

# Simulation Studies For Goodness-of-Fit and Two-Sample Methods For Univariate Data

Wolfgang Rolke

University of Puerto Rico - Mayaguez  
wolfgang.rolke@upr.edu  
November 13, 2024

## Abstract

We present the results of a large number of simulation studies regarding the power of various goodness-of-fit as well as nonparametric two-sample tests for univariate data. This includes both continuous and discrete data. In general no single method can be relied upon to provide good power, any one method may be quite good for some combination of null hypothesis and alternative and may fail badly for another. Based on the results of these studies we propose a fairly small number of methods chosen such that for any of the case studies included here at least one of the methods has good power. The studies were carried out using the R packages *R2sample* and *Rgof*, available from CRAN.

## 1 Introduction

Both the goodness-of-fit (gof) and the nonparametric two-sample problem have histories going back a century, with many contributions by some of the most eminent statisticians. In the goodness-of-fit problem we have a sample  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  drawn from some probability distribution  $F$ , possibly with unknown parameters, and we wish to test  $H_0 : X \sim F$ . In the two-sample problem we also have a second sample  $(y_1, \dots, y_m)$  from some distribution  $G$ , and here we want to test  $H_0 : F = G$ , that is we want to test whether the two data sets were generated by the same (unspecified) distribution.

The literature on both of these problems is vast and steadily growing. Detailed discussions can be found in [D'Agostini and Stephens, 1986], [Thas, 2010], [Raynor et al., 2012]. For an introduction to Statistics and hypothesis testing in general see [Casella and Berger, 2002] or [Bickel and Doksum, 2015].

The power studies in this article were carried out using **R** programs in the packages *R2sample* and *Rgof*, available from the CRAN website. Some tests such as the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test are already implemented for both problems in base **R**. Many others can be run through various packages, for example the Anderson-Darling goodness-of-fit test is available in the **R** package *ADGofTest* [Bellosta, 2011]. There are also packages that allow the user to run several tests, for example the *twosamples* [Dowd, 2022] package. However, there are no packages that bring together as many tests as *R2sample* and *Rgof*. Also

- all the methods are implemented for both continuous and discrete data. Discrete data includes the case of histogram (aka discretized or binned) data.
- the methods are implemented using both *Rcpp* [Eddelbuettel et al., 2024] and parallel programming.
- some of the methods allow for data with weights.
- the routines allow for a random sample size, assumed to come from a Poisson distribution.

- in the two-sample problem some methods make use of large-sample formulas, therefore allowing for very large data sets.
- there are routines that allow the user to combine several tests and find a corrected p value.
- the routines can also use any other user-defined tests.
- the packages include routines to easily carry out power studies and draw power graphs.

Including tests for discrete data is useful in two ways: Of course discrete data is of interest in its own right, and there are no implementations in  $R$  at this time. It also makes it possible to apply the tests to very large continuous data sets via discretization. While a test for a continuous data set with (say) 100,000 observations each can be done in a matter of a few minutes, for larger data sets the calculations will be quite time consuming. Binning the data and then running the corresponding discrete tests however is quite fast.

There are also situations where the underlying distribution is continuous but the data is collected in binned form. This is for example often the case for data from high energy physics experiments and from astronomy because of finite detector resolution. In this situation the theoretical distribution is continuous but the data is discrete.

For the tests in the two-sample problem p-values are found via the permutation method. If the data sets are large for some of the tests the p-values can be found via large sample approximations. In the goodness-of-fit case p-values are always found via simulation. While large sample approximations are known for some methods such as Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Anderson-Darling, there are no known large sample theories for most of the other tests. Moreover, in the more common situation where the distribution under the null hypothesis depends on parameters, which have to be estimated from the data, even those tests no longer have known large sample theories and one is forced to use simulation to find p-values.

## 2 The Types of Problems Included in this Study

- **Goodness-of-Fit Problem - Continuous Data:** We have a sample  $x$  of size of  $n$ .  $F$  is a continuous probability distribution, which may depend on unknown parameters. We want to test  $X \sim F$ .
- **Goodness-of-Fit Problem - Discrete Data:** We have a set of values  $vals$  and a vector of counts  $x$ .  $F$  is a discrete probability distribution, which may depend on unknown parameters. We want to test  $X \sim F$ .
- **Two-sample Problem - Continuous Data:** We have a sample  $x$  of size of  $n$ , drawn from some unknown continuous probability distribution  $F$ , and a sample  $y$  of size  $m$ , drawn from some unknown continuous probability distribution  $G$ . We want to test  $F = G$ .
- **Two-sample Problem - Discrete Data:** We have a set of values  $vals$  and vectors of counts  $x$  and  $y$ , drawn from some unknown discrete probability distributions  $F$  and  $G$ . We want to test  $F = G$ .

## 3 Highlights of the Results

1. No single method can be relied upon to provide good power, any one method may be quite good for some combination of null hypothesis and alternative and may fail badly for another.

Quick links: [goodness-of-fit](#), [twosample](#).

2. All the methods included in the packages achieve the desired type I error rate.

Quick links: [goodness-of-fit](#), [twosample](#) [twosample](#).

- Chi-square tests with a large number of bins generally have poor power. Care needs to be taken so that the expected counts in the goodness-of fit problem and the combined observed counts in the twosample problem are at least 5. We recommend to use a number of bins so that the degrees of freedom of the chi-square distribution is about 10.

Quick links: goodness-of-fit, twosample twosample.

- Several tests can be combined as follows: one rejects the null hypothesis if any of the individual tests does so. It is possible to find a correct p-value for this combination test via simulation.

Quick links: simultaneous testing

- In general a method that has good power for the continuous data problem will also have good power for the corresponding discrete (aka histogram) problem) Quick links: goodness-of-fit.

- Based on the results of these studies we propose to use the following methods:

Quick links: goodness-of-fit, twosample twosample.

- Goodness-of-fit problem, continuous data: Wilson's test, Zhang's ZC, Anderson-Darling and a chi-square test with a small number of equal-size bins.
- Goodness-of-fit problem, discrete data: Wilson's test, Anderson-Darling and a chi-square test with a small number of bins.
- Two-sample problem, continuous data: Kuiper's test, Zhang's ZA and ZK methods, the Wasserstein test as well as a chi-square test with a small number of equal spaced bins.
- Two-sample problem, discrete data: Kuiper's test, Anderson-Darling, Zhang's ZA test as well as a chi-square test with a small number of bins.

## 4 The Methods

In the following we list the methods included in the packages. Most are well known and have been in use for a long time. For their details see the references. In the following we use the following notations:

Goodness-of-fit problem, continuous data: we denote the cumulative distribution functions (cdf) by  $F$ , its empirical distribution function (edf) by  $\hat{F}$ . The sample size is  $n$  and the ordered data set is  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .

Goodness-of-fit problem, discrete data: There are  $k$  possible values  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  that can be observed, the cdf is  $F$ , the edf  $\hat{F}$ . The sample size is  $n$  and the counts are  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ .

Two-sample problem, continuous data: There are data sets  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_m$ . The combined data set is denoted by  $z_1, \dots, z_{n+m}$ . These have edf's  $\hat{F}$ ,  $\hat{G}$  and  $\hat{H}$ , respectively.

Two-sample problem, discrete data: There are  $k$  possible values  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  that can be observed. The two data sets have counts  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_k$ . The combined data set has counts  $z_i = x_i + y_i$ . These have edf's  $\hat{F}$ ,  $\hat{G}$  and  $\hat{H}$ , respectively.

### 4.1 Chi-Square Tests

In the case of continuous data the routines include eight chi-square tests, with either equal size (ES) or equal probability (EP) bins, either a large ( $l=50$ ) or a small ( $s=10$ ) number of bins and with either the Pearson (P) or the log-likelihood (L) formula. So the combination of a large number of equal size bins and Pearson's chi-square formula is denoted by ES-l-P, etc.

In the case of discrete data the type and the number of classes is already given, and then these are combined for a total of 10. Again both chi-square formulas are used. So here the case of a large number of bins and Pearson's formula is denoted by l-P.

In all cases neighboring bins with low counts are joined until all bins have a count of at least 5. In all cases the p-values are found using the usual chi-square approximation.

If parameters have to be estimated, this is done via the user-provided routine *phat*. As long as the method of estimation used is consistent and efficient and the expected counts are large enough the chi-square statistic will have a chi-square distribution, as shown by (Fisher 1922) and (Fisher 1924).

Alternatively we can use the argument *ChiUsePhat=FALSE*. In that case the value provided by *phat* is used as a starting point but the parameters are estimated via the method of minimum chi-square. This method has the desirable feature that if the null hypothesis is rejected for this set of values, it will always be rejected for any other as well. For a discussion of this estimation method see [Berkson, 1980].

The formulas are as follows.

#### 4.1.1 Goodness-of-Fit Problem

Say the  $i^{th}$  bin is  $[a_i, a_{i+1}]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and  $O_i$  is the observed counts in the  $i^{th}$  bin. If  $E_i = n [F(a_{i+1}) - F(a_i)]$  is the expected counts in the  $i^{th}$  bin, then the test statistics are given by

##### Continuous Data

Pearson:  $\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{O_i^2}{E_i} - n$

log-likelihood:  $2 \sum_{i=1}^k \left[ E_i - O_i + O_i \log \frac{O_i}{E_i} \right]$

##### Discrete Data

Because a chi-square test is based on binned data, the formulas are essentially the same as in the continuous case.

If the large-sample approximation holds, then these test statistics will have a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom df, where

- no parameter estimation, fixed sample size: df = number of bins - 1
- no parameter estimation, random sample size: df = number of bins
- with parameter estimation, fixed sample size: df = number of bins - 1 - number of estimated parameters
- with parameter estimation, random sample size: df = number of bins - number of estimated parameters

#### 4.1.2 Two-Sample Problem

Here we have the observed counts  $O_i$  and  $M_i$  for the two data sets in the  $i^{th}$  bin. Let  $N_1 = \sum O_i$ ,  $N_2 = \sum M_i$  and  $N = N_1 + N_2$  as well as  $Z_i = O_i + M_i$ , then the chi-square test statistic is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(O_i - NZ_i/N_1)^2}{NZ_i/N_1} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(M_i - (NZ_i/N_2))^2}{NZ_i/N_2}$$

Here the "expected counts" are found by simply combining the two data sets.

This can be simplified to

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(O_i/s - sM_i)^2}{Z_i}$$

where  $s = \sqrt{N_1/N_2}$ . Under the null hypothesis this test statistic will have a chi-square distribution with the degrees of freedom equal to the number of bins - 1.

## 4.2 Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS)

This test is based on the largest absolute distance between  $F$  and  $\hat{F}$  in the goodness-of-fit problem and between  $\hat{F}$  and  $\hat{G}$  in the two-sample problem. The tests were first proposed in [Kolmogorov, 1933], [Smirnov, 1939] and are among the most widely used tests today. There is a known large sample distribution of the test statistic in the two-sample problem, which is used either if both sample sizes exceed 1000 or if the argument *UseLargeSample=TRUE* is set. In the goodness-of-fit case the large sample theory is known only in the case of a fully specified distribution under the null hypothesis. Because this is rarely of interest the large sample approximation is not used.

The formulas are as follows:

### 4.2.1 Goodness-of-Fit Problem

Theory

$$\max\{|\hat{F}(x) - F(x)| : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

Continuous Data

$$\max\left\{|\hat{F}(x_i) - \frac{i}{n}|, \left|\frac{i-1}{n} - \hat{F}(x_i)\right| : i = 1, \dots, n\right\}$$

Discrete Data

$$\max\left\{|F(v_i) - \hat{F}(v_i)|, |\hat{F}(v_{i-1}) - F(v_i)| : i = 1, \dots, k\right\}$$

### 4.2.2 Two-Sample Problem

Theory

$$\max\{|\hat{F}(x) - \hat{G}(x)| : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

Continuous Data

$$\max\left\{|\hat{F}(z_i) - \hat{G}(z_i)| : i = 1, \dots, n\right\}$$

Discrete Data

$$\max\left\{|\hat{F}(v_i) - \hat{G}(v_i)| : i = 1, \dots, k\right\}$$

## 4.3 Kuiper (K)

This test is closely related to Kolmogorov-Smirnov, but it uses the sum of the largest positive and negative differences as a test statistic. It was first proposed in [Kuiper, 1960].

### 4.3.1 Goodness-of-Fit Problem

Theory

$$\max\{|\hat{F}(x) - F(x)| : x \in \mathbb{R}\} + \max\{|F(x) - \hat{F}(x)| : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

Continuous Data

$$\max\left\{|\hat{F}(x_i) - \frac{i}{n}| : i = 1, \dots, n\right\} + \max\left\{\left|\frac{i-1}{n} - \hat{F}(x_i)\right| : i = 1, \dots, n\right\}$$

Discrete Data

$$\max\left\{|F(v_i) - \hat{F}(v_i)| : i = 1, \dots, k\right\} + \max\left\{|\hat{F}(v_{i-1}) - F(v_i)| : i = 1, \dots, k\right\}$$

### 4.3.2 Two-Sample Problem

Theory

$$\max\{\hat{F}(x) - \hat{G}(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} - \min\{\hat{F}(x) - \hat{G}(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

Continuous Data

$$\max\left\{\hat{F}(x_i) - \hat{G}(x_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\right\} - \min\left\{\hat{F}(x_i) - \hat{G}(x_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\right\}$$

## Discrete Data

$$\max \left\{ \hat{F}(v_i) - \hat{G}(v_i) : i = 1, \dots, k \right\} - \min \left\{ \hat{F}(v_i) - \hat{G}(v_i) : i = 1, \dots, k \right\}$$

## 4.4 Cramer-vonMises (CvM)

This test is based on the integrated squared differences. The GoF version is discussed in [Cramer, 1928] and [von Mises, 1928]. The two-sample version was proposed in [Anderson, 1962].

### 4.4.1 Goodness-of-Fit Problem

#### Theory

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (F(x) - \hat{F}(x))^2 dF(x)$$

#### Continuous Data

$$\frac{1}{12n} + \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{2i-1}{2n} - F(x_i) \right)^2$$

#### Discrete Data

$$\frac{1}{12n} + n \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \hat{F}(v_i) - F(v_i) \right)^2 (F(v_i) - F(v_{i-1}))$$

### 4.4.2 Two-sample Problem

#### Theory

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\hat{F}(x) - \hat{G}(x))^2 d\hat{H}(x)$$

#### Continuous Data

$$\frac{nm}{(n+m)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \left( \hat{F}(z_i) - \hat{G}(z_i) \right)^2$$

#### Discrete Data

$$\frac{nm}{(n+m)^2} \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \hat{F}(v_i) - \hat{G}(v_i) \right)^2$$

## 4.5 Anderson-Darling (AD)

This test is similar to the Cramer-vonMises test but with an integrand that emphasizes the tails. It was first proposed in [Anderson and Darling, 1952]. The two-sample version is discussed in [Pettitt, 1976].

### 4.5.1 Goodness-of-Fit Problem

#### Theory

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(F(x) - \hat{F}(x))^2}{\hat{F}(x)(1 - \hat{F}(x))} dF(x)$$

#### Continuous Data

$$-n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (2i - 1) \left( \log(\hat{F}(x_i)) + \log(1 - \hat{F}(x_{n+1-i})) \right)$$

**Discrete Data**

$$\sum \frac{(F(v_i) - \hat{F}(v_i))^2}{\hat{F}(v_i)(1 - \hat{F}(v_i))}$$

where the sum runs over those  $v_i$  with  $\hat{F}(v_i) > 0$  and  $\hat{F}(v_i) < 1$ .

#### 4.5.2 Two-sample Problem

**Theory**

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(\hat{F}(x) - \hat{G}(x))^2}{\hat{H}(x)(1 - \hat{H}(x))} d\hat{H}(x)$$

**Continuous Data**

$$nm \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \frac{(\hat{F}(z_i) - \hat{G}(z_i))^2}{i(n+m+1-i)}$$

**Discrete Data**

$$nm \sum_{i=1}^k w_i (\hat{F}(v_i) - \hat{G}(v_i))^2$$

where

$$w_i = \sum_{j=z_{i-1}}^{z_i} \frac{1}{j(n+m+1-j)}$$

#### 4.6 Wasserstein p=1 (Wassp1)

A test based on the Wasserstein p=1 metric. It is based on a comparison of quantiles. In the goodness-of-fit case these are the quantiles of the data set and the quantiles of the cdf, and in the two-sample problem they are the quantiles of the individual data sets and the quantiles of the combined data set. If  $n = m$  the test statistic in the continuous case takes a very simple form:  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - y_i|$ . In the goodness-of-fit problem for continuous data the user has to supply a function that calculates the inverse of the cdf under the null hypothesis. For a discussion of the Wasserstein distance see [Vaserstein, 1969].

#### 4.7 Zhang's tests (ZA, ZK and ZC)

These tests were proposed in [Zhang, 2002] and [Zhang, 2006]. They are variations of test statistics based on the likelihood ratio.

**Theory**

For the theory behind these tests consult the papers by Zhang.

### 4.7.1 Goodness-of-Fit Problem

#### Continuous Data

$$Z_K = \max \left( \left( i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \log \left\{ \frac{i - \frac{1}{2}}{nF(x_i)} \right\} + \left( n - i + \frac{1}{2} \right) \log \left\{ \frac{n - i + \frac{1}{2}}{n[1 - F(x_i)]} \right\} \right)$$

$$Z_A = - \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{\log[F(x_i)]}{n - i + \frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\log[1 - F(x_i)]}{i - \frac{1}{2}} \right]$$

$$Z_C = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \log \left\{ \frac{F(x_i)^{-1} - 1}{(n - \frac{1}{2}) / (i - \frac{3}{4}) - 1} \right\} \right]^2$$

#### Discrete Data

None of these tests have a version for discrete data. The reason is that they are built on the concept of ranks, and in the discrete data case there are simply too many ties.

### 4.7.2 Two-sample Problem

We define  $R_j^x$  to be the rank of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  order statistic of the  $x$  data set in the pooled data set, and  $R_j^y$  accordingly. Next define  $t_k = (k - \frac{1}{2}) / (n + m)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, n + m$ . Also let  $z_i$  be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  observation in the ordered pooled sample of  $x$  and  $y$ .

#### Continuous Data

$$Z_K = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n+m} \left\{ n \left[ \hat{F}(x_i) \log \frac{\hat{F}(z_i)}{t_k} + (1 - \hat{F}(z_i)) \log \frac{1 - \hat{F}(z_i)}{1 - t_k} \right] + m \left[ \hat{G}(z_i) \log \frac{\hat{G}(z_i)}{t_k} + (1 - \hat{G}(z_i)) \log \frac{1 - \hat{G}(z_i)}{1 - t_k} \right] \right\}$$

$$Z_A = - \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} \left\{ n \frac{\hat{F}(z_i) \log \hat{F}(z_i) + (1 - \hat{F}(z_i)) \log(1 - \hat{F}(z_i))}{(i - \frac{1}{2})(n - i + \frac{1}{2})} - m \frac{\hat{G}(z_i) \log \hat{G}(z_i) + (1 - \hat{G}(z_i)) \log(1 - \hat{G}(z_i))}{(i - \frac{1}{2})(n - i + \frac{1}{2})} \right\}$$

$$Z_C = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left( \frac{n}{i - \frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right) \log \left( \frac{n + m}{R_i^x - \frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \log \left( \frac{m}{i - \frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right) \log \left( \frac{n + m}{R_i^y - \frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right)$$

#### Discrete Data

Only the  $Z_A$  method has a discrete version, which uses a formula essentially the same as the continuous data formula.

There are also a number of tests which are only implemented for either the goodness-of-fit or the two-sample problem and/or either continuous or discrete data:

### 4.8 Watson's Test (W), Goodness-of-Fit Problem

This test is closely related to the Cramer-vonMises test. It adjusts that test's statistic via a squared difference of the mean of  $\hat{F}(x_i)$  and 0.5. It was proposed in [Watson, 1961].



#### 4.9 Lehmann-Rosenblatt (LR), Two-sample Problem

Let  $r_i$  and  $s_i$  be the ranks of  $x$  and  $y$  in the combined sample, then the test statistic is given by

$$\frac{1}{nm(n+m)} \left[ n \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i - 1)^2 + m \sum_{i=1}^m (s_i - 1)^2 \right]$$

For details see [Lehmann, 1951] and [Rosenblatt, 1952].

## 5 Case Studies - Goodness-of-Fit Problem

### 5.1 Case Study 1: Uniform [0,1] - Linear Models

The density of the linear model is given by  $f(x) = 2sx + 1 - s; 0 < x < 1$ , so the parameter is the slope of the line.




Figure 1: Uniform vs Linear Models




Figure 1: Power Curves for Uniform vs Linear Models

## 5.2 Case Study 2: Uniform [0,1] - Quadratic Models




Figure 2: Uniform vs Quadratic Models




Figure 2: Power Curves for Uniform vs Quadratic Models

### 5.3 Case Study 3: Uniform [0,1] - Uniform with a Bump




Figure 3: Uniform vs Uniform+Bump Models




Figure 3: Power Curves for Uniform vs Uniform+Bump Models

### 5.4 Case Study 4: Uniform [0,1] - Uniform with a Sine Wave




Figure 4: Uniform vs Sine Models




Figure 4: Power Curves for Uniform vs Sine Models

### 5.5 Case Study 5: Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)




Figure 5: Beta(2,2) vs Beta(a,a) Models




Figure 5: Power Curves for Beta(2,2) vs Beta(a,a) Models

## 5.6 Case Study 6: Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)




Figure 6: Beta(2,2) vs Beta(2,a) Models




Figure 6: Power Curves for Beta(2,2) vs Beta(2,a) Models

## 5.7 Case Study 7: Standard Normal - Normal with Shift




Figure 7: Standard Normal vs Normal with Shift Models




Figure 7: Power Curves for Standard Normal vs Normal with Shift Models



## 5.8 Case Study 8: Standard Normal - Normal with Stretch




Figure 8: Standard Normal vs Normal with Stretch Models




Figure 8: Power Curves for Standard Normal vs Normal with Stretch Models

## 5.9 Case Study 9: Standard Normal - t distribution




Figure 9: Standard Normal vs t distribution Models




Figure 9: Power Curves for Standard Normal vs t distribution Models

## 5.10 Case Study 10: Normal - Normal with Large Outliers




Figure 10: Normal vs Normal with Large Outliers Models




Figure 10: Power Curves for Normal vs Normal with Large Outliers Models

## 5.11 Case Study 11: Normal - Normal with Outliers on Both Sides




Figure 11: Normal vs Normal with Outliers on Both Sides Models




Figure 11: Power Curves for Normal vs Normal with Outliers on Both Sides Models

## 5.12 Case Study 14: Exponential - Exponential with Bump




Figure 14: Exponential vs Exponential with Bump Models




Figure 14: Power Curves for Exponential vs Exponential with Bump Models

### 5.13 Case Study 15: Truncated Exponential - Linear




Figure 15: Truncated Exponential vs Linear Models




Figure 15: Power Curves for Truncated Exponential vs Linear Models

## 5.14 Case Study 16: Normal, Parameters Estimated - t ,Parameters Estimated




Figure 16: Normal, Parameters Estimated vs t Models




Figure 16: Power Curves for Normal, Parameters Estimated vs t Models

## 5.15 Case Study 17: Exponential - Weibull, Parameters Estimated




Figure 17: Exponential vs Weibull Models




Figure 17: Power Curves for Exponential vs Weibull Models



## 5.16 Case Study 18: Truncated Exponential - Linear, Parameters Estimated




Figure 18: Truncated Exponential vs Linear Models




Figure 18: Power Curves for Truncated Exponential vs Linear Models

## 5.17 Case Study 19: Exponential - Gamma, Parameters Estimated




Figure 19: Exponential vs Gamma Models




Figure 19: Power Curves for Exponential vs Gamma Models

## 5.18 Case Study 20: Exponential - Cauchy (Breit-Wigner), Parameters Estimated




Figure 20: Exponential vs Cauchy (Breit-Wigner) Models




Figure 20: Power Curves for Exponential vs Cauchy (Breit-Wigner) Models

## 5.19 Results for Goodness-of-Fit Tests

### 5.19.1 Type I Errors

#### Continuous Data

	KS	K	AD	CvM	W	ZA	ZK	ZC	Wassp1	ES-1-P
Uniform - Linear	4.3	4.3	3.3	3.3	4.3	4.8	4.0	5.3	2.9	5.2
Uniform - Quadratic	5.7	5.7	6.8	6.1	4.6	5.0	5.7	5.6	6.8	5.6
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	5.6	5.6	5.3	6.1	6.9	5.5	5.7	4.8	5.9	5.4
Uniform - Uniform+Sine	4.8	4.8	5.9	5.6	5.0	5.4	4.7	5.0	5.8	6.0
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.3	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.3
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)	5.0	5.0	5.3	5.2	6.2	5.4	5.2	4.9	5.0	5.1
Normal - Shift	5.1	5.1	5.6	5.5	4.0	4.1	5.1	5.1	5.8	4.8
Normal - Stretch	5.1	5.1	5.7	5.8	4.4	6.6	5.0	4.5	5.4	4.9
Normal - Outliers large	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.6	4.9	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.3
Normal - Outliers	5.4	5.4	4.7	5.1	6.1	3.1	4.2	3.6	4.7	5.0
Exponential - Gamma	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.8	3.7	4.4	4.7	4.7	5.3
Exponential - Weibull	6.1	6.1	8.4	6.4	5.3	5.9	6.4	5.6	7.1	5.0
Exponential - Bump	4.8	4.8	3.3	3.6	4.0	3.7	4.3	4.2	3.5	4.2
Exponential - Weibull, est.	4.9	4.9	5.4	5.3	5.1	5.1	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.4
Exponential - Gamma, est.	4.7	4.7	4.1	4.8	5.0	5.9	5.5	5.5	5.1	5.2

	ES-s-P	EP-1-P	EP-s-P	ES-1-L	ES-s-L	EP-1-L	EP-s-L
Uniform - Linear	5.0	5.2	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.0
Uniform - Quadratic	5.2	5.6	5.2	6.2	5.1	6.2	5.1
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	5.1	5.4	5.1	7.1	5.2	7.1	5.2
Uniform - Uniform+Sine	4.8	6.0	4.8	6.6	4.8	6.6	4.8
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	4.9	5.5	3.5	6.0	5.2	6.0	3.9
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)	4.0	4.9	4.3	5.6	4.2	5.3	4.5
Normal - Shift	5.3	4.6	6.0	5.6	5.8	5.6	5.9
Normal - Stretch	4.6	4.9	5.4	4.9	4.9	5.9	5.5
Normal - Outliers large	5.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.9	4.1
Normal - Outliers	5.6	5.6	5.2	5.6	5.3	6.1	5.5
Exponential - Gamma	5.3	5.0	5.9	5.2	5.1	6.0	5.9
Exponential - Weibull	5.9	6.2	5.7	5.1	6.2	7.0	6.1
Exponential - Bump	4.2	5.6	5.5	4.8	4.9	6.7	5.7
Exponential - Weibull, est.	6.2	5.2	5.1	5.6	6.0	6.0	4.9
Exponential - Gamma, est.	4.6	5.2	4.8	5.8	4.8	5.9	4.7

## Discrete Data

	KS	K	AD	CvM	W	Wassp1	l-P	s-P
Uniform - Linear	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	5.6	4.4	6.1	5.4
Uniform - Quadratic	4.3	4.3	5.4	5.1	4.8	5.1	4.7	4.5
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.4	5.2	4.4	4.7	5.1
Uniform - Uniform+Sine	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.7	4.3	4.6	6.4	5.9
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	6.8	6.7	4.7	5.1	6.0	4.2	4.5	3.9
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)	6.8	6.8	6.7	6.3	5.8	6.8	5.1	4.8
Normal - Shift	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.0	5.5	6.2	5.4
Normal - Stretch	5.3	5.6	4.8	4.8	6.3	5.6	6.3	5.9
Normal - Outliers large	3.3	3.3	4.2	4.1	4.4	5.0	5.4	5.3
Normal - Outliers	3.4	3.2	3.6	4.6	4.8	3.9	5.0	4.2
Exponential - Gamma	3.6	5.3	4.5	5.1	3.7	5.0	5.5	6.1
Exponential - Weibull	4.9	5.7	4.8	5.1	6.0	5.2	5.6	4.9
Exponential - Bump	5.4	4.8	5.0	5.6	4.7	4.4	6.3	4.4
Exponential - Weibull, est.	3.9	4.7	4.4	4.7	3.8	4.0	5.7	6.5
Exponential - Gamma, est.	4.3	4.8	5.5	5.6	4.0	5.3	5.8	7.9

As we can see, all the methods achieve the correct type I error rate of 5%, within simulation error. In the discrete case many have an actual type I error much smaller than 5%, as is often the case for discrete data.

Note that in Case 9: Normal - t, Case 16: Normal - t, estimated, Case 15: Truncated Exponential - Linear and Case 18: Truncated Exponential - Linear, estimated the null hypothesis is always wrong, and therefore no check of the type I error is possible.

## 5.20 Power

The following table shows the powers of all the methods at that value of the parameter where at least one method has a power higher than 80%. The method with the highest power is shown in blue and the method with the lowest power is shown in red. However, there are often other methods as good as the best and as bad as the worse, within simulation error.

### Continuous Data

	KS	K	AD	CvM	W	ZA	ZK	ZC	Wassp1	ES-l-P
Uniform - Linear	74	74	80	80	52	65	64	66	81	22
Uniform - Quadratic	46	46	68	49	84	45	56	50	49	31
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	46	46	32	36	83	19	28	17	26	48
Uniform - Uniform+Sine	61	61	60	54	60	39	60	40	48	58
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	26	26	54	29	79	86	68	85	46	26
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)	78	78	85	40	49	78	74	75	85	21
Normal - Shift	71	71	82	80	40	66	65	68	84	28
Normal - Stretch	32	32	70	37	76	86	78	87	78	65
Normal - t	6	6	17	7	14	73	66	84	29	31
Normal - Outliers large	11	11	32	16	12	69	90	84	37	57
Normal - Outliers sym.	10	10	36	12	33	77	87	89	51	68
Exponential - Gamma	68	68	79	74	45	74	69	72	84	18
Exponential - Weibull	57	57	72	65	34	58	62	60	81	37
Exponential - Bump	40	40	20	24	68	12	21	11	16	55
Truncated Exp. - Linear	75	75	83	78	60	80	83	79	83	20
Normal - t, est.	57	57	80	73	75	83	79	86	84	22
Exponential - Weibull, est.	70	70	83	80	65	79	64	75	67	33
Trunc Exp. - Linear, est.	62	62	80	78	74	66	57	65	84	24
Exponential - Gamma, est.	70	70	81	79	68	84	74	81	62	31
Normal - Cauchy, est.	36	36	21	25	69	5	15	11	7	52

	ES-s-P	EP-l-P	EP-s-P	ES-l-L	ES-s-L	EP-l-L	EP-s-L
Uniform - Linear	47	22	47	25	48	25	48
Uniform - Quadratic	61	31	61	33	60	33	60
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	76	48	76	46	73	46	73
Uniform - Uniform+Sine	88	58	88	61	88	61	88
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	60	28	56	37	68	33	60
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)	50	22	47	24	52	24	50
Normal - Shift	50	22	47	28	50	24	48
Normal - Stretch	85	45	62	54	80	43	60
Normal - t	42	19	13	24	34	19	13
Normal - Outliers large	74	42	21	41	63	35	20
Normal - Outliers sym.	84	51	20	56	74	43	20
Exponential - Gamma	40	22	44	32	55	26	46
Exponential - Weibull	53	18	34	27	44	18	32
Exponential - Bump	16	56	81	53	18	52	76
Truncated Exp. - Linear	56	26	58	26	63	31	61
Normal - t, est.	47	19	37	29	48	21	37
Exponential - Weibull, est.	33	22	45	33	38	25	46
Trunc Exp. - Linear, est.	56	26	49	28	59	28	49
Exponential - Gamma, est.	26	21	47	33	30	28	50
Normal - Cauchy, est.	80	48	81	58	81	50	80

## Discrete Data

	KS	K	AD	CvM	W	Wassp1	l-P	s-P
Uniform - Linear	84	84	80	80	54	80	23	47
Uniform - Quadratic	41	41	66	49	87	46	30	55
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	46	46	39	40	88	31	60	71
Uniform - Uniform+Sine	28	28	57	51	56	44	59	86
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	28	29	61	34	86	52	29	67
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)	30	32	85	82	28	85	25	48
Normal - Shift	81	82	83	82	61	85	25	47
Normal - Stretch	13	19	65	33	69	77	60	82
Normal - t	5	8	67	14	31	76	81	94
Normal - Outliers large	18	21	52	21	11	51	76	95
Normal - Outliers sym.	4	5	22	7	13	32	56	83
Exponential - Gamma	4	13	78	76	59	84	17	38
Exponential - Weibull	56	76	78	74	9	86	40	57
Exponential - Bump	26	24	32	36	82	23	75	49
Truncated Exp. - Linear	22	30	87	82	72	87	27	65
Normal - t, est.	16	18	88	34	31	69	87	86
Exponential - Weibull, est.	76	81	84	83	79	69	28	37
Trunc Exp. - Linear, est.	70	72	81	79	83	83	23	56
Exponential - Gamma, est.	69	71	84	77	69	43	26	29
Normal - Cauchy, est.	28	30	26	19	83	10	59	77

In all cases the powers differ widely, with no clear pattern of which methods are best. Any one method can perform very well in one case and very poorly in another. In most cases where the best method has a power exceeding 80%, the worst method has a power less than 30%.

### 5.21 Best Default Selection

While there is no single method that always has a reasonably high power, there are some methods that never do. To see which methods can be excluded, we proceed as follows: First we note that in the power graphs above the curves never cross. That is to say, if for a specific case study method A has a higher power than method B for some value of the parameter under the alternative, it has a higher power for any other value as well. We also note that although this is not shown here, the same is true for the sample size. Therefore from now on we will concentrate on the smallest (sometimes largest) value of the parameter such that at least one method has a power of 80% or higher. We then check all combinations of  $k$  methods to see whether they include at least one method that is within 90% of the best. If so it also finds the mean power of this selection over all cases.

In the case of continuous data it turns out that we need four methods to always have one of them near the best. These are W, ZC, AD and a chi-square test with a small number of bins. In the discrete data case three methods suffice, namely W, AD and a chi-square test with a small number of bins.

### 5.22 Combining Several Tests

As no single test can be relied upon to consistently have good power, it is reasonable to employ several of them. We would then reject the null hypothesis if any of the tests does so, that is, if the smallest p-value is less than the desired type I error probability  $\alpha$ .

This procedure clearly suffers from the problem of simultaneous inference, and the true type I error probability will be much larger than  $\alpha$ . It is however possible to adjust the p value so it does achieve the desired  $\alpha$ . This can be done as follows:

We generate a number of data sets under the null hypothesis. Generally about 1000 will be sufficient. Then for each simulated data set we apply the tests we wish to include, and record the smallest p value.

As an example consider the following. The null hypothesis specifies a Uniform  $[0, 1]$  distribution and a sample size of 250. As all the calculations are done under the null hypothesis no alternative hypothesis is needed here.

Next we find the smallest p value in each run for two selections of four methods. One is the selection found to be best above, namely the methods by Wilson, Anderson-Darling, Zhang’s ZC and a chi-square test with a small number of bins and using Pearson’s formula. As a second selection we use the methods by Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Kuiper, Anderson-Darling and Cramer-vonMises. For this problem these tests turn out to be highly correlated.

Next we find the empirical distribution function for the two sets of p values and draw their graphs. We also add the curve for the cases of four identical tests and the case of four independent tests, which of course is the Bonferroni correction:




Figure 21: Distribution functions of smallest p value for several selections of methods.

As one would expect, the two curves for the p-values fall between the extreme cases of total dependence and independence. Moreover, the curve of our best selection is closer to the curve of independence than the selection of correlated methods.

Finally we make use of the Probability Integral Transform by applying this function to the smallest p value found for the actual data. This will give the transformed p values a uniform distribution, as required for a proper hypothesis test.

This procedure is implemented in the routine *gof\_test\_adjusted\_pvalue*.

### 5.23 Continuous vs Discrete Data

To what degree does the performance of a method depend on whether the data is continuous or discrete? To investigate this question we perform the following analysis: first we concentrate on the methods that work for both cases, namely Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Kuiper, Cramer-vonMises, Anderson-Darling, Wilson, Wasserstein and two chi-square tests, with either a large or a small number of bins. For those tests we find the mean power over the 20 cases and then calculate the correlation between the continuous and the discrete data versions. We find

Kolmogorov-Smirnov	86%
Kuiper	90%
Cramer-vonMises	95%
Anderson-Darling	95%
Wilson	83%



Wasserstein	95%
Chisquare Large	96%
Chisquare Small	94%

We find them to be highly correlated. In other words, a method that performs well for the continuous data case generally also performs well for the corresponding discretized data.

### 5.23.1 Optimal Number of Bins for Chi-square Tests

How many bins should be used in a chi-square goodness-of-fit test? To study this question we rerun the 20 case studies above. This time we run the chi-square tests with the number of bins ranging from 2 to 20. We also use just one value of the parameter under the alternative hypothesis. The results are:

*Continuous Data*




Figure 21b: Powers of Chi-square test for continuous data with the number of bins ranging from 2 to 20

We see that the highest power is achieved for a fairly small number of bins. In the next table we have the number of bins and how often this number was best:

Number of Bins	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	12	13	14	17	21
Times Number is Best	2	2	3	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

*Discrete Data*

Number of Bins	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	12	13	16
Times Number is Best	2	4	1	2	1	5	1	1	1	1	1

In order to choose the optimal number of bins one would need to know the (unknown) true distribution. Based on these results we recommend as a reasonable compromise that the chi-square goodness of fit tests be run with 10 bins, adjusted for the number of estimated parameters.

## 6 Case Studies - Twosample Problems

Now we turn to the two sample problem and present the results of 20 power studies:




Figure 21c: Powers of Chi-square test for discrete data with the number of bins ranging from 2 to 20

### 6.1 Case Study 22: Uniform - Linear




Figure 22: Uniform vs Linear Models




Figure 22: Power Curves for Data from Uniform vs Data from Linear Models

## 6.2 Case Study 23: Uniform - Quadratic




Figure 23: Uniform vs Quadratic Models




Figure 23: Power Curves for Data from Uniform vs. Data from Quadratic Models

### 6.3 Case Study 24: Uniform - Uniform + Bump




Figure 24: Uniform vs Uniform + Bump Models




Figure 24: Power Curves for Data from Uniform vs. Data from Uniform + Bump Models

#### 6.4 Case Study 25: Uniform - Uniform + Sine Wave




Figure 25: Uniform vs Uniform + Sine Wave Models




Figure 25: Power Curves for Data from Uniform vs. Data from Uniform + Sine Wave Models

### 6.5 Case Study 26: Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)




Figure 26: Beta(2,2) vs Beta(a,a) Models




Figure 26: Power Curves for Data from Beta(2,2) vs. Data from Beta(a,a) Models

### 6.6 Case Study 27: Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,a)




Figure 27: Beta(2,2) vs Beta(2,a) Models




Figure 27: Power Curves for Data from Beta(2,2) vs. Data from Beta(2,a) Models

### 6.7 Case Study 28: Normal(0,1) - Normal(mean, 1)




Figure 28: Normal(0,1) vs Normal(mean, 1) Models






Figure 28: Power Curves for Data from Normal(0,1) vs. Data from Normal(mean, 1) Models

### 6.8 Case Study 29: Normal(0,1) - Normal(0, sd)




Figure 29: Normal(0,1) vs Normal(0, sd) Models




Figure 29: Power Curves for Data from Normal(0,1) vs. Data from Normal(0, sd) Models

### 6.9 Case Study 30: Normal(0,1) - t(df)




Figure 30: Normal(0,1) vs t(df) Models




Figure 30: Power Curves for Data from Normal(0,1) vs. Data from  $t(df)$  Models

### 6.10 Case Study 31: Normal(0,1) - Normal with Large Outlier




Figure 31: Normal(0,1) vs Normal with Large Outliers




Figure 31: Power Curves for Data from Normal(0,1) vs. Data from Normal with Large Outliers

### 6.11 Case Study 32: Normal(0,1) - Normal with Symmetric Outliers




Figure 32: Normal(0,1) vs Normal with Symmetric Outliers




Figure 32: Power Curves for Data from Normal(0,1) vs. Data from Normal with Symmetric Outliers

### 6.12 Case Study 33: Exponential - Gamma




Figure 33: Exponential vs Gamma Models




Figure 33: Power Curves for Data from Exponential vs. Data from Gamma Models

### 6.13 Case Study 34: Exponential - Weibull




Figure 34: Exponential vs Weibull Models




Figure 34: Power Curves for Data from Exponential vs. Data from Weibull Models

#### 6.14 Case Study 35: Exponential - Exponential with Bump




Figure 35: Exponential vs Exponential with Bump Models




Figure 35: Power Curves for Data from Exponential vs. Data from Exponential with Bump Models

### 6.15 Case Study 36: Gamma - Normal




Figure 36: Gamma vs Normal Models






Figure 36: Power Curves for Data from Gamma vs. Data from Normal Models

### 6.16 Case Study 37: Normal - Mixture of Normals




Figure 37: Normal vs Mixture of Normals Models




Figure 37: Power Curves for Data from Normal vs. Data from Mixture of Normals Models

### 6.17 Case Study 38: Uniform - Mixture of Uniforms




Figure 38: Uniform vs Mixture of Uniforms Models




Figure 38: Power Curves for Data from Uniform vs. Data from Mixture of Uniforms Models

### 6.18 Case Study 39: Uniform - Mixture of Uniform and Beta




Figure 39: Uniform vs Mixture of Uniform and Beta Models




Figure 39: Power Curves for Data from Uniform vs. Data from Mixture of Uniform and Beta Models

### 6.19 Case Study 40: Central Chisquare - Noncentral Chisquare




Figure 40: Central Chisquare vs Noncentral Chisquare Models




Figure 40: Power Curves for Data from Central Chi-Square vs. Data from Noncentral Chi-Square Models

### 6.20 Case Study 41: Uniform - Triangular




Figure 41: Uniform vs Triangular Models




Figure 41: Power Curves for Data from Uniform vs. Data from Triangular Models

## 6.21 Results for Twosample Tests

### 6.21.1 Type I Errors

#### Continuous Data

	KS	Kuiper	CvM	AD	LR	ZA	ZK	ZC	Wassp1
Uniform - Linear	5.9	5.2	5.7	5.5	5.7	5.9	5.3	5.8	5.6
Uniform - Quadratic	4.9	4.2	5.2	5.4	4.6	5.4	5.4	5.3	0.0
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	5.5	5.3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.5	4.9	5.0
Uniform - Sin Wave	5.6	5.2	5.4	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.0
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	5.1	5.5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	5.0
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,b)	5.2	5.4	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.4	5.0	4.4	4.9
Normal - Shift	5.6	5.3	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.2	5.5	5.3	5.0
Normal - Stretch	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.6
Normal - Outlier large	5.6	5.1	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	5.2	4.8	4.8
Normal - Outlier symmetric	5.5	5.2	5.5	5.3	5.5	5.0	5.3	4.8	5.2
Exp - Gamma	5.0	4.1	5.4	5.5	4.4	4.9	4.9	4.5	0.0
Exp - Weibull	5.2	5.7	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.0
Exp - Exp+Bump	5.2	5.5	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.3	4.9
Normal - Normal Mixture	5.2	5.6	4.9	5.2	4.9	5.6	5.8	5.5	5.2
Uniform - Mixture of Uniforms	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.7	4.6	5.0	5.2	5.0	4.6
Uniform - Mix of Uniform and Beta	5.6	5.5	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.2	4.9	4.6
Chisquare - Noncentral Chisquare	5.5	5.5	5.0	5.1	5.0	5.2	5.4	5.2	5.1
Uniform - Triangular	5.3	5.3	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.4	5.1	5.3	5.1

	ES large	ES small	EP large	EP small
Uniform - Linear	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.8
Uniform - Quadratic	4.9	4.2	5.2	5.4
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	4.6	5.3	5.0	5.7
Uniform - Sin Wave	4.6	4.8	4.9	5.5
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	4.3	4.7	5.1	4.4
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,b)	4.5	5.2	4.7	4.7
Normal - Shift	4.5	4.7	5.3	5.1
Normal - Stretch	4.6	5.2	5.0	4.9

Normal - Outlier large	4.3	4.5	5.0	5.4
Normal - Outlier symmetric	4.8	4.7	4.6	5.1
Exp - Gamma	5.0	4.1	5.4	5.5
Exp - Weibull	5.1	4.6	4.8	5.4
Exp - Exp+Bump	4.7	4.4	4.5	5.3
Normal - Normal Mixture	4.2	4.5	5.2	4.9
Uniform - Mixture of Uniforms	4.2	4.7	4.5	4.5
Uniform - Mix of Uniform and Beta	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.8
Chisquare - Noncentral Chisquare	4.2	4.6	4.6	4.4
Uniform - Triangular	4.4	5.1	4.4	4.9

## Discrete Data

	KS	Kuiper	CvM	AD	LR	ZA	Wasspi	large	small
Uniform - Linear	4.9	5.1	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.7
Uniform - Quadratic	5.5	5.6	5.5	5.3	5.5	4.9	5.5	5.5	5.4
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.1	4.8	3.9	4.9
Uniform - Sine	5.0	5.1	5.0	5.1	5.0	5.2	4.7	3.9	5.0
Beta(2,2) - Beta(b,b)	5.5	4.8	5.3	5.1	5.3	4.3	5.1	4.3	5.1
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,b)	4.8	5.2	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.9
Normal - Shift	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.9	4.8	4.8
Normal - Stretch	5.5	5.4	5.0	5.1	5.0	5.3	5.0	5.0	5.0
Normal - Outlier large	5.2	4.5	5.4	5.2	5.4	4.7	5.3	4.5	5.1
Normal - Outlier symmetric	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.2	5.0
Exp - Gamma	4.9	5.4	4.8	4.6	4.8	5.2	5.0	4.3	5.1
Exp - Weibull	4.1	4.7	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.8
Exp - Exp+Bump	5.7	4.9	5.2	5.4	5.2	5.1	5.1	4.6	5.1
Normal - Normal Mixture	4.9	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.0	5.0
Uniform - Mixture of Uniforms	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.7
Uniform - Mix of Uniform and Beta	5.4	5.3	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.6	5.2
Chisquare - Noncentral Chisquare	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.0	5.5	4.7	5.1
Uniform - Triangular	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	5.0

As we can see, all the methods achieve the correct type I error rate of 5%, within simulation error. In the discrete case many have an actual type I error much smaller than 5%, as is often the case for discrete data.

Note that in Case 9: Normal - t, Case 16: Normal - t, estimated, Case 15: Truncated Exponential - Linear and Case 18: Truncated Exponential - Linear, estimated the null hypothesis is always wrong, and therefore no check of the type I error is possible.



## 6.22 Power

The following table shows the powers of all the methods at that value of the parameter where at least one method has a power higher than 80%:

### Continuous Data

	KS	Kuiper	CvM	AD	LR	ZA	ZK	ZC	Wassp1
Uniform - Linear	74	55	80	80	80	67	64	69	81
Uniform - Quadratic	46	84	45	58	45	55	51	57	38
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	45	81	31	31	31	20	29	21	25
Uniform - Sin Wave	52	52	44	51	44	38	49	40	40
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	32	76	32	62	32	87	72	87	56
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,b)	75	53	83	86	83	82	72	82	85
Normal - Shift	78	54	85	86	85	80	71	81	88
Normal - Stretch	29	75	31	60	31	87	73	87	69
Normal - t	7	22	8	18	8	87	69	86	42
Normal - Outlier large	7	7	7	9	7	59	89	56	28
Normal - Outlier symmetric	6	11	5	9	5	97	82	92	32
Exp - Gamma	67	47	73	76	73	74	65	75	84
Exp - Weibull	63	41	68	72	68	71	61	72	82
Exp - Exp+Bump	55	91	41	40	41	22	34	22	28
Gamma - Normal	21	45	17	21	17	84	69	83	27
Normal - Normal Mixture	32	77	35	63	35	81	67	82	68
Uniform - Mixture of Uniforms	83	73	80	80	82	58	66	58	80
Uniform - Mix Uniform/Beta	36	81	35	59	35	70	59	71	41
Chisq. - Noncentral Chisq.	71	46	79	81	79	72	64	74	83
Uniform - Triangular	26	55	27	52	40	80	41	56	41
	ES large	ES small	EP large	EP small					
Uniform - Linear	20	48	19	45					
Uniform - Quadratic	29	66	28	66					
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	36	75	35	72					
Uniform - Sin Wave	49	82	48	82					
Beta(2,2) - Beta(a,a)	36	68	34	57					
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,b)	24	59	24	58					
Normal - Shift	24	57	23	56					
Normal - Stretch	40	75	35	64					
Normal - t	37	68	23	22					
Normal - Outlier large	18	52	10	8					
Normal - Outlier symmetric	38	83	13	8					
Exp - Gamma	26	55	20	46					
Exp - Weibull	27	51	20	42					
Exp - Exp+Bump	66	21	57	89					
Gamma - Normal	46	73	32	26					
Normal - Normal Mixture	38	72	33	63					
Uniform - Mixture of Uniforms	25	56	25	54					
Uniform - Mix Uniform/Beta	27	64	27	60					
Chisq. - Noncentral Chisq.	24	53	21	46					
Uniform - Triangular	58	51	59	46					

## Discrete Data

	KS	Kuiper	CvM	AD	LR	ZA	Wasspl	large	small
Uniform - Linear	75	55	80	80	80	72	81	20	45
Uniform - Quadratic	49	80	50	65	50	67	45	35	70
Uniform - Uniform+Bump	52	86	37	37	37	25	33	42	75
Uniform - Sine	50	52	43	48	43	42	38	49	80
Beta(2,2) - Beta(b,b)	30	74	32	63	32	85	55	36	58
Beta(2,2) - Beta(2,b)	78	58	84	86	84	85	88	24	57
Normal - Shift	70	49	80	81	80	74	82	19	44
Normal - Stretch	31	73	32	60	32	83	65	33	57
Normal - t	10	35	8	28	8	92	55	47	27
Normal - Outlier large	12	14	15	27	14	95	77	49	14
Normal - Outlier symmetric	7	19	7	16	7	94	62	56	10
Exp - Gamma	69	47	72	66	72	74	81	19	40
Exp - Weibull	70	48	76	68	76	80	85	23	45
Exp - Exp+Bump	52	85	40	36	40	26	32	62	86
Gamma - Normal	32	63	29	55	29	84	34	49	27
Normal - Normal Mixture	36	79	38	64	38	83	70	41	62
Uniform - Mix of Uniforms	85	76	84	81	83	67	82	24	50
Uniform - Mix Uniform/Beta	37	84	39	63	40	78	47	34	69
Chisq. - Noncentral Chisq.	78	60	84	85	84	80	87	27	52
Uniform - Triangular	33	66	43	85	46	64	46	67	52

In all cases the powers differ widely, with no clear pattern of which methods are best. Any one method can perform very well in one case and very poorly in another.

### 6.23 Best Combinations

Again we can try to identify a small selection of methods such that at least one of them has a power almost as good as the best method. In the case of continuous data these turn out to be Kuiper's test, Zhang's ZA and ZK method, the Wasserstein test as well as a chi-square test with a small number of equal spaced bins. In the discrete case the selection includes Kuiper's test, Anderson-Darling, Zhang's ZA as well as a chi-square test with a small number of equal spaced bins.

### 6.24 Combining Several Tests

This can be done with the routine *twosample.test.adjusted.pvalues*, which works exactly the same as the routine *gof.test.adjusted.pvalues* in the goodness-of-fit case.

#### 6.24.1 Optimal Number of Bins for Chi-Square Tests

How many bins should be use in a chi-square goodness-of-fit test? We carry out the same study described earlier for the goodness-of-fit problem. We find

##### *Continuous Data*

We see that the highest power is achieved for a fairly small number of bins. In the next table we have the number of bins and how often this number was best:

Number of Bins	3	4	5	6	7	8	11	37
Times Number is Best	3	2	3	5	3	2	1	1

##### *Discrete Data*

Number of Bins	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	24	27
Times Number is Best	6	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2




Figure 42a: Powers of Chi-square test for continuous data with the number of bins ranging from 2 to 40




Figure 42b: Powers of Chi-square test for discrete data with the number of bins ranging from 2 to 40

Unlike the goodness-of-fit case, here there is one case studies where a much larger number of bins is required. Nevertheless based on the majority of case studies we also recommend that the chi-square goodness of fit tests be run with 10 bins.

## 7 Conclusions

We presented the results of a large number of simulation studies regarding the power of various goodness-of-fit as well as nonparametric two-sample tests for univariate data. This includes both continuous and discrete data. In general no single method can be relied upon to provide good power, any one method may be quite good for some combination of null hypothesis and alternative and may fail badly for another. Based on the results of these studies we propose to include the following methods:

1. Goodness-of-fit problem, continuous data: Wilson’s test, Zhang’s ZC, Anderson-Darling and a chi-square test with a small number of equal-size bins.
2. Goodness-of-fit problem, discrete data: Wilson’s test, Anderson-Darling and a chi-square test with a small number of bins.
3. Two-sample problem, continuous data: Kuiper’s test, Zhang’s ZA and ZK methods, the Wasserstein test as well as a chi-square test with a small number of equal spaced bins.
4. Two-sample problem, discrete data: Kuiper’s test, Anderson-Darling, Zhang’s ZA test as well as a chi-square test with a small number of equal spaced bins.

## References

- [Anderson, 1962] Anderson, T. W. (1962). On the distribution of the two-sample Cramer-von Mises criterion. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 33(3):1148–1159.
- [Anderson and Darling, 1952] Anderson, T. W. and Darling, D. A. (1952). Asymptotic theory of certain goodness-of-fit criteria based on stochastic processes. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23:193–212.
- [Bellosta, 2011] Bellosta, C. G. (2011). *Anderson-Darling GoF test with p-value calculation based on Marsaglia’s 2004 paper Evaluating the Anderson-Darling Distribution*. None. R package version 0.3.
- [Berkson, 1980] Berkson, J. (1980). Minimum chi-square, not maximum likelihood. *Ann. Math. Stat*, 8(3):457–487.
- [Bickel and Doksum, 2015] Bickel, P. J. and Doksum, K. A. (2015). *Mathematical Statistics Vol 1 and 2*. CRC Press.
- [Casella and Berger, 2002] Casella, G. and Berger, R. (2002). *Statistical Inference*. Duxbury Advanced Series in Statistics and Decision Sciences. Thomson Learning.
- [Cramer, 1928] Cramer, H. (1928). On the composition of elementary errors. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, 1:13–74.
- [D’Agostini and Stephens, 1986] D’Agostini, R. B. and Stephens, M. A. (1986). *Goodness-of-Fit Techniques*. Statistics: Textbooks and Monographs. Marcel Dekker.
- [Dowd, 2022] Dowd, C. (2022). *twosamples: Fast Permutation Based Two Sample Tests*. None. R package version 2.0.0.
- [Eddelbuettel et al., 2024] Eddelbuettel, D., Francois, R., Allaire, J., Ushey, K., Kou, Q., Russell, N., Ucar, I., Bates, D., and Chambers, J. (2024). *Rcpp: Seamless R and C++ Integration*. R package version 1.0.12.
- [Kolmogorov, 1933] Kolmogorov, A. (1933). Sulla determinazione empirica di una legge di distribuzione. *G. Ist. Ital. Attuari.*, 4:83–91.

- [Kuiper, 1960] Kuiper, N. H. (1960). Tests concerning random points on a circle. *Proceedings of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, 63:38–47.
- [Lehmann, 1951] Lehmann, E. (1951). Consistency and unbiasedness of certain nonparametric tests. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 22(1):165–179.
- [Pettitt, 1976] Pettitt, A. (1976). A two-sample anderson-darling rank statistic. *Biometrika*, 63 No.1:161–168.
- [Raynor et al., 2012] Raynor, J. C., Thas, O., and Best, D. J. (2012). *Smooth Tests of Goodness of Fit*. Wiley Sons.
- [Rosenblatt, 1952] Rosenblatt, M. (1952). Limit theorems associated with variants of the von mises statistic. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 23:617–623.
- [Smirnov, 1939] Smirnov, N. (1939). Estimate of deviation between empirical distribution functions in two independent samples. *Bull. Moscow Univ.*, 2:3–16.
- [Thas, 2010] Thas, O. (2010). *Continuous Distributions*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer.
- [Vaserstein, 1969] Vaserstein, L. N. (1969). Markov processes over denumerable products of spaces, describing large systems of automata. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 5(3):64–72.
- [von Mises, 1928] von Mises, R. E. (1928). *Wahrscheinlichkeit, Statistik und Wahrheit*. Springer.
- [Watson, 1961] Watson, G. S. (1961). Goodness-of-fit tests on a circle. *Biometrika*, 48:109–114.
- [Zhang, 2002] Zhang, J. (2002). Powerful goodness-of-fit tests based on likelihood ratio. *Journal of the RSS (Series B)*, 64:281–294.
- [Zhang, 2006] Zhang, J. (2006). Powerful two-sample tests based on the likelihood ratio. *Techometrics*, 48:95–103.