Homework 7

Darnell Chen

2024-11-04

Problem 7.2.6

$$\sigma_{\bar{X}} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{1.5}{7}$$

a)
$$z = \frac{X-\mu}{\sigma_{\bar{X}}} = \frac{10-8.2}{\frac{1.5}{7}} = 8.4$$

 $P(Z < 8.4) \approx 1$ since the z-score is so high.

Thus, the probability that the average time waiting in line is less than 10 minutes is approximately 1.

b)
$$z = \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma_{\bar{X}}} = \frac{5 - 8.2}{\frac{1.5}{7}} \approx -14.9333$$

$$P(-14.933 < X < 8.4) = P(X < 8.4) - P(X > -14.933) \approx 1 - 0 = 1$$

Thus, the probability that the average time waiting in line between 5 and 10 minutes is approximately 1.

c)
$$z = \frac{X-\mu}{\sigma_{\bar{X}}} = \frac{6-8.2}{\frac{1.5}{7}} \approx -10.267$$

$$P(Z < -10.267) \approx 4.979314 \times 10^{-25} \approx 0$$

Thus, the probability that the average waiting time in line is less than 6 minutes is approximately 0.

```
pnorm(10, mean=8.2, sd=(1.5/7))
```

[1] 1

```
pnorm(10, mean=8.2, sd=(1.5/7)) - pnorm(5, mean=8.2, sd=(1.5/7))
```

[1] 1

```
pnorm(6, mean=8.2, sd=(1.5/7))
```

[1] 4.979314e-25

Problem 7.3.7

 $a)\,\hat{\theta} = \tfrac{425 + 431 + 416 + 419 + 421 + 436 + 418 + 410 + 431 + 433 + 423 + 426 + 410 + 435 + 436 + 428 + 411 + 426 + 409 + 437 + 422 + 428 + 413 + 416}{24} \approx 423.33$

423.33
$$b) S = \sqrt{S^2} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{24} (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{n-1}} = \sqrt{\frac{(425 - 423.33)^2 + (431 - 423.33)^2 + \dots + (413 - 423.33)^2 + (416 - 423.33)^2}{23}} \approx \sqrt{82.49275} \approx 9.082552$$

c)
$$\hat{\sigma}_{ar{X}}=rac{S}{\sqrt{n}}=\sqrt{rac{S^2}{n}}pprox\sqrt{rac{82.49275}{24}}pprox1.853968$$

d)
$$\frac{423+425}{2} = 424$$

e) $\frac{7}{24}$ Notably, the following thicknesses are larger than 430: 431 431 433 435 436 436

data <- c(425, 431, 416, 419, 421, 436, 418, 410, 431, 433, 423, 426, 410, 435, 436, 428, 411, 426, 409 mean(data)

[1] 423.3333

sqrt(var(data))

[1] 9.082552

sqrt(var(data)/length(data))

[1] 1.853968

sort(data)

[1] 409 410 410 411 413 416 416 418 419 421 422 423 425 426 426 428 428 431 431 ## [20] 433 435 436 436 437

median(data)

[1] 424

Problem 7.3.9

a) $E[\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2] = E[\bar{X}_1] - E[\bar{X}_2]$ $= E[\frac{X_{1,1} + X_{1,2} + \dots + X_{1,n_1}}{n_1}] - E[\frac{X_{2,1} + X_{2,2} + \dots + X_{2,n_2}}{n_2}]$ $= \frac{1}{n_1} E[X_{1,1} + X_{1,2} + \dots + X_{1,n_1}] - \frac{1}{n_2} E[X_{2,1} + X_{2,2} + \dots + X_{2,n_1}]$ $= \frac{1}{n_1} (\mu_1 + \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_1) - \frac{1}{n_2} (\mu_2 + \mu_2 + \dots + \mu_2)$ $= \frac{1}{n_1} n_1 \mu_1 - \frac{1}{n_2} n_2 \mu_2$ $= \mu_1 - \mu_2$

 $se(X_1 - X_2) = \sqrt{V(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)}$ $= \sqrt{V(\bar{X}_1) + V(\bar{X}_2)}$ $= \sqrt{V(\frac{X_{1,1} + X_{1,2} + \dots + X_{1,n_1}}{n_1}) + V(\frac{X_{2,1} + X_{2,2} + \dots + X_{2,n_2}}{n_2})}$ $= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1^2}V(X_{1,1} + X_{1,2} + \dots + X_{1,n_1}) + \frac{1}{n_2^2}V(X_{2,1} + X_{2,2} + \dots + X_{2,n_1})}$ $= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1^2}(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_1^2) + \frac{1}{n_2^2}(\sigma_2^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \dots + \sigma_2^2)}$ $= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1^2}n_1\sigma_1^2 + \frac{1}{n_2^2}n_2\sigma_2^2}$ $= \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}$

c) For an unbiased estimator $E[s_P^2] = \sigma^2$ has to be true:

$$\begin{split} E[S_p^2] &= E[\frac{(n_1-1)S_1^2 + (n_2-1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}] \\ &= E[\frac{(n_1-1)S_1^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}] + E[\frac{(n_2-1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}] \\ &= \frac{n_1-1}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} E[S_1^2] + \frac{n_2-1}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} E[S_2^2] \\ &= \frac{n_1-1}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \sigma^2 + \frac{n_2-1}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \sigma^2 \\ &= \frac{n_1 + n_2 - 2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \sigma^2 \\ &= \sigma^2 \end{split}$$

Since $E[S_p^2] = \sigma^2$, it is thus an unbiased estimator of σ^2 .

Problem 7.3.11

a) We know that X_1 and X_2 represent the sample of students who own an Apple Computer at ASU and VT respectively, while n_1 and n_2 are the respective sample sizes. Thus, we know that the probability of choosing a student who owns an Apple computer at the two schools are $\frac{X_1}{n_1}$ and $\frac{X_2}{n_2}$ respectively. To show this is unbiased estimator for $p_1 - p_2$ we can take its expected value:

$$\begin{split} E[\frac{X_1}{n_1} - \frac{X_2}{n_2}] &= E[\frac{X_1}{n_1}] - E[\frac{X_2}{n_2}] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_1} E[X_1] - \frac{1}{n_2} E[X_2] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_1} n_1 p_1 - \frac{1}{n_2} n_2 p_2 \quad \text{,This comes from mean in binomial distribution} \\ &= p_1 - p_2 \end{split}$$

Since $E\left[\frac{X_1}{n_1} - \frac{X_2}{n_2}\right] = p_1 - p_2$, it is therefore an unbiased estimator.

 $\sigma = \sqrt{V(\frac{X_1}{n_1} - \frac{X_2}{n_2})}$ $= \sqrt{V(\frac{X_1}{n_1}) + V(\frac{X_2}{n_2})}$ $= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1^2}V(X_1) + \frac{1}{n_2^2}V(X_2)}$ $= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1^2}n_1p_1(1-p_1) + \frac{1}{n_2^2}n_2p_2(1-p_2)} \quad , \text{ np(1-p) is variance of binom. distribution}$ $= \sqrt{\frac{p_1(1-p_1)}{n_1} + \frac{p_2(1-p_2)}{n_2}}$

c) Since we know that $p_1 = \frac{X_1}{n_1}$ and $p_2 = \frac{X_2}{n_2}$ from part (a), we can thus plug them into the equation we got from part (b):

$$\sqrt{\frac{\frac{X_1}{n_1}(1-\frac{X_1}{n_1})}{n_1} + \frac{\frac{X_2}{n_2}(1-\frac{X_2}{n_2})}{n_2}} = \sqrt{\frac{\frac{X_1}{n_1} - \frac{X_1^2}{n_1^2}}{n_1} + \frac{\frac{X_2}{n_2} - \frac{X_2^2}{n_2^2}}{n_2}}{n_2}}$$
$$= \sqrt{X_1 - X_1^2 + X_2 - X_2^2}$$

Thus we get: $\sqrt{X_1 - X_1^2 + X_2 - X_2^2}$, where we can simply plug in our values X_1 and X_2 .

d)
$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{X_1}{n_1} - \frac{X_2}{n_2} = \frac{150}{200} - \frac{185}{250} = 0.01.$$

Our point estimate for $p_1 - p_2$ is thus 0.01.

$$\hat{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{p_1(1-p_1)}{n_1} + \frac{p_2(1-p_2)}{n_2}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{0.75(1-0.75)}{200} + \frac{0.74(1-0.74)}{250}}$$

$$\approx \sqrt{0.0009375 + 0.0007696}$$

$$\approx 0.041317$$

Problem 7.4.1

We know that the function for geometric distribution is: $f(x) = P(X = x) = p(1 - p)^{x-1}$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Its likelihood function is then the product of all possible x up to n:\

$$L(p) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1-p)^{x_i-1} p = (1-p)^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i-1)} p^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} 1} = (1-p)^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i-1)} p^n \setminus l(p) = \ln(L(p)) = \ln((1-p)^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i-1)} p^n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i-1) \ln(1-p) + n \cdot \ln(p)$$

Now that we have the likelihood function l(p), we want to take its derivative to find where it maximizes at:

$$\frac{\partial l(p)}{\partial p} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\right] \cdot ln(1 - p) + n \frac{\partial}{\partial p} ln(p)$$

$$= \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)\right] \cdot \left(\frac{-1}{1 - p}\right) + n \frac{1}{p}$$

$$= \frac{n}{p} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)}{1 - p}$$

We want to set the derivative to 0 to find where the MLE function maximizes p:

$$\frac{n}{p} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)}{1 - p} = 0$$

$$\frac{n}{p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)}{1 - p}$$

$$\frac{(1 - p)(n)}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)$$

$$(1 - p)(n) = p \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)$$

$$n - np = p \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)$$

$$n = np + p \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)$$

$$n = p[n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)]$$

$$\frac{n}{p} = n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)$$

$$\frac{p}{n} = \frac{1}{n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)}$$

$$p = \frac{n}{n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - 1)}$$

Thus, we get our mean likelihood estimator for p:

$$\hat{p}_{MLE} = \frac{n}{n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - 1)}.$$

Problem 2

A) to check that either estimator is unbiased, we want to see if $E[\hat{\mu_1}] = \mu$ or $E[\hat{\mu_2}] = \mu$. We'll first check the former:

$$E[\hat{\mu_1}] = E[\frac{\bar{X}_n + \bar{Y}_m}{2}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}E[\bar{X}_n + \bar{Y}_m]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}E[\bar{X}_n] + \frac{1}{2}E[\bar{Y}_m]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}E[\frac{\sum_{i=0}^n X_i}{n}] + \frac{1}{2}E[\frac{\sum_{j=0}^m Y_j}{m}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n}E[\sum_{i=0}^n X_i] + \frac{1}{2m}E[\sum_{j=0}^m Y_j]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n}\mu + \frac{1}{2m}\mu\mu$$

$$= \frac{\mu}{2} + \frac{\mu}{2}$$

$$= \mu$$

Since $E[\hat{\mu}_1] = \mu$ it is an unbiased estimator.\ Next we will check if $E[\hat{\mu}_2]$ is unbiased:\

$$\begin{split} E[\hat{\mu_2}] &= E[\frac{n \cdot \bar{X}_n + m \cdot \bar{Y}_m}{n + m}] \\ &= \frac{1}{n + m} E[n \cdot \bar{X}_n + m \cdot \bar{Y}_m] \\ &= \frac{1}{n + m} E[n \cdot \bar{X}_n] + \frac{1}{n + m} E[m \cdot \bar{Y}_m] \\ &= \frac{n}{n + m} E[\frac{\sum_{i=0}^n X_i}{n}] + \frac{m}{n + m} E[\frac{\sum_{j=0}^m Y_j}{m}] \\ &= \frac{1}{n + m} E[\sum_{i=0}^n X_i] + \frac{1}{n + m} E[\sum_{j=0}^m Y_j] \\ &= \frac{1}{n + m} n\mu + \frac{1}{n + m} m\mu \\ &= \frac{\mu(n + m)}{n + m} \\ &= \mu \end{split}$$

Since $E[\hat{\mu}_2] = \mu$, our second estimator is also unbiased. Thus $\hat{\mu}_1$ and $\hat{\mu}_2$ are both unbiased.

B) Let's begin with the variance of $\hat{\mu_1}$:

$$\begin{split} V[\hat{\mu_1}] &= V[\frac{\bar{X}_n + \bar{Y}_m}{2}] \\ &= \frac{1}{4}V[\bar{X}_n + \bar{Y}_m] \\ &= \frac{1}{4}V[\bar{X}_n] + \frac{1}{4}V[\bar{Y}_m] \\ &= \frac{1}{4}V[\frac{\sum_{i=0}^n X_i}{n}] + \frac{1}{4}V[\frac{\sum_{j=0}^m Y_j}{m}] \\ &= \frac{1}{4n^2}V[\sum_{i=0}^n X_i] + \frac{1}{4m^2}V[\sum_{j=0}^m Y_j] \\ &= \frac{1}{4n^2}n\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{4m^2}m\sigma^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4n}\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{4m}\sigma^2 \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{4}(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m}) \end{split}$$

Then the variance of $\hat{\mu}_2$:

$$\begin{split} V[\hat{\mu_2}] &= V[\frac{n \cdot \bar{X}_n + m \cdot \bar{Y}_m}{(n+m)}] \\ &= \frac{1}{(n+m)^2} V[n \cdot \bar{X}_n + m \cdot \bar{Y}_m] \\ &= \frac{1}{(n+m)^2} V[n \cdot \bar{X}_n] + \frac{1}{(n+m)^2} V[m \cdot \bar{Y}_m] \\ &= \frac{n^2}{(n+m)^2} V[\bar{X}_n] + \frac{m^2}{(n+m)^2} V[\bar{Y}_j] \\ &= \frac{n^2}{(n+m)^2} \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \frac{m^2}{(n+m)^2} \frac{\sigma^2}{m} \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n+m} \end{split}$$

C)

$$\begin{split} \frac{MSE(\hat{\mu_1})}{MSE(\hat{\mu_2})} &= \frac{V(\hat{\mu_1})}{V(\hat{\mu_2})} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\sigma^2}{4}(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m})}{\frac{\sigma^2}{n+m}} \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{4}(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m})(\frac{n+m}{\sigma^2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m})(\frac{n+m}{1}) \\ &= \frac{n+m}{4} \cdot (\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m}) \\ &= \frac{n+m}{4} \cdot (\frac{n+m}{nm}) \\ &= \frac{(n+m)^2}{4nm} \end{split}$$

d) Using the formula for part 3, we know that if $\frac{(n+m)^2}{4nm} < 1$ then $\hat{\mu_1}$ is more efficient. On the other hand, if $\frac{(n+m)^2}{4nm} > 1$, then $\hat{\mu_2}$ is more efficient.