

# On Estimation and Optimization of Mean Values of Bounded Variables \*

Xinjia Chen

First Submitted in February 2008

## Abstract

In this paper, we develop a general approach for probabilistic estimation and optimization. An explicit formula and a computational approach are established for controlling the reliability of probabilistic estimation based on a mixed criterion of absolute and relative errors. By employing the Chernoff-Hoeffding bound and the concept of sampling, the minimization of a probabilistic function is transformed into an optimization problem amenable for gradient descent algorithms.

## 1 Analytical Sample Size Formula for Estimation of Mean Values

Let  $X$  be a random variable bounded in interval  $[0, 1]$  with mean  $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu \in (0, 1)$ , which are defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \Pr)$ . In many areas of sciences and engineering, it is desired to estimate  $\mu$  based on samples  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  of  $X$ . Frequently, the samples  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  may not be identical and independent (i.i.d). Thus, it is a significant problem to estimate  $\mu$  under the assumption that

$$0 \leq X_k \leq 1 \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k, \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = \mu \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k, \quad (2)$$

where  $\{\mathcal{F}_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$  is a sequence of  $\sigma$ -subalgebra such that  $\{\emptyset, \Omega\} = \mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{F}$ , with  $\mathcal{F}_k$  being generated by  $X_1, \dots, X_k$ .

Naturally, an estimator for  $\mu$  is taken as

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}. \quad (3)$$

Since  $\hat{\mu}$  is of random nature, it is crucial to control the statistical error. For this purpose, we have established the following result.

---

\*The author is currently with Department of Electrical Engineering, Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA, and Department of Electrical Engineering, Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA 70813, USA; Email: chenxinjia@gmail.com

**Theorem 1** Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $\varepsilon_a \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon_r \in (0, 1)$  be real numbers such that  $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Assume that (1) and (2) are true. Then,

$$\Pr \left\{ |\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } \left| \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu}{\mu} \right| < \varepsilon_r \right\} > 1 - \delta \quad (4)$$

for any  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  provided that

$$n > \frac{\varepsilon_r \ln \frac{2}{\delta}}{(\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r) \ln(1 + \varepsilon_r) + (\varepsilon_r - \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r) \ln \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r}{\varepsilon_r - \varepsilon_a} \right)}. \quad (5)$$

It should be noted that conventional methods for determining sample sizes are based on normal approximation, see [4] and the references therein. In contrast, Theorem 1 offers a rigorous method for determining sample sizes. In the special case that  $X$  is a Bernoulli random variable, a numerical approach has been developed by Chen [2] which permits exact computation of the minimum sample size.

## 2 A Computational Approach for General Case

In this section, we shall investigate an exact computational sample size method for the case that  $X \in [a, b]$  with  $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu$ . Assume that

$$a \leq X_k \leq b \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = \mu \quad \text{almost surely for any positive integer } k, \quad (7)$$

where  $\{\mathcal{F}_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$  is a sequence of  $\sigma$ -subalgebra such that  $\{\emptyset, \Omega\} = \mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{F}$ , with  $\mathcal{F}_k$  being generated by  $X_1, \dots, X_k$ .

We wish to determine minimum sample size  $n$  such that

$$\Pr \{ |\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } |\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| < \varepsilon_r |\mu| \} > 1 - \delta \quad (8)$$

for any  $\mu \in [a, b]$ , where  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  is defined by (3). Unlike the special case that  $X$  is bounded in interval  $[0, 1]$ , there is no explicit formula for the general case that  $X$  is bounded in interval  $[a, b]$ . We will employ the branch and bound technique of global optimization. For this purpose, we need to derive a sample size formula and the associated bounding method.

To describe the relevant theory for computing sample sizes, define function

$$\mathcal{M}(z, \theta) = \begin{cases} z \ln \frac{\theta}{z} + (1 - z) \ln \frac{1 - \theta}{1 - z} & \text{for } z \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \theta \in (0, 1), \\ \ln(1 - \theta) & \text{for } z = 0 \text{ and } \theta \in (0, 1), \\ \ln \theta & \text{for } z = 1 \text{ and } \theta \in (0, 1), \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \theta \notin (0, 1) \end{cases}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta(\mu) &= \frac{\mu - a}{b - a}, \\ g(\mu) &= \vartheta(\mu) - \frac{\max\{\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_r|\mu|\}}{b - a}, \\ h(\mu) &= \vartheta(\mu) + \frac{\max\{\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_r|\mu|\}}{b - a}, \\ \mathcal{W}(\mu) &= \max\{\mathcal{M}(g(\mu), \vartheta(\mu)), \mathcal{M}(h(\mu), \vartheta(\mu))\}\end{aligned}$$

for  $\mu \in [a, b]$ . By virtue of such functions, we have established theoretical results which are essential for the exact computation of sample sizes as follows.

**Theorem 2** *Assume that (6) and (7) are satisfied. Then, (8) holds for any  $\mu \in [a, b]$  provided that*

$$n \geq \frac{\ln \frac{\delta}{2}}{\max_{\nu \in [a, b]} \mathcal{W}(\nu)}. \quad (9)$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{W}(\nu) \leq \max\{\mathcal{M}(g(d), \vartheta(c)), \mathcal{M}(h(c), \vartheta(d))\}, \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{W}(\nu) \geq \max\{\mathcal{M}(g(c), \vartheta(d)), \mathcal{M}(h(d), \vartheta(c))\} \quad (11)$$

for  $\nu \in [c, d] \subseteq [a, b]$  such that  $g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(d) \leq h(c)$ .

See Appendix 5 for a proof.

Since (10) and (11) of Theorem 2 provide computable upper and lower bounds of  $\mathcal{W}(\nu)$ , the maximum of  $\mathcal{W}(\nu)$  over  $[a, b]$  can be exactly computed with the *Branch and Bound* method proposed by Land and Doig [6].

### 3 Optimization of Probability

In many applications, it is desirable to find a vector of real numbers  $\theta$  to minimize a probability,  $p(\theta)$ , which can be expressed as

$$p(\theta) = \Pr\{Y(\theta, \mathbf{\Delta}) \leq 0\},$$

where  $Y(\theta, \mathbf{\Delta})$  is piece-wise continuous with respect to  $\theta$  and  $\mathbf{\Delta}$  is a random vector. If we define

$$\mu(\lambda, \theta) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda Y(\theta, \mathbf{\Delta})}],$$

then, applying Chernoff bound [3], we have

$$p(\theta) \leq \inf_{\lambda > 0} \mu(\lambda, \theta).$$

This indicates that we can make  $p(\theta)$  small by making  $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$  small. Hence, we shall attempt to minimize  $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$  with respect to  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\theta$ .

To make the new objective function  $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$  more tractable, we take a sampling approach. Specifically, we obtain  $n$  i.i.d. samples  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$  of  $\Delta$  and approximate  $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$  as

$$g(\lambda, \theta) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{-\lambda Y(\theta, \Delta_i)}}{n}.$$

A critical step is the determination of sample size  $n$  so that  $g(\lambda, \theta)$  is sufficiently close to  $\mu(\lambda, \theta)$ . Since  $0 < e^{-\lambda Y(\theta, \Delta)} < 1$ , an appropriate value of  $n$  can be computed based on (5) of Theorem 1.

Finally, we have transformed the problem of minimizing the probability function  $p(\theta)$  as the problem of minimizing a piece-wise continuous function  $g(\lambda, \theta)$ . Since  $g(\lambda, \theta)$  is a more smooth function, we can bring all the power of nonlinear programming to solve the problem. An extremely useful tool is the *gradient descent algorithm*, see, e.g. [1] and the references therein.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1

To prove the theorem, we shall introduce function

$$\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) = (\mu + \varepsilon) \ln \frac{\mu}{\mu + \varepsilon} + (1 - \mu - \varepsilon) \ln \frac{1 - \mu}{1 - \mu - \varepsilon}$$

where  $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \mu$ . We need some preliminary results.

The following lemma is due to Hoeffding [5].

**Lemma 1** *Assume that (1) and (2) hold for any positive integer  $k$ . Then,*

$$\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \geq \mu + \varepsilon\} \leq \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)) \quad \text{for } 0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \mu < 1,$$

$$\Pr\{\hat{\mu} \leq \mu - \varepsilon\} \leq \exp(n \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)) \quad \text{for } 0 < \varepsilon < \mu < 1.$$

**Lemma 2** *Let  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ . Then,  $\psi(\varepsilon, \mu)$  is monotonically increasing with respect to  $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon)$  and monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1 - \varepsilon)$ . Similarly,  $\psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)$  is monotonically increasing with respect to  $\mu \in (\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2})$  and monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon, 1)$ .*

**Proof.** Tedious computation shows that

$$\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = \ln \frac{\mu(1 - \mu - \varepsilon)}{(\mu + \varepsilon)(1 - \mu)} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\mu} + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \mu}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mu^2(\mu + \varepsilon)} - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1 - \mu)^2(1 - \mu - \varepsilon)} < 0$$

for  $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \mu < 1$ . Note that

$$\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} = \ln \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{1 + 2\varepsilon} + \varepsilon < 0$$

because

$$\frac{d \left[ \ln \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \varepsilon \right]}{d\varepsilon} = -\frac{4}{1-4\varepsilon^2} < 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} = \ln \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} > 0$$

because

$$\frac{d \left[ \ln \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon} + \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} \right]}{d\varepsilon} = \frac{32\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} > 0.$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = \ln \frac{\mu(1-\mu+\varepsilon)}{(\mu-\varepsilon)(1-\mu)} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\mu} - \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\mu}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mu^2(\mu-\varepsilon)} - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1-\mu)^2(1-\mu+\varepsilon)} < 0$$

for  $0 < \varepsilon < \mu < 1$ . Hence,

$$\frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} = \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \varepsilon > 0$$

because

$$\frac{d \left[ \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \right]}{d\varepsilon} = \frac{4}{1-4\varepsilon^2} > 0;$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} = \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} < 0$$

as a result of

$$\frac{d \left[ \ln \frac{1+2\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon} - \frac{4\varepsilon}{1-4\varepsilon^2} \right]}{d\varepsilon} = -\frac{32\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon^2)^2} < 0.$$

Since  $\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} < 0$ ,  $\frac{\partial \psi(\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} > 0$  and  $\psi(\varepsilon, \mu)$  is concave with respect to  $\mu$ , it must be true that  $\psi(\varepsilon, \mu)$  is monotonically increasing with respect to  $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon)$  and monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1 - \varepsilon)$ . Since  $\frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}} > 0$ ,  $\frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} < 0$  and  $\psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)$  is concave with respect to  $\mu$ , it must be true that  $\psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)$  is monotonically increasing with respect to  $\mu \in (\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2})$  and monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon, 1)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3** *Let  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ . Then,*

$$\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) > \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) \quad \forall \mu \in \left( \varepsilon, \frac{1}{2} \right],$$

$$\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) < \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) \quad \forall \mu \in \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1 - \varepsilon \right).$$

**Proof.** It can be shown that

$$\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial\varepsilon} = \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2(1 - 2\mu)}{(\mu^2 - \varepsilon^2)(1 - \mu)^2} \right]$$

for  $0 < \varepsilon < \min(\mu, 1 - \mu)$ . Note that

$$\frac{\varepsilon^2(1 - 2\mu)}{(\mu^2 - \varepsilon^2)(1 - \mu)^2} > 0 \quad \text{for } \varepsilon < \mu < \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$\frac{\varepsilon^2(1 - 2\mu)}{(\mu^2 - \varepsilon^2)(1 - \mu)^2} < 0 \quad \text{for } \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} < \mu < 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial\varepsilon} > 0 \quad \text{for } \varepsilon < \mu < \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial\varepsilon} < 0 \quad \text{for } \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} < \mu < 1 - \varepsilon.$$

So, we can complete the proof of the lemma by observing the sign of the partial derivative  $\frac{\partial[\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu)]}{\partial\varepsilon}$  and the fact that  $\psi(\varepsilon, \mu) - \psi(-\varepsilon, \mu) = 0$  for  $\varepsilon = 0$ . □

**Lemma 4** *Let  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . Then,  $\psi(\varepsilon\mu, \mu)$  is monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon})$ . Similarly,  $\psi(-\varepsilon\mu, \mu)$  is monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (0, 1)$ .*

**Proof.** Note that

$$\frac{\partial\psi(\varepsilon\mu, \mu)}{\partial\mu} = (1 + \varepsilon) \ln \frac{1 - (1 + \varepsilon)\mu}{1 - \mu} - (1 + \varepsilon) \ln(1 + \varepsilon) + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \mu}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2\psi(\varepsilon\mu, \mu)}{\partial\mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1 - \mu)^2[1 - (1 + \varepsilon)\mu]} < 0$$

for any  $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon})$ .

Since  $\frac{\partial\psi(\varepsilon\mu, \mu)}{\partial\mu}|_{\mu=0} = \varepsilon - (1 + \varepsilon) \ln(1 + \varepsilon) < 0$ , we have

$$\frac{\partial\psi(\varepsilon\mu, \mu)}{\partial\mu} < 0, \quad \forall \mu \in \left(0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}\right)$$

and it follows that  $\psi(\varepsilon\mu, \mu)$  is monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon})$ .

Similarly, since

$$\frac{\partial\psi(-\varepsilon\mu, \mu)}{\partial\mu}|_{\mu=0} = -\varepsilon - (1 - \varepsilon) \ln(1 - \varepsilon) < 0$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2\psi(-\varepsilon\mu, \mu)}{\partial\mu^2} = -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1 - \mu)^2[1 - (1 - \varepsilon)\mu]} < 0, \quad \forall \mu \in (0, 1)$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial \psi(-\varepsilon \mu, \mu)}{\partial \mu} < 0, \quad \forall \mu \in (0, 1)$$

and, consequently,  $\psi(-\varepsilon \mu, \mu)$  is monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (0, 1)$ . □

**Lemma 5** Suppose  $0 < \varepsilon_r < 1$  and  $0 < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then,

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a\} \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) \quad (12)$$

for  $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}$ .

**Proof.** We shall show (12) by investigating three cases as follows. In the case of  $\mu < \varepsilon_a$ , it is clear that

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a\} = 0 < \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right).$$

In the case of  $\mu = \varepsilon_a$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a\} &= \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_a} \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \eta\} \\ &\leq \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_a} \exp(n \psi(-\eta, \mu)) = \exp(n \psi(-\varepsilon_a, \mu)) \\ &= \exp(n \psi(-\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_a)) \\ &< \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that  $\varepsilon_a < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_a$ .

In the case of  $\varepsilon_a < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}$ , we have

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a\} \leq \exp(n \psi(-\varepsilon_a, \mu)) < \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right),$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1 and the second inequality follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that  $\varepsilon_a < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_a$ . So, (12) is established. □

**Lemma 6** Suppose  $0 < \varepsilon_r < 1$  and  $0 < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then,

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq (1 + \varepsilon_r)\mu\} \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) \quad (13)$$

for  $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} < \mu < 1$ .

**Proof.** We shall show (13) by investigating three cases as follows. In the case of  $\mu > \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r}$ , it is clear that

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq (1 + \varepsilon_r)\boldsymbol{\mu}\} = 0 < \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right).$$

In the case of  $\mu = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq (1 + \varepsilon_r)\boldsymbol{\mu}\} &= \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_r} \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq (1 + \eta)\boldsymbol{\mu}\} \\ &\leq \lim_{\eta \uparrow \varepsilon_r} \exp(n \psi(\eta\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) = \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon_r\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) \\ &< \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4 and the fact that  $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r} < \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r}$  as a result of  $0 < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

In the case of  $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} < \mu < \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_r}$ , we have

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon_r)\boldsymbol{\mu}\} \leq \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon_r\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) < \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right),$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1 and the second inequality follows from Lemma 4. So, (13) is established.  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove the theorem. We shall assume (5) is satisfied and show that (4) is true. It suffices to show that

$$\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}| \geq \varepsilon_r\boldsymbol{\mu}\} < \delta.$$

For  $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}| \geq \varepsilon_r\boldsymbol{\mu}\} &= \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}| \geq \varepsilon_a\} \\ &= \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq \boldsymbol{\mu} + \varepsilon_a\} + \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \boldsymbol{\mu} - \varepsilon_a\}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Noting that  $0 < \boldsymbol{\mu} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , we have

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq \boldsymbol{\mu} + \varepsilon_a\} \leq \exp(n \psi(\varepsilon_a, \boldsymbol{\mu})) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right),$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1 and the second inequality follows from Lemma 2. It can be checked that (5) is equivalent to

$$\exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) < \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq \boldsymbol{\mu} + \varepsilon_a\} < \frac{\delta}{2}$$



for  $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}$ .

On the other hand, since  $\varepsilon_a < \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} < \frac{1}{2}$ , by Lemma 5 and Lemma 3, we have

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_a\} \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

for  $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}$ . Hence, by (14),

$$\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r \mu\} < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta.$$

This proves (4) for  $0 < \mu \leq \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}$ .

For  $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} < \mu < 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r \mu\} &= \Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r \mu\} \\ &= \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq \mu + \varepsilon_r \mu\} + \Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_r \mu\}. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking Lemma 6, we have

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq \mu + \varepsilon_r \mu\} \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right).$$

On the other hand,

$$\Pr\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \mu - \varepsilon_r \mu\} \leq \exp(n \psi(-\varepsilon_r \mu, \mu)) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(-\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right)$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 1, the second inequality follows from Lemma 4, and the last inequality follows from Lemma 3. Hence,

$$\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r \mu\} \leq 2 \exp\left(n \psi\left(\varepsilon_a, \frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r}\right)\right) < \delta.$$

This proves (4) for  $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} < \mu < 1$ . The proof of Theorem 1 is thus completed.

## 5 Proof of Theorem 2

Define  $\overline{Y}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$  with  $Y_i = \frac{X_i - a}{b - a}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then,  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \vartheta(\mu)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r |\mu|\} &= \Pr\{\overline{X}_n \leq \mu - \max(\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_r |\mu|)\} \\ &\quad + \Pr\{\overline{X}_n \geq \mu + \max(\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_r |\mu|)\} \\ &= \Pr\{\overline{Y}_n \leq g(\mu)\} + \Pr\{\overline{Y}_n \geq h(\mu)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

It follows from (15) and Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\overline{X}_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon_r |\mu|\} &\leq \exp(n \mathcal{M}(g(\mu), \vartheta(\mu))) + \exp(n \mathcal{M}(h(\mu), \vartheta(\mu))) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(n \mathcal{W}(\mu)), \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows immediately that (8) holds for any  $\mu \in [a, b]$  provided that (9) is true.

Now we shall show (10) and (11). For  $\nu \in [c, d] \subseteq [a, b]$  with  $g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(d) \leq h(c)$ , it can be shown that

$$g(c) \leq g(\nu) \leq g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(\nu) \leq \vartheta(d) \leq h(c) \leq h(\nu) \leq h(d).$$

By differentiation, it can be shown that for any fixed  $\mu \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(z, \mu)$  is monotonically increasing with respect to  $z \in (0, \mu)$ . Since  $g(\nu) \leq g(d) \leq \vartheta(\nu)$  for all  $\nu \in [c, d]$ , it follows that

$$\mathcal{M}(g(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq \mathcal{M}(g(d), \vartheta(\nu)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d]. \quad (16)$$

By differentiation, it can be shown that for any fixed  $z \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(z, \mu)$  is monotonically decreasing with respect to  $\mu \in (z, 1)$ . Since  $g(d) \leq \vartheta(c) \leq \vartheta(\nu) \leq 1$  for all  $\nu \in [c, d]$ , we have

$$\mathcal{M}(g(d), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq \mathcal{M}(g(d), \vartheta(c)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d]. \quad (17)$$

By virtue of (16) and (17), we have

$$\mathcal{M}(g(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq \mathcal{M}(g(d), \vartheta(c)), \quad \forall \nu \in [c, d]. \quad (18)$$

Similarly, it can be shown that

$$\mathcal{M}(h(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq \mathcal{M}(h(c), \vartheta(d)), \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(g(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \geq \mathcal{M}(g(c), \vartheta(d)), \quad (20)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(h(\nu), \vartheta(\nu)) \leq \mathcal{M}(h(d), \vartheta(c)) \quad (21)$$

for all  $\nu \in [c, d]$ . Combining (18), (19), (20) and (21) yields (10) and (11). Theorem 2 is thus established.

## References

- [1] M. S. Bazaraa, H. D. Sherali and C. M. Shetty, *Nonlinear Programming – Theory and Algorithms*, Wiley, 1993.
- [2] X. Chen, “Exact computation of minimum sample size for estimation of binomial parameters,” arXiv:0707.2113 [math.ST], July 2007.
- [3] CHERNOFF, H. (1952). A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **23** 493–507.
- [4] M. M. Desu and D. Raghavarao, *Sample Size Methodology*, Academic Press, 1990.
- [5] Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **58** 13–29.
- [6] A. H. Land and A. G. Doig, “An automatic method of solving discrete programming problems,” *Econometrica*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 497–520, 1960.