

Solution Sheet 7

1. (a) Let us interpret the question as meaning ‘from which point on the ruler is the *average* distance to 1, 2 and 11 minimised?’. That is, find θ such that $d_1(\theta) = (|1 - \theta| + |2 - \theta| + |11 - \theta|)/3$ is as small as possible. You cannot use calculus to solve this, since this function of θ is not always differentiable. But note that for $\theta \in (1, 2)$, $d_1(\theta)$ is decreasing, since $|1 - \theta|$ is getting bigger at rate 1, while $|2 - \theta|$ and $|11 - \theta|$ are both getting smaller at rate 1. Similarly on $(2, 11)$, $d_1(\theta)$ is increasing. In fact $d_1(\theta)$ is decreasing for all $\theta < 2$ and increasing for all $\theta > 2$, so the minimum is at $\theta = 2$. It is not accident that 2 is the *median* of 1, 2 and 11. In fact, it is a general result that for any odd n , the quantity $\{|x_i - \theta|\}$ is minimised when θ is the median of $\{x_i\}$. For even n , the function is constant between the middle two data values. These can be readily proved by generalising the argument for $n = 3$ given above.
- (b) Now we want to minimise $(|1 - \theta|^2 + |2 - \theta|^2 + |11 - \theta|^2)/3$, or in general $(1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta)^2$, which we denote $(d_2(\theta))^2$. This is a *least squares* estimate. You can use calculus, and it is easy to see that $d_2(\theta)$ is minimised when θ is the mean \bar{x} of the data values, or $14/3$ for the flea’s $n = 3$ example.
- (c) In this 3rd version, we want to minimise $d_\infty(\theta) = \max\{|1 - \theta|, |2 - \theta|, |11 - \theta|\}$, or in general $\max\{|x_i - \theta|, i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$. It is easy to see that the value of θ making this as small as possible is the one in the middle of the interval spanned by the data, i.e. $(x_{(1)}, x_{(n)})$, i.e. the *mid-range*, $(x_{(1)} + x_{(n)})/2$, or 6 for the flea’s problem.
- (d) All of these three versions of the question ask us to define the ‘centre’ of the set of numbers, using different criteria. They are all examples of a general family of location estimators, those minimising $d_p(\theta) = ((1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - \theta|^p)^{(1/p)}$. You can check that this definition agrees with those above when $p = 1, 2$ and $\rightarrow \infty$. All of these have some use in statistics – which is best to use depends on the statistical properties of the population from which the data can be assumed to be drawn.
2. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a random sample of size n from a distribution with population mean denoted by $\mu = E(X)$ and population variance denoted by $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(X)$, and let $\bar{X} = (X_1 + \dots + X_n)/n$ denote the sample mean.
- (a) From your notes, the bias of \bar{X} as an estimator of μ is defined as $E(\bar{X} - \mu)$, and the mean square error of \bar{X} as an estimator of μ is defined as $E[(\bar{X} - \mu)^2]$.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Now } E(\bar{X}) &= E((X_1 + \dots + X_n)/n) = E(X_1/n) + \dots + E(X_n/n) \\ &= E(X_1)/n + \dots + E(X_n)/n = \mu/n + \dots + \mu/n = n\mu/n \\ &= \mu.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, whatever the distribution of X , $E(\bar{X} - \mu) = E(\bar{X}) - \mu = \mu - \mu = 0$, so \bar{X} has zero bias as an estimator of μ . We say \bar{X} is unbiased as an estimator for the population mean.

(b) Also

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(\bar{X}) &= \text{Var}((X_1 + \dots + X_n)/n) \\ &= \text{Var}(X_1/n) + \dots + \text{Var}(X_n/n) \text{ as the } X_i \text{ are independent} \\ &= \text{Var}(X_1)/n^2 + \dots + \text{Var}(X_n)/n^2 \\ &= \sigma^2/n^2 + \dots + \sigma^2/n^2 = n\sigma^2/n^2 \\ &= \sigma^2/n.\end{aligned}$$

Since $E(\bar{X}) = \mu$, from above, $E[(\bar{X} - \mu)^2] = \text{Var}(\bar{X}) = \sigma^2/n$.

(c) Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a random sample of size n from a distribution with population mean denoted by the $\mu = E(X)$ and population variance denoted by the $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(X)$. From notes, the condition for the sample variance $S^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 / (n-1)$ to be an unbiased estimator of the population variance σ^2 is that $E(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 / (n-1) - \sigma^2) = 0$.

From the handout $\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - E(X))^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 - n\bar{X}^2$.

But $E(X_i^2) = \text{Var}(X_i) + [E(X_i)]^2 = \sigma^2 + \mu^2$

and $E(\bar{X}^2) = \text{Var}(\bar{X}) + [E(\bar{X})]^2 = \sigma^2/n + \mu^2$ from question 3 above, so

$$\begin{aligned}E(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2) &= E(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2) - E(n\bar{X}^2) = \sum_{i=1}^n E(X_i^2) - nE(\bar{X}^2) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\sigma^2 + \mu^2) - n(\sigma^2/n + \mu^2) \\ &= n\sigma^2 + n\mu^2 - n\sigma^2/n - n\mu^2 = n\sigma^2 - \sigma^2 \\ &= (n-1)\sigma^2\end{aligned}$$

so $E(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 / (n-1)) = \sigma^2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 / (n-1)$ is unbiased as an estimator for σ^2 .

3. The hint in the question reminds us that $\int_{x=0}^{\infty} x^{a-1} e^{-bx} dx = \Gamma(a)/b^a$ for $a > 0$ and $b > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Now } E(Y) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x f(x) dx \\ &= \int_{x=0}^{\infty} x \lambda^\alpha x^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda x} (\Gamma(\alpha))^{-1} dx = \lambda^\alpha (\Gamma(\alpha))^{-1} \int_{x=0}^{\infty} x^\alpha e^{-\lambda x} dx \\ &= \lambda^\alpha (\Gamma(\alpha))^{-1} \Gamma(\alpha+1) / \lambda^{\alpha+1} \text{ from above with } a = \alpha+1 > 0 \text{ and } b = \lambda > 0 \\ &= \lambda^\alpha / \lambda^{\alpha+1} \times \Gamma(\alpha+1) / \Gamma(\alpha) = \alpha / \lambda \text{ as } \Gamma(\alpha+1) = \alpha \Gamma(\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{and } E(1/Y) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^{-1} f(x) dx = \int_{x=0}^{\infty} x^{-1} \lambda^\alpha x^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda x} (\Gamma(\alpha))^{-1} dx \\ &= \lambda^\alpha (\Gamma(\alpha))^{-1} \int_{x=0}^{\infty} x^{\alpha-2} e^{-\lambda x} dx \\ &= \lambda^\alpha (\Gamma(\alpha))^{-1} \Gamma(\alpha-1) / \lambda^{\alpha-1} \text{ from above with } a = \alpha-1 > 0 \text{ and } b = \lambda > 0 \\ &= \lambda^\alpha / \lambda^{\alpha-1} \times \Gamma(\alpha-1) / \Gamma(\alpha) = \lambda / (\alpha-1) \text{ as } \Gamma(\alpha) = (\alpha-1) \Gamma(\alpha-1).\end{aligned}$$

4. (a) From your notes §6.1(ii) the Exponential(θ) distribution has moment generating function $\mathcal{M}_X(t) = \theta/(\theta - t)$ (defined for $t < \theta$). If X_1, \dots, X_n is a random sample from this distribution then, from your notes §6.1(v), it has moment generating function $[\mathcal{M}_X(t)]^n = \theta^n/(\theta - t)^n$, and from your notes §6.1(ii) this is the moment generating function of the Gamma(n, θ) distribution. Thus, if X_1, \dots, X_n is a random sample from the Exponential(θ) distribution, then $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim \text{Gamma}(n, \theta)$. Let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, then, from question 6 above, $E(Y) = n/\theta$ and $E(1/Y) = \theta/(n - 1)$. Note that for a random variable Y it is generally not true that $E(1/Y) = 1/E(Y)$.

(b) Let $\tau = 1/\theta$. Then $\hat{\theta}_{mle} = n/Y$ and $\hat{\tau}_{mle} = \tau(\hat{\theta}_{mle}) = 1/\hat{\theta} = Y/n$. Thus $E(\hat{\tau}_{mle}) = E(Y/n) = E(Y)/n = n/\theta n = 1/\theta = \tau$, so $\hat{\tau}_{mle}$ is unbiased as an estimator of the population mean.

(c) Now $\hat{\theta}_{mle} = n/Y$ so $E(\hat{\theta}_{mle}) = E(n/Y) = n E(1/Y) = n\theta/(n - 1) = \theta + [\theta/(n - 1)]$. Thus $E(\hat{\theta}_{mle}) - \theta = \theta/(n - 1)$ so $\hat{\theta}_{mle}$ has bias $\theta/(n - 1)$ as an estimator of θ , i.e. $\hat{\theta}_{mle}$ on average systematically overestimates θ by an amount $\theta/(n - 1)$.