

## 2011 Theory I Problem #1

1. Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be a sequence of i.i.d. real random variables with  $\mathbb{E}X_1 = 0$ . Let  $N$  be a Poisson random variable with parameter  $\lambda \geq 0$  and is independent of  $X_1, X_2, \dots$ . For each integer  $m \geq 0$ , let  $\bar{X}_m = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$ , where we define  $\bar{X}_0 = 0$ .

(a) Assume  $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}X_1^2 < \infty$  and do the following:

- (i) Show that  $\text{Var}[\bar{X}_N] \leq \sigma^2 \left[ \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq \lambda^{1/3})}{\lambda} \right]$

It can be shown that the claim does not hold for all  $\lambda$ . We will instead prove a weaker claim which is sufficiently sharp to obtain the desired results in the following sections. We wish to show that

$$\text{Var}[\bar{X}_N] \leq \sigma^2 \left[ \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq \lambda^{1/3})}{\lambda^{1/3}} \right]$$

First we observe that  $\mathbb{E}[X_m] = 0$ ,  $m = 0, 1, \dots$  and that

$$\text{Var}[\bar{X}_m] = \begin{cases} 0, & m = 0 \\ \sigma^2/m, & m = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\bar{X}_N] &= \mathbb{E}(\text{Var}[\bar{X}_N | N]) + \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_N | N]) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\text{Var}[\bar{X}_N | N]) + 0 \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \text{Var}[\bar{X}_m] \mathbb{P}(N = m) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}[\bar{X}_m] \mathbb{P}(N = m) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma^2}{m} \mathbb{P}(N = m) \\ &= \sigma^2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{P}(N = m) \end{aligned}$$

Thus it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{P}(N = m) \leq \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq \lambda^{1/3})}{\lambda^{1/3}}$$

We consider two cases. First suppose that  $\lambda \leq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{P}(N = m) &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}(N = m) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq 1)}{\lambda^{1/3}} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(N = 0) + \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq 1)}{\lambda^{1/3}} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq \lambda^{1/3})}{\lambda^{1/3}}
\end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $\lambda > 1$  and let  $M_\lambda$  be the largest integer less than  $\lambda^{1/3}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{P}(N = m) &= \sum_{m=1}^{M_\lambda} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{P}(N = m) + \sum_{m=M_\lambda+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{P}(N = m) \\
&\leq \sum_{m=1}^{M_\lambda} \frac{1}{1} \mathbb{P}(N = m) + \sum_{m=M_\lambda+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}(N = m) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(1 \leq N \leq M_\lambda) + \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}(N \geq M_\lambda + 1) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(0 \leq N \leq M_\lambda) + \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}(N \geq M_\lambda + 1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq \lambda^{1/3})}{\lambda^{1/3}}
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) Show that  $\mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . Hint: use Chebychev's inequality.

By Chebychev's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) &< \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3} \text{ or } N > \lambda^{5/3}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(|N - \lambda| > \lambda^{2/3}) \\
&\leq \frac{\text{Var}[N]}{(\lambda^{2/3})^2} \\
&= \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^{4/3}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) Show that  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon) = 0$  for every  $\epsilon > 0$ .

By Chebychev's inequality and our results in (1a.i) and (1a.ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon) &\leq \frac{\text{Var}[\bar{X}_N]}{\epsilon^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\epsilon^2} \left[ \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \frac{\mathbb{P}(N \geq \lambda^{1/3})}{\lambda^{1/3}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\epsilon^2} \left[ \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/3}} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Let  $\psi(t)$  be the characteristic function of a standard normal random variable, and define  $Z_m = m^{1/2}\bar{X}_m/\sigma$ . Continue to assume  $\sigma^2 < \infty$ . Do the following:

(i) Show that for any real  $t$ ,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N}] - \psi(t) \right| \leq 2\mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right|$$

Recall that by Euler's formula  $|e^{it}| = 1$ . Further recall that for arbitrary integrable random variable  $W$  it holds that  $|\mathbb{E}[W]| \leq \mathbb{E}|W|$ . Use of these facts and multiple applications of the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N}] - \psi(t) \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N} I_{N < \lambda^{1/3}}] + \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N} I_{N \geq \lambda^{1/3}}] - \psi(t) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N} I_{N < \lambda^{1/3}}] + \mathbb{E}_N(\mathbb{E}_{Z_N|N}[e^{itZ_N} | N] I_{N \geq \lambda^{1/3}}) - \psi(t) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N} I_{N < \lambda^{1/3}}] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_N(\mathbb{E}_{Z_N|N}[e^{itZ_N} | N] I_{N \geq \lambda^{1/3}}) - \psi(t) \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|e^{itZ_N}| I_{N < \lambda^{1/3}}] + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}_N(\mathbb{E}_{Z_m}[e^{itZ_m}] I_{N \geq \lambda^{1/3}}) - \psi(t) \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E}[1 \cdot I_{N < \lambda^{1/3}}] + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] \mathbb{P}(N \geq \lambda^{1/3}) - \psi(t) \right| \\ &= \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] (1 - \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3})) - \psi(t) \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left\{ \left| -\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}|e^{itZ_m}| \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left\{ 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| \right\} \\ &= 2\mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Show that for any real  $t$ ,  $|\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N}] - \psi(t)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

From our results in (1a.ii) and (1b.i) it suffices to show that

$$\max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty$$

From the central limit theorem  $Z_m \xrightarrow{L} N(0, 1)$ , so that by the continuity theorem  $\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] \rightarrow \psi(t)$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $m \geq N_\epsilon$ ,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| < \epsilon$$

Thus for the above  $\epsilon$ , choosing  $\lambda > N_\epsilon^3$  implies that

$$\max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| < \epsilon$$

and since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary we obtain that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_m}] - \psi(t) \right| = 0$$

(c) Now do not assume  $\sigma^2 < \infty$ . Do the following:

(i) Show that for each  $\epsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon) \leq \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon) &= \mathbb{E}\left[I(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{I(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon, N < \lambda^{1/3}) + I(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon, N \geq \lambda^{1/3})\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon, N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon, N \geq \lambda^{1/3}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\bar{X}_N| \geq \epsilon, N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon, N \geq \lambda^{1/3}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(N < \lambda^{1/3}) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon\right) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Show that  $\bar{X}_N \xrightarrow{P} 0$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . Hint: use the strong law of large numbers.

From (1a.ii) and (1c.i) it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty$$

From the SLLN we obtain that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{X}_m = 0$ . Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be the probability space upon which  $\bar{X}_m$  resides, and let  $\mathcal{N} \subset \Omega$  denote the set upon which  $\bar{X}_m \rightarrow 0$ . Consider  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then for  $\omega \in \mathcal{N}$ , there exists a  $N_{\epsilon, \omega} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $m \geq N_{\epsilon, \omega}$  it holds that  $|\bar{X}_m(\omega)| < \epsilon$ . It follows that for such an  $\omega$  we find that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m(\omega)| = 0$$

and consequently

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0$$

Now let  $g$  be the function which identically maps each element of  $\Omega$  to the value 1. Then

$$I\left(\max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq g \quad \text{and} \quad \int g \, dP = 1 < \infty$$

so that we may invoke the dominated convergence theorem yielding

$$0 = \mathbb{P} \left( \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon \right) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{m \geq \lambda^{1/3}} |\bar{X}_m| \geq \epsilon \right)$$

## 2011 Theory I Problem #2

2. (a) Let  $X$  be a random variable and let  $\nu$  be a parameter of interest in the distribution of  $X$ . Suppose that  $T(X)$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\nu$ . Show that any unbiased estimator of  $\nu$  is of the form  $T(X) - U(X)$ , where  $\mathbb{E}[U(X)] = 0$ .

Consider some other unbiased estimator of  $\nu$ , say  $W(X)$ . Define  $U(X) = T(X) - W(X)$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}[U(X)] = \mathbb{E}[T(X) - W(X)] = \mathbb{E}[T(X)] - \mathbb{E}[W(X)] = \nu - \nu = 0$$

Furthermore,

$$W(X) = T(X) - U(X)$$

In the sequel, let  $X$  be a discrete random variable with  $\mathbb{P}(X = -1) = p$  and  $\mathbb{P}(X = k) = (1-p)^2 p^k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $p \in (0, 1)$  is unknown.

- (b) Show that  $\mathbb{E}[U(X)] = 0$  if and only if  $U(k) = ak$  for all  $k = -1, 0, 1, \dots$  and some  $a$ .

We wish to find a  $U$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[U(X)] = 0$ . To begin with, we express  $\mathbb{E}[U(X)]$  as a polynomial in  $p$  where each coefficient is a function of  $U$ . Then in order for  $\mathbb{E}[U(X)]$  to be uniformly 0 for each  $p \in (0, 1)$  we will need to find a choice of  $U$  such that each coefficient is 0. We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\stackrel{\text{set}}{=} \mathbb{E}[U(X)] \\ &= pU(-1) + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} U(x)(1-p)^2 p^x \\ &= pU(-1) + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} U(x)[1 - 2p + p^2] p^x \\ &= pU(-1) + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} U(x)p^x - 2 \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} U(x)p^{x+1} + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} U(x)p^{x+2} \\ &= pU(-1) + \sum_{x=-2}^{\infty} U(x+2)p^{x+2} - 2 \sum_{x=-1}^{\infty} U(x+1)p^{x+2} + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} U(x)p^{x+2} \\ &= pU(-1) + \left[ U(0) + \sum_{x=-1}^{\infty} U(x+2)p^{x+2} \right] - 2 \sum_{x=-1}^{\infty} U(x+1)p^{x+2} + \left[ \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} U(x)p^{x+2} - pU(-1) \right] \\ &= U(0) + \sum_{x=-1}^{\infty} [U(x) - 2U(x+1) + U(x+2)] p^{x+2} \end{aligned}$$

Now we wish to argue that  $U(0)$  must be 0 for  $\mathbb{E}[U(X)]$  to uniformly equal 0. Suppose for a moment that  $U(0) \neq 0$ . Then

$$-U(0) = \sum_{x=-1}^{\infty} [U(x) - 2U(x+1) + U(x+2)] p^{x+2}$$

for all  $p \in (0, 1)$ . However, this implies that  $U(X)$  must be a function of  $p$ , which it may not be as it an estimator; thus we conclude that  $U(0) = 0$ .

Thus we may reduce the problem to finding  $U(\cdot)$  that satisfies

$$U(x) - 2U(x+1) + U(x+2) = 2, \quad x = -1, 0, 1, \dots$$

Incorporating the fact that  $U(0)$  must equal 0, we wish to solve the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= U(-1) + 0 + U(1) \\ 0 &= \quad \quad 0 - 2U(1) + U(2) \\ 0 &= \quad \quad \quad U(1) - 2U(2) + U(3) \\ 0 &= \quad \quad \quad \quad U(2) - 2U(3) + U(4) \\ \vdots & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \ddots \quad \quad \ddots \quad \quad \ddots \end{aligned}$$

By summing equalities  $\{1,2\}, \{1,2,3\}, \{1,2,3,4\}, \dots$  we find that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= U(-1) + U(1) \\ 0 &= U(-1) - U(1) + U(2) \\ 0 &= U(-1) \quad \quad - U(2) + U(3) \\ \vdots & \quad \quad \quad \ddots \quad \quad \ddots \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently (after some rearrangement and substitution)

$$\begin{cases} U(0) = 0 \\ -U(-1) = U(1) \\ U(1) = U(x) - U(x-1), \quad x = 2, 3, \dots \end{cases}$$

We conclude that  $U(k) = ak$  solves the system of equations for any choice of  $a$  (where  $a$  is our  $U(1)$ ).

- (c) Using the results in (a) and (b), show that  $I(X = 0)$  is the unique admissible estimator under squared error loss amongst all unbiased estimators of  $(1-p)^2$ , where  $I(\cdot)$  is the indicator function.

Let  $T(X) = I(X = 0)$ . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T(X)] &= \sum_{x=-1}^{\infty} I(x=0)(1-p)^2 p^x = (1-p)^2 \\ \text{Var}[T(X)] &= \mathbb{E}([T(X)]^2) - (\mathbb{E}[T(X)])^2 = \mathbb{E}[T(X)] - (\mathbb{E}[T(X)])^2 = (1-p)^2 - (1-p)^4 \end{aligned}$$

and note that  $T$  is unbiased for  $(1-p)^2$ .

Now consider some other unbiased estimator or  $(1-p)^2$ , say  $W(X)$ . Since  $T$  is unbiased we have from

(2a) and (2b) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ W(X) - (1-p)^2 \right]^2 \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ T(X) - U(X) - (1-p)^2 \right]^2 \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ T(X) - U(X) \right]^2 \right\} - 2(1-p)^2 \mathbb{E} [T(X) - U(X)] + (1-p)^4 \\
&= \left\{ \left[ T(-1) - U(-1) \right]^2 p + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} \left[ T(x) - U(x) \right]^2 (1-p)^2 p^x \right\} \\
&\quad - 2(1-p)^2 \left( \mathbb{E} [T(X)] - \mathbb{E} [U(X)] \right) + (1-p)^4 \\
&= \left\{ \left[ I(-1=0) - (-a) \right]^2 p + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} \left[ T(x) - U(x) \right]^2 (1-p)^2 p^x \right\} \\
&\quad - 2(1-p)^2 \left( (1-p)^2 - 0 \right) + (1-p)^4 \\
&= a^2 p + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} \left[ T(x) - U(x) \right]^2 (1-p)^2 p^x - (1-p)^4 \\
&\geq a^2 p - (1-p)^4 = \text{Var} [T(X)] = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ T(X) - (1-p)^2 \right]^2 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

(d) Show that no unique admissible estimator exists for  $p$  under squared error loss amongst unbiased estimators for  $p$ .

Let  $T(X) = I(= -1)$ . Then  $\mathbb{E} [T(X)] = P(X = -1) = p$  so that  $T$  is an unbiased estimator of  $p$ . Consider another unbiased estimator of  $p$ , say  $W(X)$ . Then from (2a) and (2b) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ W(X) - p \right]^2 \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ W(X) - U(X) - p \right]^2 \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ W(X) - U(X) \right]^2 \right\} - 2p \mathbb{E} [W(X) - U(X)] + p^2 \\
&= \left\{ \left[ I(-1 = -1) - (-a) \right]^2 p + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} \left[ I(x = -1) - ax \right]^2 (1-p)^2 p^x \right\} \\
&\quad - 2p \left( \mathbb{E} [W(X)] - \mathbb{E} [U(X)] \right) + p^2 \\
&= (1-a)^2 p + a^2 \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} (1-p)^2 p^{x+2} - 2p(p-0) + p^2 \\
&= (1-a)^2 p + a^2 \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} (1-p)^2 - p^2
\end{aligned}$$

To find an admissible estimator we need to minimize the above expression with respect to  $a$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\stackrel{\text{set}}{=} \frac{d}{da} \left\{ (1-a)^2 p + a^2 \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} (1-p)^2 - p^2 \right\} \\
&= -2(1-a)p + 2a \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} x^2 (1-p)^2 p^x \\
&= -2p + 2a \left[ p + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} x^2 (1-p)^2 p^x \right] \\
\Rightarrow \quad a &= \left[ 1 + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} x^2 (1-p)^2 p^{x-1} \right]^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $(1-a)^2 p + a^2 \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} (1-p)^2 - p^2$  is quadratic in  $a$ , the choice of  $a$  above is the unique minimizer for a fixed  $p$ ; note that  $a$  changes with  $p$ . Now an admissible estimator  $d$  is unique if and only if for any other admissible estimator  $d^*$  it holds that  $d = d^*$ . Suppose now there exists a unique admissible estimator  $d_{\text{opt}}$ . It is clear that we can find a  $p$  such that  $d^* \neq d_{\text{opt}}$  where

$$d^* = \arg \min_d \mathbb{E}_p \left\{ [d(X) - p]^2 \right\}$$

Since  $d^*$  is the unique minimizer for this choice of  $p$  we see that  $d^*$  is not inadmissible; hence it is admissible. But then  $d_{\text{opt}}$  is not unique and a contradiction is reached.

- (e) Prove whether there exists unbiased estimators of  $p^{-1}$ . If so, then determine whether a unique admissible estimator exists under squared error loss amongst unbiased estimators for  $p^{-1}$ .

Let  $g(X)$  be an unbiased estimator of  $p^{-1}$ . Then

$$p^{-1} = \mathbb{E}[g(X)]$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= p \mathbb{E}[g(X)] \\
&= p \left[ p g(-1) + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x) (1-p)^2 p^x \right] \\
&= p^2 g(-1) + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x) [1 - 2p + p^2] p^{x+1} \\
&= p^2 g(-1) + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x) p^{x+1} - 2 \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x) p^{x+2} + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x) p^{x+3} \\
&= p^2 g(-1) + \left[ g(0)p + g(1)p^2 + \sum_{x=2}^{\infty} g(x) p^{x+1} \right] \\
&\quad - \left[ 2g(0)p^2 + 2 \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} g(x) p^{x+2} \right] + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x) p^{x+3} \\
&= p^2 g(-1) + \left[ g(0)p + g(1)p^2 + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x+2) p^{x+3} \right]
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left[ 2g(0)p^2 + 2 \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x+1)p^{x+3} \right] + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} g(x)p^{x+3} \\
& = g(0)p + [g(-1) - 2g(0) + g(1)]p^2 + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} [g(x) - 2g(x+1) + g(x+2)]p^{x+3} \\
& = g(0)p + \sum_{x=-1}^{\infty} [g(x) - 2g(x+1) + g(x+2)]p^{x+3}
\end{aligned}$$

From this form we can see that for  $g$  to satisfy the above equation for all values of  $p$  it must be a function of  $p$ . Since an estimator may only be a function of the data we conclude that no unbiased estimator of  $p^{-1}$  exists.

### 2011 Theory I Problem #3

3. Consider a sequence of numbers  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  and place vertical lines before  $x_1$  and between  $x_j$  and  $x_{j+1}$  whenever  $x_j > x_{j+1}$ . We say that the runs are the segments between pairs of lines. Thus each run is an increasing segment of the sequence  $x_1, x_2, \dots$

Suppose that  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  are independent and identically distributed uniform(0,1) random variables and that we are interested in the lengths of the successive runs. Let  $L_j$  denote the length of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  run.

- (a) Compute  $\mathbb{P}(L_1 \geq m)$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$

We claim that

$$\mathbb{P}(L_1 \geq m) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_m) = \frac{1}{m!}$$

The first equality is immediately apparent and we proceed with proof-by-induction to show the second. Consider first

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 < X_2) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq X_2 | X_2)] = \mathbb{E}[F(X_2)] = \mathbb{E}X_2 = \frac{1}{2}$$

Next, by the induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_m) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_m | X_m)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}, \max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) \leq X_m | X_m)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1} | X_m) \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) \leq X_m | X_m)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1} | X_m)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) \leq X_m | X_m)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}) \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq X_m, \dots, X_{m-1} \leq X_m | X_m)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq X_m | X_m)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} F(X_m)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} X_m \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{E} [X_m^{m-1}] \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \int_0^1 x^{m-1} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \left. \frac{x^m}{m} \right|_0^1 \\
&= \frac{1}{m!}
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Suppose that we know that the  $j^{\text{th}}$  run starts with the value  $x$ . Compute  $\mathbb{P}(L_j \geq m | x)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(L_j \geq m | x) &= \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}, \min(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > x \mid \min(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > x) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}) I(\min(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > x) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{(m-1)!} I(X_1 > x, \dots, X_{m-1} > x) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} I(X_i > x) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} [I(X_i > x)] \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}(X_i > x) \\
&= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} [\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x)]^{m-1} \\
&= \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!}
\end{aligned}$$

(c) Let  $I_j$  denote the initial value of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  run. Show that  $p_n(y|x)$  the probability density that the  $(n+1)^{\text{st}}$  run has  $I_{n+1} = y$  given that the  $n^{\text{th}}$  run has just begun with  $I_n = x$ , equals  $e^{1-x}$  if  $y < x$  and  $e^{1-x} - e^{y-x}$  if  $y > x$ .

The  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  run will start with value  $y$  conditional on the  $n^{\text{th}}$  run starting with value  $x$  if for some positive integer  $m$

- (i) the next  $(m-1)$  values in the sequence are in increasing order and are all greater than  $x$
- (ii) the  $m^{\text{th}}$  value must equal  $y$
- (iii) the  $(m-1)^{\text{th}}$  value is greater than  $y$

Notice that we may replace condition (iii) with  $\max(X_k, \dots, X_{k+m-1}) > y$  for a run starting at  $X_k$  without changing the overall statement, which will prove helpful in what follows. We start with a few results and then piece everything together at the end.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(I_{n+1} \in (y, y + \Delta), L_n = m \mid I_n = x) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}, X_m \in (y, y + \Delta), \max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_m \in (y, y + \Delta)) \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}, \max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_m \in (y, y + \Delta)) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_m \in (y, y + \Delta)) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1} \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \right\} \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_m \in (y, y + \Delta)) \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Now when  $y < x$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) = 1$$

and when  $y > x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq y, \dots, X_{m-1} \leq y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \\
&= 1 - \left[ \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq y \mid X_1 > x) \right]^{m-1} \\
&= 1 - \left[ \frac{\mathbb{P}(x < X_1 \leq y)}{\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x)} \right]^{m-1} \\
&= 1 - \left( \frac{y-x}{1-x} \right)^{m-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$f_{X_m}(y) = \lim_{\Delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbb{P}(X_m \in (y, y + \Delta)) = \lim_{\Delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \Delta = 1, \quad \text{for all } m$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
p(y|x) &= \lim_{\Delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbb{P}(I_{n+1} \in (y, y + \Delta) \mid I_n = x) \\
&= \lim_{\Delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(I_{n+1} \in (y, y + \Delta), L_n = m \mid I_n = x) \\
&= \lim_{\Delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(X_m \in (y, y + \Delta)) \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \\
&= \lim_{\Delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in (y, y + \Delta)) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(x \leq X_1 \leq \dots \leq X_{m-1}) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by the Taylor series expansion for  $e^a$ , when  $y < x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
p(y|x) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \\
&= e^{1-x}
\end{aligned}$$

and for  $y > x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
p(y|x) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \mathbb{P}(\max(X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}) > y \mid X_i > x, i = 1, \dots, m-1) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{y-x}{1-x} \right)^{m-1} \right] \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} - \frac{(y-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \right] \\
&= e^{1-x} - e^{y-x}
\end{aligned}$$

- (d) Demonstrate that  $\pi(y)$ , the probability density function for  $I_n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , satisfies  $\pi(y) = 2(1-y)$ ,  $0 < y < 1$ . You may do this by verifying the continuous state equilibrium equations for discrete time Markov chains:  $\pi(y) = \int_0^1 \pi(x) p(y|x) dx$ .

Wish to verify that

$$\begin{aligned}
2(1-y) = \pi(y) &= \int_0^1 \pi(x) p(y|x) dx = \int_0^1 2(1-x) p(y|x) dx \\
&\iff 1-y = \int_0^1 (1-x) p(y|x) dx
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 (1-x)p(y|x) dx &= \int_0^1 (1-x) \left[ (e^{1-x} - e^{y-x}) I(y > x) + e^{1-x} I(y < x) \right] dx \\
&= \int_0^y (1-x)(e^{1-x} - e^{y-x}) dx + \int_y^1 (1-x) e^{1-x} dx \\
&= \int_0^1 (1-x) e^{1-x} dx - \int_y^1 (1-x) e^{y-x} dx \\
&= \int_0^1 (1-x) e^{1-x} dx - e^{-(1-y)} \int_0^y (1-x) e^{1-x} dx \\
&= \int_0^1 z e^z dz - e^{-(1-y)} \int_{1-y}^1 z e^z dz \\
&= (ze^z - e^z) \Big|_0^1 - e^{-(1-y)} (ze^z - e^z) \Big|_{1-y}^1 \\
&= \left[ (e - e) - (0 - 1) \right] - e^{-(1-y)} \left[ (1 - 1) - \left( (1-y) e^{1-y} - e^{1-y} \right) \right] \\
&= 1 + e^{-(1-y)} \left[ (1-y) e^{1-y} - e^{1-y} \right] \\
&= 1 + (1-y) - 1 \\
&= 1 - y
\end{aligned}$$

(e) Find  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m)$ .

Let  $\pi_n$  denote the density of the initial value of the  $n^{th}$  run. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m \mid I_n) \right] \\
&= \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m \mid I_n) \pi_n(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \pi_n(x) dx
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we observe that

$$\frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in (0, 1)$$

so that for any density  $p(x)$ ,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} p(x) dx \leq \int_0^1 p(x) dx = 1$$

Then the limiting distribution of the length of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  run is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \pi_n(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \pi_n(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \pi(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \frac{(1-x)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} 2(1-x) dx \\
&= \frac{2}{(m-1)!} \int_0^1 (1-x)^m dx \\
&= \frac{2}{(m-1)!} \int_0^1 x^m dx \\
&= \frac{2}{(m-1)!} \left. \frac{x^{m+1}}{m+1} \right|_{x=0}^{x=1} \\
&= \frac{2}{(m+1)(m-1)!}
\end{aligned}$$

where the interchange of the limit and integral is justified by the dominated convergence theorem.

(f) What is the average length of a run as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , that is, what is  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[L_n]$ ?

First we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(L_n = k) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^k \mathbb{P}(L_n = k) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}(L_n = k) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[L_n]
\end{aligned}$$

where interchange of the integrals is justified by Fubini's theorem for nonnegative functions (sometimes called Tonelli's theorem). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[L_n] &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[L_n | I_n]) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[L_n \geq m | I_n] \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-I_n)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[e^{1-I_n}]$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[L_n] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{1-I_n}] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 e^{1-x} \pi_n(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{1-x} \pi_n(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 e^{1-x} \pi(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 e^{1-x} 2(1-x) dx \\
&= 2 \int_0^1 z e^z dz \\
&= 2(z e^z - e^z) \Big|_0^1 \\
&= 2
\end{aligned}$$

where interchange of the limit and the integral is justified via the dominated convergence theorem in a similar manner as was done in (e).

An alternative solution can be obtained as follows. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[L_n] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(L_n \geq m) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{(m+1)(m-1)!} \\
&= 2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{m!} - \frac{1}{(m+1)!} \right) \\
&= 2[(e-1) - (e-2)] \\
&= 2
\end{aligned}$$