

Statistics 581, Problem Set 3 Solutions

Wellner; 10/21/2010

1. A sequence of random variables Y_n is *bounded in probability* and we write $Y_n = O_p(1)$ if

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|Y_n| > \lambda) = 0;$$

i.e. for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exist λ_ϵ and N_ϵ such that $P(|Y_n| > \lambda_\epsilon) < \epsilon$ for all $n > N_\epsilon$.

(a) Show that if $Y_n \rightarrow_d Y$ for some random variable Y , then Y_n is bounded in probability. (This is Lehmann and Casella, problem 8.24, page 77.)

(b) Give an example of a sequence of random variables Y_n that is bounded in probability, but does not converge in distribution.

(c) Lehmann and Casella, problem 8.25, page 77.

Solution: (a) Let F denote the limiting distribution, and let $Y \sim F$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Choose $\pm M \in C_F$ so large that $P(|Y| > M) \leq 1 - F(M) + F(-M) < \epsilon/2$. Since $\pm M \in C_F$, and $Y_n \sim F_n$ converge in distribution to $Y \sim F$, we can find an $N = N_{M,\epsilon}$ so that $|F_n(\pm M) - F(\pm M)| < \epsilon/4$. Then for $n \geq N$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P(|Y_n| > M) &= 1 - F_n(M) + F_n(-M) \\ &\leq 1 - F(M) + F(-M) + F(M) - F_n(M) + F_n(-M) - F(-M) \\ &< \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} = \epsilon; \end{aligned}$$

i.e. Y_n is bounded in probability.

(b) Suppose that $Y_n = (-1)^n Y$ where $Y \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$. Then $|Y_n| \leq |Y| = O_p(1)$, but $Y_{2n} \rightarrow Y$ while $Y_{2n+1} \rightarrow -Y$, and therefore $Y_n \not\rightarrow_d$.

(c) Problem 8.21 holds with o and O replaced by o_p and O_p :

(a') If $R_n = o_p(1/k_n)$, then $R_n/(1/k_n) = k_n R_n = o_p(1)$, so $k_n R_n = O_p(1)$, and hence $R_n = O_p(1/k_n)$.

(b') If $R_n = O_p(1)$ then R_n is bounded in probability. This is just the definition of R_n being $O_p(1)$.

(c') If $R_n = o_p(1)$, then $R_n \rightarrow_p 0$; this is just the definition of $R_n = o_p(1)$.

(d') If $R_n = O_p(1/k_n)$, and $k'_n/k_n \rightarrow \rho \in (-\infty, \infty)$, then $R_n = O_p(1/k'_n)$: for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $M = M_\epsilon$ and $N = N_\epsilon$ such the for $n \geq N_\epsilon$ we have

$$P(|k_n R_n| > M) < \epsilon$$

and, perhaps by choosing N_ϵ somewhat larger, $|k'_n/k_n - \rho| < \epsilon$. Thus with $M' = M(|\rho| + \epsilon)$,

$$P(|k'_n R_n| > M') = P(|(k'_n/k_n)k_n R_n| > M') \leq P((|\rho| + \epsilon)|k_n R_n| > M') \leq P(|k_n R_n| > M) < \epsilon.$$

Problem 8.22 holds with o and O replaced by o_p and O_p :

(a') If $R_n = O_p(1/k_n)$ and $R'_n = O_p(1/k'_n)$, then $R_n + R'_n = O_p(1/k_n)$: by the hypothesis, for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $M = M_\epsilon, M'_\epsilon$ such that for $n \geq N_\epsilon$

$$P(|k_n R_n| > M) < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad P(|k'_n R'_n| > M') < \epsilon.$$

Let $\tilde{M} \equiv M_{\epsilon/2} + M'_{\epsilon/2}$. Then

$$P(|k_n(R_n + R'_n)| > \tilde{M}) \leq P(|k_n R_n| > M_{\epsilon/2}) + P(|k_n R'_n| > M'_{\epsilon/2}) < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon.$$

Thus $R_n + R'_n = O_p(1/k_n)$.

(b') If $R_n = o_p(1/k_n)$ and $R'_n = o_p(1/k_n)$, then $k_n R_n \rightarrow_p 0$ and $k_n R'_n \rightarrow_p 0$, so $k_n(R_n + R'_n) \rightarrow_p 0$; i.e. $R_n + R'_n = o_p(1/k_n)$.

Problem 8.23 holds with o and O replaced by o_p and O_p : Suppose that $k'_n/k_n \rightarrow \infty$.

(a') If $R_n = O_p(1/k_n)$ and $R'_n = O_p(1/k'_n)$, then $R_n + R'_n = O_p(1/k_n)$: The hypotheses imply that $k_n R_n = O_p(1)$ and $R'_n = O_p(1/k'_n)$. Thus

$$k_n(R_n + R'_n) = k_n R_n + \frac{k_n}{k'_n} k'_n R'_n = O_p(1) + o_p(1)O_p(1) = O_p(1);$$

i.e. $R_n + R'_n = O_p(1/k_n)$.

(b') If $R_n = o_p(1/k_n)$ and $R'_n = o_p(1/k'_n)$, then $R_n + R'_n = o_p(1/k_n)$: This follows easily since

$$k_n(R_n + R'_n) = k_n R_n + \frac{k_n}{k'_n} k'_n R'_n \rightarrow_p 0 + 0 \cdot 0 = 0.$$

2. Suppose that X is a random variable with finite fourth moment; $E|X|^4 < \infty$. Then $\mu_4 = E(X - \mu)^4$ is the fourth central moment of X . The ratio $\mu_4/\sigma^4 \equiv \kappa$ is the *kurtosis* of X (or of the distribution function F of X), and $\gamma_2 \equiv \mu_4/\sigma^4 - 3$ is called the *excess of kurtosis*; note that for any $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ random variable, $\gamma_2 = 0$. Investigate the value of γ_2 for various classical distributions (t_r , uniform, bernoulli, Poisson(λ), ...). How big can γ_2 be? How small can γ_2 be?

Solution: Note that $\mu_4^{1/4} = \{E(X - \mu)^4\}^{1/4} \geq \{E(X - \mu)^2\}^{1/2} = \sigma$ by Liapunov's inequality. Thus $\mu_4/\sigma^4 \geq 1$ always, or $\gamma_2 \equiv \mu_4/\sigma^4 \geq -2$ with equality if $X = \pm 1$ with probability $1/2$ each: then $\mu = 0$, $\sigma^2 = 1$, $\mu_4 = 1$, and $\gamma_2 = -2$.

For $X \sim N(0, 1)$, $\gamma_2 = 0$ since $EX^4 = 3$.

For $X \sim t_r$, $r > 4$, $\gamma_2 = 6/(r - 4) \nearrow \infty$ as $r \searrow 4$; $\gamma_2 \searrow 0$ as $r \nearrow \infty$.

For $X \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$, $\gamma_2 = 6/\alpha \nearrow \infty$ as $\alpha \searrow 0$.

For $X \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$, $\gamma_2 = 1/\lambda \nearrow \infty$ as $\lambda \searrow 0$.

For $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$, $\gamma_2 = (1 - p)^2/p + p^2/(1 - p) - 3$ which $= -2$ when $p = 1/2$, and $\nearrow \infty$ when $p \rightarrow 0, 1$.

3. Suppose that X, X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. with mean μ , variance σ^2 , and $E|X|^4 < \infty$.

(a) Show that the sample variance $S_n^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2 / (n - 1)$ satisfies

$$\sqrt{n}(S_n^2 - \sigma^2) / \sqrt{2}\sigma^2 \rightarrow_d N(0, 1 + \gamma_2/2).$$

(b) Suppose that you want to test $H : \sigma \leq \sigma_0^2$ versus $K : \sigma^2 > \sigma_0^2$ for σ_0 a fixed number, and you base your test on normal theory, but in fact the X 's are *not normal* with $\gamma_2 \neq 0$. What effect does this have on the level (or size or actual type one

error) of the normal theory test?

Solution: (a) Since

$$\bar{S}_n^2 \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 - (\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2$$

where $Y_i \equiv (X_i - \mu)^2$ are i.i.d. $(E(Y_1), Var(Y_1)) = (\sigma^2, \mu_4 - \sigma^4)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\bar{S}_n^2 - \sigma^2) &= \sqrt{n}(\bar{Y}_n - \sigma^2) - \sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu)(\bar{X}_n - \mu) \\ &\rightarrow_d N(0, \mu_4 - \sigma^4) - N(0, \sigma^2) \cdot 0 \\ &= N(0, \mu_4 - \sigma^4). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{S}_n^2 - \sigma^2)/(\sqrt{2}\sigma^2) \rightarrow_d N(0, (\mu_4/\sigma^4 - 1)/2) = N(0, (\mu_4/\sigma^4 - 3 + 2)/2) = N(0, 1 + \gamma_2/2).$$

If instead of \bar{S}_n^2 we consider the more usual $S_n^2 = (n/(n-1))\bar{S}_n^2$, it is easily seen that

$$\sqrt{n}(S_n^2 - \bar{S}_n^2) = \sqrt{n}\left(\frac{n}{n-1} - 1\right)\bar{S}_n^2 = o(1)O_p(1) = o_p(1).$$

Thus we also have

$$\sqrt{n}(S_n^2 - \sigma^2)/(\sqrt{2}\sigma^2) \rightarrow_d N(0, 1 + \gamma_2/2).$$

(b) When the X_i 's are normal, $\gamma_2 = 0$ and $(n-1)S_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \sim \chi_{n-1}^2$ when $\sigma = \sigma_0$ is true. Hence the size of the normal theory test when normal theory is true is

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= P_{\sigma_0}((n-1)S_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \geq \chi_{n-1, \alpha}^2) \\ &= P_{\sigma_0}(\sqrt{n}(S_n^2/\sigma_0^2 - 1)/\sqrt{2} \geq \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\frac{\chi_{n-1, \alpha}^2}{n-1} - 1)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sqrt{n}(S_n^2/\sigma_0^2 - 1)/\sqrt{2} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1)$ under normality, this forces

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\frac{\chi_{n-1, \alpha}^2}{n-1} - 1) \rightarrow z_\alpha.$$

Thus when the X_i 's are *not* normal we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\sigma_0}((n-1)S_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \geq \chi_{n-1, \alpha}^2) &= P_{\sigma_0}(\sqrt{n}(S_n^2/\sigma_0^2 - 1)/\sqrt{2} \geq \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\frac{\chi_{n-1, \alpha}^2}{n-1} - 1)) \\ &\rightarrow P(N(0, 1 + \gamma_2/2) \geq z_\alpha) \\ &= P(Z \geq \frac{z_\alpha}{\sqrt{1 + \gamma_2/2}}) = 1 - \Phi(\frac{z_\alpha}{\sqrt{1 + \gamma_2/2}}). \end{aligned}$$

When $\gamma_2 = -2$, the asymptotic size is 0; when $\gamma_2 = 0$, the asymptotic size is α ; when $\gamma_2 = \infty$, the asymptotic size is 1/2. For $\gamma_2 \in [-2, 0)$ the asymptotic size is $< \alpha$ while for $\gamma_2 \in (0, \infty)$ the asymptotic size is $> \alpha$.

4. Suppose that X_1, \dots, X_n are independent Poisson(λ) random variables (so $P(X_1 = k) = e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k / k!$, $k = 0, 1, \dots$).

(a) Show that $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \lambda) \rightarrow_d N(0, \text{"something"})$.

(b) Show that the sequence $\{\sqrt{n}|\bar{X}_n - \lambda|\}$ is uniformly integrable and find $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\sqrt{n}|\bar{X}_n - \lambda|)$.

(c) Let $g(x) = x^\gamma$ for $x \geq 0$ and $0 < \gamma < \infty$. Show that $\sqrt{n}(g(\bar{X}_n) - g(\lambda)) \rightarrow_d N(0, V^2)$ and compute V^2 explicitly in terms of λ and γ . For what γ is V^2 constant in λ ? Is this the value of γ that makes $g(\bar{X}_n)$ "most nearly normal"?

Solution: (a) By the univariate CLT, since $E(X_1) = \lambda$ and $\text{Var}(X_1) = \lambda$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \lambda) \rightarrow_d Y \sim N(0, \lambda);$$

note that $Y =_d \sqrt{\lambda}Z$ where $Z \sim N(0, 1)$.

(b) Let $Y_n = \sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \lambda)$. Then $E(Y_n) = 0$ and $E(Y_n^2) = \text{Var}(Y_n) = n(\lambda/n) = \lambda$. Hence $\lim_n E(Y_n^2) = \lambda < \infty$. But this implies that $\{|Y_n|\}_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable. Hence by Vitali's theorem (applied to almost surely convergent versions Y_n^* , Y^* as described in section 2.3), or by the Helly-Bray theorem and truncation ($E|Y_n| = E\{|Y_n| \wedge M\} + E\{(|Y_n| - M)1_{\{|Y_n| > M\}}\}$),

$$E|Y_n| \rightarrow E|Y| = \sqrt{\lambda}E|Z| = \sqrt{2\lambda/\pi}$$

since

$$E|Z| = 2 \int_0^\infty z\phi(z)dz = 2 \int_0^\infty \{-\phi'(z)\}dz = 2\phi(0) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}.$$

(c) Since $g'(x) = \gamma x^{\gamma-1}$ the g' theorem yields

$$\sqrt{n}(g(\bar{X}_n) - g(\lambda)) \rightarrow_d g'(\lambda)Y = \gamma\lambda^{\gamma-1}Y \sim N(0, \gamma^2\lambda^{2\gamma-1}).$$

When $\gamma = 1/2$ this yields

$$\sqrt{n}(\sqrt{\bar{X}_n} - \sqrt{\lambda}) \rightarrow_d N(0, 1/4).$$

Thus $g(x) = \sqrt{x}$ is variance stabilizing for Poisson. It is not the transformation which makes $g(\bar{X}_n)$ most nearly normal in terms of skewness; it turns out that with $g(x) = x^{2/3}$ the transformed variable $g(\bar{X}_n)$ has approximate skewness 0; see e.g. Anscombe (1948), *Biometrika* **35**, 246 - 254, or Efron (1982), *Ann. Statist.* **10**, 323 - 339. Of course this transformation is *not* variance stabilizing; $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n^{2/3} - \lambda^{2/3}) \rightarrow_d N(0, (4/9)\lambda^{1/3})$ which depends on λ .

5. Suppose that X_1, X_2, \dots are i.i.d. positive random variables, and define $\bar{X}_n \equiv n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, $H_n \equiv 1/(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1/X_i))$, and $G_n \equiv \{\prod_{i=1}^n X_i\}^{1/n}$ to be the *arithmetic*, *harmonic*, and *geometric* means respectively. We know that $\bar{X}_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} E(X_1) = \mu$ if and only if $E|X_1| < \infty$.

(a) Use the SLLN together with appropriate additional hypotheses to show that $H_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} 1/\{E(1/X_1)\} \equiv h$, and $G_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} \exp\{E\{\log X_1\}\} \equiv g$.

(c) Use the multivariate CLT and the delta method to find the joint limiting distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu, H_n - h, G_n - g)$. You will need to impose or assume

additional moment conditions to be able to prove this. Specify these additional assumptions carefully.

Solution: (a) If $0 < E(1/X_1) < \infty$, then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1/X_i) \rightarrow_{a.s.} E(1/X_1) > 0.$$

If $E|\log(X_1)| < \infty$, then

$$\log G_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(X_i) \rightarrow_{a.s.} E \log X_1.$$

Thus by the continuous mapping theorem if both $E(1/X_1) < \infty$ and $E|\log X_1| < \infty$, it follows that

$$(H_n, G_n) \rightarrow_{a.s.} (1/E(1/X_1), \exp(E \log X_1)) \equiv (h, g).$$

(c) By the multivariate CLT, if $EX_1^2 < \infty$, $E(1/X_1)^2 < \infty$, and $E(\log X_1)^2 < \infty$, then

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}_n - \mu \\ \bar{X}_n^{-1} - E(1/X_1) \\ \log \bar{X}_n - E \log X_1 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow_d \underline{Z} \sim N_3(0, \Sigma)$$

where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Var}(X_1) & \text{Cov}(X_1, 1/X_1) & \text{Cov}(X_1, \log(X_1)) \\ \text{Cov}(X_1, 1/X_1) & \text{Var}(1/X_1) & \text{Cov}(1/X_1, \log X_1) \\ \text{Cov}(X_1, \log(X_1)) & \text{Cov}(1/X_1, \log X_1) & \text{Var}(\log(X_1)) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence by the delta method with $g(x, y, z) = (x, 1/y, \exp(z))$ so that $\nabla g(x, y, z) = \text{diag}(1, -y^{-2}, \exp(z))$ and $\nabla g(\mu, E(1/X_1), E(\log X_1)) = \text{diag}(1, -h^2, g)$, it follows that

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}_n - \mu \\ H_n - h \\ G_n - g \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow_d \nabla g \cdot \underline{Z} \sim N_3(0, \nabla g \Sigma \nabla g^T).$$