

**Biostat 602 Winter 2017**

**Lecture Set 17**

**Hypothesis Testing  
Likelihood Ratio Test**

**Reading: CB 8.2**

## Likelihood Ratio Tests (LRT)

**Definition** Let  $L(\theta|\mathbf{x})$  be the likelihood function of  $\theta$ . The likelihood ratio test statistic for testing  $H_0 : \theta \in \Omega_0$  vs.  $H_1 : \theta \in \Omega_0^c$  is

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} L(\theta|\mathbf{x})}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} L(\theta|\mathbf{x})} = \frac{L(\hat{\theta}_0|\mathbf{x})}{L(\hat{\theta}|\mathbf{x})}$$

where  $\hat{\theta}$  is the MLE of  $\theta$  over  $\theta \in \Omega$ , and  $\hat{\theta}_0$  is the MLE of  $\theta$  over  $\theta \in \Omega_0$  (restricted MLE).

The *likelihood ratio test* is a test that rejects  $H_0$  if and only if  $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \leq c$  where  $0 \leq c \leq 1$ .

$c$  is obtained from the size condition of the test, namely

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} \beta(\theta) = \alpha$$

where  $\beta(\theta) = \Pr(\mathbf{X} \in R|\theta) = \Pr(\text{reject } H_0|\theta)$  is the power function of the test.

## LRT based on sufficient statistics

**Theorem 8.2.4:** If  $T(\mathbf{X})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ ,  $\lambda^*(t)$  is the LRT statistic based on  $T$ , and  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$  is the LRT statistic based on  $\mathbf{x}$  then

$$\lambda^*[T(\mathbf{x})] = \lambda(\mathbf{x})$$

for every  $\mathbf{x}$  in the sample space.

**Proof:** By Factorization Theorem, the joint pdf of  $\mathbf{x}$  can be written as

$$f(\mathbf{x}|\theta) = g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta)h(\mathbf{x})$$

and we can choose  $g(t|\theta)$  to be the pdf or pmf of  $T(\mathbf{x})$ . Then, the LRT statistic based on  $T(\mathbf{X})$  is defined as

$$\lambda^*(t) = \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} L(\theta|T(\mathbf{x}) = t)}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} L(\theta|T(\mathbf{x}) = t)} = \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} g(t|\theta)}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} g(t|\theta)}$$

LRT statistic based on  $\mathbf{X}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} L(\theta|\mathbf{x})}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} L(\theta|\mathbf{x})} \\ &= \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} f(\mathbf{x}|\theta)}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} f(\mathbf{x}|\theta)} \\ &= \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta)h(\mathbf{x})}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta)h(\mathbf{x})} \\ &= \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta)}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta)} = \lambda^*(T(\mathbf{x})) \end{aligned}$$

The simplified expression of  $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$  should depend on  $\mathbf{x}$  only through  $T(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $T(\mathbf{x})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

**Example 1:** Consider  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is known.

$$H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$$

$$H_1 : \theta \neq \theta_0$$

Find a size  $\alpha$  LRT.

**Solution - Using sufficient statistics:** Note that in this case,  $T(\mathbf{X}) = \bar{X}$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

$$T \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\theta, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\right)$$

$$\lambda(t) = \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} L(\theta|t)}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} L(\theta|t)} = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2/n}} \exp\left[-\frac{(t-\theta_0)^2}{2\sigma^2/n}\right]}{\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2/n}} \exp\left[-\frac{(t-\theta)^2}{2\sigma^2/n}\right]}$$

The numerator is fixed, and MLE in the denominator is  $\hat{\theta} = t$ . Therefore the LRT statistic is

$$\lambda(t) = \exp\left[-\frac{n(t-\theta_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right]$$

LRT rejects  $H_0$  if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(t) &= \exp\left[-\frac{n(t-\theta_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \leq c \\ \Rightarrow \left|\frac{t-\theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right| &\geq \sqrt{-2\log c} = c^* \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$T = \overline{X} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\theta, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\right)$$

$$\frac{T - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

A size  $\alpha$  test satisfies

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} \Pr\left(\left|\frac{T - \theta}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right| \geq c^*\right) = \alpha$$

$$\Pr\left(\left|\frac{T - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right| \geq c^*\right) = \alpha$$

$$\Pr(|Z| \geq c^*) = \alpha$$

$$\Pr(Z \geq c^*) + \Pr(Z \leq -c^*) = \alpha$$

$$|Z| = \left|\frac{T - \theta}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right| \geq z_{\alpha/2}$$

## LRT with nuisance parameters

**Example 2:** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be i.i.d  $\mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where both  $\theta$  and  $\sigma^2$  are unknown. Obtain a LRT for testing  $H_0 : \theta \leq \theta_0$  against  $H_1 : \theta > \theta_0$ .

1. Specify  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega_0$
2. Find size  $\alpha$  LRT.

**Solution -  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega_0$**

$$\Omega = \{(\theta, \sigma^2) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma^2 > 0\}$$

$$\Omega_0 = \{(\theta, \sigma^2) : \theta \leq \theta_0, \sigma^2 > 0\}$$

**Size  $\alpha$  LRT**

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sup_{\{(\theta, \sigma^2) : \theta \leq \theta_0, \sigma^2 > 0\}} L(\theta, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{x})}{\sup_{\{(\theta, \sigma^2) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma^2 > 0\}} L(\theta, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{x})}$$

For the denominator, the MLE of  $\theta$  and  $\sigma^2$  are

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\theta} = \bar{X} \\ \hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sum (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{n} = \frac{n-1}{n} s_{\mathbf{X}}^2 \end{cases}$$

For numerator, we need to maximize  $L(\theta, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{x})$  over the region  $\theta \leq \theta_0$  and  $\sigma^2 > 0$ .

$$L(\theta, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{x}) = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right)^n \exp \left[ -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right]$$

## Maximizing Numerator

**Step 1:** fix  $\sigma^2$ , likelihood is maximized when  $\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta)^2$  is minimized over  $\theta \leq \theta_0$ .

$$\hat{\theta}_0 = \begin{cases} \bar{x} & \text{if } \bar{x} \leq \theta_0 \\ \theta_0 & \text{if } \bar{x} > \theta_0 \end{cases}$$

**Step 2:** Now, we need to maximize likelihood (or log-likelihood) with respect to  $\sigma^2$  and we substitute  $\hat{\theta}_0$  for  $\theta$ .

$$l(\hat{\theta}, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{x}) = -\frac{n}{2} (\log 2\pi + \log \sigma^2) - \frac{\sum (x_i - \hat{\theta}_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}$$

$$\frac{\partial \log l}{\partial \sigma^2} = -\frac{n}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{\sum (x_i - \hat{\theta}_0)^2}{2(\sigma^2)^2} = 0$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_0^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\theta}_0)^2}{n}$$

Combining the results together

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \bar{x} \leq \theta_0 \\ \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_0^2}{\sigma_0^2}\right)^{n/2} & \text{if } \bar{x} > \theta_0 \end{cases}$$

## Constructing LRT

LRT test rejects  $H_0$  if and only if  $\bar{x} > \theta_0$  and

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_0^2}\right)^{n/2} &\leq c \\ \left(\frac{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2/n}{\sum(x_i - \theta_0)^2/n}\right)^{n/2} &\leq c \\ \frac{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{\sum(x_i - \theta_0)^2} &\leq c^* \\ \frac{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \theta_0)^2} &\leq c^* \\ \frac{1}{1 + \frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta_0)^2}{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2}} &\leq c^*\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta_0)^2}{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2} &\geq c^{**} \\ \frac{\bar{x} - \theta_0}{s_{\mathbf{X}}/\sqrt{n}} &\geq c^{***}\end{aligned}$$

LRT test rejects  $H_0$  if

$$\frac{\bar{x} - \theta_0}{s_{\mathbf{X}}/\sqrt{n}} \geq c^{***}$$

The next step is to specify  $c^{***}$  to get size  $\alpha$  test (can you figure out?).



## Unbiased Test

**Definition:** If a test always satisfies

$$\Pr(\text{reject } H_0 \text{ when } H_0 \text{ is false}) \geq \Pr(\text{reject } H_0 \text{ when } H_0 \text{ is true})$$

Then the test is said to be unbiased.

**Alternative Definition:** Recall that  $\beta(\theta) = \Pr(\text{reject } H_0)$ . A test is unbiased if

$$\beta(\theta') \geq \beta(\theta)$$

for every  $\theta' \in \Omega_0^c$  and  $\theta \in \Omega_0$ .

**Example 3:** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is known, testing  $H_0 : \theta \leq \theta_0$  vs  $H_1 : \theta > \theta_0$ . LRT test rejects  $H_0$  if

$$\frac{\bar{x} - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > c.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(\theta) &= \Pr\left(\frac{\bar{X} - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > c\right) \\ &= \Pr\left(\frac{\bar{X} - \theta + \theta - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > c\right) \\ &= \Pr\left(\frac{\bar{X} - \theta}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\theta - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > c\right) \\ &= \Pr\left(\frac{\bar{X} - \theta}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > c + \frac{\theta_0 - \theta}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$ ,  $\bar{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2/n)$ , and  $\frac{\bar{X}-\theta}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Therefore, for  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$

$$\beta(\theta) = \Pr \left( Z > c + \frac{\theta_0 - \theta}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

Because the power function is increasing function in  $\theta$ ,

$$\beta(\theta') \geq \beta(\theta)$$

always holds when  $\theta \leq \theta_0 < \theta'$ . Therefore the LRTs are unbiased.

**Question:** Can the same test be biased when hypotheses change?

**Example 4:** Same framework as before.

- New hypotheses :  $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ ,  $H_1 : \theta \neq \theta_0$ .
- Same test :  $R = \left\{ \frac{\bar{x}-\theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > c \right\}$ .

### Testing unbiasedness

The power function  $\beta(\theta)$  is still an increasing function. Therefore, if  $\theta_+ > \theta_0 > \theta_-$ , then

$$\beta(\theta_+) > \beta(\theta_0) > \beta(\theta_-)$$

where both  $\beta(\theta_+)$  and  $\beta(\theta_-)$  are power but  $\beta(\theta_0)$  is Type I error.

Hence, power can be smaller than the Type I error when  $\theta < \theta_0$ , so the test is biased.

## Uniformly Most Powerful Test (UMP)

**Definition:** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of tests between  $H_0 : \theta \in \Omega$  vs  $H_1 : \theta \in \Omega_0^c$ . A test in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with power function  $\beta(\theta)$  is *uniformly most powerful (UMP) test* in class  $\mathcal{C}$  if  $\beta(\theta) \geq \beta'(\theta)$  for every  $\theta \in \Omega_0^c$  and every  $\beta'(\theta)$ , which is a power function of another test in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

### UMP level $\alpha$ test

Consider  $\mathcal{C}$  to be the set of all the level  $\alpha$  test. The UMP test in this class is called a UMP level  $\alpha$  test.

UMP level  $\alpha$  test has the smallest type II error probability for any  $\theta \in \Omega_0^c$  in this class.

- A UMP test is "uniform" in the sense that it is most powerful for every  $\theta \in \Omega_0^c$ .
- For simple hypothesis such as  $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$  and  $H_1 : \theta = \theta_1$ , UMP level  $\alpha$  test always exists.

## Neyman-Pearson Lemma

**Theorem 8.3.12 - Neyman-Pearson Lemma:** Consider testing  $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$  vs.  $H_1 : \theta = \theta_1$  where the pdf or pmf corresponding to  $\theta_i$  is  $f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_i)$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , using a test with rejection region  $R$  that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} \in R & \quad \text{if } f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_1) > k f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_0) \\ \mathbf{x} \in R^c & \quad \text{if } f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_1) < k f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_0) \end{aligned} \tag{8.3.1}$$

for some  $k \geq 0$  and

$$\alpha = \Pr(\mathbf{X} \in R|\theta_0). \tag{8.3.2}$$

Then,

- (Sufficiency) Any test that satisfies 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 is a UMP level  $\alpha$  test
- (Necessity) If there exist a test satisfying 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 with  $k > 0$ , then every UMP level  $\alpha$  test is a size  $\alpha$  test (satisfies 8.3.2), and every UMP level  $\alpha$  test satisfies 8.3.1 except perhaps on a set  $A$  satisfying  $\Pr(\mathbf{X} \in A|\theta_0) = \Pr(\mathbf{X} \in A|\theta_1) = 0$ .

**Example 5:** Let  $X \sim \text{Binomial}(2, \theta)$ , and consider testing  $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0 = 1/2$  vs.  $H_1 : \theta = \theta_1 = 3/4$ .

Calculating the ratios of the pmfs given,

$$\frac{f(0|\theta_1)}{f(0|\theta_0)} = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \frac{f(1|\theta_1)}{f(1|\theta_0)} = \frac{3}{4}, \quad \frac{f(2|\theta_1)}{f(2|\theta_0)} = \frac{9}{4}$$

- Suppose that  $k < 1/4$ , then the rejection region  $R = \{0, 1, 2\}$ , and UMP level  $\alpha$  test always rejects  $H_0$ . Therefore

$$\alpha = \Pr(\text{reject } H_0|\theta = \theta_0 = 1/2) = 1.$$

- Suppose that  $1/4 < k < 3/4$ , then  $R = \{1, 2\}$ , and UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  if  $x = 1$  or  $x = 2$ .

$$\alpha = \Pr(\text{reject } H_0 | \theta = \frac{1}{2}) = \Pr(x \neq 0 | \theta = 1/2) = \frac{3}{4}$$

- Suppose that  $3/4 < k < 9/4$ , then UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  if  $x = 2$

$$\alpha = \Pr(\text{reject } H_0 | \theta = 1/2) = \Pr(x = 2 | \theta = 1/2) = \frac{1}{4}$$

- If  $k > 9/4$  the UMP level  $\alpha$  test will always not reject  $H_0$ , and  $\alpha = 0$

**Example 6 – Normal Distribution:**  $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is known. Consider testing  $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$  vs.  $H_1 : \theta = \theta_1$  where  $\theta_1 > \theta_0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}|\theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(x_i - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\} \right] \\ \frac{f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_1)}{f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_0)} &= \frac{\exp \left\{ -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\}}{\exp \left\{ -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta_0)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\}} \\ &= \exp \left[ -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta_0)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\ &= \exp \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta_0)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\ &= \exp \left[ \frac{n(\theta_0^2 - \theta_1^2) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i(\theta_1 - \theta_0)}{2\sigma^2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  if

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left[ \frac{n(\theta_0^2 - \theta_1^2) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i(\theta_1 - \theta_0)}{2\sigma^2} \right] > k \\ \iff & \frac{n(\theta_0^2 - \theta_1^2) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i(\theta_1 - \theta_0)}{2\sigma^2} > \log k \\ \iff & \sum_{i=1}^n x_i > k^* \end{aligned}$$

$$\alpha = \Pr \left( \sum_{i=1}^n X_i > k^* | \theta_0 \right)$$

Under  $H_0$ ,

$$X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_0, \sigma^2)$$

$$\overline{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_0, \sigma^2/n)$$

$$\frac{\overline{X} - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \Pr \left( \sum_{i=1}^n X_i > k^* | \theta_0 \right) \\ &= \Pr \left( Z > \frac{k^*/n - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ .

$$\frac{k^*/n - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} = z_\alpha$$

$$k^* = n \left( \theta_0 + z_\alpha \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

Thus, the UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  if  $\sum X_i > k^*$ , or equivalently, rejects  $H_0$  if  $\bar{X} > k^*/n = \theta_0 + z_\alpha \sigma / \sqrt{n}$

## Neyman-Pearson Lemma on Sufficient Statistics

**Corollary 8.3.13:** Consider  $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$  vs  $H_1 : \theta = \theta_1$ . Suppose  $T(\mathbf{X})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  and  $g(t|\theta_i)$  is the pdf or pmf of  $T$ . Corresponding  $\theta_i, i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then any test based on  $T$  with rejection region  $S$  is a UMP level  $\alpha$  test if it satisfies

$$t \in S \quad \text{if } g(t|\theta_1) > k \cdot g(t|\theta_0) \text{ and}$$

$$t \in S^c \quad \text{if } g(t|\theta_1) < k \cdot g(t|\theta_0)$$

for some  $k > 0$  and  $\alpha = \Pr(T \in S|\theta_0)$

**Proof:** The rejection region in the sample space is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \{\mathbf{x} : T(\mathbf{x}) = t \in S\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{x} : g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta_1) > k g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta_0)\} \end{aligned}$$

By Factorization Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_i) &= h(\mathbf{x})g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta_i) \\ R &= \{\mathbf{x} : g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta_1)h(\mathbf{x}) > k g(T(\mathbf{x})|\theta_0)h(\mathbf{x})\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{x} : f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_1) > k f(\mathbf{x}|\theta_0)\} \end{aligned}$$

By Neyman-Pearson Lemma, this test is the UMP level  $\alpha$  test, and

$$\alpha = \Pr(\mathbf{X} \in R) = \Pr(T(\mathbf{X}) \in S | \theta_0)$$

## Revisiting the Example of Normal Distribution

$X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is known. Consider testing

$$H_0 : \theta = \theta_0 \text{ vs. } H_1 : \theta = \theta_1, \text{ where } \theta_1 > \theta_0.$$

It is known that  $T = \bar{X}$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ , where  $T \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2/n)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} g(t|\theta_i) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2/n}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(t - \theta_i)^2}{2\sigma^2/n} \right\} \\ \frac{g(t|\theta_1)}{g(t|\theta_0)} &= \frac{\exp \left\{ -\frac{(t - \theta_1)^2}{2\sigma^2/n} \right\}}{\exp \left\{ -\frac{(t - \theta_0)^2}{2\sigma^2/n} \right\}} \\ &= \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2/n} [(t - \theta_1)^2 - (t - \theta_0)^2] \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2/n} [\theta_1^2 - \theta_0^2 - 2t(\theta_1 - \theta_0)] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  if

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2/n} [\theta_1^2 - \theta_0^2 - 2t(\theta_1 - \theta_0)] \right\} > k \\ \iff &\frac{1}{2\sigma^2/n} [-(\theta_1^2 - \theta_0^2) + 2t(\theta_1 - \theta_0)] > \log k \\ \iff &\bar{X} = t > k^* \end{aligned}$$



Under  $H_0$ ,  $\bar{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_0, \sigma^2/n)$ . Now,

$$\Pr(\text{reject } H_0 | \theta_0) = \alpha$$

$$\alpha = \Pr(\bar{X} > k^* | \theta_0)$$

$$= \Pr\left(\frac{\bar{X} - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > \frac{k^* - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

$$= \Pr\left(Z > \frac{k^* - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

$$\frac{k^* - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} = z_\alpha$$

$$k^* = \theta_0 + z_\alpha \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$$

## Monotone Likelihood Ratio (Karlin-Rubin)

**Definition:** A family of pdfs or pmfs  $\{g(t|\theta) : \theta \in \Omega\}$  for a univariate random variable  $T$  with real-valued parameter  $\theta$  have a monotone likelihood ratio if  $\frac{g(t|\theta_2)}{g(t|\theta_1)}$  is an increasing (or non-decreasing) function of  $t$  for every  $\theta_2 > \theta_1$  on  $\{t : g(t|\theta_1) > 0 \text{ or } g(t|\theta_2) > 0\}$ .

Note: we may define MLR using decreasing function of  $t$ . But all following theorems are stated according to the definition.

### Examples of Monotone Likelihood Ratio

- Normal, Poisson, Binomial have the MLR Property (Exercise 8.25)
- If  $T$  is from an exponential family with the pdf or pmf

$$g(t|\theta) = h(t)c(\theta) \exp[w(\theta) \cdot t]$$

Then  $T$  has an MLR if  $w(\theta)$  is a non-decreasing function of  $\theta$ .

**Proof:** Suppose that  $\theta_2 > \theta_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g(t|\theta_2)}{g(t|\theta_1)} &= \frac{h(t)c(\theta_2) \exp[w(\theta_2)t]}{h(t)c(\theta_1) \exp[w(\theta_1)t]} \\ &= \frac{c(\theta_2)}{c(\theta_1)} \exp[\{w(\theta_2) - w(\theta_1)\}t] \end{aligned}$$

If  $w(\theta)$  is a non-decreasing function of  $\theta$ , then

1.  $w(\theta_2) - w(\theta_1) \geq 0$  and
2.  $\exp[\{w(\theta_2) - w(\theta_1)\}t]$  is an increasing function of  $t$ .

Therefore,  $\frac{g(t|\theta_2)}{g(t|\theta_1)}$  is a non-decreasing function of  $t$ , and  $T$  has MLR if  $w(\theta)$  is a non-decreasing function of  $\theta$ .

## Karlin-Rubin Theorem

**Theorem 8.3.17:** Suppose  $T(\mathbf{X})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  and the family  $\{g(t|\theta) : \theta \in \Omega\}$  is an MLR family. Then

1. For testing  $H_0 : \theta \leq \theta_0$  vs  $H_1 : \theta > \theta_0$ , the UMP level  $\alpha$  test is given by rejecting  $H_0$  if and only if  $T > t_0$  where  $\alpha = \Pr(T > t_0|\theta_0)$ .
2. For testing  $H_0 : \theta \geq \theta_0$  vs  $H_1 : \theta < \theta_0$ , the UMP level  $\alpha$  test is given by rejecting  $H_0$  if and only if  $T < t_0$  where  $\alpha = \Pr(T < t_0|\theta_0)$ .

**Example 7:** Let  $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is known, Find the UMP level  $\alpha$  test for  $H_0 : \theta \leq \theta_0$  vs  $H_1 : \theta > \theta_0$ .

**Solution:** Here  $T(\mathbf{X}) = \bar{X}$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ , and  $T \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2/n)$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} g(t|\theta) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2/n}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(t - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2/n} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2/n}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2 + \theta^2 - 2t\theta}{2\sigma^2/n} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2/n}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2/n} \right\} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\theta^2}{2\sigma^2/n} \right\} \exp \left\{ \frac{t\theta}{\sigma^2/n} \right\} \\ &= h(t)c(\theta) \exp[w(\theta)t] \end{aligned}$$

where  $w(\theta) = \frac{\theta}{\sigma^2/n}$  is an increasing function in  $\theta$ . Therefore  $T$  has an MLR property.

### Finding a UMP level $\alpha$ test

By Karlin-Rubin Theorem, UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  iff  $T > t_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= \Pr(T > t_0 | \theta_0) \\
&= \Pr\left(\frac{T - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} > \frac{t_0 - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \middle| \theta_0\right) \\
&= \Pr\left(Z > \frac{t_0 - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{t_0 - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} &= z_\alpha \\
\Rightarrow t_0 &= \theta_0 + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} z_\alpha
\end{aligned}$$

UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  if  $T = \bar{X} > \theta_0 + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} z_\alpha$ .

**Testing**  $H_0 : \theta \geq \theta_0$  **vs.**  $H_1 : \theta < \theta_0$

UMP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0$  if  $T < t_0$  where

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= \Pr(T < t_0 | \theta_0) = \Pr\left(\frac{T - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} < \frac{t_0 - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \middle| \theta_0\right) \\
&= \Pr\left(Z < \frac{t_0 - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
1 - \alpha &= \Pr\left(Z \geq \frac{t_0 - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
\frac{t_0 - \theta_0}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} &= z_{1-\alpha} \\
t_0 &= \theta_0 + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} z_{1-\alpha} = \theta_0 - \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} z_\alpha
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the test rejects  $H_0$  if  $T < t_0 = \theta_0 - \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}z_\alpha$

**Example 8: Normal Example with Known Mean** Let  $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is unknown and  $\mu_0$  is known. Find the UMP level  $\alpha$  test for testing  $H_0 : \sigma^2 \leq \sigma_0^2$  vs.  $H_1 : \sigma^2 > \sigma_0^2$ . Let  $T = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu_0)^2$  is sufficient for  $\sigma^2$ .

To check whether  $T$  has MLR property, we need to find  $g(t|\sigma^2)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{X_i - \mu_0}{\sigma} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\ \left(\frac{X_i - \mu_0}{\sigma}\right)^2 &\sim \chi_1^2 \\ Y = T/\sigma^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{X_i - \mu_0}{\sigma}\right)^2 \sim \chi_n^2 \\ f_Y(y) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{n/2}} y^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{y}{2}} \\ f_T(t) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{n/2}} \left(\frac{t}{\sigma^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{t}{2\sigma^2}} \left|\frac{dy}{dt}\right| \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{n/2}} \left(\frac{t}{\sigma^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{t}{2\sigma^2}} \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \\ &= \frac{t^{\frac{n}{2}-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) 2^{n/2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{t}{2\sigma^2}} \\ &= h(t)c(\sigma^2) \exp[w(\sigma^2)t]\end{aligned}$$

where  $w(\sigma^2) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}$  is an increasing function in  $\sigma^2$ . Therefore,  $T = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu_0)^2$  has the MLR property.

By Karlin-Rubin Theorem, UMP level  $\alpha$  rejects  $H_0$  if and only if  $T > t_0$  where  $t_0$  is chosen such that  $\alpha = \Pr(T > t_0 | \sigma_0^2)$ . Note that  $\frac{T}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_n^2$ . Hence

$$\Pr(T > t_0 | \sigma_0^2) = \Pr\left(\frac{T}{\sigma_0^2} > \frac{t_0}{\sigma_0^2} \middle| \sigma_0^2\right)$$

$$\frac{T}{\sigma_0^2} \sim \chi_n^2$$

$$\Pr\left(\chi_n^2 > \frac{t_0}{\sigma_0^2}\right) = \alpha$$

$$\frac{t_0}{\sigma_0^2} = \chi_{n,\alpha}^2$$

$$t_0 = \sigma_0^2 \chi_{n,\alpha}^2$$

where  $\chi_{n,\alpha}^2$  satisfies  $\int_{\chi_{n,\alpha}^2}^{\infty} f_{\chi_n^2}(x) dx = \alpha$ .

**Example 9:** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is known. Consider testing  $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$  versus an alternative hypothesis.

1. When the alternative hypothesis is  $H_1 : \theta_1 < \theta_0$ , does UMP level  $\alpha$  test exist? If yes, what is it?
2. When the alternative hypothesis is  $H_1 : \theta_1 > \theta_0$ , does UMP level  $\alpha$  test exist? If yes, what is it?
3. When the alternative hypothesis is  $H_1 : \theta_1 \neq \theta_0$ , does UMP level  $\alpha$  test exist? If yes, what is it?
4. Are the tests above unbiased?

$$H_1 : \theta < \theta_0$$

A level  $\alpha$  test should satisfy  $\Pr(\mathbf{X} \in R|\theta_0) \leq \alpha$ .

As  $\bar{X}$  is sufficient and its distribution has an MLR as shown in the previous example, by Karlin-Rubin Theorem, the rejection region of UMP level  $\alpha$  test is

$$\bar{X} < -\frac{\sigma z_\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta_0$$

$$H_1 : \theta > \theta_0$$

As  $\bar{X}$  is sufficient and its distribution has an MLR as shown in the previous example, by Karlin-Rubin Theorem, the rejection region of UMP level  $\alpha$  test is

$$\bar{X} > \frac{\sigma z_\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta_0$$

$$H_1 : \theta \neq \theta_0$$

1. When  $\theta < \theta_0$ ,  $\beta_1(\theta) = \Pr(\mathbf{X} \in R_1) = \Pr\left(\bar{X} < -\frac{\sigma z_\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta_0\right)$  is the largest among level  $\alpha$  tests.
2. If UMP level  $\alpha$  test exists, the rejection region must be  $R_1$  by the necessity condition of Neyman-Pearson Lemma.
3. When  $\theta > \theta_0$ ,  $\beta_2(\theta) = \Pr(\mathbf{X} \in R_2) = \Pr\left(\bar{X} > \frac{\sigma z_\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta_0\right)$  is the largest among level  $\alpha$  tests.
4. Accordingly,  $\beta_1(\theta)$  is not the power function of a UMP level  $\alpha$  test.
5. Therefore, UMP level  $\alpha$  test does not exist.

### Are these tests unbiased?

Test based on  $\bar{X} < -\frac{\sigma z_{\alpha}}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta_0$

1. When  $\theta < \theta_0$ ,  $\beta_1(\theta) > \beta_1(\theta_0)$ .
2. When  $\theta > \theta_0$ ,  $\beta_1(\theta) < \beta_1(\theta_0)$ .
3. Therefore, the test is not unbiased.

Test based on  $\bar{X} > \frac{\sigma z_{\alpha}}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta_0$

1. When  $\theta > \theta_0$ ,  $\beta_2(\theta) > \beta_2(\theta_0)$ .
2. When  $\theta < \theta_0$ ,  $\beta_2(\theta) < \beta_2(\theta_0)$ .
3. Therefore, the test is not unbiased.

### UMPU test

#### What is the optimal test for the two-sided test?

Consider a class of unbiased tests. Define a rejection region

$$|\bar{X} - \theta_0| > \frac{\sigma z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

1. The test is unbiased.  $\beta_3(\theta) > \beta_3(\theta_0)$  for all  $\theta \neq \theta_0$ .
2. The test is indeed the UMP test in the class of unbiased level  $\alpha$  test.
3. This test is called a UMPU level  $\alpha$  test.
4. Proving that the test is UMPU level  $\alpha$  test is a little more complicated than UMP.



**Example 8:** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \sim \text{Uniform}(0, \theta)$ . Consider testing

$$H_0 : \theta \leq \theta_0 \text{ vs. } H_1 : \theta > \theta_0.$$

- (a) Show that the family of  $\text{Uniform}(0, \theta)$  has MLR in  $X_{(n)}$ .
- (b) Find a size  $\alpha$  UMP test for the above testing problem.

**Example 9:** Suppose that  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are *i.i.d.* observations from  $\text{Exponential}(\theta)$ , and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  are *i.i.d.* observations from  $\text{Exponential}(\mu)$ . Assume that  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  are independent between them.

- (a) Find the LRT statistic of  $H_0 : \theta = \mu$  versus  $H_1 : \theta \neq \mu$
- (b) Show that the LRT from part (a) can be represented as a function of the following statistic  $T$ .

$$T = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i + \sum_{i=1}^m Y_i}$$

(Note that it is possible to construct a size  $\alpha$  LRT using the fact that  $T$  follows a beta distribution under the null hypothesis.)

```
x=c(seq(0,1,by=0.0001))  
z=(x^5)*((1-x)^15)  
plot(x,z)  
abline(h=.000002)
```

