

## Assignment #5

Page No.:

Date:

youva

ABHINAV KUNAR  
180050003

BHASKAR GUPTA  
180050022

Q.1

MLE estimate  $\hat{\mu}_{MLE} = \sum x_i / n$

i) Gaussian prior

$$P(\mu | \text{data}) = \frac{P(\text{data} | \mu) P(\mu; 10.5, 1)}{\int P(\text{data} | \mu) P(\mu; 10.5, 1) d\mu}$$

$$\int P(\text{data} | \mu) P(\mu; 10.5, 1) d\mu$$

MAP Estimate:  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} P(\mu | \text{data}) = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \log [P(\mu | \text{data})] = 0$

$$\log P(\mu | \text{data}) \propto \sum_i \cancel{e^{-(x_i - \mu)^2 / 2\sigma^2}}$$

$$\sum_i \frac{(x_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma_{\text{true}}^2} + \frac{(\mu - 10.5)^2}{2(1)}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \log P(\mu | \text{data}) = \frac{\sum (x_i - \mu)}{\sigma_{\text{true}}^2} + \frac{(10.5 - \mu)}{(1)} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{n\mu}{\sigma_{\text{true}}^2} + \mu = 10.5 + \frac{\sum x_i}{\sigma_{\text{true}}^2}$$

$$\mu = \frac{10.5 + \frac{\sum x_i}{\sigma_{\text{true}}^2}}{\frac{n}{\sigma_{\text{true}}^2} + 1}$$

ii) Uniform prior

$$P(\mu | \text{data}) = \frac{P(\text{data} | \mu) \times (1/2)}{\int_{\mu} P(\text{data} | \mu) \times 1/2 d\mu} \rightarrow e^{-\sum (x_i - \mu)^2 / 2\sigma_{\text{true}}^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \log P(\mu | \text{data}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu = \sum x_i / n$$

But since  $\mu$  has a uniform prior in  $(9.5, 11.5)$ , and Likelihood function is parabolic,  
 if  $\bar{x} < 9.5$ , MAP estimate in  $(9.5, 11.5)$  is 9.5  
 if  $\bar{x} > 11.5$ , MAP estimate in  $(9.5, 11.5)$  is 11.5  
 else MAP estimate is  $\bar{x}$ .

b) As  $N$  increases, the relative error for all the three estimates of  $\mu$  converges to that of MLE estimate. And, Gaussian prior boxplot has the minimum variance amongst all three estimate as The posterior  $\mu$  which is product of two Gaussians, mean

$$\text{has } \sigma^{2*}(\text{variance}) = \frac{(\sigma^2)(\sigma_0^2/n)}{\sigma^2 + \sigma_0^2/n} < \left(\frac{\sigma_0^2}{n}\right) [\text{ML estimator Variance}]$$

Hence, Gaussian prior is preferable.

$$Q2) y = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \log x.$$

$$g(x) = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \log x.$$

$$x = e^{-\lambda y}$$

$$\therefore g^{-1}(y) = e^{-\lambda y}$$

$$p(y) = \left| g(g^{-1}(y)) \frac{d}{dy} (g^{-1}(y)) \right|$$

$$p(y) = \lambda e^{-\lambda y}$$

$$P(Y|\lambda) = \lambda^N e^{-\lambda \sum_{i=1}^N y_i}$$

To find  $\hat{\lambda}_{ML}$  we will differentiate  $P(Y|\lambda)$  w.r.t.  $\lambda$ .

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} P(Y|\lambda) \stackrel{!}{=} 0.$$

$$N \lambda^{N-1} e^{-\lambda \sum y_i} - (\sum y_i) \lambda^N e^{-\lambda \sum y_i} = 0.$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_{ML} = \frac{N}{\sum y_i}$$



$$P(\lambda|Y) = \frac{P(Y|\lambda)P(\lambda)}{\int_0^{\infty} P(Y|\lambda)P(\lambda)d\lambda}$$

$$\int_0^{\infty} P(Y|\lambda)P(\lambda)d\lambda$$

$$= \frac{\lambda^N e^{-\lambda \sum y_i} \lambda^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta \lambda}}{\int_0^{\infty} \lambda^N e^{-\lambda \sum y_i} \lambda^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta \lambda} d\lambda} \quad \left( \text{ignored the constant as this will be cancelled} \right)$$

$$= \frac{\lambda^{N+\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda(\beta + \sum y_i)}}{\frac{\Gamma(N+\alpha)}{(\sum y_i + \beta)^{N+\alpha}}}$$

$$E(\lambda) = \int_0^{\infty} \lambda \cdot \frac{\lambda^{N+\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda(\beta + \sum y_i)}}{\frac{\Gamma(N+\alpha)}{(\sum y_i + \beta)^{N+\alpha}}} d\lambda$$

$$= \frac{N+\alpha}{\sum y_i + \beta}$$

We can find it by using the property  $\Gamma(x+1) = x\Gamma(x)$ .

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{posterior mean}} = \frac{N+\alpha}{\sum y_i + \beta}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_{MLE} = \frac{N}{\sum y_i}$$

Posterior mean for small  $N$ . M.L.E. for large  $N$ .

The posterior mean estimate is more accurate for small  $N$ . As  $N$  increases MLE becomes more efficient.

P.M.E. ~~is~~ tends to M.L.E. as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and has less variance.

Posterior is more reliable for limited data, but as  $N$  increases weight of the biased prior causes M.L.E. to be better.



(Q3) Points are of the form  
 $(r_0 \cos \theta, r_0 \sin \theta)$

$$E[r_0 \cos \theta, r_0 \sin \theta] = [0, 0]$$

$$C = E \left( \begin{bmatrix} r_0 \cos \theta \\ r_0 \sin \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} r_0 \cos \theta & r_0 \sin \theta \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

$$= E \begin{bmatrix} r_0^2 \cos^2 \theta & r_0^2 \sin \theta \cos \theta \\ r_0^2 \sin \theta \cos \theta & r_0^2 \sin^2 \theta \end{bmatrix}$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} r_0^2/2 & 0 \\ 0 & r_0^2/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

The theoretical and empirical mean and covariance matrix are closely correlated.

The modal point is theoretically  $(0, 0)$  but no data point is present there.

We can even find the modal radius:

$$P(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi \left(\frac{r_0^2}{2}\right)} e^{-\frac{r^2}{r_0^2}} r dr d\theta$$

$$P(r) = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{r_0^2}{2}\right)} e^{-r^2/r_0^2} r dr$$

$$\frac{dP(r)}{dr} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow e^{-r^2/r_0^2} \left(1 - \frac{2r^2}{r_0^2}\right) e^{-r^2/r_0^2} = 0$$

$$r = \frac{r_0}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ (modal radius)}$$

The Gaussian model is not satisfactory as  
The modal radius is at  $1/\sqrt{2}$  times the  
distance of the data



$$\text{Likelihood } (L) = \prod_{i=1}^N p(x_i; \mu; C)$$

$$L = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sqrt{|C|})^N} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_i (x_i - \mu)^T C^{-1} (x_i - \mu)}$$

~~log L~~ Taking log and differentiating w.r.t.  $\mu$  we get.

$$-\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \frac{d}{d\mu} [(x_i - \mu)^T C^{-1} (x_i - \mu)] = 0.$$

$$\sum_i C^{-1} (x_i - \mu) = 0.$$

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\sum_i x_i}{N}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C} \left( \log |C| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i (x_i - \mu)^T C^{-1} (x_i - \mu) \right) = 0.$$

$$\hat{C} = \frac{\sum_i (x_i - \hat{\mu})(x_i - \hat{\mu})^T}{N}$$

$$\hat{C} = \frac{\sum_i x_i x_i^T}{N} - \hat{\mu} \hat{\mu}^T.$$



Q.3 c) Yes. They match the theoretical values

$$\hat{Cov} = \begin{bmatrix} .5 & -.0007 \\ -.0007 & .5 \end{bmatrix} \quad C_{theor} = \begin{bmatrix} .5 & 0 \\ 0 & .5 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\hat{\mu} = \begin{bmatrix} .0016 \\ .0008 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mu_{theor} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$N = 100000$$

Q. 4

a)

$\hat{\theta}_{ML}$

likelihood function  $f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta^n}$  → decreasing function,

$$\theta \geq \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$$

⇒ Max-likelihood estimate is

$$\hat{\theta}_{ML} = \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$$

$$P(\theta|x) \propto P(x|\theta) \times P(\theta)$$

$$P(x|\theta) \propto \frac{1}{\theta^n},$$

$$\theta \geq \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$$

otherwise 0.

$$P(\theta) \propto \left(\frac{\theta_m}{\theta}\right)^\alpha$$

for  $\theta \geq \theta_m$

0 otherwise

$$\Rightarrow P(x|\theta)P(\theta) \propto \frac{1}{\theta^{n+\alpha}}, \quad \theta \geq \max\{\max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, \theta_m\}$$

0 otherwise

⇒ Posterior is also Pareto with parameters  $(n+\alpha, \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta_m\})$

$$\text{MAP estimate } \hat{\theta}_{MP} = \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta_m\}$$

[Same reasoning as MLE case,  $P(\theta|x)$  is decreasing].

b)  $\hat{\theta}_{ML} = \max \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$   
 $\hat{\theta}_{MP} = \max \{x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta_m\}$

As sample size tends to infinity & by the prior we know that  $\hat{\theta}_1 > \theta_m$ , there will be  $x_i$ 's  $> \theta_m$  & hence (more chances of finding)

$\hat{\theta}_{ML} = \max \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} = \max \{x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta_m\}$   
 (Since,  $x_i > \theta_m$ , both equalities are the same)  
 $\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_{MAP} \rightarrow \hat{\theta}_{ML}$  or rather  $\hat{\theta}_{ML} = \hat{\theta}_{MAP}$  if samples are perfectly random.

And above is desirable as MLE estimate has asymptotically lowest MSE.

c) Posterior  $P(\theta|x)$  is also proportional to  $\text{Pareto}(n+\alpha, \underbrace{\max \{x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta\}}_{\theta'_m})$

$\Rightarrow E_{P(\theta|x)}[\hat{\theta}] \propto \int_{\theta'_m}^{\infty} \frac{(\theta'_m)^{n+\alpha}}{(\theta)^{n+\alpha}} \theta d\theta$   
 $\propto (\theta'_m)^{n+\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{(n+\alpha-2)(\theta'_m)^{n+\alpha-2}} \propto \frac{(\theta'_m)^2}{n+\alpha-2}$

More rigorous  $\rightarrow$

$P(\theta|x) = c \cdot \frac{1}{\theta^n} \times \left(\frac{\theta'_m}{\theta}\right)^\alpha$   $\theta \geq \underbrace{\max \{x_1, \dots, x_n, \theta\}}_{\theta'_m}$   
 $\int \frac{1}{\theta^n} \times \frac{(\theta'_m)^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} d\theta$   
 $= \frac{c}{\theta^{n+\alpha}} \times \frac{1}{\int_{\theta'_m}^{\infty} \frac{d\theta}{\theta^{n+\alpha}}} = \frac{c/\theta^{n+\alpha}}{\frac{1}{(n+\alpha-1)(\theta'_m)^{n+\alpha-1}}}$



$$\Rightarrow E_{P(\theta|x)}[\hat{\theta}] = \int_{\theta'_m} \frac{c}{\theta^{n+\alpha}} \times \frac{(\theta'_m)^{n+\alpha-1}}{\theta} \times (n+\alpha-1) \theta d\theta$$

$$= \frac{(c)(\theta'_m)^{n+\alpha-1} (n+\alpha-1)}{(\theta'_m)^{n+\alpha-2} (n+\alpha-2)}$$

$$= \boxed{\frac{(c)(\theta'_m)(n+\alpha-1)}{(n+\alpha-2)}}$$

$$\theta'_m = \max\{\theta_m, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$$

d)

a

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (c) \theta'_m \frac{(n+\alpha-1)}{(n+\alpha-2)} = c \theta'_m$$

The exact value of  $\hat{\theta}_{pm}$  depends on coefficient in Pareto but asymptotically,  $\hat{\theta}'_m$  also tends to  $\hat{\theta}_m$  by the same reasoning as in (b).

This is desirable as we want our estimate to have minimum MSE & MLE has minimum estimate.