

## Hypothesis testing

Example fixed effects only

$$H_0: Y_i = \alpha + \varepsilon_i$$

'reduced model'

$$H_1: Y_i = \alpha + \beta x_i + \varepsilon_i$$

'full model'

$$( \equiv H_0: \beta = 0 \text{ vs } H_1: \beta \neq 0 )$$

$$F\text{-tot} \quad f = \frac{(D_0 - D_1) / q}{D_1 / (n-p)}$$

$D_0$  = deviance of reduced model.  $D_1$  = deviance of full model

$q$  = # parameter constraints = 1

$p$  = # parameters in full model = 2

$n$  = # data points

$$\text{Under } H_0 \quad F \sim F_{q, n-p}$$

Or alternatively ...

Generalized likelihood ratio test (GLRT)

$$\text{Data } y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

Full model has parameters  $\varphi$ , likelihood  $L(\varphi | y) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(y_i | \varphi)$

$$\text{Loglikelihood } \lambda(\varphi | y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log f_i(y_i | \varphi)$$

Compare with the reduced model

→ parameters  $\varphi_s$  = obtained by applying  $r$  constraints to  $\varphi$ , i.e. reduced model is nested within full model.

$$\text{Reduced model loglikelihood } \lambda(\varphi_s | y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log f_i(y_i | \varphi_s)$$

Eg c'td  
Constraint is  
 $\beta = 0$   
So  $r = 1$

Likelihood ratio

$$\Lambda(y) = \frac{L(\hat{\varphi}_s | y)}{L(\hat{\varphi} | y)}$$

where  $\hat{\varphi}$  &  $\hat{\varphi}_s$  are the maximum likelihood estimates of  $\underline{\varphi}$  &  $\underline{\varphi}_s$

Note  $0 \leq \Lambda \leq 1$  as full model will always fit better than the reduced model i.e.  $L(\hat{\varphi}_s | y) \leq L(\hat{\varphi} | y)$

$\Lambda$  expresses how much more likely the data are under  $H_1$  rather than  $H_0$ .

Large values of  $\Lambda$  (i.e.  $\Lambda \approx 1$ ) suggest the reduced model is as good as the full model

Small values of  $\Lambda$  (i.e.  $\Lambda \approx 0$ ) suggest the full model is better than the reduced model.

---

GLRT says reject  $H_0$  in favour of  $H_1$  if  $\Lambda$  is smaller than expected under  $H_0$ .

GLRT 1) Find the MLEs  $\hat{\varphi}$  &  $\hat{\varphi}_s$

2) Calculate the test statistic

$$L = -2 \log \Lambda = -2 (\ell(\hat{\varphi}_s | y) - \ell(\hat{\varphi} | y))$$

3) Calculate the distribution of  $L$  under  $H_0$  & reject  $H_0$  if  $P(L \geq L_{0.05})$  is small.

$L$  is small if  $H_1$  is better, thus  $L = -2 \log \Lambda$   
will be large if  $H_1$  is better

Wilks' Theorem says that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , if  
 then (under a bunch of restrictions)

$$\mathcal{L} \sim \chi^2_r$$

Example ctd  $\varphi = (\alpha, \beta, \sigma^2)$   $\varphi_s = (\alpha, \sigma^2)$   
 1 constraint  $\beta = 0$  so  $r = 1$

Since  $y_i \sim N(\alpha + \beta x_i, \sigma^2)$

$$f_i(y_i | \varphi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y_i - \alpha - \beta x_i)^2\right)$$

Exercise

We find  $\hat{\varphi} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$

$$= \left( \bar{y} - \hat{\beta} \bar{x}, \frac{S_{xy}}{S_{xx}}, \frac{1}{n} \sum (y_i - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} x_i)^2 \right)$$

&  $\hat{\varphi}_s = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\sigma}^2) = \left( \bar{y}, \frac{1}{n} \sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2 \right)$

So find  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{obs}} = -2 \left( \ell(\hat{\varphi}_s | y) - \ell(\hat{\varphi} | y) \right)$

& compare with a  $\chi^2_1$  random variable.













