

## Final Examination, Stat 701, 8-10am, 5/17/23

The exam is closed-book: you may use one or two single-sided formula sheets as a memory aid, but no other books or papers. You may use a calculator, but you need **not** give a numerically simplified answer in any numerical problem. Explain your reasoning in words, referring to standard theorems whenever you can state them. The exam has a possible 100 points.

(1). A large random sample  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  of size  $n$  is assumed to follow the density  $f(x, \theta) = \theta(1+x)^{-\theta-1}$  for all  $x > 0$ , where  $\theta > 0$  is an unknown parameter.

(a). (20 points) As a function of  $\theta$ , find the Asymptotic Relative Efficiency of the Generalized Method of Moments estimator of  $\theta$  based on the function  $g(x) = I_{[x > e-1]}$ , i.e., the estimator solving the estimating equation  $\sum_{i=1}^n \{I_{[X_i > e-1]} - e^{-\theta}\} = 0$ .

(b). (15 points) Find the estimating equation estimator for  $\theta$  with smallest asymptotic variance. (Give both the estimator and its asymptotic variance.)

(2). A sample  $\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  of iid pairs of nonnegative integers satisfy  $Y_i \sim \text{Poisson}(r\lambda)$ ,  $Z_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ , with  $Y_i$  and  $Z_i$  independent, where  $r, \lambda > 0$  are unknown parameters.

(a) (27 points) Find the Rao-Score and Wald Tests (rejection regions) of the hypothesis  $H_0 : r = 1$  versus the general alternative  $H_A : r \neq 1$ , with approximate size  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

(b) (15 points) Find the limiting power of the Wald test in part (a), for large  $n$ , against the simple alternative  $H_1 : r = 1 + 1/\sqrt{n}$ ,  $\lambda = \lambda_0$ . (It should not depend on  $n$ .) The answer will depend on the true  $\lambda = \lambda_0$ , but  $\lambda$  was treated as **unknown** when you formulated your test in (a).

(c) (8 points) Does your answer in (b) tell you anything about the power of the Rao-Score test versus  $H_1$ ?

(3). A large sample of 1000 binary observations  $Z_i \sim \text{Binom}(1, \theta)$  is collected, yielding  $1000 \cdot \bar{Z} = \sum_{i=1}^{1000} Z_i = 360$ . The parameter  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  is unknown, but you believe that the appropriate prior distribution for it is  $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$  with  $\alpha = 3, \beta = 5$ .

(a). (15 points) Explain why the Bernstein-von Mises Theorem applies, and what it says about the approximate posterior distribution for  $\theta$  given  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_{1000})$ . Would your answer change if the prior were  $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$  with  $\alpha, \beta \in (1, 5)$  unknown?

(b). (12 points) Find a two-sided equal-tailed 95% Bayesian credible interval for  $\theta$  based on the exact posterior for the prior with  $\alpha = 3, \beta = 5$ ; and find the approximate Bayesian credible interval using the posterior you found in (a).