theta\_0 being in the confidence interval with coverage probability 1 - alpha, is equivalent to the test at size alpha retaining.  $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{R} \text{ ET}_{\mathcal{O}_o} \times \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{C} \text{ I}_{\mathcal{O}_o} \times \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{O} \times \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \times \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{O} \times \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \times \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{O} \times \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \times \\ \hat$ 

We inverted a 2-sided hypothesis test to get a 2-sided CI. You can also have a 1-sided CI e.g.  $(\mathcal{L}_{L_{j}}, \theta_{j}) = (\mathcal{L}_{L_{j}}, \mathcal{L}_{L_{j}}, \mathcal{L}_{L_{j}}) \quad \text{or} \quad (\mathcal{L}_{R_{j}}, \mathcal{L}_{L_{j}}) = (\mathcal{L}_{L_{j}}, \mathcal{L}_{L_{j}}, \mathcal{L}_{L_{j}})$  but we won't do this in class only for the interest of saving time and moving on to other topics.

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{h_{1}}^{2} + \frac{\sigma_{x}^{2}}{h_{2}} = \sigma^{2} \quad \text{Khown}$$

$$= \left[ \left( \hat{\partial}_{1} - \hat{\partial}_{1} \right) + 2_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \right] \quad \text{See let}, \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{h_{1}}^{2} + \frac{\sigma_{x}^{2}}{h_{2}} = \frac{\sigma_{x}^{2}}{h_{1}} \int_{h_{1}}^{2} + \frac{\sigma_{x}^{2}}{h_{2}} \int_{h_{1}}^{2} \int_{h_{2}}^{2} \int_{h_{1}}^{2} \int_{h_{2}}^{2} \int_{h_{2}}^{2} \int_{h_{1}}^{2} \int_{h_{2}}^{2} \int_{h_{2}$$

see lec 7 for the Satterthwaite approximation 
$$O(G)$$
:  $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$  bern  $(B)$ ,  $\stackrel{\circ}{O} = \overline{X}$  via the CLT,  $\stackrel{\circ}{O(B)} = \overline{X}$   $N(C)$ 
 $\stackrel{\circ}{\rightarrow} O(C)$ 
 $\stackrel{\circ}{\rightarrow$ 

 $\Rightarrow P\left(\frac{\partial - \hat{\theta}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{1}}} \in \left[Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, +Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\right]\right) \approx 1 - \alpha$   $\Rightarrow P\left(\partial \in \left[\hat{O} - Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \frac{\partial (1-\theta)}{\partial x}, \hat{O} + Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \frac{\partial (1-\theta)}{\partial x}\right]\right) \approx 1 - \alpha$   $\Rightarrow CI_{0,1-\alpha} \approx \left[\hat{\theta} - Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \frac{\partial (1-\theta)}{\partial x}, \hat{O} + Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \frac{\partial (1-\theta)}{\partial x}\right]$ 

this is \*a\*\* CI for the binomial proportion. It is actually a bad approximation for low n and theta near 0 or 1. There are other CI's we won't study and it is actually an area of modern research.

Och: 
$$X_{1_1,...}X_{1_{h_1}}$$
 it ban(P) integ. of  $X_{2_1,...}X_{2_{h_2}}$  if bar(P) integ. of  $X_{2_1,...}X_{2_{h_2}}$  if bar(P) integ. of  $X_{2_1,...}X_{2_{h_2}}$  if bar(P) integrated in  $X_{2_1,...}X_{2_{h_2}}$  if bar(P) integrated in  $X_{2_1,...}X_{2_{h_2}}$  if  $X_{2_1,...}X_$ 

 $\int \frac{\partial_{1}(\underline{l} \cdot \underline{\theta})}{n_{1}} + \frac{\partial_{1}(\underline{l} \cdot \underline{\theta}_{2})}{n_{2}} \qquad \int \frac{\hat{\partial}_{1}(\underline{l} \cdot \hat{\theta}_{1})}{n_{1}} + \frac{\hat{\partial}_{1}(\underline{l} \cdot \hat{\theta}_{1})}{n_{2}}$   $\Rightarrow (I_{\partial_{1} - \partial_{2}, 1 - \infty} \approx \left[ (\hat{\hat{\theta}}_{1} - \hat{\hat{\theta}}_{2}) \pm z_{1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}} \right] \frac{\hat{\partial}_{1}(\underline{l} \cdot \hat{\theta}_{1})}{n_{1}} + \frac{\hat{\partial}_{2}(\underline{l} \cdot \hat{\partial}_{2})}{n_{2}}$  e.g. from the radial study,  $h_{1} = 81, \hat{\partial}_{1} = 0.335, n_{2} = 74, \hat{\partial}_{2} = 0.167$ 

$$CI_{B_1B_2, N_5N} \approx \left[ (0.377 - 0.187) \pm [.16 \right]_{\frac{1379 \cdot 0.167}{81}}^{\frac{1379 \cdot 0.167}{81}} + \frac{0.167 \cdot 0.047}{71} \right]$$

$$= \left[ .18 \right] \pm 1.96 \cdot 0.066 \right] = \left[ 0.051, 0.311 \right] \qquad \text{for } \frac{\partial \cdot \partial}{\partial x}$$
"You're 95% confident that the true proportion difference is between 5.1% and 31.1%.

Of  $\rho$  is some to with the proportion  $\rho$  is some  $\rho$ 

ifference is between 5.1% and 31.1%.

Of  $\beta$  force  $\gamma$  with them  $\beta$ , variouse  $\delta^2$  whichowh.  $\beta = X$   $CI_{\beta_1,1-d} \approx \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\beta} \\ \hat{\beta} \\ \hat{\beta} \end{bmatrix} = X$ if you use the tit won't be "so bad"

Frob || on random X : X = 2.57, S = 1.00

example from last class. DGP: iid Gumbel(theta, 1) and the data is <2.15, 1.91, 3.66, 4.85, 3.03, 1.03, 3.58> and n = 7. Find a 95% CI for theta:

$$\hat{\beta}^{MLE} = \ln \left( \frac{\Delta}{5 - X_{c}} \right) \hat{\beta}^{MLE} = 7.26$$

Now that we've been properly introduced to statistical inference (all three goals), let's talk about some big picture things. For an unbiased estimator, MSE (being small) is KING. Why?

(1) Point Estimation
The lower the MSE, the closer thetahathat is to theta on average.

(2) Hypothesis Testing
Most estimators we discussed with exactly or approximately normally distributed. Thus the retainment region for a 2-sided test looks like:

 $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{O}_{0} \pm \mathcal{I}_{1-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \mathcal{I}_{\text{PASE}}$ with a smaller MSE => smaller RET => higher power!

(3) Confidence Intervals

For exactly or approximately normally distributed estimators,  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{I}_{0} + \mathcal{I}_{$ 

A lower MSE means a tighter / smaller CI which means you're more confidence about where theta lies e.g.  $CI_{\partial_1 AS} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.41.5.1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{vs.} \quad CI_{\partial_1 AS} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4119, 0.5001 \end{bmatrix}$  Let's picture all three goals:  $0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.41.5.1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{let's picture all three goals:}$ 

RET CI