# Ch. 6 – Point Estimation

A parameter is a constant describing a distribution:

• In a normal distribution, the mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are parameters.

A **parameter** is a constant describing a distribution:

- In a normal distribution, the mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are parameters.
- In an exponential distribution, the rate  $\lambda$  is a parameter.

#### A **parameter** is a constant describing a distribution:

- In a normal distribution, the mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are parameters.
- ullet In an exponential distribution, the rate  $\lambda$  is a parameter.
- ullet We will often use the symbol  $\theta$  to represent a parameter generically.

A **parameter** is a constant describing a distribution:

- In a normal distribution, the mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are parameters.
- ullet In an exponential distribution, the rate  $\lambda$  is a parameter.
- ullet We will often use the symbol  $\theta$  to represent a parameter generically.

An **estimator** is a random variable which is used to estimate a parameter.

A **parameter** is a constant describing a distribution:

- In a normal distribution, the mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are parameters.
- ullet In an exponential distribution, the rate  $\lambda$  is a parameter.
- We will often use the symbol  $\theta$  to represent a parameter generically.

An **estimator** is a random variable which is used to estimate a parameter.

• Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the sample mean  $\overline{X} = \frac{1}{n}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)$  is an estimator for the mean  $\mu$ .

A **parameter** is a constant describing a distribution:

- In a normal distribution, the mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are parameters.
- ullet In an exponential distribution, the rate  $\lambda$  is a parameter.
- We will often use the symbol  $\theta$  to represent a parameter generically.

An **estimator** is a random variable which is used to estimate a parameter.

- Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the sample mean  $\overline{X} = \frac{1}{n}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)$  is an estimator for the mean  $\mu$ .
- The sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i \overline{X})^2$  is an estimator for the variance  $\sigma^2$ .

A **parameter** is a constant describing a distribution:

- In a normal distribution, the mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are parameters.
- ullet In an exponential distribution, the rate  $\lambda$  is a parameter.
- ullet We will often use the symbol heta to represent a parameter generically.

An **estimator** is a random variable which is used to estimate a parameter.

- Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the sample mean  $\overline{X} = \frac{1}{n}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)$  is an estimator for the mean  $\mu$ .
- The sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i \overline{X})^2$  is an estimator for the variance  $\sigma^2$ .
- We will often use the symbol  $\hat{\theta}$  to represent an estimator generically.

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right)$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X)$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

• If X is a binomial random variable, then the **sample** proportion  $\hat{p} = \frac{X}{n}$  is an unbiased estimator of p:

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

• If X is a binomial random variable, then the **sample** proportion  $\hat{p} = \frac{X}{n}$  is an unbiased estimator of p:

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

$$E(\overline{X}) = E\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

• If X is a binomial random variable, then the **sample** proportion  $\hat{p} = \frac{X}{n}$  is an unbiased estimator of p:

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

$$E(\overline{X}) = E\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

• If X is a binomial random variable, then the **sample** proportion  $\hat{p} = \frac{X}{n}$  is an unbiased estimator of p:

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

$$E(\overline{X}) = E\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}E(X_{i})$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

• If X is a binomial random variable, then the **sample** proportion  $\hat{p} = \frac{X}{n}$  is an unbiased estimator of p:

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

$$E(\overline{X}) = E\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}E(X_{i}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

• If X is a binomial random variable, then the **sample** proportion  $\hat{p} = \frac{X}{n}$  is an unbiased estimator of p:

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

$$E(\overline{X}) = E\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}E(X_{i}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu = \frac{1}{n}\cdot n\mu$$

An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is an **unbiased** estimator for  $\theta$  if  $E(\hat{\theta}) = \theta$ .

• If X is a binomial random variable, then the **sample** proportion  $\hat{p} = \frac{X}{n}$  is an unbiased estimator of p:

$$E(\hat{p}) = E\left(\frac{X}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p$$

$$E(\overline{X}) = E\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right) = \frac{1}{n}E\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}E(X_{i}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu = \frac{1}{n}\cdot n\mu = \mu$$

Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  from a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ , how do we estimate  $\theta$ ?

Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  from a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ , how do we estimate  $\theta$ ?

• The mean  $\mu$  is the midpoint of the interval,  $\mu = \theta/2$ . Therefore,  $\theta = 2\mu$ . Since we can estimate  $\mu$  with  $\overline{X}$ , we can estimate  $\theta$  with  $\hat{\theta} = 2\overline{X}$ .

Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  from a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ , how do we estimate  $\theta$ ?

- The mean  $\mu$  is the midpoint of the interval,  $\mu = \theta/2$ . Therefore,  $\theta = 2\mu$ . Since we can estimate  $\mu$  with  $\overline{X}$ , we can estimate  $\theta$  with  $\hat{\theta} = 2\overline{X}$ .
- Each of the observations  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  will be less than  $\theta$ , and if n is large we expect one of them to be close to  $\theta$ . So we may estimate  $\theta$  using the maximum:  $\hat{\theta} = \max\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ .

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Are these estimators unbiased?

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Are these estimators unbiased?

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Are these estimators unbiased?

$$E(\hat{\theta}_1) = E(2\overline{X})$$

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Are these estimators unbiased?

$$E(\hat{\theta}_1) = E(2\overline{X}) = 2E(\overline{X})$$

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Are these estimators unbiased?

$$E(\hat{\theta}_1) = E(2\overline{X}) = 2E(\overline{X}) = 2\mu$$

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Are these estimators unbiased?

$$E(\hat{\theta}_1) = E(2\overline{X}) = 2E(\overline{X}) = 2\mu = \theta$$

We gave two possible estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Are these estimators unbiased?

We may calculate the expected value of  $\hat{\theta}_1$ :

$$E(\hat{\theta}_1) = E(2\overline{X}) = 2E(\overline{X}) = 2\mu = \theta$$

Since  $E(\hat{\theta}_1) = \theta$ , this means that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  is an unbiased estimator for  $\theta$ .

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x)$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \le x)$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$ 

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$   
=  $P(X_1 \le x)P(X_2 \le x) \cdots P(X_n \le x) = (x/\theta)^n$ 

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$   
=  $P(X_1 \le x)P(X_2 \le x) \cdots P(X_n \le x) = (x/\theta)^n$ 

Therefore the pdf of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is, for  $0 \le x \le \theta$ ,

$$f(x) = F'(x)$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$   
=  $P(X_1 \le x)P(X_2 \le x) \cdots P(X_n \le x) = (x/\theta)^n$ 

Therefore the pdf of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is, for  $0 \le x \le \theta$ ,

$$f(x) = F'(x) = \frac{d}{dx}(x/\theta)^n$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$   
=  $P(X_1 \le x)P(X_2 \le x) \cdots P(X_n \le x) = (x/\theta)^n$ 

Therefore the pdf of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is, for  $0 \le x \le \theta$ ,

$$f(x) = F'(x) = \frac{d}{dx}(x/\theta)^n = nx^{n-1}/\theta^n$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$   
=  $P(X_1 \le x)P(X_2 \le x) \cdots P(X_n \le x) = (x/\theta)^n$ 

Therefore the pdf of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is, for  $0 \le x \le \theta$ ,

$$f(x) = F'(x) = \frac{d}{dx}(x/\theta)^n = nx^{n-1}/\theta^n$$

So the expected value of  $\hat{ heta}_2$  is

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x f(x) \ dx$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$   
=  $P(X_1 \le x)P(X_2 \le x) \cdots P(X_n \le x) = (x/\theta)^n$ 

Therefore the pdf of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is, for  $0 \le x \le \theta$ ,

$$f(x) = F'(x) = \frac{d}{dx}(x/\theta)^n = nx^{n-1}/\theta^n$$

So the expected value of  $\hat{ heta}_2$  is

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x f(x) \ dx = \int_{0}^{\theta} x \cdot \frac{nx^{n-1}}{\theta^n} \ dx$$

Since  $\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is always less than  $\theta$ , intuition suggests that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  will underestimate  $\theta$  and hence must be biased.

Now we will calculate  $E(\hat{\theta}_2)$ . For  $0 \le x \le \theta$ , the cdf F(x) of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$F(x) = P(\hat{\theta}_2 \le x) = P(\max\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \le x)$$
  
=  $P(X_1 \le x, X_2 \le x, ..., X_n \le x)$   
=  $P(X_1 \le x)P(X_2 \le x) \cdots P(X_n \le x) = (x/\theta)^n$ 

Therefore the pdf of  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is, for  $0 \le x \le \theta$ ,

$$f(x) = F'(x) = \frac{d}{dx}(x/\theta)^n = nx^{n-1}/\theta^n$$

So the expected value of  $\hat{ heta}_2$  is

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x f(x) \ dx = \int_{0}^{\theta} x \cdot \frac{n x^{n-1}}{\theta^n} \ dx = \frac{n}{n+1} \theta$$

We considered two estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We considered two estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We found that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  was unbiased but that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  was biased.

We considered two estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We found that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  was unbiased but that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  was biased. However, it is easy to modify  $\hat{\theta}_2$  to produce an unbiased estimator  $\hat{\theta}_3$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2 = \frac{n+1}{n}\max\{X_1,\dots,X_n\}$$

We considered two estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We found that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  was unbiased but that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  was biased. However, it is easy to modify  $\hat{\theta}_2$  to produce an unbiased estimator  $\hat{\theta}_3$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2 = \frac{n+1}{n}\max\{X_1,\ldots,X_n\}$$

Since  $E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \frac{n}{n+1}\theta$ , it follows that

$$E(\hat{\theta}_3) = E\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2\right)$$

We considered two estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We found that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  was unbiased but that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  was biased. However, it is easy to modify  $\hat{\theta}_2$  to produce an unbiased estimator  $\hat{\theta}_3$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2 = \frac{n+1}{n}\max\{X_1,\dots,X_n\}$$

Since  $E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \frac{n}{n+1}\theta$ , it follows that

$$E(\hat{\theta}_3) = E\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2\right) = \frac{n+1}{n}E(\hat{\theta}_2)$$

We considered two estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We found that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  was unbiased but that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  was biased. However, it is easy to modify  $\hat{\theta}_2$  to produce an unbiased estimator  $\hat{\theta}_3$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2 = \frac{n+1}{n}\max\{X_1,\dots,X_n\}$$

Since  $E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \frac{n}{n+1}\theta$ , it follows that

$$E(\hat{\theta}_3) = E\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2\right) = \frac{n+1}{n}E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \frac{n+1}{n}\cdot\frac{n}{n+1}\theta = \theta$$

We considered two estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ ,

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We found that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  was unbiased but that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  was biased. However, it is easy to modify  $\hat{\theta}_2$  to produce an unbiased estimator  $\hat{\theta}_3$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2 = \frac{n+1}{n}\max\{X_1,\dots,X_n\}$$

Since  $E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \frac{n}{n+1}\theta$ , it follows that

$$E(\hat{\theta}_3) = E\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2\right) = \frac{n+1}{n}E(\hat{\theta}_2) = \frac{n+1}{n} \cdot \frac{n}{n+1}\theta = \theta$$

so  $\hat{\theta}_3$  is in fact an unbiased estimator for  $\theta$ .

We now have two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Which of these estimators is better?

We now have two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{ heta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{ heta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Which of these estimators is better?

To answer this, we need a measure of how good an estimator is. One commonly used such measure is the *variance* of the estimator.

We now have two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Which of these estimators is better?

To answer this, we need a measure of how good an estimator is. One commonly used such measure is the *variance* of the estimator.

$$V(\hat{\theta}_1) = V(2\overline{X})$$

We now have two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Which of these estimators is better?

To answer this, we need a measure of how good an estimator is. One commonly used such measure is the *variance* of the estimator.

$$V(\hat{\theta}_1) = V(2\overline{X}) = 4V(\overline{X})$$

We now have two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Which of these estimators is better?

To answer this, we need a measure of how good an estimator is. One commonly used such measure is the *variance* of the estimator.

$$V(\hat{\theta}_1) = V(2\overline{X}) = 4V(\overline{X}) = \frac{4}{n}V(X_1)$$

We now have two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Which of these estimators is better?

To answer this, we need a measure of how good an estimator is. One commonly used such measure is the *variance* of the estimator.

$$V(\hat{\theta}_1) = V(2\overline{X}) = 4V(\overline{X}) = \frac{4}{n}V(X_1) = \frac{4}{n} \cdot \frac{\theta^2}{12}$$

We now have two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

Question: Which of these estimators is better?

To answer this, we need a measure of how good an estimator is. One commonly used such measure is the *variance* of the estimator.

$$V(\hat{\theta}_1) = V(2\overline{X}) = 4V(\overline{X}) = \frac{4}{n}V(X_1) = \frac{4}{n} \cdot \frac{\theta^2}{12} = \frac{\theta^2}{3n}$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \ dx$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \ dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \ dx$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \ dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \ dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \ dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \ dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_2) = E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) - [E(\hat{\theta}_2)]^2$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \, dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \, dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_2) = E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) - [E(\hat{\theta}_2)]^2 = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2 - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\theta\right)^2$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \, dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \, dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_2) = E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) - [E(\hat{\theta}_2)]^2 = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2 - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\theta\right)^2$$

$$= \left(\frac{n(n+1)^2 - n^2(n+2)}{(n+1)^2(n+2)}\right) \theta^2$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \, dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \, dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_2) = E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) - [E(\hat{\theta}_2)]^2 = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2 - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\theta\right)^2$$

$$= \left(\frac{n(n+1)^2 - n^2(n+2)}{(n+1)^2(n+2)}\right) \theta^2 = \frac{n}{(n+1)^2(n+2)} \theta^2$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \, dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \, dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_2) = E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) - [E(\hat{\theta}_2)]^2 = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2 - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\theta\right)^2$$

$$= \left(\frac{n(n+1)^2 - n^2(n+2)}{(n+1)^2(n+2)}\right) \theta^2 = \frac{n}{(n+1)^2(n+2)} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_3) = V\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2\right)$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) = \int_0^\infty x^2 f(x) \, dx = \int_0^\infty n x^{n+1} / \theta^n \, dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_2) = E(\hat{\theta}_2^2) - [E(\hat{\theta}_2)]^2 = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^2 - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\theta\right)^2$$

$$= \left(\frac{n(n+1)^2 - n^2(n+2)}{(n+1)^2(n+2)}\right) \theta^2 = \frac{n}{(n+1)^2(n+2)} \theta^2$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_3) = V\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_2\right) = \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^2 V(\hat{\theta}_2)$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_{2}^{2}) = \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{2} f(x) \, dx = \int_{0}^{\infty} n x^{n+1} / \theta^{n} \, dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^{2}$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_{2}) = E(\hat{\theta}_{2}^{2}) - [E(\hat{\theta}_{2})]^{2} = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^{2} - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\theta\right)^{2}$$

$$= \left(\frac{n(n+1)^{2} - n^{2}(n+2)}{(n+1)^{2}(n+2)}\right) \theta^{2} = \frac{n}{(n+1)^{2}(n+2)} \theta^{2}$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_{3}) = V\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_{2}\right) = \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^{2} V(\hat{\theta}_{2})$$

$$= \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^{2} \cdot \frac{n}{(n+1)^{2}(n+2)} \theta^{2}$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_{2}^{2}) = \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{2} f(x) \, dx = \int_{0}^{\infty} n x^{n+1} / \theta^{n} \, dx = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^{2}$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_{2}) = E(\hat{\theta}_{2}^{2}) - [E(\hat{\theta}_{2})]^{2} = \frac{n}{n+2} \theta^{2} - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\theta\right)^{2}$$

$$= \left(\frac{n(n+1)^{2} - n^{2}(n+2)}{(n+1)^{2}(n+2)}\right) \theta^{2} = \frac{n}{(n+1)^{2}(n+2)} \theta^{2}$$

$$V(\hat{\theta}_{3}) = V\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\hat{\theta}_{2}\right) = \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^{2} V(\hat{\theta}_{2})$$

$$= \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^{2} \cdot \frac{n}{(n+1)^{2}(n+2)} \theta^{2} = \frac{\theta^{2}}{n(n+2)}$$

We considered two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{ heta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{ heta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We considered two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0, \theta]$ :

$$\hat{ heta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{ heta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We calculated that their variances were  $V(\hat{\theta}_1) = \frac{\theta^2}{3n}$  and  $V(\hat{\theta}_3) = \frac{\theta^2}{n(n+2)}$ . Therefore, for n > 1,  $\hat{\theta}_3$  has a smaller variance.

We considered two unbiased estimators for the parameter  $\theta$  of a uniform distribution on  $[0,\theta]$ :

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = 2\overline{X}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_3 = \frac{n+1}{n} \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$$

We calculated that their variances were  $V(\hat{\theta}_1) = \frac{\theta^2}{3n}$  and  $V(\hat{\theta}_3) = \frac{\theta^2}{n(n+2)}$ . Therefore, for n > 1,  $\hat{\theta}_3$  has a smaller variance.

More advanced statistical theory can be used to show that in fact  $\hat{\theta}_3$  is a **minimum variance unbiased estimator**: it has a smaller variance than any other unbiased estimator.

Given a distribution with variance  $\sigma^2$ , the sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \overline{X})^2$  is an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma^2$ .

Given a distribution with variance  $\sigma^2$ , the sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \overline{X})^2$  is an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma^2$ .

$$E(S^{2}) = E\left[\frac{1}{n-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}^{2} - n\overline{X}^{2}\right)\right]$$

Given a distribution with variance  $\sigma^2$ , the sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \overline{X})^2$  is an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma^2$ .

$$E(S^2) = E\left[\frac{1}{n-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 - n\overline{X}^2\right)\right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n E(X_i^2) - nE(\overline{X}^2)\right]$$

Given a distribution with variance  $\sigma^2$ , the sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \overline{X})^2$  is an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma^2$ .

$$E(S^{2}) = E\left[\frac{1}{n-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}^{2} - n\overline{X}^{2}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} E(X_{i}^{2}) - nE(\overline{X}^{2})\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (V(X_{i}) + [E(X_{i})]^{2}) - n(V(\overline{X}) + [E(\overline{X})]^{2})\right]$$

Given a distribution with variance  $\sigma^2$ , the sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \overline{X})^2$  is an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma^2$ .

$$E(S^{2}) = E\left[\frac{1}{n-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}^{2} - n\overline{X}^{2}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} E(X_{i}^{2}) - nE(\overline{X}^{2})\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (V(X_{i}) + [E(X_{i})]^{2}) - n(V(\overline{X}) + [E(\overline{X})]^{2})\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\sigma^{2} + \mu^{2}) - n(\frac{\sigma^{2}}{n} + \mu^{2})\right]$$

Given a distribution with variance  $\sigma^2$ , the sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \overline{X})^2$  is an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma^2$ .

$$E(S^{2}) = E\left[\frac{1}{n-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}^{2} - n\overline{X}^{2}\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} E(X_{i}^{2}) - nE(\overline{X}^{2})\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (V(X_{i}) + [E(X_{i})]^{2}) - n(V(\overline{X}) + [E(\overline{X})]^{2})\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\sigma^{2} + \mu^{2}) - n(\frac{\sigma^{2}}{n} + \mu^{2})\right] = \sigma^{2}$$

Suppose a Poisson process has unknown rate  $\lambda$ . We observe the process for 2 hours, and the number of events which occur is X=40. What value of  $\lambda$  gives the largest probability P(X=40)?

Suppose a Poisson process has unknown rate  $\lambda$ . We observe the process for 2 hours, and the number of events which occur is X=40. What value of  $\lambda$  gives the largest probability P(X=40)?

X is a Poisson random variable with mean  $2\lambda$ , so

$$P(X = 40) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

Suppose a Poisson process has unknown rate  $\lambda$ . We observe the process for 2 hours, and the number of events which occur is X=40. What value of  $\lambda$  gives the largest probability P(X=40)?

X is a Poisson random variable with mean  $2\lambda$ , so

$$P(X = 40) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

The function  $L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$  here is called the **likelihood** function.

Suppose a Poisson process has unknown rate  $\lambda$ . We observe the process for 2 hours, and the number of events which occur is X=40. What value of  $\lambda$  gives the largest probability P(X=40)?

X is a Poisson random variable with mean  $2\lambda$ , so

$$P(X = 40) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

The function  $L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$  here is called the **likelihood** function. To maximize  $L(\lambda)$ , we take the derivative:

$$L'(\lambda) = \frac{1}{40!} (e^{-2\lambda} \cdot 40(2\lambda)^{39} \cdot 2 - 2e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40})$$

Suppose a Poisson process has unknown rate  $\lambda$ . We observe the process for 2 hours, and the number of events which occur is X=40. What value of  $\lambda$  gives the largest probability P(X=40)?

X is a Poisson random variable with mean  $2\lambda$ , so

$$P(X = 40) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

The function  $L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$  here is called the **likelihood** function. To maximize  $L(\lambda)$ , we take the derivative:

$$L'(\lambda) = \frac{1}{40!} (e^{-2\lambda} \cdot 40(2\lambda)^{39} \cdot 2 - 2e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40})$$

Setting this equal to zero gives  $40 - 2\lambda = 0$ , so  $\lambda = 20$ . This is called the **maximum likelihood estimate** of  $\lambda$ .

In the previous problem, the likelihood function was given by

$$L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

In the previous problem, the likelihood function was given by

$$L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

The log-likelihood function is

$$\ell(\lambda) = \ln(L(\lambda)) = -2\lambda + 40\ln(2\lambda) - \ln(40!)$$

In the previous problem, the likelihood function was given by

$$L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

The log-likelihood function is

$$\ell(\lambda) = \ln(L(\lambda)) = -2\lambda + 40\ln(2\lambda) - \ln(40!)$$

The value of  $\lambda$  which maximizes  $\ell(\lambda)$  will also maximize  $L(\lambda)$ . The log-likelihood function is often easier to differentiate than the likelihood function.

In the previous problem, the likelihood function was given by

$$L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

The log-likelihood function is

$$\ell(\lambda) = \ln(L(\lambda)) = -2\lambda + 40\ln(2\lambda) - \ln(40!)$$

The value of  $\lambda$  which maximizes  $\ell(\lambda)$  will also maximize  $L(\lambda)$ . The log-likelihood function is often easier to differentiate than the likelihood function. In this case,

$$\ell'(\lambda) = -2 + \frac{40}{\lambda}$$

In the previous problem, the likelihood function was given by

$$L(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-2\lambda}(2\lambda)^{40}}{40!}$$

The log-likelihood function is

$$\ell(\lambda) = \ln(L(\lambda)) = -2\lambda + 40\ln(2\lambda) - \ln(40!)$$

The value of  $\lambda$  which maximizes  $\ell(\lambda)$  will also maximize  $L(\lambda)$ . The log-likelihood function is often easier to differentiate than the likelihood function. In this case,

$$\ell'(\lambda) = -2 + \frac{40}{\lambda}$$

Setting this equal to zero gives  $\lambda = 20$  as before.

In general, given a random variable X with pmf or pdf  $f(x;\theta)$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the **maximum likelihood estimator** (mle) is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $f(X;\theta)$ .

In general, given a random variable X with pmf or pdf  $f(x;\theta)$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the **maximum likelihood estimator** (mle) is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $f(X;\theta)$ .

More generally, given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the mle is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  that maximizes the joint pmf or joint pdf of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ :  $f(X_1, \ldots, X_n; \theta) = f(X_1; \theta) f(X_2; \theta) \cdots f(X_n; \theta)$ .

In general, given a random variable X with pmf or pdf  $f(x;\theta)$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the **maximum likelihood estimator** (mle) is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $f(X;\theta)$ .

More generally, given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the mle is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  that maximizes the joint pmf or joint pdf of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ :  $f(X_1, \ldots, X_n; \theta) = f(X_1; \theta) f(X_2; \theta) \cdots f(X_n; \theta)$ .

In general, given a random variable X with pmf or pdf  $f(x;\theta)$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the **maximum likelihood estimator** (mle) is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $f(X;\theta)$ .

More generally, given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the mle is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  that maximizes the joint pmf or joint pdf of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ :  $f(X_1, \ldots, X_n; \theta) = f(X_1; \theta) f(X_2; \theta) \cdots f(X_n; \theta)$ .

Under fairly general conditions, the maximum likelihood estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  satisfies some desirable statistical properties:

•  $\hat{\theta}$  exists and is unique.

In general, given a random variable X with pmf or pdf  $f(x;\theta)$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the **maximum likelihood estimator** (mle) is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $f(X;\theta)$ .

More generally, given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the mle is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  that maximizes the joint pmf or joint pdf of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ :  $f(X_1, \ldots, X_n; \theta) = f(X_1; \theta) f(X_2; \theta) \cdots f(X_n; \theta)$ .

- $\bullet$   $\hat{\theta}$  exists and is unique.
- $\hat{\theta}$  is asymptotically unbiased: for large sample sizes, it is practically an unbiased estimator.

In general, given a random variable X with pmf or pdf  $f(x;\theta)$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the **maximum likelihood estimator** (mle) is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $f(X;\theta)$ .

More generally, given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the mle is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  that maximizes the joint pmf or joint pdf of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ :  $f(X_1, \ldots, X_n; \theta) = f(X_1; \theta) f(X_2; \theta) \cdots f(X_n; \theta)$ .

- $\bullet$   $\hat{\theta}$  exists and is unique.
- $\hat{\theta}$  is asymptotically unbiased: for large sample sizes, it is practically an unbiased estimator.
- $egin{align*} egin{align*} egin{align*}$

In general, given a random variable X with pmf or pdf  $f(x;\theta)$  depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , the **maximum likelihood estimator** (mle) is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  that maximizes  $f(X;\theta)$ .

More generally, given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , the mle is the value  $\hat{\theta}$  that maximizes the joint pmf or joint pdf of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ :  $f(X_1, \ldots, X_n; \theta) = f(X_1; \theta) f(X_2; \theta) \cdots f(X_n; \theta)$ .

- $\bullet$   $\hat{\theta}$  exists and is unique.
- $\hat{\theta}$  is asymptotically unbiased: for large sample sizes, it is practically an unbiased estimator.
- $egin{align*} egin{align*} egin{align*}$
- $\hat{\theta}$  is asymptotically normal: for large sample sizes, it has approximately a normal distribution.

Given an observation of an exponential random variable X with unknown rate  $\lambda$ , find the mle for  $\lambda$ .

Given an observation of an exponential random variable X with unknown rate  $\lambda$ , find the mle for  $\lambda$ .

The pdf of each X is  $f(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$ .

Given an observation of an exponential random variable X with unknown rate  $\lambda$ , find the mle for  $\lambda$ .

The pdf of each X is  $f(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$ . The log-likelihood is therefore

$$\ell(\lambda) = \ln \lambda - \lambda x$$

Given an observation of an exponential random variable X with unknown rate  $\lambda$ , find the mle for  $\lambda$ .

The pdf of each X is  $f(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$ . The log-likelihood is therefore

$$\ell(\lambda) = \ln \lambda - \lambda x$$

Setting the derivative equal to zero gives  $\frac{1}{\lambda} - x = 0$ .

Given an observation of an exponential random variable X with unknown rate  $\lambda$ , find the mle for  $\lambda$ .

The pdf of each X is  $f(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$ . The log-likelihood is therefore

$$\ell(\lambda) = \ln \lambda - \lambda x$$

Setting the derivative equal to zero gives  $\frac{1}{\lambda} - x = 0$ . Solving for  $\lambda$ , we find the mle:

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{1}{X}$$

### Invariance Principle for MLE

Let  $h(\theta)$  be a function of  $\theta$ . If  $\hat{\theta}$  is the mle for  $\theta$ , then  $h(\hat{\theta})$  is the mle for  $h(\theta)$ .

### Invariance Principle for MLE

Let  $h(\theta)$  be a function of  $\theta$ . If  $\hat{\theta}$  is the mle for  $\theta$ , then  $h(\hat{\theta})$  is the mle for  $h(\theta)$ .

Example: Given an observation of an exponential random variable X with unknown rate  $\lambda$ , we found that the mle for  $\lambda$  was

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{1}{X}$$

Therefore, the mle for  $\mu=1/\lambda$  is

$$\hat{\mu} = 1/\hat{\lambda} = \frac{1}{1/X} = X$$

Thus, the mle for  $\mu$  is simply the observed value X. It can be shown that this in fact is the minimum variance unbiased estimator for  $\mu$ .

#### MLE of Several Parameters

There are many families of distributions where we would want to estimate two parameters at once. For example,

- ullet For a normal distribution, we want to estimate  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ .
- For a gamma distribution, we want to estimate k and  $\lambda$ .
- For a Weibull distribution, we want to estimate  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

#### MLE of Several Parameters

There are many families of distributions where we would want to estimate two parameters at once. For example,

- ullet For a normal distribution, we want to estimate  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ .
- For a gamma distribution, we want to estimate k and  $\lambda$ .
- For a Weibull distribution, we want to estimate  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

The definition of mle extends in an natural way to distributions with several parameters:

#### MLE of Several Parameters

There are many families of distributions where we would want to estimate two parameters at once. For example,

- ullet For a normal distribution, we want to estimate  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ .
- For a gamma distribution, we want to estimate k and  $\lambda$ .
- For a Weibull distribution, we want to estimate  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

The definition of mle extends in an natural way to distributions with several parameters:

Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  from a distribution with several parameters  $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m$ , the mle of  $(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m)$  is the combination of values  $(\hat{\theta}_1, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_m)$  maximizing the joint pmf or joint pdf  $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n; \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m)$  of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ .

### Estimating Parameters of a Normal Distribution

Given a random sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  from a normal distribution:

The MLE for  $\mu$  is the sample mean  $\overline{X}$ , and this is also the minimum variance unbiased estimator.

This means that alternative estimators for  $\mu$ , such as the sample median  $\tilde{X}$ , must have a greater variance. (In fact,  $V(\overline{X}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$ , while  $V(\tilde{X}) \approx \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$  for large n.)

The MLE for  $\sigma^2$  is  $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \overline{X})^2$ . However, this estimator is biased; the minimum variance unbiased estimator is the sample variance  $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \overline{X})^2$ .