

Solutions to exercises - Week 46

Most powerful tests

- Exercises 8.15, 8.22ac, 8.25bc, 8.31, 8.34b

Likelihood ratio tests

- Exercise 10.34a
- Additional exercise

1

Exercise 8.15

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be iid and $n(0, \sigma^2)$

We will derive the most powerful test of

$H_0: \sigma = \sigma_0$ versus $H_1: \sigma = \sigma_1$ where $\sigma_0 < \sigma_1$

The joint pdf of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x} | \sigma) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} \\ &= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 / (2\sigma^2)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

2

From Neyman-Pearsons Lemma, the most powerful test rejects H_0 if

$$\frac{f(\mathbf{x} | \sigma_1)}{f(\mathbf{x} | \sigma_0)} > k$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(\mathbf{x} | \sigma_1)}{f(\mathbf{x} | \sigma_0)} &= \frac{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 / (2\sigma_1^2)\right\}}{(2\pi\sigma_0^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 / (2\sigma_0^2)\right\}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma_1}\right)^n \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2\right\} \end{aligned}$$

3

Thus the most powerful test rejects H_0 if

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma_1}\right)^n \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2\right\} > k$$

i.e. if (since $\sigma_0 < \sigma_1$)

$$\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 > \frac{2 \log[k(\sigma_1 / \sigma_0)^n]}{1/\sigma_0^2 - 1/\sigma_1^2} = c$$

When H_0 is true, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i / \sigma_0)^2 \sim \chi_n^2$$

4

Define $\chi_{n,\alpha}^2$ by $P(\chi_n^2 > \chi_{n,\alpha}^2) = \alpha$

Then

$$\alpha = P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i / \sigma_0)^2 > \chi_{n,\alpha}^2\right) = P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 > \sigma_0^2 \chi_{n,\alpha}^2\right)$$

So the test has size α if we let $c = \sigma_0^2 \chi_{n,\alpha}^2$

5

Exercise 8.22

Let X_1, \dots, X_{10} be iid Bernoulli(p)

a) We will find most powerful test with size $\alpha = 0.0547$ for testing $H_0: p = 1/2$ versus $H_1: p = 1/4$

We have the pmf

$$f(\mathbf{x} | p) = \prod_{i=1}^{10} p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i} = p^y (1-p)^{10-y}$$

where $y = \sum x_i$

The most powerful test rejects H_0 if

$$\frac{f(\mathbf{x} | p = 1/4)}{f(\mathbf{x} | p = 1/2)} > k$$

6

Now we have

$$\frac{f(\mathbf{x} | p = 1/4)}{f(\mathbf{x} | p = 1/2)} = \frac{(1/4)^y (1-1/4)^{10-y}}{(1/2)^y (1-1/2)^{10-y}} = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{10} \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^y$$

Since the ratio is decreasing in y , we reject H_0 if $y \leq c$

E.g. by using R [command: `pbinom(2, 10, 1/2)`] we find that $P(Y \leq 2 | p = 1/2) = 0.0547$, so the most powerful test rejects H_0 if $Y \leq 2$

The power of the test is

$$P(Y \leq 2 | p = 1/4) = 0.526$$

7

c) There exist a most powerful test for all levels α that are given by

$$\alpha = P(Y \leq c | p = 1/2) \text{ for } c = 0, 1, \dots, 10$$

Using R we find [command: `pbinom(0:10, 10, 1/2)`] that α can take the values

0.00098	0.0107	0.0547	0.1719	0.3770	0.6230
0.8281	0.9453	0.9893	0.9990	1.0000	

8

Exercise 8.25

b) Assume that T is Poisson(θ)

We have the pmf

$$g(t|\theta) = \frac{\theta^t}{t!} e^{-\theta}$$

For $\theta_2 > \theta_1$ we have the likelihood ratio

$$\frac{g(t|\theta_2)}{g(t|\theta_1)} = \frac{\theta_2^t e^{-\theta_2} / t!}{\theta_1^t e^{-\theta_1} / t!} = \left(\frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1}\right)^t e^{\theta_1 - \theta_2}$$

which is increasing in t

9

c) Assume that T is binomial(n, θ) with n known

We have the pmf

$$g(t|\theta) = \binom{n}{t} \theta^t (1-\theta)^{n-t}$$

For $\theta_2 > \theta_1$ we have the likelihood ratio

$$\frac{g(t|\theta_2)}{g(t|\theta_1)} = \frac{\binom{n}{t} \theta_2^t (1-\theta_2)^{n-t}}{\binom{n}{t} \theta_1^t (1-\theta_1)^{n-t}} = \left(\frac{\theta_2(1-\theta_1)}{\theta_1(1-\theta_2)}\right)^t \left(\frac{1-\theta_2}{1-\theta_1}\right)^n$$

which is increasing in t

10

Exercise 8.31

Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be iid Poisson(λ)

a) We will find a UMP test of $H_0: \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ vs $H_1: \lambda > \lambda_0$

$T = \sum X_i \sim \text{Poisson}(n\lambda)$ is a sufficient statistic for λ

and by exercise 8.25b it has an increasing likelihood ratio

By theorem 8.3.17 we then have that the UMP level α test rejects H_0 if $\sum X_i > k$ where $\alpha = P_{\lambda_0} \left(\sum X_i > k \right)$

11

b) We consider the case when $\lambda_0 = 1$

By the central limit theorem we have that

$$\frac{\sum X_i - n\lambda}{\sqrt{n\lambda}} \rightarrow Z \sim n(0,1)$$

Therefore

$$P\left(\sum X_i > k \mid \lambda = 1\right) = P\left(\frac{\sum X_i - n}{\sqrt{n}} > \frac{k-n}{\sqrt{n}} \mid \lambda = 1\right) \approx P\left(Z > \frac{k-n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

and

$$P\left(\sum X_i > k \mid \lambda = 2\right) = P\left(\frac{\sum X_i - 2n}{\sqrt{2n}} > \frac{k-2n}{\sqrt{2n}} \mid \lambda = 2\right) \approx P\left(Z > \frac{k-2n}{\sqrt{2n}}\right)$$

12

We obtain an approximate 5% level test with power approximately 90% for $\lambda = 2$ if we chose n such that

$$P\left(Z > \frac{k-n}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = 0.05 \quad \text{and} \quad P\left(Z > \frac{k-2n}{\sqrt{2n}}\right) = 0.90$$

This gives

$$\frac{k-n}{\sqrt{n}} = 1.645 \quad \frac{k-2n}{\sqrt{2n}} = -1.28$$

and we obtain

$$n = 12 \quad \text{and} \quad k = 17.7$$

13

Exercise 8.34.b

We assume that the family $\{g(t|\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ of pdfs or pmfs for T has a nondecreasing likelihood ratio, i.e. that for every $\theta_2 > \theta_1$ the ratio $g(t|\theta_2)/g(t|\theta_1)$ is a nondecreasing function of t on the set $\{t: g(t|\theta_1) > 0 \text{ or } g(t|\theta_2) > 0\}$

We will show that for $\theta_2 > \theta_1$ we have

$$P_{\theta_1}(T > c) \leq P_{\theta_2}(T > c)$$

or equivalently

$$P_{\theta_2}(T \leq c) \leq P_{\theta_1}(T \leq c)$$

We will show the result for pdfs (the argument for pmfs is similar, but with sums instead of integrals)

We consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} D(c) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{\theta_2}(T \leq c) - P_{\theta_1}(T \leq c) = \int_{-\infty}^c g(t|\theta_2) dt - \int_{-\infty}^c g(t|\theta_1) dt \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^c [g(t|\theta_2)/g(t|\theta_1) - 1] g(t|\theta_1) dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Then } D'(c) = [g(c|\theta_2)/g(c|\theta_1) - 1] g(c|\theta_1)$$

Now $g(c|\theta_2)/g(c|\theta_1)$ is increasing, so $D'(c)$ can only change sign from negative to positive showing that any interior extremum of $D(c)$ is a minimum.

Thus $D(c)$ is maximized by its value at $-\infty$ or ∞ , which is zero.

Hence $D(c) \leq 0$, and the result is proved

Exercise 10.34.a

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be iid Bernoulli(p)

We will test $H_0: p = p_0$ versus $H_1: p \neq p_0$

The likelihood is given by $[\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)]$

$$L(p | \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i} = p^y (1-p)^{n-y}$$

$$\text{where } y = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$$

The unrestricted MLE for p is $\hat{p} = y/n$

16

The LRT statistic becomes

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{L(p_0 | \mathbf{x})}{L(\hat{p} | \mathbf{x})} = \frac{p_0^y (1-p_0)^{n-y}}{\hat{p}^y (1-\hat{p})^{n-y}}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log \lambda(\mathbf{x}) &= 2 \log \left(\frac{\hat{p}^y (1-\hat{p})^{n-y}}{p_0^y (1-p_0)^{n-y}} \right) \\ &= 2y \log \left(\frac{\hat{p}}{p_0} \right) + 2(n-y) \log \left(\frac{1-\hat{p}}{1-p_0} \right) \end{aligned}$$

17

Additional exercise

Let $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, X_{i2}, X_{i3}); i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be iid with pmf

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3 | p_1, p_2, p_3) = p_1^{x_1} p_2^{x_2} p_3^{x_3}$$

where $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ with $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 1$

and $p_i \geq 0$ with $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1$

We will test (Hardy-Weinberger)

$$H_0: p_1 = \theta^2, p_2 = 2\theta(1-\theta), p_3 = (1-\theta)^2$$

for a $\theta \in (0, 1)$ versus the alternative that H_0 does not hold

18

The likelihood is given by $[\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)]$

$$L(p_1, p_2, p_3 | \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_1^{x_{i1}} p_2^{x_{i2}} p_3^{x_{i3}} = p_1^{y_1} p_2^{y_2} p_3^{y_3}$$

where $y_j = \sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$

Using the facts that $p_3 = 1 - p_1 - p_2$ and $y_3 = n - y_1 - y_2$ one may show that the MLE of the p_j 's are $\hat{p}_j = y_j / n$

Under H_0 we may write the likelihood as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta | \mathbf{x}) &= [\theta^2]^{y_1} [2\theta(1-\theta)]^{y_2} [(1-\theta)^2]^{y_3} \\ &= 2^{y_2} \theta^{2y_1 + y_2} (1-\theta)^{2y_3 + y_2} \\ &= 2^{y_2} \theta^{2y_1 + y_2} (1-\theta)^{2n - (2y_1 + y_2)} \end{aligned}$$

19

One may then show that the MLE of θ is

$$\theta^* = \frac{2y_1 + y_2}{2n}$$

and hence that the MLEs of the p_j 's under H_0 are

$$p_1^* = (\theta^*)^2, p_2^* = 2\theta^*(1-\theta^*) \quad \text{and} \quad p_3^* = (1-\theta^*)^2$$

Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log \lambda(\mathbf{x}) &= -2 \log \left(\frac{(p_1^*)^{y_1} (p_2^*)^{y_2} (p_3^*)^{y_3}}{\hat{p}_1^{y_1} \hat{p}_2^{y_2} \hat{p}_3^{y_3}} \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^3 y_j \log \left(\frac{\hat{p}_j}{p_j^*} \right) \end{aligned}$$

20