

Re: Bob Ling's ignorance is clear

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2006-12/msg00875.html>

- *From:* "\"Luis A. Afonso\"" <licas_@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 30 Dec 2006 11:50:26 EST
-

Let be the GENERAL problem of comparing two INDEPENDENT Binomial distributions $X \sim \text{Bin}(p(X), n1)$, $Y \sim \text{Bin}(p(Y), n2)$, when it was observed x *good* items from the X Distribution in $n1$ trials and y from Y in $n2$ trials.

The Null Hypotheses, H_0 , is

_____ $H_0: |p(X) - p(Y)| \leq w$

and _____ $H_1: |p(X) - p(Y)| > w$

where w is a GIVEN quantity.

(in words : we intend to check if the absolute difference between the parameters values are at most w).

The method:

We evaluate the probability of all pairs x, y obeying to H_0 or $1 - \text{ALPHA}$. Therefore if ALPHA is _____ higher or equal to the pretended Significance Level H_0 MUST BE RETAINED; otherwise there is sufficient evidence to reject it.

The probability

___ $p(\text{not accepting } H_0 \mid H_0 \text{ is true}) = \alpha$

___ = $p(\text{to commit a Type I error})$

The Exact method is characterized in that ALPHA is directly obtained, being the respective CRITICAL VALUE unknown. This fact is understandable for RATIONAL PEOPLE (excluding Bob Ling and his GANG obviously).

Example: (program

___ $x = 17, n1 = 20$ ($pX = x / n1 = 0.85$)

___ $y = 7, n2 = 20$ ($pY = y / n2 = 0.35$)

___ $w = 0.17$

the probability of the two tails (left and right) is $\text{ALPHA} = 0.00959$ and we must not reject H_0 at the at 95 and at 99% Confidence Levels.

What is interesting (not boring as Robert (Bob) Ling's DOCTORALY and BURRICALLY claimed) is that the CLASSIC Z test gives the CONFIDENCE INTERVALS for w :

___ at 95% Confidence Level [0.2389 , 0.7611]

___ at 99% [0.1568 , 0.8432]

$Z = 2.4769$ therefore lower than

$Z [(1 - \alpha) = 0.99] = 2.576$ WHICH *** ERROUSLY *** DOES NOT REJECTS THE NULL

Re: Bob Ling's ignorance is clear

HYPOTHESES AT THE 99% Confidence Level.

This is an SERIOUS WARNING against the use of the Z test in this instance. IT MUST BE SUBSTITUTED UNMISTABLY by the exact method which, based on the FIRST PRINCIPLES, could not provide wrong results.

ONLY MAD MEN ARE UNCOMFORTABLE WITH REALITY

_____licas (Luis A. Afonso)

```
REM "FOR22"
1 CLS : PRINT "FOR22 *****";
PRINT " d1=x/n1 , d2=y/n2 ----> |p(X)-p(Y)| <= W "
PRINT " ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ";
PRINT " ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * "
DEFDBL A-Z
INPUT " X "; x
INPUT " Y "; y
INPUT " nX "; n1: p1 = x / n1
INPUT " nY "; n2: p2 = y / n2
PRINT " pX , pY DELTA = ";
PRINT USING "#.#### "; p1; p2; ABS(p1 - p2)
INPUT " w "; w
PRINT " ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ";
PRINT " ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * ** * * * * * "
DIM px(n1), py(n2)
px(0) = (1 - p1) ^ n1
FOR j = 0 TO n1 - 1
px(j + 1) = px(j) * (n1 - j) / (j + 1) * p1 / (1 - p1)
NEXT j
py(0) = (1 - p2) ^ n2
FOR j = 0 TO n2 - 1
py(j + 1) = py(j) * (n2 - j) / (j + 1) * p2 / (1 - p2)
NEXT j
REM
LOCATE 10, 1
pp = 0: FOR yy = 0 TO n2
FOR xx = 0 TO n1
d = ABS(xx / n1 - yy / n2)
IF d > w THEN GOTO 22
pp = pp + px(xx) * py(yy)
22 NEXT xx: NEXT yy: LOCATE 8, 50
PRINT USING " 2tails = #.#### "; pp
REM current method
LOCATE 10, 20
cv(1) = 1.959964: cv(2) = 2.575829
cl$(1) = "95CL=": cl$(2) = "99CL="
d = ABS(p1 - p2)
s = p1 * (1 - p1) / n1 + p2 * (1 - p2) / n2
s = SQR(s): z = (d - w) / s
```

Re: Bob Ling's ignorance is clear

Re: Bob Ling's ignorance is clear

```
LOCATE 10, 19
PRINT USING " Z value=###.#####"; z
FOR kk = 1 TO 2
c2 = d + s * cv(kk): c1 = d - s * cv(kk)
PRINT c1$(kk); : PRINT " for W -----> ";
PRINT USING " ###.#####" ; c1; c2
NEXT kk
END
```

.