

$$a) \underline{y} = f_x(x|\underline{\xi})$$

$$H_0: h(\underline{\xi}) = b_0 \quad H_0: \mu = \mu_0$$

$$H_1: h(\underline{\xi}) \neq b_0 \quad H_1: \mu \neq \mu_0 \quad (\Rightarrow)$$

Wald test is

$$W_n = (h(\hat{\underline{\xi}}) - b_0)' \left[ H(\hat{\underline{\xi}}) \mathbb{I}_n(\hat{\underline{\xi}})^{-1} H'(\hat{\underline{\xi}}) \right]^{-1} (h(\hat{\underline{\xi}}) - b_0)$$

$$H(\underline{\xi}) = \frac{\partial h(\underline{\xi})}{\partial \underline{\xi}}$$

$$\underline{\xi} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu \\ \emptyset \end{pmatrix}, \quad h(\underline{\xi}) = (\mu), \quad b_0 = (\mu_0), \quad H(\underline{\xi}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

2 c) Suppose  $\mu_1, \mu_0$  known

Then by NPL,  $\exists$  a UMP test  $\phi$  of  
 $H_0: \gamma = \gamma_0$  v  $H_1: \gamma = \gamma_1$  s.t.  $\gamma_1 > \gamma_0$  of the form

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & p(x|\gamma_1) > k p(x|\gamma_0) \\ 0 & p(x|\gamma_1) \leq k p(x|\gamma_0) \end{cases} = \begin{cases} 1 & p(x|\gamma_1)/p(x|\gamma_0) > k \\ 0 & p(x|\gamma_1)/p(x|\gamma_0) \leq k \end{cases} \text{ when } E_{\gamma_0}[\phi] = \alpha$$

our rejection region is:  $\frac{p(x|\gamma_1)}{p(x|\gamma_0)} = \left(\frac{\gamma_0 \mu_0^2}{\gamma_1 \mu_1^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left\{\frac{-1}{2\gamma_1 \mu_1^2} \sum (x_i - \mu_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma_0 \mu_0^2} \sum (x_i - \mu_0)^2\right\} > k$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{\gamma_1 \mu_1^2} \sum (x_i - \mu_1)^2 - \frac{1}{\gamma_0 \mu_0^2} \sum (x_i - \mu_0)^2 > k^*$$

Thus our rejection region depends on  $\gamma_1$  & Thus a UMP  
 doesn't exist for  $H_0: \gamma = \gamma_0$  v  $H_1: \gamma > \gamma_0$  when  $\mu_0, \mu_1$  known

Suppose  $\mu_0, \mu_1$  aren't known  $\Rightarrow$  use their estimates

In part (b) it is seen that  $\hat{\mu}_1$  depends on  $\hat{\gamma}_1$  (aka  $\hat{\mu}_1$  depends on  $H_1$ )

So it still doesn't exist