

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IN ECONOMICS
PROBABILITY AND STATISTICS
WRITTEN EXAMINATION
SEPTEMBER 2nd, 2021

NAME AND SURNAME: _____ ID:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

INSTRUCTIONS

Read the problems carefully before starting your work. There are four problems. You can have a sheet with formulae and a mathematical handbook. Write your solutions on the paper provided. You have two hours.

Problem	a.	b.	c.	d.	
1.				•	
2.			•	•	
3.				•	
4.					
Total					

1. (25) Suppose the population is stratified into K strata of sizes N_1, \dots, N_K . Denote by μ_k the population mean in stratum k and by σ_k^2 the population variance in stratum k for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$. Let μ be the population mean for the whole population and σ^2 the population variance for the whole population. Suppose a stratified sample is taken with sample sizes in each stratum equal to n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K . Let \bar{X}_k be the sample mean in stratum k and let

$$\bar{X} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{N} \bar{X}_k = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \bar{X}_k.$$

a. (5) Compute $E[(\bar{X}_k - \bar{X})^2]$.

Solution: we compute

$$\begin{aligned} E[(\bar{X}_k - \bar{X})^2] &= \text{var}(\bar{X}_k - \bar{X}) + (E(\bar{X}_k - \bar{X}))^2 \\ &= \text{var}(\bar{X}_k) + \text{var}(\bar{X}) - 2\text{cov}(\bar{X}_k, \bar{X}) + (\mu_k - \mu)^2 \\ &= \frac{\sigma_k^2}{n_k} \cdot \frac{N_k - n_k}{N_k - 1} + \sum_{i=1}^K w_i^2 \cdot \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i} \cdot \frac{N_i - n_i}{N_i - 1} \\ &\quad - 2w_k \cdot \frac{\sigma_k^2}{n_k} \cdot \frac{N_k - n_k}{N_k - 1} + (\mu_k - \mu)^2. \end{aligned}$$

b. (10) Suggest an unbiased estimator for the quantity

$$\gamma^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k (\mu_k - \mu)^2.$$

Explain why the suggested estimator is unbiased.

Solution: since we have unbiased estimators for σ_k^2 the quantity

$$\hat{\gamma}_k^2 = (\bar{X}_k - \bar{X})^2 - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_k^2}{n_k} \cdot \frac{N_k - n_k}{N_k - 1} - \sum_{i=1}^K w_i^2 \cdot \frac{\hat{\sigma}_i^2}{n_i} \cdot \frac{N_i - n_i}{N_i - 1} + 2w_k \cdot \frac{\hat{\sigma}_k^2}{n_k} \cdot \frac{N_k - n_k}{N_k - 1}$$

is an unbiased estimator of $(\mu_k - \mu)^2$. Multiplying $\hat{\gamma}_k^2$ by w_k and summing over k we get an unbiased estimator of γ^2 .

c. (10) Suggest an unbiased estimator of the population variance σ^2 . Explain why your estimator is unbiased.

Hint: check that

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \sigma_k^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K w_k (\mu_k - \mu)^2.$$

Solution: we write

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \sigma_k^2 + \gamma^2.$$

Since both terms on the right can be estimated in an unbiased way we have that

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \hat{\sigma}_k^2 + \hat{\gamma}^2$$

is an unbiased estimator of σ^2 .

2. (25) Assume the data x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are an i.i.d. sample from the distribution with density

$$f(x) = \frac{\alpha}{2} |x|^{\alpha-1} e^{-|x|^\alpha}$$

for $\alpha > 0$.

- a. (15) Write the equation for the MLE estimate of α . Compute the Fisher information $I(\alpha)$. Assume as known that

$$\int_0^\infty x^{2\alpha-1} \log^2 x e^{-x^\alpha} dx = \frac{\pi^2}{6\alpha^3} - \frac{(2-\gamma)\gamma}{\alpha^3}$$

where $\gamma = 0.577216$ is the Euler constant.

Solution: the log-likelihood function is given by

$$\ell(\alpha|x_1, \dots, x_n) = n \log(\alpha) - n \log 2 + (\alpha - 1) \sum_{k=1}^n \log |x_k| - \sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^\alpha.$$

Setting the derivative to 0 we get the equation

$$\frac{n}{\alpha} + \sum_{k=1}^n \log |x_k| - \sum_{k=1}^n |x_k|^\alpha \log |x_k| = 0.$$

For the Fisher information we compute

$$\ell'' = -\frac{1}{\alpha^2} - |x|^\alpha \log^2 |x|.$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} I(\alpha) &= \frac{1}{\alpha^2} + \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x|^{2\alpha-1} \log^2 |x| e^{-|x|^\alpha} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha^2} - \frac{\pi^2}{12\alpha^2} - \frac{(2-\gamma)\gamma}{2\alpha^2}. \end{aligned}$$

- b. (10) Suppose you knew the MLE estimate $\hat{\alpha}$. Write explicitly the approximate 99%-confidence interval for α .

Solution: the approximate standard error is given by

$$\text{se}(\hat{\alpha}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{nI(\hat{\alpha})}}$$

and $z_\alpha = 2.56$. The approximate confidence interval is

$$\hat{\alpha} \pm 2.56 \cdot \text{se}(\hat{\alpha}).$$

3. (25) Assume the observations x_1, \dots, x_n are an i.i.d. sample from the $\Gamma(2, \theta)$ distribution with density

$$f(x) = \theta^2 x e^{-\theta x}$$

for $x > 0$ and $\theta > 0$.

a. (5) Find the maximum likelihood estimator for the parameter θ .

Solution: the log-likelihood function is

$$\ell(\theta|\mathbf{x}) = 2n \log \theta + \sum_{k=1}^n \log x_k - \theta \sum_{k=1}^n x_k.$$

Equating the derivative to 0 we get

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{2n}{\sum_{k=1}^n x_k}.$$

b. (10) For the testing problem $H_0: \theta = 1$ versus $H_1: \theta \neq 1$ find the Wilks's test statistic λ . Describe when you would reject H_0 given that the size of the test is $1 - \alpha$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Solution: by definition

$$\lambda = 2\ell(\hat{\theta}) - 2\ell(1).$$

Using the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}$ we get

$$\lambda = -4n \log \left(\frac{\bar{x}}{2} \right) + 2n(\bar{x} - 2).$$

By Wilks's theorem under H_0 the distribution of the test statistic λ is approximately $\chi^2(1)$. The null-hypothesis is rejected when $\lambda > c_\alpha$ where c_α is such that $P(\chi^2(1) \geq c_\alpha) = \alpha$.

c. (10) The function

$$f(y) = -4n \log \left(\frac{y}{2} \right) + 2n(y - 2)$$

is strictly decreasing on $(0, 2)$ and strictly increasing on $(2, \infty)$. Assume for all $c > \min_{y>0} f(y)$ you can find the two solutions of the equation $f(y) = c$. Can you use this information to give an exact test given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$? Describe the procedure. No calculations are required.

Hint: by properties of the gamma distribution $\bar{X} \sim \Gamma(2n, \theta/n)$.

Solution: given the assumptions we can find such a c_α that under H_0 we have

$$P_{H_0}(f(\bar{X}) \geq c_\alpha) = \alpha.$$

Let $x_1 < x_2$ be the solutions of the equation $f(x) = c_\alpha$. The test that rejects H_0 when either $\bar{X} < x_1$ or $\bar{X} > x_2$ is exact.

4. (25) Assume the regression model with

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$$

where $E(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = 0$ and $\text{var}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = \sigma^2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is an invertible known matrix and σ^2 is an unknown parameter.

a. (5) Show that

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{Y}$$

is an unbiased estimate of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Solution: we compute

$$E(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^TE(\mathbf{Y}).$$

Since $E(\mathbf{Y}) = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ we have

$$E(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

b. (5) Show that

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$$

is an unbiased estimate of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Solution: we compute

$$E(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\mathbf{X}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}E(\mathbf{Y}).$$

Since $E(\mathbf{Y}) = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ we have

$$E(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

c. (5) Compute the covariance matrix

$$\text{cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}).$$

Solution: denote

$$\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T$$

and

$$\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{X}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}.$$

In this notation

$$\text{cov}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{B}\mathbf{Y}) = (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})\text{cov}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y})\mathbf{B}^T.$$

Note that $\text{cov}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}) = \sigma^2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. It is straightforward to check that

$$(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{B}^T = 0.$$

d. (10) Which of the two estimators for β is better? Explain.

Solution: write as in the Gauss-Markov theorem

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}(\hat{\beta}) &= \text{var}(\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\beta}) \\ &= \text{var}(\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}) + \text{var}(\tilde{\beta}) + 2\text{cov}(\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\beta}) \\ &= \text{var}(\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}) + \text{var}(\tilde{\beta}).\end{aligned}$$

This means that $\tilde{\beta}$ is the better estimator of β .