

# Solutions Assignment 2

7.9.2:

Instead of the last sentence ("Explain why ..."), do the following:

(a) Give a one-sentence argument that shows that there is another estimator that makes  $\delta_1$  (as given in problem) inadmissible.

Because  $T(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_{(n)}$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  (see lecture notes or Ex. 7.7.5 in textbook) and  $\delta_1$  is not a function of  $T$ , there is another estimator by the Rao-Blackwell theorem that makes  $\delta_1$  inadmissible.

(b) Find such an estimator and compare its MSE to the MSE of  $\delta_1$  through an explicit calculation.

Because  $\delta_1$  is unbiased,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}(\delta_1; \theta) &= \text{Var}(\delta_1(X_1, \dots, X_n)) = \text{Var}(2\bar{X}_n) = 4\text{Var}(\bar{X}_n) = \frac{4}{n}\text{Var}(X_1) \\ &= \frac{4}{n} \times \frac{\theta^2}{12} = \frac{\theta^2}{3n} \end{aligned}$$

Note: Some students may propose  $T(X_n) = (1 + \frac{1}{n})X_{(n)}$  which has an even better MSE:  $\text{MSE}(T; \theta) = \frac{1}{n(n+2)}$

Consider  $T(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_{(n)}$ . The cdf of  $X_{(n)}$  has been obtained in Ex 6.3.15, from which we get the pdf of  $X_{(n)}$  as

$$f_n(x) = F_n'(x) = \frac{n}{\theta^n} x^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \theta]}(x). \quad \text{Therefore,}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{(n)}] = \int_0^\theta x f_n(x) dx = \int_0^\theta \frac{n}{\theta^n} x^n dx = \frac{n}{(n+1)\theta^n} x^{n+1} \Big|_0^\theta = \frac{n}{n+1} \theta,$$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{(n)}^2] = \int_0^\theta x^2 f_n(x) dx = \int_0^\theta \frac{n}{\theta^n} x^{n+1} dx = \frac{n}{(n+2)\theta^n} x^{n+2} \Big|_0^\theta = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \text{MSE}(T; \theta) &= \text{Var}(T) + (\text{Bias}(T; \theta))^2 = \mathbb{E}[X_{(n)}^2] - \mathbb{E}[X_{(n)}]^2 + (\mathbb{E}[X_{(n)}] - \theta)^2 \\ &= \left( \frac{n}{n+2} - \frac{n^2}{(n+1)^2} \right) \theta^2 + \left( \frac{1}{n+1} \right)^2 \theta^2 = \frac{2}{(n+2)(n+1)} \theta^2 \end{aligned}$$

We can now verify that  $\text{MSE}(T; \theta) \leq \text{MSE}(\delta_1; \theta)$ :

$$\frac{2}{(n+2)(n+1)} \leq \frac{1}{3n} \Leftrightarrow 6n \leq n^2 + 3n + 2 \Leftrightarrow n^2 - 3n + 2 \geq 0$$

The function  $n^2 - 3n + 2$  has zeros  $n=1$  and  $n=2$  and is strictly positive outside  $[1, 2]$ . Therefore  $\text{MSE}(T; \theta) \leq \text{MSE}(\delta_1; \theta)$  for all  $n$ , with strict inequality for  $n \geq 3$ .



NOT GRADED

NOT  
GRADED

### 7.9.6 (see also lecture notes)

It was shown in Exercise 6 of Sec. 7.7 that  $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  is a sufficient statistic in this problem. Since the value of  $\bar{X}_n$  cannot be determined from the value of the sufficient statistic alone,  $\bar{X}_n$  is inadmissible. By the Rao-Blackwell theorem.

4

### 7.7.4

In Exercises 1-11, let  $t$  denote the value of the statistic  $T$  when the observed values of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . In each exercise, we shall show that  $T$  is a sufficient statistic by showing that the joint p.f. or joint p.d.f. can be factored as in Eq. (7.7.1).

The joint p.d.f. is

$$f_n(\mathbf{x} | \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{t}{2\sigma^2} \right\}.$$

More details

$$f_n(\mathbf{x}; \sigma^2) = \underbrace{1}_{u(\mathbf{x})} \times \underbrace{\frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}}_{v(r(\mathbf{x}), \sigma^2)} = r(\mathbf{x}) \quad \checkmark$$

By the factorization theorem,  $r(\mathbf{X}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2$  is a sufficient statistic. ✓

Students must (somehow) indicate  $u$ ,  $v$ , and  $r$  to get the points.

5

### 7.7.12

The likelihood function is

$$\frac{\alpha^n x_0^{\alpha n}}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha+1}},$$

for all  $x_i \geq x_0$ .

More details:

$$f_n(\underline{x}; \alpha, x_0) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha x_0^\alpha}{x_i^{\alpha+1}} \mathbb{1}_{[x_0, \infty)}(x_i)$$

$$= \frac{\alpha^n x_0^{\alpha n}}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha+1}} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{[0, x_i]}(x_0) = \frac{\alpha^n x_0^{\alpha n}}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha+1}} \mathbb{1}_{(0, X_{(1)}}(x_0) \quad (S.7.9)$$

- (a) If  $x_0$  is known,  $\alpha$  is the parameter, and (S.7.9) has the form  $u(x)v(r(x), \alpha)$ , with  $u(x) = 1$  if all  $x_i \geq x_0$  and 0 if not,  $r(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n x_i$ , and  $v[t, \alpha] = \alpha^n x_0^{\alpha n} / t^{\alpha+1}$ . So  $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  is a sufficient statistic.
- (b) If  $\alpha$  is known,  $x_0$  is the parameter, and (S.7.9) has the form  $u(x)v(r(x), x_0)$ , with  $u(x) = \alpha^n / [\prod_{i=1}^n x_i]^{\alpha+1}$ ,  $r(x) = \min\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , and  $v[t, x_0] = 1$  if  $t \geq x_0$  and 0 if not. Hence  $\min\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is a sufficient statistic.

More details on b:

$$f_n(\underline{x}; x_0) = \underbrace{\frac{\alpha}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha+1}}}_{= u(x)} \times \underbrace{x_0^{\alpha n} \mathbb{1}_{(0, X_{(1)}}(x_0)}_{= v(r(x), x_0)}$$

$\Rightarrow r(\underline{x}) = X_{(1)}$  is a sufficient statistics.

### 7.8.4

In Exercises 1-4, let  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  denote the values of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  when the observed values of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . In each exercise, we shall show that  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are jointly sufficient statistics by showing that the joint p.d.f. of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  can be factored as in Eq. (7.8.1).

Again let the function  $h$  be as defined in Example 7.8.4. Then the joint p.d.f. can be written as follows:

$$f_n(\underline{x} | \theta) = \frac{h(\theta, t_1)h(t_2, \theta + 3)}{3^n}$$

$$\theta \leq x_1 \leq \theta + 3 \Leftrightarrow x_i - 3 \leq \theta \leq x_i$$

$$f_n(\underline{x}; \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i; \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{1}_{[\theta, \theta+3]}(x_i) = 3^{-n} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{[x_i-3, x_i]}(\theta)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta \leq x_i \text{ for all } i &\Rightarrow \theta \leq X_{(1)} \\ \theta \geq x_i - 3 \text{ for all } i &\Rightarrow \theta \geq X_{(n)} - 3 \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow r(\underline{x}) = (X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$$

$$= 3^{-n} \times \underbrace{\mathbb{1}_{[X_{(n)}-3, X_{(1)}}(\theta)}_{u(x)} \times \underbrace{\mathbb{1}_{[X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}}(\theta)}_{v((X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}); \theta)}$$

$\Rightarrow r(\underline{x}) := (X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

Both blue and green versions are acceptable.  
But: For the green version, if the underlined parts are missing/wrong: no points!

NOT  
GRADED

### 8.1.2

It is known that  $\bar{X}_n$  has the normal distribution with mean  $\theta$  and variance  $4/n$ . Therefore,

$$E_{\theta}(|\bar{X}_n - \theta|^2) = \text{Var}_{\theta}(\bar{X}_n) = 4/n,$$

and  $4/n \leq 0.1$  if and only if  $n \geq 40$ .

$$= P\left(\left|\frac{\bar{X}_n - \theta}{\sqrt{4/n}}\right| \leq \frac{0.1}{\sqrt{4/n}}\right)$$

$$= \Phi(0.05\sqrt{n}) - \underbrace{\Phi(-0.05\sqrt{n})}_{= -\Phi(0.05\sqrt{n})}$$

### 8.1.4 $\sim N(0,1)$

If  $Z$  is defined as in the solution of Exercise 3 then

$$\Pr(|\bar{X}_n - \theta| \leq 0.1) = \Pr(|Z| \leq 0.05\sqrt{n}) = 2\Phi(0.05\sqrt{n}) - 1.$$

Therefore, this value will be at least 0.95 if and only if  $\Phi(0.05\sqrt{n}) \geq 0.975$ . It is found from a table of values of  $\Phi$  that we must have  $0.05\sqrt{n} \geq 1.96$ . Therefore, we must have  $n \geq 1536.64$  or, since  $n$  must be an integer,  $n \geq 1537$ .

p. 860

2

**8.2.10 (also find how many degrees of freedom the  $\chi^2$  distribution has)**

Each of the variables  $X_1 + X_2 + X_3$  and  $X_4 + X_5 + X_6$  will have the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 3. Therefore, if each of them is divided by  $\sqrt{3}$ , each will have a standard normal distribution. Therefore, the square of each will have the  $\chi^2$  distribution with one degree of freedom and the sum of these two squares will have the  $\chi^2$  distribution with two degrees of freedom. In other words,  $Y/3$  will have the  $\chi^2$  distribution with two degrees of freedom.

(only grade results for this exercise)

7

**8.4.2**

Since  $\hat{\mu} = \bar{X}_n$  and  $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \overset{(n-1)}{S_n^2}/n$ , it follows from the definition of  $U$  in Eq. (8.4.4) that

$$\Pr(\hat{\mu} > \mu + k\hat{\sigma}) = \Pr\left(\frac{\bar{X}_n - \mu}{\hat{\sigma}} > k\right) = \Pr[U > k(n-1)^{1/2}] \quad \text{where } U = \frac{\bar{X}_n - \mu}{\sqrt{S_n^2/n}}$$

Since  $U$  has the  $t$  distribution with  $n-1$  degrees of freedom and  $n=17$ , we must choose  $k$  such that  $\Pr(U > 4k) = 0.95$ . It is found from a table of the  $t$  distribution with 16 degrees of freedom that  $\Pr(U < 1.746) = 0.95$ . Hence, by symmetry,  $\Pr(U > -1.746) = 0.95$ . It now follows that  $4k = -1.746$  and  $k = -0.4365$ .

### 8.5.4

Since  $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu)/\sigma$  has a standard normal distribution,  $\Pr \left[ -1.96 < \frac{\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu)}{\sigma} < 1.96 \right] = 0.95$ .

This relation can be rewritten in the form

$$\Pr \left( \bar{X}_n - \frac{1.96\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} < \mu < \bar{X}_n + \frac{1.96\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \right) = 0.95.$$

Therefore, the interval with endpoints  $\bar{X}_n - 1.96\sigma/\sqrt{n}$  and  $\bar{X}_n + 1.96\sigma/\sqrt{n}$  will be a confidence interval for  $\mu$  with confidence coefficient 0.95. The length of this interval will be  $3.92\sigma/\sqrt{n}$ . It now follows that  $3.92\sigma/\sqrt{n} < 0.01\sigma$  if and only if  $\sqrt{n} > 392$ . This means that  $n > 153664$  or  $n = 153665$  or more.

NOT  
GRADED

### 8.5.6

The exponential distribution with mean  $\mu$  is the same as the gamma distribution with  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = 1/\mu$ . <sup>(the reproductive property)</sup> Therefore, by Theorem 5.7.7,  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  will have the gamma distribution with parameters

$\alpha = n$  and  $\beta = 1/\mu$ . <sup>(scaling property)</sup> In turn, it follows from Exercise 1 of Sec. 5.7 that  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i/\mu$  has the gamma distribution with parameters  $\alpha = n$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ . <sup>which is by a theorem in class just</sup> It follows from Definition 8.2.1 that  $2 \sum_{i=1}^n X_i/\mu$  has

the  $\chi^2$  distribution with  $2n$  degrees of freedom. <sup>Constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  which satisfy the relation given in the hint for this exercise will then each be  $1/2$  times some quantile of the  $\chi^2$  distribution with  $2n$  degrees of freedom. There are an infinite number of pairs of values of such quantiles, one corresponding to each pair of numbers  $q_1 \geq 0$  and  $q_2 \geq 0$  such that  $q_2 - q_1 = \gamma$ . For example, with  $q_1 = (1 - \gamma)/2$  and  $q_2 = (1 + \gamma)/2$  we can let  $c_i$  be  $1/2$  times the  $q_i$  quantile of the  $\chi^2$  distribution with  $2n$  degrees of freedom for  $i = 1, 2$ . It now follows that</sup>

$$\Pr \left( \frac{1}{c_2} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i < \mu < \frac{1}{c_1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right) = \gamma.$$

Therefore, the interval with endpoints equal to the observed values of  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i/c_2$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i/c_1$  will be a confidence interval for  $\mu$  with confidence coefficient  $\gamma$ .

In other words,  $\bar{X}(X_1, \dots, X_n; \mu) = \frac{2}{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  is a pivot for  $\mu$ .

Choose  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in [0, 1-\gamma]$  such that  $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1-\gamma$ . <sup>Because</sup>

$\bar{X} \sim \chi^2_{2n}$  it follows that

<sup>(either specific or general  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  that add as seen in class up to  $1-\gamma$ )</sup>

$$\Pr (q(\chi^2_{2n}; \beta_1) \leq \bar{X}(X_1, \dots, X_n; \mu) \leq q(\chi^2_{2n}; \beta_2)) = \gamma$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \Pr (q(\chi^2_{2n}; \beta_1) \leq \frac{2}{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq q(\chi^2_{2n}; \beta_2)) = \gamma$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{2}{q(\chi^2_{2n}; \beta_2)} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq \mu \leq \frac{2}{q(\chi^2_{2n}; \beta_1)} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

$\Rightarrow$  A  $\gamma$ -CI for  $\mu$  is given by

$$\left( \frac{2}{q(\chi^2_{2n}; 1-\beta_2)} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \frac{2}{q(\chi^2_{2n}; \beta_1)} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right)$$

<sup>(or a specific interval like the one below)</sup>

where  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in [0, 1-\gamma]$  can be chosen arbitrarily as long as  $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1-\gamma$ . For example, if  $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \frac{1-\gamma}{2}$ , we obtain

$$\left( \frac{2}{q(\chi^2_{2n}; \frac{1+\gamma}{2})} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \frac{2}{q(\chi^2_{2n}; \frac{1-\gamma}{2})} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right)$$

**8.7.4**

back of textbook

If  $X$  has the geometric distribution with parameter  $p$ , then it follows from ~~Eq. (5.5.7)~~ that  $E(X) = (1-p)/p = 1/p - 1$ . Therefore,  $E(X+1) = 1/p$ , which implies that  $X+1$  is an unbiased estimator of  $1/p$ .

**8.9.6** (i.e.,  $\hat{\theta}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_A(X_i) = \overline{Y}_n$  where  $Y_i = \mathbb{1}_A(X_i)$  )

Let  $\hat{\theta}_n$  be the proportion of the  $n$  observations that lie in the set  $A$ . Since each observation has probability  $\theta$  of lying in  $A$ , the observations can be thought of as forming  $n$  Bernoulli trials, each with probability  $\theta$  of success. Hence,  $E(\hat{\theta}_n) = \theta$  and  $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_n) = \theta(1-\theta)/n$ .



NOT  
GRADED

**Ex I:** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be iid Bernoulli( $p$ ). Show that there is no unbiased estimator of  $\theta = \log(p)$ .

If  $T = \varphi(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  were an unbiased estimator, we would have

$$E[T] = \sum_{x_i \in \{0,1\}} \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) P(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_n = x_n) = \sum_{x_i \in \{0,1\}} \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) p^{\sum x_i} (1-p)^{n-\sum x_i} \\ \stackrel{!}{=} \log p$$

However, as  $p \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\left| \sum_{x_i \in \{0,1\}} \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) p^{\sum x_i} (1-p)^{n-\sum x_i} \right| \leq \sum_{x_i \in \{0,1\}} |\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)|$$

is bounded, but

$$|\log p| \rightarrow \infty,$$

a contradiction.

6

**Ex II:** For a sample of 9 iid <sup>normal</sup> observations with sample standard deviation  $s_n = 3.2$ , construct a 99%-confidence interval of the form  $(0, b)$  for the variance  $\sigma^2$ .

Because

$$\text{(pivot!)} \quad \frac{(n-1)S_n^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_{n-1}^2,$$

we know that

$$P\left(\frac{(n-1)S_n^2}{\sigma^2} > q(\chi_{n-1}^2, 0.01)\right) = 0.99, \quad \checkmark$$

where  $\chi_{0.01, n-1}^2 = \chi_{0.01, 8}^2 = 20.090$ . The inside of the probability statement above is equivalent to

$$\frac{(n-1)S_n^2}{\sigma^2} < \frac{1.647}{20.090} \iff \sigma^2 < \frac{(n-1)S_n^2}{\frac{1.647}{20.090}} = \frac{8 \times 3.2^2}{\frac{1.647}{20.090}} = 49.74 \quad \checkmark$$

Thus, an upper ~~lower~~ 99%-confidence bound for  $\sigma^2$  is given by

$$\text{an upper } \text{bound} \quad (0, 49.74) \quad \checkmark$$

Sum: 41