

def sample n times.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob 3. } \hat{y}_{ML} &= \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} p(x|y) = \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x_i - y)^2}{2}\right) \\ (a) \quad &= \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} \ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x_i - y)^2}{2}\right)\right) = \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{(x_i - y)^2}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} \end{aligned}$$

for MAP, we maximize $\ln(p(x|y)p(y))$. i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_1 &= \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} \ln[p(x|y)p(y)] = \\ \underset{y}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left\{ A + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{(x_i - y)^2}{2}\right) + \left(-\frac{S(y - z)^2}{2}\right) \right\} &= f \quad A = \text{const} \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = 0, \text{ we have } \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y) + S(y - z) &= 0 \\ \hat{y}_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + Sz}{n + S} &= \frac{\hat{y}_{ML} \cdot n + Sz}{n + S} \end{aligned}$$

(b). prior distro of y is Uniform, $p(x|y)p(y)$, $p(x|y)$ in the domain, $y \in [-1, 1]$.

$$\underset{y \in \mathbb{D}}{\operatorname{argmax}} p(x|y)p(y) = \underset{y \in \mathbb{D}}{\operatorname{argmax}} p(x|y)$$

indicating in the Uniform domain $[-1, 1]$ MLE is same as MAP-Estimator.

$$\hat{y}_2 = \begin{cases} \hat{y}_{MLE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} & \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \in [-n, n] \right) \\ \text{not defined} & \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \notin [-n, n] \right) \end{cases}$$

(c) Real y distro $y \sim N(0, 2)$

+ choose $\hat{y}_1|_{z=10, S=1}$ or \hat{y}_2 for $n \gg 1 / n \rightarrow \infty$

$n \rightarrow 1$, $\hat{y}_2 \equiv \hat{y}_{MLE}$ so long as $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^1 x_i}{1}$ is in the domain, which is probably guaranteed, while $\hat{y}_1|_{z=10, S=1} = \frac{\hat{y}_{MLE} + 10}{2}$

Hence \hat{y}_2 is more like \hat{y}_{MLE} and should be chosen.

$n \rightarrow \infty$ both are close to \hat{y}_{MLE} , while \hat{y}_1 estimator has a wider domain, rather than $[-1, 1]$, chosen.

Prob 4. $\text{def } A = \int_{\omega_{\text{Dom}}} (y - \omega) p(\omega|x) d\omega$

Minimum loss (conditional) is obtained when $\frac{\partial A}{\partial y} = 0$

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[\int_{\omega_{\text{Domain}}} (y - \omega)^2 p(\omega|x) d\omega \right] = \int_{\omega_{\text{Domain}}} \frac{\partial (y - \omega)^2}{\partial y} p(\omega|x) d\omega$$

$$= \int_{\omega_{\text{Domain}}} 2(y - \omega) p(\omega|x) d\omega = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow y \left(\int_{\omega_{\text{Domain}}} p(\omega|x) d\omega \right) = \int_{\omega_{\text{Domain}}} \omega p(\omega|x) d\omega$$

$$\boxed{y = \frac{1}{1} = E(\omega|x)}$$

Estimator which brings "min-risk(conditional)"

is the conditional expectation of the A-Post-distro

Overall risk is minimized so long as conditional risk is minimized. Thus the two estimators, which bring either min-overall-risk or min-conditional-risk, should be identical.

b. same procedure.

$$0 = \frac{\partial A}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[\int_{\omega} (y - \omega) p(\omega|x) d\omega \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[\int_{\omega < y} (\omega - y) p(\omega|x) d\omega + \int_{\omega > y} (y - \omega) p(\omega|x) d\omega \right]$$

$$0 = - \int_{\omega < y} p(\omega|x) d\omega + \int_{\omega > y} p(\omega|x) d\omega \Leftrightarrow \int_{\omega < y} p(\omega|x) d\omega = \int_{\omega > y} p(\omega|x) d\omega$$



y is median

Since for " $\omega < y$ "

" $\omega > y$ "

Share equal prob.

ii. same mentality as in (a)-session.

Prob 5. $\lambda_{MLE} = \arg \max_{\lambda} \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \frac{\lambda^{x_i}}{x_i!} e^{-\lambda} \right)$

a.

$$= \arg \max_{\lambda} \left(\ln \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{\lambda^{x_i}}{x_i!} e^{-\lambda} \right)$$

$$= \arg \max_{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i \log \lambda - \lambda)$$

$$\frac{\partial \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \log \lambda - \lambda \right)}{\partial \lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(x_i \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1 \right) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0 \Rightarrow \hat{\lambda}_{MLE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N x_i}{N}$$

$$E\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N x_i}{N}\right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E[x_i] = \frac{N\lambda}{N} = \lambda \Rightarrow \text{unbiased.}$$

b. $p = P(X=0) = e^{-2\lambda}$ thus $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2} \ln p$

single sample, thus no "N" i.e.

$$\hat{p} = \arg \max_p p(x|p) = \arg \max_p \left[\frac{\left(-\frac{1}{2} \ln p\right)^x}{x!} e^{\frac{1}{2} \ln p} \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial p} = 0 \text{ i.e. } \frac{1}{2} + \frac{x}{\ln p} = 0 \therefore \hat{p} = e^{-2x}$$

$$E(\hat{p}) = E(e^{-2x}) = \sum_{x_i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{x_i}}{x_i!} e^{-\lambda} e^{-2x_i}$$

Given $e^u = 1 + u + \frac{u^2}{2!} + \frac{u^3}{3!} + \dots + \frac{u^n}{n!} + \dots$

$$\sum_{x_i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda e^{-2})^{x_i}}{x_i!} = e^{\lambda e^{-2}}$$

$$\therefore E(\hat{p}) = e^{-\lambda + \lambda e^{-2}} \neq e^{-2\lambda} \Rightarrow \text{biased}$$

c.