

## Sta 532: Homework #4

1. Find the Kullback-Leibler divergence  $\text{KL}(\theta : \theta')$  for the binomial distribution  $\text{Bi}(n, \theta)$  with fixed  $n$ , for  $\theta, \theta' \in (0, 1)$ .
2. Find the Fisher Information  $I_n(\theta)$  for the binomial distribution  $\text{Bi}(n, \theta)$  with fixed  $n$ , and verify that<sup>1</sup>

$$\text{KL}(\theta : \theta') = \frac{1}{2}I_n(\theta)(\theta - \theta')^2 + o(\theta - \theta')^2$$

Suggestion: Write  $\theta' = \theta + \epsilon$ , and use the Taylor series  $\log(1 + x) = x - x^2/2 + \xi^3/3$  for some  $\xi \in [0, x]$ .

This *always* happens (under the usual regularity conditions)— so, within parametric families, closeness in the Kullback-Leibler is the same as closeness in the *Information metric*, and the Information distance is approximately  $\sqrt{2\text{KL}(\theta : \theta')}$  for  $\theta' \approx \theta$ .

3. Let  $\{X_i\} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Un}(0, \theta)$  be uniformly distributed on the interval  $[0, \theta]$  for some uncertain  $\theta > 0$ . The MLE is  $\hat{\theta}_n = X_n^* := \max\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ , the sample maximum. Verify that  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is consistent, *i.e.*, that

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta [|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta| > \epsilon] \rightarrow 0$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , by giving an explicit bound for the indicated probability in terms of  $n$ ,  $\epsilon$ , and  $\theta$ .

4. Again let  $\{X_i\} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Un}(0, \theta)$  be uniformly distributed, and let  $\theta$  have the improper scale-invariant prior density function  $\pi(\theta) = \theta^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\theta>0\}}$ . Find the Bayesian posterior mean  $\bar{\theta}_n := \mathbb{E}[\theta \mid X_1 \cdots X_n]$  and verify that it too is consistent.

Last edited: January 29, 2015

---

<sup>1</sup>A note on “little oh” and “big oh” notation: The notation “ $f(x) = o(g(x))$  at  $x_0$ ” or “ $f(x) \in o(g(x))$  at  $x_0$ ”, pronounced “ $f(x)$  is little oh of  $g(x)$  at  $x_0$ ”, means that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} |f(x)/g(x)| = 0$ , *i.e.*, that  $f(x)$  is negligible compared to  $g(x)$  near  $x_0$ . Often (as in problem 2)  $x_0$  is zero or infinity and is implicit. The notation “ $f(x) = O(g(x))$  at  $x_0$ ” or “ $f(x) \in O(g(x))$  at  $x_0$ ”, pronounced “ $f(x)$  is big oh of  $g(x)$  at  $x_0$ ”, means that  $|f(x)/g(x)|$  is bounded in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ .