

$$1.1) n = 154$$

$$z_{\alpha/2} = 2.576$$

$$\hat{p} = \frac{76}{154} = 0.49$$

$$\hat{p} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}}$$

$$\left( \hat{p} - z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}}, \hat{p} + z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} \right)$$

$$(0.276, 0.710)$$



1.2) Yes, if you calculate the new interval for  $\hat{p} = 0.65$ , then we get:

$$(0.44, 0.85)$$

therefore there is evidence that the treatments are different b/c the first interval is lower than the second interval.



2.1) 1) pmf:  $f(x; \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^x e^{-\lambda}}{x!}$

2) joint pmf:

$$f(x; \lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i, \lambda)$$

$$= \frac{\lambda^{x_1} e^{-\lambda}}{x_1!} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{x_2} e^{-\lambda}}{x_2!} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{x_n} e^{-\lambda}}{x_n!}$$

$$L(p) = \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} e^{-n\lambda}}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i!}$$

3)  $l'(L(p)) = \log \left( \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} e^{-n\lambda}}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i!} \right)$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log(\lambda) - n\lambda - \sum_{i=1}^n \log(x_i!)$$

4) max:

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log(\lambda) - n\lambda - \sum_{i=1}^n \log(x_i!)$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{\lambda} - n$$

$$MLE \rightarrow \hat{\lambda} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \quad \checkmark$$

$$\begin{aligned} 2.2) \quad E(\hat{\lambda}) &= E\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E(X_i) = \frac{1}{n} (n\mu) = \mu \end{aligned}$$

Yes  $\hat{\lambda}$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\lambda$ .  $\checkmark$

$$2.3) \quad \theta = \alpha \hat{\lambda} + (1-\alpha) X_1$$

$$E(\theta) = E(\alpha \hat{\lambda} + (1-\alpha) X_1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \alpha E(\hat{\lambda}) + E(X_1) - \alpha E(X_1) \\ &= \alpha \mu + \mu - \alpha \mu = \mu \quad \checkmark \end{aligned}$$

We showed above

$$\sum_{i=1}^n E(X_i) = n\mu$$

$$\text{so } E(X_1) = \mu$$

$$2.4) \quad \text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}) < \text{Var}(\alpha \hat{\lambda} + (1-\alpha)X_1)$$

$$\text{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right) < \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 \text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}) + \text{Var}(X_1) - \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 \text{Var}(X_1)$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 n \sigma^2$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\sigma^2}{n} < \frac{1}{9} \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \lambda - \frac{\lambda}{9}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\sigma^2}{n} < \lambda \left(\frac{8}{9}\right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{9n}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\sigma^2}{3} < \lambda \left(\frac{8}{9}\right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{27} \quad \text{✓}$$

2.5) Yes it is still true b/c

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{n} < \lambda \left(\frac{8}{9}\right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{9n}$$

we will always be adding a  $\lambda \left(\frac{8}{9}\right)$  in our right side.

✓