

Exam for **Fundamental Theory of Statistical Inference, 2024.**

You should answer *all* parts, which are of equal weight.

(1) Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_p$  be independent, with  $Z_i$  distributed as  $N(\mu_i, 1)$ . Then  $W = Z_1^2 + \dots + Z_p^2$  is said to be distributed as ‘non-central chi-squared with  $p$  degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter  $\lambda = \mu_1^2 + \dots + \mu_p^2$ ’, denoted  $\chi^2(p, \lambda)$ .

Letting  $\chi_{0.5}^2(p, \lambda)$  denote the median of  $\chi^2(p, \lambda)$ , Robert (1990) showed that, for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,

$$p - 1 + \lambda \leq \chi_{0.5}^2(p, \lambda) \leq \chi_{0.5}^2(p, 0) + \lambda.$$

Let  $\hat{\theta}_1$  and  $\hat{\theta}_2$  be estimators of a  $p$ -dimensional parameter  $\theta$ , and suppose the Euclidean loss function  $L(\theta, \hat{\theta}) = (\theta - \hat{\theta})^T(\theta - \hat{\theta})$  is specified. Then the probability that  $\hat{\theta}_1$  is closer to  $\theta$  than  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is

$$PN_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2) = P_{\theta}\{L(\theta, \hat{\theta}_1) < L(\theta, \hat{\theta}_2)\}.$$

We would say that  $\hat{\theta}_2$  is *inadmissible in terms of closeness* if there exists an estimator  $\hat{\theta}_1$  such that  $PN_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2) > 1/2$ , for all  $\theta$ .

(a) Let  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_p)^T$ ,  $p \geq 3$ , have a  $p$ -dimensional normal distribution with mean  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)^T$  and identity covariance matrix [so that  $Y_1, \dots, Y_p$  are independent and  $Y_i$  is distributed as  $N(\mu_i, 1)$ ]. Assuming the Euclidean loss function, as above, consider the class of shrinkage estimators given by

$$\left\{ \hat{\mu}_c : \hat{\mu}_c = \left(1 - \frac{c}{Y^T Y}\right) Y \right\},$$

for constants  $c \geq 0$ . Then  $\hat{\mu}_0 \equiv Y$  and  $\hat{\mu}_{p-2}$  is the James-Stein estimator.

Let  $c_1 > c_2$ , with corresponding estimators in the shrinkage class

$$\hat{\mu}_i = \left(1 - \frac{c_i}{Y^T Y}\right) Y, i = 1, 2.$$

Show that  $PN_{\mu}(\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_2) = P\{\chi^2(p, \lambda) > (c_1 + c_2)/2 + \lambda\}$ , for a function  $\lambda$  of  $\mu$  which you should specify.

(b) Show that the theoretically optimal [‘oracle’] value of  $c$  would be  $c^* = \chi_{0.5}^2(p, \lambda) - \lambda$ . Why does this value  $c^*$  not provide a useful estimator?

(c) By comparing with the James-Stein estimator, show that  $Y$  is inadmissible in terms of closeness. By considering the estimator  $\hat{\mu}_{p-1}$ , or otherwise, show that the James-Stein estimator is inadmissible in terms of closeness.

CONTINUED

(d) Consider now the case  $\mu = \mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)^T$ , and let  $D = L(\mathbf{0}, \hat{\mu}_{p-2}) - L(\mathbf{0}, Y)$  be the difference in losses of the James-Stein estimator and  $Y$ .

Show that  $P_0\{D < E_0(D)\} > 0.5$ . [The subscript 0 denotes that we are fixing  $\mu = 0$ .]

How does  $P_0\{D < E_0(D)\}$  behave as a function of  $p$ ?

(2) Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be independent, identically distributed, with common inverse Gaussian probability density function

$$f(y; \mu, \lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} y^{-3/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda(y - \mu)^2}{2\mu^2 y}\right\}, \quad y > 0, \lambda > 0, \mu > 0.$$

(a) Discuss this distribution as an example of a full exponential family.

(b) Suppose that  $\mu$  is *known*. What is the minimum variance unbiased estimator of  $\lambda$ ? Justify your answer.

(c) Explain in detail how to test the null hypothesis  $H_0 : \lambda \leq \lambda_0$  against the alternative hypothesis  $H_1 : \lambda > \lambda_0$ , in the case that  $\mu$  is *unknown*. Explain carefully the justification of the test and explain any UMP or UMPU properties it may possess.

[You may note that  $\frac{\lambda}{\mu^2}(Y - \mu)^2/Y$  is  $\chi_1^2$ , chi-squared with one degree of freedom. Further,  $V = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i^{-1} - \bar{Y}^{-1})$  is independent of  $\bar{Y} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ , with  $\lambda V$  distributed as  $\chi_{n-1}^2$ .]

(3) ‘The role of unbiasedness in statistical theory is ambiguous’. Discuss, in no more than about 250–300 words.