

# STATS3100A - Lecture 10

Dominik Rothenhaeusler  
Scribed by Michael Howes

10/20/21

## Contents

1	Announcements	1
2	Minimaxity and limits of Bayes estimators	1
3	Randomized estimators	2
4	“Boosting” via submodel restrictions	3

## 1 Announcements

- No new homework this week.
- Last years midterm+solutions are on Canvas.
- Midterm review session Monday 6pm on Zoom.
- Midterm in one week time. Midterm is open book and 90 minutes long.
- The relevant content is everything up to and including today.

## 2 Minimaxity and limits of Bayes estimators

Recall that if a Bayes estimator  $\delta_\Lambda$  has constant risk, then  $\delta_\Lambda$  is minimax.

**Example 1.** Suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is known and  $L(\theta, d) = (\theta - d)^2$ . We have seen that  $\bar{X}$  has constant risk but it cannot be the Bayes estimator for any proper prior since it is unbiased. One can show that  $\bar{X}$  is a generalized Bayes estimator w.r.t. the improper prior  $\pi(\theta) = 1$ . We wish to show that  $\bar{X}$  is minimax. To do this we will look at limits of Bayes estimators

**Definition 1.** Let  $(\Lambda_m)_{m=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of priors with  $r_{\Lambda_m} := \inf_\delta r(\Lambda_m, \delta)$ . The sequence  $(\Lambda_m)$  is called *least favourable* if  $r_{\Lambda_m} \rightarrow r$  and  $r \geq r_{\Lambda'}$  for all priors  $\Lambda'$ .

**Theorem 1.** [TPE 5.1.12] Suppose  $(\Lambda_m)$  is a sequence of priors with  $r_{\Lambda_m} \rightarrow r < \infty$ . Let  $\delta$  be an estimator such that  $\sup_\theta R(\theta, \delta) = r$ . Then  $\delta$  is minimax and  $(\Lambda_m)$  is least favourable.

*Proof.* Let  $\delta'$  be an estimator. We know that

$$\sup_\theta R(\theta, \delta') \geq \int_\Omega R(\theta, \delta') d\Lambda_m \geq r_{\Lambda_m}.$$

Letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  we can conclude that

$$\sup_{\theta} R(\theta, \delta') \geq r = \sup_{\theta} R(\theta, \delta).$$

Thus  $\delta$  is minimax. Now let  $\Lambda'$  be a prior. We know that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\Lambda'} &\leq \int_{\Omega} R(\theta, \delta) d\Lambda' \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta} R(\theta, \delta) \\ &= r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $(\Lambda_m)$  is least favourable. □

**Example 2.** Returning to our example with  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\theta, \sigma^2)$  and  $L(\theta, d) = (\theta - d)^2$ . Consider the prior  $\Lambda_m \sim N(0, m^2)$ . We have seen that

$$\Theta|X \sim N\left(\frac{\frac{n}{\sigma^2}}{\frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{m^2}} \bar{X}, \frac{1}{\frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{m^2}}\right).$$

Thus  $\delta_{\Lambda_m} = \frac{n}{\sigma^2} \frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{m^2} \bar{X}$  is the posterior mean and hence the Bayes estimator for  $\Lambda_m$ . Note that  $\delta_{\Lambda_n}(X)$  is the mean of  $\Theta|X$  and thus

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\Lambda_m} &= \mathbb{E}[L(\Theta, \delta_{\Lambda_m}(X))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\Theta - \delta_{\Lambda_n}(X))^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(\Theta - \delta_{\Lambda_n}(x))^2 | X = x]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(\Theta | X = x)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\frac{n}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{m^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  we have  $r_{\Lambda_m} \rightarrow \frac{\sigma^2}{n} = R(\theta, \bar{X})$ . Thus  $\bar{X}$  is minimax.

### 3 Randomized estimators

Recall that a randomized estimator is one of the form  $\delta(X, U)$  where  $U \sim \text{Unif}([0, 1])$  and  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp X$ . This is in contrast to estimators of the form  $\delta(X)$  which are deterministic functions of the data. We saw that for convex loss functions we can ignore randomized estimators since by Jensen's inequality

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta} L(\theta, \delta(X, U)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\theta} L(\theta, \mathbb{E}[\delta(X, U) | X]) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta} L(\theta, \eta(X)).$$

For non-convex loss functions the minimax estimator may be randomized.

**Example 3.** Consider  $X$  a binomial random variable with parameters  $(n, \theta)$  where  $n$  is fixed and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ . Consider the 0-1 loss

$$L(\theta, d) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |d - \theta| < \alpha, \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

If  $\delta$  is a non-randomized estimator,  $\delta$  can take at most  $n + 1$  values. For  $\alpha < \frac{1}{2(n+1)}$ , there exists  $\theta_0$  such that  $|\delta(x) - \theta_0| \geq \alpha$  for all  $x$  and thus the worst case risk of  $\delta$  is 1. Consider  $\delta'(X, U) = U$ . For every  $\theta$ ,

$$R(\theta, \delta') = \mathbb{P}(|U - \theta| \geq \alpha) \leq 1 - \alpha.$$

Thus the worst case risk of  $\delta'$  is  $1 - \alpha < 1$ .

## 4 “Boosting” via submodel restrictions

Consider  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(\theta, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  and  $\theta$  are both unknown but  $\sigma^2 \leq B_0$ . Consider squared error loss  $L(\theta, d) = (\theta - d)^2$ . Is  $\bar{X}$  minimax? To prove this we need to show that

$$\sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 \leq B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \delta) \geq \sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 \leq B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \bar{X}),$$

where  $\delta$  is any estimator. We know that

$$\sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 \leq B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \bar{X}) = \sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 \leq B_0} \frac{\sigma^2}{n} = \frac{B_0}{n}.$$

Thus (and this is crucial)

$$\sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 \leq B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \bar{X}) = \sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 = B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \bar{X}).$$

We know that for fixed variance  $\bar{X}$  is minimax. Thus for any estimator  $\delta$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 \leq B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \delta) &\geq \sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 = B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \delta) \\ &\geq \sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 = B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \bar{X}) \\ &= \sup_{\theta, \sigma^2 \leq B_0} R((\theta, \sigma^2), \bar{X}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\bar{X}$  is minimax. Formalizing this example, we have:

**Lemma 1.** [TPE 5.1.15] *If  $\delta$  is minimax for a submodel  $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$  and  $\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} R(\theta, \delta) = \sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} R(\theta, \delta)$ , then  $\delta$  is minimax for the full model  $\Omega$ .*

*Proof.* This is the same argument we saw in the example. For any estimator  $\delta'$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Omega} R(\theta, \delta') &\geq \sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} R(\theta, \delta') \\ &\geq \sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0} R(\theta, \delta) \\ &= \sup_{\theta \in \Omega} R(\theta, \delta) \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Example 4** (Non-parametric). Suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F$ , where  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  has mean  $\mu(F)$  and variance  $\sigma^2(F) < B$ . Our goal is to estimate  $\mu(F)$  under  $L(F, d) = (\mu(F) - d)^2$ . We wish to show that the minimax estimator is  $\delta(X) = \bar{X}$ . We know that  $\bar{X}$  is minimax on the submodel  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{N(\theta, \sigma^2) : \sigma^2 \leq B\}$ . On the full model  $\mathcal{F}$ , the estimator  $\bar{X}$  has risk  $R(F, \bar{X}) = \frac{\sigma^2(F)}{n} \leq \frac{B}{n}$ . Thus we have

$$\sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_0} R(F, \bar{X}) = \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} R(F, \bar{X}).$$

Thus by boosting,  $\bar{X}$  is sufficient on the full model.

**Example 5** (Another non-parametric example). Now suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of all distributions with support on  $[0, 1]$ . Again we will do estimation with squared error loss  $L(F, d) = (\mu(F) - d)^2$ . Suppose  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{F}$ . Consider the submodel  $\mathcal{F}_0$  of all Bernoulli distributions with parameter  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . We have seen that in this setting the minimax estimator is

$$\delta_n(X) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}}{n + \sqrt{n}}.$$

By studying the risk of  $\delta_n$  on the full model we can show that  $\delta_n$  is minimax on  $\mathcal{F}$ .