

# hmwrk 8-Beimnet Taye

2023-03-15

## P1

1.

- First let:
- $Z_i = \frac{1}{X_i}$  and  $Z = \frac{1}{\bar{X}}$
- Then we get:
- $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i (Z_i)$
- Since the CLT always holds no matter how Z is distributed, with a large enough sample the plug in estimator for Z will have a sampling distribution distributed in the following fashion:
- final:  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(E[Z], \sqrt{\frac{V[Z]}{n}})$

2.

- The asymptotic variance is  $V[\frac{1}{\bar{X}}]$

3.

- Plug in:  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i (\frac{1}{\bar{X}_i} - \hat{\mu})^2$

4.

- Plug in:  $\sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_i (\frac{1}{\bar{X}_i} - \hat{\mu})^2}{n}}$

5.

```
CI <- function(X) {  
  inv <- 1/X  
  n <- length(inv)  
  mu <- mean(inv)  
  SE <- sd(inv)/sqrt(n)  
  CI <- c(mu - 1.96*SE, mu + 1.96*SE)  
  return(CI)  
}  
  
CI(rnorm(500))
```

```
## [1] -0.09046914  1.34657489
```

## P2

### 1.

- First, The expectation, and thus its plug-in estimator, the mean, of a binary variable is just its probability. So:
- $\mu_1 = E[Y|W = 1] = P(Y|W = 1)$
- From here we can use this conditional probability identity:
- $P(Y|W = 1) = \frac{P(W=1,Y)}{P(W=1)}$
- Since we already defined for binary variables Y and W that their probabilities equal their expected values we arrive at:
- $E[Y|W = 1] = \frac{E[WY]}{E[W]}$
- Using plug in estimators for the expectations we arrive at:
- $= \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_i WY}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_i W}$
- The generalized notation with indicator functions work since the indicator function of a binary value for value w:  $1_w(W)$  returns 1 if inputted W equals the set condition w and returns 0 if that statement is not true. Thus the average of an indicator function of a binary variable is just the probability of the set condition, in this case w.
- $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i 1_w(W) = P(W = w)$

### 2.

- We can code them into R, generate samples and apply these estimators. Repeat this multiple times to derive sampling distributions of the numerator and denominators and see if they become more normal and the variances decrease as you increase the sample size.

### 3.

- We can code  $\hat{\mu}_w$  into R, generate a sample and apply this estimator. Repeat this multiple times to derive a sampling distribution of the estimate and see if it becomes more normal and the variance decreases as you increase the sample size.

### 4.

- We can code  $\hat{\psi}$  into R, generate a sample and apply this estimator. Repeat this multiple times to derive a sampling distribution of the estimate and see if it becomes more normal and the variance decreases as you increase the sample size.

## P3.

### 1.

```
estimator = function(data) {  
  n = nrow(data)  
  # estimate required sample averages  
  data %>%  
  mutate( # to handle rare case where all W=0 or =1  
    W = factor(W, levels=c(0,1))  
  ) %>%
```

```
group_by(W, .drop=F) %>%
  summarize(
    EY_W = mean(Y),
    EW = n()/n
  ) %>%
  {
    EY_W[W==1] / EY_W[W==0]
  }
}
```

```
bootstrap_estimator = function(data, esti, B=100) {
  estimate = esti(data)
  size <- nrow(data)
  bootstraps <- map_df(1:B,function(.x){
    boot_ratio <- slice_sample(data,n = size, replace = TRUE) %>%
      esti()
    return(tibble(
      error = estimate - boot_ratio
    ))
  })

  tibble(
    estimate = estimate, # the point estimate
    ci_a = estimate - quantile(bootstraps$error, probs = 0.975), # lower bound of the CI
    ci_b = estimate - quantile(bootstraps$error, probs = 0.025) # upper bound of the CI
  )
}
```

2.

```
DGP_ratio <- function(n) {
  tibble(W = rbern(n, 0.75),
    Y = rbern(n,0.75))
}

test_DGP <- DGP_ratio(100)
```

3.

```
true_ratio <- estimator(DGP_ratio(100000)) #should be 1
true_ratio
```

```
## [1] 0.9991845
```

4.

```
coverage <- function(data, esti,n=100, rep = 10){
  true_ratio <- esti(data(100000))
  samples <- map_df(1:rep,function(.x){
    dataset <- slice_sample(data(n),n = nrow(data(n)),replace = T)
    return(bootstrap_estimator(data= dataset,esti, B=100))
  })
  samples %>%
    mutate(cover = ifelse(true_ratio >= ci_a & true_ratio <= ci_b,1,0)) %$% {
      mean(cover)
    }
}
```

```
test <- coverage(DGP_ratio,estimator, rep = 500)
test
```

```
## [1] 0.794
```

5.

```
estimator_delta = function(data) {
  n = nrow(data)
  # estimate required sample averages
  data %>%
  mutate( # to handle rare case where all W=0 or =1
    W = factor(W, levels=c(0,1))
  ) %>%
  group_by(W, .drop=F) %>%
  summarize(
    EY_W = mean(Y),
    EW = n()/n
  ) %$%
  c(EY_W[W==0], EY_W[W==1], EW[W==0], EW[W==1]) %>%
  c(mu0, mu1, pi0, pi1)
  # construct the plugins
  rr = mu1/mu0
  avar = rr^2 * ((1-mu0)/(mu0*pi0) + (1-mu1)/(mu1*pi1)) # from math
  se = sqrt(avar / n)
  # return result
  tibble(
    estimate=rr,
    ci_a=rr-2*se,
    ci_b=rr+2*se
  )
}
```

```
coverage_delta <- function(data,esti=estimator_delta,rep = 10, n = 100) {
  true_ratio <- estimator(data(10000))
  map_df(1:rep,function(.x){
```

```

    esti(data(n))
  }
) %>%
  mutate(cover = ifelse(true_ratio >= ci_a & true_ratio <= ci_b,1,0)) %$% {
    mean(cover)
  }
}

test_delta <- coverage_delta(DGP_ratio, rep = 500)
test_delta

```

```
## [1] 0.936
```

6.

- Deriving the formula has better coverage on average of the true value while the bootstrap has worse coverage of the true value but is easier to implement since you don't have to do any mathematical derivations.