

Problem Set 5

Issued: Tuesday 28th November, 2017

Due: Monday 4th December, 2017

5.1. Assume $p_y(y; x)$ is a continuously differentiable function of x . Show that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{D(p_y(\cdot; x) \| p_y(\cdot; x + \delta))}{\delta^2} = \frac{1}{2} J_y(x),$$

so that for small δ we can make the approximation

$$D(p_y(\cdot; x) \| p_y(\cdot; x + \delta)) \approx \frac{\delta^2}{2} J_y(x),$$

where $J_y(x)$ is the Fisher information in y about x :

$$J_y(x) = -\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log p_y(y; x) \right].$$

5.2. Suppose, for $i = 1, 2$

$$y_i = x + w_i$$

where x is an unknown but non-zero constant, w_1 and w_2 are statistically independent, zero-mean Gaussian random variables with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(w_1) &= 1 \\ \text{Var}(w_2) &= \begin{cases} 1 & x > 0 \\ 2 & x < 0 \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

(a) Calculate the Cramér-Rao bound for unbiased estimators of x based on observation of

$$\underline{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

(b) Show that a minimum variance unbiased estimator $\hat{x}_{\text{MVU}}(\underline{y})$ does not exist.

Hint: Consider the estimators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_1(\underline{y}) &= \frac{1}{2} y_1 + \frac{1}{2} y_2, \\ \hat{x}_2(\underline{y}) &= \frac{2}{3} y_1 + \frac{1}{3} y_2. \end{aligned}$$

- 5.3. A random variable y is observed and used to decide between two hypotheses, H_0 and H_1 . Under each of these two hypotheses, y is as follows:

$$H_0 : y = s_0 + w$$

$$H_1 : y = s_1 + w$$

where s_0 and s_1 are known scalars with $s_0 < s_1$, and w is a zero mean normal random variable with known variance σ^2 . Assume symmetric costs (i.e., $C_{00} = C_{11} = 0, C_{10} = C_{01} = 1$).

The *a priori* probabilities $\mathbb{P}(H = H_0) = 1 - p$ and $\mathbb{P}(H = H_1) = p$ are unknown; hence we wish to conduct a minimax test.

- (a) What is the least favorable prior and its corresponding decision rule $\hat{H}_M(y)$?
- (b) Assuming now that the priors $1 - p$ and p are known, what is the expected cost of the minimax decision rule $\hat{H}_M(y)$ calculated in part (a), and how does it compare to the expected cost (Bayesian risk) of the optimum Bayes' decision rule $\hat{H}_B(y)$? Determine an expression for the expected costs in terms of the unspecified parameters, and then evaluate both costs when $p = (e^2 + 1)^{-1}$, $s_0 = 0$, $s_1 = 2$, and $\sigma^2 = 1$.

Hint: Use Q-function (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Q-function>) to simplify your expressions.

- 5.4. (a) Let $p_y(y; x)$ be a member of the exponential family, i.e.,

$$p_y(y; x) = \exp[\lambda(x)t(y) - \alpha(x) + \beta(y)]$$

for some functions $\lambda(\cdot), t(\cdot), \alpha(\cdot)$ and $\beta(\cdot)$. Put $z = y + a$, where a is a known constant. Is $p_z(z; x)$ in the exponential family, as well?

- (b) Let y_1 and y_2 be two independent identically distributed continuous random variables with a distribution $p_y(y; x)$ that is in the canonical (one-parameter) exponential family. That is, $p_y(y; x) = \exp(xy - \alpha(x) + \beta(y))$ for some functions α and β . Put $z = y_1 + y_2$.

Show that $p_z(z; x)$ is also in the canonical exponential family. That is, show that $p_z(z; x) = \exp(xz - \alpha'(x) + \beta'(z))$ for some functions α' and β' . Express α' in terms of α , and β' in terms of β .

This result means that the canonical exponential family possesses a kind of stability characteristic.