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Abstract: Balasooriya and Gadag (1994) proposed a location and scale invariant test based on the test statistic Zk for testing the k upper outliers in two-parameter exponential sample. Kumar et al have proposed test statistics for testing multiple upper outlier detection in gamma sample. In literature, various test statistics have been proposed to detect outliers in an exponential sample. Likes (1966) also proposed a new test statistics to detect outlier in the exponential case. In this paper, the test statistic proposed by Likes has been used to detect outliers in a two parameter gamma sample and the null distribution of the test statistics has been obtained. A simulation study is carried out to compare the theoretical developments.
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1 Introduction

The two parameters of a gamma distribution represent the scale and the shape parameters and because of this, it has flexibility in analysing any positive real data. It has increasing as well as decreasing failure rate depending on the shape parameter, which gives an extra edge over exponential distribution, which has only constant failure rate. Since sum of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) gamma random variables has a gamma distribution, it has more practical utility. For example, if a system is dependent on a particular component which requires n-spare parts for maintenance, and if the component and each spare parts has i.i.d. gamma lifetime distributions, then the lifetime distribution of the system also follows a gamma distribution. Another interesting property of the family of gamma distributions is that it has likelihood ratio ordering, with respect to shape parameter, when the scale parameter remains constant. It naturally implies the ordering in hazard rate as well as in distribution. Hence, if some outlying observations are present in a sample from Gamma distribution, the inferences made on the basis of this sample may not be dependable. Hence, a study of detection of outlying observations is needed. For gamma samples, a number of discordancy tests for a single and multiple upper outliers have been proposed by various authors; for example, see Barnett and Lewis (1994), Kale (1976), Kimber (1979, 1983), Chikkagoudar and Kunchur (1983), Likes (1987), Lewis and Fieller (1979), Balasooriya and Gadag (1994) and Zhang (1998) etc. Jabbari Nooghabi et. al. (2010) extended the work of Zerbet and Nikulin (2003) for gamma distribution. In this paper a test statistic is developed for identification of multiple upper outliers. To start with, the null and the alternative hypotheses are formulated. Thus the null hypothesis $H_0$ says that there is no outlying observation in the sample and the alternative hypothesis $H_k$ states that there are $k$ upper outliers in the sample.

2 The Test Statistic

In case of a sample from an exponential distribution, Likes (1987) proposed a test statistic for testing upper outliers

$$D_k = \frac{X_{(n)} - X_{(n-k)}}{X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}}$$ (1)

The test statistic (1) is based on score function for testing $H_0$ against $H_k$. The statistic (1) will have small values if upper outliers are present in the data and declare them as discordant if they exceed by a specified value. Since, exponential
distribution has constant failure rate, so it may not be appropriate to assume that the outliers are from the exponential distribution. However, it would be more appropriate to consider more general lifetime model for detecting upper outliers in the data.

The probability density function (pdf) of a gamma distribution with shape parameter $\alpha$ and scale parameter $\theta$ is given by

$$f(x; \alpha, \theta) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)\theta^\alpha} x^{\alpha-1} \exp\left(-\frac{x}{\theta}\right), \ x > 0, \ \alpha > 0, \ \theta > 0.$$  

For identification of outliers, a statistical test procedure called a discordancy test to decide whether or not the contaminant observations are to be declared as discordant is performed. Thus, given a sample $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ and its corresponding order statistics $X_{(1)}, X_{(2)}, \ldots, X_{(n)}$, it may be desirable to test the null hypothesis $H_0$ that $n - k$ observations are from this model but $k$ values come from a $G(\lambda, b\theta)$, $b \geq 1$. Clearly, $H_k$ is a scale slippage alternative.

Thus for a discordancy test of these $k$ observations, the test statistic $D_k$ proposed by Likes (1987) for testing $k$ upper outliers in exponential sample, is applied for gamma sample and the performance of the test is computed.

### 3 Null Distribution of the Test Statistics

For developing a test procedure, the null distribution of the test statistic has to be obtained. The null distribution of the test statistic $D_k$ is obtained in a similar manner as that was obtained by Kumar and Lalitha (2012) for Exponential sample. The distribution of $D_k$ under the null hypothesis $H_0$ is given in the following theorem.

**Theorem** Under the null hypothesis, the statistic $D_k$ defined in (1) follows a beta distribution of second kind with parameters $\lambda k$ and $\lambda(n-1)$ respectively.

**Proof:** This theorem can be proved using the characteristic function and the inversion theorem. Let

$$Y_j = X_{(n-j+1)} - X_{(n-j)}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1.$$  

Then the numerator and denominator of (1) may be written as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} Y_j = X_{(n)} - X_{(n-k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} Y_j = X_{(n)} - X_{(1)} \text{ respectively}.$$  

The test statistic can be rewritten as

$$D_k = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} (X_{(n-j+1)} - X_{(n-j)})}{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (X_{(n-j+1)} - X_{(n-j)})}.$$  

Or $D_k = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} Y_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} Y_j} = \frac{V}{W}$, where, $V = \sum_{j=1}^{k} Y_j$ and $W = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} Y_j$.

The joint characteristic function of and is-

$$\varphi_{v,w}(t,z) = E\left(e^{itv+izw}\right) = E\left(e^{i \sum_{j=1}^{k} y_j t + i \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j z}\right) = \int f(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{n-1}) dy_1 dy_2 \ldots dy_{n-1}.$$  

Under the null hypothesis, i.e. when no outlying observations are present, $Y_j$ follows a Gamma distribution. Then $V$ and $W$ being functions of $Y_j$, the joint characteristic function of $V$ and $W$ is given by

$$\varphi_{v,w}(t,z) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \lambda^{\alpha} e^{-\frac{\lambda y_j}{\theta}} dy_j \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \lambda^{\alpha} e^{-\frac{\lambda y_j}{\theta}} dy_j,$$
\[
= \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\theta^k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\theta^k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1}.
\]

Or
\[
\phi (v, w) = \left(\frac{1}{\theta^k}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1}.
\]

Now using inversion theorem, the joint distribution of V and W can be obtained as follows-
\[f_{V,W}(v, w) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{k}{2}}} \int \phi_{V,W}(t, z) e^{-i(vt + wc)} dt dz\]
\[= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{k}{2}}} \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1} e^{-i\theta^k} dt \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1} e^{-i\theta^k} dz.
\]

Since \[\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-izt} dt = \frac{\theta^k}{-(iz)^k}, \quad v > 0 \text{ and } \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-izt} dt = \frac{\theta^k}{-(iz)^k}, \quad w > 0,
\]
\[f_{V,W}(v, w) = \frac{1}{\theta^k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1} e^{-\theta^k w}.
\]

Or
\[f_{V,W}(v, w) = \frac{1}{\theta^k(n-1)} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1} e^{-\theta^k w}.
\]

Hence, the joint distribution of v and w is
\[= f(v) f(w),
\]
where \[f(v) = \frac{1}{\theta^k(n-1)} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1} e^{-\theta^k w}.
\]

and \[f(w) = \frac{1}{\theta^k(n-1)} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \frac{1}{\theta^k} \int \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right)^{-1} e^{-\theta^k w}.
\]

From this, the probability density function (pdf) of \(D_k\) is obtained as
\[f_{D_k}(D) = \frac{1}{B(\lambda k, \lambda (n-1))} \frac{d_{k}^{\lambda k-1}}{(1 + d_{k})^{\lambda (n+k-1)}}, \quad 0 < d_{k} < \infty.
\]

This is a \(\beta_k(\lambda k, \lambda (n-1))\) density.

Now, let \[\frac{1}{1 + d_{k}} = d_{k}', \text{ then equation (2) transform to}
\]
\[f_{D_{k}'}(D) = \frac{1}{B(\lambda (n-1), \lambda k)} \left(d_{k}'\right)^{\lambda (n-1)-1} \left(1 - d_{k}'\right)^{\lambda k-1}, \quad 0 < d_{k}' < 1.
\]

where, \(B(a, b) = \frac{\Gamma(a) \Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\) is a complete beta function.

4 Critical Values

It can be seen that if k largest observations are outlying, then the statistic \(D_k\) will assume small value. Hence, the critical values \(d_{\alpha}\) for level of significance \(\alpha\) may be obtained by using from the following equation.
\[P[D_k < d_{\alpha} | H_0] = \alpha
\]

Consequently, \[\int_{0}^{d_{\alpha}} f_{D_{k}'}(D) dD = \alpha\] has to be solved for \(d_{\alpha}\) for obtaining critical values.

Thus on using (3),
\[d_{\alpha} = I_{\lambda (n-1), \lambda k}(\alpha), \text{ where, } I_{\lambda, \beta}(x) = \frac{1}{B(\alpha, \beta)} \int_{0}^{x} y^\alpha (1-y)^{\beta-1}.
\]
is an incomplete beta function of first kind. This equation has to be solved for obtaining the values of $d_\alpha$.

Hence, the test procedure is as follows: Reject $H_0$, when $D_k < d_\alpha$ otherwise it may be accepted. Here $k$ denotes the number of largest observations that are declared as discordant at $\alpha$ level of significance.

An Example: Kimber and Steven(1981) in which the time intervals data are given by 25, 52, 7, 61, 446, 34, 87, 76, 4, 17, 19, 240, 116, 45, 64, 141, 31, 503, 10, 181, 101. For testing $k=2$ upper outliers, the value of the test statistic for $k=1$ and 2 were found to be $D_1 = 0.1142285$ and $D_2 = 0.5270541$ respectively at 5 percent level of significance. The critical values for $k=1$ and 2 are $d_1 = 0.2641682$ and $d_2 = 0.6231105$. Hence, in this case both upper extreme observations were declared as outliers.

5 Performance Criteria

To compute the performance of the discordancy test, David (1981) and Barnett and Lewis (1994) have described different performance criteria for single and multiple outliers in a sample. These are refined by Hayes and Kinsella (2003). Under $H_k$, the following probabilities were defined for different values of $k$.

$$p_i^k = P(\text{Accept}H_i|H_j); i, j = 1, 2, k. \quad (5)$$

When $k = 2$, from (5), the probabilities $p_{11}^2$ and $p_{22}^2$ of correct decisions and $p_{12}^2, p_{21}^2$ of masking and swamping effects respectively were computed for the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ and for different choices of $n & b$.

When $k \geq 3$, from (5), similar probabilities can be defined for performance studies. For a good performance, the probabilities in (5) should be high for $i = j, i, j = 1, 2, k$, while it should be low for $i < j, i, j = 1, 2, k$, (case of masking) and $i > j, i, j = 1, 2, k$ (case of swamping).

6 Simulation Study

Here, a simulation study is carried out to compute the performance of the test statistic (1) using the method given by Lin et al (2014). The powers were evaluated and also the probabilities of masking and swamping for the case when $k = 2 & 3$ were determined. For given $n, k$ and $b$, the samples of size $n$ under the hypothesis $H_k$, were first generated by choosing a sample of size $n$ from $G(1, 1)$. After that, these samples were arranged in ascending order of magnitude to obtain the ordered samples. For $k = 2, N = 10000$, replications of size $n = 10$, the samples were generated from $G(1, 1)$ distribution and $(n-1)^{th}$ and $n^{th}$ observations were replaced by $hx_{n-1}$ and $hx_n$, where $b > 1$. The test statistic $D_k$ was computed and compared with the respective critical values. The different performance probabilities given in (5) were obtained for $b = 10, 50, 50(10), 100, 150$. Graphs of these probabilities were plotted which are shown in figure 1 to 9 for different value of significance.

It can be seen from 1 and 5 that has low power at initial value of $b$ but as $b$ increases, the power of the test increases very rapidly and become steady for both the cases. The probability $p_{22}^2$, shown in figure 2, also increases as $b$ increases. The probability of swamping and masking effects $p_{12}^2 & p_{21}^2$, respectively, shown in figures 3, and 4, are very low for all values of $b$.

From fig. 1, it can be seen that the probability $p_{11}^2$ increases moderately till $b = 20$, but beyond that it increases very rapidly.

From fig. 2, it can be seen that the probability $p_{22}^2$ increases moderately till $b = 22$, but beyond that it increases very rapidly.

From fig. 3, it can be seen that the probability $p_{12}^2$ is same at all value for $b$ and very low. From fig.4, it can be seen that the probability $p_{21}^2$ high at initial value of $b$ and moderately drop at $b = 20$ beyond that it decreases very rapidly.

From fig. 6, it can be seen that probability $p_{12}^2$ increases very rapidly till $b = 90$ after that it become steady. From fig.7, the probability $p_{22}^3$ is very low till $b = 100$ and after that it increases very rapidly and from $b = 300$, it becomes steady. From fig.8 & 9, masking and swamping effects for $k = 3$ are also very low.
Fig. 1: Overall Power of the statistic $D_k$ for $n = 10$ and $k = 2$ and $\alpha = 0.05$.

Fig. 2: Performance criterion $P_{22}$ of testing procedure for $n = 10$ and $k = 2$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. 
Fig. 3: Masking effect probability of $D_k$ for $n = 10$ and $k = 2$ and $\alpha = 0.05$.

Fig. 4: Swamping effect probability of $D_k$ for $n = 10$ and $k = 2$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. 
Fig. 5: Power of testing procedure for $n = 15$ and $k = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.05$.

Fig. 6: Performance criterion $p_{22}^{1/3}$ of testing procedure for $n = 15$ when $k = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. 
Fig. 7: Performance criterion $p_{33}^3$ of testing procedure for $n = 15$ when $k = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.05$.

Fig. 8: Masking effect of testing procedure for $n = 15$ when $k = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. 
Fig. 9: swamping effect of testing procedure for $n = 15$ when $k = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. This implies that larger the deviation in scale parameter the lower the effect on the power of testing procedure beyond $b = 90$.

Hence, it shows that all powers and masking, swamping effects have similar pattern for different value of $n$&$k$. Similar pattern can be seen for other values of level of significance, i.e for $\alpha = 0.01$ and 0.1.

7 Concluding Remarks

On the basis of performance, in terms of general power and probabilities of swamping and masking effects, it can be concluded that the test based on $D_k$ has a good performance as it correctly identifies the contaminant observations as discordant. Also, $D_k$ has very low probability of masking effect i.e. of not identifying the contaminant observations as outliers. Masking effect of $D_k$ is not very good however, it is considerably low.
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