STA261 Probability and Statistics II Lecture Notes

Yuchen Wang June 1, 2019

Contents

1 Converge in distribution

2 Normal Distribution Theory

Theorem: Sum of independent normal random variables Suppose $X_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$ for i = 1, 2, ..., n and that they are independent random variables. Let $Y = (\sum_i a_i X_i) + b$ for some constants $\{a_i\}$ and b. Then

$$Y \sim N((\Sigma_i a_i \mu_i) + b, \Sigma_i a_i^2 \sigma_i^2)$$

Corollary: The distribution of the sample mean of normal random variables Suppose $X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ for i = 1, 2, ..., n and that they are independent random variables, If $\bar{X} = (X_1 + ... + X_n)/n$, then $\bar{X} \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2/n)$

Theorem: The covariance of sums of normal random variables Suppose $X_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$ for i = 1, 2, ..., n and also that the $\{X_i\}$ are independent. Let $U = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i X_i$ and $V = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i X_i$ for some constants $\{a_1\}$ and $\{b_i\}$. Then $Cov(U, V) = \sum_i a_i b_i \sigma^2$. Furthermore, Cov(U, V) = 0 if and only if U and V are independent.

3 Expectation and Covariance

3.1 Expectation -Discrete case

Definition of expectation Let X be a discrete random variable, taking on distince values $x_1, x_2, ...$, with $p_i = P(X = x_i)$. Then the *expected value* (or *mean* or *mean value*) of X, written E(X) (or μ_x), is defined by

$$E(X) = \sum_{i} x_i p_i$$

Theorem: expectation involving nested functions

1. Let X be a discrete random variable, and let $g: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function such that the expectation of the random variable g(X) exists. Then

$$E(g(X)) = \Sigma_x g(x) P(X = x)$$

2. Let X and Y be discrete random variables, and let $h: \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function such that the expectation of the random variable h(X,Y) exists. Then

$$E(h(X,Y)) = \Sigma_{x,y}h(x,y)P(X=x,Y=y)$$

Theorem: Linearity of expected values Let X and Y be discrete random variables, let a and b be real numbers, and put Z = aX + bY. Then

$$E(Z) = aE(X) + bE(Y)$$

Theorem: Expectation of product of independent r.v Let X and Y be discrete random variables that are independent. Then

$$E(XY) = E(X)E(Y)$$

Monotonicity Let X and Y be discrete random variables, and suppose that $X \leq Y$ (Remember that this means $X(s) \leq Y(s)$ for all $s \in S$) Then $E(X) \leq E(Y)$.

3.2 Expectation - Continuous case

Definition of expectation Let X be an absolutely continuous random variable, with density function f_X . Then the *expected value* of X is given by

$$E(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x f_X(x) dx$$

Theorem: expectation involving nested functions

1. Let X be a an absolutely continuous random variable with density function f_X , and let $g: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function such that the expectation of the random variable g(X) exists. Then

$$E[g(x)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(x) f_X(x) dx$$

2. Let X and Y be discrete random variables, and let $h: \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function such that the expectation of the random variable h(X,Y) exists. Then

$$E(h(X,Y)) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x,y) f_{X,Y}(x,y) dx dy$$

Theorem: Linearity of expected values Let X and Y be jointly absolutely continuous random variables, let a and b be real numbers. Then

$$E(aX + bY) = aE(X) + bE(Y)$$

Monotonicity Let X and Y be jointly continuous random variables, and suppose that $X \leq Y$ (Remember that this means $X(s) \leq Y(s)$ for all $s \in S$) Then $E(X) \leq E(Y)$.

3.3 Variance, Covariance and Correlation

Definition of variance The *variance* of a random variable X is the quantity

$$\sigma_x^2 = Var(X) = E((X - \mu_X)^2)$$

where σ_X is the standard deviation of X.

Theorem Let X be any r.v. with $\mu_X = E(X)$ and variance Var(X). Then the following hold true:

- 1. $Var(X) \ge 0$
- 2. If a and b are real numbers, $Var(aX + b) = a^2Var(X)$
- 3. $Var(X) = E(X^2) (\mu_X)^2 = E(X^2) E(X)^2$
- 4. $Var(X) \leq E(X^2)$

Definition of covariance

$$Cov(X, Y) = E((X - \mu_X)(Y - \mu_Y))$$

Theorem: Linearity of covariance Let X, Y and z be three r.v.s. Let a and b be real numbers. Then

$$Cov(aX + bY.Z) = aCov(X, Z) + bCov(Y, Z)$$

Theorem Let X and Y be r.v.s. Then

$$Cov(X,Y) = E(XY) - E(X)E(Y)$$

Theorem If X and Y are independent, then

$$Cov(X, Y) = 0$$

Theorem

1. For any r.v.s X and Y,

$$Var(X + Y) = Var(X) + Var(Y) + 2Cov(X, Y)$$

2. More generally, for any r.v.s $X_1, ..., X_n$,

$$Var(\Sigma_i X_i) = \Sigma_i Var(X_i) + 2\Sigma_{i < j} Cov(X_i, X_j)$$

Corollary

- 1. If X and Y are independent, then Var(X+Y) = Var(X) + Var(Y)
- 2. If $X_1,...X_n$ are independent, then $Var(\Sigma_{i=1}^n X_i) = \Sigma_{i=1}^n Var(X_i)$

Definition The *correlation* of two r.v.s X and Y is given by

$$Corr(X,Y) = \frac{Cov(X,Y)}{Sd(X)Sd(Y)}$$

provided $Var(X) < \infty$ and $Var(Y) < \infty$

4 Independent Random Variables

Definition 1 Let X and Y be two continuous random variables. We say X and Y are independent if

$$f_{X,Y}(x,y) = f_X(x) \times f_Y(y)$$

 $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

Lemma 1 X and Y are two continuous random variables. If X and Y are independent, then

$$E[g(X)h(Y)] = E(g(X)] \times E[h(Y)]$$

for any two functions g() and h().

proof:

$$E[g(X)h(Y)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(x)h(y)f_{X,Y}(x,y) \, dxdy$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(x)h(y)f_X(x)f_Y(y) \, dxdy$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_Y(y)h(y) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(x)f_X(x) \, dxdy$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_Y(y)h(y)E[g(X)] \, dy$$

$$= E[g(X)] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_Y(y)h(y) \, dy$$

$$= E[g(X)]E[h(Y)]$$

5 Types of Inferences

Estimation:

- 1. Point estimation: Based on the sample observations, calculating a particular value as an estimate of the parameter θ
- 2. Interval estimation: Calculating a range of values that is likely to contain the parameter θ

Hypothesis testing Based on the sample, assess whether a hypothetical value θ_0 is a plausible value of the parameter θ or not.

6 Different Types of Estimation

6.1 Method of Moments Estimation

Let $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$ are independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables.

Let the k^{th} population moment be

$$\mu_k = E[X^k]$$

 k^{th} sample moment based on sample

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^k$$

We use $\hat{\mu}_k$ as an estimator of μ_k

In other words, we use the sample moments as estimators of the population moments.

6.2 Maximum Likelihood Estimation

Definition of Likelihood Function Suppose $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$ has a joint density or mass function $f(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n | \theta)$

We observe sample, $X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2, ..., X_n = x_n$

Given the sample, the likelihood function of θ , noted as $L(\theta|x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$, is defined as

$$L(\theta|x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = f(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n|\theta)$$

Often written as $L(\theta)$, is a function of θ .

If X follows a discrete distribution, it gives the probability of observing the sample as a function of the parameter θ

If $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$ are i.i.d. then their joint density is the product of marginal densities, $f_{\theta}(x)$

Hence, in i.i.d. case we write

$$L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_{\theta}(x_i)$$

Comments

- 1. $L(\theta)$ is NOT a pdf or pmf of θ
- 2. Likelihood introduces a belief ordering on parameter space, Ω
- 3. For $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Omega$, we believe in θ_1 as the true value of θ over θ_2 whenever $L(\theta_1) > L(\theta_2)$
- 4. Which means, the data is more likely to come from f_{θ_1} than f_{θ_2}
- 5. The value $L(\theta)$ is very small for every value of θ
- 6. So often, we are interested in the likelihood ratios:

$$\frac{L(\theta_1)}{L(\theta_2)}$$

Maximum Likelihood Estimation

- 1. Let's say we are interested in a point estimate of θ
- 2. A sensible choice will be to pick $\hat{\theta}$ that maximizes $L(\theta)$
- 3. So $\hat{\theta}$ satisfies $L(\hat{\theta}) \geq L(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Omega$
- 4. $\hat{\theta}$ is called the maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) of θ

Computation of the MLE

- 1. Define, log-likelihood function, $l(\theta) = \ln L(\theta)$
- 2. $\ln(x)$ is a 1-1 increasing function of $x>0 \implies L(\hat{\theta}) \geq L(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Omega$ iff $l(\hat{\theta}) \geq l(\theta)$
- 3. In other words, if $L(\theta)$ is maximized at $\hat{\theta}$ then $l(\theta)$ will also be maximized at $\hat{\theta}$
- 4. Therefore,

$$l(\theta) = \ln (\prod_{i=1}^{n} f_{\theta}(x_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln f_{\theta}(x_i)$$

- 5. The obvious benefit: It's much easier to differentiate a sum than a product
- 6. Solve the equation, $\frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta} = 0$ for θ
- 7. Say, $\hat{\theta}$ is the solution. But it's still not the MLE
- 8. Need to check whether or not

$$\frac{\partial^2 l(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2}|_{\theta = \hat{\theta}} < 0$$

Properties of MLE

- 1. MLE is not unique
- 2. MLE may not exist
- 3. The likelihood may not always be differentiable.

7 Sampling Distribution of an Estimator

- 1. Recall: An Estimator (T) is a random variable (infinite number of sample means)
- 2. If we repeat the sampling procedure and keep calculating T for each set of sample and finally draw a density histogram based on the T values we get the sampling distribution of T
- 3. **Standard error:** Standard deviation of an estimator is called the standard error (SE)

Definition of Mean Squared Error Let $\psi(\theta)$ be any real valued function of θ , suppose T is an estimator of $\psi(\theta)$

$$MSE_{\theta}(T) = E_{\theta}[(T - \psi(\theta))^2]$$

Corollary

$$MSE_{\theta}(T) = Var_{\theta}(T) + (E_{\theta}(T) - \psi(\theta))^2$$

proof:

$$MST(T) = E[(T - \psi(\theta))^{2}]$$

$$= E[(T - E(T) + E(T) - \psi(\theta))^{2}]$$

$$= E[(T - E(T))^{2} + (E(T) - \psi(\theta))^{2} + 2(T - E(T))(E(T) - \psi(\theta))]$$

$$= E[(T - E(T))^{2}] + (E(T) - \psi(\theta))^{2} + 2E[T - E(T)](E(T) - \psi(\theta))$$

$$= E[(T - E(T))^{2}] + (E(T) - \psi(\theta))^{2}$$
(Since $E[T - E(T)] = E(T) - E(T) = 0$)
$$= Var(T) + (E(T) - \psi(\theta))^{2}$$

$$= Var(T) + Bias^{2}(T)$$

Bias The bias of an estimator T of $\psi(\theta)$ is given by

$$E_{\theta}(T) - \psi(\theta)$$

Unbiased estimator: When the bias of an estimator is zero, it's called unbiased

Remark

1. For unbiased estimators,

$$MSE_{\theta}(T) = Var_{\theta}(T)$$

- 2. If all the other properties are similar, then an unbiased estimator is preferred over a biased estimator.
- 3. In practice, often an biased estimator with lower variance is preferred over an unbiased estimator with really high variance. **We minimize MSE**.

8 Population Variance (σ^2)

Definition $\sigma^2 = E[(X - \mu)^2]$ where $\mu = E[X]$.

If we have equally likely N data points in our population, this is equivalent of

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \mu)^2$$

In words: It's the average squared difference of each of the data points (X_i) from the mean (μ)

Estimate σ^2 based on a sample of size n When we are estimating based on the sample of size n, we replace μ by \bar{X} , so the numerator is $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2$. We can divide it by both n or n-1. The latter one is unbiased!

The fraction, $\frac{n-1}{n} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. So for large n, both estimator will produce similar estimate. In statistical literature, whenever we say sample variance we refer to the unbiased one. Hence, from now on,

Definition of sample variance

$$S^{2} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}$$

Sampling distribution of S^2 (under Normal Distribution

Theorem Suppose $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ iid, $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$. Then

1. \bar{X} and S^2 are independent, and

2.
$$\frac{(n-1)S^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2_{(df=n-1)}$$

proof:

Part 1 Let

$$U = \bar{X} = \frac{1}{n}X_1 + \dots + \frac{1}{n}X_n$$

$$V = X_1 - \bar{X} = X_1 - (\frac{1}{n}X_1 + \dots + \frac{1}{n}X_n)$$

$$= (1 - \frac{1}{n})X_1 - (\frac{1}{n}X_2 + \dots + \frac{1}{n}X_n)$$

$$Cov(\bar{X}, X_1 - \bar{X}) = Cov(\bar{X}, X_1) - Cov(\bar{X}, \bar{X})$$

$$= Cov(\frac{1}{n}X_1 + \dots + \frac{1}{n}X_n, X_1) - \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}Cov(X_1, X_1) - \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$

$$= \frac{\sigma^2}{n} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$

$$= 0$$

Hence by E&R theorem, U and V are independent. Similarly, we can show \bar{X} is independent to each $X_i - \bar{X}$ for i = 1, ..., n

11

Therefore, \bar{X} is independent to $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2$ Therefore, \bar{X} is independent to $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{n-1} = S^2$

Part 2

$$\sum_{i} (X_{i} - \mu)^{2} = \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X} + \bar{X} - \mu)^{2}$$

$$= \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2} + \sum_{i} (\bar{X} - \mu)^{2} + 2 \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})(\bar{X} - \mu)$$

$$= \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2} + \sum_{i} (\bar{X} - \mu)^{2} + 2(\bar{X} - \mu) \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})$$

$$= \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2} + \sum_{i} (\bar{X} - \mu)^{2} + 2(\bar{X} - \mu)(\sum_{i} X_{i} - n\bar{X})$$

$$= \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2} + \sum_{i} (\bar{X} - \mu)^{2} + 2(\bar{X} - \mu)(n\bar{X} - n\bar{X})$$

$$= \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2} + n(\bar{X} - \mu)^{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2} = \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \mu)^{2} - n(\bar{X} - \mu)^{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i} (X_{i} - \mu)^{2} = \frac{\sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}{\sigma^{2}} + \frac{n(\bar{X} - \mu)^{2}}{\sigma^{2}}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i} (\frac{X_{i} - \mu}{\sigma})^{2} = \frac{\sum_{i} (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}}{\sigma^{2}} + (\frac{\bar{X} - \mu}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}})^{2}$$

$$= \frac{(n - 1)S^{2}}{\sigma^{2}} + (\frac{\bar{X} - \mu}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}})^{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \chi_{(n)}^{2} = \frac{(n - 1)S^{2}}{\sigma^{2}} + \chi_{(1)}^{2}$$

$$= MGF(\chi_{(n)}^{2}) = MGF(\frac{(n - 1)S^{2}}{\sigma^{2}}) * MGF(\chi_{(1)}^{2})$$

$$\Rightarrow MGF(\frac{(n - 1)S^{2}}{\sigma^{2}}) = \frac{MGF(\chi_{(n)}^{2})}{MGF(\chi_{(1)}^{2})}$$

$$= \frac{(1 - 2t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}}{(1 - 2t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$= (1 - 2t)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}$$

which is the MGF of $\chi^2_{(n-1)}$

E&R theorem 4.6.2 $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)i.i.d.,$, U and V are two different linear combinations of the X_i 's, then $Cov(U, V) = 0 \iff U$ and V are independent.

Note In general, zero covariance doesn't imply independent Example: $X \sim N(0,1), Y = X^2$, clearly X and Y are dependent, but

$$Cov(X,Y) = E[XY] - E[X]E[Y]$$

$$= E[X^3] - 0 \cdot E[Y]$$

$$= E[X^3]$$

$$= \int x^3 f(x) dx$$

$$= 0 \qquad \text{(since } x^3 f(x) \text{ is centro-symmetric)}$$

Unbiasedness of S^2 using the Chi-sq distribution

$$E\left[\frac{(n-1)S^2}{\sigma^2}\right] = n - 1$$

$$\implies E[S^2] = \sigma^2$$

This proves S^2 is an unbiased estimator for σ^2 under Normal distribution There's another way to prove it under any arbitrary distribution with the assumption that X_i 's are i.i.d. and μ, σ^2 exists.

10 Some relationships among distributions

1.
$$\frac{\bar{X}-\mu}{S/\sqrt{n}} \sim t_{(n-1)}$$

$$2. \ \frac{\chi^2_{(m)}}{m} \stackrel{P}{\to} 1$$

11 Difference between sample variance and variance of sample mean

variance of sample mean: Expectation of squared difference of sample mean from the true mean

sample variance: average squared difference of each data points in the sample from the sample mean

12 Consistent Estimator

Definition Let T_n be an estimator of parameter θ , T_n is said to be consistent (in probability) if

$$T_n \stackrel{P}{\to} \theta$$

In words, T_n converges to θ in probability.

Note If $T_n \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} \theta$ then T_n is called consistent (almost surely). In this course we will only talk about consistent (in probability)

Proving consistency using LLN LLN tells us, $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum X_i \stackrel{P}{\to} E[X_i]$ for any distribution. Immediately that tells us:

- 1. If $X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ then \bar{X} is a consistent estimator of μ
- 2. If $X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Poisson(\lambda)$ then \bar{X} is a consistent estimator of λ
- 3. And we can say this for few other known distributions

Goal: prove consistency when the estimator is not simply \bar{X} Still use LLN but with the help of a well known Lemma and the continuous mapping theorem

Slutsky's Lemma We have two different sequence X_n and Y_n If $X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X$ and $Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} Y$, then $X_n + Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X + Y$ If $X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X$ and $Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} Y$, then $X_n Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} XY$

Continuous mapping theorem Let $X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X$ and g() be a continuous function, then $g(X_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} g(X)$

Proving S^2 is a consistent estimator of σ^2 ...

MSE consistent An estimator T_n is called <u>MSE consistent</u> if

$$MSE(T_n) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

Example: for $N(\mu,\sigma^2)$ $MSE(\bar{X})=\sigma^2/n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ Therefore \bar{X} is a MSE consistent estimator of μ

In naive words, after you have calculated the MSE of an estimator, just check if it goes to zero for large n

Note MSE consistent ⇒ consistent (in probability)

13 Efficient Estimator

Definition of Efficiency Let T_1 and T_2 be two different estimators of θ , Efficiency of T_1 relative to T_2 is defined as

$$eff(T_1, T_2) = \frac{var[T_2]}{var[T_1]}$$

Remark

- 1. $eff(T_1, T_2) > 1 \implies T_1$ has smaller variance $\implies T_1$ is more efficient
- 2. This comparison is meaningful when T_1 and T_2 are both unbiased or both have the same bias.

Lower bound of the variance of an unbiased estimator This famous inequality provides a lower bound for the variance of all the unbiased estimators. In other words it gives a lower bound of the MSE (since Bias = 0). The estimator whose variance achieves this lower bound is said to be efficient. Before we state the inequality let's define few terms...

Score function, $S(\theta)$ The derivative of the log-likelihood

$$S(\theta) = \frac{\partial l(\theta)}{\partial \theta}$$

For the random variable X, $S(\theta|X=x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \ln f_{\theta}(x)$. For an observed i.i.d sample, it's written as $S(\theta|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ with

$$S(\theta|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \sum_{i} \ln f_{\theta}(x_i) = \sum_{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \ln f_{\theta}(x_i) = \sum_{i} S(\theta|x_i)$$

Fisher Information, $I(\theta)$ The function

$$I(\theta) = var_{\theta}[S(\theta|X)]$$

It's the amount of information that each observable random variable X contains about θ .

Information of a sample of size $n = var[S(\theta|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)] = nI(\theta)$

A plot showing the randomness of $S(\theta)$ The likelihood function looks different for different data!

One important property of $S(\theta)$ Under some assumptions,

$$E[S(\theta|X=x)] = 0$$

Which implies

$$E[S(\theta|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)] = \sum_i E[S(\theta|x_i)] = 0$$

Cramer-Rao Inequality Let $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$ be i.i.d. with density $f_{\theta}(x)$, $T(X_1, X_2, ..., X_n)$ be an unbiased estimator of θ , Then under some assumptions on $f_{\theta}(x)$,

$$var[T] \ge \frac{1}{nI(\theta)}$$

 $\frac{1}{nI(\theta)}$ is also known as the Cramer-Rao lower bound (CRLB)

Proof of Cramer-Rao Inequality ...

Definition of sufficient statistic A statistic $T(X_1, X_2, ..., X_n)$ is said to be <u>sufficient</u> for θ if the conditional distribution of $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$, given T = t, does not depend on θ