## **Homework Monte Carlo methods**

## 1. Monte Carlo methods

Consider the ratio of integrals

$$r_m = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^m \cdot \frac{1}{b\pi \cdot \left[1 + \left(\frac{x-a}{b}\right)^2\right]} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \cdot e^{-(x-\mu)^2/2\sigma^2} dx}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b\pi \cdot \left[1 + \left(\frac{x-a}{b}\right)^2\right]} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \cdot e^{-(x-\mu)^2/2\sigma^2} dx}$$

which can be seen as the expected value  $r_m = E(X^m)$ , where

$$f_X(x) = \frac{\frac{1}{b\pi \cdot \left[1 + \left(\frac{x-a}{b}\right)^2\right]} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \cdot e^{-(x-\mu)^2/2\sigma^2}}{I}$$

and

$$I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b\pi \cdot \left[1 + \left(\frac{x-a}{b}\right)^2\right]} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \cdot e^{-(x-\mu)^2/2\sigma^2} dx$$

Consider for instance the case m=1. The expected value can be computed with three methods. In this question, implement all three and compare the accuracy of the three methods. The parameters  $a, b, \mu$  and  $\sigma$  are free to choose.

- (a) Use **rejection sampling** to generate data X from  $f_X(x)$  and estimate  $\theta = r_1 = EX$  by  $\hat{\theta}_1 = \overline{X}$ . For this, you can use the matlab routine randCauchyplusNormal.m.
- (b) Generate normal data  $Z\sim N(\mu,\sigma^2)$  and estimate EX by  $\hat{\theta}_2=\frac{\overline{Z\cdot I_Z}}{\overline{I_Z}}$  with

$$I_Z = \frac{1}{b\pi \left[1 + \left(\frac{Z-a}{b}\right)^2\right]}$$

(c) Generate Cauchy data  $T\sim {\rm Cauchy}(a,b)$  and estimate EX by  $\hat{\theta}_3=\frac{\overline{T\cdot I_T}}{\overline{I_T}}$  with

$$I_T = \exp\left[-(T-\mu)^2/2\sigma^2\right]/\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma$$

Repeat each estimation procedure to be able to estimate its accuracy. Perform a statistical test (ANOVA-type, for instance Levene's test) to check whether  $var(\hat{\theta}_1) = var(\hat{\theta}_2) = var(\hat{\theta}_3)$ . Briefly discuss the bias of each of the three samplers.

## 2. Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling

The matlab file randgammaMCMC.m implements a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm for the generation of pseudo random variables following a Gamma distribution. It is an alternative to the routine randgamma.m, which uses rejection sampling. The file testrandgammaMCMC.m compares both generators.

(a) In order to generate  $X \sim \Gamma(\lambda, \alpha)$ , meaning that

$$f_X(x) = \frac{x^{\alpha - 1} \lambda^{\alpha} e^{-\lambda x}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}$$

(as on slide 40), the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm uses a proposal distribution

$$q(x|y) = \frac{x^{r-1}\lambda^r e^{-\lambda x}}{(r-1)!},$$

where  $r=\lfloor\alpha\rfloor$  is the floor function (i.e., the greatest integer less than or equal to) of  $\alpha$ . In other words, the proposal distribution is an Erlang distribution (= Gamma with integer parameter = distribution of the sum of independent, identically distributed exponential variables). Note that the proposal distribution does not depend on the current value (i.e., q(x|y) does not depend on y).

Knowing this, explain how to arrive at the lines of code in randgammaMCMC.m, more precisely the lines

```
Y = randexp(1,r,lambda); X(k) = sum(Y);
a = (X(k)/X(k-1))^ralfa;
U = rand;
if U<a, reject = false; end</pre>
```

(b) Run the file testrandgammaMCMC.m and explain in one or two sentences what you see. What could be a drawback of randgammaMCMC.m (MCMC sampling) compared to randgamma.m (rejection sampling).