lik(
$$\theta$$
) =  $\begin{pmatrix} 3839 \\ 1997, 906, 904, 32 \end{pmatrix}$  . 25  $(2+\theta)^{1997} (1-\theta)^{906} (1-\theta)^{904} \theta^{32}$ 

$$l'(\theta) = \frac{1997}{2+\theta} + \frac{906+904}{1-\theta} + \frac{32}{\theta} = 0$$

$$\frac{-38390^{2} - 16550 + 64}{(2+0)(1-0)0} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_{ML} = 0.0357 \Rightarrow P_{1}(\hat{\theta}) = 0.509 P_{2}(\hat{\theta}) = 0.241 P_{3}(\hat{\theta}) = 0.241 P_{4}(\hat{\theta}) = 0.009$$

## - Expected vs Observed:

## - Test Stat:

$$TS = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{(Oi - Ei)^2}{Ei} = \frac{1877.49}{1953.67} + \frac{383.49}{925.58} + \frac{465.70}{925.58} + \frac{4.69L}{34.17} = 2.015$$

$$TS \sim \chi^2_{4-1-1.57}$$

p value = 1 - pchisq (2.015, 2) = 0.365 > 
$$\alpha$$
 (for any typical  $\alpha$ )

So the model is a good fit for the data.

(7B) 9.38

Ho: Pran = Preb = ... = Pdec = 12

H,: not all month's probabilities are equal

n = number of men = 43229 ⇒ Ei = 43229. 1 = 3602.42 +i=1,...,12

m = number of women = 16379 = Ei = 16379. 12 = 1364.92 \ \text{i=1,...,12}

 $TS_{men} = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{(0i - 3602.42)^2}{3602.42} = 74.56 \quad (in R)$ 

 $TS_{wom} = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{(0i - 1364.92)^2}{1364.92} = 53.79$  (in R)

TS ~ 22

praire men = 1 - pchisq (74.56, 11) =  $1.65 \times 10^{-11}$  } less than any praire won = 1 - pchisq (53.79, 11) =  $1.29 \times 10^{-7}$  } typical d

So we reject Ho and conclude that the suicide rates are seasonal,

(7C)

Ho: these are 2 independent RVs of size 3,3, ie. Tij = TiTij

"marital status and employment status are independent"

H,: these are 2 dependent RVs...

"marital status" and employment status are not independent"

Degrees of freedom = dim IZ - dim Wo

= (3.3-1)-(2+2) = 8-4=4

They are dependent. (low p-value)

b) R gives a warning message because their are very low values in the expected table.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(0i-Ei)^2}{Ei} = 13.369$$
 (in R)

So the first technique was used by R to do the test.

95% CI: 
$$\hat{p}$$
,  $\pm z\sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p}_1)} = 0.076 \pm 1.96 (.0076)$ 

$$S\hat{\rho}_1 - \hat{\rho}_2 = \int S\hat{\rho}_1^2 + S\hat{\rho}_2^2 = \int \hat{\rho}_1(1-\hat{\rho}_1) + \hat{\rho}_2(1-\hat{\rho}_2) = 0.011$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{16}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{(x_{i}-np_{i})^{2}}{np_{i}}} = \frac{(x_{i}-np_{i})^{2}}{np_{i}} + \frac{(x_{2}-np_{2})^{2}}{np_{2}} = \frac{(x_{i}-np_{i})^{2}}{np_{i}} + \frac{(n-x_{i}-n(1-p_{i}))^{2}}{n(1-p_{i})}$$

$$= \frac{(1-p_i)(x_i-np_i)^2 + p_i(n-x_i-n(i-p_i))^2}{np_i(i-p_i)}$$

$$= \frac{(1-p_i)(x_i-np_i)^2 + p_i(-x+np_i)^2}{np_i(i-p_i)}$$

$$= \frac{(x_i-np_i)^2 + p_i(x_i-np_i)^2}{np_i(i-p_i)} = \frac{(x_i-np_i)^2}{np_i(i-p_i)}$$

7H)

We have six categories : 0,1,2,3,4,5 so the df = 6-1 = 5 which what R used for the test.

The p-value is 0.9641, which is too large to reject-the null hypothesis at any standard significance level. Thus, the data appears to follow a binomial distribution. (which we know to be true!)

7I)

yes, these histograms agree with the conclusions on 3HI-3H3 of the text. They show that the two test statistics are approximately equal. We can see that they are very similar density histograms compared to the  $\chi^2$  distribution.