

## Statistics 583, Problem Set 5

Wellner; 5/27/2016

**Reading:** Chapter 6, pages 1 - 50.

Van der Vaart, Chapters 13-15, pages 173 - 226.

**Due:** Wednesday, May 4, 2016

**Reminder:** Midterm exam, Monday, May 2.

1. A random variable  $X$  takes on the values 1, 2, 3, 4 with probability distribution  $p_0(x)$  or  $p_1(x)$  as follows:

$x$	1	2	3	4
$p_0(x)$	.54	.08	.12	.26
$p_1(x)$	.22	.16	.36	.26

- (a) Find a most powerful test of size  $\alpha = .15$  for testing  $p_0$  versus  $p_1$  and determine its power.
  - (b) Find a test  $\phi$  which minimizes the Bayes risk with 0 - 1 loss and prior distribution  $(\lambda, 1 - \lambda) = (2/5, 3/5)$ ; i.e. a test  $\phi$  which minimizes  $\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b$  where  $a = E_0\phi$  and  $b = E_1(1 - \phi)$ .
2. Continuation of problem 1. For  $P_0$  and  $P_1$  as given in problem 1, compute  $d_{TV}(P_0, P_1)$ ,  $H(P_0, P_1)$ , and the affinity  $\rho(P_0, P_1) = \int \sqrt{p_0 p_1} d\mu$ . For the product laws  $P_{0n}$  and  $P_{1n}$  (corresponding to observation of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  i.i.d.  $P_0$  or  $P_1$  respectively) compute  $\rho(P_{0n}, P_{1n})$  and  $H(P_{0n}, P_{1n})$  for  $n = 20, 50, 100$ . What does this imply about the test,  $\phi_n$  say, based on  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  which minimizes the sum of risks?
  3. **Optional bonus problem 1:** For observations  $\underline{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , let  $X_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}$  denote the *order statistics* of the  $X_i$ 's ( $X_{(i)} \equiv \mathbb{F}_n^{-1}(i/n)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) and let  $\underline{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_n)$  denote the *ranks*; defined by  $X_i = X_{(R_i)}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$  (if  $X_i = X_j$  for some  $i < j$ , define the ranks by  $R_i < R_j$  and  $X_i = X_{(R_i)}$ ).
    - (a) Suppose that  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are i.i.d.  $F \in \mathcal{F}_{ac}$  (the absolutely continuous df's  $F$  on  $R$ ) with density  $f$ . Show that the order statistics  $\underline{X}_{(\cdot)} \equiv (X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)})$  are independent of the ranks  $\underline{R}$  and that the order statistics have joint density  $\bar{p}$  given by

$$\bar{p}(\underline{x}_{(\cdot)}) = n! \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_{(i)}), \quad -\infty < x_{(1)} < \dots < x_{(n)} < \infty$$

while

$$P(\underline{R} = \underline{r}) = \frac{1}{n!}, \quad \underline{r} \in \Pi \equiv \{ \text{all permutations of } \{1, \dots, n\} \} .$$

(b) Show that if the density  $f$  of the  $X_i$ 's is log-concave, then the joint density  $\bar{p}$  of the order statistics  $\underline{X}_{(\cdot)}$  is log-concave; i.e. show that if  $f((x+y)/2)^2 \geq f(x)f(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\bar{p}((\underline{x} + \underline{y})/2)^2 \geq \bar{p}(\underline{x})\bar{p}(\underline{y})$  for all  $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{O}_n \equiv \{\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n\}$ .

(c) Show that (a) continues to hold for any joint density  $p$  of the  $\underline{X}$  which is symmetric with respect to permutation of its coordinates:  $p(\pi \underline{x}) = p(\underline{x})$  for all  $\underline{x}$  and  $\pi \in \Pi$  where  $\pi \underline{x} \equiv (x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(n)})$ .

(d) If the joint density  $p$  of  $\underline{X}$  is general (not permutation symmetric), show that the joint density  $\bar{p}$  of the order statistics is given by

$$\bar{p}(\underline{x}_{(\cdot)}) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} p(\pi \underline{x}_{(\cdot)}) ,$$

and

$$P(\underline{R} = \underline{r} | \underline{X}_{(\cdot)} = \underline{x}_{(\cdot)}) = \frac{p(\underline{r} \underline{x}_{(\cdot)})}{\bar{p}(\underline{x}_{(\cdot)})} .$$

Hint: The easiest way might be to solve (d) first, then (c) followed by (a) and (b).

4. **Optional bonus problem 2:** Let  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$  where  $p_\theta$  is a family of densities with respect to a fixed dominating measure  $\mu$  defined on a sample space  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$ .

(a) Suppose that the densities  $p_\theta(x) \equiv p(x, \theta)$  have a second mixed partial derivative and that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial \theta} \log p(x, \theta) \geq 0$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Show that the inequality in the last display implies that  $\mathcal{P}$  has monotone likelihood ratio. [Hint: use the fundamental theorem of calculus twice.]

(b) Show that the condition in (a) is equivalent to

$$p(x, \theta) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial \theta} p(x, \theta) \geq \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} p(x, \theta) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} p(x, \theta) \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta, x \in \mathcal{X} .$$