

# UNCLASSIFIED

|                                                                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                                                                                                                                         |
| AD NUMBER                                                                                                                                               |
| AD497772                                                                                                                                                |
| NEW LIMITATION CHANGE                                                                                                                                   |
| TO<br>Approved for public release, distribution unlimited                                                                                               |
| FROM<br>Distribution: Further dissemination only as directed by Office of Naval Research, Arlington VA 22217-0000; 20 Apr 1951 or higher DoD authority. |
| AUTHORITY                                                                                                                                               |
| ONR ltr, 26 Oct 1977                                                                                                                                    |

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

UNANNOUNCED

APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS LABORATORY  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
CALIFORNIA

MINIMAX PROCEDURES FOR TWO-VALUED  
DECISION PROBLEMS WHEN THE SIZE  
OF SAMPLE IS FIXED


By  
S. G. ALLEN, JR.

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 3  
APRIL 20, 1951

JUN 28 1951

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT N6onr-25126  
(NR-042-002)

ALBERT H. BOWKER, Director  
FOR  
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH



AD 497772

U1792

MINIMAX PROCEDURES FOR TWO-VALUED DECISION  
PROBLEMS WHEN THE SIZE OF SAMPLE IS FIXED

BY

S. G. ALLEN, Jr.

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 3


APRIL 20, 1951

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT N6onr-25126  
(NR-042-022)

FOR  
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS LABORATORY  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

PRELIMINARY DRAFT  
For Comment



MINIMAX PROCEDURES FOR TWO-VALUED DECISION  
PROBLEMS WHEN THE SIZE OF SAMPLE IS FIXED\*

by

S. G. Allen, Jr.

1. The Minimax Solution for the Case of a Simple Dichotomy.

The problem to be considered is a statistical decision procedure for choosing between two alternative actions,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , after taking  $n$  independent observations on a random variable  $x$ . The probability density  $p(x, \theta)$  of  $x$  is known except for the value of a real parameter  $\theta$  which is assumed to be one-dimensional.<sup>1/</sup> The parameter space  $\Omega$  is partitioned into two subspaces  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  such that decision  $A_1$  is preferred if  $\theta \in \Omega_1$  and  $A_2$  preferred if  $\theta \in \Omega_2$ . The costs of decisions  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are, respectively,

$$1.1 \quad w_1(\theta) \begin{cases} = 0, & \theta \in \Omega_1 \\ \geq 0, & \theta \in \Omega_2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$1.2 \quad w_2(\theta) \begin{cases} \geq 0, & \theta \in \Omega_1 \\ = 0, & \theta \in \Omega_2. \end{cases}$$

---

\* The motivating idea for Theorem A of this report is to be found in a lot acceptance sampling procedure proposed in an unpublished paper by Mr. Norman Rudy of Sacramento State College. Discussion with members of the Department of Statistics, Stanford University, in particular with Professor M. A. Girshick, was most beneficial in the formulation of the present draft of the report.

<sup>1/</sup> The main results of this paper will be based on the assumption that the probability distribution of  $x$  is continuous. The necessary modification of the results for the case of discrete probability distributions will be discussed in a concluding section of the paper.

If the parameter space consists of a simple dichotomy (i.e.  $\Omega_1$  consists of the single point  $\theta_1$ , and  $\Omega_2$ , the single point  $\theta_2$ ), the minimax procedure is well known. The relevant statistic is the likelihood ratio

$$1.3 \quad \lambda = \lambda(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i, \theta_2)}{\prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i, \theta_1)}$$

and the decision procedure which minimizes the maximum expected cost is to

1.4 choose  $A_1$ , if  $\lambda \leq c$ , and

1.5 choose  $A_2$ , if  $\lambda > c$ ,

where the criterion  $c$  satisfies the relation

$$1.6 \quad w_1(\theta_2) \Pr(\lambda \leq c | \theta_2) = w_2(\theta_1) \Pr(\lambda > c | \theta_1) .$$

This value of  $c$  is

$$1.7 \quad c = \frac{w_2(\theta_1)g}{w_1(\theta_2)(1-g)} ,$$

where  $g$  is the least favorable a priori probability that  $\theta = \theta_1$ .

2. The Minimax Solution to a More General Problem. The assumption that  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  each consists of a single point is often a very artificial one. A more general formulation of the two-valued decision problem is the following:  $\Omega$  is an interval,  $\theta \in \Omega_1$  if  $\theta \leq \theta_0$ , and  $\theta \in \Omega_2$  if  $\theta > \theta_0$ , where the costs of decisions  $A_1$  and  $A_2$

are given by 1.1, 1.2, and

$$2.1 \quad w_1(\theta_0) = w_2(\theta_0) = 0. \quad 2/$$

This statement of the problem avoids the often unrealistic postulate of an "indifference interval", i.e. an interval such that decisions  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are either costless or equally costly if  $\theta$  assumes a value in this interval. However, in this more general formulation, is the likelihood ratio test for some  $\theta_1 \in \Omega_1$  and  $\theta_2 \in \Omega_2$  still a minimax decision procedure?

The following theorem supplies the answer.

Theorem A. Let

$$2.2 \quad R_1(c, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta) = w_1(\theta) \Pr[\lambda(\theta_1, \theta_2) \leq c | \theta] \text{ and}$$

$$2.3 \quad R_2(c, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta) = w_2(\theta) \Pr[\lambda(\theta_1, \theta_2) > c | \theta], \text{ where}$$

$\theta_1 \in \Omega_1$  and  $\theta_2 \in \Omega_2$ . Then the likelihood ratio test is a minimax procedure if and only if there exists a triple  $(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0)$  such that

$$2.4 \quad \max_{\theta \in \Omega} R_1(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta) = R_1(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_2^0) = R_2(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_1^0) \\ = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta) .$$

Proof of necessity:

Suppose the likelihood ratio test for some  $\theta_1^0 \in \Omega_1$ ,  $\theta_2^0 \in \Omega_2$ , and  $c = c^0$  is minimax. Then 2.4 follows.

---

2/ It seems only reasonable to assume that  $\inf_{\theta \in \Omega_2} w_1(\theta) = w_1(\theta_0)$  and  $\inf_{\theta \in \Omega_1} w_2(\theta) = w_2(\theta_0)$ . With this in view, there is no loss in generality in requiring 2.1.

Proof of sufficiency:

Let  $F_0$  denote the likelihood ratio test procedure associated with the triple  $(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0)$  satisfying 2.4. Then the expected cost of this procedure is given by

$$\begin{aligned} 2.5 \quad R(F_0, G) = & \int_{\Omega_2} w_1(\theta) \Pr[\lambda(\theta_1^0, \theta_2^0) \leq c_0 | \theta] dG(\theta) \\ & + \int_{\Omega_1} w_2(\theta) \Pr[\lambda(\theta_1^0, \theta_2^0) > c_0 | \theta] dG(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

where  $dG(\theta)$  denotes any a priori probability measure over  $\Omega$ . Since  $R_1(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_2^0)$  and  $R_2(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_1^0)$  are the maxima of the integrands appearing in 2.5, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2.6 \quad R(F_0, G) & \leq \int_{\Omega_2} R_1(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_2^0) dG(\theta) + \int_{\Omega_1} R_2(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_1^0) dG(\theta) \\ & = R_1(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_2^0) = R_2(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_1^0). \end{aligned}$$

If  $G$  is a distribution concentrating all probability at  $\theta_1^0$  and  $\theta_2^0$ , 2.6 is a strict equality. Therefore

$$2.7 \quad \max_G R(F_0, G) = R_1(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_2^0) = R_2(c_0, \theta_1^0, \theta_2^0, \theta_1^0).$$

Let  $G_0$  be the a priori distribution given by

$$2.8 \quad g = \Pr(\theta = \theta_1^0)$$

$$2.9 \quad 1-g = \Pr(\theta = \theta_2^0)$$

where  $g$  satisfies

$$2.10 \quad c_0 = \frac{w_2(\theta_1^0)g}{w_1(\theta_2^0)(1-g)} .$$

Clearly  $F_0$  is the Bayes procedure against  $G_0$ . Therefore

$$2.11 \quad \min_F R(F, G_0) = R(F_0, G_0) ,$$

where  $F$  is any decision procedure for choosing between  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . Since  $G_0$  is a distribution for which 2.6 is a strict equality, the minimax property of  $F_0$  follows.

3. Assumptions Under Which the Likelihood Ratio Test Is a Minimax Procedure. It is now of interest to examine a class of distribution functions and a class of cost functions for which condition 2.4 of Theorem A is satisfied.

Consider a family of probability measures defined by

$$3.1 \quad dL_0(x|\theta) = \frac{1}{\omega_0(\theta)} e^{\theta x} d\psi_0(x) ,$$

where  $\psi_0(x)$  is a measure defined over an interval  $X$ , and where

$$3.2 \quad \omega_0(\theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\theta x} d\psi_0(x)$$

is a bounded function of  $\theta$  defined over an interval  $\Omega$ .<sup>3/</sup> If  $u$  is the sum of  $n$  independent random variables each distributed according to 3.1, then  $u$  is distributed according to

---

<sup>3/</sup> The properties of this family of distribution functions are given an extensive discussion in Section 3 of Girshick and Savage, "Bayes and Minimax Estimates for Quadratic Loss Functions", Technical Report No. 5, Contract No. N6-ONR-251 Task III, Department of Statistics, Stanford University, November 21, 1950.

$$3.3 \quad dL(u|\theta) = \frac{1}{\omega(\theta)} e^{\theta u} dY(u) .$$

This is again the distribution family introduced in 3.1 and 3.2, with  $Y(u)$  defined over an interval  $U$ .

In view of the form of the distributions 3.1 and 3.3, it is simple to show that for every number  $c$  such that  $\lambda \leq c$  (where  $\lambda$  is defined in 1.3) there exists a unique number  $k$  such that  $u \leq k$ . This correspondence permits the functions 2.2 and 2.3 to be rewritten as

$$3.4 \quad R_1(k, \theta) = w_1(\theta) L(k|\theta)$$

$$3.5 \quad R_2(k, \theta) = w_2(\theta) [1 - L(k|\theta)] .$$

These functions have the following important property:

Lemma 1.

If  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta)$  and  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$  exist, then they are, respectively, monotonic increasing and decreasing functions of  $k$ .

Proof:

$$\text{Let } \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = w_1(\theta') L(k|\theta'), \quad \theta' \in \Omega_2$$

$$\text{and } \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta) = w_2(\theta'') [1 - L(k|\theta'')], \quad \theta'' \in \Omega_1 .$$

Obviously  $L(k|\theta)$  is an increasing function of  $k$  for any  $\theta$ .

Thus for  $\Delta$  positive

$$w_1(\theta') L(k|\theta') \leq w_1(\theta') L(k+\Delta|\theta') \leq \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} w_1(\theta) L(k+\Delta|\theta) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k+\Delta, \theta)$$

and

$$w_2(\theta'') [1 - L(k|\theta'')] \leq w_2(\theta'') [1 - L(k-\Delta|\theta'')] \leq \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} w_2(\theta) [1 - L(k-\Delta|\theta)]$$

$$= \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k-\Delta, \theta) ,$$

as desired.

It is now possible to prove the following

Theorem B. Let  $\psi(u)$ ,  $w_1(\theta)$ , and  $w_2(\theta)$  be continuous throughout any finite intervals in  $U = (a, b)$ ,  $\Omega_2$ , and  $\Omega_1$ , respectively.<sup>4/</sup> Let

$$3.6 \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow a} R_1(k, \theta) = \lim_{k \rightarrow b} R_2(k, \theta) = 0$$

uniformly in  $\theta$ . Then if the  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta)$  and  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$  exist

for some  $k \in U$ , there exists a unique value of  $k \in U$  such that

$$3.7 \quad \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta).$$

Proof:

Suppose for some  $k = k_0 \in U$ ,  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k_0, \theta) > \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k_0, \theta)$ . For

$k < k_0$ ,  $R_1(k, \theta)$  is uniformly bounded by  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k_0, \theta)$ . Since  $R_1(k, \theta)$

is continuous in  $k$  and  $\theta$ , the  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta)$  exists and is continuous

for  $k < k_0$ . Certainly the  $\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$  is continuous in  $k$ , and for

$k < k_0$ ,  $\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta) \geq \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k_0, \theta)$ . Since by 3.6  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_2(k, \theta) \rightarrow 0$  as

$k \rightarrow a$ , there must be some  $k \in (a, k_0)$  such that  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = \sup_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$ ,

or, actually,  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$ . Furthermore in view of

Lemma 1 there is only one such value of  $k$ . If on the other hand

$\max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta) > \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta)$  for some  $k_0 \in U$ , then, in like manner, the

restriction 3.6, Lemma 1, and the continuity hypothesis imply the

existence of a unique  $k \in (k_0, b)$  such that  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$ .

---

<sup>4/</sup> The interval  $U$  may of course be the open interval  $(-\infty, \infty)$ .

Corollary 1. Let  $\psi(u)$ ,  $w_1(\theta)$ , and  $w_2(\theta)$  be continuous and bounded over  $U = (a, b)$ ,  $\Omega_2$ , and  $\Omega_1$ , respectively.<sup>5/</sup> Then there exists a unique  $k \in U$  such that  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$ .

Corollary 2. Let

$$3.8 \quad w_1(\theta) = O(e^{\delta_2 \theta}); \quad \delta_2 > 0$$

$$3.9 \quad w_2(\theta) = O(e^{-\delta_1 \theta}); \quad \delta_1 > 0$$

be continuous functions throughout any finite intervals in  $\Omega_2$  and  $\Omega_1$ , respectively. Let  $\psi(u)$  be continuous, positive, and less than  $\psi(\infty)$  for any real  $u$ . Then there exists a unique  $k \in U$  such that  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$ .

Proof:

For  $\Delta > 0$ ,

$$(1) \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} w_1(\theta) L(k|\theta) \leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} e^{\delta_2 \theta} \frac{\int_{-\infty}^k e^{\theta u} d\psi(u)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\theta u} d\psi(u)} \cdot \text{constant}$$

$$\leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{-\infty}^k e^{(u+\delta_2)\theta} d\psi(u)}{\int_{k+\delta_2+\Delta}^{\infty} e^{\theta u} d\psi(u)} \cdot \text{constant}$$

$$\leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{(\delta_2+k)\theta}}{e^{(\delta_2+\Delta+k)\theta}} \frac{\int_{-\infty}^k d\psi(u)}{\int_{k+\delta_2+\Delta}^{\infty} d\psi(u)} \cdot \text{constant} = 0, \text{ and}$$

---

<sup>5/</sup>  $\psi(u)$  is of course always bounded.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2) \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} w_2(\theta) [1-L(k|\theta)] &\leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} e^{-\delta_1 \theta} \frac{\int_k^{\infty} e^{\theta u} d\psi(u)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\theta u} d\psi(u)} \cdot \text{constant} \\
 &\leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\int_k^{\infty} e^{(u-\delta_1)\theta} d\psi(u)}{\int_{-\infty}^{k-\delta_1-\Delta} e^{u\theta} d\psi(u)} \cdot \text{constant} \\
 &\leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{e^{(k-\delta_1)\theta} \int_k^{\infty} d\psi(u)}{e^{(k-\delta_1-\Delta)\theta} \int_{-\infty}^{k-\delta_1-\Delta} d\psi(u)} \cdot \text{constant} \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3) \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} w_1(\theta) L(k|\theta) &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} w_2(\theta) [1-L(k|\theta)] = w_1(\theta_0) L(k|\theta_0) \\
 &= w_2(\theta_0) [1-L(k|\theta_0)] = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $k$ , the  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta)$  and  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$  exist for any  $k$ .

The  $\min_{\theta \in \Omega_2} \omega(\theta)$  and  $\min_{\theta \in \Omega_1} \omega(\theta)$  are positive constants. Therefore,

for  $\theta \in \Omega_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4) \quad w_1(\theta)L(k|\theta) &\leq e^{\delta_2\theta} \int_{-\infty}^k e^{\theta u} d\psi(u). \text{ constant} \\
 &\leq \int_{-\infty}^k e^{(\delta_2+u)(\theta-\theta_0+1)} e^{(\delta_2+u)(\theta_0-1)} d\psi(u). \text{ constant} \\
 &\leq e^{(\delta_2+k)(\theta-\theta_0+1)} \int_{-\infty}^k e^{(\delta_2+u)(\theta_0-1)} d\psi(u) = \text{constant} \\
 &\leq e^{\delta_2+k} \int_{-\infty}^k e^{(\delta_2+u)(\theta_0-1)} d\psi(u) = \text{constant},
 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, for  $\theta \in \Omega_1$

$$(5) \quad w_2(\theta)[1-L(k|\theta)] \leq e^{k-\delta_1} \int_k^\infty e^{(u-\delta_1)(\theta_0+1)} d\psi(u) = \text{constant}.$$

The inequalities (4) and (5) demonstrate that 3.6 of Theorem B is satisfied. The conclusion of Corollary 2 follows.

Theorem B serves primarily as a criterion for determining whether or not minimax likelihood ratio tests exist in particular cases. The corollaries to Theorem B are interesting as applications of this criterion in the analysis of certain classes of sampling distributions and cost functions. Individual cases could of course be subjected to a much more direct analysis.

4. Remarks on the Discrete Case. The generality of the family of distributions introduced in 3.1 should not be overlooked: it includes many of the most important distributions encountered in statistics, such as the normal, binomial, and Poisson distributions. Suppose the distribution under consideration in this class

is a discrete one, and suppose that  $\Psi(u)$  assumes jumps at each value of a denumerable sequence in which the values are placed in order of increasing magnitude. For example, in the binomial distribution,  $u = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ . In general it will not be possible to find a value of  $k$  in such a sequence so that  $\max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k, \theta) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k, \theta)$ .

However, provided that all other conditions of Theorem B are satisfied except for the continuity of  $\Psi(u)$ , it will be possible to find a pair  $(k_0, k'_0)$  such that

$$4.1 \quad \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k_0, \theta) < \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k_0, \theta)$$

$$4.2 \quad \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} R_1(k'_0, \theta) > \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} R_2(k'_0, \theta),$$

where  $k'_0$  is the next larger value in the sequence than  $k_0$ . The minimax procedure is then a convex linear mixture of two procedures involving  $k_0$  and  $k'_0$ , a mixture determined by

$$4.3 \quad \max_{\theta \in \Omega_2} [fR_1(k_0, \theta) + (1-f)R_1(k'_0, \theta)] = \max_{\theta \in \Omega_1} [fR_2(k_0, \theta) + (1-f)R_2(k'_0, \theta)],$$

where  $0 < f < 1$ .

STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
 Technical Reports      Distribution List  
 Contract N6onr-25126

|                                                                                                                                                       |   |                                                                                                                                                                    |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Dr. Herbert Solomon<br>Mathematics Branch<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington 25, D. C.                               | 5 | Commanding Officer<br>Signal Corps Procurement Agency<br>2800 South 20th Street<br>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania                                                      | 1  |
| Scientific Section<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Department of the Navy<br>1000 Geary<br>San Francisco 9,<br>California                              | 2 | Commanding General<br>New York Quartermaster<br>Procurement Agency,<br>Inspection Division<br>111 East 16th Street<br>New York, New York                           | 1  |
| Director, Naval Research<br>Laboratory<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: Technical<br>Information Officer                                              | 9 | Commanding General<br>Army Chemical Center<br>Quality Assurance Branch<br>Edgewood, Maryland                                                                       | 1  |
| Chief of Naval Research<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn: Code 432<br>(Mathematics Branch)                                 | 2 | Commanding Officer<br>9766 Technical Service Unit<br>Station Complement<br>Camp Detrick<br>Frederick, Maryland                                                     | 1  |
| Office of the Assistant<br>Naval Attache for<br>Research<br>Naval Attache<br>American Embassy<br>Navy #100<br>Fleet Post Office<br>New York, New York | 2 | Commanding Officer<br>9926 Technical Service Unit<br>Armed Services Medical<br>Procurement Agency,<br>Inspection Division<br>84 Sands Street<br>Brooklyn, New York | 1  |
| Planning Research Division<br>Deputy Chief of Staff<br>Comptroller,<br>U. S. Air Force<br>The Pentagon<br>Washington, D. C.                           | 1 | Asst. Chief of Staff, G-4<br>United States Army<br>Procurement Division<br>Standards Branch<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                                | 15 |
|                                                                                                                                                       |   | Chairman, Munitions Board<br>Material Inspection Agency<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                                                                    | 1  |

|                                                                                                                                              |   |                                                                                                                              |   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Chief of Ordnance<br>United States Army<br>Research and Development<br>Division<br>Washington 25, D. C.<br>Attn:<br>Brig. General L.E. Simon | 1 | Commanding Officer<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Branch Office<br>346 Broadway<br>New York 13, New York                     | 1 |
| Chief, Bureau of Ordnance<br>Department of the Navy<br>Quality Control Division<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                      | 2 | Commanding Officer<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Branch Office<br>1030 East Green Street<br>Pasadena 1, California          | 1 |
| Chief, Bureau of<br>Aeronautics<br>Department of the Navy<br>Code 231<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                                | 1 | Commanding Officer<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Branch Office<br>495 Summer Street<br>Boston 10, Massachusetts             | 1 |
| Chief, Bureau of Ships<br>Asst. Chief for Research<br>and Development<br>Code 373<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                    | 1 | Officer in Charge<br>Office of Naval Research<br>London Branch Office<br>Fleet Post Office - Navy #100<br>New York, New York | 2 |
| Chief of Naval Material<br>Code M553<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                                       | 1 | Chairman<br>Research and Development Board<br>The Pentagon<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                           | 1 |
| Commanding General<br>Air Materiel Command<br>Quality Control<br>Division MCPLXP<br>Wright-Patterson<br>Air Force Base<br>Dayton, Ohio       | 5 | Chief of Naval Operations<br>Operations Evaluation<br>Group - OP342E<br>The Pentagon<br>Washington 25, D. C.                 | 1 |
| Headquarters, USAF<br>Director of Research<br>and Development<br>Washington 25, D. C.                                                        | 1 | Commanding General<br>Air Proving Ground<br>Eglin Air Force Base<br>Eglin, Florida                                           | 1 |
| Commanding Officer<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Branch Office<br>844 North Rush Street<br>Chicago 11, Illinois                             | 1 | Commander<br>U. S. Naval Proving Ground<br>Dahlgren, Virginia                                                                | 1 |
|                                                                                                                                              |   | Commander<br>U. S. Naval Ordnance<br>Test Station<br>Inyokern, China Lake,<br>California                                     | 1 |

Commanding General  
U. S. Army Proving  
Grounds  
Aberdeen, Maryland  
Attn: Ballistics  
Research Lab.

Walter Shewhart  
Bell Telephone  
Laboratories, Inc.  
Murray Hill, New Jersey

1

RAND Corporation  
1500 Fourth Street  
Santa Monica, California

1

Eugene L. Grant  
Civil Engineering Department  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

1

Office of Naval Research  
Logistics Branch  
Code 436  
T-3 Building  
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Additional copies for Project  
leader and assistants, office  
file and reserve for future  
requirements

20

Logistics Research Project  
George Washington  
University  
T-3 Building - Code 437  
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Director of Research  
Operations Research  
Office

U. S. Army  
Fort McNair  
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Asst. for Operations  
Analysis  
Headquarters,  
U. S. Air Force  
Washington 25, D. C.

1

H. F. Dodge  
Bell Telephone  
Laboratories, Inc.  
463 West Street  
New York, New York

1

W. Allen Wallis  
Committee on Statistics  
University of Chicago  
Chicago 37, Illinois

1