STA 522, Spring 2021 Introduction to Theoretical Statistics II

Lecture 7

Department of Biostatistics University at Buffalo

15 March, 2021

AGENDA

- ▶ Wrap up discussions of the Bayesian approach to Statistics
- ► Methods of evaluating estimators
- ► Cramér-Rao Lower Bound

Review: Bayesian approach to statistics

- The parameter θ is considered a random variable. Consider a **prior** distribution for θ before observing any data.
- After drawing a sample find the likelihood function for θ , and use Bayes' Rule to update the prior with the likelihood function to get the **posterior distribution**:

$$\pi(\theta \mid \underline{x}) = \frac{f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)\pi(\theta)}{m(\underline{x})} = \frac{f(\underline{x}, \theta)}{m(\underline{x})},$$

where $m(\underline{x})$ is the marginal distribution of \underline{X} :

$$m(\underline{x}) = \int f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) \pi(\theta) d\theta.$$

- The posterior distribution combines information from prior and likelihood.
- One Bayesian point estimator of θ is given by the posterior mean $E(\theta \mid \underline{X})$ (can also use posterior median, posterior mode, etc.)

Example (Binomial Bayes estimation): Let

$$X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n \sim \mathsf{iid}$$
 Bernoulli (p), and let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then

 $Y \sim \text{binomial}(n, p)$. Assume the prior distribution on p to be $\text{beta}(\alpha, \beta)$.

The posterior distribution of p is

$$p \mid Y \sim \text{Beta}(y + \alpha, n - y + \beta)$$

The posterior mean is:

$$\begin{split} \hat{p}_{B} &= \mathsf{E}(p \mid Y) \\ &= \frac{y + \alpha}{n + \alpha + \beta} \\ &= \left(\frac{n}{n + \alpha + \beta}\right) \underbrace{\left(\frac{y}{n}\right)}_{=\mathsf{sample mean}} + \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{n + \alpha + \beta}\right) \underbrace{\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta}\right)}_{=\mathsf{prior mean}} \end{split}$$

Conjugate Family

Definition: Let \mathcal{F} denote the class of pdfs or pmfs $f(x \mid \theta)$, indexed by θ . A class Π of prior distributions is a **conjugate family** for \mathcal{F} if the posterior distribution is in the class Π for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, all priors in Π , and all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

► The beta family is conjugate for the binomial family, which is why it was chosen as the prior distribution in the previous example.

the gamma family is conjugate for the Poisson family.

the normal family is its own conjugate.

Example (Normal Bayes Estimator): Let $X \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2)$, and suppose that the prior distribution on θ is $N(\mu, \tau^2)$ where σ^2 , μ and τ^2 are all known.

The posterior distribution of θ is also normal (Exercise 7.22; Homework) with

$$\mathsf{E}(\theta \mid x) = \frac{\tau^2}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2} x + \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2} \mu = \frac{1/\sigma^2}{1/\sigma^2 + 1/\tau^2} x + \frac{1/\tau^2}{1/\sigma^2 + 1/\tau^2} \mu$$

and

$$Var(\theta \mid x) = \frac{\sigma^2 \tau^2}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2} = \frac{1}{1/\sigma^2 + 1/\tau^2}$$

Using the posterior mean, a Bayes point estimator is given by $E(\theta \mid X)$.

Note that the Bayes estimator is again a linear combination of prior and sample means.

Method of Evaluating Estimators

- ► There may exist multiple estimators for the same problem, obtained from different approaches, e.g., method of moments, maximum likelihood, Bayesian approach etc.
- We want to compare these estimators and possibly obtain the "best" estimator.

Definition: The **mean squared error (MSE)** of an estimator W of a parameter θ is the function of θ defined by

$$MSE = MSE_{\theta}(W) = E_{\theta}[(W - \theta)^{2}].$$

Note: mean absolute error, defined as

$$\mathsf{E}_{\theta}\left[\left|\mathcal{W}-\theta\right|\right],$$

is an alternative for measuring the performance of an estimator.

Definition: The **bias** of a point estimator W of a parameter θ is the difference between the expected value of W and θ ; that is,

$$\mathsf{Bias}_{\theta}(W) = \mathsf{E}_{\theta}(W) - \theta.$$

An estimator whose bias is identically equal to 0 as a function of θ is called **unbiased** and satisfies $E_{\theta}(W) = \theta$ for all θ .

Note that
$$MSE = E_{\theta} [(W - \theta)^2] = Var_{\theta}(W) + [Bias_{\theta}(W)]^2$$

For an unbiased estimator, we have

$$\mathsf{MSE} = \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \left[(W - \theta)^2 \right] = \mathsf{Var}_{\theta}(W)$$

Unbiased is a good property for an estimator to have, but it can be misleading. **Example:** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n \sim$ iid Bernoulli(p). Let $W = X_1$. Since E(W) = p, W is unbiased, but doesn't use all the data. Note that for W.

$$MSE(W) = Var(W) = p(1-p).$$

Example: Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n \sim \text{iid N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$. Since $\mathsf{E}(\overline{X}) = \mu$ and $\mathsf{E}(S^2) = \sigma^2$, \overline{X} and S^2 are unbiased for μ and σ^2 .

Thus, the mean squared errors (see Thms. 5.2.6 and 5.3.1) are

$$MSE(\overline{X}) = Var(\overline{X}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$
 $MSE(S^2) = Var(S^2) = \frac{2\sigma^4}{n-1}$

Recall the MLE for σ^2 is $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{n-1}{n}S^2$.

Note that

$$\mathsf{E}\left(\hat{\sigma}^2\right) = \mathsf{E}\left(\frac{n-1}{n}S^2\right) = \frac{n-1}{n}\sigma^2 \implies \left[\mathsf{Bias}\left(\hat{\sigma}^2\right)\right]^2 = \frac{\sigma^4}{n^2}$$

$$\mathsf{Var}\left(\hat{\sigma}^2\right) = \mathsf{Var}\left(\frac{n-1}{n}S^2\right) = \frac{2(n-1)\sigma^4}{n^2}$$

Therefore

$$\mathsf{MSE}\left(\hat{\sigma}^2\right) = \mathsf{Var}\left(\hat{\sigma}^2\right) + \left[\mathsf{Bias}\left(\hat{\sigma}^2\right)\right]^2 = \frac{2n-1}{n^2}\sigma^4$$

Note that

$$\frac{2n-1}{n^2} = \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{n^2} < \frac{2}{n-1}$$

which implies MSE $(\hat{\sigma}^2)$ < MSE (S^2) .

Example (7.3.5; Contd.): Let $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n \sim \text{iid Bernoulli}(p)$. Then $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim \text{binomial}(n, p)$. Recall that we have developed two estimators for p, the MLE and the Bayes estimator:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{Y}{n} = \overline{X}$$

$$\hat{p}_B = \frac{Y + \alpha}{\alpha + \beta + n}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{MSE}_{\rho}(\hat{p}) &= \frac{p(1-p)}{n} \\ \mathsf{MSE}_{\rho}(\hat{p}_B) &= \mathsf{Var}_{\rho}(\hat{p}_B) + (\mathsf{Bias}_{\rho}(\hat{p}_B))^2 \\ &= \mathsf{Var}_{\rho} \left(\frac{Y+\alpha}{\alpha+\beta+n} \right) + \left[\mathsf{E}_{\rho} \left(\frac{Y+\alpha}{\alpha+\beta+n} \right) - \rho \right]^2 \\ &= \frac{np(1-p)}{(\alpha+\beta+n)^2} + \left(\frac{np+\alpha}{\alpha+\beta+n} - p \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\alpha = \beta = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}$ makes the MSE of \hat{p}_B constant as a function of p. Under this choice the MSEs are as follows:

$$\mathsf{MSE}(\hat{p}) = \frac{p(1-p)}{n}$$

$$\mathsf{MSE}(\hat{p}_B) = \frac{n}{4(n+\sqrt{n})^2}$$

$$00075 \longrightarrow \mathsf{MSE}(\overline{X})$$

$$00050 \longrightarrow \mathsf{MSE}(\overline{X})$$

$$000050 \longrightarrow \mathsf{MSE}(\overline{P}_B)$$

$$000025 \longrightarrow \mathsf{MSE}(\hat{p}_B)$$

Figure 7.3.1. Comparison of MSE of \hat{p} and \hat{p}_B for sample sizes n=4 and n=400 in Example 7.3.5

Finding the "Best" Estimator

- Depends on what "best" means.
- ▶ Depends on the value of the parameter.
- ▶ There may be situations where a biased estimator (like \hat{p}_B) may be better.
- ► We first define "best" in relation to the variance of an unbiased estimator.

Definition: An estimator W^* is a **best unbiased estimator** of $\tau(\theta)$ if it satisfies the following:

- (a) W^* is unbiased, i.e., $E_{\theta}(W^*) = \tau(\theta)$ for all θ ; and
- (b) among all unbiased estimators, the variance (or MSE) of W^* is a minimum, i.e., for any other estimator W with $E_{\theta}(W) = \tau(\theta)$, we have

$$\mathsf{MSE}(W^*) = \mathsf{Var}_{\theta}(W^*) \le \mathsf{Var}_{\theta}(W) = \mathsf{MSE}(W)$$

for all θ . W^* may also be called a **uniform minimum variance unbiased estimator (UMVUE)** of $\tau(\theta)$.

Cramér-Rao Inequality

- It is usually hard to determine if a UMVUE exists.
- However, there is a lower bound on the variance of any unbiased estimator.
- ➤ So if we can find an unbiased estimator that achieves this lower bound, we know it must be UMVUE.

Theorem (7.3.9; Cramér-Rao Lower Bound)

Let $\underline{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ have pdf $f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)$, and let $W(\underline{X})$ be any estimator satisfying

(a)
$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \operatorname{E}_{\theta} [W(\underline{X})] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} [W(\underline{x}) f(\underline{x} \mid \theta)] d\underline{x}$$
; and

(b)
$$\operatorname{Var}_{\theta}[W(\underline{X})] < \infty$$
.

Then

$$\mathsf{Var}_{\theta}(W(\underline{X})) \geq \frac{\left[\frac{d}{d\theta} \, \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \, [W(\underline{X})]\right]^{2}}{\mathsf{E}_{\theta} \, \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \, \mathsf{log} \, f(\underline{X} \mid \theta)\right]^{2}\right]}.$$

Proof: Note that for any two random variables U and V

$$[\mathsf{Cov}(U,V)]^2 \overset{\mathsf{Cauchy-Schwarz}}{\leq} \mathsf{Var}(U)\,\mathsf{Var}(V) \implies \mathsf{Var}(U) \geq \frac{[\mathsf{Cov}(U,V)]^2}{\mathsf{Var}(V)}$$

Take $U \equiv W(\underline{X})$ and $V \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(\underline{X} \mid \theta)$. Note that

$$\mathsf{E}(V) = E_{\theta}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}\log f(\underline{X}\mid\theta)\right) = \int_{\mathcal{X}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}\log f(\underline{x}\mid\theta)\,f(\underline{x}\mid\theta)\,d\underline{x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}\mathsf{E}(1) = 0$$

So, Cov(U, V) = E(UV) and $Var(V) = E(V^2)$. Note that

$$\mathsf{E}(UV) = \int_{\mathcal{V}} W(\underline{x}) \; \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f(\underline{x} \mid \theta) \; d\underline{x} = \frac{d}{d\theta} \, \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \, (W(\underline{X}))$$

Therefore, combining we get

$$\mathsf{Var}_{\theta}(W(\underline{X})) = \mathsf{Var}(U) \geq \frac{[\mathsf{Cov}(U,V)]^2}{\mathsf{Var}(V)} = \frac{[\mathsf{E}(UV)]^2}{\mathsf{E}(V^2)} = \frac{\left[\frac{d}{d\theta}\,\mathsf{E}_{\theta}\,[W(\underline{X})]\right]^2}{\mathsf{E}_{\theta}\left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\,\mathsf{log}\,f(\underline{X}\mid\theta)\right]^2\right]}$$

Corollary: Cramér-Rao Lower Bound, iid case

If the assumptions of Theorem 7.3.9 are satisfied, and, additionally, if X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n are iid with pdf $f(x \mid \theta)$, then

$$\mathsf{Var}_{\theta}(W(\underline{X})) \geq \frac{\left[\frac{d}{d\theta} \, \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \, [W(\underline{X})]\right]^{2}}{n \, \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \, \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(X_{1} \mid \theta)\right]^{2}\right]}.$$

Proof: Homework. See p. 337 in the textbook.

Notes

▶ If W(X) is unbiased for θ , then the numerator is

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\theta}\,\mathsf{E}_{\theta}\,[W(\underline{X})]\right]^2=1.$$

The denominator is a function of the density, not the data.

Fisher Information

Definition: $\mathsf{E}_{\theta} \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(\underline{X} \mid \theta) \right]^2 \right]$ is called the **Fisher information** of the sample.

Lemma 7.3.11: Calculating the Fisher Information

If $f(x \mid \theta)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \, \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(X \mid \theta) \right] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(x \mid \theta) \right] f(x \mid \theta) \right] \, dx$$

(which is always true for an exponential family), then

$$\mathsf{E}_{\theta} \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(X \mid \theta) \right]^{2} \right] = - \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \left[\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \theta^{2}} \log f(X \mid \theta) \right].$$

Example: Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n \sim \text{iid gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$, and assume α is known. Show that $W(\underline{X}) = \frac{1}{\alpha}\overline{X}$ attains the Cramér-Rao lower bound for an unbiased estimator of β , and hence is UMVUE.

First note that
$$\operatorname{Var}_{\beta}(W(\underline{X})) = \operatorname{Var}_{\beta}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\overline{X}\right) = \frac{1}{\alpha^2}\operatorname{Var}_{\beta}\left(\overline{X}\right) = \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha n}$$

Now obtain the CR lower bound. We have $f(x \mid \beta) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)\beta^{\alpha}} x^{\alpha-1} e^{-x/\beta}$ which implies $\log f(x \mid \beta) = \log \Gamma(\alpha) - \alpha \log \beta + (\alpha - 1) \log x - \frac{x}{\beta}$. Then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log f(x \mid \beta) = -\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \frac{x}{\beta^2}; \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} \log f(x \mid \beta) = \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} - \frac{2x}{\beta^3}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log f(x \mid \beta) = -\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \frac{x}{\beta^2}; \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} \log f(x \mid \beta) = \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} - \frac{2x}{\beta^3}$$
Therefore

	$\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial \beta} \log r(x \mid \beta) =$	$-\frac{1}{\beta}+\frac{1}{\beta^2}$,	$\frac{\partial \beta^2}{\partial \beta^2} \log T(x)$	$(\beta) - \frac{\beta^2}{\beta^2}$	$-{\beta^3}$
Т	herefore				
F	$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log f(X_1 \mid \beta)\right]^{2}$	F[$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x} \log f(X_1)$	β) $- \mathbf{F}_{a}$	$\frac{2X_1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2}$

$$\mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\left\lfloor \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log f(X_1 \mid \beta) \right\rfloor \right] = -\mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^2} \log f(X_1 \mid \beta) \right] = \mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\frac{2X_1}{\beta^3} - \frac{1}{\beta^3} \right]$$

$$\mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log f(X_1 \mid \beta) \right]^2 \right] = - \, \mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} \log f(X_1 \mid \beta) \right] = \mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\frac{2X_1}{\beta^3} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}$$
Of course, $W(\underline{X}) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \overline{X}$ being unbiased for β means $\frac{d}{d\beta} \, \mathsf{E}_{\beta} \, [W(\underline{X})] = 1$.

$$\mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\left\lfloor \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log f(X_1 \mid \beta) \right\rfloor \right] = - \mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^2} \log f(X_1 \mid \beta) \right] = \mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[\frac{2X_1}{\beta^3} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} \right]$$
Of course, $W(\underline{X}) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \overline{X}$ being unbiased for β means $\frac{d}{d\beta} \mathsf{E}_{\beta} \left[W(\underline{X}) \right] = 1$.
Hence, the CR lower bound is (iid):

 $\frac{\left[\frac{d}{d\beta} \operatorname{E}_{\beta} \left[W(\underline{X})\right]\right]^{2}}{n \operatorname{E}_{\beta} \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log f(X_{1} \mid \beta)\right]^{2}\right]} = \frac{1}{\alpha/\beta^{2}} = \frac{\beta^{2}}{\alpha} = \operatorname{Var}_{\beta}(W(\underline{X}))$

Example Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n \sim \text{iid uniform}(0, \theta)$. The assumptions in CR inequality does not hold (verify; see p. 340 in the textbook). We will show that there exists an unbiased estimator of θ whose variance is uniformly smaller than the CRLB.

Note that here $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(x \mid \theta) = -\frac{1}{\theta} \implies \mathsf{E}_{\theta} \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(X_1 \mid \theta) \right]^2 \right] = \frac{1}{\theta^2}.$

So, CR lower bound
$$=\frac{\theta^2}{n}$$
.

Consider $Y = X_{(n)}$. $f_Y(y) = ny^{n-1}/\theta^n$, $0 < y < \theta$ so that

$$E_{ heta}(Y) = \int_{0}^{ heta} \frac{ny^{n}}{ heta^{n}} \ dy = \frac{n}{n+1} \ heta \implies E_{ heta}\left(\underbrace{\frac{n+1}{n}Y}\right) = heta$$

i.e., U is an unbiased estimator of θ . We have

$$\operatorname{Var}_{\theta}(U) = \operatorname{Var}_{\theta}\left(\frac{n+1}{n}Y\right) = \frac{1}{n(n+2)}\theta^2 < \frac{1}{n}\theta^2$$

NOTE: In general, if the range of the pdf depends on the parameter, the Cramér-Rao Theorem will not be applicable.

Attainment

► There is no guarantee that the bound given in the Cramér-Rao Inequality is sharp. That is, our best unbiased estimator may not achieve the CRLB.

Problem: when do we stop searching?

Homework

- ► Read p. 330 342.
- Exercises: TBA.

