

Homework 7

Problem 1 (#5.11)

Consider the Lagrange multiplier method with

$$H(p_1, \dots, p_n, \tau, \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log p_i + \tau \left(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i - 1 \right) - n\lambda^\tau \sum_{i=1}^n p_i u_i.$$

Taking the derivatives of H and setting them to 0, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{p_i} + \tau - n\lambda^\tau \mu_i = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \mu_i = 0$$

The solution to these equations is $\tau = -n$ and

$$\hat{p}_i = \frac{1}{n(1 + \lambda^\tau \mu_i)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Substituting \hat{p}_i into $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \mu_i = 0$, we conclude that λ is the solution of

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mu_i}{1 + \lambda^\tau \mu_i} = 0$$

Problem 2 (# 5.15)

i

Since

$$1 - q_i = 1 - \frac{p_i}{\sum_{j=i}^{n+1} p_j} = \frac{\sum_{j=i+1}^{n+1} p_j}{\sum_{j=i}^{n+1} p_j}$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^n q_i^{\delta_i} (1 - q_i)^{1-\delta_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i^{\delta_i} \left(\sum_{j=i+1}^{n+1} p_j \right)^{1-\delta_i} \left(\sum_{j=i}^{n+1} p_j \right)^{-1}$$

From

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (1 - q_i)^{n-i} = \left(\frac{\sum_{j=2}^{n+1} p_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} p_j} \right)^{n-1} \left(\frac{\sum_{j=3}^{n+1} p_j}{\sum_{j=2}^{n+1} p_j} \right)^{n-2} \dots \left(\frac{\sum_{j=n}^{n+1} p_j}{\sum_{j=n-1}^{n+1} p_j} \right)$$
$$= \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} p_j \sum_{j=3}^{n+1} p_j \dots \sum_{j=n}^{n+1} p_j$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i}^{n+1} p_j$$

We obtain that

$$\prod_{i=1}^n q_i^{\delta_i} (1 - q_i)^{n-i+1-\delta_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i^{\delta_i} \left(\sum_{j=i+1}^{n+1} p_j \right)^{1-\delta_i}$$

The result follows since q_1, \dots, q_n are n free variables.

ii

From part(1),

$$\log \ell(p_1, \dots, p_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n [\delta_i \log q_i + (n - i + 1 - \delta_i) \log 1 - q_i]$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial \log \ell}{\partial q_i} = \frac{\delta_i}{q_i} - \frac{n - i + 1 - \delta_i}{1 - q_i} = 0, i = 1, \dots, n,$$

have the solution

$$\hat{q}_i = \frac{\delta_i}{n - i + 1}, i = 1, \dots, n,$$

Which maximizes $\ell(p_1, \dots, p_{n+1})$ since

$$\frac{\partial^2 \log \ell}{\partial q_i^2} = -\frac{\delta_i}{q_i^2} - \frac{n - i + 1 - \delta_i}{(1 - q_i)^2} \leq 0, \text{ and } \frac{\partial^2 \log \ell}{\partial q_i \partial q_k} = 0;$$

for any i and $k \neq i$. Since

$$\prod_{j=1}^i (1 - q_j) = \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{n+1} p_k}{\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} p_k} \frac{\sum_{k=3}^{n+1} p_k}{\sum_{k=2}^{n+1} p_k} \dots \frac{\sum_{k=i}^{n+1} p_k}{\sum_{k=i-1}^{n+1} p_k} = \sum_{k=i}^{n+1} p_k,$$

we obtain that

$$q_i \prod_{j=1}^i (1 - q_j) = p_i, i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Hence, by (i), $\ell(p_1, \dots, p_{n+1})$ is maximized by

$$\hat{p}_i = \hat{q}_i \prod_{j=1}^i (1 - \hat{q}_j) = \frac{\delta_i}{n - i + 1} \prod_{j=1}^i \left(1 - \frac{\delta_j}{n - j + 1} \right), i = 1, \dots, n$$

and $p_{n+1} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{p}_i$

iii

Define $x_0 = 0$ and $x_{n+1} = \infty$. Let $t \in (x_i, x_{i+1}]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Then

$$\prod_{x_i \leq t} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_i}{n - i + 1} \right) = \prod_{j=1}^i (1 - \hat{q}_j) = \frac{\hat{p}_i}{\hat{q}_i} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \hat{p}_j$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \hat{p}_i I_{(0,t]}(x_i) = 1 - \prod_{x_i \leq t} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_i}{n - i + 1} \right).$$

iv

When $\delta_i = 1$ for all i ,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{p}_i &= \frac{1}{n-i+1} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n-j}{n-j+1} \\ &= \frac{1}{n-i+1} \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdots \frac{n-i+1}{n-i+2} = \frac{1}{n}\end{aligned}$$

Problem 3

(# 5.20)

Suppose that ξ satisfies $\ell(\theta, \xi) = \sup_{\xi} \ell(\theta, \xi)$ for any θ . Then the profile likelihood function is $\ell_P(\theta) = \ell(\theta, \hat{\xi})$. If $\hat{\theta}$ satisfies $\ell_P(\hat{\theta}) = \sup_{\theta} \ell_P(\theta)$, then $\ell(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\xi}) = \ell_P(\hat{\theta}) \geq \ell_P(\theta) = \ell(\theta, \hat{\xi}) \geq \ell(\theta, \xi)$ for any θ and ξ . Hence, $(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\xi})$ is an MLE.

5.21)

The likelihood function is

$$\ell(\mu, \sigma^2) = (2\pi)^{-n/2} (\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2\right)$$

For fixed σ^2 , $\ell(\mu, \sigma^2) \leq \ell(\bar{X}, \sigma^2)$, since $\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$. Hence the maximum does not depend on σ^2 and the profile likelihood function is

$$\ell_{\bar{X}, \sigma^2} = (2\pi)^{-n/2} (\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2\right).$$

By the result in the previous exercise, the profile MLE of σ^2 is the same as the MLE of σ^2 . This can also be shown by directly verifying that $\ell(\bar{X}, \sigma^2)$ is maximized at $\hat{\sigma}^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$. For fixed μ , $\ell(\mu, \sigma^2)$ is maximized at $\sigma^2(\mu) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2$. Then the profile likelihood function is

$$(2\pi)^{-n/2} e^{-n/2} \left[\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2} \right]^{n/2}.$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2$, $\ell(\mu, \sigma^2(\mu))$ is maximized at \bar{X} .

Problem 4 # 5.23)

i

If $\pi(x) \equiv \pi$, then X_i and δ_i are independent. Hence, $F_1(x) = P(X_i \leq x | \delta_i = 1) = P(X_i \leq x) = F(x)$ for any x . If $F_1(x) = F(x)$ for any x , then $P(X_i \leq x, \delta_i = 1) = P(X_i \leq x)P(\delta_i = 1)$ for any x and, hence X_i and δ_i are independent. Thus, $\pi(x) \equiv \pi$.

ii

Note that

$$\hat{F}(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i I_{(-\infty, x]}(X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i}$$

Since $E[\delta_i I_{(-\infty, x]}(X_i) | \delta_i] = \delta_i F_1(x)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\hat{F}(x)] &= E[E[\hat{F}(x) | \delta_1, \dots, \delta_n]] \\ &= E\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n E[\delta_i I_{(-\infty, x]}(X_i) | \delta_i]}{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i}\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i F_1(x)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i}\right] = F_1(x) \end{aligned}$$

. From the law of large numbers,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i I_{(-\infty, x]}(X_i) \rightarrow_p E[\delta_1 I_{(-\infty, x]}(X_1)] = E[\delta_1 F_1(x)] = \pi F_1(x)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i \rightarrow_p E(\delta_1) = \pi$$

Hence, $\hat{F}(x) \rightarrow_p F_1(x)$

iii

When $\pi(x) = \pi$, $F(x) = F_1(x)$. Hence, $\hat{F}(x)$ is unbiased and consistent for $F(x)$. When $\pi(x)$ is not constant, $F(x) \neq F_1(x)$ for some x . Since $\hat{F}(x)$ is unbiased and consistent for $F_1(x)$, it is biased and inconsistent for $F(x)$ for x at which $F(x) \neq F_1(x)$.