

Stat 461-561: Solutions Exercises 3

Exercise 8.3

- Let $y = \sum_{i=1}^m y_i$. The likelihood is given by

$$L(\theta | \mathbf{y}) = \theta^y (1 - \theta)^{m-y}$$

so the log-likelihood is

$$l(\theta | \mathbf{y}) = y \log(\theta) + (m - y) \log(1 - \theta).$$

We want to compute

$$\lambda(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{\sup_{\theta \leq \theta_0} L(\theta | \mathbf{y})}{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} L(\theta | \mathbf{y})}.$$

The unconstrained MLE is y/m , while the MLE under the null hypothesis is $\min(\sum_{i=1}^m y_i/m, \theta_0)$. Thus

$$\lambda(\mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^m y_i/m \leq \theta_0 \\ \frac{\theta_0^y (1 - \theta_0)^{m-y}}{(y/m)^y (1 - y/m)^{m-y}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and we reject H_0 if $\frac{\theta_0^y (1 - \theta_0)^{m-y}}{(y/m)^y (1 - y/m)^{m-y}} < c$. To show that this is equivalent to rejecting if $y < b$, we could show that $\lambda(\mathbf{y})$ is decreasing in y so that $\lambda(\mathbf{y}) < c$ occurs for $y > b > m\theta_0$.

We have

$$\log \lambda(\mathbf{y}) = y \log(\theta_0) + (m - y) \log(1 - \theta_0) - y \log(y/m) - (m - y) \log(1 - y/m)$$

and

$$\frac{d \log \lambda(\mathbf{y})}{d\lambda} = \log \left(\frac{\theta_0 \left(\frac{m-y}{m} \right)}{y/m (1 - \theta_0)} \right).$$

For $y/m > \theta_0$, $1 - y/m < 1 - \theta_0$, we have $\frac{d \log \lambda(\mathbf{y})}{d\lambda} < 0$ and $\lambda(\mathbf{y}) < c$ if and only if $y > b$.

Exercise 8.7.a

- We have

$$L(\theta, \lambda | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\lambda^n} \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + n\theta \right) \mathbb{I}_{[\theta, \infty)}(x_{(1)})$$

which is increasing in θ if $x_{(1)} \geq \theta$ whatever being λ . So the MLE of θ is $\hat{\theta} = x_{(1)}$ and we can easily check that $\hat{\lambda} = \bar{x} - x_{(1)}$. Under the restriction $\theta \leq 0$, the MLE of θ regardless of λ is

$$\hat{\theta}_0 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_{(1)} > 0 \\ x_{(1)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

For $x_{(1)} > 0$, substituting $\hat{\theta}_0 = 0$ and maximizing the likelihood with respect to λ , as above yields $\hat{\lambda}_0 = \bar{x}$. Therefore

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_{(1)} < 0 \\ \frac{L(0, \bar{x}|\mathbf{x})}{L(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\lambda}|\mathbf{x})} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L(0, \bar{x}|\mathbf{x})}{L(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\lambda}|\mathbf{x})} &= \frac{(1/\bar{x})^n \exp(-n\bar{x}/\bar{x})}{\left(1/\hat{\lambda}\right)^n \exp(-n(\bar{x} - x_{(1)})/(\bar{x} - x_{(1)}))} \\ &= \left(\frac{\hat{\lambda}}{\bar{x}}\right)^n = \left(1 - \frac{x_{(1)}}{\bar{x}}\right)^n. \end{aligned}$$

So rejecting if $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \leq c$ is equivalent to rejecting if $\frac{x_{(1)}}{\bar{x}} \geq c^*$.

Exercise 8.13.a,b,c

- Let $Y = X_1 + X_2$ then

$$f_Y(y) = \begin{cases} y - 2\theta & \text{if } 2\theta \leq y < 2\theta + 1 \\ 2\theta + 2 - y & \text{if } 2\theta + 1 \leq y < 2\theta + 2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (a) The size of ϕ_1 is $\alpha_1 = \Pr(X_1 > .95 | \theta = 0) = 0.05$. The size of ϕ_2 is $\alpha_2 = \Pr(X_1 + X_2 > C | \theta = 0)$. If $1 \leq C \leq 2$, then

$$\alpha_2 = \Pr(Y > C | \theta = 0) = \int_C^2 (2 - y) dy = \frac{1}{2}(2 - C)^2.$$

Setting this equal to α gives $C = 2 - \sqrt{2\alpha}$, and for $\alpha = .05$, we get $C \approx 1.68$.

- (b) For the first test, we have

$$\beta_1(\theta) = \Pr(X_1 > 0.95 | \theta) = \int_{0.95}^{\theta+1} 1 dx = \theta + 0.05.$$

So we have

$$\beta_1(\theta) = P_\theta(X_1 > 0.95) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \theta \leq -0.05 \\ \theta + 0.05 & \text{if } -0.05 \leq \theta \leq 0.95 \\ 1 & \text{if } \theta > 0.95 \end{cases}.$$

For the second test, we have to consider $2\theta \leq C < 2\theta + 1$ and $2\theta + 1 \leq C < 2\theta + 2$. For $2\theta \leq C < 2\theta + 1$, we have $\frac{C-1}{2} < \theta \leq \frac{C}{2}$ and

$$\beta_2(\theta) = 1 - \int_{2\theta}^C (y - 2\theta) dy = 1 - \frac{(C - 2\theta)^2}{2}.$$

For $2\theta + 1 \leq C < 2\theta + 2$, we have that $\frac{C}{2} - 1 < \theta \leq \frac{C-1}{2}$ and

$$\beta_2(\theta) = \int_C^{2\theta+2} (2\theta + 2 - y) dy = \frac{(2\theta + 2 - C)^2}{2}.$$

Thus the power function for the second test is

$$\beta_2(\theta) = P_\theta(Y > C) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \theta \leq \frac{C}{2} - 1 \\ \frac{(2\theta+2-C)^2}{2} & \text{if } \frac{C}{2} - 1 < \theta \leq \frac{C-1}{2} \\ 1 - \frac{(C-2\theta)^2}{2} & \text{if } \frac{C-1}{2} < \theta \leq \frac{C}{2} \\ 1 & \text{if } \theta > \frac{C}{2} \end{cases}.$$

• I haven't drawn the figure but you can check that ϕ_1 is more powerful for θ near 0, but ϕ_2 is more powerful for larger θ 's. Hence, neither test is uniformly more powerful than the other.

Exercise 8.15

- From the Neyman-Pearson lemma, the UMP test rejects H_0 if

$$\frac{f(x|\sigma_1)}{f(x|\sigma_0)} = \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma_1}\right)^n \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\right)\sum_i x_i^2\right)$$

for some $k \geq 0$. This is equivalent to rejecting if

$$\sum_i x_i^2 > \frac{2 \log\left(k \left(\frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_0}\right)^n\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\right)} = c \text{ (remember that } \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} > 0).$$

This is the UMP test of size α , where $\alpha = P_{\sigma_0}(\sum_i X_i^2 > c)$. Note that $Z = \sum_i X_i^2/\sigma_0^2 \sim \chi_n^2$. Thus

$$\alpha = P\left(Z > \frac{c}{\sigma_0^2}\right)$$

so we must have $c\sigma_0^2 = \chi_{n,\alpha}^2$ which means $c = \sigma_0^2 \chi_{n,\alpha}^2$.

Exercise 8.17

- We have the following likelihood

$$L(\mu, \theta | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mu^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right)^{\mu-1} \theta^m \left(\prod_{j=1}^m y_j\right)^{\theta-1}$$

and the log-likelihood is

$$l(\mu, \theta | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = n \log(\mu) + (\mu - 1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i + m \log \theta + (\theta - 1) \sum_{j=1}^m \log y_j.$$

Thus the unconstrained MLE is given by

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{-n}{\sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i} \text{ and } \hat{\theta} = \frac{-m}{\sum_{j=1}^m \log y_j}.$$

Under H_0 , the likelihood is $L(\theta | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \theta^{n+m} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \prod_{j=1}^m y_j\right)^{\theta-1}$ and maximizing wrt θ yields the restricted MLE

$$\hat{\theta}_0 = -\frac{(n+m)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i + \sum_{j=1}^m \log y_j}.$$

Thus the LRT statistic is simply

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\hat{\theta}_0^{n+m}}{\hat{\mu}^n \hat{\theta}^m} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^{\hat{\theta}_0 - \hat{\mu}} \theta^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^m y_j \right)^{\hat{\theta}_0 - \hat{\mu}}.$$

- Substituting in the expressions for $\hat{\mu}$, $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}_0$, we have $\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^{\hat{\theta}_0 - \hat{\mu}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^m y_j \right)^{\hat{\theta}_0 - \hat{\mu}} =$

1 and

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\hat{\theta}_0^{n+m}}{\hat{\mu}^n \hat{\theta}^m} \frac{\hat{\theta}_0^{n+m}}{\hat{\mu}^n \hat{\theta}^m} = \left(\frac{m+n}{m} \right)^m \left(\frac{m+n}{m} \right)^m (1-T)^m T^n.$$

This is a unimodal function of T . So rejecting if $\lambda(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq c$ is equivalent to rejecting if $T \leq c_1$ or $T \geq c_2$ where c_1 and c_2 are appropriately chosen constants.

- It is easy to check that $-\log X_i \sim \exp(1/\mu)$ and $-\log Y_i \sim \exp(1/\theta)$. Therefore, $T = W/(W+V)$ where V and W are independent, $V \sim \text{Gamma}(n, 1/\mu)$ and $W \sim \text{Gamma}(m, 1/\theta)$. Under H_0 , the scale parameters of V and W are equal. Then, a simple generalization of Exercise 4.19b yields $T \sim \text{Beta}(n, m)$. The constants c_1 and c_2 are determined by the two equations

$$P(T \leq c_1) + P(T \geq c_2) = \alpha$$

and we could select for example

$$(1 - c_1)^m c_1^n = (1 - c_2)^m c_2^n.$$