

MATH3911 Assignment One

Simon Cheng, z333348

This assignment is my own work. I have read and understood the University Rules with respect to Student Academic Misconduct.

Question 1

a) A simple unbiased estimator is given by $W = I_{\{X_1=3\}}(\mathbf{X})$ since $E_\lambda(W) = Pr(X_1 = 3) = \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6}$.

b) We see that the given density can be written in the following form

$$f(x; \theta) = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{x!} e^{x \log \lambda} = a(\lambda) b(x) \exp(c(\lambda) d(x))$$

where $a(\lambda) = e^{-\lambda}$, $b(x) = 1/x!$, $c(\lambda) = \log \lambda$ and $d(x) = x$, noting that $c(\lambda)$ is strictly monotone. Thus, the density is a one parameter exponential family density so the statistic $T = \sum_{i=1}^n d(X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is complete and sufficient.

By noting that $T \sim Po(n\lambda)$ and $\sum_{i=2}^n X_i \sim Po((n-1)\lambda)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(W | \sum_{i=1}^n X_i = t) &= P(W = 1 | \sum_{i=1}^n X_i = t) \\ &= \frac{P(X_1 = 3 \cap \sum_{i=1}^n X_i = t)}{P(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = t)} \\ &= \frac{P(X_1 = 3 \cap \sum_{i=2}^n X_i = t-3)}{P(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = t)} \\ &= \frac{P(X_1 = 3) P(\sum_{i=2}^n X_i = t-3)}{P(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = t)} \\ &= \frac{[\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}/6] [e^{-\lambda(n-1)} (\lambda(n-1))^{t-3} ((t-3)!)^{-1}]}{e^{-n\lambda} (n\lambda)^t (t!)^{-1}} \\ &= \frac{t(t-1)(t-2)}{6} \frac{(n-1)^{t-3}}{n^t} \end{aligned}$$

By Lehmann-Scheffe's theorem, since T is complete and sufficient and W is unbiased for τ , we conclude $\frac{T(T-1)(T-2)}{6} \frac{(n-1)^{t-3}}{n^t}$ is the UMVUE.

c) The MLE of λ is \bar{X} . Hence, the MLE of $\tau(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6}$ is $\hat{\tau} = \frac{\bar{X}^3 e^{-\bar{X}}}{6}$ by the transformation invariance property of the MLE. We know that the MLE is asymptotically normal, unbiased and efficient, so using the delta method, the asymptotic distribution is given by:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \tau(\lambda)) \xrightarrow{d} N \left(0, \left(\frac{3\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda} - \lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6} \right)^2 \lambda \right) = N \left(0, \frac{\lambda e^{-2\lambda} (3\lambda^2 - \lambda^3)^2}{36} \right).$$

d) To find a point estimate of $\tau(\lambda)$, we note that $T = \sum_{i=1}^{15} X_i = 45$ and $\bar{X} = \frac{T}{15} = 3$. By applying the method in part b), we obtain the estimate

$$\frac{T(T-1)(T-2)}{6} \frac{(n-1)^{t-3}}{n^t} = \frac{45(44)(43)}{6} \frac{15^{42}}{15^{45}} = 0.231875$$

By applying the method in part c), we obtain the estimate

$$\frac{\bar{X}^3 e^{-\bar{X}}}{6} = \frac{3^3 e^{-3}}{6} = 0.2240418$$

Both values are relatively similar to each other. This is to be expected since we know that the UMVUE approaches the MLE asymptotically. More explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(T-1)(T-2)}{6} \frac{(n-1)^{t-3}}{n^t} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n\bar{X}(n\bar{X}-1)(n\bar{X}-2)}{6} \frac{(n-1)^{n\bar{X}-3}}{n^{n\bar{X}}} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^3 \bar{X}^3 (n-1)^{n\bar{X}-3}}{6 n^{n\bar{X}}} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{X}^3}{6} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n\bar{X}-3} \\ &= \frac{\bar{X}^3}{6} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n\bar{X}} \right] \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{-3} \right] \\ &= \frac{\bar{X}^3 e^{-\bar{X}}}{6} \\ &= \hat{\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

e) The variance according to the Cramer-Rao lower bound is given by:

$$\frac{(r'(\lambda))^2}{nI_{X_1}(\lambda)} = \frac{((3\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda} - \lambda^3 e^{-\lambda})/6)^2}{n/\lambda} = \frac{\lambda e^{-2\lambda} (3\lambda^2 - \lambda^3)^2}{36n}.$$

Suppose that the Cramer-Rao lower bound is attainable by $T(\mathbf{X})$, an unbiased estimator of $\tau(\lambda)$. Then the score $V(\mathbf{X}, \lambda)$ can be expressed as $k_n(\lambda)[W(\mathbf{X}) - \tau(\lambda)]$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{X}, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - n \\ &= \frac{n}{\lambda} (\bar{X} - \lambda) \\ &= \frac{n\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda}}{6} \left(\frac{6\bar{X}}{n\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda}} - \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6} \right) \\ &= k_n(\lambda) \left(\frac{6\bar{X}}{n\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda}} - \tau(\lambda) \right) \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $T(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{6\bar{X}}{n\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda}}$. However, this is not an estimator since it depends on the parameter λ so the Cramer-Rao lower bound is not attainable. Thus the variance of the UMVUE does not have the same variance as that implied by the Cramer-Rao lower bound.

f) Note that the asymptotic distribution is $N\left(\tau(\lambda), \frac{\lambda e^{-2\lambda}(3\lambda^2 - \lambda^3)^2}{36n}\right)$. Thus, the standard error of $\hat{\tau}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{se}[\hat{\tau}] &\approx \sqrt{\frac{1}{36n} \hat{\lambda} e^{-2\hat{\lambda}} (3\hat{\lambda}^2 - \hat{\lambda}^3)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{36n} \bar{x} e^{-2\bar{x}} (3\bar{x}^2 - \bar{x}^3)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{36 \times 15} 3 \times e^{-2 \times 3} (3 \times 3^2 - 3^3)^2} \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

so an asymptotic 90% confidence interval for $\tau(\lambda)$ is given by:

$$(\hat{\tau} - \Phi^{-1}(0.95)\hat{se}[\hat{\tau}], \hat{\tau} + \Phi^{-1}(0.95)\hat{se}[\hat{\tau}]) = (0.2240418, 0.2240418).$$

The reason why we only get a point interval is that coincidentally, the sample mean was exactly equal to 3 so the standard error was 0.

Question 2

Firstly, consider Distribution 1. Suppose that $E_{\theta}g(T) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. That is, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}g(1)3\theta + g(2)2\theta + g(3)(2\theta^3 - \theta^4) + g(4)(1 + \theta^4 - 5\theta - 2\theta^3) &= 0 \\ [g(4) - g(3)]\theta^4 + [2g(3) - 2g(4)]\theta^3 + [3g(1) + 2g(2) - 5g(4)]\theta + g(4) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

By the fundamental theorem of algebra, this implies each coefficient is equal to 0 so, we have

$$g(4) = 0 \Rightarrow g(4) - g(3) = 0 \Rightarrow g(3) = 0 \Rightarrow 3g(1) + 2g(2) = 0,$$

but the latter relationship does not necessarily imply both $g(1)$ and $g(2)$ are equal to 0. Hence Distribution 1 is not complete.

Now, consider Distribution 2. Suppose that $E_{\theta}g(T) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. That is, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}g(1)\theta + g(2)(\theta - \theta^3) + g(3)2\theta^2 + g(4)(1 - \theta - 2\theta^2 + \theta^3) &= 0 \\ [g(4) - g(2)]\theta^3 + [2g(3) - 2g(4)]\theta^2 + [g(1) + g(2) - 2g(4)]\theta + g(4) &= 0\end{aligned}$$

By the fundamental theorem of algebra, this implies each coefficient is equal to 0 so, we have

$$\begin{aligned}g(4) = 0 &\Rightarrow 2g(3) - 2g(4) = 0 \Rightarrow g(3) = 0 \\ \Rightarrow g(4) - g(2) = 0 &\Rightarrow g(2) = 0 \Rightarrow g(1) + g(2) - 2g(4) \Rightarrow g(1) = 0\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, this implies $P_{\theta}(g(T) = 0) = 1$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Hence, Distribution 2 is complete.

Question 3

a) See Appendix

b) The cumulative distribution function $F(x; \theta)$ of X_1 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} F(x; \theta) &= \int_{-\infty}^x f(t; \theta) dt \\ &= \int_{\theta}^x \frac{3\theta^3}{t^4} dt \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{\theta}{x}\right)^3 \end{aligned}$$

c) We note that X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d random variables with common density $f(x; \theta) = \frac{3\theta^3}{x^4} I_{(-\infty, x]}(\theta)$. Then the likelihood function is

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, \theta) &= \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i; \theta) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{3\theta^3}{x_i^4} I_{(-\infty, x_i]}(\theta) \\ &= \frac{(3\theta^3)^n}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^4} I_{(-\infty, x_{(1)}]}(\theta) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

To show that $X_{(1)}$ is a minimal sufficient statistic for θ , we consider the ratio

$$\psi(\theta) = \frac{L(x, \theta)}{L(y, \theta)} = \frac{(3\theta^3)^n / \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^4 I_{(-\infty, x_{(1)}]}(\theta)}{(3\theta^3)^n / \prod_{i=1}^n y_i^4 I_{(-\infty, y_{(1)}]}(\theta)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{y_i}{x_i}\right)^4 \frac{I_{(-\infty, x_{(1)}]}(\theta)}{I_{(-\infty, y_{(1)}]}(\theta)}.$$

When $x_{(1)} < y_{(1)}$, we have

$$\psi(\theta) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{y_i}{x_i}\right)^4 & , \theta \leq x_{(1)} \\ 0 & , x_{(1)} < \theta < y_{(1)} \\ \text{undefined} & , \theta > y_{(1)} \end{cases}$$

When $y_{(1)} < x_{(1)}$, we have

$$\psi(\theta) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{y_i}{x_i}\right)^4 & , \theta \leq y_{(1)} \\ \infty & , y_{(1)} < \theta < x_{(1)} \\ \text{undefined} & , \theta > x_{(1)} \end{cases}$$

When $x_{(1)} = y_{(1)}$, we have

$$\psi(\theta) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{y_i}{x_i}\right)^4 & , \theta \leq x_{(1)} \\ \text{undefined} & , \theta > x_{(1)} \end{cases}$$

So we see that $\psi(\theta)$ is constant with respect to θ , where it is defined. Hence, by the Lehmann and Scheffe's method, $X_{(1)}$ is a minimal sufficient statistic for θ .

d) Using the given fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F(y; \theta) &= P(X_{(1)} \leq y) \\
&= 1 - [P(X_1 \geq y)]^n \\
&= 1 - [1 - P(X_1 \leq y)]^n \\
&= 1 - \left(\frac{\theta}{y}\right)^{3n}
\end{aligned}$$

To find the density of $X_{(1)}$, we differentiate the cumulative distribution function,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(y; \theta) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y} F(y; \theta) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\theta}{y}\right)^{3n} \right] \\
&= \frac{3n\theta^{3n}}{y^{3n+1}}
\end{aligned}$$

if $y \geq \theta$ and 0 otherwise.

Now, we calculate the expectation of $X_{(1)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
EX_{(1)} &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y f(y; \theta) dy \\
&= \int_{\theta}^{\infty} y \frac{3n\theta^{3n}}{y^{3n+1}} dy \\
&= \frac{3n}{3n-1} \theta.
\end{aligned}$$

e) Let g be a function from $[\theta, \infty)$ to \mathbb{R} . Suppose that $E_{\theta}g(X_{(1)}) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. That is, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\theta}^{\infty} g(x) f_{X_{(1)}}(x; \theta) dx &= 0 \\
3n\theta^{3n} \int_{\theta}^{\infty} g(x) \frac{1}{x^{3n+1}} dx &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

By differentiating both sides with respect to x and using the fundamental theorem of calculus, we obtain $-g(\theta) \frac{1}{\theta^{3n+1}} = 0$ and so $g(\theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $P_{\theta}(g(X_{(1)}) = 0) = 1$ and as a result, $X_{(1)}$ is complete.

Consider the estimator $W = \frac{3n-1}{3n} X_{(1)}$. We have $E_{\theta}(W) = \frac{3n-1}{3n} E_{\theta}(X_{(1)}) = \frac{3n-1}{3n} \frac{3n}{3n-1} \theta = \theta$, so clearly W is an unbiased estimator of θ . Now, we know that $X_{(1)}$ is complete and sufficient from the previous parts and it is clear from part d) that $\frac{3n-1}{3n} X_{(1)}$ is an unbiased estimator of θ . Thus, by the Theorem of Lehmann-Scheffe, $\frac{3n-1}{3n} X_{(1)}$ is the UMVUE of θ is $E[W|X_{(1)}] = \frac{3n-1}{3n} X_{(1)}$.

Question 4

a) We note that $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim \text{Bin}(n, \theta)$ since it is made of n i.i.d. Bernoulli observations with probability of success θ . Suppose that an unbiased estimator of $\tau(\theta) = 1/\theta$ did exist and let this estimator be $T(X)$. Then we must have $E_\theta[T(X)] = 1/\theta$. That is,

$$\sum_{x=0}^n T(X) \binom{n}{x} \theta^x (1-\theta)^{n-x} = \frac{1}{\theta}.$$

However, this is impossible since no polynomial in θ is equal to $1/\theta$. Furthermore, we note that as $\theta \rightarrow 0$, the left hand side tends to $T(0)$ which is finite but the right hand side tends to ∞ , again this is not possible. Therefore, there is a contradiction and so there exists no unbiased estimator of $1/\theta$.

b) Since \mathbf{X} is made up of i.i.d observations, we have $I_{\mathbf{X}}(\theta) = nI_{X_1}(\theta)$. Now,

$$V(X_1, \theta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(X_1; \theta) = \frac{x}{\theta} - \frac{1-x}{1-\theta}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V(X_1, \theta) = -\frac{x}{\theta^2} - \frac{1-x}{(1-\theta)^2}.$$

By noting that $X_1 \sim \text{Bern}(\theta)$ and that $E(X_1) = \theta$, we then have

$$I_{X_1}(\theta) = E_\theta\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V(X_1, \theta)\right) = \frac{E(x)}{\theta^2} + \frac{1-E(x)}{(1-\theta)^2} = \frac{\theta}{\theta^2} + \frac{1-\theta}{(1-\theta)^2} = \frac{1}{\theta(1-\theta)}$$

Thus,

$$I_{\mathbf{X}}(\theta) = nI_{X_1}(\theta) = \frac{n}{\theta(1-\theta)}.$$

Since \mathbf{Y} is made up of i.i.d observations, we have $I_{\mathbf{Y}}(\theta) = nI_{Y_1}(\theta)$. Now,

$$V(Y_1, \theta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(Y_1; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{y-1}{1-\theta}.$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V(Y_1, \theta) = -\frac{1}{\theta^2} - \frac{y-1}{(1-\theta)^2}.$$

By noting that $Y_1 \sim \text{Geom}(\theta)$ and that $E(Y_1) = \frac{1}{\theta}$, we then have

$$I_{Y_1}(\theta) = E_\theta\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V(Y_1, \theta)\right) = \frac{1}{\theta^2} + \frac{E(y)-1}{(1-\theta)^2} = \frac{1}{\theta^2} + \frac{1/\theta-1}{(1-\theta)^2} = \frac{1}{\theta^2(1-\theta)}$$

Thus,

$$I_{\mathbf{Y}}(\theta) = nI_{Y_1}(\theta) = \frac{n}{\theta^2(1-\theta)}.$$

Now since $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we have $\theta^2 < \theta$ and so $\frac{n}{\theta^2(1-\theta)} > \frac{n}{\theta(1-\theta)}$, which implies $I_{\mathbf{Y}}(\theta) > I_{\mathbf{X}}(\theta)$. Since we know the variance of the estimate is inversely related to the Fisher information for n large enough, the variance of the sampling scheme \mathbf{Y} would be lower than the variance of the sampling scheme \mathbf{X} and so will lead to more precise inference about the parameter $\tau(\theta) = \theta$.

c) If we were to reparameterize the geometric observations scheme with η instead of θ , we would have

$$f(Y_1; \eta) = \frac{1}{\eta} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{y-1} = \theta(1 - \theta)^{y-1} = f(Y_1; \theta).$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \log f(Y_1; \eta) &= -\log \eta + (y-1)[\log(\eta-1) - \log \eta] \\ V(Y_1, \eta) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f(Y_1; \eta) = -\frac{1}{\eta} + (y-1) \left[\frac{1}{\eta-1} - \frac{1}{\eta} \right] \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V(Y_1, \eta) &= \frac{1}{\eta^2} + (y-1) \left[-\frac{1}{(\eta-1)^2} + \frac{1}{\eta^2} \right] = \frac{1}{\eta^2} + (y-1) \left[\frac{1-2\eta}{\eta^2(\eta-1)^2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

By noting that $Y_1 \sim \text{Geom}(1/\eta)$ and that $E(Y_1) = \frac{1}{1/\eta} = \eta$, we then have

$$I_{Y_1}(\eta) = E_{\theta} \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V(Y_1, \eta) \right) = -\frac{1}{\eta^2} - (\eta-1) \left[\frac{1-2\eta}{\eta^2(\eta-1)^2} \right] = \frac{1}{\eta(\eta-1)}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathbf{Y}}(\eta) &= n I_{Y_1}(\eta) \\ &= \frac{n}{\eta(\eta-1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\eta^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)} \frac{1}{\eta^4} \\ &= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\eta^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)} \left(-\frac{1}{\eta^2} \right)^2 \\ &= I_{\mathbf{Y}}(\theta(\eta)) \left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \eta} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

In general, when a smooth parameter transformation is performed on the fischer information such that $\theta = h(\eta)$, then we would expect the result

$$I_{\mathbf{Y}}(\eta) = I_{\mathbf{Y}}(\theta(\eta)) \left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \eta} \right)^2.$$

d) For convenience, we will represent the n i.i.d. observations $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ each with geometric distribution rewritten as

$$f_{Y_i}(y) = \theta(1 - \theta)^y, y = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Firstly, we will argue that $T = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ is complete. Since the sum of n i.i.d $\text{Geom}(p)$ random variables is a *NegativeBinomial*(n, θ), we have $T \sim \text{NegativeBinomial}(n, \theta)$. Suppose that $E_{\theta} g(T) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. That is, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^n \binom{n-1+t}{t} \theta^n (1-\theta)^t g(t) &= 0 \\ \theta^n \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n-1+t}{t} (1-\theta)^t g(t) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the left hand side is a power series in $(1 - \theta)$. Then for all possible values of t , we have

$$\binom{n-1+t}{t} g(t) = 0$$

which implies that $g(t) = 0$. Thus, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, we have $P_\theta(g(T) = 0) = 1$ and as a result, $T = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ is complete.

Now, consider the estimator $W = I_{\{Y_1=0\}}(\mathbf{Y})$. We have $E_\theta(W) = Pr(Y_1 = 0) = \theta$, so W is an unbiased estimator of θ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} E(W|T=t) &= Pr(Y_1 = 0|T=t) \\ &= \frac{Pr(Y_1 = 0, \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i = t)}{Pr(T=t)} \\ &= \frac{Pr(Y_1 = 0, \sum_{i=2}^n Y_i = t)}{\binom{n-1+t}{t} \theta^n (1-\theta)^t} \\ &= \frac{Pr(Y_1 = 0) P(\sum_{i=2}^n Y_i = t)}{\binom{n-1+t}{t} \theta^n (1-\theta)^t} \\ &= \frac{\theta \binom{n-2+t}{t} \theta^{n-1} (1-\theta)^t}{\binom{n-1+t}{t} \theta^n (1-\theta)^t} \\ &= \frac{\binom{n-2+t}{t}}{\binom{n-1+t}{t}} \\ &= \frac{[(n-2+t)!]/[t!(n-2)!]}{[(n-1+t)!]/[t!(n-1)!]} \\ &= \frac{n-1}{n-1+t} \end{aligned}$$

so by the Lehmann-Scheffe Theorem, the UMVUE of θ is $\frac{n-1}{n-1+T} = \frac{n-1}{n-1+nY}$.

Appendix

Sketch of density (used in 3.a)

Proof that sum of n i.i.d $Geom(\theta)$ random variables is $NegativeBinomial(n, \theta)$ (used in 4.d)

Let the common m.g.f of Y_1, \dots, Y_n be $m_Y(t)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} m_Y(t) &= E[e^{Yt}] \\ &= \sum_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{yt} f(y; \theta) \\ &= \sum_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{yt} \theta (1 - \theta)^y \\ &= \theta \sum_{y=0}^{\infty} (e^t (1 - \theta))^y \\ &= \frac{\theta}{1 - e^t (1 - \theta)} \end{aligned}$$

Let $T = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$. Then the m.g.f. of T is given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_T(t) &= \prod_{i=1}^n m_X(t) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\theta}{1 - e^t (1 - \theta)} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\theta}{1 - e^t (1 - \theta)} \right)^n \end{aligned}$$

But this is the m.g.f. of a negative binomial distribution with parameters n and θ so $T \sim NegativeBinomial(n, \theta)$

Alternative proof that \mathbf{T} is complete and minimal sufficient (in 1.b)

Firstly, we will show that $T = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is complete. It is clear that $T \sim Po(-n\lambda)$. Suppose that $E_\lambda g(T) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Theta$. That is, for all $\lambda \in \Theta$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{-n\lambda} (n\lambda)^t}{t!} g(t) &= 0 \\ e^{-n\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(n\lambda)^t}{t!} g(t) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a polynomial in terms of θ , so by the fundamental theorem of algebra, we have,

$$\frac{n^t}{t!} g(t) = 0$$

which implies that $g(t) = 0$. Thus, for all $\lambda \in \Theta$, we have $P_\lambda(g(T) = 0) = 1$ and as a result, $T = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is complete.

Now we will show that $T = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is minimal sufficient. Consider the following expression:

$$\frac{L(x, \theta)}{L(y, \theta)} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n y_i!}{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i!} \lambda^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n y_i},$$

which is not a function of θ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$. Hence, $T = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is minimal sufficient.

Explicit calculation of Variance of proposed estimator (in 1.e)

The variance of the proposed estimator in b) is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V(b(T)) &= \sum_{t=3}^{\infty} \frac{t(t-1)(t-2)}{6} \frac{(n-1)^{t-3}}{n^t} \frac{e^{-n\lambda} (n\lambda)^t}{t!} - \left(\frac{\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-n\lambda}}{6} \sum_{t=3}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda(n-1))^{t-3}}{(t-3)!} - \left(\frac{\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-n\lambda}}{6} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda(n-1))^t}{t!} - \frac{\lambda^6 e^{-2\lambda}}{36} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-n\lambda}}{6} e^{\lambda(n-1)} - \frac{\lambda^6 e^{-2\lambda}}{36} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^3 e^{-\lambda}}{6} \right) \end{aligned}$$