

# 2012 Qualifying Exam Section 2

February 21, 2019

## Question 1

### 1.a

Note that

$$P(Y_{i1} = 1, Y_{i2} = 1) = P(Y_{i2} = 1|Y_{i1} = 1)P(Y_{i1} = 1) = \beta\alpha = \alpha\beta$$

$$P(Y_{i1} = 1, Y_{i2} = 0) = P(Y_{i2} = 0|Y_{i1} = 1)P(Y_{i1} = 1) = (1 - \beta)\alpha = \alpha(1 - \beta)$$

$$P(Y_{i1} = 0, Y_{i2} = 1) = 0$$

$$P(Y_{i1} = 0, Y_{i2} = 0) = P(Y_{i1} = 0) = 1 - \alpha$$

The last equality follows because someone can only get the secondary illness if they've received a primary illness. We put these probabilities in a table below.

		$Y_{i2}$		
		0	1	
$Y_{i1}$	0	$1 - \alpha$	0	$1 - \alpha$
	1	$\alpha(1 - \beta)$	$\alpha\beta$	$\alpha$
		$1 - \alpha\beta$	$\alpha\beta$	1

Now, the likelihood function can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 L(\alpha, \beta) &= (\alpha\beta)^{x_1} [\alpha(1 - \beta)]^{x_2} (1 - \alpha)^{x_3} \\
 &= \exp\{x_1 \log(\alpha\beta) + x_2 \log(\alpha[1 - \beta]) + x_3 \log(1 - \alpha)\} \\
 &= \exp\{x_1 \log(\alpha\beta) + x_2 \log(\alpha[1 - \beta]) + (n - x_1 - x_2) \log(1 - \alpha)\} \\
 &= \exp\left\{x_1 \log \frac{\alpha\beta}{1 - \alpha} + x_2 \log \frac{\alpha(1 - \beta)}{1 - \alpha} + n \log(1 - \alpha)\right\} \\
 &= \exp\{\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{x})^T \boldsymbol{\theta} - b(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{x}) = (x_1, x_2)^T$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2)^T$ ,  $\theta_1 = \log \frac{\alpha\beta}{1-\alpha}$ ,  $\theta_2 = \log \frac{\alpha(1-\beta)}{1-\alpha}$ , and  $b(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = n \log(1 - \alpha)$ .

We recognize  $L(\alpha, \beta)$  as a multiparameter exponential family.

### 1.b.

The maximum likelihood estimators of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are found by setting the derivative of the log likelihood to 0. We have

$$\ell(\alpha, \beta) = (x_1 + x_2) \log \alpha + x_3 \log (1 - \alpha) + x_1 \log \beta + x_2 \log (1 - \beta)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \alpha} &= \frac{x_1 + x_2}{\alpha} - \frac{x_3}{1 - \alpha} \stackrel{\text{SET}}{=} 0 \implies (1 - \hat{\alpha})(x_1 + x_2) - \hat{\alpha}x_3 = 0 \\ &\implies x_1 + x_2 - \hat{\alpha}(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) = 0 \\ &\implies \hat{\alpha} = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{x_1 + x_2 + x_3} = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \beta} &= \frac{x_1}{\beta} - \frac{x_2}{1 - \beta} \stackrel{\text{SET}}{=} 0 \implies (1 - \hat{\beta})x_1 - \hat{\beta}x_2 = 0 \\ &\implies x_1 - \hat{\beta}(x_1 + x_2) = 0 \\ &\implies \hat{\beta} = \frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2} \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \alpha^2} = -\frac{x_1 + x_2}{\alpha^2} - \frac{x_3}{(1 - \alpha)^2} < 0$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \beta^2} = -\frac{x_1}{\beta^2} - \frac{x_2}{(1 - \beta)^2} < 0$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ell}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta} = 0$$

So the negative Hessian is positive definite. Hence,  $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$  is a maximum.

### 1.c.

The Fisher information matrix is the negative of the expectation of the Hessian matrix. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}X_1 &= nP(Y_{i1} = 1, Y_{i2} = 1) = n\alpha\beta \\ \mathbb{E}X_2 &= nP(Y_{i1} = 1, Y_{i2} = 0) = n\alpha(1 - \beta) \\ \mathbb{E}X_3 &= nP(Y_{i1} = 0, Y_{i2} = 0) = n(1 - \alpha)\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}I_{\alpha\alpha} &:= -\mathbb{E}\frac{\partial^2\ell}{\partial\alpha^2} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{X_1 + X_2}{\alpha^2} + \frac{X_3}{(1 - \alpha)^2}\right\} = \frac{n\alpha\beta + n\alpha(1 - \beta)}{\alpha^2} + \frac{n(1 - \alpha)}{(1 - \alpha)^2} \\ &= \frac{n}{\alpha} + \frac{n}{1 - \alpha} = \frac{n}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)}\end{aligned}$$

$$I_{\beta\beta} := -\mathbb{E}\frac{\partial^2\ell}{\partial\beta^2} = \mathbb{E}\frac{X_1}{\beta^2} + \mathbb{E}\frac{X_2}{(1 - \beta)^2} = \frac{n\alpha\beta}{\beta^2} + \frac{n\alpha(1 - \beta)}{(1 - \beta)^2} = \frac{n\alpha}{\beta} + \frac{n\alpha}{1 - \beta} = \frac{n\alpha}{\beta(1 - \beta)}$$

$$I_{\alpha\beta} = 0$$

The Fisher information matrix is

$$I(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\alpha\alpha} & I_{\alpha\beta} \\ I_{\beta\alpha} & I_{\beta\beta} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{n\alpha}{\beta(1 - \beta)} \end{pmatrix}$$

The asymptotic covariance matrix, which we will denote A-Cov, is the inverse of the Fisher information matrix. Since the samples are i.i.d., we ignore the  $n$  in the Fisher information matrix.

$$\text{A-Cov}(\alpha, \beta) = [I(\alpha, \beta)]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(1 - \alpha) & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\beta(1 - \beta)}{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}$$

Note, this matrix is approximately the covariance matrix of  $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})^T$ . Putting the  $n$ 's back in will yield the approximation for the covariance matrix of  $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})^T$ .

## 1.d

Suppose a UMP test  $\phi$  exists for  $H_0 : \beta = 0.5$  vs.  $H_1 : \beta > 0.5$ . Let  $\beta_1 > \beta_2 > 0.5$ . Consider testing

$$H_0^i : \beta = 0.5 \text{ vs. } H_1^i : \beta = \beta_i, \quad i = 1, 2$$

By the Neyman-Pearson Lemma, a UMP test exists for testing  $H_0^i$  vs.  $H_1^i$ , say,  $\phi_i$  where  $\phi_i$  takes the form

$$\phi_i(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \frac{p(x|\alpha, \beta_i)}{p(x|\alpha, 0.5)} > k_i \\ \gamma_i, & \text{if } \frac{p(x|\alpha, \beta_i)}{p(x|\alpha, 0.5)} = k_i \\ 0, & \text{if } \frac{p(x|\alpha, \beta_i)}{p(x|\alpha, 0.5)} < k_i \end{cases}$$

where  $k_i$  and  $\gamma_i$  are chosen so that  $E_{0.5}(\phi_i(x)) = \alpha$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p(x|\alpha, \beta_i)}{p(x|\alpha, 0.5)} &= \frac{\alpha^{x_1+x_2} \beta_i^{x_1} (1 - \beta_i)^{x_2} (1 - \alpha)^{x_3}}{\alpha^{x_1+x_2} 0.5^{x_1} 0.5^{x_2} (1 - \alpha)^{x_3}} \\ &= 2^{x_1+x_2} \beta_i^{x_1} (1 - \beta_i)^{x_2} \end{aligned}$$

The rejection region of  $\phi_i$  depends on  $\beta_i$ , and thus  $k_i$  is different for each  $i$ . Hence,  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are UMP tests with different rejection regions. Thus,  $\phi$  cannot be UMP for testing  $H_0$  vs.  $H_1$  since it has a different rejection region than the UMP test that tests  $H_0^i$  vs.  $H_1^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  where  $\beta_1 > \beta_2 > 0.5$  were chosen arbitrarily.

**1.e.**

Under  $H_0$ ,  $\alpha - \beta = 0$ , so  $\alpha = \beta = \theta$  for some  $\theta$ . Thus, the restricted likelihood is

$$L(\theta, \theta) = \theta^{x_1+x_2} \theta^{x_1} (1-\theta)^{x_2} (1-\theta)^{x_3} = \theta^{2x_1+x_2} (1-\theta)^{x_2+x_3}$$

Hence, the restricted log-likelihood is

$$\ell_0 := \ell(\theta, \theta) = (2x_1 + x_2) \log(\theta) + (x_2 + x_3) \log(1 - \theta)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\ell_0}{d\theta} &= \frac{2x_1 + x_2}{\theta} - \frac{x_2 + x_3}{1 - \theta} \stackrel{\text{SET}}{=} 0 \\ \implies (2x_1 + x_2) - \theta(2x_1 + x_2) - \theta(x_2 + x_3) &= 0 \\ \implies 2x_1 + x_2 &= \theta(2x_1 + 2x_2 + x_3) \\ \implies \hat{\theta} &= \frac{2x_1 + x_2}{2x_1 + 2x_2 + x_3} = \frac{2x_1 + x_2}{n + x_1 + x_2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\theta}$  is the MLE under  $H_0$ .

From here, simply take the ratio of the likelihood plugging in  $\hat{\theta}$  in the restricted likelihood and plugging in  $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$  in the full likelihood. It does not simplify well.

## 1.f.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \alpha} &= \frac{x_1 + x_2}{\alpha} - \frac{x_3}{1 - \alpha} = \frac{(x_1 + x_2) - \alpha(x_1 + x_2) - \alpha x_3}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} \\ &= \frac{(x_1 + x_2) - \alpha(x_1 + x_2 + x_3)}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} \\ &= \frac{x_1 + x_2 - n\alpha}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)}\end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \beta} = \frac{x_1}{\beta} - \frac{x_2}{1 - \beta} = \frac{(1 - \beta)x_1 - \beta x_2}{\beta(1 - \beta)} = \frac{x_1 - (x_1 + x_2)\beta}{\beta(1 - \beta)}$$

We can write the score equation as

$$S_n(\alpha, \beta) = \left( \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \alpha}, \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \beta} \right)^T = \left( \frac{x_1 + x_2 - n\alpha}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)}, \frac{x_1 - (x_1 + x_2)\beta}{\beta(1 - \beta)} \right)^T$$

Hence,

$$S_n(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta}) = \left( \frac{x_1 + x_2 - n\hat{\theta}}{\hat{\theta}(1 - \hat{\theta})}, \frac{x_1 - (x_1 + x_2)\hat{\theta}}{\hat{\theta}(1 - \hat{\theta})} \right)$$

The inverse fisher information evaluated at the restricted MLE is

$$[I_n(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta})]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-\hat{\theta}}{n} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\hat{\theta}(1-\hat{\theta})}{n\hat{\theta}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-\hat{\theta}}{n} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{(1-\hat{\theta})}{n} \end{pmatrix}$$

The score statistic is given by

$$SC_n = S_n(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta})^T [I_n(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta})]^{-1} S_n(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta})$$

which is asymptotically distributed as a  $\chi^2(1)$  random variable under  $H_0$ .

**1.g.**

Note that this is a linear test. Let  $\xi = (\alpha, \beta)^T$ . Then  $\alpha - \beta = R\xi$  where  $R = (1, -1)$ . The Wald Test statistic for a linear hypothesis is given by

$$(R\hat{\xi} - b_0)^T [R[I_n(\hat{\xi})]^{-1} R^T]^{-1} (R\hat{\xi} - b_0)$$

$R\hat{\xi} = \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} [R[I_n(\hat{\xi})]^{-1} R^T]^{-1} &= \left\{ (1 \quad -1) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\hat{\alpha}(1-\hat{\alpha})}{n} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\hat{\beta}(1-\hat{\beta})}{n\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}^{-1} \\ &= \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left[ \hat{\alpha}(1 - \hat{\alpha}) + \frac{\hat{\beta}(1 - \hat{\beta})}{\alpha} \right] \right\}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{n\hat{\alpha}}{\hat{\alpha}^2(1 - \hat{\alpha}) + \hat{\beta}(1 - \hat{\beta})} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the Wald Test is given by

$$W_n = \frac{n\hat{\alpha}(\hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta})^2}{\hat{\alpha}^2(1 - \hat{\alpha}) + \hat{\beta}(1 - \hat{\beta})} \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2(1)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  under  $H_0$ .



## 1.h.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\alpha, \beta) &= \alpha^{x_1+x_2} \beta^{x_1} (1-\beta)^{x_2} (1-\alpha)^{x_3} \\
&= \exp\{(x_1+x_2) \log \alpha + x_1 \log \beta + x_2 \log(1-\beta) + x_3 \log(1-\alpha)\} \\
&= \exp\{(n-x_3) \log \alpha + x_1 \log \beta + (n-x_1-x_3) \log(1-\beta) + x_3 \log(1-\alpha)\} \\
&= \exp\left\{x_1 \log \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} + x_3 \log \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} + n \log[\alpha(1-\beta)]\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

This is a full rank multivariate exponential family and since  $\log \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}$  is a 1-1 function of  $\beta$ , we have that  $X_1$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\beta$  and similarly  $X_3$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\alpha$ . Marginally,  $X_3 \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1-\alpha)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_3) &= \frac{P(x_1, x_2, x_3)}{P(x_3)} \\
&= \frac{\frac{n!}{x_1!x_2!x_3!} \alpha^{x_1+x_2} \beta^{x_1} (1-\beta)^{x_2} (1-\alpha)^{x_3}}{\frac{n!}{x_3!(n-x_3)!} (1-\alpha)^{x_3} \alpha^{n-x_3}} \\
&= \frac{\frac{n!}{x_1!x_3!(n-x_1-x_3)!} \alpha^{n-x_3} \beta^{x_1} (1-\beta)^{n-x_1-x_3} (1-\alpha)^{x_3}}{\frac{n!}{x_3!(n-x_3)!} (1-\alpha)^{x_3} \alpha^{n-x_3}} \\
&= \frac{(n-x_3)!}{x_1!(n-x_3-x_1)!} \beta^{x_1} (1-\beta)^{n-x_1-x_3} \\
&= \binom{n-x_3}{x_1} \beta^{x_1} (1-\beta)^{(n-x_3)-x_1}
\end{aligned}$$

This is the p.m.f. of a  $\text{Bin}(n-x_3, \beta)$  random variable. From basic probability theory, we know that  $\hat{\beta}_c$  is simply the average number of successes, i.e.,

$$\hat{\beta}_c = \frac{x_1}{n-x_3} = \frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2+x_3-x_3} = \frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2}$$

This estimate is intuitive since it is equal to the unconditional MLE, which was independent of  $\alpha$