

## Assignment 5

Assume that a random variable  $\Lambda$  follows the logarithmic normal distribution with parameters  $\mu, \sigma$ ,  $\Lambda \sim \text{LN}(\mu, \sigma)$  with:

$$P_{\Lambda}(\lambda | \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\lambda \sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(-(\log(\lambda) - \mu)^2 / 2\sigma^2\right)$$

Given  $\Lambda = \lambda$ , a random variable  $N$  follows the Poisson distribution with parameter  $\lambda$ ,  $N \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ . Assume that we observe  $N = u$ . An estimator of  $(\mu, \sigma)$  is given by maximizing the likelihood function  $L(\mu, \sigma; u) = P(N = u | \mu, \sigma)$ .

① Prove that  $L(\mu, \sigma; u) \propto E_{\Lambda}(\Lambda^u \exp(-\Lambda) | \mu, \sigma)$

② Define an algorithm that takes 1000 values from the normal distribution  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$  with known  $\mu, \sigma$ . The algorithm will convert them to 1000 values from  $\Lambda \sim \text{LN}(\mu, \sigma)$  and using these values it creates an estimator of  $L(\mu, \sigma; u)$ .

③ Experiment with different variance reduction methods

④ We have  $L(\mu, \sigma; u) = P(N = u | \mu, \sigma)$ ,  $N \sim \text{Poisson}(\Lambda)$  with  $\Lambda = \lambda$  so we get:

$$P(N = u | \mu, \sigma) = \frac{\lambda^u \exp(-\lambda)}{u!} = \frac{\Lambda^u \exp(-\Lambda)}{u!}$$

Moreover, we have:  $L(\mu, \sigma; u) \propto \Lambda^u \exp(-\Lambda) | \mu, \sigma$  ④

Since  $u$  is considered a constant and therefore we can omit it.

Finally, since the likelihood function  $L(\mu, \sigma | u)$  is proportional to the probability density function of  $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ , we can deduce that it will be proportional to the expected value of  $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ .

This means that ①  $\Rightarrow$

$$P(N=u | \mu, \sigma) = \frac{\lambda^u \exp(-\lambda)}{u!} = E_N \left( \frac{\lambda^u \exp(-\lambda)}{u!} \right)$$

② The algorithm will have the following steps:

① We get 1000 samples from the Normal distribution and we set  $\mu=0$  and  $\sigma=1$ .

② We convert these samples to the Logarithmic Normal distribution using  $Y \sim e^X$  where  $X$  denotes the samples that we got from the normal distribution. This stands, because log-normal distribution means the logarithm of the random variable is normally distributed, so in our case, if  $X$  has a normal distribution then  $Y = e^X$  is log-normally distributed.

(Optional) ③ Prove that the samples are indeed following the lognormal distribution.

④ Calculate the  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  of  $Y \sim \text{LN}$  since we expect them to be different from  $\mu=0, \sigma=1$  set for the Normal distribution.

⑤ Set  $\text{LN} \sim (\mu, \sigma)$  as  $f$  and  $x^u \cdot e^{-x}$  as  $g$  and simulate the integral  $\int_0^{+\infty} x^u \cdot e^{-x} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot e^{-\frac{(\log x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx$

⑥ Confirm that the mean is correct and calculate the variance of  $\theta$



⑤ For this part we just have to follow the theory. We need to find an  $h(x) \approx q(x)$  where  $E[h(x)]$  is known. If we choose  $h(x) = \text{Gamma}(\theta=1, k=n)$  then we will get:

$$h(x) = \frac{x^n \cdot e^{-x}}{(n+1)!}$$

We also know that the mean of this distribution is  $x$  and the plot shows that there is indeed a close relation between them. We get:

$$\hat{\theta}B = \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(x_i) + \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^n \cdot e^{-x_i}}{(n+1)!} - x_i \right) \right]$$

and we need to minimize:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{x_i^n \cdot e^{-x_i}}{(n+1)!} - x \right)$$

The way that I chose  $\mathbb{P}$  was to run the above algorithm for  $i=10$  samples and minimize the function in terms of  $\mathbb{P}$  each time. Afterwards, I set  $\mathbb{P}$  equal to the mean value of the generated  $b$ 's.

After calculating the above sum, we divide by  $n$  where  $n$  is the number of samples (1000) and return the variance.

Note  $\rightarrow$  The algorithm achieves a quite good variance without this method for small values of  $n$ , but as  $n$  gets bigger the variance skyrockets and we can really see the benefit of this method. To be precise, for  $n=1, 2, 3$  the <sup>initial</sup> variance is less than the variance using control variates, for  $n=4$  there seems to be a balance and for  $n \geq 5$  this method is by far the best.