Estimation Procedure of Mean under Measurement Errors in Systematic Sampling

Jagmohan Singh Dhakar^¹ , Sabir Ali Siddiqui^² and Sanjay Jain ³

¹Department of Community Medicine, Virendra Kumar Sakhlecha Government Medical College, Neemuch (MP), INDIA

²Department of Mathematics and Sciences, Dhofar University, Salalah, Sultanate of Oman

³ Department of Statistics, St. John's College, Agra (UP), INDIA

Abstract:

This article suggest estimation method of finite population mean for systematic sampling under measurement error and presented a class of estimators under measurements error using systematic sampling scheme. The study variable and auxiliary variables are commingled with measurement error. The properties of the estimators is achieved. The simulation study is accompanied to shows the influence of measurement error at various phase of correlation coefficient and measurements error variance.

Keywords: Proposed Estimator, Systematic Sampling, Measurement Error, Ratio, Product, Difference Estimator, Mean Square Error

DOI: 10.57030/cims.20240901

1. Introduction

Systematic sampling is widely used and more convenient than simple random sampling as it is simplest sampling scheme. Apart from simplicity, systematic sampling give precise estimate than simple random sampling and stratified random sampling under certain conditions. The use of auxiliary information is fruitful and give precise estimates. The ratio, product and difference estimator are well known consistent, biased and reliable estimates than those based on simple averages (Cochran, 1963). Swain (1964) and Shukla (1971) proposed ratio and product estimators respectively in context of systematic sampling.

Cochran (1968) and Murthy (1967) discuss the real life problem where the data is found with error. Measurement error is the difference between observed and accurate values of the variables. The measurement error first encountered by Shalabh (1997) in sampling technique. In survey sampling, measurement error is further studied by Singh and Manisha (2001), Allen and Singh (2003), Sahoo et al. (2006), Gregorre and Salas (2009). Shalabh (2017) studied correlated measurement error in perspective of ratio and product method. Singh et al. (2019) commingled error on ratio, product and mean estimator. Singh and Vishwakarma (2019) calculated the consequence of measurement error and non-response on mean estimation simultaneously.

In study related to parametric estimation in systematic sampling, But during survey sampling context to systematic sampling, observations are commingled with error. In this article, we proposed a class of estimators which contain ratio, product and difference estimator and unbiased mean estimator under measurement errors.

Suppose the units $u = (u_1, u_2, ..., u_N)$ are a finite population N . The population size is distributed into k interval such that $N = nk$. To choose a sample, first unit is chosen randomly from the first k units and then select every subsequent k^{th} unit. This methods of sampling is to select a cluster randomly among k cluster (each cluster contain n units), in a way that ith cluster encompasses serial numbered units $i, i + k, i + 2k, ..., i + (n-1)k$. Under the situation when data are observed with error. Let (x_{ij}, y_{ij}) are observed value and (X_{ij}, Y_{ij}) is true values for each i^{th} $(i = 1, 2, ..., n)$ unit. It can be expressed in additive form as, $x_{ij} = X_{ij} + V_{ij}$ and $y_{ij} = Y_{ij} + U_{ij}$. For measurement error, the expected value of s_z s_x^2 and s_y^2 s_y^2 is

$$
E(s_x^2) = \sigma_{x_{sy}}^2 + \sigma_{y_{sy}}^2
$$
 and $E(s_y^2) = \sigma_{y_{sy}}^2 + \sigma_{y_{sy}}^2$

where $\sigma^2_{\scriptscriptstyle U\!{\scriptscriptstyle S}\!y}$, $\sigma^2_{\scriptscriptstyle V\!{\scriptscriptstyle S}\!y}$ are variance of U and V respectively.

The systematic sample means are

$$
\mu_{Y_{sy}} = \frac{1}{nk} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{ij}
$$
 and $\mu_{X_{sy}} = \frac{1}{nk} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij}$.

The sample means are unbiased estimators of population means $\mu_{_{Y\!sy}}$ and $\mu_{_{X\,sy}}$ respectively.

$$
\overline{y}_{sy} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{ij}, (i = 1, 2, ..., k) \quad(1)
$$

$$
\overline{x}_{sy} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij}, (i = 1, 2, ..., k) \quad(2)
$$

To determine the bias and variance, means are expressed as the error terms e_0 and e_1 , which are defined as

$$
\overline{y}_{sy} = \mu_{Ysy} (1 + e_0)
$$
 and $\overline{x}_{sy} = \mu_{Xsy} (1 + e_1)$

We can write

$$
E(e_0) = E(e_1) = 0
$$

\n
$$
\text{and} E(e_1^2) = \frac{1}{\mu_{Xsy}^2} \{ \sigma_{Xsy}^2 + \sigma_{Vsy}^2 \}, \quad E(e_0^2) = \frac{1}{\mu_{Ysy}^2} \{ \sigma_{Ysy}^2 + \sigma_{Usy}^2 \}.
$$

\n
$$
E(e_0 e_1) = \frac{\rho \sigma_{Xsy} \sigma_{Ysy}}{\mu_{Ysy} \mu_{Xsy}}, \qquad R = \frac{\mu_{Ysy}}{\mu_{Xsy}}.
$$

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems $\overline{\hspace{1cm}}$ 82

$$
\sigma_{Y_{sy}}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^n (\overline{y}_{sy} - \mu_{Y_{sy}})^2, \qquad \sigma_{X_{sy}}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^n (\overline{x}_{sy} - \mu_{X_{sy}})^2.
$$

$$
\sigma_{Usy}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (\overline{U}_{i.})^2 \qquad \sigma_{Vsy}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (\overline{V}_{i.})^2
$$

2. Existing Estimator

The variance of systematic sample mean

$$
\sigma_{\text{Ysy}}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\bar{Y}_{\text{sy}} - \mu_{\text{Ysy}} \right)^2.
$$
...(3)

Considering that the presence of measurement error in observations, then the variance in the is obtained as

$$
V\left(\overline{y}_{sym}\right) = \sigma_{Ysy}^2 + \sigma_{Usy}^2.
$$
\n
$$
\sigma_{USy}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (\overline{U}_i)^2
$$
\n....(5)\n
$$
(5)
$$

The usual ratio estimators Swain (1964) under the systematic random sampling is

Xsy Rsy sy sy y Y X =. ….(6)

The mean square error of the estimator is given as

$$
MSE\left(\overline{y^*}_{Rsy}\right) = \left[\sigma_{Ysy}^2 + R^2 \sigma_{Xsy}^2 - 2R\left(\rho \sigma_{Xsy} \sigma_{Ysy}\right)\right].
$$
...(7)

 $\sigma_{\text{re}}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^k (x_k - \mu_{k0})$, $\sigma_{\text{re}}^2 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^k (x_k - \mu_{k0})$.
 $\sigma_{\text{re}}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^k (B_k)^2$
 $\sigma_{\text{re}}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^k (B_k)^2$

2. Existing Estimator

The antance of systems is sample mean
 $\sigma_{\text{re}}^2 = \frac{1}{k$ The situations of measurement error when the variables are recorded with error. Ratio estimators, for this scenario is defined as

$$
\overline{y}_{Rsym} = \overline{y}_{sy} \frac{\mu_{Xsy}}{\overline{x}_{sy}} \qquad \qquad \dots (8)
$$

To attain the bias and mean square error equation (8) can be expressed as

$$
\overline{y}_{Rsym} = \mu_{Y_{xy}} (1 + e_0) \frac{\mu_{X_{xy}}}{\mu_{X_{xy}} (1 + e_1)} \quad \dots (9)
$$

$$
\overline{y}_{Rsym} = \mu_{Y_{xy}} (1 + e_0) (1 + e_1)^{-1}
$$
...(10)

For bias of the estimators we obtained

$$
\overline{y}_{Rsym} = \mu_{Y_{sy}} \left(e_1^2 - e_0 e_1 \right) \tag{11}
$$

Taking expectation we get the bias of the estimators

$$
bias\left(\overline{y}_{Rsym}\right) = \mu_{Y_{xy}}\left(e_1^2 - e_0e_1\right) \tag{12}
$$

For mean square error it can written

$$
\overline{y}_{Rsym} = \mu_{Y_{xy}} (e_0 - e_1)^{-1}
$$
...(13)

$$
\left(\overline{y}_{Rsym} - \mu_{Y_{sy}}\right)^2 = \mu_{Y_{sy}}^2 \left(e_0^2 + e_1^2 - 2e_0e_1\right)
$$
(14)

The mean square error can be obtained as by taking expectation of (14)

$$
MSE\left(\overline{y^*}_{Rsym}\right) = \left[\sigma_{Ysy}^2 + \sigma_{Usy}^2 + R^2(\sigma_{Xsy}^2 + \sigma_{Vsy}^2) - 2R(\rho \sigma_{Xsy} \sigma_{Ysy})\right] \qquad \dots (15)
$$

Under no committed error, the results can be obtained by putting σ_{Usy}^2 and σ_{Vsy}^2 zero. This will

give same results as obtained by Swain (1964). From (7) and (15) it is inferred that MSE in the presence of measurement error is always high.

The product estimators Shukla (1971) under systematic random sampling is defined as

$$
\overline{y}_{Psy} = \overline{Y}_{sy} \frac{X_{sy}}{\mu_{Xsy}}
$$
...(16)

The mean square error of the estimator is

$$
MSE(\bar{y}_{Rsym}) = [\sigma_{YSy}^2 - R^2 \sigma_{Xsy}^2 - 2\rho R \sigma_{YSy} \sigma_{Xsy}]
$$

....(17)

The situations when the variables are commingled with measurement error. Thus the product estimator is defined as

$$
\overline{y}_{Psym} = \overline{y}_{sy} \frac{\overline{x}_{sy}}{\mu_{Xsy}} \tag{18}
$$

In order to obtain the bias and mean square error, (18) is expressed in terms of *e*

$$
\overline{y}_{Psym} = \mu_{Y_{xy}} (1 + e_0) (1 + e_1) \tag{19}
$$

For the bias by taking expectation we get

$$
bias(\bar{y}_{Psym}) = \left(\frac{\rho \sigma_{Ysy} \sigma_{Xsy}}{\mu_{Xsy}}\right) \tag{20}
$$

To derive the mean square error we can write from (19) as

$$
\left(\overline{y}_{p_{sym}} - \mu_{Y_{xy}}\right)^2 = \mu_{Y_{xy}}^2 \left(e_0^2 + e_1^2 + 2e_0e_1\right)
$$
...(21)

$$
MSE\left(\overline{y}_{p_{sym}}\right) = \left(\sigma_{Y_{sy}}^2 + \sigma_{U_{sy}}^2 + R^2\left(\sigma_{X_{sy}}^2 + \sigma_{Y_{sy}}^2\right) + 2\rho R \sigma_{Y_{sy}} \sigma_{X_{sy}}\right).
$$
...(22)

By substituting the value $\sigma_{U_{\text{SV}}}^2$ and $\sigma_{V_{\text{SV}}}^2$ equal to zero we can obtain the MSE without measurement error which is similar to Shukla (1971). From (17) and (22), it can be inferred that MSE is larger in the presence of measurement error.

The difference estimator under systematic sampling is defined as

$$
\overline{y}_{dsy} = \overline{Y}_{sy} + b\left(\mu_{Xsy} - \overline{X}_{sy}\right) \tag{23}
$$

$$
V(\bar{y}_{dsym}) = \sigma_{\text{Fsy}}^2(\rho^2 - 1) \qquad \dots \qquad (24)
$$

We consider the situations when the both variables are recorded with measurement error. Under that conditions, we define the difference type estimator as

$$
\overline{y}_{dsym} = \overline{y}_{sy} + b\left(\mu_{Xsy} - \overline{x}_{sy}\right) \tag{25}
$$

In order to derive, bias and mean square error, we can write (25) as

$$
\overline{y}_{dsym} = \mu_{Y_{sy}} (1 + e_0) + b (\mu_{X_{sy}} - \mu_{X_{sy}} (1 + e_1)) \qquad \qquad \dots (26)
$$

$$
\overline{y}_{dsym} = \mu_{Ysy}e_0 - be_1\mu_{Xsy} \tag{27}
$$

No. 9 Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems 1006-5911

$$
V(\bar{y}_{dsym}) = E[\mu_{Ysy}^2 e_0^2 + b^2 e_1^2 \mu_{Xsy}^2 - 2b \mu_{Ysy} \mu_{Xsy} e_0 e_1] \qquad \qquad \dots (28)
$$

$$
V(\bar{y}_{dsym}) = [(\sigma_{Ysy}^2 + \sigma_{USy}^2) + b^2 (\sigma_{Xsy}^2 + \sigma_{Vsy}^2) - 2b \rho \sigma_{Ysy} \sigma_{Xsy}] \qquad \qquad \dots (29)
$$

The minimum variance is obtained by differentiate (29) with respect to *b* and equate the results zero, we attain

$$
b = \frac{\rho \sigma_{Y_{xy}} \sigma_{X_{xy}}}{\left(\sigma_{X_{xy}}^2 + \sigma_{V_{xy}}^2\right)}
$$
...(30)

After putting the value of *b* in (30), we get minimum variance of the estimator as

$$
V(\bar{y}_{dsym}) = \left[\left(\sigma_{Ysy}^2 + \sigma_{Usy}^2 \right) - \frac{\rho^2 \sigma_{Ysy}^2 \sigma_{Xsy}^2}{\left(\sigma_{Xsy}^2 + \sigma_{Ysy}^2 \right)} \right] \tag{31}
$$

From (24) and (31), it is concluded that MSE in the presence of measurement error is always high. After substituting the values of $\sigma^2_{\!_{\rm Usy}}$ and $\sigma^2_{\rm Vsy}$ equal to zero, we can attain the MSE under no measurement error, similar as given in (24).

1. The Proposed Estimator

Considering the impact of measurement errors on the mean square error, we proposed a class of ratio, product, difference and mean estimators in the presence of measurement errors as

$$
V(\bar{y}_{dmm}) = E\left[\mu_{sn}^2 e_0^2 + b^2 e_1^2 \mu_{xv}^2 - 2b \mu_{rn} \mu_{xv} e_0 e_1\right]
$$
(28)
\n
$$
V(\bar{y}_{dsym}) = [(\sigma_{dsy}^2 + \sigma_{dsy}^2) + b^2 (\sigma_{dsy}^2 + \sigma_{dsy}^2) - 2b \rho \sigma_{tsy} \sigma_{xxy}]
$$
(29)
\nThe minimum variance is obtained by differentiate (29) with respect to *b* and equate the results
\nzero, we attain
\n
$$
b = \frac{\rho_{sr} \sigma_{xx}}{(\sigma_{xy}^2 + \sigma_{xy}^2)}
$$
(30)
\nAfter putting the value of *b* in (30), we get minimum variance of the estimator as
\n
$$
V(\bar{y}_{dsym}) = \left[(\sigma_{xy}^2 + \sigma_{dsy}^2) - \frac{\rho^2 \sigma_{xy}^2 \sigma_{xy}^2}{(\sigma_{xy}^2 + \sigma_{xy}^2)}\right]
$$
(31)
\nFrom (24) and (31), it is is concluded that MSE in the presence of measurement error is always high.
\nAfter substituting the values of σ_{tgy}^2 and σ_{tgy}^2 equal to zero, we can attain the MSE under no
\nmeasurement error, similar as given in (24).
\n1. The Proposed Estimator
\nConsidering the impact of measurement errors on the mean square error, we proposed a class of
\nratio, product, difference and mean estimators in the presence of measurement errors as
\n
$$
\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} = \overline{y}_{sv} \left(\frac{\overline{x}_{sv}}{\mu_{xv}}\right)^{\theta}
$$
(32)
\n(i) When $\theta = 1$, $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} = \hat{\bar{Y}}_{syn}$ (restriction to estimate)
\n(ii) When $\theta = 1$, $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} = \hat{\bar{Y}}_{syn}$ (restriction to estimate)
\n(iii) When $\theta = 1$, $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} = \hat{\bar{Y}}_{syn}$ (restriction to estimate)
\n(iv) when $\theta = 1$, $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} = \hat{\bar{Y}}_{syn}$ (restriction to estimate)
\n(iv) when $\theta = 1$, $\hat{\bar{$

$$
\overline{Y}_{SM} = \mu_{Y_{sy}} (1 + e_0) \left(\frac{\mu_{X_{sy}} (1 + e_1)}{\mu_{X_{sy}}} \right) \qquad \qquad \dots (33)
$$

$$
\hat{Y}_{SM} - \mu_{Y_{sy}} = \mu_{Y_{sy}} e_0 \left[(1 + e_1)^{\theta} \right] \qquad \qquad \dots (34)
$$

As $|e_1|$ < 1, thus $(1+e_1)^\theta$ is a powers a series in terms of θ . Simplifying and retaining θ up-to the second degree, we can get

$$
\left[\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} - \mu_{Y_{SY}}\right] = \mu_{Y_{SY}}\left(\theta e_0 e_1 - \frac{\theta(1-\theta)}{2}e_1^2\right) \qquad \qquad \dots (35)
$$

S $E(e_0^2)$, $E(e_0e_1)$ we obtain the bias of \hat{Y}_{SM} upto first order

$$
B\left(\hat{\overline{Y}}_{SM}\right) = \mu_{Y_{SY}} \frac{1}{k} \left[\theta \rho C_{X_{SY}} C_{Y_{SY}} - \frac{\theta(\theta - 1)}{2} C_{X_{SY}}^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{\sigma_{V_{SY}}^2}{\sigma_{X_{SY}}^2} \right\} \right] \quad \dots (36)
$$

$$
B(\hat{Y}_{SM}) = \mu_{Y_{SY}} \frac{1}{k} \left[\theta \rho C_{X_{SY}} C_{Y_{SY}} - \frac{\theta(\theta - 1)}{2} C_{X_{SY}}^2 - \frac{\theta(\theta - 1)}{2} C_{X_{SY}}^2 \frac{\sigma_{V_{SY}}^2}{\sigma_{X_{SY}}^2} \right] \quad \qquad \dots (37)
$$

On squaring equation (34) and again retaining terms of ^e to the second degree,

$$
\left(\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} - \mu_{Y_{sy}}\right)^2 = \mu_{Y_{sy}}^2 \left[e_0^2 + \theta^2 e_1^2 + 2\theta e_0 e_1\right]
$$
...(38)

The *MSE* of $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM}$ to the first degree of approximation as obtained as

$$
M(\hat{T}_{SM}) = \mu_{Ysy}^2 \left[C_{Ysy}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{Usy}^2}{\sigma_{Ysy}^2} \right) + \theta^2 C_{Xsy}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{Vsy}^2}{\sigma_{Xsy}^2} \right) + 2\theta \rho C_{Xsy} C_{Ysy} \right] \quad \dots (39)
$$

Differentiating partially (39) with respect to θ and equate to zero, we get the optimum value of θ as

$$
B(\hat{Y}_{SM}) = \mu_{\text{Fyr}} \frac{1}{k} \left[\theta \rho C_{\text{Xup}} C_{\text{By}} - \frac{\theta(\theta - 1)}{2} C_{\text{Xup}}^2 - \frac{\theta(\theta - 1)}{2} C_{\text{Xup}}^3 - \frac{\omega}{\sigma_{\text{XY}}^3} \right] \dots (37)
$$

On squaring equation (34) and again retaining terms of *e* to the second degree,
 $(\hat{Y}_{SM} - H_{\text{Py}})^2 = \mu_{\text{Fyr}}^2 \left[e_0^2 + \theta^2 e_1^2 + 2\theta e_0 e_1 \right]$...(38)
The MSE of \hat{Y}_{SM} to the first degree of approximation as obtained as
 $M(\hat{Y}_{SM}) = \mu_{\text{Fyr}}^2 \left[c_{\text{Fyr}}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2}{\sigma_{\text{Xup}}^2} \right) + \theta^2 C_{\text{XY}}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{\text{Xup}}^2}{\sigma_{\text{Xup}}^2} \right) + 2\theta \rho C_{\text{XY}} C_{\text{XY}} \right] \dots (39)$
Differentiating partially (39) with respect to θ and equate to zero, we get the optimum value of
 θ as
 $\theta = \frac{-\rho C_{\text{Xup}} C_{\text{Py}}}{\mu_{\text{XY}}^2 - \sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2}$...(40)
 $C_{\text{Xup}}^2 + \frac{\mu_{\text{Yup}}^2}{\mu_{\text{XY}}^2 - \sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2}$...(40)
The second order derivative with respect to θ is positive thus substituting the optimum value of
 θ in (40), the minimum mean square error of the proposed class of estimators \hat{Y}_{SM} as
min. $MSE(\sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2) = (\sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2) - \frac{\rho^2 \sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2 \sigma_{\text{XY}}^2}{\sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2 \sigma_{\text{Yup}}^2})$...(41)
3. Efficientering Common
From (41) and (31), one can conclude that, the proposed class of estimators is as efficient as
difference estimators.
For <

The second order derivative with respect to θ is positive thus substituting the optimum value of θ in (40), the minimum mean square error of the proposed class of estimators \hat{Y}_{SM} as

min.
$$
MSE(\sigma_{Ysy}^2) = (\sigma_{Ysy}^2 + \sigma_{Usy}^2) - \frac{\rho^2 \sigma_{Ysy}^2 \sigma_{Xsy}^2}{(\sigma_{Xsy}^2 + \sigma_{Vsy}^2)}
$$
(41)

3. Efficiency Comparison

From (41) and (31), one can conclude that, the proposed class of estimators is as efficient as difference estimators.

For $\theta = 0$, the proposed class of estimators \hat{Y}_{SM} will convert into unbiased mean estimator under measurement error as $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM} = \bar{y}_{sy}$.

The variance of this estimator is derived from (39) by substituting the value of $\,\theta\,$ equals to zero

$$
V\left(\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM}\right) = \sigma_{Ysy}^2 + \sigma_{Usy}^2
$$

$$
....(42)
$$

From (41) and (44) we can write that proposed estimator is more efficient if

$$
\sigma_{Ysy}^2[\rho^2\eta_X]>0.
$$

 \ldots (43)

When $\theta = -1$, the proposed class of estimators \hat{Y}_{SM} will transform into ratio estimator under

measurement error as $\hat{\overline{Y}}_{SM} = \frac{{\cal Y}_{sy}}{s}$ $\mu_{\overline{Y}_{SM}} = \hat{\overline{Y}}$ $SM = \frac{1}{\pi}$ M_X sy $\frac{1}{2}$ SR *sy* $\hat{\overline{Y}}_{\rm ext} = \frac{y_{\rm sy}}{y_{\rm y}} u_{\rm y} = \hat{\overline{Y}}_{\rm y}$ *x* $=\frac{y_{sy}}{1} \mu_{x_{sy}} = Y_{SR}$.

After putting the value of $\,\theta$ in (39) we get the mean square error of the estimator $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{_{SR}}$ as $M(\hat{Y}_{SR}) = \sigma_{YSy}^2 + \sigma_{Usy}^2 + R^2(\sigma_{Xsy}^2 + \sigma_{Vsy}^2) - 2\rho R \sigma_{YSy} \sigma_{Xsy})$(44)

From (41) and (44), it is revealed that $\min M{(\hat{\bar{Y}}_{_{SM}}) \leq M{(\hat{\bar{Y}}_{_{SR}})}$ if

$$
\sigma_{Ysy}^{2}\left[-\rho^{2}\eta_{Xsy}\right] < \left[\frac{\mu_{Ysy}^{2}}{\mu_{Xsy}^{2}} - \frac{2\rho\sigma_{Xsy}\sigma_{Ysy}\mu_{Ysy}^{\Box}}{\mu_{Xsy}^{\Box}} + \frac{\mu_{Ysy}^{2}}{\mu_{Xsy}^{2}}\sigma_{vsy}^{2}\right] \tag{45}
$$

For $\theta = 1$, the proposed class of estimators \hat{Y}_{SM} will be product estimator under measurement error as $\hat{\overline{Y}}_{SM} = \frac{y_{sy}}{y} \overline{x}_{sv} = \hat{\overline{Y}}$ $SM - \lambda_{sy} - \lambda_{SP}$ *Xsy* $\hat{\overline{Y}}_{\rm ext} = \frac{y_{\rm sy}}{x} \overline{x} = \hat{\overline{Y}}_{\rm ext}$ μ $=\frac{\sqrt{sy}}{x_{\infty}}\overline{x}_{\infty}=Y_{\rm cp}$.

For the value of $\,\theta$ equal to zero in (39), the mean square error of $\hat{\bar{Y}}_{_{SP}}\,$ as

$$
M(\widehat{\bar{Y}}_{SP})=(\sigma_{YSy}^2+\sigma_{USy}^2+R^2(\sigma_{XSy}^2+\sigma_{Vsy}^2)+2\rho R\sigma_{YSy}\sigma_{Xsy}).
$$

. ….(46)

From (41) and (46), it is revealed that $\min M(\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SM}) \leq M(\hat{\bar{Y}}_{SP})$ if

$$
\sigma_{\gamma_{sy}}^2[-\rho^2 \eta_{Xsy}] < \left[\frac{\mu_{\gamma_{sy}}^2}{\mu_{Xsy}^2} + \frac{2\rho \sigma_{Xsy} \sigma_{\gamma_{sy}} \mu_{\gamma_{sy}}^{\Box}}{\mu_{Xsy}^{\Box}} + \frac{\mu_{\gamma_{sy}}^2}{\mu_{Xsy}^2} \sigma_{\gamma_{sy}}^2\right]
$$

Thus from (41), (43), (45) and (47) we have

$$
M(\hat{\overline{Y}}_{SM})_{Opt} \le M(\hat{\overline{Y}}_{SR}) \le V(\overline{y}_{sym}).
$$
...(48)

$$
M(\hat{\overline{Y}}_{SM})_{Opt} \le M(\hat{\overline{Y}}_{SP}) \le V(\overline{y}_{sym}).
$$
...(49)

Equation (48) and (49) provide that the proposed class of estimators \hat{Y}_{SM} is better than \hat{Y}_{SR} , \hat{Y}_{SP} and \bar{y}_{sym} at its optimum conditions.

4. Simulation Study

Simulation study is carried to validate the results of study. The data matrix have been generated using multivariate normal distribution on X , Y , u and v for four variable with mean vector $(\mu_{Xsy}$ μ_{Xsy} 0 0) and covariance matrix

$$
\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{_{Y\!sy}}^2 & \rho \sigma_{_{X\!sy}} \sigma_{_{Y\!sy}} & 0 & 0 \\ \rho \sigma_{_{X\!sy}} \sigma_{_{Y\!sy}} & \sigma_{_{X\!sy}}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_{_{U\!sy}}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{_{V\!syy}}^2 \end{pmatrix}
$$

The data for N=1000 has been generated by using bellow groups of parameters $\mu_{X_{sy}}$ = 16, $\mu_{Y_{sy}}$ = 18, $\sigma_{X_{sy}}^2$ = (40, 20), $\sigma_{Y_{sy}}^2$ = (50, 30), ρ = (-0.9,-0.5,-0.1, 0.9, 0.5, 0.1), σ_{Usy}^2 = (0, 4), σ_{Vsy}^2 = (0, 4).

Two sets of sample $n=250$ ($k=4$) and $n=100$ ($k=10$) has been selected under systematic sampling scheme. The mean square errors and percentage relative efficiency are achieved for all the proposed estimators. Eight numbers of tables are made for four stage of measurements errors and two stage of variance of study and auxiliary variable in estimating practise of mean.

The outcomes of simulation study are given in tables. Table 1 provide the MSE and PRE of proposed estimator and members of estimators for the various phase of correlation coefficient $(\rho = -0.9, -0.5, -0.1, 0.1, 0.5, 0.9)$. From Table 1, we conclude that proposed estimator has higher efficacy than ratio, product and mean estimator for the various phase of correlation coefficient under no commingled error. Table 2, reflect the commingled of error in MSE and PRE for ($\sigma^2_{\scriptscriptstyle U\!{\scriptscriptstyle S}\!y}$ = 4 , $\sigma^2_{\scriptscriptstyle V\!{\scriptscriptstyle S}\!y}$ =4) for proposed and members of estimators. We can also conclude from Table 2, that MSE is always high in the presence of measurement error. From Table 2,3,4,6,7 and Table 8, we find that MSE has higher value with increase in measurement error in study and auxiliary variable. Properties of the estimators related to correlation coefficient, MSE is always minimum for proposed estimator. For positive correlation ratio estimator is more efficient for and negative correlation product estimators is respectively. From Table 1 to 8, we can conclude that with increase in sample size MSE is increasing. For increasing value of sample size MSE is more precise and PRE is more efficient for large samples.

5. Conclusion

As we can see from simulation study of the Tables, that MSE is minimum for proposed class of estimator. Also the proposed estimator is most precise than ratio and product estimator for all correlation coefficient. It is inclusive that MSE has been constantly higher after study and auxiliary variables are observed with measurement error. MSE is high, when the degree of error is high. Measurements error effects the MSE as well as PRE of the estimator when the degree of error is high, but behavior of estimators do not alter in the occurrence of measurement error. Since PRE is the ratio, it does not precisely illustrate the consequence of measurement error. Inference based on the data that commingled with error will deceive the results. It can also be conclude that, for large values of the sample, the MSE is more precise and more proficient. Thus proposed class of estimators is useful to evaluate the population mean for commingled error.

Table 1: MSE and PRE of estimators of \bar{Y} **for** $\rho = (-0.9, -0.5, -0.1, 0.1, 0.5, 0.9)$

								when $(\sigma_{xy}^2, \sigma_{xy}^2 = 50, 40)$, $(\sigma_{Usy}^2, \sigma_{Vsy}^2 = 0, 0)$ and $(k = 4, 10)$		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ISSN

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems

1006-5911

0 0			MSE	PRE	MSE	PRE
		$\hat{\bar{Y}}_{\!\scriptscriptstyle\mathit{SM}}$	0.1516	527.7704	0.9391	521.51
	-0.9	y_{Rsym}	3.0406	26.31389	18.5340	26.42441
		\overline{y}_{Psym}	0.2002	399.6503	1.1058	442.892
		\overline{y}_{sym}	0.8001	100	4.8975	100
0 0		$\hat{\bar{Y}}_{_{SM}}$	0.6009	133.3833	3.6373	133.3352
	-0.5	\overline{y}_{Rsym}	2.2915	34.97709	14.5312	33.37508
		y_{Psym}	0.8852	90.54451	5.1093	94.92103
		\overline{y}_{sym}	0.8015	100	4.8498	100
0 0		$\hat{\bar{Y}}_{_{SM}}$	0.8021	102.107	4.8763	101.011
	-0.1	y_{Rsym}	1.7628	46.46018	10.9054	45.16661
		\overline{y}_{Psym}	1.4854	55.13666	9.0182	54.61844
		\overline{y}_{sym}	0.8190	100	4.9256	100
0 0		$\hat{\bar{Y}}_{\!\scriptscriptstyle{SM}}$	0.7970	100.1757	4.8505	101.0102
	0.1	y_{Rsym}	1.4669	54.4277	8.9441	54.77913
		y_{Psym}	1.7485	45.662	10.8066	45.33803
		\overline{y}_{sym}	0.7984	100	4.8995	100
0		$\hat{\bar{Y}}_{_{SM}}$	0.5910	133.2318	3.6950	133.3342
	0.5 0	\overline{y}_{Rsym}	0.8908	88.39246	5.2067	94.62231
		\overline{y}_{Psym}	2.3005	34.22734	14.7890	33.31327
		\overline{y}_{sym}	0.7874	100	4.9267	100
0		$\hat{\bar{Y}}_{\scriptscriptstyle{SM}}$	0.1462	527.0178	0.9506	526.3833
	0.9 0	\bar{y}_{Rsym}	0.2005	384.2893	1.0957	456.6761
		\overline{y}_{Psym}	2.9104	26.47402	18.9404	26.41866
		y_{sym}	0.7705	100	5.0038	100

Table 2: MSE and PRE of estimators of \bar{Y} for $\rho = (-0.9, -0.5, -0.1, 0.1, 0.5, 0.9)$ when

 $(\sigma_{Y_{xy}}^2, \sigma_{X_{xy}}^2$ = 50, 40), $(\sigma_{U_{xy}}^2, \sigma_{V_{xy}}^2$ = 4, 4) and $(k = 4, 10)$

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems

1006-5911

Table 3: MSE and PRE of estimator of \bar{Y} for $\rho = (-0.9, -0.5, -0.1, 0.1, 0.5, 0.9)$ when $(\sigma_{Y_{xy}}^2, \sigma_{X_{xy}}^2 = 50, 40)$, $(\sigma_{U_{xy}}^2, \sigma_{V_{xy}}^2 = 4, 0)$ and $(k = 4, 10)$

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems

1006-5911

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems 1006-5911

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems

1006-5911

 $\overline{2}$

Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems

References

- 1. Allen, J., Singh, H.P. and Smarandache, F. (2003): "A family of estimators of population mean using multi auxiliary information in presence of measurement error", International Journal of Social Economics, 30 (7):837-848.
- 2. Cochran, W.G. (1968): "Errors of measurement in Statistics", Technometrics, 10(4), 637-666.
- 3. Cochran, WG (1977): "Sampling Techniques", John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- 4. Gautschi, W. (1957): "Some remarks on systematic sampling", The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 28(2), 385-394.
- 5. Madow, W. G. (1949): "On the theory of systematic sampling", II. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 20(3), 333-354.
- 6. Madow, W. G. (1953): "On the theory of systematic sampling, III. Comparison of centered and random start systematic sampling", The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 101-106.
- 7. Murthy, M. N. (1967):. "Sampling theory and methods", Calcutta, India: Statistical Publishing Society.
- 8. Sahoo, L.N., Sahoo, R.K. and Senapati, S.C. (2006): "An empirical study on the accuracy of ratio and regression estimators in the presence of measurement error", Monte Carlo Methods and Applications, 12(5), 495-501.
- 9. Salas, C., and T. G. Gregoire. (2010): "Statistical analysis of ratio estimators and their estimators of variances when the auxiliary variate is measured with error", European Journal of Forest Research 129 (5):847–61.
- 10. Singh, H.P. and Mathur, N. (2005): "Estimation of population mean when coefficient of variation is known using scrambled response technique", Journal of Statistical Planning and inference 131, 1, 135-144.
- 11. Singh, N. and Vishwakarma, G.K. (2019)" "A generalised class of estimator of population mean with the combined effect of measurement errors and non-response in sample survey", Revista Investigación Operacional, 40, 2, 275-285.
- 12. Shalabh (1997): "Ratio method of estimation in the presence of measurement error", Journal of the Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics, 50(2), 150-55.
- 13. Shalabh and Tsai, J.R. (2017): "Ratio and product methods of estimation of population mean in the presence of correlated measurement error", Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation, 46(7), 5566-5593.
- 14. Shukla, N. D. (1971): "Systematic sampling and product method of estimation", In Proceeding of all India Seminar on Demography and Statistics. BHU, Varanasi, India.

15. Swain, A. K. P. C. (1964): "The use of systematic sampling in ratio estimate", Jour. Ind. Stat. Assoc, 2(213), 160-164.