

36-705 Intermediate Statistics Homework #4 Solutions

October 6, 2016

Problem 1 [30 pts.]

(a) [20 pts.] Find a minimal sufficient statistic.

A statistic T is minimal sufficient if $\frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)}$ does not depend on μ, Σ iff $T(y^n) = T(x^n)$. Suppose $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$. We will show that (\bar{X}, S_X) is minimal sufficient, where $S_X = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})^T$.

Let us start by deriving an expression for $\frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)}$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)} &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \left[(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2} \right]^{-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (y_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \mu) \right\}}{\prod_{i=1}^n \left[(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2} \right]^{-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (x_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x_i - \mu) \right\}} \\ &= \frac{\exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left[-\frac{1}{2} (y_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \mu) \right] \right\}}{\exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left[-\frac{1}{2} (x_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x_i - \mu) \right] \right\}} \\ &= \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \mu) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x_i - \mu) \right] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(y_i - \mu)^T$ is $1 \times d$, Σ^{-1} is $d \times d$, and $(y_i - \mu)$ is $d \times 1$. So $\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \mu)$ is a scalar and will equal its own trace. Let us rewrite $\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \mu)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \mu) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y} + \bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \bar{y} + \bar{y} - \mu) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left[(y_i - \bar{y} + \bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \bar{y} + \bar{y} - \mu) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left\{ \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \bar{y} + \bar{y} - \mu) (y_i - \bar{y} + \bar{y} - \mu)^T \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left\{ \Sigma^{-1} \left[(y_i - \bar{y})(y_i - \bar{y})^T + 2(y_i - \bar{y})(\bar{y} - \mu)^T + (\bar{y} - \mu)(\bar{y} - \mu)^T \right] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left\{ \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \bar{y})(y_i - \bar{y})^T \right\} + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left\{ 2\Sigma^{-1} (y_i - \bar{y})(\bar{y} - \mu)^T \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left\{ \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu)(\bar{y} - \mu)^T \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \text{tr} \left\{ \Sigma^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})(y_i - \bar{y})^T \right\} + \text{tr} \left\{ (\bar{y} - \mu)^T 2 \Sigma^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y}) \right\} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left\{ (\bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu) \right\} \\
 &= \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} n S_y \} + 0 + n (\bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu) \\
 &= n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_y \} + n (\bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)} &= \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left\{ n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_y \} + n (\bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu) \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. - n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_x \} - n (\bar{x} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{x} - \mu) \right\} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we can show that $\frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)}$ does not depend on μ, Σ iff $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ and $S_x = S_y$.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose that $\frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)}$ does not depend on μ, Σ . Define

$$A = -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_y \} + n (\bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu) - n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_x \} - n (\bar{x} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{x} - \mu) \right\}.$$

Since $\frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)}$ does not depend on μ , we know that

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)} = \exp[A] \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} A.$$

That means that

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} A \\
 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left[-\frac{1}{2} n (\bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu) + \frac{1}{2} n (\bar{x} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{x} - \mu) \right] \\
 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left[-\frac{1}{2} n (\mu - \bar{y})^T \Sigma^{-1} (\mu - \bar{y}) + \frac{1}{2} n (\mu - \bar{x})^T \Sigma^{-1} (\mu - \bar{x}) \right] \\
 &= -\frac{n}{2} \left[\Sigma^{-1} (\mu - \bar{y}) + (\Sigma^{-1})^T (\mu - \bar{y}) \right] + \frac{n}{2} \left[\Sigma^{-1} (\mu - \bar{x}) + (\Sigma^{-1})^T (\mu - \bar{x}) \right] \\
 &= -\frac{n}{2} \left[\Sigma^{-1} (\mu - \bar{y}) + (\Sigma^T)^{-1} (\mu - \bar{y}) \right] + \frac{n}{2} \left[\Sigma^{-1} (\mu - \bar{x}) + (\Sigma^T)^{-1} (\mu - \bar{x}) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= -\frac{n}{2} \left[\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{y}) + \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{y}) \right] + \frac{n}{2} \left[\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{x}) + \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{x}) \right] \\
 &= -n \left[\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{y}) \right] + n \left[\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{x}) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 n \left[\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{y}) \right] &= n \left[\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{x}) \right] \\
 \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{y}) &= \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{x}) \\
 \Sigma \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{y}) &= \Sigma \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \bar{x}) \\
 \mu - \bar{y} &= \mu - \bar{x} \\
 \bar{y} &= \bar{x}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Also, since $\frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)}$ does not depend on Σ , we know that

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \Sigma} \frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)} = \exp[A] \frac{\partial}{\partial \Sigma} A.$$

That means that

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \Sigma} A \\
 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \Sigma} \left[-\frac{1}{2} n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_y \} + \frac{1}{2} n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_x \} \right] \\
 &= -\frac{n}{2} \{ -\Sigma^{-1} S_y \Sigma^{-1} \} + \frac{n}{2} \{ -\Sigma^{-1} S_x \Sigma^{-1} \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{n}{2} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_x \Sigma^{-1} \} &= \frac{n}{2} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_y \Sigma^{-1} \} \\
 \Sigma^{-1} S_x \Sigma^{-1} &= \Sigma^{-1} S_y \Sigma^{-1} \\
 \Sigma \Sigma^{-1} S_x \Sigma^{-1} \Sigma &= \Sigma \Sigma^{-1} S_y \Sigma^{-1} \Sigma \\
 S_x &= S_y.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ and $S_x = S_y$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ and $S_x = S_y$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)} &= \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left\{ n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_y \} + n(\bar{y} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{y} - \mu) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_x \} - n(\bar{x} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{x} - \mu) \right\} \right] \\ &= \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left\{ n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_x \} + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{x} - \mu) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - n \text{tr} \{ \Sigma^{-1} S_x \} - n(\bar{x} - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{x} - \mu) \right\} \right] \\ &= \exp(0) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

So $\frac{p(y^n; \mu, \Sigma)}{p(x^n; \mu, \Sigma)}$ does not depend on μ, Σ .

We conclude that (\bar{X}, S_X) is a minimal sufficient statistic.

(b) [10 pts.] Show that $X_1 + X_2$ is not a sufficient statistic.

Since (\bar{X}, S_X) is minimal sufficient for (μ, Σ) , if $X_1 + X_2$ were sufficient there would be a function f such that $(\bar{X}, S_X) = f(X_1 + X_2)$, which is clearly impossible.

Problem 2 [30 pts.]

(a) [20 pts.] Find the distribution of (X_1, X_2) given T , where $T = \max\{X_1, X_2\}$.

Since X_1 and X_2 are independent, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1, x_2) &= f_{X_1}(x_1) f_{X_2}(x_2) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right) \cdot I(X_1 \leq \theta) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right) \cdot I(X_2 \leq \theta) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \cdot I(\max\{X_1, X_2\} \leq \theta) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \cdot I(T \leq \theta). \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X_1, X_2, T}(x_1, x_2, t) &= \begin{cases} 0 & : T = \max\{x_1, x_2\} \neq t \\ f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1, x_2) & : T = \max\{x_1, x_2\} = t \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & : T = \max\{x_1, x_2\} \neq t \\ \left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \cdot I(T \leq \theta) & : T = \max\{x_1, x_2\} = t \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Next, let us solve for $f_T(t)$. We determine

$$F_T(t) = \mathbb{P}(T \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq t \cap X_2 \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq t)\mathbb{P}(X_2 \leq t).$$

We know that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq t) = \begin{cases} 0 & : t < 0 \\ \frac{t}{\theta} & : 0 \leq t \leq \theta \\ 1 & : t > \theta \end{cases}$$

So

$$F_T(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & : t < 0 \\ \left(\frac{t}{\theta}\right)^2 & : 0 \leq t \leq \theta \\ 1 & : t > \theta \end{cases}$$

Differentiating with respect to t , we see that $f_T(t)$ will be non-zero on the interval $0 \leq t \leq \theta$. Specifically,

$$f_T(t) = \frac{2t}{\theta^2}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \theta.$$

Hence $f_{X_1, X_2|T}(x_1, x_2|t)$ is defined where $t = \max\{x_1, x_2\}$ (and hence t is in the interval $0 \leq t \leq \theta$). For $0 \leq x_1 \leq \theta$, $0 \leq x_2 \leq \theta$, and $t = \max\{x_1, x_2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X_1, X_2|T}(x_1, x_2|t) &= \frac{f_{X_1, X_2, T}(x_1, x_2, t)}{f_T(t)} \\ &= \frac{(1/\theta)^2}{2t/\theta^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2t} \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$f_{X_1, X_2|T}(x_1, x_2|t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2t} & : 0 \leq x_1 \leq \theta, 0 \leq x_2 \leq \theta, t = \max\{x_1, x_2\} \\ 0 & : \text{else} \end{cases}$$

(b) **[10 pts.]** Show that $X_1 + X_2$ is not sufficient.

Consider the ratio

$$\begin{aligned} R(x^n, y^n; \theta) &= \frac{p(y_1, y_2; \theta)}{p(x_1, x_2; \theta)} \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\max\{Y_1, Y_2\} \leq \theta\}}}{\left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\max\{X_1, X_2\} \leq \theta\}}} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\max\{Y_1, Y_2\} \leq \theta\}}}{\mathbb{1}_{\{\max\{X_1, X_2\} \leq \theta\}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

(1) is independent of θ if and only if $\max\{X_1, X_2\} = \max\{Y_1, Y_2\}$, so $\max\{X_1, X_2\}$ is a minimal sufficient statistic for θ . If $X_1 + X_2$ were sufficient there would be a function f such that $\max\{X_1, X_2\} = f(X_1 + X_2)$, which is clearly impossible.

Problem 3

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{3\theta} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{-\theta \leq X_i \leq 2\theta\}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{3\theta} \right)^n \mathbb{1}_{\{-\theta \leq X_{(1)}, \theta \geq X_{(n)}/2\}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{3\theta} \right)^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta \geq \max\{-X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}/2\}\}} \end{aligned}$$

Problem 4

By linearity of the expectation we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n} n\lambda = \lambda$$

So bias = 0. Moreover, since X_i 's are independent:

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}(X_i) = \frac{1}{n^2} n\lambda = \frac{\lambda}{n}$$

such that $\text{se} = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}}$ and $\text{MSE}(\hat{\lambda}) = 0^2 + \frac{\lambda}{n} = \frac{\lambda}{n}$.

Problem 5 [10 pts.]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\hat{\theta}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[2\bar{X}_n] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\bar{X}_n] \\ &= 2 \cdot \frac{\theta}{2} \\ &= \theta, \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{Bias}_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\hat{\theta}] - \theta = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{se}_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{\theta}(2\bar{X}_n)} \\ &= \sqrt{4\mathbb{V}_{\theta}(\bar{X}_n)} \\ &= \sqrt{4 \cdot \frac{\theta^2}{12n}} \\ &= \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{3n}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2] &= \text{Bias}_{\hat{\theta}}^2(\hat{\theta}) + \text{se}_{\hat{\theta}}^2(\hat{\theta}) \\ &= \frac{\theta^2}{3n}.\end{aligned}$$

Problem 6 [30 pts.]

- (a) [10 pts.] The first and second moments of $X_1 \sim \text{Uniform}(a, b)$ are:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_1] &= \frac{a+b}{2} \\ \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] &= \int_a^b x^2 \frac{1}{b-a} dx = \frac{a^2 + ab + b^2}{3}\end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{\alpha}_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $\hat{\alpha}_2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2$ be the first and second sample moments. By solving the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\alpha}_1 &= \frac{b+a}{2} \\ \hat{\alpha}_2 &= \frac{a^2+ab+b^2}{3} \end{cases}$$

we obtain the following estimators:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{a} &= \hat{\alpha}_1 - \sqrt{3(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_1^2)} \\ \hat{b} &= \hat{\alpha}_1 + \sqrt{3(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_1^2)}\end{aligned}$$

To obtain \hat{a} for example note that the first equation gives us that $2\hat{\alpha}_1 - a = b$, replacing this in the second equation:

$$\frac{a^2 + a(2\hat{\alpha}_1 - a) + (2\hat{\alpha}_1 - a)^2}{3} = \hat{\alpha}_2$$

Expanding the square, cancelling and regrouping we obtain:

$$(a - \hat{\alpha}_1)^2 = 3(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_1^2)$$

So that $\hat{a} = \hat{\alpha}_1 - \sqrt{3(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_1^2)}$. \hat{b} is obtained similarly.

- (b) [10 pts.] The likelihood function of $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is:

$$\mathcal{L}(a, b) = \prod_{i=1}^n (b-a)^{-1} I_{(a,b)}(x_i) = (b-a)^{-n} I_{(-\infty, x_{(1)})}(a) I_{(x_{(n)}, \infty)}(b)$$

By inspection this is maximized when $b-a$ is as small as possible while also satisfying $a \leq x_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)} \leq b$. So the MLE estimators are $\hat{a} = X_{(1)}$, $\hat{b} = X_{(n)}$.

- (c) [10 pts.] We have $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \frac{a+b}{2}$. By equivariance property of the MLE we have that the MLE of τ is:

$$\hat{\tau} = \frac{\hat{a} + \hat{b}}{2} = \frac{X_{(1)} + X_{(n)}}{2}$$