

Problem 3

Part 1

Prior on Θ

$$\text{PDF}_{\Theta}(\theta) = \frac{(\alpha-1) \theta_m^{\alpha-1}}{\theta^{\alpha}} \quad \text{if } \theta \geq \theta_m$$
$$= 0 \quad \text{otherwise}$$

Likelihood

$$\text{PDF}(X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n | \Theta=\theta)$$
$$= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\theta^n} & \text{if } \forall i=1,2,\dots,n \ x_i \in [0, \theta] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Evidence

$$\text{PDF}(X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n)$$
$$= \int_{\Theta} P(X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n | \Theta=\theta) d\theta$$
$$= \int_{\Theta} P(X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n | \Theta=\theta) P(\Theta=\theta) d\theta$$
$$= \int_0^{\beta} \frac{(\alpha-1) \theta_m^{\alpha-1}}{\theta^{\alpha+n}} d\theta \quad \text{if } \theta \geq \theta_m \text{ and } \forall i, x_i \in [0, \theta]$$
$$= \frac{(\alpha-1) \theta_m^{\alpha-1}}{(\alpha+n-1) \beta^{\alpha+n-1}} \quad \text{where } \beta = \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \theta_m)$$

Posterior

$$\text{PDF}(\Theta=\theta | X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n)$$
$$= \frac{\text{PDF}(X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n | \Theta=\theta) P(\Theta=\theta)}{P(X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n)}$$
$$= \frac{\frac{1}{\theta^n} \cdot \frac{(\alpha-1) \theta_m^{\alpha-1}}{\theta^{\alpha-1}} \cdot \frac{(\alpha+n-1) \beta^{\alpha+n-1}}{(\alpha-1) \theta_m^{\alpha-1}}}{\frac{(\alpha+n-1) \beta^{\alpha+n-1}}{(\alpha-1) \theta_m^{\alpha-1}}}$$
$$= \begin{cases} \frac{(\alpha+n-1) \beta^{\alpha+n-1}}{\theta^{\alpha+n}} & \text{if } x_i \in [0, \theta] \forall i \text{ and } \theta \geq \theta_m \\ & \text{and } \beta = \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \theta_m) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

ML Estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PDF}(X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n | \Theta=\theta) \\ = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\theta^n} & \text{iff } \forall i \in [n], x_i \in [0, \theta] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For the condition to be satisfied, $\theta \geq \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and $x_i \geq 0 \forall i \in [n]$. Since, $\frac{1}{\theta^n}$ is a decreasing function on positive θ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta}_{ML} &= \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \text{ if } x_i \geq 0 \forall i=1, 2, \dots, n \\ &= 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

MAP Estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PDF}(\Theta=\theta | X_1=x_1, \dots, X_n=x_n) \\ = \begin{cases} \frac{(\alpha+n-1) \beta^{\alpha+n-1}}{\theta^{\alpha+n}} & \text{if } x_i \in [0, \theta] \forall i=1, 2, \dots, n \\ & \text{and } \theta \geq \theta_m \\ & \text{and } \beta = \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \theta_m) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Using similar reasoning as above, $\theta \geq \max(x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta_m)$ and $x_i \geq 0 \forall i \in [n]$. Since $\frac{(\alpha+n-1) \beta^{\alpha+n-1}}{\theta^{\alpha+n}}$ is a decreasing function on positive θ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta}_{MAP} &= \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \theta_m) \text{ if } x_i \geq 0 \forall i=1, \dots, n \\ &= 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

Part 2

We now compare ML and MAP estimates for θ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

Define $\lambda = \max(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$.

Then $\hat{\theta}_{ML} = \lambda$ if $x_i \geq 0 \ \forall i=1, 2, \dots, n$
 $= 0$ otherwise

and $\hat{\theta}_{MAP} = \max(\lambda, \theta_m)$ if $x_i \geq 0 \ \forall i=1, 2, \dots, n$
 $= 0$ otherwise

We see that $\hat{\theta}_{ML} = \hat{\theta}_{MAP}$ iff $\lambda \geq \theta_m$.

Let θ_{true} denote true value of θ .

Case 1 - $\theta_{true} < \theta_m$

Then all of $x_i \in [0, \theta_{true}] \subset [0, \theta_m]$

Hence, $\hat{\theta}_{ML} \neq \hat{\theta}_{MAP}$ for any n .

Case 2 - $\theta_{true} \geq \theta_m$

Since X is a uniform distribution on $[0, \theta]$,

$$P(X \geq \theta_m) = 1 - \frac{\theta_m}{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad P(X < \theta_m) = \frac{\theta_m}{\theta}$$

$$P(\lambda \geq \theta_m) = 1 - P(\lambda < \theta_m)$$

$$= 1 - P(X_1 < \theta_m) \dots P(X_n < \theta_m)$$

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

But as $\lambda \geq \theta_m$ implies $\hat{\theta}_{MAP} = \hat{\theta}_{ML}$,

$$P(\hat{\theta}_{MAP} = \hat{\theta}_{ML}) = 1 - \left(\frac{\theta_m}{\theta}\right)^n \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

Hence, if $\theta_{true} < \theta_m$, they do not converge which isn't desirable as number of experiments $\rightarrow \infty$

If $\theta_{true} \geq \theta_m$, then they do converge, which is desirable as the real experiments dominates the prior belief.

Part 3

Posterior - Mean

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Theta}_{\text{Posterior Mean}} &= E_{P(\Theta | x_1, \dots, x_n)}[\Theta] \\&= \int_{\Theta} \Theta \cdot P(\Theta | x_1, \dots, x_n) d\Theta \\&= \int_{\beta}^{\infty} \frac{(\alpha+n-1) \beta^{\alpha+n-1}}{\Theta^{\alpha+n-1}} d\Theta \quad \text{where} \\&\quad \beta = \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \Theta_m) \\&= \frac{(\alpha+n-1)}{(\alpha+n-2)} \cdot \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \Theta_m)\end{aligned}$$

Part 4

We now compare $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{ML}}$ and $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{Posterior Mean}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It is easy to see that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\frac{\alpha+n-1}{\alpha+n-2} \rightarrow 1$

Hence as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{Posterior Mean}} = \max(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \Theta_m)$

Defining $\lambda = \max(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ as previously,

We get $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{ML}} = \lambda$ and $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{Posterior Mean}} = \max(\lambda, \Theta_m)$.

This is exactly like what we encountered before.

We use the same result. Hence,

if $\Theta_{\text{true}} < \Theta_m$, they do not converge, which is not desirable as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

if $\Theta_{\text{true}} \geq \Theta_m$, then they do converge, which is desirable as results of real experiments should dominate prior belief as $n \rightarrow \infty$.