

Fall 2014

1. Let p, q be values in $[0, 1]$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Assume α and q known, and that p is an unknown parameter we would like to estimate. A coin is tossed n times, resulting in the sequence of zero one valued random variables X_1, \dots, X_n . At each toss, independently of all other tosses, the coin has probability p of success with probability α , and probability q of success with probability $1 - \alpha$.

- a) Write out the probability function of the observed sequence, and compute the maximum likelihood estimate \hat{p} of p , when p is considered a parameter over all of \mathbb{R} . Verify that when $\alpha = 1$, one recovers the standard estimator of the unknown probability.

Solution. Note that

$$P(X_i = 1) = \begin{cases} p & \text{with probability } \alpha \\ q & \text{with probability } 1 - \alpha \end{cases}.$$

Hence,

$$P(X_i = 1) = p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha),$$

and

$$P(X_i = 0) = 1 - P(X_i = 1) = 1 - p\alpha - q(1 - \alpha).$$

Thus, the likelihood function is

$$\mathcal{L}(p; \mathbf{x}) = (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))^{\sum x_i} (1 - p\alpha - q(1 - \alpha))^{n - \sum x_i},$$

and so, the log-likelihood function is

$$\log \mathcal{L}(p; \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log(p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha)) + \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) \log(1 - p\alpha - q(1 - \alpha)).$$

The first derivative of the log-likelihood function is

$$\frac{d}{dp} \log \mathcal{L} = \frac{\alpha \sum x_i}{p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha)} - \frac{\alpha (n - \sum x_i)}{1 - p\alpha - q(1 - \alpha)},$$

and since the second derivative of the log-likelihood function,

$$\frac{d^2}{dp^2} \log \mathcal{L} = -\frac{\alpha^2 \sum x_i}{(p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))^2} - \frac{\alpha^2 (n - \sum x_i)}{(1 - p\alpha - q(1 - \alpha))^2},$$

is always negative, we see that

$$\hat{p} = \boxed{\frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - q(1 - \alpha) \right)}$$

is the MLE of p . When $\alpha = 1$, the MLE becomes

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i,$$

which is the MLE for the Bernoulli distribution with parameter p , which is what we expected.

b) Show \hat{p} is unbiased, and calculate its variance.

Solution. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\hat{p} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_i - q(1 - \alpha) \right) = \frac{1}{\alpha} (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha) - q(1 - \alpha)) = p,$$

and so, \hat{p} is unbiased. As for the variance, since $X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))$, we have that

$$\text{Var}(X_i) = (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))(1 - (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))).$$

Hence,

$$\text{Var}(\hat{p}) = \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \text{Var}(\bar{X}_n - q(1 - \alpha)) = \frac{1}{n\alpha^2} (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))(1 - (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))).$$

□

c) Calculate the information bound for p , and determine if it is achieved by \hat{p} .

Solution. The Fisher information is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(p) &= -\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\alpha^2 \sum x_i}{(p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))^2} - \frac{\alpha^2(n - \sum x_i)}{(1 - p\alpha - q(1 - \alpha))^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{n\alpha^2}{p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha)} + \frac{n\alpha^2}{1 - (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))} \\ &= \frac{n\alpha^2}{(p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))(1 - (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha)))}, \end{aligned}$$

and so, the Cramer-Rao lower bound is

$$\mathcal{I}^{-1}(p) = \frac{1}{n\alpha^2} (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))(1 - (p\alpha + q(1 - \alpha))),$$

which is achieved by \hat{p} .

□

d) If one of the other parameters is unknown, can p still be estimated consistently?

Solution. We can still get an MLE for p , and since MLEs are consistent, why not?

2. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be distributed according to the density of mass function $p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ for $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

a) State the definition for $T(\mathbf{X})$ to be sufficient for θ .

Solution. $T(\mathbf{X})$ is sufficient for θ if

$$P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \mid T(\mathbf{X}) = T(\mathbf{x}))$$

is independent from θ .

b) Prove that if the (discrete) mass functions $p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ can be factored as $h(\mathbf{x})g(T(\mathbf{x}), \theta)$ for some functions h and g , then $T(\mathbf{X})$ is sufficient for θ .

Solution. Define $A_{T(\mathbf{x})} = \{\mathbf{y} : T(\mathbf{y}) = T(\mathbf{x})\}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \mid T(\mathbf{X}) = T(\mathbf{x})) &= \frac{P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, T(\mathbf{X}) = T(\mathbf{x}))}{P(T(\mathbf{X}) = T(\mathbf{x}))} \\ &= \frac{P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})}{P(T(\mathbf{X}) = T(\mathbf{x}))} \\ &= \frac{P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in A_{T(\mathbf{x})}} P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{y})} \\ &= \frac{h(\mathbf{x})g(T(\mathbf{x}), \theta)}{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in A_{T(\mathbf{x})}} h(\mathbf{y})g(T(\mathbf{y}), \theta)} \\ &= \frac{h(\mathbf{x})g(T(\mathbf{x}), \theta)}{g(T(\mathbf{x}), \theta) \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in A_{T(\mathbf{x})}} h(\mathbf{y})} \\ &= \frac{h(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in A_{T(\mathbf{x})}} h(\mathbf{y})} \end{aligned}$$

is independent of θ , and so, $T(\mathbf{X})$ is sufficient for θ . □

c) Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent with the Cauchy distribution $\mathcal{C}(\theta)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$p(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\pi(1 + (x - \theta)^2)}.$$

Prove that the unordered sample $S = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ can be determined from any $T(\mathbf{X})$ sufficient for θ . [HINT: Produce a polynomial from which S can be determined.]

Solution. Basically, we want to show that S is minimal sufficient, i.e. for all sufficient statistic $T(\mathbf{X})$, $S(\mathbf{X}) = g(T(\mathbf{X}))$. Recall that if

$$\frac{f(x \mid \theta)}{f(y \mid \theta)} \text{ is constant as a function of } \theta \iff S(x) = S(y),$$

then $S(\mathbf{X})$ is minimal sufficient.

The reverse direction is trivial. As for the forward direction, suppose that $f(x \mid \theta)/f(y \mid \theta) = c \neq 0$. Then,

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (1 + (x_i - \theta)^2) = c \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + (y_j - \theta)^2).$$

Note that the LHS is a polynomial of θ of degree $2n$ with roots $\theta = x_i \pm i$ and the RHS is a polynomial of θ of degree $2n$ with roots $\theta = y_j \pm i$. Since the roots must be equal we have that there exists a permutation that can match the roots up, i.e. $S(X) = S(Y)$. Hence, S is minimal sufficient, and we are done. □