## STAT 513 hw 5

1. Let $X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}$ and $X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}$ be independent random samples from the $\operatorname{Normal}\left(\mu_{1}, \sigma^{2}\right)$ and $\operatorname{Normal}\left(\mu_{1}, \sigma^{2}\right)$ distributions, respectively, where $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}$, and $\sigma^{2}$ are unknown. Suppose it is of interest to test the hypotheses $H_{0}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2}$ versus $H_{1}: \mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2}$.
(a) Give the likelihood function $L\left(\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \sigma^{2} ; X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)$ for $X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}$. Hint: It is the product of the likelihood functions of the two samples.
(b) Give the log-likelihood function $\ell\left(\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \sigma^{2} ; X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)$.
(c) Find the maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\mu}_{1}, \hat{\mu}_{2}$, and $\hat{\sigma}^{2}$ of $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}$, and $\sigma^{2}$, respectively; that is, find

$$
\left(\hat{\mu}_{1}, \hat{\mu}_{2}, \hat{\sigma}^{2}\right)=\operatorname{argmax}_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \sigma^{2}} L\left(\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \sigma^{2} ; X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right) .
$$

Hint: Use calculus methods on the log-likelihood function.
(d) Under $H_{0}$, we have $\mu_{1}=\mu_{2}=\mu$, say, where $\mu$ denotes the common mean. Let $\hat{\mu}_{0}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{0}^{2}$ be

$$
\left(\hat{\mu}_{0}, \hat{\sigma}_{0}^{2}\right)=\operatorname{argmax}_{\mu, \sigma^{2}} L\left(\mu, \mu, \sigma^{2} ; X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)
$$

Find expressions for $\hat{\mu}_{0}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{0}^{2}$.
(e) Show that the likelihood ratio

$$
\operatorname{LR}\left(X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)=\frac{L\left(\hat{\mu}_{0}, \hat{\mu}_{0}, \hat{\sigma}_{0}^{2} ; X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)}{L\left(\hat{\mu}_{1}, \hat{\mu}_{2}, \hat{\sigma}^{2} ; X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)}
$$

can be simplified to

$$
\operatorname{LR}\left(X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)=\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{1}}\left(X_{1 i}-\hat{\mu}_{1}\right)^{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{n_{2}}\left(X_{2 j}-\hat{\mu}_{2}\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{1}}\left(X_{1 i}-\hat{\mu}_{0}\right)^{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{n_{2}}\left(X_{2 j}-\hat{\mu}_{0}\right)^{2}}\right]^{\left(n_{1}+n_{2}\right) / 2}
$$

(f) Show that for any $c \in[0,1]$, there exists a $c_{1}$ such that the likelihood ratio test

$$
\text { Reject } H_{0} \text { iff } \operatorname{LR}\left(X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1 n_{1}}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{2 n_{2}}\right)<c
$$

is equivalent to the test

$$
\frac{\left|\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}\right|}{S_{\text {pooled }} \sqrt{1 / n_{1}+1 / n_{2}}}>c_{1}
$$

Note: Please just attempt this question. It is quite tricky. You will get points for trying.
(g) Provide the value $c_{1}$ such that the test in the previous part has size $\alpha$ for any $\alpha \in(0,1)$.
2. Let $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$ be a random sample from the $\operatorname{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ distribution with density

$$
f(x)=\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha) \beta^{\alpha}} x^{\alpha-1} \exp (-x / \beta) \mathbb{1}(x>0)
$$

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are unknown.
(a) Give the likelihood function $L\left(\alpha, \beta ; X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ for the sample $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$.
(b) Give the log-likelihood function $\ell\left(\alpha, \beta ; X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ for the sample $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}$.
(c) For any $\alpha \geq 0$, let $\hat{\beta}(\alpha)$ be the value of $\beta$ which maximizes $L\left(\alpha, \beta ; X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$. Get an expression for $\hat{\beta}(\alpha)$.
(d) Consider testing the hypotheses $H_{0}: \alpha=\alpha_{0}$ versus $H_{1}: \alpha \neq \alpha_{0}$ and let $\hat{\alpha}$ be the maximum likelihood estimator for $\alpha$. Then the likelihood ratio is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{LR}\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right) & =\frac{\sup _{\left\{\alpha, \beta: \alpha=\alpha_{0}, \beta \geq 0\right\}} L\left(\alpha, \beta ; X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)}{\sup _{\{\alpha, \beta: \alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0\}} L\left(\alpha, \beta ; X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)} \\
& =\frac{L\left(\alpha_{0}, \hat{\beta}\left(\alpha_{0}\right) ; X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)}{L\left(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}(\hat{\alpha}) ; X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Show that $-2 \log \operatorname{LR}\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ can be simplified to

$$
-2 \log \operatorname{LR}\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)
$$

$$
=-2\left[n \log \left(\frac{\Gamma(\hat{\alpha})}{\Gamma\left(\alpha_{0}\right)}\right)+n\left(\hat{\alpha}-\alpha_{0}\right)\left(\log \bar{X}_{n}-n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log X_{i}+1\right)+n \alpha_{0} \log \alpha_{0}-n \hat{\alpha} \log \hat{\alpha}\right]
$$

(e) The following R code stores in the vector X the survival times of several guinea pigs from the point in time at which they were infected with virulent tubercle bacilli and computes on these data the maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ for the $\operatorname{Gammma}(\alpha, \beta)$ distribution. The data are taken from Bjerkedal (1960).

```
X <- c(12, 15, 22, 24, 24, 32, 32, 33, 34, 38, 38, 43, 44, 48, 52,
    53, 54, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 58, 59, 60, 60, 60, 60, 61, 62,
    63, 65, 65, 67, 68, 70, 70, 72, 73, 75, 76, 76, 81, 83, 84,
    85, 87, 91, 95, 96, 98, 99, 109, 110, 121, 127, 129, 131,
    143, 146, 146, 175, 175, 211, 233, 258, 258, 263, 297, 341, 341, 376)
library(MASS) # pull in library of functions including the fitdistr() function
fitdistr(X,"gamma") # gives alpha.hat and 1/beta.hat
```

Compute the value of $-2 \log \operatorname{LR}\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ for these data when testing the hypotheses $H_{0}$ : $\alpha=1$ versus $H_{0}: \alpha \neq 1$.
(f) Report the $p$-value for testing the hypotheses in the previous question, using the asymptotic distribution of $-2 \log \operatorname{LR}\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ under the null hypothesis.
(g) Consider testing $H_{0}: \alpha=\alpha_{0}$ versus $H_{1}: \alpha \neq \alpha_{0}$ using the guinea pig data. Find an interval such that you fail to reject $H_{0}$ at the 0.01 significance level for all $\alpha_{0}$ in the interval. Hint: Compute $-2 \log \operatorname{LR}\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ over many values of $\alpha_{0}$ and find those values of $\alpha_{0}$ (search, say, between $1 / 2$ and 4) for which $-2 \log \operatorname{LR}\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)<\chi_{1,0.01}^{2}$.
(h) Give an interpretation of this interval.
(i) Based on these results, do you think it would be reasonable to model these data using the Exponential $(\beta)$ distribution?
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