

# On the mid-p-value of a test statistic with arbitrary real support

Patrick Rubin-Delanchy\* and Nicholas A Heard\*\*

\*Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research, University of Bristol, U.K.

\*\*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, U.K.

## Abstract

The mid-p-value is a proposed improvement on the ordinary p-value for the case where the test statistic is partially or completely discrete. In this case, the ordinary p-value is conservative, meaning that its null distribution is larger than a uniform distribution on the unit interval, in the usual stochastic order. The mid-p-value is not conservative. However, as first recognised in this article, its null distribution is dominated by the uniform distribution in a different stochastic order, called the convex order. The property leads us to discover some new probability bounds on sums, products and other functions of mid-p-values, which can be used, for example, to combine results from different hypothesis tests conservatively. Furthermore, some commonly encountered conditions are identified where combining mid-p-values, but not ordinary p-values, leads to consistent inference. Our main message is that mid-p-values need not be considered ‘ad-hoc’; they have some definite advantages and, under the null hypothesis, they are simply related to the uniform distribution by a different stochastic order.

Let  $T$  be a real-valued test statistic, with probability measure  $P_0$  under the null hypothesis, denoted  $H_0$ , and  $P_1$  under the alternative hypothesis, denoted  $H_1$ . Let  $X$  be a uniform random variable on the unit interval that is independent of  $T$ , both under  $P_0$  and  $P_1$ .  $X$  is a randomisation device which is in practice usually generated by a computer.

We consider the (one-sided) p-value,

$$P = P_0(T^* \geq T), \quad (1)$$

the mid-p-value (Lancaster, 1952),

$$Q = \frac{1}{2}P_0(T^* \geq T) + \frac{1}{2}P_0(T^* > T), \quad (2)$$

and the randomised p-value,

$$R = XP_0(T^* \geq T) + (1 - X)P_0(T^* > T), \quad (3)$$

where  $T^*$  is a hypothetical independent replicate of  $T$  under  $P_0$ . If  $T$  is absolutely continuous under  $H_0$ , then the three quantities are equal and distributed uniformly on the unit interval. More generally, that is, if discrete components are possible, the three quantities are different. Two main factors, one obvious and one more subtle, make this a very common occurrence. First,  $T$  is discrete if it is a function of discrete data, e.g. a contingency table, categorical data or a presence/absence event. Second, discrete test statistics often occur as a result of conditioning, as in the permutation test or Kendall’s tau test (Sheskin, 2003). Partially discrete tests occur, for example, as a result of censoring.

When  $P$ ,  $Q$  and  $R$  are not equal, it is a question which to choose. The ordinary p-value is often preferred in relatively strict hypothesis testing conditions, e.g. in clinical trials, where the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis must not exceed the nominal level (often 5%). The randomised p-value has some theoretical advantages, e.g. the nominal level of the test is met exactly. However, to quote one of its earliest proponents, “most people will find repugnant the idea

of adding yet another random element to a result which is already subject to the errors of random sampling” (Stevens, 1950). Randomised p-values also fail Birnbaum’s admissibility criterion (Birnbaum, 1954). Finally, in more exploratory analyses the mid-p-value is often recommended because, at an intuitive level, it is deemed to better represent the evidence against the null hypothesis than either the p-value, which understates the evidence, or the randomised p-value, because of reproducibility issues (Barnard, 1989; Routledge, 1994; Hwang and Yang, 2001; Graffelman and Moreno, 2013).

The main drawback of the mid-p-value is that it is not well understood, and generally thought to be ‘ad-hoc’. Under the null hypothesis, it is not clear how  $Q$  should behave and, as a result, decision-making with mid-p-values seems unsafe. This article effectively solves this problem, by using a stochastic order known as the *convex order*.

Let  $U$  denote a uniform random variable on the unit interval, with expectation operator  $E$ , and let  $E_i$  denote expectation with respect to  $P_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ . Under the null hypothesis, it is well known, see e.g. Casella and Berger (2002), that  $P$  dominates  $U$  in the *usual stochastic order*, denoted  $P \geq_{st} U$ . One way to write this is

$$E_0\{f(P)\} \geq E\{f(U)\}, \quad (4)$$

for any non-decreasing function  $f$ , whenever the expectations exist (Shaked and Shanthikumar, 2007). It is also well known, and in fact true by design, that  $R$  is uniformly distributed under the null hypothesis, denoted  $R =_{st} U$ . On the other hand, it is not widely known that, under the null hypothesis,  $Q$  is dominated by  $U$  in the *convex order*, denoted  $Q \leq_{cx} U$ . One way to write this is (Shaked and Shanthikumar, 2007, Chapter 3)

$$E_0\{h(Q)\} \leq E\{h(U)\}, \quad (5)$$

for any *convex* function  $h$ , whenever the expectations exist. We have used the qualifier ‘widely’, because an effective equivalent of equation (5) can be found in Hwang and Yang (2001). However, even there, equation (5) is not recognised as a major stochastic order, meaning that some of its importance is missed. The present article aims to make more of this connection.

In a statistical context, it is common to say that the ordinary p-value is *conservative*. This is because  $P_0(P \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha$  for any  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . One way to see this is to let  $f(x) = \mathbb{I}(x \leq \alpha)$  in (4), where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the indicator function. In words, the evidence against the null hypothesis is at worst understated. A drawback of the mid-p-value is that it is not conservative. However, the convex order provides a different form of statistical control, restricting the *variability* of  $Q$  under the null hypothesis. For example, the property directly implies that  $Q$  has mean  $1/2$  and a variance less than or equal to  $1/12$  (the variance of a uniform distribution on the unit interval).

As well as providing theoretical support for the mid-p-value, the convex order allows substantial gains in performance on some estimation tasks. The problem we focus on is combining p-values, that is, combining evidence from different hypothesis tests into one, global measure of significance. In some of the scenarios analysed, which are commonly encountered, the use of the ordinary p-value leads to sub-optimal, and even spurious results. Unlike any previous study on mid-p-values, our improvements, which are in some cases overwhelming (in both finite and asymptotic scenarios), have an associated false positive rate that is controlled exactly (albeit conservatively).

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. Section 1 provides, for the purpose of practical data analysis, tail probability bounds for three different functions of multiple independent mid-p-values. Each of these bounds acts as a conservative combined p-value for the corresponding combined test. Section 2 provides a probabilistic description of the mid-p-value through the convex order. We show that, amongst all of the distributions that are dominated by the uniform distribution in the convex order, the distributions that the mid-p-value can take under the null hypothesis are in a sense the most liberal. For example, the bound  $P_0(Q \leq \alpha) \leq 2\alpha$ , which is sharp for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$  if the mid-p-value is purely discrete, is also implied by the convex order. We also analyse the closure of the mid-p-value distributions under mixture operations, and more general constructions of the mid-p-value. Section 3 derives and discusses the three bounds given in Section 1, with improvements. The first bound is an (intriguing) improvement over Hoeffding’s inequality (Hoeffding, 1963), although the latter would be available more generally. The second bound allows us to revisit and enrich an earlier analysis by Barnard (1990) with some explicit

probabilities, and the third bound is applicable to the most common approach to combining p-values, called Fisher's method (Fisher, 1934), and overwhelming gains in performance are achieved. We then present some commonly encountered conditions where mid-p-values can detect a signal which is lost, asymptotically, with ordinary p-values. Finally, inspired by economic literature on the convex order, we discuss a completely different approach to combining mid-p-values.

## 1 Combining discrete p-values: practical results for data analysis

For fast reference, three directly implementable bounds are now given. Each provides a method for combining mid-p-values conservatively. Derivation details and improved (but more complicated) bounds are given in Section 3. In what follows,  $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$  denote independent (but not necessarily identically distributed) mid-p-values, with an implied joint probability measure  $\tilde{P}_0$  under the null hypothesis. The mid-p-values do not need to be purely discrete.

Let  $\bar{Q}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Q_i$  denote the average mid-p-value. For  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\tilde{P}_0(1/2 - \bar{Q}_n \geq t) \leq \exp(-6nt^2).$$

Note that, first, no knowledge of the individual mid-p-value distributions is required. Second, Hoeffding's inequality (Hoeffding, 1963), which would be available more generally, gives the larger bound  $\exp(-2nt^2)$  (the cubic root).

Let  $\bar{D}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1/2 - Q_i)/\sigma_i$  denote the average standardised mid-p-value, suggested by Barnard (1990), where  $\sigma_i$  is the standard deviation of  $Q_i$ . For  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\tilde{P}_0(\bar{D}_n \geq t) \leq \exp\{-6n(\bar{\sigma}t)^2\},$$

where  $\bar{\sigma} = (\prod \sigma_i)^{1/n}$  is the geometric mean of the standard deviations.

Let  $F_n = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log(Q_i)$ , known as Fisher's statistic (Fisher, 1934). For  $t \geq 2n$ ,

$$\tilde{P}_0(F_n \geq t) \leq \exp\{n - t/2 - n \log(2n/t)\}.$$

Again, no knowledge of the individual mid-p-value distributions is required.

## 2 Sub-uniform and mid-p-value distributions

In this article, we say that a random variable (and its measure and distribution function) is *sub-uniform* if it is less variable than a uniform random variable,  $U$ , in the convex order.

To see why the mid-p-value is sub-uniform, notice that  $Q = E_0(R | T)$ . By Jensen's inequality, for any convex function  $h$ ,

$$E_0\{h(Q)\} = E_0[h\{E_0(R | T)\}] \leq E_0[E_0\{h(R) | T\}] = E_0\{h(R)\} = E\{h(U)\}, \quad (6)$$

whenever the expectations exist, since  $R =_{st} U$ . Using  $h(x) = -x$  and then  $h(x) = x$ , we find that sub-uniformity implies a mean of  $1/2$ , which in turn implies a variance not exceeding  $1/12$  (the variance of  $U$ ). Any sub-uniform variable is also bounded between 0 and 1.

The mid-p-value distributions are the possible distributions that a mid-p-value can take under the null hypothesis. These form a subset of the sub-uniform distributions. Taking a mathematical perspective, natural questions to ask are: 'where' do the mid-p-value distributions lie in this larger set? How many sub-uniform distributions are mid-p-value distributions? How many other sub-uniform distributions can we form by mixing mid-p-value distributions?

### 2.1 Almost uniform and extremely liberal

Amongst the sub-uniform distributions, the mid-p-value distributions are *extremely liberal*, in the following sense. Let  $S_Q$  denote the support of  $Q$  and  $F_Q$  its distribution function.




Figure 1: A discrete p-value and its associated mid-p-value. a) distribution function of the p-value. b) integrated distribution function of the mid-p-value. Black circles indicate where the point masses are for each quantity. White circles in b) show the points where  $t^2/2$  and  $\phi(t)$  touch, which are also the locations of the point masses of the p-value.

**Lemma 1.** *The distribution function of a mid-p-value satisfies*

$$F_Q(x) = \sup\{F_W(x) : F_W \text{ is a sub-uniform distribution function,}$$

$$\text{and } F_W = F_Q \text{ over } S_Q \cap [0, x)\}, \quad (7)$$

for  $x \in S_Q$ , with the requirement  $F_W = F_Q$  ignored when  $S_Q \cap [0, x)$  is empty.

This can be seen to be desirable, since bounds intended for conservative testing, even if they have been derived assuming only sub-uniformity, are likely to be fairly tight for mid-p-values. A proof of the above is given in the Appendix.

To illustrate how Lemma 1 fits in with currently known properties of mid-p-values and sub-uniform distributions, consider that if  $F$  is the distribution of a sub-uniform variable, then  $F(\alpha) \leq 2\alpha$  is a sharp bound for any  $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$  (see Meng (1994) for the bound and Rüschendorf (1982), Dahl (2006) or Rubin-Delanchy and Lawson (2014) for some constructions). Now let  $q = \min(S_Q)$  be the smallest supported point of  $Q$  (the minimum and not the infimum because a support is closed). Taken with the points above, Equation (7) would imply that  $F_Q(q) = 2q$ , which can of course be verified directly.

Müller and Rüschendorf (2001) provide a useful restatement of the convex order for variables on the real line. Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be an arbitrary probability measure on the real line with distribution function  $F$ . Its integrated distribution function is  $\phi(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t F(x)dx$ , which is non-decreasing, convex, and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \phi(t) = 0$ . The mean of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{t - \phi(t)\}$ . Finally, if  $\mathcal{U}$  is another probability measure with the same mean, then  $\mathcal{Q} \leq_{cx} \mathcal{U}$  if and only if  $\phi \leq \psi$ . This gives a practical method of determining whether  $\mathcal{Q}$  is sub-uniform: we must have  $\phi(t) \leq t^2/2 = \int_0^t x dx$ , for  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\phi(1) = 1/2$ .

Figure 1 shows the distribution function,  $F_P$ , of a purely discrete p-value in a), and the integrated distribution function,  $\phi_Q$ , of the corresponding mid-p-value in b). The black circles represent the atoms of probability of each statistic, which are at  $\{0.1, 0.5, 1\}$  for the p-value and, therefore,  $\{0.05, 0.3, 0.75\}$  for the mid-p-value. As  $y = x$  dominates  $F_P(x)$  (the ordinary p-value is conservative),  $t^2/2$  dominates  $\phi_Q(t)$ ; in both cases, the functions only touch at  $\{0.1, 0.5, 1\}$ . In Figure 1b), those points are shown as white circles. The integrated distribution function of a mid-p-value always ‘hugs’ the  $t^2/2$  line in this way, whereas the same need not be true for an arbitrary

sub-uniform distribution. Previously mid-p-values have been said to be “nearly” uniform (Agresti, 1992, p.147) or “quasi-exact” (Hirji et al., 1991). A comparison of the integrated distribution functions supports this view.

Figure 1 also gives some intuition for why (7) holds. Let  $q$  be a point in the support of  $Q$ . Since  $F_Q$  is the right-derivative of  $\phi_Q$ , if we want to maximise  $F_Q(q)$  given  $\phi$  up to  $[0, q)$ , we make the slope at  $q$  as steep as possible subject there existing a convex extension of  $\phi_Q$  to the right that is below  $t^2/2$ . In Figure 1b) the slopes at each of the points in  $\{0.05, 0.3, 0.75\}$  achieve this exactly.

## 2.2 Mixtures of mid-p-values

A mixture of mid-p-value distributions is not a mid-p-value distribution in general but *is* a sub-uniform distribution. Furthermore, the set of sub-uniform measures is closed under mixture operations, by a direct application of Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007, Theorem 3.A.12(b)). It could then be conjectured that *any* sub-uniform measure could arise from mixing mid-p-value distributions. This is not true. The distribution that takes value 0.4 or 0.6 with probability 1/2 each is sub-uniform (as can be verified from its integrated distribution function), but is not a mixture of mid-p-value distributions<sup>1</sup>.

## 2.3 Generalised mid-p-values

In this section we define a statistic,  $Q'$ , that we call a *generalised mid-p-value*. Two scenarios are envisaged:

1. The ideal test has a distribution that depends on unknowns. The dependence can be eliminated by randomisation.
2. The ideal test is too computationally costly (e.g. in a large-scale inference problem). On the other hand, it is feasible to test a random subset of the data.

We will define  $Q'$  to be the expected p-value taken over repeated randomisations. As we next show,  $Q'$  is also sub-uniform under the null hypothesis (regardless of any dependence between the randomised tests, e.g., even if the random data subsets overlap) and therefore:

1.  $P(Q' \leq \alpha) \leq 2\alpha$  for any  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  (see Section 2.1).
2. Bounds on functions of mid-p-values, derived in the next section, also apply to generalised mid-p-values.

Let  $D$  denote the underlying data, with probability measure  $P_0$  under  $H_0$ . The test statistic  $T$  is a function, say  $t$ , of  $D$ . A different way of viewing the randomised p-value in (3) is to see it as the p-value of a randomised test statistic,

$$R = P_0\{f(D^*, X^*) \geq f(D, X)\},$$

where  $D^*, X^*$  are hypothetical replicates of  $D, X$  under  $H_0$ . This randomised test statistic satisfies

$$f(D, X) = g\{XP_0(T^* \geq T) + (1 - X)P_0(T^* > T)\},$$

with probability one, where  $g$  is some strictly decreasing function.  $f(D, X)$  is not an arbitrary randomised test statistic since, for example,  $f(d_1, x_1) > f(d_2, x_2)$  whenever  $t(d_1) > t(d_2)$ . The natural generalisation is to allow any randomised test statistic,

$$R' = P_0\{f'(D^*, Y^*) \geq f'(D, Y)\},$$

where  $Y$  and its hypothetical replicate  $Y^*$  are now arbitrary randomisation devices, which are independent of each other and the data (e.g. the indices of a random subset of  $D$  and  $D^*$  respectively). We only require that  $f'(T, Y)$  be absolutely continuous under  $H_0$ , so that  $R' =_{st} U$ .

Recall that  $Q = E_0(R | T) = E_0(R | D)$ . This invites us to define a generalised mid-p-value,  $Q' = E_0(R' | D)$ . The same argument used for the mid-p-value, at the beginning of this section, shows that  $Q'$  is sub-uniform. In fact, a stronger statement is true:

<sup>1</sup>We thank Prof. Alfred Müller for identifying this counter-example during his visit.

**Lemma 2.**  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a sub-uniform probability measure if and only if there exists a generalised mid-p-value with distribution  $\mathcal{Q}$  under the null hypothesis.

The lemma is proved in the Appendix. As a final point,  $Q'$  will often be replaced by an estimate  $\hat{Q} = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m R'_i$ , for some fixed  $m$ , where  $R'_i$  are identically distributed replicates of  $R'$  conditional on  $D$ .  $\hat{Q}$  is also sub-uniform, because it is an average of marginally uniform variables (Shaked and Shanthikumar, 2007, Theorem 3.A.36).

### 3 Application: combining mid-p-values

The approach of combining p-values, also referred to as “second-level testing”, “higher criticism” (Donoho and Jin, 2004) or sometimes “meta-analysis”, consists of combining separate test results into one, global, measure of significance. This mode of inference has a long history; for example, one of the most popular approaches to combining p-values is due to R.A. Fisher, a procedure now known as “Fisher’s method” (Fisher, 1934). Today, this approach is used in many scientific and technological endeavours, for example genomics, where it is ubiquitous (Begum et al., 2012), astronomy (Cruz et al., 2007), neuro-imaging (Lazar et al., 2002), and more.

Our own interest in the problem stems from a cyber-security application. As the “Internet of things” starts to become a reality (Atzori et al., 2010), tools that sift through data in search for anomalous patterns of behaviour are likely to form an important part of our cyber and physical security (Miorandi et al., 2012). If different anomaly detection tools are running on every service and device, then clearly they can only be useful if there is also a system to connect the anomalies together and make global decisions. In this type of application, discrete test statistics are the norm rather than the exception, if only because the data are measurements of a digital system. This makes combining discrete p-values a crucial problem in the field.

To formalise, let  $T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(n)}$  be a sequence of independent test statistics. We consider a joint null hypothesis,  $\tilde{H}_0$ , under which  $T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(n)}$  have probability measure  $P_0^{(1)}, \dots, P_0^{(n)}$  respectively, and a joint alternative,  $\tilde{H}_1$ , with probability measures  $P_1^{(1)}, \dots, P_1^{(n)}$  respectively. The p-values,  $P_i$ , mid-p-values,  $Q_i$ , and randomised p-values,  $R_i$ , are obtained by replacing  $P_0$  with  $P_0^{(i)}$  in (1), (2) and (3) respectively. In the case of the randomised p-value, an independent uniform variable,  $X_i$ , is generated each time.  $\tilde{P}_0$  and  $\tilde{P}_1$  denote the implied joint probability measures of the statistics under  $\tilde{H}_0$  and  $\tilde{H}_1$  respectively. The focus of this section is on testing  $\tilde{H}_0$  versus  $\tilde{H}_1$ .

Probability bounds that follow often have the form  $\tilde{P}_0\{f(Q_1, \dots, Q_n) \geq t\} \leq b_n(t)$ . If the observed mid-p-values are  $q_1, \dots, q_n$  and level of the test is  $\alpha$  (e.g. 5%), then a procedure that rejects when  $b_n\{f(q_1, \dots, q_n)\} \leq \alpha$  is conservative: the probability of rejecting  $\tilde{H}_0$  if  $\tilde{H}_0$  is true does not exceed  $\alpha$ .

#### 3.1 Sums of mid-p-values

An early advocate of mid-p-values, Barnard (1989, 1990), studied their properties in the context of interpreting Fisher’s exact test of a contingency table. He proposed to combine test results from different tables by using the sum of standardised mid-p-values. His exposition relies on some approximations. Exact inference is possible using the convex order.

We begin with a bound on the sum of independent mid-p-values. This bound bears an interesting resemblance to Hoeffding’s inequality (Hoeffding, 1963). It will later be extended to be relevant to Barnard’s analysis.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  denote  $n$  independent sub-uniform random variables with mean  $\bar{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . Then, for  $0 \leq t \leq 1/2$ ,

$$P(1/2 - \bar{X}_n \geq t) \leq \min_{h \geq 0} \{2e^{-ht} \sinh(h/2)/h\}^n, \quad (8)$$

$$\leq \exp(-12nt^2) \{\sinh(6t)/(6t)\}^n, \quad (9)$$

$$\leq \exp(-6nt^2). \quad (10)$$

Remember that if  $X$  is sub-uniform then it has expectation  $1/2$  and is bounded between 0 and 1. Hoeffding's inequality would therefore give us  $P(1/2 - \bar{X}_n \geq t) \leq \exp(-2nt^2)$ , the cubic root. The improvement is unlikely to make much difference in asymptotic arguments. However, when combining real mid-p-values via  $\bar{Q}_n = n^{-1} \sum Q_i$ , the improvement is substantial. For example, suppose we observe an average of 0.4 from  $n = 100$  mid-p-values. This is very significant:  $\bar{P}_0(1/2 - \bar{Q}_n \geq 0.1) \leq 0.0025$  using (10). However, we would only find  $\bar{P}_0(1/2 - \bar{Q}_n \geq 0.1) \leq 0.14$  using Hoeffding's inequality.

*Proof.* Since  $1 - X$  is sub-uniform if and only if  $X$  is sub-uniform, it is sufficient to prove the bounds in (8), (9) and (10) hold for  $P(\bar{X}_n - 1/2 \geq t)$ . Since  $\exp(xh)$  is a convex function in  $x$  for any  $h$ , the convex order gives us  $E\{\exp(hX_i)\} \leq E\{\exp(hU)\} = (e^h - 1)/h$ . Therefore, for any  $h \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\bar{X}_n - 1/2 \geq t) &= P\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n hX_i\right) \geq \exp\{nh(t + 1/2)\}\right], \\ &\leq \exp\{-nh(t + 1/2)\} E\left\{\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n hX_i\right)\right\}, \\ &\leq \exp\{-nh(t + 1/2)\} \{(e^h - 1)/h\}^n \\ &= \{2e^{-ht} \sinh(h/2)/h\}^n, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from Markov's inequality. The choice  $h = 12t$  (motivated by an analysis of the Taylor expansion in  $h$  at 0) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} P(\bar{X}_n - 1/2 \geq t) &\leq \exp(-12nt^2) \{\sinh(6t)/(6t)\}^n \\ &\leq \exp(-6nt^2) \{e^{-6t} \sinh(6t)/(6t)\}^n \leq \exp(-6nt^2). \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that  $e^{-x} \sinh(x)/x = (1 - e^{-2x})/(2x)$  is one at  $x = 0$  (using l'Hospital's rule) and decreasing.  $\square$

Instead of summing the mid-p-values, Barnard (1990) considers sums of the standardised statistics

$$D_i = (1/2 - Q_i)/\sigma_i,$$

where  $\sigma_i$  is the standard deviation of  $Q_i$  under  $\tilde{H}_0$ . The upper tail probability of the sum is then estimated by Gaussian approximation. In the purely discrete case, Barnard shows that  $\sigma_i = \{(1 - s_i)/12\}^{1/2}$  where

$$s_i = \sum_{t \in S_i} \left\{P_0^{(i)}(T_i = t)\right\}^3,$$

and  $S_i$  is the (countable) support of  $Q_i$ . Instead of appealing to the Gaussian approximation, the convex order allows us to find an exact bound.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  denote  $n$  independent sub-uniform random variables with standard deviations  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$  respectively, and let*

$$\bar{Y}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1/2 - X_i)/\sigma_i.$$

*Then, for  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$P(\bar{Y}_n \geq t) \leq \min_{h \geq 0} \left( \prod_{i=1}^n \exp[-h\{t + 1/(2\sigma_i)\}] \left\{ \frac{e^{h/\sigma_i} - 1}{h/\sigma_i} + h^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{24\sigma_i^2} \right) \right\} \right), \quad (11)$$

$$\leq \exp\{-6n(\bar{\sigma}t)^2\}, \quad (12)$$

*where  $\bar{\sigma} = (\prod \sigma_i)^{1/n}$  is the geometric mean of the standard deviations.*

In practice, the bound (11), which is an important improvement over (12), is found numerically by minimising over  $h$ . Of course, even if the optimum cannot be determined exactly the obtained bound still holds, i.e., the tail area is simply over-estimated.

*Proof.* Again, we will prove the bound holds for  $W_n = n^{-1} \sum (X_i - 1/2)/\sigma_i$ , so that the theorem holds by symmetry. For any  $h \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\exp(hX_i/\sigma_i)\} &= 1 + \mathbb{E}(hX_i/\sigma_i) + \mathbb{E}\{(hX_i/\sigma_i)^2\}/2 + \dots \\ &= 1 + \mathbb{E}(hU/\sigma_i) + h^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8\sigma_i^2} \right) + \dots \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\{\exp(hU/\sigma_i)\} + h^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8\sigma_i^2} - \frac{1}{6\sigma_i^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

because  $\mathbb{E}\{(hX_i/\sigma_i)^n\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{(hU/\sigma_i)^n\}$  for  $n \geq 3$ , by the convex order, and  $\mathbb{E}\{(U/\sigma_i)^2\}/2 = 1/(6\sigma_i^2)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) &= \mathbb{P} \left[ \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i - 1/2)/\sigma_i \right\} \geq e^{hnt} \right], \\ &\leq e^{-hnt} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i - 1/2)/\sigma_i \right\} \right], \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \exp[-h\{t + 1/(2\sigma_i)\}] \left\{ \frac{e^{h/\sigma_i} - 1}{h/\sigma_i} + h^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{24\sigma_i^2} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

proving that (11) holds. Next, since  $\sigma_i^2 \leq 1/12$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) &\leq \prod_{i=1}^n \exp[-h\{t + 1/(2\sigma_i)\}] \left( \frac{e^{h/\sigma_i} - 1}{h/\sigma_i} \right) \\ &= \left( 2e^{-ht} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n \sinh\{h/(2\sigma_i)\} \right]^{1/n} / (h/\bar{\sigma}) \right)^n \\ &\leq \{2e^{-ht} \sinh(h/(2\bar{\sigma})) / (h/\bar{\sigma})\}^n, \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that the function  $\sinh$  is geometrically convex on  $[0, \infty)$  (Niculescu, 2000). We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1, choosing  $h = 12\bar{\sigma}t$ .  $\square$

To illustrate how the bound (11) performs in practice, we now re-visit Barnard's example (Barnard, 1990, p.606). The first experiment he considers yields  $Q_1 = 1/7$ ,  $s_1 = 9002/42^3$ ,  $D_1 = 1.32$ . The second yields  $Q_2 = 1/9$ ,  $s_2 = 141/729$ ,  $D_2 = 1.5$ . Since the sum divided by  $\sqrt{2}$  is almost two, i.e. two standard deviations away, he finds "serious evidence" against the null hypothesis. Lemma 3 finds  $\tilde{P}_0(D_1 + D_2 \geq 1.32 + 1.5) \leq 0.12$ , providing some evidence in favour of the alternative, but not significant at, say, the 5% level. On the other hand, evidence would start to become compelling if we were to observe the second result again,  $Q_3 = 1/9$ ,  $s_3 = 141/729$ ,  $D_3 = 1.5$ ; Lemma 3 then finds  $\tilde{P}_0(D_1 + D_2 + D_3 \geq 1.32 + 1.5 + 1.5) \leq 0.036$ .

### 3.2 Products of mid-p-values (Fisher's method)

Fisher's method (Fisher, 1934) is one of the most popular ways of combining p-values. Let  $U_1, \dots, U_n$  denote independent uniform random variables on the unit interval. Then,

$$-2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log(U_i) \sim \chi_{2n}^2,$$

where  $\chi_k^2$  denotes a chi-square distribution with  $k$  degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis is rejected when  $-2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log(P_i)$  is large or, equivalently, the product of the p-values is small. Let



$P^\dagger = S_{2n}\{-2\sum_{i=1}^n \log(P_i)\}$ , where  $S_k$  is the survival function of a chi-square distribution with  $k$  degrees of freedom.  $P^\dagger$  is the p-value of the combined test. The procedure is exact when  $P_i$  are absolutely continuous, and conservative otherwise, i.e.  $P^\dagger \geq_{st} U$  under  $\tilde{H}_0$ .

Rubin-Delanchy and Lawson (2014) found tail probability bounds for the sum  $-2\sum_{i=1}^n \log(X_i)$  when  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent sub-uniform variables. Re-stating their results, we have, for any  $x \geq 2n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(-2\sum_{i=1}^n \log(X_i) \geq x\right) \leq \min\left[S_{2n}(x - 2n \log 2), \right. \\ \left. n / [n + \{(x - 2n)/2\}^2], \exp\{n - x/2 - n \log(2n/x)\}\right] = u_n(x). \end{aligned}$$

The last of these bounds is often the best by far. Hence it is the only one mentioned in the summary of Section 1. Let  $Q^\dagger = u_n\{-2\sum_{i=1}^n \log(Q_i)\}$ . Then  $Q^\dagger$  is again conservative, i.e.,  $Q^\dagger \geq_{st} U$  under  $\tilde{H}_0$ .

Both  $P^\dagger$  and  $Q^\dagger$  are valid p-values. Clearly, if the underlying p-values are continuous then the standard approach is superior. However,  $Q^\dagger$  seems to be substantially more powerful in a wide range of discrete cases. This is illustrated in Figure 2. We considered p-values from three types of support. In the first column, each p-value  $P_i$  can only take one of two values,  $1/2$  and  $1$ . We therefore have  $Q_i = 0.25$  if  $P_i = 1/2$  and  $Q_i = 0.75$  if  $P_i = 1$ . Under the null hypothesis,  $\mathbb{P}_0^{(i)}(P_i = 1/2) = \mathbb{P}_0^{(i)}(P_i = 1) = 1/2$ . In the second column, each p-value  $P_i$  is supported on the pair  $\{p_i, 1\}$ , where  $p_i$  is drawn uniformly on the unit interval. We therefore have  $Q_i = p_i/2$  if  $P_i = p_i$  and  $Q_i = (1 + p_i)/2$  otherwise. Under the null hypothesis,  $\mathbb{P}_0^{(i)}(P_i = p_i) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_0^{(i)}(P_i = 1) = p_i$ , for each  $i$ . Finally, in the third column each p-value  $P_i$  takes one of ten values,  $1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1$ , and therefore  $Q_i = P_i - 1/20$ . Under the null hypothesis,  $\mathbb{P}_0^{(i)}(P_i = j/10) = 1/10$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, 10$ . The rows represent two different alternatives and sample sizes. In both cases, the  $P_i$  are generated by left-censoring a sequence of independent and identically distributed Beta variables,  $B_1, \dots, B_n$ , that is,  $P_i$  is the smallest supported value larger than  $B_i$ . In the first scenario, the dataset is small ( $n = 10$ ), but the signal is strong (a Beta distribution with parameters 1 and 20). In the second the dataset is larger ( $n = 100$ ) but the signal is made weaker accordingly (a Beta distribution with parameters 1 and 20). Comparing just the solid and dashed lines first, we see that  $Q^\dagger$  always outperforms  $P^\dagger$  substantially, and sometimes overwhelmingly. In the bottom-left corner, for example, we have a situation where, at a false positive rate set to 5% say, the test  $Q^\dagger$  would detect the effect with probability close to one whereas with  $P^\dagger$  the probability would be close to zero.

As a final possibility, consider  $R^\dagger = S_{2n}\{-2\sum_{i=1}^n \log(R_i)\}$ . A disappointment is that this randomised version, the dotted line in Figure 2, tends to outperform even the mid-p-values, and by a substantial margin. On the other hand, as pointed out in the introduction, the randomised p-value has some important philosophical disadvantages.

### 3.3 Asymptotic consistency

Figure 2 hints at a disturbing problem with combining discrete p-values. In the bottom-left pane, there appears to be a situation where, although there is clear ‘signal’ in data, as is evident from the performance of the randomised and mid-p-values, it is virtually undetectable using standard p-values.

The problem is that signal in discrete p-values is often obfuscated when p-values with different probability distributions are mixed together. This is illustrated in Figure 3. Suppose we are shown a sequence of independent p-values which each come from one of two types of experiment, indicated by a variable  $E = 1$  or  $E = 2$ . If  $\tilde{H}_0$  holds, then every p-value comes from one of  $F_0^{(1)}$  ( $E = 1$ , Figure 3a, dashed line), or  $F_0^{(2)}$  ( $E = 2$ , Figure 3a, dotted line). Likewise, if  $\tilde{H}_1$  holds, each comes from  $F_1^{(1)}$  ( $E = 2$ , Figure 3b, dashed line) or  $F_1^{(2)}$  ( $E = 2$ , Figure 3b, dotted line).

We say that consistent identification of  $\tilde{H}_1$  is possible if, at any false positive rate  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , the probability of rejecting under  $\tilde{H}_1$  tends to one. Returning to our example, if all four distributions are known and we are also told which experiment generated which p-value, then consistent




Figure 2: Fisher's method with discrete p-values. Empirical distribution functions of Fisher's combined p-value under different conditions. 50/50: each p-value is equal to  $1/2$  or  $1$  (with probability  $1/2$  each under  $\tilde{H}_0$ ). Random binary: each p-value is equal to  $p$  or  $1$  (with probability  $p$  and  $1-p$  respectively under  $\tilde{H}_0$ ).  $p$  is drawn uniformly on  $[0, 1]$  (independently of whether  $\tilde{H}_0$  or  $\tilde{H}_1$  holds). Grid of ten: each p-value is drawn from  $1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1$  (with probability  $1/10$  each under  $\tilde{H}_0$ ).  $n = 10, \beta = 20$ : 10 p-values from a left-censored Beta(1, 20) distribution.  $n = 100, \beta = 5$ : 100 p-values from a left-censored Beta(1, 5) distribution. Dotted line: randomised p-values. Solid line: mid-p-value. Dashed line: standard p-values. Further details in main text.

identification of  $\tilde{H}_1$  is possible. For example, we could simply subselect the p-values from the first experiment, and count how many are equal to 0.1; there should be about 10% under  $\tilde{H}_0$  versus 20% under  $\tilde{H}_1$  — asymptotically it would be easy to tell.

If  $E$  is 1 or 2 with equal probability for each p-value, then marginally the p-values are independent and identically distributed samples from the mixture, with distribution function  $(F_i^{(1)} + F_i^{(2)})/2$  (Figure 3a–b, solid line). Now, suppose we have no information on the distributions or the experiments that generated the p-values. For the particular choices made in Figure 3, the mixture  $(F_1^{(1)} + F_1^{(2)})/2$  is a valid null distribution function, illustrated in Figure 3b. Therefore, without more information, consistent estimation of  $\tilde{H}_1$  is impossible.

As is shown in the next lemma, the issue is corrected if mid-p-values are used. The integrated distribution functions of the mid-p-value for each experiment and hypothesis are denoted  $\phi_j^{(e)}$ , for  $e = 1, 2$  and  $j = 0, 1$ . Figures 3a and b show the integrated distribution function of the corresponding mixture of mid-p-values under  $\tilde{H}_0$  and  $\tilde{H}_1$  respectively. Under  $\tilde{H}_0$  the mixture of mid-p-values is sub-uniform, as expected (the integrated distribution function is below  $t^2/2$  and equal to  $1/2$  at  $1/2$ , see Section 2). On the other hand, the mixture is visibly not sub-uniform under  $\tilde{H}_1$  (the integrated distribution function is sometimes above  $t^2/2$ ). The next lemma shows that such an effect will be detectable asymptotically.

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose that, for all  $i$ ,  $P_i$  is stochastically smaller under  $\tilde{H}_1$  than under  $\tilde{H}_0$  and that there exists  $x_i$  such that  $P_1^{(i)}\{P_i \leq x_i\} \geq x_i + \epsilon_n$ , where  $\epsilon_n > 0$ . If the probability measures  $P_0^{(i)}$  are unknown then,*

1. *consistent identification of  $\tilde{H}_1$  may be impossible if only  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  are observable and  $\epsilon_n$  is constant.*
2. *consistent identification of  $\tilde{H}_1$  is always possible if only  $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$  are observable and  $\epsilon_n^{-1} = o(n^{1/4})$ .*

*Proof.* The example of Figure 3 proves the first point. More formally, consider two distribution




Figure 3: Signal obfuscation by mixing. a) Null distribution functions of two discrete p-values (dashed and dotted lines) and their mixture (solid line). b) Distribution functions of the same p-values under the alternative, and their mixture. c) The integrated distribution function of the mixed mid-p-value under  $\tilde{H}_0$ . d) The integrated distribution function of the mixed mid-p-value under  $\tilde{H}_1$ . Consistent identification is possible with the mid-p-value but not the p-value. Further details in main text.

functions of the form

$$F_1^{(i)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < x_i, \\ x_i + \epsilon & x_i < x < 1, \\ 1 & x = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $\epsilon = x_1$ ,  $x_2 = 3x_1$ , and  $0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 + x_1 \leq 1$ . Then  $F_1^{(i)}$  satisfy the conditions of the Lemma, but their average is a valid null p-value distribution. Therefore, it is impossible to identify  $\tilde{H}_1$  consistently without knowledge of the distributions.

We next prove the second point. In the Appendix, it is shown that  $1/2 - E_1^{(i)}(Q_i) \geq \epsilon_n^2/2$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  be a rejection threshold and consider the test statistic  $\Delta = 1/2 - \bar{Q}$ . Using Theorem 1,

$$\tilde{P}_0(\Delta \geq c_{n,\alpha}) \leq \alpha,$$

where

$$c_{n,\alpha} = \{-\log(\alpha)/6n\}^{1/2}.$$

Therefore, rejecting when  $\Delta \geq c_{n,\alpha}$  incurs a false positive rate not exceeding  $\alpha$ . Under  $\tilde{P}_1$ , the  $Q_i$  are independent and bounded on  $[0, 1]$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_1(\Delta \leq c_{n,\alpha}) &= \tilde{P}_1\{\bar{Q} - \mu_1 \geq (1/2 - \mu_1) - c_{n,\alpha}\}, \\ &\leq \tilde{P}_1(\bar{Q} - \mu_1 \geq \epsilon_n^2/2 - c_{n,\alpha}), \\ &\leq \exp\left[-2n\{\max(0, \epsilon_n^2/2 - c_{n,\alpha})\}^2\right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu_1 = n^{-1} \sum E_1^{(i)}(Q_i)$ , using Hoeffding's inequality (Hoeffding, 1963, Theorem 1) in the last line. The right-hand side goes to zero if  $\epsilon_n^{-1} = o(n^{1/4})$ . □

### 3.4 Tests based on the integrated distribution function

This section discusses using the integrated distribution function as the basis of a method for combining mid-p-values. Recall that a probability measure is sub-uniform if and only if its integrated distribution function is below  $t^2/2$  and equal to  $1/2$  at  $1$ . Therefore, a large exceedance of the empirical integrated distribution function over  $t^2/2$  would constitute evidence against the null hypothesis. In fact, many approaches concerned with testing for dominance in the convex order use the integrated distribution function as a starting point (Deshpande and Singh, 1985; Kaur et al., 1994; Schmid and Trede, 1998; Davidson and Duclos, 2000; Barrett and Donald, 2003; Berrendero and Cárcamo, 2011).

$Q_1, \dots, Q_n$  are now independent and identically distributed random variables from a mid-p-value distribution or a mixture of mid-p-value distributions, with integrated distribution function  $\phi_Q$ . The empirical integrated distribution function is

$$\hat{\phi}_Q(t) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(Q_i \leq x) dx = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (t - Q_i)_+,$$

where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the indicator function and  $(x)_+ = \max(x, 0)$ . Taking inspiration from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, we might then consider

$$G_1 = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} n^{1/2} \{\hat{\phi}_Q(t) - t^2/2\},$$

which is the test proposed by Schmid and Trede (1998). An attractive feature of this test is that it is consistent on the entire set of alternatives or, in our language, consistent identification of  $\tilde{H}_1$  is possible whenever the mid-p-values are independently drawn from a distribution that is not sub-uniform. A different test was proposed by Deshpande and Singh (1985),

$$G_2 = n^{1/2} \int_0^1 \{\hat{\phi}_Q(x) - x^2/2\} dx = n^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(1 - Q_i)^2}{2} - \frac{1}{6} \right\},$$

which we find less attractive because it is clearly inconsistent in our setting, since  $\phi_Q$  is not identically  $t^2/2$  under the null hypothesis.

Other tests are proposed in the articles cited above and references therein (although focus is often on the two-sample problem). However, a recurring difficulty with these tests, if they are used to combine mid-p-values, is guaranteeing conservativeness in finite samples. This is because  $Q \leq_{cx} U$  does not imply  $\hat{\phi}_Q(t) \leq_{st} \hat{\phi}_U(t)$  for all  $t$ , where  $\hat{\phi}_U$  is the empirical integrated distribution function of  $n$  independent uniform random variables on the unit interval. For example, if  $n = 1$ , then  $\hat{\phi}_Q(1) = 1 - Q_1$ . Therefore, if the smallest supported point  $q$  of  $Q$  is positive, then  $\hat{\phi}_Q(1) \leq 1 - q$  with probability  $2q$ , under the null hypothesis, which is greater than the probability that  $\hat{\phi}_U(1) \leq 1 - q$ , which is  $q$ .

## 4 Conclusion

The convex order provides a formal platform for the treatment and interpretation of mid-p-values that was previously not available. On a theoretical level, the main contributions of this paper are to describe how mid-p-value distributions fit within the set of sub-uniform distributions, provide some conditions where consistent inference is possible with mid-p-values but not ordinary p-values, and derive some probability bounds on functions of multiple mid-p-values. The implications for practical data analysis are that, for the first time, evidence from a finite sample of independent mid-p-values can be combined, in a conservative manner, without resorting to heuristics. Furthermore, in the examples analysed, this approach provides a drastic improvement over combining ordinary p-values, at no additional cost.

Whereas the focus of this article was on combining p-values, another canonical problem is sub-selecting a set of p-values, for example, subject to a maximum false discovery rate (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995). Investigating improvements for the discrete case, using the convex order, would make a promising (but ostensibly harder) avenue of research.

## Appendix

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Choose  $x \in S_Q$  and let  $W$  be a sub-uniform random variable with distribution function  $F_W$ , integrated distribution function  $\phi_W$ , satisfying  $F_W = F_Q$  over  $S_Q \cap [0, x)$ . Then  $F_W \geq F_P$  over  $[0, x)$  and, therefore,  $\phi_W(x) \geq \phi_Q(x)$ . On the other hand, since  $W$  is sub-uniform,  $\phi_W(t) \leq t^2/2$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Now let  $p = \min(y : y \geq x; y \in S_P)$ , where  $S_P$  is the support of  $P$ . By analysis of the distribution of  $Q$ , we have  $\phi_Q(x) + F_Q(x)(p - x) = \phi_Q(p)$ . Furthermore,

$$\phi_Q(p) = E_0\{(p - Q)_+\} = E_0\{(p - R)_+\} = p^2/2,$$

where  $(a)_+ = \max(0, a)$ . Two cases are now distinguished:  $x < p$  and  $x = p$ . In the first case, suppose that  $F_W(x) > F_P(x)$ . Then we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_W(p) &\geq \phi_W(x) + F_W(x)(p - x) \\ &> \phi_Q(x) + F_Q(x)(p - x) = p^2/2, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting  $\phi_W(t) \leq t^2/2$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

If  $x = p$ , then  $F_Q(x) = x$ , again by analysis of the distribution of  $Q$ . On the other hand,  $\phi_W(x) = \phi_P(x) = x^2/2$  and therefore either  $x = 1$  and then  $F_W(x) \leq x$  directly, or  $x < 1$  and then  $F_W(x) \leq x$  because otherwise we would have  $\phi_W(x) > x^2/2$  somewhere over  $(x, 1)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* We make use of Strassen's theorem Strassen (1965), as set out by Müller and Rüschendorf (2001). Because  $Q$  is sub-uniform, there exists a joint probability measure  $P_0$  on two random variables,  $Q'$  and  $R'$ , such that  $E_0(R' | Q') = Q'$  where  $Q'$  has marginal distribution  $Q$ ,  $R'$  is marginally uniform on the unit interval and  $E_0$  is expectation taken according to  $P_0$ . Heuristically, we now only need to construct a 'hypothesis testing story' around these variables.

Let  $D$  be an arbitrary random object (the data) that a) implies  $Q'$ , that is, there is a function  $v$  such that  $Q' = v(D)$  with probability one and b) is conditionally independent of  $R'$  given  $Q'$ . Let  $S$

be an absolutely continuous survival function, and  $W = S^{-1}(R')$ . From the conditional distribution of  $W$  given  $Q'$ , it is possible to construct a deterministic function  $f'$  such that  $W = f'(D, Y)$  where  $Y$  is an independent uniform random variable (using the inverse transform method). Thus,

$$R' = S\{f'(D, Y)\} = P_0\{f'(D^*, Y^*) \geq f'(D, Y)\},$$

where  $D^*, Y^*$  are independent replicates of  $D, Y$  under  $P_0$ . Furthermore,  $Q' = E_0(\tilde{R}' | Q') = E_0(R' | D)$ . Therefore,  $Q'$  is a generalised mid-p-value.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *If  $T$  is stochastically larger under  $H_1$  than under  $H_0$ , and there exists  $x$  such that  $P_1\{P \leq x\} \geq x + \epsilon$ , then  $E_0(Q) - E_1(Q) \geq \epsilon^2/2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $H'_1$  and  $H^*_1$  be two possible alternatives, under which the distribution function of  $P$  is  $F'_1$  or  $F^*_1$  respectively. It is clear that the expectation of  $Q$  under  $H^*_1$  is no larger than under  $H'_1$  if  $F^*_1 \geq F'_1$ . Hence, the expectation of  $Q$  is maximised for an alternative of the form  $F_1 = \max(F_0, E)$ , where  $F_0$  is the null distribution of  $P$  and  $E(t) = (x + \epsilon)\mathbb{I}(t \geq x)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , for some  $x \in [0, 1 - \epsilon]$ , and  $\mathbb{I}$  denotes the indicator function.

Let  $S$  denote the support of  $P$  under  $H_0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} I^- &= \max\{y \in S; y \leq x\}, \\ I^+ &= \min\{y \in S; y \geq x + \epsilon\}, \\ I^\pm &= \max\{y \in S; y \leq x + \epsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

setting  $I = [I^-, I^+]$ . Obviously  $I^- \leq I^\pm \leq I^+$ , and  $I^+ - I^- \geq \epsilon$ .

Recall that  $U$  is a uniform random variable on  $[0, 1]$ , and that the randomised p-value  $R$  is distributed as  $U$  under  $H_0$ . We can obtain a random variable  $U_1$ , distributed as  $R$  under the alternative, by letting  $U_1 = U$  if  $U \notin I$ , and otherwise: redistributing  $U$  onto to some subset of  $[0, I^-]$  with probability  $p = \epsilon/(I^+ - I^-)$ , and uniformly over  $(I_m, I^+]$  otherwise. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} E(U - U_1 | U \in I) &\geq p(I^+ - I^-)/2 + (1 - p)\{(I^+ + I^-)/2 - (I^\pm + I^+)/2\}, \\ &\geq p(I^+ - I^-)/2 \geq \epsilon/2, \end{aligned}$$

so that  $E_0(R) - E_1(R) = E(U - U_1) \geq \epsilon^2/2$ . Since  $Q$  and  $R$  have the same expectation (both under the null and alternative hypotheses), we also have  $E_0(Q) - E_1(Q) \geq \epsilon^2/2$ .  $\square$

## References

- Agresti, A. (1992). A survey of exact inference for contingency tables. *Statistical Science*, 7(1):131–153.
- Atzori, L., Iera, A., and Morabito, G. (2010). The internet of things: A survey. *Computer networks*, 54(15):2787–2805.
- Barnard, G. (1989). On alleged gains in power from lower p-values. *Statistics in Medicine*, 8(12):1469–1477.
- Barnard, G. (1990). Must clinical trials be large? The interpretation of p-values and the combination of test results. *Statistics in Medicine*, 9(6):601–614.
- Barrett, G. F. and Donald, S. G. (2003). Consistent tests for stochastic dominance. *Econometrica*, 71(1):71–104.
- Begum, F., Ghosh, D., Tseng, G. C., and Feingold, E. (2012). Comprehensive literature review and statistical considerations for GWAS meta-analysis. *Nucleic acids research*, 40(9):3777–3784.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300.

- Berrendero, J. R. and Cárcamo, J. (2011). Tests for the second order stochastic dominance based on L-statistics. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 29(2):260–270.
- Birnbaum, A. (1954). Combining independent tests of significance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 49(267):559–574.
- Casella, G. and Berger, R. L. (2002). *Statistical inference*, volume 2. Duxbury Pacific Grove, CA.
- Cruz, M., Cayón, L., Martínez-Gonzalez, E., Vielva, P., and Jin, J. (2007). The non-Gaussian cold spot in the 3 year Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe data. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 655(1):11–20.
- Dahl, F. A. (2006). On the conservativeness of posterior predictive p-values. *Statistics & probability letters*, 76(11):1170–1174.
- Davidson, R. and Duclos, J.-Y. (2000). Statistical inference for stochastic dominance and for the measurement of poverty and inequality. *Econometrica*, 68(6):1435–1464.
- Deshpande, J. V. and Singh, H. (1985). Testing for second order stochastic dominance. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 14(4):887–893.
- Donoho, D. and Jin, J. (2004). Higher criticism for detecting sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *Annals of Statistics*, 32(3):962–994.
- Fisher, R. A. (1934). Statistical methods for research workers.
- Graffelman, J. and Moreno, V. (2013). The mid p-value in exact tests for Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, 12(4):433–448.
- Hirji, K. F., Tan, S.-J., and Elashoff, R. M. (1991). A quasi-exact test for comparing two binomial proportions. *Statistics in Medicine*, 10(7):1137–1153.
- Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 58(301):13–30.
- Hwang, J. G. and Yang, M.-C. (2001). An optimality theory for mid p-values in 2 x 2 contingency tables. *Statistica Sinica*, 11(3):807–826.
- Kaur, A., Prakasa Rao, B., and Singh, H. (1994). Testing for second-order stochastic dominance of two distributions. *Econometric theory*, 10(5):849–866.
- Lancaster, H. (1952). Statistical control of counting experiments. *Biometrika*, 39:419–422.
- Lazar, N. A., Luna, B., Sweeney, J. A., and Eddy, W. F. (2002). Combining brains: a survey of methods for statistical pooling of information. *Neuroimage*, 16(2):538–550.
- Meng, X.-L. (1994). Posterior predictive p-values. *The Annals of Statistics*, 22(3):1142–1160.
- Miorandi, D., Sicari, S., De Pellegrini, F., and Chlamtac, I. (2012). Internet of things: Vision, applications and research challenges. *Ad Hoc Networks*, 10(7):1497–1516.
- Müller, A. and Rüschendorf, L. (2001). On the optimal stopping values induced by general dependence structures. *Journal of applied probability*, 38(3):672–684.
- Niculescu, C. P. (2000). Convexity according to the geometric mean. *Math. Inequal. Appl*, 3(2):155–167.
- Routledge, R. (1994). Practicing safe statistics with the mid-p. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 22(1):103–110.
- Rubin-Delanchy, P. and Lawson, D. J. (2014). Posterior predictive p-values and the convex order. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3442*.

- Rüschendorf, L. (1982). Random variables with maximum sums. *Advances in Applied Probability*, pages 623–632.
- Schmid, F. and Tiede, M. (1998). A Kolmogorov-type test for second-order stochastic dominance. *Statistics & probability letters*, 37(2):183–193.
- Shaked, M. and Shanthikumar, J. G. (2007). *Stochastic orders*. Springer.
- Sheskin, D. J. (2003). *Handbook of parametric and nonparametric statistical procedures*. Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.
- Stevens, W. (1950). Fiducial limits of the parameter of a discontinuous distribution. *Biometrika*, 37:117–129.
- Strassen, V. (1965). The existence of probability measures with given marginals. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(2):423–439.