57
		c	19.23	17.91	18.62	32.05	31.04	36.04	55.53	54.87	60.50
1.2	I	a	26.93	25.44	36.59	46.53	45.64	56.82	75.63	75.25	81.73
		b	32.19	31.83	24.26	55.73	55.48	52.93	84.72	84.61	84.31
		c	23.58	22.64	23.71	42.03	41.27	45.80	69.50	69.02	73.13
	II	a	26.08	24.69	38.63	45.07	44.24	57.07	73.74	73.35	81.11
		b	32.12	31.59	28.11	55.92	55.50	55.66	84.60	84.42	85.20
		c	23.21	22.10	26.80	40.38	39.53	46.57	68.18	67.67	73.16
	III	a	25.01	23.57	33.72	43.19	42.30	52.72	71.42	70.94	77.90
		b	29.46	29.14	20.32	51.46	51.18	47.74	80.86	80.72	80.02
		c	22.52	21.55	21.26	38.34	37.56	41.36	65.27	64.77	68.83
	IV	a	21.04	19.54	30.03	35.65	34.63	46.38	61.31	60.71	69.90
		b	25.19	24.60	17.21	43.64	43.05	41.07	71.28	70.95	71.32
		c	19.22	17.81	18.81	32.22	31.15	36.30	55.42	54.75	60.56
1.4	I	a	41.34	40.43	54.55	68.20	68.07	78.02	92.89	92.90	95.72
		b	51.00	50.73	44.36	80.03	79.85	79.33	97.66	97.64	97.77
		c	36.28	35.64	38.82	61.71	61.30	67.19	89.13	89.03	91.66
	II	a	40.11	39.42	55.73	66.62	66.53	78.12	91.77	91.81	95.26
		b	50.43	50.02	48.41	79.41	79.20	80.61	97.64	97.61	97.94
		c	35.81	34.99	42.21	60.90	60.46	68.32	88.45	88.36	91.80
	III	a	38.26	37.20	50.40	64.30	64.06	74.31	90.46	90.43	93.87
		b	46.88	46.61	37.68	75.52	75.34	74.04	96.33	96.29	96.36
		c	33.84	33.18	34.64	58.03	57.62	62.91	86.32	86.20	89.16
	IV	a	31.58	30.29	44.33	53.92	53.44	66.05	82.66	82.62	88.62
		b	38.76	38.25	30.88	65.27	64.90	64.61	91.18	91.09	91.75
		c	28.77	27.92	30.19	48.92	48.25	55.19	78.05	77.81	82.60

Table 7: Part of simulation results of the empirical powers for 4 strata. (where $H_0 : \delta_0 = 0.5$, $H_a: \delta_a = 1, 1.2, 1.4$)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	32.87	30.38	48.85	59.56	58.18	72.66	89.67	89.28	94.18
		b	40.86	39.69	30.64	70.84	70.34	66.69	95.60	95.51	95.31
		c	29.00	26.69	31.53	52.47	51.05	57.92	84.27	83.74	87.69
	II	a	32.10	29.50	51.67	57.77	56.29	73.66	88.52	88.17	94.13
		b	40.33	38.83	35.05	70.27	69.52	69.56	95.53	95.38	95.77
		c	28.69	26.25	35.14	51.87	50.40	60.72	83.40	82.87	88.02
	III	a	30.39	27.84	44.42	55.07	53.44	68.31	86.43	85.97	91.93
		b	36.86	35.63	25.39	65.70	65.09	60.02	93.41	93.23	92.82
		c	26.88	24.49	27.42	48.56	47.06	53.13	80.64	80.01	84.34
	IV	a	25.34	22.30	40.20	44.79	42.91	60.59	75.83	75.03	85.05
		b	30.47	28.89	21.99	55.09	54.09	51.29	86.40	86.08	86.35
		c	22.60	19.72	25.29	39.81	38.01	46.74	70.79	69.85	76.81
1.2	I	a	32.75	30.27	48.53	59.52	58.08	72.99	89.65	89.28	94.25
		b	40.88	39.67	30.42	70.86	70.29	66.52	95.69	95.59	95.29
		c	28.69	26.47	31.21	51.90	50.47	57.29	84.16	83.67	87.50
	II	a	32.00	29.35	51.70	57.66	56.26	73.73	88.27	87.86	93.85
		b	40.38	38.90	35.35	70.82	70.06	69.99	95.53	95.41	95.81
		c	28.57	26.10	35.42	51.29	49.75	59.64	83.62	83.02	88.32
	III	a	30.26	27.61	44.43	54.79	53.27	68.30	86.34	85.84	91.86
		b	36.84	35.75	25.45	66.33	65.77	60.66	93.60	93.51	92.95
		c	26.78	24.54	27.52	48.98	47.62	53.27	80.12	79.56	83.88
	IV	a	25.22	22.08	40.12	44.90	43.01	60.79	76.19	75.34	85.75
		b	30.42	28.69	22.04	55.26	54.11	51.47	86.49	86.19	86.37
		c	23.01	20.06	25.44	40.13	38.27	46.62	70.89	69.92	77.00
1.4	I	a	52.49	51.28	70.46	83.77	83.49	92.09	99.01	99.01	99.62
		b	65.03	63.95	56.54	92.94	92.74	92.16	99.89	99.89	99.90
		c	46.87	45.12	51.77	77.37	76.73	82.95	97.77	97.72	98.60
	II	a	50.94	49.81	72.32	81.89	81.70	91.91	98.75	98.75	99.62
		b	64.53	63.43	61.68	92.68	92.45	93.34	99.87	99.86	99.90
		c	45.21	43.42	55.03	76.33	75.69	84.21	97.49	97.43	98.67
	III	a	48.69	47.21	65.89	79.26	78.87	89.03	98.34	98.33	99.32
		b	59.67	58.62	48.28	89.65	89.38	87.99	99.71	99.71	99.71
		c	43.01	41.14	45.97	73.60	72.82	78.78	96.65	96.55	97.90
	IV	a	39.47	37.50	58.69	68.48	67.78	82.49	94.44	94.36	97.61
		b	49.51	47.94	40.46	80.65	80.14	80.02	98.54	98.50	98.76
		c	35.60	33.30	40.54	62.51	61.44	70.62	91.48	91.26	94.54

Table 8: Part of simulation results of the empirical powers for 6 strata. (where $H_0 : \delta_0 = 0.5$, $H_a: \delta_a = 1, 1.2, 1.4$)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	40.02	36.70	59.66	70.92	69.37	83.71	96.27	96.04	98.35

Table 8: Part of simulation results of the empirical powers for 6 strata. (*continued*)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.2	II	b	49.23	47.55	38.32	82.00	81.43	78.55	99.02	98.99	98.93
		c	34.86	31.81	39.62	62.97	61.27	69.62	92.79	92.47	95.02
		a	38.51	34.82	62.47	68.57	66.99	84.25	95.63	95.39	98.35
		b	48.86	46.94	44.27	81.72	80.98	81.39	98.96	98.91	99.05
		c	34.06	30.74	44.31	61.82	59.99	71.78	92.12	91.71	95.24
		a	36.85	33.41	55.33	66.00	64.15	79.57	94.25	93.94	97.20
	III	b	44.80	43.08	32.56	77.23	76.64	72.09	98.07	98.04	97.76
		c	32.28	29.08	35.48	58.88	57.15	64.36	90.22	89.66	92.77
		a	29.80	25.63	50.13	54.55	52.14	72.38	86.83	86.13	93.60
	IV	b	36.81	34.42	28.77	66.50	65.40	62.99	94.42	94.20	94.51
		c	26.98	22.90	32.89	48.50	46.17	57.24	82.32	81.45	87.58
		a	40.41	36.99	59.85	70.89	69.31	83.71	96.34	96.14	98.44
	I	b	49.43	47.84	38.51	81.91	81.37	78.27	98.98	98.95	98.87
		c	34.68	31.62	39.72	62.86	61.16	69.42	92.86	92.50	95.11
		a	38.42	34.84	62.64	68.75	67.14	84.36	95.63	95.37	98.36
	II	b	48.73	46.82	44.11	82.08	81.31	81.61	98.97	98.93	99.06
		c	34.28	30.91	44.00	62.16	60.39	72.05	92.31	91.88	95.44
		a	36.56	33.13	55.12	66.00	64.25	79.66	94.23	93.89	97.31
	III	b	45.17	43.44	32.73	77.28	76.55	72.27	98.09	98.03	97.84
		c	32.09	28.92	35.37	58.70	56.87	64.17	90.36	89.91	93.00
		a	30.06	25.92	50.14	54.05	51.84	72.12	86.75	86.08	93.65
	IV	b	37.00	34.67	28.79	65.97	64.87	62.56	94.60	94.41	94.51
		c	26.66	22.95	32.40	48.68	46.44	57.22	82.15	81.31	87.49
		a	63.39	61.87	81.92	92.32	92.13	97.29	99.90	99.90	99.97
I	b	76.50	75.35	68.99	97.88	97.78	97.57	99.99	99.99	100.00	
	c	56.29	54.05	63.31	87.87	87.31	91.96	99.65	99.64	99.85	
	a	61.21	59.88	82.91	91.19	91.04	97.22	99.80	99.80	99.97	
II	b	76.17	74.95	74.00	97.78	97.67	98.08	100.00	100.00	100.00	
	c	55.03	52.85	67.24	86.57	86.06	92.63	99.57	99.57	99.82	
	a	58.40	56.59	77.40	89.73	89.39	96.05	99.72	99.71	99.93	
III	b	71.22	69.95	60.57	96.20	96.05	95.46	99.98	99.98	99.98	
	c	51.78	49.24	57.37	84.27	83.57	88.74	99.32	99.29	99.64	
	a	47.65	45.07	70.12	79.89	79.25	91.34	98.62	98.59	99.58	
IV	b	59.82	57.82	51.78	90.42	90.03	89.91	99.81	99.80	99.83	
	c	42.93	39.65	51.36	74.25	73.09	82.35	97.26	97.14	98.59	

Table 9: Part of simulation results of the empirical powers for 8 strata. (where $H_0 : \delta_0 = 0.5$, $H_a : \delta_a = 1, 1.2, 1.4$)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100		
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
1.0	I	a	46.43	42.49	68.28	79.26	77.67	90.56	98.71	98.60	99.57
		b	57.29	55.50	45.95	89.45	89.02	86.87	99.77	99.76	99.74
		c	40.76	37.04	47.42	71.99	70.35	78.53	97.00	96.80	98.21

Table 9: Part of simulation results of the empirical powers for 8 strata. (*continued*)

δ	γ	π_1	m = 25			m = 50			m = 100			
			T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W	
1.2	II	a	44.83	40.73	70.98	77.48	75.88	91.08	98.28	98.18	99.50	
		b	56.62	54.41	52.08	89.08	88.47	88.84	99.80	99.79	99.82	
		c	39.56	35.53	52.08	70.52	68.76	80.60	96.51	96.24	98.19	
	III	a	42.95	38.80	63.91	74.75	72.98	87.34	97.64	97.46	99.10	
		b	52.30	50.28	39.44	85.55	84.98	81.40	99.47	99.46	99.39	
		c	37.17	33.43	42.08	67.15	65.29	73.34	95.29	94.93	96.91	
	IV	a	34.38	29.36	58.12	62.64	60.07	80.74	93.20	92.74	97.49	
		b	42.94	40.16	34.89	75.04	73.84	72.37	97.78	97.70	97.80	
		c	30.87	26.10	39.41	56.57	54.07	66.46	89.25	88.56	93.50	
	1.4	I	a	46.36	42.49	68.44	79.20	77.81	90.29	98.69	98.59	99.58
			b	56.96	55.08	45.89	89.38	88.99	86.72	99.78	99.77	99.73
			c	40.51	36.99	47.27	71.60	69.99	78.17	96.96	96.73	98.14
II		a	44.56	40.51	70.95	77.29	75.72	90.88	98.41	98.31	99.57	
		b	56.35	54.11	51.92	89.20	88.63	89.02	99.76	99.75	99.78	
		c	39.42	35.41	52.14	70.79	68.94	80.39	96.44	96.17	98.13	
III		a	42.60	38.47	63.53	74.74	73.09	87.30	97.71	97.56	99.15	
		b	52.36	50.39	39.68	85.43	84.78	81.17	99.46	99.44	99.37	
		c	37.79	33.89	42.83	67.53	65.67	73.69	95.43	95.09	96.90	
IV		a	35.08	30.14	58.73	62.74	60.31	80.71	93.00	92.52	97.36	
		b	42.43	39.59	34.48	75.12	73.99	72.13	97.87	97.77	97.82	
		c	30.51	25.97	39.28	56.69	54.20	66.17	89.24	88.42	93.19	
1.4	I	a	72.00	70.38	88.71	96.50	96.38	99.08	99.99	99.99	100.00	
		b	85.04	83.98	78.48	99.38	99.35	99.26	100.00	100.00	100.00	
		c	64.45	62.20	72.64	93.79	93.44	96.58	99.95	99.95	99.98	
	II	a	69.89	68.35	89.87	95.82	95.69	99.16	99.98	99.98	100.00	
		b	84.30	83.16	83.04	99.41	99.38	99.49	100.00	100.00	100.00	
		c	63.40	60.96	76.32	92.75	92.36	96.77	99.95	99.95	99.98	
	III	a	67.11	65.17	85.14	94.76	94.57	98.32	99.97	99.97	99.99	
		b	80.05	78.72	70.40	98.80	98.70	98.43	100.00	100.00	100.00	
		c	60.13	57.35	66.70	91.25	90.73	94.42	99.90	99.88	99.96	
	IV	a	55.17	52.10	78.76	87.37	86.82	95.94	99.67	99.66	99.95	
		b	68.44	66.54	61.19	95.50	95.20	95.30	99.98	99.98	99.98	
		c	49.91	46.09	60.05	82.62	81.56	89.40	99.13	99.09	99.64	

6 Real Data Example

We use the double-blinded randomized clinical trial data by Mandel et al. (1982) to illustrate the proposed three tests. In this clinical trial, children who suffer from otitis media with effusion (OME) and simultaneously have bilateral tympanocentesis are randomized into two group: amoxicillin or cefaclor to received the 14-day treatment [23]. After the treatment, the number of cured ears are summarized in table 10 with age group as strata. To explore whether the cured rates between two group: amoxicillin and cefaclor among strata age are clinically equivalent, we test the homogeneity based on proposed three

tests. The null hypothesis of homogeneity test is $H_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2 = \delta_3$ and alternative hypothesis is $H_a : \delta_1 \neq \delta_2 \neq \delta_3$, for $J = 1, 2, 3$. The MLEs of parameters based on observed data are listed in Table 11, and the three test statistics and p -value are summarized in table 12. However, all the p -value are greater than 0.05, which means there is no statistical evidence to reject null hypothesis $H_0 : \delta_1 = \delta_2 = \delta_3$.

Table 10: Frequency of number of OME-free ears after treatment.

Number of OME-Free ears	Age group					
	<2 years		2-5 years		≥ 6 years	
	Cefactor	Amoxicillin	Cefactor	Amoxicillin	Cefactor	Amoxicillin
0	8	11	6	3	0	1
1	2	2	6	1	1	0
2	8	2	10	5	3	6

Table 11: MLEs of parameters based on observed data.

Age groups	Global MLEs			Unconstrained MLEs		
	$\tilde{\pi}_1$	$\tilde{\gamma}$	$\tilde{\delta}$	$\hat{\pi}_1$	$\hat{\gamma}$	$\hat{\delta}$
<2 years	0.4762	0.8333	0.4800	0.4036	0.8333	0.8174
2-5 years	0.6116	0.8108	0.9167	0.6249	0.8108	-
≥ 6 years	0.9500	0.9474	0.8572	0.9500	0.9474	-

Table 12: The values of statistics and p -values for three different test.

	T_L	T_{SC}	T_W
Statistic	1.6918	1.6392	2.3520
P	0.4292	0.4406	0.3085

7 Conclusions

This article utilizes three MLE-based tests (LRT, Wald-type test, and score test) to test the homogeneity relative risk of two proportions on stratified bilateral correlated data.

Three Monte Carlo simulation results show that the score test yields a robust performance by empirical Type I error and power. Even with a small sample size and multiple strata, the score test still generates stable empirical Type I error and satisfactory power. Meanwhile, the likelihood ratio test and Wald-type test offer reasonable power, but comes with unstable empirical Type I error performances. By incorporating a small sample size, the Wald-type test shows unsatisfactory performance of empirical Type I error, but the

performance tends to be reasonable by increasing the sample size. Under a small sample size with multiple strata, the score test is slightly unstable, but the performance also tends to be robust by increasing the sample size.

However, asymptotic methods might have some limitations because of poor performance under a small sample size with multiple strata. Future work might consider exact tests to investigate related issues.

8 Appendix

8.1 Derivation of score statistic

The first order differential equations of stratum j are:

$$\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \delta} = \frac{m_{12j}}{\delta} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\delta} + \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j}} = \frac{m_{12j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{21j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{01j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta m_{02j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{m_{11j} (2\gamma_j - 2)}{2 \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 1)},$$

$$\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \gamma_j} = \frac{m_{21j}}{\gamma_j} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\gamma_j} + \frac{m_{11j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{12j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{01j} \pi_{1j}}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta m_{02j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1}.$$

The second order differential equations of stratum j are:

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta^2} = -\frac{m_{12j}}{\delta^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\delta^2} - \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta \partial \pi_{1j}} = \frac{m_{02j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta m_{02j} \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta \partial \gamma_j} = \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j} \partial \delta} = \frac{m_{02j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta m_{02j} \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j}^2} = -\frac{m_{12j}}{\pi_{1j}^2} - \frac{m_{21j}}{\pi_{1j}^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\pi_{1j}^2} - \frac{m_{01j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} - \frac{\delta^2 m_{02j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} - \frac{m_{11j} (2\gamma_j - 2)}{2 \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 1)},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j} \partial \gamma_j} = \frac{m_{01j}}{(\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} + \frac{\delta m_{02j}}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j \partial \delta} = \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j \partial \pi_{1j}} = \frac{m_{01j}}{(\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} + \frac{\delta m_{02j}}{(\pi_{1j} (2\delta - \delta \gamma_j) - 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j^2} = -\frac{m_{21j}}{\gamma_j^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\gamma_j^2} - \frac{m_{11j}}{(\gamma_j - 1)^2} - \frac{m_{12j}}{(\gamma_j - 1)^2} - \frac{m_{01j} \pi_{1j}^2}{(\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} - \frac{\delta^2 m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2}{(\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2}.$$

Fisher information of stratum j are:

$$I_{11}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta^2} \right) = \frac{m_{+2j}}{\delta^2 (\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)} - \frac{m_{+2j}}{\delta^2},$$

$$I_{12}^{(j)} = I_{21}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta \partial \pi_{1j}} \right) = \frac{m_{+2j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$I_{13}^{(j)} = I_{31}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta \partial \gamma_j} \right) = -\frac{m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$I_{22}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j}^2} \right) = \frac{m_{+1j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{(\gamma_j - 2) (m_{+1j} + \delta m_{+2j})}{\pi_{1j}} - \frac{\delta^2 m_{+2j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{\pi_{1j} (2\delta - \delta \gamma_j) - 1},$$

$$I_{23}^{(j)} = I_{32}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j} \partial \gamma_j} \right) = \frac{\delta m_{+2j}}{\pi_{1j} (2\delta - \delta \gamma_j) - 1} - \frac{m_{+1j}}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$I_{33}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j^2} \right) = \frac{m_{+1j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j} - \frac{2 m_{+1j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{+1j} \pi_{1j}^2}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} \\ + \frac{\delta^2 m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}^2}{\delta \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j} - \frac{2 \delta m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j - 1}.$$

8.2 Derivation of Wald-type statistic

The first order differential equations of stratum j are:

$$\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \delta_j} = \frac{m_{12j}}{\delta_j} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\delta_j} + \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta_j \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j}} = \frac{m_{12j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{21j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\pi_{1j}} + \frac{m_{01j}(\gamma_j - 2)}{\pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta_j m_{02j}(\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{m_{11j}(2\gamma_j - 2)}{2\pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 1)},$$

$$\frac{\partial l_j}{\partial \gamma_j} = \frac{m_{21j}}{\gamma_j} + \frac{m_{22j}}{\gamma_j} + \frac{m_{11j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{12j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{01j} \pi_{1j}}{\pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta_j m_{02j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1}.$$

The second order differential equations of stratum j are:

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta_j^2} = -\frac{m_{12j}}{\delta_j^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\delta_j^2} - \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta_j \partial \pi_{1j}} = \frac{m_{02j}(\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta_j m_{02j} \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta_j \partial \gamma_j} = \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta_j m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j} \partial \delta_j} = \frac{m_{02j}(\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta_j m_{02j} \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j}^2} = -\frac{m_{12j}}{\pi_{1j}^2} - \frac{m_{21j}}{\pi_{1j}^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\pi_{1j}^2} - \frac{m_{01j}(\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} - \frac{\delta^2 m_{02j}(\gamma_j - 2)^2}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} - \frac{m_{11j}(2\gamma_j - 2)}{2\pi_{1j}^2(\gamma_j - 1)},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j} \partial \gamma_j} = \frac{m_{01j}}{(\pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} + \frac{\delta_j m_{02j}}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j \partial \delta_j} = \frac{m_{02j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{\delta_j m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2 (\gamma_j - 2)}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j \partial \pi_{1j}} = \frac{m_{01j}}{(\pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} + \frac{\delta_j m_{02j}}{(\pi_{1j}(2\delta_j - \delta_j \gamma_j) - 1)^2},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j^2} = -\frac{m_{21j}}{\gamma_j^2} - \frac{m_{22j}}{\gamma_j^2} - \frac{m_{11j}}{(\gamma_j - 1)^2} - \frac{m_{12j}}{(\gamma_j - 1)^2} - \frac{m_{01j} \pi_{1j}^2}{(\pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2} - \frac{\delta^2 m_{02j} \pi_{1j}^2}{(\delta_j \pi_{1j}(\gamma_j - 2) + 1)^2}.$$

Fisher information of stratum j are:

$$I_{W11}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta_j^2} \right) = \frac{m_{+2j}}{\delta_j^2 (\delta_j \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1)} - \frac{m_{+2j}}{\delta_j^2},$$

$$I_{W12}^{(j)} = I_{W21}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta_j \partial \pi_{1j}} \right) = \frac{m_{+2j} (\gamma_j - 2)}{\delta_j \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$I_{W13}^{(j)} = I_{W31}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \delta_j \partial \gamma_j} \right) = -\frac{m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}}{\delta_j \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$I_{W22}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j}^2} \right) = \frac{m_{+1j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} - \frac{(\gamma_j - 2) (m_{+1j} + \delta_j m_{+2j})}{\pi_{1j}} - \frac{\delta_j^2 m_{+2j} (\gamma_j - 2)^2}{\pi_{1j} (2 \delta_j - \delta_j \gamma_j) - 1},$$

$$I_{W23}^{(j)} = I_{W32}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \pi_{1j} \gamma_j} \right) = \frac{\delta_j m_{+2j}}{\pi_{1j} (2 \delta_j - \delta_j \gamma_j) - 1} - \frac{m_{+1j}}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1},$$

$$I_{W33}^{(j)} = E \left(-\frac{\partial^2 l_j}{\partial \gamma_j^2} \right) = \frac{m_{+1j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j} - \frac{2 m_{+1j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j - 1} + \frac{m_{+1j} \pi_{1j}^2}{\pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} \\ + \frac{\delta_j^2 m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}^2}{\delta_j \pi_{1j} (\gamma_j - 2) + 1} + \frac{\delta_j m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j} - \frac{2 \delta_j m_{+2j} \pi_{1j}}{\gamma_j - 1}.$$

References

- [1] Bernard Rosner. Statistical methods in ophthalmology: an adjustment for the intraclass correlation between eyes. *Biometrics*, 38, March 1982.
- [2] Allan Donner. Statistical methods in ophthalmology: an adjusted chi-square approach. *Biometrics*, 45, 1989.
- [3] Gerade E. Dallal. Paired bernoulli trials. *Biometrics*, 44, March 1988.
- [4] Chang-Xing Ma and Song Liu. Testing equality of proportions for correlated binary data in ophthalmologic studies. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*, 27(4), 2017.
- [5] Chang-Xing Ma, Guogen Shan, and Song Liu. Homogeneity test for binary correlated data. *PLoS ONE*, 10(4), 2015.
- [6] Nian-Sheng Tang, Bo Zhang, and Hu-Qiong Li. Homogeneity test of difference between two correlated proportions in stratified matched-pair studies. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*, 23(6):1261–1280, 2013.

- [7] Nian-Sheng Tang, Man-Lai Tang, and Shi-Fang Qiu. Testing the equality of proportions for correlated otolaryngologic data. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 52, 2008.
- [8] Xiaobin Liu, Guogen Shan, Lili Tian, and Chang-Xing Ma. Exact methods for testing homogeneity of proportions for correlated multiple groups paired binary data. *Communications in Statistics—Simulation and Computation*, 46(8), 2017.
- [9] Xi Shen, T. Li, Chang-Xing Ma, and Guo-Liang Tian. Testing homogeneity of odds ratio for stratified bilateral correlated data. *Unpublished manuscript*, 2019.
- [10] Man-Lai Tang, Nian-Sheng Tang, and Bernard Rosner. Statistical inference for correlated data in ophthalmologic studies. *Statistics in Medicine*, 25(16), 2006.
- [11] J. R. Thompson. The chi-square test for data collected on eyes. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*, 77(2), 1993.
- [12] Xiaobin Liu, Song Liu, and Chang-Xing Ma. Testing equality of correlation coefficients for paired binary data from multiple groups. *Communications in Statistics—Simulation and Computation*, 86, 2015.
- [13] Zhiming Li, Changxing Ma, and Mingyao Ai. Statistical tests under dallal’s model: Asymptotic and exact methods. *Plos one*, 15(11):e0242722, 2020.
- [14] Yafei Chen, Zhiming Li, and Changxing Ma. Further study on testing the equality of response rates under dallal’s model. *Statistics and Its Interface*, 15(1):115–126, 2022.
- [15] Robert G Newcombe. *Confidence intervals for proportions and related measures of effect size*. CRC press, 2012.
- [16] Weizhen Wang and Guogen Shan. Exact confidence intervals for the relative risk and the odds ratio. *Biometrics*, 71(4):985–995, 2015.
- [17] Xuan Peng, Chang Liu, Song Liu, and Chang-Xing Ma. Asymptotic confidence interval construction for proportion ratio based on correlated paired data. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*, 29(6), 2019.
- [18] Nian-Sheng Tang, Shi-Fang Qiu, Man-Lai Tang, and Yan-Bo Pei. Asymptotic confidence interval construction for proportion difference in medical studies with bilateral data. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 20(3), 2011.

- [19] Nian-Sheng Tang and Shi-Fang Qiu. Homogeneity test, sample size determination and interval construction of difference of two proportions in stratified bilateral-sample designs. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 142(5), 2012.
- [20] Tingting Zhuang, Guo-Liang Tian, and Chang-Xing Ma. Homogeneity test of ratio of two proportions in stratified bilateral data. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, 11(1), 2018.
- [21] Xi Shen and Chang-Xing Ma. Testing homogeneity of difference of two proportions for stratified correlated paired binary data. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 45(8), 2018.
- [22] Yuqing Xue and Chang-Xing Ma. Interval estimation of proportion ratios for stratified bilateral correlated binary data. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 29(7), 2020.
- [23] Ellen M Mandel, Charles D Bluestone, Howard E Rockette, Mark M Blatter, Keith S Reisinger, Frederick P Wucher, and James Harper. Duration of effusion after antibiotic treatment for acute otitis media: comparison of cefaclor and amoxicillin. *Pediatric infectious disease*, 1(5):310–316, 1982.