1. Let  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$  be a random sample from  $N(100, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is unknown. Consider testing at level  $\alpha$ ,

$$H_0: \sigma^2 \le 20 \ versus \ H_1: \sigma^2 > 20.$$

- (a) Show that the conditions required for the existence of UMP test are satisfied here.
- (b) Derive UMP test of level  $\alpha$ .
- (c) Consider the test which rejects  $H_0$  whenever  $\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i \bar{X})^2 > C$  where C > 0 is such that  $\sup_{\sigma^2 \leq 20} P(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i \bar{X})^2 > C) = \alpha$ . Show that this test is not UMP test of level  $\alpha$ .

**Solution:** The joint pdf of  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$  is

$$f(\mathbf{x}|\sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi^n}(\sigma^2)^n} exp\Big(-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - 100)^2}{2\sigma^2}\Big).$$

The sufficient statistics for  $\sigma^2$  is  $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - 100)^2$ .

(a) The distribution of  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - 100)^2 / \sigma^2$  has a  $\chi^2$  distribution with *n* degrees of freedom. The distribution function of *Y* is

$$g(y|\sigma^2) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}(\sigma^2)^{\frac{n}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}y^{\frac{n}{2}-1}exp(-\frac{y}{2\sigma^2}), y > 0.$$

The family of pdfs  $\{g(y|\sigma^2): \sigma^2 > 0\}$  has a monotone likelihood ratio (MLR), as for every  $\sigma_2^2 > \sigma_1^2$ , the ratio  $g(y|\sigma_2^2)/g(y|\sigma_1^2)$  is a increasing function of y on  $\{y: g(y|\sigma_2^2) > 0 \text{ or } g(y|\sigma_1^2) > 0\}$ . Using the theorem due to Karlin and Rubin, for any  $y_0$ , the test that rejects  $H_0$  if and only if  $Y > y_0$  is a UMP level  $\alpha$  test, where  $\alpha = P_{\sigma^2=20}(Y > y_0)$ .

- (b) Choosing  $y_0 = 20\chi^2(n)(1-\alpha)$  (where  $\chi^2(n)(1-\alpha)$  is the  $100 \times (1-\alpha)^{th}$  percentile of a  $\chi^2$  distribution with (n-1) degrees of freedom), we get  $P_{\sigma^2=20}(\sum_{i=1}^n Y > y_0) = \alpha$ . The UMP test of level  $\alpha$  rejects  $H_0$  if and only if  $Y > 20\chi^2(n)(1-\alpha)$ .
- (c) Consider testing the hypothesis  $H_0^*$ :  $\sigma^2 = 20$  against  $H_1^*$ :  $\sigma^2 = \sigma_1^2$ , for some  $\sigma_1^2 > 20$ . Using the Neyman- Pearson lemma, the MP level  $\alpha$  test rejects  $H_0^*$  for  $H_1^*$  if and only if  $Y > 20\chi^2(n)(1-\alpha)$ . Any other level  $\alpha$  test having a power as high as the former must have the same rejection region except for a set A satisfying  $\int_A f(\mathbf{x}|\sigma^2)d\mathbf{x} = 0$ .

Therefore, the test given in (c) of the question is not a UMP test for testing  $H_0$  against  $H_1$ .

2. Let  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$  be a random sample from the distribution with density  $f(x|\lambda) = \lambda exp(-\lambda x), x > 0$ , where  $\lambda > 0$  is unknown. For testing

$$H_0: \lambda = 1 \text{ versus } H_1: \lambda \neq 1,$$

find the generalized likelihood ratio test at the significance level  $\alpha$ .

**Solution:** The parameter space  $\Theta = \{\lambda : \lambda > 0\}$ . The parameter space under  $H_0$  is  $\Theta_0 = \{\lambda : \lambda = 0\}$ . 1}.

The likelihood function is

$$L(\lambda | \mathbf{x}) = \lambda^n exp(-\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n x_i).$$

The LRT statistic is

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sup_{\substack{\Theta_0\\\Theta}} L(1|\mathbf{x})}{\sup_{\Theta} L(\lambda|\mathbf{x})}.$$

The M.L.E of  $\lambda$  over  $\Theta$  is  $\lambda_n = 1/\bar{x}_n = 1/(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i/n)$ . The LRT statistic is

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i/n)^n exp(-(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i - n)).$$

The generalized likelihood ratio test of significance level  $\alpha$  that rejects  $H_0$  is given as  $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ , for  $(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i/n)^n exp(-(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - n)) < c_{\alpha} = 0$  otherwise,

where  $c_{\alpha}$  is such that  $P_{H_0}((\sum_{i=1}^n X_i/n)^n exp(-(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i-n)) < c_{\alpha}) = \alpha$ . The above critical region for generalized likelihood ratio test of size  $\alpha$  that rejects  $H_0$  can be written as

$$\bar{x}_n < c'_{1,\alpha}, \text{ and } \bar{x}_n > c'_{2,\alpha},$$

where  $c'_{1,\alpha}$  and  $c'_{2,\alpha}$  are chosen such that

$$P_{H_0}(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i < c'_{1,\alpha}, \sum_{i=1}^n X_i > c'_{2,\alpha}) = \alpha.$$

 $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$  follows a Gamma distribution, with pdf

$$g(y|\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^n}{\Gamma(n)} y^{n-1} exp(-y\lambda), y > 0$$

For an equal tail test,  $c'_{1,\alpha}$  and  $c'_{2,\alpha}$ , respectively, are the  $\frac{\alpha}{2} \times 100^{th}$  and  $(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}) \times 100^{th}$  percentile of  $Gamma(n, \lambda)$  distribution with pdf  $g(y|\lambda)$ .

3. Let  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$  be i.i.d.  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , where  $\mu \ge 0$  and  $\sigma^2 > 0$ . Let  $\theta = (\mu, \sigma^2)$ .

- (a) What is the parameter space  $\Theta$  in this model?
- (b) Find the m.l.e.,  $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$  of  $(\mu, \sigma^2)$ .
- (c) Find the UMVUE  $\hat{\mu}^*$  of  $\mu$ .
- (d) Show that  $E((\hat{\mu} \mu)^2) \leq E((\hat{\mu}^* \mu)^2)$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

## Solution:

(a) The parameter space  $\Theta = \{(\mu, \sigma^2) : \mu \ge 0, \sigma^2 > 0\}.$ 

(b) the log-likelihood for estimating  $\theta$  can be written as

$$L(\theta|\mathbf{x}) = \log(f(\theta|\mathbf{x})) = C - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{n}{2}\log(\sigma^2),$$

where C is independent of  $\theta$ . The partial derivative, with respect to  $\mu$  is

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta | \mathbf{x})}{\partial \mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i - \mu}{\sigma^2}.$$

Setting the partial derivative to 0 and solving the equation yield the following solution

$$\hat{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i}{n} = \bar{x}_n.$$

Next, to obtain the mle of  $\theta$ .

$$S(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \mu)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x}_n)^2 + n(\bar{x}_n - \mu)^2$$

When  $\bar{x}_n < 0$ ,  $S(\mathbf{x})$  is increasing in  $\mu$  for  $\mu \ge 0$ . Therefore, for  $\bar{x}_n < 0$ , for any value of  $\sigma^2$ ,  $L(\theta|\mathbf{x})$  is maximized at  $\hat{\mu} = 0$ . While for  $\bar{x}_n \ge 0$ , the sum  $S(\mathbf{x})$  is minimum at  $\hat{\mu} = \bar{x}_n$ . The MLE for  $\mu$  is

$$\hat{\mu} = 0$$
 for  $\bar{X}_n < 0$  and  $\hat{\mu} = \bar{X}_n$  for  $\bar{X}_n \ge 0$ .

From the above, we only need to show that  $\frac{1}{(\sigma^2)^{n/2}}exp\Big(-(\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\mu})^2)/2\sigma^2\Big)$  attains its maximum at  $\frac{1}{n}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\mu})^2\Big)$ . Let

$$log(g_1(\sigma^2|\mathbf{x})) = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\mu})^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{n}{2}log(\sigma^2)$$

Then, setting the derivative of this function with respect to  $\sigma^2$  to 0, yields the unique solution  $\frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \hat{\mu})^2 \right)$ . Also,

$$\frac{d^2 log(g_1(\sigma^2|\mathbf{x}))}{d(\sigma^2)^2}\Big|_{\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\mu})^2\right)} < 0$$

Therefore, the MLE of  $\sigma^2$  is  $\frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\mu})^2 \right)$ .

- (c) The statistic  $(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^2, \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i)$  is complete. To find the UMVUE for  $\mu$  we only need to look for an unbiased estimator for  $\mu$  based on the statistic. As  $E(\bar{X}_n) = \mu$ , UMVUE  $\hat{\mu}^*$  of  $\mu$  is  $\bar{X}_n$ .
- (d)

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\mu}^{\star} - \mu)^2 &= (\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2 I(\bar{X}_n \ge 0) + (\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2 I(\bar{X}_n < 0) \\ &= (\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2 I(\bar{X}_n \ge 0) + \mu^2 I(\bar{X}_n < 0) + \bar{X}_n (\bar{X}_n - 2\mu) I(\bar{X}_n < 0) \\ &= (\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2 + \bar{X}_n (\bar{X}_n - 2\mu) I(\bar{X}_n < 0) \ge (\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2, \end{aligned}$$

as  $\bar{X}_n I(\bar{X}_n < 0) < 0$  and  $(\bar{X}_n - 2\mu)I(\bar{X}_n < 0) < 0$  for  $\mu \ge 0$ . Hence,

$$E(\hat{\mu}^{\star} - \mu)^2 \ge E(\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2.$$

- 4. The weekly number of fires X in a town has the  $Poisson(\theta)$  distribution. The number of fires observed for five weekly periods were 0, 1, 1, 0, 0. Assume that these observations are independent, and that the prior distribution on  $\theta$  is  $\pi(\theta) \propto \theta exp(-10\theta)I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta)$ .
  - (a) Derive the posterior distribution  $\theta$  given the data.
  - (b) Find the posterior mean and posterior standard deviation of  $\theta$ .

**Solution:** The distribution of *X* is

$$f(x|\theta) = \frac{exp(-\theta)\theta^x}{x!}, x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

The prior distribution of  $\theta$  is a Gamma distribution given by

$$\pi(\theta) = \frac{10^2}{\Gamma(2)} \theta exp(-10\theta), 0 < \theta < \infty.$$

The joint distribution of  $(X, \theta)$  is

$$g(x,\theta) = f(x|\theta) \times \pi(\theta).$$
$$p(x) = \int_0^\infty g(x,\theta) d\theta = \left(\frac{10}{11}\right)^2 (x+1).$$

(a) The posterior distribution  $\theta$  given the data is

$$g_1(\theta|X=2) = \frac{11^2\theta^3 exp(-11\theta)}{\Gamma(4)}.$$

The posterior distribution is Gamma distribution with scale parameter 1/11 and shape parameter 4.

(b) The posterior mean is 4/11 and posterior standard deviation is 2/11.

- 5. Let  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$  be i.i.d. Poisson $(\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ , and let  $Y_i = 1$  when  $X_i > 0$ , and 0 otherwise,  $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ .
  - (a) Show that  $\bar{X}$  is a consistent estimator of  $\lambda$ , and it is asymptotically normally distributed.
  - (b) Find a transform,  $g(\bar{Y})$ , of  $\bar{Y}$  which is a consistent estimator of  $\lambda$ ; derive its asymptotic distribution.
  - (c) Compare the asymptotic relative efficiency of  $\bar{X}$  with respect to  $g(\bar{Y})$ .

**Solution:** The pmf of  $X_1$  is

$$p(x|\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^x exp(-\lambda)}{x!}, x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

The log likelihood function is

$$logL(\lambda|\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i log(\lambda) - n\lambda - nlog(x!).$$

(a) The partial derivatives, with respect to  $\lambda$  is

$$\frac{\partial L(\lambda | \mathbf{x})}{\partial \lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i}{\lambda} - n.$$

Setting these partial derivatives to 0 and solving the equations yield the following unique solution

$$\hat{\lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i}{n} = \bar{x}_n.$$

Also,

$$\frac{d^2 log(L(\lambda | \mathbf{x}))}{d\lambda^2} \Big|_{\lambda = \hat{\lambda}} < 0.$$

The mle of  $\lambda$  is  $\overline{X}$ .

(b) The probability distribution of  $X_1$  satisfies the regularity conditions. Hence, the estimator  $\hat{\lambda}$  is consistent and

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda) \to N(0, \frac{1}{I_X(\lambda)}), \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

where  $I_X(\lambda)$  is the Fisher's information number obtained as

$$I_X(\lambda) = E\left(\frac{\partial p(x|\lambda)}{\partial \lambda} log(p(x|\lambda))\right)^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

(c)  $P(Y_i = 0) = exp(-\lambda)$  and  $P(Y_i = 1) = 1 - exp(-\lambda)$ . The joint distribution of  $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$  is

$$h(\mathbf{y}|\lambda) = exp(-\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i)(1 - exp(-\lambda))^{n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i}$$

The log likelihood function is

$$logL_1(\lambda|\mathbf{y}) = -\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + \frac{(n - \sum_{i=1}^n y_i)}{(1 - exp(-\lambda))}$$

The partial derivative, with respect to  $\lambda$  is

$$\frac{\partial L_1(\lambda | \mathbf{y})}{\partial \lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \frac{(n - \sum_{i=1}^n y_i)exp(-\lambda)}{(1 - exp(-\lambda))}$$

Setting these partial derivatives to 0 and solving the equations yield the following unique solution

$$\hat{\lambda}_1 = -log(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i}{n}).$$

Also,

$$\frac{d^2 log(L(\lambda|\mathbf{y}))}{d\lambda^2}\Big|_{\lambda=\hat{\lambda}_1} < 0.$$

The mle of  $\lambda$  is  $-log(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{Y_i}{n})$ , *i.e.*  $g(\bar{Y}) = -log(\bar{Y})$ .

$$I_Y(\lambda) = \frac{exp(-\lambda)}{(1 - exp(-\lambda))}.$$

The probability distribution of  $Y_1$  satisfies the regularity conditions, and hence

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\lambda}_1 - \lambda) \to N(0, \frac{1}{I_Y(\lambda)}), \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

(c) The A.R.E of of  $\bar{X}$  with respect to  $g(\bar{Y})$  is

$$A.R.E(\bar{X},g(\bar{Y})) = \frac{I_Y(\lambda)}{I_X(\lambda)} = \frac{\lambda exp(-\lambda)}{(1 - exp(-\lambda))} = \frac{\lambda}{exp(\lambda) - 1}.$$

This function is strictly decreasing and reaches a maximum value of 1. At  $\lambda = 0$ , it is 0 and for  $\lambda \to \infty$ , the limit of the function is 1.