

Chapter 9: Parametric Inference

All of Statistics, Wasserman

1. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$. Find the method of moments estimator for α and β .

Solution. By definition, we must solve the following system of equations for α and β :

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X} &= E_{\alpha, \beta}(X) = \alpha\beta, \\ \overline{X^2} &= E_{\alpha, \beta}(X^2) = V_{\alpha, \beta}(X) + (E_{\alpha, \beta}(X))^2 = \alpha\beta^2 + \alpha^2\beta^2.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\alpha = \bar{X}/\beta$ in the second equation and solving for β yields

$$\alpha = \frac{\bar{X}^2}{\overline{X^2} - \bar{X}^2} \text{ and } \beta = \frac{\overline{X^2} - \bar{X}^2}{\bar{X}}.$$

◇

2. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim U(a, b)$ where a and b are unknown parameters and $a < b$.

- (a) Find the method of moments estimators of a and b .
- (b) Find the MLE of a and b .
- (c) Let $\tau = \int x dF(x)$. Find the MLE of τ .
- (d) Let $\hat{\tau}$ be the MLE of τ . Let $\tilde{\tau}$ be the non-parametric plug-in estimator of τ . Find the MSE of $\tilde{\tau}$.

Solution. (a) By definition, we must solve the following system of equations for a and b :

$$\bar{X} = E_{a, b}(X) = \frac{a + b}{2}, \tag{1}$$

$$\overline{X^2} = E_{a, b}(X^2) = V_{a, b}(X) + (E_{a, b}(X))^2 = \frac{(b - a)^2}{12} + \left(\frac{a + b}{2}\right)^2. \tag{2}$$

Calculating $(2) - (1)^2$ yields $\overline{X^2} - \bar{X}^2 = \frac{(b-a)^2}{12}$. Substituting $a = 2\bar{X} - b$ in this equation, solving for b , and substituting the value obtained for b in the first equation yields

$$a = \bar{X} - \sqrt{3(\overline{X^2} - \bar{X}^2)} \text{ and } b = \sqrt{3(\overline{X^2} - \bar{X}^2)} + \bar{X}.$$

- (b) Recall that $f(x; a, b) = \frac{1}{b-a}I_{(a, b)}(x)$. Hence,

$$L(a, b) = \frac{1}{(b - a)^n} \prod_{i=1}^n I_{(a, b)}(X_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(b-a)^n} & \text{if } a \leq \min_{i=1}^n X_i \text{ and } b \geq \max_{i=1}^n X_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Its easy to see that $\hat{a} = \min_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $\hat{b} = \max_{i=1}^n X_i$ maximize L .

- (c) Note that $\tau = E_{a, b}(X) = (a + b)/2$. Thus, by equivariance of the MLE, $\hat{\tau} = (\hat{a} + \hat{b})/2$.

(d) By definition, $\tilde{\tau} = \int x d\hat{F}(x) = \bar{X}$. Since $E\bar{X} = EX_1$ and $V\bar{X} = \frac{VX_1}{n}$,

$$\text{MSE}(\tilde{\tau}) = \text{MSE}(\bar{X}) = \text{bias}^2(\bar{X}) + V(\bar{X}) = 0 + \frac{(b-a)^2/12}{n} = \frac{(b-a)^2}{12n}.$$

◇

3. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$. Let τ be the 95 percentile, i.e., $P(X < \tau) = .95$.

(a) Find the MLE of τ .

(b) Find an expression for an approximate $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for τ .

Solution. (a) By definition,

$$.95 = P(X < \tau) = P\left(\frac{X - \mu}{\sigma} < \frac{\tau - \mu}{\sigma}\right) = P\left(Z < \frac{\tau - \mu}{\sigma}\right) = \Phi\left(\frac{\tau - \mu}{\sigma}\right)$$

Solving for τ yields

$$\tau = \sigma \cdot \Phi^{-1}(.95) + \mu.$$

Therefore, by equivariance of the MLE,

$$\hat{\tau} = \hat{\sigma} \cdot \Phi^{-1}(.95) + \hat{\mu}$$

where $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ are the MLE of μ and σ (cf. Example 9.11).

(b) Recall that

$$J_n = \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The gradient of $g(\mu, \sigma) = \tau$ is

$$\nabla g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \Phi^{-1}(.95) \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus,

$$\widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\tau}) = \sqrt{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Phi^{-1}(.95) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{n} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{2n} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \Phi^{-1}(.95) \end{pmatrix}} = \hat{\sigma} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\Phi^{-1}(.95)^2}{2n}}$$

An expression for an approximate $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for τ is

$$\hat{\tau} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \cdot \widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\tau}).$$

◇

4. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim U(0, \theta)$. Show that the MLE is consistent.

Proof. The MLE is $\hat{\theta} = \max_{i=1}^n X_i$ (cf. Exercise 2b). Calculating directly, for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} P(|\hat{\theta} - \theta| > \epsilon) &= P\left(\max_{i=1}^n X_i - \theta > \epsilon\right) + P\left(\theta - \max_{i=1}^n X_i > \epsilon\right) \\ &= P\left(\theta - \max_{i=1}^n X_i > \epsilon\right) && \text{(since } X_i < \theta \text{ for all } i) \\ &= P\left(\max_{i=1}^n X_i < \theta - \epsilon\right) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i < \theta - \epsilon) \\ &= \left(\frac{\theta - \epsilon}{\theta}\right)^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

5. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$. Find the method of moments estimator, the MLE, and $I(\lambda)$.

Solution. Since $E_\lambda(X) = \lambda$ for $X \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$, the method of moments estimator of λ is simply \bar{X} . Recall that the pmf is given by

$$f(x; \lambda) = e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^x}{x!}, \quad x \geq 0.$$

Hence, the likelihood function is

$$L(\lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^n e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^{X_i}}{X_i!} = e^{-n\lambda} \frac{\lambda^S}{\prod_{i=1}^n X_i!}$$

where $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then

$$\ell(\lambda) = -n\lambda + S \log \lambda - \log \prod_{i=1}^n X_i!$$

Differentiating yields

$$\ell'(\lambda) = -n + \frac{S}{\lambda}. \quad (3)$$

Equating to 0 and solving for λ yields the MLE

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{S}{n} = \bar{X}.$$

Setting $n = 1$ and differentiating (3) yields

$$\frac{\partial^2 f(X; \lambda)}{\partial \lambda^2} = -\frac{X}{\lambda^2}$$

Finally,

$$I(\lambda) = -E_\lambda \left(-\frac{X}{\lambda^2} \right) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2} = \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

◇

6. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim N(\theta, 1)$. Define

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X_i > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } X_i \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $\psi = P(Y_1 = 1)$.

- Find the MLE $\hat{\psi}$ of ψ .
- Find an approximate 95 percent confidence interval of ψ .
- Define $\tilde{\psi} = \bar{Y}$. Show that $\tilde{\psi}$ is a consistent estimator of ψ .
- Compute the asymptotic relative efficiency of $\tilde{\psi}$ to $\hat{\psi}$.
- Suppose the data are not really normal. (Let $\hat{\psi} := \Phi(\hat{\theta})$ where $\hat{\theta}$ is the MLE of θ .)¹ Show that $\hat{\psi}$ is not consistent. What, if anything, does $\hat{\psi}$ converge to?

¹This sentence doesn't actually appear in the textbook, but seems prudent since otherwise one may think $\hat{\psi}$ is the MLE of ψ under the new hypothesis. This is not the case since the MLE is always consistent.

Solution. (a) Note that

$$\psi = P(Y_1 = 1) = P(X_i > 0) = P(X_i - \theta > -\theta) = P(Z > -\theta) = P(Z < \theta) = \Phi(\theta) =: g(\theta).$$

where Φ is the cdf of $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. By equivariance of the MLE, $\hat{\psi} = \Phi(\hat{\theta})$ where $\hat{\theta}$ is the MLE of θ .

(b) Recall that

$$\widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\theta}) = \widehat{\text{se}}(\bar{X}) = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

By the delta method,

$$\widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\psi}) = |g'(\theta)|\widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\theta}) = \phi(\hat{\theta})\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where $\phi = \Phi'$. Therefore,

$$\hat{\psi} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \cdot \widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\psi})$$

is a $1 - \alpha$ percent confidence interval of ψ .

(c) Since $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\psi)$, the LLN implies the desired result.

(d) Since $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\psi)$,

$$V\tilde{\psi} = V\bar{Y} = \frac{\psi(1-\psi)}{n}.$$

Therefore,

$$\text{ARE}(\tilde{\psi}, \hat{\psi}) = \frac{\frac{\phi(\hat{\theta})^2}{n}}{\frac{\psi(1-\psi)}{n}} = \frac{\phi(\hat{\theta})^2}{\psi(1-\psi)}.$$

(e) Since $\hat{\theta} \rightarrow \theta$ (the MLE is consistent) and convergence in probability is equivariant (cf. Theorem 5.5f),

$$\Phi(\hat{\theta}) \rightarrow \Phi(\theta) \neq \psi.$$

since the data are not normal

◇

7. (Comparing two treatments.) Let $i = 1, 2$. n_i people are given treatment i . Let X_i be the number of people who respond favorably to treatment i . Assume that $X_i \sim \text{Binomial}(n_i, p_i)$. Let $\psi = p_1 - p_2$.

(a) Find the MLE $\hat{\psi}$ of ψ .

(b) Find the Fisher information matrix $I(p_1, p_2)$.

(c) Use the multiparameter delta method to find the asymptotic standard error of $\hat{\psi}$.

Solution. (a) The likelihood function for p_i is given by

$$L(p_i) = \binom{n_i}{X_i} p_i^{X_i} (1 - p_i)^{n_i - X_i}.$$

Recall we're assuming only one sample $X_i \sim \text{Binomial}(n_i, p_i)$. Moreover,

$$\ell(p_i) = \log \binom{n_i}{X_i} + X_i \log p_i + (n_i - X_i) \log(1 - p_i).$$

Differentiating yields

$$\ell'(p_i) = \frac{X_i}{p_i} + \frac{n_i - X_i}{1 - p_i}(-1).$$

Equating to 0 and solving for p_i yields the MLE

$$\hat{p}_i = \frac{X_i}{n_i}.$$

By equivariance of the MLE,

$$\hat{\psi} = \hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2 = \frac{X_1}{n_1} - \frac{X_2}{n_2}.$$

(b) The multiparameter model to consider is

$$f((X_1, X_2); p_1, p_2) = f(X_1, p_1) \cdot f(X_2, p_2)$$

since $X_1 \perp X_2$. Calculating directly²

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial p_i^2} = -\frac{X_i}{p_i^2} - \frac{n_i - X_i}{(1 - p_i)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial p_i \partial p_j} = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j.$$

Moreover, since $E_{p_i}(X_i) = n_i p_i$,

$$E_{(p_1, p_2)} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial p_i^2} \right) = -\frac{n_i p_i}{p_i^2} - \frac{n_i - n_i p_i}{(1 - p_i)^2} = -\frac{n_i}{p_i(1 - p_i)}$$

Therefore,

$$I(p_1, p_2) = - \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{n_1}{p_1(1-p_1)} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{n_2}{p_2(1-p_2)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n_1}{p_1(1-p_1)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{n_2}{p_2(1-p_2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

(c) The inverse of $I(p_1, p_2)$ is

$$J(p_1, p_2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p_1(1-p_1)}{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{p_2(1-p_2)}{n_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

The transformation g is given by $g(p_1, p_2) = p_1 - p_2$, so

$$\nabla g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Therefore,

$$\widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\psi}) = \sqrt{(1 \quad -1) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\hat{p}_2(1-\hat{p}_2)}{n_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{p}_2(1-\hat{p}_2)}{n_2}}$$

Furthermore, $\hat{\psi} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \cdot \widehat{\text{se}}(\hat{\psi})$ is a $1 - \alpha$ percent confidence interval of ψ .

◇

²The log-likelihood of (p_1, p_2) is the sum of the log-likelihoods, so differentiating w.r. to p_i , nullifies the log-likelihood of p_j .