

Parameter Estimation

- the problem of estimating a (time invariant) parameter x
- given the measurements $z(j) = h[j, x, w(j)]$ $j = 1, \dots, k$
- made in the presence of the disturbances (noises) $w(j)$
- find a function of the k observations, $\hat{x}(k) \triangleq \hat{x}[k, Z^k]$
- observations are denoted as $Z^k \triangleq \{z(j)\}_{j=1}^k$
- that estimates the value of x in some sense
- this function is called the **estimator** and its value is the **estimate**
- the estimation error corresponding to the estimate \hat{x} is $\tilde{x} \triangleq x - \hat{x}$
- alternate notation when k is fixed $\hat{x}(Z) \triangleq \hat{x}[k, Z^k]$



Models for Parameter Estimation

- two models used in estimation of a (time invariant) parameter:
- **nonrandom** - there is an unknown true value x_0 also called **non-Bayesian or Fisher approach**
- **random** - the parameter is a random variable with a prior pdf $p(x)$
- a realization of x according to $p(x)$ is assumed to have occurred,
- this value then stays constant during the measurement process
- called the **Bayesian approach**; described as below:
- starts with the prior pdf of the parameter from which one can obtain its posterior pdf (a posterior pdf) using Bayes' formula

$$p(x|Z) = \frac{p(Z|x)p(x)}{p(Z)} = \frac{1}{c}p(Z|x)p(x)$$

c is the normalization constant, which does not depend on x

- the posterior pdf can be used in several ways to estimate x



Models for Parameter Estimation

- Non-Bayesian (Likelihood Function) approach
- there is no prior pdf associated with the parameter
- one can not define a posterior pdf for it
- one has the pdf of the measurements conditioned on the parameter
- called the **likelihood function** (LF) of the parameter

$$\Lambda_Z(x) \triangleq p(Z|x) \quad \text{or} \quad \Lambda_k(x) \triangleq p(z^k|x)$$



Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Maximum A Posterior (MAP) Estimators

- **ML Estimator:** a common method of estimating nonrandom parameter
- maximizes the likelihood function
- x is an unknown constant
- $\hat{x}^{\text{ML}}(Z)$ being a function of the set of random observation Z is a random variable

$$\hat{x}^{\text{ML}}(Z) = \arg \max_x \Lambda_Z(x) = \arg \max_{\mathbb{R}^x} p(Z|x)$$

- MLE is the solution of the likelihood function

$$\frac{d\Lambda_Z(x)}{dx} = \frac{dp(Z|x)}{dx} = 0$$

Maximum A Posterior estimator (MAP)

- estimate for a random parameter
- maximization of the posterior pdf

$$\hat{x}^{\text{MAP}}(Z) = \arg \max_x p(x|Z) = \arg \max_x [P(Z|x)p(x)]$$

normalization constant is irrelevant for the maximization

- MAP estimate depends on the observations Z and through them on the realization of x is obviously a random variable



MLE vs. MAP Estimator with Gaussian Prior

- consider the single measurement
- $z = x + w$ of the unknown parameter x in the presence of the additive measurement noise w ,
- assumed to be a normally (Gaussian) distributed random variable with mean zero and variance σ^2 $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$
- first assume x is an unknown constant (no prior information about it is available)
- the likelihood function of x

$$\Lambda(x) = p(z|x) = \mathcal{N}(z; x, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(z-x)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$$

$$\hat{x}^{\text{ML}} = \arg \max_x \Lambda(x) = z$$

- the peak or mode of the above equation occurs at $x = z$



MLE vs. MAP Estimator with Gaussian Prior

- Next assume that the prior information about the parameter is that x is Gaussian with mean \bar{x} and variance σ_0^2

$$p(x) = \mathcal{N}(x; \bar{x}, \sigma_0^2)$$

assume x is independent of w

- the posterior pdf of x conditioned on the observation z is

$$p(z|x) = \frac{p(z|x)p(x)}{p(z)} = \frac{1}{c} e^{-\frac{(z-x)^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{(x-\bar{x})^2}{2\sigma_0^2}}$$

where $c = 2\pi\sigma\sigma_0 p(z)$ is the normalization constant independent of x

- normalization constant which guarantees that the pdf integrates to unity



MLE vs. MAP Estimator with Gaussian Prior

- it can be shown that the posterior pdf of x is (i.e., Gaussian)

$$p(x|z) = \mathcal{N}[x; \xi(z), \sigma_1^2] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} e^{-\frac{(x-\xi(z))^2}{2\sigma_1^2}}$$

$$\xi(z) \triangleq \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2} \bar{x} + \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2} z = \bar{x} + \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2} (z - \bar{x})$$

$$\sigma_1^2 \triangleq \frac{\sigma_0^2 \sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2}$$

- maximization of $p(x|z)$ with respect to x yields

$$\hat{x}^{\text{MAP}} = \xi(z)$$

- $\xi(z)$ is the MAP estimator for the random parameter x



MLE vs. MAP Estimator with Gaussian Prior

- MAP estimator for purely Gaussian problem is a weighted combination of
 - 1 z the MLE which is the peak (or mode) of the likelihood function
 - 2 \bar{x} which is the peak of the prior pdf of the parameter to be estimated

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}^{\text{MAP}} &= (\sigma_0^{-2} + \sigma^{-2})^{-1} \sigma_0^{-2} \bar{x} + (\sigma_0^{-2} + \sigma^{-2})^{-1} \sigma^{-2} z \\ &= (\sigma_0^{-2} + \sigma^{-2})^{-1} \left[\frac{\bar{x}}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{z}{\sigma^2} \right]\end{aligned}$$

- the weightings of the prior mean and the measurement are inversely proportional to their variances
- $\sigma_1^{-2} = \sigma_0^{-2} + \sigma^{-2}$
- the inverse variances (also called information) are additive
- this additive property of information holds in general when the information sources are independent



Bayesian vs. Non-Bayesian

- \hat{x}^{ML} based on non-Bayesian approach and \hat{x}^{MAP} based on Bayesian
- \hat{x}^{MAP} coincides with \hat{x}^{ML} for a certain prior pdf called a diffuse pdf

$$\lim_{\sigma_0 \rightarrow \infty} \xi(z) = z$$

- Sufficient statistic and likelihood equation
- if the likelihood function of a parameter can be decomposed as follows

$$\Lambda(x) \triangleq p(Z|x) = f_1[g(Z), x] f_2^{\text{I}}(Z)$$

- then the ML estimate of x depends only on the function $g(Z)$ called the sufficient statistic, rather than on the entire data set Z
- the sufficient statistic summarizes the information about x contained in the entire data



Example :Sufficient statistic and likelihood equation

- consider the scalar measurements $z(j) = x + w(j)$ $j = 1, \dots, k$
- if the noise components $w(j)$ $j = 1, \dots, k$ are independent and identically distributed zero-mean Gaussian random variables with variance σ^2

$$w(j) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad \text{then} \quad z(j) \sim \mathcal{N}(x, \sigma^2)$$

and conditioned on x , the observations $z(j)$ are mutually independent

- the likelihood function of x in terms of $Z^k \triangleq \{z(j), j = 1, \dots, k\}$ is then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_k(x) &\triangleq p(Z^k|x) \triangleq p[z(1), \dots, z(k)|x] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^k \mathcal{N}[z(j); x, \sigma^2] = ce^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^k [z(j)-x]^2} \end{aligned}$$



Example :Sufficient statistic and likelihood equation

- it can be rewritten into the product of two functions

$$\Lambda_k(x) = ce^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^k z(j)^2 + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} 2 \sum_{j=1}^k z(j)x - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} kx^2}$$

$$= ce^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^k z(j)^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} kx[x - \frac{2}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k z(j)]}$$

$$\triangleq f_2(Z) f_1[g(Z), x]$$

$$f_2(Z) \triangleq ce^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^k z(j)^2}$$

$$f_1[g(Z), x] \triangleq e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} kx[x - 2\bar{z}]}$$

$$g(Z) \triangleq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k z(j) \triangleq \bar{z}$$

- \bar{z} is the sufficient statistic for estimating x



Least Squares and Minimum Mean Square Error Estimation

- LS Estimator
- another common estimation procedure for nonrandom parameters
- given the scalar and nonlinear measurements $z(j) = h(j, x) + w(j)$
 $j = 1, \dots, k$
- the least squares estimator (LSE) of x is

$$\hat{x}^{\text{LS}}(k) = \arg \min_x \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k [z(j) - h(j, x)]^2 \right\}$$

- it is nonlinear LS problem
- if the function h is linear in x then it is linear LS problem
- does not make any assumptions about the "measurement errors" or "noises" $w(j)$



Least Squares and Minimum Mean Square Error Estimation

- if these are independent and identically distributed zero-mean Gaussian random variables, that is
- $w(j) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ then LSE coincides with the MLE under these assumptions
- $z(j) \sim \mathcal{N}[h(j, x), \sigma^2] \quad j = 1, \dots, k$
- likelihood function of x is then

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_k(x) &\triangleq p(Z^k|x) \triangleq p[z(1), \dots, z(k)|x] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^k \mathcal{N}[z(j); h(j, x), \sigma^2] = ce^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^k [z(j) - h(j, x)]^2}\end{aligned}$$

- the minimization of LSE problem is equivalent to the maximization of ML approach

