

## Chapter 5. Properties of Random Variable.

Notation: Big O

We have  $g(n) = O(f(n))$  if  $\frac{g(n)}{f(n)} \rightarrow c$ .

$\Rightarrow \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} \rightarrow c$ . as.  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

$\Rightarrow f(n)$  &  $g(n)$  grow or decay at same rate

Example: Big O

$$f(n) = an^2 + bn + c \quad a \neq 0 \Rightarrow f(n) = O(n^2)$$

Notation: Small o

$f(n) = o(g(n))$  iff for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists N$  s.t. if  $n > N$

$$|f(n)| < \epsilon \cdot g(n)$$

$$\text{i.e. } \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as. } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note: these notations often applicable to statistics

$$\{x_n\} \sim \text{D.V.s.}$$

then  $x_n = o_p(a_n)$  if  $\frac{x_n}{a_n} \xrightarrow{P} 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

Example: Statistical Application

$$\{x_n\} = o_p(\frac{1}{n}) \Rightarrow \frac{x_n}{\frac{1}{n}} = n \cdot x_n \xrightarrow{P} 0 \text{ as. } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Notation: Tight Sequence.

$\{x_n\} = O_p(a_n)$  if  $\frac{x_n}{a_n}$  stochastically bounded.

i.e. Given  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists N$  s.t.  $P\left(\left|\frac{x_n}{a_n}\right| > N\right) < \epsilon$  for  $n > N$ .

Theorem: Central Limit Theorem. C & B. 5.5.14.

Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be iid R.V.s whose MGF exist in a neighborhood of 0.

( $M_{X_i}(t)$  exist for  $|t| = h$ , for some positive  $h$ ) (i.e.  $E[X_i] = \mu$  and).

$\text{Var}(X_i) = \sigma^2 > 0$ . (Both  $\mu$  &  $\sigma^2 < \infty$ . Since MGF exists).

Define.  $\bar{X}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  Then  $\bar{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$

Note: How big does  $n$  have to be to get a good approximation?

Ans: 30 or more observations are needed usually.

But, more skewed distribution needs more observations.

Take bootstrap sample to see if a statistic is Normally distributed.

Proof: Based on Taylor's Series. (Wool's book).

$$\text{Let } y_i = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{\sigma} \quad z_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n y_i = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}$$

By theorem 2.3.15,

$$MGF_{z_n} = MGF(\bar{x}) = MGF\left(\frac{\sum y_i}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \stackrel{\substack{\text{Theorem} \\ 2.3.15}}{=} MGF\left(\frac{\bar{x}}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}}\right)$$
$$\stackrel{\substack{\text{Theorem} \\ 4.6.7}}{=} \left(MGF_y\left(\frac{t}{\sigma}\right)\right)^n.$$

Now, we expand  $MGF_y\left(\frac{t}{\sigma}\right)$  in a Taylor Series.

$$MGF_y\left(\frac{t}{\sigma}\right) = MGF(0) + MGF'(0)\left(\frac{t}{\sigma}\right) + \frac{1}{2!} MGF''(0) \cdot \frac{t^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{3!} MGF'''(0) \left(\frac{t}{\sigma}\right)^3 + \dots$$
$$= 1 + \underset{\text{mean}}{0} + \underset{\text{Variance}}{\frac{1}{2}\frac{t^2}{\sigma^2}} + o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

$$MGF_{z_n}(t) = \left[1 + \frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2} + o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right]^n$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[1 + \frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2} + o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right]^n = e^{\frac{t^2}{2}} \Rightarrow MGF \text{ of } N(0, 1).$$

$$\Rightarrow z_n \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$$

However, In practice, we need more general form of CLT.

Theorem: Lindeberg's Central Limit Theorem.

$\{X_{nj}, j=1, 2, \dots, k_n\}$ ,  $\Rightarrow$  independent R.V.s. with  $\sigma_n^2 = \text{Var}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} X_{nj}\right) < \infty$

for  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  as  $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ .

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sigma_n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E\left[\left(X_{nj} - E(X_{nj})\right)^2 \cdot I\left(|X_{nj} - \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} X_{nj}| > \varepsilon \sigma_n\right)\right] = o(\sigma_n^2)$$

$$\text{Then, } \frac{1}{\sigma_n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} (X_{nj} - E(X_{nj})) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$$

\* For the CLT above, the std. case is a special case.

\* Typically,  $k_n = n$  in practice.

However, Lindeberg condition is often hard to verify in practice.

Theorem: Lyapunov condition for CLT. (Alternative for Lindeberg's CLT).

$\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ , sc. independent R.V.s. Each with finite expected value  $m_i$  & finite variance  $\sigma_i^2$ .

Define  $S_n^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$ , sf. for some  $S > 0$ . Lyapunov condition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{S_n^{2+\delta}} E[|X_i - m_i|^{2+\delta}] = 0 \text{ is satisfied. Then } \frac{1}{S_n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - m_i) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$$

In practice, it's easiest to check Lyapunov condition for  $\delta = 1$ .

Lyapunov condition  $\xrightarrow{\text{Lyapunov}} \text{Lindeberg condition}$

Example: Lyapunov condition for Bernoulli distribution

$$\{X_i\} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_i). \text{ Then we have } E|X_i - p_i|^{2+\delta} \leq E|X_i - p_i|^2 = p_i(1-p_i).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus, } \frac{1}{S_n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{j=1}^n E|X_j - p_j|^{2+\delta} &= \frac{1}{S_n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j(1-p_j) \\ &\rightarrow 0. \text{ sf. } \sum_{j=1}^n p_j(1-p_j) \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow$  Lyapunov condition holds.

$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$  Asymptotically normal by Lindeberg CLT.

Note: Two Central Limit theorem can be used when R.V.s are iid. or independent.

What about when R.V.s are not independent?

Theorem: Central Limit theorem for not independent R.V.s.

Finite population problem

Let's say we are sampling without replacement from a finite population size  $N$ .

Then,  $\{X_i\}$  is not independent. But, variance of  $\bar{X}$  still holds for

$\bar{X}$  when  $N \rightarrow \infty$  &  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (large population, & large sample size).

See paper Hajek, 1960

In practice, we need  $\frac{1}{\min(N-n)} \cdot \frac{m_N}{V_N} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

$$m_N = \max(X_{N+1} - \bar{X}_N)^2$$

$$V_N = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (X_{N+i} - \bar{X}_N)^2$$

Variance of  $X_i$

Theorem: Multivariate Central Limit Theorem

$\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \dots, \tilde{X}_n$  iid.  $X_i$  are bivariate random vectors.

$$\tilde{X}_i = \begin{pmatrix} X_{i1} \\ \vdots \\ X_{ip} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad E(\tilde{X}_i) = \tilde{\mu}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mu_p \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cov}(X_i) = \Psi_{p \times p} = E\left[\frac{(X-\tilde{\mu})(X-\tilde{\mu})'}{n}\right]$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - \tilde{\mu}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Psi).$$

Proof: Proof of this is similar to the 1-dimension case.

Set.  $Y_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{X}_i - \tilde{\mu}_i)$ . & look at MGF of  $\sum \tilde{X}_i$ .

$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum (\tilde{X}_i - \tilde{\mu}_i)$  are "iid" 1-dimensional R.V.s.

Apply 1-dimension CLT to prove.

Theorem: Crammer-Wold Device.

$\tilde{X}_n$  iid  $p$ -dimensional  $n = 1, 2, \dots$

$\tilde{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}$  iff.  $\tilde{z}' \tilde{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{z}' \tilde{X}$  for all  $\tilde{z} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_p \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

Proof:

Necessary:

If  $\tilde{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}$  for any  $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

Mgf of  $\tilde{z}' \tilde{X}_n$  is  $E[e^{\tilde{z}' \tilde{X}_n}] = M_{\tilde{X}_n}(\tilde{z}) \rightarrow M_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{z}) \Rightarrow \tilde{z}' \tilde{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{z}' \tilde{X}$ .

Sufficient:

Assume  $\tilde{z}' \tilde{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{z}' \tilde{X}$  &  $\tilde{z}' \in \mathbb{R}^p$

Then  $M_{\tilde{X}_n}(\tilde{z}) = E[e^{\tilde{z}' \tilde{X}_n}] = M_{\tilde{X}_n}(1) = M_{\tilde{X}_n}(1) = M_{\tilde{X}}(1) \Rightarrow \tilde{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}$ .

Theorem: Slutsky theorem.

Suppose  $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$  &  $y_n \xrightarrow{P} a$ .  $a$  is a constant.

(i)  $X_n + y_n \xrightarrow{d} X + a$ .

(ii)  $X_n y_n \xrightarrow{d} a X$ .

Proof = Part. (i)

a.

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) &= P(X_n + Y_n \leq t) \\
 &= P(X_n + Y_n \leq t, |Y_n - a| < \varepsilon) + P(X_n + Y_n \leq t, |Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon) \\
 &\leq P(X_n + Y_n \leq t, a - \varepsilon < Y_n < a + \varepsilon) + P(|Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon) \\
 &\leq P(X_n \leq t - a + \varepsilon) + P(|Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon). \quad \text{---> } \text{O} \because Y_n \xrightarrow{P} a.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(X_n \leq t - a + \varepsilon) + \boxed{\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon)}.$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq F_X(t - a + \varepsilon) = f_X(t - a + \varepsilon).$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq f_x(t - a + \varepsilon).$$

b.

$$1 - F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) = P(X_n + Y_n > t).$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= P(X_n + Y_n > t, |Y_n - a| < \varepsilon) + P(X_n + Y_n > t, |Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon) \\
 &\leq P(X_n + Y_n > t, a - \varepsilon < Y_n < a + \varepsilon) + P(|Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon) \\
 &\leq P(X_n > t - a - \varepsilon) + P(|Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon). \quad \text{---> } \text{O} \because Y_n \xrightarrow{P} a
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - F_{X_n+Y_n}(t)) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(X_n > t - a - \varepsilon) + \boxed{\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|Y_n - a| \geq \varepsilon)}$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq 1 - F_X(t - a - \varepsilon) = 1 - f_X(t - a - \varepsilon)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \geq f_X(t - a - \varepsilon).$$

Thus. we have. follow. sequence.

$$f_X(t - a - \varepsilon) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq f_X(t - a + \varepsilon).$$

$$F_{x-a}(t - \varepsilon) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) \leq f_{x-a}(t + \varepsilon).$$

Since.  $\varepsilon$ . is an arbitrary. number.  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$ .

We have.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{X_n+Y_n}(t) = f_{x-a}(t) \implies X_n + Y_n \xrightarrow{d} x + a$ .

Theorem: Delta method L&B. 5.5.24.

Let.  $Y_n$ . be a sequence of. R.V.s. that satisfied.  $J_n(Y_n - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2)$ .

for. a given function  $g$  and. a specific value. of.  $\theta$ . Suppose. that.  $g'(\theta)$  exists and.  $g'(\theta) \neq 0$ .

Then we have:

$$\sqrt{n}(g(\bar{Y}_n) - g(\theta)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2 [g'(\theta)]^2).$$

Proof: Also uses Taylor Expansion & Slutsky Theorem.

$$g(\bar{Y}_n) = g(\theta) + g'(\theta)(\bar{Y}_n - \theta) + \text{Remainder}.$$

$$g(\bar{Y}_n) - g(\theta) = g'(\theta)(\bar{Y}_n - \theta) + \text{Remainder}.$$

$$\sqrt{n}(g(\bar{Y}_n) - g(\theta)) = \sqrt{n}g'(\theta)(\bar{Y}_n - \theta) + \sqrt{n}(\text{Remainder}).$$

$$P(|\bar{Y}_n - \theta| < \epsilon) = P(|\sqrt{n}(\bar{Y}_n - \theta)| < \sqrt{n}\epsilon)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Therefore, } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|\bar{Y}_n - \theta| < \epsilon) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|\sqrt{n}(\bar{Y}_n - \theta)| < \sqrt{n}\epsilon) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|Z| < \infty) = 1. \text{ where, } Z \sim N(0, \sigma^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have,  $\bar{Y}_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta$ .

By Slutsky theorem (a),  $g'(\theta)\sqrt{n}(\bar{Y}_n - \theta) \rightarrow g'(\theta) \cdot Z$ . Where,  $Z \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ .

$$\text{Therefore, } \sqrt{n}[g(\bar{Y}_n) - g(\theta)] = g'(\theta)\sqrt{n}(\bar{Y}_n - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2 [g'(\theta)]^2).$$

Example: Delta Method.

$\{\hat{X}_i\} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$  iid. R.V.s.

$$\sqrt{n} \frac{\bar{X} - p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} \rightarrow N(0, 1) \text{ - look at } g(p) = p(1-p), g'(p) = 1 - 2p$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{p}(1-\hat{p}) - p(1-p)) \rightarrow N(0, p(1-p)(1-2p)^2).$$

Theorem: Multivariate Delta Method.

Suppose  $\underline{x}_n = \begin{pmatrix} x_{n1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{np} \end{pmatrix}$  is a  $p$ -dimension vector

$$\text{where, } \sqrt{n}(\underline{x}_n - \underline{\mu}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma)$$

&  $g: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}'$  with continuous partial derivatives in a neighborhood of  $\underline{\mu}$ .

$$\text{Then, } \sqrt{n}(g(\underline{x}_n) - g(\underline{\mu})) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, (\nabla g(\underline{\mu}))' \Sigma (\nabla g(\underline{\mu})))$$

provided that  $(\nabla g(\underline{\mu}))' \Sigma (\nabla g(\underline{\mu})) \neq 0$ .

Note:  $\nabla g(\underline{\mu}) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_p} \end{pmatrix}$  gradient of  $g$  at  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .

Example - Non-linear Regression (least square) Application of Multivariate Delta Method

$$y_i = \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} (1 - e^{-\beta_1 t}) + \frac{\alpha_2}{\beta_2} (1 - e^{-\beta_2 t}) + \varepsilon_i. \quad \text{Compartmental Model.}$$

$$\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \beta_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \sim \text{non-negative Parameters} \quad (\text{Also, } S^2 = \text{Var}(\varepsilon_i))$$

We can use least square estimate,  $\hat{\theta}$ . ("nls" package.)

$$\hat{\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha}_1 \\ \hat{\beta}_1 \\ \hat{\alpha}_2 \\ \hat{\beta}_2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ Needs to use iteration algorithm to find. } \hat{\theta}.$$

Concentration of drug in blood accumulate.

As.  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .  $t = \text{time}$ . Concentration  $\rightarrow \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} + \frac{\alpha_2}{\beta_2}$ .

$$g(\theta) = g \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \beta_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \beta_2 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} + \frac{\alpha_2}{\beta_2}.$$

$$\frac{\partial g(\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial g(\theta)}{\partial \alpha_1} \\ \frac{\partial g(\theta)}{\partial \beta_1} \\ \frac{\partial g(\theta)}{\partial \alpha_2} \\ \frac{\partial g(\theta)}{\partial \beta_2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_1/\beta_1^2 \\ 1/\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_2/\beta_2^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma_{\text{approx}}).$$

By Delta Method.

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \left( \frac{\hat{\alpha}_1}{\hat{\beta}_1} + \frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{\hat{\beta}_2} \right) - \left( \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} + \frac{\alpha_2}{\beta_2} \right) \right) \xrightarrow{d} N \left( 0, \left( \frac{1}{\beta_1} - \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1^2}, \frac{1}{\beta_2} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\beta_2^2} \right) \Sigma \begin{pmatrix} 1/\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_1/\beta_1^2 \\ 1/\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_2/\beta_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

Example.: Approximate Mean & Variance Using Taylor expansion -

$\{x\} \sim R.V.$  with mean  $m$  & variance  $S^2$ .

Let  $h(x)$  be a smooth function. (use transformation to get distribution)

Taylor expansion  $h(x) \approx h(m) + h'(m)(x-m)$ .

$$\Rightarrow (h(x) - h(m))^2 \approx (h'(m))^2(x-m)^2$$

$$\Rightarrow E[(h(x) - h(m))^2] \approx (h'(m))^2 \cdot E[(x-m)^2]$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{Var}(h(x)) \approx (h'(m))^2 \cdot \text{Var}(x).$$

Also. By the Taylor expansion.  $h(x) \approx h(u) + h'(u)(x-u) + \frac{1}{2} h''(u)(x-u)^2$

$$\Rightarrow E[h(x)] \approx h(u) + h'(u) \cdot E(x-u) + \frac{1}{2} h''(u) E[(x-u)^2].$$

$$\Rightarrow E[h(x)] \approx h(u) + h'(u) \cdot 0 + \frac{1}{2} h''(u) \cdot S_x^2.$$

$$\Rightarrow E[h(x)] \approx h(u) + \frac{h''(u)}{2} S_x^2.$$

Theorem: Quantiles of R.V.s - also follows CLT. (Proof using Lyapunov CLT.)

Let.  $F$  be a CDF that is continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of  $\xi_p$ . When  $F(\xi_p) = p$ .  $\xi_p$  = Sample Quantiles Assume  $F'(\xi_p) = f(\xi_p) > 0$ .

We have.  $\bar{T}_n(\xi_p - \hat{\xi}_p) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \frac{p(1-p)}{f^2(\xi_p)})$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Theorem: Finite population Central Limit theorem (Simple Random Sample)

$\{Y\} = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N\}$  ~ R.V.s.  $N$ : Population size.  $n$ : Sample size.

Each  $f$ -samples have equal probability of selection

Let  $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$  Approximate to Normal distribution as  $n, N \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  = one of the  $C_n^n$  samples.

$E(\bar{y})$  = Average Sample mean over all  $C_n^n$  samples.

$$= \frac{1}{C_n^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathcal{L}} \bar{y}_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{C_n^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathcal{L}} \frac{1}{n} (y_{s1} + y_{s2} + \dots + y_{sn}).$$

$$= \frac{(N-n)! (n-1)!}{N!} \cdot \sum_{\mathcal{L}} y_{s1} \cdot \{ \# \text{ of samples } y_s \text{ that contain } y_{s1} \}.$$

$$= \frac{(N-n)! (n-1)!}{N!} \cdot \sum_{s=1}^N y_{s1} \cdot c_s \cdot \frac{n!}{C_{N-1}^{n-1}}$$

$$= \frac{(N-n)! (n-1)!}{N!} \times \frac{(N-1)!}{(N-n)! (n-1)!} \cdot \sum_{s=1}^N y_{s1}.$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_{s=1}^N y_{s1} = \hat{m}_y \Rightarrow \hat{m}_y \text{ is unbiased for } m_y \text{ in SRS.}$$

Theorem: finite population correction factor.

Let.  $z_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if unit } i \text{ is selected} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$$P(Z=1) = \frac{C_i^1 C_{N-1}^{n-1}}{C_N^n} = \frac{n}{N} = E(Z).$$

$$P(Z_i, Z_j=1) = \frac{C_i^1 C_{N-2}^{n-2}}{C_N^n} = \frac{n(n-1)}{N(N-1)} = E(Z_i, Z_j).$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \text{cov}(Z_i, Z_j) &= E(Z_i, Z_j) - E(Z_i)E(Z_j), \\ &= \frac{n(n-1)}{N(N-1)} - \frac{n}{N} \cdot \frac{n}{N} = 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \Rightarrow Z_i, Z_j \text{ are n.t. independent.}$$

Example: Delta Method on Survival Analysis.

Simulating survival time in a Cox model with covariate  $x$ , with cumulative hazard function  $H(t) = \lambda t$ . (Generating survival time to simulate Cox proportional hazard models. Bender, Statistics in Medicine).

$$T = H^{-1}[-\log(u) e^{-\beta x}] \sim \text{survival time}.$$

$$u \sim \text{uniform}(0, 1). \quad -\frac{1}{\lambda} \log(u) \cdot e^{-\beta x}.$$

Goal: Find  $\beta$  that give a specific percentile.

i.e.  $P = p^{\text{th}}$  percentile & we want  $P = P(T \leq 12) \sim \text{probability of death in year}$ .

$$P(-\frac{1}{\lambda} \log(u) e^{-\beta x} \leq 12) = P. \text{ Solve for } \beta.$$

$$P(-\frac{1}{\lambda} \log(u) \leq e^{\beta x}) = P. \quad \text{let } y = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \log(u) \sim \exp(12\lambda). \\ w = e^{\beta x} \sim \text{log-normal}. \\ x \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2).$$

$$P(T \leq 12) = P(y \leq w).$$

$$= \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^w 12\lambda e^{-12\lambda y} \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{(\frac{1}{\lambda} \log(u)-y)^2}{2\beta^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma \beta w} \cdot dy dw.$$

$$= 1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-12\lambda w}]. \quad \beta = 0, \quad \mu = 0.$$

We can estimate  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-12\lambda w}]$  by Delta Method with  $g(w) = e^{-12\lambda w}$ .

$$w \sim \text{lognormal}(\mu, \sigma^2) \quad E(w) = e^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}} \quad \text{Var}(w) = (e^{\sigma^2} - 1)e^{\sigma^2}$$

By Mean & Variance Approximation from Delta Method

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-12\lambda w}] = \exp\{-12\lambda - e^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}}\} + \frac{1}{2}(12\lambda)^2 \exp\{-12\lambda - e^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}}\} \cdot (e^{\sigma^2} - 1)e^{\sigma^2}.$$

## Chapter 6. Principle of Data Reduction.

### Principles of Data Reduction:

1. Sufficient Principle: Use a statistic that contain more information about  $\theta$ .
2. Likelihood Principle: A function of parameters determined by data  $\Rightarrow$  what value of  $\theta$  makes the observed data most likely.
3. Equivalent principle: Are the data reduction method processing those important features.

### Definition: Sufficient Statistics

- A. Statistics  $T(x)$  is sufficient statistics for  $\theta$  if conditional distribution of sample  $x$  given the value of  $T(x)$  does not depends on  $\theta$ .

### Example: Sufficient Statistics.

$\{x_i\}$  denotes number of accident in NYC on a particular day

Assume independent with Poisson distribution -

$x_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} f(x|n) &= f(x_1, \dots, x_n | \lambda) \quad \text{Joint PDF} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{x_1}}{x_1!} \cdot \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{x_2}}{x_2!} \cdots \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{x_n}}{x_n!} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^n}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i!} \end{aligned}$$

$T(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$  is the sufficient statistics.

Proof:  $T(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$  is a sufficient statistics by definition of sufficient.

$$P(x_1=x_1, x_2=x_2, \dots, x_n=x_n | T(x)=t).$$

$$= \frac{P(x_1=x_1, \dots, x_n=x_n, T(x)=t)}{P(T(x)=t)} = \frac{P(x_1=x_1, \dots, x_n=x_n, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i=t)}{P(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i=t)}.$$

$$= \frac{P(x_1=x_1, \dots, x_n=x_n)}{P(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i=t)} \quad \text{Since } \{x_1=x_1, \dots, x_n=x_n\} \subseteq \{T(x)=t\}$$

$$= \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{x_1}}{x_1!} \cdots \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{x_n}}{x_n!} = n \text{ independent of } \lambda.$$

Theorem 6.2.2.

2)  $f(\underline{x}|\theta)$  is a joint PDF of  $\underline{x}$  and  $g(t|\theta)$  is PDF or PMF of  $T(x)$

Theo.  $T(\underline{x})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ , if for every  $x$  in the sample

space, the ratio of  $\frac{f(\underline{x}|\theta)}{g(T(\underline{x}))|\theta|}$  is constant as a function of  $\theta$ .

Proof:

$$P_\theta(X_1=x_1 \dots X_n=x_n) = P_\theta(X_1=x_1 \dots X_n=x_n, T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x})) = P_\theta(T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x})).$$

$$P_\theta(\underline{x}=\underline{x}) = P_\theta(\underline{x}=\underline{x}, T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x})) \cdot P_\theta(T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x})).$$

$$\frac{P_\theta(\underline{x}=\underline{x})}{P_\theta(T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x}))} = \underbrace{P_\theta(\underline{x}=\underline{x}, T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x}))}_{\text{independent of } \theta \text{ if } T(\underline{x}) \text{ is a sufficient statistic.}}$$

Theorem: Factorisation Theorem (8B.6.2).

Let  $f(\underline{x}|\theta)$  denote the joint PDF or PMF of  $\underline{x}$ . A statistic  $T(\underline{x})$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ , if there exists function  $g(T|\theta)$  and  $h(\underline{x})$ , s.t. for all sample points  $\underline{x}$  and all parameter points  $\theta$ ,

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

Proof = discrete case. Prove both necessary & sufficient.

Suppose  $T(\underline{x})$  is a sufficient statistic. Choose  $g(t|\theta) = P_\theta(T(\underline{x})=t)$

and  $h(\underline{x}) = P(\underline{X}=\underline{x}, T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x}))$ . Because  $T(\underline{x})$  is sufficient, the conditional probability defining  $h(\underline{x})$  does not depend on  $\theta$ . Thus the choice of  $h(\underline{x})$  &  $g(t|\theta)$  is legitimate, and for this choice, we have

$$f(\underline{x}|\theta) = P_\theta(\underline{X}=\underline{x})$$

$$= P_\theta(\underline{X}=\underline{x}, T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x})).$$

$$= P_\theta(T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x})) \cdot P_\theta(\underline{X}=\underline{x} | T(\underline{x})=t(\underline{x})).$$

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

The above exhibited the factorisation theorem. We also see from the last

two. lines above. that.

$P_{\theta}(T(x)=t(x)) = g(T(x)|\theta)$ . so,  $g(T(x)|\theta)$  is PDF or PMF of  $T(x)$ .

Now, we assume factorization theorem exists. let  $g(t|\theta)$  be the PMF

of  $T(x)$ . Show that  $T(x)$  is sufficient. We examine the ratio.  $\frac{f(x|\theta)}{g(T(x)|\theta)}$

Define  $A_{T(x)} = \{y : T(y) = T(x)\}$ . Then,

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

Since factorization theorem exists.

$$= \frac{g(T(x)|\theta) h(x)}{\sum_{A_{T(x)}} f(y|\theta)}$$

$$(T(x) = \sum x_i, \quad x_1=1, \quad x_1=2, \quad x_2=1).$$

$$P(T(x)) = f(x_1=1, x_2=2) + f(x_1=2, x_2=1).$$

$$= \frac{g(T(x)|\theta) h(x)}{\sum_{A_{T(x)}} g(T(x)|\theta) h(y)}$$

$$= \frac{g(T(x)|\theta) h(x)}{g(T(x)|\theta) \sum_{A_{T(x)}} h(y)}$$

Since  $T$  is constant on  $A_{T(x)}$

$$= \frac{h(x)}{\sum_{A_{T(x)}} h(y)} \sim \text{not depends on } \theta.$$

Since the ratio does not depends on  $\theta$ . by theorem b.2.2.

$T(x)$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

Various Version of this proved by Fisher & Savage.

See "Testing statistical Hypothesis" by F. Lehman

Also see Billingsley, Dell, for general framework.

Example: Poisson. Re-visit.

$$f_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{e^{-n\lambda} \frac{n}{\sum x_i}^{\sum x_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i!} = h(x) e^{-n\lambda} \frac{n}{\sum x_i}^{\sum x_i} \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \sum x_i \text{ is a sufficient statistics.} \\ \Rightarrow \text{One-to-one function.} \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \bar{x} \text{ is also a sufficient statistics.} \end{array} \right\}$$

This form holds for any distribution in general.

Example: Uniform distribution. German Tank Problem

Use Serial number on tank. To estimate total number of tank.  $\theta$

Set.  $\{x_i\} \sim$  uniform distribution

$$f(x|o) = \frac{1}{o} \text{ for } x = 1, 2, \dots, o,$$

Select.  $n$ . serial. number without replacement we will have  $C_n^o$  possible samples. each with. DPF  $\frac{1}{C_n^o}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} f(x|o) &= \frac{1}{C_n^o} \cdot I(1 \leq x_1 \leq o, 1 \leq x_2 \leq o \dots 1 \leq x_n \leq o), \\ &= (C_n^o)^{-1} \cdot I(\max(x_i) \leq o). \\ &= (C_n^o)^{-1} \cdot I(x_{(n)}) \leftarrow n^{\text{th}} \text{ order statistic.} \end{aligned}$$

Let.  $h(x) = 1$ . By. factorization theorem.

$X_{(n)}$  is a sufficient. Statistic for  $o$ .

However,  $E[X_{(n)}] < o$ . so. it's a biased. sufficient. statistic

So. it need. to be. rescaled. to get. the. unbiased. estimator.

Note: Sufficient. Statistics. with. Extreme. Value. Statistics.

Typically, in examples where support. of. distribution. depends on some unknown parameters (e.g. uniform  $(0, o)$ ) The. sufficient. statistics. will involve some. extreme order statistics.

Example: Sufficient. Statistics. for. Normal. distribution.

$\{x_i\} \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . Both.  $\mu$ . &  $\sigma^2$ . are. unknown.

$$\begin{aligned} f(x|\mu, \sigma^2) &= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} (\sigma)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 \right\} \\ &= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x} + \bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right\} \\ &= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(\bar{x} - \mu) \right\} \\ &= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right\}, \quad S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \\ &= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (n-1)S^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By. factorization. Theorem.  $T(x) = (\bar{x}, S^2)$  are. sufficient. statistics for  $(\mu, \sigma^2)$ ,

Example: Sufficient Statistics for Multi-variate Normal distribution.

$$\tilde{\underline{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{x}_n \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(\underline{m}, \underline{\Psi}).$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n | \underline{m}, \underline{\Psi}) &= (\det(\underline{\Psi}))^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\underline{\Psi}|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})' \underline{\Psi}^{-1} (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})\right) \\
 &= (\det(\underline{\Psi}))^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\underline{\Psi}|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})' \underline{\Psi}^{-1} (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})\right)\right) \\
 &= (\det(\underline{\Psi}))^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\underline{\Psi}|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}\left(\underline{\Psi}^{-1} (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})' (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})\right)\right) \\
 &= (\det(\underline{\Psi}))^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\underline{\Psi}|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}\left(n \underline{\Psi}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})' (\tilde{x}_i - \underline{m})\right)\right) \\
 &= (\det(\underline{\Psi}))^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\underline{\Psi}|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}\left(n \underline{\Psi}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{x} + \bar{x} - \underline{m})' (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{x} + \bar{x} - \underline{m})\right)\right) \\
 &= (\det(\underline{\Psi}))^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\underline{\Psi}|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}\left(n \underline{\Psi}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{x})' (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{x}) + n (\bar{x} - \underline{m})' (\bar{x} - \underline{m}) + \cancel{n (\tilde{x}_i - \bar{x})' (\bar{x} - \underline{m})}\right)\right) \\
 &= (\det(\underline{\Psi}))^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\underline{\Psi}|^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}\left(n \underline{\Psi}^{-1} (\underline{s}^2 + n (\bar{x} - \underline{m})' (\bar{x} - \underline{m}))\right)\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

By factorisation theorem,  $(\tilde{\underline{x}}, \underline{s}^2)$  are sufficient statistics for  $(\underline{m}, \underline{\Psi})$ .