

9.23.) a)

Note: among  $\theta^2$ ,  $\sigma^2$  which  $\theta^2$  is S.P.

MLE of  $\theta^2$ :

$$L(\theta, \theta) = (2\pi\theta^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2\theta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i)^2\right]$$

$$\ell(\theta, \theta) = -\frac{n}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2} \ln(\theta^2) - \frac{1}{2\theta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2$$

$$\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta^2} = -\frac{n}{2\theta^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(x_i)^2}{\theta^2} \right) \right] = -\frac{n}{2\theta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\theta^2} \left[ \frac{1}{\theta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right] = \frac{n}{2\theta^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_{MLE}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2$$

Is  $\hat{\theta}_{MLE}$  biased?

$$E[\hat{\theta}^2] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E(x_i^2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Var(x_i) + E(x_i)^2$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Var(x_i) + \theta^2 = \frac{n\theta^2}{n} = \theta^2$$

Thus  $\hat{\theta}_{MLE}$  is unbiased.

(a) (15pt)

9.28) b.) Let  $\sigma^2 = \theta$  and  $x_i^2$  is unbiased for  $\theta$

$$l(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2\theta} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\theta} : \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$\ell'(\theta) = -\frac{1}{2\theta^2} + \frac{\sum x_i^2}{2\theta^2} : (\theta, 0)$$

$$\Sigma(\theta) = -E[\ell'(\theta)] = -E\left[-\frac{1}{2\theta^2} + \frac{\sum x_i^2}{2\theta^2}\right] = \frac{1}{2\theta^2}$$

$$= \frac{n}{2\theta^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2\theta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right] =$$

$$\text{CRLB: } V_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) \geq \frac{1}{n \cdot \frac{1}{2\theta^2}} = \frac{2\theta^4}{n^2} =$$

$$\text{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2\right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(x_i^2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 2\theta^2 = 2\theta^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \cdot 2n\theta^2 = \frac{2\theta^2}{n} = \frac{2\theta^2}{n}$$

Therefore it achieves the CRLB and is unbiased, thus it is a UMVUE

704 Hw 5

1.) BE.)  $q_2(1) \cdot ((q-1)q)T = 2400 \quad (\lambda = 15)$

a.) CRLB =  $\left[ T'(p) \right]^2 \quad T'(p) = 1$   
 $n I(p) \cdot (q-1)q = (q-1) \cdot n$

$$I(p) = \frac{d}{dp^2} \ln f(x_i, p) = -E \left[ \frac{1}{p} \left( \frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^x \left( \frac{1-p}{p} \right)^{q-x} \right) \right]$$

$$= E \left[ \frac{d}{dp^2} \left[ \frac{1}{p} \left( \frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^x + (1-q) \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^{q-x} \right) \right] \right]$$

$$= -E \left[ \frac{d}{dp} \left[ \frac{1}{p} \left( \frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^x \right) \right] \right]$$

$$= -E \left[ \frac{-x}{p^2} \left( \frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^{x-1} \right) \right] \quad (\text{with } x=1, \dots, n) \quad (\lambda)$$

$$= \left[ \frac{x}{p^2} \right]_{x=1}^{x=n} = \left[ \frac{n+1}{p^2} \right] = \left[ \frac{1}{p^2} \right]$$

$$\frac{1}{p^2} \cdot (1-p^n) \approx x \cdot n \lambda \quad \lambda = 15 \cdot \frac{1}{n} =$$

$$\Rightarrow CRLB \approx \frac{1}{n \left( \frac{1}{p^2} \right)} = \frac{n p (1-p)}{n} = \left[ \frac{1}{p^2} \right]$$

$$(q-1)q \approx (q-1)q^n \cdot \frac{1}{n^2} =$$

$$9.21.) b) \text{ CRLB} = \left[ T(p(1-p)) \right]$$

$$\text{also, } I(p) = \frac{1}{p(1-p)} (q)^{-n}$$

$$T'(p(1-p)) = \frac{1}{p(1-p)} (p - p^2) = 1 - 2p$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{CRLB} = \frac{(1-2p)}{n \left( \frac{1}{p(1-p)} \right)} = \frac{p(1-p)(1-2p)}{n}$$

c.) Consider the sample mean  $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$

$$\begin{aligned} E[\bar{X}] &= E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E[X_i] = \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \cdot np = p, \text{ Thus } \bar{X} \text{ is unbiased} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Var}[\bar{X}] = \text{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot np(1-p) = \frac{p(1-p)}{n}$$

Thus  $\bar{X}$  attains the CRLB, thus it is a UMVUE

$$9.26.) \text{ a)} L(x, \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x_i/\theta} \quad (\text{W. (dS.)})$$

$$l(x, \theta) = -n \ln(\theta)$$

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{n}{\theta} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \theta = n \bar{x} = (1/n) \sum x_i$$

Since the derivative is  $-\frac{n}{\theta}$ , and  $l(x, \theta) = -\ln(\theta)$   
 with  $L(x, \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta^n} \prod x_i \stackrel{\text{this likelihood is maxima}}{\rightarrow}$

by  $\bar{x}_{\text{min}}$ , the maximum statistic.

$$b.) \text{ Min}_{\theta} \left( \frac{1}{\theta} \right)^n = \frac{1}{\theta} \times \frac{n}{\theta} =$$

$$\bar{E}(X) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x \frac{1}{\theta} \theta x = \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \theta =$$

$$\text{and } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \stackrel{\text{law}}{\sim} \frac{\theta}{2} \Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \frac{2}{n} \sum x_i + \text{const}$$

Q.26.) c.) The PDF of the minimum of  $n$  iid r.v.s.

$$F_{X_{\min}}(x) = \left(\frac{x}{\theta}\right)^n$$

$$(0 < x < \theta)$$

$$f_{X_{\min}}(x) = \frac{1}{\theta^n} n x^{n-1}$$

$$\theta = \frac{\theta}{\theta} = \frac{1}{\theta}$$

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \int_0^\theta x f_{X_{\min}}(x) dx = \int_0^\theta x \frac{n}{\theta^n} n x^{n-1} dx = \frac{n}{\theta^n} \int_0^\theta x^n dx$$

$$= \frac{n}{\theta^n} \int_0^\theta x^n dx = \frac{n}{n+1} \left(\frac{x}{\theta}\right)^{n+1} \Big|_0^\theta$$

$$= \frac{n}{n+1} \theta \left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right)^{n+1} = \frac{n}{n+1} \theta^{-n-1}$$

Note that  $\frac{n}{n+1} \theta \neq \theta$ , Thus  $X_{\min}$  is biased

$$Q. 26.) d) E[2\bar{X}_n] = \frac{2}{n} E[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i]$$

$$= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E[X_i] = \frac{2}{n} (\frac{n}{2})$$

$$= \theta$$

Thus  $\bar{\theta}$  is unbiased.

$$Q. 26.) e.) \text{ The MSE of } \bar{\theta}, \quad \text{Ans} = \frac{1}{n}$$

$$E((X_{min} - \theta)^2)$$

will be larger than

MSE of  $\hat{\theta}$

$$E((\hat{\theta}_{\text{min}} - \theta)^2)$$

is because  $\hat{\theta}$  is biased and  $\bar{\theta}$  is unbiased

$$\frac{\bar{X}}{S} = \frac{X_{(1)}}{S} \text{ with std } (d)$$

9.31) a)  $\hat{\theta} = X_{\min}$  (stating that the  $E(\hat{\theta})$  is the limit at  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (using the law of large numbers))  $\Rightarrow$   $E(\hat{\theta})$  is unbiased  $\Rightarrow$   $\hat{\theta}$  is asymptotically unbiased

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\hat{\theta}_{\min}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \theta = \theta, \text{ thus by Defn. 9.4.3 } \hat{\theta} \text{ is}$$

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{\min}) = E(\hat{\theta}_{\min}^2) - E(\hat{\theta}_{\min})^2$$

$$E(\hat{\theta}_{\min}^2) = \left( \frac{1}{n+1} x^{n+1} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{n+1} \left( \frac{n+1}{n+2} \theta \right)^{n+2} = \frac{\theta^2}{n+2}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{\min}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+2} \theta^2 - \left( \frac{1}{n+1} \theta \right)^2 = 0$$

Thus  $\hat{\theta}$  is asymptotically unbiased as well.

Thus by Theorem 9.4.1, since it is asymptotically unbiased

and  $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{\min}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\hat{\theta}$  is MSE consistent

for  $\theta$  as  $\hat{\theta}$  is not even at stating that we know nothing about  $\theta$ .

$$9.31.) \text{ b.) } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\theta}(2\bar{X}_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\theta} = \Theta \quad \text{in P}$$

Thus by definition 9.4.3  $\tilde{\theta}$  is asymptotically unbiased

$$(x_i - \bar{x}) \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n q_i = (q)\bar{x}$$

$x_i \sim \text{Unif}(0, \theta)$

$$\text{Var}(x_i) = \frac{\theta^2}{12} - \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n} - \frac{\bar{x}^2}{n} = \frac{(q)\theta^2}{9n}$$

$$\text{Thus } \text{Var}(\tilde{\theta}) = 4 \text{Var}(\bar{X}_n) = 4 \frac{\theta^2}{12n} = \frac{\theta^2}{3n}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\tilde{\theta}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\theta^2}{3n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{in P}$$

Thus by Theorem 9.4.1 since it is asympt. unbiased  
 and  $\text{Var}(2\bar{X}_n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\tilde{\theta}$  is MSE consistent.

$$Q. 38) X_i \sim \text{Bin}(1, p)$$

MLE of  $p$

$$L(p) = \prod_{i=1}^n p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i}$$

$$\ell(p) = \log p \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \log(1-p) \sum_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)$$

$$\frac{\partial \ell(p)}{\partial p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{p} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)}{1-p} = \frac{np - n + q - q}{p(1-p)} = q =$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} = \bar{x}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ell(p)}{\partial p^2} = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{p^2} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)}{(1-p)^2} < 0$$

Thus  $\hat{p}$  is the MLE of  $p$ .

By the CLT,  $\bar{X}_n \xrightarrow{d} N(p, \frac{p(1-p)}{n})$

$$2.1) a) \text{ part of } L(\theta_2) = \frac{1}{\theta^2} x_i^{-\theta}$$

$$L(x|\lambda, \beta) = \frac{1}{\theta^{2n}} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{-\frac{\lambda}{\theta}}$$

$$\ell(x|\lambda, \beta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log(x_i) - n \log(\beta) - 2n \log(\theta) - \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$$

$$\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{2n}{\theta} + \frac{1}{\theta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\theta^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \frac{2n}{\theta}$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_{MLE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{2n}$$

$$b) \text{ Note that } \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{2n} = \bar{x}_n$$

By the WLLM,  $\bar{x}_n \rightarrow E(x_i) = 2\theta$

$$\text{By the WLLM, } \frac{\bar{x}_n}{2} \Rightarrow \frac{2\theta}{2} = \theta$$

$\Rightarrow$  The MLE of  $\theta$  is simply constant

3) a.) It is not appropriate to compare performance by computing relative efficiency, since the MLE estimator is biased.

b.) Since both the MME and MLE of  $\theta$  are MSE consistent as shown in Q.3, they are both simply consistent, and by Q.4, they are asymptotically unbiased. Therefore we can use asymptotic relative efficiency

$$\text{arc}(\hat{\theta}_n | \hat{\theta}_m) = \frac{\text{arc}(\hat{\theta}_n)}{\text{arc}(\hat{\theta}_m)} = \frac{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V(\hat{\theta}_n)}{\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} V(\hat{\theta}_m)} = \theta^2 \left( \frac{n}{(n+2)(n+1)^2} \right) \cdot \frac{3n}{\theta^2}$$

Thus  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is asymptotically efficient

c.) We wouldn't want to use either metric for finite-sample performance, as we can't use relative efficiency and the asymptotic relative efficiency requires taking the limit. Instead, we can evaluate the MSE for  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\theta}$  and see which estimator has the smaller MSE

d.) We can use the asymptotic relative efficiency to compare the large sample performance of the estimators.

$$4.) \text{ a) MLE of } p = (\bar{x}) \text{ will find } f(p)$$

$$L(p) = \prod_{i=1}^n p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i}$$

not differentiable at 0 and 1  
Boundary

$$\ell(p) = \log p \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \log(1-p) \sum_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)$$

$$\frac{\partial \ell(p)}{\partial p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{p} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)}{1-p} = 0$$

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

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ell(p)}{\partial p^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{p^2} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)}{(1-p)^2} < 0$$

Thus the MLE of  $p$  is  $\hat{p} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i / n$

By the Invariance property of MLEs,

provided  $x_i$  is i.i.d. H.P. moment and MLE

The MLE of  $p(1-p)$  is to be  $(\bar{x})(1-\bar{x})$

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} \left( 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} \right)$$

4b) Note that the MLE of  $p(1-p)$  is  $\bar{X}_n / \bar{x}_n - 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
 E(\bar{X}_n - \bar{x}_n)^2 &= E(\bar{X}_n) - E(\bar{x}_n)^2 \\
 &= p - (Var(\bar{X}_n) + (E(\bar{X}_n))^2) \\
 &= p - \left( \frac{p(1-p)}{n} + \frac{p^2}{n(n-1)} \right) \\
 &= p - \left( \frac{p - p^2 + np^2}{n} \right) \\
 &= \frac{2p^2 - p^2 + np^2}{n} = \frac{p^2(1+n)}{n} = \frac{p^2}{1+\frac{1}{n}} = (q) \text{ by } \text{UVM} \\
 &= \frac{p^2}{1+\frac{1}{n}} - \frac{p^2}{1+\frac{1}{n-1}} = \frac{p^2}{n} \text{ by } \text{UVM}
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus the MLE found in part (a) is biased, and so it cannot be an UMVUE EJM yet and

4c.) No, this does not contradict the result in 3/6, since the result in 4b is biased, it cannot be the UMVUE. This violates our assumptions.