

300a Quals Guide

July 10, 2025

1 Misc facts

Definition 1 (Convexity)

For all $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $x_1, x_2 \in X$:

$$f(tx_1 + (1-t)x_2) \leq tf(x_1) + (1-t)f(x_2).$$

Alternative, check the second derivative ≥ 0

Theorem 2 (Jensen's Inequality)

If ϕ convex, then $E\phi(X) \geq \phi(EX)$. Eg $EX^2 \geq (EX)^2$. Inequality is strict if ϕ is strictly convex and X is not degenerate (constant). Also conditional version holds.

2 Exponential Families

Definition 3 (Exponential Family)

$$p_{\theta}(x) = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^s T_i(X)\eta_i(\theta) - A(\theta)\right)h(x)$$

$$p_{\eta}(x) = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^s T_i(X)\eta_i - \tilde{A}(\eta)\right)h(x)$$

Fact 4 (Expectation and covariance of sufficient stats in exponential fam)

$$E[T(X)] = \nabla A(\eta)$$

$$\text{Cov}(T_i(X), T_j(X)) = \partial_{\eta_i} \partial_{\eta_j} A(\eta)$$

2.1 All the Expo family examples

Include curved..

3 Sufficiency

"Throwing away everything else besides this statistic entails no loss of info in estimating θ "

Definition 5 (Sufficiency)

If for all t , the distribution of $X|T = t$ does not depend on θ .

If you collect data X_1, \dots, X_n , then throw away data except for $T = t$, then can construct $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n$ with same distribution as \underline{X} just by knowing T .

Make a table of good examples including $\text{Unif}(0, \theta)$

Theorem 6 (Factorization Theorem)

T sufficient for θ (or for the model) \iff we can write $p_\theta(\underline{x}) = g_\theta(t(\underline{x}))h(\underline{x})$. I.e., can factor the density into a part that depends on statistic and θ , and another part that depends on data but not θ .

Example 7 (Expo(θ))

Can write $p_\theta(\underline{x}) = \theta^n \exp(-\theta \sum x_i)$ so $T(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is sufficient.

Example 8 (Exponential families)

Look at the form – T is sufficient.

Definition 9 (Minimal sufficiency)

For all T' sufficient, T is a function of T' .

Theorem 10 (Rao-Blackwell)

If T sufficient, L is any convex loss, and δ estimates $g(\theta)$, define:

$$\eta(T) = \mathbf{E}[\delta(X)|T],$$

then using Tower property and Jensen's:

$$R(\theta, \delta(X)) = \mathbf{E}[g(\theta), \delta(X)] \geq \mathbf{E}[L(\theta, \eta(T)) = R(\theta, \eta(T))]$$

Definition 11 (Ancillary Statistic)

Distribution of $A(X)$ does not depend on θ .

Definition 12 (First Order Ancillary)

If $\mathbf{E}_\theta A(X)$ does not depend on θ . Weaker than Ancillary.

4 Completeness

Definition 13 (Completeness)

$T(X)$ complete if no non-constant function of T is even 1st order ancillary, or equivalently:

$$Ef(T) = 0 \implies f(T) = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Example 14 ($X_i \sim \text{Unif}(0, \theta)$)

See coaching notes– break h into positive and negative parts to show $h = 0$ as.

Theorem 15 (Full rank exponential family)

Ie if $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k) : \eta \in \Omega$ contains a k -dimensional rectangle, then T is not only sufficient, but **also complete**.

Theorem 16 (Basu's Theorem)

If T is CSS and A Ancillary, then $T \perp A$.

A common strategy with Basu's theorem is to consider a submodel– show independence in the submodel, then based on arbitrariness of submodel, show true for full model.

Example 17 (Show sample mean and sample variance in $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ are independent)

(Assume both unknown). then in the submodel where $\sigma = \sigma_0$ known, then \bar{X} is CSS. Can show that $\sum(X_i - \bar{X})^2$ is Ancillary. So $\bar{X} \perp \sum(X_i - \bar{X})^2$. This is true for all μ , and for $\sigma = \sigma_0$ fixed. But σ_0 arbitrary, so true for all μ, σ .

Add a table here including 2 param Unif

1. $\text{Unif}(0, \theta) : T = X_{(n)}$
2. $\text{Unif}(\theta_1, \theta_2) : T = (X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$

4.1 Epic CSS rolodex**5 UMVU**

Note that we can't take existence of an unbiased estimator for granted. If $x \sim \text{Bin}(n, \theta)$. Take like $g(\theta) = \frac{1-\theta}{\theta}$ or a polynomial of degree $> n$ – no unbiased estimators. Strategy to show no unbiased estimator is just write out the expectation of an estimator.

Definition 18 (UMVU)

δ^* is unbiased and for all other δ , $R(\delta^*, g(\theta)) \leq R(\delta, g(\theta))$ for all θ .

Note that if we have an unbiased estimator, we can Rao-Blackwellize with a sufficient statistic and still have unbiased estimator.

Theorem 19 (Lehman-Scheffe)

If unbiased estimator is function of CSS, it is UMVU. (Since there exists at most one unbiased estimator that's function of T by completeness).

Alternate statement: if there exists any unbiased estimator and a CSS T , then there is a unique unbiased estimator that's a function of T , which is UMVU (UMRU for any convex loss). Unique UMRU if strict convex loss, since this makes Jensen strict.

Recipe 20 (UMVU with CSS)

Steps:

1. Find a CSS
2. Find an unbiased estimator function of CSS. (Alternatively, find a dumb unbiased estimator and RB)
3. \implies UMVU

Note that UMVU can be inadmissible - see James-Stein or the Poisson UMVU for $g(\theta) = \exp(-3\lambda)$ example in Lecture 5.

Theorem 21 (Orthogonality Condition)

Let $\hat{\theta}$ be an unbiased estimator with $E_P \hat{\theta}^2 < \infty$ if $U(X)$ is an unbiased estimator of 0 for all P , then:

$$\hat{\theta} \text{ UMVU} \iff E_P[\hat{\theta}(X)U(X)] = 0 \text{ for all unbiased estimators of 0 and for all } P$$

An application is showing that the addition of UMVUs is UMVU. Also, product of UMVUs is UMVU for its expectation.

Also reasonable to try to show not UMVU. [Come back to Ex 2.3 in Notes](#)

Theorem 22 (Cramer Rao LB)

For any $\hat{\theta}$ unbiased for θ :

$$\text{Var}_{\theta} \hat{\theta} \geq I_{\theta}^{-1}$$

when $\{P_{\theta}\}$ is QMD with non singular I_{θ} .

5.1 UMVU Examples

1. Basic Expo Fam examples – eg \bar{X} in Bernoulli or Normal with known variance
2. Empirical CDF in $\mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$.
 - CSS is \bar{X} , $\delta = 1[X_1 < u]$ unbiased.
 - Idea to RB then add and subtract \bar{X} since $X_1 - \bar{X}$ is ancillary, then apply Basu
 - UMVU is $\Phi\left(\frac{u - \bar{X}}{\sqrt{(n-1)/n}}\right)$

Non parametric examples

1. $X_i \sim F \in \mathcal{F} = \{ \text{all distributions with density wrt Lebesgue and finite variance} \}$. $g(\theta) = E_F X_i$.
 - Note that \bar{X} is unbiased in the big family and is UMVU in the normal **subfamily**
 - Order statistics CSS (always sufficient - complete by subfamily arg and bijection with sums of powers): $(X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}) \iff (\sum X_i, \dots, \sum X_i^n)$ bijection.
 - So \bar{X} is UMVU
2. X_i iid symmetric about θ , $EX_i = \theta$. Finite variance.
 - Two subclasses: normal family, $\text{Unif}(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ family - have different UMVUs and both are unbiased in the original class

Recipe 23 (Subfamily UMVU Argument)

If UMVU in subfamily and unbiased in big family, must be UMVU in big family **if** an UMVU exists in the big family. Because the UMVU **uniquely** minimizes variance in the subfamily.

Proof. Take the big family. Take a function such that $E_\theta f(X) = 0$ for all θ . Then true for subfamily. So $P_\theta(f(X) = 0)$ for all θ in the subfamily. Same null sets as big family, means that also $P_\theta(f(X) = 0)$ for the big family. \square

Fact 24 (Completeness in subfamily)

If $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}$ and they have the same null sets, then completeness in \mathcal{F}_0 implies completeness in \mathcal{F} .

Recipe 25 (Non-existence of Non-parametric UMVU)

Find two different subclasses with different unique UMVU that are also unbiased in the big class – no UMVU in big class.

If we can't use Lehman-Scheffe, try one of the following ideas:

1. Cramer-Rao lower bound
2. Orthogonality condition
3. Subfamily arguments

5.2 Non-convex loss functions

If loss is bounded, there is no UMRU estimator. This is unbiased:

$$\delta_\pi = \begin{cases} g(\theta_0) & \text{wp } 1 - \pi \\ \frac{1}{\pi}[\delta_0(X) - g(\theta_0)] + g(\theta_0) & \text{wp } \pi \end{cases}$$

and its risk is πM , so it could be arbitrarily small.

5.3 UMVU Tools

1. Find a CSS and do Lehman Scheffe
 - Directly show CSS
 - Use exponential family
2. Orthogonality condition
3. Cramer Rao
4. Subfamily

6 MRE

Big picture– there’s an easy recipe for MRE for square error or absolute error if we pick any old δ_0 equivariant function of CSS.

Definition 26 (Location models)

Density satisfies

$$f_{\theta+h}(x+h) = f_{\theta}(x)$$

Think: normal at its mean has same density as a shifted normal at shifted mean.

A **location invariant loss** is $\ell(a+h, \theta+h) = \ell(a, \theta)$ for all a, θ, h .

Want location equivariant estimators, ie $\hat{\theta}(x+h) = \hat{\theta}(x) + h$ – if our observations all shift by some amount, our estimate of the location should also shift by that amount.

Fact 27 (Bias, variance, risk of equivariant estimators)

Do not depend on θ . Ie,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\theta} \hat{\theta} = \theta + b \text{ for all } \theta$$

for risk, since it’s constant, we can hope to find the best among all equivariant estimators.

Definition 28 (MRE)

Satisfies equivariance condition:

$$\hat{\theta}(x+c, u) = \hat{\theta}(x, u) + c$$

and minimum risk condition amongst all equivariant estimators.

Definition 29 (Characterization of location invariant estimators)

Location invariant means $U(X_1 + c, \dots, X_n + c) = U(X)$. Characterize by: U location invariant $\iff U = V(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$ where $y_i = X_i - X_n$.

Fact 30 (Characterization of location equivariant estimators)

Let δ_0 be **any** location equivariant estimator, eg $\delta_0 = \bar{X}$.

$$\delta \text{ is location equivariant} \iff \delta(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \delta_0(X_1, \dots, X_n) + U(X_1, \dots, X_n)$$

where U is location **invariant**. Then from invariant characterization:

$$\iff \delta(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \delta_0(X_1, \dots, X_n) + V(Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-1})$$

Recipe 31 (Finding the MRE)

Let X_i observations iid from location model and let $Y = (X_1 - X_n, \dots, X_{n-1} - X_n)$. Let $\hat{\theta}_0$ be any location equivariant estimator of θ_0 with finite risk. If the following is well-defined:

$$v(y) = \arg \min_v E_0[\ell(\hat{\theta}_0(X) - v, 0) \mid Y = y]$$

Then there exists an MRE $\hat{\theta}^*(X) = \hat{\theta}_0(X) - v(Y)$.

Want to minimize

$$E_\theta[\rho(\delta_0(X) - V(Y) - \theta)] = E_0[\rho(\delta_0(X) - V(Y))]$$

Apply Tower property and minimize the inner expectation. For square error yields:

$$V = E_0[\delta_0(X) \mid Y]$$

So $\delta^* = \delta_0 - E_0[\delta_0 \mid Y]$ Notice that the Y_i here are ancillary so if we pick δ_0 function of CSS, easy.

If we can make δ_0 a function of CSS, then we can apply Basu

Recipe 32 (MRE for Square Error Loss)

Choose δ_0 equivariant function of CSS. Then $\delta^* = \delta_0 - E_0 \delta_0$ is MRE.

Example 33 ($X_i \sim N(\theta, 1)$)

Let $\delta_0 = \bar{X}$. Then $E_0 \delta_0 = 0$. So \bar{X} is MRE.

Note for absolute error, just do $\text{median}_{\theta=0}[\delta(X) \mid Y]$ instead of expectation. Ie find m such that $P(X \leq m) \geq 1/2$ and $P(X \geq m) \geq 1/2$.

Theorem 34 (Existence of MRE)

If loss is convex and not monotone, then MRE exists by the previous theorem. If strictly convex, unique.

Fact 35 (MRE is Unbiased (under squared error loss))

Since the bias does not depend on θ , just subtract off whatever bias.

Fact 36 (UMVU is MRE if UMVU is location equivariant)

In a location model, the UMVU is location equivariant. Since MRE is the best amongst equivariant estimators, and any competing equivariant estimators are unbiased.. **Is this just with square error loss?**

Theorem 37 (Anderson's Lemma)

Review this $Z \sim N(0, \Sigma)$, and ℓ is bowl shaped, then $\mathbf{E}\ell(Z) \leq \mathbf{E}\ell(Z + U)$ for any $U \perp Z$.

Definition 38 (Pitman Estimator)

Under square error loss, we can derive MRE because it's the Pitman estimator.

Theorem 39 (Mini-convolution theorem)

.....

7 James-Stein Estimator

Setup: $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ with σ^2 known.

Theorem 40 (SURE - Stein Unbiased Risk Estimator)

Letting $\hat{\mu}(x) = x + g(x)$ for $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ almost differentiable, and assume that $\mathbf{E}[\sum_{i=1}^p |\partial_i g_i(X)|] < \infty$. Then:

$$\mathbf{E}_\mu[\|\hat{\mu}(X) - \mu\|^2] = p\sigma^2 + \mathbf{E}\left[\|g(X)\|^2 + 2\sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^p \partial_i g_i(X)\right].$$

Proved using integration by Parts – see Lec 17 300c.

Fact 41 (UMVU is not admissible in $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)$ model)

Because James Stein renders X inadmissible.

J-S estimator is given by:

$$\hat{\mu}^{JS}(X) = \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2(p-2)}{\|X\|_2^2}\right) X,$$

biased towards the origin. Prove that it has better risk by SURE estimator.

8 Bayes Estimators

Average risk over some choice of prior $\Lambda(\theta)$ on parameter space.

Want to minimize:

$$\int R(\theta, \delta) d\Lambda(\theta) = \mathbf{E}_{(X, \Theta)} L(\Theta, \delta(X)).$$

So our P_θ is $X|\Theta = \theta$. By tower property, we can minimize this by minimizing the following for almost all x :

$$\arg \min_{\delta} \mathbf{E}[L(\Theta, \delta(X)) | X = x]$$

ie this is an integral with respect to posterior distribution. For square error: $\delta = \mathbf{E}[g(\Theta) | X]$, abs error gives $\delta = \text{median } g(\Theta) | X$. See the quals notes for a list. For square error, often (?) gives a convex combination of UMVU and the prior mean.

Theorem 42 (When Bayes is Unique?)

???

Fact 43 (Unique Bayes is Admissible)

Idea is that if $R(\hat{\theta}', \theta) \leq R(\hat{\theta}, \theta)$ for all θ , it would then be Bayes.
 provided the prior isn't super weird (eg continuous dist with an atom)

Fact 44 (Constant risk Bayes is minimax)

If not, some other estimator would render Bayes inadmissible, which would make that estimator the Bayes estimator.

Fact 45 (Bayes is not UMVU if $r_\Lambda < \infty$)

Under square error loss, Bayes estimators are biased, unless $r_\Lambda = 0$.

An example of an unbiased Bayes estimator would be if $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, \theta)$ and Λ puts mass on $\{0, 1\}$ only. Then there exists an estimator of 0 risk – X/n .

9 Minimax

Want δ to minimize $\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} R(\theta, \delta)$.

Note that for any prior, the bayes risk is upper bounded by the minimax (frequentist) risk.

If δ' is our guess:

$$\inf_{\delta} \int R(\delta, \theta) d\Pi(\theta) \leq \inf_{\delta} \sup_{\theta} R(\delta, \theta) \leq \sup_{\theta} R(\delta', \theta).$$

If we can find a prior such that δ' is Bayes, then $\inf_{\delta} \int R(\delta, \theta) d\Pi(\theta) = \int R(\delta', \theta) d\Pi(\theta)$. If this also equals the sup risk RHS, then δ' is minimax.

Next best thing is a sequence Π_n such that $r_{\Lambda_n} \rightarrow \sup_{\theta} R(\delta', \theta)$. Then we squeeze the above inequality by taking a limit in n – so that

$$\inf_{\delta} \sup_{\theta} R(\delta, \theta) = \sup_{\theta} R(\delta', \theta)$$

Recipe 46 (Minimax - Constant risk)

A Bayes or admissible estimator is constant risk, then it is minimax.

So: find a prior with constant frequentist risk.

1. Hopefully conjugate prior
2. Find Bayes estimator
3. Write the frequentist risk $R(\theta, \delta_\Lambda) = E_X L(\theta, \delta_{\Lambda})$
4. Find parameters of the prior Λ such that $R(\theta, \delta_\Lambda)$ is constant
5. Conclude this estimator is minimax

If unique Bayes, unique minimax. Prior Λ is *least favorable*.

The above is most useful in case when parameter space Θ is compact. Is the supremum achieved by some Λ , making the frequentist constant, so that the inequality at beginning of section is equality.

Example 47 (Multinomial minimax for p)

See Theory Coaching. Use conjugate prior Dirichlet. One idea is that a least favorable prior must be symmetric in $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$.

Analogous to in class Binomial minimax for p using Beta prior.

Definition 48 (Minimax - Least favorable prior)

Λ least favorable if $r_\Lambda \geq r_{\Lambda'}$ for any other Λ' .

A sequence of priors Λ_m is least favorable if for any Λ' , $r_{\Lambda'} \leq \lim_m r_{\Lambda_m}$.

Recipe 49 (Minimax - Least favorable sequence of priors)

If $\sup R(\theta, \delta) = r$ and have a sequence such that $r_{\Lambda_m} \rightarrow r$ then Λ_m is least favorable and δ is minimax.

1. Guess some δ by looking at limit of Bayes estimator
2. Find the sup risk of our guess δ , ie $\sup_\theta R(\delta, \theta)$.
3. Find a sequence of priors s.t. $r_{\Lambda_m} \rightarrow r$
4. Conclude δ minimax

Example 50 (Normal location model minimax)

If $X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(\theta, \sigma^2)$ with σ known, then we can show that \bar{X} is minimax by the above approach. Let $\Lambda_m = N(0, b_m^2)$ with $b_m \rightarrow \infty$ eg $b_m = m$. Note that $\sup R(\theta, \bar{X}_n) = \sigma^2/n$ – it's constant risk so a good candidate.

$$r_{\Lambda_m} = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Var}(\Theta|X)] \rightarrow r$$

Conclude \bar{X} is minimax.

Connection that just because an estimator is minimax doesn't mean it's admissible. \bar{X} is UMVU, minimax, MRE.. but not admissible.

Recipe 51 (Minimax in subfamily argument)

δ minimax in Λ_0 then it is also minimax in Λ if

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Lambda_0} R(\theta, \delta) = \sup_{\theta \in \Omega} R(\theta, \delta)$$

Eg, \bar{X} in $\Lambda_0 = \{\sigma^2 = b\}$ and $\Lambda = \{\sigma^2 \leq b\}$.

Can extend to non parametric big family– \bar{X} is minimax if $X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$ since don't increase sup risk in the larger family.

Theorem 52 (Connection MRE and Minimax)

Pg 340: If δ is the MRE under square error loss and it has finite variance, then it is minimax under square error loss.

9.1 Approximate Minimax

Theorem 53 (Le Cam's Two point Lemma)

For any $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{P}$

$$\inf_A \sup_P R(A, P) \geq \frac{1}{2} \inf_a (\ell(a, P_0) + \ell(a, P_1))(1 - d_{TV}(P_0, P_1)).$$

Recipe 54 (Approx Minimax)

$X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} P_\theta$.

1. Fix θ_0, θ_1 . Often θ_0 something trivial like 0
2. Bound by Le Cam's 2 Point Lemma

$$\frac{1}{2}(\ell(a, P_0^n) + \ell(a, P_1^n))(1 - d_{TV}(P_0^n, P_1^n)).$$

3. Bound tv:

$$d_{TV}(P^n, Q^n) \leq n d_{TV}(P, Q)$$

Or use Pinsker's Inequality using KL:

$$d_{TV}(P^n, Q^n) \leq \sqrt{n/2(KL(P\|Q))}$$

4. Choose θ_1 very close to θ_0 st the infimum term is very small – gives the minimax order, and the tv distance term is constant order.

Example 55 (Exponential location family)

$X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \theta + \text{Exp}(1)$. Q: What is order of $\inf_A \sup_\theta \mathbf{E}(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2$, ie minimax risk?

Follow the steps and get

$$\text{minimax risk} \leq \frac{\theta_1^2}{4}(1 - n\theta_1) \geq \frac{c}{n^2}$$

If we choose $\theta_1 = 1/(2n)$.

10 Testing

Types of errors:

1. Type 1: Reject the null when the null is true (restricted to size α size of test)
2. Type 2: Retain the null when the null is false (given by 1-power)

10.1 Simple-simple

Theorem 56 (Neyman-Pearson (NP) Lemma)

For simple versus simple, a MP test always exists and is given by

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & p_1(x) > kp_0(x) \\ \gamma & p_1(x) = kp_0(x) \\ 0 & p_0(x) < kp_0(x) \end{cases}$$

where constants determined by level constraint. This is just the likelihood ratio test. First find a k , then find the γ .

Also note that MP test must have level exactly α unless there exists a test with power 1 with size $< \alpha$.

1. Existence of MP test of the above form that is level exactly α . Is most powerful.
2. Sufficiency. If a test is of the above form, it is MP test at level
3. Necessary. Any MP test is of the above form unless there's a test with size $< \alpha$ with power 1.

Note that non-uniqueness comes from the $=$ condition— how to randomize.

Fact 57 (NP characterizes MP tests)

The NP is actually an if and only if statement. If MP test, then satisfies the above along with level constraint. MP test must be of this form.

10.2 Simple-Composite

A UMP test only exists if the NP test is the same for **all** alternatives! If not, have different MP tests, no UMP test! If you want to show that a UMP does not exist, show that the MP test depends on the alternative— to show exist, does not depend. Eg, testing normal $\theta = 0$ versus $\theta \neq 0$, we get different MP tests depending on which side our alternative is on.

Recipe 58 (Simple-Composite)

Fix an alternative, find the NP test, argue it doesn't depend on the alternative you chose.

Occurs most often in a one-dimensional parametric family with monotone-likelihood ratio.

Definition 59 (Monotone Likelihood Ratio (MLR))

If exists $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ statistic that likelihood ratio $p_{\theta'}/p_{\theta_0}$ is **non-decreasing** in T whenever $\theta_0 < \theta'$.

Ie if we have a singleton null and for alternative $\mathcal{H}_1 : \theta' > \theta_0$, then we check whether there's a statistic such that likelihood ratio is increasing.

Theorem 60 (UMP in MLR)

Testing $\theta = \theta_0$ versus $\theta > \theta_0$, if there's a MLR, then the UMP test given by

$$\phi(x) = \mathbf{1}[T(X) > C] + \gamma \mathbf{1}[T(X) = C].$$

where we choose C to get $\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0} \phi(X) = \alpha$.

Moreover $\beta(\theta)$, the power function, is **increasing** as a function of θ .

Fact 61 (MLR in Exponential Families)

Exponential families satisfy MLR! Also satisfied in non-central chi-square.

10.3 Composite-Simple

An important insight is that:

$$\{\text{tests valid for full composite null}\} \subset \{\text{tests valid for a specific point in the null}\}.$$

So if you can find a best test for a specific point, and it is also valid for the full null, then it is the best for the composite null.

If we have a composite null, to find UMP test we put a prior on the null parameter space and reduce to a simple-simple. If the MP test in this simple-simple problem is also **valid** for the original problem null, then it is the UMP for composite-simple testing problem. Ie:

$$\tilde{P}_0(\cdot) = \int_{H_0} P(\cdot) d\Pi(P) \quad \text{weighted average of null measures}$$

Definition 62 (Least favorable prior)

The prior with the lowest powered MP test, ie $\beta_{\Lambda} \leq \beta_{\Lambda'}$ for all Λ' prior on Θ_0 .

Recipe 63 (Composite-Simple)

To find UMP test:

1. Posit a least favorable prior
2. Compute the simple-simple MP test ϕ_{Π} wrt the simple null from the LFP
3. Show that ϕ_{Π} is *valid* for the original problem, ie $\mathbf{E}_{\theta_0} \phi_{\Pi} \leq \alpha$ for all $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0$.
4. Conclude that ϕ_{Π} is UMP in the original problem

Unique UMP if ϕ_{Π} is unique in the simple-simple case.

For least favorable prior, try to make it hard to reject. Ie, mass on the boundary.

The idea is that for any other valid test will also be valid for the mixture null, but our test ϕ_{Π} is most powerful in that family.

10.4 Composite-Composite

UMP rarely exists in composite-composite. To check, always first fix an alternative, find MP test for composite-simple case. Then show that it does or doesn't depend on the alternative chosen. Here are the times when it does:

1. One-side MLR testing: $\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta \leq \theta_0, \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta > \theta_0$. The test is the same regardless of which alternative we choose.
2. Bioequivalence: Test null that $\theta \notin (\theta_1, \theta_2)$. If we have a 1-param expo family, then $\phi(x) = \mathbf{1}[T \in (C_1, C_2)]$ is UMP
3. One sided testing of Gaussian mean, ie $\mathcal{H}_0 : v^T \mu = \delta$ versus $\mathcal{H}_1 : v^T \mu > \delta$ for fixed v with $v^T \Sigma v > 0$, then reject for large $v^T X$.

10.5 Examples

Example 64 ($X \sim N(\mu_x, \sigma^2), Y \sim N(\mu_y, \sigma^2)$ with σ known)

Want to test $\mu_y \leq \mu_x$ versus not.

1. Fix an alternative θ_x, θ_y .
2. Put a point mass prior on average of the $\mu_x = \mu_y$ line ie $(\theta_x + \theta_y)/2$ for both
3. Get NP test: $\frac{Y-X}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} > z_{1-\alpha}$
4. Need to check that level α for original problem. So fix a null μ_x, μ_y such that $\mu_y \leq \mu_x$.
5. Conclude that MP for testing \mathcal{H}_0 versus (θ_x, θ_y)
6. Since doesn't depend on the specific alternative chosen, it's UMP

Example 65 (Non-parametric - hypothesis about the cdf $H_0 : F_{X_i}(u) \geq p_0$)

Idea is to parametrize P by conditional distributions:

1. $p = P(X_i \leq u)$
2. P^- Distribution of $X_i | X_i \leq u$
3. P^+ Distribution of $X_i | X_i > u$

Least favorable prior will be have the same conditional distributions with a different p such that in the null space. (Point mass). Becomes isomorphic to testing $\text{Bin}(n, p) \ p \geq p_0$.

Weird: we have a MP but not UMP for testing $H_0 : \sigma \geq \sigma_0$ where both μ, σ unknown– place point mass LFP. By contrast, testing $\sigma \leq \sigma_0$ we can't use a point mass- need a normal prior. Leads to UMP test.
 $\phi = 1[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{\sigma_0^2} > c_{n-1, 1-\alpha}]$.

10.6 P-values

Definition 66 (p-value)

Given some nested rejection regions for valid test, then

$$\hat{p}(X) = \inf\{\alpha : X \in R_\alpha\}.$$

Fact 67 (P-values are sub-uniform)

P values are sub-uniform. If we have exact level α for any α , then \hat{p} is exactly uniform.

11 UMPU

What we do when there's no UMP?

Definition 68 (Unbiased test)

Unbiased level α if

1. Level α : $E_\theta \phi \leq \alpha \quad \forall \theta \in \Omega_0$
2. $E_\theta \phi \geq \alpha \quad \forall \theta \in \Omega_1$.

Think – for a specific alternative, we never have power worse than α .

Helpful that in exponential families, power function is smooth. This means that if β is power function, and simple null θ_0 , then $\beta'(\theta_0) = 0$ is a minimizer.

Theorem 69 (Simple null UMPU, 1-param Expo)

Want to test:

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \theta = \theta_0, \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \theta \neq \theta_0.$$

Given by

$$\phi(X) = \begin{cases} 1 & T(X) > c_1 \text{ or } T(X) < c_2 \\ \gamma_i & T_i = c_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise (between } c_1, c_2) \end{cases}.$$

Where the constants above must satisfy level constraint and also so that:

$$\mathbf{E}_{\theta_0}[T(X)\Phi(T(X))] = \alpha \mathbf{E}[T(X)].$$

Example 70 ($X_i \sim N(\theta, 1)$)

If want to test $\theta = 0$ in normal location model with known variance, the equitailed test is UMPU; see above.

One unbiased proof argument is to compare to the $\phi = \alpha$ test. Our test above is the best power in the class where $\beta'(\theta_0) = 0$, therefore it must be unbiased, since it beats out the constant test.

Definition 71 (Similar (on boundary) test)

If $E_\theta \phi = \alpha$ for all θ on the boundary.

Unbiased tests are similar if power function is continuous: unbiased tests \subset similar tests.

We find the UMP among similar tests and then show it's unbiased.

Definition 72 (Neyman structure)

Let T be sufficient at the boundary. Then ϕ has Neyman structure if $\mathbf{E}[\phi|T = t] = \alpha$ for all t . It's like conditional similarity.

Equivalent to T being complete and sufficient for the boundary if ϕ is a similar test.

If T is CSS, then every similar test has Neyman structure.

Idea is $\mathbf{E}_{\theta, \sigma} \phi(X) = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}\phi|T]$, maximize the inner expectation.

Recipe 73 (UMPU in multiparameter exponential family)

Todo

1. Get nice form

$$p_{\theta, \xi}(x) = \exp(\theta U(X) + \xi T(X) - \Psi(\theta, \xi))$$

2. Where parameter θ that's equivalent to testing original parameter
3. T is CSS at boundary. Then $U(X)|T$ does not depend on ξ on the boundary
4. Reject for $U > k(T)$ etc depending on side of test
5. k is found by satisfying $P_{\theta}(U > k(T)|T) = \alpha$ at boundary.
6. Helpful to try to use Basu's theorem
7. To satisfy the orthogonality condition, hope to use symmetry.

Add the recipes here

Example 74 (Inference on Winners Example)

12 Invariant Tests

Invariance— looking for transformations of the data that don't change the testing problem at all. What is a map that takes nulls to nulls and alternatives to alternatives?

Example 75 ($X_i \sim N(\theta_i, \sigma^2)$ with σ known)

Test $\theta_i = 0$ for all i versus not. Eg linear model. An invariance is orthogonal transformation. Applying UX maps nulls to nulls and alternatives to alternatives.

$$\Phi(X) = \Phi(UX)$$

Test depends only on distance of \underline{X} from the origin, ie on $T = \sum_i X_i^2$. What is the UMP if we only observe $\sum X_i^2$, instead of our full data?

UMPI rejects when $\frac{\sum X_i^2}{\sigma^2} > q(1 - \alpha)$ of χ_n^2 .

Invariance reduces the sample space, ie $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \mapsto T(X)$.

The general setup is that we have a g that maps $X' = gX$. This induces a transform \bar{g} that maps $\bar{g}\theta = \theta'$. We want that $\bar{g}(\Omega_0) \subset \Omega_0$ and $\bar{g}(\Omega_1) \subset \Omega_1$. Ie, the map keeps us within classes. Class G of such transformations must be a **group**, ie having inverse and composition. We say that the problem is "invariant" with respect to G : testing based on X or gX is the same.

Need:

1. Applying g we don't leave our model

2. For any g we pick, for any θ we pick, there's some θ' such that g takes θ' to θ . Ie, $g(X)$ under $P'_{\theta'}$ has distribution P_{θ} . That is, any g we choose induces a surjection onto Θ .
3. Stay within \mathcal{H}_0 or \mathcal{H}_1 .

Definition 76 (Invariant tests)

$$\phi(X) = \phi(gX) \quad \forall g \in G, \forall X \in S.$$

Our test gives the same result regardless of whether we transform. The hope is that there's a UMP test among invariant tests (depends on the group you choose).

Look for– linear regression type problems, unitary matrices, translations.

Definition 77 (Maximal Invariant)

Given a group of transformations G . Then T is maximal invariant if:

1. T invariant ie $T(gX) = T(X)$ for all g, X .
2. If $T(X_1) = T(X_2)$, there exists a g such that $X_2 = gX_1$.

Eg, $\sum X_i^2$ is max invariant in the $N(\theta_i, \sigma^2)$ example.

Any invariant function (eg test) is a function of the maximal invariant. So we can consider tests that are only functions of the maximal invariant!!!! TSH 6.2.1

Example 78 (Location Changes)

If $gX = X + c$, then maximal invariant is:

$$\begin{aligned} n = 1 : & \quad \text{constant functions.} \\ n > 1 : & \quad T = Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-1}) = (X_1 - X_n, \dots, X_{n-1} - X_n) \end{aligned}$$

The proof is that there exists a $c = X'_n - X_n$ such that if $T(X) = T(X')$, there exists a $c = X'_n - X_n$ such that $X' = X + c$.

Alternatively it's sometimes helpful to use $(X_1 - \bar{X}, \dots, X_{n-1} - \bar{X})$.

Example 79 (Scale Changes)

$g(X) = (cX_1, \dots, cX_n)$, then $Y = (\frac{X_1}{X_n}, \dots, \frac{X_{n-1}}{X_n})$ is maximal invariant. $c = \frac{X'_n}{X_n}$.

Example 80 (Group of increasing functions)

If $g(X) = (f(X_1), \dots, f(X_n))$ for some increasing f , then g preserves the order but not the values. **Ranks** are maximal invariant.

- Recipe 81 (Find the UMPI)**
1. Reduce by sufficient stat if necessary
 2. Find the transform group G that leaves the problem invariant
 3. Find the maximal invariant
 4. Test based on the maximal invariant (ie find UMP test as if this was the only thing observed.)