

# STAT 530 Homework 6

2022-03-18

- (1) Problem 7.55 (a) and (b) Casella & Berger: For each of the following pdfs, let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be a sample from that distribution. In each case, find the best unbiased estimator of  $\theta^r$ .

(a)  $f(x | \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta^n}, \quad 0 < x < \theta, r < n$

It is known that  $T = X_{(n)}$  is a minimal sufficient and complete statistic (example 6.2.23). Using theorem 7.2.23 from Casella and Berger, we can find a UMVUE  $g(X_{(n)})$ . We first calculate the density of T:

$$\begin{aligned} f_T(t) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(X_{(n)} \leq t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} [F_X(t)]^n \\ &= n[F_X(t)]^{n-1} f_X(t) \\ &= \frac{nt^{n-1}}{\theta^n} I(0 < t < \theta) \end{aligned}$$

Then the UMVUE  $g(T)$  must satisfy

$$\theta^r = \int_0^\theta g(t) \frac{nt^{n-1}}{\theta^n} dt$$

Taking the derivative of both sides with respect to  $\theta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} r\theta^{r-1} &= -n\theta^{-(n+1)} \int_0^\theta g(t) nt^{n-1} dt + \theta^n g(\theta) n\theta^{n-1} \\ &= -\frac{n}{\theta} \int_0^\theta g(t) \frac{nt^{n-1}}{\theta^n} dt + \frac{ng(\theta)}{\theta} \\ &= -\frac{n\theta^r}{\theta} + \frac{ng(\theta)}{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can solve for  $g(\theta)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} r\theta^{r-1} &= -\frac{n\theta^r}{\theta} + \frac{ng(\theta)}{\theta} \\ r\theta^r &= -n\theta^r + ng(\theta) \\ \theta^r(r+n) &= ng(\theta) \\ \frac{\theta^r(r+n)}{n} &= g(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing  $\theta$  is the complete sufficient statistic  $X_{(n)}$ , we have that the UMVUE for  $\theta^r$  is

$$g(X_{(n)}) = \frac{X_{(n)}^r (n+r)}{n}$$

(b)  $f(x | \theta) = e^{-(x-\theta)}, \quad x > \theta$

Here, it can be shown that  $T = X_{(1)}$  is a complete and sufficient statistic. By the Neyman-Fisher factorization criterion,  $T$  is sufficient, and we can show that  $T$  is complete as follows:

First we find the density function  $f_T(t)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f_T(t) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} 1 - [1 - F_X(t)]^n = n[1 - F_X(t)]^{n-1} f_X(t) \\ &= ne^{-n(t-\theta)} I(t > \theta). \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose there exists a function  $g(T)$  such that  $Eg(T) = 0$  for all  $\theta$ . Then we have

$$0 = \int_{\theta}^{\infty} g(t) ne^{n\theta} e^{-nt} dt = -ne^{n\theta} \int_{\infty}^{\theta} g(t) e^{-nt} dt$$

Taking the partial derivative with respect to  $\theta$  on both sides, we get

$$0 = n \int_{\theta}^{\infty} ng(t) e^{-n(t-\theta)} dt - ng(\theta).$$

The first term,  $nEg(T)$ , is equal to zero. But then we have that  $g(t) = 0$  for all  $\theta$ . So by the definition of completeness,  $T$  is a complete statistic.

Now that we have established that  $T$  is complete and sufficient, we know that an unbiased estimator  $\varphi(T)$  of  $\theta^r$  which is a function of only  $T$  will be the UMVUE for  $\theta^r$ . So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^r &= E\varphi(T) \\ &= \int_{\theta}^{\infty} \varphi(t) ne^{-n(t-\theta)} dt \end{aligned}$$

Taking the derivative with respect to  $\theta$  on both sides, we get

$$\begin{aligned} r\theta^{r-1} &= n \int_{\theta}^{\infty} \varphi ne^{-n(t-\theta)} dt - n\varphi(\theta) \\ &= \theta^r - n\varphi(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

We then have that  $\varphi$  must satisfy  $\varphi(\theta) = \frac{\theta^{r-1}(n\theta-r)}{n}$ , so the UMVUE for  $\theta^r$  must be

$$\varphi(X_{(1)}) = \frac{X_{(1)}^{r-1}(nX_{(1)} - r)}{n}.$$

(2) Suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ , where

$$P(X = x | \lambda) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^x}{x!}; \quad x = 0, 1, \dots; \quad 0 \leq \lambda < \infty.$$

Find the UMVUE of  $\tau(\lambda) = \lambda^r$  for some positive integer  $r$ .

It is known that  $T = \bar{X}$  is a complete, sufficient statistic. If we can find a function  $\varphi(T)$  that is unbiased for  $\lambda^r$ , then  $\phi(T)$  will be the UMVUE for  $\lambda^r$ . So suppose there does exist a function  $\phi(T)$  that is an unbiased estimator of  $\lambda^r$ . Then because  $T \sim \text{Poisson}(n\lambda)$ , we have

$$\lambda^r = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \varphi(T) \frac{e^{-n\lambda} (n\lambda)^t}{t!}.$$

Rewriting this equality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^r e^{n\lambda} &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \varphi(t) \frac{(n\lambda)^t}{t!} \\ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{n^i \lambda^{r+i}}{i!} &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \varphi(t) \frac{(n\lambda)^t}{t!} \end{aligned}$$

Since both sides of the equality are polynomials in  $\lambda$ , each term on the left hand side must have the same coefficient as the term on the right side with the corresponding degree. Because the smallest power of  $\lambda$  on the left hand side is  $r$ ,  $\varphi(t) = 0$  for  $0 \leq t < r$ . For  $t \geq r$ , we see that

$$\frac{n^{t-r} \lambda^t}{(t-r)!} = \varphi(t) \frac{(n\lambda)^t}{t!}$$

Solving for  $\varphi(t)$ , we find that the UMVUE for  $\lambda^r$  is

$$\varphi(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } 0 \leq t < r \\ \frac{n^{-r} t!}{(t-r)!} & \text{for } t \geq r \end{cases}$$

(3) Prove the following claims:

- (a) Suppose  $\hat{\theta}$  is the unique Bayes estimator, then  $\hat{\theta}$  is admissible.
- (b) Suppose  $\theta^*$  is the unique minimax estimator, then  $\theta^*$  is admissible.

(4) For this question, we will study the *breakdown value* in greater depth. The textbook definition of a breakdown value is given below:

Definition 10.2.2 Let  $X_{(1)} < \dots < X_{(n)}$  be an ordered sample of size  $n$ , and let  $T_n$  be a statistic based on this sample.  $T_n$  has *breakdown value*  $b$ ,  $0 \leq b \leq 1$ , if, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{X_{(\{(1-b)n\})} \rightarrow \infty} T_n < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{X_{(\{(1-(b+\epsilon)n\})} \rightarrow \infty} T_n = \infty$$

(Recall Definition 5.4.2 on percentile notation)

Where  $\{b\}$  is the number  $b$  rounded to the nearest integer. That is, if  $i$  is an integer and  $i - 0.5 \leq b < i + 0.5$ , then  $\{b\} = i$ . The textbook also claims that the sample median  $M_n$  has a breakdown value of 50%. These do not make sense. For example, consider  $n = 10$ ,  $b = 50\%$ , and  $\epsilon = 0.01$ , then  $\{(1-b)n\} = \{(1-(b+\epsilon))n\} = 5$ . Obviously we cannot have

$$\lim_{X_{(\{(1-b)n\})} \rightarrow \infty} M_n = \lim_{X_{(5)} \rightarrow \infty} M_n < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{X_{(\{(1-(b+\epsilon)n\})} \rightarrow \infty} T_n = \lim_{X_{(5)} \rightarrow \infty} M_n = \infty$$

at the same time.

Now consider replacing the equations in Definition 10.2.2 by

$$\lim_{X_{(\lfloor (1-b)n \rfloor)} \rightarrow \infty} T_n < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{X_{(\lfloor (1-(b+\epsilon))n \rfloor)} \rightarrow \infty} T_n = \infty,$$

where  $\lfloor b \rfloor$  is the greatest integer less than or equal to  $b$ , that is, the floor function of  $b$ . Show that, under the new definition, the sample median  $M_n$  has a breakdown value of  $\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \rfloor}{n}$  (assume  $n \geq 3$ ). Obviously, this converges to 50% as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .