

Statistical Theory Problem set 6

Bohao Tang

Problem 1:

$$(i) \quad P(X_i, Y_{i,1}, Y_{i,2}; \theta) = P(Y_{i,1} | X_i, \theta) \cdot P(Y_{i,2} | X_i, \theta) \cdot P(X_i | \theta) \\ = e^{-\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i)} \frac{[\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i)]^{Y_{i,1}}}{Y_{i,1}!} \cdot e^{-\mu_0(X_i)} \frac{[\mu_0(X_i)]^{Y_{i,2}}}{Y_{i,2}!} \cdot p_0(X_i)$$

(ii) $\Pr(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2} | X_i, \theta)$, since Poisson have additivity, and give X_i
 $Y_{i,1}, Y_{i,2}$ are independent follow Poisson distribution

$$\Rightarrow \Pr(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2} | X_i, \theta) = \text{Poisson}[(\beta_0 + 1) \mu_0(X_i)](Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) \\ = e^{-(\beta_0 + 1) \mu_0(X_i)} \frac{[(\beta_0 + 1) \mu_0(X_i)]^{Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}}}{(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2})!}$$

(iii) Given X_i, θ , $Y_{i,1}, Y_{i,2}$ are independent Poisson variable

therefore Given $X_i, \theta, Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}$, $Y_{i,1}$ is Binomial variable

conditionally $Y_{i,1} \sim \text{Binomial}(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}, \frac{\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i)}{\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i) + \mu_0(X_i)}) = \text{Binomial}(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}, \frac{\beta_0}{\beta_0 + 1})$

$$\Rightarrow \Pr(Y_{i,1} | Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}, X_i, \theta) = \binom{Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}}{Y_{i,1}} \left[\frac{\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i)}{(\beta_0 + 1) \mu_0(X_i)} \right]^{Y_{i,1}} \left[\frac{\mu_0(X_i)}{(\beta_0 + 1) \mu_0(X_i)} \right]^{Y_{i,2}}$$

$$(iv) \quad P = \frac{\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i)}{(\beta_0 + 1) \mu_0(X_i)} = \frac{\beta_0}{\beta_0 + 1} \Rightarrow \beta_0 = \frac{p}{1-p} = \binom{Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}}{Y_{i,1}} \left(\frac{\beta_0}{\beta_0 + 1} \right)^{Y_{i,1}} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_0 + 1} \right)^{Y_{i,2}}$$

and MLE for p is $\frac{\sum Y_{i,1}}{\sum Y_{i,1} + \sum Y_{i,2}} \Rightarrow$ MLE for β_0 is $\frac{\sum Y_{i,1}}{\sum (Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2})}$

$$= \frac{\sum Y_{i,1}}{\sum Y_{i,2}}$$

(V) See the code in appendix, The Function is `Poisson.ratio_exactCI.C` ...)
 It has a parameter 'interval' to decide whether to form a interval, all return all possible β

Here we first do simulation for $\beta = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 10$, each sampling 10000 samples and
~~do not~~ return all possible β , we have β can $\approx 2, 3, 4, 5$

Then do simulation for $\beta = 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, \dots, 6.0$, each sampling 100000 and return all β
 we have β can $\approx 1.1 \rightarrow 5.1$

Since β actually forms a interval well, we lastly do simulation for $\beta = \text{seq}(1, 5.2, \text{by} = 0.01)$
 each sampling 1000000 and return a interval of β

we have $\beta \in (1.10, 5.12)$ So the \checkmark CI is $(1.10, 5.12)$ error up to 0.02.
 (notice that the result is somehow stable)

Problem 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad \log \Pr(X_i, Y_{i,1}, Y_{i,2}) &= \log \Pr(Y_{i,1} | X_i, \theta) + \log \Pr(Y_{i,2} | X_i, \theta) + \log \Pr(X_i | \theta) \\ &= -\beta \mu(X_i) - \mu(X_i) + \log P(X_i) - \log Y_{i,1}! - \log Y_{i,2}! \\ &\quad + Y_{i,1} \log \beta \mu(X_i) + Y_{i,2} \log \mu(X_i) \end{aligned}$$

(ii)

$$\text{(a)} \quad \psi_{P,S}(P_i, \theta_0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial v_2} \log \Pr(P_i; \theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} = \frac{\frac{\partial P}{\partial v_2}(X_i, v_i^*)}{P(X_i, v_i^*)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(b)} \quad \psi_{\mu,S}(P_i, \theta_0) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1} \log \Pr(P_i; \theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} = -\beta \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(X_i, v_i^*) - \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(X_i, v_i^*) \\ &\quad + Y_{i,1} \frac{\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(X_i, v_i^*)}{\mu(X_i, v_i^*)} + Y_{i,2} \frac{\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(X_i, v_i^*)}{\mu(X_i, v_i^*)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(c)} \quad \psi_{\beta,S}(P_i, \theta_0) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log \Pr(P_i; \theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} = -\mu(X_i, v_i^*) + \frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta} \\ &= -\mu_0(X_i) + \frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

We can remove S because in the full model we also have parameter β
 and its score in full model is also $-\mu_0(X_i) + \frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta}$.

(iii)

(a) Since $E_{\theta_0} \psi_{p,s}(D_i, \theta_0) = 0$, obviously all function in Λ_p have mean 0 under θ_0

On the other side For any function ~~under~~ $f(X_i, \theta_0)$ which $E_{\theta_0} f(X_i, \theta_0) = 0$ we can build a submodel as.

$$p(x_i, v_2) = p_0(x_i) [1 + (v_2 - v_2^*) f(x_i, \theta_0)]$$

this is a likelihood because $E_{\theta_0} f(X_i, \theta_0) = 0 \Rightarrow \int p_0(x_i) (v_2 - v_2^*) f(x_i, \theta_0) dx_i = 0$
 $\Rightarrow \int p(x_i, v_2) dx_i = 1$

Then the score is $\frac{\partial}{\partial v_2} \log p(x_i, v_2) \Big|_{v_2 = v_2^*} = f(x_i, \theta_0)$

therefore $\Lambda_p = \{ \text{all function of } X_i \text{ and } \theta_0, \text{ that have mean } 0 \text{ at } \theta_0 \}$

$$\begin{aligned} (b) \psi_{\mu,s}(D_i, \theta_0) &= (Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(x_i, v_1^*) / \mu_0(x_i) - (\beta + 1) \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(x_i, v_1^*) \\ &= \frac{\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(x_i, v_1^*)}{\mu_0(x_i)} [(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) - (\beta + 1) \mu_0(x_i)] \end{aligned}$$

~~Since~~ Since $Y_{i,1}, Y_{i,2}, \beta, \mu_0(x_i)$ are all given

$$\text{span} \{ \psi_{\mu,s}(D_i, \theta_0) \} = [(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) - (\beta + 1) \mu_0(x_i)] \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(x_i, v_1^*) / \mu_0(x_i) \right\}$$

For all $g(x_i, \theta_0)$ just let submodel be $\mu(x_i, v_1) = \exp[(v_1 - v_1^*) g(x_i, \theta_0)] \cdot \mu_0(x_i)$

$$\text{Then } \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial v_1}(x_i, v_1^*) / \mu_0(x_i) = g(x_i, \theta_0)$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{span} \{ \psi_{\mu,s}(D_i, \theta_0) \} = \{ g(x_i, \theta_0) \cdot [(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) - (\beta + 1) \mu_0(x_i)], \text{ all } g(x_i, \theta_0) \}$$

~~Here X_i only have 15 value, therefore $g(x_i, \theta_0)$ will always be bounded.~~

~~therefore choose v_1 such that $(v_1 - v_1^*)$ small enough $\mu(x_i, v_1)$ will be a mean function~~

Here the $\mu(x_i, v_1)$ is positive therefore do be a mean function $(\Rightarrow 0)$

(iv). (a) $\psi_\beta(D_i, \theta_0) = \frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta} - \mu_0(X_i)$

\forall function $f(x_i, \theta_0) \in \Lambda_p$

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta_0} \psi_\beta(D_i, \theta_0) f(x_i, \theta_0) &= E \left[E \left[\left(\frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta} - \mu_0(X_i) \right) \cdot f(x_i, \theta_0) \mid X_i \right] \right] \\ &= E \left\{ f(x_i, \theta_0) E \left[\frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta} - \mu_0(X_i) \mid X_i \right] \right\} \\ &= E \left[f(x_i, \theta_0) \cdot 0 \right] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

therefore $\psi_\beta(D_i, \theta_0) \perp \Lambda_p \Rightarrow \text{proj } \psi_\beta(D_i, \theta_0) \text{ on } \Lambda_p = 0$

(b) Since $\psi_\beta(D_i, \theta_0)$ is $\perp \Lambda_p$

therefore proj of $\psi_\beta(D_i, \theta_0)$ on $\Lambda_p + \Lambda_\mu$ is the same as

proj of $\psi_\beta(D_i, \theta_0)$ on Λ_μ .

therefore the efficient score for $\beta = \psi_\beta - \psi_\beta \text{ proj on } \Lambda_p + \Lambda_\mu$
 $= \psi_\beta - \text{proj } \psi_\beta \text{ on } \Lambda_\mu$.

(c) from (b) we know that $\psi(D_i, \theta_0) = \psi_\beta - \text{some function in } \Lambda_\mu$

$$\Rightarrow \psi(D_i, \theta_0) = \left[\frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta} - \mu_0(X_i) \right] - \left[(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) - (1 + \beta_0) \mu_0(X_i) \right] g^*(X_i, \theta_0)$$

Then since $\psi(D_i, \theta_0)$ is the residual of projection, we have $\psi(D_i, \theta_0) \perp \Lambda_\mu$

$$\Rightarrow E_{\theta_0} \left[\psi(D_i, \theta_0) \cdot \left\{ (Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) - (1 + \beta_0) \mu_0(X_i) \right\} \cdot \check{g}(X_i, \theta_0) \right] = 0.$$

$\forall \check{g}$

(v) Do the expectation $E_{\theta_0}(\cdot)$ by $E[E(\cdot \mid X_i)]$

Then we have $E_{\theta_0} \left[\left(\frac{\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i)}{\beta} \right) \check{g}(X_i, \theta_0) - g^*(X_i, \theta_0) \check{g}(X_i, \theta_0) (1 + \beta_0) \mu_0(X_i) \right] = 0$

$$\Rightarrow E_{\theta_0} \left[\check{g}(X_i, \theta_0) \left[\frac{\beta_0 \mu_0(X_i)}{\beta} - g^* (1 + \beta_0) \mu_0(X_i) \right] \right] = 0 \Rightarrow g^* = \frac{\beta_0}{1 + \beta_0} \frac{1}{\mu_0(X_i)}$$

(Vi) Based on (V), the efficient score ~~is~~ for β is

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(D_i, \theta_0) &= \left[\frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta_0} - \mu_0(X_i) \right] - \cancel{\frac{(Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2})}{1 + \beta_0} \mu_0(X_i) + \frac{\beta_0}{\beta_0} \mu_0^2(X_i)} \\ &\quad - (Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) \frac{1}{1 + \beta_0} + \mu_0(X_i) \\ &= \frac{Y_{i,1}}{\beta_0} - (Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2}) \frac{1}{1 + \beta_0}\end{aligned}$$

Then solve efficient score function

$$\begin{aligned}\sum \psi(D_i, \hat{\theta}_0) &= 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\sum Y_{i,1}}{\hat{\beta}_0} - \frac{\sum (Y_{i,1} + Y_{i,2})}{1 + \hat{\beta}_0} = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \hat{\beta}_0 &= \frac{\sum Y_{i,1}}{\sum Y_{i,2}} = \text{MLE}\end{aligned}$$

So that conditional MLE is somehow ~~q~~ efficient in general sense that it achieves C-R bound for the whole semi-parametric model.

Coding Part

Bohao Tang

March 9, 2018

```
Y1 = c(2,1,4,5,3,4,4,5,8,8,9,12,14,14,15)
Y2 = c(0,1,0,0,3,2,3,4,2,5,6,6,4,6,7)

Poisson.ratio.exactCI <- function(Y1, Y2, searchlist, nsamples, alpha, interval=FALSE){
  n = length(Y1)
  results = c()
  if(!interval){
    for( beta in searchlist ){
      flag = 1
      for( i in 1:n ){
        samples = rbinom(nsamples, Y1[i]+Y2[i], beta/(1+beta))
        inf = quantile(samples, (1-alpha)/2)
        sup = quantile(samples, (1+alpha)/2)
        if(Y1[i] < inf || Y1[i] > sup){
          flag = 0
          break
        }
      }
      if(flag){
        results = c(results, beta)
      }
    }
  }
  else{
    for( beta in searchlist ){
      flag = 1
      for( i in 1:n ){
        samples = rbinom(nsamples, Y1[i]+Y2[i], beta/(1+beta))
        inf = quantile(samples, (1-alpha)/2)
        sup = quantile(samples, (1+alpha)/2)
        if(Y1[i] < inf || Y1[i] > sup){
          flag = 0
          break
        }
      }
      if(flag){
        results = c(results, beta)
        break
      }
    }
  }
  for( beta in rev(searchlist) ){
    flag = 1
    for( i in 1:n ){
      samples = rbinom(nsamples, Y1[i]+Y2[i], beta/(1+beta))
      inf = quantile(samples, (1-alpha)/2)
      sup = quantile(samples, (1+alpha)/2)
      if(Y1[i] < inf || Y1[i] > sup){
```

```

        flag = 0
        break
    }
}
if(flag){
    results = c(results, beta)
    break
}
}
}
results
}

betas = Poisson.ratio.exactCI(Y1, Y2, seq(0, 10, by=1), 10000, 0.95)
betas

## [1] 2 3 4 5

betas = Poisson.ratio.exactCI(Y1, Y2, seq(1, 6, by=0.1), 100000, 0.95)
betas

## [1] 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.7 1.8 1.9 2.0 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7 2.8
## [18] 2.9 3.0 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 3.6 3.7 3.8 3.9 4.0 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5
## [35] 4.6 4.7 4.8 4.9 5.0 5.1

betas = Poisson.ratio.exactCI(Y1, Y2, seq(1.0, 5.2, by=0.01), 1000000, 0.95, interval=TRUE)
betas

## [1] 1.10 5.12

```