

Foundations of Statistical Inference, BS2a

Exercises 1: brief solutions

Ex 1. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent Poisson random variables with means $\mathbb{E}(X_i) = \lambda m_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ where $\lambda > 0$ is unknown and m_1, \dots, m_n are known constants.

- (a) Show that the model defines a canonical exponential family with canonical parameter $\theta = \log \lambda$.
- (b) What is the canonical sufficient statistic? Find its mean and variance.
- (c) Find the MLE $\hat{\theta}$ of θ .
- (d) Find the Fisher information for θ . What statements can you make about the variance of $\hat{\theta}$.

Sol Ex1

(a)

$$\begin{aligned} L(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) &= \prod_{i=1}^n e^{-\lambda m_i} (\lambda m_i)^{x_i} / x_i! \\ &= \exp \left\{ (\log \lambda) \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n m_i + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log m_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \log(x_i!) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

which is in canonical exponential form with $\theta = \log \lambda$, $B_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$

(b) The canonical (minimal) sufficient statistic is \bar{X} ($n\bar{X}$ is fine as well).

$\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}] = \lambda \bar{m}$. $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is Poisson ($\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$) so $\text{Var}(\bar{X}) = \lambda \bar{m} / n$.

(c) $\ell(\theta) = \text{const} + \theta \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - e^\theta \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$, $\partial \ell / \partial \theta = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - e^\theta \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$, so $\hat{\theta} = \log[\bar{x} / \bar{m}]$, provided $\bar{x} > 0$. If $\bar{x} = 0$ then $\hat{\lambda} = 0$, $\hat{\theta} = -\infty$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$ the probability that $\bar{X} = 0$ tends to zero if $\lambda > 0$.

(d) Fisher information $I_\theta = -\mathbb{E}[\partial^2 \ell / \partial \theta^2] = e^\theta \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$. The variance of $\hat{\theta}$ is asymptotic to $I_\theta^{-1} = e^{-\theta} / \sum m_i$. There is a problem with the exact variance being infinite because $\bar{X} = 0$ has positive probability.

Ex 2 A random sample X_1, \dots, X_n is taken from the Weibull distribution

$$\frac{\beta}{\alpha^\beta} x^{\beta-1} \exp \left\{ - \left(\frac{x}{\alpha} \right)^\beta \right\}, \quad x > 0, \alpha > 0, \beta > 0.$$

Assuming that β is known, find a single function of X_1, \dots, X_n which is sufficient for α . Show that however if α is known there is no single function of X_1, \dots, X_n which is sufficient for β . Does the Weibull distribution belong to a 2-parameter exponential family?

Solution Ex 2

$$L(\theta; \mathbf{x}) = \alpha^{-n\beta} \exp\{-\alpha^{-\beta} \sum_1^n x_i^\beta\} \times \beta^n \prod_1^n x_i^{\beta-1}.$$

Assuming β is known constant, this is exponential form in canonical parameter $-\alpha^{-\beta}$. $n^{-1} \sum_1^n x_i^\beta$ is thus a (minimal) sufficient statistic for α if β is known. If α is known we cannot express $\sum_1^n x_i^\beta$ as a single function of (x_1, \dots, x_n) which does not depend on β times a function of β . The Weibull distribution cannot belong to a 2-parameter exponential family, since then there would exist sufficient statistics for α and β .

Ex 3. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a random sample from the density

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

- (a) Show that the MLE $\hat{\theta}$ of θ is the minimum of X_1, \dots, X_n .
- (b) Show that $\hat{\theta}$ is a sufficient for θ . Is the family a regular exponential family?
- (c) Show that for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$P_\theta[|\hat{\theta} - \theta| > \epsilon] \leq e^{-n\epsilon},$$

deduce that $\hat{\theta}$ is consistent in probability and in quadratic mean, but is biased estimator of θ with $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}] = \theta + 1/n$. Suggest an unbiased and consistent estimator and find its variance.

Solution Ex 3

$$L(\theta; \mathbf{x}) = e^{-\sum_1^n x_i + n\theta} \prod_{i=1}^n I[x_i > \theta]$$

Note that X_1 is just θ plus a mean 1 exponential r.v.

- (a) $\hat{\theta} = \min_i X_i$ maximizes $L(\theta, \mathbf{x})$.
- (b)

$$L(\theta; \mathbf{x}) = e^{n\theta} \mathbb{1}_{\min(x_i) > \theta} \times e^{-n\bar{x}}$$

so it factorizes into $f_1(\min(x_i); \theta)h(x)$ and $\min(x_i)$ is sufficient. The family is not an exponential family

- (c)

$$P(\hat{\theta} - \theta > \epsilon) = P(\forall i X_i > \epsilon + \theta) = e^{-n\epsilon}, \quad \epsilon > 0$$

and

$$P(\hat{\theta} - \theta < -\epsilon) = 0$$

Hence for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lim_n P_\theta[|\hat{\theta} - \theta| > \epsilon] = 0$$

and it is consistent in probability. Alternatively, since $\min(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is just $\theta + \min(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) = \theta + \xi$ where the Z are iid exponential(1) variables and ξ is an exponential(n) rv, we have that

$$E[\hat{\theta}] = \theta + 1/n, V(\hat{\theta}) = n^{-2}.$$

We thus have

$$E[(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2] = 2/n^2 = o(1)$$

it is not unbiased. An unbiased estimator is $\tilde{\theta} = \hat{\theta} - 1/n$.

Ex 4. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a random sample from a distribution with density

$$f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{2} \theta^3 x^2 e^{-\theta x}, \quad x > 0.$$

- (a) Rewrite the density in standard exponential form, giving $A(\theta)$, $B(X)$, $C(X)$, $D(\theta)$ explicitly.
- (b) Find a minimal sufficient statistic for θ , $T(X)$. Find the expected value of the statistic.
- (c) Find the maximum likelihood estimator for θ . Is it unbiased for θ ?
- (d) Show that $\theta^* = (2/n) \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{-1}$ is an unbiased estimator of θ and find its variance.
- (e) Compute the Fisher information matrix $I_n(\theta)$ of the model and compare the variance of θ^* with $I_n(\theta)$.

Solutions to Ex 4

$$f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{2} \theta^3 x^2 e^{-\theta x} = \exp \left\{ -\theta x + \log\left(\frac{1}{2} x^2\right) + 3 \log \theta \right\}$$

$$A(\theta) = -\theta, B(x) = x, C(x) = \log\left(\frac{1}{2} x^2\right), D(\theta) = 3 \log \theta$$

or

$$A(\theta) = -\theta, B(x) = x, \omega(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^2, \psi(\theta) = \theta^3$$

(b)

$$L(\theta; x) \propto \theta^{3n} e^{-\theta \sum x_i} \times \prod x_i^2$$

By the factorization theorem \bar{x} is a minimal sufficient statistic for θ ($K_1(\bar{x}, \theta) = \theta^{3n} e^{-n\bar{x}}$ and $K_2(x) = \prod x_i^2$ and the mean is $3/\theta$).

(c) $l(\theta) = 3n \log \theta - \theta \sum x_i + \text{const}$, $l'(\theta) = 3n/\theta - \sum x_i$ so $\hat{\theta} = 3/\bar{x}$.

Recall: Gamma density with parameters (α, β) is $\frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta x}$. If $X \sim \Gamma(a_1, \beta)$, $Y \sim \Gamma(a_2, \beta)$ and independent then $X + Y \sim \Gamma(a_1 + a_2, \beta)$. Mean of $\Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ is α/β .

$\sum_1^n X_i$ has a Gamma distribution with density

$$\frac{\theta^{3n}}{\Gamma(3n)} x^{3n-1} e^{-\theta x} \quad x > 0$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}] &= 3n \int_0^\infty \frac{\theta^{3n}}{\Gamma(3n)} x^{3n-2} e^{-\theta x} dx \\ &= 3n \cdot \frac{\theta^{3n}}{\Gamma(3n)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(3n-1)}{\theta^{3n-1}} \\ &= \frac{3n\theta}{3n-1} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\hat{\theta}$ is a biased estimate of θ .

(d)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_i^{-1}] &= \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2} \theta^3 x e^{-\theta x} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \theta \end{aligned}$$

so $\theta^* = (2/n) \sum_1^n X_i^{-1}$ is an unbiased estimate of θ . Similarly, from the density, one can show that $\text{Var}(\theta^*) = \theta^2/n$.

(e) Fisher's information is $I_\theta = -E[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \ell(\theta)] = 3n/\theta^2$ $\text{Var}(\theta^*) = \theta^2/n \geq \theta^2/(3n)$.

Ex 5.

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a sample from $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$.

(a) Show that the MLE of σ^2 is

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2.$$

(b) Show that $\hat{\sigma}^2$ has a smaller mean square error than

$$(n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2.$$

(c) For which value of a is the MSE of

$$(n+a)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$$

the smallest. Hint: For (b) and (c) you will need to find $\text{Var}(\chi_{n-1}^2)$ which is a special case of the variance of a gamma distribution.

Solution to Ex 5

(a)

$$\ell(\mu, \sigma^2) = \text{const} - \frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 / \sigma^2$$

so

$$\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \sigma^2} = -\frac{n}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^4} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2$$

and the MLE of μ is \bar{x} , uniformly in σ^2 , so

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2.$$

Recap from Part A Statistics

$$\frac{(n-1)S^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_{n-1}^2$$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{n-1}{n} S^2 \sim \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \chi_{n-1}^2$$

χ_f^2 has a density

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(f/2)2^{f/2}} x^{f/2-1} e^{-x/2}, \quad x > 0$$

which is a Gamma $(f/2, 1/2)$ density with mean $2 \times f/2 = f$ and variance $4 \times f/2 = 2f$.

(b) $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\sigma}^2) = ((n-1)/n)\sigma^2$, $\text{Bias}(\hat{\sigma}^2) = -\sigma^2/n$, $\text{Var}(\hat{\sigma}^2) = (2(n-1)/n^2)\sigma^4$.

Thus

$$\text{MSE}(\hat{\sigma}^2) = \text{Var}(\hat{\sigma}^2) + \text{Bias}(\hat{\sigma}^2)^2 = \frac{2n-1}{n^2} \sigma^4$$

Let

$$S^2 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \sim \frac{\sigma^2}{n-1} \chi_{n-1}^2,$$

then

$$\text{MSE}(S^2) = \frac{2(n-1)}{(n-1)^2} \sigma^4 = \frac{2}{n-1} \sigma^4 > \text{MSE}(\hat{\sigma}^2) = \frac{2n-1}{n^2} \sigma^4.$$

(c) Let

$$\sigma^{*2} = (n+a)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$$

A similar calculation to (b) shows that

$$\text{MSE}(\sigma^{*2}) = \left(\frac{2}{n-1} b^2 + (b-1)^2 \right) \sigma^4$$

where $b = (n-1)/(n+a)$. The MSE is minimal when

$$b = \frac{1}{\frac{2}{n-1} + 1}, \text{ or } a = 1$$

That is the minimal MSE solution is

$$(n+1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$$

Exo 6. a) Let Y_1, \dots, Y_n be a random sample from a Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda > 0$. One observes only $W_i = \mathbf{1}_{Y_i > 0}$. Compute the likelihood associated with the sample (W_1, \dots, W_n) and the MLE in λ . Show that it is consistent in probability.

b) Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a random sample from a truncated Poisson distribution with distribution

$$f(x; \lambda) = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \cdot \frac{\lambda^x}{x!}, \quad x = 1, 2, \dots$$

For $i = 1, \dots, n$ a random variable Z_i is defined by

$$Z_i = X_i \text{ if } X_i \geq 2 \text{ or } Z_i = 0 \text{ if } X_i = 1$$

Show that \bar{Z} is an unbiased estimator of λ with efficiency

$$\frac{1 - e^{-\lambda}}{1 - \left(\frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \right)^2}.$$

Solution to Ex 6

$$f(x; \lambda) = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \frac{\lambda^x}{x!}, x = 1, 2, \dots$$

The mean of Z is

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = \sum_{x \geq 2} x \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \frac{\lambda^x}{x!} = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \sum_{x \geq 2} \frac{\lambda^x}{(x-1)!} = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \lambda (e^\lambda - 1) = \lambda$$

To obtain the variance consider

$$\mathbb{E}[Z(Z-1)] = \sum_{x \geq 2} x(x-1) \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \frac{\lambda^x}{x!} = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \sum_{x \geq 2} \frac{\lambda^x}{(x-2)!} = \frac{\lambda^2}{1 - e^{-\lambda}}$$

Then

$$\text{Var}(Z) = \frac{\lambda^2}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} + \lambda - \lambda^2 = \lambda \left[1 + \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \right]$$

The loglikelihood

$$l(\lambda) = -\lambda - \log(1 - e^{-\lambda}) + x \log \lambda - \log x!$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial l}{\partial \lambda} &= -\frac{1}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} + \frac{x}{\lambda} \\ \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda^2} &= \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{(1 - e^{-\lambda})^2} - \frac{x}{\lambda^2} \end{aligned}$$

Fisher information for one observation is

$$\begin{aligned} i_\lambda &= -\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda^2} \right) \\ &= -\frac{e^{-\lambda}}{(1 - e^{-\lambda})^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left[\frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} + \lambda \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \left[1 - \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

I have

$$\begin{aligned} i_\lambda &= -\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda^2} \right) \\ &= -\frac{e^{-\lambda}}{(1 - e^{-\lambda})^2} + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \left[1 - \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Efficiency} &= [I_\lambda \text{Var}(\bar{Z})]^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda}}{1 - \left(\frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}}\right)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

7. (a) Break the condition into two parts:

(*) $T(x) = T(y) = t$ implies $f(x; \theta)/f(y; \theta)$ is not a function of θ ;

(**) $f(x; \theta)/f(y; \theta)$ not a function of θ implies $T(x) = T(y) = t$.

Let $f(x; \theta) = g(x|t(x), \theta)h(t|\theta)$ (with no assumption of sufficiency) and suppose $T(x) = T(y) = t$. If (*) holds then

$$\frac{f(x; \theta)}{f(y; \theta)} = \frac{g(x|t, \theta)}{g(y|t, \theta)} = c(x, y)$$

say, with c independent of θ (factors of h cancel). But then

$$\sum_{x:T(x)=t} g(x|t, \theta) = g(y|t, \theta) \sum_{x:T(x)=t} c(x, y)$$

so

$$g(y|t, \theta) = \left[\sum_{x:T(x)=t} c(x, y) \right]^{-1}$$

which is independent of θ , so T is sufficient for θ in f . If $f(x; \theta)/f(y; \theta)$ does depend on θ when $T(x) = T(y) = t$ then c depends on θ and the same reasoning shows T cannot be sufficient, so condition (*) is necessary for sufficiency. Let $U(x)$ be some sufficient statistic. We must show that T is a function of U , so T is minimal. It is enough to show that $U(x) = U(y)$ implies $T(x) = T(y)$. But $U(x) = U(y) = u$ implies $f(x; \theta)/f(y; \theta)$ is not a function of θ , and then (**) implies $T(x) = T(y)$, so T is minimal sufficient.

(b) The intervals of a Poisson arrival process of rate λ are exponential so $X_i \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ likelihood for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The probability that the final interval between time $Y = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ and S has no event is the probability that an $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$ random variable exceeds $S - Y$, that is, $\exp(-\lambda(S - Y))$.

The likelihood for λ given data $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta; x) &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \lambda \exp(-\lambda x_i) \right] \exp(-\lambda(S - Y)) \\ &= \exp(-\lambda S) \lambda^n \end{aligned}$$

since $(S - Y) + x_n + \dots + x_1 = S$ and so N is sufficient for λ by the factorization theorem ($L = K_1(x, \theta)K_2(x)$ with $K_1(x, \theta) = L$ and $K_2 = 1$). It is minimal sufficient by part (a) since, if $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = y_1, \dots, y_m$ then $L(x; \lambda)/L(y; \lambda)$ is independent of λ if and only if $n = m$.