

# STA 522, Spring 2021

## Introduction to Theoretical Statistics II

### Lecture 3

Department of Biostatistics  
University at Buffalo

15 February, 2021



# AGENDA

- ▶ almost sure convergence & SLLN
- ▶ convergence in distribution
- ▶ central limit theorem
- ▶ sufficiency

## Review: Sufficiency

- ▶ A statistic  $T(\underline{x})$  is a **sufficient statistic** for a parameter  $\theta$  if the conditional distribution of the sample  $\underline{X}$  given that  $T(\underline{x}) = t$  does not depend on  $\theta$ .
- ▶ **Checking sufficiency:**  $T(\underline{x})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  if, for every  $\underline{x}$  in the sample space, the ratio  $\frac{p(\underline{x} | \theta)}{q(T(\underline{x}) | \theta)}$  is constant as a function of  $\theta$ . Here  $p(\underline{x} | \theta)$  = joint pdf/pmf of  $\underline{X}$  and  $q(t | \theta)$  = pdf/pmf of  $T(\underline{x})$ .
- ▶ **Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid Bernoulli random variables with parameter  $\theta$ ,  $0 < \theta < 1$ . Then  $T(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  is sufficient for  $\theta$ .

**Example (sufficient order statistics).** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid from a distribution with pdf  $f(x)$ , where we are unable to specify any more information about the pdf (as is the case in nonparametric estimation). Then the order statistics are a sufficient statistic.

To verify this, first let  $\theta$  be the vector of all parameters in the density  $f$  and define  $T(\underline{x}) = (X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)})$  where  $X_{(i)}$  are the order statistics.

Then  $p(\underline{x} \mid \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i \mid \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_{(i)} \mid \theta)$  and

$$q(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) = n! \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_{(i)} \mid \theta), \text{ which means } \frac{p(\underline{x} \mid \theta)}{q(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta)} = \frac{1}{n!}.$$

## Notes

- ▶ this is not much of a reduction, but we shouldn't expect more with so little information about the density
- ▶ for specific parametric densities substantial reduction is possible.

## How to find sufficient statistics?

- ▶ The previous theorem allows one to check *if* a statistic is sufficient, but doesn't say *how* to find a sufficient statistic (requires guesswork).
- ▶ The following theorem provides *one way* to find a sufficient statistic. The following form is due to Halmos and Savage (1949), but the original idea can be traced back to Neyman and Fisher (1930-39).

### Theorem 6.2.6 (Factorization Theorem)

Let  $f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)$  denote the joint pdf or pmf of a sample  $\underline{X}$ . A statistic  $T(\underline{x})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  *if and only if* there exist functions  $g(t \mid \theta)$  and  $h(\underline{x})$  such that, for all sample points  $\underline{x}$  and all parameter points  $\theta$ ,

$$f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) = g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) \cdot h(\underline{x}).$$

## Notes

1. Thus the Factorization Theorem says that to find a sufficient statistic we first factor  $f$  into  $g \cdot h$ , where (i)  $h$  is free of  $\theta$ , and (ii)  $g$  depends on  $\theta$  and on  $\underline{x}$  only through some function  $T(\underline{x})$ . This function is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .
2.  $h(\underline{x})$  can be 1 in some situations.

**Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid Bernoulli random variables with parameter  $\theta$ ,  $0 < \theta < 1$ . We know that  $T(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  is sufficient for  $\theta$ .

To obtain this through the Factorization Theorem, note that for  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \{ \theta^{x_i} (1 - \theta)^{1-x_i} \} \\ &= \theta^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} (1 - \theta)^{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} = g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $h(\underline{x}) = 1$ ,  $T(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ , and  $g(t \mid \theta) = \theta^t (1 - \theta)^{n-t}$ .

**Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid Weibull  $(\gamma, \beta)$  with common pdf  $f(x | \beta) = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} x^{\gamma-1} e^{-x^\gamma/\beta}$  for  $x > 0$  where  $\gamma > 0$  is known and  $\beta > 0$  is unknown.

To find a sufficient statistic for  $\beta$ , write for  $\underline{x}$  with  $x_i > 0$ , all  $i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x} | \beta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{\beta} x_i^{\gamma-1} e^{-x_i^\gamma/\beta} \right\} \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{\beta^n} e^{-\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^\gamma} \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma x_i^{\gamma-1} \right) = g(T(\underline{x}) | \beta) h(\underline{x}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $h(\underline{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma x_i^{\gamma-1}$ ,  $T(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^\gamma$ , and  $g(t | \beta) = \frac{1}{\beta^n} e^{-t/\beta}$ .

Therefore, from the Factorization Theorem it follows that  $T(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\gamma$  is sufficient for  $\beta$ .



## Note

If the support of  $f$  involves  $\theta$ , then we must appropriately define  $h$  and  $g$  to ensure that the product is 0 where  $f$  is 0.

**Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid Discrete-Uniform  $(1, \dots, \theta)$ , where  $\theta$  is a positive integer. To find a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ , write

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i \mid \theta) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{\theta} I(x_i \in \{1, \dots, \theta\}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta^n} I\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i \leq \theta\right) \\ &= g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $h(\underline{x}) = 1$ ,  $T(\underline{x}) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i$ , and  $g(t \mid \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta^n} I(t \leq \theta)$ .

**Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$  random variables, where  $\sigma^2$  is known. We want a sufficient statistic for  $\mu$ .

The joint pdf of  $\underline{X}$  is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x} | \mu) &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \right)^n \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \right)^n \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right\} \right) \\ &= \underbrace{\exp \left( -\frac{n}{2\sigma^2} (\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right)}_{=g(T(\underline{x})|\mu)} \underbrace{\left[ \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \right)^n \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \right) \right]}_{=h(\underline{x})} \end{aligned}$$

This means that  $T(\underline{X}) = \bar{X}$  is sufficient for  $\mu$ .

## Proof of Theorem 6.2.6

We'll prove this only for discrete cases.

**Only if Part:** Let  $T(\underline{x})$  be a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ . Choose

$$g(t \mid \theta) = P_{\theta}(T(\underline{X}) = t) \text{ and } h(\underline{x}) = P(\underline{X} = \underline{x} \mid T(\underline{X}) = T(\underline{x})).$$

Since  $T(\underline{X})$  is sufficient, the conditional probability  $P(\underline{X} = \underline{x} \mid T(\underline{X}) = T(\underline{x}))$  doesn't depend on  $\theta$  (definition), and so this choice of  $h$  is legitimate.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) &= P_{\theta}(\underline{X} = \underline{x}) \\ &= P_{\theta}(\underline{X} = \underline{x} \text{ and } T(\underline{X}) = T(\underline{x})) \\ &= P_{\theta}(T(\underline{X}) = T(\underline{x})) P(\underline{X} = \underline{x} \mid T(\underline{X}) = T(\underline{x})) \\ &= g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x}) \end{aligned}$$

i.e., factorization holds.

**If part:** Suppose factorization holds.

Let  $q(t \mid \theta)$  be the pmf of  $T(\underline{X})$ . Define  $A_{T(\underline{x})} = \{\underline{y} : T(\underline{y}) = T(\underline{x})\}$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)}{q(T(\underline{X}) \mid \theta)} &= \frac{g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x})}{q(T(\underline{X}) \mid \theta)} \\ &= \frac{g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x})}{\sum_{\underline{y} \in A_T} g(T(\underline{y}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{y})} \\ &= \frac{g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x})}{g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) \sum_{\underline{y} \in A_T} h(\underline{y})} \\ &= \frac{h(\underline{x})}{\sum_{\underline{y} \in A_T} h(\underline{y})}\end{aligned}$$

is free of  $\theta$ .

Therefore,  $T(\underline{X})$  is sufficient for  $\theta$ .

# Joint Sufficiency

**Definition:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be a random sample from the density  $f(x | \theta)$ . The statistics  $T_1(\underline{X}), \dots, T_r(\underline{X})$  are **jointly sufficient for  $\theta$**  if and only if the conditional distribution of  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  given  $T_1(\underline{X}) = t_1, \dots, T_r(\underline{X}) = t_r$  does not depend on  $\theta$ .

## Notes

- ▶ A set of jointly sufficient statistics may also be referred to as a **vector-valued sufficient statistic**.
- ▶ The sample itself,  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ , is always jointly sufficient since the conditional distribution of the sample given the sample does not depend on  $\theta$ . Also, as seen in a previous example, the order statistics are jointly sufficient as well.
- ▶ The Factorization Theorem can still be used to find jointly sufficient statistics.

**Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid Uniform  $(\theta - \frac{1}{2}, \theta + \frac{1}{2})$ . We want a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ I \left( \theta - \frac{1}{2} < x_i < \theta + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} \\ &= I \left( \theta - \frac{1}{2} < x_{(1)} < x_{(n)} < \theta + \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ &= g(T_1(\underline{x}), T_2(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $T_1(\underline{x}) = x_{(1)}$ ,  $T_2(\underline{x}) = x_{(n)}$ , and  $h(\underline{x}) = 1$ . This shows that  $(T_1, T_2) = (X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$  are jointly sufficient for  $\theta$ .

## Notes

- ▶ It is likely that a set of jointly sufficient statistics  $(T_1(\underline{X}), \dots, T_r(\underline{X}))$  is needed when the parameter is also a vector, say  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s)$ .
- ▶ Usually the sufficient statistic and the parameter vectors are of equal lengths ( $r = s$ ), but different combinations of lengths are possible.

**Example (Contd.):** Suppose that  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  are iid  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$  with both  $\mu$  and  $\sigma^2$  unknown. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(\underline{x} \mid \mu, \sigma^2) &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \right)^n \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 \right) \\
 &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^n \left( \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right)^{n/2} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right\} \right) \\
 &= \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right)^{n/2} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \{ (n-1)s^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \} \right)}_{=g(T_1(\underline{x}), T_2(\underline{x}) \mid \mu, \sigma^2)} \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^n}_{=h(\underline{x})}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $T_1(\underline{x}) = \bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$  and  $T_2(\underline{x}) = s^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$ .

This shows that  $(\bar{X}, S^2)$  are jointly sufficient for  $(\mu, \sigma^2)$ .

**Example (Sufficient Statistic for Exponential Family):** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid observations from a pdf/pmf  $f(x | \theta)$  that belongs to an exponential family given by

$$f(x | \theta) = h(x)c(\theta) \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^k w_i(\theta) t_i(x) \right),$$

where  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$  and  $d \leq k$ .

Then

$$T(\underline{X}) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^n t_1(X_j), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^n t_k(X_j) \right)$$

is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .



# Invariance Principle for Sufficient Statistics

## Theorem

Suppose  $T(\underline{X})$  is sufficient for a parameter  $\theta$ , and let  $u$  be a one-to-one function. Then  $T^*(\underline{X}) = u(T(\underline{X}))$  is also sufficient for  $\theta$ .

**Proof:** Since  $u$  is one-to-one,  $u^{-1}$  exists as a function and  $T(\underline{X}) = u^{-1}(T^*(\underline{X}))$ . Then by the Factorization Theorem there exists  $g$  and  $h$  such that

$$f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) = g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x}) = g(u^{-1}(T^*(\underline{x})) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x}) = g^*(T^*(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x})$$

where  $g^*(t \mid \theta) = g(u^{-1}(t) \mid \theta)$ . Again from the Factorization theorem this shows that  $T^*(\underline{X})$  is also sufficient for  $\theta$ .

# Sufficient Statistics are NOT unique

- ▶ Based on the Invariance Principle, we see that sufficient statistics are not unique.
- ▶ Note that the sample itself, i.e.,  $T(\underline{X}) = \underline{X}$ , is a sufficient statistic. So are the order statistics  $T(\underline{X}) = (X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)})$ .
- ▶ Question: Is one sufficient statistic better than another?
- ▶ Recall that the purpose of sufficient statistics is to achieve data reduction without loss of information about the parameter  $\theta$ .
- ▶ A statistic that achieves the most data reduction while still retaining all the information about  $\theta$  might be preferable.

# Minimal Sufficient Statistic

**Definition:** A sufficient statistic  $T(\underline{X})$  is called a **minimal sufficient statistic** if, for any other sufficient statistic  $T'(\underline{X})$ ,  $T(\underline{x})$  is a function of  $T'(\underline{x})$ , i.e., whenever  $T'(\underline{x}) = T'(\underline{y})$ , then  $T(\underline{x}) = T(\underline{y})$ .

Among all sufficient statistics, a minimal sufficient statistic achieves the greatest possible data reduction.

**Example:** Suppose that  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  are iid  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , with  $\sigma$  known.

We have seen that  $T(\underline{X}) = \bar{X}$  is sufficient for  $\mu$ .

We can also show that the statistic  $T'(\underline{X}) = (\bar{X}, S^2)$  is sufficient for  $\mu$ .

Since both  $T(\underline{X})$  and  $T'(\underline{X})$  are sufficient for  $\mu$ , they each contain the same information about  $\mu$ . But clearly  $T(\underline{X})$  achieves greater data reduction than  $T'(\underline{X})$ .

If  $\sigma$  were unknown, however, things would be different.

# Checking for Minimal Sufficiency

## Theorem 6.2.13

Let  $f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)$  be the pdf/pmf of a sample  $\underline{X}$ . Suppose there exists a function  $T(\underline{X})$  such that, for every  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$ , the ratio

$$\frac{f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)}{f(\underline{y} \mid \theta)}$$

is constant as a function of  $\theta$  if and only if  $T(\underline{x}) = T(\underline{y})$ . Then  $T(\underline{X})$  is a minimal sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

**Proof:** To simplify proof assume  $f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) > 0$  for all  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\theta$ .

**$T(\underline{X})$  is sufficient:** Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{t : t = T(\underline{x}) \text{ for some } \underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  be the image of  $\mathcal{X}$  under  $T(\underline{x})$ .

Define the partition set  $A_t = \{\underline{x} : T(\underline{x}) = t\}$ , and choose and fix  $\underline{x}_t \in A_t$  for each  $t$ .

For any  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\underline{x}_{T(\underline{x})}$  is the fixed element that is in the same set,  $A_t$ , as  $\underline{x}$ . Since both  $\underline{x} \in A_t$  and  $\underline{x}_{T(\underline{x})} \in A_t$ , so  $T(\underline{x}) = T(\underline{x}_{T(\underline{x})})$ , and hence  $h(\underline{x}) = f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) / f(\underline{x}_{T(\underline{x})} \mid \theta)$  is a constant function of  $\theta$ .

Define  $g(t \mid \theta) = f(\underline{x}_t \mid \theta)$ . Then

$$f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) = \frac{f(\underline{x}_{T(\underline{x})} \mid \theta) f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)}{f(\underline{x}_{T(\underline{x})} \mid \theta)} = g(T(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h(\underline{x})$$

which implies sufficiency of  $T(\underline{X})$  by the Factorization Theorem.

**$T(\underline{X})$  is minimal:** Let  $T'(X)$  be any other sufficient statistic. By the Factorization Theorem, there exist functions  $g'$  and  $h'$  such that  $f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) = g'(T'(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h'(\underline{x})$ . Let  $x$  and  $y$  be two sample points with  $T'(\underline{x}) = T'(\underline{y})$ . Then

$$\frac{f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)}{f(\underline{y} \mid \theta)} = \frac{g'(T'(\underline{x}) \mid \theta) h'(\underline{x})}{g'(T'(\underline{y}) \mid \theta) h'(\underline{y})} = \frac{h'(\underline{x})}{h'(\underline{y})}$$

Since this ratio does not depend on  $\theta$  from the assertion of the theorem, we have  $T(\underline{x}) = T(\underline{y})$ . So,  $T(\underline{x})$  is a function of  $T'(\underline{x})$  and  $T(\underline{x})$  is a minimal sufficient statistic.

**Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , with both  $\mu$  and  $\sigma^2$  unknown. Given a sample  $\underline{X}$  we saw that  $(\bar{X}, S^2)$  is sufficient for  $(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . To show that  $(\bar{X}, S^2)$  is minimal sufficient, consider two sample points  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  with sample mean and variances  $(\bar{x}, s_x^2)$  and  $(\bar{y}, s_y^2)$  respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(\underline{x} \mid \mu, \sigma^2)}{f(\underline{y} \mid \mu, \sigma^2)} &= \frac{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \exp(-[n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 + (n-1)s_x^2]/(2\sigma^2))}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \exp(-[n(\bar{y} - \mu)^2 + (n-1)s_y^2]/(2\sigma^2))} = \frac{h'(\underline{x})}{h'(\underline{y})} \\ &= \exp([ -n(\bar{x}^2 - \bar{y}^2) + 2n\mu(\bar{x} - \bar{y}) - (n-1)(s_x^2 - s_y^2) ] / (2\sigma^2)) \end{aligned}$$

is constant as a function of  $(\mu, \sigma^2)$  if and only if  $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$  and  $s_x^2 = s_y^2$ .

**Example:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be iid beta  $(\alpha, \beta)$ . Show that  $\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \log X_i, \sum_{i=1}^n \log (1 - X_i) \right)$  is a minimal sufficient statistic for  $(\alpha, \beta)$ .

Verify sufficiency using Factorization Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x} \mid \alpha, \beta) &= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha) \Gamma(\beta)} \prod_{i=1}^n \{x_i^{\alpha-1} (1 - x_i)^{\beta-1}\} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha) \Gamma(\beta)} \exp \left[ (\alpha - 1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i + (\beta - 1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 - x_i) \right] \times 1 \\ &= g \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i, \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 - x_i) \mid \alpha, \beta \right) h(\underline{x}) \end{aligned}$$

Show minimal sufficiency:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{f(\underline{x} \mid \alpha, \beta)}{f(\underline{y} \mid \alpha, \beta)} &= \frac{\frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} \exp [(\alpha-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i + (\beta-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1-x_i)]}{\frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} \exp [(\alpha-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log y_i + (\beta-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1-y_i)]} \\&= \exp \left[ (\alpha-1) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \log y_i \right) \right. \\&\quad \left. + (\beta-1) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1-x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1-y_i) \right) \right].\end{aligned}$$

This is constant in  $(\alpha, \beta)$  if and only if  $\sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \log y_i$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n \log(1-x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1-y_i)$ .



# Invariance Principle for Minimal Sufficient Statistics

## Theorem

Suppose  $T(\mathbf{X})$  is a minimal sufficient statistic for a parameter  $\theta$ , and let  $u$  be a one-to-one function. Then  $T^*(\mathbf{X}) = u(T(\mathbf{X}))$  is also a minimal sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

Example:  $\left( \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 \right)$  is a minimal sufficient statistic for  $(\mu, \sigma^2)$ .

# Homework

- ▶ Convergence: Read p. 235 – 240 Exercises 5.33, 5.34, 5.39b, 5.41.
- ▶ Sufficiency: Read p. 271 – 274.