

## 2.f

To find  $\lambda_{MAP}$ , we start by detailing its expression:

$$\lambda_{MAP} = \arg \max_{\lambda} p(\lambda|k) =$$

From Bayes rule, we get:

$$= \arg \max_{\lambda} \frac{p(k|\lambda)p(\lambda)}{p(k)} = \arg \max_{\lambda} \frac{p(k|\lambda)p(\lambda)}{\int p(k|\lambda)p(\lambda)\partial\lambda}$$

As the question states, it can be hard to compute the integral in the denominator of the above expression. But because we are working with maximum a posteriori estimation, we are using the  $\arg \max$  operator on  $\lambda$ . This means we are looking through all the possible values of  $\lambda$ , and all of them will have the same common denominator, so we can simply ignore the integral and work on finding the  $\lambda$  that maximizes  $p(k|\lambda)p(\lambda)$  without any effect on the estimator found. We then continue our computations:

$$\lambda_{MAP} = \arg \max_{\lambda} p(k|\lambda)p(\lambda) =$$

Using the log trick, we get:

$$= \arg \max_{\lambda} \log(p(k|\lambda)p(\lambda)) = \arg \max_{\lambda} \log p(k|\lambda) + \log p(\lambda)$$

Since we already have the log-likelihood, we just need to compute the expression for the prior  $\log p(\lambda)$  before continuing with our  $\lambda_{MAP}$  computations. Considering the given prior distribution, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log p(\lambda) &= \log p(\lambda|\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \log \frac{\alpha_2^{\alpha_1}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)} \lambda^{\alpha_1-1} e^{-\alpha_2 \lambda} = \\
&= \alpha_1 \log \alpha_2 - \log \Gamma(\alpha_1) + (\alpha_1 - 1) \log \lambda - \alpha_2 \lambda = \\
&\text{Expanding the Gamma function } \Gamma(x) = (x-1)!:
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \alpha_1 \log \alpha_2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_1-1} \log(\alpha_1 - i) \right) + (\alpha_1 - 1) \log \lambda - \alpha_2 \lambda$$

Going back to the original equation  $\arg \max_{\lambda} \log p(k|\lambda) + \log p(\lambda)$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\arg \max_{\lambda} \log p(k|\lambda) + \log p(\lambda) &= \arg \max_{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^N k_i \log \lambda - \sum_{i=1}^N \log(k_i!) - N\lambda + \alpha_1 \log \alpha_2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_1-1} \log(\alpha_1 - i) \right) + (\alpha_1 - 1) \log \lambda - \alpha_2 \lambda = \\
&= \arg \max_{\lambda} \log \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N k_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \log(k_i!) + \alpha_1 \log \alpha_2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_1-1} \log(\alpha_1 - i) \right) + (\alpha_1 - 1) \log \lambda - (N + \alpha_2) \lambda = \\
&= \arg \max_{\lambda} \left( \left( \sum_{i=1}^N k_i \right) + \alpha_1 - 1 \right) \log \lambda - (N + \alpha_2) \lambda - \sum_{i=1}^N \log(k_i!) + \alpha_1 \log \alpha_2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_1-1} \log(\alpha_1 - i) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

But to get to the value that maximizes the above expression w.r.t  $\lambda$ , we would take its derivative and equal it to zero, which would zero out all the terms that do not depend on  $\lambda$ . Therefore, we can rewrite the expression with only the terms that depend on  $\lambda$  without compromising the maximum a posteriori estimation:

$$\lambda_{MAP} = \arg \max_{\lambda} \left( \left( \sum_{i=1}^N k_i \right) + \alpha_1 - 1 \right) \log \lambda - (N + \alpha_2) \lambda$$

Exactly what was expected.