

# Robust approach for comparing two dependent normal populations through Wald-type tests based on Rényi's pseudodistance estimators

María Jaenada<sup>a</sup>, Elena Castilla<sup>b</sup>, Nirian Martín<sup>c,\*</sup> and Leandro Pardo<sup>a</sup>

September 27, 2022

## Abstract

Since the two seminal papers by Fisher (1915, 1921) were published, the test under a fixed value correlation coefficient null hypothesis for the bivariate normal distribution constitutes an important statistical problem. In the framework of asymptotic robust statistics, it remains being a topic of great interest to be investigated. For this and other tests, focused on paired correlated normal random samples, Rényi's pseudodistance estimators are proposed, their asymptotic distribution is established and an iterative algorithm is provided for their computation. From them the Wald-type test statistics are constructed for different problems of interest and their influence function is theoretically studied. For testing null correlation in different contexts, an extensive simulation study and two real data based examples support the robust properties of our proposal.

## 1 Introduction

In parametric estimation the role of divergence measures is very intuitive: minimizing a suitable divergence measure between the data and the assumed model in order to estimate the unknown parameters. These estimators are called “minimum divergence estimators” (MDEs). There is a growing body of literature that recognizes the importance of MDEs on the basis of their robustness, without a significant loss of efficiency, in comparison with the maximum likelihood

---

<sup>a</sup>, Dep. of Statistics and Operations Research, Complutense University of Madrid; <sup>b</sup>, Dep. of Applied Mathematics, Materials Science and Engineering, and Electronic Technology, Rey Juan Carlos University; <sup>c</sup>, Dep. of Financial and Actuarial Economics & Statistics, Complutense University of Madrid; \*, Corresponding author: Nirian Martín, nirian@estad.ucm.es.

estimator (MLE). [5] showed that the minimum Hellinger distance estimator that minimizes Hellinger distance between the modelled parametric density and its non-parametric estimator is robust against small perturbation in the underlying model. Other interesting results in relation to the MDEs can be seen in [36], [34, 35], [23], [27], [4], [7] and references therein.

In the case of continuous models, it is convenient to consider families of divergence measures for which non-parametric estimators of the unknown density function are needed. For instance, the theory developed by the cited paper of Beran needs a non-parametric estimator of the unknown density function. From this perspective, the density power divergence (DPD) family, leading to the minimum density power divergence estimators (MDPDEs), is a good example. For more details see [4]. However, there is another important family of divergence measures which neither needs non-parametric estimators, the Rényi's pseudodistances (RPDs). This family of pseudodistances will be considered in this paper.

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be a random sample of size  $n$  from a population  $X$ , having true and unknown density function  $g$ , modelled by a parametric family of densities  $f_{\theta}$  with  $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ . The RPD between the densities  $f_{\theta}$  and  $g$  is given, for a tuning parameter  $\alpha > 0$ , by

$$R_{\alpha}(f_{\theta}, g) = \frac{1}{\alpha + 1} \log \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_{\theta}^{\alpha+1}(x) dx + \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha + 1)} \log \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g^{\alpha+1}(x) dx - \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_{\theta}^{\alpha}(x) g(x) dx. \quad (1)$$

The RPD was considered for the first time in [22]. [15] used the RPD under the name of  $\gamma$ -cross entropy. Due to the resemblance with the Rényi divergence ([32]), [7] named it RPD.

The RPD can be extended for  $\alpha = 0$  taking continuous limits on the left yielding the expression

$$R_{\alpha=0}(f_{\theta}, g) = \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} R_{\alpha}(f_{\theta}, g) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g(x) \log \frac{g(x)}{f_{\theta}(x)} dx,$$

i.e., the RPD coincides with the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD) between  $g$  and  $f_{\theta}$ , at  $\alpha = 0$  (see [27]).

[7] established that the RPD is positive for any two densities and for all values of the tuning parameter  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $R_{\alpha}(f_{\theta}, g) \geq 0$  and further  $R_{\alpha}(f_{\theta}, g) = 0$  if and only if  $f_{\theta} = g$ . This property suggests the definition of the minimum RPD estimators (MRPDEs) as the minimizer of the RPD between the assumed distribution and the empirical distribution of the data. Therefore, the MRPDE for the unknown parameter  $\theta$ , based on the random sample  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_{R,\alpha} = \hat{\theta}_{R,\alpha}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , is given, for a tuning parameter  $\alpha > 0$ , by

$$\hat{\theta}_{R,\alpha} = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{\alpha}(\theta) f_{\theta}^{\alpha}(X_i), \quad (2)$$

where the weight is defined as  $w_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \kappa_\alpha^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  with

$$\kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}[f_\boldsymbol{\theta}^\alpha(X)] = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\alpha+1}(x)dx. \quad (3)$$

Note that the value  $\alpha = 0$  was defined as the KLD and hence, the MRPDE coincides with the MLE at  $\alpha = 0$ .

The estimating equations, based on (2), are given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_\alpha(x_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_p, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{0}_p$  is the null column vector of dimension  $p$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\alpha(x_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= f_\boldsymbol{\theta}^\alpha(x_i) (\mathbf{u}_\boldsymbol{\theta}(x_i) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})), \\ \mathbf{u}_\boldsymbol{\theta}(x_i) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \log f_\boldsymbol{\theta}(x_i) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} f_\boldsymbol{\theta}(x_i)}{f_\boldsymbol{\theta}(x_i)}, \\ \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\alpha + 1} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = (c_{\alpha,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \dots, c_{\alpha,p}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is given by (3) and

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{\alpha + 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}[f_\boldsymbol{\theta}^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\boldsymbol{\theta}(X)] = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\alpha+1}(x) \mathbf{u}_\boldsymbol{\theta}(x) dx. \quad (6)$$

The MRPDE is an  $M$ -estimator and thus its asymptotic distribution and influence function (IF) can be obtained based on the asymptotic theory of the  $M$ -estimators. [7] studied the asymptotic properties and robustness of the MRPDEs. In relation with the asymptotic distribution they got

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_p, \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)), \quad (7)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  is the true unknown value of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and

$$\mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{S}_\alpha^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{S}_\alpha^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (8)$$

with

$$\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial \Psi_\alpha^T(X; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right], \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E} [\Psi_\alpha(X; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \Psi_\alpha^T(X; \boldsymbol{\theta})]. \quad (10)$$

The new result given in Section 2 provides a simplified version which is very useful in practice.

At the same time [7] established that the IF of the functional of the MRPDE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}_\alpha$ , is given by  $\mathcal{IF}(x, \mathbf{T}_\alpha, F_\theta) = \mathbf{S}_\alpha^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_\alpha(x, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . In aforementioned paper an application was presented to the multiple regression model (MRM) with random covariates. [37] used RP in order to define new robustness and efficiency measures. In the same vein, [8] introduced Wald-type tests based on the minimum RPD estimators for the MRM and its extension for Generalized Linear models was presented in [21]. Further, [9] studied the MRPDE for the linear regression model in the ultra-high dimensional set-up.

## 2 Simplified version of the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of Rényi's pseudodistance estimators

This is a short but very important section as it establishes for the first time new and short expressions of  $\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , given in (9) and (10), in terms of a scalar  $\kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , a vector  $\mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , and a matrix  $\mathbf{J}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , whose calculation of any distribution is exactly the same as the one developed for MDPDEs, so the complexity of the construction of the theory based on MRPDEs is not higher than the MDPDEs.

**Theorem 1** *The expression of the variance-covariance matrix in the asymptotic distribution, (7), is given by (8) where*

$$\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{J}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{S}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T, \quad (12)$$

with

$$\mathbf{J}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}[f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X)] = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_\theta^{\alpha+1}(x) \mathbf{u}_\theta(x) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(x) dx, \quad (13)$$

and the expressions of  $\kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  were given by (3) and (5) respectively.

**Proof.** See Appendix A. ■

## 3 Minimum Rényi pseudodistance estimators for two dependent populations with normal distribution

In the previous results univariate case was considered, but it is straightforward to extend it for the multivariate set-up. In this paper we are considering the bidimensional normal distribution model, and so in the following the role of  $x$  is replaced by  $(x, y)$  and all the integrals are in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

In addition, we are going to get Wald-type test statistics for testing different composite null hypothesis regarding the model parameters.

Let  $(X, Y)$  be a bidimensional normal model with density function

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_1\sigma_2\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - 2\rho \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (14)$$

$\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$ ,  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $-1 < \rho < 1$ , and we shall denote by

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho)^T \quad (15)$$

the model parameters belonging to the parameter space  $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times (-1, 1)$ .

We are interested, on the basis of a random sample of size  $n$ ,  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ , in obtaining the MRPDE for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , as well as the asymptotic distribution. Further, we aim to develop Wald-type tests, in the bidimensional normal model, based on MRPDE. Some preliminary results from which proofs the reader could find many clues were presented in [25].

**Proposition 2** *For the bidimensional normal model, (14), the vector of score functions is given by*

$$\mathbf{u}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x, y) = (u_{\mu_1}(x, y), u_{\mu_2}(x, y), u_{\sigma_1}(x, y), u_{\sigma_2}(x, y), u_{\rho}(x, y))^T, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\mu_1}(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\sigma_1(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} - \rho \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right], \\ u_{\mu_2}(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\sigma_2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right], \\ u_{\sigma_1}(x, y) &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_1} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 \right], \\ u_{\sigma_2}(x, y) &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right], \\ u_{\rho}(x, y) &= \frac{1}{(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \rho + \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{\rho}{(1-\rho^2)^2} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - 2\rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3** For the bidimensional normal model, (14), the expressions of (6) and (3) are given by

$$\mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (c_\alpha(\mu_1), c_\alpha(\mu_2), c_\alpha(\sigma_1), c_\alpha(\sigma_2), c_\alpha(\rho))^T = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ \mathbf{c}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\mathbf{c}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_2, \quad \mathbf{c}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ \frac{\rho}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sigma_1} \\ -\frac{1}{\sigma_2} \\ \frac{\rho}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$\mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} = \text{diag}\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, 1\}, \quad (18)$$

and

$$\kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\alpha+1)}, \quad (19)$$

with

$$k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2\pi\sigma_1\sigma_2\sqrt{1-\rho^2}. \quad (20)$$

In the following theorem we shall present the expressions of the matrices  $\mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , defined in (12) and (11). But first, it is necessary to provide the following result.

**Proposition 4** For the bidimensional normal model, (14), we have the following results concerning with the integrals of the cross product for the score functions

$$\mathbf{J}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \\ \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} & \mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\mathbf{J}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\alpha+1)^2} \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{J}_1(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1}, \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_1(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\rho \\ -\rho & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1},$$

$$\mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) + 2 & \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) & -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) \\ \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) & \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) + 2 & -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) \\ -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) & -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) & \frac{\rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) + 1}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$\mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} = \text{diag}\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}, \quad (22)$$

$\mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}$  is given by (18) and  $k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  by (20).

**Theorem 5** For the bidimensional normal model, (14), we have the following results concerning with the expectations of the estimating equations

$$\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \\ \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} & \mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$\mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{J}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1},$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \begin{pmatrix} 2-\rho^2 & -\rho^2 & -\rho \\ -\rho^2 & 2-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ -\rho & -\rho & \frac{1+\rho^2}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

On the other hand

$$\mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \\ \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} & \mathbf{K}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{J}_{1,2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \\ \mathbf{K}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{k^{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})(2\alpha+1)^3(\alpha+1)^2} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\mathbf{K}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) = (\alpha+1)^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\rho) + \alpha^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho), \quad (24)$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1-\rho^2 & 1-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ 1-\rho^2 & 1-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ -\rho & -\rho & \frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

For both,  $\mathbf{J}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is given by (21),  $\mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}$  by (18) and  $k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  by (20).

**Proof.** See Appendix B. ■

Inverting the diagonal blocks of  $\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , we obtain

$$\mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\alpha+1)^2 \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} \mathbf{J}_1^{-1}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\mathbf{J}_1^{-1}(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\alpha+1)^3 \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} \mathbf{S}_{2,1}^{-1}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}_{2,1}^{-1}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho^2 & \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \rho^2 & 1 & \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \rho(1-\rho^2) & \rho(1-\rho^2) & 2(1-\rho^2)^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

Therefore, (8) is given by

$$\mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \\ \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} & \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

where

$$\mathbf{V}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{K}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{(\alpha+1)^4}{(2\alpha+1)^2} \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} \mathbf{J}_1^{-1}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{K}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{(\alpha+1)^4}{(2\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}, \quad (31)$$

with

$$\mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) = \mathbf{S}_{2,1}^{-1}(\rho) \mathbf{K}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) \mathbf{S}_{2,1}^{-1}(\rho) = (\alpha+1)^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,1}^{-1}(\rho) + \alpha^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,1}^{-1}(\rho) \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho) \mathbf{S}_{2,1}^{-1}(\rho). \quad (32)$$

Based on the previous results we have the following Theorem.

**Theorem 6** *For the bidimensional normal model, (14), the MRPDE for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ ,*

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} = (\widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha}, \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha}, \widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}, \widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}, \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})^T, \quad (33)$$

is obtained as a solution of

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} (\mathbf{u}_\boldsymbol{\theta}(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = \mathbf{0}_5,$$

with

$$w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \left( \frac{X_i - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{Y_i - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - 2\rho \frac{X_i - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{Y_i - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right] \right\}, \quad (34)$$

$\mathbf{u}_\boldsymbol{\theta}(X_i, Y_i)$  is given in Proposition 2 and  $\mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  in Proposition 3. The corresponding asymptotic distribution is

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_p, \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)), \quad (35)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  is the true unknown value of (15) and  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  was given in (29).



The following algorithm is useful for computing the MRPDE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  given in Theorem 6. It works iteratively for a sequence of increasing values of the tuning parameter,  $\alpha \in \{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^K$  with  $\alpha_k = \frac{k}{K}$ , having a very simple iterative scheme and converging rapidly to the final optimal value. As the MLEs have an explicit expression, the tuning parameter  $\alpha_0 = 0$  initializes the iterations. Herein the following parameter transformation is considered

$$\boldsymbol{\vartheta} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \zeta_1^2, \zeta_2^2, \rho)^T \quad \text{where} \quad \sigma_j^2 = (\alpha + 1)\zeta_j^2, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

The strength of the algorithm is its simplicity for estimating in a chained way and with the semi-explicit expressions given in the inner iterations, with expression which mimics the MLEs as weighted version (see the corresponding proof given in Appendix D). The updating recursive elements comprise only of the weights, as the name Iteratively Reweighted Moments Algorithm suggests. The semi-explicit expressions given in the inner iterations of Algorithm 1 are particular cases of (6) and (7) of [38] with  $N$  equals 2. However, our proposed algorithm is different from the one proposed in the Monte-Carlo simulations of Toma and Leoni-Aubin (2015) in two features. First, their algorithm does not consider outer iterations as the estimation is initialized always with the MLE and second, they do not consider the reparameterization of the variance-covariance matrix. Both are crucial features, first one to save iterations when a grid of the tuning parameter is considered, taking into account the smoothness of the objective function. The second one justifies our proposed Iteratively Reweighted Moments Algorithm to be an EM algorithm. It is well-known that some M-estimators are obtained from estimating equations associated to scale mixture of normal distributions, and their corresponding iterative reweighted algorithm is an EM algorithm. Under weak conditions, each step of IRLS increases the objective function and the solution of the iterative reweighted algorithm converges to a local maximum of the likelihood function. The minimum pseudodistance distance estimators for bivariate normal populations falls within this class of M-estimators. From Algorithm 1 and taking into account the Bayesian interpretation of the EM algorithm (see for example Section 12.2 in [24]), we obtain the following way of understanding the weights update or the E step. Let us consider the sample  $(X_i^{(k)}, Y_i^{(k)}, Z_i^{(k)})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , with  $(X_i^{(k)}, Y_i^{(k)})$  being a bivariate normal distribution with parameters  $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_k = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \zeta_{1,k}^2, \zeta_{2,k}^2, \rho)^T$ , where  $\zeta_{j,k}^2 = \frac{1}{\alpha_k + 1}\sigma_j^2$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , and  $Z_i^{(k)}$  being an auxiliary random variable (a latent random variable for the usual EM algorithm with missing data). Assuming that  $Z_i^{(k)}$  is a random variable degenerated at  $\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_k + 1}$  (prior distribution), it holds  $\left( (X_i^{(k)}, Y_i^{(k)}) \mid Z_i^{(k)} = z \right)$  behaves as a bivariate normal distribution with parameters  $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \frac{\zeta_{1,k}^2}{z}, \frac{\zeta_{2,k}^2}{z}, \rho)^T$ , while the weight is the expectation of the posterior distribution (line 13 of Algorithm 1),

$$\widehat{\omega}_{i, \alpha_k} = E \left[ Z_i^{(k)} \mid (X_i^{(k)}, Y_i^{(k)}) \right], \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

The estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_k$  is updated in the M step (line 14 of Algorithm 1). While parameters

$\zeta_{j,k}^2$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , produce a shrinkage effect on the original variance parameters  $\sigma_j^2$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , the estimates associated with small values the weights,  $\widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k}^{(k)}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , produce a down-weighting effect on estimates of  $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_k$  to prevent from high value of the Mahalanobis distance (line 11) for the  $i$ -th observation and  $k$ -th tuning parameter  $\alpha_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .

It is clear that due to the invariance property of the MRPDEs, it holds

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{j,R,\alpha} = \sqrt{\alpha + 1} \widehat{\zeta}_{j,R,\alpha}, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

## 4 Wald-type tests based on Rényi's pseudodistance estimators

Based on the asymptotic distribution of the MRPDE for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ ,  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}$ , given in Theorem 6, we present Wald-type tests for testing composite null hypothesis regarding bidimensional normal model parameters.

The restricted parameter space  $\Theta_0 \subset \Theta = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times (-1, 1)$ , is often defined by a set of  $r$  restrictions of the form

$$\mathbf{m}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_r, \quad (36)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is (15) and  $\mathbf{m} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$  (see Serfling 1980). Assume that the  $5 \times r$  matrix

$$\mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{m}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad (37)$$

exists and is continuous in  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , and  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = r$ , where  $r \leq 5$ . Let  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$  be a random sample of size  $n$  from a distribution modelled by the bidimensional normal model probability density function  $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x, y)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ . Our interest is in testing the hypothesis

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0 \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \notin \Theta_0, \quad (38)$$

where  $\Theta_0 = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta : \mathbf{m}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}\}$ .

**Definition 1** Let  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}$  be the MDPDE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . The family of proposed Wald-type test statistics for testing the null hypothesis in (38) is given by

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \mathbf{m}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \left( \mathbf{M}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{M}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \right)^{-1} \mathbf{m}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}), \quad (39)$$

where the matrix  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha$  is as in (29) and the functions  $\mathbf{m}(\cdot)$  and  $\mathbf{M}(\cdot)$  are defined in (36) and (37).

**Theorem 7** The asymptotic null distribution of the proposed Wald-type test statistics given in (39) is chi-square with  $r$  degrees of freedom,  $\chi_r^2$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Iteratively Reweighted Moments Algorithm for MRPDE of  $\vartheta$ 


---

**Input:**  $K, \{\alpha_k = \frac{k}{K}\}_{k=0}^K, \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n, \xi;$

1:  $k \leftarrow 0, r_{k=0} \leftarrow 0$  ▷ Initialization

2:  $\text{vec}\{\widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)}\}_{i=1}^n = \mathbf{1}_n$

3: Compute  $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}, & \widehat{\zeta}_{1,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0}^2 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)})^2}{n}, \\ \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i}{n}, & \widehat{\zeta}_{2,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0}^2 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)})^2}{n}, \\ \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i - \widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)}}{\widehat{\zeta}_{1,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)}} \frac{Y_i - \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)}}{\widehat{\zeta}_{2,R,\alpha_{k=0}=0,(r_{k=0}=0)}}}{n};\end{aligned}$$

4: **while**  $k < K$  **do** ▷ Outer loop starts

5:    $k \leftarrow k + 1, r_k \leftarrow 0$

6:    $\text{vec}\{\widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k=0)}\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{vec}\{\widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_{k-1},r_{k-1}}\}_{i=1}^n$

7:    $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_k,(r_k=0)} = \widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_{k-1},r_{k-1}}$  ▷ Inner loop starts

8:   **repeat**

9:      $\text{vec}\{\widehat{X}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{vec}\left\{\frac{X_i - \widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}{\widehat{\zeta}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}\right\}_{i=1}^n$

10:      $\text{vec}\{\widehat{Y}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{vec}\left\{\frac{Y_i - \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}{\widehat{\zeta}_{2,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}\right\}_{i=1}^n$

11:      $\text{vec}\{d_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}^2\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{vec}\left\{\frac{\widehat{X}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}^2 + \widehat{Y}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}^2 - 2\widehat{\rho}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}\widehat{X}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}\widehat{Y}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}{1 - \widehat{\rho}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}^2}\right\}_{i=1}^n$

12:      $r_k \leftarrow r_k + 1,$

13:      $\text{vec}\{\widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{vec}\{\exp^{-\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_{k-1}}} (\frac{1}{2}d_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k-1)}^2)\}_{i=1}^n$

14:     Compute  $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_k,(r_k)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}t_{\alpha_k,(r_k)} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)}, \\ \widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)} X_i}{t_{\alpha_k,(r_k)}}, & \widehat{\zeta}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}^2 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)} (X_i - \widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)})^2}{t_{\alpha_k,(r_k)}}, \\ \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)} Y_i}{t_{\alpha_k,(r_k)}}, & \widehat{\zeta}_{2,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}^2 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)} (Y_i - \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)})^2}{t_{\alpha_k,(r_k)}}, \\ \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha_k,(r_k)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{i,\alpha_k,(r_k)} \frac{X_i - \widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}{\widehat{\zeta}_{1,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}} \frac{Y_i - \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}{\widehat{\zeta}_{2,R,\alpha_k,(r_k)}}}{t_{\alpha_k,(r_k)}}\end{aligned}$$

15:   **until**  $\|\widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_k,(r_k)} - \widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_k,(r_k-1)}\|_2 < \xi$  ▷ Inner loop ends

16: **end while** ▷ Outer loop ends

**Output:**  $\{\widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_k} = \widehat{\vartheta}_{\alpha_k,(r_k)}\}_{k=0}^K.$

---

**Proof.** See Appendix C. ■

We will reject the null hypothesis in (36) if  $W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) > \chi_{r,\varsigma}^2$ , where  $\chi_{r,\varsigma}^2$  is the upper percentage point of order  $\varsigma$  of the  $\chi_r^2$  distribution. Based on Definition 1 and Theorem 7, the following subsections are devoted to derive a variety hypothesis tests for the bidimensional normal model. The proofs of the stated formulas are given in Appendix F.

**Case 1 (Comparing means of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2, \quad (40)$$

the corresponding Wald-type test statistics based on MRPDEs is

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \frac{(\widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha})^2}{(\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} - \widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha})^2 + 2(1 - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}, \quad (41)$$

and its asymptotic distribution is a chi-squared distribution with one degree of freedom under (40).

In Case 1 a non-standard Behrens–Fisher problem is covered, i.e., a comparison of the means of two populations which may possess not only different variances, but also a non-null correlation. It is of great interest to be aware that formulating the same problem as a paired test constructed taking the difference of both populations,  $V = X - Y$ , as a single population problem for testing  $H_0 : \mu_V = 0$ , with an unknown variance  $\sigma_V^2$ , the same value of the Wald-type test statistics

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}, \widehat{\sigma}_{V,R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2 \widehat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4 \widehat{\sigma}_{V,R,\alpha}^2}$$

is obtained ( $W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}, \widehat{\sigma}_{V,R,\alpha})$ ) from the invariance property of the Rényi's pseudodistance estimators, since  $\mu_V = \mu_1 - \mu_2$ ,  $\sigma_V^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - 2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + 2(1 - \rho)\sigma_1\sigma_2$ .

The most efficient classic procedure to address this problem is the paired  $t$ -test, i.e

$$T_V = \sqrt{n} \frac{\bar{V}_n}{S_{V,n-1}},$$

where

$$\bar{V}_n = \bar{X}_n - \bar{Y}_n,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{V,n-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (V_i - \bar{V}_n)^2 = S_{X,n-1}^2 + S_{Y,n-1}^2 - 2S_{XY,n-1}, \\
S_{X,n-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha=0}^2, \\
S_{Y,n-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y}_n)^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha=0}^2, \\
S_{XY,n-1} &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)(Y_i - \bar{Y}_n) = \frac{n}{n-1} \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0} \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha=0} \hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Its exact distribution is a Student- $t$  with  $n - 1$  degrees of freedom,  $t_{n-1}$ .

**Case 2 (Comparing variances of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \sigma_1 = \sigma_2. \quad (42)$$

the corresponding Wald-type test statistics based on MRPDEs is

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3 (\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} - \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha})^2}{(\alpha + 1)^6 \beta_\alpha(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha})}, \quad (43)$$

where

$$\beta_\alpha(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \right] (\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} - \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha})^2 + (1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2) \hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}. \quad (44)$$

The asymptotic distribution of (43) is a chi-squared distribution with 1 degree of freedom under (42).

**Case 3 (Fixing a value of the for correlation coefficient of two normal populations).**

If we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \rho = \rho_0, \quad (45)$$

the corresponding Wald-type test statistics based on MRPDEs is

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3 (\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} - \rho_0)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^6 (1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2)^2}, \quad (46)$$

and its asymptotic distribution is a chi-squared distribution with 1 degree of freedom under (45).

The classic Wald and Rao test statistics are given by

$$W_{n,\alpha=0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha=0}) = n \frac{(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0} - \rho_0)^2}{(1 - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0}^2)^2},$$

$$R_{n,\alpha=0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha=0}) = n \frac{(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0} - \rho_0)^2}{(1 - \rho_0 \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0})^2},$$

where

$$\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)(Y_i - \bar{Y}_n)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y}_n)^2}} = R_{XY},$$

but

$$W'_{n,\alpha=0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha=0}) = n \frac{(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0} - \rho_0)^2}{(1 - \rho_0^2)^2}$$

converges more rapidly to the chi-square distribution with 1 degree of freedom (see [1]). The extension of  $W'_{n,\alpha=0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha=0})$  to

$$W'_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3 (\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} - \rho_0)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^6 (1 - \rho_0^2)^2}, \quad (47)$$

is directly obtained from the same proof of  $W_{n,\alpha=0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha=0})$ , since in (84)  $\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha=0}$  can be replaced by  $\rho_0$ . In the particular case of fixing  $\rho_0 = 0$  under the null, (45), it holds  $W'_{n,\alpha=0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha=0}) = R_{n,\alpha=0}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha=0})$

**Case 4 (Comparing means and variances of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 \text{ and } \sigma_1 = \sigma_2, \quad (48)$$

the corresponding Wald-type test statistics based on MRPDEs is

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \left( \frac{(\widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha})^2}{(\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} - \widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha})^2 + 2(1 - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2) \widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} \widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}} + \frac{(2\alpha + 1) (\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}^\alpha - \widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}^\alpha)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^2 \beta_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha})} \right), \quad (49)$$

and its asymptotic distribution is a chi-squared distribution with 2 degrees of freedom under (48).

**Case 5 (Fixing a value for covariance of two normal populations).**

If we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \rho = \sigma_{12,0}, \quad (50)$$

where  $\sigma_{12,0} \in \mathbb{R}$ , the corresponding Wald-type test statistics based on MRPDEs is

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \frac{(\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} \widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha} \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} - \sigma_{12,0})^2}{\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}^2 \widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}^2 [(\alpha + 1)^2 (\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2 + 1) + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2]}. \quad (51)$$

The asymptotic distribution of (51) is a chi-squared distribution with 1 degree of freedom under (50).

**Case 6 (Fixing values for means of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_{1,0} \text{ and } \mu_2 = \mu_{2,0}, \quad (52)$$

the corresponding Wald-type test statistics based on MRPDEs is

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \left[ \frac{\left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}} - \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}} \right)^2}{1 - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2} + 2(1 - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) \frac{\left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}} \right) \left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}} \right)}{1 - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2} \right] \quad (53)$$

The asymptotic distribution of (53) is a chi squared distribution with 2 degrees of freedom under (52).

**Case 7 (Fixing values for variances and covariance of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \sigma_1 = \sigma_{1,0}, \sigma_2 = \sigma_{2,0}, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \rho = \sigma_{12,0}, \quad (54)$$

the corresponding Wald-type test statistics based on MRPDEs is

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \mathbf{w}_\alpha^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{w}_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}), \quad (55)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) &= \mathbf{D}_{2,\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha},\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}^{-1} (\mathbf{M}_{22}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{-1} \mathbf{m}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{\sigma_{1,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}} \\ 1 - \frac{\sigma_{2,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}} \\ \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} - \frac{\sigma_{12,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}} - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} \left( 2 - \frac{\sigma_{1,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}} - \frac{\sigma_{2,0}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}} \right) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) = (\alpha + 1)^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) \left[ \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) + \left( \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1} \right)^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) \right]^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}),$$

$\mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})$  given by (23) and  $\mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})$  by (25). The asymptotic distribution of (55) is a chi squared with 3 degrees of freedom under (54).

## 5 Study of the Influence Function

In the precedent sections we have developed the MRPDE for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  in the bidimensional normal model, as well as Wald-type tests based on MRPDE, as a robust alternative to the MLE and classic Wald-type tests. In this section, we will theoretically justify the robustness of the proposed estimators through the study of its Influence Function (IF). The IF ([16]) for any estimator defined in terms of an statistical functional  $\mathbf{T}(F)$  from the true distribution  $F$ , is defined as

$$\mathcal{IF}(t, \mathbf{T}, F) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{T}((1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon\Delta_t) - \mathbf{T}(F)}{\varepsilon} = \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}(F_\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0^+}, \quad (56)$$

with  $\varepsilon$  being the contamination proportion and  $\Delta_t$  being the degenerate distribution at the contamination point  $t$ . Thus, the IF, as a function of  $t$ , measures the standardized asymptotic bias caused by the infinitesimal contamination at the point  $t$ . The maximum of this IF over  $t$  indicates the extent of bias due to contamination and so smaller its value, the more robust the estimator is. Note that, in this context, the statistical functional  $\mathbf{T}_\alpha$  corresponding to the MRPDE is defined as the minimizer of  $R_\alpha(f_\theta, g)$  in (1).

IF for MLE in the bidimensional normal model has been widely studied in literature. For example, [12] presented the IF for the Pearson's correlation coefficient  $\rho$ . A proof was given years later by [11]. IFs for the mean and variance can be found, in [30] and [19], among others.

In [7] (Theorem 5), the IF of Renyi's pseudodistances-based estimators was provided in a general form and particularized to some particular models. [10] generalized this result to the case of independent not identically distributed observations. Based on these results, in



Theorem 8 we present the IF associated to the MRPDE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  the bidimensional normal model. A detailed proof of the following result is provided in Appendix E.

**Theorem 8** *Let us consider the bidimensional normal model (14). The IF associated to the MRPDE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is given by*

$$\mathcal{IF}((x, y)^T, \mathbf{T}_\alpha, F_\theta) = (\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\mu_1), \mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\mu_2), \mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\sigma_1), \mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\sigma_2), \mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\rho))^T,$$

where

$$\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\mu_1) = (\alpha + 1)^2 w_\theta^{-\alpha/(1-\rho^2)}(x, y)(x - \mu_1), \quad (57)$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\mu_2) = (\alpha + 1)^2 w_\theta^{-\alpha/(1-\rho^2)}(x, y)(y - \mu_2), \quad (58)$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\sigma_1) = \frac{(\alpha + 1)^3}{2} w_\theta^{-\alpha}(x, y) \frac{\sigma_1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 - \rho^2 \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - (1-\rho^2)(1+2\rho^2) \frac{1}{\alpha+1} \right], \quad (59)$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\sigma_2) = \frac{(\alpha + 1)^3}{2} w_\theta^{-\alpha}(x, y) \frac{\sigma_2}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - \rho^2 \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 - (1-\rho^2)(1+2\rho^2) \frac{1}{\alpha+1} \right], \quad (60)$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\rho) = (\alpha + 1)^3 w_\theta^{-\alpha}(x, y) \left\{ -\frac{\rho}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right\}, \quad (61)$$

with

$$w_\theta(x, y) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - 2\rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right] \right\}.$$

**Remark 1** *In particular, for  $\alpha = 0$  (MLE),*

$$\mathcal{IF}_{\alpha=0}(\mu_1) = x - \mu_1,$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_{\alpha=0}(\mu_2) = y - \mu_2,$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_{\alpha=0}(\sigma_1) = \frac{\sigma_1}{2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 - \rho^2 \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] - \frac{\sigma_1}{2}(1+2\rho^2),$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_{\alpha=0}(\sigma_2) = \frac{\sigma_2}{2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - \rho^2 \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 \right] - \frac{\sigma_2}{2}(1+2\rho^2),$$

$$\mathcal{IF}_{\alpha=0}(\rho) = -\frac{\rho}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2}.$$

The IF (62) is bounded for positive values of the parameter  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , and is unbounded at the MLE,  $\alpha = 0$ .




Figure 1:  $\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\mu_1)$  (above),  $\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\sigma_1)$  (middle) and  $\mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\rho)$  (below) for  $\alpha = 0$  (left) and  $\alpha = 0.3$  (right), with  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (1, 2, 1, 1.5, 0.3)^T$ .




Figure 2:  $\mathcal{IF}_2((x, y)^T, W_\alpha, F_\theta)$  for testing  $H_0: \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ , with  $\alpha = 0$  (left) and  $\alpha = 0.3$  (right), and  $\theta = (1, 2, 1, 1.5, 0.3)^T$ .

Once we have computed the IF for the minimum RP estimators, we can define and study the IF for the Wald-type test statistics defined in (39). As noted by [10], when the corresponding IF is identically zero and is therefore necessary to consider the second order IF of the proposed Wald-type tests functional  $W_\alpha$ .

**Theorem 9** *Let us consider the bidimensional normal model (14). The second order IF of the proposed Wald-type test functionals for testing simple null hypothesis in (38) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{IF}_2((x, y)^T, W_\alpha, F_\theta) \\ &= 2(\mathcal{IF}((x, y)^T, \mathbf{T}_\alpha, F_\theta))^T \mathbf{M}(\theta) (\mathbf{M}^T(\theta) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\theta) \mathbf{M}(\theta))^{-1} \mathbf{M}^T(\theta) \mathcal{IF}((x, y)^T, \mathbf{T}_\alpha, F_\theta), \quad (62) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{IF}((x, y)^T, \mathbf{T}_\alpha, F_\theta)$  is given in Theorem 8.

Note that the second-order IF of the proposed Wald-type tests is a quadratic function of the corresponding IF of the MRPDE. Therefore, the boundedness of the IF of MRPDE at  $\alpha > 0$  also indicates the boundedness of the IF of the Wald-type test functionals, implying its robustness against contamination.

## 6 Simulation study

It is well-known that the Morgan-Pitman test is best unbiased and best invariant test statistic for testing equality of variances (see [26], [28] and [17]). The idea behind the Morgan-Pitman test allows us to include for testing equality of variances not only the family of test statistics given in Case 2 but also the family of test statistics given in Case 3 for the data  $(u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_n, v_n)$ , where  $U = X + Y$  and  $V = X - Y$  are transformed variables. As  $\text{Cov}[U, V] = \sigma_1^2 - \sigma_2^2$ , testing  $H_0: \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$  given in (42) (Case 2), matches  $H_0: \rho_{UV} = 0$ , from (45) with  $\rho_0 = 0$  (Case 3). We have compared these two families of test statistics, first (43) in Tables 2, 10, 14, 18, rewritten as

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3 (\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha} - 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^6 \beta_\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})}, \quad (63)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha} &= \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}}{\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}, \\ \beta_\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) &= \frac{1}{4} \left[ \left( \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} \right)^2 + 2 \right] (\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha} - 1)^2 + (1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2) \hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

and second (47) in Tables 4, 12, 16, 20, rewritten as

$$W'_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha}) = n \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3}{(\alpha + 1)^6} \hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha}^2. \quad (65)$$

A third one, (46), was also considered but do not present the results here as the corresponding results were very bad in comparison with (47). In addition, the exact Morgan-Pitman test,

$$T_{MP} = \hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha=0} \sqrt{\frac{n-2}{1 - \hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha=0}^2}}, \quad (66)$$

is taken into account, whose exact distribution is a Student  $t$  with  $n - 2$  degrees of freedom ( $t_{n-2}$ ) under  $H_0$ , with

$$\hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha=0} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (U_i - \bar{U}_n)(V_i - \bar{V}_n)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (U_i - \bar{U}_n)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (V_i - \bar{V}_n)^2}} = R_{UV},$$

being the Pearson correlation coefficient, i.e. the MLE of  $\rho_{UV}$ . Furthermore, we included the simulated significance level of the Morgan Pitman test described in (66) in the aforementioned tables and calculated by simulation  $\text{MSE}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}) = |\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha} - 1|$  in Tables 1, 9, 13, 17 as well as  $\text{MSE}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}) = |\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}|$  in Tables 3, 11, 15, 19.

So as to evaluate the performance of the proposed Wald-type tests, we considered the bidimensional normal model (14) for the true parameters values  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$ ,  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1$  and the different correlations between the normal variables  $\rho \in \{0, 0.3, 0.6, 0.9\}$ . Additionally, in order to evaluate the robustness of the Wald-type tests, we analysed ten different scenarios of contamination:

- Pure data
- Slightly contaminated data : We replace a 5%, 10% and 20% of the samples by a bidimensional normal distribution, substituting the true parameter values  $\sigma'_1 = \sigma'_2 = 1$  by  $\sigma'_1 = \sigma'_2 = \sqrt{3}$ .
- Contaminated data : We replace a 5%, 10% and 20% of the samples by a bidimensional Student  $t$  distribution with  $d = 5$  degrees of freedom.
- Heavily contaminated data : We replace a 5%, 10% and 20% of the samples by a bidimensional normal distribution, substituting the true parameter value  $\sigma'_2 = 1$  by  $\sigma'_2 = 5$ .

We repeated the same schema for a nominal type I error,  $\varsigma = 0.05$ , for different sample sizes  $n \in \{15, 25, 50, 100\}$ , but in the main document only the case of  $n = 25$  is presented (the remaining sizes are included in the Appendix G). We report, for the different values of the tuning parameter  $\alpha \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$ , the simulated mean square error (MSE) committed in the estimation of  $\gamma = \sigma_1/\sigma_2$  and  $\rho$  as well as the simulated significance level of the tests, computed as the number of times the null hypothesis is rejected out of the total simulated samples  $R = 15,000$ .

With pure data, as expected, the MSEs and closeness of the simulated significance level of both asymptotic tests, (63) and (65), to the nominal significance level,  $\varsigma = 0.05$ , is improved as the sample size,  $n$ , increases. For MSEs under contamination  $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.2\}$  tuning parameters outperform the MSEs with  $\alpha = 0$  but the greatest improvement under contamination is for the simulated significance levels of  $W'_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha})$ , given in (65), when  $\alpha = 0.2$ , since it is always better than any other, included the well-known Morgan-Pitman test, for all the considered scenarios.

For MSEs under contamination, MRPDEs with  $\alpha \geq 0.1$  outperform the MSEs with  $\alpha = 0$  (the MLE) for all the considered scenarios. Furthermore, the effect of contamination is accented for low sample sizes. The greater contamination, the greater the optimal choice of the tuning parameter is, although moderate values of  $\alpha$  over 0.2 generally offer a suitable trade-off between efficiency and robustness. Conversely, contamination is quite difficult to measure in real-life datasets, and therefore an optimality criterion for the choice of the best tuning parameter is of great practical interest. Several criteria have been proposed in the robustness literature for

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.169	0.175	0.182	0.190	0.173	0.179	0.186	0.279	0.380	0.522
	0.1	0.170	0.173	0.178	0.184	0.172	0.175	0.178	0.209	0.281	0.432
	0.2	0.176	0.177	0.182	0.187	0.178	0.179	0.181	0.187	0.220	0.320
	0.3	0.187	0.187	0.192	0.198	0.188	0.189	0.192	0.191	0.209	0.267
	0.5	0.223	0.224	0.229	0.236	0.228	0.227	0.230	0.226	0.234	0.264
	0.7	0.307	0.327	0.313	0.320	0.304	0.384	0.313	0.330	0.317	0.351
0.3	0	0.161	0.169	0.175	0.182	0.164	0.168	0.176	0.278	0.376	0.523
	0.1	0.162	0.167	0.170	0.176	0.162	0.164	0.169	0.204	0.273	0.430
	0.2	0.168	0.171	0.174	0.180	0.168	0.168	0.173	0.181	0.210	0.313
	0.3	0.178	0.181	0.184	0.189	0.177	0.177	0.183	0.184	0.199	0.256
	0.5	0.213	0.216	0.219	0.225	0.214	0.213	0.218	0.218	0.226	0.252
	0.7	0.290	0.290	0.304	0.329	0.298	0.289	0.295	0.290	0.312	0.353
0.6	0	0.133	0.142	0.146	0.150	0.139	0.142	0.147	0.268	0.371	0.522
	0.1	0.134	0.140	0.142	0.146	0.137	0.139	0.140	0.178	0.252	0.417
	0.2	0.139	0.143	0.145	0.149	0.141	0.143	0.143	0.154	0.181	0.288
	0.3	0.147	0.151	0.154	0.157	0.149	0.152	0.152	0.156	0.169	0.227
	0.5	0.176	0.179	0.184	0.189	0.176	0.181	0.183	0.183	0.191	0.220
	0.7	0.241	0.248	0.253	0.254	0.237	0.245	0.244	0.250	0.268	0.289
0.9	0	0.074	0.077	0.079	0.081	0.075	0.077	0.081	0.240	0.367	0.525
	0.1	0.074	0.076	0.077	0.078	0.075	0.075	0.077	0.099	0.162	0.348
	0.2	0.077	0.078	0.079	0.080	0.077	0.077	0.078	0.082	0.098	0.170
	0.3	0.081	0.082	0.084	0.084	0.081	0.081	0.083	0.085	0.092	0.120
	0.5	0.097	0.098	0.101	0.102	0.099	0.097	0.099	0.101	0.107	0.121
	0.7	0.131	0.131	0.136	0.143	0.137	0.130	0.135	0.136	0.148	0.204

Table 1: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for ratio of variances,  $\widehat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 25$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.059	0.070	0.081	0.093	0.067	0.074	0.089	0.352	0.585	0.852
	0.1	0.058	0.063	0.072	0.079	0.062	0.064	0.069	0.172	0.362	0.699
	0.2	0.059	0.064	0.069	0.075	0.063	0.064	0.066	0.094	0.180	0.438
	0.3	0.064	0.068	0.071	0.079	0.067	0.067	0.072	0.081	0.124	0.276
	0.5	0.085	0.091	0.094	0.103	0.093	0.089	0.097	0.100	0.115	0.182
	0.7	0.144	0.148	0.155	0.167	0.154	0.146	0.159	0.157	0.173	0.217
	MP	0.051	0.062	0.071	0.082	0.059	0.065	0.080	0.341	0.572	0.844
0.3	0	0.061	0.075	0.082	0.092	0.062	0.072	0.086	0.365	0.596	0.860
	0.1	0.060	0.066	0.071	0.078	0.056	0.060	0.069	0.179	0.361	0.708
	0.2	0.061	0.064	0.067	0.075	0.058	0.058	0.068	0.097	0.181	0.433
	0.3	0.065	0.066	0.070	0.079	0.062	0.063	0.073	0.081	0.123	0.271
	0.5	0.089	0.093	0.097	0.104	0.088	0.088	0.098	0.101	0.122	0.181
	0.7	0.146	0.152	0.156	0.172	0.148	0.143	0.154	0.158	0.181	0.223
	MP	0.052	0.063	0.071	0.082	0.054	0.062	0.075	0.352	0.584	0.852
0.6	0	0.057	0.072	0.081	0.090	0.067	0.075	0.090	0.394	0.631	0.883
	0.1	0.056	0.064	0.071	0.075	0.060	0.064	0.070	0.175	0.368	0.713
	0.2	0.058	0.064	0.068	0.072	0.060	0.062	0.070	0.095	0.167	0.430
	0.3	0.063	0.069	0.074	0.077	0.065	0.067	0.074	0.085	0.116	0.265
	0.5	0.088	0.093	0.102	0.109	0.088	0.091	0.099	0.101	0.120	0.183
	0.7	0.148	0.148	0.160	0.171	0.143	0.151	0.155	0.157	0.179	0.226
	MP	0.047	0.062	0.069	0.076	0.057	0.064	0.079	0.380	0.616	0.875
0.9	0	0.064	0.078	0.084	0.091	0.068	0.077	0.092	0.465	0.719	0.932
	0.1	0.061	0.068	0.073	0.075	0.062	0.065	0.073	0.125	0.282	0.647
	0.2	0.060	0.067	0.073	0.072	0.063	0.063	0.071	0.075	0.111	0.280
	0.3	0.066	0.069	0.079	0.077	0.068	0.068	0.075	0.073	0.094	0.162
	0.5	0.089	0.093	0.105	0.110	0.097	0.092	0.102	0.100	0.118	0.146
	0.7	0.147	0.151	0.165	0.171	0.157	0.153	0.163	0.158	0.185	0.217
	MP	0.051	0.064	0.069	0.077	0.057	0.063	0.078	0.448	0.706	0.927

Table 2: Simulated significance level for testing equal variances through  $W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})$  given by (63) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 25$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.165	0.171	0.177	0.185	0.169	0.174	0.181	0.317	0.448	0.627
	0.1	0.167	0.169	0.174	0.180	0.168	0.170	0.174	0.225	0.322	0.515
	0.2	0.172	0.173	0.177	0.183	0.173	0.174	0.177	0.193	0.238	0.371
	0.3	0.181	0.182	0.187	0.192	0.183	0.183	0.187	0.192	0.218	0.297
	0.5	0.213	0.214	0.218	0.224	0.217	0.215	0.219	0.220	0.234	0.272
	0.7	0.270	0.272	0.277	0.284	0.275	0.273	0.278	0.277	0.291	0.320
0.3	0	0.165	0.173	0.178	0.185	0.168	0.173	0.180	0.325	0.453	0.636
	0.1	0.166	0.171	0.174	0.180	0.166	0.169	0.173	0.227	0.321	0.520
	0.2	0.171	0.175	0.178	0.184	0.171	0.173	0.177	0.194	0.236	0.370
	0.3	0.181	0.184	0.187	0.192	0.181	0.182	0.187	0.194	0.216	0.294
	0.5	0.213	0.217	0.220	0.225	0.213	0.213	0.220	0.223	0.234	0.271
	0.7	0.270	0.275	0.278	0.287	0.271	0.270	0.277	0.280	0.293	0.322
0.6	0	0.163	0.172	0.177	0.183	0.169	0.172	0.179	0.342	0.477	0.664
	0.1	0.165	0.170	0.173	0.178	0.168	0.169	0.172	0.225	0.324	0.534
	0.2	0.171	0.175	0.177	0.181	0.172	0.174	0.175	0.192	0.230	0.370
	0.3	0.180	0.183	0.186	0.191	0.181	0.184	0.184	0.193	0.212	0.290
	0.5	0.212	0.215	0.218	0.225	0.212	0.215	0.218	0.221	0.232	0.271
	0.7	0.270	0.272	0.280	0.287	0.268	0.275	0.276	0.279	0.294	0.323
0.9	0	0.166	0.173	0.178	0.183	0.168	0.172	0.180	0.382	0.542	0.729
	0.1	0.167	0.171	0.174	0.176	0.167	0.167	0.172	0.199	0.283	0.514
	0.2	0.172	0.175	0.178	0.179	0.172	0.171	0.175	0.179	0.201	0.294
	0.3	0.181	0.183	0.187	0.189	0.182	0.180	0.184	0.186	0.198	0.235
	0.5	0.215	0.216	0.223	0.228	0.217	0.214	0.219	0.220	0.232	0.254
	0.7	0.285	0.286	0.296	0.307	0.289	0.284	0.294	0.294	0.311	0.344

Table 3: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for correlation coefficient,  $\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 25$



$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.053	0.065	0.074	0.085	0.062	0.069	0.082	0.345	0.576	0.847
	0.1	0.053	0.058	0.065	0.072	0.057	0.059	0.063	0.162	0.351	0.689
	0.2	0.053	0.058	0.063	0.068	0.057	0.058	0.061	0.087	0.170	0.425
	0.3	0.058	0.060	0.064	0.071	0.060	0.061	0.065	0.073	0.115	0.264
	0.5	0.076	0.082	0.085	0.095	0.085	0.080	0.090	0.092	0.106	0.168
	0.7	0.132	0.137	0.143	0.154	0.141	0.135	0.146	0.144	0.160	0.203
	MP	0.051	0.062	0.071	0.082	0.059	0.065	0.080	0.341	0.572	0.844
0.3	0	0.055	0.067	0.074	0.084	0.056	0.065	0.079	0.357	0.588	0.855
	0.1	0.055	0.059	0.063	0.072	0.051	0.054	0.062	0.170	0.350	0.699
	0.2	0.055	0.058	0.060	0.067	0.051	0.051	0.062	0.088	0.170	0.422
	0.3	0.058	0.059	0.062	0.072	0.055	0.056	0.066	0.073	0.113	0.258
	0.5	0.080	0.084	0.088	0.094	0.079	0.080	0.088	0.091	0.111	0.168
	0.7	0.134	0.138	0.143	0.157	0.137	0.132	0.141	0.144	0.167	0.208
	MP	0.052	0.063	0.071	0.082	0.054	0.062	0.075	0.352	0.584	0.852
0.6	0	0.049	0.064	0.072	0.080	0.060	0.067	0.082	0.386	0.621	0.878
	0.1	0.048	0.057	0.063	0.066	0.053	0.056	0.064	0.164	0.353	0.705
	0.2	0.049	0.056	0.060	0.064	0.052	0.055	0.060	0.087	0.155	0.417
	0.3	0.055	0.060	0.065	0.068	0.057	0.058	0.065	0.075	0.104	0.251
	0.5	0.077	0.082	0.089	0.098	0.077	0.082	0.087	0.089	0.106	0.168
	0.7	0.135	0.134	0.148	0.159	0.130	0.138	0.142	0.146	0.166	0.211
	MP	0.047	0.062	0.069	0.076	0.057	0.064	0.079	0.380	0.616	0.875
0.9	0	0.055	0.067	0.072	0.081	0.060	0.067	0.081	0.453	0.710	0.929
	0.1	0.052	0.059	0.063	0.064	0.053	0.055	0.063	0.112	0.268	0.635
	0.2	0.051	0.057	0.061	0.063	0.052	0.053	0.060	0.064	0.098	0.265
	0.3	0.055	0.059	0.065	0.066	0.057	0.057	0.064	0.064	0.082	0.148
	0.5	0.080	0.084	0.094	0.100	0.088	0.082	0.091	0.089	0.106	0.140
	0.7	0.152	0.158	0.171	0.182	0.161	0.157	0.168	0.164	0.191	0.236
	MP	0.051	0.064	0.069	0.077	0.057	0.063	0.078	0.448	0.706	0.927

Table 4: Simulated significance level for testing null correlation coefficient through  $W'_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha})$  given by (65) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 25$

choosing optimal values of the DPD tuning parameter, that can be straightforward extended for the RP divergence. [39] proposed a useful data-based procedure based on the minimization of an estimate of the asymptotic MSE, given by

$$\widehat{\text{MSE}}(\alpha) = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_P)^T (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_P) + \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\mathbf{V}_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha})), \quad (67)$$

where the  $\text{tr}$  denotes the trace of the matrix  $\mathbf{V}_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha})$  given in (8) and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_P$  is a pilot estimator used for assessing the bias. Naturally, the previous criterion was considerably pilot-dependent, as the pilot invariably draws the optimal estimator towards itself. [2] improved the method by iteratively updating the pilot with the optimal estimate obtained, and so the process was repeated until there was no further change in the optimal estimate. The iterative algorithm empirically shown to alleviate the pilot dependency of the optimal choice. Then, Basak et al. algorithm could be adopted in real life problems for choosing the best MRPDE of the bivariate normal distribution, iteratively minimizing formula (67). The MLE or MRPDE with moderate values of the tuning parameter  $\alpha = 0.2$  can be used as initial pilot estimators. Further, applying transformed Wald-type test statistics,  $W'_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha})$  given in (65) entails a clear improvement in terms of significance levels under contamination. In this case, we would empirically recommend the choice of  $\alpha = 0.2$  since it is better than any other, included the well-known Morgan-Pitman test, in most of the considered scenarios.

## 7 Illustrative examples

### 7.1 Cork data set: comparing means or variances

Originally studied in [31], there is a well-known and publicity available real data set, the cork data set. It is included in several R packages ([29]), in particular in `agridat` as a `box.cork` data. The data report the weights of cork boring of the trunk of 28 trees in the north, east, west and south sides. Rao pointed out that there exist positive correlation between the reported pairs of 4 variables, and sometimes it is assumed that they follow a normal distribution. Four-dimensional normality is an arguable issue since using the R package `MVN`, in four out of five tests could multivariate normality be rejected with significance level 0.05, as shown in Table 5 (left hand side). We focussed on the two variables devoted to east and south sides respectively, as in [40, 41], performed two-dimensional normal tests and this time all the tests rejected according to Table 5 (central columns). We did not study the robustness of an estimator and test statistic as in [40], in the sense of being resistant to data coming from distribution different from the bivariate normal as required for the original data. Our proposed estimator and test statistic are robust in the sense of being resistant to outliers once normality is being assumed. Having this in mind, the data were transformed using the base  $e$  logarithm and as shown in Table 5 (right hand side) and in four out five tests could not be multivariate normality rejected. In addition,

outliers were studied for transformed data through the scatter-plot with confidence ellipses shown in Figure 3, concluding that observations 18 and 16 were suspicious to be outliers.

Taking the root of the Wald-type test statistics given in Cases 1, 2 and 3, as well as the Wald-type test given in Section 6 based on transformed variables, here we are going to provide alternative but equivalent expressions in practice, having the same  $p$ -value. From the original data,  $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ , the  $z$ -type test statistic for equal variances and based on MRPDEs, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) &= \text{sign}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha} - 1) \sqrt{W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})} \\ &= \sqrt{n} \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\alpha + 1}}{\alpha + 1} \right)^3 \frac{\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha} - 1}{\sqrt{\beta_\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})}}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

with  $\beta_\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})$  given by (64), has a standard normal asymptotic distribution. From the transformed data  $(u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_n, v_n)$ , where  $U = X + Y$  and  $V = X - Y$ , the  $z$ -type test statistic for equal variances and based on MRPDEs, is given by

$$Z'_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha}) = \text{sign}(\hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha}) \sqrt{W'_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha})} = \sqrt{n} \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\alpha + 1}}{\alpha + 1} \right)^3 \hat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha}. \quad (69)$$

Notice that the paired  $t$ -test for the same test (null correlation), with exact distribution  $t_{n-2}$ , is the Morgan-Pitman test  $T_{MP}$  given by (66). The  $z$ -type test statistic for equal means and based on MRPDEs and the transformed data  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ , where  $V = X - Y$ , is given by

$$Z_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}, \hat{\sigma}_{V,R,\alpha}) = \text{sign}(\hat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}) \sqrt{W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}, \hat{\sigma}_{V,R,\alpha})} = \sqrt{n} \frac{2\alpha + 1}{(\alpha + 1)^2} \frac{\hat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}}{\hat{\sigma}_{V,R,\alpha}}. \quad (70)$$

Notice that the paired  $t$ -test for the same test (equal means), with exact distribution  $t_{n-1}$ , is given by

$$T_V = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{n}} Z_{n,\alpha=0}(\hat{\mu}_{V,R,\alpha}, \hat{\sigma}_{V,R,\alpha}).$$

The results of the classic exact tests,  $T_V$  for testing (40) or  $T_{MP}$  for (42), with two-sided alternative, are summarized in Table 6. The decision, with 0.05 significance level, is opposite for both versions of the data, since the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for the full data set, while it is rejected for the outliers deleted data.

The advantage of these new expressions, (68)-(70), is that one-sided tests can be considered, apart from the two sided ones (as in the example given in Section 7.2). Based on (68)-(70), in Figures 4-5 the values of the test statistics (left hand side) and the values of the estimates of parameters used to construct the test statistics (right hand sides) are shown, in solid lines the ones associated with the full log-transformed cork data set and in dashed lines the ones associated with the outliers deleted log-transformed cork data set. All the left hand side figures suggest rejecting the null, equal means or variances, as an appropriate decision with 0.05 significance level.

Table 5: Normality tests for three versions of the corn data set

normality test	4-dimensional		2-dimensional		log 2-dimensional	
	value	$p$ -value	value	$p$ -value	value	$p$ -value
1.- Doornik-Hansen	16.123	0.041	9.833	0.043	2.490	0.646
2.- Henze-Zirkler	0.999	0.011	1.236	0.003	0.784	0.053
3.- Royston	12.161	0.003	11.784	0.002	5.564	0.047
4.- E-statistic	1.276	0.007	1.473	0.001	0.931	0.053
5a.- Mardia: Skewness	20.890	0.404	10.231	0.037	2.622	0.623
5b.- Mardia: Kurtosis	-0.398	0.690	0.899	0.369	-0.795	0.427




Figure 3: Scatter-plot of east and south variables, with confidence ellipses, for log-transformed cork data set.

Table 6: Classic exact tests of equal means or equal variances for the log-transformed corn data set with respect to full data or outliers deleted data.

classic exact t-test	full data		outliers deleted data	
	value	$p$ -value	value	$p$ -value
Paired t-test (equal means), $T_V$	-1.454	0.157	-2.233	0.035
Morgan-Pitman test (equal variances), $T_{MP}$	-1.656	0.110	-3.033	0.005




Figure 4: Wald-type tests (left) and estimates (right) for log-transformed cork data set: Case 2 (above) and Case 3 (below)




Figure 5: Wald-type tests in Case 1 (left) and mean difference estimates (right) for log-transformed cork data set

## 7.2 Lactate levels data set: fixing a positive correlation coefficient

[18] studied the one sided test (45),  $H_0 : \rho = \rho_0$  vs.  $H_0 : \rho > \rho_0$ , where  $\rho_0 = 0$ , for lactate levels measured in the blood and the cerebrospinal fluid on 13 female subjects. The study was done with a newly proposed robust test statistic, but in the sense of being resistant to data coming from distribution different from the bivariate normal. Using the R package MVN, in none of tests could multivariate normality be rejected with significance level 0.05, as shown in Table 7. Again, we highlight that our proposed estimators and test statistics are robust in the sense of being resistant to outliers once normality is being assumed. Deleting the two most influential observations, i.e. taking observations 1 and 7 as influential (rather than outliers), the sample Pearson correlation is modified from 0.572 for the full data to 0.471 for the influential observations deleted data (see Figure 6) and according to Table 8, using the Morgan-Pitman exact test statistic, the decision of being accepted a positive correlation with 0.05 significance level is modified to not being possible to be accepted. With Figure 7 we try to test whether with the  $Z$ -test statistic based on MRPDE of  $\rho$ , (69), a positive correlation could be accepted for the lactate levels data and actually it suggest as desirable decision nor being possible to reject it.




Figure 6: Scatter-plot of CSF and blood variables, with confidence ellipses, for lactate levels data set.

## 8 Concluding Remarks

In practice, it is very important finding out a robust estimator and test statistic which does not lose much efficiency. Under the null hypothesis  $\rho = 0$ , the Morgan-Pitman exact test is the most efficient one but among the classic asymptotic tests there are several versions we should know. However, we would like to highlight that in comparative studies of recent papers the most competitive one, the Rao test given in Case 3 (Section 4),  $R_{n,\alpha=0}(\hat{\theta}_{R,\alpha=0})$ , is not often being recognized. Since the MRPDEs are regulated through a positive  $\alpha$  tuning parameter, being the tuning parameter  $\alpha = 0$  the cornerstone as being the most efficient one out of all possible values of  $\alpha \geq 0$ . In case of having a poor efficiency for the asymptotic test statistic with the null tuning parameter of the MRPDEs, the test statistics constructed with the other values of the tuning parameters will increase such lack of efficiency and the obtained robustness could not compensate such drawback. This is just what happened with the Wald-type test statistic  $W_{n,\alpha=0}(\hat{\theta}_{R,\alpha=0})$ , given in Case 3 (Section 4) for testing  $\rho = 0$ . Further, we used a modified version of the Wald-type test statistic  $W'_{n,\alpha=0}(\hat{\theta}_{R,\alpha=0})$ , given in Case 3 (Section 4), which matches the Rao test statistic only when  $\rho_0 = 0$ , and has provided for  $\alpha = 0$  magnificent results in efficiency and also for  $\alpha > 0$  strong robust properties. The improvements and properties are shown by simulation for the specific null hypothesis  $\rho = 0$ ,

Table 7: Normality tests for lactate levels data set

normality test	value	$p$ -value
1.- Doornik-Hansen	1.436	0.838
2.- Henze-Zirkler	0.352	0.461
3.- Royston	0.923	0.642
4.- E-statistic	0.620	0.509
5a.- Mardia: Skewness	1.814	0.770
5b.- Mardia: Kurtosis	-0.774	0.439




Figure 7: Wald-type tests (left) and estimates (right) for the lactate levels data set.

but proven in the framework of the developed general theory.

## Acknowledgement

This research is supported by the Spanish Grants PGC2018-095194-B-100 and FPU/018240 (M. Jaenada). E. Castilla, M.Jaenada, N. Martín and L. Pardo are members of the Instituto de Matematica Interdisciplinar, Complutense University of Madrid.



Table 8: Classic exact test of uncorrelation for the lactate levels data set with respect to full data or influential observations deleted data.

classic exact t-test	full data		infl. obs. deleted data	
	value	$p$ -value	value	$p$ -value
one-sided positive correlation with $T_{MP}$	2.313	0.020	1.601	0.072

## References

- [1] ANDERSON, T. W. (2003). *An introduction to multivariate statistical analysis*. Third Edition. New York: Wiley.
- [2] BASAK, S., BASU, A., and JONES, M. C. (2021). *On the optimal density power divergence tuning parameter..* Journal of Applied Statistics, **48**(3), 536–556.
- [3] BASU, A., GHOSH, A., MARTIN, N. and PARDO, L. (2021). *Robust Generalization of the Rao Test..* Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, **40**(2), 868–879.
- [4] BASU, A., SHIOYA, H. and PARK, C. (2011). *Statistical Inference: The minimum Distance Approach*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca de Raton, Florida.
- [5] BERAN, R. (1977). *Minimum Hellinger distance estimates for parametric models..* Annals of Statistics, **5**, 445–463.
- [6] BRONIATOWSKI, M. (2021). *Minimum Divergence Estimators, Maximum Likelihood and the Generalized Bootstrap*. Entropy, **23**, 185.
- [7] BRONIATOWSKI, M., TOMA, A. and VAJDA, I. (1961). *Decomposable pseudodistances and applications in statistical estimation*. Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, **142**, 2574-2585.
- [8] CASTILLA, E., MARTIN, N., MUÑOZ, S. and PARDO, L. (2020). *Robust Wald-type tests based on minimum Rényi pseudodistance estimators for the multiple linear regression model*. Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation, **90**, 2655–2680.
- [9] CASTILLA, E., GHOSH, A., JAENADA, M. and PARDO, L. (2020). *On regularization methods based on Renyi’s pseudodistances for sparse high-dimensional linear regression models*. arXiv:2007.15929.

- [10] CASTILLA, E., JAENADA, M. and PARDO, L. (2021). *Estimation and testing on independent not identically distributed observations based on Renyi's pseudodistances*. To appear in IEEE Transactions of Information Theory.
- [11] CHERNICK, M. R. (1982). *The influence function and its application to data validation*. American Journal of Mathematical and Management Sciences, **2**(4), 263–288.
- [12] DEVLIN, S.J., GNANADESIKAN, R. and KETTERING, J.R. (1975). *Robust estimation and outlier detection with correlation coefficients*. Biometrika, **62**, 531–545.
- [13] FISHER R. A. (1915). *Frequency-distribution of the values of the correlation coefficient in samples from an indefinitely large population*. Biometrika, 10 507–521.
- [14] FISHER, R. A. (1921). *On the “probable error” of a coefficient of correlation deduced from a small sample*. Metron, **1**, 1-32.
- [15] FUJISAWA, H. and EGUCHI, S. (2008). *Robust parameter estimation with a small bias against contamination*. Journal of Multivariate Analysis, **99**, 2053-2081.
- [16] HAMPEL, F.R., RONCHETTI, E.M., ROUSSEEUW, P.J., and STAHEL, W.A. (1986). *Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- [17] HSU, C. T. (1940). *On Samples from a Normal Bivariate Population*. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, **11**, 410–426.
- [18] HUTSON, A.D. (2019). *A robust Pearson correlation test for a general point null using a surrogate bootstrap distribution*. PLoS ONE, **14**(5), e0216287.
- [19] ISOGAI, T. (1989). *On using influence functions for testing multivariate normality*. Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, **41**(1), 169–186.
- [20] JAENADA M. and PARDO L. (2022). *Robust Statistical Inference in Generalized Linear Models Based on Minimum Rényi's Pseudodistance Estimators*. Entropy, **24**, 123.
- [21] JAENADA M. and PARDO L. (2021). *The minimum Rényi's Pseudodistances estimators for Generalized Linear Models*. In *Data Analysis and Related Applications: Theory and Practice*, Proceeding of the ASMDA, Wiley: Athens, Greece.
- [22] JONES, M.C., HJORT, N.L., HARRIS, I.R. and BASU, A. (2001). *A comparison of related density-based minimum divergence estimators*. Biometrika, **88**, 865-873.
- [23] LINDSAY, B. G. (1994). *Efficiency versus robustness: the case for minimum Hellinger distance and related methods*. Annals of Statistics, **22** , 1081–1114.

- [24] LITTLE, R. J. AND RUBIN, D. B. (2019). *Statistical analysis with missing data*. John Wiley & Sons (3rd edition).
- [25] MARTÍN, N. (2020). *Rao's Score Tests on Correlation Matrices*. arXiv:2012.14238.
- [26] MORGAN, W.A. (1939). *TA test for the significance of the difference between two variances in a sample from a normal bivariate population*. *Biometrika*, **31**, 13–19.
- [27] PARDO, L. (2006). *Statistical Inference Based on Divergence Measures*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca de Raton.
- [28] PITMAN, E. (1939). *A Note on Normal Correlation*. *Biometrika*, **31**, 9-12.
- [29] R CORE TEAM (2020). *A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- [30] RADHAKRISHNAN, R. and KSHIRSAGAR, A. M. (1981). *Influence functions for certain parameters in multivariate analysis*. *Communications in Statistics A—Theory Methods*, **10**, 515–529.
- [31] RAO, C.R. (1948). *Tests of significance in multivariate analysis*. *Biometrika*, **35**, 58–79.
- [32] RÉNYI, A. (1961). *On measures of entropy and information*. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics (pp. 547-561). University of California Press.
- [33] SERFLING, R. J. (1980). *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [34] SIMPSON, D. G. (1989). *Minimum Hellinger distance estimation for the analysis of count data*. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **82**, 399, 802–807.
- [35] SIMPSON, D. G. (1989). *Hellinger deviance tests: efficiency, breakdown points, and examples*. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **84** 107–113.
- [36] TAMURA, R. N. and BOOS, D. D. (1986). *Minimum Hellinger distance estimation for multivariate location and covariance*. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **81**, 223–229.
- [37] TOMA, A. and LEONI-AUBIN, S. (2013). *Optimal robust M-estimators using Rényi pseudodistances*. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **115**, 259–273.
- [38] TOMA, A. and LEONI-AUBIN, S. (2015). *Robust Portfolio Optimization Using Pseudodistances*. *PLoS One*, 10(10): e0140546.

- [39] WARWICK, J. and JONES, M.C. (2005). *Choosing a robustness tuning parameter*. Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation, **75**(7), 581–588.
- [40] WILCOX, R. (2015). *Comparing the variances of two dependent variables*. Journal of Statistical Distributions and Applications, **2**, 7.
- [41] WILCOX, R. (2016). *Understanding and applying basic statistical methods using R*. John Wiley & Sons.

## A Proof of Theorem 1

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_\alpha^T(X; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} f_\theta^\alpha(X) (\mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + f_\theta^\alpha(X) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \\
&= \alpha f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) (\mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + f_\theta^\alpha(X) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \\
&= \alpha f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) - \alpha f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + f_\theta^\alpha(X) \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) - f_\theta^\alpha(X) \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_\alpha^T(X; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \\
&= \alpha E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] - \alpha E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \right] \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&+ E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] - E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \alpha E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] - \alpha E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \right] \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&+ E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] - E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \alpha E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] - \alpha E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \right] \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&+ (\alpha + 1) E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \right] \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - (\alpha + 1) E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] \\
&= E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \right] \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] \\
&= E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \right] \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= -E \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_\alpha^T(x; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] = E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) \right] - E \left[ f_\theta^\alpha(X) \right] \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \mathbf{J}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (f_\theta^\alpha(X) (\mathbf{u}_\theta(X) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}))) (f_\theta^\alpha(X) (\mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}))) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [f_\theta^{2\alpha}(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X)] + \mathbb{E} [f_\theta^{2\alpha}(X)] \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} [f_\theta^{2\alpha}(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta(X)] \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbb{E} [f_\theta^{2\alpha}(X) \mathbf{u}_\theta^T(X)] \\
&= \mathbf{J}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&\quad - \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \mathbf{S}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{S}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{J}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
(\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T &= \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_\alpha^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}).
\end{aligned}$$

## B Proof of Theorem 5

We shall follow 1 as well as Propositions 2, 3, 4. About the first partition, since  $\mathbf{c}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_2$  it is trivial that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{J}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \\
\mathbf{K}_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{J}_{1,2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \kappa_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{c}_{2,\alpha}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \frac{1}{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \\
&\quad - \frac{\alpha^2}{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} [\mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) - \alpha^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho)] \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{J}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) - \alpha^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) + 2 & \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) & -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) \\ \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) & \alpha^2 - \rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) + 2 & -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) \\ -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) & -\rho(\alpha^2 + 1) & \frac{\rho^2(\alpha^2 + 1) + 1}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \alpha^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1-\rho^2 & 1-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ 1-\rho^2 & 1-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ -\rho & -\rho & \frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \begin{pmatrix} 2-\rho^2 & -\rho^2 & -\rho \\ -\rho^2 & 2-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ -\rho & -\rho & \frac{\rho^2+1}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\alpha}{(2\alpha+1)(\alpha+1)} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ \frac{\rho}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix} \\
(\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T &= \frac{\alpha^2}{(2\alpha+1)^2(\alpha+1)^2} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \mathbf{S}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\mathbf{c}_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T \\
&= \frac{1}{k^{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})(2\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} + \kappa_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{\alpha^2}{(2\alpha+1)^2(\alpha+1)^2} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{k^{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})(2\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} + \frac{\alpha^2}{k^{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})(2\alpha+1)^3(\alpha+1)^2} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{k^{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})(2\alpha+1)^3} \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1} ((\alpha+1)^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,1}(\rho) + \alpha^2 \mathbf{S}_{2,2}(\rho)) \mathbf{D}_{2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2}^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

## C Proof of Theorem 7

Let  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in \Theta_0$  be the true value of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Using a Taylor series expansion we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{m}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) &= \mathbf{m}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p\left(\left\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\right\|\right) \\
&= \mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p\left(\left\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\right\|\right), \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

because from equation (36) we have  $\mathbf{m}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mathbf{0}_r$ . Now, under  $H_0$ ,

$$n^{1/2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_p, \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)).$$

Therefore, from equation (71) we get, under  $H_0$ ,

$$n^{1/2}\mathbf{m}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_r, \mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)).$$

As  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = r$ , we get

$$n\mathbf{m}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) (\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))^{-1} \mathbf{m}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \chi_r^2.$$

Now  $\mathbf{M}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{M}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha})$  is a consistent estimator of

$$\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0).$$

Hence, under  $H_0$ ,

$$W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \chi_r^2.$$

## D Proof of the formulas of the inner iterations of Algorithm 1

Taking into account Theorem 6 and the components of  $\mathbf{u}_\theta(x, y) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , given by

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\mu_1}(x, y) - c_\alpha(\mu_1) &= \frac{1}{\sigma_1(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} - \rho \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) \right], \\ u_{\mu_2}(x, y) - c_\alpha(\mu_2) &= \frac{1}{\sigma_2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \rho \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \right], \\ u_{\sigma_1}(x, y) - c_\alpha(\sigma_1) &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) - \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 \right] \right\}, \\ u_{\sigma_2}(x, y) - c_\alpha(\sigma_2) &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_2} \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) - \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\}, \\ u_\rho(x, y) - c_\alpha(\rho) &= \frac{1}{(1-\rho^2)^2} \left\{ (1+\rho^2) \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) - \rho \left[ \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} + \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

the estimating equations are

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i - \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i = 0, \quad (72)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i - \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i = 0, \quad (73)$$

$$\frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i^2 = 0, \quad (74)$$

$$\frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i^2 = 0, \quad (75)$$

$$(1+\rho^2) \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i + \rho \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} - \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i^2 - \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i^2 = 0, \quad (76)$$

$$w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \tilde{X}_i^2 + \tilde{Y}_i^2 - 2\rho \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i \right] \right\},$$

$$\tilde{X}_i = \frac{X_i - \mu_1}{\sigma_1}, \quad \tilde{Y}_i = \frac{Y_i - \mu_2}{\sigma_2}.$$

Since  $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ , from (72)-(73) it holds

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i = 0 \quad (77)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i = 0, \quad (78)$$

from (74)-(75)

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i^2, \quad (79)$$

with

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i^2 = \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i^2 = \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i.$$



Replacing both in (76) we get

$$(1 + \rho^2) \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i + \rho \frac{1 - \rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} - 2\rho \left( \frac{1 - \rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i \right) = 0,$$

i.e.

$$\rho = \frac{(\alpha + 1) \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha}}. \quad (80)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - \rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i^2, \\ \frac{1 - \rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \frac{\rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i^2, \\ \frac{1}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i^2, \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - \rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \rho \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{X}_i \tilde{Y}_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i^2, \\ \frac{1 - \rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} + \frac{\rho^2}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i^2, \\ \frac{1}{\alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \tilde{Y}_i^2. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha}}, & \mu_2 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha}}, \\ \frac{\sigma_1^2}{\alpha + 1} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} (X_i - \mu_1)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha}}, & \frac{\sigma_2^2}{\alpha + 1} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} (Y_i - \mu_2)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha}}, \\ \rho &= \frac{(\alpha + 1) \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha} \frac{X_i - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{Y_i - \mu_2}{\sigma_2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha}},\end{aligned}$$

from which are derived the main formulas of the inner iterations of the Iteratively Reweighted Moments Algorithm.

## E Proof of Theorem 8

From Theorem 5 in [7], the IF associated to the MRPDE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{IF}((x, y)^T, \mathbf{T}_\alpha, F_\theta) = \mathbf{S}_\alpha^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_\theta^\alpha(x, y) [\mathbf{u}_\theta(x, y) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})],$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}_\alpha^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 3} \\ \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2} & \mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix}$$

is the inverse of the matrix,  $\mathbf{S}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , defined in Theorem 5. The expressions of  $\mathbf{S}_{1,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  are given in (26) and (27) respectively and the ones of  $\mathbf{u}_\theta(x, y) - \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  in (72)-(75). On one hand

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\mu_1) \\ \mathcal{IF}_\alpha(\mu_2) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) (\alpha + 1)^2}{1 - \rho^2} f_\theta^\alpha(x, y) \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_1 \rho \\ \sigma_2 \rho & \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} - \rho \left( \frac{y - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) \\ \frac{y - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \rho \left( \frac{x - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_1 \rho \\ \sigma_2 \rho & \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} - \rho \left( \frac{y - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) \\ \frac{y - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \rho \left( \frac{x - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \end{pmatrix} = (1 - \rho^2) \begin{pmatrix} x - \mu_1 \\ y - \mu_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\alpha}(x, y) &= \frac{w_{\alpha, \boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-\alpha/(1-\rho^2)}(x, y)}{k^{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \\ &= \frac{1}{k^{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\rho^2)} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - 2\rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

hence we obtain (57)-(58). On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{IF}_{\alpha}(\sigma_1) \\ \mathcal{IF}_{\alpha}(\sigma_2) \end{pmatrix} &= k^{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{(\alpha+1)^3}{2} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\alpha}(x, y) \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_1 \rho^2 & \sigma_1 \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \sigma_2 \rho^2 & \sigma_2 & \sigma_2 \rho(1-\rho^2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\times \begin{pmatrix} -\left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{(x-\mu_1)(y-\mu_2)}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} - \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ -\left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{(x-\mu_1)(y-\mu_2)}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} - \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ \frac{1}{(1-\rho^2)^2} \left\{ (1+\rho^2) \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) - \rho \left[ \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} + \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_1 \rho^2 & \sigma_1 \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \sigma_2 \rho^2 & \sigma_2 & \sigma_2 \rho(1-\rho^2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\cdot \begin{pmatrix} -\left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{(x-\mu_1)(y-\mu_2)}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} - \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ -\left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{(x-\mu_1)(y-\mu_2)}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} - \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ \frac{1}{(1-\rho^2)^2} \left\{ (1+\rho^2) \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) - \rho \left[ \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} + \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sigma_1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 - \rho^2 \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - (1-\rho^2)(1+2\rho^2) \frac{1}{\alpha+1} \right] \\ \frac{\sigma_2}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 - \rho^2 \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 - (1-\rho^2)(1+2\rho^2) \frac{1}{\alpha+1} \right] \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain (59)-(60). Finally,

$$\mathcal{LF}_\alpha(\rho) = k^\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{(\alpha+1)^3}{2} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\alpha(x, y) \left( \rho(1-\rho^2) \quad \rho(1-\rho^2) \quad 2(1-\rho^2)^2 \right) \\ \times \left( \begin{array}{c} - \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ - \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ \frac{1}{(1-\rho^2)^2} \left\{ (1+\rho^2) \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) - \rho \left[ \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} + \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \end{array} \right)$$

where

$$\left( \rho(1-\rho^2) \quad \rho(1-\rho^2) \quad 2(1-\rho^2)^2 \right) \\ \cdot \left( \begin{array}{c} - \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ - \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha+1} + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left[ \rho \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} - \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\ \frac{1}{(1-\rho^2)^2} \left\{ (1+\rho^2) \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right) - \rho \left[ \frac{1-\rho^2}{\alpha+1} + \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \end{array} \right) \\ = -\rho \left[ \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right)^2 \right] + 2 \left( \frac{x-\mu_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \left( \frac{y-\mu_2}{\sigma_2} \right),$$

from which it follows (61).

## F Proofs of cases of testing problems (Section 4)

**Case 1 (Comparing means of two dependent populations with normal distributions).**

If we consider the function

$$m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = \mu_1 - \mu_2,$$

the null hypothesis can be given by  $m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = 0$ . In this case

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) &= (1 \ -1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0), \\
\left(\mathbf{M}^T(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{M}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha})\right)^{-1} &= \left( (1 \ -1) \mathbf{V}_{1,\alpha}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} (\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}^2 - 2\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} \hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha} + \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}^2)^{-1} \\
&= \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} [(\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} - \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha})^2 \\
&\quad + 2(1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) \hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{V}_{1,\alpha}(\cdot)$  is given by (30). Therefore, (41) is obtained.

**Case 2 (Comparing variances of two dependent populations with normal distributions).**

If we consider the function

$$m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = \sigma_1 - \sigma_2,$$

the null hypothesis can be given by  $m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = 0$ . In this case

$$\mathbf{M}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = (0 \ 0 \ 1 \ -1 \ 0)$$

and taking

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{M}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) \\
&= (\sigma_1 \ -\sigma_2 \ 0) \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ -\sigma_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{(\alpha + 1)^4}{(2\alpha + 1)^3} b_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}),
\end{aligned}$$

we denote

$$\begin{aligned}
b_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= (\alpha + 1)^2 b_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \alpha^2 b_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\
&= \frac{2(\alpha + 1)^2 + \alpha^2}{4} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (\alpha + 1)^2 (1 - \rho^2) \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\alpha + 1)^2 \left\{ \left[ 2 + \left( \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1} \right)^2 \right] (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + 4(1 - \rho^2) \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
b_{1,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & -\sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho^2 \\ \rho^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ -\sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2) - \rho^2 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (1 - \rho^2) \sigma_1 \sigma_2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
b_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & -\sigma_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho^2 & \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \rho^2 & 1 & \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \rho(1-\rho^2) & \rho(1-\rho^2) & 2(1-\rho^2)^2 \end{pmatrix} \\
&\quad \times \begin{pmatrix} 1-\rho^2 & 1-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ 1-\rho^2 & 1-\rho^2 & -\rho \\ -\rho & -\rho & \frac{\rho^2}{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho^2 & \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \rho^2 & 1 & \rho(1-\rho^2) \\ \rho(1-\rho^2) & \rho(1-\rho^2) & 2(1-\rho^2)^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ -\sigma_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & -\sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_2 \mathbf{1}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ -\sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{4} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, denoting  $b_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = (\alpha + 1)^2 \beta_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha})$ , we get (43).

**Case 3 (Fixing a value of the correlation coefficient of two dependent populations with normal distributions).**

If we consider the function

$$m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = \rho - \rho_0,$$

the null hypothesis can be given by  $m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = 0$ . In this case  $\mathbf{M}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and we have

$$\left( \mathbf{M}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \mathbf{M}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) \right)^{-1} = \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^3}{(\alpha + 1)^6} \frac{1}{(1 - \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2)^2}. \quad (84)$$

Therefore, we get (46).

**Case 4 (Comparing means and variances of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we consider the function

$$\mathbf{m}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = (\mu_1 - \mu_2, \sigma_1 - \sigma_2),$$

the null hypothesis can be written by  $\mathbf{m}(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = \mathbf{0}_2$ . In this case,

$$\mathbf{M}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{(\alpha+1)^4}{(2\alpha+1)^2} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 - 2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 + \sigma_2^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{(\alpha+1)^2}{2\alpha+1} \beta_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix},$$

with  $\beta_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  given in (83). Therefore, we get (49).

**Case 5 (Fixing a value for covariance of two normal populations).**

If we consider the function

$$m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = \sigma_1\sigma_2\rho - \sigma_{12,0},$$

the null hypothesis can be written as  $m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2 \begin{pmatrix} \rho & \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{1,\sigma_1,\sigma_2} \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \rho \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2 \left[ (\alpha+1)^2 (\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2 + 1) + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\rho)$  is given by (32). Therefore, we get (51).

**Case 6 (Fixing values for means of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we consider the function

$$\mathbf{m}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = (\mu_1 - \mu_{1,0}, \mu_2 - \mu_{2,0}),$$

the null hypothesis can be written by  $m(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = 0$ . It is clear that

$$\mathbf{M}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we get (53) since

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{-1} &= \mathbf{V}_{1,\alpha}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \left( \frac{(\alpha+1)^4}{(2\alpha+1)^2} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 \\ \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 & \sigma_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{(2\alpha+1)^2}{(1-\rho^2)(\alpha+1)^4} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} & -\frac{\rho}{\sigma_1\sigma_2} \\ -\frac{\rho}{\sigma_1\sigma_2} & \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{m}^T(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) (\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{-1} \mathbf{m}(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho) \\
&= \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \left[ \frac{(\hat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}^2 \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}^2 (1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{-2\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}(\hat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0})(\hat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0})\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha} + (\hat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}^2 \hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}^2 (1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2)} \right] \\
&= \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \left[ \frac{\left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}}\right)^2 - 2\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}}\right) \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}\right)}{1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}\right)^2}{1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{(2\alpha + 1)^2}{(\alpha + 1)^4} \left[ \frac{\left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}} - \frac{\hat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}\right)^2}{1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{2(1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}) \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{1,R,\alpha} - \mu_{1,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}}\right) \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{2,R,\alpha} - \mu_{2,0}}{\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}\right)}{1 - \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}^2} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

**Case 7 (Fixing values for variances and covariance of two dependent populations with normal distribution).**

If we consider the function

$$\mathbf{m}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_{1,0}, \sigma_2 - \sigma_{2,0}, \sigma_1\sigma_2\rho - \sigma_{12,0}),$$

the null hypothesis can be written by  $\mathbf{m}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}_3$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\mathbf{0}_{3 \times 2}, \mathbf{M}_{22}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad \mathbf{M}_{22}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \sigma_2\rho & \sigma_1\rho & \sigma_1\sigma_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and we denote by

$$\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{M}_{22}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}_{22}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{M}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{-1} &= (\mathbf{M}_{22}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{M}_{22}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{-1} \\
&= \mathbf{M}_{22}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{D}_{2,\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha},\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\rho) \mathbf{D}_{2,\hat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha},\hat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}}^{-1} (\mathbf{M}_{22}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$



and

$$\mathbf{m}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{R,\alpha}) = (\widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha} - \sigma_{1,0}, \widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha} - \sigma_{2,0}, \widehat{\sigma}_{1,R,\alpha}\widehat{\sigma}_{2,R,\alpha}\widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha} - \sigma_{12,0}).$$

Therefore, we get (55).

## G Complementary tables for Simulation (Section 6)

$\rho$	$\alpha$	pure	slightly			regular			heavily		
			0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.225	0.232	0.239	0.249	0.229	0.234	0.245	0.305	0.372	0.499
	0.1	0.227	0.231	0.236	0.243	0.229	0.232	0.239	0.268	0.316	0.438
	0.2	0.237	0.239	0.244	0.251	0.239	0.241	0.245	0.250	0.276	0.355
	0.3	0.258	0.259	0.266	0.270	0.259	0.262	0.264	0.264	0.280	0.328
	0.5	0.347	0.360	0.361	0.368	0.353	0.363	0.353	0.364	0.366	0.396
	0.7	0.596	0.580	0.761	0.597	0.612	0.558	0.597	0.575	0.620	0.709
0.3	0	0.214	0.226	0.230	0.237	0.220	0.225	0.234	0.299	0.371	0.496
	0.1	0.215	0.224	0.227	0.232	0.219	0.223	0.229	0.258	0.311	0.434
	0.2	0.224	0.232	0.235	0.240	0.228	0.231	0.236	0.242	0.267	0.350
	0.3	0.244	0.251	0.254	0.261	0.247	0.251	0.256	0.255	0.269	0.322
	0.5	0.322	0.335	0.338	0.351	0.330	0.338	0.342	0.337	0.387	0.387
	0.7	0.510	0.555	0.557	0.615	0.550	0.573	0.550	0.556	0.627	0.641
0.6	0	0.182	0.188	0.193	0.200	0.185	0.189	0.195	0.275	0.362	0.494
	0.1	0.184	0.187	0.190	0.195	0.185	0.187	0.191	0.223	0.285	0.415
	0.2	0.192	0.193	0.197	0.201	0.192	0.193	0.196	0.205	0.233	0.317
	0.3	0.209	0.210	0.212	0.217	0.208	0.208	0.213	0.215	0.231	0.281
	0.5	0.280	0.285	0.291	0.294	0.282	0.279	0.290	0.299	0.298	0.332
	0.7	0.468	0.460	0.485	0.496	0.460	0.468	0.455	0.468	0.512	0.513
0.9	0	0.098	0.103	0.105	0.109	0.101	0.103	0.106	0.230	0.339	0.492
	0.1	0.098	0.102	0.104	0.107	0.101	0.102	0.104	0.131	0.188	0.336
	0.2	0.102	0.106	0.107	0.110	0.105	0.106	0.107	0.112	0.131	0.205
	0.3	0.112	0.115	0.116	0.119	0.114	0.114	0.115	0.118	0.128	0.166
	0.5	0.149	0.153	0.155	0.161	0.153	0.151	0.157	0.159	0.169	0.195
	0.7	0.247	0.263	0.248	0.247	0.251	0.249	0.299	0.271	0.280	0.311

Table 9: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for ratio of variances,  $\widehat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 15$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.064	0.071	0.085	0.091	0.071	0.074	0.089	0.270	0.426	0.687
	0.1	0.062	0.065	0.075	0.082	0.067	0.066	0.077	0.169	0.290	0.563
	0.2	0.067	0.068	0.075	0.085	0.069	0.067	0.077	0.103	0.167	0.354
	0.3	0.080	0.080	0.087	0.097	0.083	0.081	0.088	0.098	0.131	0.249
	0.5	0.141	0.147	0.151	0.162	0.145	0.145	0.149	0.158	0.172	0.235
	0.7	0.253	0.263	0.267	0.280	0.255	0.257	0.269	0.273	0.288	0.338
	MP	0.049	0.057	0.066	0.073	0.058	0.058	0.071	0.250	0.405	0.666
0.3	0	0.064	0.080	0.084	0.097	0.074	0.079	0.090	0.270	0.441	0.692
	0.1	0.062	0.074	0.076	0.086	0.068	0.071	0.080	0.167	0.299	0.567
	0.2	0.064	0.075	0.077	0.085	0.069	0.074	0.078	0.108	0.169	0.363
	0.3	0.078	0.084	0.090	0.099	0.082	0.086	0.091	0.100	0.136	0.255
	0.5	0.138	0.147	0.150	0.164	0.142	0.145	0.151	0.157	0.174	0.236
	0.7	0.250	0.255	0.268	0.277	0.257	0.260	0.267	0.265	0.290	0.326
	MP	0.049	0.063	0.065	0.074	0.057	0.060	0.071	0.249	0.417	0.672
0.6	0	0.070	0.081	0.083	0.100	0.075	0.080	0.092	0.286	0.474	0.735
	0.1	0.068	0.074	0.076	0.089	0.071	0.074	0.081	0.163	0.303	0.582
	0.2	0.073	0.077	0.081	0.088	0.073	0.076	0.079	0.106	0.166	0.353
	0.3	0.085	0.088	0.092	0.099	0.087	0.087	0.092	0.102	0.134	0.248
	0.5	0.146	0.150	0.158	0.163	0.148	0.149	0.154	0.162	0.179	0.237
	0.7	0.260	0.262	0.271	0.280	0.255	0.262	0.265	0.273	0.293	0.335
	MP	0.050	0.061	0.065	0.077	0.056	0.061	0.071	0.262	0.449	0.711
0.9	0	0.068	0.084	0.088	0.107	0.082	0.086	0.093	0.342	0.547	0.805
	0.1	0.067	0.080	0.080	0.097	0.078	0.080	0.081	0.136	0.248	0.528
	0.2	0.070	0.082	0.083	0.099	0.079	0.082	0.083	0.092	0.124	0.276
	0.3	0.083	0.095	0.093	0.111	0.092	0.093	0.094	0.101	0.113	0.193
	0.5	0.143	0.155	0.158	0.172	0.156	0.154	0.155	0.162	0.181	0.225
	0.7	0.257	0.268	0.273	0.285	0.270	0.273	0.268	0.279	0.300	0.345
	MP	0.047	0.061	0.063	0.081	0.060	0.061	0.068	0.312	0.519	0.786

Table 10: Simulated significance level for testing equal variances through  $W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})$  given by (63) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 15$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.217	0.224	0.230	0.239	0.221	0.224	0.233	0.338	0.431	0.596
	0.1	0.219	0.223	0.227	0.234	0.221	0.223	0.229	0.284	0.353	0.516
	0.2	0.227	0.230	0.233	0.240	0.229	0.230	0.234	0.253	0.290	0.403
	0.3	0.244	0.247	0.251	0.257	0.246	0.247	0.250	0.258	0.282	0.352
	0.5	0.306	0.313	0.314	0.325	0.309	0.312	0.314	0.320	0.332	0.374
	0.7	0.409	0.420	0.421	0.434	0.412	0.417	0.423	0.426	0.438	0.476
0.3	0	0.217	0.226	0.231	0.238	0.221	0.226	0.234	0.338	0.439	0.601
	0.1	0.218	0.225	0.228	0.234	0.220	0.224	0.229	0.282	0.357	0.518
	0.2	0.226	0.232	0.235	0.240	0.228	0.231	0.235	0.253	0.292	0.404
	0.3	0.243	0.248	0.252	0.258	0.244	0.249	0.252	0.259	0.282	0.354
	0.5	0.305	0.311	0.316	0.325	0.307	0.309	0.315	0.319	0.334	0.373
	0.7	0.410	0.413	0.424	0.432	0.412	0.417	0.422	0.421	0.441	0.468
0.6	0	0.218	0.226	0.231	0.240	0.222	0.226	0.232	0.347	0.462	0.628
	0.1	0.220	0.225	0.228	0.235	0.222	0.224	0.228	0.279	0.360	0.527
	0.2	0.228	0.232	0.235	0.240	0.230	0.231	0.234	0.252	0.289	0.400
	0.3	0.246	0.250	0.251	0.256	0.247	0.246	0.251	0.259	0.281	0.348
	0.5	0.311	0.314	0.319	0.324	0.311	0.311	0.317	0.322	0.335	0.376
	0.7	0.415	0.423	0.432	0.439	0.416	0.417	0.424	0.431	0.448	0.478
0.9	0	0.216	0.226	0.230	0.239	0.223	0.228	0.232	0.377	0.507	0.688
	0.1	0.217	0.225	0.227	0.235	0.223	0.226	0.227	0.258	0.325	0.503
	0.2	0.226	0.233	0.234	0.243	0.231	0.233	0.233	0.239	0.261	0.354
	0.3	0.244	0.251	0.253	0.264	0.250	0.251	0.252	0.255	0.267	0.319
	0.5	0.323	0.333	0.338	0.353	0.333	0.333	0.333	0.340	0.355	0.397
	0.7	0.459	0.472	0.476	0.497	0.468	0.473	0.471	0.480	0.497	0.539

Table 11: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for correlation coefficient,  $\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 15$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.054	0.061	0.072	0.079	0.063	0.063	0.076	0.061	0.072	0.079
	0.1	0.052	0.055	0.063	0.070	0.057	0.056	0.066	0.055	0.063	0.070
	0.2	0.056	0.055	0.064	0.072	0.058	0.056	0.064	0.055	0.064	0.072
	0.3	0.068	0.065	0.075	0.083	0.070	0.067	0.074	0.065	0.075	0.083
	0.5	0.122	0.128	0.133	0.143	0.127	0.128	0.130	0.128	0.133	0.143
	0.7	0.229	0.238	0.240	0.254	0.228	0.231	0.241	0.238	0.240	0.254
	MP	0.049	0.057	0.066	0.073	0.058	0.058	0.071	0.250	0.405	0.666
0.3	0	0.053	0.067	0.070	0.081	0.061	0.065	0.077	0.067	0.070	0.081
	0.1	0.051	0.062	0.063	0.070	0.057	0.060	0.066	0.062	0.063	0.070
	0.2	0.052	0.062	0.064	0.071	0.058	0.060	0.065	0.062	0.064	0.071
	0.3	0.065	0.071	0.074	0.085	0.067	0.073	0.076	0.071	0.074	0.085
	0.5	0.119	0.127	0.131	0.144	0.124	0.126	0.132	0.127	0.131	0.144
	0.7	0.224	0.230	0.243	0.253	0.231	0.233	0.241	0.230	0.243	0.253
	MP	0.049	0.063	0.065	0.074	0.057	0.060	0.071	0.249	0.417	0.672
0.6	0	0.056	0.065	0.069	0.083	0.062	0.066	0.076	0.065	0.069	0.083
	0.1	0.054	0.060	0.062	0.072	0.058	0.059	0.066	0.060	0.062	0.072
	0.2	0.058	0.060	0.065	0.072	0.060	0.061	0.064	0.060	0.065	0.072
	0.3	0.069	0.071	0.075	0.082	0.072	0.072	0.076	0.071	0.075	0.082
	0.5	0.127	0.129	0.138	0.142	0.129	0.130	0.133	0.129	0.138	0.142
	0.7	0.233	0.241	0.249	0.258	0.231	0.236	0.242	0.241	0.249	0.258
	MP	0.050	0.061	0.065	0.077	0.056	0.061	0.071	0.262	0.449	0.711
0.9	0	0.051	0.067	0.069	0.087	0.065	0.067	0.072	0.067	0.069	0.087
	0.1	0.051	0.062	0.063	0.076	0.061	0.062	0.063	0.062	0.063	0.076
	0.2	0.053	0.063	0.064	0.078	0.063	0.062	0.063	0.063	0.064	0.078
	0.3	0.067	0.077	0.076	0.094	0.076	0.075	0.076	0.077	0.076	0.094
	0.5	0.147	0.160	0.164	0.185	0.159	0.155	0.158	0.160	0.164	0.185
	0.7	0.296	0.313	0.317	0.347	0.304	0.312	0.309	0.313	0.317	0.347
	MP	0.047	0.061	0.063	0.081	0.060	0.061	0.068	0.312	0.519	0.786

Table 12: Simulated significance level for testing null correlation coefficient through  $W'_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha})$  given by (65) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 15$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.115	0.123	0.128	0.131	0.121	0.123	0.131	0.278	0.403	0.552
	0.1	0.117	0.120	0.123	0.126	0.119	0.118	0.121	0.160	0.251	0.440
	0.2	0.121	0.123	0.125	0.128	0.122	0.122	0.124	0.134	0.168	0.296
	0.3	0.127	0.129	0.130	0.133	0.127	0.127	0.130	0.133	0.148	0.217
	0.5	0.144	0.145	0.147	0.151	0.144	0.144	0.148	0.147	0.153	0.179
	0.7	0.168	0.171	0.173	0.178	0.171	0.168	0.175	0.172	0.176	0.193
0.3	0	0.110	0.117	0.121	0.124	0.114	0.119	0.124	0.274	0.402	0.552
	0.1	0.111	0.114	0.116	0.119	0.112	0.114	0.116	0.155	0.242	0.438
	0.2	0.115	0.116	0.118	0.121	0.116	0.117	0.118	0.127	0.158	0.290
	0.3	0.121	0.122	0.123	0.127	0.121	0.122	0.124	0.126	0.139	0.210
	0.5	0.137	0.137	0.139	0.143	0.138	0.137	0.140	0.139	0.143	0.171
	0.7	0.159	0.161	0.163	0.168	0.161	0.161	0.164	0.162	0.166	0.184
0.6	0	0.093	0.097	0.102	0.106	0.097	0.100	0.105	0.270	0.402	0.553
	0.1	0.094	0.095	0.098	0.101	0.095	0.096	0.097	0.134	0.224	0.430
	0.2	0.097	0.098	0.100	0.102	0.098	0.098	0.099	0.108	0.138	0.262
	0.3	0.101	0.102	0.104	0.106	0.102	0.103	0.103	0.107	0.121	0.180
	0.5	0.114	0.115	0.118	0.120	0.116	0.116	0.116	0.118	0.125	0.146
	0.7	0.134	0.135	0.139	0.141	0.136	0.136	0.137	0.137	0.144	0.157
0.9	0	0.050	0.053	0.056	0.057	0.052	0.054	0.057	0.263	0.401	0.555
	0.1	0.051	0.052	0.054	0.054	0.051	0.052	0.053	0.068	0.128	0.365
	0.2	0.053	0.053	0.054	0.055	0.053	0.053	0.054	0.056	0.066	0.138
	0.3	0.055	0.056	0.057	0.057	0.055	0.055	0.056	0.058	0.062	0.086
	0.5	0.063	0.063	0.064	0.065	0.063	0.062	0.063	0.064	0.067	0.077
	0.7	0.073	0.074	0.075	0.076	0.074	0.074	0.074	0.075	0.079	0.088

Table 13: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for ratio of variances,  $\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 50$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.054	0.072	0.081	0.089	0.063	0.071	0.091	0.535	0.809	0.980
	0.1	0.054	0.061	0.066	0.068	0.057	0.056	0.063	0.206	0.485	0.885
	0.2	0.055	0.058	0.061	0.064	0.057	0.053	0.061	0.100	0.215	0.593
	0.3	0.055	0.059	0.061	0.065	0.058	0.055	0.062	0.079	0.131	0.348
	0.5	0.062	0.064	0.071	0.076	0.065	0.063	0.071	0.072	0.097	0.182
	0.7	0.079	0.082	0.090	0.096	0.083	0.081	0.091	0.088	0.107	0.151
	MP	0.050	0.067	0.077	0.084	0.061	0.068	0.086	0.529	0.805	0.979
0.3	0	0.057	0.067	0.077	0.087	0.063	0.074	0.089	0.542	0.817	0.981
	0.1	0.057	0.058	0.065	0.071	0.055	0.059	0.063	0.206	0.485	0.890
	0.2	0.056	0.056	0.061	0.066	0.054	0.056	0.061	0.099	0.205	0.592
	0.3	0.058	0.060	0.060	0.066	0.057	0.057	0.063	0.080	0.119	0.345
	0.5	0.065	0.065	0.067	0.073	0.067	0.066	0.070	0.076	0.088	0.175
	0.7	0.082	0.081	0.086	0.092	0.082	0.082	0.090	0.090	0.099	0.146
	MP	0.052	0.063	0.072	0.081	0.059	0.070	0.084	0.536	0.814	0.980
0.6	0	0.058	0.067	0.079	0.092	0.066	0.079	0.090	0.580	0.847	0.986
	0.1	0.056	0.057	0.068	0.072	0.058	0.059	0.061	0.197	0.487	0.891
	0.2	0.056	0.056	0.065	0.066	0.058	0.057	0.060	0.093	0.199	0.565
	0.3	0.056	0.059	0.064	0.069	0.058	0.058	0.060	0.074	0.119	0.315
	0.5	0.065	0.066	0.072	0.073	0.066	0.064	0.067	0.075	0.090	0.161
	0.7	0.080	0.083	0.090	0.094	0.084	0.080	0.084	0.090	0.104	0.143
	MP	0.053	0.062	0.074	0.085	0.060	0.074	0.084	0.574	0.843	0.985
0.9	0	0.054	0.068	0.085	0.088	0.064	0.075	0.090	0.679	0.907	0.996
	0.1	0.054	0.058	0.069	0.071	0.056	0.060	0.064	0.113	0.322	0.806
	0.2	0.054	0.055	0.066	0.066	0.057	0.056	0.061	0.066	0.103	0.339
	0.3	0.056	0.055	0.067	0.066	0.060	0.058	0.062	0.061	0.079	0.164
	0.5	0.067	0.067	0.074	0.074	0.068	0.064	0.070	0.070	0.083	0.112
	0.7	0.084	0.082	0.090	0.095	0.084	0.083	0.085	0.089	0.100	0.125
	MP	0.048	0.062	0.079	0.081	0.057	0.070	0.084	0.673	0.904	0.996

Table 14: Simulated significance level for testing equal variances through  $W_{n,\alpha}(\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})$  given by (63) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 50$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.114	0.121	0.126	0.130	0.119	0.122	0.129	0.322	0.479	0.665
	0.1	0.115	0.119	0.121	0.124	0.117	0.117	0.120	0.174	0.288	0.525
	0.2	0.119	0.121	0.123	0.126	0.120	0.121	0.123	0.139	0.184	0.345
	0.3	0.125	0.127	0.129	0.132	0.126	0.126	0.129	0.136	0.157	0.245
	0.5	0.141	0.142	0.145	0.148	0.141	0.142	0.146	0.147	0.157	0.193
	0.7	0.164	0.166	0.168	0.173	0.166	0.164	0.170	0.169	0.177	0.201
0.3	0	0.115	0.121	0.125	0.128	0.118	0.123	0.129	0.326	0.487	0.673
	0.1	0.116	0.118	0.120	0.123	0.117	0.118	0.120	0.175	0.285	0.532
	0.2	0.120	0.121	0.122	0.125	0.120	0.121	0.122	0.138	0.179	0.346
	0.3	0.125	0.126	0.127	0.131	0.126	0.126	0.128	0.135	0.153	0.244
	0.5	0.141	0.142	0.143	0.147	0.142	0.142	0.145	0.146	0.154	0.192
	0.7	0.164	0.164	0.166	0.171	0.165	0.165	0.168	0.167	0.174	0.200
0.6	0	0.114	0.120	0.126	0.130	0.119	0.124	0.129	0.348	0.518	0.704
	0.1	0.116	0.118	0.121	0.124	0.117	0.119	0.120	0.171	0.289	0.552
	0.2	0.119	0.121	0.123	0.125	0.121	0.122	0.122	0.136	0.177	0.338
	0.3	0.125	0.126	0.128	0.130	0.126	0.127	0.127	0.134	0.154	0.232
	0.5	0.141	0.142	0.145	0.146	0.142	0.142	0.143	0.146	0.156	0.186
	0.7	0.163	0.165	0.169	0.171	0.165	0.165	0.166	0.169	0.178	0.196
0.9	0	0.114	0.121	0.127	0.129	0.118	0.123	0.129	0.411	0.588	0.767
	0.1	0.115	0.118	0.122	0.123	0.116	0.118	0.120	0.141	0.228	0.539
	0.2	0.119	0.121	0.123	0.125	0.120	0.121	0.122	0.124	0.139	0.242
	0.3	0.125	0.126	0.128	0.130	0.125	0.126	0.127	0.128	0.135	0.171
	0.5	0.141	0.141	0.144	0.146	0.141	0.141	0.142	0.143	0.149	0.164
	0.7	0.164	0.164	0.169	0.171	0.165	0.165	0.166	0.167	0.174	0.188

Table 15: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for correlation coefficient,  $\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 50$



$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.051	0.068	0.078	0.086	0.062	0.069	0.088	0.532	0.807	0.979
	0.1	0.052	0.058	0.063	0.065	0.055	0.053	0.061	0.199	0.480	0.883
	0.2	0.052	0.055	0.058	0.061	0.054	0.051	0.058	0.096	0.210	0.588
	0.3	0.052	0.057	0.057	0.062	0.056	0.052	0.060	0.075	0.126	0.343
	0.5	0.059	0.061	0.067	0.072	0.062	0.059	0.067	0.069	0.092	0.176
	0.7	0.074	0.078	0.085	0.092	0.079	0.075	0.085	0.084	0.101	0.145
	MP	0.050	0.067	0.077	0.084	0.061	0.068	0.086	0.529	0.805	0.979
0.3	0	0.053	0.064	0.074	0.083	0.060	0.071	0.086	0.538	0.815	0.980
	0.1	0.054	0.055	0.062	0.069	0.051	0.056	0.060	0.201	0.480	0.888
	0.2	0.054	0.053	0.058	0.063	0.051	0.054	0.058	0.095	0.200	0.586
	0.3	0.055	0.056	0.057	0.064	0.054	0.054	0.058	0.076	0.114	0.339
	0.5	0.062	0.061	0.063	0.070	0.063	0.061	0.067	0.072	0.084	0.168
	0.7	0.077	0.077	0.080	0.088	0.078	0.077	0.084	0.085	0.094	0.139
	MP	0.052	0.063	0.072	0.081	0.059	0.070	0.084	0.536	0.814	0.980
0.6	0	0.054	0.063	0.076	0.086	0.061	0.076	0.086	0.575	0.845	0.985
	0.1	0.052	0.054	0.064	0.067	0.055	0.056	0.058	0.191	0.481	0.889
	0.2	0.052	0.053	0.060	0.062	0.055	0.053	0.056	0.088	0.192	0.558
	0.3	0.053	0.055	0.061	0.064	0.055	0.054	0.055	0.070	0.114	0.306
	0.5	0.060	0.061	0.067	0.069	0.060	0.060	0.062	0.069	0.085	0.155
	0.7	0.074	0.077	0.083	0.087	0.078	0.074	0.078	0.084	0.098	0.134
	MP	0.053	0.062	0.074	0.085	0.060	0.074	0.084	0.574	0.843	0.985
0.9	0	0.050	0.064	0.080	0.082	0.059	0.071	0.085	0.674	0.905	0.996
	0.1	0.050	0.053	0.064	0.065	0.051	0.055	0.059	0.108	0.315	0.804
	0.2	0.051	0.051	0.061	0.061	0.053	0.052	0.056	0.060	0.096	0.331
	0.3	0.051	0.051	0.062	0.061	0.056	0.052	0.058	0.056	0.073	0.155
	0.5	0.061	0.060	0.067	0.067	0.062	0.059	0.064	0.063	0.076	0.104
	0.7	0.077	0.075	0.083	0.088	0.079	0.076	0.079	0.082	0.093	0.118
	MP	0.048	0.062	0.079	0.081	0.057	0.070	0.084	0.673	0.904	0.996

Table 16: Simulated significance level for testing null correlation coefficient through  $W'_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha})$  given by (65) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 50$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.081	0.086	0.089	0.093	0.085	0.089	0.094	0.288	0.429	0.569
	0.1	0.082	0.084	0.085	0.088	0.083	0.084	0.085	0.133	0.241	0.451
	0.2	0.085	0.086	0.087	0.089	0.086	0.086	0.086	0.100	0.141	0.292
	0.3	0.089	0.090	0.090	0.092	0.090	0.089	0.089	0.095	0.114	0.197
	0.5	0.099	0.100	0.100	0.103	0.100	0.099	0.099	0.102	0.108	0.140
	0.7	0.111	0.113	0.113	0.116	0.112	0.111	0.112	0.114	0.117	0.135
0.3	0	0.077	0.082	0.086	0.088	0.080	0.084	0.090	0.288	0.427	0.569
	0.1	0.078	0.079	0.082	0.084	0.078	0.080	0.081	0.128	0.234	0.449
	0.2	0.081	0.081	0.083	0.084	0.080	0.082	0.082	0.094	0.134	0.284
	0.3	0.084	0.085	0.086	0.087	0.084	0.085	0.085	0.090	0.109	0.190
	0.5	0.093	0.094	0.096	0.097	0.093	0.094	0.095	0.096	0.104	0.135
	0.7	0.105	0.107	0.108	0.110	0.105	0.107	0.106	0.108	0.113	0.130
0.6	0	0.064	0.070	0.072	0.074	0.068	0.071	0.076	0.289	0.427	0.571
	0.1	0.065	0.068	0.069	0.070	0.066	0.067	0.068	0.109	0.210	0.443
	0.2	0.067	0.069	0.070	0.070	0.068	0.068	0.069	0.079	0.112	0.255
	0.3	0.070	0.072	0.073	0.073	0.071	0.071	0.072	0.076	0.091	0.161
	0.5	0.077	0.080	0.081	0.081	0.079	0.079	0.080	0.081	0.088	0.114
	0.7	0.087	0.090	0.091	0.092	0.089	0.089	0.090	0.091	0.095	0.111
0.9	0	0.035	0.038	0.039	0.040	0.037	0.039	0.041	0.286	0.428	0.570
	0.1	0.035	0.037	0.037	0.038	0.036	0.037	0.037	0.049	0.106	0.387
	0.2	0.036	0.037	0.038	0.039	0.037	0.037	0.038	0.040	0.049	0.112
	0.3	0.038	0.039	0.039	0.040	0.039	0.039	0.039	0.040	0.044	0.064
	0.5	0.042	0.043	0.044	0.045	0.043	0.043	0.044	0.044	0.046	0.055
	0.7	0.048	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.050	0.052	0.058

Table 17: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for ratio of variances,  $\hat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 100$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.053	0.068	0.080	0.087	0.067	0.080	0.096	0.748	0.963	1.000
	0.1	0.054	0.059	0.063	0.067	0.057	0.056	0.061	0.280	0.684	0.983
	0.2	0.053	0.058	0.059	0.062	0.057	0.055	0.057	0.120	0.303	0.795
	0.3	0.054	0.058	0.060	0.063	0.056	0.055	0.058	0.086	0.166	0.500
	0.5	0.057	0.059	0.063	0.066	0.057	0.058	0.059	0.069	0.097	0.227
	0.7	0.062	0.064	0.069	0.072	0.065	0.062	0.063	0.072	0.089	0.153
	MP	0.052	0.066	0.077	0.085	0.065	0.078	0.094	0.746	0.962	1.000
0.3	0	0.051	0.069	0.079	0.086	0.063	0.077	0.095	0.760	0.964	1.000
	0.1	0.051	0.057	0.063	0.069	0.050	0.057	0.057	0.280	0.678	0.988
	0.2	0.052	0.055	0.058	0.066	0.052	0.054	0.054	0.117	0.291	0.793
	0.3	0.052	0.055	0.058	0.065	0.051	0.055	0.056	0.083	0.161	0.494
	0.5	0.053	0.057	0.060	0.068	0.055	0.059	0.058	0.068	0.096	0.223
	0.7	0.059	0.065	0.065	0.073	0.061	0.063	0.065	0.070	0.087	0.148
	MP	0.049	0.067	0.077	0.084	0.060	0.074	0.093	0.759	0.964	1.000
0.6	0	0.049	0.071	0.084	0.088	0.066	0.078	0.098	0.803	0.975	1.000
	0.1	0.047	0.059	0.068	0.070	0.055	0.059	0.062	0.267	0.661	0.987
	0.2	0.049	0.058	0.065	0.063	0.054	0.056	0.056	0.102	0.262	0.773
	0.3	0.049	0.059	0.063	0.062	0.056	0.057	0.056	0.076	0.146	0.464
	0.5	0.053	0.059	0.066	0.068	0.059	0.061	0.058	0.066	0.095	0.207
	0.7	0.058	0.065	0.070	0.074	0.063	0.066	0.065	0.070	0.089	0.144
	MP	0.047	0.069	0.081	0.085	0.063	0.076	0.096	0.801	0.974	1.000
0.9	0	0.051	0.070	0.079	0.091	0.068	0.078	0.096	0.881	0.994	1.000
	0.1	0.050	0.058	0.062	0.072	0.055	0.057	0.060	0.131	0.423	0.948
	0.2	0.050	0.058	0.059	0.065	0.054	0.056	0.059	0.068	0.118	0.443
	0.3	0.050	0.059	0.058	0.065	0.054	0.056	0.059	0.063	0.084	0.201
	0.5	0.056	0.062	0.058	0.067	0.057	0.057	0.063	0.064	0.071	0.116
	0.7	0.062	0.068	0.066	0.075	0.062	0.064	0.070	0.069	0.073	0.106
	MP	0.047	0.067	0.076	0.088	0.065	0.075	0.093	0.880	0.993	1.000

Table 18: Simulated significance level for testing equal variances through  $W_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\gamma}_{R,\alpha}, \widehat{\rho}_{R,\alpha})$  given by (63) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 100$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.081	0.086	0.089	0.092	0.085	0.089	0.093	0.334	0.510	0.685
	0.1	0.082	0.084	0.085	0.087	0.083	0.083	0.084	0.144	0.274	0.538
	0.2	0.085	0.086	0.086	0.088	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.104	0.154	0.337
	0.3	0.088	0.089	0.090	0.092	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.098	0.121	0.221
	0.5	0.098	0.099	0.099	0.102	0.099	0.098	0.098	0.103	0.112	0.152
	0.7	0.110	0.111	0.112	0.115	0.111	0.110	0.111	0.114	0.120	0.144
0.3	0	0.081	0.085	0.089	0.092	0.084	0.088	0.093	0.342	0.517	0.695
	0.1	0.082	0.083	0.085	0.087	0.081	0.083	0.084	0.143	0.274	0.545
	0.2	0.084	0.084	0.086	0.088	0.084	0.085	0.085	0.103	0.152	0.337
	0.3	0.088	0.088	0.090	0.091	0.087	0.089	0.089	0.097	0.120	0.220
	0.5	0.097	0.098	0.099	0.101	0.097	0.098	0.098	0.102	0.112	0.152
	0.7	0.109	0.110	0.112	0.114	0.109	0.111	0.110	0.113	0.120	0.143
0.6	0	0.080	0.086	0.089	0.092	0.085	0.088	0.094	0.373	0.550	0.726
	0.1	0.081	0.084	0.086	0.087	0.083	0.083	0.084	0.140	0.271	0.569
	0.2	0.083	0.085	0.087	0.088	0.085	0.085	0.086	0.101	0.144	0.330
	0.3	0.087	0.089	0.091	0.091	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.096	0.116	0.208
	0.5	0.096	0.099	0.100	0.100	0.098	0.098	0.099	0.102	0.111	0.147
	0.7	0.108	0.111	0.113	0.114	0.111	0.110	0.112	0.114	0.120	0.141
0.9	0	0.079	0.086	0.088	0.092	0.085	0.089	0.094	0.446	0.626	0.786
	0.1	0.080	0.084	0.085	0.087	0.082	0.084	0.085	0.104	0.194	0.572
	0.2	0.083	0.085	0.086	0.088	0.084	0.085	0.086	0.088	0.104	0.205
	0.3	0.086	0.089	0.089	0.092	0.088	0.089	0.090	0.090	0.097	0.132
	0.5	0.096	0.099	0.099	0.102	0.098	0.098	0.100	0.099	0.103	0.118
	0.7	0.109	0.111	0.112	0.115	0.110	0.111	0.113	0.112	0.115	0.126

Table 19: Simulated mean square error of the MRPDE for correlation coefficient,  $\hat{\rho}_{R,\alpha}$ , when  $n = 100$

$\rho$	$\alpha$	slightly			regular			heavily			
		pure	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20	0.05	0.10	0.20
0	0	0.053	0.067	0.078	0.086	0.066	0.079	0.095	0.747	0.962	1.000
	0.1	0.052	0.058	0.062	0.066	0.056	0.055	0.060	0.278	0.682	0.983
	0.2	0.052	0.057	0.058	0.061	0.056	0.053	0.056	0.118	0.301	0.794
	0.3	0.053	0.056	0.058	0.061	0.055	0.053	0.057	0.085	0.164	0.497
	0.5	0.055	0.057	0.061	0.064	0.056	0.056	0.057	0.068	0.095	0.224
	0.7	0.061	0.063	0.067	0.070	0.063	0.060	0.062	0.070	0.087	0.150
	MP	0.052	0.066	0.077	0.085	0.065	0.078	0.094	0.746	0.962	1.000
0.3	0	0.049	0.068	0.077	0.085	0.061	0.076	0.093	0.759	0.964	1.000
	0.1	0.050	0.055	0.061	0.068	0.049	0.056	0.055	0.276	0.675	0.988
	0.2	0.051	0.053	0.057	0.065	0.050	0.053	0.052	0.116	0.289	0.791
	0.3	0.050	0.054	0.056	0.063	0.050	0.054	0.054	0.081	0.159	0.490
	0.5	0.052	0.056	0.059	0.066	0.053	0.057	0.056	0.066	0.094	0.220
	0.7	0.057	0.063	0.064	0.071	0.059	0.060	0.063	0.067	0.085	0.145
	MP	0.049	0.067	0.077	0.084	0.060	0.074	0.093	0.759	0.964	1.000
0.6	0	0.048	0.070	0.082	0.086	0.064	0.077	0.096	0.801	0.974	1.000
	0.1	0.046	0.058	0.066	0.068	0.053	0.058	0.061	0.264	0.659	0.987
	0.2	0.047	0.056	0.062	0.060	0.053	0.054	0.054	0.099	0.259	0.771
	0.3	0.047	0.058	0.060	0.060	0.054	0.056	0.054	0.074	0.143	0.460
	0.5	0.051	0.057	0.063	0.065	0.057	0.059	0.056	0.063	0.093	0.204
	0.7	0.055	0.061	0.068	0.071	0.061	0.063	0.062	0.068	0.086	0.140
	MP	0.047	0.069	0.081	0.085	0.063	0.076	0.096	0.801	0.974	1.000
0.9	0	0.048	0.068	0.076	0.089	0.065	0.076	0.094	0.880	0.994	1.000
	0.1	0.048	0.056	0.060	0.069	0.053	0.055	0.058	0.128	0.418	0.947
	0.2	0.047	0.056	0.056	0.063	0.052	0.054	0.057	0.066	0.115	0.438
	0.3	0.048	0.056	0.056	0.062	0.052	0.053	0.057	0.061	0.081	0.197
	0.5	0.053	0.060	0.056	0.064	0.054	0.054	0.059	0.061	0.068	0.112
	0.7	0.059	0.065	0.062	0.071	0.059	0.061	0.067	0.066	0.069	0.101
	MP	0.047	0.067	0.076	0.088	0.065	0.075	0.093	0.880	0.993	1.000

Table 20: Simulated significance level for testing null correlation coefficient through  $W'_{n,\alpha}(\widehat{\rho}_{UV,R,\alpha})$  given by (65) and the Morgan-Pitman test, when  $n = 100$