

1. In question 1(c) of assignment 2 we examined the validity the Poisson distribution. Here we will do this more formally with a Poisson dispersion test by way of a likelihood ratio test.

Suppose we have observations x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n from a $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ distribution. For example, in this assignment 1, we observed for the last 13 years ($n = 13$) we observed

Drownings=c(65,91,75,77,70,85,84,87,66,79,84,90,93).

We know that the MLE for λ is given by the sample mean \bar{x} . The likelihood ratio statistic is given by comparing $\hat{\lambda} = \bar{x}$ to the situation whereby each observation has a different λ_i with its estimate being $\hat{\lambda}_i = x_i$.

Note that, for example, $\prod_{i=1}^n x_i = x_1 \times x_2 \times \dots \times x_n$ is the multiplicative (product) analog to summation.

the likelihood ratio statistic, Λ is calculated as follows:

$$\Lambda = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{x_i!}}{\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\hat{\lambda}_i e^{-\hat{\lambda}_i}}{x_i!}} = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\bar{x}}{x_i} \right)^{x_i} e^{x_i - \bar{x}}.$$

It turns out that $-2 \log_e(\Lambda) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(x_i \log_e \left(\frac{\bar{x}}{x_i} \right) + (x_i - \bar{x}) \right)$ is approximately Chi-squared ($df = n - 1$) when λ is deemed to be large — as it is for this example.

- (a) The expression $-2 \log_e(\Lambda) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(x_i \log_e \left(\frac{\bar{x}}{x_i} \right) + (x_i - \bar{x}) \right)$ can be simplified to $-2 \log_e(\Lambda) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log_e \left(\frac{x_i}{\bar{x}} \right)$.

How was this achieved?

(4 marks)

- (b) In the following we will produce repeated observations to produce many $-2\log_e(\Lambda)$ random statistics from a $\text{Poisson}(\lambda = 80)$ distribution. Reproduce this code and the display the resulting plot. Comment briefly on the how well the Chi-squared($df = 13-1$) approximates the distribution of the $-2\log_e(\Lambda)$.

```
xmat=matrix(rpois(13*1e4,lambda=80), nc=13)
xbars=apply(xmat,1, mean)

# produce -2log(Lambda)
sims=2*apply(xmat*log(xmat/xbars),1,sum)

# histogram
hist(sims, ylim=1.1*c(0,dchisq(13-2, df=13-1)),prob=T,
      xlab=expression(paste("-2log(",Lambda,")")), ylab="probability",
      main=expression(paste("Histogram of simulated -2log(",Lambda,")")))
xs=seq(min(sims), max(sims), length=1e3)
# superimpose Chi-squared pdf
lines(xs, dchisq(xs, df=13-1), col="blue")
```

(4 marks)

- (c) In the above plot we formatted the limits of the probability by the command `ylim=1.1*c(0,dchisq(13-2, df=13-1))`. This allowed us to see the peak value of the density of the Chi-squared probability density function at $k = 13 - 2 = 11$. Here we will see how this number is computed for $k > 2$.

The pdf of a Chi-squared($df = k$) is given by:

$$f_X(x) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)} x^{\frac{k}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2}} \text{ for } x > 0 .$$

Show that for $k > 2$ peaks at the value $k - 2$. Verify is it a maximal value.

Hints: As $f_X(x) > 0$ maximising $f_X(x)$ is equivalent to maximising $\log_e(f_X(x))$. Identify constants.

(4 marks)

- (d) Compute $-2 \log_e(\Lambda)$ for the data

`Drownings=c(65,91,75,77,70,85,84,87,66,79,84,90,93)`.

Compute the P -value to test the hypothesis that we have the data is consistent H_0 : data comes from a Poisson distribution using the Chi-squared ($df = 13 - 1 = 12$) distribution. Comment briefly on you conclusion.

Hint: This is a more formal test to the one done in Question 1 (c) of Assignment 2. (4 marks)

- (e) Here we will produce a Taylor series approximation for

$-2 \log_e(\Lambda) \approx \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{\bar{x}} = \frac{(n-1)s^2}{\bar{x}}$ where s^2 is the sample variance.

We start by defining here $g(x) = 2x \log_e \left(\frac{x}{\bar{x}} \right)$ and from the above

and not that $-2 \log_e(\Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i)$.

Your first task is to approximate a Taylor series for the function up to the quadratic term. Then use this approximation to derive the statement above.

(6 marks)

- (f) Verify that approximation is, not surprisingly, is close to the same Chi-squared distribution. Produce a similar plot to the above.

Hint: Adapt the R code, above, to obtain a similar histograms with density plot. We the sample means, \bar{x} via

`apply(xmat,1 mean)`. The sample variance, s^2 , in R can be computed using the `var` command.

(4 marks)

- (g) Test the null hypothesis above. How does the statistic above compare to the ad-hoc test we did in question 1(c) of assignment two. Comment briefly.

`Drownings=c(65,91,75,77,70,85,84,87,66,79,84,90,93)` and comment on the P -value obtained for testing the null hypotheisi: H_0 : data comes from a Poisson distribution. (4 marks)

Assignment 4, STATS210 SS, 2023

2. Suppose an insect lays N random eggs which can be described by a Poisson(λ) distribution. Furthermore, suppose of those laid, the the number that hatch (i.e. $Y|N = n$) can be described by a Binomial(n, p) probability distribution.
- (a) Use the partition theorem for expectation and variances to obtain the expected number and variance of the total number of eggs that hatch Y . **(5 marks)**
- (b) The relationship above suggests that Y has a certain distribution. Suggest a distribution and explain why you suspect this is so. **(2 marks)**
- (c) Derive the distribution for Y and verify your suggestion above. **(7 marks)**

3. In this question we will examine the awesome bi-variate normal distribution.

- (a) Generate random bi-variate Normal observations of size $n = 1000$ with correlation coefficient of $\rho = -.95$, $\rho = 0$, and $\rho = .95$, respectively, as described in example 7.3 of your notes. Plot the the resulting observations of Y versus X ,

Note: Start with two $n = 1000$ observations using the R functions `rnorm`.

Here's the code for the first plot:

```
Z=rnorm(1e3); W=rnorm(1e3)
rho=-.95
X=Z; Y=rho*Z+sqrt(1-rho^2)*W
plot(Y~X, col="lightgrey",
main=expression(
paste("Bivariate Normal("
, mu[x], "=0," , sigma[X], "=1,"
, mu[Y], "=0," , sigma[Y], "=1,"
, rho[XY], "=-0.95)"))))

abline(0, rho, lty=2, col="blue" )
abline(h=0, col="red", lty=3)
abline(v=0, col="red", lty=3)
```

Adapt the code above for $\rho = 0$ and $\rho = .95$. Comment briefly on all three plots.

(6 marks)

- (b) It can be shown that for the bi-variate normal distributions (with $\mu_X = \mu_Y = 0$ and $\sigma_X^2 = \sigma_Y^2 = 1$) that

$$\mathbb{P}(X > 0, Y > 0) = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\sin^{-1}(\rho)}{2\pi} \text{ when}$$

Calculate this probability for each of the three cases above and explain how these 'make sense' when you compare these values with their respective plots.

Note: the inverse sine function gives the angle in radians for a given value $-1 \leq \rho \leq 1$, $\sin^{-1}(\rho) = \text{arcsine}(\rho) = \text{asin}(\text{rho})$ in R. Also, $\pi = \text{pi}$ in R.

(6 marks)

Assignment 4, STATS210 SS, 2023

- (c) Consider the model $Y_i = \beta x_i + \varepsilon_i$ where $\varepsilon_i \sim iid \text{Normal}(0, \sigma^2)$. Let us assume σ^2 . Compute the MLE estimate of β , $\hat{\beta}$. Ensure you confirm that it is unbiased and that it maximises the likelihood. **(6 marks)**
- (d) Compute the variance of this MLE estimate. **(4 marks)**
- (e) Using the data generated above above when $\rho = 0.95$ - calculate the MLE estimate for these data. **(4 marks)**
- (f) Using the distribution of $Y|X$ discussed in example 7.3. Explain why this result is not at all surprising. As a consequence tell us what the variance of each ε_i would be. **(4 marks)**

Total: 74 marks.