

Quantifying Uncertainty: All We Need is the Bootstrap?

Urša Zrimšek^a and Erik Štrumbelj^a

^aFaculty of Computer and Information Science, University of Ljubljana, Večna pot 113, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled November 1, 2024

ABSTRACT

Quantifying uncertainty through standard errors, confidence intervals, hypothesis tests, and related measures is a fundamental aspect of statistical practice. However, these techniques involve a variety of methods, mathematical formulas, and underlying concepts, which can be complex. Could the non-parametric bootstrap, known for its simplicity and general applicability, serve as a universal alternative? In this study, we address this question through a review of existing literature and a simulation analysis of one- and two-sided confidence intervals across varying sample sizes, confidence levels, data-generating processes, and statistical functionals. Our findings indicate that the double bootstrap consistently performs best and is a promising alternative to traditional methods used for common statistical tasks. These results suggest that the bootstrap, particularly the double bootstrap, could simplify statistical education and practice without compromising effectiveness.

KEYWORDS

Statistics; inference; standard errors; confidence intervals; simulation study

1. Introduction

University curricula in fields such as the social sciences, medicine, and life sciences, which heavily rely on statistical methodology, typically include only one or two applied statistics courses. However, it is practitioners in these fields, rather than professional statisticians, who perform the majority of statistical analyses. The mismatch between the level of training provided and the practical demand for statistical analysis often results in an over-reliance on rote memorization and formulaic application of methods, contributing to challenges such as the replication crisis in science. This underscores the importance of exploring ways to simplify current statistical practices. Simplification could not only enhance comprehension and reduce errors but also create opportunities to incorporate other aspects of statistical methodology into curricula.

In this paper, we focus on the quantification of uncertainty. Standard errors, confidence intervals, and hypothesis tests are integral components of statistical practice, yet they typically involve advanced concepts—such as test statistics and sampling distributions—and encompass a wide array of methods. Among these, one method stands out: the bootstrap. The bootstrap offers several advantages over traditional techniques for quantifying uncertainty. It is conceptually straightforward, reinforces the fundamental role of sampling in statistics, allows direct interaction with estimates and their

distributions, and can be applied to a wide range of practical tasks without requiring the mastery of new concepts or complex mathematical formulas. These characteristics give the bootstrap significant pedagogical value [1], positioning it as a strong candidate for a one-size-fits-all approach to quantifying uncertainty, particularly for practitioners with limited statistical training.

Historically, the use of the bootstrap was constrained by computational limitations. With advancements in computing power, this is no longer a concern, yet introductory applied statistics textbooks and courses rarely place the bootstrap at the forefront. In our experience, this is largely due to the inertia of established practices, which are supported by more extensive instructional resources and software tools—resources that bootstrapping has historically lacked [1], and to some extent still does. Moreover, there is currently insufficient empirical evidence to convincingly establish the bootstrap as a comprehensive, one-size-fits-all solution for quantifying uncertainty.

1.1. Related work

Theoretical cases where bootstrap fails are pathological with limited implications for practice (see [2] and [3, Ch.2.6]). Large sample properties of common bootstrap approaches have also been established (see [2] for a summary). Unfortunately, large sample theory is not always a reliable predictor of finite sample performance, so we have to turn to empirical work.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize empirical studies on bootstrap methods. Early research primarily focused on the Pearson correlation and the sample mean, with subsequent work extending to other functionals, particularly quantiles and regression parameters. In this review, we concentrate on non-parametric bootstrap techniques and methods that are widely taught and applied in practice, referred to hereafter as **baseline** methods. These include, for example, Fisher confidence intervals (CIs) for the Pearson correlation and t-intervals for the sample mean.

While most, though not all, related studies include a baseline comparison, there are only three instances—aside from an early study where the 1st-order accurate percentile bootstrap (**PB**) was the best-performing method [4]—in which the baseline outperforms the top-performing bootstrap approach. For example, [5] demonstrated that Fieller and Taylor series-based confidence intervals for elasticities and flexibilities marginally outperformed the bias-corrected and accelerated (**BCa**), bias-corrected (**BC**), and PB methods, though this result was observed with relatively small sample sizes ($n = 13, 15$). Similarly, [6] showed that for Pearson correlation under a bivariate normal distribution with varying correlation coefficients, Fisher intervals achieved coverage close to the nominal 95%, while BCa intervals yielded coverage rates around 93% and 94% for sample sizes of 20 and 10, respectively. Furthermore, [7] found that for the log-normal distribution, baseline methods attained nominal coverage with smaller sample sizes than BCa, though this was contingent on assuming log-normality.

The most common recommendation propagated through literature is to use BCa, based mostly on theoretical results. Empirical results also often recommend BCa, with the exception of the mean, where studentized bootstrap (also bootstrap-t, **B-t**) is better. However, some studies suggest that BCa does not perform well with small sample sizes [2, 8, 9]. Double or iterated (also calibrated) bootstrap (**DB**) appears in only 7 studies. When it does, it performs as well as or better than other methods.

In summary, much of the related research is confined to a single functional, a single data-generating process (DGP), and/or a single confidence level. Additionally, the

most commonly used methods are not always included as baselines for comparison. DB also warrants greater attention. While the findings are promising, it remains challenging to fully assess the practical implications of relying exclusively on bootstrap methods.

Table 1. A summary of simulation studies in related work (1981-1999). Ordered by year of publication.

Ref.	DGP	n	n _{rep}	Functional	Evaluating	Methods	Summary of results
[10]	normal	14	200	mean	SE	PB, SB (B = 128, 512)	SB better than PB
[11]	normal	20-100	1600	variance	90% CI	BC, PB (B = 1000)	bootstrap coverage below nominal
[12]	normal, exponential	15	200	trimmed mean	SE	PB (B = 200)	PB better than jackknife
[4]	normal, non-normal	5-60	1000	mean	95%, 99% CI	baseline; PB (B = 500)	baseline better than PB
[13]	normal	14-100	200	mean	SE	PB, SB (B = 200)	SB better than PB
[14]	exponential	5	1	corr	95% CI	BC, BCa, PB (B = ?)	BCa good; PB and BC poor
	bivariate non-normal	5	1	ratio	95% CI	BC, BCa, PB (B = ?)	BCa good; PB and BC poor
	normal	8	1	mean	95% CI	B-t, BC, PB (B = ?)	BC and PB perform similarly, B-t is worse
[15]	normal	100	100	mean	several CI	baseline; PB, SB (B = 2000)	PB similar to baseline; SB better than PB
[9]	chi-squared	20	1000	corr	90% CI	baseline; hybrid, B-t, BC, BCa, PB (B = 1000)	hybrid, B-t, and PB perform similarly; BC and BCa have lower than nominal coverage
[5]	(see paper)	13, 15	500	regression	90% CI	baseline; BC, BCa, PB (B = 500)	baseline better than bootstrap; bootstrap methods similar to each other
[16]	normal, exponential	10, 20	1000	corr	several CI	PB (B = 50000)	PB is biased
[17]	7 distributions (see paper)	3-20	1000	corr	95% CI	baseline; B-t, BCa, PB (B = 1000)	B-t performs well
[18]	chi-squared, mixture of normal	20	1000	corr	several CI	baseline; B-t, PB (B = 1000)	bootstrap similar to baseline; B-t is best
[19]	normal, Poisson, t, Weibull	20	500	corr	90% CI	baseline; B-t, BCa, DB, PB (B = 500)	DB and B-t perform best
[20]	normal, exponential	5-25	1000	corr	95% CI	baseline; DB, PB (B = 1000)	DB as good or better than baseline, except for $n = 5$; PB is worst
[21]	normal, exponential, beta, gamma, t	10, 100	500	median	SE	PB, SB (B = 200)	smoothing improves performance
[22]	normal	20	1	mean	90% CI	baseline; ABC, BCa, B-t (B = 2000)	bootstrap better than baseline
[23]	normal, folded normal, exponential, log-normal	15, 30	1600	corr	90% CI	ABC, DB, DB-ABC, PB (B = 1000)	DB better than ABC and calibrated ABC
[24]	(see paper)	13, 15	500	regression	90% CI	DB, PB (B = 1999)	DB better than PB

n = sample size or range, if more than two; **n_{rep}** = number of Monte Carlo replications; **B** = number of bootstrap replications; ? indicates we were not able to discern the information from the paper

Table 2. A summary of simulation studies in related work (2000-2023). Ordered by year of publication.

Ref.	DGP	n	n _{rep}	Functional	Evaluating	Methods	Summary of results
[2]	inverse exponential	20	1000	corr	99% CI	baseline; B-t, BC, BCa, PB (B = 4999)	baseline, B-t, and BCa perform similarly; BCa poor for small n
[25]	normal	15	1	mean	90% CI	baseline; ABC	bootstrap better than baseline
[26]	log-normal, gamma	10-50	1000	diff. in means	95% CI	baseline; B-t, BCa (B = 1000)	B-t performs well and better than BCa
[27]	bivariate normal (censored)	25-400	2000	(see paper)	90%, 95% CI	B-t, BCa, PB (B = 520)	jackknife performs best; PB performs worst
[8]	normal, log-normal, gamma, t, uniform	10-3600	1000 6400	variance	several CI	baseline; ABC, BC, BCa, PB (B = 1000, 16000)	2nd order accurate methods can converge slowly and perform worse than PB
[28]	(see paper)	50-500	5000	regression	95% CI	baseline; BC, PB (B = 2000)	BC and PB perform well
[29]	exponential, Pareto	10-25	2000	extrema	80%, 90% CI	baseline; PB, DB (B = 699)	DB is best
[30]	(see paper)	50-500	5000	regression	95% CI	baseline; BCa, PB (B = 10000)	BCa and PB perform well
[31]	(see paper)	10-50	1000	capture-recapture	95% CI	baseline; B-t, PB (B = 100, 250)	B-t performs best
[32]	log-logistic with censored data	25-50	1000	(see paper)	90%, 95% CI	baseline; B-t, DB, DB-t, PB (B = ?)	PB poor; other bootstrap methods good and similar to each other
[33]	normal, uniform, triangular, beta, Laplace, Pareto	50?-300?	1000	mean	95% CI	BCa, PB (B = 2000)	BCa slightly better than PB; good coverage except on Pareto
[1]	normal, exponential	5-4000	1000	corr	95% CI	baseline; B-t, PB, reverse PB (B = 10000)	bootstrapped CI narrow, especially for small n; PB worse than baseline for small n; reverse PB poor; B-t best
[34]	log-logistic with censored data	25-60	1000	(see paper)	90%, 95% CI	baseline, JK, DB, PB (B = 1000)	DB best; PB poor
[6]	normal	10-100	1000	mean	95% CI	baseline; B-n, B-t, BC, BCa, PB (B = 10000)	baseline better than bootstrap on small n; BCa performs well
[35]	(see paper)	?	1000	quantiles	95% CI	modified BC, BCa, PB (B = 1999)	bootstrap methods perform similarly
[36]	log-normal	20-120	100	quantiles	95% CI	baseline; BCa, PB (B = 10000)	baseline better than bootstrap for small n
[37]	26 pairs	20-600	1000	corr	95% CI	baseline; BCa, PB (B = 2000)	BCa better than PB on small n; PB better than BCa for large n; poor coverage for uniform-chi-squared

n = sample size or range, if more than two; **n_{rep}** = number of Monte Carlo replications; **B** = number of bootstrap replications; ? indicates we were not able to discern the information from the paper

2. Simulation Study

We ran an experiment for each possible combination of sample size n from $\{4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256\}$, intervals $(-\infty, \alpha)$ with endpoints α from $\{0.025, 0.05, 0.25, 0.75, 0.95, 0.975\}$, statistical functional from $\{\text{mean, median, standard deviation, } 5^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 95^{\text{th}} \text{ percentile, and Pearson correlation}\}$, and data generating process from

- normal with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$,
- exponential with $\lambda = 1$,
- uniform from 0 to 1,
- beta with $\alpha = 10$ and $\beta = 2$,
- log-normal with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$,
- Laplace with $\mu = 0$ and $b = 1$, and
- bi-normal with $\mu = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$.

Note that the bi-normal and Pearson correlation appear only in combination with each other.

Our experimental design was informed by a combination of related simulation studies, theoretical considerations, and computational constraints. The selected range of sample sizes is consistent with those commonly used in similar studies. However, we include sample sizes of 4 and 8, which are rarely examined. Although such small samples are uncommon in most statistical practice, they may hold practical relevance in fields where data is limited (for example, gene expression studies). For sample sizes of 256 and above, we anticipate that all methods will perform well from a practical standpoint, though these larger sample sizes can also become computationally prohibitive.

The selected range of endpoints includes the 5% and 95% confidence levels and enables the construction of symmetric two-sided confidence intervals at 95% and 90% levels by combining the 0.025 and 0.975, or 0.05 and 0.95 endpoints. These levels are the most commonly used in practice and in almost all simulation studies. However, our choice of endpoints also permits the exploration of other confidence levels. It is important to note, from an evaluation standpoint, that considering one-sided coverage is crucial, as relying solely on two-sided coverage can be misleading (see Section 2.2 for details).

The selected statistical functionals include the most commonly used functionals (mean, median, standard deviation, and correlation) and two extreme percentiles, which are less commonly used in practice but are known to pose challenges in quantifying uncertainty. A notable omission is the inclusion of model coefficients, such as those from the family of generalized linear mixed-effects models. However, for many of these models, and for most more complex models, the bootstrap is not only a viable alternative but the only option for quantifying uncertainty.

We selected the data-generating processes to cover the entire spectrum of difficulty, which is primarily characterized by the skewness and kurtosis of the underlying distribution. A notable omission in our study is the consideration of categorical data, specifically the estimation of proportions in binary data. Addressing categorical data would require a different experimental setup, as our chosen data-generating processes are incompatible with proportion estimation, and the selected statistical functionals do not apply to categorical data. We delegate the analysis of categorical data to future work. However, note that in all but the smallest sample sizes and most extreme proportions, the mean and corresponding quantification of uncertainty will perform well.

We used $n_{\text{rep}} = 10000$ replications for every experiment, to limit coverage standard error to 0.005 in the worst case, and $B = \{10, 100, 1000\}$ bootstrap replications. More bootstrap replications is better, so we do not consider B a dimension of the experiment. We only report results for $B = 1000$, but we would reach the same conclusions with $B = 100$. For $B = 10$ the performance of bootstrap methods is noticeably worse.

Recommendations [3, 8, 38] and choices of B in simulation studies also suggest that $B = 1000$ is enough.

2.1. Methods

As a baseline for comparison, we include the CIs produced by the methods that are most commonly used in practice for that statistical functional. For the *mean* we use the t-based CIs from the commonly used t-test (**t-test**). For the *median* we use CIs from the *Wilcoxon signed rank test* (**wilcoxon**) [39]. For *standard deviation*, we use the *chi-squared* CIs (**chi-sq**) [40]. For Pearson correlation we use Fisher CIs (**fisher**) [41]. For quantiles we use parametric CIs based on normal assumption (**q-par**), non-parametric CI (**q-nonpar**) (see [7] for both), and the Maritz-Jarrett method (**m-j**) [42].

The bootstrap procedure can be divided into two primary steps. First, *bootstrap sampling* to generate the bootstrap distribution, which serves as an approximation of the sampling distribution of the functional of interest. And second, applying a *bootstrap method* to construct a confidence interval.

Bootstrap sampling can be further categorized into parametric and non-parametric approaches. The parametric bootstrap assumes a specific distribution for the underlying population, F , and estimates the associated parameters from the observed data, $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. In contrast, the non-parametric bootstrap infers properties of F by resampling directly from X without imposing distributional assumptions. Given that there are n^n possible samples from resampling, we typically restrict the process to B independent bootstrap samples to maintain computational feasibility. This yields B bootstrap samples $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_B^*$ and the bootstrap distribution of the parameter $\hat{\theta}^* = (\hat{\theta}_1^*, \hat{\theta}_2^*, \dots, \hat{\theta}_B^*)$.

The assumptions underlying parametric bootstrap methods restrict their applicability or require additional user input, making them less suitable as a universal approach. Therefore, our experiments focus exclusively on non-parametric bootstrap methods. Below, we provide a brief overview of the bootstrap methods used for CI construction, along with references for further details. The source code for our implementation is also available (see Section 3).

2.1.1. Percentile Bootstrap (**PB**)

The percentile method is the original method proposed by Efron in [43] (for details, also see [38, chap. 13]). Even though multiple improvements have been made since, it is still one of the most popular bootstrap methods. The percentile CI for confidence level α is obtained by taking the α -quantile of the bootstrap distribution:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{PB}}[\alpha] = \hat{\theta}_\alpha^*.$$

In all of our implementations of methods that use quantiles, we used the median-unbiased version of quantile calculation, recommended in [44].

2.1.2. Standard Bootstrap (**B-n**)

The standard method, sometimes also called the normal method, assumes that the bootstrap distribution is normal [38, chap. 13]:

$$\hat{\theta}_{B-n}[\alpha] = \hat{\theta} + \hat{\sigma} z_\alpha,$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ is the plug-in estimator of the functional, $\hat{\sigma}$ is the standard deviation estimate from the bootstrap distribution and z_α is the z-score.

2.1.3. Basic Bootstrap (**BB**)

In the basic bootstrap [38, chap. 13.4], sometimes called the reverse percentile method, we replace the observed bootstrap distribution, θ^* with $W^* = \theta^* - \hat{\theta}$. This results in

$$\hat{\theta}_{BB}[\alpha] = 2\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}_{1-\alpha}^*.$$

Davison and Hinkley [3] show that it provides an accurate confidence interval for the sample median, but it can have a substantial coverage error because of errors in quantile calculation of W^* . It can also give us invalid parameter values, when there are constraints on θ .

2.1.4. Smoothed Bootstrap (**SB**)

The smoothed bootstrap [3] gets its name from smoothing the bootstrap distribution. We implement smoothing with a normal kernel centered on 0. We determine kernel size with

$$h = 0.9 \min \left(\hat{\sigma}, \frac{\text{IQR}}{1.34} \right),$$

where IQR is the inter-quartile range of the bootstrap distribution, respectively. The CI estimate is then obtained by taking the α quantile of the smoothed bootstrap distribution $\tilde{\theta}^*$:

$$\hat{\theta}_{SB}[\alpha] = \tilde{\theta}_\alpha^*.$$

2.1.5. Bias Corrected Bootstrap (**BC**)

The bias corrected bootstrap corrects the bias of the percentile CI [38, chap. 14]. The CI estimate is:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{BC}[\alpha] &= \hat{\theta}_{\alpha_{BC}}^*, \\ \alpha_{BC} &= \Phi(2\Phi^{-1}(\hat{b}) + z_\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where Φ is the standard normal CDF \hat{b} is the bias, calculated as the percentage of values from the bootstrap distribution that are lower than the value of the functional on the data.

2.1.6. Bias Corrected and Accelerated Bootstrap (**BCa**)

The bias corrected and accelerated bootstrap [38, chap. 14] further corrects the *BC* interval by computing acceleration a , which accounts for the skewness of the bootstrap distribution:

$$\hat{\theta}_{BCa}[\alpha] = \hat{\theta}_{\alpha_{BCa}}^*,$$

$$\alpha_{BCa} = \Phi\left(\Phi^{-1}(b) + \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\hat{b}) + z_\alpha}{1 + \hat{a}(\Phi^{-1}(\hat{b}) + z_\alpha)}\right),$$

where \hat{a} is the leave-one-out jackknife approximation of the acceleration constant.

2.1.7. Studentized Bootstrap (**B-t**)

The studentized bootstrap [38, chap. 14], also known as bootstrap-t, generalizes the Student's t method, using the distribution of $T = (\hat{\theta} - \theta)/\hat{\sigma}$ to estimate the CI:

$$\hat{\theta}_{B-t}[\alpha] = \hat{\theta} - \hat{\sigma}T_{1-\alpha}.$$

But since the distribution of T is not known, we need to approximate its percentiles from the bootstrap distribution. We do that by defining $T^* = (\hat{\theta}^* - \hat{\theta})/\hat{\sigma}^*$, where $\hat{\sigma}^*$ is obtained by doing another inner bootstrap sampling on each of the outer samples.

2.1.8. Double Bootstrap (**DB**)

The double bootstrap [45, chap. 3.11] corrects bias with another level of inner of bootstraps. We repeat the bootstrap procedure on each of the bootstrap samples to calculate the the percentage of times that the inner bootstrap functional is smaller than on the original sample. We want to take such a limit that $P\{\hat{\theta} \in (-\infty, \hat{\theta}_{double}[\alpha])\} = \alpha$, which is why we need to select the α -th quantile of biases \hat{b}^* for the adjusted level α_{DB} . This leads to

$$\hat{\theta}_{DB}[\alpha] = \hat{\theta}_{\alpha_{double}}^*,$$

$$\alpha_{DB} = \hat{b}_\alpha^*.$$

2.2. Measuring the quality of confidence intervals

Most related work measures only coverage, with only a few studies measuring interval length [2, 6, 17, 25, 35–37] or comparing CIs with exact intervals [14, 22, 25].

While we also focus on coverage, we measure and report results for *interval length* for two-sided CIs and the *absolute distance from exact intervals* for one-sided intervals. The exact interval for endpoint α and parameter θ is defined as $\hat{\theta}_{exact}[\alpha] = \hat{\theta} - \hat{\sigma}K^{-1}(1-\alpha)$, where K is the cumulative distribution function of θ [46]. We approximate $\hat{\sigma}K^{-1}(1-\alpha)$ with 100000 samples.

Note that two-sided coverage can be misleading regarding a method's coverage, because good two-sided coverage can be, and in practice often is, a result of substantial,

but opposite errors in the two one-sided intervals (see [46] for an example). That is, while two-sided error can be studied from one-sided CIs, the converse is not true.

We argue that the practical meaning of coverage error depends on nominal coverage and is not symmetric. For example, 51% coverage at 50% nominal coverage is not the same as 96% coverage at 95% nominal coverage. And 85% coverage is not the same as 95% coverage at 90% nominal coverage. To aggregate results and for a threshold-based criterion that can be applied to all confidence levels, we propose a novel criterion based on the Kullback-Leibler divergence. That is, we measure information loss if we assume nominal coverage π when actual coverage is p :

$$\text{KL}(p, \pi) = p \log_2\left(\frac{p}{\pi}\right) + (1 - p) \log_2\left(\frac{1 - p}{1 - \pi}\right).$$

For a threshold-based criterion of what we consider *good enough* we modify Bradley’s criterion $|p - \pi| < \frac{\min(\pi, 1 - \pi)}{k}$, where π is the nominal coverage [47]. Common choices for k are 10 (stringent), 4 (intermediate), 2 (liberal), and 0.75 (very liberal). Note that the intermediate and very liberal were introduced by [48]. In related work on the bootstrap, only [37] uses a *good enough* criterion - that actual coverage should lie between 92.5% and 97.5% when nominal coverage is 95% (this is based on the work of [47]).

At 95% nominal coverage, the KL divergences for the Bradley lower bounds 94.5% ($k = 10$), 93.8% ($k = 4$), 92.5% ($k = 2$), and 88.3% ($k = 0.75$) are approximately 0.0004, 0.0020, 0.0083, and 0.0503. We adopt $\text{KL}(0.945, 0.95)$ as the stringent criterion and a factor of 5 as an *order of magnitude* worse/better performance. For nominal coverage 95% this leads to criteria very similar to Bradley’s: (93.8, 96.2) vs (93.9, 96.1) (intermediate), (92.5, 97.5) vs (92.4, 97.3) (liberal), and (88.3, 101.7) vs (88.6, 99.4) (very liberal). However, for nominal coverage further away from 95% our approach gives produces sensible criteria and does not produce endpoints outside of the unit interval.

3. Results

The simulation study consists of 1302 combinations and it is infeasible to list them all. We will focus on identifying if a bootstrap method is a viable one-size-fits-all approach. Inevitably, some details that are relevant to the reader might be left out. We prepared a visualization tool to browse all of the the results of the experiments zrimseku.github.io/bootstrap-simulation/ (see Figure 2).

The raw results (aggregated over 10000 replications) and the source code for the tool, simulation framework, pre-processing, and analysis can be found here: github.com/zrimseku/bootstrap-simulation. The source code can be used to generate the full non-aggregated results. The library with all the bootstrap methods can be found here: github.com/zrimseku/bootstrap-ci.

3.1. When methods fail to produce a CI

There are only a few cases where a method fails to produce a CI. All bootstrap methods fail to produce a CI for Pearson correlation for $n = 4$, due to division by zero variance. It can also happen for $n = 8$, but rarely. BC and BCa do not produce a CI for the

Table 3. Mean KL coverage performance of bootstrap methods for one-sided CIs. The *all* column is across all combinations, while the remaining results are grouped by sample size or statistical functional. The best performing method for each column is underlined.

	all	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	corr	mean	Q _{0.5}	Q _{0.05}	Q _{0.95}	std
B-n	<u>0.082</u>	0.322	<u>0.180</u>	<u>0.091</u>	<u>0.038</u>	0.021	0.014	0.010	0.006	0.030	0.004	<u>0.024</u>	<u>0.145</u>	0.208
B-t	0.088	<u>0.199</u>	0.280	0.112	0.051	0.024	0.020	0.014	0.008	0.015	0.012	0.078	0.264	<u>0.084</u>
BB	0.117	0.253	0.194	0.227	0.106	0.047	0.034	0.023	0.017	0.034	0.045	0.159	0.234	0.145
SB	0.124	0.459	0.278	0.160	0.063	0.028	0.018	0.011	0.002	0.026	0.003	0.064	0.230	0.308
DB	0.140	0.544	0.348	0.200	0.060	<u>0.008</u>	<u>0.005</u>	<u>0.003</u>	<u>0.000</u>	<u>0.010</u>	<u>0.002</u>	0.125	0.401	0.188
BCa	0.159	0.600	0.335	0.242	0.096	0.018	0.010	0.005	0.001	0.023	0.017	0.201	0.379	0.218
BC	0.162	0.607	0.350	0.234	0.096	0.022	0.013	0.008	0.001	0.026	0.017	0.169	0.387	0.246
PB	0.165	0.620	0.378	0.229	0.076	0.029	0.019	0.012	0.002	0.028	0.003	0.109	0.377	0.330

Table 4. Threshold-based coverage performance of bootstrapping on one-sided CIs. The table shows the percentage of experiments where a method does not meet the stringent criterion KL(0.945, 0.95). The *all* column is across all experiments, while the remaining results are grouped by sample size or statistical functional. The best performing method for each column is underlined.

	all	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	corr	mean	Q _{0.5}	Q _{0.05}	Q _{0.95}	std
DB	<u>0.64</u>	0.96	<u>0.85</u>	<u>0.82</u>	<u>0.73</u>	<u>0.59</u>	<u>0.48</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>0.30</u>	<u>0.52</u>	0.38	0.87	<u>0.78</u>	0.75
BCa	0.78	0.99	0.91	0.89	0.81	0.72	0.64	0.59	0.43	0.60	0.85	0.97	0.88	<u>0.69</u>
B-n	0.78	0.97	0.93	0.89	0.82	0.71	0.67	0.59	0.67	0.76	0.65	<u>0.71</u>	0.80	1.00
SB	0.79	0.96	0.94	0.83	0.78	0.74	0.71	0.66	0.67	0.75	<u>0.33</u>	0.98	0.97	1.00
PB	0.82	0.94	0.97	0.94	0.84	0.73	0.72	0.68	0.70	0.76	0.46	0.97	0.98	1.00
BC	0.84	0.99	0.94	0.94	0.91	0.83	0.75	0.61	0.43	0.67	0.85	0.86	1.00	0.89
B-t	0.85	<u>0.89</u>	0.88	0.87	0.87	0.84	0.84	0.81	0.80	0.64	0.91	0.92	0.95	0.88
BB	0.88	0.93	0.96	0.92	0.89	0.83	0.84	0.80	0.77	0.72	0.93	0.94	0.97	0.86

5th percentile for $n \leq 8$. For the 95th percentile, B-t does not produce an interval in most cases when $n = 4$ for the Laplace distribution. m-j is unable to produce CIs for small sample sizes and extreme percentiles (5th percentile for $n \leq 16$ and the 95th percentile for $n \leq 8$). Method q-nonpar fails to produce the 95th percentile for $n = 4$ and $\alpha \leq 0.75$, for $n \in \{8, 16\}$ and $\alpha \leq 0.25$, for $n = 32$ and $\alpha \leq 0.05$ and for $n = 64$ and $\alpha = 0.025$. When predicting CIs for the median, it fails at $n = 4$ and $\alpha \leq 0.05$. And, although wilcoxon returns CIs for asymmetric distributions, they are not useful CIs for location.

3.2. Coverage of bootstrap methods

Table 3 shows a comparison of bootstrap methods in mean KL. As expected, coverage improves with sample size and the two extreme percentiles and standard deviation are the most difficult functionals. For Pearson correlation, mean, and median, DB is best. For the percentiles, B-n is best. And for standard deviation, B-t is best. B-n and B-t perform the best overall. Because coverage gets worse with smaller sample size, the overall results are biased towards methods that perform well on small n . DB and BCa, which we would expect to perform best, perform relatively poorly for small n , but are best and second best for sample sizes $n \geq 64$.

Table 4 shows how often methods fail to meet the stringent criterion. DB outperforms other methods overall and on all sample sizes except $n = 4$. It is the best method or relatively close to the best on all functionals, except on one of the two extreme percentiles. BCa is second-best overall. The results so far suggest that overall DB is best, but can have very poor coverage in some cases, especially for the two extreme percentiles at small sample sizes. While a more liberal criterion will result in fewer failures

Table 5. Threshold-based coverage performance of bootstrapping on two-sided CIs. The table shows the percentage of experiments where a method does not meet the liberal criterion $25 \times \text{KL}(0.945, 0.95)$. The *all* column is across all experiments, while the remaining results are grouped by sample size or statistical functional. The best performing method for each column is underlined.

	all	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	corr	mean	Q _{0.5}	Q _{0.05}	Q _{0.95}	std
DB	<u>0.33</u>	0.81	<u>0.50</u>	<u>0.58</u>	<u>0.52</u>	<u>0.10</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.00</u>	0.25	<u>0.07</u>	0.43	<u>0.40</u>	<u>0.57</u>
SB	0.45	1.00	0.67	0.73	0.63	0.24	0.13	0.08	0.10	0.46	0.14	0.43	0.42	0.82
B-n	0.46	0.97	0.81	0.76	0.56	0.29	0.13	0.08	0.40	0.48	0.23	<u>0.35</u>	0.43	0.80
BCa	0.48	1.00	0.89	0.69	0.63	0.35	0.11	0.06	<u>0.00</u>	0.46	0.25	<u>0.62</u>	<u>0.40</u>	0.74
PB	0.48	1.00	0.78	0.77	0.63	0.32	0.13	0.08	0.20	0.49	0.19	0.47	<u>0.47</u>	0.82
BC	0.49	1.00	0.92	0.74	0.61	0.39	0.10	0.06	<u>0.00</u>	0.48	0.25	0.57	0.45	0.77
B-t	0.67	<u>0.50</u>	0.72	0.81	0.76	0.66	0.61	0.60	0.40	<u>0.17</u>	0.76	1.00	1.00	0.65
BB	0.82	1.00	1.00	0.94	0.85	0.79	0.68	0.63	0.60	0.49	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.79

for all methods, the ordering does not change.

From the six confidence levels in our experiments we derive results for the two most common two-sided CIs (95%, 90%). Table 5 shows how often the methods fail to meet the liberal criterion for these two-sided intervals. These and results for other thresholds and KL are similar for one-sided and two-sided intervals. Most bootstrap methods meet the liberal criterion in almost all cases when $n \geq 128$ ($n \geq 64$ for DB), but even at $n = 256$ there are still two cases where even DB does not (standard deviation for log-normal). Excluding these, DB meets the very liberal criterion for all experiments for $n \geq 64$.

3.3. Coverage comparison with baseline methods

Note that all the results in this section are for one-sided CIs. Results for two-sided CIs are similar.

We start with the premise that if we are limited to a single method, DB is the best choice. Now we take a closer look at where DB is clearly outperformed by another method. The criterion we use is that method A outperforms method B if B does not meet the stringent criterion and A is at least an order of magnitude better than method B. If a method is not able to produce CIs, it is outperformed by any method that can.

Table 6 adds detail to the results from Section 3.2. For Pearson correlation DB does not produce CIs for $n = 4$ and performs poorly for $n = 8$. It performs poorly on the two extreme percentiles for $n \leq 32$ and in some cases on the other functionals, mostly for $n \leq 8$. For Q(0.05) and Q(0.95), we would do better by choosing q-par for the smaller sample sizes and m-j for sample size $n = 32$. For the other functionals and $n \geq 8$ ($n \geq 16$ for Pearson correlation) there is no clear advantage of using baseline methods. Note that for Q(0.05) and Q(0.95) and $n = 16, 32$ B-n is as good as or better than baseline. However, for $n \leq 8$ even B-n is worse than the baseline, but less so than DB.

Table 6 adds detail to the results from Section 3.2. For Pearson correlation DB does not produce CIs for $n = 4$ and performs poorly for $n = 8$. It performs poorly on the two extreme percentiles for $n \leq 32$ and in some cases on the other functionals, mostly for $n \leq 8$. For Q(0.05) and Q(0.95), we would do better by choosing q-par for the smaller sample sizes and m-j for sample size $n = 32$. For the other functionals and $n \geq 8$ ($n \geq 16$ for Pearson correlation) there is no clear advantage of using baseline methods. Table 7 shows the advantage of using B-n instead of DB for Q(0.05) and Q(0.95) for $n \leq 32$.

Table 6. Cases where DB and baseline outperform each other. The number in the parentheses is the number of combinations where a method outperforms. There are a total of 36 combinations for every pair of n and functional, except Pearson correlation, where there are 6.

n	functional	baseline \gg DB	DB \gg baseline
4	corr	fisher (6)	
4	mean	t-test (8); wilcoxon (1)	DB (4)
4	median	m-j (8); q-par (3)	
4	Q(0.05)	q-nonpar (12); q-par (22)	
4	Q(0.95)	q-par (21)	DB (4)
4	std	chi-sq (14)	DB (6)
8	corr	fisher (6)	
8	mean	t-test (4); wilcoxon (6)	DB (4)
8	median	m-j (2); q-par (1); wilcoxon (3)	DB (4)
8	Q(0.05)	q-nonpar (12); q-par (22)	DB (3)
8	Q(0.95)	q-nonpar (12); q-par (21)	
8	std	chi-sq (8)	DB (11)
16	mean	t-test (8); wilcoxon (8)	DB (13)
16	median	wilcoxon (1)	DB (7)
16	Q(0.05)	q-nonpar (17); q-par (15)	
16	Q(0.95)	m-j (11); q-par (11)	DB (5)
16	std	chi-sq (2)	DB (12)
32	mean	t-test (3); wilcoxon (3)	DB (14)
32	median	m-j (1)	DB (3)
32	Q(0.05)	m-j (6); q-nonpar (17); q-par (5)	
32	Q(0.95)	m-j (18); q-par (6)	
32	std	chi-sq (2)	DB (15)
64	mean		DB (12)
64	median		DB (1)
64	Q(0.05)	m-j (6); q-nonpar (3)	
64	Q(0.95)	m-j (5)	DB (11)
64	std	chi-sq (1)	DB (20)
128	mean		DB (14)
128	Q(0.05)	m-j (9)	DB (1)
128	Q(0.95)	m-j (5)	DB (1)
128	std		DB (28)
256	mean		DB (10)
256	Q(0.05)		DB (4)
256	Q(0.95)		DB (10)
256	std		DB (27)

Table 7. Cases where B-n and baseline outperform each other. Results are for the two extreme percentiles and $n \leq 32$. The number in the parentheses is the number of combinations where a method outperforms. There are a total of 36 combinations for every pair of n and functional.

n	functional	baseline \gg B-n	B-n \gg baseline
4	Q(0.05)	q-nonpar (11); q-par (14)	
4	Q(0.95)	q-par (14)	
8	Q(0.05)	q-par (13)	B-n (1)
8	Q(0.95)	q-nonpar (4); q-par (13)	B-n (4)
16	Q(0.05)	q-nonpar (5); q-par (6)	B-n (5)
16	Q(0.95)	m-j (2); q-par (6)	B-n (2)
32	Q(0.05)		B-n (10)
32	Q(0.95)	m-j (3); q-par (1)	B-n (11)

Table 8. Mean absolute distance from exact for one-sided CIs. For each combination, the value is normalized with two standard deviations of exact intervals. The *all* column is across all experiments, while the remaining results are grouped by sample size or statistical functional. The best performing method for each column is underlined.

	all	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	corr	mean	Q _{0.5}	Q _{0.05}	Q _{0.95}	std
B-n	<u>0.245</u>	0.423	<u>0.337</u>	<u>0.276</u>	<u>0.228</u>	<u>0.187</u>	<u>0.151</u>	<u>0.123</u>	<u>0.095</u>	<u>0.140</u>	<u>0.201</u>	<u>0.329</u>	<u>0.330</u>	0.244
BB	0.271	<u>0.392</u>	0.354	0.328	0.270	0.213	0.185	0.160	<u>0.095</u>	0.141	0.262	0.362	0.383	<u>0.227</u>
BC	0.322	0.566	0.436	0.373	0.316	0.254	0.210	0.177	0.136	0.161	0.286	0.416	0.536	0.258
SB	0.326	0.546	0.446	0.362	0.306	0.252	0.207	0.172	0.125	0.148	0.276	0.479	0.441	0.308
BCa	0.327	0.542	0.427	0.379	0.326	0.274	0.224	0.186	0.136	0.180	0.286	0.432	0.521	0.268
DB	0.353	0.557	0.488	0.387	0.331	0.290	0.240	0.193	0.159	0.224	0.299	0.488	0.501	0.279
PB	0.359	0.644	0.508	0.399	0.324	0.258	0.213	0.178	0.124	0.150	0.295	0.554	0.502	0.320
B-t	1.018	4.647	0.702	0.700	0.550	0.314	0.242	0.197	0.116	0.776	1.751	0.912	1.127	0.636

Note that BCa behaves similarly to DB, but DB is the better choice. For example, DB is at least an order of magnitude better than BCa in 17% of all cases while BCa is better than DB in 4% of the cases.

3.4. Absolute distance from exact CIs

Coverage by itself is not enough - we would also like the CI endpoints to match the exact. An extreme example would be to generate a very large endpoint (wide two-sided interval) with probability α and a very small endpoint (narrow two-sided interval) with probability α . This would result in nominal coverage but useless CIs.

Table 8 shows that B-n has lowest distance from exact, while DB and BCa perform relatively poorly across all groups. This result cannot be interpreted in isolation, because there is typically a trade-off between coverage and distance (see Figure 1 for an illustrative example).

Table 9 shows where a baseline method has better distance from exact than DB, but only for cases where its coverage is not an order of magnitude worse. We included B-n as the bootstrap method that performs best in distance from exact. Results are similar to those in Table 6 - baseline methods and B-n outperform DB for the two extreme percentiles. That is, in most cases, lower distance from exact comes at the expense of worse coverage.

4. Conclusion

This paper presents the most comprehensive review of empirical results for bootstrap methods to date, along with an extensive empirical comparison. Our study encompasses not only the most widely used non-parametric bootstrap methods but also the most common techniques for quantifying uncertainty in general. Furthermore, we introduce a novel criterion for assessing confidence interval quality, which improves on existing evaluation approaches.

We identify DB as the overall best method, contrary to some recommendations of BCa for general cases [2], but in line with other recommendations [23, 49] and the few empirical studies that included DB. These results are also in line with related work: PB performs relatively poorly. For small n B-t performs best for the mean and BCa best for Pearson correlation, although DB performs similarly. B-t relies on an estimate of variance and can produce very long CIs. Bootstrapping can perform poorly compared do chi-squared CIs on variance for small n and normal distribution, however, as we

Table 9. Cases where baseline (with B-n) outperforms DB in absolute distance from exact intervals. The number in the parentheses is the number of combinations where a method outperforms. Note that there are a total of 36 combinations for every pair of n and functional, except Pearson correlation, where there are 6.

n	functional	baseline \gg DB
4	corr	fisher (6)
4	mean	B-n (9); t-test (9); wilcoxon (9)
4	median	B-n (5); m-j (5); q-nonpar (4); q-par (5); wilcoxon (5)
4	Q(0.05)	B-n (27); q-nonpar (27); q-par (24)
4	Q(0.95)	B-n (21); q-nonpar (10); q-par (21)
4	std	B-n (14); chi-sq (14)
8	corr	fisher (6)
8	mean	B-n (3); t-test (3); wilcoxon (3)
8	median	B-n (1); m-j (1); q-nonpar (1); q-par (1); wilcoxon (1)
8	Q(0.05)	B-n (30); q-nonpar (28); q-par (24)
8	Q(0.95)	B-n (27); q-nonpar (15); q-par (23)
8	std	B-n (7); chi-sq (7)
16	Q(0.05)	B-n (35); q-nonpar (35); q-par (27)
16	Q(0.95)	B-n (16); m-j (16); q-nonpar (2); q-par (16)
16	std	B-n (2); chi-sq (2)
32	Q(0.05)	B-n (29); m-j (29); q-nonpar (26); q-par (15)
32	Q(0.95)	B-n (30); m-j (30); q-nonpar (13); q-par (20)
64	Q(0.05)	B-n (8); m-j (8); q-nonpar (8); q-par (4)
64	std	B-n (1); chi-sq (1)
128	Q(0.05)	B-n (2); m-j (2); q-nonpar (2); q-par (1)




Figure 1. Density estimates for endpoints for $n = 32$, $\pi = 0.95$, standard normal DGP, and standard deviation. Estimated coverage of DB and B-t is 93.7% and 86.3%, respectively. Absolute distance from exact is 0.084 and 0.045, respectively. Note that the endpoints produced by methods strongly correlate with exact endpoints ($\rho \approx 0.9$).




Figure 2. A visualization of the visualization tool for browsing the results of our simulation study. The user can filter results by method and facet based on the dimensions of the experiment (functional, confidence level, distribution).

demonstrated, chi-squared performs poorly on non-normal distributions and DB is comparable or better for $n \geq 32$.

DB has two weaknesses. It can perform relatively poorly when $n = 4, 8$ and on extreme percentiles for $n \leq 32$. The latter can be mitigated by using B-n but also raises the question if DB can be modified to deal with these cases, while still preserving most of its simplicity. This leaves us with $n = 4, 8$, where we have to acknowledge that a non-parametric approach is often worse than a parametric approach even when the assumptions of the parametric method are violated. However, we would argue that these are extremely small and of little relevance to most practitioners. We did not investigate to what extent bootstrap diagnostics (see [50] and [3, Ch.3.10]) could further mitigate these issues.

The dimensions of our experiment can be improved. We omit categorical data with commonly used baselines such as the binomial test for proportions. We only include one DGP for Pearson correlation, which is not nearly as comprehensive as the recent study by [37], who, unfortunately, did not include DB. Other commonly used functionals could also be included, such as regression model coefficients, non-parametric correlation, and distances between distributions. However, we believe that the dimensions our simulation study were diverse enough to reveal the most important results.

We focused on independent data. Related work on hierarchical, temporal, spatial, and other dependencies is sparse, but mostly in favor of bootstrapping. And in more complex problems bootstrapping is often the only viable approach. From a pedagogical perspective, the bootstrap on dependent data is more difficult, but the most of the difficulties arise from understanding the dependencies and adjusting how to resample accordingly.

There is no substitute for thoroughly understanding the statistical task at hand, carefully choosing the most appropriate method, and correctly applying it. In practice, however, these come at a training cost that is prohibitive for most practitioners. Any simplification is welcome and we identify the bootstrap as a viable one-size-fits-all method for quantifying uncertainty, at least in the independent data case. We would argue that using a single and conceptually more simple method outweighs even a moderate drop in performance compared to methods that are most commonly taught and used today. However, we show that bootstrapping even performs as well if not better on all but the smallest sample sizes.

Arguably, the lack of adoption of the bootstrap as a one-size-fits-all method might not be due to performance issues but for a lack of software, materials, and legitimate concerns for backwards compatibility. The logical next step appears to be to develop and test a first course in applied statistics that relies solely on the bootstrap.

Acknowledgment

We thank Gregor Sočan for his helpful comments.

Funding

This work was supported by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency under Grant P2-0442.

Data Availability Statement

The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and its supplementary materials.

References

- [1] T.C. Hesterberg, *What teachers should know about the bootstrap: Resampling in the undergraduate statistics curriculum*, The American Statistician 69 (2015), pp. 371–386.
- [2] J. Carpenter and J. Bithell, *Bootstrap confidence intervals: when, which, what? a practical guide for medical statisticians*, Statistics in medicine 19 (2000), pp. 1141–1164.
- [3] A.C. Davison and D.V. Hinkley, *Bootstrap methods and their application*, 1, Cambridge university press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [4] J.L. Rasmussen, *Estimating correlation coefficients: Bootstrap and parametric approaches.*, Psychological Bulletin 101 (1987), p. 136.
- [5] J.H. Dorfman, C.L. Kling, and R.J. Sexton, *Confidence intervals for elasticities and flexibilities: Reevaluating the ratios of normals case*, American Journal of Agricultural Economics 72 (1990), pp. 1006–1017.
- [6] M.T. Puth, M. Neuhäuser, and G.D. Ruxton, *On the variety of methods for calculating confidence intervals by bootstrapping*, Journal of Animal Ecology 84 (2015), pp. 892–897.
- [7] C. Ialongo, *Confidence interval for quantiles and percentiles*, Biochemia medica 29 (2019), pp. 5–17.
- [8] M.R. Chernick and R.A. Labudde, *Revisiting qualms about bootstrap confidence intervals*, American Journal of Mathematical and Management Sciences 29 (2009), pp. 437–456.
- [9] A.B. Owen, *Empirical likelihood ratio confidence intervals for a single functional*, Biometrika 75 (1988), pp. 237–249.
- [10] B. Efron, *Nonparametric estimates of standard error: the jackknife, the bootstrap and other methods*, Biometrika 68 (1981), pp. 589–599.
- [11] N. Schenker, *Qualms about bootstrap confidence intervals*, Journal of the American Statistical Association 80 (1985), pp. 360–361.
- [12] B. Efron and R. Tibshirani, *Bootstrap methods for standard errors, confidence intervals, and other measures of statistical accuracy*, Statistical science (1986), pp. 54–75.
- [13] B.W. Silverman and G.A. Young, *The bootstrap: To smooth or not to smooth?*, Biometrika 74 (1987), pp. 469–479.
- [14] T.J. Diccio and J.P. Romano, *A review of bootstrap confidence intervals*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological) 50 (1988), pp. 338–354.
- [15] B. Efron, *Bootstrap confidence intervals: good or bad?*, Psychological bulletin 104 (1988), p. 293.
- [16] G. Young and H. Daniels, *Bootstrap bias*, Biometrika 77 (1990), pp. 179–185.
- [17] A.B. Owen, *Empirical likelihood and small samples*, Computing Science and statistics (1992), pp. 79–88.
- [18] E. Mammen, *When does bootstrap work?: asymptotic results and simulations*, Vol. 77, Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 1992.
- [19] S.G. Shi, *Accurate and efficient double-bootstrap confidence limit method*, Computational statistics & data analysis 13 (1992), pp. 21–32.
- [20] R. Stanny, *Iterated-bootstrap Confidence Intervals for the Mean*, Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory, Pensacola, Florida, 1993.
- [21] S. Lee and G.A. Young, *Practical higher-order smoothing of the bootstrap*, Statistica Sinica 4 (1994), pp. 445–459.
- [22] T.J. DiCiccio and B. Efron, *Bootstrap confidence intervals*, Statistical science 11 (1996), pp. 189–228.
- [23] S.M.S. Lee and G.A. Young, *[bootstrap confidence intervals]: Comment*, Statistical Science

- 11 (1996), pp. 221–223.
- [24] D. Letson and B.D. McCullough, *Better confidence intervals: The double bootstrap with no pivot*, American Journal of Agricultural Economics 80 (1998), pp. 552–559.
- [25] B. Efron, *Second thoughts on the bootstrap*, Statistical science (2003), pp. 135–140.
- [26] X.H. Zhou and P. Dinh, *Nonparametric confidence intervals for the one-and two-sample problems*, Biostatistics 6 (2005), pp. 187–200.
- [27] J. Arasan and M. Lunn, *Alternative interval estimation for parameters of bivariate exponential model with time varying covariate*, Computational Statistics 23 (2008), pp. 605–622.
- [28] M.W. Cheung, *Comparison of methods for constructing confidence intervals of standardized indirect effects*, Behavior research methods 41 (2009), pp. 425–438.
- [29] P. Hall and H. Miller, *Bootstrap confidence intervals and hypothesis tests for extrema of parameters*, Biometrika 97 (2010), pp. 881–892.
- [30] J.A. Jones and N.G. Waller, *Computing confidence intervals for standardized regression coefficients.*, Psychological methods 18 (2013), p. 435.
- [31] N. Karavarsamis, A.P. Robinson, G. Hepworth, A.J. Hamilton, and G.W. Heard, *Comparison of four bootstrap-based interval estimators of species occupancy and detection probabilities*, Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics 55 (2013), pp. 235–252.
- [32] J. Arasan and M.B. Adam, *Double bootstrap confidence interval estimates with censored and truncated data*, Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods 13 (2014), p. 22.
- [33] M.A. Padilla and A. Veprinsky, *Bootstrapped deattenuated correlation: Nonnormal distributions*, Educational and Psychological Measurement 74 (2014), pp. 823–830.
- [34] Y.F. Loh, J. Arasan, H. Midi, and M.R.A. Bakar, *Inferential procedures based on the double bootstrap for log logistic regression model with censored data*, Malaysian Journal of Science 34 (2015), pp. 199–207.
- [35] R.S. Flowers-Cano, R. Ortiz-Gómez, J.E. León-Jiménez, R. López Rivera, and L.A. Perera Cruz, *Comparison of bootstrap confidence intervals using monte carlo simulations*, Water 10 (2018), p. 166.
- [36] C. Ialongo, *Confidence interval of percentiles in skewed distribution: The importance of the actual coverage probability in practical quality applications for laboratory medicine*, Biochemia Medica 29 (2019), pp. 471–482.
- [37] J.M.V. DelosReyes and M.A. Padilla, *Bootstrap correlation confidence interval estimation: The positive impact of a symmetric distribution*, The Journal of Experimental Education 0 (2023), pp. 1–21.
- [38] B. Efron and R.J. Tibshirani, *An introduction to the bootstrap*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida, USA, 1994.
- [39] D.F. Bauer, *Constructing confidence sets using rank statistics*, Journal of the American Statistical Association 67 (1972), pp. 687–690.
- [40] G.W. Snedecor and W.G. Cochran, *Statistical methods, eight edition*, Iowa state University press, Ames, Iowa 1191 (1989).
- [41] D.G. Bonett and T.A. Wright, *Sample size requirements for estimating pearson, kendall and spearman correlations*, Psychometrika 65 (2000), pp. 23–28.
- [42] J. Maritz and R. Jarrett, *A note on estimating the variance of the sample median*, Journal of the American Statistical Association 73 (1978), pp. 194–196.
- [43] B. Efron, *Bootstrap Methods: Another Look at the Jackknife*, Vol. 7. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 1979, pp. 1 – 26.
- [44] R.J. Hyndman and Y. Fan, *Sample quantiles in statistical packages*, The American Statistician 50 (1996), pp. 361–365.
- [45] P. Hall, *The bootstrap and Edgeworth expansion*, Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 2013.
- [46] T.J. DiCiccio and B. Efron, *[bootstrap confidence intervals]: Rejoinder*, Statistical Science 11 (1996), pp. 223–228, Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2246115>.
- [47] J.V. Bradley, *Robustness?*, British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology 31 (1978), pp. 144–152.

- [48] R.R. Robey and R.S. Barcikowski, *Type i error and the number of iterations in monte carlo studies of robustness*, British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology 45 (1992), pp. 283–288.
- [49] P. Hall and M.A. Martin, *[bootstrap confidence intervals]: Comment*, Statistical Science 11 (1996), pp. 212–214.
- [50] A.J. Canty, A.C. Davison, D.V. Hinkley, and V. Ventura, *Bootstrap diagnostics and remedies*, Canadian Journal of Statistics 34 (2006), pp. 5–27.