

1. (10pts, 2pts for each)

- (a) False. The probability that $(-2.0, 3.0)$ contains μ is either 0 or 1. The 99% means that if the procedure is repeated over and over to generate many different confidence intervals, about 99% of them will cover μ .
- (b) False. The null would be rejected because $-3 \notin (-2.0, 3.0)$.
- (c) False. Under the (Frequentist) theoretical framework of hypothesis testing, the null hypothesis is either true or false. It is meaningless to talk about “the probability that null hypothesis is true”.
- (d) True.
- (e) True

2. (15pts, 3pts for each)

- (a) **(1)** $X \sim \text{Binomial}(1919, p)$ (Note that the total number of deaths, i.e., 1919, is treated as a fixed number, rather than a random variable.)
 - (2)** $\Omega = \{p \mid 0 < p \leq 1/2\}$ (**Note.** It is either there is no holiday effect, i.e., $p = 1/2$, or there is a holiday effect, i.e., $0 < p < 1/2$. We do not assume there exists an “anti-holiday” effect, i.e., more people dying before holiday than after holiday.)
 - (3)** $\Omega_0 = \{1/2\}$
- (b) **(1)** X_1, \dots, X_{20} are i.i.d. from $\text{Exponential}(\lambda)$
 - (2)** $\Omega = \{\lambda \mid 0 < \lambda < \infty\}$
 - (3)** From the customers viewpoint, we would like to protect the hypothesis “the mean time to failure is less than 2 years” and therefore use it as the null hypothesis, i.e., $\Omega_0 = \{\lambda \mid \lambda \geq \frac{1}{2 \times 365} = \frac{1}{730}\}$. (**Note.** $E(X_i) = 1/\lambda$.)
- (c) **(1)** $X_i \sim \text{Binomial}(200, p_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$, and X_1, \dots, X_4 are independent
 - (2)** $\Omega = \{(p_1, \dots, p_4) \mid 0 < p_i < 1, i = 1, \dots, 4\}$. (Note that $\dim(\Omega) = 4$, not 3.)
 - (3)** $\Omega_0 = \{(p_1, \dots, p_4) \mid 0 < p_1 = \dots = p_4 < 1\}$. (Note that $\dim(\Omega_0) = 1$.)
- (d) **(1)** X_1, \dots, X_8 are i.i.d. from $\text{Normal}(\mu, \sigma^2)$
 - (2)** $\Omega = \{(\mu, \sigma) \mid -\infty < \mu < \infty, 0 < \sigma < \infty\}$
 - (3)** $\Omega_0 = \{(\mu, \sigma) \mid \mu = 0, 0 < \sigma < \infty\}$
- (e) **(1)** $(X_0, X_1, \dots, X_5) \sim \text{Multinomial}(280, p_0, p_1, \dots, p_5)$
 - (2)** $\Omega = \{(p_0, p_1, \dots, p_5) \mid \sum_{i=0}^5 p_i = 1\}$ (Note that $\dim(\Omega) = 6 - 1 = 5$.)
 - (3)** $\Omega_0 = \{(p_0, p_1, \dots, p_5) \mid p_i = P(Z = i), i = 0, 1, \dots, 5, \text{ where } Z \sim \text{Binomial}(5, p) \text{ and } 0 < p < 1\}$ (Note that $\dim(\Omega_0) = 1$.)

3. (a) (15pts) The joint pmf of X_1, \dots, X_n is

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) = e^{-n\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i!} \right).$$

Therefore, the likelihood ratio is

$$\Lambda = \frac{f(\mathbf{x}, \lambda_0)}{f(\mathbf{x}, \lambda_1)} = e^{n(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)} \left(\frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_1} \right)^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}.$$

Because $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$, Λ decreases as $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ increases. A randomized test function based on the likelihood ratio is then given by:

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n X_i > c \\ \gamma, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n X_i = c \\ 0, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n X_i < c \end{cases}.$$

The c and γ are determined by

$$E_{\lambda_0}(\phi) = P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > c\right) + \gamma \cdot P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = c\right) = \alpha,$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim P(n\lambda_0)$.

(b) (5pts) By Neyman-Pearson lemma, the test in (a) is the most powerful test for any particular simple alternative $H_A : \lambda = \lambda_1$, where $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$. Furthermore, because the rejection region, i.e., c and γ , of the test does not depend on λ_1 , the test is UMP for $H_0 : \lambda = \lambda_0$ versus $H_1 : \lambda > \lambda_0$.

4. (a) (7pts) Because $\Omega_0 = \{\theta_0\}$ and $\Omega = (0, \infty)$,

$$\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{\max_{\theta \in \Omega_0} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathbf{x})}{\max_{\theta \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathbf{x})} = \frac{\left[\frac{1}{\theta_0} \right]^n \cdot I_{[0, \theta_0]}(x_{(n)})}{\left[\frac{1}{x_{(n)}} \right]^n \cdot I_{[0, x_{(n)}]}(x_{(n)})} = \left[\frac{x_{(n)}}{\theta_0} \right]^n \cdot I_{[0, \theta_0]}(x_{(n)}).$$

(b) (4pts) As a function of $x_{(n)}$, Λ increases from 0 to 1 when $x_{(n)}$ increases from 0 to θ_0 , and $\Lambda = 0$ when $x_{(n)}$ is larger than θ_0 . Therefore, for $0 < s < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(X_1, \dots, X_n) < s &\Leftrightarrow X_{(n)} > \theta_0 \text{ or } \left[\frac{X_{(n)}}{\theta_0} \right]^n < s \\ &\Leftrightarrow X_{(n)} > \theta_0 \text{ or } X_{(n)} < s^{1/n} \theta_0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I})$$

(c) (9pts) The rejection region of the GLR test is $\Lambda < s$, where s is determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= P(\Lambda < s | H_0) = P\left(\{X_{(n)} > \theta_0\} \cup \{X_{(n)} < s^{1/n} \theta_0\} \mid H_0\right) \\ &= P\left(X_{(n)} > \theta_0 \mid \theta = \theta_0\right) + P\left(X_{(n)} < s^{1/n} \theta_0 \mid \theta = \theta_0\right) \\ &= \int_{\theta_0}^{\infty} 0 \, dx + \int_0^{s^{1/n} \theta_0} \frac{nx^{n-1}}{\theta_0^n} \, dx = 0 + \frac{x^n}{\theta_0^n} \Big|_0^{s^{1/n} \theta_0} = s. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for $\alpha = 0.05$, we can substitute $s = 0.05$ into (I) to get the rejection region $\{X_{(n)} < (0.05)^{1/n}\theta_0\} \cup \{X_{(n)} > \theta_0\}$.

(d) (4pts) The acceptance region is $(0.05)^{1/n}\theta_0 \leq X_{(n)} \leq \theta_0$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} 0.95 &= P\left((0.05)^{1/n}\theta_0 \leq X_{(n)} \leq \theta_0 \mid H_0\right) \\ &= P\left(\frac{(0.05)^{1/n}}{X_{(n)}} \leq \frac{1}{\theta_0} \leq \frac{1}{X_{(n)}} \mid \theta = \theta_0\right) \\ &= P\left(X_{(n)} \leq \theta_0 \leq \frac{X_{(n)}}{(0.05)^{1/n}} \mid \theta = \theta_0\right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $[X_{(n)}, 20^{1/n}X_{(n)}]$ is a 95% confidence interval for θ .

5. (a) (2pts) $\dim(\Omega_0) = 1$ and $\dim(\Omega) = m$

(b) (8pts) Because

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_m) &= \frac{\max_{\theta \in \Omega_0} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathbf{x})}{\max_{\theta \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathbf{x})} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{n_i}{x_i} \hat{p}^{x_i} (1 - \hat{p})^{n_i - x_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{n_i}{x_i} \hat{p}_i^{x_i} (1 - \hat{p}_i)^{n_i - x_i}} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{\hat{p}}{\hat{p}_i}\right)^{x_i} \left(\frac{1 - \hat{p}}{1 - \hat{p}_i}\right)^{n_i - x_i}, \end{aligned}$$

we can get

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log \Lambda &= -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \left[x_i \log \left(\frac{\hat{p}}{\hat{p}_i}\right) + (n_i - x_i) \log \left(\frac{1 - \hat{p}}{1 - \hat{p}_i}\right) \right] \\ &= -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \left[n_i \hat{p}_i \log \left(\frac{n_i \hat{p}}{n_i \hat{p}_i}\right) + n_i (1 - \hat{p}_i) \log \left(\frac{n_i (1 - \hat{p})}{n_i (1 - \hat{p}_i)}\right) \right] \\ &= -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^2 O_{ij} \log \left(\frac{E_{ij}}{O_{ij}}\right) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^2 O_{ij} \log \left(\frac{O_{ij}}{E_{ij}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

(c) (2pts) Because $\dim(\Omega) - \dim(\Omega_0) = m - 1$, the large sample distribution of $-2 \log \Lambda$ is Chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom $m - 1$, i.e., χ_{m-1}^2 .

(d) (4pts) The rejection region is $2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^2 O_{ij} \log \left(\frac{O_{ij}}{E_{ij}}\right) > c$, where c is determined by $P(\chi_{m-1}^2 > c) = \alpha$.

6. (a) (5pts) The posterior pdf is

$$h(\theta | x_1, \dots, x_n) \propto f(x_1, \dots, x_n | \theta) \cdot g(\theta) = \left[\prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i | \theta) \right] \cdot g(\theta)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\propto \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \theta^{x_i} e^{-\theta} \right] \cdot \theta^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda\theta} \\
&= \theta^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} e^{-n\theta} \cdot \theta^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda\theta} \\
&= \theta^{(n\bar{X}+\alpha)-1} e^{-(n+\lambda)\theta},
\end{aligned}$$

which follows the form of the pdf of Gamma distribution with shape parameter $n\bar{X} + \alpha$ and scale parameter $n + \lambda$, i.e., $\Theta|x_1, \dots, x_n \sim \Gamma(n\bar{X} + \alpha, n + \lambda)$.

- (b) (2pts) Yes, because both the prior and the posterior distributions belong to Gamma family when the sample is from Poisson distribution.
- (c) (5pts) Because $\Theta|x_1, \dots, x_n \sim \Gamma(n\bar{X} + \alpha, n + \lambda)$, the Bayes estimator is

$$\mu_{\text{post}} = E[\Theta|x_1, \dots, x_n] = \frac{n\bar{X} + \alpha}{n + \lambda} = \frac{n}{n + \lambda} \cdot \bar{X} + \frac{\lambda}{n + \lambda} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}, \quad (\text{II})$$

where $\frac{\alpha}{\lambda}$ is the prior mean, and sum of the weights is one, i.e., $\frac{n}{n+\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{n+\lambda} = 1$.

- (d) (3pts) When n is large, the weights in (II) will approximate 1 and 0 respectively, i.e.,

$$\frac{n}{n + \lambda} \approx 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\lambda}{n + \lambda} \approx 0.$$

Therefore, $\mu_{\text{post}} \approx \bar{X}$, which is a function of sample.