



Interval Estimation for a Binomial Proportion

Author(s): Lawrence D. Brown, T. Tony Cai, Anirban DasGupta

Source: *Statistical Science*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (May, 2001), pp. 101-117

Published by: Institute of Mathematical Statistics

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2676784>

Accessed: 25/03/2010 16:14

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ims>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Institute of Mathematical Statistics is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Statistical Science*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Interval Estimation for a Binomial Proportion

Lawrence D. Brown, T. Tony Cai and Anirban DasGupta

Abstract. We revisit the problem of interval estimation of a binomial proportion. The erratic behavior of the coverage probability of the standard Wald confidence interval has previously been remarked on in the literature (Blyth and Still, Agresti and Coull, Santner and others). We begin by showing that the chaotic coverage properties of the Wald interval are far more persistent than is appreciated. Furthermore, common textbook prescriptions regarding its safety are misleading and defective in several respects and cannot be trusted.

This leads us to consideration of alternative intervals. A number of natural alternatives are presented, each with its motivation and context. Each interval is examined for its coverage probability and its length. Based on this analysis, we recommend the Wilson interval or the equal-tailed Jeffreys prior interval for small n and the interval suggested in Agresti and Coull for larger n . We also provide an additional frequentist justification for use of the Jeffreys interval.

Key words and phrases: Bayes, binomial distribution, confidence intervals, coverage probability, Edgeworth expansion, expected length, Jeffreys prior, normal approximation, posterior.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article revisits one of the most basic and methodologically important problems in statistical practice, namely, interval estimation of the probability of success in a binomial distribution. There is a textbook confidence interval for this problem that has acquired nearly universal acceptance in practice. The interval, of course, is $\hat{p} \pm z_{\alpha/2} n^{-1/2}(\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p}))^{1/2}$, where $\hat{p} = X/n$ is the sample proportion of successes, and $z_{\alpha/2}$ is the $100(1 - \alpha/2)$ th percentile of the standard normal distribution. The interval is easy to present and motivate and easy to compute. With the exceptions

of the t test, linear regression, and ANOVA, its popularity in everyday practical statistics is virtually unmatched. The standard interval is known as the Wald interval as it comes from the Wald large sample test for the binomial case.

So at first glance, one may think that the problem is too simple and has a clear and present solution. In fact, the problem is a difficult one, with unanticipated complexities. It is widely recognized that the actual coverage probability of the standard interval is poor for p near 0 or 1. Even at the level of introductory statistics texts, the standard interval is often presented with the caveat that it should be used only when $n \cdot \min(p, 1 - p)$ is at least 5 (or 10). Examination of the popular texts reveals that the qualifications with which the standard interval is presented are varied, but they all reflect the concern about poor coverage when p is near the boundaries.

In a series of interesting recent articles, it has also been pointed out that the coverage properties of the standard interval can be erratically poor even if p is not near the boundaries; see, for instance, Vollset (1993), Santner (1998), Agresti and Coull (1998), and Newcombe (1998). Slightly older literature includes Ghosh (1979), Cressie (1980) and Blyth and Still (1983). Agresti and Coull (1998)

Lawrence D. Brown is Professor of Statistics, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 3000 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall, 3620 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6302. T. Tony Cai is Assistant Professor of Statistics, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 3000 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall, 3620 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6302. Anirban DasGupta is Professor, Department of Statistics, Purdue University, 1399 Mathematical Science Bldg., West Lafayette, Indiana 47907-1399

particularly consider the nominal 95% case and show the erratic and poor behavior of the standard interval's coverage probability for small n even when p is not near the boundaries. See their Figure 4 for the cases $n = 5$ and 10.

We will show in this article that the eccentric behavior of the standard interval's coverage probability is far deeper than has been explained or is appreciated by statisticians at large. We will show that the popular prescriptions the standard interval comes with are defective in several respects and are not to be trusted. In addition, we will motivate, present and analyze several alternatives to the standard interval for a general confidence level. We will ultimately make recommendations about choosing a specific interval for practical use, separately for different intervals of values of n . It will be seen that for small n (40 or less), our recommendation differs from the recommendation Agresti and Coull (1998) made for the nominal 95% case. To facilitate greater appreciation of the seriousness of the problem, we have kept the technical content of this article at a minimal level. The companion article, Brown, Cai and DasGupta (1999), presents the associated theoretical calculations on Edgeworth expansions of the various intervals' coverage probabilities and asymptotic expansions for their expected lengths.

In Section 2, we first present a series of examples on the degree of severity of the chaotic behavior of the standard interval's coverage probability. The chaotic behavior does not go away even when n is quite large and p is not near the boundaries. For instance, when n is 100, the actual coverage probability of the nominal 95% standard interval is 0.952 if p is 0.106, but only 0.911 if p is 0.107. The behavior of the coverage probability can be even more erratic as a function of n . If the true p is 0.5, the actual coverage of the nominal 95% interval is 0.953 at the rather small sample size $n = 17$, but falls to 0.919 at the much larger sample size $n = 40$.

This eccentric behavior can get downright extreme in certain practically important problems. For instance, consider defective proportions in industrial quality control problems. There it would be quite common to have a true p that is small. If the true p is 0.005, then the coverage probability of the nominal 95% interval increases monotonically in n all the way up to $n = 591$ to the level 0.945, only to drop down to 0.792 if n is 592. This unlucky spell continues for a while, and then the coverage bounces back to 0.948 when n is 953, but dramatically falls to 0.852 when n is 954. Subsequent unlucky spells start off at $n = 1279$, 1583 and on and on. It should be widely known that the coverage of the standard interval can be significantly

lower at quite large sample sizes, and this happens in an unpredictable and rather random way.

Continuing, also in Section 2 we list a set of common prescriptions that standard texts present while discussing the standard interval. We show what the deficiencies are in some of these prescriptions. Proposition 1 and the subsequent Table 3 illustrate the defects of these common prescriptions.

In Sections 3 and 4, we present our alternative intervals. For the purpose of a sharper focus we present these alternative intervals in two categories. First we present in Section 3 a selected set of three intervals that clearly stand out in our subsequent analysis; we present them as our "recommended intervals." Separately, we present several other intervals in Section 4 that arise as clear candidates for consideration as a part of a comprehensive examination, but do not stand out in the actual analysis.

The short list of recommended intervals contains the score interval, an interval recently suggested in Agresti and Coull (1998), and the equal tailed interval resulting from the natural noninformative Jeffreys prior for a binomial proportion. The score interval for the binomial case seems to have been introduced in Wilson (1927); so we call it the Wilson interval. Agresti and Coull (1998) suggested, for the special nominal 95% case, the interval $\tilde{p} \pm z_{0.025} \tilde{n}^{-1/2} (\tilde{p}(1 - \tilde{p}))^{1/2}$, where $\tilde{n} = n + 4$ and $\tilde{p} = (X + 2)/(n + 4)$; this is an adjusted Wald interval that formally adds two successes and two failures to the observed counts and then uses the standard method. Our second interval is the appropriate version of this interval for a general confidence level; we call it the Agresti-Coull interval. By a slight abuse of terminology, we call our third interval, namely the equal-tailed interval corresponding to the Jeffreys prior, the Jeffreys interval.

In Section 3, we also present our findings on the performances of our "recommended" intervals. As always, two key considerations are their coverage properties and parsimony as measured by expected length. Simplicity of presentation is also sometimes an issue, for example, in the context of classroom presentation at an elementary level. On consideration of these factors, we came to the conclusion that for small n (40 or less), we recommend that either the Wilson or the Jeffreys prior interval should be used. They are very similar, and either may be used depending on taste. The Wilson interval has a closed-form formula. The Jeffreys interval does not. One can expect that there would be resistance to using the Jeffreys interval solely due to this reason. We therefore provide a table simply listing the

limits of the Jeffreys interval for n up to 30 and in addition also give closed form and very accurate approximations to the limits. These approximations do not need any additional software.

For larger n ($n > 40$), the Wilson, the Jeffreys and the Agresti–Coull interval are all very similar, and so for such n , due to its simplest form, we come to the conclusion that the Agresti–Coull interval should be recommended. Even for smaller sample sizes, the Agresti–Coull interval is strongly preferable to the standard one and so might be the choice where simplicity is a paramount objective.

The additional intervals we considered are two slight modifications of the Wilson and the Jeffreys intervals, the Clopper–Pearson “exact” interval, the arcsine interval, the logit interval, the actual Jeffreys HPD interval and the likelihood ratio interval. The modified versions of the Wilson and the Jeffreys intervals correct disturbing downward spikes in the coverages of the original intervals very close to the two boundaries. The other alternative intervals have earned some prominence in the literature for one reason or another. We had to apply a certain amount of discretion in choosing these additional intervals as part of our investigation. Since we wish to direct the main part of our conversation to the three “recommended” intervals, only a brief summary of the performances of these additional intervals is presented along with the introduction of each interval. As part of these quick summaries, we indicate why we decided against including them among the recommended intervals.

We strongly recommend that introductory texts in statistics present one or more of these recommended alternative intervals, in preference to the standard one. The slight sacrifice in simplicity would be more than worthwhile. The conclusions we make are given additional theoretical support by the results in Brown, Cai and DasGupta (1999). Analogous results for other one parameter discrete families are presented in Brown, Cai and DasGupta (2000).

2. THE STANDARD INTERVAL

When constructing a confidence interval we usually wish the actual coverage probability to be close to the nominal confidence level. Because of the discrete nature of the binomial distribution we cannot always achieve the exact nominal confidence level unless a randomized procedure is used. Thus our objective is to construct nonrandomized confidence intervals for p such that the coverage probability $P_p(p \in CI) \approx 1 - \alpha$ where α is some prespecified value between 0 and 1. We will use the notation

$C(p, n) = P_p(p \in CI)$, $0 < p < 1$, for the coverage probability.

A standard confidence interval for p based on normal approximation has gained universal recommendation in the introductory statistics textbooks and in statistical practice. The interval is known to guarantee that for any fixed $p \in (0, 1)$, $C(p, n) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\phi(z)$ and $\Phi(z)$ be the standard normal density and distribution functions, respectively. Throughout the paper we denote $\kappa \equiv z_{\alpha/2} = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2)$, $\hat{p} = X/n$ and $\hat{q} = 1 - \hat{p}$. The standard normal approximation confidence interval CI_s is given by

$$(1) \quad CI_s = \hat{p} \pm \kappa n^{-1/2}(\hat{p}\hat{q})^{1/2}.$$

This interval is obtained by inverting the acceptance region of the well known Wald large-sample normal test for a general problem:

$$(2) \quad |(\hat{\theta} - \theta)/\widehat{se}(\hat{\theta})| \leq \kappa,$$

where θ is a generic parameter, $\hat{\theta}$ is the maximum likelihood estimate of θ and $\widehat{se}(\hat{\theta})$ is the estimated standard error of $\hat{\theta}$. In the binomial case, we have $\theta = p$, $\hat{\theta} = X/n$ and $\widehat{se}(\hat{\theta}) = (\hat{p}\hat{q})^{1/2}n^{-1/2}$.

The standard interval is easy to calculate and is heuristically appealing. In introductory statistics texts and courses, the confidence interval CI_s is usually presented along with some heuristic justification based on the central limit theorem. Most students and users no doubt believe that the larger the number n , the better the normal approximation, and thus the closer the actual coverage would be to the nominal level $1 - \alpha$. Further, they would believe that the coverage probabilities of this method are close to the nominal value, except possibly when n is “small” or p is “near” 0 or 1. We will show how completely both of these beliefs are false. Let us take a close look at how the standard interval CI_s really performs.

2.1 Lucky n , Lucky p

An interesting phenomenon for the standard interval is that the actual coverage probability of the confidence interval contains nonnegligible oscillation as both p and n vary. There exist some “lucky” pairs (p, n) such that the actual coverage probability $C(p, n)$ is very close to or larger than the nominal level. On the other hand, there also exist “unlucky” pairs (p, n) such that the corresponding $C(p, n)$ is much smaller than the nominal level. The phenomenon of oscillation is both in n , for fixed p , and in p , for fixed n . Furthermore, drastic changes in coverage occur in nearby p for fixed n and in nearby n for fixed p . Let us look at five simple but instructive examples.




FIG. 1. Standard interval; oscillation phenomenon for fixed $p = 0.2$ and variable $n = 25$ to 100.

The probabilities reported in the following plots and tables, as well as those appearing later in this paper, are the result of direct probability calculations produced in S-PLUS. In all cases their numerical accuracy considerably exceeds the number of significant figures reported and/or the accuracy visually obtainable from the plots. (Plots for variable p are the probabilities for a fine grid of values of p , e.g., 2000 equally spaced values of p for the plots in Figure 5.)

EXAMPLE 1. Figure 1 plots the coverage probability of the nominal 95% standard interval for $p = 0.2$. The number of trials n varies from 25 to 100. It is clear from the plot that the oscillation is significant and the coverage probability does not steadily get closer to the nominal confidence level as n increases. For instance, $C(0.2, 30) = 0.946$ and $C(0.2, 98) = 0.928$. So, as hard as it is to believe, the coverage probability is significantly closer to 0.95 when $n = 30$ than when $n = 98$. We see that the true coverage probability behaves contrary to conventional wisdom in a very significant way.

EXAMPLE 2. Now consider the case of $p = 0.5$. Since $p = 0.5$, conventional wisdom might suggest to an unsuspecting user that all will be well if n is about 20. We evaluate the exact coverage probability of the 95% standard interval for $10 \leq n \leq 50$. In Table 1, we list the values of “lucky” n [defined as $C(p, n) \geq 0.95$] and the values of “unlucky” n [defined for specificity as $C(p, n) \leq 0.92$]. The conclusions presented in Table 2 are surprising. We

note that when $n = 17$ the coverage probability is 0.951, but the coverage probability equals 0.904 when $n = 18$. Indeed, the unlucky values of n arise suddenly. Although p is 0.5, the coverage is still only 0.919 at $n = 40$. This illustrates the inconsistency, unpredictability and poor performance of the standard interval.

EXAMPLE 3. Now let us move p really close to the boundary, say $p = 0.005$. We mention in the introduction that such p are relevant in certain practical applications. Since p is so small, now one may fully expect that the coverage probability of the standard interval is poor. Figure 2 and Table 2.2 show that there are still surprises and indeed we now begin to see a whole new kind of erratic behavior. The oscillation of the coverage probability does not show until rather large n . Indeed, the coverage probability makes a slow ascent all the way until $n = 591$, and then dramatically drops to 0.792 when $n = 592$. Figure 2 shows that thereafter the oscillation manifests in full force, in contrast to Examples 1 and 2, where the oscillation started early on. Subsequent “unlucky” values of n again arise in the same unpredictable way, as one can see from Table 2.2.

2.2 Inadequate Coverage

The results in Examples 1 to 3 already show that the standard interval can have coverage noticeably smaller than its nominal value even for values of n and of $np(1 - p)$ that are not small. This subsec-

TABLE 1
Standard interval; lucky n and unlucky n for $10 \leq n \leq 50$ and $p = 0.5$

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Lucky n | 17 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 37 | 42 | 44 | 49 |
| $C(0.5, n)$ | 0.951 | 0.959 | 0.957 | .957 | 0.959 | 0.953 | 0.956 | 0.951 | 0.956 |
| Unlucky n | 10 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 18 | 23 | 28 | 33 | 40 |
| $C(0.5, n)$ | 0.891 | 0.854 | 0.908 | 0.882 | 0.904 | 0.907 | 0.913 | 0.920 | 0.919 |

TABLE 2
Standard interval; late arrival of unlucky n for small p

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Unlucky n | 592 | 954 | 1279 | 1583 | 1876 |
| $C(0.005, n)$ | 0.792 | 0.852 | 0.875 | 0.889 | 0.898 |

tion contains two more examples that display further instances of the inadequacy of the standard interval.

EXAMPLE 4. Figure 3 plots the coverage probability of the nominal 95% standard interval with fixed $n = 100$ and variable p . It can be seen from Figure 3 that in spite of the “large” sample size, significant change in coverage probability occurs in nearby p . The magnitude of oscillation increases significantly as p moves toward 0 or 1. Except for values of p quite near $p = 0.5$, the general trend of this plot is noticeably below the nominal coverage value of 0.95.

EXAMPLE 5. Figure 4 shows the coverage probability of the nominal 99% standard interval with $n = 20$ and variable p from 0 to 1. Besides the oscillation phenomenon similar to Figure 3, a striking fact in this case is that the coverage never reaches the nominal level. The coverage probability is *always* smaller than 0.99, and in fact on the average the coverage is only 0.883. Our evaluations show that for all $n \leq 45$, the coverage of the 99% standard interval is strictly smaller than the nominal level for all $0 < p < 1$.

It is evident from the preceding presentation that the actual coverage probability of the standard interval can differ significantly from the nominal confidence level for moderate and even large sample sizes. We will later demonstrate that there are other confidence intervals that perform much better

in this regard. See Figure 5 for such a comparison. The error in coverage comes from two sources: discreteness and skewness in the underlying binomial distribution. For a two-sided interval, the rounding error due to discreteness is dominant, and the error due to skewness is somewhat secondary, but still important for even moderately large n . (See Brown, Cai and DasGupta, 1999, for more details.) Note that the situation is different for one-sided intervals. There, the error caused by the skewness can be larger than the rounding error. See Hall (1982) for a detailed discussion on one-sided confidence intervals.

The oscillation in the coverage probability is caused by the discreteness of the binomial distribution, more precisely, the lattice structure of the binomial distribution. The noticeable oscillations are unavoidable for any nonrandomized procedure, although some of the competing procedures in Section 3 can be seen to have somewhat smaller oscillations than the standard procedure. See the text of Casella and Berger (1990) for introductory discussion of the oscillation in such a context.

The erratic and unsatisfactory coverage properties of the standard interval have often been remarked on, but curiously still do not seem to be widely appreciated among statisticians. See, for example, Ghosh (1979), Blyth and Still (1983) and Agresti and Coull (1998). Blyth and Still (1983) also show that the continuity-corrected version still has the same disadvantages.

2.3 Textbook Qualifications

The normal approximation used to justify the standard confidence interval for p can be significantly in error. The error is most evident when the true p is close to 0 or 1. See Lehmann (1999). In fact, it is easy to show that, for any fixed n , the




FIG. 2. Standard interval; oscillation in coverage for small p .




FIG. 3. Standard interval; oscillation phenomenon for fixed $n = 100$ and variable p .

confidence coefficient $C(p, n) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow 0$ or 1 . Therefore, most major problems arise as regards coverage probability when p is near the boundaries.

Poor coverage probabilities for p near 0 or 1 are widely remarked on, and generally, in the popular texts, a brief sentence is added qualifying when to use the standard confidence interval for p . It is interesting to see what these qualifications are. A sample of 11 popular texts gives the following qualifications:

The confidence interval may be used if:

1. $np, n(1 - p)$ are ≥ 5 (or 10);
2. $np(1 - p) \geq 5$ (or 10);
3. $n\hat{p}, n(1 - \hat{p})$ are ≥ 5 (or 10);
4. $\hat{p} \pm 3\sqrt{\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})/n}$ does not contain 0 or 1;
5. n quite large;
6. $n \geq 50$ unless p is very small.

It seems clear that the authors are attempting to say that the standard interval may be used if the central limit approximation is accurate. These prescriptions are defective in several respects. In the estimation problem, (1) and (2) are not verifiable. Even when these conditions are satisfied, we see, for instance, from Table 1 in the previous section, that there is no guarantee that the true coverage probability is close to the nominal confidence level.

For example, when $n = 40$ and $p = 0.5$, one has $np = n(1 - p) = 20$ and $np(1 - p) = 10$, so clearly either of the conditions (1) and (2) is satisfied. However, from Table 1, the true coverage probability in this case equals 0.919 which is certainly unsatisfactory for a confidence interval at nominal level 0.95.

The qualification (5) is useless and (6) is patently misleading; (3) and (4) are certainly verifiable, but they are also useless because in the context of frequentist coverage probabilities, a data-based prescription does not have a meaning. The point is that the standard interval clearly has serious problems and the influential texts caution the readers about that. However, the caution does not appear to serve its purpose, for a variety of reasons.

Here is a result that shows that sometimes the qualifications are not correct even in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

PROPOSITION 1. Let $\gamma > 0$. For the standard confidence interval,

$$(3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{p: np, n(1-p) \geq \gamma} C(p, n) \leq P(a_\gamma < \text{Poisson}(\gamma) \leq b_\gamma),$$




FIG. 4. Coverage of the nominal 99% standard interval for fixed $n = 20$ and variable p .




FIG. 5. Coverage probability for $n = 50$.

TABLE 3

Standard interval; bound (3) on limiting minimum coverage when $np, n(1-p) \geq \gamma$

| γ | 5 | 7 | 10 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{p: np, n(1-p) \geq \gamma} C(p, n)$ | 0.875 | 0.913 | 0.926 |

where a_γ and b_γ are the integer parts of

$$(\kappa^2 + 2\gamma \pm \kappa\sqrt{\kappa^2 + 4\gamma})/2,$$

where the $-$ sign goes with a_γ and the $+$ sign with b_γ .

The proposition follows from the fact that the sequence of $\text{Bin}(n, \gamma/n)$ distributions converges weakly to the $\text{Poisson}(\gamma)$ distribution and so the limit of the infimum is at most the Poisson probability in the proposition by an easy calculation.

Let us use Proposition 1 to investigate the validity of qualifications (1) and (2) in the list above. The nominal confidence level in Table 3 below is 0.95.

TABLE 4

Values of λ_x for the modified lower bound for the Wilson interval

| $1 - \alpha$ | $x = 1$ | $x = 2$ | $x = 3$ |
|--------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 0.90 | 0.105 | 0.532 | 1.102 |
| 0.95 | 0.051 | 0.355 | 0.818 |
| 0.99 | 0.010 | 0.149 | 0.436 |

It is clear that qualification (1) does not work at all and (2) is marginal. There are similar problems with qualifications (3) and (4).

3. RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE INTERVALS

From the evidence gathered in Section 2, it seems clear that the standard interval is just too risky. This brings us to the consideration of alternative intervals. We now analyze several such alternatives, each with its motivation. A few other intervals are also mentioned for their theoretical importance. Among these intervals we feel three stand out in their comparative performance. These are labeled separately as the “recommended intervals”.

3.1 Recommended Intervals

3.1.1 *The Wilson interval.* An alternative to the standard interval is the confidence interval based on inverting the test in equation (2) that uses the null standard error $(pq)^{1/2}n^{-1/2}$ instead of the estimated standard error $(\hat{p}\hat{q})^{1/2}n^{-1/2}$. This confidence interval has the form

$$(4) \quad CI_W = \frac{X + \kappa^2/2}{n + \kappa^2} \pm \frac{\kappa n^{1/2}}{n + \kappa^2} (\hat{p}\hat{q} + \kappa^2/(4n))^{1/2}.$$

This interval was apparently introduced by Wilson (1927) and we will call this interval the Wilson interval.

The Wilson interval has theoretical appeal. The interval is the inversion of the CLT approximation

to the family of equal tail tests of $H_0: p = p_0$. Hence, one accepts H_0 based on the CLT approximation if and only if p_0 is in this interval. As Wilson showed, the argument involves the solution of a quadratic equation; or see Tamhane and Dunlop (2000, Exercise 9.39).

3.1.2 *The Agresti–Coull interval.* The standard interval CI_s is simple and easy to remember. For the purposes of classroom presentation and use in texts, it may be nice to have an alternative that has the familiar form $\hat{p} \pm z\sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})/n}$, with a better and new choice of \hat{p} rather than $\hat{p} = X/n$. This can be accomplished by using the center of the Wilson region in place of \hat{p} . Denote $\tilde{X} = X + \kappa^2/2$ and $\tilde{n} = n + \kappa^2$. Let $\tilde{p} = \tilde{X}/\tilde{n}$ and $\tilde{q} = 1 - \tilde{p}$. Define the confidence interval CI_{AC} for p by

$$(5) \quad CI_{AC} = \tilde{p} \pm \kappa(\tilde{p}\tilde{q})^{1/2}\tilde{n}^{-1/2}.$$

Both the Agresti–Coull and the Wilson interval are centered on the same value, \tilde{p} . It is easy to check that the Agresti–Coull intervals are never shorter than the Wilson intervals. For the case when $\alpha = 0.05$, if we use the value 2 instead of 1.96 for κ , this interval is the “add 2 successes and 2 failures” interval in Agresti and Coull (1998). For this reason, we call it the Agresti–Coull interval. To the best of our knowledge, Samuels and Witmer (1999) is the first introductory statistics textbook that recommends the use of this interval. See Figure 5 for the coverage of this interval. See also Figure 6 for its average coverage probability.

3.1.3 *Jeffreys interval.* Beta distributions are the standard conjugate priors for binomial distributions and it is quite common to use beta priors for inference on p (see Berger, 1985).

Suppose $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$ and suppose p has a prior distribution $\text{Beta}(a_1, a_2)$; then the posterior distribution of p is $\text{Beta}(X + a_1, n - X + a_2)$. Thus a $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ equal-tailed Bayesian interval is given by

$$[B(\alpha/2; X + a_1, n - X + a_2), B(1 - \alpha/2; X + a_1, n - X + a_2)],$$

where $B(\alpha; m_1, m_2)$ denotes the α quantile of a $\text{Beta}(m_1, m_2)$ distribution.

The well-known Jeffreys prior and the uniform prior are each a beta distribution. The noninformative Jeffreys prior is of particular interest to us. Historically, Bayes procedures under noninformative priors have a track record of good frequentist properties; see Wasserman (1991). In this problem

the Jeffreys prior is $\text{Beta}(1/2, 1/2)$ which has the density function

$$f(p) = \pi^{-1}p^{-1/2}(1-p)^{-1/2}.$$

The $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ equal-tailed Jeffreys prior interval is defined as

$$(6) \quad CI_J = [L_J(x), U_J(x)],$$

where $L_J(0) = 0, U_J(n) = 1$ and otherwise

$$(7) \quad L_J(x) = B(\alpha/2; X + 1/2, n - X + 1/2),$$

$$(8) \quad U_J(x) = B(1 - \alpha/2; X + 1/2, n - X + 1/2).$$

The interval is formed by taking the central $1 - \alpha$ posterior probability interval. This leaves $\alpha/2$ posterior probability in each omitted tail. The exception is for $x = 0(n)$ where the lower (upper) limits are modified to avoid the undesirable result that the coverage probability $C(p, n) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow 0$ or 1 .

The actual endpoints of the interval need to be numerically computed. This is very easy to do using softwares such as Minitab, S-PLUS or Mathematica. In Table 5 we have provided the limits for the case of the Jeffreys prior for $7 \leq n \leq 30$.

The endpoints of the Jeffreys prior interval are the $\alpha/2$ and $1 - \alpha/2$ quantiles of the $\text{Beta}(x + 1/2, n - x + 1/2)$ distribution. The psychological resistance among some to using the interval is because of the inability to compute the endpoints at ease without software.

We provide two avenues to resolving this problem. One is Table 5 at the end of the paper. The second is a computable approximation to the limits of the Jeffreys prior interval, one that is computable with just a normal table. This approximation is obtained after some algebra from the general approximation to a Beta quantile given in page 945 in Abramowitz and Stegun (1970).

The lower limit of the $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ Jeffreys prior interval is approximately

$$(9) \quad \frac{x + 1/2}{n + 1 + (n - x + 1/2)(e^{2\omega} - 1)},$$

where

$$\omega = \frac{\kappa\sqrt{4\hat{p}\hat{q}/n + (\kappa^2 - 3)/(6n^2)}}{4\hat{p}\hat{q}} + \frac{(1/2 - \hat{p})(\hat{p}\hat{q}(\kappa^2 + 2) - 1/n)}{6n(\hat{p}\hat{q})^2}.$$

The upper limit may be approximated by the same expression with κ replaced by $-\kappa$ in ω . The simple approximation given above is remarkably accurate. Berry (1996, page 222) suggests using a simpler normal approximation, but this will not be sufficiently accurate unless $n\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})$ is rather large.

TABLE 5
95% Limits of the Jeffreys prior interval

| x | $n = 7$ | | $n = 8$ | | $n = 9$ | | $n = 10$ | | $n = 11$ | | $n = 12$ | |
|-----|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| 0 | 0 | 0.292 | 0 | 0.262 | 0 | 0.238 | 0 | 0.217 | 0 | 0.200 | 0 | 0.185 |
| 1 | 0.016 | 0.501 | 0.014 | 0.454 | 0.012 | 0.414 | 0.011 | 0.381 | 0.010 | 0.353 | 0.009 | 0.328 |
| 2 | 0.065 | 0.648 | 0.056 | 0.592 | 0.049 | 0.544 | 0.044 | 0.503 | 0.040 | 0.467 | 0.036 | 0.436 |
| 3 | 0.139 | 0.766 | 0.119 | 0.705 | 0.104 | 0.652 | 0.093 | 0.606 | 0.084 | 0.565 | 0.076 | 0.529 |
| 4 | 0.234 | 0.861 | 0.199 | 0.801 | 0.173 | 0.746 | 0.153 | 0.696 | 0.137 | 0.652 | 0.124 | 0.612 |
| 5 | | | | | 0.254 | 0.827 | 0.224 | 0.776 | 0.200 | 0.730 | 0.180 | 0.688 |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | 0.270 | 0.800 | 0.243 | 0.757 |
| x | $n = 13$ | | $n = 14$ | | $n = 15$ | | $n = 16$ | | $n = 17$ | | $n = 18$ | |
| 0 | 0 | 0.173 | 0 | 0.162 | 0 | 0.152 | 0 | 0.143 | 0 | 0.136 | 0 | 0.129 |
| 1 | 0.008 | 0.307 | 0.008 | 0.288 | 0.007 | 0.272 | 0.007 | 0.257 | 0.006 | 0.244 | 0.006 | 0.232 |
| 2 | 0.033 | 0.409 | 0.031 | 0.385 | 0.029 | 0.363 | 0.027 | 0.344 | 0.025 | 0.327 | 0.024 | 0.311 |
| 3 | 0.070 | 0.497 | 0.064 | 0.469 | 0.060 | 0.444 | 0.056 | 0.421 | 0.052 | 0.400 | 0.049 | 0.381 |
| 4 | 0.114 | 0.577 | 0.105 | 0.545 | 0.097 | 0.517 | 0.091 | 0.491 | 0.085 | 0.467 | 0.080 | 0.446 |
| 5 | 0.165 | 0.650 | 0.152 | 0.616 | 0.140 | 0.584 | 0.131 | 0.556 | 0.122 | 0.530 | 0.115 | 0.506 |
| 6 | 0.221 | 0.717 | 0.203 | 0.681 | 0.188 | 0.647 | 0.174 | 0.617 | 0.163 | 0.589 | 0.153 | 0.563 |
| 7 | 0.283 | 0.779 | 0.259 | 0.741 | 0.239 | 0.706 | 0.222 | 0.674 | 0.207 | 0.644 | 0.194 | 0.617 |
| 8 | | | | | 0.294 | 0.761 | 0.272 | 0.728 | 0.254 | 0.697 | 0.237 | 0.668 |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | 0.303 | 0.746 | 0.284 | 0.716 |
| x | $n = 19$ | | $n = 20$ | | $n = 21$ | | $n = 22$ | | $n = 23$ | | $n = 24$ | |
| 0 | 0 | 0.122 | 0 | 0.117 | 0 | 0.112 | 0 | 0.107 | 0 | 0.102 | 0 | 0.098 |
| 1 | 0.006 | 0.221 | 0.005 | 0.211 | 0.005 | 0.202 | 0.005 | 0.193 | 0.005 | 0.186 | 0.004 | 0.179 |
| 2 | 0.022 | 0.297 | 0.021 | 0.284 | 0.020 | 0.272 | 0.019 | 0.261 | 0.018 | 0.251 | 0.018 | 0.241 |
| 3 | 0.047 | 0.364 | 0.044 | 0.349 | 0.042 | 0.334 | 0.040 | 0.321 | 0.038 | 0.309 | 0.036 | 0.297 |
| 4 | 0.076 | 0.426 | 0.072 | 0.408 | 0.068 | 0.392 | 0.065 | 0.376 | 0.062 | 0.362 | 0.059 | 0.349 |
| 5 | 0.108 | 0.484 | 0.102 | 0.464 | 0.097 | 0.446 | 0.092 | 0.429 | 0.088 | 0.413 | 0.084 | 0.398 |
| 6 | 0.144 | 0.539 | 0.136 | 0.517 | 0.129 | 0.497 | 0.123 | 0.478 | 0.117 | 0.461 | 0.112 | 0.444 |
| 7 | 0.182 | 0.591 | 0.172 | 0.568 | 0.163 | 0.546 | 0.155 | 0.526 | 0.148 | 0.507 | 0.141 | 0.489 |
| 8 | 0.223 | 0.641 | 0.211 | 0.616 | 0.199 | 0.593 | 0.189 | 0.571 | 0.180 | 0.551 | 0.172 | 0.532 |
| 9 | 0.266 | 0.688 | 0.251 | 0.662 | 0.237 | 0.638 | 0.225 | 0.615 | 0.214 | 0.594 | 0.204 | 0.574 |
| 10 | 0.312 | 0.734 | 0.293 | 0.707 | 0.277 | 0.681 | 0.263 | 0.657 | 0.250 | 0.635 | 0.238 | 0.614 |
| 11 | | | | | 0.319 | 0.723 | 0.302 | 0.698 | 0.287 | 0.675 | 0.273 | 0.653 |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | 0.325 | 0.713 | 0.310 | 0.690 |
| x | $n = 25$ | | $n = 26$ | | $n = 27$ | | $n = 28$ | | $n = 29$ | | $n = 30$ | |
| 0 | 0 | 0.095 | 0 | 0.091 | 0 | 0.088 | 0 | 0.085 | 0 | 0.082 | 0 | 0.080 |
| 1 | 0.004 | 0.172 | 0.004 | 0.166 | 0.004 | 0.160 | 0.004 | 0.155 | 0.004 | 0.150 | 0.004 | 0.145 |
| 2 | 0.017 | 0.233 | 0.016 | 0.225 | 0.016 | 0.217 | 0.015 | 0.210 | 0.015 | 0.203 | 0.014 | 0.197 |
| 3 | 0.035 | 0.287 | 0.034 | 0.277 | 0.032 | 0.268 | 0.031 | 0.259 | 0.030 | 0.251 | 0.029 | 0.243 |
| 4 | 0.056 | 0.337 | 0.054 | 0.325 | 0.052 | 0.315 | 0.050 | 0.305 | 0.048 | 0.295 | 0.047 | 0.286 |
| 5 | 0.081 | 0.384 | 0.077 | 0.371 | 0.074 | 0.359 | 0.072 | 0.348 | 0.069 | 0.337 | 0.067 | 0.327 |
| 6 | 0.107 | 0.429 | 0.102 | 0.415 | 0.098 | 0.402 | 0.095 | 0.389 | 0.091 | 0.378 | 0.088 | 0.367 |
| 7 | 0.135 | 0.473 | 0.129 | 0.457 | 0.124 | 0.443 | 0.119 | 0.429 | 0.115 | 0.416 | 0.111 | 0.404 |
| 8 | 0.164 | 0.515 | 0.158 | 0.498 | 0.151 | 0.482 | 0.145 | 0.468 | 0.140 | 0.454 | 0.135 | 0.441 |
| 9 | 0.195 | 0.555 | 0.187 | 0.537 | 0.180 | 0.521 | 0.172 | 0.505 | 0.166 | 0.490 | 0.160 | 0.476 |
| 10 | 0.228 | 0.594 | 0.218 | 0.576 | 0.209 | 0.558 | 0.201 | 0.542 | 0.193 | 0.526 | 0.186 | 0.511 |
| 11 | 0.261 | 0.632 | 0.250 | 0.613 | 0.239 | 0.594 | 0.230 | 0.577 | 0.221 | 0.560 | 0.213 | 0.545 |
| 12 | 0.295 | 0.669 | 0.282 | 0.649 | 0.271 | 0.630 | 0.260 | 0.611 | 0.250 | 0.594 | 0.240 | 0.578 |
| 13 | 0.331 | 0.705 | 0.316 | 0.684 | 0.303 | 0.664 | 0.291 | 0.645 | 0.279 | 0.627 | 0.269 | 0.610 |
| 14 | | | | | 0.336 | 0.697 | 0.322 | 0.678 | 0.310 | 0.659 | 0.298 | 0.641 |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | 0.341 | 0.690 | 0.328 | 0.672 |




FIG. 6. Comparison of the average coverage probabilities. From top to bottom: the Agresti–Coull interval CI_{AC} , the Wilson interval CI_W , the Jeffreys prior interval CI_J and the standard interval CI_s . The nominal confidence level is 0.95.

In Figure 5 we plot the coverage probability of the standard interval, the Wilson interval, the Agresti–Coull interval and the Jeffreys interval for $n = 50$ and $\alpha = 0.05$.

3.2 Coverage Probability

In this and the next subsections, we compare the performance of the standard interval and the three recommended intervals in terms of their coverage probability and length.

Coverage of the Wilson interval fluctuates acceptably near $1 - \alpha$, except for p very near 0 or 1. It might be helpful to consult Figure 5 again. It can be shown that, when $1 - \alpha = 0.95$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} C\left(\frac{\gamma}{n}, n\right) = 0.92, \quad \gamma \geq 1$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} C\left(\frac{\gamma}{n}, n\right) = 0.936, \quad \gamma \geq 5$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} C\left(\frac{\gamma}{n}, n\right) = 0.938, \quad \gamma \geq 10$$

for the Wilson interval. In comparison, these three values for the standard interval are 0.860, 0.870, and 0.905, respectively, obviously considerably smaller.

The modification CI_{M-W} presented in Section 4.1.1 removes the first few deep downward spikes of the coverage function for CI_W . The resulting coverage function is overall somewhat conservative for p very near 0 or 1. Both CI_W and CI_{M-W} have the same coverage functions away from 0 or 1.

The Agresti–Coull interval has good minimum coverage probability. The coverage probability of the interval is quite conservative for p very close to 0 or 1. In comparison to the Wilson interval it is more conservative, especially for small n . This is not surprising because, as we have noted, CI_{AC} always contains CI_W as a proper subinterval.

The coverage of the Jeffreys interval is qualitatively similar to that of CI_W over most of the parameter space $[0, 1]$. In addition, as we will see in Section 4.3, CI_J has an appealing connection to the mid- P corrected version of the Clopper–Pearson “exact” intervals. These are very similar to CI_J , over most of the range, and have similar appealing properties. CI_J is a serious and credible candidate for practical use. The coverage has an unfortunate fairly deep spike near $p = 0$ and, symmetrically, another near $p = 1$. However, the simple modification of CI_J presented in Section 4.1.2 removes these two deep downward spikes. The modified Jeffreys interval CI_{M-J} performs well.

Let us also evaluate the intervals in terms of their average coverage probability, the average being over p . Figure 6 demonstrates the striking difference in the average coverage probability among four intervals: the Agresti–Coull interval, the Wilson interval, the Jeffreys prior interval and the standard interval. The standard interval performs poorly. The interval CI_{AC} is slightly conservative in terms of average coverage probability. Both the Wilson interval and the Jeffreys prior interval have excellent performance in terms of the average coverage probability; that of the Jeffreys prior interval is, if anything, slightly superior. The average coverage of the Jeffreys interval is really very close to the nominal level even for quite small n . This is quite impressive.

Figure 7 displays the mean absolute errors, $\int_0^1 |C(p, n) - (1 - \alpha)| dp$, for $n = 10$ to 25, and $n = 26$ to 40. It is clear from the plots that among the four intervals, CI_W , CI_{AC} and CI_J are comparable, but the mean absolute errors of CI_s are significantly larger.

3.3 Expected Length

Besides coverage, length is also very important in evaluation of a confidence interval. We compare




FIG. 7. The mean absolute errors of the coverage of the standard (solid), the Agresti-Coull (dashed), the Jeffreys (+) and the Wilson (dotted) intervals for $n = 10$ to 25 and $n = 26$ to 40 .

both the expected length and the average expected length of the intervals. By definition,

Expected length

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= E_{n,p}(\text{length}(CI)) \\
 &= \sum_{x=0}^n (U(x,n) - L(x,n)) \binom{n}{x} p^x (1-p)^{n-x},
 \end{aligned}$$

where U and L are the upper and lower limits of the confidence interval CI , respectively. The average expected length is just the integral $\int_0^1 E_{n,p}(\text{length}(CI)) dp$.

We plot in Figure 8 the expected lengths of the four intervals for $n = 25$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. In this case, CI_W is the shortest when $0.210 \leq p \leq 0.790$, CI_J is the shortest when $0.133 \leq p \leq 0.210$ or $0.790 \leq p \leq 0.867$, and CI_s is the shortest when $p \leq 0.133$ or $p \geq 0.867$. It is no surprise that the standard interval is the shortest when p is near the boundaries. CI_s is not really in contention as a credible choice for such values of p because of its poor coverage properties in that region. Similar qualitative phenomena hold for other values of n .

Figure 9 shows the average expected lengths of the four intervals for $n = 10$ to 25 and $n = 26$ to

40 . Interestingly, the comparison is clear and consistent as n changes. Always, the standard interval and the Wilson interval CI_W have almost identical average expected length; the Jeffreys interval CI_J is comparable to the Wilson interval, and in fact CI_J is slightly more parsimonious. But the difference is not of practical relevance. However, especially when n is small, the average expected length of CI_{AC} is noticeably larger than that of CI_J and CI_W . In fact, for n till about 20 , the average expected length of CI_{AC} is larger than that of CI_J by 0.04 to 0.02 , and this difference can be of definite practical relevance. The difference starts to wear off when n is larger than 30 or so.

4. OTHER ALTERNATIVE INTERVALS

Several other intervals deserve consideration, either due to their historical value or their theoretical properties. In the interest of space, we had to exercise some personal judgment in deciding which additional intervals should be presented.

4.1 Boundary modification

The coverage probabilities of the Wilson interval and the Jeffreys interval fluctuate acceptably near




FIG. 8. The expected lengths of the standard (solid), the Wilson (dotted), the Agresti-Coull (dashed) and the Jeffreys (+) intervals for $n = 25$ and $\alpha = 0.05$.




FIG. 9. The average expected lengths of the standard (solid), the Wilson (dotted), the Agresti-Coull (dashed) and the Jeffreys (+) intervals for $n = 10$ to 25 and $n = 26$ to 40 .

$1 - \alpha$ for p not very close to 0 or 1. Simple modifications can be made to remove a few deep downward spikes of their coverage near the boundaries; see Figure 5.

4.1.1 *Modified Wilson interval.* The lower bound of the Wilson interval is formed by inverting a CLT approximation. The coverage has downward spikes when p is very near 0 or 1. These spikes exist for all n and α . For example, it can be shown that, when $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ and $p = 0.1765/n$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_p(p \in CI_W) = 0.838$$

and when $1 - \alpha = 0.99$ and $p = 0.1174/n$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_p(p \in CI_W) = 0.889$. The particular numerical values (0.1174, 0.1765) are relevant only to the extent that divided by n , they approximate the location of these deep downward spikes.

The spikes can be removed by using a one-sided Poisson approximation for x close to 0 or n . Suppose we modify the lower bound for $x = 1, \dots, x^*$. For a fixed $1 \leq x \leq x^*$, the lower bound of CI_W should be

replaced by a lower bound of λ_x/n where λ_x solves

$$(10) \quad e^{-\lambda}(\lambda^0/0! + \lambda^1/1! + \dots + \lambda^{x-1}/(x-1)!) = 1 - \alpha.$$

A symmetric prescription needs to be followed to modify the upper bound for x very near n . The value of x^* should be small. Values which work reasonably well for $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ are

$$x^* = 2 \text{ for } n < 50 \text{ and } x^* = 3 \text{ for } 51 \leq n \leq 100+.$$

Using the relationship between the Poisson and χ^2 distributions,

$$P(Y \leq x) = P(\chi^2_{2(1+x)} \leq 2\lambda)$$

where $Y \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$, one can also formally express λ_x in (10) in terms of the χ^2 quantiles: $\lambda_x = (1/2)\chi^2_{2x, \alpha}$, where $\chi^2_{2x, \alpha}$ denotes the 100 α th percentile of the χ^2 distribution with $2x$ degrees of freedom. Table 4 gives the values of λ_x for selected values of x and α .

For example, consider the case $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ and $x = 2$. The lower bound of CI_W is $\approx 0.548/(n + 4)$. The modified Wilson interval replaces this by a lower bound of λ/n where $\lambda = (1/2)\chi^2_{4, 0.05}$. Thus,




FIG. 10. Coverage probability for $n = 50$ and $p \in (0, 0.15)$. The plots are symmetric about $p = 0.5$ and the coverage of the modified intervals (solid line) is the same as that of the corresponding interval without modification (dashed line) for $p \in [0.15, 0.85]$.




FIG. 11. Coverage probability of other alternative intervals for $n = 50$.

from a χ^2 table, for $x = 2$ the new lower bound is $0.355/n$.

We denote this modified Wilson interval by CI_{M-W} . See Figure 10 for its coverage.

4.1.2 *Modified Jeffreys interval.* Evidently, CI_J has an appealing Bayesian interpretation, and, its coverage properties are appealing again except for a very narrow downward coverage spike fairly near 0 and 1 (see Figure 5). The unfortunate downward spikes in the coverage function result because $U_J(0)$ is too small and symmetrically $L_J(n)$ is too large. To remedy this, one may revise these two specific limits as

$$U_{M-J}(0) = p_l \quad \text{and} \quad L_{M-J}(n) = 1 - p_l,$$

where p_l satisfies $(1 - p_l)^n = \alpha/2$ or equivalently $p_l = 1 - (\alpha/2)^{1/n}$.

We also made a slight, ad hoc alteration of $L_J(1)$ and set

$$L_{M-J}(1) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad U_{M-J}(n - 1) = 1.$$

In all other cases, $L_{M-J} = L_J$ and $U_{M-J} = U_J$. We denote the modified Jeffreys interval by CI_{M-J} . This modification removes the two steep downward spikes and the performance of the interval is improved. See Figure 10.

4.2 Other intervals

4.2.1 *The Clopper-Pearson interval.* The Clopper-Pearson interval is the inversion of the equal-tail binomial test rather than its normal approximation. Some authors refer to this as the “exact” procedure because of its derivation from the binomial distribution. If $X = x$ is observed, then the Clopper-Pearson (1934) interval is defined by $CI_{CP} = [L_{CP}(x), U_{CP}(x)]$, where $L_{CP}(x)$ and $U_{CP}(x)$ are, respectively, the solutions in p to the equations

$$P_p(X \geq x) = \alpha/2 \quad \text{and} \quad P_p(X \leq x) = \alpha/2.$$

It is easy to show that the lower endpoint is the $\alpha/2$ quantile of a beta distribution $\text{Beta}(x, n - x + 1)$, and the upper endpoint is the $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile of a beta distribution $\text{Beta}(x + 1, n - x)$. The Clopper-Pearson interval guarantees that the actual coverage probability is always equal to or above the nominal confidence level. However, for any fixed p , the actual coverage probability can be much larger than $1 - \alpha$ unless n is quite large, and thus the confidence interval is rather inaccurate in this sense. See Figure 11. The Clopper-Pearson interval is wastefully conservative and is not a good choice for practical use, unless strict adherence to the prescription $C(p, n) \geq 1 - \alpha$ is demanded. Even then, better exact methods are available; see, for instance, Blyth and Still (1983) and Casella (1986).

4.2.2 *The arcsine interval.* Another interval is based on a widely used variance stabilizing transformation for the binomial distribution [see, e.g., Bickel and Doksum, 1977: $T(\hat{p}) = \arcsin(\hat{p}^{1/2})$]. This variance stabilization is based on the delta method and is, of course, only an asymptotic one. Anscombe (1948) showed that replacing \hat{p} by $\check{p} = (X + 3/8)/(n + 3/4)$ gives better variance stabilization; furthermore

$$2n^{1/2}[\arcsin(\check{p}^{1/2}) - \arcsin(p^{1/2})] \rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

This leads to an approximate $100(1-\alpha)\%$ confidence interval for p ,

$$(11) \quad CI_{Arc} = \left[\sin^2(\arcsin(\check{p}^{1/2}) - \frac{1}{2}\kappa n^{-1/2}), \sin^2(\arcsin(\check{p}^{1/2}) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa n^{-1/2}) \right].$$

See Figure 11 for the coverage probability of this interval for $n = 50$. This interval performs reasonably well for p not too close to 0 or 1. The coverage has steep downward spikes near the two edges; in fact it is easy to see that the coverage drops to zero when p is sufficiently close to the boundary (see Figure 11). The mean absolute error of the coverage of CI_{Arc} is significantly larger than those of CI_W , CI_{AC} and CI_J . We note that our evaluations show that the performance of the arcsine interval with the standard \hat{p} in place of \check{p} in (11) is much worse than that of CI_{Arc} .

4.2.3 *The logit interval.* The logit interval is obtained by inverting a Wald type interval for the log odds $\lambda = \log(\frac{p}{1-p})$; (see Stone, 1995). The MLE of λ (for $0 < X < n$) is

$$\hat{\lambda} = \log\left(\frac{\hat{p}}{1-\hat{p}}\right) = \log\left(\frac{X}{n-X}\right),$$

which is the so-called empirical logit transform. The variance of $\hat{\lambda}$, by an application of the delta theorem, can be estimated by

$$\hat{V} = \frac{n}{X(n-X)}.$$

This leads to an approximate $100(1-\alpha)\%$ confidence interval for λ ,

$$(12) \quad CI(\lambda) = [\lambda_l, \lambda_u] = [\hat{\lambda} - \kappa \hat{V}^{1/2}, \hat{\lambda} + \kappa \hat{V}^{1/2}].$$

The logit interval for p is obtained by inverting the interval (12),

$$(13) \quad CI_{Logit} = \left[\frac{e^{\lambda_l}}{1 + e^{\lambda_l}}, \frac{e^{\lambda_u}}{1 + e^{\lambda_u}} \right].$$

The interval (13) has been suggested, for example, in Stone (1995, page 667). Figure 11 plots the coverage of the logit interval for $n = 50$. This interval performs quite well in terms of coverage for p away from 0 or 1. But the interval is unnecessarily long; in fact its expected length is larger than that of the Clopper–Pearson exact interval.

REMARK. Anscombe (1956) suggested that $\hat{\lambda} = \log(\frac{X+1/2}{n-X+1/2})$ is a better estimate of λ ; see also Cox and Snell (1989) and Santner and Duffy (1989). The variance of Anscombe’s $\hat{\lambda}$ may be estimated by

$$\hat{V} = \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{n(X+1)(n-X+1)}.$$

A new logit interval can be constructed using the new estimates $\hat{\lambda}$ and \hat{V} . Our evaluations show that the new logit interval is overall shorter than CI_{Logit} in (13). But the coverage of the new interval is not satisfactory.

4.2.4 *The Bayesian HPD interval.* An exact Bayesian solution would involve using the HPD intervals instead of our equal-tails proposal. However, HPD intervals are much harder to compute and do not do as well in terms of coverage probability. See Figure 11 and compare to the Jeffreys’ equal-tailed interval in Figure 5.

4.2.5 *The likelihood ratio interval.* Along with the Wald and the Rao score intervals, the likelihood ratio method is one of the most used methods for construction of confidence intervals. It is constructed by inversion of the likelihood ratio test which accepts the null hypothesis $H_0: p = p_0$ if $-2 \log(\Lambda_n) \leq \kappa^2$, where Λ_n is the likelihood ratio

$$\Lambda_n = \frac{L(p_0)}{\sup_p L(p)} = \frac{p_0^X (1-p_0)^{n-X}}{(X/n)^X (1-X/n)^{n-X}},$$

L being the likelihood function. See Rao (1973). Brown, Cai and DasGupta (1999) show by analytical calculations that this interval has nice properties. However, it is slightly harder to compute. For the purpose of the present article which we view as primarily directed toward practice, we do not further analyze the likelihood ratio interval.

4.3 Connections between Jeffreys Intervals and Mid-P Intervals

The equal-tailed Jeffreys prior interval has some interesting connections to the Clopper–Pearson interval. As we mentioned earlier, the Clopper–

Pearson interval CI_{CP} can be written as

$$CI_{CP} = [B(\alpha/2; X, n - X + 1), \\ B(1 - \alpha/2; X + 1, n - X)].$$

It therefore follows immediately that CI_J is always contained in CI_{CP} . Thus CI_J corrects the conservativeness of CI_{CP} .

It turns out that the Jeffreys prior interval, although Bayesianly constructed, has a clear and convincing frequentist motivation. It is thus no surprise that it does well from a frequentist perspective. As we now explain, the Jeffreys prior interval CI_J can be regarded as a continuity corrected version of the Clopper–Pearson interval CI_{CP} .

The interval CI_{CP} inverts the inequality $P_p(X \leq L(p)) \leq \alpha/2$ to obtain the lower limit and similarly for the upper limit. Thus, for fixed x , the upper limit of the interval for p , $U_{CP}(x)$, satisfies

$$(14) \quad P_{U_{CP}(x)}(X \leq x) \leq \alpha/2,$$

and symmetrically for the lower limit.

This interval is very conservative; undesirably so for most practical purposes. A familiar proposal to eliminate this over-conservativeness is to instead invert

$$(15) \quad P_p(X \leq L(p) - 1) + (1/2)P_p(X = L(p)) = \alpha/2,$$

This amounts to solving

$$(16) \quad (1/2)\{P_{U_{CP}(x)}(X \leq x - 1) \\ + P_{U_{CP}(x)}(X \leq x)\} = \alpha/2,$$

which is the same as

$$(17) \quad U_{\text{mid-}P}(X) = (1/2)B(1 - \alpha/2; x, n - x + 1) \\ + (1/2)B(1 - \alpha/2; x + 1, n - x)$$

and symmetrically for the lower endpoint. These are the “Mid- P Clopper–Pearson” intervals. They are known to have good coverage and length performance. $U_{\text{mid-}P}$ given in (17) is a weighted average of two incomplete Beta functions. The incomplete Beta function of interest, $B(1 - \alpha/2; x, n - x + 1)$, is continuous and monotone in x if we formally treat x as a continuous argument. Hence the average of the two functions defining $U_{\text{mid-}P}$ is approximately the same as the value at the halfway point, $x + 1/2$. Thus

$$U_{\text{mid-}P}(X) \approx B(1 - \alpha/2; x + 1/2, n - x + 1/2) = U_J(x),$$

exactly the upper limit for the equal-tailed Jeffreys interval. Similarly, the corresponding approximate lower endpoint is the Jeffreys’ lower limit.

Another frequentist way to interpret the Jeffreys prior interval is to say that $U_J(x)$ is the upper

limit for the Clopper–Pearson rule with $x - 1/2$ successes and $L_J(x)$ is the lower limit for the Clopper–Pearson rule with $x + 1/2$ successes. Strawderman and Wells (1998) contains a valuable discussion of mid- P intervals and suggests some variations based on asymptotic expansions.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Interval estimation of a binomial proportion is a very basic problem in practical statistics. The standard Wald interval is in nearly universal use. We first show that the performance of this standard interval is persistently chaotic and unacceptably poor. Indeed its coverage properties defy conventional wisdom. The performance is so erratic and the qualifications given in the influential texts are so defective that the standard interval should not be used. We provide a fairly comprehensive evaluation of many natural alternative intervals. Based on this analysis, we recommend the Wilson or the equal-tailed Jeffreys prior interval for small n ($n \leq 40$). These two intervals are comparable in both absolute error and length for $n \leq 40$, and we believe that either could be used, depending on taste.

For larger n , the Wilson, the Jeffreys and the Agresti–Coull intervals are all comparable, and the Agresti–Coull interval is the simplest to present. It is generally true in statistical practice that only those methods that are easy to describe, remember and compute are widely used. Keeping this in mind, we recommend the Agresti–Coull interval for practical use when $n \geq 40$. Even for small sample sizes, the easy-to-present Agresti–Coull interval is much preferable to the standard one.

We would be satisfied if this article contributes to a greater appreciation of the severe flaws of the popular standard interval and an agreement that it deserves not to be used at all. We also hope that the recommendations for alternative intervals will provide some closure as to what may be used in preference to the standard method.

Finally, we note that the specific choices of the values of n , p and α in the examples and figures are artifacts. The theoretical results in Brown, Cai and DasGupta (1999) show that qualitatively similar phenomena as regarding coverage and length hold for general n and p and common values of the coverage. (Those results there are asymptotic as $n \rightarrow \infty$, but they are also sufficiently accurate for realistically moderate n .)

APPENDIX

TABLE A.1
95% Limits of the modified Jeffreys prior interval

| x | $n = 7$ | | $n = 8$ | | $n = 9$ | | $n = 10$ | | $n = 11$ | | $n = 12$ | |
|-----|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| 0 | 0 | 0.410 | 0 | 0.369 | 0 | 0.336 | 0 | 0.308 | 0 | 0.285 | 0 | 0.265 |
| 1 | 0 | 0.501 | 0 | 0.454 | 0 | 0.414 | 0 | 0.381 | 0 | 0.353 | 0 | 0.328 |
| 2 | 0.065 | 0.648 | 0.056 | 0.592 | 0.049 | 0.544 | 0.044 | 0.503 | 0.040 | 0.467 | 0.036 | 0.436 |
| 3 | 0.139 | 0.766 | 0.119 | 0.705 | 0.104 | 0.652 | 0.093 | 0.606 | 0.084 | 0.565 | 0.076 | 0.529 |
| 4 | 0.234 | 0.861 | 0.199 | 0.801 | 0.173 | 0.746 | 0.153 | 0.696 | 0.137 | 0.652 | 0.124 | 0.612 |
| 5 | | | | | 0.254 | 0.827 | 0.224 | 0.776 | 0.200 | 0.730 | 0.180 | 0.688 |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | 0.270 | 0.800 | 0.243 | 0.757 |
| x | $n = 13$ | | $n = 14$ | | $n = 15$ | | $n = 16$ | | $n = 17$ | | $n = 18$ | |
| 0 | 0 | 0.247 | 0 | 0.232 | 0 | 0.218 | 0 | 0.206 | 0 | 0.195 | 0 | 0.185 |
| 1 | 0 | 0.307 | 0 | 0.288 | 0 | 0.272 | 0 | 0.257 | 0 | 0.244 | 0 | 0.232 |
| 2 | 0.033 | 0.409 | 0.031 | 0.385 | 0.029 | 0.363 | 0.027 | 0.344 | 0.025 | 0.327 | 0.024 | 0.311 |
| 3 | 0.070 | 0.497 | 0.064 | 0.469 | 0.060 | 0.444 | 0.056 | 0.421 | 0.052 | 0.400 | 0.049 | 0.381 |
| 4 | 0.114 | 0.577 | 0.105 | 0.545 | 0.097 | 0.517 | 0.091 | 0.491 | 0.085 | 0.467 | 0.080 | 0.446 |
| 5 | 0.165 | 0.650 | 0.152 | 0.616 | 0.140 | 0.584 | 0.131 | 0.556 | 0.122 | 0.530 | 0.115 | 0.506 |
| 6 | 0.221 | 0.717 | 0.203 | 0.681 | 0.188 | 0.647 | 0.174 | 0.617 | 0.163 | 0.589 | 0.153 | 0.563 |
| 7 | 0.283 | 0.779 | 0.259 | 0.741 | 0.239 | 0.706 | 0.222 | 0.674 | 0.207 | 0.644 | 0.194 | 0.617 |
| 8 | | | | | 0.294 | 0.761 | 0.272 | 0.728 | 0.254 | 0.697 | 0.237 | 0.668 |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | 0.303 | 0.746 | 0.284 | 0.716 |
| x | $n = 19$ | | $n = 20$ | | $n = 21$ | | $n = 22$ | | $n = 23$ | | $n = 24$ | |
| 0 | 0 | 0.176 | 0 | 0.168 | 0 | 0.161 | 0 | 0.154 | 0 | 0.148 | 0 | 0.142 |
| 1 | 0 | 0.221 | 0 | 0.211 | 0 | 0.202 | 0 | 0.193 | 0 | 0.186 | 0 | 0.179 |
| 2 | 0.022 | 0.297 | 0.021 | 0.284 | 0.020 | 0.272 | 0.019 | 0.261 | 0.018 | 0.251 | 0.018 | 0.241 |
| 3 | 0.047 | 0.364 | 0.044 | 0.349 | 0.042 | 0.334 | 0.040 | 0.321 | 0.038 | 0.309 | 0.036 | 0.297 |
| 4 | 0.076 | 0.426 | 0.072 | 0.408 | 0.068 | 0.392 | 0.065 | 0.376 | 0.062 | 0.362 | 0.059 | 0.349 |
| 5 | 0.108 | 0.484 | 0.102 | 0.464 | 0.097 | 0.446 | 0.092 | 0.429 | 0.088 | 0.413 | 0.084 | 0.398 |
| 6 | 0.144 | 0.539 | 0.136 | 0.517 | 0.129 | 0.497 | 0.123 | 0.478 | 0.117 | 0.461 | 0.112 | 0.444 |
| 7 | 0.182 | 0.591 | 0.172 | 0.568 | 0.163 | 0.546 | 0.155 | 0.526 | 0.148 | 0.507 | 0.141 | 0.489 |
| 8 | 0.223 | 0.641 | 0.211 | 0.616 | 0.199 | 0.593 | 0.189 | 0.571 | 0.180 | 0.551 | 0.172 | 0.532 |
| 9 | 0.266 | 0.688 | 0.251 | 0.662 | 0.237 | 0.638 | 0.225 | 0.615 | 0.214 | 0.594 | 0.204 | 0.574 |
| 10 | 0.312 | 0.734 | 0.293 | 0.707 | 0.277 | 0.681 | 0.263 | 0.657 | 0.250 | 0.635 | 0.238 | 0.614 |
| 11 | | | | | 0.319 | 0.723 | 0.302 | 0.698 | 0.287 | 0.675 | 0.273 | 0.653 |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | 0.325 | 0.713 | 0.310 | 0.690 |
| x | $n = 25$ | | $n = 26$ | | $n = 27$ | | $n = 28$ | | $n = 29$ | | $n = 30$ | |
| 0 | 0 | 0.137 | 0 | 0.132 | 0 | 0.128 | 0 | 0.123 | 0 | 0.119 | 0 | 0.116 |
| 1 | 0 | 0.172 | 0 | 0.166 | 0 | 0.160 | 0 | 0.155 | 0 | 0.150 | 0 | 0.145 |
| 2 | 0.017 | 0.233 | 0.016 | 0.225 | 0.016 | 0.217 | 0.015 | 0.210 | 0.015 | 0.203 | 0.014 | 0.197 |
| 3 | 0.035 | 0.287 | 0.034 | 0.277 | 0.032 | 0.268 | 0.031 | 0.259 | 0.030 | 0.251 | 0.029 | 0.243 |
| 4 | 0.056 | 0.337 | 0.054 | 0.325 | 0.052 | 0.315 | 0.050 | 0.305 | 0.048 | 0.295 | 0.047 | 0.286 |
| 5 | 0.081 | 0.384 | 0.077 | 0.371 | 0.074 | 0.359 | 0.072 | 0.348 | 0.069 | 0.337 | 0.067 | 0.327 |
| 6 | 0.107 | 0.429 | 0.102 | 0.415 | 0.098 | 0.402 | 0.095 | 0.389 | 0.091 | 0.378 | 0.088 | 0.367 |
| 7 | 0.135 | 0.473 | 0.129 | 0.457 | 0.124 | 0.443 | 0.119 | 0.429 | 0.115 | 0.416 | 0.111 | 0.404 |
| 8 | 0.164 | 0.515 | 0.158 | 0.498 | 0.151 | 0.482 | 0.145 | 0.468 | 0.140 | 0.454 | 0.135 | 0.441 |
| 9 | 0.195 | 0.555 | 0.187 | 0.537 | 0.180 | 0.521 | 0.172 | 0.505 | 0.166 | 0.490 | 0.160 | 0.476 |
| 10 | 0.228 | 0.594 | 0.218 | 0.576 | 0.209 | 0.558 | 0.201 | 0.542 | 0.193 | 0.526 | 0.186 | 0.511 |
| 11 | 0.261 | 0.632 | 0.250 | 0.613 | 0.239 | 0.594 | 0.230 | 0.577 | 0.221 | 0.560 | 0.213 | 0.545 |
| 12 | 0.295 | 0.669 | 0.282 | 0.649 | 0.271 | 0.630 | 0.260 | 0.611 | 0.250 | 0.594 | 0.240 | 0.578 |
| 13 | 0.331 | 0.705 | 0.316 | 0.684 | 0.303 | 0.664 | 0.291 | 0.645 | 0.279 | 0.627 | 0.269 | 0.610 |
| 14 | | | | | 0.336 | 0.697 | 0.322 | 0.678 | 0.310 | 0.659 | 0.298 | 0.641 |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | 0.341 | 0.690 | 0.328 | 0.672 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Xuefeng Li for performing some helpful computations and Jim Berger, David Moore, Steve Samuels, Bill Studden and Ron Thisted for useful conversations. We also thank the Editors and two anonymous referees for their thorough and constructive comments. Supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and the National Security Agency.

REFERENCES

- ABRAMOWITZ, M. and STEGUN, I. A. (1970). *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*. Dover, New York.
- AGRESTI, A. and COULL, B. A. (1998). Approximate is better than “exact” for interval estimation of binomial proportions. *Amer. Statist.* **52** 119–126.
- ANSCOMBE, F. J. (1948). The transformation of Poisson, binomial and negative binomial data. *Biometrika* **35** 246–254.
- ANSCOMBE, F. J. (1956). On estimating binomial response relations. *Biometrika* **43** 461–464.
- BERGER, J. O. (1985). *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis*, 2nd ed. Springer, New York.
- BERRY, D. A. (1996). *Statistics: A Bayesian Perspective*. Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.
- BICKEL, P. and DOKSUM, K. (1977). *Mathematical Statistics*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- BLYTH, C. R. and STILL, H. A. (1983). Binomial confidence intervals. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **78** 108–116.
- BROWN, L. D., CAI, T. and DASGUPTA, A. (1999). Confidence intervals for a binomial proportion and asymptotic expansions. *Ann. Statist.* to appear.
- BROWN, L. D., CAI, T. and DASGUPTA, A. (2000). Interval estimation in discrete exponential family. Technical report, Dept. Statistics, Univ. Pennsylvania.
- CASELLA, G. (1986). Refining binomial confidence intervals. *Canad. J. Statist.* **14** 113–129.
- CASELLA, G. and BERGER, R. L. (1990). *Statistical Inference*. Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole, Belmont, CA.
- CLOPPER, C. J. and PEARSON, E. S. (1934). The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika* **26** 404–413.
- COX, D. R. and SNELL, E. J. (1989). *Analysis of Binary Data*, 2nd ed. Chapman and Hall, London.
- CRESSIE, N. (1980). A finely tuned continuity correction. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **30** 435–442.
- GHOSH, B. K. (1979). A comparison of some approximate confidence intervals for the binomial parameter. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **74** 894–900.
- HALL, P. (1982). Improving the normal approximation when constructing one-sided confidence intervals for binomial or Poisson parameters. *Biometrika* **69** 647–652.
- LEHMANN, E. L. (1999). *Elements of Large-Sample Theory*. Springer, New York.
- NEWCOMBE, R. G. (1998). Two-sided confidence intervals for the single proportion; comparison of several methods. *Statistics in Medicine* **17** 857–872.
- RAO, C. R. (1973). *Linear Statistical Inference and Its Applications*. Wiley, New York.
- SAMUELS, M. L. and WITMER, J. W. (1999). *Statistics for the Life Sciences*, 2nd ed. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- SANTNER, T. J. (1998). A note on teaching binomial confidence intervals. *Teaching Statistics* **20** 20–23.
- SANTNER, T. J. and DUFFY, D. E. (1989). *The Statistical Analysis of Discrete Data*. Springer, Berlin.
- STONE, C. J. (1995). *A Course in Probability and Statistics*. Duxbury, Belmont, CA.
- STRAWDERMAN, R. L. and WELLS, M. T. (1998). Approximately exact inference for the common odds ratio in several 2×2 tables (with discussion). *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **93** 1294–1320.
- TAMHANE, A. C. and DUNLOP, D. D. (2000). *Statistics and Data Analysis from Elementary to Intermediate*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- VOLLSET, S. E. (1993). Confidence intervals for a binomial proportion. *Statistics in Medicine* **12** 809–824.
- WASSERMAN, L. (1991). An inferential interpretation of default priors. Technical report, Carnegie-Mellon Univ.
- WILSON, E. B. (1927). Probable inference, the law of succession, and statistical inference. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **22** 209–212.

Comment

Alan Agresti and Brent A. Coull

In this very interesting article, Professors Brown, Cai and DasGupta (BCD) have shown that discrete-

Alan Agresti is Distinguished Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611-8545 (e-mail: aa@stat.ufl.edu). Brent A. Coull is Assistant Professor, Department of Biostatistics, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts 02115 (e-mail: bcoull@hsph.harvard.edu).

ness can cause havoc for much larger sample sizes that one would expect. The popular (Wald) confidence interval for a binomial parameter p has been known for some time to behave poorly, but readers will surely be surprised that this can happen for such large n values.

Interval estimation of a binomial parameter is deceptively simple, as there are not even any nuisance parameters. The gold standard would seem to be a method such as the Clopper–Pearson, based on inverting an “exact” test using the binomial dis-