

EdX and its Members use cookies and other tracking technologies for performance, analytics, and marketing purposes. By using this website, you accept this use. Learn more about these technologies in the [Privacy Policy](#).



[Course](#) > [Unit 3 Methods of Estimation](#) > [Likelihood Estimation](#) > [Lecture 9: Introduction to Maximum Likelihood Estimation](#) > [12. Examples of Maximum Likelihood Estimators](#)

Currently enrolled in **Audit Track** (expires December 25, 2019) [Upgrade \(\\$300\)](#)

12. Examples of Maximum Likelihood Estimators

Note: The following problem will be presented in lecture (at the bottom of this page), but we encourage you to attempt it first.

Maximum Likelihood Estimator of a Bernoulli Statistical Model I

3/3 points (graded)

In the next two problems, you will compute the MLE (maximum likelihood estimator) associated to a Bernoulli statistical model.

Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Ber}(p^*)$ for some unknown $p^* \in (0, 1)$. You construct the associated statistical model $(\{0, 1\}, \{\text{Ber}(p)\}_{p \in (0, 1)})$. Let L_n denote the likelihood of this statistical model. Recall that in the fourth problem "Likelihood of a Bernoulli Statistical Model" from two slides ago that you derived the formula

$$L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) = \prod_{i=1}^n p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i} = p^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} (1-p)^{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}.$$

Oftentimes for computing the MLE it is more convenient to work with and optimize the **log-likelihood** $\ell(p) := \ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p)$.

The derivative of the log-likelihood can be written

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p} \ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) = A/p - (n - A)/B$$

where A can be expressed in terms of $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ and B can be expressed in terms of p . Fill in the blanks with the appropriate values for A and B

(Enter **Sigma_n** for entire sum $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$).

$A =$ ✓ Answer: Sigma_n

Σ_n

$B =$ ✓ Answer: 1-p

$1 - p$

For which p does $\frac{\partial}{\partial p} \ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) = 0$? Denote this critical point by \hat{p} .

☐ $\hat{p} = 0$

☐ $\hat{p} = 1$

☐ $\hat{p} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$

☒ $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$



STANDARD NOTATION

Solution:

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) &= \ln \left(p^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} (1-p)^{n-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \ln p + \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \ln(1-p).\end{aligned}$$

Taking the derivative with respect to p ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p} \ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{p} - \frac{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{1-p}.$$

We set this to be 0 and solve for p :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{p} - \frac{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{1-p} &= 0 \Leftrightarrow \\ \frac{(1-p) \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - p(n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)}{p(1-p)} &= 0 \Leftrightarrow \\ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - np}{p(1-p)} &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since the derivative blows up at $p = 0, 1$, we can assume $0 < p < 1$ and ignore the denominator for the purpose of solving for p . Hence $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ is the unique critical point of the log-likelihood.

Submit

You have used 1 of 2 attempts

i Answers are displayed within the problem

Maximum Likelihood Estimator of a Bernoulli Statistical Model: Second Derivative Test

5/5 points (graded)

Setup:

As above, let $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Ber}(p^*)$ for some unknown $p^* \in (0, 1)$. You construct the associated statistical model $(\{0, 1\}, \{\text{Ber}(p)\}_{p \in (0, 1)})$. Let L_n denote the likelihood of this statistical model. Recall from a previous problem that

$$L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) = \prod_{i=1}^n p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i} = p^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} (1-p)^{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}.$$

As stated, it will be more convenient to work with the **log-likelihood** $\ell(p) = \ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p)$.

Question:

Next we will do the second derivative test to see if the critical point \hat{p} obtained from the previous question is a local maximum. The second derivative of the log-likelihood can be written

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2} \ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) = -\frac{C}{p^2} - \frac{n - C}{D}$$

where C depends on $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ and D depends on p . Fill in the blanks with the correct values of C and D .

(Type **Sigma_n** for the entire sum $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$)

$C =$

Sigma_n

✓ Answer: Sigma_n

Σ_n

$D =$

(1-p)^2

✓ Answer: (1-p)^2

$(1-p)^2$

Next we will test the endpoints of our optimization problem. Fill in the blanks with the correct values:

(Note that here we are working with the **likelihood**, *not* the **log-likelihood**)

$$L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, 0) =$$

0

✔ Answer: 0.0

$$L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, 1) =$$

0

✔ Answer: 0.0

What is the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) \hat{p}_n^{MLE} for the true parameter p^* ?

☐ 0

☐ 1

☐ $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$
☒ $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$


Solution:

The second derivative is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{p} - \frac{n - \sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{1-p} \right) = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{p^2} - \frac{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{(1-p)^2}.$$

Since this expression is always negative, this implies that the critical point \hat{p} is a **local maximum**.

Testing the endpoints we see

$$L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, 0) = 0^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} (1)^{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} = 0$$

$$L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, 1) = 1^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} (0)^{n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i} = 0$$

Since the likelihood is non-negative, the endpoints are actually **global minima**.

Hence, the global maximum is achieved at $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$. Plugging in the random variables X_1, \dots, X_n , we derive the MLE

$$\hat{p}_n^{MLE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

which is precisely the **sample mean**.

Remark 1: This problem illustrates the conceptually nice fact that the **maximum likelihood estimator** for a Bernoulli statistical model is the **sample mean**.

Remark 2: Note that for this problem, we derived the maximum likelihood estimator by optimizing $\ln L_n$ treating x_1, \dots, x_n as abstract variables. At the end, we plugged in our random samples X_1, \dots, X_n . In practice, we would have access to observations $X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_n = x_n$, and we can simply plug in x_1, \dots, x_n for the values of X_1, \dots, X_n in the expression for the MLE to get our estimate of the true parameter.

Remark 3: Alternatively, to get the estimate for p^* , we can first plug in the observations $X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_n = x_n$ and then optimize the log-likelihood $\ln L_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, p)$ as a function of p . You will get the same answer either way.

Submit

You have used 2 of 3 attempts

i Answers are displayed within the problem

Exponential: $L(x_1, \dots, x_n, \lambda) = \lambda^n \exp(-\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)$

Uniform: $L(x_1, \dots, x_n, b) = \frac{1}{b^n} \mathbb{1}(\max_i x_i \leq b)$

$\ln l(p) = \ln L(x_1, \dots, x_n, p) = \ln p \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \ln \left(\frac{1-p}{p} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)$
 $l'(p) = \frac{1}{p} S_n - \frac{1}{1-p} (n - S_n)$
 $l''(p) = -\frac{1}{p^2} S_n - \frac{1}{(1-p)^2} (n - S_n) \leq 0 \quad \text{-- } l \text{ concave}$
 $n \cdot l'(p) = \dots$
 $S_n = \frac{1}{1-p} (n - S_n)$
 $\hat{p}(n) = \hat{p}(n - S_n) \Rightarrow \hat{p} n = S_n \Rightarrow \hat{p} = \frac{S_n}{n}$

$\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \end{pmatrix}$
 $-l(\theta) = -\theta_1^2 - 2\theta_2^2$
 $\nabla l(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} -2\theta_1 \\ -4\theta_2 \end{bmatrix}$
 $H l(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & -4 \end{bmatrix}$
 $-2\theta = 0$
 $-4\theta = 0$

▶ 1.50x 🔊 🔗 CC “

Transcripts

Download SubRip (.srt) file

Discussion

[Hide Discussion](#)

Topic: Unit 3 Methods of Estimation:Lecture 9: Introduction to Maximum Likelihood Estimation / 12. Examples of Maximum Likelihood Estimators

[Add a Post](#)

Show all posts ▼

by recent activity ▼

? [\[STAFF\] Clarification required on diagonal of hessian](#)

This statement from the professor " More generally, if you want to disprove the fact that it's the hessian of a concave function, you have to just exhibit an x such that the x tra...

3 ▼

💬 [The result of \$h''\(p\)\$ when \$S_n = n\$](#)

2 ▼

💬 [Don't think solution to second problem is technically correct even if it's easy to infer the intent.](#)

The answer has a calculation with powers that doesn't seem to be correct in a certain trivial case and it seems the likelihood would be different then wouldn't it?

2 ▼

Audit Access Expires Dec 24, 2019

You lose all access to this course, including your progress, on Dec 24, 2019.

Upgrade by Nov 4, 2019 to get unlimited access to the course as long as it exists on the site. [Upgrade now](#)

[Learn About Verified Certificates](#)

© All Rights Reserved