

ENEE 621

Spring 2016

Homework 8

Solutions

1- See problem 1 of homework 7.

2. a) CR1 is equivalent to that  $\Theta$  is an open set in  $\mathbb{R}^p$

CR2a is equivalent to that  $c(\theta)q(y)e^{Q(\theta)'k(y)}$  is absolutely continuous in  $\mathbb{R}^k$

CR2b is equivalent to  $f_\theta(y) > 0$  for  $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , which is also equivalent to  $q(y) > 0$  for  $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ .

It makes no difference for  $\theta \in \Theta$ , thus CR2b holds

CR3 is equivalent to the condition that the mappings  $C$  and  $Q$  are differentiable on  $\Theta$ .

To identify CR4, we notice that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \ln f_\theta(y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \ln c(\theta) + \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta) \right)' k(y),$$

$i=1, \dots, p, \quad \theta \in \Theta.$

thus, CR4 holds if  $E_\theta[|k_l(y)|^2] < \infty$ ,  
 $l=1, \dots, d, \quad \theta \in \Theta$

CR5 is equivalent to the condition that

$$0 = c(\theta) \int_S \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta) \right)' K(y) \cdot \exp[Q(\theta)' K(y)] q(y) dF(y) \\ + \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} c(\theta) \cdot \int_S \exp[Q(\theta)' K(y)] q(y) dF(y), \quad i=1, \dots, p,$$

which is further equivalent to

$$0 = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta) \right)' E_{\theta} [K(y)] + \frac{1}{c(\theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} c(\theta), \quad i=1, \dots, p,$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \ln c(\theta) = - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta) \right)' E_{\theta} [K(y)]$$

2. b) Let  $M_{ij}(\theta)$  denote the element at the position  $(i, j)$ ,

~~$$M_{ij}(\theta) = E_{\theta} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta) \right)' \right]$$~~

using the conclusion of 2.a),

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \log c(\theta) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' K(y)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' [K(y) - E_{\theta} [K(y)]]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus, } M_{ij}(\theta) &= E_{\theta} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' [K(\eta) - E_{\theta}[K(\eta)]] [K(\eta) - E_{\theta}[K(\eta)]]' \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta) \right] \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' \text{COV}_{\theta}[K(\eta)] \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{c) } E_{\theta} \left[ g(\eta) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \log f_{\theta}(\eta) \right) \right] &= \int_{\mathcal{S}} g(\eta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} (c(\theta) \exp[Q(\theta)' K(\eta)]) q(\eta) dF(\eta) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{S}} g(\eta) \left( \frac{1}{c(\theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} c(\theta) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' K(\eta) \right) f_{\theta}(\eta) dF(\eta) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} (\log c(\theta) E_{\theta}[g(\eta)]) + E_{\theta} \left[ g(\eta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' K(\eta) \right] \\ &= E_{\theta} \left[ (g(\eta) - E_{\theta}[g(\eta)]) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' K(\eta) \right], \quad i=1, \dots, \beta, \\ &\quad \theta \in \Theta \end{aligned}$$

The regularity condition is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} E[g(\eta)] &= E_{\theta} \left[ (g(\eta) - E_{\theta}[g(\eta)]) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} Q(\theta)' K(\eta) \right], \\ &\quad i=1, \dots, \beta, \quad \theta \in \Theta \end{aligned}$$

3. See problem 7 in homework 7.

4. The Poisson distribution is

$$p(Y=y) = \frac{\lambda^y e^{-\lambda}}{y!}$$

With  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$ , we have

$$p_{\theta}(y) = \frac{\lambda^{\eta_1} e^{-\lambda}}{\eta_1!} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{\eta_2} e^{-\lambda}}{\eta_2!} = \frac{\lambda^{(\eta_1+\eta_2)} e^{-2\lambda}}{\eta_1! \eta_2!}$$

Let  $\theta = e^{-\lambda}$ , then  $\lambda = -\log \theta$

$$p_{\theta}(y) = \frac{(-\log \theta)^{\eta_1+\eta_2} \theta^2}{\eta_1! \eta_2!}$$

$$= \theta^2 \exp \{ \log(-\log \theta) \cdot (\eta_1 + \eta_2) \} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_1! \eta_2!}$$

By proposition IV.C-3 in the textbook,

$\eta_1 + \eta_2$  is a complete sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ .

5. a) From  $F_\theta(y) = [F(y)]^{1/\theta}$ , we can have

$$f_\theta(y) = \exp\left\{ \frac{n}{\theta} \log F(y_k) \right\},$$

which means that  $\sum_{k=1}^n \log F(y_k)$  is a complete sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  by the completeness theorem for exponential families.

$$E\left[ \sum_{k=1}^n \log F(y_k) \right] = \frac{n}{\theta} \int_{-\infty}^0 x e^{\frac{x}{\theta}} dx = -n\theta$$

Thus we have  $E[\hat{\theta}_{MV}(y)] = \theta$

$$b) f(\theta|y) = C^m \exp\left(-\left(-\sum_{k=1}^n \log F(y_k)\right)/\theta\right) / (\Gamma(m)\theta^{m+1}), \theta > 0.$$

$$E[\theta|y] = \frac{-\sum_{k=1}^n \log F(y_k)}{m+n-1} = \hat{\theta}_{MMSE}(y)$$

c)  $\hat{\theta}_{MV}(y)$  does not depend on the prior distribution of  $\theta$ , in other words, no prior information is used.

For  $\hat{\theta}_{MMSE}(y)$ , if  $n$  is small,  $E[\theta|y] \approx \frac{C}{m-1} = E[\theta]$ , which is the estimate from prior information. With more observations available,  $n$  increases, and the weight of prior information decreases.

6. Since  $E_{\theta} [\nabla_{\theta} \log f_{\theta}(\gamma)] = 0$ , it is easy to verify that

$$E_{\theta} [U(\theta, \gamma)] = 0.$$

$$\text{cov}_{\theta} [U(\theta, \gamma)] = E [U(\theta, \gamma)' U(\theta, \gamma)]$$

$$= E [(g(\nabla_{\theta})' (g(\gamma) - \theta)) - b_{\theta}(g) b_{\theta}(g)']$$

$$- (I_p + \nabla_{\theta} b_{\theta}(g)) M(\theta) M(\theta)^{-2} (I_p + \nabla_{\theta} b_{\theta}(g))'$$

$$= \Sigma_{\theta}(g) - b_{\theta}(g) b_{\theta}(g)' - (I_p + \nabla_{\theta} b_{\theta}(g)) M(\theta)^{-1} (I_p + \nabla_{\theta} b_{\theta}(g))'$$

It is easy to see that  $\text{cov}_{\theta} (U(\theta, \gamma)) \geq 0$

$$\Rightarrow \Sigma_{\theta}(g) \geq b_{\theta}(g) b_{\theta}(g)' + (I_p + \nabla_{\theta} b_{\theta}(g)) M(\theta)^{-1} (I_p + \nabla_{\theta} b_{\theta}(g))'$$

which is the claim of Theorem 5.1 in the lecture notes.

In Theorem 5.1, if the equality holds iff

$$g(\gamma) - \theta = b_{\theta}(g) + K(\theta) \nabla_{\theta} \log f_{\theta}(\gamma) \quad \text{F-a.e.}$$

where  $K(\theta) = (I_p + \nabla_{\theta} b_{\theta}(g)) M(\theta)^{-1}$ , which means  $U(\theta, \gamma) = 0$ .



$$7. i) f_{\theta}(y_k) = \begin{cases} \theta e^{-\theta y_k} & \text{if } y_k \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f_{\theta}(y) = \begin{cases} \theta^n e^{-\theta \sum_{k=1}^n y_k} & \text{if } \min(y_1, \dots, y_n) \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\log f_{\theta}(y) = n \log \theta - \theta \sum_{k=1}^n y_k$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{n}{\theta} - \sum_{k=1}^n y_k$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log f_{\theta}(y) = -\frac{n}{\theta^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The Fisher information matrix } M^{(1)}(\theta) &= -E_{\theta} \left[ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log f_{\theta}(y) \right] \\ &= \frac{\theta^2}{n} \frac{n}{\theta^2} \end{aligned}$$

ii) The MVUE is the estimator that achieves unbiased estimation with lowest variance. Therefore we just investigate whether the variance is greater than the CRLB.

It's easy to see that  $\sum_{k=1}^n y_k$  is a complete sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ , and

$$E\left[\frac{n-1}{n} \cdot \frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}\right] = \theta \equiv \theta$$

and  $\frac{n-1}{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}$  is the MVUE

$\text{Var}[\hat{\theta}_{MV}(y)] = \frac{\theta^2}{n-2}$ , while the CRLB is  $\frac{\theta^2}{n}$ ,  
therefore, there is no efficient estimator for  $\theta$ .

iii) Since  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{n}{\theta} - \frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}$

$$\hat{\theta}_{ML}(y) = \frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}$$

iv)  $E_{\theta}[\hat{\theta}_{ML}(y)] = \frac{n\theta}{n-1}$ , it is biased

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{\theta}[\hat{\theta}_{ML}(y)] = \theta$ , it is asymptotically unbiased.

Since  $\frac{1}{\hat{\theta}_{ML}(\eta)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}{n}$ , by the law of large numbers, with  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , it converges to  $\frac{1}{\theta}$  almost surely, thus  $\hat{\theta}_{ML}(\eta)$  is consistent.

Since  $\hat{\theta}_{ML}(\eta)$  can not be written in the form of sum of i.i.d random variables, it is not asymptotically normal.

$$8. i) \log f_{\theta}(y) = -\log \pi - \log (1 + (y - \theta)^2)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{2(y - \theta)}{1 + (y - \theta)^2}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log f_{\theta}(y) = -2 \frac{1 - (y - \theta)^2}{(1 + (y - \theta)^2)^2}$$

$$\text{Thus, } I(\theta) = E_{\theta} \left[ -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log f_{\theta}(y) \right]$$

$$= 2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1 - (y - \theta)^2}{(1 + (y - \theta)^2)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (y - \theta)^2} dy$$

$$= \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1 - x^2}{(1 + x^2)^3} dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} = M^{(1)}(\theta)$$

ii) If there exists an efficient estimator, it satisfies

$$g(y) - \theta = M(\theta)^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) \quad \text{when } n=1$$

$$\text{In this problem, } M(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{2(y - \theta)}{1 + (y - \theta)^2}$$

Then we obtain

$$g(\eta) - \theta = \frac{2 \cdot 2(\eta - \theta)}{1 + (\eta - \theta)^2}$$

$$g(\eta) = \theta + \frac{4(\eta - \theta)}{1 + (\eta - \theta)^2}$$

which can not be reduced to the form independent of  $\theta$ .  
In this problem, there is no efficient estimator.

iii) While there is no closed form solution of the ML estimator with  $n > 1$ , we obtain the ML estimator with  $n = 1$ .

$$\text{From } \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(\eta) = \frac{2(\eta - \theta)}{1 + (\eta - \theta)^2},$$

it is easy to see that

$$\hat{\theta}_{ML}(\eta) = \eta$$

For  $n > 1$ , it has to be solved by numerical methods.

$$\text{iv) } E_{\theta}[\hat{\theta}_{ML}(\eta)] = E_{\theta}(\eta) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\eta}{1 + (\eta - \theta)^2} d\eta$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \pi \theta = \theta,$$

it is unbiased as well as ~~asymptotically unbiased~~.

$$q. i) f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}} \exp\left\{-\frac{y^2}{2\theta}\right\}$$

$$\log f_{\theta}(y) = -\frac{y^2}{2\theta} - \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \log \theta$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{y^2}{2\theta^2} - \frac{1}{2\theta}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^2} \log f_{\theta}(y) = -\frac{y^2}{\theta^3} + \frac{1}{2\theta^2}$$

$$M^{(1)}(\theta) = -E\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^2} \log f_{\theta}(y)\right] = -E\left[-\frac{y^2}{\theta^3} + \frac{1}{2\theta^2}\right] = \frac{1}{2\theta^2}$$

With  $n$  observations,  $M^{(1)}(\theta) = \frac{h}{2\theta^2}$

ii) With  $n$  independent observations,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) = \frac{\sum y_i^2}{2\theta^2} - \frac{n}{2\theta}$$

By lemma 5.2 in the lecture notes, we get

$$g(y) - \theta = M(\theta)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} \log f_{\theta}(y)$$

$$g(y) - \theta = \frac{\sum y_i^2}{n} - \theta$$

$$g(y) = \frac{\sum y_i^2}{n}$$

$$\text{iii) } \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta}(y) = 0 \iff$$

$$\frac{\sum y_i^2 - n\theta}{2\theta^2} = 0$$

$\hat{\theta}_{ML}(y) = \frac{\sum y_i^2}{n}$ , which is the same as the efficient estimator.

iv) Since for any r.v.  $X$ ,  $E[X^2] = \text{Var}(X) + E[X]^2$ ,

$$E[y_i^2] = \theta, \text{ and } E\left[\frac{\sum y_i^2}{n}\right] = \theta.$$

Therefore, the estimator is unbiased, as well as asymptotically unbiased.

By the Law of large numbers,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\theta} [|\hat{\theta}_{ML}(y) - \theta| > \epsilon] = 0,$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\theta}_{ML}(y) = \theta \quad \text{a.s.}$$

it is both strong and weak consistent.

By Theorem 9.3 in the lecture notes, it is also asymptotically normal.

10. a) The log-likelihood function is

$$\log f_{\theta}(y) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{k=1}^n [y_k - A \sin(\frac{k\pi}{Z} + \phi)]^2 - \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi\sigma^2)$$

The likelihood equations are

$$\sum_{k=1}^n [y_k - \hat{A} \sin(\frac{k\pi}{Z} + \hat{\phi})] \sin(\frac{k\pi}{Z} + \hat{\phi}) = 0$$

and

$$\hat{A} \sum_{k=1}^n [y_k - \hat{A} \sin(\frac{k\pi}{Z} + \hat{\phi})] \cos(\frac{k\pi}{Z} + \hat{\phi}) = 0$$

The ML estimates can be expressed as

$$\hat{A}_{ML}(y) = \sqrt{\eta_c^2 + \eta_s^2}$$

$$\hat{\phi}_{ML}(y) = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\eta_c}{\eta_s} \right)$$

where  $\eta_c = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n y_k \cos(\frac{k\pi}{Z})$

$$\eta_s = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n y_k \sin(\frac{k\pi}{Z})$$



b) Since the prior of  $\phi$  does not contain any information,

$$\hat{\phi}_{\text{MAP}} = \hat{\phi}_{\text{ML}}$$

Using the prior of  $A$ , the MAP estimate can be obtained as

$$\hat{A}_{\text{MAP}} = \frac{\hat{A}_{\text{ML}} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\alpha}{n}\right)^2 + \frac{2cHd\Delta^2}{n}}}{1 + \alpha} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{where } \alpha = \frac{2\Delta^2}{h\beta^2}$$

c)  $\hat{\phi}_{\text{MAP}} = \hat{\phi}_{\text{ML}}$  since the prior contains no information.

Similarly, if  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ , the prior of  $A$  is more and more flat. By (1),  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  and  $\hat{A}_{\text{MAP}} = \hat{A}_{\text{ML}}$ .