

Q1

ans) Given X_1, X_2 iid Poisson(λ), $\lambda > 0$
 Also,

$$T = X_1 + 2X_2$$

We need to check if T is sufficient for λ

The formal defⁿ of sufficiency is

$P(X = x | T(x) = t)$: does not depend on λ

For values $X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1$;

$$P(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1 | T = X_1 + 2X_2 = 2) \stackrel{\text{redundant}}{=} P(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1 \cap X_1 + 2X_2 = 2) / P(X_1 + 2X_2 = 2)$$

$$= \frac{P(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1)}{P(X_1 + 2X_2 = 2)}$$

$$= \frac{P(X_1 = 0) \cdot P(X_2 = 1)}{P(X_1 + 2X_2 = 2)} \quad (\text{iid})$$

$$= \frac{P(X_1=0) \cdot P(X_2=1)}{P(X_1=0, X_2=1) + P(X_1=2, X_2=0)}$$

$$P(X_1=0, X_2=1) + P(X_1=2, X_2=0)$$

Break the den'g into
rep. prob's by setting
each to 0

$$= \frac{(e^{-\lambda}) (\lambda e^{-\lambda})}{(e^{-\lambda}) (\lambda e^{-\lambda}) + (e^{-\lambda}) (\frac{\lambda^2}{2} e^{-\lambda})}$$

$$= \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \frac{\lambda^2}{2}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\lambda}{2}}$$

\therefore , it does depend on $\theta = \lambda$

Hence, $T = X_1 + 2X_2$ is not sufficient for λ

Q-2

- a) For a distribution to belong to exponential family, of distributions, the likelihood fn should be of the form

$$L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \{h(x_i)\} \{c(\theta)\}^n \exp \left\{ w_1(\theta) \sum_{i=1}^n d_1(x_i) + w_2(\theta) \sum_{i=1}^n d_2(x_i) + \dots + w_k(\theta) \sum_{i=1}^n d_k(x_i) \right\}$$

Given: pdf of X from $\text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ given by:

$$f(x) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta x} \quad 0 < x < \infty, \alpha > 0, \beta > 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n f_\theta(x_i) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} (x_i)^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta x_i} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left[\frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \right]^n \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i)^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta \sum x_i}$$

$$= \left[\frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \right]^n \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i)^\alpha e^{-\beta \sum x_i}$$

$$= \left[\frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \right]^n \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{d \ln(x_i)^\alpha}{e^{\beta \sum x_i}} e^{-\beta \sum x_i}$$

$$= \left[\frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \right]^n \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} e^{\alpha \sum \ln x_i - \beta \sum x_i}$$

Comparing it to exponential family distribution $L(\theta)$
 we get,

$$L(\theta) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \prod_{i=1}^n h(x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n x_i$$

$$w_1(\theta) = \alpha \sum t_1(x_i) = \sum \ln x_i$$

$$w_2(\theta) = \beta \sum t_2(x_i) = \sum x_i$$

∴ gamma distribution belongs to exponential family of distributions

b) Using factorization theorem, we can find sufficient statistic for exponential family of distributions

$$T(X) = [T_1(x), T_2(x), \dots, T_n(x)]$$

where in this case $T_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ln x_i$ and $T_2(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$

Therefore $T = \{T_1(x), T_2(x)\}$

$= \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \ln x_i, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right\}$ are jointly

sufficient statistic for $\theta = (\alpha, \beta)$.

Q.3)

For a random variable X , the

p.d.f is

$$f_{\theta}(x_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta - \frac{1}{2} < x_i < \theta + \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The corresponding likelihood f^n is

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(x_i) \\ &= 1 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n I_{\theta}(x_i) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } I_{\theta}(x_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta - \frac{1}{2} < x_i < \theta + \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

but we take ordered random variable
 x_i ,

$$\text{i.e. } \theta - \frac{1}{2} < x_{(1)} < x_{(2)} < \dots < x_{(n)} < \theta + \frac{1}{2}$$

Again defining indicator function

$$I_{\theta}(x_{(1)}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta - \frac{1}{2} < x_{(1)} < x_{(2)} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$I_{\theta}(x_{(2)}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_{(1)} < x_{(2)} < x_{(3)} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$I_{\theta}(x_{(n)}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_{(n-1)} < x_{(n)} < \theta + \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

From the indicator functions, if one of them is zero then the likelihood will be zero

$$\text{So } I_{\theta}(x_{(n)}), \dots, I_{\theta}(x_{(n-1)}) = 1$$

hence,

$$L(\theta) = 1 \cdot I_{\theta}(x_{(n)}) \cdot I_{\theta}(x_{(n)})$$

Applying factorization theorem

& taking $h(x) = 1$ if $L(\theta) = g_{\theta}(\pi(x)) \cdot h(x)$
then $\pi(x)$ is sufficient for θ .

$$g_{\theta}(\theta, \pi(x)) = I_{\theta}(x_{(n)}) \cdot I_{\theta}(x_{(n)})$$

$$\text{So } T(x) = (\min(x_1, \dots, x_n), \max(x_1, \dots, x_n))$$

are jointly sufficient statistic for θ .