MAST20005 Exam Solution, Semester 2, 2014

1. (a)

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n; \theta) \propto \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i}{\theta^{2n}} \exp\{-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i/\theta\}$$
$$= \left\{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right\} \exp\{-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i/\theta - 2n\log\theta\}$$

and the factorization theorem yields that $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ is sufficient for θ .

(b) The log-likelihood and score functions are, respectively:

$$\ell(\theta) = -2n\log(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i/(\theta)$$

$$s(\theta) = \frac{\partial \ell(\theta)}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{2n}{\theta} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i}{\theta^2}$$

(c) Solving $s(\theta) = 0$ gives the MLE $\hat{\theta} = \overline{X}/2$.

(d)

$$-\frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2} = -\frac{2n}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{\theta^3},$$

which has expected value

$$E\left(\frac{\partial^2 \ell(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2}\right) = -\frac{2n}{\theta^2} + \frac{2n(2\theta)}{\theta^3} = \frac{2n}{\theta^2}.$$

Hence the Rao-Crámer lower bound is $\theta^2/2n$.

- (e) The maximum likelihood estimate is $\hat{\theta} = 10.5/2 = 5.25$ and an approximate 95% confidence interval is $5.25 \pm 1.96 \times \sqrt{5.25^2/70} = (4.02, 6.48)$.
- 2. (a) The method of moments estimator is obtained by solving

$$\sum_{i} x_i/n = E(X) = \alpha\beta$$
$$\sum_{i} x^2/n = Var(X) + [E(X)]^2 = \alpha\beta^2 + \alpha^2\beta^2.$$

Let $\overline{X} = \sum_i X_i/n$ and $\overline{X}^2 = \sum_i X_i^2/n$. Then the solution is

$$\hat{\alpha} = \overline{X}^2 / (\overline{X^2} - \overline{X}), \quad \hat{\beta} = (\overline{X}^2 - \overline{X}) / \overline{X}.$$

- (b) Estimates are $\hat{\alpha} = 1.25$ and $\hat{\beta} = 3.38$.
- 3. The posterior distribution is

$$f(\lambda|x_1,\ldots,x_n) \propto \lambda^{\sum_i x_i + \alpha - 1} e^{-(n+\beta)\lambda}$$

1

This is the form of a Gamma distribution. So we can conclude that the posterior distribution is a Gamma distribution, namely $Gamma(\alpha + \sum_i x_i, \beta + n)$. The minimiser of the squared loss is the posterior mean, which can be expressed by the weighted average

$$\frac{\alpha + \sum_{i} x_i}{\beta + n} = \frac{2 + 138}{2 + 10} = 11.7.$$

4. (a) The cdf of X_i is $P(X_i \le x_i) = 1 - e^{-x_i/\theta}$. Thus,

$$P(\min\{X_1, \dots, X_n\} > x) = P(X_1 > x, \dots, X_n > x)$$
(1)

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(X_i > x) \tag{2}$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp(-x/\theta) = \exp(-xn/\theta).$$
 (3)

- (b) Since $E(W)=\theta/n$, an unbiased estimator is T=nW. Then $Var(T)=n^2Var(W)=n^2\theta^2/n^2=\theta^2$, while the C-R lower bound is θ^2/n .
- (c) Note that $n\theta \times W/\theta$ follows Exp(1). The inverse cdf for Exp(1) is

$$F^{-1}(p) = -\ln(1-p), \quad 0 \le p < 1.$$

Thus, $F^{-1}(0.025) = 0.0253$ and $F^{-1}(0.975) = 3.689$. Since

$$0.95 = P\left(0.0253 \le \frac{nW}{\theta} \le 3.689\right),\,$$

a 95% CI for θ is [nw/0.0253, nw/3.689].

- (d) Since $x_{(1)} = 0.16$ a 95% confidence interval for θ is [0.217, 31.6].
- 5. (a) $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ versus $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

$$s_p^2 = \frac{(29 \times .71^2 + 29 \times .89^2)}{60 - 2} = 5.08^2$$

Then

$$t = \frac{8.63 - 10.97}{5.08\sqrt{1/30 + 1/30}} = -1.784$$

Now, $t_{0.025}(58) = -2.002$ so that at the 5% level of significance we cannot reject H_0 .

- (b) Since $0.025 < P(T_{58} \le -1.784) < 0.05$, we have 0.05 < p-value < 0.1
- (c) Consider the test statistic

$$f = \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2} = \frac{0.071^2}{0.089^2} = 0.6364.$$

Under the null hypothesis this is drawn from a F(29,29) distribution so we reject $H_0: \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$ in favour of $H_1: \sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$ at the 5% level if f < 0.476 or f > 2.101. Thus we cannot reject H_0 at the 5% level of significance.

- 6. (a) $H_0: X \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Pois}(2)$, the goodness-of-fit statistic is computed by $q = \sum (o e)^2/e \approx 3.21$ which is smaller than the critical value $c_{0.95}(\mathcal{X}_5^2) = 11.07$. Therefore, there is not enough evidence to reject the theoretical model proposed by the researcher.
 - (b) Since we estimate an additional unknown parameter (λ), the goodness-of-fit statistics follows a chisquare distribution with 4 degrees of freedom. Since $c_{0.95}(\mathcal{X}_4^2) = 9.49$, we cannot reject the theoretical model proposed by the researcher.
- 7. (a) There are 3 negative signs, so the p-value is $P(X \le 3; n = 8, p = 0.5) = 0.36$ and at the 5% level we cannot reject H_0 .
 - (b) Ranks are

Sum of the ranks of Carb-replacement group is thus 50. Under the null hypothesis, this has mean

$$\mu = \frac{8(8+8+1)}{2} = 68,$$

and variance

$$\sigma_W^2 = \frac{8 \times 8 \times (17)}{12} = 9.52^2.$$

Thus

$$z = \frac{50 - 68}{9.52} = -1.8907,$$

and $z_{0.975} = -1.96$, so we cannot reject H_0 at the 5% level of significance.

- 8. (a) F = 0.2141 which has an F(4,9) distribution and the p-value is 0.9240.
 - (b) F = 38.8982 which has an F(2, 13) distribution. The p-value is approximately 0. F = 4.8239 which has an F(2, 13) distribution. The p-value is 0.0271.
 - (c) $\hat{\sigma}^2 = 0.01289$
 - (d) At the 5% level there was no significant interaction between type of coal and NaOH concentration. There was a significant difference in the mean acidity for both coal type and ethanolic NaOH concentration.
 - (e) Reject H_0 when $|T| > t_{0.975}(15) = 2.13145$, where the statistic T is defined by

$$T = \frac{\overline{X}_{1.} - (\overline{X}_{2.} + \overline{X}_{3.})/2}{S_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} + \frac{1}{n_3}}},$$

where

$$S_p = \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) S_i^2$$

and S_i^2 's denotes the sample variance in group *i*. The above *T* statistic follows the t-student distribution with n - k = 15 degrees of freedom under H_0 . This

can shown by noting that under then null hypothesis,

$$Z = \frac{\overline{X}_{1.} - (\overline{X}_{2.} + \overline{X}_{3.})/2}{\sigma \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} + \frac{1}{n_3}}} \sim N(0, 1)$$

and $U = (n-k)S_p^2/\sigma^2 \sim \mathcal{X}_{n-k}$ independently. Thus, $Z/\sqrt{U/(n-k)} \sim t_{n-k}$.