

# EXAM #1 EXTRA CREDIT WEEKS 1-6

## ANSWER KEY

---

You are studying whether a new sleep medication is effective. You recruit patients to participate in an experiment: they each take the medication at 10pm then go to bed in a monitored setting. For each patient, you collect whether the patient entered REM sleep before 2am (a yes/no variable, coded 1/0). You want to estimate, at the population level, the proportion of people that will indeed enter REM sleep within 4 hours when taking the medication. But, of course, you only have your sample (of  $n$  patients in the experiment), so you need to perform statistical inference.

1. [+1] Create notation for this problem. Make sure you clearly define:
  - a. Your outcome variable and its theoretical distribution
  - b. The population parameter of interest (that you want to estimate)
  - c. The data you actually collected

*Outcome is  $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$  - 1s and 0s from the population*

*The population parameter of interest is  $p$ , the underlying probability of REM sleep within 4 hours*

*$X_i \sim \text{iid } i=1, \dots, n$  draws from  $X$  was collected as data*

*Stating the data was  $\text{Bin}(n, p)$ , but not specifying  $n=1$ , was given partial credit. Students who assumed we collected the total number of successes (rather than 1s/0s) had significantly more trouble on later parts (they added extra  $n$ 's in many places).*

2. [+1] Why would the sample mean be a reasonable statistic to use in this setting? Mathematically prove your justification, using notation from (1). *Hint: use the linearity of expectations.*

*It is an unbiased estimator of  $p$ .*

$$E[\text{sum}(X_i)/n] = 1/n * E[\text{sum}(X_i)] = 1/n * (\text{sum}(E[X_i])) = 1/n * \text{sum}(p) = 1/n * np = p$$

- Full credit is given to "it's consistent" if it was mathematically proven.
- 1/2 credit is given to "it's unbiased" and/or "it's consistent" if no mathematical proof is given

- 1/2 credit is given to “the central limit theorem applies, if  $n$  is large enough” [which is true, but without a mathematical proof]
3. [+1] Using the central limit theorem, what is the approximate distribution of your sample mean? *Hint: use the fact that a  $\text{Bern}(p)$  has variance  $p(1-p)$  – which you proved in homework #1! – or the fact that a  $\text{Bin}(n,p)$  has variance  $np(1-p)$*

CLT says that the sample mean is approximately  $N(\text{population mean}, \text{population variance} / n) = N(p, p^*(1-p)/n)$ .

*Note: the  $\text{Bin}(n,p)$  variance was given in case students wanted to directly calculate the variance of the sample mean (sum of  $X_i / n$ ), where the numerator has the variance of  $np(1-p)$ , so the overall variance is  $p(1-p)/n$*

4. [+1] Explain, in words or with a picture, how you'd decide if a certain medication effectiveness in the population (e.g. 70%) was likely or not, given your realized data. Please be concise (2-3 sentences is plenty).

*If  $p = 0.7$ , that means the sample mean, from (3), is approximately  $N(0.7, 0.21/n)$ . I can calculate how likely/extreme my realized sample mean is using that distribution (via area under the curve of one or two tails of the distribution).*

*A picture showing a normal distribution, centered at 0.7 with  $sd = \sqrt{0.21/n}$ , and calculating an area under the curve (of one or two tails), based on the realized value of the sample mean, is also a great answer.*

*Note that many students got this switched (they drew a picture centered at the sample mean, and checked if 0.7 was extreme); this was given partial credit*

5. [+1] What is an “iid” sample? Explain the concept in your own non-technical words (do not just state what the letters stand for). What could go wrong with this experiment that would violate an “iid” assumption? Please be concise (2-3 sentences is plenty).

*An “iid” sample is a collection of observations that are all from a single population, each drawn independently from each other. That means that observing one subject has no influence on whether I observe a different subject, and all subjects’ outcomes come from the same underlying distribution of outcomes. If this experiment had patients co-located, the “independence” assumption would be very unlikely because someone could interrupt someone else’s sleep.*