

Midterm exam, Statistical Inference II: (2016 Spring): [+40points]

Name: Shih Jia-Han

- Proofs must be understandable to the instructor.
- Avoid typos and undefined notations in your proofs.

Q1 [+5] Prove or disprove (with a counter example) the following statements.

1) [+3] The unique Bayes estimator is minimax.

Answer:

Assume that

$$X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p), \quad p \sim \text{Beta}(a, b) \Rightarrow p | x \sim \text{Beta}(x+a, n-x+b).$$

Therefore, the Bayes estimator of p can be written as

$$\delta_{\Lambda} = E(p | x) = \frac{x+a}{n+a+b},$$

which is an unique Bayes estimator for arbitrary a, b . Then consider the risk function of δ_{Λ}

$$\begin{aligned} R(p, \delta_{\Lambda}) &= E\left\{\left(\frac{x+a}{n+a+b} - p\right)^2\right\} = \frac{1}{(n+a+b)^2} E[\{(a+x) - (a+b+n)p\}^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{(n+a+b)^2} E[(x-np) + \{a(1-p) - bp\}]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(n+a+b)^2} [np(1-p) + \{a(1-p) - bp\}^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Solve for

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R(p, \delta_{\Lambda})}{\partial p} = 0 &\Rightarrow n - 2np - 2(a+b)\{a - (a+b)p\} = 0 \\ &\Rightarrow \{2(a+b)^2 - 2n\}p + n - 2a(a+b) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\begin{cases} (a+b)^2 = n \\ 2a(a+b) = n \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} a = \sqrt{n}/2 \\ b = \sqrt{n}/2 \end{cases}$$

Thus, let

$$\delta_M = \frac{x - \sqrt{n}/2}{n + \sqrt{n}}.$$

Therefore, for all arbitrary a, b , δ_λ is an unique Bayes estimator but

$$\sup_p R(p, \delta_\lambda) > \sup_p R(p, \delta_M).$$

Hence unique Bayes estimator is not minimax. \square

2) [+2] The unique Bayes estimator is admissible.

Answer:

Let δ_λ be an unique Bayes estimator of θ . Assume δ_λ is not admissible, that is there exist δ' such that $R(\theta, \delta') \leq R(\theta, \delta_\lambda)$. Since δ_λ is a Bayes estimator, we have

$$R(\theta, \delta') \leq R(\theta, \delta_\lambda) \leq R(\theta, \delta), \text{ for all } \delta.$$

Therefore, δ' is also a Bayes estimator which contradict to the uniqueness.

Hence the unique Bayes estimator is admissible. \square

Q2 [+3]. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim}$ with $E[X_i] = \xi$, and $Var[X_i] = \sigma^2$. Derive the asymptotic distribution of $n\{h(\bar{X}) - h(\xi)\}$ when $h'(\xi) = 0$ and $h''(\xi) \neq 0$. (with proof)

Answer:

By a Taylor expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\bar{X}) &= h(\xi) + (\bar{X} - \xi)h'(\xi) + \frac{1}{2}(\bar{X} - \xi)^2 h''(\xi) + O_p(|\bar{X} - \xi|^3) \\ \Rightarrow n\{h(\bar{X}) - h(\xi)\} &= \frac{1}{2}h''(\xi)n(\bar{X} - \xi)^2 + nO_p(|\bar{X} - \xi|^3). \end{aligned}$$

By the Central Limit Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - \xi) &\xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2) \Rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sigma}(\bar{X} - \xi) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \\ \Rightarrow \frac{n}{\sigma^2}(\bar{X} - \xi)^2 &\xrightarrow{d} \chi_{df=1}^2 \Rightarrow n(\bar{X} - \xi)^2 \xrightarrow{d} \sigma^2 \chi_{df=1}^2, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By the Weak Law of Large Number,

$$\bar{X} - \xi \xrightarrow{p} 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By the Slutsky's Theorem,

$$n(\bar{X} - \xi)^3 = n(\bar{X} - \xi)^2(\bar{X} - \xi) = O_p(1)(\bar{X} - \xi) \xrightarrow{p} 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combining the results above, again, by the Slutsky's Theorem, we have

$$n\{h(\bar{X}) - h(\xi)\} \xrightarrow{d} \frac{h''(\xi)}{2} \sigma^2 \chi_{df=1}^2, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad \square$$

Q3 [+12]. Consider an exponential family

$$\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p) \sim p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \exp \left[\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i T_i(\mathbf{x}) - A(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \right] h(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ is the density with respect to some measure, and let $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta})$, where π is the prior density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Let $m(\mathbf{x})$ be the marginal density of \mathbf{X} .

(1) [+10] Express $E \left[\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i \frac{\partial T(\mathbf{X})}{\partial X_i} \middle| \mathbf{X} \right]$ by $m(\mathbf{x})$, $h(\mathbf{x})$, and their derivatives.

Answer:

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i \frac{\partial T_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right) p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \Rightarrow \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i \frac{\partial T_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right) p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\partial p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i \frac{\partial T(\mathbf{X})}{\partial X_i} \middle| \mathbf{X} \right] &= \int \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i \frac{\partial T_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right) \frac{p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta})}{m(\mathbf{x})} d\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &= \frac{1}{m(\mathbf{x})} \int \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i \frac{\partial T_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right) p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &= \frac{1}{m(\mathbf{x})} \int \frac{\partial p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} - \frac{1}{m(\mathbf{x})} \int \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &= \frac{1}{m(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \int p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} - \frac{1}{m(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \int p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &= \frac{1}{m(\mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial m(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \\ &= \frac{\partial \log m(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) [+2] Let $T_i(\mathbf{x}) = x_i$ $i = 1, \dots, p$. Express the Bayes estimator of η_i by $m(\mathbf{x})$, $h(\mathbf{x})$, and their derivatives.

Answer:

Since $T_i(\mathbf{x}) = x_i$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, by the formula above, we have

$$E\left[\sum_{i=1}^s \eta_i \frac{\partial T(\mathbf{X})}{\partial X_i} \middle| \mathbf{X}\right] = \frac{\partial \log m(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j}$$
$$\Rightarrow E[\eta_j | \mathbf{x}] = \frac{\partial \log m(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j}.$$

Hence the Bayes estimator of η_i is

$$\frac{\partial \log m(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial \log h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i},$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$.

Q4 [+10]. Let $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$ and $g(p) = p$ be the estimand.

- 1) [+3] Show that $\delta(X) = X/n$ is a minimax estimator under some loss function (also calculate the risk under the loss function).

Answer:

Let the loss function

$$L(\delta, p) = \frac{(p - \delta)^2}{p(1-p)}.$$

Suppose the prior distribution of p follows $U(0, 1)$. The Bayes estimator is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \frac{\int_0^1 \frac{1}{p(1-p)} p \cdot p^x (1-p)^{n-x} dp}{\int_0^1 \frac{1}{p(1-p)} p^x (1-p)^{n-x} dp} = \frac{\int_0^1 p^{x+1-1} (1-p)^{n-x-1} dp}{\int_0^1 p^{x-1} (1-p)^{n-x-1} dp} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(x+1)\Gamma(n-x)}{\Gamma(n+1)} = \frac{x}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

And the risk function is

$$R\left(p, \frac{x}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{p(1-p)} E\left(p - \frac{x}{n}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{p(1-p)n^2} E(x - np)^2 = \frac{np(1-p)}{p(1-p)n^2} = \frac{1}{n}.$$

The risk function does not depend on p . Therefore, $\delta(X) = X/n$ is a Bayes estimator with constant risk, that is, $\delta(X) = X/n$ is a minimax estimator.

2) [+3] Find a minimax estimator under the square loss $L(a, p) = |p - a|^2$.

Answer:

Let

$$p \sim \text{Beta}(a, b) \Rightarrow p | x \sim \text{Beta}(x+a, n-x+b).$$

Therefore, the Bayes estimator of p is

$$\delta_\lambda = E(p | x) = \frac{x+a}{n+a+b}.$$

Then consider the risk function of δ_λ

$$\begin{aligned} R(p, \delta_\lambda) &= E \left\{ \left(\frac{x+a}{n+a+b} - p \right)^2 \right\} = \frac{1}{(n+a+b)^2} E \left[\{ (a+x) - (a+b+n)p \}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{(n+a+b)^2} E \left[\{ (x-np) + \{ a(1-p) - bp \} \}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{(n+a+b)^2} [np(1-p) + \{ a(1-p) - bp \}^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Solve for

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R(p, \delta_\lambda)}{\partial p} = 0 &\Rightarrow n - 2np - 2(a+b)\{ a - (a+b)p \} = 0 \\ &\Rightarrow \{ 2(a+b)^2 - 2n \} p + n - 2a(a+b) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\begin{cases} (a+b)^2 = n \\ 2a(a+b) = n \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} a = \sqrt{n}/2 \\ b = \sqrt{n}/2 \end{cases}$$

Thus, let

$$\delta_M = \frac{x - \sqrt{n}/2}{n + \sqrt{n}}.$$

Since δ_M is a Bayes estimator with constant risk then it is a minimax estimator.

3) [+4] Is the following estimator minimax under the square loss

$$L(a, p) = |p - a|^2?$$

$$\delta(X) = \begin{cases} X/n & \text{with probability } n/(n+1) \\ 1/2 & \text{with probability } 1/(n+1) \end{cases}$$

[Hint: calculate the risk]

Answer:

$$\begin{aligned} R(p, \delta) &= E(\delta - p)^2 = E\left(\frac{x}{n} - p\right)^2 \frac{n}{n+1} + E\left(\frac{1}{2} - p\right)^2 \frac{1}{n+1} \\ &= \frac{E(x - np)^2}{n(n+1)} + \frac{p^2 - p + \frac{1}{4}}{n+1} = \frac{p - p^2}{n+1} + \frac{p^2 - p + \frac{1}{4}}{n+1} = \frac{1}{4(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the minimax estimator δ_M in the previous problem, that is

$$\delta_M = \frac{x - \sqrt{n}/2}{n + \sqrt{n}}.$$

The risk function of δ_M is

$$\begin{aligned} R(p, \delta_M) &= \frac{1}{(n + \sqrt{n})^2} \left[np(1-p) + \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}(1-p) - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}p \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4(n + \sqrt{n})^2} \{ 4np(1-p) + n(1-2p)^2 \} \\ &= \frac{1}{4(n + \sqrt{n})^2} \{ 4np - 4np^2 + 4np^2 + n - 4np \} \\ &= \frac{n}{4(n + \sqrt{n})^2} = \frac{1}{4(1 + \sqrt{n})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$R(p, \delta) = \frac{1}{4n+4} > \frac{1}{4n+4+8\sqrt{n}} = R(p, \delta_M).$$

Hence δ is not a minimax estimator.

Q5 [+10]. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} f(x|\theta)$, $\theta \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$, where the usual regularity conditions are assumed. Let $\tilde{\theta}_n$ be an initial estimator of θ .

1. [+3] Define and explain what is the one-step estimator

Answer:

Assume that $\ell'(\hat{\theta}_n) = 0$, that is, $\hat{\theta}_n$ is the MLE of θ . Then the one-step estimator is

$$\hat{\theta}_n \approx \tilde{\theta}_n - \frac{\ell'(\tilde{\theta}_n)}{\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)}.$$

This can be derived by a Taylor expansion (this can also be explained by slope),

$$\ell'(\hat{\theta}_n) \approx \ell'(\tilde{\theta}_n) + (\hat{\theta}_n - \tilde{\theta}_n) \ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n) \stackrel{\text{set}}{=} 0 \Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_n = \tilde{\theta}_n - \frac{\ell'(\tilde{\theta}_n)}{\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)}.$$

If $\tilde{\theta}_n$ is close to $\hat{\theta}_n$ then approximate $\hat{\theta}_n$ by the one-step estimator.

2. [+7] Prove the asymptotic efficiency of the one-step estimator. In the proof, please explain what conditions are used.

Answer:

Suppose initial estimator $\tilde{\theta}_n$ is \sqrt{n} -consistent, that is,

$$\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = O_p(1),$$

where θ_0 is the true parameter. Then the one-step estimator is

$$\delta_n = \tilde{\theta}_n - \frac{\ell'(\tilde{\theta}_n)}{\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)}.$$

By a Taylor expansion, we have

$$\ell'(\tilde{\theta}_n) = \ell'(\theta_0) + (\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \ell''(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)^2 \ell'''(\theta_n^*),$$

where θ_n^* is between $\tilde{\theta}_n$ and θ_0 .

By the definition of one-step estimator, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}(\delta_n - \theta_0) &= \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) - \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\ell'(\tilde{\theta}_n)}{\frac{1}{n}\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)} \\
&= \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) - \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left\{\ell'(\theta_0) + (\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)\ell''(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)^2\ell'''(\theta_n^*)\right\}}{\frac{1}{n}\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)} \\
&= \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\ell'(\theta_0)}{-\frac{1}{n}\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)} + \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)\left\{1 - \frac{\ell''(\theta_0)}{\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)\ell'''(\theta_n^*)}{\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have,

$$E\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log f(x|\theta_0)\right) = 0,$$

and

$$\text{var}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log f(x|\theta_0)\right) = E\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log f(x|\theta_0)\right)^2 = I(\theta_0).$$

By the Central Limit Theorem,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\ell'(\theta_0) = \sqrt{n}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \log f(x|\theta_0) - 0\right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I(\theta_0)), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By the Weak Law of Large Number,

$$-\frac{1}{n}\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n) = -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2}\log f(x|\theta_0) \xrightarrow{p} E\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2}\log f(x|\theta_0)\right) = I(\theta_0),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By the Slutsky's Theorem,

$$\frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\ell'(\theta_0)}{-\frac{1}{n}\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I^{-1}(\theta_0)), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By assumption ($\tilde{\theta}_n$ is \sqrt{n} -consistent),

$$\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = O_p(1), \text{ and } \tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0 \xrightarrow{p} 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{n} \ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \ell''(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{n} (\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \ell'''(\theta_n^{**}),$$

where θ_n^{**} is between $\tilde{\theta}_n$ and θ_0 . Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\ell''(\theta_0)}{\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)} \xrightarrow{p} 1, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By the regularity condition provided that $\ell'''(\theta_n^*)$ is bounded, we have

$$\frac{\ell'''(\theta_n^*)}{\ell''(\tilde{\theta}_n)} \xrightarrow{p} \text{constant}, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then combining the results above, by the Slutsky's Theorem, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\delta_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I^{-1}(\theta_0)) + O_p(1) \times \left(1 - 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0 \cdot 0\right) = N(0, I^{-1}(\theta_0)),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence the one-step estimator is efficient. \square