

French – English Lexicon

- *i.i.d.* : *independent and identically distributed*
- échantillon : *sample*
- fonction de répartition : *cumulative distribution function*
- fonction de densité : *probability distribution function*
- fonction génératrice des moments : *moment-generating function*
- famille exponentielle : *exponential family*
- espace naturel des paramètres : *natural parameter space*
- vraisemblance : *likelihood*
- statistique exhaustive : *sufficient statistic*
- statistique libre : *ancillary statistic*
- statistique complète : *complete statistic*

Exercise 1

..... / 9

For the following statements, give the correct answer(s). Incorrect answers and missing justification return zero point while incomplete answers gain partial points.

1. Let $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ be a sequence of independent discrete random variables such that

$$\mathbb{P}[X_n = 0] = \frac{n-1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}[X_n = \sqrt{n}] = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Then, when n goes to $+\infty$,

- | | |
|--|--|
| (a) the sequence converges in L^1 (convergence in mean), | (c) for any continuous function g , $\mathbb{E}[g(X_n)]$ converges to 0, |
| (b) the sequence converges in L^2 (convergence in quadratic mean), | (d) the sequence converges in distribution, |
| | (e) the sequence does not converge at all. |

- (a, d) For any continuous and bounded function g , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[g(X_n)] = \frac{n-1}{n} g(0) + \frac{1}{n} g(\sqrt{n}).$$

Since g is bounded, the second term in the above sum converges to 0 when n goes to $+\infty$ and thus

$$\mathbb{E}[g(X_n)] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\text{a.s.}} g(0).$$

Then, (X_n) converges in distribution to 0. Moreover, if it converges in L^p , $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, it is necessarily to 0. We have $\mathbb{E}[X_n] = 1/\sqrt{n}$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_n^2] = 1$. Thus, X_n converges in L^1 to 0, but not in L^2 .

2. Consider the exponential family associated to the Bernoulli distribution with unknown parameter $p \in (0, 1)$. The moment generating function of natural statistic $T(x) = x$ of the family is defined for $t \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ by

- (a) $(1-p)/(1-p-t)$ (b) $1+p(\exp(t)-1)$ (c) $(1-p-t)/(1-p)$ (d) $1/[1+p(\exp(t)-1)]$

- (b) To get the canonical form we set $\theta = \log(p) - \log(1-p)$. The canonical form is then

$$f(x|\theta) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(\theta)} \exp(\theta x), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then the moment generating function is defined for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$M(t) = \frac{1 + \exp(\theta + t)}{1 + \exp(\theta)} = \frac{1 + \exp[\log(p) - \log(1 - p) + t]}{1 + \exp[\log(p) - \log(1 - p)]} = 1 + p(\exp(t) - 1).$$

3. Consider the density (with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$) parametrised by an **unknown** $(k, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{R}_+^*$ and defined by

$$f(x | k, \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^k x^{k-1} \exp(-\lambda x)}{(k-1)!} \mathbb{1}_{x>0}.$$

- (a) It constitutes a minimal and canonical exponential family.
- (b) It constitutes a minimal exponential family but is not in a canonical form.
- (c) It constitutes an exponential family that is neither minimal nor canonical.
- (d) None of the other answers.

(a) The density writes as

$$f(x | k, \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^k}{(k-1)!} \frac{1}{x} \mathbb{1}_{x \geq 0} \exp[k \log(x) - \lambda x].$$

Then it constitutes a canonical exponential family with natural parameter (k, λ) and natural statistic $T(x) = (\log(x), -x)$. Moreover for $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{R}^* \times \mathbb{R}^*$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+; \alpha_1 \log(x) - \alpha_2 x - c = 0\}$ contains at most 2 elements (maximal number of intersections between an affine function and $x \mapsto \log(x)$) and hence has measure zero (null set) for the Lebesgue measure. The family is minimal.

4. We run an experiment where we measure how much time n different customers spend on a specific page of a website. Our observations $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are stored in a vector $\mathbf{x}$. We assume that the underlying statistical model is a Gamma distribution with parameter (α, β) . Which one among the following R command lines does return the first quartile of the sample?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (a) <code>rgamma(0.25, 1, 2)</code> | (d) <code>qgamma(0.25, 1, 2)</code> |
| (b) <code>pgamma(0.25, 1, 2)</code> | (e) <code>quantile(0.25, 1, 2)</code> |
| (c) <code>dgamma(0.25, 1, 2)</code> | (f) <code>quantile(x, 0.25)</code> |

(f) In order to get the empirical quantiles of a sample we use the function `quantile`. The first argument is the sample, followed by the order of the quantiles we are interested in.

5. Let X be a random variable with density, parametrised by $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, with respect to the composition of the counting measure on $\mathbb{N}$ and the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$:

$$f_X(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda^x \exp(-\lambda)}{2^{(x!)}} & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \frac{\lambda}{2} \exp(-\lambda x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The likelihood for the sample $(1, 1, 2, 2, 2, x_1, \dots, x_n)$, with $x_1, \dots, x_n \notin \mathbb{N}$ is

- (a) $\frac{\lambda^n}{2^{n+5}} \exp\left(-\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)$ (c) $\frac{\lambda^8 \exp(-5\lambda)}{2^{n+8}}$
(b) $\frac{\lambda^{n+8}}{2^{n+8}} \exp\left[-\lambda \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + 5\right)\right]$ (d) $\frac{\lambda^{n+3}}{2^{n+6}} \exp\left[-\lambda \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + 2\right)\right]$

(b) The likelihood is given by

$$\left[\frac{\lambda}{2} \exp(-\lambda)\right]^2 \left[\frac{\lambda^2 \exp(-\lambda)}{4}\right]^3 \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda}{2} \exp(-\lambda x_i) = \frac{\lambda^{n+8}}{2^{n+8}} \exp\left[-\lambda \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + 5\right)\right].$$

6. Consider X distributed according to the Binomial distribution $\mathcal{B}(n, p)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ **known** and $p \in (0, 1)$ **unknown**. If we denote θ the parameter of the canonical form of this exponential family, $I(p)$ and $I(\theta)$ the Fisher information contained in X for p and θ respectively, we have

- (a) $I(p) = n/[p(1-p)]$ (b) $I(p) = 1/[p(1-p)]$ (c) $I(\theta) = ne^{-\theta}(1+e^\theta)^2$ (d) $I(\theta) = ne^\theta/(1+e^\theta)^2$

(a, d) The density $f(\cdot | n, p)$ of the Binomial distribution is twice differentiable with respect to p on $(0, 1)$ and

$$\frac{d}{dp} f(x | n, p) = \frac{x}{p} - \frac{n-x}{1-p} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d^2}{dp^2} f(x | n, p) = -\frac{x}{p^2} - \frac{n-x}{(1-p)^2}.$$

Using that $\mathbb{E}_p[X] = np$, we then have

$$I(p) = -\mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{d^2}{dp^2} f(X | n, p) \right] = \frac{np}{p^2} - \frac{n-np}{(1-p)^2} = \frac{n}{p(1-p)}.$$

The parameter of the canonical form is $\theta = \log(p) - \log(1-p)$, that is $p = \exp(\theta)/[1 + \exp(\theta)] := \psi(\theta)$. We then have

$$I(\theta) = \left(\frac{d}{d\theta} \psi(\theta) \right)^2 I(p) = \frac{\exp(2\theta)}{[1 + \exp(\theta)]^4} \frac{n[1 + \exp(\theta)]^2}{\exp(\theta)} = \frac{n \exp(\theta)}{[1 + \exp(\theta)]^2}.$$

7. Consider a regular and minimal exponential family with natural statistic $T(\cdot)$ and density $f(\cdot | \theta)$, $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. For $X_1, \dots, X_n$ i.i.d. random variables distributed according to $f(\cdot | \theta)$, we set $S = \sum_{i=1}^n T(X_i)$.

- (a) Any bijective transform of S is sufficient for θ . (c) Any sufficient statistic for θ that is a function of S is minimal sufficient for θ .
(b) S is minimal sufficient for θ . (d) None of the other answers.

(a, b, c) S is a sufficient statistic for θ . Thus any bijective transform of S is sufficient for θ . For a minimal representation, S is minimal sufficient. Thus S is a function of any other sufficient statistic. Therefore any sufficient statistic R that is a function of S is also a function of any other sufficient statistic. Hence R is also minimal sufficient.

8. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be *i.i.d.* random variables distributed according to the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)$ and denote

$$\bar{X}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \quad X_{(1)} = \min(X_1, \dots, X_n) \quad \text{and} \quad X_{(n)} = \max(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

- (a) $X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}$ is independent of $\bar{X}_n$.
 (b) $(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$ is not a complete statistic.
 (c) $(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$ is a sufficient statistic for μ .
 (d) $(X_1 - \bar{X}_n, \dots, X_n - \bar{X}_n)$ is independent of $\bar{X}_n$.
 (e) None of the other answers.

(a, b, d) $X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}$ and $(X_1 - \bar{X}_n, \dots, X_n - \bar{X}_n)$ are ancillary statistics. Moreover $\bar{X}_n$ is a complete and sufficient statistic for μ (result on natural statistic associated to an exponential family). It follows from Basu's theorem that both $X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}$ and $(X_1 - \bar{X}_n, \dots, X_n - \bar{X}_n)$ are independent from $\bar{X}_n$.

$X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}$ is an ancillary statistic that is not constant almost surely and such that $\mathbb{E}_\mu[X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}] = c < \infty$ is independent of μ . Thus, for the function $\phi: (x, y) \mapsto y - x - c$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\phi(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})] = 0, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathbb{R}.$$

But $\mathbb{P}_\mu[\phi(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}) = 0] = \mathbb{P}_\mu[X_{(n)} - X_{(1)} = c] \neq 1$ since $X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}$ is not constant almost surely. Therefore $(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$ is not a complete statistic.

Exercise 2

..... / 12

Given $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the Lévy distribution of scale parameter $b \in \Theta_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^*$ admits a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $(a, +\infty)$

$$f(x | b) = \frac{1}{x - a} \sqrt{\frac{b}{2\pi(x - a)}} \exp\left(-\frac{b}{2x - 2a}\right) \mathbb{1}_{x > a}.$$

In this exercise we consider $X_1, \dots, X_n$, $n > 2$, *i.i.d.* random variables distributed according to $f(\cdot | b)$ for a **known** parameter a and an **unknown** scale parameter b .

1. Show that $f(\cdot | b)$ can define an exponential family with a natural statistic $T(\cdot)$. Precise its canonical form and its natural parameter space. Is the family regular and minimal?

The density writes as

$$f(x | b) = c(b)h(x) \exp(\eta(b)T(x)), \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} c(b) = \sqrt{\frac{b}{2\pi}}, & h(x) = \frac{1}{(x-a)\sqrt{x-a}} \mathbb{1}_{x \geq a}, \\ \eta(b) = b, & T(x) = -\frac{1}{2x-2a}. \end{cases}$$

The family is already in its canonical form and its natural parameter space is

$$\Theta = \{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid c(b) > 0\} = \mathbb{R}_+^*.$$

The family is regular since Θ is an open set, and minimal, since it is a one dimensional family.

2. Show that there is a **unique** maximum likelihood estimator of b defined as

$$\hat{b}_n = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{X_i - a} \right)^{-1}$$

The log-likelihood writes as

$$\ell(b | x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log f(x_i | b) = \frac{n}{2} \log(b) - b \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2(x_i - a)} - n \log(2\pi) - \frac{3}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(x_i - a).$$

It is differentiable on $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+^*$ and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial b} \ell(b | x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{n}{2b} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2(x_i - a)}.$$

The log-likelihood has a unique critical point in Θ given by

$$\hat{b}_n = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i - a} \right)^{-1}$$

Since $f(\cdot | b)$ defines a regular exponential family, the critical point is the unique maximum likelihood estimator of b .

3. Show that $\hat{b}_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathbb{P}} b$.

We have

$$\hat{b}_n = \left(-\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T(X_i) \right)^{-1}.$$

$T(X_1), \dots, T(X_n)$ is a sequence of *i.i.d.* (as measurable transform of *i.i.d.* random variables) and integrable (comparative growth in a and Riemann criterion in $+\infty$) random variables. The Law of Large Numbers gives

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T(X_i) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}[T(X_1)].$$

The first moment of the natural statistic $T(X_1)$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[T(X_1)] = -\frac{d}{db} \log c(b) = -\frac{1}{2b}. \quad (1)$$

The continuity of $g : x \mapsto (-2x)^{-1}$ on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ gives that

$$\hat{b}_n = g \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T(X_i) \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathbb{P}} g(\mathbb{E}[T(X_1)]) = b.$$

4. Show that

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{\hat{b}_n - b}{\hat{b}_n} \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Since the exponential family defined by $f(\cdot | b)$ is regular, the fundamental theorem of statistic gives

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{b}_n - b) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathcal{N}(0, I_{X_1}(b)^{-1}).$$

The log-likelihood is twice differentiable and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial b^2} \ell(b | x_1) = -\frac{1}{2b^2}$$

The Fisher information contained in X_1 on b is then

$$I_{X_1}(b) = -\mathbb{E}_b \left[-\frac{1}{2b^2} \right] = \frac{1}{2b^2}.$$

We thus have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{b}_n - b) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 2b^2).$$

Using the previous question and the continuity of $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ at $b > 0$, we get

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\hat{b}_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}b}.$$

It follows from Slutsky's theorem that

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{2}\hat{b}_n} (\hat{b}_n - b) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}b} \mathcal{N}(0, 2b^2) \equiv \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

5. Prove that the bias of the estimator $\hat{b}_n$ is strictly positive.

Since the function $x \mapsto 1/x$ is strictly convex, the Jensen inequality and equation (1) from question 2. lead to

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{b}_n] > \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i - a}\right]} = \frac{1}{-2\mathbb{E}[T(X_1)]} = b.$$

The bias is then strictly positive.

6. Given a vector of observations x , write a R code that computes a non-parametric bootstrap estimation of the bias for k bootstrap samples.

```
b_ref <- 1 / mean(1/(x - a))
# --- Solution with a for loop
b_star <- rep(0, k)
for (i in seq_len(k)) {
  b_star[i] <- 1 / mean(1/(sample(x, length(x), TRUE) - a))
}
bias <- mean(b_star) - b_ref
# --- Solution with apply function
mean(apply(matrix(sample(x, k * length(x), TRUE), length(x)), 2,
  function(x, a) {1 / mean(1/(x - a))}, a = a)) - b_ref
```

7. Denote $b_1^*, \dots, b_k^*$ the estimations of b we got with the previous bootstrap procedure. Give the definition of the empirical bootstrap confidence interval on b with $1 - \alpha$ confidence level, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Choose the R code that computes this interval for a 90% confidence level, where $b_ref = \hat{b}_n$ and $b_star = (b_1^*, \dots, b_k^*)$.

- (a) `quantile(b_star, c(.05, .95))`
- (b) `b_ref - quantile(b_star - b_ref, c(.95, .05))`
- (c) `quantile(b_star, c(.025, .975))`
- (d) `b_ref - quantile(b_star - b_ref, c(.975, .025))`

The empirical bootstrap confidence interval on b with $1 - \alpha$ confidence level is the interval $[\hat{b}_n - q_{1-\alpha/2}, \hat{b}_n - q_{\alpha/2}]$ where q_β denotes the quantile of order $\beta \in (0, 1)$ of $(\beta_1^* - \hat{b}_n, \dots, \beta_k^* - \hat{b}_n)$. For $\alpha = 10\%$ the corresponding code is then (b).

8. Show that if X_1 is distributed according to $f(\cdot | b)$ then $Y_1 = (2X_1 - 2a)^{-1}$ admits a density $g(\cdot | b)$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ given by

$$g(y | b) = \frac{\sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{\pi y}} \exp(-by) \mathbb{1}_{y>0}.$$

$\phi : x \mapsto (2x - 2a)^{-1}$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ -diffeomorphism between $(a, +\infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}_+^*$. The density of Y_1 is then

$$g(y | b) = f(\phi^{-1}(y) | b) \left| \frac{d}{dy} \phi^{-1}(y) \right| = f\left(\frac{1}{2y} + a \mid b\right) \times \frac{1}{2y^2} = \sqrt{\frac{b}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}} \exp(-by) \mathbb{1}_{y>0}.$$

9. Admit the following result : if $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ are *i.i.d.* random variables distributed according $g(\cdot | b)$ then $n/(Y_1 + \dots + Y_n)$ has a density $d(\cdot | b)$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ given by

$$d(x | b) = \frac{(nb)^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} x^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} \exp\left(-\frac{nb}{x}\right) \mathbb{1}_{x>0}.$$

Show that the following estimator is an unbiased estimator of b :

$$\hat{\beta}_n = \frac{n-2}{n} \hat{b}_n.$$

Hint. You can use without justification that for all $\alpha > 1$, $\Gamma(\alpha + 1) = \alpha \Gamma(\alpha)$ and

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{(nb)^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{-\alpha-1} \exp\left(-\frac{nb}{x}\right) dx = 1.$$

We have

$$\mathbb{E}_b[\hat{\beta}_n] = \frac{n-2}{n} \mathbb{E}_b[\hat{b}_n] = \frac{n-2}{n} \mathbb{E}_b\left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{X_i - a}\right)^{-1}\right] = \frac{n-2}{2n} \mathbb{E}_b\left[\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i}\right].$$

Using the density of $n/(Y_1 + \dots + Y_n)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_b\left[\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i}\right] = \int_0^\infty x d(x | b) dx = \int_0^\infty \frac{\sqrt{nb}^n}{\Gamma(n/2)} x^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{nb}{x}\right) dx = \frac{nb \Gamma(n/2 - 1)}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \frac{(nb)^{\frac{n}{2}-1}}{\Gamma(n/2 - 1)} x^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{nb}{x}\right) dx$$

Using the hint ($n/2 > 1$ for $n > 2$), we get that the integral is equal to one and $\Gamma(n/2) = (n/2 - 1) \Gamma(n/2 - 1)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_b\left[\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i}\right] = \frac{2nb}{n-2},$$

and the result follows.

10. Show that

$$\text{Var}_b[\hat{b}_n] \geq 2 \left(\frac{nb}{n-2} \right)^2.$$

We deduce from the previous question that the bias of $\hat{b}_n$ is

$$\mathbb{E}_b[\hat{b}_n] - b = \frac{2}{n-2}b.$$

The Cramér-Rao bound is then

$$\text{Var}_b[\hat{b}_n] \geq \left(1 + \frac{2}{n-2} \right)^2 \frac{1}{I_{X_1}(b)} = \left(\frac{n}{n-2} \right)^2 2b^2.$$

11. Show that $\hat{\beta}_n$ is the unique uniformly minimum variance unbiased estimator.

$\hat{\beta}_n$ is an unbiased estimator of b . Moreover, we have

$$\hat{b}_n = \left(-\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T(X_i) \right)^{-1}.$$

However $T(X)$ is the natural statistic associated to a regular exponential family. Then $S(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n T(X_i)$ is a complete and sufficient statistic for b . Since $\hat{b}_n$ is a bijective transform of $S(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, it is also a complete and sufficient statistic for b . The Lehmann-Scheffé theorem then states that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}_n | \hat{b}_n]$ is the unique uniformly minimum variance unbiased estimator. But $\hat{\beta}_n$ is a measurable function of $\hat{b}_n$. Then $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}_n | \hat{b}_n] = \hat{\beta}_n$.