

557: MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS II
LARGE SAMPLE AND ASYMPTOTIC RESULTS - III

Behaviour of the Likelihood Ratio Test Statistic

In the test of

$$H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$$

$$H_1 : \theta \neq \theta_0$$

using the likelihood ratio test, suppose that, in fact $\theta = \theta_T$. Then, under conditions A0-A4,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{2}{n}(l_n(\theta_0) - l_n(\hat{\theta}_n)) &= \frac{2}{n}(l_n(\theta_T) - l_n(\theta_0)) - \frac{2}{n}(l_n(\theta_T) - l_n(\hat{\theta}_n)) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{f_{X|\theta}(X_i|\theta_T)}{f_{X|\theta}(X_i|\theta_0)} - \frac{2}{n}(l_n(\theta_T) - l_n(\hat{\theta}_n)) \end{aligned}$$

But, as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{f_{X|\theta}(X_i|\theta_T)}{f_{X|\theta}(X_i|\theta_0)} \xrightarrow{p} 2K(\theta_T, \theta_0) \quad \frac{2}{n}(l_n(\theta_T) - l_n(\hat{\theta}_n)) \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

as $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{p} \theta_T$, so

$$-\frac{2}{n}(l_n(\theta_0) - l_n(\hat{\theta}_n)) \xrightarrow{p} 2K(\theta_T, \theta_0)$$

***d*-dimensional Parameters**

Consider using the likelihood ratio statistic for testing H_0 versus H_1 if θ is d -dimensional parameter. Under assumptions A0-A4, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ under H_0 ,

$$-2 \log \lambda_X(\underline{X}) = -2(l_n(\underline{\theta}_0) - l_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)) \xrightarrow{d} Q \sim \chi_d^2$$

This follows using identical methods to the $d = 1$ case. A second-order Taylor expansion to the log-likelihood around the MLE, $\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n$

$$l_n(\underline{\theta}) = l_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) + (\underline{\theta} - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)^\top \dot{l}_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) + \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\theta} - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)^\top \ddot{l}_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)(\underline{\theta} - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) + o_P(1)$$

As $\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n$ is the maximum likelihood estimate

$$\dot{l}_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) = 0$$

and therefore on rearrangement, evaluating at $\underline{\theta} = \underline{\theta}_0$,

$$-2(l_n(\underline{\theta}_0) - l_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)) = -(\underline{\theta}_0 - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)^\top \ddot{l}_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)(\underline{\theta}_0 - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) + o_P(1)$$

But, by previous results

$$(\underline{\theta}_0 - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)^\top \ddot{l}_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)(\underline{\theta}_0 - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) = \sqrt{n}(\underline{\theta}_0 - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)^\top \left(-\frac{1}{n} \ddot{l}_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) \right) \sqrt{n}(\underline{\theta}_0 - \hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) \xrightarrow{d} \underline{Z}^\top \mathcal{I}(\underline{\theta}_0) \underline{Z}$$

as

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n - \underline{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow{d} \underline{Z} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \mathcal{I}(\underline{\theta}_0)^{-1}) \quad -\frac{1}{n} \ddot{l}_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n) \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{I}(\underline{\theta}_0)$$

Hence

$$-2(l_n(\underline{\theta}_0) - l_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)) \xrightarrow{d} Q \sim \chi_d^2.$$

Theorem Consider testing the hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 & : \underline{\theta} \in \Theta_0 \\ H_1 & : \underline{\theta} \in \Theta_1 \end{aligned}$$

using the likelihood ratio statistic

$$\lambda_{\underline{X}}(\underline{x}) = \frac{\sup_{\underline{\theta} \in \Theta_0} f_{\underline{X}|\underline{\theta}}(\underline{x}|\underline{\theta})}{\sup_{\underline{\theta} \in \Theta} f_{\underline{X}|\underline{\theta}}(\underline{x}|\underline{\theta})} = \frac{L(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_{n0} | \underline{x})}{L(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n | \underline{x})}$$

say, where $\Theta \equiv \Theta_0 \cup \Theta_1$, and where H_0 specifies a model with k_1 free parameters (parameters not determined by the hypothesis), and H_1 and specifies a model with k_2 free parameters, with $k_2 > k_1$. Then, under assumptions A0-A4, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, under H_0

$$-2 \log \lambda_{\underline{X}}(\underline{X}) = -2(l_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_{n0}) - l_n(\hat{\underline{\theta}}_n)) \xrightarrow{d} Q \sim \chi_{k_2 - k_1}^2$$

Note: Such hypotheses can often be specified in the form

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 & : \underline{\theta} = (\underline{\theta}_0, \underline{\theta}_1), \quad \underline{\theta}_1 \text{ unspecified} \\ H_1 & : \underline{\theta} \neq (\underline{\theta}_0, \underline{\theta}_1), \quad \underline{\theta}_1 \text{ unspecified} \end{aligned}$$

that is, H_0 places constraints on one component $\underline{\theta}$, but leaves the other unspecified.

Other Asymptotic Tests

The Wald and Rao/Score test statistics derived from a sample of size n , W_n and R_n , for testing

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 & : \underline{\theta} = \underline{\theta}_0 \\ H_1 & : \underline{\theta} \neq \underline{\theta}_0 \end{aligned}$$

are constructed as follows:

- **Wald Test :** The **Wald Statistic**, W_n , is defined by

$$W_n = n(\tilde{\underline{\theta}}_n - \underline{\theta}_0)^\top \hat{I}_n(\tilde{\underline{\theta}}_n)(\tilde{\underline{\theta}}_n - \underline{\theta}_0) \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{\underline{\theta}}_n$ is a solution to the likelihood equations, \hat{I}_n is the observed information.

- **Score Test :** Let

$$\underline{Z}_n \equiv \underline{Z}_n(\underline{\theta}_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{l}_n(\underline{\theta}_0).$$

Then the (Rao) Score Test Statistic, R_n , is defined by

$$R_n = \underline{Z}_n^\top \mathcal{I}(\underline{\theta}_0)^{-1} \underline{Z}_n \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\underline{\theta}_0)$ can be replaced by the observed information $\hat{I}_n(\underline{\theta}_0)$ if necessary.

In the one parameter case, the statistics can be expressed as

$$W_n = -(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)^2 \ddot{l}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n) \quad R_n = -\left\{ \dot{l}_n(\theta_0) \right\}^2 \left\{ \ddot{l}_n(\theta_0) \right\}^{-1}$$

Example: Poisson. For $\theta > 0$, if $s_n = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$, then

$$\begin{aligned} l_n(\theta) &= -n\theta + s_n \log \theta - \sum_{i=1}^n \log x_i! \\ \dot{l}_n(\theta) &= -n + s_n/\theta \\ \ddot{l}_n(\theta) &= -s_n/\theta^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence the MLE, from $\dot{l}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) = 0$, is $\hat{\theta}_n = s_n/n = \bar{x}$, with estimator $S_n/n = \bar{X}$. Thus

- **Wald Statistic :** using the formula above

$$W_n = -(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)^2 \ddot{l}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n) = -(\bar{X} - \theta_0)^2 (-S_n/(\bar{X})^2) = n(\bar{X} - \theta_0)^2/\bar{X}.$$

- **Rao Statistic :** In this case, we can compute the Fisher Information $\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)$ exactly - we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\theta_0) = \mathbb{E}_{f_{X|\theta}} [-\Psi(\theta_0, X)] = \mathbb{E}_{f_{X|\theta}} [X/\theta_0^2] = \frac{1}{\theta_0^2} \mathbb{E}_{f_{X|\theta}} [X] = \frac{\theta_0}{\theta_0^2} = \frac{1}{\theta_0}$$

so

$$R_n = \frac{\{Z_n(\theta_0)\}^2}{I(\theta_0)} = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(S_n/\theta_0 - n)\right)^2}{1/\theta_0} = \frac{\theta_0}{n} (S_n/\theta_0 - n)^2 = \frac{n(\bar{X} - \theta_0)^2}{\theta_0}$$

However, using the observed information,

$$R_n = -\{ \dot{l}_n(\theta_0) \}^2 \{ \ddot{l}_n(\theta_0) \}^{-1} = \frac{-(S_n/\theta_0 - n)^2}{-S_n/\theta_0^2} = \frac{(S_n - n\theta_0)^2}{S_n} = \frac{n(\bar{X} - \theta_0)^2}{\bar{X}}$$

that is, identical to Wald.

- **Likelihood Ratio Statistic:**

$$\lambda_X(\underline{x}) = \frac{L_n(\hat{\theta}_n)}{L_n(\theta_0)} = \frac{e^{-n\hat{\theta}_n} \hat{\theta}_n^{S_n}}{e^{-n\theta_0} \theta_0^{S_n}} = \exp \left\{ -n(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + S_n(\log \hat{\theta}_n - \log \theta_0) \right\}$$

or equivalently

$$2 \log \lambda_X(\underline{x}) = -2n(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + 2S_n(\log \hat{\theta}_n - \log \theta_0)$$

Example: Normal. Under the normal model, the likelihood is

$$L_n(\mu, \sigma) = f_{X|\mu, \sigma}(x|\mu, \sigma^2) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2}\right)^{n/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 \right\}$$

and thus, in terms of the random variables, for general X ,

$$l(X|\theta) = \log f_{X|\mu, \sigma}(X|\mu, \sigma^2) = -\frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi\sigma^2) - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (X - \mu)^2$$

and, for μ

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} l(X|\theta) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} (X - \mu) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mu^2} \{l(X|\theta)\} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$$

whereas for σ^2

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma^2} \{l(X|\theta)\} = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2\sigma^4}(X - \mu)^2 \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (\sigma^2)^2} \{l(X|\theta)\} = \frac{1}{2\sigma^4} - \frac{1}{\sigma^6}(X - \mu)^2$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mu \partial \sigma^2} \{l(X|\theta)\} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^4}(X - \mu)$$

(here taking σ^2 as the variable with which we differentiating with respect to). Now

$$E_{f_{X|\mu,\sigma}} [(X - \mu)] = 0 \quad E_{f_{X|\mu,\sigma}} [(X - \mu)^2] = \sigma^2$$

we have for the Fisher Information for (μ, σ^2) from a single data point as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\mu, \sigma^2) &= - \begin{bmatrix} E[-1/\sigma^2] & E[-(X - \mu)/\sigma^4] \\ E[-(X - \mu)/\sigma^4] & E[1/(2\sigma^4) - (X - \mu)^2/\sigma^6] \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^{-2} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma^{-4} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{I}_{11} & \mathcal{I}_{12} \\ \mathcal{I}_{21} & \mathcal{I}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

To test

$$H_0 : (\mu, \sigma) = \underline{\theta}_0 = (0, \sigma_0^2)$$

$$H_1 : (\mu, \sigma) \neq \underline{\theta}_0.$$

such W_n and R_n can be constructed. Under H_0 , the μ and σ^2 are completely specified, whereas under H_1 , the MLEs of μ and σ^2 are

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \quad S^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2.$$

and therefore

$$\hat{I}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2\hat{\sigma}^4} \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence the Wald Statistic is

$$\begin{aligned} W_n &= n(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)^T \hat{I}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - 0) \\ \sqrt{n}(S^2 - \sigma_0^2) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{S^2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2S^4} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{n}(\bar{X} - 0) \\ \sqrt{n}(S^2 - \sigma_0^2) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{n(\bar{X})^2}{S^2} + \frac{n(S^2 - \sigma_0^2)^2}{2S^4} \end{aligned}$$

Asymptotic Properties of the Wald and Score Statistics

(a) Under the **null hypothesis**

- **Wald Test** : For the Wald test, as

$$D_n = \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \underline{Z} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \mathcal{I}(\theta_0)^{-1})$$

it follows that

$$W_n = n(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)^\top \hat{I}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = D_n^\top \hat{I}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n) D_n \xrightarrow{d} \underline{Z}^\top \mathcal{I}(\theta_0) \underline{Z} \sim \chi_d^2$$

- **Score Test** : For the Score test,

$$\underline{Z}_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{l}_n(\theta_0) = \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{l}_n(\theta_0) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \underline{Z} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \mathcal{I}(\theta_0))$$

and hence for the Score Test Statistic,

$$R_n = \underline{Z}_n^\top \mathcal{I}(\theta_0)^{-1} \underline{Z}_n \xrightarrow{d} \underline{Z}^\top \mathcal{I}(\theta_0) \underline{Z} \sim \chi_d^2$$

(b) If the null hypothesis is **not true**, let θ_T denote the true value of the parameter.

- **Wald Test** : For the Wald test,

$$\frac{1}{n} W_n = (\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0)^\top \hat{I}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)(\tilde{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{p} (\theta_T - \theta_0)^\top \mathcal{I}(\theta_T)(\theta_T - \theta_0) > 0$$

- **Score Test** : For the Score test, from above

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \underline{Z}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{l}_n(\theta_0) \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}_{f_{X|\theta}}[\dot{l}_n(\theta_0)] = \underline{\mu}(\theta_T, \theta_0)$$

say, and hence for the Score Test Statistic,

$$\frac{1}{n} R_n = \frac{1}{n} \underline{Z}_n^\top \mathcal{I}(\theta_0)^{-1} \underline{Z}_n \xrightarrow{p} \underline{\mu}(\theta_T, \theta_0)^\top \mathcal{I}(\theta_0)^{-1} \underline{\mu}(\theta_T, \theta_0) > 0$$

Composite Hypotheses

Consider testing the hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \theta \in \Theta_0 \\ H_1 &: \theta \in \Theta_1 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1), \quad \theta_1 \text{ unspecified} \\ H_1 &: \theta \neq (\theta_0, \theta_1), \quad \theta_1 \text{ unspecified} \end{aligned}$$

where θ_0 is $k_1 \times 1$, and θ_1 is $(d - k_1) \times 1$, that is, H_0 places constraints on one component θ , but leaves the other unspecified.

Let $\tilde{\theta}_{n0} = (\theta_0, \tilde{\theta}_{n01})^\top$ and $\tilde{\theta}_{n1} = (\tilde{\theta}_{n10}, \tilde{\theta}_{n11})^\top$ denote consistent estimators (possibly MLEs) under H_0 and H_1 respectively.

Suppose that

$$\mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{I}_{00}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathcal{I}_{01}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ \mathcal{I}_{10}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathcal{I}_{11}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{bmatrix}$$

denotes the Fisher information for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, with blocks $\mathcal{I}_{00}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ ($k_1 \times k_1$), $\mathcal{I}_{01}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ ($k_1 \times (d - k_1)$) etc. Let

$$\mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{00}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{01}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{10}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{11}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{bmatrix}$$

Then for the hypotheses above the Wald and Score tests are constructed as follows:

- **Wald Test :** The **Wald Statistic**, W_n , is defined by

$$W_n = n(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n10} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \hat{I}_{n00.1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0})(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n10} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ is a solution to the likelihood equations, \hat{I}_n is the observed information, and $\hat{I}_{n00.1}$ is the upper $k_1 \times k_1$ block of the inverse if \hat{I}_n . It can be shown that if

$$\hat{I}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{I}_{n00}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \hat{I}_{n01}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ \hat{I}_{n10}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \hat{I}_{n11}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{bmatrix}$$

then

$$\hat{I}_{n00.1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0}) = \left(\hat{I}_{n00}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0}) - \hat{I}_{n01}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0}) \hat{I}_{n11}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0}) \hat{I}_{n10}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0}) \right)^{-1}$$

- **Score Test :** Let

$$\mathcal{Z}_n \equiv \mathcal{Z}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0).$$

Then the (Rao) Score Test Statistic, R_n , is defined by

$$R_n = \mathcal{Z}_n^\top(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0}) \mathcal{I}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0})^{-1} \mathcal{Z}_n(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n0}) \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ can be replaced by the observed information $\hat{I}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ if necessary.

In both cases, under H_0 , the statistics converge in distribution to a Chi-squared distribution,

$$W_n \xrightarrow{d} \chi_{k_1}^2 \quad R_n \xrightarrow{d} \chi_{k_1}^2$$