

1. (a) Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $P(|X_{(1)} - a| > \varepsilon) = P(X_{(1)} > a + \varepsilon) + P(X_{(1)} < a - \varepsilon)$ . The last probability is zero. The first is  $[a/(a + \varepsilon)]^{bn}$  which goes to zero, and this proves the result.
- (b) Let  $z > 0$ . Then  $P[(X_{(n)} - a_n)/b_n \leq z] = P(X_{(n)} \leq b_n z - a_n)$  assuming  $b_n > 0$ . This can be written as

$$\left[ 1 - \left( \frac{a}{b_n z + a_n} \right)^b \right]^n$$

and we want to find  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  such that this converges to  $e^{-z^{-b}}$ . This is the limit, for instance, of the sequence  $[1 - z^{-b}/n]$  which can be obtained by setting  $a_n = 0$  and  $b_n = a n^{1/b}$ . We can now go back and make sure that all calculations are fine as long as  $z > 0$ .

- (c) The central limit theorem states that  $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - 3a/2)$  converges in distribution to  $N(0, 3a^2/4)$ . This is equivalent to

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - \mu) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, h(\mu))$$

where  $h(\mu) = \mu^2/3$ . When applying the delta method, we want to find  $g(\cdot)$  satisfying  $[g'(\mu)]^2 = 1/h(\mu)$  that is,  $g'(\mu) = \sqrt{3}/\mu$ . Hence,  $g(x) = \sqrt{3} \ln(x)$ ,  $x > 0$ .

2. (a) Consider two samples of size  $n$ ,  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2)$ . It is easy to see that

$$\frac{f(x_1, y_1 | \theta)}{f(x_2, y_2 | \theta)} = \exp \left[ \sum_i (x_{2i} - x_{1i}) \theta \right] \exp \left[ \sum_j (y_{2j} - y_{1j})/\theta \right]$$

and this does not depend on  $\theta$  iff  $\sum_i x_{2i} = \sum_i x_{1i}$  and  $\sum_j y_{2j} = \sum_j y_{1j}$ . Hence,  $T$  is minimal sufficient. When a most efficient estimator exists, it is sufficient. Since the minimal sufficient statistic is 2-dimensional, there cannot exist 1-dimensional statistics which are sufficient. Hence, there are no most efficient estimators of  $\theta$ .

- (b) It is clear that  $T_1 \sim G(n, \theta)$  and  $T_2 \sim G(n, 1/\theta)$ . Hence,  $E[T_1 T_2] = E[2\theta T_1 2T_2/\theta]/4 = (2n)^2/4 = n^2$  by independence. Hence,  $T_1 T_2 - n^2$  is a function of  $T$  which has zero expected value but is not identically zero, and this shows that  $T$  is not complete. In this case, there are no complete and sufficient statistics as either all minimal sufficient are complete, or there are no minimal sufficient statistics which are complete.
- (c) The likelihood is  $L(\theta | x, y) \propto \exp(-\theta \sum x_i - \sum y_j/\theta)$  and it's straightforward to see that the value of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $\ln L$  is precisely  $t_2/t_1$ . This shows the result.
- (d)  $E[T_2/T_1] = E[T_2]E[1/T_1]$  by independence. We already know that  $E[T_2] = n\theta$ . To obtain  $E[1/T_1]$  one computes the integral

$$\int_0^{+\infty} 1/t f(t) dt$$

where  $f(t)$  is the density of a  $G(n, \theta)$  distribution by recognizing the kernel of a  $G(n-1, \theta)$ . The end result is  $\theta/(n-1)$ . As such,  $E[U] = \theta^2 n/(n-1)$ , and hence  $U$  is a biased estimator of  $\theta^2$ .  $V = (n-1)U/n$  is therefore an unbiased estimator of  $\theta^2$ . (Alternatively, we can construct an F-Snedecor using  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .)

- (e) Clearly,  $T_2/n$  converges in probability to  $\theta$  by the weak law of large numbers, and hence in distribution. By the same reasoning,  $T_1/n$  converges in probability to  $1/\theta$  and, by the continuous mapping theorem,  $n/T_1$  converges in probability to  $\theta$ . Apply Slutsky to conclude that  $U = (T_2/n) \times (n/T_1)$  converges in distribution to  $\theta^2$ , and hence in probability, because convergence in probability to a constant is equivalent to convergence in distribution to a constant.
3. (a) For one observation of the model, we have  $L(\theta | x) \propto \theta(1-\theta)^{x-1}$ ,  $\ln L(\theta | x) = c + \ln \theta + (x-1) \ln(1-\theta)$ ,  $d \ln L(\theta | x)/d\theta = 1/\theta - (x-1)/(1-\theta)$ ,  $d^2 \ln L(\theta | x)/d\theta^2 = -1/\theta^2 - (x-1)/(1-\theta)^2$ , and hence the Fisher information about  $\theta$  in one observation is  $I_X(\theta) = 1/\theta^2 + (1/\theta - 1)/(1-\theta)^2 = 1/[\theta^2(1-\theta)]$ . The Jeffreys prior is thus  $\pi(\theta) \propto \theta^{-1} (1-\theta)^{-1/2}$ . For  $n$  observations, the likelihood is  $L(\theta | x_1, \dots, x_n) \propto \theta^n (1-\theta)^{t-n}$ , where  $t = \sum x_i$ . Following Bayes theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\theta | x_1, \dots, x_n) &\propto L(\theta | x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ &\propto \theta^n (1-\theta)^{t-n} \theta^{-1} (1-\theta)^{-1/2} \\ &\propto \theta^{n-1} (1-\theta)^{t-n-1/2} \\ &\propto \text{Be}(\theta | n, t - n + 1/2). \end{aligned}$$

- (b) The posterior mean is  $n/(t + 1/2)$ , whereas the method of moments estimate is  $n/t$ . If  $\theta$  is large and  $n$  is small, it's not unlikely that  $t = n$ , which will result in an unreasonable estimate of 1 for the probability of success using the method of moments estimate. This will not happen using the posterior mean.
- (c)  $E[X_{n+1} | x_1, \dots, x_n] = E[E[X_{n+1} | \theta] | x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Since  $E[X_{n+1} | \theta] = 1/\theta$ , we have to compute

$$\begin{aligned} E[1/\theta | x_1, \dots, x_n] &= \int_0^1 \theta^{-1} \text{Be}(\theta | n, t - n + 1/2) d\theta \\ &= \frac{B(n-1, t-n+1/2)}{B(n, t-n+1/2)} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(t+1/2)}{\Gamma(n) \Gamma(t-n+1/2)} \frac{\Gamma(n-1) \Gamma(t-n+1/2)}{\Gamma(t-1+1/2)} \\ &= \frac{t-1/2}{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact  $\Gamma(t) = (t-1)\Gamma(t-1)$ .