

01/18/21

- HW#1: Due 01/20
- HW#2: Due 01/28 (Fri) 5pm
- Midterm 1: 02/03 (Th) - not 02/01

♣ Example (contd): Assume that observations, x_1, \dots, x_n are iid from $N(\theta, \sigma^2)$, where μ and σ^2 are unknown. Consider $\tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma) = 1/\sigma^2$ (not a probability density, i.e., improper prior).

- Find the joint posterior distribution, $\tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma^2 \mid \mathbf{x})$.
- Find the posterior distributions $\tilde{\pi}_1(\theta \mid \mathbf{x}, \sigma^2)$ and $\tilde{\pi}_2(\sigma^2 \mid \mathbf{x})$.
- Find the marginal posterior distribution of θ , $\tilde{\pi}(\theta \mid \mathbf{x})$.
** Also, read Hoff §5.3, BDA §3.2, and Robert §4.4.1-4.4.2.

$$x_i | \theta, \sigma^2 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\theta, \sigma^2)$$

$$\tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R} \quad \& \quad \sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$$

Likelihood

$$f(x | \theta, \sigma^2) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x_i - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$l(\theta, \sigma^2 | x)$$

$$\propto (\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$\text{where } \bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i / n \quad \& \quad s^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

sufficient statistics

$$\textcircled{1} \quad \tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma^2 | x) = \tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma^2 | \bar{x}, s^2)$$

$$\propto f(\bar{x}, s^2 | \theta, \sigma^2) \cdot \tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma^2)$$

$$\propto (\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$$

$$\& \quad \underline{n(x)} < \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{posterior distr. exists}$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad \tilde{\pi}_1(\theta | x, \sigma^2) \propto \tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma^2 | x)$$

$$\propto \exp\left(-\frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \underline{\theta | x, \sigma^2} \sim N(\bar{x}, \sigma^2/n)$$

$$\tilde{\pi}_2(\sigma^2 | x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\pi}(\theta, \sigma^2 | x) \, d\theta$$

$$\propto \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \, d\theta$$

$$= (\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \, d\theta \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2/n}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2/n}}$$

$$\propto (\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma^2 | X \sim \text{IG} \left(\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2}, \frac{s^2}{2} \right)$$

$$\propto \int_0^\infty (\sigma^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{S^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{n(\bar{X}-\theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma^2} d\sigma^2$$

a kernel for $IG \left(\underbrace{\frac{n}{2}}_{=\alpha}, \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} (\hat{\sigma}^2 + n(\bar{x} - \theta)^2)}_{=\beta} \right)$.

$$x \sim \text{IG}(\alpha, \beta)$$
$$f(x) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{-\alpha-1} \cdot e^{-\beta/x}$$

$$x \sim t_v(\mu, \sigma^2) \Leftrightarrow \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \sim t_v$$

$$\propto \left(1 + \frac{n(\bar{x} - \theta)^2}{\delta^2} \right)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}$$

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{n-1} \cdot \frac{(x-\theta)^2}{\underbrace{s^2/n(n-1)}_{= \sigma^2}} \right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}$$

$$\sigma^2 = s^2 / (n(n-1))$$

$$12 / (3 \cdot 2) = 2$$

$$\theta | x \sim t_{n-1} \left(\bar{x}, \frac{s^2}{n(n-1)} \right)$$

$$\theta \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \theta \in [0, 1]$$

$\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ \rightarrow $\theta \in [0, 1]$

where π_1 is a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2/n_0)$ and π_2 is a inverse gamma distribution $\text{IG}(v/2, s_0^2/2)$.

- Find the joint posterior distribution $\pi(\theta, \sigma^2 \mid \mathbf{x})$. " \mathbb{N} " $\mathbb{IG}(\alpha, \beta)$
- Find the posterior distributions $\pi_1(\theta \mid \mathbf{x}, \sigma^2)$ and $\pi_2(\sigma^2 \mid \mathbf{x})$. x
- Find the marginal posterior distribution of θ , $\pi(\theta \mid \mathbf{x})$. x
- * Read Hoff §5.3, BDA §3.3, and Robert §4.4.1-4.4.2. t
- * Hoff and BDA use different parameterization for π_2 .
- * Do the example on Hoff pages 76-78.

† Likelihood Principle

- (Recall the definition of Likelihood) For the observed data, $X = x$, the function $\ell(\theta | x) = f(x | \theta)$, considered as a function of θ , is called the likelihood function.

★★ no guarantee that $\ell(\theta | x)$ as a function of θ is a pdf.

★★ *Intuitive reason for the name:* given x , the value of θ_1 is more likely to be the true parameter than θ_2 if $\ell(\theta_1 | x) > \ell(\theta_2 | x)$,
(x would be more probable occurrence with θ_1).

$$\underbrace{f(x | \theta_1)} > \underbrace{f(x | \theta_2)}$$

- Likelihood Principle** The information brought by an observation x about θ is entirely contained in the likelihood $\ell(\theta | x)$. Moreover, if x_1 and x_2 are two observations depending on the same parameter θ , such that there exists a constant c satisfying

$$\ell_1(\theta | x_1) = c \ell_2(\theta | x_2)$$

$\theta \propto c\theta$

for $\theta \in \Theta$

$P(\theta | x)$

for every θ , they then bring the **same information about θ** and must lead to identical inference.

$$\ell_1(\theta | x_1) \propto \ell_2(\theta | x_2)$$

- c does not depend on θ .
- In other words**, In the inference about θ , after x is observed, all relevant experimental information is contained in the likelihood function for the observed x . Furthermore, the likelihood functions contain the **same information about θ** if they are proportional to each other.

† The Likelihood Principle is emphasized in Bayesian statistics!

- *Recall* The Bayesian approach is entirely based on the posterior distribution.

$$\underline{\pi(\theta \mid x)} = \frac{\cancel{\underline{\ell}}\ell(\theta \mid x)\pi(\theta)}{\int \cancel{\underline{\ell}}\ell(\theta \mid x)\pi(\theta)d\theta}.$$

That is, the posterior depends on data (x) only through $\ell(\theta \mid x)$.

- Thus, the Likelihood Principle is automatically satisfied in a Bayesian setting.

Example 15 (JB, p28)– Testing fairness (1)

Suppose we are interested in testing θ , the unknown probability of heads for a possibly biased coin. Suppose we test $H_0: \theta = 1/2$ vs $H_a: \theta > 1/2$. An experiment is conducted by flipping the coin independently in a series of trials and 9 heads and 3 tails are observed. The information is not sufficient to fully specify the model, $f(x | \theta)$. Let's consider classical testing.

- **Scenario 1** The number of flips is pre-determined. $N=12$

x : # of heads

$$X | \theta \sim \text{Binom}(12, \theta), \quad x \in \{0, 1, \dots, 12\}$$

$$q_1(\theta | x) = \binom{n}{x} \theta^x (1-\theta)^{n-x}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{p-value : } p &= P_r(X \geq 9 | \theta = \frac{1}{2}) = \sum_{x=9}^{12} P_r(X = x | \theta = \frac{1}{2}) \\ &= \boxed{0.075} \end{aligned}$$

$\alpha = 0.05 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{fail to reject } H_0: \theta = \frac{1}{2}.$

Example 15 (JB, p28)– Testing fairness (2)

- **Scenario 2** The number of tails is predetermined. $m = \# \text{ of tails} = \underline{3}$

X : # of heads, θ = Prob. of H

$X | \theta \sim \text{Negative binomial}(3, 1-\theta)$

$$l_2(\theta | x) = \binom{x+3-1}{2} \theta^x (1-\theta)^3, \quad x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{p-value} \quad p &= \Pr(X \geq 9 | \theta = \tfrac{1}{2}) = 1 - \Pr(X \leq 8 | \theta = \tfrac{1}{2}) \\ &= 0.0325 \end{aligned}$$

\Rightarrow using $\alpha = 0.05$, reject H_0

$$l_1(\theta | x) = \binom{n}{x} \theta^x (1-\theta)^{n-x} \propto l_2(\theta | x)$$

Example 15 (JB, p28)– Testing fairness (3)

- How about Bayesian inference?

①

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\theta | x) &\propto \underbrace{\binom{n}{x} \theta^x (1-\theta)^{n-x}} \pi(\theta) \\ &\propto \theta^9 (1-\theta)^3 \pi(\theta)\end{aligned}$$

②

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\theta | x) &\propto \binom{x+3-1}{2} \theta^x (1-\theta)^3 \times \pi(\theta) \\ &\propto \theta^9 (1-\theta)^3 \pi(\theta)\end{aligned}$$

Example 15 (JB, p28)– Testing fairness (4)

* What does this imply?

- We did not really need to know anything about the “series of trials”. That is, the rules governing when data collection stops are irrelevant to data interpretation.
- It is entirely appropriate to collect data until a point has been proven or disproven, or until the data collector runs out of time, money, or patience. — Edwards, Lindman, and Savage (1963, 193)

† Few Remarks!

- The correspondence of information from proportional likelihood functions applies *only* when the two likelihood functions are for the *same* parameter.
- The likelihood principle does not say all information about θ is contained in $\ell(\theta)$, just that all *experimental* information is.
- It is of fundamental importance to get the likelihood function right (the likelihood function should be a close approximation or representation of data).
- Also, see Example 1.3.5.
- Optional: read **Example 1.3.6 & Stopping Rule Principle**
CR p17 & JB Chapter 7.7