

Day 1: Problem 1.

$$X_1, \dots, X_n \text{ i.i.d. } f(x|\theta) = \theta^{-c} c x^{c-1} e^{-(x/\theta)^c} I(x>0)$$

(a) The likelihood function is

$$f(X|\theta) = \theta^{-nc} c^n \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{c-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^c\right)$$

$$l(\theta) = -nc \log \theta + n \log c + (c-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \log X_i - \frac{1}{\theta^c} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^c$$

Setting $\frac{\partial l}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{nc}{\theta} + \frac{c \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^c}{\theta^{c+1}} = 0$ and solving for θ yields

$$\text{the MLE for } \theta, \hat{\theta}_{MLE} = \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^c}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{c}} \triangleq \left(\frac{T(X)}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{c}}$$

$$\left(\text{Check second derivative: } \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \theta^2} \Big|_{\hat{\theta}_{MLE}} = \frac{-nc^2}{\left(\frac{T}{n}\right)^{\frac{c+2}{c}}} < 0 \right)$$

(b) According to the likelihood in (a), $T(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^c$ is a complete sufficient statistic for θ . Moreover, using the pdf technique, one can show that

$X^c \sim \text{Exponential}(\theta^c)$ and thus

$T(X) \sim \text{gamma}(n, \theta^c)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E(\hat{\theta}_{MLE}) &= \int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{c}} \frac{1}{\Gamma(n) \theta^{cn}} t^{n-1} e^{-\frac{t}{\theta^c}} dt \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(n + \frac{1}{c})}{\Gamma(n) n^{\frac{1}{c}}} \theta \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the UMVUE for θ is $\frac{\Gamma(n) n^{\frac{1}{c}}}{\Gamma(n + \frac{1}{c})} \hat{\theta}_{MLE}$.

Day 1. Problem 1.

(C) For $\theta_2 > \theta_1 > 0$, the ratio

$$\frac{f(x, \theta_2)}{f(x, \theta_1)} = \left(\frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}\right)^{nc} \exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\theta_1} - \frac{1}{\theta_2}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^c\right\}$$

is an increasing function of $T(X)$. Hence the distribution family of X has an MLR in $T(X)$. By the Karlin-Rubin Theorem, the UMP test of size α is given by

$$\delta_\alpha(x) = I\{T(x) > t_\alpha\}, \quad \text{where } t_\alpha \text{ satisfies}$$

$$P_{\theta_0}\{T(X) > t_\alpha\} = \alpha, \quad \text{i.e.}$$

$$P_{\theta_0}\left\{\frac{2T(X)}{\theta_0^c} > \frac{2t_\alpha}{\theta_0^c}\right\} = \alpha, \quad \text{note that } \frac{2T(X)}{\theta^c} \sim \chi_{2n}^2$$

$$\text{or } P_{\theta_0}\left(\chi_{2n}^2 > \frac{2t_\alpha}{\theta_0^c}\right) = \alpha.$$

$$\text{Hence, } \frac{2t_\alpha}{\theta_0^c} = \chi_{2n, \alpha}^2, \quad \text{that is } t_\alpha = \frac{\theta_0^c \chi_{2n, \alpha}^2}{2}$$

#

X_1, \dots, X_n i.i.d $f(x|\theta) = \theta^{-1} x^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}} I(0 \leq x \leq 1)$, $\theta > 0$

(a) The pdf follows the format of that of an exponential family.

$$f(x|\theta) = I(0 \leq x \leq 1) \theta^{-1} \exp\left\{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta} \log x\right\}$$

It follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i$ is a sufficient statistic for θ . To show that it is also a minimal, consider the ratio

$$\frac{f(\mathbf{X}|\theta)}{f(\mathbf{Y}|\theta)} = \frac{\theta^{-n} I(0 \leq x_{(1)} \leq x_{(n)} \leq 1) \exp\left(\frac{1-\theta}{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i\right)}{\theta^{-n} I(0 \leq y_{(1)} \leq y_{(n)} \leq 1) \exp\left(\frac{1-\theta}{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \log y_i\right)}$$

$$= \frac{I(0 \leq x_{(1)} \leq x_{(n)} \leq 1)}{I(0 \leq y_{(1)} \leq y_{(n)} \leq 1)} \exp\left\{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \log y_i\right)\right\}$$

which is free of θ iff $\sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \log y_i$.

Therefore $T(\mathbf{X}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i$ is a minimal sufficient statistic for θ .

(b) Solving $y = -2 \log x$ for x gives $x = e^{-\frac{y}{2}}$

The pdf of Y is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_Y(y|\theta) &= \theta^{-1} (e^{-\frac{y}{2}})^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}} I(y > 0) \cdot \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{y}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\theta} e^{-\frac{y}{2\theta}} I(y > 0) \end{aligned}$$

That is, $Y \sim \text{Exponential}(2\theta)$.

(c) Since $T(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$, $T \sim \text{Gamma}(n, 2\theta)$, and thus $\frac{T}{\theta} \sim \chi_{2n}^2$.

It follows that a two-sided 95% confidence interval for θ can be induced from the following,

$$P(\chi_{2n, 0.975}^2 < \frac{T}{\theta} < \chi_{2n, 0.025}^2) = 0.95, \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$P\left(\frac{T}{\chi_{2n, 0.025}^2} < \theta < \frac{T}{\chi_{2n, 0.975}^2}\right) = 0.95.$$

where $\chi_{2n, \alpha}^2$ is a χ_{2n}^2 percentile that satisfies $P(\chi_{2n}^2 > \chi_{2n, \alpha}^2) = \alpha$.

In summary, a two-sided 95% C.I. is $\left(\frac{T}{\chi_{2n, 0.025}^2}, \frac{T}{\chi_{2n, 0.975}^2}\right)$

(d) The expected length of the above C.I. is

$$2n\theta \left(\frac{1}{\chi_{2n, 0.975}^2} - \frac{1}{\chi_{2n, 0.025}^2} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

One can prove this by approximating χ^2 distribution using normal that is, $\frac{\chi_{2n, 0.975}^2}{n} \approx \frac{2n + 1.96\sqrt{4n}}{n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2$, and

$$\frac{\chi_{2n, 0.025}^2}{n} \approx \frac{2n - 1.96\sqrt{4n}}{n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2.$$

Hence $2n\theta \left(\frac{1}{\chi_{2n, 0.975}^2} - \frac{1}{\chi_{2n, 0.025}^2} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$

DI Prob 3

(1)

① First we look at the joint dist of
 $L_1 = c_1 X + c_2 Y$ and $L_2 = c_3 X + c_4 Y$
when $X \sim N(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$ and $Y \sim N(\mu_2, \sigma^2)$ w/ $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$.
The joint MGF is

$$\begin{aligned} M_{L_1, L_2}(s, t) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{s(c_1 X + c_2 Y) + t(c_3 X + c_4 Y)} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{(sc_1 + tc_3)X + (sc_2 + tc_4)Y} \right\} \\ &= M_X(sc_1 + tc_3) M_Y(sc_2 + tc_4) \quad \text{by indep.} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \mu_1(sc_1 + tc_3) + \frac{1}{2}(sc_1 + tc_3)^2 \sigma^2 \right\} \times \\ &\quad \exp \left\{ \mu_2(sc_2 + tc_4) + \frac{1}{2}(sc_2 + tc_4)^2 \sigma^2 \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ (\mu_1 c_1 + \mu_2 c_2)s + (\mu_1 c_3 + \mu_2 c_4)t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left[(c_1^2 + c_2^2)s^2 + (c_3^2 + c_4^2)t^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2(c_1 c_3 + c_2 c_4)st \right] \sigma^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

This will factor out into a fun of s and t iff

$$c_1 c_3 + c_2 c_4 = 0.$$

This is the condition for independence between L_1 and L_2 .

Day 1, Problem 3

(2)

Note that in this case,

$$L_1 \sim N(\mu_1 c_1 + \mu_2 c_2, (c_1^2 + c_2^2) \sigma^2)$$

$$L_2 \sim N(\mu_1 c_3 + \mu_2 c_4, (c_3^2 + c_4^2) \sigma^2).$$

$$\textcircled{b} \quad V = \frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} = c_1 X + c_2 Y \quad \text{w) } c_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}, c_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}$$

$$W = \frac{X-Y}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} = c_3 X + c_4 Y \quad \text{w) } c_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}, c_4 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}$$

Since $c_1 c_3 + c_2 c_4 = 0$ then V and W are indep.

\textcircled{c} When $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu$, then

$$V \sim N\left(\mu\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right), \left(\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\right)\sigma^2\right)$$

$$= N\left(\sqrt{2} \frac{\mu}{\sigma}, 1\right)$$

$$W \sim N\left(\mu(0), \left(\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\right)\sigma^2\right)$$

$$= N(0, 1).$$

and $V \perp W$.

\textcircled{d} When $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu$, we seek dist of $P = \frac{XY}{\sigma^2}$,
Several ways to do this. Given $\chi^2_2 = \frac{(X+Y)^2}{2\sigma^2} = t$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \frac{XY}{\sigma^2} = \left\{ \left(\frac{X+Y}{\sigma} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{X-Y}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right\} \frac{1}{4} \\ &= \left\{ 2V^2 - 2W^2 \right\} \frac{1}{4} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (V^2 - W^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since we want $(P | T=t) = (P | (V=\sqrt{t}))$, and noting that W^2 and $|V|$ are indep for previous result, and also the fact that

$$W^2 \sim \chi_1^2 = \text{chi-square with 1 df.}$$

the

$$P | T=t \sim \frac{1}{2} (t - \chi_1^2).$$

Note: Other approaches would be using the transformation theorem.