

Recap: \rightarrow LRT for 1-parameter case

9th Feb' 2024.

* Show that the cross product $\sum_{i=1}^{10} 2[(x_i - \bar{x})(\bar{x} - \mu_0)]$ is equal to zero.

$$\begin{aligned} \hookrightarrow & \sum_{i=1}^{10} 2[(x_i - \bar{x})(\bar{x} - \mu_0)] \\ &= 2(\bar{x} - \mu_0) \sum_{i=1}^{10} (x_i - \bar{x}) \\ &= 2(\bar{x} - \mu_0) \left[\sum_{i=1}^{10} x_i - 10\bar{x} \right] \\ &= 2(\bar{x} - \mu_0) [10\bar{x} - 10\bar{x}] \quad \dots \left[\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right. \\ & \quad \left. \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = n\bar{x} \right] \\ &= 2(\bar{x} - \mu_0) * 0 \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{So, } \sum_{i=1}^{10} 2[(x_i - \bar{x})(\bar{x} - \mu_0)] = 0$$

Multi-parameter case

LRS for testing, $H_0: \underline{\theta} = \underline{\theta}_0$; Where $\underline{\theta}_0$ is a vector of numerical values

$$\mathcal{D} \equiv -2\pi(\underline{\theta}_0) = 2[\ell(\hat{\underline{\theta}}) - \ell(\underline{\theta}_0)]$$

Where, $\hat{\underline{\theta}}$ is the joint MLE of $\underline{\theta}$, and $\mathcal{D} \geq 0$.

E.g. in Example 4.2.1, if δ was unknown and we wanted to estimate it as well (i.e., get joint MLE $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\delta})$), any example of a simple hypothesis could be

$$H_0: \mu = 226, \text{ and } \delta = 1.$$

Assuming $H_0: \underline{\theta} = \underline{\theta}_0$ is true, $\mathcal{D} \approx \chi^2_{(k)}$ where k is the # of functionally independent parameters.

e.g. if $\underline{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_b)$, then $1 \leq k \leq b$.

p-value $\approx P(\chi^2_{(k)} \geq \text{obs})$, assuming H_0 is true.

For example:- In Ex 4.2.1, if δ was not assumed known, one possible simple hypothesis is,

$$H_0: \mu = 226, \delta = 1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{D} \approx \chi^2_{(2)}$$

For example:- In case of Multinomial Distribution,

Suppose, $(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) \sim \text{Multinomial}(n, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$
 $\hookrightarrow 4 \text{ parameters}$

If 3 are known, then 4th is defined by $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i = 1$.

$$\therefore k = 4 - 1 = 3$$

$$\text{So, } \mathcal{D} \approx \chi^2_{(3)}$$

Not, $\chi^2_{(4)}$

Let's look at an Example; Example 4.2.3 from the Complete Lecture Notes.

Hence, $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_7) \sim \text{Multinomial}(n, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_7)$

$$H_0: p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_7 = 1/7 \quad ; \quad p_0 = (1/7, 1/7, \dots, 1/7)$$

$$D = 2 \left[\ell(\hat{p}) - \ell(p_0) \right]$$

We need to maximize $\ell(p)$ subject to $\sum_{i=1}^7 p_i = 1$.

$$\ell(p) = \sum_{i=1}^7 x_i \ln(p_i) \quad ; \quad p_i \in (0, 1]$$

$$\frac{\partial \ell(p)}{\partial p_i} = x_i / p_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, 7.$$

Substitute, $p_7 = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^6 p_i \rightarrow [p_7 = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^6 p_i]$.

$$\ell(p) = \sum_{i=1}^6 x_i \ln(p_i) + x_7 \ln\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^6 p_i\right)$$

Set of Equations $\left\{ \frac{\partial \ell(p)}{\partial p_i} = \frac{x_i}{p_i} - \frac{x_7}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^6 p_i} \right\}$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$

$$= \frac{x_i}{p_i} - \frac{x_7}{p_7}$$

At joint MLE \hat{p} , all partials = 0

$$\therefore \frac{x_i}{\hat{p}_i} = \frac{x_7}{\hat{p}_7}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{p}_i = \frac{x_i}{x_7} \hat{p}_7, \text{ for } i=1,2,\dots,6 \quad \dots (\star)$$

↳ Dependent MLEs, So we have to find one and then replace to get another one.

$$\text{We know, } \hat{p}_7 = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^6 \hat{p}_i = 1 - \frac{\hat{p}_7}{x_7} \sum_{i=1}^6 x_i$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{p}_7 = 1 - \frac{\hat{p}_7}{x_7} (n - x_7) \quad \dots \left[\begin{aligned} n &= \sum_{i=1}^7 x_i = \sum_{i=1}^6 x_i + x_7 \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^6 x_i &= n - x_7 \end{aligned} \right]$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \vdots \quad [\text{Algebra}]$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{p}_7 = x_7/n \quad \dots \text{Substitute this in } (\star)$$

$$\text{we get, } \hat{p}_i = \frac{x_i}{x_7} * \frac{x_7}{n} = x_i/n$$

$$\text{So, } \boxed{\hat{p}_i = x_i/n}; \text{ for } i=1,2,\dots,6$$

$$D = 2[\ell(\hat{p}) - \ell(\hat{p}_0)]$$

$$D_{\text{obs}} = 2 \left[\sum_{i=1}^7 x_i \ln\left(\frac{x_i}{n}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^7 x_i \ln\left(\frac{1}{7}\right) \right]$$

plug in $n = 63$, and all x_i 's from table,

$$D_{\text{obs}} = 23.27,$$

$$\therefore p\text{-value} \Rightarrow P[\chi^2_{(6)} \geq 23.27] \approx 0.0007$$

Conclusion:-

Under the Null hypothesis, the estimated expected frequencies are $E(x_i) = np_0 = 63(1/7) = 9$. The p-value of our test was 0.0007, showing very strong evidence against H_0 .

The data do not support the hypothesis that fatal heart attacks are equally likely to occur on any day of the week.

Next week:- Sec 4.3 [LRT for Composite Hypothesis]