



Mean square law of large numbers

Asked 3 years, 9 months ago Active 3 years, 9 months ago Viewed 514 times



I have the following line in my notes (which I believe is flawed):

1

$$E\left[(\hat{\mu}(N) - \mu)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu)\right)^2\right] = \frac{\sigma^2}{N}$$



I think the error is in brackets, $\frac{1}{N}$ is not multiplied by $\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu)$, but only: $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i$, since $\hat{\mu}$ is defined as the sample mean: $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$.

1

But even given that (and supposing that I am correct), I cannot arrive at the required result of σ^2/N .

This is what I get:

$$E\left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i - \mu\right)^2\right] = \frac{1}{N^2} E\left[\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2\right] - \frac{2\mu}{N} E\left[\sum_{i=1}^N x_i\right] + \mu^2$$

EDIT:

If I have i.i.d RV's with finite mean, then can I develop the above by saying the following:

$E[X] = \langle X \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$ and $E[X^2] = \langle X^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2$, therefore I have

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i - \mu\right)^2\right] &= \frac{1}{N^2} E\left[\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2\right] - \frac{2\mu}{N} E\left[\sum_{i=1}^N x_i\right] + \mu^2 = \frac{1}{N} \langle X^2 \rangle - \langle X \rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} (\langle X^2 \rangle - \langle X \rangle^2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{N} \end{aligned}$$

probability

edited Jan 13 '16 at 15:16

asked Jan 13 '16 at 14:40



i squared - Keep it Real

1,681 1 13 35



Your edit uses some notation that is new to me. May I ask you what $\langle \cdot \rangle$ means in your example? – N. Wouda Jan 13 '16 at 15:20

It is the physics notation for mean – [i squared - Keep it Real](#) Jan 13 '16 at 15:21

- 1 Yes, got it. I was a bit confused, since you seem use μ and $\langle X \rangle$ interchangeably. I should note that $E[X] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$ is an asymptotic result (that is, $E[X] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$). – [N. Wouda](#) Jan 13 '16 at 15:31

2 Answers



The trick is a clever grouping of terms:

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i) - \mu \right)^2 \right] &= E \left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} E \left[\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N (x_i - \mu)(x_j - \mu) \right] \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{N} + \frac{1}{N^2} E \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N (x_i - \mu)(x_j - \mu) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Now, why is the last term zero?

What we have really shown here is two basic facts:

- The variance of a sum of uncorrelated variables is the sum of the variances.
- The variance of αX is $\alpha^2 \text{Var}(X)$, if $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

This technique can also be used to prove that the expected value of $\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \hat{\mu}(N))^2$ is $(N-1)\sigma^2$ (which explains the somewhat mysterious $N-1$ in the standard formula for the sample variance).

edited Jan 13 '16 at 15:14



JnxF

1,101

1

8

22

answered Jan 13 '16 at 14:50



lan

72k

2

57

105

can you quickly check my edit please – [i squared - Keep it Real](#) Jan 13 '16 at 15:17

- @isquared-KeepitReal There are some notational problems: for instance you've replaced expected value with sample mean, when they are different. What you really mean to say is that $E \left[\sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N E[X_i] = NE[X]$ and similarly $E \left[\sum_{i=1}^N X_i^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N E[X_i^2] = NE[X^2]$. This same point was made in a comment on the OP. – [lan](#) Jan 13 '16 at 16:27



The secret to the middle expression is simple: if you add together N copies of the exact same quantity, you get N times the original quantity.



$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mu = N\mu.$$

So if we take $\frac{1}{N}$ of the sum, we get back the original quantity:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \frac{1}{N} (N\mu) = \mu.$$

Now combine this with the already-known formula for $\hat{\mu}(N)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}(N) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i, \\ \hat{\mu}(N) - \mu &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i - \mu \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \mu \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now apply the well-known fact that $\sum_{i=1}^N a_i - \sum_{i=1}^N b_i = \sum_{i=1}^N (a_i - b_i)$. That is, instead of adding up all the x_i s and then subtracting off the sum of all the μ s in that order, pair off each x_i with one of the μ s that we are going to subtract:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N x_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu).$$

Therefore

$$\hat{\mu}(N) - \mu = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \mu \right) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu).$$

The first equals sign in your question is simply taking the expectation of the square of the quantity on both sides of an equation.

This is a somewhat long-winded way of showing how the first equals sign in Ian's answer works. Follow that answer for the rest of the derivation.

edited Jan 13 '16 at 15:29

answered Jan 13 '16 at 15:21



David K

60.8k 4 48 137

