

Frequentist Inference Tools (Cont'd)

⑤ Pivotal statistics

- Recall we're trying to estimate $\theta = E_F(X)$
- would be desirable if we had $\hat{\theta} = f(\underline{x})$ such that it does not depend on F.
- (No need to estimate other parameters of F in order to estimate the parameter we want).
- A statistic w/ this property is called a pivotal statistic.

Example :

- Say we have two samples:
- $\underline{x}_1 = (x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, \dots, x_{1n_1})$; $\underline{x}_2 = (x_{21}, x_{22}, \dots, x_{2n_2})$
- n_1 is size of \underline{x}_1
cardinality
- Assume C to make things easy)
 - $x_{1i} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$ $i = 1, \dots, n_1$
 - $x_{2i} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(\mu_2, \sigma^2)$ $i = 1, \dots, n_2$
- . we wish to test hypothesis $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ null

- The difference of means test statistic

$\hat{\theta} = \bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_1$ has distribution:

$$\hat{\theta} \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right))$$

We don't know this.

(of course, we can use ① plug-in principle)

Digression:

Let X be a $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ r.v.

$x_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(\mu, \sigma^2) \leftarrow$

$$E\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n E(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu = n \cdot \mu$$

$$E\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot E\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = \frac{1}{n} \mu = \mu$$

$\rightarrow \bar{X}$ is unbiased estimator of μ

$$V\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot V\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n V(x_i) = \frac{n \cdot \sigma^2}{n^2}$$
$$= \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$

\rightarrow We could estimate σ^2 with $\hat{\sigma}^2$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (x_{1i} - \bar{x}_1)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} (x_{2i} - \bar{x}_2)^2\right]}{(n_1 + n_2 - 2)}$$

However, there is a better way.

Student instead of using $\hat{\theta}$, proposed testing the using

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_1}{\hat{\sigma} d}$$

$$\hat{\sigma} d = \hat{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$t \sim t_{n_1+n_2-2}$$

(No other parameter to estimate).

- Under H_0 , t statistic is pivotal. (σ^2 doesn't matter).

Then, $\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_1 \pm [t_{V, \alpha}]$. S_d is an exact confidence interval for $\mu_2 - \mu_1$.

$$V = n_1 + n_2 - 2$$

Level of significance.

no need to estimate σ^2 with $\hat{\sigma}^2$.

- Most times pivotality is not available, but we still got the other frequentist tools \Rightarrow .

Frequentist Optimality

Neyman-Pearson lemma for

optimal hypothesis testing.

(Simple Version) NP Lemma:

- Assumptions
- Trying to decide between 2 possible densities for observed data \underline{x} , a null hyp. density $f_0(\underline{x})$ and alternative density $f_1(\underline{x})$
 - A testing w/ $t(\underline{x})$ says which choice, 0 or 1, we will make having \underline{x} .

For any decision we make, there will be two associated errors α & β .

Type I

Type II.

Rejecting H_0 Incorrectly

choosing 1 when H_0 generated x .

$$\alpha = \Pr_{f_0} \{ T(x) = 1 \}$$

The null hypothesis is true

$$\beta = \Pr_{f_1} \{ T(x) = 0 \} - \text{Choosing 0 when } f_1 \text{ generated } x.$$

Incorrectly failing to reject H_0

Let $L(x)$ be the likelihood ratio

$$L(x) = f_1(x) / f_0(x)$$

and define testing rule $T_c(x)$ by

$$T_c(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } L(x) \geq c \\ 0 & \text{if } L(x) < c \end{cases}$$

a fixed cutoff value.

↑ Alternatively

$$T'_c(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \log L(x) \geq c' \\ 0 & \text{if } \log L(x) < c' \end{cases}$$

N-P Lemma: Only rules of this form can be optimal.

That is : $\alpha_c < \alpha$ and $\beta_c < \beta$ for some c
 where α, β are generated by any other kind
of rule.

Example : We'd like to get a c such that
 our Type I error rate is equal to α_0 and Type II

error β is minimized for $f_0 \sim N(0, 1)$

If we have sample $\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ $f_1 \sim N(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$

$$f_0(x_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot e^{\frac{-x_i^2}{2}} \quad [\text{Normal}(0, 1) \text{ pdf}]$$

$$\Rightarrow f_0(\underline{x}) = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right]^n \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e^{\frac{-x_i^2}{2}} = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right]^n \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$$

$$\text{If } A \text{ and } B \text{ are indep} \Rightarrow P(A \cap B) = P(A) \cdot P(B)$$

$$\Rightarrow f_1(x_i) = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right]^n \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e^{\frac{-(x_i - \frac{1}{2})^2}{2}} = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right]^n \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \frac{1}{2})^2}$$

$$L(\underline{x}) = \frac{f_1(\underline{x})}{f_0(\underline{x})} = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \frac{1}{2})^2}}{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}} = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \frac{1}{2})^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right]}$$

$$= e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left[-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{4} \right]} = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left[-n \cdot \bar{x} + \frac{n}{4} \right]}$$

$$= e^{\frac{1}{2} \left[n \bar{x} - \frac{n}{4} \right]}$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{\frac{1}{2} \left[n \bar{x} - \frac{n}{4} \right]} > c$$

Then,

$$L(\underline{x}) > c$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{2} n \bar{x} - \frac{n}{2} > \log(c) = c'$$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\bar{X} > C_2}$$

We must compare \bar{X} vs. a constant.

- Most Powerful hyp. test for 2 Normals is to compare \bar{X} vs. a constant.

Now, how to relate c , α and β for this test?

$$\alpha = \Pr(\bar{X} > c \mid \mu = 0)$$

Your typical z-statistic
we reject Null density is true.

$$\text{Then } z = \frac{\bar{X} - 0}{\sigma / \sqrt{n}} = \frac{\bar{X} \sqrt{n}}{\sigma} \sim N(0, 1)$$

$$\text{Thus, } \alpha = \Pr(\bar{X} > c \mid \mu = 0)$$

$$= \Pr(\bar{X} \sqrt{n} > c \sqrt{n} \mid \mu = 0)$$

$$= 1 - \Pr(\bar{X} \sqrt{n} \leq c \sqrt{n} \mid \mu = 0)$$

$$\alpha = 1 - \Pr(\bar{X} \leq c \sqrt{n})$$

Standard Normal Cdf.

Value of
a $N(0, 1)$
cdf
at
 $c \sqrt{n}$

$$\Rightarrow \Phi(c\sqrt{n}) = 1 - \alpha$$

$$c\sqrt{n} = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

"!"

$$c = \frac{\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

(Btw, in general

for 2 normals

$$c = \mu_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

$$\beta = P(\bar{x} < c \mid \mu = \frac{1}{2})$$

we do not
reject H_0

f. is true.

Then

$$\frac{\bar{x} - \frac{1}{2}}{1/\sqrt{n}} \sim N(0, 1)$$

following
same reasoning.

$$\beta = \Pr[(\bar{x} - \frac{1}{2}) \cdot \sqrt{n} \leq (c - \frac{1}{2}) \cdot \sqrt{n} \mid \mu = \frac{1}{2}]$$

$$\Rightarrow \beta = \Phi[(c - \frac{1}{2}) \cdot \sqrt{n}]$$

$$\Phi^{-1}(\beta) = (c - \frac{1}{2}) \sqrt{n}$$

Smallest type 2 error for a hyp. test
with type I error equal to α ,