

Math 5090–001, Fall 2009
Solutions to the Midterm Exam

1. Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. according to a density [and/or mass function] $f(x; \theta)$, where θ is unknown. State, very carefully, the Neymann–Pearson lemma for the simple hypothesis $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ versus the simple alternative $H_a : \theta = \theta_a$.

Solution: See the text.

2. Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. $\text{EXP}(\theta)$'s, where $\theta > 0$ is unknown. That is, they have common density

$$f(x; \theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Find the form of the UMP test for $H_0 : \theta = 1$ versus $H_a : \theta > 1$. Justify your assertion carefully.

Solution: The likelihood ratio for H_0 versus $H_a : \theta = \theta_a$ [$\theta_a > 1$] is

$$L = \theta_a^n \exp \left\{ - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta_a} \right) \sum_{j=1}^n X_j \right\} = \theta_a^n \exp \{ -n (1 - \theta_a^{-1}) \bar{X} \}.$$

This is a decreasing function of $t(\mathbf{X}) := \bar{X}$ because $1 - \theta_a^{-1} > 0$. Therefore, the Neymann–Pearson lemma provides us with a UMP test against the one-sided alternative $H_a : \theta > 1$. That is, reject H_0 when $\bar{X} \geq c$. [The constant c comes from a χ^2 -table. In fact, $2n\bar{X}$ is $\chi^2(2n)$ under H_0 .]

3. (Consider the following density on the interval $(0, 1)$):

$$f(x, \theta) := \begin{cases} \theta x^{\theta-1} & \text{if } 0 < x < 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\theta > 0$ is unknown.

- (a) Show that $-2\theta \ln X_1 \sim \chi^2(2)$. You may use, without derivation, the fact that if $Y \sim \chi^2(2n)$, then its MGF is

$$E[e^{tY}] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-2t} & \text{if } t < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Solution: We compute the MGF of $-2\theta \ln X_1$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M(t) &= E[e^{-t2\theta \ln X_1}] = e[E[X_1^{-2\theta t}]] \\ &= \theta \int_0^1 x^{-2\theta t} x^{\theta-1} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{1-2t} \quad \text{if } t < \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

and ∞ if $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$. This and the uniqueness theorem for MGF's together imply the result.

- (b) Use the result of part (a) to find a $(1-\alpha)100\%$ confidence interval for θ . You may use (a) even if you did not derive it.

Solution: By (a), $-2\theta \sum_{j=1}^n \ln X_j \sim \chi^2(2n)$. Therefore,

$$P \left\{ \chi_{\alpha/2}^2(2n) \leq -2\theta \sum_{j=1}^n \ln X_j \leq \chi_{1-(\alpha/2)}^2(2n) \right\} = 1 - \alpha.$$

Solve algebraically, all the time recalling that $-\sum_{j=1}^n \ln X_j$ is a positive random variable, to see that

$$P \left\{ \frac{\chi_{1-(\alpha/2)}^2(2n)}{-2 \sum_{j=1}^n \ln X_j} \leq \theta \leq \frac{\chi_{\alpha/2}^2(2n)}{-2 \sum_{j=1}^n \ln X_j} \right\} = 1 - \alpha.$$

Therefore, a $(1-\alpha)100\%$ CI for θ is

$$\left(\frac{\chi_{1-(\alpha/2)}^2(2n)}{-2 \sum_{j=1}^n \ln X_j}, \frac{\chi_{\alpha/2}^2(2n)}{-2 \sum_{j=1}^n \ln X_j} \right).$$