

A class of sequential multi-hypothesis tests

June 4, 2024

Andrey Novikov

Metropolitan Autonomous University, Mexico City, Mexico

Abstract: In this paper, we deal with sequential testing of multiple hypotheses. In the general scheme of construction of optimal tests based on the backward induction, we propose a modification which provides a simplified (generally speaking, suboptimal) version of the optimal test, for any particular criterion of optimization. We call this DBC version (the one with Dropped Backward Control) of the optimal test. In particular, for the case of two simple hypotheses, dropping backward control in the Bayesian test produces the classical sequential probability ratio test (SPRT). Similarly, dropping backward control in the modified Kiefer-Weiss solutions produces Lorden's 2-SPRTs .

In the case of more than two hypotheses, we obtain in this way new classes of sequential multi-hypothesis tests, and investigate their properties. The efficiency of the DBC-tests is evaluated with respect to the optimal Bayesian multi-hypothesis test and with respect to the matrix sequential probability ratio test (MSPRT) by Armitage. In a multihypothesis variant of the Kiefer-Weiss problem for binomial proportions the performance of the DBC-test is numerically compared with that of the exact solution. In a model of normal observations with a linear trend, the performance of of the DBC-test is numerically compared with that of the MSPRT. Some other numerical examples are presented.

In all the cases the proposed tests exhibit a very high efficiency with respect to the optimal tests (more than 99.3% when sampling from Bernoulli populations) and/or with respect to the MSPRT (even outperforming the latter in some scenarios).

Keywords: sequential analysis; hypothesis testing; optimal stopping; optimal sequential tests; multiple hypotheses; SPRT; 2-SPRT; MSPRT;

Subject Classifications: 62L10, 62L15, 62F03, 60G40, 62M02

Address correspondence to A. Novikov, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa, Avenida Ferrocarril San Rafael Atlixco, 186, col. Leyes de Reforma 1A Sección, C.P. 09310, Cd. de México, Mexico, E-mail: an@xanum.uam.mx

ACRONYMS AND NOMENCLATURE

ESS	Expected sample size
SPRT	Sequential probability ratio test
MSPRT	Matrix sequential probability ratio test (Armitage, 1950)
2-SPRT	Lorden's 2-SPRT
$\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n, \dots)$	Stopping rule
$I_A(x)$	Indicator function of event A
k	Number of hypotheses to be tested
ϕ_n^i	Conditional probability to accept hypothesis H_i at stage n
$\phi_n = (\phi_n^1, \dots, \phi_n^k)$	Conditional probabilities to accept H_1, \dots, H_k at stage n
$\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n, \dots)$	(Terminal) decision rule
$\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$	Sequential test
$X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$	Stochastic process of observations
$H_i : \theta = \theta_i$	i -th hypothesis about the underlying process
θ	Parameter of the distribution of the underlying process
τ_ψ	Stopping time generated by stopping rule ψ
$s_n^\psi = (1 - \psi_1)(1 - \psi_2) \dots (1 - \psi_{n-1})\psi_n$	Conditional probability to stop at stage n
P_θ	Distribution of the process when θ is the true value of parameter
$E_\theta(\cdot)$	Expected value when θ is the true value of parameter
ϑ_i	Parameter values to use for evaluation of the expected sample size
K	Number of ESSs to be weighted in the minimization criterion
$\alpha_{ij}(\psi, \phi)$	Error probability of test $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ (to accept H_j given that H_i is true)
$\alpha_i(\psi, \phi)$	Error probability of test $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ (to reject H_i given that H_i is true)
$C_{\gamma, \vartheta}(\tau_\psi)$	Weighted ESS, to be minimized
γ_i	Weight for ESS calculated under ϑ_i
λ_{ij}	Lagrangian multipliers for $\alpha_{ij}(\psi, \phi)$
λ_i	Lagrangian multipliers for $\alpha_i(\psi, \phi)$
$L(\psi, \phi)$	Lagrangian function for test $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$
$f_\theta^n = f_\theta^n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$	Radon-Nikodym derivative of the distribution of (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) with respect to a product-measure μ^n
$f_{\gamma\vartheta}^n = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i f_{\vartheta_i}^n$	Weighted distribution to be used for ESS minimization

1. Introduction

In this paper, we deal with sequential multi-hypothesis testing. The Bayesian setting is most commonly used for construction of optimal multi-hypothesis tests (see, for example, Blackwell and Girshick, 1954; Baum and Veeravalli, 1994; Tartakovsky, Nikiforov, and Basseville, 2015, among others). The distinctive feature of the Bayesian approach is the assumption that any one of the hypotheses comes up with some probability called *a priori*. In this way, the Bayesian risk is defined as a weighted sum of losses from incorrect decisions plus the expected sample size, with the *a priori* probabilities as weights. The optimal test

(called Bayesian) in this approach is that minimizing the Bayesian risk. The existence of optimal Bayesian tests is usually demonstrated applying general techniques of *dynamic programming* or *optimal stopping* (see, for example Chow, Robbins, and Siegmund, 1971; Shiryaev, 2008, for the case of two hypotheses), and for the numerical approximations the *backward induction* is applied.

The characteristics typically involved in the Bayesian risk are error probabilities and expected sample size calculated under the hypotheses. At the same time, there is a number of statistical testing problems where the expected sample size should be evaluated at parameter points distinct from the hypothesized ones. Probably the most notable is the so called modified Kiefer-Weiss problem, where the goal is to minimize the expected sample size under a parameter value located strictly between the hypothesized values (see, for example, Kiefer and Weiss, 1957; Lai, 1973; Lorden, 1976). Other examples can be found in Eales and Jennison (1992). Some authors consider this type of problems Bayesian, too (for example Weiss, 1962; Eales and Jennison, 1992, among others), but others don't (see, for example Lorden, 1976; Schmitz, 1993). Whatever be the term, all these problems have much in common, because they incorporate the important characteristics of the tests (like error probabilities, expected sample size, etc.) in a sole expression representing the "risk" (or "average loss") of the whole statistical procedure. Unless their practical context is of a true Bayesian nature (with a real *a priori* distribution behind), the use of Bayesian methodology in this type of problems is rather "opportunistic" (as in the classical work of Wald and Wolfowitz, 1948, for example), because the statisticians are in fact interested in the really meaningful characteristics like error probabilities, etc. This is why the Bayesian methods in these applications are often "indirect", because they require re-calculation of the output characteristics in terms of the Bayesian input "loss" structure.

It should be noted nevertheless that there exist numerous hypothesis testing settings in the literature, which depart "directly" from the meaningful characteristics like error probability, statistical power, etc. (see, for example Jennison and Turnbull, 1999, where many references to previous work can be found). Other problems for more specific and/or more elaborated models can also be found in the literature (as in Chen, 2000; Silva, Kulldorff, and Yih, 2020, for example).

In this paper, we deal with the "Bayesian" model described above. In Novikov (2023b), a computer-oriented approach to construction of optimal Bayesian tests was proposed. For the model of binary responses we developed a complete set of algorithms facilitating the evaluation of optimal tests and their characteristics for this problem, implemented them in the R programming language and made them publicly available in the form of a GitHub repository. With the program at hand it is easy to find (numerically) the input values in the Bayesian problem in order to satisfy the requirements on output quality. This approach can be, in principle, adapted to other exponential families of distribution, but requires some programming work to be done for any specific family.

In this paper, we propose a modification of the optimal sequential tests which is quite simple because only affects the stopping rule in the way the "backward induction" part of the governing equations is omitted, while this is the most laborious part of the dynamic programming techniques. At the same time this modification is rather universal because it is applicable to virtually any stochastic model, at least to those with calculatable expressions for joint distributions. In addition, it is applicable on finite and infinite horizons and it requires only forward run for its evaluation. We call this modification "optimal test with dropped backward control (DBC)". We numerically study the properties of the proposed tests, evaluating their characteristics and comparing them with those of the optimal tests. The problems and models examined are: Bayesian testing between three simple hypotheses about binomial proportions, testing between two two-sided hypotheses about binomial proportions, Bayesian test for three hypotheses about the mean of a normal distribution with a linear trend in the mean, and the Kiefer-Weiss testing between three hypotheses about binomial proportions.

In the particular case of two hypotheses, this method provides the well-known class of sequential probability ratio tests (SPRTs) in the Bayesian setting, and the class of 2-SPRTs by Lorden (1976) for the modified Kiefer-Weiss problem, as well as some other tests known from the literature.

For three or more hypotheses the proposed method generates a new class of sequential multi-hypothesis tests, whose properties we investigate in this paper.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains the use of the method of Lagrange multipliers for optimal sequential multi-hypothesis testing. Section 3 introduces the new class of multihypothesis tests called DBC (Dropped Backward Control) variants of the optimal tests and some of their properties are highlighted. In Section 4, five numerical examples of applications of the new tests are presented.

2. Optimal multi-hypothesis tests

In this section, we describe a general method of construction of the optimal sequential multi-hypotheses tests. Essentially, this is a brief recount of the full construction found in Novikov (2009) adapted to the present context.

Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ be a sequence of random variables the statistician is receiving for analysis on the one-by-one basis. The distribution of the sequence is uniquely defined by a parameter θ the statistician wants to decide about, namely, which one of the k hypotheses is true: $H_1: \theta = \theta_1, H_2: \theta = \theta_2, \dots$, or $H_k: \theta = \theta_k, k \geq 2$.

Let $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ be a sequential multi-hypothesis test, τ_ψ its corresponding stopping time, $E_\theta \tau_\psi$ the expected sample size when θ is the true value of the parameter, $\alpha_{ij}(\psi, \phi)$ (or $\alpha_i(\psi, \phi)$) the error probabilities of the test $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$. We refer to Novikov (2009) for the formal definitions.

The general purpose of the construction is the minimization of the expected sample size weighted over some set of parameter points. Let ϑ_i , be some parameter points, $i = 1, \dots, K, K \geq 1$, and $\gamma_i > 0$ be some weights (i. e. $\sum_{i=1}^K \gamma_i = 1$). Then we are interested in minimizing

$$C_{\gamma, \vartheta}(\tau_\psi) = \sum_{i=1}^K \gamma_i E_{\vartheta_i} \tau_\psi \quad (2.1)$$

under the conditions

$$\alpha_{ij}(\psi, \phi) \leq \alpha_{ij}, \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq k \quad (\text{or } \alpha_i(\psi, \phi) \leq \alpha_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k), \quad (2.2)$$

where α_{ij} and α_i are some non-negative numbers.

The problem is solved applying the method of Lagrange multipliers.

Let λ_{ij} be some non-negative constants, $1 \leq i \neq j \leq k$. Then the problem of minimization of (2.1) under conditions on $\alpha_{ij}(\psi, \phi)$ reduces to that of minimization of

$$L(\psi, \phi) = C_{\gamma, \vartheta}(\tau_\psi) + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k} \lambda_{ij} \alpha_{ij}(\psi, \phi). \quad (2.3)$$

Quite analogously, the problem of minimization under restrictions on $\alpha_i(\psi, \phi)$ reduces to minimization of

$$L(\psi, \phi) = C_{\gamma, \vartheta}(\tau_\psi) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \alpha_i(\psi, \phi) \quad (2.4)$$

with some Lagrangian multipliers $\lambda_i \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq k$ (see Novikov, 2009). It is easy to see that (2.4) is a particular case of (2.3) when $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_i$ for all $j \neq i$, so we focus on the problem of minimization of (2.3).

When $\theta_i = \vartheta_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k = K$ the Lagrangian function (2.3) can also be interpreted as a Bayesian risk corresponding to the a priori distribution $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ on $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\}$.

To characterize the tests minimizing (2.3), an additional assumption is needed. Let us assume that for each n and each θ the vector (X_1, \dots, X_n) has a density $f_\theta^n = f_\theta^n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ (Radon-Nikodym derivative)

with respect to a product-measure μ^n (n times μ by itself, where μ is a σ -finite measure). Let us also denote $f_{\gamma\vartheta}^n = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i f_{\vartheta_i}^n$.

Let now

$$v_n = v_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} f_{\vartheta_i}^n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (2.5)$$

Then the optimal decision rule ϕ can be defined as

$$\phi_n^j = 0 \text{ whenever } \sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} f_{\vartheta_i}^n > v_n, \quad (2.6)$$

so that, with this ϕ ,

$$L(\psi, \phi) \geq L(\psi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int s_n^\psi (n f_{\gamma\vartheta}^n + v_n) d\mu^n \quad (2.7)$$

and the problem is reduced to that of minimization of the right-hand side of (2.7) over all stopping rules ψ (see Novikov (2009)).

This latter problem is first solved over the class of truncated stopping rules. Let \mathcal{S}^N be the class of stopping rules such that $(1 - \psi_1)(1 - \psi_2) \dots (1 - \psi_N) = 0$. Then the the optimal stopping rule in \mathcal{S}^N is constructed as follows.

Starting from $V_N^N \equiv v_N$, define recursively over $n = N, \dots, 2$

$$V_{n-1}^N = \min\{v_{n-1}, f_{\gamma\vartheta}^{n-1} + \mathcal{I}_n V_n^N\}, \quad (2.8)$$

where \mathcal{I}_n is an operator defined for any non-negative measurable function $v = v(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ as

$$\mathcal{I}_n v = (\mathcal{I}_n v)(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \int v(x_1, \dots, x_n) d\mu(x_n).$$

Equation (2.8) is what usually called ‘‘backward induction’’ equation.

Then for any $\psi \in \mathcal{S}^N$

$$L(\psi) \geq 1 + \mathcal{I}_1 V_1^N, \quad (2.9)$$

and there is an equality in (2.9) when

$$\psi_n = I_{\{v_n \leq f_{\gamma\vartheta}^n + \mathcal{I}_{n+1} V_{n+1}^N\}} \quad (2.10)$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$. Thus, stopping rule (2.10) solves the problem of minimization of $L(\psi)$ in the class \mathcal{S}^N of truncated stopping rules. The stopping rule can be arbitrarily randomized between the samples for which there is an equality in the inequality under the indicator function in (2.10) (Novikov, 2009).

Under very mild condition (see, for example, Novikov, 2009, Remark 7), the solution of the problem of minimization of (2.7) is obtained by letting $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For any $n \geq 1$ and $N \geq 1$ $V_n^{N+1} \leq V_n^N$, so there exists $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} V_n^N = V_n$, so it follows from (2.9) that

$$L(\psi) \geq 1 + \mathcal{I}_1 V_1, \quad (2.11)$$

for all stopping rules ψ , and there is an equality in (2.11) if

$$\psi_n = I_{\{v_n \leq f_{\gamma\vartheta}^n + \mathcal{I}_{n+1} V_{n+1}\}} \quad (2.12)$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Thus, (2.12) defines an optimal stopping rule. Again, it can be arbitrarily randomized in case there is an equality in the inequality in (2.12). The details of this result can be found in Novikov (2009).

As a concluding remark, let us note that the problem of minimization of (2.3) has a trivial decision in case

$$\sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} \leq 1 \quad \text{for some } j = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

Indeed, in this case the trivial test $\langle \psi_0, \phi_j \rangle$ that always (without any observation) takes the decision to accept H_j , has $\alpha_{ij}(\psi_0, \phi_j) = 1$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\alpha_{ji}(\psi_0, \phi_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, so

$$\sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} \alpha_{ij}(\psi_0, \phi_j) = \sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} \leq 1 + \mathcal{I}_1 V_1$$

which means the trivial test performs better than the best test among those taking at least one observation.

Therefore, when it comes to minimization of $L(\psi, \phi)$ (or Bayesian risk) we will always assume that

$$\sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} > 1 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (2.13)$$

In particular, in the case of $k = 2$ hypotheses, $\lambda_{12}(= \lambda_1) > 1$ and $\lambda_{21}(= \lambda_2) > 1$.

3. Proposed modification

The idea of the modification of the optimal multi-hypothesis test we propose in this paper is suggested by the form of optimal stopping rule (2.12). We see from (2.12) that the optimal test stops (that is, $\psi_n = 1$) when

$$v_n \leq f_{\gamma\vartheta}^n \quad (3.1)$$

(because all V_n are non-negative). This corresponds to “dropping” the term $\mathcal{I}_{n+1} V_{n+1}$ in (2.12) which is responsible, at step n , for the optimum stopping due to the future behaviour of the controlled process. Without any additional information about the exact form of V_{n+1} , a natural “simplified” way of acting is to continue whenever (3.1) does not hold. This takes us to the stopping time $\tau_\psi = \min\{n \geq 1 : v_n \leq f_{\gamma\vartheta}^n\}$ (see (3.1)). τ_ψ stops at a later time than the optimal one does, but has the advantage that it does not require any specification of the functions V_n , which is normally not an easy task.

Taking into account the above arguments, we propose the following multi-hypothesis test for the general case of $k \geq 2$ hypotheses.

Let for any natural n

$$\psi_n = 1 \text{ whenever } \min_{j=1, \dots, k} \sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} f_{\theta_i}^n \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \gamma_i f_{\vartheta_i}^n, \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\phi_n^j = 0 \text{ whenever } \sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} f_{\theta_i}^n > \min_{l=1, \dots, k} \sum_{i:i \neq l} \lambda_{il} f_{\theta_i}^n \quad (3.3)$$

The minimum on the right hand side of (3.3) is achieved for at least one j . If there is more than one j with this property, the final decision may be obtained by an arbitrary randomization between all of them. A randomization can also be applied in case there is an equality in (3.2).

We will call the test $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ defined by (3.2) – (3.3) DBC-version of the optimal one, because it is obtained by omitting the details of the functions V_n responsible for the exact form of the optimal control.

Remark 3.1. It is worth noting that the test defined by (3.2) – (3.3) is applicable to statistical models where the observations are not necessarily independent or identically distributed. Restriction of (3.2) – (3.3) to steps $1 \leq n \leq N$ is also a DBC version of the optimal truncated test (2.10) – (2.6).

3.1. Some properties of DBC-test for two hypotheses

Let us show that, in some particular cases of two hypotheses, the DBC-test defined in (3.2) – (3.3) reduces to very well known sequential tests.

Let us first look at the classical case of two simple hypotheses in the Bayesian setting (i. e., $\vartheta_i = \theta_i$, $i = 1, 2$). It is easy to see that in this case stopping according to (3.1) is equivalent to stopping when

$$\text{either } \lambda_2 f_{\theta_2}^n \leq \gamma_1 f_{\theta_1}^n + \gamma_2 f_{\theta_2}^n \quad \text{or} \quad \lambda_1 f_{\theta_1}^n \leq \gamma_1 f_{\theta_1}^n + \gamma_2 f_{\theta_2}^n,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{f_{\theta_2}^n}{f_{\theta_1}^n} \leq \frac{\gamma_1}{\lambda_2 - \gamma_2} = A < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{f_{\theta_2}^n}{f_{\theta_1}^n} \geq \frac{\lambda_1 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_2} = B > 1,$$

respectively. That is, our “simplified” procedure yields in fact the classical stopping time of an SPRT

$$\min\{n \geq 1 : \frac{f_{\theta_2}^n}{f_{\theta_1}^n} \notin (A, B)\}$$

introduced by A. Wald at the very beginning of the sequential analysis (see, for example, Wald, 1945).

The decision rule (2.6) in this case is to accept hypothesis H_2 when

$$\frac{f_{\theta_2}^n}{f_{\theta_1}^n} \geq \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \tag{3.4}$$

and accept H_1 otherwise.

It is easy to see that

$$A = \frac{\gamma_1}{\lambda_2 - \gamma_2} < \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} < B = \frac{\lambda_1 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_2} \tag{3.5}$$

which implies that our rule (3.4) takes the same decision the SPRT does, when this latter stops.

To prove (3.5) let us suppose that, by the contrary,

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \leq \frac{\gamma_1}{\lambda_2 - \gamma_2},$$

say. Then

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \leq \gamma_1 \lambda_2 + \gamma_2 \lambda_1 \leq \max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$$

which contradicts to the fact that both $\lambda_1 > 1$ and $\lambda_2 > 1$. Analogously, the second inequality in (3.5) can be proved.

Thus, any Bayesian (as well as any SPRT) for two simple hypotheses is a particular case of the DBC-test (3.2) – (3.3).

Let us look now at the Kiefer-Weiss problem. The problem is originally formulated by Kiefer and Weiss (1957) for two hypotheses and consists in minimizing $\sup_{\theta} E_{\theta} \tau_{\psi}$ over all tests subject to restrictions on the error probabilities. They suggested that the problem, in some cases, can be reduced to minimization of $E_{\vartheta} \tau_{\psi}$ for a specific choice of ϑ , under the same restrictions (this problem is called nowadays the modified Kiefer-Weiss problem). This exactly matches the problem of minimization of $C_{\gamma, \vartheta}(\tau_{\psi})$ with $K = 1$ and $\gamma_1 = 1$ and $\vartheta_1 = \vartheta$ (see (2.1)) under restrictions on $\alpha_i(\psi, \phi)$, $i = 1, 2$. Thus, our DBC-test (3.2) - (3.3) is applicable.

Let us examine the particular form the DBC-test (3.2) - (3.3) acquires in this case.

The stopping time (3.2) provides

$$\tau_\psi = \min\{n \geq 1 : \min\{\lambda_1 f_{\theta_1}^n, \lambda_2 f_{\theta_2}^n\} \leq f_\vartheta^n\}, \quad (3.6)$$

and the decision is in favour of H_1 (i. e., $\phi_n = 1$), whenever

$$\lambda_1 f_{\theta_1}^n \geq \lambda_2 f_{\theta_2}^n. \quad (3.7)$$

It is easily seen that this is a variant of the 2-SPRT proposed by Lorden (1976), where $A = 1/\lambda_1$ and $B = 1/\lambda_2$. The numerical results of Lorden (1976) show a very high efficiency of the 2-SPRT in the symmetric normal case.

In Section 4 (see Example V) we also suggest using the test (3.2) - (3.3) in the multi-hypothesis version of the Kiefer-Weiss problem.

Remark 3.2. Taking into account the Bayesian origin of the proposed test, let us represent it in the traditional Bayesian terms like the prior and posterior probabilities of hypotheses. This setting corresponds to the particular case of our proposed test (3.2) - (3.3), when $\vartheta_i = \theta_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, and $K = k$.

Interpreting γ_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$ as the prior probabilities of the respective hypotheses H_1, \dots, H_k , let us denote

$$\pi_i^n = \frac{\gamma_i f_{\theta_i}^n}{\sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j f_{\theta_j}^n}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

the posterior probabilities of the hypotheses, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, and let $\pi_i^0 = \gamma_i$.

Then stopping rule (3.2) gives

$$\tau_\psi = \min\{n \geq 1 : \min_{j=1, \dots, k} \sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} \pi_i^n / \gamma_i \leq 1\}, \quad (3.8)$$

and the condition of deciding in favour of H_j in (3.3) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} \pi_i^n / \gamma_i = \min_{l=1, \dots, k} \sum_{i:i \neq l} \lambda_{il} \pi_i^n / \gamma_i. \quad (3.9)$$

In this way, our proposed test (3.2) - (3.3) provides a simplified form (omitting the backward recursion) of the Bayesian tests in the multi-hypothesis case.

3.2. A general stopping property

We show in this section that, under rather general conditions, $\tau_\psi < \infty$ with probability 1 under any hypothesis H_j , for ψ defined in (3.2). Let us denote $\Theta_1 = \{\theta_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, $\Theta_2 = \{\vartheta_i : 1 \leq i \leq K\}$ (may coincide).

Proposition 3.1. Let us suppose that $\vartheta \in \Theta_2$ is such that $f_\vartheta^n / f_\theta^n \rightarrow 0$ in P_ϑ -probability, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all $\theta \neq \vartheta$ in $\Theta_1 \cup \Theta_2$. Then $P_\vartheta(\tau_\psi < \infty) = 1$.

Proof. Let us suppose that the conditions of Proposition 3.1 hold. Let $\vartheta = \vartheta_i \in \Theta_2$. If $\vartheta_j \in \Theta_1$, let l be such that $\theta_l = \vartheta_j$, otherwise let $l = 1$. Then

$$P_{\vartheta_j}(\tau_\psi > n) \leq P_{\vartheta_j}\left(\sum_{i:i \neq l} \lambda_{il} f_{\theta_i}^n > \sum_{i=1}^K \gamma_i f_{\vartheta_i}^n\right) = P_{\vartheta_j}\left(\sum_{i:i \neq l} \lambda_{il} \frac{f_{\theta_i}^n}{f_{\vartheta_j}^n} - \sum_{\vartheta_i \neq \vartheta_j} \gamma_i \frac{f_{\vartheta_i}^n}{f_{\vartheta_j}^n} > \gamma_j\right). \quad (3.10)$$

It follows from the condition of Proposition 3.1 that the sums under the probability sign on the right-hand side of (3.10) tend to 0 in P_{ϑ_j} -probability, which implies that $P_{\vartheta_j}(\tau_\psi > n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so $P_{\vartheta_j}(\tau_\psi = \infty) = 0$, that is, $P_{\vartheta_j}(\tau_\psi < \infty) = 1$. \square

In the case of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) observations the conditions of Proposition 3.1 are satisfied when the distributions of X for any pair of distinct $\theta \in \Theta_1 \cup \Theta_2$ are distinct. Indeed, in this case for any positive ϵ

$$P_\vartheta(f_\theta^n/f_\vartheta^n > \epsilon) \leq E_\vartheta \left(\frac{f_\theta^n}{f_\vartheta^n} \right)^{1/2} \epsilon^{-1/2} = \left(\int (f_\theta f_\vartheta)^{1/2} d\mu \right)^n \epsilon^{-1/2} = (r_{\theta\vartheta})^n \epsilon^{-1/2}, \quad (3.11)$$

where $r_{\theta\vartheta} = \int (f_\theta f_\vartheta)^{1/2} d\mu < 1$, given that $\mu(f_\theta \neq f_\vartheta) > 0$. Thus, the right-hand side of (3.11) tends to 0, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, it follows from (3.11) that τ_ψ is exponentially bounded under these conditions, namely, that $P_\vartheta(\tau_\psi > n) \leq cr_\vartheta^n$ with some c for all $n \geq 1$, where $r_\vartheta = \max_{\theta:\theta \neq \vartheta} r_{\theta\vartheta} < 1$. Because of this,

$$E_\vartheta \tau_\psi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_\vartheta(\tau_\psi \geq n) \leq 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} cr_\vartheta^{n-1} = 1 + cr_\vartheta/(1 - r_\vartheta) < \infty$$

For Markov-dependent observations, Schmitz and Süselbeck (1983) showed that some SPRTs for testing two simple hypotheses are not closed (in the sense their stopping times are infinite with positive probability). Naturally, the conditions of Proposition 3.1 can not be satisfied in this case. On the other hand, there are non-trivial examples of SPRTs which are closed, despite that the conditions of Proposition 3.1 do not hold, so the conditions of Proposition 3.1 are not necessary for being the test (3.2) – (3.3) closed.

Even when no general conditions exist which guarantee that stopping time (3.2) is finite (like those of Proposition 3.1), there is still a way to use the DBC variant of the optimal test just truncating the stopping time at some reasonable (and/or convenient, and/or required) level, i. e. using as the stopping time $\min\{N, \tau_\psi\}$ where ψ is defined by (3.2) and N is a finite horizon. The decision rule does not need to change in any way (i. e. (3.3) may be used).

In this way, the proposed DBC-tests are quite universal: they can be used for testing any number of hypotheses for independent or dependent observations, on the infinite or finite horizon.

3.3. Computational aspects

The use of the method of Lagrange in Section 2 requires the determination of the multipliers λ_{ij} in such a way that the test minimizing (2.3) complies with the restrictions (2.1). Because the (probably most) essential element governing the optimal behaviour has been dropped, we can not expect the DBC version would (even approximately) be optimal, for these given λ_{ij} . Nevertheless, keeping in mind that the rules of the DBC-test still bear inside the multipliers λ_{ij} , we can try to use them as was initially intended: to vary λ_{ij} trying to make the error probabilities satisfy the restrictions. Just instead of the optimal test we now have the DCB-version to be manipulated in this way. There is no theoretical reason by which the resulting tests could have any attractive properties, but it may be encouraging that, in the case of two hypotheses, the resulting DCB-tests provide highly efficient tests (see Section 3.1). More precisely, making the modification to the optimal Bayesian test, we obtain an SPRT, subject to the needed error probabilities, which is *optimal* under these conditions (Wald and Wolfowitz, 1948). And doing the same with the modified Kiefer-Weiss solution one obtains the Lorden's 2-SPRT, which has a very high efficiency (exceeding 99%) with respect to the *optimal* Kiefer-Weiss solution (see Lorden, 1976). The examples we present in Section 4 provide more situations where DBC-tests are also highly efficient.

As described above, to apply the proposed DBC-tests in the practice we need a routine for the numerical evaluation of their characteristics (like error probabilities, expected sample size, etc.) for any set of parameters $\lambda_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq k, i \neq j$, and $\gamma_i, \vartheta_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$. The algorithms developed in Novikov (2023a), for the particular case of binomial model, enable all the needed computations both for the optimal and for the DBC version of multihypothesis tests. For other statistical models, the numerical evaluation

of the optimal tests requires developing algorithms implementing backward recursion (like those for two hypotheses in Novikov and Farkhshatov (2022); Novikov, Novikov, and Farkhshatov (2023)). In contrast, the implementation of the proposed DBC-tests appears to be rather straightforward, at least while Monte Carlo simulations can be used for the approximate evaluation of statistical characteristics of the tests. The DBC-tests themselves normally will not cause computational complications in this sense, as seen from (3.2) – (3.3).

For independent observations, Liu, Gao, and Li (2016) proposed computational algorithms for evaluating the characteristics of SPRTs and multi-hypothesis matrix sequential probability tests (MSPRT) by Armitage (1950). It is likely that the algorithms of Liu, Gao, and Li (2016) can be extended to some classes of the DBC-tests.

4. Computations and simulations results

In this Section, we want to see numerical results related to applications of the proposed test (3.2) – (3.3). We use the program code in Novikov (2023a) for binary data models in this section. The basic algorithms are described in Novikov (2023b), the function `DBCtest` for designing the DBC-test (3.2) – (3.3) is newly added to the repository.

Example 1

First of all, let us revisit the example in Novikov (2023b) to numerically compare the performance of the proposed test with that of the optimal (Bayesian) sequential multi-hypothesis test.

We refer to the case of testing three hypotheses $H_1 : \theta = 0.3$, $H_2 : \theta = 0.4$ and $H_3 : \theta = 0.5$ about the success probability θ of a Bernoulli distribution.

In this case, all the evaluations of the performance characteristics can be made using the algorithms developed in Novikov (2023b) and are carried out with double computer precision.

For a series of nominal error probabilities $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha$, where α is any one of the numbers 0.1, 0.05, 0.025, 0.01, 0.005, 0.002, 0.001, 0.0005, we found the optimal multi-hypothesis tests which fit best (up to approx. 0.002 of the relative distance) the nominal value of α . As a criterion of optimization we used the Bayesian criterion (2.4) with the uniform weights ($\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = 1/3$). The optimization was conducted over λ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$. The gradient-free general-purpose optimization method by Nelder and Mead (1965) was used for finding the best fit, with respect to the relative distance

$$\max_i \{ |\alpha_i(\psi, \phi) - \alpha_i| / \alpha_i \}. \quad (4.1)$$

The same fitting procedure was then carried out for our DBC-test, with the same vector of γ weights, but over its own multipliers $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_i$ for $j \neq i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ (see (3.2) – (3.3)). The truncation level of $N = 3000$ was used for all the evaluations.

The fitted results are shown in Table 1. The efficiency is defined as the ratio between the minimum ESS calculated for Bayesian and for DBC-test. In each column, the values of the weighted ESS (2.1) are presented (with $\vartheta_i = \theta_i$), both for the optimal test (first row) and for its DBC variant (second row). We observe a very high efficiency of the DBC-test (over 99.3%) with a clear tendency of increasing for small values of α .

Yet another series of numerical experiments was carried out, in the same model but in a slightly more applied context. Let us imagine that a clinical trial of a cancer treatment is on the run where the proportion of “regressions” is observed, after the treatment has been applied. The hypotheses are $H_1 : \theta = 0.1$ (low proportion of regressions), $H_2 : \theta = 0.3$ (moderate proportion of regressions) and $H_3 : \theta = 0.5$ (very high proportion). As usual in sequential clinical trials, there is an ethical issue in this case: if the treatment is turning out to be non-efficient, it should be terminated as soon as possible. This may be controlled by

α	0.1	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005	0.002	0.001	0.0005
Bayes	121.79	168.73	211.73	264.46	302.10	350.40	386.22	421.68
DBC	122.63	169.58	212.46	264.99	302.69	350.96	386.81	422.18
Efficiency (%)	99.32	99.50	99.65	99.80	99.81	99.84	99.85	99.88

Table 1. Efficiency data for $\theta_1 = 0.3, \theta_2 = 0.4, \theta_3 = 0.5, \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = 1/3$

α	0.1	0.05	0.01	0.001
Bayes	22.93	33.35	54.42	81.37
DBC	23.49 (97.62%)	33.59 (99.30%)	54.49 (99.87%)	81.48 (99.87%)
MSPRT	27.04 (84.80%)	38.02 (87.72%)	58.82 (92.52%)	85.74 (94.90%)

Table 2. Efficiency data for $\theta_1 = 0.1, \theta_2 = 0.3, \theta_3 = 0.5, \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.1, \gamma_3 = 0.8$

assigning a higher weight to the expected sample size corresponding to the no-efficiency hypothesis H_3 : let $\gamma_3 = 0.8$ while $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.1$. This will make the expected sample size under H_3 smaller in comparison with H_1 and H_2 .

The results of the evaluations are presented in Table 2. The efficiency is defined as the ratio between the minimum ESS calculated for Bayesian and for DBC-test, and respectively between the Bayesian test and the MSPRT. The efficiency of the DBC-test is still very high, while the efficiency of the MSPRT is notably lower.

Example II

Let us consider a case of group sequential testing for normal observations. Let $Y_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ be samples from a normal $N(m, 1)$ distribution being extracted in a group sequential setting (starting from one sample and sequentially taking up to a maximum number of M samples. Let us suppose each sample consists of the same number n of observations. This is a typical model for group sequential hypothesis testing in clinical trials (see, for example Eales and Jennison, 1992). The hypotheses of interest are $H_1 : m = -\delta$ vs. $H_2 : m = \delta, \delta = 0.1$. The problem is to find a sequential plan with error probabilities of the first and second type equal to $\alpha = \beta$ minimizing a weighted expected number of observations (according to criteria F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, F_5 in Eales and Jennison (1992)). We choose F_4 as a criterion of minimization for our numerical example, just because no evaluation data for this is shown in Eales and Jennison (1992). In terms of our setting in Section 2, we have $\theta_1 = -\delta, \theta_2 = \delta, k = 2, K = 9, \vartheta_i = \delta(i - 5)/2, i = 1, \dots, 9$, and $\gamma_i = 0.1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and for $i = 6, 7, 8, 9$, and $\gamma_5 = 0.2$ (see the Bayesian setup for F_4 in Eales and Jennison, 1992, p.15). We take a group sequential setting with $M = 10$ groups and $n = 40$ observations per group. We can use for the evaluation of the optimal group sequential test, with a slight adaptation, the program in Novikov, Novikov, and Farkhshatov (2023), applying the Nelder-Mead optimization (over $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$) in order to fit the error probabilities to $\alpha = \beta = 0.05$. The weighted ESS found for the optimal test is 149.0.

For DBC version we do not need the program part of test evaluation, and only use the program for computation of the error probabilities and expected sample size. Running the Nelder-Mead optimization over $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ again, we find a DBC-test providing the best fit to $\alpha = \beta = 0.05$. The weighted ESS found for this is 149.75. So the efficiency, with respect to the optimal test, reached by the DBC-test is approx. 99.5.

Taking into account that the fixed sample size (FSS) for $\alpha = \beta = 0.05$ and $\delta = 0.1$ is 270.55, and the maximum sample size is 400, we are situated at $t = 400/270.55 = 1.48$ in the terms of Table 1 in Eales and Jennison (1992) while the calculated value of $F_4/FSS = 149/270.55 = 0.55$, i.e. practically as

low as the respective ratio for criterion F_2 (which is equal to 0.544 for $t = 1.5$, according to Table 1 in Eales and Jennison (1992)).

It seems that there is a good reason not to include the data for F_4 in Table 1, being those as close as this to F_2 .

Example III

Now, let us apply our results to the case of testing a simple hypothesis vs. a two-sided alternative.

Billard (1977) proposed a computer-oriented method of construction of “partial sequential tests” for testing a simple hypothesis vs. a two-sided alternative in the Bernoulli model. In this example we want to show how our multi-hypothesis tests can be used for construction of two-sided tests in the case of two hypotheses and to compare their efficiency with respect to the Billard’s partial sequential test.

The hypotheses of interest, about the success probability θ in a Bernoulli scheme, are $H'_0 : \theta = 0.5$ vs.

$H'_1 : \theta = 0.2$ or $\theta = 0.8$. The desired error probabilities α and β are equal to 0.05.

Let us consider an auxiliary problem of testing $H_1 : \theta = \theta_1 = 0.2$, $H_2 : \theta = \theta_2 = 0.5$ and

$H_3 : \theta = \theta_3 = 0.8$. Let us suppose there is a (non-randomized) test $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{21}(\psi, \phi) + \alpha_{23}(\psi, \phi) &\leq \alpha, \\ \alpha_{12}(\psi, \phi) + \alpha_{13}(\psi, \phi) &\leq \beta, \\ \alpha_{32}(\psi, \phi) + \alpha_{31}(\psi, \phi) &\leq \beta.\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

Then let us define a test $\langle \psi', \phi' \rangle$ for testing H'_0 vs. H'_1 in the following way: let $\psi'_n \equiv \psi_n$, and $\phi'_n = 1$ (rejecting H'_0) when either $\phi_n^1 = 1$ or $\phi_n^3 = 1$, being $\phi'_n = 0$ otherwise (accepting H'_0), for all natural n . Then $\alpha(\psi', \phi') \leq \alpha$ and $\beta(\psi', \phi') \leq \beta$.

Thus, to find a two-sided test for testing H'_0 vs. H'_1 it suffices to find a test for three hypotheses, H_1 , H_2 and H_3 , minimizing the Lagrangian function corresponding to (4.2):

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{21}(\alpha_{21}(\psi, \phi) + \alpha_{23}(\psi, \phi)) + \lambda_{12}(\alpha_{12}(\psi, \phi) + \alpha_{13}(\psi, \phi)) \\ + \lambda_{32}(\alpha_{32}(\psi, \phi) + \alpha_{31}(\psi, \phi)) + C_{\gamma, \theta}(\psi),\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

with an appropriate choice of λ_{21} , λ_{12} , λ_{32} and any convenient γ .

We used the algorithms developed in Novikov (2023b) to numerically find a test minimizing (4.3) with α and β as close as possible to 0.05, using the Nelder-Mead optimization. $\gamma_1 = \gamma_3 = 0.25$ and $\gamma_2 = 0.5$ were used for all numerical evaluations in this example. The results of the evaluations are reported in Table 3 in the “Optimal” column: OC stands for the operating characteristic and ESS for the expected sample size. Another evaluation was made, under the same scheme, with our DBC-test (3.2) – (3.3). The results are reported in Table 3 in the “DBC” column. The performance results for both evaluations are close to each other, with slightly lower ESS values but larger error probabilities in the DBC part.

For comparison, the results of Monte Carlo simulations for the “partial sequential” test from Billard (1977) are also placed in Table 3. The ESS levels for this test notably exceed those of the two other tests, but this can be explained, at least in part, by lower levels of error probabilities this latter test demonstrated. It is remarkable that “theoretical” values for the OC of Billard’s test are quite close to those our “optimal” test really has, while our ‘optimal’ test shows even better NSS levels than the Billard’s optimal test theoretically designed for (see Table 1 in Billard (1977)).

The overall conclusion is that the DBC version performs nearly as well as the optimal test does.

Example IV

Now, let us examine a case when the observations are independent but have a trend in the mean.

θ	Optimal		DBC		Partial sequential	
	OC	ESS	OC	ESS	OC	ESS
0.50	0.950	18.44	0.944	17.64	0.974	20.12
0.55	0.921	19.42	0.914	18.41	0.943	21.26
0.60	0.816	21.93	0.813	20.39	0.847	25.21
0.65	0.615	24.36	0.622	22.34	0.640	29.55
0.70	0.361	24.31	0.378	22.42	0.355	29.34
0.75	0.157	21.33	0.172	20.06	0.168	25.54
0.80	0.050	17.36	0.056	16.57	0.038	20.54
0.85	0.011	13.90	0.012	13.38	0.010	16.69
0.90	0.001	11.31	0.001	10.99	0.000	14.27

Table 3. Performance comparison of two-sided tests (the data for the partial sequential test are due to Monte Carlo simulations in Billard (1977))

We refer to the example seen in Liu, Gao, and Li (2016) (Case 6). It is supposed that the observations $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ follow the normal distribution with mean $E_\theta X_n = \theta n$ and variance 1, where θ is an unknown parameter.

The hypotheses of interest are $H_1 : \theta = 0$, $H_2 : \theta = -0.2$ and $H_3 : \theta = 0.1$. In Liu, Gao, and Li (2016), various characteristics of the MSPRT with the thresholds $\log(A_{ij}) = 4.6$ are evaluated. We reproduce here the matrix of calculated error probabilities

$$\begin{bmatrix} \times & 3.6 \cdot 10^{-3} & 4.4 \cdot 10^{-3} \\ 6.5 \cdot 10^{-4} & \times & 1.1 \cdot 10^{-11} \\ 4.0 \cdot 10^{-3} & 2.2 \cdot 10^{-5} & \times \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.4)$$

(each row is calculated assuming that the respective H_i is true, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and the column number j contains the probability to accept the respective H_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$. We had to re-arrange some items because the data corresponding to H_1 and H_2 in the original matrix in Liu, Gao, and Li (2016) are interchanged for some reason),

The simulations of our test (3.2) – (3.3) were carried out with $\lambda_1 = 35$, $\lambda_2 = 18$, $\lambda_3 = 33$, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = 1/3$ and 10^6 replications and gave the following matrix of error probabilities:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \times & 3.4 \cdot 10^{-3} & 4.2 \cdot 10^{-3} \\ 6.7 \cdot 10^{-4} & \times & 0.0 \\ 4.0 \cdot 10^{-3} & 2.6 \cdot 10^{-5} & \times \end{bmatrix}$$

with the corresponding standard errors:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \times & 5.8 \cdot 10^{-5} & 6.5 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 2.7 \cdot 10^{-5} & \times & 0.0 \\ 6.3 \cdot 10^{-5} & 4.0 \cdot 10^{-6} & \times \end{bmatrix}$$

The results of evaluation of the ESS are shown in Table 4. Surprisingly, the two distinct suboptimal tests have almost identical sets of performance characteristics.

Example V

In this example we want to revisit the case of the numerical solution of the Kiefer-Weiss problem for three hypotheses presented in Novikov (2023b), Section 4.3.

θ	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.05	0.1
MSPRT	8.91 (.0018)	13.51 (.0036)	14.34 (.0025)	19.69 (.0057)	14.02 (.0028)
DBC	8.94 (.0018)	13.35 (.0033)	14.36 (.0025)	19.75 (.0057)	14.06 (.0028)

Table 4. The expected sample size for the MSPRT and the DBC version of the Bayes tests. The numbers in parentheses are the estimated standard errors of the respective means.

The method proposed in Novikov (2023b) is based on the following multi-hypothesis generalization of the modified Kiefer-Weiss problem. We find $\vartheta_i \in (\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, $\gamma_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \gamma_i = 1$, and a test $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ that minimizes $C_{\gamma, \vartheta}(\psi) + \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \alpha_i(\psi, \phi)$, such that $E_{\vartheta_i} \tau_\psi = \sup_{\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_k)} E_\theta \tau_\psi$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Then for any test with error probabilities not exceeding $\alpha_i(\psi, \phi)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, its maximum ESS is greater than or equal to $\sup_{\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_k)} E_\theta \tau_\psi$. This means, $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ solves the Kiefer-Weiss problem for k hypotheses.

In this way in Novikov (2023b), a numerical solution to the Kiefer-Weiss problem was found in a particular case of three hypotheses $\theta_1 = 0.3$, $\theta_2 = 0.5$ and $\theta_3 = 0.7$ about the success probability in the Bernoulli model, with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_3 = 0.037$ and $\alpha_2 = 0.07$. The maximum of the ESS is achieved at $\vartheta_1 = 0.4026$ and at $\vartheta_2 = 0.5974$ and is equal to 56.2. To verify these results one can use the program code in Novikov (2023a) taking $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 200$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.5$.

In the algorithm above, the optimal test (the one that minimizes the Lagrangian function) plays the key role. The question arises, whether its simplified DBC-version can provide a reasonably good approximation to the Kiefer-Weiss solution. Let us try this out, just substituting the DBC-version for the optimal test in the algorithm above. In the same numerical routine as in Novikov (2023b) we find a DBC-test which achieves its maximum ESS at two symmetrical points $\vartheta_1 = 1 - \vartheta_2$, providing the best fit to the error probabilities of the Kiefer-Weiss solution (using the Nelder-Mead optimization). The best approximation is obtained with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = 6.582$ and $\lambda_2 = 5.964$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.5$ giving $\alpha_1 = \alpha_3 = 0.0376$ and $\alpha_2 = 0.0706$. It is impossible to obtain a better match to the error probabilities of the optimal test above due to the discrete nature of the probabilities involved. The maximum value of the ESS is 56.01 and is achieved at $\vartheta_1 = 1 - \vartheta_2 = 0.4026$. This result may seem paradoxical because the value achieved by a suboptimal test is smaller than that of the (optimal) Kiefer-Weiss solution of 56.2 mentioned above, but in fact it is not, because this latter test does not strictly comply with the error probabilities of the former.

Anyway, the simplified variant of the optimal test provides an excellent approximate solution to the Kiefer-Weiss problem, very much like Lorden's 2-SPRT does in the case of two hypotheses (Lorden, 1976) It is worth noting that the DBC-test evaluations are far much faster than the backward recursion in the optimal test, so the DCB version may be recommended for the approximation to the Kiefer-Weiss solution, especially when the number of hypotheses is large.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a new class of sequential multi-hypothesis tests which are not based on the backward induction nor on any type of recursion. It is applicable whenever a computable expression for the joint density functions is available at any stage of the experiment. Numerical comparisons are made with the optimal (Bayes) and the MSPRT by Armitage, in a particular case of sampling from a Bernoulli population. Analogous comparison is made with the optimal (minimizing a weighted expected sample size, see Eales and Jennison, 1992) group sequential test for normal mean. A new construction of two-sided sequential test for two hypotheses is proposed and a numerical comparison is carried out with the "partial sequential" test by Billard (1977), in the Bernoulli model. A Monte Carlo study of the performance of the proposed test is conducted in a case of independent observations with a linear trend in the mean. A

numerical comparison with the MSPRT is made. An application to the multi-hypothesis Kiefer-Weiss problem is proposed which generalizes the Lorden's 2-SPRT. A numerical comparison of its performance with that of the Kiefer-Weiss solution is carried out. In all the cases, a very good performance of the proposed test is observed.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the Associate Editor and the anonymous Reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions on improvement of an earlier version of the paper.

The author gratefully acknowledges a partial support of the National Researchers System (SNI) by CONACyT (Mexico) for this work.

REFERENCES

- Armitage, P. 1950. "Sequential analysis with more than two alternative hypotheses, and its relation to discriminant function analysis." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 12: 137–144.
- Baum, C. W., and V. V. Veeravalli. 1994. "A Sequential Procedure for Multihypothesis Testing ." *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 40 (6): 1994–2007.
- Billard, L. 1977. "Optimum Partial Sequential Tests for Two-Sided Tests of the Binomial Parameter." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 72 (357): 197–201.
- Blackwell, D., and M. A. Girshick. 1954. *Theory of Games and Statistical Decisions*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Chen, K. 2000. *The Annals of Statistics* 1452–1471. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2674102>.
- Chow, Y.S, H. Robbins, and S. Siegmund. 1971. *Great Expectations: The Theory of Optimal Stopping*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Eales, J. D., and C. Jennison. 1992. "An improved method for deriving optimal one-sided group sequential tests." *Biometrika* 79 (1): 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/79.1.13>.
- Jennison, C., and B. W. Turnbull. 1999. *Group Sequential Methods with Applications to Clinical Trials*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Kiefer, J., and L. Weiss. 1957. "Some Properties of Generalized Sequential Probability Ratio Tests." *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 28: 57–75.
- Lai, T. L. 1973. "Optimal Stopping and Sequential Tests which Minimize the Maximum Expected Sample Size." *The Annals of Statistics* 1 (4): 659–673.
- Liu, Y., Y. Gao, and X. Rong Li. 2016. "Operating Characteristic and Average Sample Number of Binary and Multi-Hypothesis Sequential Probability Ratio Test." *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 64 (12): 3167–3179.
- Lorden, G. 1976. "2-SPRT's and the Modified Kiefer-Weiss Problem of Minimizing an Expected Sample Size." *The Annals of Statistics* 4 (2): 281 – 291.
- Nelder, J. A., and T. Mead. 1965. "A Simplex Method for Function Minimization." *Computer Journal* 7 (4): 308–313.

- Novikov, A. 2009. “Optimal Sequential Multiple Hypothesis Tests.” *Kybernetika* 45 (2): 309–330.
- Novikov, A. 2023a. “An R Project for Construction and Performance Evaluation of Sequential Multi-Hypothesis Tests.” <https://github.com/HOBuKOB-MEX/multihypothesis>. Accessed on 2024-02-25.
- Novikov, A. 2023b. “A Numerical Approach to Sequential Multi-Hypothesis Testing for Bernoulli Model.” *Sequential Analysis* 42 (03): 303–322.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07474946.2023.2215825>.
- Novikov, A., and F. Farkhshatov. 2022. “Design and Performance Evaluation in Kiefer-Weiss Problems when Sampling from Discrete Exponential Families.” *Sequential Analysis* 41 (04): 417 – 434.
- Novikov, A., A. Novikov, and F. Farkhshatov. 2023. “Numerical solution of Kiefer-Weiss problems when sampling from continuous exponential families.” *Sequential Analysis* 42 (2): 189–209.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07474946.2023.2193602>.
- Schmitz, N. 1993. *Optimal Sequentially Planned Decision Procedures*. Lecture Notes in Statistics 79. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Schmitz, N., and B. Süselbeck. 1983. “Sequential Probability Ratio Tests for Homogeneous Markov Chains.” In *Mathematical Learning Models – Theory and Algorithms*, edited by U. Herkenrath, D. Kalin, W. Vogel, Vol. 20 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*, New York, 191 – 202. Springer.
- Shiryayev, A. N. 2008. *Optimal stopping rules*. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, 8. Berlin: Springer.
- Silva, I. R., M. Kulldorff, and W. K. Yih. 2020. “Optimal Alpha Spending for Sequential Analysis with Binomial Data.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 82 (4): 1141–1164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12379>.
- Tartakovsky, A. G., I. V. Nikiforov, and M. Basseville. 2015. *Sequential analysis: hypothesis testing and changepoint detection*. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
- Wald, A. 1945. “Sequential Tests of Statistical Hypotheses.” *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 16 (2): 117–186.
- Wald, A., and J. Wolfowitz. 1948. “Optimum character of the sequential probability ratio test.” *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 19 (3): 326–339.
- Weiss, L. 1962. “On sequential tests which minimize the maximum expected sample size.” *Journal of American Statistical Association* 57: 551–566.