# 170S Week 6 Discussion Notes

### Colin Ni

# February 11, 2025

### Bayesian effects that we have seen

As usual, let X be a random variable depending on a parameter  $\theta$ , and let  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  be a sample drawn from X.

Recall that the core idea of Bayesian statistics is to make a guess, called the prior, on the distribution of  $\theta$  and not just rely solely on the sample  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ . Thus we have two forces at play, our prior distribution and the sample, and Bayes' theorem gives us a posterior distribution on  $\theta$ . We make our estimate by finding the conditional mean (or more generally by minimizing a chosen loss function) of this posterior.

**Slogan.** The sample updates our prior, and we use the posterior to estimate.

On the following page, we tabulate the examples we have seen / will see on the homework. Let us discuss three common themes in these examples.

(1) Our prior and the example pull on our Bayes estimate in a predictable way. For example, in the binomial with beta-prior example, the Bayes estimate is a weighted average of the MLE  $\bar{Y}$  (which only involves the data) and the mean  $\alpha/(\alpha+\beta)$  of our prior (which does not see the data):

$$\frac{\alpha + n\bar{Y}}{n - m\bar{Y} + \beta} = \frac{n}{n - m\bar{Y} + \beta}\bar{Y} + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{n - m\bar{Y} + \beta}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta}.$$

You will see similar things on the homework.

- (2) As  $n \to \infty$ , the effect of the prior weakens, and the Bayes estimate becomes a purely-data estimate (e.g. the MLE). For example, in the binomial with beta-prior example, as  $n \to \infty$  we recover the MLE  $\bar{Y}$  of the probability  $\theta$  of success (e.g. see the weighted average above), and in the normal with normal-prior example, as  $n \to \infty$  we recover the MLE  $\bar{X}$  of the mean  $\mu$ .
- (3) We have control over the strength of the prior. For example, in the normal with normal-prior example, taking  $\sigma_0^2$  to be very small is tantamount to the prior saying it is extremely confident the mean should be close to  $\theta_0$ , so the Bayes estimate is closer to the mean of the prior. For another example, in the binomial with beta-prior example, we can even choose the parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  of the prior so that the prior has equal weight as the data by taking  $\alpha + \beta = n$ . This makes the two weights / coefficients equal.

distr and parameter	prior	posterior	conditional mean of posterior
$Y_i \sim \text{Binom}(m, \theta)$	$\theta \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$	$Beta(\alpha + n\bar{Y}, n - m\bar{Y} + \beta)$	$\frac{\alpha + n\bar{Y}}{n - m\bar{Y} + \beta}$
$X_i \sim \text{Norm}(\theta, \sigma^2)$	$\theta \sim \text{Norm}(\theta_0, \sigma_0^2)$	$\theta \sim \text{Norm}\left(\frac{\bar{X}\sigma_0^2 + \theta_0\sigma^2/n}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2/n}, \frac{(\sigma^2/n)\sigma_0^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2/n}\right)$	$\frac{\bar{X}\sigma_0^2 + \theta_0\sigma^2/n}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2/n}$
$Y_i \sim \operatorname{Pois}(\theta)$	$\theta \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$	$\theta \sim \text{Gamma}\left(\alpha + n\bar{Y}, \frac{1}{n + \frac{1}{\beta}}\right)$	$\frac{\alpha\beta + n\beta\bar{Y}}{n\beta + 1}$
$X_i \sim \operatorname{Gamma}(\alpha, \theta)$	$\frac{1}{\theta} \sim \operatorname{Gamma}(\alpha_0, \theta_0)$	$\theta \sim \text{Gamma}\left(\alpha_0 + n\alpha, \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\theta_0} + n\bar{X}}\right)$	$\frac{\alpha_0\theta_0 + n\theta_0\alpha}{1 + n\theta_0\bar{X}}$
$f(x \mid \theta) = 3\theta x^2 e^{-\theta x^3}$	$\theta \sim \text{Gamma}\left(4, \frac{1}{4}\right)$	$\theta \sim \text{Gamma}\left(n+4, \frac{1}{4+\sum_{i} x_{i}^{3}}\right)$	$\frac{n+4}{4+\sum_{i}x_{i}^{3}}$

## Confidence intervals for Norm(0, 1)

Confidence intervals for the distribution  $Z \sim \text{Norm}(0,1)$  is the common underlying mechanic for confidence intervals for other statistics, such as means, differences of two means, and proportions. The key definition to remember is as follows; it gives the threshold  $z_{\alpha}$  for which only a proportion  $\alpha$  of sampled Z values is above  $z_{\alpha}$ , namely  $z_{\alpha} = F_Z^{-1}(1-\alpha)$ .

**Definition.** For any probability  $\alpha \in (0,1)$ , the number  $z_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$  is defined to satisfy  $F_Z(z_{\alpha}) = 1 - \alpha$ .

**Warmup.** Carefully draw a big picture of the pdf of Z, and draw  $\alpha = 0.16$  as the area under the curve over a right-tail region. Recall the 68–95–99.7 rule, and use this to label  $z_{\alpha}$ .

Suppose now that we want intervals (a, b) such that  $\mathbb{P}(a < Z < b) = \alpha$ , or in other words confidence intervals for the values of Z. We can use the  $z_{\alpha}$  values to do this in many ways, but here are the usual ones:

- The centered-at-zero interval  $(-z_{\alpha/2}, z_{\alpha/2})$ .
- The left-tail interval  $(-\infty, z_{\alpha})$ .
- The right-tail interval  $(-z_{\alpha}, \infty)$ .

#### Confidence intervals for other statistics

To find confidence intervals for some statistic, the strategy is often to reduce the statistic to  $Z \sim \text{Norm}(0,1)$  and then use these  $z_{\alpha}$  values.

**Example.** If  $X \sim \text{Norm}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , then we can construct an  $\alpha$ -confidence interval  $[\mu - z, \mu + z]$  (that is centered at  $\mu$ ) for the values of X: since  $X \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} \sigma Z + \mu$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu - z < X < \mu + z) = \mathbb{P}\left(-\frac{z}{\sigma} < Z < \frac{z}{\sigma}\right) = \alpha$$

if and only if  $z = \sigma z_{\alpha/2}$ .

**Example.** Let  $X_1, ..., X_n$  be a sample from  $\text{Norm}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , and consider the sample mean  $\bar{X}$ . Since the  $X_i$  are normal,  $\bar{X}$  is normal, and recalling (e.g. from the week 2 discussion notes) that  $\mathbb{E}(\bar{X}) = \mu$  and  $\text{Var}(\bar{X}) = \sigma^2/n$ , it follows that

$$\bar{X} \sim \text{Norm}\left(\mu, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\right).$$

Thus we can construct an  $\alpha$ -confidence interval  $[\mu - z, \mu + z]$  for the values of  $\bar{X}$ : since  $\bar{X} \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \sigma Z/\sqrt{n} + \mu$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu - z < \bar{X} < \mu + z) = \mathbb{P}\left(-\frac{\sqrt{n}z}{\sigma} < Z < \frac{\sqrt{n}z}{\sigma}\right) = \alpha$$

if and only if  $z = \sigma z_{\alpha/2} / \sqrt{n}$ .

**Example.** Let  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  be a large sample from a random variable X with mean  $\mu$  and known variance  $\sigma^2$ . By the central limit theorem

$$\frac{\bar{X} - \mu}{\sigma / \sqrt{n}} \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{\to} \mathrm{Norm}(0, 1)$$
 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Thus since our sample is large, we can approximate

$$\bar{X} \sim \text{Norm}\left(\mu, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\right),$$

which is our previous example.

**Example.** Let  $X_1, \ldots, X_{n_X}$  be a sample from  $\operatorname{Norm}(\mu_X, \sigma_X^2)$ , and let  $Y_1, \ldots, Y_{n_Y}$  be a sample from  $\operatorname{Norm}(\mu_Y, \sigma_Y^2)$ , where we assume  $\sigma_X^2, \sigma_Y^2$  are known. Then

$$\bar{X} - \bar{Y} \sim \text{Norm}(\mu_X - \mu_Y, \sigma_X^2 / n_X + \sigma_Y^2 / n_Y).$$

Thus we can construct an  $\alpha$ -confidence interval  $[\mu_X - \mu_Y - z, \mu_X - \mu_Y + z]$  for the values of  $\bar{X} - \bar{Y}$ : since

$$\bar{X} - \bar{Y} \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{=} \left( \frac{\sigma_X^2}{n_X} + \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{n_Y} \right) Z + (\mu_X - \mu_Y),$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}((\mu_X - \mu_Y) - z < \bar{X} - \bar{Y} < (\mu_X - \mu_Y) + z) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{-z}{\frac{\sigma_X^2}{n_X} + \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{n_Y}} < Z < \frac{z}{\frac{\sigma_X^2}{n_X} + \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{n_Y}}\right) = \alpha$$

if and only if  $z = (\sigma_X^2/n_X + \sigma_Y^2/n_Y)z_{\alpha/2}$ .