

Stat 2911 Lecture Notes

Class 14, 2017

Uri Keich

© Uri Keich, The University of  
Sydney

Standard error of an estimator,  
Estimated standard error or MSE,  
Studying estimators: Poisson, HW  
problem estimators (Rice 8.4, 8.5)

# Class Reps!

Initially, given a single sample  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  from a dist.  $F(\theta)$  we estimate  $\theta$  by  $\hat{\theta} = \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , e.g.,  $\hat{\theta} = \bar{x}$ .

To compare estimators we need to consider all possible samples, which we do by studying the RV

$$\Theta = \varphi(\bar{X}_1, \dots, \bar{X}_n),$$

where  $\bar{X}_1, \dots, \bar{X}_n$ , is now a random sample from  $F(\theta)$ , e.g.  $\Theta = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n \bar{X}_i$ .

An estimator is unbiased if  $E(\Theta) = \theta$ .

The quality of an estimator can be measured by

$$MSE(\Theta) = E(\Theta - \theta)^2 = V(\Theta) + (E(\Theta) - \theta)^2.$$

## Examples

i)  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are ind. Bernoulli( $\theta$ ) RVs.

$$\Theta = \hat{\theta}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n X_i \quad (\text{strictly speaking, } \Theta = \Theta(n))$$

is an unbiased estimator.

$$E(\Theta) = \theta$$

$$MSE(\hat{\theta}_n) = V(\hat{\theta}_n) = \frac{\theta(1-\theta)}{n} \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

Def. The standard deviation of an  $L^2$ -RV  $\bar{X}$  is

$$\sigma_{\bar{X}} = \sqrt{V(\bar{X})}.$$

The standard error of an estimator  $\hat{\Theta}$  is its standard deviation:

$$\sigma_{\hat{\Theta}} = \sqrt{V(\hat{\Theta})}.$$

Example. For the Bernoulli( $\theta$ ) estimator  $\hat{\Theta} = \bar{X}$ ,

$$\sigma_{\hat{\Theta}} = \sqrt{\frac{\theta(1-\theta)}{n}}.$$

The std. error is often unknown, hence we introduce the estimated standard error, where the unknown  $\theta$  is replaced with its estimate.

Example. Bernoulli( $\theta$ ), with  $\hat{\Theta} = \bar{X}$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\Theta}} = \sqrt{\frac{\bar{X}(1-\bar{X})}{n}}$$

Unsurprisingly (why?)  $\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\Theta}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$  so in some sense  $\hat{\Theta}_n \rightarrow \theta$ . Can we make it more precise?

Recall: a sequence of RVs  $Y_n$  converges to the RV  $Y$  in probability, if  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$P(|Y_n - Y| > \varepsilon) \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

Def. An estimator  $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}_n$  is *consistent* if  $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{n} \theta$  in prob. ( $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ ,  $P(|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta| > \varepsilon) \xrightarrow{n} 0$ )

Claim. If  $MSE(\hat{\theta}_n) \xrightarrow{n} 0$  then  $\hat{\theta}$  is a consistent estimator.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} P(|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta| \geq \varepsilon) &= P((\hat{\theta}_n - \theta)^2 \geq \varepsilon^2) \\ &\stackrel{Q}{\leq} \frac{E(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta)^2}{\varepsilon^2} \\ &= \frac{MSE(\hat{\theta}_n)}{\varepsilon^2} \xrightarrow{n} 0 \end{aligned}$$

Cor.  $\hat{\theta}_n = \bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  is an unbiased and consistent estimator of  $\theta$  for the Bernoulli( $\theta$ ) dist.

Proof. We showed that  $MSE(\hat{\theta}_n) \xrightarrow{n} 0$ .

Does this ring a bell?

WLLN:  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n \bar{X}_i \xrightarrow{n} \theta$

2)  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  are ind. Poisson( $\theta$ ) RVs.

$$\hat{\theta} = \bar{X} \quad (\text{MLE, or moment})$$

$$\Rightarrow E(\hat{\theta}) = E(\bar{X}) =$$

$\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}$  is estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}_n) &= \text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_n) = V(\bar{X})/n \\ &= \theta/n \xrightarrow{n} \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_n$  is estimator

The std. error of  $\hat{\theta}$  is

$$\sqrt{\theta/n}$$

and the estimated std. error is

$$\sqrt{\bar{X}/n}$$

Similarly, we can estimate the MSE as

$$\widehat{\text{MSE}}(\hat{\theta}) = \bar{X}/n$$

## Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium

AA    Aa    aa

Model:  $\underline{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3) \sim \text{multinomial}(n; (1-\theta)^2, 2\theta(1-\theta), \theta^2)$

Data:  $n = 1029$      $X_1 = 342$      $X_2 = 500$      $X_3 = 187$

Goal: estimate  $\theta$ , the frequency of the minor allele.

Moment estimator:  $\hat{\theta} = \sqrt{\frac{X_3}{n}}$  our case  $\approx \sqrt{\frac{187}{1029}} \approx 0.4263$

MLE (also moment):  $\hat{\theta} = \frac{X_2 + 2X_3}{2n}$  our case  $\approx 0.4247$

Intuitively,  $\hat{\theta}$  is better because it uses all available data.

To further study these estimators we disregard our specific sample and consider the multinomial random vector  $\underline{X}$  above to define

$$\tilde{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}_n = \sqrt{\frac{X_3}{n}} \quad \hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}_n = \frac{X_2 + 2X_3}{2n}$$

Are these estimators consistent / unbiased?

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) &= E\left(\frac{X_2 + 2X_3}{2n}\right) \\ &= \theta \quad (\text{we did this calculation}) \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}$  is unbiased

$$E(\hat{\theta}) = E\left(\sqrt{\frac{\bar{x}_3}{n}}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^n \sqrt{k/n} \binom{n}{k} (\theta^2)^k (1-\theta^2)^{n-k}$$

$\bar{X}_3 \sim$

=?

Example: choose  $\theta^2 = 1/2$  then  $\theta = 1/\sqrt{2} \approx 0.7071$

$n :$	10	1000
$E(\hat{\theta}) :$	0.6971	0.7070

This shows that  $\hat{\theta}$  is <sup>but also suggests</sup> biased but also suggests that the bias diminishes as the sample size,  $n$ , grows.

More important is the MSE.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) &= V(\hat{\theta}) \\
 &= V\left(\frac{X_2 + 2X_3}{2n}\right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{4n^2} \left[ V(X_2) + 4V(X_3) + \underbrace{2\text{Cov}(X_2, 2X_3)}_{4\text{Cov}(X_2, X_3)} \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$V(X_2) = n p_2 (1-p_2) \quad \text{where } p_2 = 2\theta(1-\theta)$$

$$V(X_3) = n p_3 (1-p_3) \quad \therefore p_3 = \theta^2$$

$$\text{Cov}(X_2, X_3) = -n p_2 p_3 \quad (\text{tutorial problem})$$

algebra

$$\Rightarrow \text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}_n) = \frac{1}{2n} \theta(1-\theta) \xrightarrow{n}$$

$\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}$  is estimator.

The standard error of  $\hat{\theta}$  is:  $S_{\hat{\theta}} = \sqrt{V(\hat{\theta})} = \sqrt{\theta(1-\theta)/2n}$

The actual values of  $S_{\hat{\theta}}$  and  $\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta})$  depend on the unknown  $\theta$ . Instead we can:

$$(i) \text{ plug in } \hat{\theta} = \frac{X_2 + 2X_3}{2n} \approx 0.4247 \Rightarrow \widehat{\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta})} \approx 1.187 \times 10^{-4}$$

(ii) use  $\theta(1-\theta) \leq \frac{1}{4}$  to get

$$\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2n} \theta(1-\theta) \leq \frac{1}{8n}$$

Plugging in  $n=1029$  yields

$$\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) \leq 1.25 \times 10^{-4}$$

(greater than the estimated MSE)

$$\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) = E[(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2] = E[(\sqrt{\bar{X}_3/n} - \theta)^2]$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^n (\sqrt{\bar{X}_3/n} - \theta)^2 \binom{n}{k} (\theta^2)^k (1-\theta^2)^{n-k}$$

$\bar{X}_3 \sim \text{Binom}(n, \theta^2)$

Like in the case of  $E(\hat{\theta})$ , we can compute this expression numerically for a given value of  $\theta$ . Before though, note the MSE can be simplified a little:

$$\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) = E(\hat{\theta}^2) - 2\theta E(\hat{\theta}) + \theta^2$$

Recall that  $\hat{\theta} = \sqrt{\bar{X}_3/n}$ , so  $\hat{\theta}^2 = \bar{X}_3/n$ .

$$\Rightarrow E(\hat{\theta}^2) = E(\bar{X}_3)/n = \theta^2$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) = 2\theta^2 - 2\theta E(\hat{\theta})$$

$$= -2\theta \underbrace{[E(\hat{\theta}) - \theta]}_{\text{bias}}$$

(this shows the bias is  $\leq 0$ ; specific sample?)

We can't compute the MSE but we can estimate it:

<u>plugged-in <math>\theta</math></u>	<u><math>E(\hat{\theta})</math></u>	<u><math>\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta})</math></u>
$\hat{\theta} = \sqrt{\bar{X}_3/n} \approx 0.4263$	$\approx 0.4261$	$\approx 1.996 \times 10^{-4}$
$\hat{\theta} = \frac{x_2 + 2x_3}{2n} \approx 0.4247$	$\approx 0.4245$	$\approx 1.998 \times 10^{-4}$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta})}{\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta})} \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{our} \\ \text{data} \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} 1.6769 \\ 1.6814 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} \theta = \hat{\theta} = \sqrt{\bar{X}_3/n} \\ \theta = \hat{\theta} = \frac{x_2 + 2x_3}{2n} \end{array}$$

which estimator is better? What if our  $\theta$ -estimation is off?

Suppose we can show that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ :

$$\frac{\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}_n)}{\text{MSE}(\tilde{\theta}_n)} \geq \frac{3}{2} \quad (1)$$

In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}_{\frac{n}{3}}) &= \frac{\theta(1-\theta)}{2\left(\frac{n}{3}\right)} \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \frac{\theta(1-\theta)}{2n} \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}_n) \\ &\leq \text{MSE}(\tilde{\theta}_n)\end{aligned}$$

Cor. Using  $\frac{n}{3}$  of the sample size,  $\hat{\theta}$  has, on average, a smaller error than  $\tilde{\theta}$ ! It can reduce the error without increasing the sample size.

That is,  $\hat{\theta}$  is a more **efficient** estimator.

Unfortunately, we can't exactly show (1) and, in fact, it is false when  $\theta \approx 1$ : it isn't hard to show that  $\tilde{\theta} \approx \hat{\theta}$  in that case.

We can however show that (1) holds for any  $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$  and any "sufficiently large"  $n$ .