M378K: April 14th, 2026. More on Sufficient Statistics. periew If Y1,, Yn T ~ distin does not depend on the target parameter Θ ,

then, we say that I've sufficient for Θ . Theorem. The Fisher Neyman Factorization Criterion Let $Y_1,...,Y_n$ be a random sample ω / the likelihood function $L(\Theta; y_1,...,y_n)$. The statistic T is sufficient for 8 of and only if L can be expressed as L(0; 4, ..., 4n) = g(0, T(41, ..., 4n)) · k (41, ..., 4n) Example. Bernoulli $\Theta \leftrightarrow \rho$ $L(\rho; y_4, y_2, ..., y_n) = \rho^{y_1} (1-\rho)^{1-y_1} \cdot ... \cdot \rho^{y_n} (1-\rho)^{1-y_n}$ = p = (1-p) n - 24) t $g(p,t)=p^{t}(1-p)^{n-t}$ and h=1Example. Normal w/ a known o. O > M $L(\mu; y_1, ..., y_n) = \int_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi i}} e^{-\frac{(y_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$ ($y_1, ..., y_n$) = $\frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{n/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_{i}-\mu)^{2}\right)$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} -2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} +n\cdot\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2} +n\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2} +n\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2} +n\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2} +n\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2} +n\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2} +n\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2} +n\mu^{2}\right)\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \left(-2\mu \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) t$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^{n}(2\pi)^{N_{2}}} e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{2}} y_{i}^{2}\right) \cdot e^{i\varphi} \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^{2$$

Set
$$g(\theta, t) = \frac{1}{\theta^n} \mathbf{1}_{\{t \le \theta\}}$$

and h(191, ..., yn) = 1 {0 < min(191, ..., yn)}

| ludeed, T=Y(n) is sufficient for 0

What if U(0,0+1)?

Hypothesis Testing.

Proof by Contradiction.

K... the claim we're trying to PROVE to be true

Assume not K

facta

facta

fact (not a)

These cannot coexist:

We say that we reached a contradiction!

Our assumption of not k