STATS 2107 Statistical Modelling and Inference II Lecture notes Chapter 5: Likelihood theory

Jono Tuke

School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Adelaide

Semester 2 2017

Maximum likelihood estimation

Joint probability distributions

Consider independent random variables Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n and let

$$f_i(y_i;\theta)$$

denote the probability density function if Y_i is continuous and the probability mass function if Y_i is discrete. The joint probability density function or probability mass function is then given by

$$f(\mathbf{y};\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(y_i;\theta).$$

Definitions

▶ The function

$$L(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = f(\mathbf{y}; \theta)$$

is called the likelihood function.

▶ The function

$$\ell(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = \log L(\theta; \mathbf{y})$$

is called the log-likelihood.

Examples

- ▶ Suppose $y_1, y_2, ..., y_n$ are *i.i.d.* $Po(\lambda)$ observations.
- Suppose y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are *i.i.d.* $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ observations with σ^2 known.

Definition

If y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are independent observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{y})$, then the function

$$S(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta}$$

is called the score function.

Examples

- ▶ Suppose $y_1, y_2, ..., y_n$ are *i.i.d.* $Po(\lambda)$
- Suppose y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are *i.i.d.* $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ observations with σ^2 known.

Definition

If y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are independent observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{y})$, then the maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) $\hat{\theta}$ is the value of θ that maximizes $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{y})$.

Remarks

In practice, $\hat{\theta}$ is usually derived by solving the ${\bf score}$ ${\bf equation}$

$$S(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = 0.$$

We assume $\hat{\theta}$ exists and is unique.

Examples

- ▶ Suppose $y_1, y_2, ..., y_n$ are *i.i.d.* $Po(\lambda)$ observations.
- Suppose y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are *i.i.d.* $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ observations with σ^2 known.



Cramér-Rao inequality

Suppose that Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n are i.i.d. with pdf $f(y; \theta)$. Subject to regularity conditions on $f(y; \theta)$, we have that for any **unbiased** estimator $\tilde{\theta}$ for θ ,

$$Var(ilde{ heta}) \geq I_{ heta}^{-1}$$

where

$$I_{\theta} = E\left[\left(\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta}\right)^2\right].$$

Fisher information

 \emph{I}_{θ} is known as the Fisher information about θ in the observations.

Alternative form

Under the same regularity conditions as for the Cramér-Rao inequality:

$$I_{\theta} = -E \left[rac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \theta^2}
ight].$$

Proof

Examples

- ▶ Suppose $y_1, y_2, ..., y_n$ are *i.i.d.* $Po(\lambda)$ observations.
- ▶ If $y_1, y_2, ..., y_n$ are *i.i.d.* $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ observations with σ^2 known.

Theorem

Suppose y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are independent observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta^*; \mathbf{y})$, where θ^* denotes the true value of the parameter. Under certain regularity conditions on $f(\mathbf{y}; \theta)$,

- ► $E(S(\theta^*; Y)) = 0.$
- \triangleright $var(S(\theta^*; \mathbf{Y})) = I_{\theta^*}.$
- ► The distribution of

$$\frac{S(\theta^*; \mathbf{Y})}{\sqrt{I_{\theta^*}}}$$

converges to N(0,1) as $n \to \infty$.

Theorem

Suppose y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are independent observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta^*; \mathbf{y})$, where θ^* denotes the true value of the parameter. Under certain regularity conditions on $f(\mathbf{y}; \theta)$, then asymptotically

$$\hat{\theta} \sim N(\theta^*, I_{\theta^*}^{-1}),$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ is the MLE for θ .

Examples

▶ Suppose $y_1, y_2, ..., y_n$ are *i.i.d.* $Po(\lambda)$ and recall

$$\hat{\lambda} = \bar{y}$$
 and $I_{\lambda} = \frac{n}{\lambda}$.

The preceding theory states that

- $ightharpoonup \hat{\lambda}$ is "asymptotically unbiased".
- ▶ The large-sample standard error is $\sqrt{\lambda/n}$.
- ▶ The distribution of

$$\frac{\hat{\lambda} - \lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda/n}}$$

converges to N(0,1) as $n \to \infty$.

Check directly



Approximate confidence intervals

Suppose y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n are independent observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{y})$.

An approximate $100(1-\alpha)\%$ confidence interval for θ is given by

$$\left(\hat{\theta}-z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{I_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1}},\ \hat{\theta}+z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{I_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1}}\right).$$

Wald test statistic

Suppose Y_1, \ldots, Y_n are i.i.d. observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{Y})$.

The Wald test statistic for

$$H_0: \theta = \theta_0$$

is given by

$$Z = \frac{\hat{\theta} - \theta_0}{\sqrt{I_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1}}}.$$

If $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ is true then, the distribution of Z converges to N(0,1) as $n \to \infty$.

A test with significance level approximately α is given by the rule:

Reject
$$H_0$$
 if $|Z| \ge z_{\alpha/2}$.

Score test statistic

Suppose Y_1, \ldots, Y_n are i.i.d. observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{Y})$.

The score test statistic for

$$H_0: \theta = \theta_0$$

is given by

$$U=rac{S(heta_0; \mathbf{Y})}{\sqrt{I_{ heta_0}}}.$$

If $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ is true then, the distribution of U converges to N(0,1) as $n \to \infty$.

A test with significance level approximately α is given by the rule:

Reject
$$H_0$$
 if $|U| \ge z_{\alpha/2}$.

Log-likelihood ratio test statistic

Suppose Y_1, \ldots, Y_n are i.i.d. observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{Y})$.

The log likelihood-ratio test statistic is given by

$$G^2 = -2(\ell(\theta_0; \mathbf{Y}) - \ell(\hat{\theta}; \mathbf{Y})).$$

If $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ is true then, under suitable regularity conditions, the distribution of G^2 converges to χ_1^2 as $n \to \infty$.

A test with significance level approximately α is given by the rule:

Reject
$$H_0$$
 if $g^2 \ge \chi^2_{1,\alpha}$.

Example

Suppose y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n are independent $Po(\lambda)$ observations.

Suppose we wish to test H_0 : $\lambda = \lambda_0$.

Calculate the Wald test statistic, the Score test statistic, and the log-likelihood ratio test statistic.



Setup

Suppose y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n are independent observations with log-likelihood $\ell(\theta; \mathbf{y})$ for a scalar parameter θ and consider an invertible, twice differentiable function, Φ . Taking $\phi = \Phi(\theta)$ we can take ϕ as the parameter of interest rather than θ .

Example Bernoulli

Suppose y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n are i.i.d. Bernoulli observations with success probability θ .

Consider the log-odds,

$$\Phi(\theta) = \log\left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right).$$

Relationship between likelihoods

Let the log-likelihoods with respect to θ and ϕ be given respectively by

$$\ell_{\theta}(\theta; \mathbf{y})$$
 and $\ell_{\phi}(\phi; \mathbf{y})$.

It can be checked that the two likelihoods are related by

$$\ell_{\phi}(\phi; \mathbf{y}) = \ell_{\theta}(\Phi^{-1}(\phi); \mathbf{y})$$

and

$$\ell_{\theta}(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = \ell_{\phi}(\Phi(\theta); \mathbf{y}).$$

Example

Calculate the log-likelihoods for both parameterizations of the Bernoulli.

Theorem

Suppose $\ell_{\theta}(\theta; \mathbf{y})$ and $\ell_{\phi}(\phi; \mathbf{y})$ are equivalent parametrizations of the same problem. Then $\hat{\phi} = \Phi(\hat{\theta})$.

Proof

Invariance of HT

For independent Bernoulli observations y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n the hypothesis $H_0: \theta = 0.5$ can be expressed equivalently as $H_0: \phi = 0$ if

$$\phi = \log\left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right).$$

However, it can be checked that the Wald test statistics corresponding to the two equivalent formulations of the problem are not equal.

Theorem

Suppose y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n are independent observations with log-likelihood function

$$\ell_{\theta}(\theta; \mathbf{y}) = \ell_{\phi}(\phi; \mathbf{y})$$

where $\phi = \Phi(\theta)$. Consider the hypothesis

$$H_0: \theta = \theta_0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad H_0: \phi = \phi_0$$

and let u_{θ} and u_{ϕ} be the score statistics defined from the two log-likelihood functions.

If Φ is 1-1 and onto and twice continuously differentiable with $\Phi'(\theta) \neq 0$ then

$$|u_{\phi}|=|u_{\theta}|.$$

"Goodness of fit"

Multinomial distribution

The integer-valued random variables, $Y_1, Y_2, ..., Y_k$ are said to follow the multinomial distribution if their joint probability function is given by

$$p(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k) = \binom{n}{y_1, y_2, \dots y_k} \pi_1^{y_1} \pi_2^{y_2} \cdots \pi_k^{y_k}$$

for

$$y_1, \ldots, y_k \geq 0; \quad y_1 + y_2 + \ldots + y_k = n,$$

where

$$\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_k \geq 0$$

with

$$\pi_1 + \pi_2 + \cdots + \pi_k = 1$$

Mean and variance of multinomial

It can be shown for the multinomial- (n, π) distribution that

$$E(Y_i) = n\pi_i$$

 $var(Y_i) = n\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$
 $cov(Y_i, Y_j) = -n\pi_i\pi_j$ if $i \neq j$.

Setup

Suppose now that we observe multinomial data Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_k and wish to test the hypothesis

$$H_0: \pi = \pi_0$$

for some specific set of probabilities π_0 .

Definition

The "goodness of fit" test statistic is given by

$$X^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(Y_{i} - n\pi_{0i})^{2}}{n\pi_{0i}}.$$

Theorem

If H_0 : $\pi=\pi_0$ is true, then for large n the distribution of X^2 is approximately χ^2_{k-1} .

Reject if $x^2 \ge \chi^2_{k-1,\alpha}$.

Example

A die was rolled 48 times and the following data recorded.

Value	1	2	3	4	5	6	total
Frequency	8	10	9	7	7	7	48

Test the hypothesis that the die is fair.

Example

In an occupational health and safety study, 414 machinists at a particular factory were recorded over 3 months and the number of accidents were recorded.

Accidents	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	total
Frequency	296	74	26	8	4	3	2	0	1	414

Can these observations be modelled by i.i.d. Poisson observations?

Theorem

If H_0 is true, then for large n, the distribution of X^2 is approximately χ^2_{k-q-1} where q is the number of parameters that have to be estimated to compute π .