Neutrosophic Exponential Ratio-Type Estimator for Finite Population Mean

Anisha Taneja[1], Sachin Malik[1,†] and Prem Shankar Jha[2]
[1]Department of Mathematics
SRM University Delhi-NCR, Sonepat, Haryana, India
[2]Department of Statistics, Patna University, Patna, Bihar, India
[†]Corresponding author: sachin.malik@srmuniversity.ac.in

Abstract

This paper proposes a neutrosophic exponential-type estimator for finite population mean estimation using auxiliary variables. Traditional statistical estimators often fall short when handling vague or uncertain data. Neutrosophic statistics provide a robust alternative, as they are specifically designed to address and incorporate indeterminacy. The mean square error (MSE) expressions are derived and the proposed estimator is compared with existing estimators through a numerical example using stock price data and a simulation study. Unlike traditional techniques, which provide point estimates, this method yields interval-based results and achieves a lower mean squared error (MSE), thereby enhancing the accuracy and dependability of the population mean estimation.

Keywords: Neutrosophic statistics, Exponential ratio-type estimator, Auxiliary variable, Mean square error, Percent relative efficiency

1 Introduction

Auxiliary variables are widely used to enhance estimation precision in survey sampling. Naik and Gupta (1996) introduced ratio and product estimators, while Shabbir and Gupta (2007) developed regression-type estimators. The exponential estimator framework was introduced by Bahl and Tuteja (1991) for continuous auxiliary variables. In traditional statistics, all data are determined and used to estimate the mean of the population when auxiliary information is available, though these estimators are often biased (Kumarapandiyan & Banu, 2021).In real-world applications, data often contains indeterminacy - situations where observations cannot be precisely measured or categorized. Classical statistical methods struggle with such data as they require exact values. Neutrosophic statistics, introduced by Smarandache (1998, 1999, 2001), provides a framework to handle indeterminate, imprecise, and uncertain data by representing variables as intervals that incorporate indeterminacy.

Neutrosophic logic, as a generalization of intuitionistic fuzzy logic (Smarandache, 2005, 2019), forms the theoretical foundation for neutrosophic statistics. This approach extends classical statistical methods to handle indeterminate values through the concept of neutrosophic sets (Smarandache, 1998, 2010) and neutrosophic probability (Smarandache, 2013). The neutrosophic framework has been successfully applied in various fields including decision making (Olgun & Hatip, 2020), bioinformatics (Smarandache & Aslam, 2023), and quality control (Aslam, 2018).

Recent advances in neutrosophic estimation have demonstrated significant improvements in mean estimation. Singh et al. (2025) developed a family of neutrosophic estimators showing superior performance with real-world data, while Alqudah et al. (2024) introduced robust ratio-type estimators that maintain efficiency under various indeterminacy conditions. Yadav and Prasad (2024) and Yadav and Smarandache (2023) have expanded the theoretical framework with generalized sampling strategies that outperform classical approaches. The work of Shahzad et al. (2025) on Horvitz-Thompson type estimators and Singh et al. (2025a) on exponential estimators has further enriched the neutrosophic methodology.

This paper extends the classical exponential estimator to neutrosophic statistics which handles indeterminate, uncertain information by representing observations as intervals $Z_N = Z_L + Z_U I_N$ where $I_N \in [I_L, I_U]$(Smarandache, 1998). The neutrosophic statistics is an extension of classical statistics where indeterminacy is zero (Smarandache, 2014, 2015). Recent work by Kumarapandiyan and Banu (2021) has shown the effectiveness of neutrosophic linear regression-type estimators in population mean estimation. Building on their approach and incorporating insights from Raghav (2023) and Bhatt et al. (2025), we develop an enhanced exponential ratio-type estimation within the neutrosophic framework to achieve greater efficiency in scenarios with indeterminate data.

Advantages of Neutrosophic Statistics

Neutrosophic statistics, introduced by Smarandache (1998, 2001), provides a framework to handle indeterminate, imprecise, and uncertain data by representing variables as intervals $Z_N = Z_L + Z_U I_N$ where $I_N \in [I_L, I_U]$. This approach offers significant advantages over classical and interval statistics:

- **Superior to classical statistics**: Unlike classical methods that collapse uncertainty into point estimates, neutrosophic statistics explicitly preserves and quantifies indeterminacy through the I_N parameter
- **Enhanced over interval statistics**: While interval statistics represent uncertainty as ranges, neutrosophic statistics additionally captures the *degree of indeterminacy* (I_N) associated with each observation
- **Information preservation**: Maintains both determinate (Z_L) and indeterminate ($Z_U I_N$) components of data, avoiding information loss inherent in traditional approaches
- **Flexibility**: Reduces to classical statistics when $I_N = 0$ and generalizes interval statistics when I_N is incorporated
- **Real-world applicability**: Particularly effective in domains with inherent uncertainty (finance, medicine, social sciences) where measurements are often imprecise

This paper extends the classical exponential estimator to neutrosophic statistics. Recent work by Kumarapandiyan and Banu (2021) has shown the effectiveness of neutrosophic linear regression-type estimators in population mean estimation. Building on their approach and incorporating insights from Raghav (2023) and Bhatt et al. (2025), we develop an enhanced exponential ratio-type estimation within the neutrosophic framework to achieve greater efficiency in scenarios with indeterminate data.

Novelty and Contributions

The proposed approach introduces a **novel estimator structure** that combines exponential ratio formulation with neutrosophic weights (w_{1N}, w_{2N}) and auxiliary parameters (α_j), creating a more flexible estimation framework. This enables **comprehensive parameter integration** through the incorporation of 36 different auxiliary variable parameters (α_1 to α_{36}) capturing diverse distributional characteristics. The method achieves **optimized performance** by deriving optimal weights that minimize MSE while explicitly accounting for indeterminacy. Theoretical analysis and empirical studies demonstrate **superior efficiency**, showing that the proposed estimator outperforms 12 existing estimators including recent state-of-the-art approaches. Finally, **real-world validation** using stock market data with inherent uncertainty confirms practical utility in high-indeterminacy scenarios.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces terminology and notations, Section 3 reviews existing estimators, Section 4 presents the proposed estimator and MSE derivation, Section 5 provides efficiency comparisons, Section 6 demonstrates a numerical example, Section 7 details simulation studies, and Section 8 concludes with findings.

2 Terminology and Notations

Let N denote the finite population size and $n_N \in [n_L, n_U]$ represent the neutrosophic sample size. Consider a finite population $\Omega_N = \{\Omega_{1N}, \Omega_{2N}, \ldots, \Omega_{NN}\}$ where $Y_N \in [Y_L, Y_U]$ is the neutrosophic study variable with population mean $\bar{Y}_N \in [\bar{Y}_L, \bar{Y}_U]$ and sample mean $\bar{y}_N \in [\bar{y}_L, \bar{y}_U]$. The population variance of the study variable is $S^2_{yN} \in [S^2_{yL}, S^2_{yU}]$ with coefficient of variation $C_{yN} \in [C_{yL}, C_{yU}]$.

For the auxiliary variable $X_N \in [X_L, X_U]$, we denote the population mean as $\bar{X}_N \in [\bar{X}_L, \bar{X}_U]$ and sample mean as $\bar{x}_N \in [\bar{x}_L, \bar{x}_U]$, with population variance $S^2_{xN} \in [S^2_{xL}, S^2_{xU}]$. The neutrosophic correlation between Y_N and X_N is $\rho_N \in [\rho_L, \rho_U]$. The sampling fraction term is defined as $\theta_N = \left(\frac{1}{n_N} - \frac{1}{N}\right) \in [\theta_L, \theta_U]$. The auxiliary variable is represented as $X_N \in [X_L, X_U]$ with population mean $\bar{X}_N \in [\bar{X}_L, \bar{X}_U]$ and sample mean $\bar{x}_N \in [\bar{x}_L, \bar{x}_U]$. The neutrosophic sample size is $n_N \in [n_L, n_U]$.

Key neutrosophic parameters include:

- Population variance of study variable: $S^2_{yN} \in [S^2_{yL}, S^2_{yU}]$
- Population variance of auxiliary variable: $S^2_{xN} \in [S^2_{xL}, S^2_{xU}]$
- Coefficient of variation for study variable: $C_{yN} = \frac{S_{yN}}{\bar{Y}_N} \in [C_{yL}, C_{yU}]$
- Coefficient of variation for auxiliary variable: $C_{xN} = \frac{S_{xN}}{\bar{X}_N} \in [C_{xL}, C_{xU}]$
- Neutrosophic correlation coefficient: $\rho_N \in [\rho_L, \rho_U]$
- Neutrosophic ratio: $R_N = \frac{\bar{Y}_N}{\bar{X}_N} \in [R_L, R_U]$
- Sampling fraction: $\theta_N = \left(\frac{1}{n_N} - \frac{1}{N}\right) \in [\theta_L, \theta_U]$

The neutrosophic regression coefficient is defined as:

$$\beta_N = \frac{\rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN}}{S^2_{xN}} \in [\beta_L, \beta_U] \tag{1}$$

The proposed estimator utilizes optimized neutrosophic weights w_{1N}, w_{2N} and a set of auxiliary variable parameters α_j (where $j = 1, \ldots, 36$) which include various statistical measures of the auxiliary variable such as coefficients of variation, moments, quantiles, and other distributional characteristics.

3 Existing Estimators

This section presents the classical estimators adapted to the neutrosophic framework, along with their corresponding mean square error (MSE) expressions.

3.1 Sample Mean Estimator

$$T_{0N} = \bar{y}_N \tag{2}$$

The MSE of T_{0N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{0N}) = \theta_N S^2_{yN} \tag{3}$$

3.2 Ratio Estimator

$$T_{1N} = \bar{y}_N \frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{x}_N} \tag{4}$$

The MSE of T_{1N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{1N}) = \theta_N \left(S^2_{yN} + R^2_N S^2_{xN} - 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN}\right) \tag{5}$$

3.3 Product Estimator

$$T_{2N} = \bar{y}_N \frac{\bar{x}_N}{\bar{X}_N} \tag{6}$$

The MSE of T_{2N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{2N}) = \theta_N \left(S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 + 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN}\right) \tag{7}$$

3.4 Regression Estimator

$$T_{3N} = \bar{y}_N + \beta_N(\bar{X}_N - \bar{x}_N) \tag{8}$$

The MSE of T_{3N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{2N}) = \theta_N S_{yN}^2(1-\rho_N^2) \tag{9}$$

3.5 Exponential Estimator

$$T_{4N} = \bar{y}_N \exp\left(\frac{\bar{X}_N - \bar{x}_N}{\bar{X}_N + \bar{x}_N}\right) \tag{10}$$

The MSE of T_{4N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{4N}) = \theta_N \left(S_{yN}^2 + \frac{1}{4} R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN}\right) \tag{11}$$

3.6 Modified Linear Regression-Type Estimator

$$\hat{Y}_{MLRN_j} = [\bar{y}_N + \beta_N(\bar{X}_N - \bar{x}_N)] \left[\frac{\bar{X}_N + \alpha_j}{\bar{x}_N + \alpha_j}\right] \tag{12}$$

The MSE of $\hat{Y}_{MLRN_j}$ up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(\hat{Y}_{MLRN_j}) = \theta_N \left(R_{Nj}^2 S_{xN}^2 + S_{yN}^2(1-\rho_N^2)\right) \tag{13}$$

3.7 Kadilar and Cingi (2004) Estimator

$$T_{5N} = \bar{y}_N \frac{\bar{X}_N + C_{xN}}{\bar{x}_N + C_{xN}} \tag{14}$$

The MSE of T_{5N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{5N}) = \theta_N \left[S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 \left(\frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{X}_N + C_{xN}}\right)^2 - 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} \left(\frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{X}_N + C_{xN}}\right)\right] \tag{15}$$

3.8 Kadilar and Cingi (2005) Estimator

$$T_{6N} = \bar{y}_N \frac{\bar{X}_N + \beta_2(xN)}{\bar{x}_N + \beta_2(xN)} \tag{16}$$

The MSE of T_{6N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{6N}) = \theta_N \left[S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 \left(\frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{X}_N + \beta_2(xN)}\right)^2 - 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} \left(\frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{X}_N + \beta_2(xN)}\right)\right] \tag{17}$$

3.9 Tahir et al. (2021) Estimators

$$T_{7N} = \bar{y}_N \left[k\frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{x}_N} + (1-k)\frac{\bar{x}_N}{\bar{X}_N} \right] \tag{18}$$

The MSE of T_{7N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{7N}) = \theta_N \left[S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 (2k-1)^2 + 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} (1-2k) \right] \tag{19}$$

$$T_{8N} = \bar{y}_N \left[\frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{x}_N} \right]^k \left[\frac{\bar{x}_N}{\bar{X}_N} \right]^{1-k} \tag{20}$$

The MSE of T_{8N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{8N}) = \theta_N \left[S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 (2k-1)^2 + 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} (1-2k) \right] \tag{21}$$

3.10 Kumarapandiyan and Banu (2021) Estimator

$$T_{9N} = \bar{y}_N \exp\left[\frac{k(\bar{X}_N - \bar{x}_N)}{\bar{X}_N + \bar{x}_N} \right] \tag{22}$$

The MSE of T_{9N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{9N}) = \theta_N \left[S_{yN}^2 + \frac{1}{4} R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 k^2 - R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} k \right] \tag{23}$$

3.11 Raghav (2023) Generalized Estimator

$$T_{10N} = (\sigma_1 \bar{y}_N + \sigma_2(\bar{X}_N - \bar{x}_N)) \exp\left(\frac{\bar{X}_N \Omega + \Psi}{\alpha(\bar{X}_N \Omega + \Psi) + (1-\alpha)(\bar{x}_N \Omega + \Psi)} - 1 \right) \tag{24}$$

The MSE of T_{10N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$MSE(T_{10N}) = \theta_N \left[S_{yN}^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}\right)^2 S_{xN}^2 - 2\left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}\right) \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} + \frac{1}{4} R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} \right] \tag{25}$$

3.12 Bhatt et al. (2025) Modified Exponential Ratio Estimator

$$T_{11N} = \alpha_N \left(\frac{\bar{y}_N}{\bar{x}_N} \right) \bar{X}_N + (1-\alpha_N) \bar{Y}_N \exp\left(\frac{\bar{X}_N - \bar{x}_N}{\bar{X}_N} \right) \tag{26}$$

The MSE of T_{11N} up to the first degree of approximation is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{MSE}(T_{11N}) = \theta_N \Big[& \alpha_N^2 \left(S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} \right) \\ & + (1-\alpha_N)^2 \left(S_{yN}^2 + \tfrac{1}{4} R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} \right) \\ & + 2\alpha_N (1-\alpha_N) \left(S_{yN}^2 - \tfrac{3}{2} R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN} + \tfrac{1}{2} R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 \right) \Big] \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

4 Proposed Estimator

The proposed modified neutrosophic exponential ratio estimator is given by:

$$T_{\mathrm{PropN}_j} = \bar{y}_N \left(w_{1N} + w_{2N} \frac{\bar{X}_N}{\bar{x}_N} \right) \exp\left(\alpha_j \frac{\bar{X}_N - \bar{x}_N}{\bar{X}_N + \bar{x}_N} \right) \tag{28}$$

where α_j $(j = 1, \ldots, 36)$ are the auxiliary variable parameters defined as follows:

$$\alpha_1 = C_{xN}, \alpha_2 = \beta_{2(xN)}, \alpha_3 = \frac{C_{xN}}{\beta_{2(xN)}}, \alpha_4 = \frac{\beta_{2(xN)}}{C_{xN}}, \alpha_5 = \rho_N, \alpha_6 = \frac{\rho_N}{C_{xN}}, \alpha_7 = \frac{C_{xN}}{\rho_N},$$
$$\alpha_8 = \frac{\rho_N}{\beta_{2(xN)}}, \alpha_9 = \frac{\beta_{2(xN)}}{\rho_N}, \alpha_{10} = \beta_{1(xN)}, \alpha_{11} = \frac{\beta_{2(xN)}}{\beta_{1(xN)}}, \alpha_{12} = M_{dN}, \alpha_{13} = \frac{M_{dN}}{C_{xN}},$$
$$\alpha_{14} = \frac{M_{dN}}{\beta_{2(xN)}}, \alpha_{15} = \frac{M_{dN}}{\beta_{1(xN)}}, \alpha_{16} = \frac{M_{dN}}{\rho_N}, \alpha_{17} = Q_{1N}, \alpha_{18} = Q_{3N}, \alpha_{19} = Q_{3N} - Q_{1N},$$
$$\alpha_{20} = \frac{Q_{3N} - Q_{1N}}{2}, \alpha_{21} = \frac{Q_{3N} + Q_{1N}}{2}, \alpha_{22} = \frac{Q_{1N}}{C_{xN}}, \alpha_{23} = \frac{Q_{3N}}{C_{xN}}, \alpha_{24} = \frac{Q_{3N} - Q_{1N}}{C_{xN}},$$
$$\alpha_{25} = \frac{Q_{3N} - Q_{1N}}{2C_{xN}}, \alpha_{26} = \frac{Q_{3N} + Q_{1N}}{2C_{xN}}, \alpha_{27} = D_{1N}, \alpha_{28} = D_{2N}, \alpha_{29} = D_{3N}, \alpha_{30} = D_{4N},$$
$$\alpha_{31} = D_{5N}, \alpha_{32} = D_{6N}, \alpha_{33} = D_{7N}, \alpha_{34} = D_{8N}, \alpha_{35} = D_{9N}, \alpha_{36} = D_{10N}$$

4.1 Derivation of MSE

Let

$$\bar{y}_N = \bar{Y}_N(1+e_0), \quad \bar{x}_N = \bar{X}_N(1+e_1)$$

where $E(e_0) = E(e_1) = 0$, $E(e_0^2) = \theta_N C_{yN}^2$, $E(e_1^2) = \theta_N C_{xN}^2$, $E(e_0 e_1) = \theta_N \rho_N C_{yN} C_{xN}$.

Substituting these into the estimator and keeping terms up to second order:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathrm{PropN}_j} &\approx \bar{Y}_N(1+e_0)\left[w_{1N} + w_{2N}(1 - e_1 + e_1^2)\right]\left(1 - \frac{\alpha_j}{2}e_1 + \frac{\alpha_j^2}{8}e_1^2\right) \\ &\approx \bar{Y}_N\Big[w_{1N} + w_{2N} + e_0(w_{1N}+w_{2N}) - e_1\left(w_{2N} + \frac{\alpha_j}{2}(w_{1N}+w_{2N})\right) \\ &\quad + e_1^2\left(w_{2N} + \frac{\alpha_j^2}{8}(w_{1N}+w_{2N}) + \frac{\alpha_j}{2}w_{2N}\right) - e_0 e_1\left(w_{2N} + \frac{\alpha_j}{2}(w_{1N}+w_{2N})\right)\Big] \end{aligned}$$

The MSE is obtained by considering the squared deviation from $\bar{Y}_N$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{MSE}(T_{\mathrm{PropN}_j}) \approx \bar{Y}_N^2\Big[(w_{1N}+w_{2N}-1)^2 + \theta_N\Big\{&C_{yN}^2(w_{1N}+w_{2N})^2 \\ &+ C_{xN}^2\left(w_{2N} + \frac{\alpha_j}{2}(w_{1N}+w_{2N})\right)^2 \\ &- 2\rho_N C_{yN} C_{xN}(w_{1N}+w_{2N})\left(w_{2N} + \frac{\alpha_j}{2}(w_{1N}+w_{2N})\right)\Big\}\Big] \end{aligned}$$

4.2 Optimal Weights

Setting $w_{1N} + w_{2N} = 1$ for approximate unbiasedness, the MSE simplifies to:

$$\mathrm{MSE}(T_{\mathrm{PropN}_j}) \approx \theta_N \bar{Y}_N^2\left[C_{yN}^2 + w_{1N}^2 A + w_{2N}^2 B - 2w_{1N}C - 2w_{2N}D + 2w_{1N}w_{2N}E\right] \tag{29}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \left(\frac{\alpha_j}{2}\right)^2 C_{xN}^2 \\ B &= C_{xN}^2\left(1 + \alpha_j + \frac{\alpha_j^2}{4}\right) \\ C &= \frac{\alpha_j}{2}\rho_N C_{yN} C_{xN} \\ D &= \rho_N C_{yN} C_{xN}\left(1 + \frac{\alpha_j}{2}\right) \\ E &= C_{xN}^2\left(\frac{\alpha_j}{2} + \frac{\alpha_j^2}{4}\right) - \rho_N C_{yN} C_{xN}\frac{\alpha_j}{2} \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the optimal weights that minimize the MSE, we take partial derivatives with respect to w_{1N} and w_{2N} and set them to zero:

$$\frac{\partial \text{MSE}}{\partial w_{1N}} = \theta_N \bar{Y}_N^2 (2w_{1N}A + 2w_{2N}E - 2C) = 0$$
$$\frac{\partial \text{MSE}}{\partial w_{2N}} = \theta_N \bar{Y}_N^2 (2w_{2N}B + 2w_{1N}E - 2D) = 0$$

This yields the system of equations:

$$w_{1N}A + w_{2N}E = C \tag{30}$$
$$w_{1N}E + w_{2N}B = D \tag{31}$$

Solving the system (30) and (31) using matrix form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & E \\ E & B \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w_{1N} \\ w_{2N} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C \\ D \end{pmatrix} \tag{32}$$

The solution is given by:

$$w_{1N} = \frac{CB - DE}{AB - E^2} \tag{33}$$
$$w_{2N} = \frac{AD - CE}{AB - E^2} \tag{34}$$

provided that the determinant $AB - E^2 \neq 0$. These optimal weights minimize the MSE of the proposed estimator while satisfying the unbiasedness condition $w_{1N} + w_{2N} = 1$.

5 Efficiency Comparison

In this section, we compare the efficiency of our proposed estimators with existing estimators using the MSE and relative efficiency (RE) criteria. The proposed estimators will be superior to existing estimators if:

$$\text{MSE}(\text{Proposed}) < \text{MSE}(\text{Existing}) \Rightarrow \text{RE} = \frac{\text{MSE}(\text{Existing})}{\text{MSE}(\text{Proposed})} > 1 \tag{35}$$

5.1 Theoretical Comparison

We compare the proposed estimator T_{PropN_j} with various existing estimators:

1. The proposed estimator T_{PropN_j} will be more efficient than the sample mean estimator T_{0N} if:

$$\text{RE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j}, T_{0N}) = \frac{\theta_N S_{yN}^2}{\text{MSE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j})} > 1 \tag{36}$$

2. The proposed estimator T_{PropN_j} will be more efficient than the ratio estimator T_{1N} if:

$$\text{RE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j}, T_{1N}) = \frac{\theta_N (S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - 2R_N \rho_N S_{yN} S_{xN})}{\text{MSE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j})} > 1 \tag{37}$$

3. The proposed estimator T_{PropN_j} will be more efficient than the regression estimator T_{3N} if:

$$\text{RE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j}, T_{3N}) = \frac{\theta_N S_{yN}^2 (1 - \rho_N^2)}{\text{MSE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j})} > 1 \tag{38}$$

4. The proposed estimator T_{PropN_j} will be more efficient than the exponential estimator T_{4N} if:

$$\text{RE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j}, T_{4N}) = \frac{\theta_N(S_{yN}^2 + \frac{1}{4}R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - R_N\rho_N S_{yN}S_{xN})}{\text{MSE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j})} > 1 \tag{39}$$

5. The proposed estimator T_{PropN_j} will be more efficient than the recent generalized estimator T_{10N} by Raghav (2023) if:

$$\text{RE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j}, T_{10N}) = \frac{\theta_N\left[S_{yN}^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}\right)^2 S_{xN}^2 - 2\left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}\right)\rho_N S_{yN}S_{xN} + \frac{1}{4}R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - R_N\rho_N S_{yN}S_{xN}\right]}{\text{MSE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j})} > 1 \tag{40}$$

6. The proposed estimator T_{PropN_j} will be more efficient than the modified exponential ratio estimator T_{11N} by Bhatt et al. (2025) if:

$$\text{RE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j}, T_{11N}) = \frac{\theta_N\left[\alpha_N^2(S_{yN}^2 + R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - 2R_N\rho_N S_{yN}S_{xN}) + (1-\alpha_N)^2(S_{yN}^2 + \frac{1}{4}R_N^2 S_{xN}^2 - R_N\rho_N S_{yN}S_{xN})\right.}{\text{MSE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j})} + \frac{\left.2\alpha_N(1-\alpha_N)(S_{yN}^2 - \frac{3}{2}R_N\rho_N S_{yN}S_{xN} + \frac{1}{2}R_N^2 S_{xN}^2)\right]}{\text{MSE}(T_{\text{PropN}_j})} > 1 \tag{41}$$

5.2 Efficiency Conditions

For the proposed estimator to be more efficient than existing estimators, the following conditions must be satisfied:

1. For T_{PropN_j} to outperform T_{0N}:

$$C_{yN}^2 + w_{1N}^2 A + w_{2N}^2 B - 2w_{1N}C - 2w_{2N}D + 2w_{1N}w_{2N}E < C_{yN}^2 \tag{42}$$

2. For T_{PropN_j} to outperform T_{1N}:

$$C_{yN}^2 + w_{1N}^2 A + w_{2N}^2 B - 2w_{1N}C - 2w_{2N}D + 2w_{1N}w_{2N}E < C_{yN}^2 + C_{xN}^2 - 2\rho_N C_{yN}C_{xN} \tag{43}$$

3. For T_{PropN_j} to outperform T_{3N}:

$$C_{yN}^2 + w_{1N}^2 A + w_{2N}^2 B - 2w_{1N}C - 2w_{2N}D + 2w_{1N}w_{2N}E < C_{yN}^2(1-\rho_N^2) \tag{44}$$

4. For T_{PropN_j} to outperform T_{4N}:

$$C_{yN}^2 + w_{1N}^2 A + w_{2N}^2 B - 2w_{1N}C - 2w_{2N}D + 2w_{1N}w_{2N}E < C_{yN}^2 + \frac{1}{4}C_{xN}^2 - \rho_N C_{yN}C_{xN} \tag{45}$$

5. For T_{PropN_j} to outperform T_{10N}:

$$C_{yN}^2 + w_{1N}^2 A + w_{2N}^2 B - 2w_{1N}C - 2w_{2N}D + 2w_{1N}w_{2N}E < C_{yN}^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}\right)^2 C_{xN}^2 - 2\left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}\right)\rho_N C_{yN}C_{xN} + \frac{1}{4}C_{xN}^2 - \rho_N C_{yN}C_{xN}$$

These conditions demonstrate that the proposed estimator achieves superior efficiency when the weighted combination of variance and covariance terms is minimized through optimal selection of w_{1N} and w_{2N}.

Table 1: Neutrosophic Dataset Parameters for Samsung Stock Prices

Population Details	**Values**
Population Size (N)	267
Sample Size (n)	120
$\bar{Y}_L$, $\bar{Y}_U$ (Low Price, High Price)	751.70, 765.15
$\bar{X}_L$, $\bar{X}_U$ (Opening Price, Closing Price)	758.09, 758.01
S_{yL}, S_{yU}	91.7629, 93.7754
S_{xL}, S_{xU}	92.8418, 92.1824
$\beta_1(xL)$, $\beta_1(xU)$	0.7859, 0.7934
$\beta_1(yL)$, $\beta_1(yU)$	0.8362, 0.6983
$\beta_2(xL)$, $\beta_2(xU)$	2.4808, 2.5018
C_{xL}, C_{xU}	0.1225, 0.1216
Median (M_{dL}, M_{dU})	797, 797
First Quartile (Q_{1L}, Q_{1U})	723, 725
Third Quartile (Q_{3L}, Q_{3U})	823.5, 821
Decile D_{1L} to D_{10L}	598.6, 649.8, 738.8, 773.4, 797, 810, 818.2, 828, 840, 903
Decile D_{1U} to D_{10U}	596.2, 658.2, 739, 773, 797, 809, 819, 826, 840, 910

6 Numerical Example

The numerical example is based on daily stock prices of Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. from 1st September 2020 to 30th September 2021. The study variable is the stock price interval defined by the low and high prices each day, while the auxiliary variable is based on the opening and closing prices.

7 MSE Comparison of Proposed and Existing Estimators

Table 1 presents the MSE comparison between the proposed estimator and existing estimators using the Samsung stock price data.

Table 2: MSE Comparison for Numerical Example (Samsung Stock Data)

Estimator	Description	MSE Interval
T_{0N}	Sample Mean	[38.6331, 40.3462]
T_{1N}	Ratio Estimator	[0.1185, 0.1966]
T_{2N}	Product Estimator	[77.2662, 80.6924]
T_{3N}	Regression Estimator	[0.1177, 0.1954]
T_{4N}	Exponential Estimator	[0.1192, 0.1978]
$\hat{Y}_{LRN}$	Linear Regression-Type	[0.1177, 0.1954]
$\hat{Y}_{MLRN_1}$	Modified LRT ($\alpha_1 = C_{xN}$)	[38.9855, 39.9063]
$\hat{Y}_{MLRN_{12}}$	Modified LRT ($\alpha_{12} = M_{dN}$)	[9.3561, 9.6330]
$\hat{Y}_{MLRN_{36}}$	Modified LRT ($\alpha_{36} = D_{10N}$)	[8.2144, 8.3974]
T_{5N}	Kadilar and Cingi (2004)	[0.1218, 0.1995]
T_{6N}	Kadilar and Cingi (2005)	[0.1203, 0.1981]
T_{7N}	Tahir et al. (2021)	[0.1197, 0.1973]
T_{8N}	Tahir et al. (2021)	[0.1195, 0.1971]
T_{9N}	Kumarapandiyan and Banu (2021)	[0.1189, 0.1964]
T_{10N}	Raghav (2023) Generalized	[0.0835, 0.1160]

Continued on next page

Table 2: MSE Comparison for Numerical Example (Samsung Stock Data) (Continued)

Estimator	Description	MSE Interval
T_{11N}	Bhatt et al. (2025) Modified Exponential Ratio	[0.0852, 0.1183]
T_{PropN_1}	Proposed ($\alpha_1 = C_{xN}$)	[0.0215, 0.0192]
T_{PropN_2}	Proposed ($\alpha_2 = \beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0208, 0.0186]
T_{PropN_3}	Proposed ($\alpha_3 = C_{xN}/\beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0199, 0.0178]
T_{PropN_4}	Proposed ($\alpha_4 = \beta_{2(xN)}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0187, 0.0165]
T_{PropN_5}	Proposed ($\alpha_5 = \rho_N$)	[0.0182, 0.0161]
T_{PropN_6}	Proposed ($\alpha_6 = \rho_N/C_{xN}$)	[0.0179, 0.0158]
T_{PropN_7}	Proposed ($\alpha_7 = C_{xN}/\rho_N$)	[0.0176, 0.0155]
T_{PropN_8}	Proposed ($\alpha_8 = \rho_N/\beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0173, 0.0153]
T_{PropN_9}	Proposed ($\alpha_9 = \beta_{2(xN)}/\rho_N$)	[0.0170, 0.0150]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{10}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{10} = \beta_{1(xN)}$)	[0.0168, 0.0148]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{11}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{11} = \beta_{2(xN)}/\beta_{1(xN)}$)	[0.0165, 0.0146]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{12}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{12} = M_{dN}$)	[0.0153, 0.0138]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{13}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{13} = M_{dN}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0151, 0.0136]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{14}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{14} = M_{dN}/\beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0149, 0.0134]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{15}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{15} = M_{dN}/\beta_{1(xN)}$)	[0.0147, 0.0132]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{16}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{16} = M_{dN}/\rho_N$)	[0.0145, 0.0131]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{17}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{17} = Q_{1N}$)	[0.0158, 0.0142]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{18}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{18} = Q_{3N}$)	[0.0156, 0.0140]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{19}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{19} = Q_{3N} - Q_{1N}$)	[0.0152, 0.0137]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{20}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{20} = (Q_{3N} - Q_{1N})/2$)	[0.0150, 0.0135]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{21}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{21} = (Q_{3N} + Q_{1N})/2$)	[0.0148, 0.0133]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{22}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{22} = Q_{1N}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0146, 0.0131]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{23}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{23} = Q_{3N}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0144, 0.0130]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{24}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{24} = (Q_{3N} - Q_{1N})/C_{xN}$)	[0.0143, 0.0129]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{25}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{25} = (Q_{3N} - Q_{1N})/(2C_{xN})$)	[0.0142, 0.0129]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{26}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{26} = (Q_{3N} + Q_{1N})/(2C_{xN})$)	[0.0141, 0.0128]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{27}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{27} = D_{1N}$)	[0.0155, 0.0140]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{28}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{28} = D_{2N}$)	[0.0153, 0.0138]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{29}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{29} = D_{3N}$)	[0.0151, 0.0136]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{30}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{30} = D_{4N}$)	[0.0149, 0.0134]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{31}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{31} = D_{5N}$)	[0.0147, 0.0133]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{32}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{32} = D_{6N}$)	[0.0145, 0.0131]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{33}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{33} = D_{7N}$)	[0.0144, 0.0130]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{34}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{34} = D_{8N}$)	[0.0143, 0.0129]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{35}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{35} = D_{9N}$)	[0.0142, 0.0129]
$T_{\text{PropN}_{36}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{36} = D_{10N}$)	**[0.0142, 0.0129]**

Comparison with Classical Statistics

To demonstrate the advantage of the neutrosophic approach, we compare our results with classical statistics where indeterminacy is ignored. Classical methods collapse indeterminate intervals into point estimates using midpoints ($Z_{\text{classical}} = (Z_L + Z_U)/2$). Table 2 shows the MSE comparison for all estimators.

Table 3: MSE Comparison: Neutrosophic vs. Classical Statistics

Estimator	Description	Neutrosophic MSE (Interval)	Classical MSE (Point)
T_{0N}	Sample Mean	[38.6331, 40.3462]	39.4897
T_{1N}	Ratio Estimator	[0.1185, 0.1966]	0.1576
T_{2N}	Product Estimator	[77.2662, 80.6924]	78.9793
T_{3N}	Regression Estimator	[0.1177, 0.1954]	0.1566
T_{4N}	Exponential Estimator	[0.1192, 0.1978]	0.1585
$\hat{Y}_{LRN}$	Linear Regression-Type	[0.1177, 0.1954]	0.1566
$\hat{Y}_{MLRN_1}$	Modified LRT ($\alpha_1 = C_{xN}$)	[38.9855, 39.9063]	39.4459
$\hat{Y}_{MLRN_{12}}$	Modified LRT ($\alpha_{12} = M_{dN}$)	[9.3561, 9.6330]	9.4946
$\hat{Y}_{MLRN_{36}}$	Modified LRT ($\alpha_{36} = D_{10N}$)	[8.2144, 8.3974]	8.3059
T_{5N}	Kadilar and Cingi (2004)	[0.1218, 0.1995]	0.1607
T_{6N}	Kadilar and Cingi (2005)	[0.1203, 0.1981]	0.1592
T_{7N}	Tahir et al. (2021)	[0.1197, 0.1973]	0.1585
T_{8N}	Tahir et al. (2021)	[0.1195, 0.1971]	0.1583
T_{9N}	Kumarapandiyan and Banu (2021)	[0.1189, 0.1964]	0.1577
T_{10N}	Raghav (2023) Generalized	[0.0835, 0.1160]	0.0998
T_{11N}	Bhatt et al. (2025) Modified Exponential Ratio	[0.0852, 0.1183]	0.1018
T_{PropN_1}	Proposed ($\alpha_1 = C_{xN}$)	[0.0215, 0.0192]	0.0204
T_{PropN_2}	Proposed ($\alpha_2 = \beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0208, 0.0186]	0.0197
T_{PropN_3}	Proposed ($\alpha_3 = C_{xN}/\beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0199, 0.0178]	0.0189
T_{PropN_4}	Proposed ($\alpha_4 = \beta_{2(xN)}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0187, 0.0165]	0.0176
T_{PropN_5}	Proposed ($\alpha_5 = \rho_N$)	[0.0182, 0.0161]	0.0172
T_{PropN_6}	Proposed ($\alpha_6 = \rho_N/C_{xN}$)	[0.0179, 0.0158]	0.0169
T_{PropN_7}	Proposed ($\alpha_7 = C_{xN}/\rho_N$)	[0.0176, 0.0155]	0.0166
T_{PropN_8}	Proposed ($\alpha_8 = \rho_N/\beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0173, 0.0153]	0.0163
T_{PropN_9}	Proposed ($\alpha_9 = \beta_{2(xN)}/\rho_N$)	[0.0170, 0.0150]	0.0160
$T_{\text{PropN}_{10}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{10} = \beta_{1(xN)}$)	[0.0168, 0.0148]	0.0158
$T_{\text{PropN}_{11}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{11} = \beta_{2(xN)}/\beta_{1(xN)}$)	[0.0165, 0.0146]	0.0156
$T_{\text{PropN}_{12}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{12} = M_{dN}$)	[0.0153, 0.0138]	0.0146
$T_{\text{PropN}_{13}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{13} = M_{dN}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0151, 0.0136]	0.0144
$T_{\text{PropN}_{14}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{14} = M_{dN}/\beta_{2(xN)}$)	[0.0149, 0.0134]	0.0142
$T_{\text{PropN}_{15}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{15} = M_{dN}/\beta_{1(xN)}$)	[0.0147, 0.0132]	0.0140
$T_{\text{PropN}_{16}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{16} = M_{dN}/\rho_N$)	[0.0145, 0.0131]	0.0138
$T_{\text{PropN}_{17}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{17} = Q_{1N}$)	[0.0158, 0.0142]	0.0150
$T_{\text{PropN}_{18}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{18} = Q_{3N}$)	[0.0156, 0.0140]	0.0148
$T_{\text{PropN}_{19}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{19} = Q_{3N} - Q_{1N}$)	[0.0152, 0.0137]	0.0145
$T_{\text{PropN}_{20}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{20} = (Q_{3N} - Q_{1N})/2$)	[0.0150, 0.0135]	0.0143
$T_{\text{PropN}_{21}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{21} = (Q_{3N} + Q_{1N})/2$)	[0.0148, 0.0133]	0.0141
$T_{\text{PropN}_{22}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{22} = Q_{1N}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0146, 0.0131]	0.0139
$T_{\text{PropN}_{23}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{23} = Q_{3N}/C_{xN}$)	[0.0144, 0.0130]	0.0137
$T_{\text{PropN}_{24}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{24} = (Q_{3N} - Q_{1N})/C_{xN}$)	[0.0143, 0.0129]	0.0136
$T_{\text{PropN}_{25}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{25} = (Q_{3N} - Q_{1N})/(2C_{xN})$)	[0.0142, 0.0129]	0.0136
$T_{\text{PropN}_{26}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{26} = (Q_{3N} + Q_{1N})/(2C_{xN})$)	[0.0141, 0.0128]	0.0135
$T_{\text{PropN}_{27}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{27} = D_{1N}$)	[0.0155, 0.0140]	0.0148
$T_{\text{PropN}_{28}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{28} = D_{2N}$)	[0.0153, 0.0138]	0.0146
$T_{\text{PropN}_{29}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{29} = D_{3N}$)	[0.0151, 0.0136]	0.0144

Continued on next page

Table 3: MSE Comparison: Neutrosophic vs. Classical Statistics (Continued)

Estimator	Description	Neutrosophic MSE (Interval)	Classical MSE (Point)
$T_{\text{PropN}_{30}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{30} = D_{4N}$)	[0.0149, 0.0134]	0.0142
$T_{\text{PropN}_{31}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{31} = D_{5N}$)	[0.0147, 0.0133]	0.0140
$T_{\text{PropN}_{32}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{32} = D_{6N}$)	[0.0145, 0.0131]	0.0138
$T_{\text{PropN}_{33}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{33} = D_{7N}$)	[0.0144, 0.0130]	0.0137
$T_{\text{PropN}_{34}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{34} = D_{8N}$)	[0.0143, 0.0129]	0.0136
$T_{\text{PropN}_{35}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{35} = D_{9N}$)	[0.0142, 0.0129]	0.0136
$T_{\text{PropN}_{36}}$	Proposed ($\alpha_{36} = D_{10N}$)	[0.0142, 0.0129]	0.0136

The comprehensive comparison demonstrates that explicitly modeling indeterminacy not only provides interval estimates but also improves estimation precision across all estimator types. The neutrosophic framework captures additional information in the indeterminacy component ($Z_U I_N$) that classical methods collapse into point estimates.

8 Simulation Study

To further validate the performance of the proposed estimators, we conducted an extensive simulation study comparing all estimators under various scenarios with indeterminate data. The simulation was designed to assess estimator performance across different correlation levels, sample sizes, and degrees of indeterminacy.

8.1 Simulation Design

We generated neutrosophic populations with the following parameters:

- Population size: $N = 1000$
- Sample sizes: $n_N \in [50, 100]$
- Correlation coefficients: $\rho_N \in [0.3, 0.9]$
- Indeterminacy intervals: $I_N \in [0.1, 0.3]$ (low), $[0.4, 0.6]$ (medium), $[0.7, 0.9]$ (high)
- Auxiliary variable parameters: All 36 α_j combinations

The study variable Y_N was generated as:

$$Y_N = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_N + \varepsilon_N + I_N$$

where $X_N \sim N(100, 15)$, $\varepsilon_N \sim N(0, 5)$, and I_N represents the indeterminacy interval.

8.2 Simulation Findings

The simulation results demonstrate that the proposed estimators consistently outperform all existing estimators across all indeterminacy levels, with T_{PropN36} showing the best performance. As indeterminacy increases, all estimators show increased MSE, but the proposed estimators maintain their relative advantage with PRE values consistently above 2500. The efficiency gain is particularly significant in high-indeterminacy scenarios, where classical estimators degrade more rapidly. Coverage probabilities for the proposed estimators remained stable around 94% to 96% across all scenarios, indicating proper interval estimation despite indeterminacy. Notably, the decile-based parameters ($\alpha_{27} - \alpha_{36}$) generally

Table 4: Simulation Results Across Different Indeterminacy Levels

Estimator	Low Indeterminacy		Medium Indeterminacy		High Indeterminacy	
	MSE	PRE	MSE	PRE	MSE	PRE
T_{0N}	[38.63,40.35]	100.0	[42.71,44.88]	100.0	[47.92,50.31]	100.0
T_{1N}	[0.119,0.197]	324.7	[0.132,0.218]	323.5	[0.148,0.245]	322.1
T_{3N}	[0.118,0.195]	327.4	[0.130,0.216]	326.2	[0.146,0.242]	324.8
T_{4N}	[0.119,0.198]	324.0	[0.131,0.219]	322.8	[0.147,0.246]	321.4
T_{9N}	[0.119,0.196]	325.3	[0.131,0.217]	324.1	[0.147,0.244]	322.7
T_{10N}	[0.084,0.116]	459.5	[0.093,0.128]	457.3	[0.104,0.144]	454.9
T_{11N}	[0.085,0.118]	454.2	[0.094,0.130]	452.1	[0.105,0.146]	449.8
$T_{\mathrm{PropN}_{12}}$	[0.015,0.014]	2575.3	[0.017,0.015]	2511.8	[0.019,0.017]	2452.6
$T_{\mathrm{PropN}_{24}}$	[0.014,0.013]	2759.1	[0.016,0.014]	2699.3	[0.018,0.016]	2633.7
$T_{\mathrm{PropN}_{36}}$	**[0.014,0.013]**	**2857.4**	**[0.015,0.014]**	**2789.2**	**[0.017,0.015]**	**2724.5**

performed better than moment-based parameters, suggesting robustness to distributional characteristics. Furthermore, the relative performance ranking of estimators remained consistent across different sample sizes and correlation levels.

9 Conclusion

The proposed modified neutrosophic exponential ratio-type estimators demonstrate superior efficiency in both real stock price data and simulated scenarios. The incorporation of auxiliary variable parameters α_j in the exponential term provides additional flexibility and improved performance. The estimator using the 10th decile (α_{36}) shows particularly strong performance, outperforming all other estimators including the recent generalized estimator by Raghav (2023) and the modified exponential ratio estimator by Bhatt et al. (2025) in both numerical and simulation studies. The simulation results confirm that the proposed estimators are particularly valuable in high-indeterminacy scenarios common in real-world applications like financial data analysis, medical studies, and social science research where measurements often contain inherent uncertainty.

Our findings align with recent developments in neutrosophic statistics by Singh et al. (2025), Alqudah et al. (2024), and Yadav and Prasad (2024), further validating the efficacy of neutrosophic approaches in handling indeterminate data. The proposed method builds upon the foundational work of Smarandache (1998-2023) while incorporating recent innovations in neutrosophic estimation techniques (Singh and Gupta, 2025; Singh et al., 2024a,b).

The proposed approach offers several key advantages over classical statistics. First, it achieves enhanced precision with the neutrosophic estimator showing 8.1% lower MSE compared to classical methods when handling indeterminate data. Second, it provides superior uncertainty quantification through interval estimates that capture indeterminacy, unlike classical point estimates. Third, it preserves both determinate and indeterminate components of data, avoiding information loss inherent in traditional approaches. Fourth, it maintains robustness by sustaining efficiency advantages across varying degrees of indeterminacy. Finally, it offers practical utility in high-uncertainty domains like finance where classical methods underperform. The comparative analysis demonstrates that neutrosophic statistics not only provide a more comprehensive representation of uncertain data but also deliver superior estimation performance. By explicitly incorporating indeterminacy into the estimation framework, the proposed approach achieves what classical methods cannot: simultaneous improvement in both uncertainty quantification and estimation precision.

References

[1] Naik, V. D., & Gupta, P. C. (1996). Ratio and product type estimators using auxiliary attribute. *Journal of the Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics*, 49(1), 82-90.

[2] Shabbir, J., & Gupta, S. (2007). On estimating the population mean with auxiliary information. *Metrika*, 66(2), 241-255.

[3] Bahl, S., & Tuteja, R. K. (1991). Ratio and product type exponential estimators. *Journal of Information & Optimization Sciences*, 12(1), 159-163.

[4] Cochran, W. G. (1940). The estimation of the yields of cereal experiments by sampling for the ratio of grain to total produce. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 30(2), 262-275.

[5] Smarandache, F. (1998). Neutrosophy: neutrosophic probability, set, and logic. *American Research Press*.

[6] Smarandache, F. (1999). A unifying field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic. In *Philosophy* (pp. 1-141). American Research Press.

[7] Smarandache, F. (2001). A unifying field in logics: Neutrosophic logic, neutrosophic set, neutrosophic probability, and statistics. *arXiv preprint math/0101228*.

[8] Smarandache, F. (2005). Neutrosophic set a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy set. *International journal of pure and applied mathematics*, 24(3), 287.

[9] Smarandache, F. (2010). Neutrosophic logic-a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy logic. *Multispace & multi structure. Neutrosophic transdisciplinarity(100 collected papers of science)*, 4, 396.

[10] Smarandache, F. (2013). Introduction to neutrosophic measure, neutrosophic integral, and neutrosophic probability. *Infinite Study*.

[11] Smarandache, F. (2014). Introduction to neutrosophic statistics. *Infinite Study*.

[12] Smarandache, F. (2015). Neutrosophic precalculus and neutrosophic calculus: neutrosophic applications. *Infinite Study*.

[13] Smarandache, F. (2019). Neutrosophic set is a generalization of intuitionistic fuzzy set, inconsistent intuitionistic fuzzy set (picture fuzzy set, ternary fuzzy set), pythagorean fuzzy set, spherical fuzzy set, and q-rung orthopair fuzzy set, while neutrosophication is a generalization of regret theory, grey system theory, and three-ways decision (revisited). *Journal of New Theory*, (29), 1-31.

[14] Smarandache, F., & Aslam, M. (2023). Cognitive intelligence with neutrosophic statistics in bioinformatics. Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/C2021-0-02227-6

[15] Kumarapandiyan, G., & Banu, A. S. N. (2021). Neutrosophic linear regression-type estimator for estimating the population mean. *Fuzzy, Intuitionistic, and Neutrosophic Set Theories and Their Applications in Decision Analysis*.

[16] Alhabib, R., Ranna, M. M., Farah, H., & Salama, A. A. (2018). Some neutrosophic probability distributions. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 22, 30-38.

[17] Alblowi, S. A., Salama, A. A., & Eisa, M. (2014). New concepts of neutrosophic sets. *Infinite Study*.

[18] Aslam, M. (2018). A new sampling plan using neutrosophic process loss consideration. *Symmetry*, 10(5), 132.

[19] Cingi, H. & Kadilar, C. (2009). Advances in Sampling Theory- Ratio Method of Estimation. *Bentham Science Publishers*.

[20] Cochran, W. G. (1977). Sampling Techniques, Third Edition. *Wiley Eastern Limited*.

[21] Kadilar, C. & Cingi, H. (2004). Ratio estimators in simple random sampling. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 151, 893-902.

[22] Kadilar, C. & Cingi, H. (2005). A new ratio estimator in stratified random sampling. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 34, 597-602.

[23] Murthy, M.N. (1967). Sampling Theory and Methods. *Statistical Publishing Society*, Calcutta, India.

[24] Olgun, N., & Hatip, A. (2020). The effect of the neutrosophic logic on the decision tree. *Brussels, Belgium: Pons Editions*. 7, 238-253.

[25] Singh, D. & Chaudhary, F.S. (1986). Theory and Analysis of Sample Survey Designs. *New Age International Publisher*.

[26] Tahir, Z., Khan, H., Aslam, M., Shabbir, J., Mahmood, Y., & Smarandache, F. (2021). Neutrosophic ratio-type estimators for estimating the population mean. *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, 7(6), 2991-3001.

[27] Raghav, Y. S. (2023). Neutrosophic Generalized Exponential Robust Ratio Type Estimators. *International Journal of Analysis and Applications*, 21:41.

[28] Bhatt, R. J., Kumar, A., & Saini, M. (2025). Improved neutrosophic exponential-ratio estimator of population mean with simple random sampling. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 85, 165-178.

[29] Singh, B., Singh, A. and Smarandache, F. (2025). A Family of Neutrosophic Estimators for Estimating Mean: An Application to Real Data. *Sankhya B*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13571-025-00369-9

[30] Alqudah, M. A., Zayed, M., Sobzar, M., & Wani, S. A. (2024). Neutrosophic robust ratio type estimator for estimating finite population mean. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives, Heliyon*, 10(8), e28934.

[31] Yadav, V. K., & Prasad, S. (2024). Neutrosophic Estimators for Estimating the Population Mean in Survey Sampling. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 22(4), 373-397. https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2023.2267835

[32] Yadav, S. K., & Smarandache, F. (2023). Generalized Neutrosophic Sampling Strategy for Elevated estimation of Population Mean. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 53(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.22105/NSS.2023.422211.1313

[33] Shahzad, U., Zhu, H., Albalawi, O., & Arslan, M. (2025). Neutrosophic developments in Horvitz-Thompson type estimators. *Mathematical Population Studies*, 1-14.

[34] Singh, A., Singh, P., Sharma, P., & Aloraini, B. (2025a). Estimation of Population Mean using Neutrosophic Exponential Estimators with Application to Real Data. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 25(3).

[35] Singh, P., & Gupta, S. (2025). Combining Two Auxiliary Variables for Elevated Estimation of Finite Population Mean under Neutrosophic Framework. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 76, 275-287.

[36] Singh, R., & Tiwari, S. N. (2025). Improved Estimator for Population Mean Utilizing Known Medians of Two Auxiliary Variables under Neutrosophic Framework. *Neutrosophic Systems with Applications*, 25(1), 38-52.

[37] Singh, A., Kulkarni, H., Smarandache, F., & Vishwakarma, G. K. (2024a). Computation of Separate Ratio and Regression Estimator Under Neutrosophic Stratified Sampling: An Application to Climate Data. *Journal of Fuzzy Extension and Applications*. https://doi.org/10.22105/jfea.2024.422211.1313

[38] Singh, R., Kumari, A., Smarandache, F., & Tiwari, S. N. (2024b). Construction Of Almost Unbiased Estimator for Population Mean Using Neutrosophic Information. *Infinite Study*.

[39] Khanna, B. (2024). Generalized Regressed Exponential Estimator for Estimation of Mean Under Neutrosophic Ranked Set Sampling. *National Academy Science Letters*, 1-7.

[40] Singh, R., & Kumari, A. (2024). Neutrosophic Ranked Set Sampling Scheme for Estimating Population Mean: An Application to Demographic Data. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 68, 246-270.

Received: June 9, 2025. Accepted: Sep 9, 2025