

4.9 Observe $\{\underline{x}_i\}_{i=0}^{N-1}$ i.i.d, with $\underline{x}_i \sim f_\theta(\underline{x}_i)$

$$H_0: \theta \leq \theta_0$$

$$H_1: \theta > \theta_0$$

here

$$f_\theta(\underline{x}_i) = c(\theta, n, \underline{x}_i) \exp[\pi(\theta) t(\underline{x}_i)]$$

let $\pi(\theta)$ be non decreasing in θ . Then for any

$$\theta_1 > \theta_0 \geq \theta$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_0, \dots, \underline{x}_{N-1}) = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{N-1} f_{\theta_1}(\underline{x}_i)}{\prod_{i=0}^{N-1} f_\theta(\underline{x}_i)} = \frac{c^N(\theta_1) \exp\left\{\left[\pi(\theta_1) - \pi(\theta)\right] \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} t(\underline{x}_i)\right\}}{c^N(\theta)}$$

• θ is a scalar.

• $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} t(\underline{x}_i)$ is a scalar

• $\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_0, \dots, \underline{x}_{N-1}) = \mathcal{L}\left(\sum t(\underline{x}_i)\right)$ is non decreasing in $\sum t(\underline{x}_i)$ if $\pi(\theta_1) - \pi(\theta_0) > 0$.

by the Karlin Ruben theorem, a threshold test on $\sum t(\underline{x}_i)$ is UMP for H_0 vs. H_1 .

4.10 normal case. $\underline{x}_1 \sim N(\underline{\theta}, \underline{m}, \underline{R})$, $\underline{a}, \underline{R}$ known.

$$H_0: \theta \leq \theta_0$$

$$H_1: \theta > \theta_0$$

$$f_0(\underline{x}_1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^N} \frac{1}{|\det \underline{R}|} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x}_1 - \underline{\theta})^T \underline{R}^{-1} (\underline{x}_1 - \underline{\theta}) \right]$$

use 4.9, with

$$L(\theta) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^N} \frac{1}{|\det \underline{R}|} \exp \left[-\frac{\theta^2}{2} \underline{m}^T \underline{R}^{-1} \underline{m} \right]$$

$$h(\underline{x}_1) = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \underline{x}_1^T \underline{R}^{-1} \underline{x}_1 \right]$$

$$t(\underline{x}_1) = \underline{m}^T \underline{R}^{-1} \underline{x}_1$$

$$\pi(\theta) = \theta$$

gamma case.

$$\text{scalar } x: f(x) = \frac{x^{\gamma-1} \exp \left[-\frac{x-\mu}{\beta} \right]}{\beta \Gamma(\gamma)}$$

$$x > \mu, \gamma > 0, \beta > 0$$

γ is the shape parameter.

μ is the location parameter.

β is the scale parameter.

rewrite in exponential form.

$$f(x) = \exp \left[-\log \beta - \log \Gamma(\gamma) + (\gamma-1) \log(x-\mu) - (\gamma-1) \log(\beta) - \frac{1}{\beta} x + \frac{\mu}{\beta} \right]$$

For μ known, gamma case is a member of the exponential family.

$$\text{family, with } \pi_1(\theta) t_1(x) = (\gamma-1) \log(x-\mu)$$

$$\pi_2(\theta) t_2(x) = -\frac{1}{\beta} x$$

(a) Now, suppose both μ and γ are known, and we are testing for scale:

$$H_0: \beta \leq \beta_0$$

$$H_1: \beta > \beta_0$$

From 4.9, with $\theta = \beta$, and

$$c(\theta) h(x_i) = \exp \left[-\log \beta - \log \Gamma(\gamma) + (\gamma-1) \log(x_i - \mu) - (\gamma-1) \log \beta + \frac{\mu}{\beta} \right]$$

$$\pi(\theta) t(x_i) = -\frac{1}{\beta} x_i$$

Since $-\frac{1}{\beta}$ increases with β , the conditions in 4.9 are met.

(b) Next suppose that μ and β are known, and we are testing for shape:

$$H_0: \gamma \leq \gamma_0$$

$$H_1: \gamma > \gamma_0$$

Use 4.9, with $\theta = \gamma$, and

$$c(\theta) t(x_i) = (\gamma-1) \log(x_i - \mu)$$

Since $(\gamma-1)$ is increasing in γ and $t(x_i) = \log(x_i - \mu)$ is a score, the conditions of 4.9 are met.

(c) Finally, if we are testing for location, with everything else known, we have

$$\theta = -\mu$$

$$l(x_i) = \exp \left[\frac{1}{\beta} (\theta_0 - \theta_1) + (\gamma-1) \log \left[\frac{x_i + \theta_1}{x_i + \theta_0} \right] \right]$$

since $\frac{x_i + \theta_1}{x_i + \theta_0}$ increases in θ for $\theta_1 > \theta_0$, the $H_0 = \theta_0$ theorem applies.

β -distr.

$$f(x) = \frac{(x-a)^{p-1} (b-x)^{q-1}}{B(p, q) (b-a)^{p+q-1}} \quad a \leq x \leq b,$$

$p > 0$
 $q > 0$

p & q are shape parameters

rewrite $f(x)$ in exponential form

$$f(x) = \exp \left[(p-1) \log(x-a) + (q-1) \log(b-x) \right. \\ \left. - \log(B(p, q)) - (p+q-1) \log(b-a) \right]$$

$a \leq x \leq b,$
 $p > 0$
 $q > 0.$

(a) when testing for $\theta = p$, with all else known,
with sm. data y_1, \dots, y_n , since

$$\pi(\theta) = \theta - 1$$

$$t(x_i) = \log(x_i - a).$$

(b) similar result when $\theta = q$

(c) suppose we are testing $\theta = a$, with all else known.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f_1(x)}{f_0(x)} &= \frac{(x-a_1)^{p-1} (b-a_1)^{p+q-1}}{(x-a_0)^{p-1} (b-a_0)^{p+q-1}} \\ &= \left(\frac{x+\theta_1}{x+\theta_0} \right)^{p-1} \left(\frac{b+\theta_0}{b+\theta_1} \right)^{p+q-1} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\left(\frac{x+\theta_1}{x+\theta_0} \right)^{p-1}$ increases in x when $\theta_1 > \theta_0$,
the R.F.T. test applies.

(d) When $\theta = b$, with all else known, the likelihood ratio is

$$\frac{\left(\frac{\theta_1 - x}{\theta_0 - x}\right)^{x-1} \left(\frac{\theta_0 - a}{\theta_1 - a}\right)^{n-x-1}}$$

increases in x when $\theta_1 > \theta_0$.

The H-R Test applies when $\theta = b$.

binomial dist

$$P_S(x) = \binom{N}{x} s^x (1-s)^{N-x}, \quad x=0, 1, \dots, N$$

$$= \exp \left[\log \binom{N}{x} + x \log \frac{s}{1-s} + N \log (1-s) \right]$$

When $\theta = s$, $\pi(\theta) = \log \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}$, $t(x_i) = x_i$.

The conditions of problem 4.9 are met.

Consider testing $\theta = n$ versus $\theta = n+r$, with s known.

The likelihood ratio is

$$\frac{\binom{N+r}{x} (1-s)^r}{\binom{N}{x} (1-s)^n} = \frac{(N+r)! (1-x)! (1-s)^r}{(N+r-x)! N!}$$

$$= K(N, r, s) \frac{1}{(N+r-x)(N+r-x-1)\dots(N-x+1)}$$

The log likelihood ratio is

$$L(x) = \log K - \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \log (N+r-j-x)$$

↑
increases
in x .

decreases in x