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Abstract

Sample size is a very important feature for estimation of population parameters in various socio-economic and agricultural surveys. Precision of population estimates depends on adequate sample size. In the present paper, we are developing an improved estimation technique for estimating population mean using sample size as auxiliary information. The asymptotic properties of proposed estimator like bias and mean square error (MSE) have been obtained up to first order of approximation. An efficiency comparison is also made between proposed estimator and other competing estimators. To justify theoretical results an empirical study is also carried out.
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Introduction

The reliable estimates play a vital role in effective policy making of various agriculture related programmes. Successful implementation of agriculture schemes depends on reliable crop estimates. These estimates are obtained from various agriculture related surveys like CCS (Crop Cutting Surveys). Use of auxiliary information is a very common practice for increasing the efficiency of the estimation techniques in these surveys. Suppose we are conducting a agriculture survey regarding the production of any particular crop. Here population total is an important parameter which is used for assessment of agriculture production. In such cases crop production and total area under cultivation are positively correlated variables so in sampling theory ratio estimators will give more reliable estimates in this situation. Population mean is one of the very important measures of central tendency used in almost all fields of society including field of agriculture. Thus the estimation of population mean is of great significance in agriculture related areas. In the present manuscript, a modified ratio type estimator of population mean of the study variable using information on size of the sample has been proposed and its large sample properties have been studied up to the first order of approximation.
**Notations & Terminology**

Let the finite population under consideration consist of $N$ distinct and identifiable units and let $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1, 2,\ldots}$ be a bivariate sample of size $n$ taken from $(X, Y)$ using a SRSWOR scheme. Let $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ respectively be the population means of the auxiliary and the study variables and $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ be the corresponding sample means. It is well known and has been seen in practice that in simple random sampling scheme, sample means $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ are unbiased estimators of population means of $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ respectively.

**Review of existing estimators**

The usual and the most suitable estimator for estimating population mean $\bar{Y}$ is sample mean $\bar{y}$, given by

$$\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \quad (1)$$

It is unbiased for population mean and its variance up to the first order of approximation is given by

$$V(\bar{y}) = \gamma s_y^2 = \gamma \bar{Y}^2 C_y^2$$

Where,

$$C_y = \frac{s_y}{\bar{y}}, \quad s_y^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2, \quad \gamma = \frac{N-n}{nN}$$

Cochran (1940) used the positively correlated auxiliary variable with study variable and proposed the following usual ratio estimator of population mean as,

$$\bar{Y}_R = \frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{X}} \quad (3)$$

The above estimator is biased estimator of population mean and its bias and MSE, up to the first order of approximation respectively are,

$$B(\bar{Y}_R) = \gamma \bar{Y} [C_x^2 - \rho_{yx} C_y C_x]$$

$$\text{MSE}(\bar{Y}_R) = \gamma \bar{Y}^2 [C_y^2 + C_x^2 - 2\rho_{yx} C_y C_x]$$ \quad (4)

Where,

$$C_x = \frac{s_x}{\bar{X}}, \quad s_x^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \bar{X})^2, \quad \rho_{yx} = \frac{\text{Cov}(X, Y)}{s_x s_y},$$

$$\text{Cov}(X, Y) = \frac{1}{(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y}), \quad \gamma = \frac{N-n}{nN}$$

In literature various modified estimators of population mean of study variable using auxiliary variables have been given by various authors. For detailed study of the modified ratio type estimators, latest references can be made of Kadilar and Cingi (2004, 2009), Singh (2003), Subramani (2013), Tailor and Sharma (2009), Yadav and Adewara (2013), Yadav et al., (2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d), Yadav et al., (2017a, 2017b, 2017c), Yadav and Gupta (2017, 2018), Yadav et al., (2018a, 2018b, 2018c), Yadav et al., (2019) and Jaroengeratikun and Lawson (2019)

Following table-1 represents some modified estimators, their constants, biases and mean squared errors.

**Proposed estimator**

Motivated by Jaroengeratikun and Lawson (2019) estimator of population mean, we propose the following ratio type estimator of the population mean using information on the on size of the sample as,

$$\bar{Y}_R = \frac{a \bar{X} + c}{a \bar{X} + c}$$
Where $c$ is any known constant. In our research paper we will take $c = n$ (sample size).

Thus proposed estimator will be,

$$\tau_R = \frac{\bar{y}(aX + n)}{a\bar{X} + n} \quad (5)$$

To study the large sample properties of the estimator, we define

$$\bar{y} = \bar{Y}(1 + \varepsilon_0)$$ and

$$\bar{x} = \bar{X} (1 + \varepsilon_1)$$ such that

$$E(\varepsilon_i) = 0 \quad (i = 0, 1)$$ and

$$E(\varepsilon_0^2) = \gamma c_X^2,$$

$$E(\varepsilon_1^2) = \gamma c_Y^2,$$

$$E(\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1) = \gamma c_X c_Y.$$  

Expressing (5) in terms of $\varepsilon^X$, we have

$$\tau_R = \bar{Y} (1 + \varepsilon_0) \left[ \frac{a\bar{X} + n}{a\bar{X} (1 + \varepsilon_1) + n} \right]$$

$$= \bar{Y} (1 + \varepsilon_0) \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{a\bar{X} + n}{a\bar{X} + n} \right) \varepsilon_1} \right]$$

$$= \bar{Y}(1 + \varepsilon_0) (1 + \delta_{\varepsilon_1})^{-1}$$

We assume that, $I_{\varepsilon_1} I < 1$, so that

$$(1 + \delta_{\varepsilon_1})^{-1}$$ may be expanded

$$= \bar{Y}(1 + \varepsilon_0)(1 - \delta_{\varepsilon_1} + \delta^2_{\varepsilon_1})$$

$$= \bar{Y} + \bar{Y}[\varepsilon_0 - \delta_{\varepsilon_0} \varepsilon_1]$$

Retaining the terms upto the first order of approximations, we have

$$\tau_R - \bar{Y} = \bar{Y}[\varepsilon_0 - \delta_{\varepsilon_0} \varepsilon_1] \quad (6)$$

Taking expectation both sides and putting the values of different expectations, we get the bias of proposed estimator upto the first order of approximation

$$E(\tau_R - \bar{Y}) = \bar{Y}[E(\varepsilon_0) - \delta E(\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1)]$$

Bias $(\tau_R) = -\gamma \bar{Y} [\delta c_X c_Y]$}

Now, squaring (6) and taking expectations both sides we get MSE of $\tau_R$ upto the first order of approximation

$$E(\tau_R - \bar{Y})^2 = \bar{Y}^2 E(\varepsilon_0 - \delta_{\varepsilon_0} \varepsilon_1)^2$$

$$= \bar{Y}^2 E[\varepsilon_0^2 + \delta^2_{\varepsilon_0} \varepsilon_1^2 - 2 \delta_{\varepsilon_0} \varepsilon_1]$$

Retaining the terms upto the first order of approximations, we have

$$E(\tau_R - \bar{Y})^2 = \bar{Y}^2 E(\varepsilon_0^2)$$

$$\text{MSE} (\tau_R) = \gamma \bar{Y}^2 c_Y^2$$

**Theoretical efficiency comparison**

Proposed estimator $\tau_R$ will be more efficient than usual ratio estimator $\bar{Y}$, if

$$\text{MSE} (\tau_R) - \text{MSE} (\bar{Y}) > 0$$

$$\rho < \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\varepsilon_X}{c_X} \right)$$

Proposed estimator $\tau_R$ will be more efficient than the estimator $\bar{Y}_1$ proposed by Sisodia and Dwivedi (1981), if

$$\text{MSE} (\tau_R) - \text{MSE} (\bar{Y}_1) > 0$$

$$\rho < \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\varepsilon_X}{c_X} \right)$$

Proposed estimator $\tau_R$ will be more efficient than the estimator $\bar{Y}_2$ proposed by Upadhyaya and Singh (1999), if
Proposed estimator \( \hat{\tau}_R \) will be more efficient than the estimator \( \hat{\tau}_3 \) proposed by Singh and Tailor (2003), if

\[
\text{MSE}(\hat{Y}_2) - \text{MSE}(\hat{Y}_3) > 0
\]

\[
\rho < \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\delta_2 C_X}{C_Y} \right)
\]

Proposed estimator \( \hat{\tau}_R \) will be more efficient than the estimator \( \hat{Y}_4 \) proposed by Singh et al., (2004), if

\[
\text{MSE}(\hat{Y}_3) - \text{MSE}(\hat{Y}_4) > 0
\]

\[
\rho < \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\delta_2 C_X}{C_Y} \right)
\]

Proposed estimator \( \hat{\tau}_R \) will be more efficient than the estimator \( \hat{Y}_5 \) proposed by Yan and Tian (2010), if

\[
\text{MSE}(\hat{Y}_4) - \text{MSE}(\hat{Y}_5) > 0
\]

\[
\rho < \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\delta_2 C_X}{C_Y} \right)
\]

### Empirical study

To judge the performances of the proposed estimator and the existing estimators of population mean using auxiliary variable, we have considered four natural populations from two sources. First two populations, population-1 and population-2 are from Murthy (1967) and rest two populations, population-3 and population-4 are from Mukhopadhyay (2009).

#### Murthy (1967)

**Population 1:** \( Y = \) Output for 80 factories in a region and \( X = \) Number of workers

\[
N = 80, \ n = 20, \ \bar{Y} = 51.8264, \ \bar{X} = 11.2646
\]

\[
\rho = 0.9413, \ C_Y = 0.3542, \ C_X = 0.7507
\]

\[
\beta_1 = 1.0500, \ \beta_2 = -0.0634, \ M_d = 7.5750
\]

**Population 2:** \( Y = \) Output for 80 factories in a region and \( X = \) Fixed Capital

\[
N = 80, \ n = 20, \ \bar{Y} = 51.8264, \ \bar{X} = 2.8153
\]

\[
\rho = 0.9150, \ C_Y = 3.542, \ C_X = 0.9485
\]

\[
\beta_1 = 1.3006, \ \beta_2 = 0.6977, \ M_d = 1.4800
\]

#### Mukhopadhyay (2009)

**Population 3:** \( Y = \) Output for 40 factories in a region and \( X = \) Number of workers

\[
N = 40, \ n = 8, \ \bar{Y} = 50.7858, \ \bar{X} = 2.3033
\]

\[
\rho = 0.8006, \ C_Y = 0.3295, \ C_X = 0.8406
\]

\[
\beta_1 = 0.9740, \ \beta_2 = -0.5344, \ M_d = 1.250
\]

**Population 4:** \( Y = \) Output for 40 factories in a region and \( X = \) Fixed Capital

\[
N = 40, \ n = 8, \ \bar{Y} = 50.7858, \ \bar{X} = 9.4543
\]

\[
\rho = 0.8349, \ C_Y = 0.3295, \ C_X = 0.6756
\]

\[
\beta_1 = 0.8799, \ \beta_2 = -0.4622, \ M_d = 7.0700
\]

Following Table-2 and Table-3 represents the biases, mean squared errors of proposed and existing estimators of population mean.
**Table 1.** Various estimators, their constants, biases and mean squared errors

| S.No | Estimators | Constants | Bias | MSE |
|------|------------|-----------|------|-----|
| 1    | \( \bar{y}_1 = \frac{X + C_x}{X + C_x} \) Sisodia and Dwivedi [1981] | \( \delta_1 = \left( \frac{X}{X + C_x} \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y} \left( \delta_1^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_1 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y}^2 \left( \delta_1^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_1 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) |
| 2    | \( \bar{y}_2 = \frac{X C_x + \beta_2 X}{X C_x + \beta_2} \) Upadhyaya & Singh (1999) | \( \delta_2 = \left( \frac{X C_x + \beta_2}{X C_x + \beta_2} \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y} \left( \delta_2^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_2 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y}^2 \left( C_y^2 + \delta_2^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_2 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) |
| 3    | \( \bar{y}_3 = \frac{X + \rho}{X + \rho} \) Singh & Tailor (2003) | \( \delta_3 = \left( \frac{X}{X + \rho} \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y} \left( \delta_3^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_3 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y}^2 \left( C_y^2 + \delta_3^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_3 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) |
| 4    | \( \bar{y}_4 = \frac{X + \beta_2}{X + \beta_2} \) Singh et al. (2004) | \( \delta_4 = \left( \frac{X}{X + \beta_2} \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y} \left( \delta_4^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_4 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y}^2 \left( C_y^2 + \delta_4^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_4 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) |
| 5    | \( \bar{y}_5 = \frac{X + \beta_2}{X + \beta_2} \) Yan and Tian (2010) | \( \delta_5 = \left( \frac{X}{X + \beta_2} \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y} \left( \delta_5^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_5 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) | \( \gamma \bar{Y}^2 \left( C_y^2 + \delta_5^2 C_x^2 - 2 \delta_5 \rho C_x C_y \right) \) |

**Table 2.** Biases of the existing and proposed modified ratio estimators for four natural populations

| Estimator | Population I | Population II | Population III | Population IV |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| \( \bar{y}_1 \) | 0.60 | 1.15 | 2.46 | 1.37 |
| \( \bar{y}_2 \) | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.25 |
| \( \bar{y}_3 \) | 0.11 | 0.15 | 3.73 | 0.65 |
| \( \bar{y}_4 \) | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.30 | 0.22 |
| \( \bar{y}_5 \) | 0.11 | 0.16 | 3.15 | 0.57 |
| \( \bar{y}_6 \) | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.21 |
| \( \tau_R(Proposed) \) | **0.18** | **0.08** | **0.31** | **0.61** |

**Table 3.** Variance/mean squared errors of the existing and proposed modified ratio estimators for four natural populations

| Estimator | Population I | Population II | Population III | Population IV |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| \( \bar{y}_1 \) | 18.97 | 41.32 | 95.86 | 49.85 |
| \( \bar{y}_2 \) | 15.25 | 17.19 | 42.01 | 41.06 |
| \( \bar{y}_3 \) | 18.51 | 20.67 | 217.70 | 61.45 |
| \( \bar{y}_4 \) | 14.45 | 17.69 | 43.47 | 39.30 |
| \( \bar{y}_5 \) | 18.62 | 21.37 | 188.05 | 57.33 |
| \( \bar{y}_6 \) | 18.70 | 12.84 | 37.62 | 38.82 |
| \( \tau_R(Proposed) \) | **12.62** | **12.63** | **27.98** | **28.00** |
Results and Discussion

In the present manuscript we have proposed a generalized ratio type estimator of the study variable by making use of information on the size of the sample. Table-2 and Table-3 represent the biases and the mean squared errors of the proposed and the existing estimators. From both the tables, we can see that the proposed estimator has minimum bias and mean squared error in all four natural populations. Thus proposed estimator is recommended to survey practitioners for its use in various agriculture surveys.
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