

Statistical Signal Processing
Prof. Prabin Kumar Bora
Department of Electronics & Electrical Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology, Guwahati

Lecture No 11
MVUE through Sufficient Statistic

Hello students, welcome to lecture 12 and MVUE through sufficient statistic, miniMuem variance unbiased estimator through sufficient statistic.

(Refer Slide Time: 00:48)

- ❖ We saw that MVUE is the most desirable estimator.
- ❖ CR theorem sets a bound on the minimum variance of the estimator.
- ❖ If the MVUE reaches the CRLB, it can be obtained through the factorization of
$$\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{x}/\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \mathbf{I}(\theta)(\hat{\theta} - \theta).$$
- ❖ However, the CRLB may not be achieved by the MVUE.
- ❖ The concepts of *sufficient statistic* and *complete statistic* may be used to find the MVUE under certain conditions.

We saw that MVUE is the most desirable estimator; Cramer Rao theorem sets a bound on the minimum variance of the unbiased estimator. If the MVUE reaches the CRLB, it can be obtained through the factorization of this matrix log likelihood matrix $\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{x}/\theta)}{\partial \theta}$ that is equal to $\mathbf{I}(\theta)(\hat{\theta} - \theta)$, where $\hat{\theta}$ is the unbiased estimator factor and $\mathbf{I}(\theta)$ is the Fisher information statistics.

However CRLB may not be achieved by the MVUE. So in that situation the concepts of sufficient statistic and complete statistic may be used to find the MVUE under certain conditions. So we will introduce the concepts of sufficient statistic and complete statistic in this lecture.

(Refer Slide Time: 01:57)

Sufficient Statistic

- ❖ The observations $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$ contain information about the unknown parameter θ . An estimator should carry the same information about θ as the observed data.
- ❖ A statistic $T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ of θ is called sufficient if it contains the same information about θ as contained in the random samples $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$. In other word, the conditional PDF $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta | T=t)$ does not involve θ .
- ❖ If $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$ are discrete, the conditional PDF $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta | T=t)$ above is replaced by the conditional PMF $p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta | T=t)$.

We will start with sufficient statistic; the observations X_1, X_2 up to X_N contain information about the unknown parameter θ . So because of that we will be able to estimate θ from the observations. An estimator should carry the same information about θ as the observed θ , whatever information is there for θ same should be carried by the estimator also. Now we will go to sufficient statistic, a statistics T X_1, X_2 up to X_N of θ is called sufficient.

If it contains the same information about θ as containing the random samples X_1, X_2 up to X_N . In other word, the conditional PDF $f(x_1, x_2$ up to x_N as a function of θ given T is equal to t does not involve θ . So this conditional PDF does not involve θ , then we will say that this statistics T X_1, X_2 up to X_N is sufficient and now in the case of discrete random variables X_1, X_2 up to X_N , the conditional PDF above is replaced by the conditional PMF.

So that means in the case of discrete random variable X_1, X_2 up to X_N this statistic T X_1, X_2 up to X_N of θ is sufficient. If this conditional PMF, conditional PMF of the θ given T is equal to small t , does not involve the parameter θ . So we have defined and this sufficient statistic

(Refer Slide Time: 03:58)

Example 1:

❖ Suppose $X_i \sim N(\mu, 1)$, $i=1,2$ and $T(X_1, X_2) = X_1 + X_2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(x_1, x_2; \mu | T(X_1, X_2) = x_1 + x_2) &= \frac{f(x_1, x_2, x_1 + x_2; \mu)}{f(x_1 + x_2; \mu)} \\
 &= \frac{f(x_1, x_2; \mu)}{f(x_1 + x_2; \mu)} \quad X_1 + X_2 \sim N(2\mu, 2) \\
 &= \frac{\frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}[(x_1 - \mu)^2 + (x_2 - \mu)^2]}}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}(x_1 + x_2 - 2\mu)^2}} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}[(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 2\mu^2 - 2\mu(x_1 + x_2)) + \frac{1}{4}(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 4\mu^2 - 4\mu(x_1 + x_2) - 2x_1x_2)]} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 2x_1x_2)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}(x_1 + x_2)^2}
 \end{aligned}$$

And let us see an example; suppose X_i is normally distributed with mean μ and variance 1 for i is equal to 1 to 2 and $T(X_1, X_2) = X_1 + X_2$. We will examine if $T(X_1, X_2)$ is a sufficient statistics. Now the conditional PDF $f(x_1, x_2 | T(X_1, X_2) = x_1 + x_2)$ as a function of μ given $T(X_1, X_2) = x_1 + x_2$ is equal to that is the joint PDF $f(x_1, x_2, x_1 + x_2; \mu)$ as a function of μ divided by the marginal PDF that is $f(x_1 + x_2; \mu)$ as a function of μ .

So this is the conditional PDF in terms of the joint PDF and marginal PDF. Now the same can be written as $f(x_1, x_2; \mu | T(X_1, X_2) = x_1 + x_2)$ as a function of μ divided by $f(x_1 + x_2; \mu)$ as a function of μ , because x_1, x_2 and $x_1 + x_2$ is a function of μ . Therefore, the PDF will be same as the PDF of x_1, x_2 . So that way this expression is equal to a joint PDF of x_1, x_2 as a function of μ divided by PDF of $x_1 + x_2$ as a function of μ .

Now, since X_i is the iid Gaussian function; therefore joint PDF will be the product of the individual PDF. So that way $f(x_1, x_2)$ into $f(x_1) f(x_2)$; we can write like this, so $1/(2\pi)$ into $e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x_1 - \mu)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(x_2 - \mu)^2}$. So this is the joint PDF divided by marginal PDF that is the PDF of $x_1 + x_2$. Now I know that x_1 is normally distributed with mean μ and variance 1 and x_2 is also normally distributed with mean μ and variance 1.

Therefore, $X_1 + X_2$ will be distributed as normal mean will be mean of X_1 plus mean of X_2 , that is 2μ and variance of X_1 plus variance of X_2 ; that will be is equal to 2. So that way this will be normal with mean 2μ and variance 2. So therefore this marginal PDF of

$X_1 + X_2$ will be given by this; now if we simplify, I will get this expression so 1 by root π will be only there and bringing this to the numerator we will get like this.

And ultimately if we simplify this expression we will get the same equal to 1 by root π into e to the power of $-\frac{1}{2}$ into $X_1^2 + X_2^2 + 2X_1X_2$. So here we see that μ is not involved, so this conditional PDF does not involve μ therefore and these statistics $X_1 + X_2$ is a sufficient statistic.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:38)

Example 1 ...

❖ Thus $f(x_1, x_2; \mu | T(X_1, X_2) = x_1 + x_2)$ does not involve the parameter μ .

Hence $T(X_1, X_2) = X_1 + X_2$ is a sufficient statistic for μ

Remark:

❖ If $T(X_1, X_2) = X_1 + 2X_2$, we can show in a similar way that $T(X_1, X_2)$ is not a sufficient statistic for μ . Because,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1, x_2; \mu | T(X_1, X_2) = x_1 + 2x_2) &= \frac{f(x_1, x_2; \mu)}{f(x_1 + 2x_2; \mu)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}[(x_1 - \mu)^2 + (x_2 - \mu)^2]}}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}\pi} e^{-\frac{1}{10}(x_1 + 2x_2 - 3\mu)^2}} \end{aligned}$$

which involves μ .

So we see that this conditional PDF does not involve any parameter μ . Hence $T(X_1, X_2)$ is equal to $X_1 + X_2$ is a sufficient statistics for μ . We will see one example for a statistic which is not sufficient; suppose we have this $T(X_1, X_2)$ is equal to $X_1 + 2X_2$. Earlier, we will consider $X_1 + X_2$; now $X_1 + 2X_2$, now this conditional PDF $f(x_1, x_2)$ as a function of μ given that $T(X_1, X_2)$ is equal to small $X_1 + 2X_2$.

That we can write as joint PDF of X_1, X_2 as a function of μ divided by marginal PDF at point $X_1 + 2X_2$ as a function of μ . So if we write the Gaussian PDF for these two then we will get numerator as this and denominator as this. Here, we see that from these two expressions we cannot cancel out μ ; therefore this will involve μ . So therefore this conditional PDF given this a statistic is will involve μ therefore it is not a sufficient statistic.

(Refer Slide Time: 09:11)

Factorization theorem

A way to determine a sufficient statistic is through the Neyman Fisher Factorization theorem.

- ❖ For continuous RVS $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$, the statistic $T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ is a sufficient statistic for θ if and only if

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta) = g(\theta, T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N))h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \\ = g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))h(\mathbf{x})$$

where $g(\theta, T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N))$ is a non-constant and non-negative function of θ and $T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ and $h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ is a non-negative function of $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ and does not involve θ .

- ❖ For the discrete case,
↓
 $T(\mathbf{x})$ is sufficient if and only if

$$p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))h(\mathbf{x})$$

And now we will discuss one important theorem, what is known as the factorization theorem; that is Neyman Fisher factorization theorem. This is one of the ways to determine whether statistic is sufficient or not. For continuous random variables X_1, X_2 up to X_N , this statistic T X_1, X_2 up to X_N is the sufficient statistic for θ if and only if; this joint PDF as a function of θ is product of two functions g and h .

And g is a function of the parameter θ and the statistic $T(\mathbf{x})$ and h is a function of data only, it is a function of $\mathbf{x}$; is X_1, X_2 up to X_N and it does not involve any θ . So that way we factorize the joint PDF in terms of two factor, where $g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))$ is a non constant it should be a proper function of X_1, X_2 extra and non-negative function of θ and $T(x_1, x_2$ up to x_N and h is x_1, x_2 up to x_N is a non-negative function of X_1, X_2 up to x_N and it does not involve in any parameter θ .

So then we say that, this statistic will be sufficient. So that way we have to see the joint PDF if it is a product of two factors; one factor is θ into T , other factor is a function of $h(\mathbf{x})$ only then this statistic will be sufficient. For discrete case, we will be considering the condition in terms of joint PMF therefore $T(\mathbf{x})$ is sufficient if and only if, this joint PMF $p(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ as a function of θ is product of $g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))$ into $h(\mathbf{x})$.

Where g and h are defined as earlier, so we have introduced the factorization theorem we will try to prove this

(Refer Slide Time: 11:39)

Proof (Discrete case)

❖ Denote the value $T(\mathbf{x})$ by t . Suppose $T(\mathbf{X})$ is a sufficient statistic. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) &= P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}; \theta) \\ &= P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta) \\ &= P(T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta) P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta) \\ &= P(T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta) P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | T(\mathbf{X}) = t) \quad [\because T(\mathbf{X}) \text{ is a sufficient statistic}] \\ &= \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x} : T(\mathbf{x}) = t} p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) \right) h(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x})) h(\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where} \quad h(\mathbf{x}) = P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | T(\mathbf{X}) = t)$$

Considering the discrete random variables X_1, X_2 up to X_N , let us denote the particular value of $T\mathbf{X}$ by a small t ; that is small t is equal to T of small x_1 , small x_2 up to small x_n . Suppose $T\mathbf{X}$ is sufficient statistic. Then, PMF probability mass function of $\mathbf{x}$ as a function of θ that is equal to probability of $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to $\mathbf{x}$ as a function of θ . Now if we introduce any function $T\mathbf{X}$ then this joint probability will be also same.

Therefore this probability is same as probability of $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to small $\mathbf{x}$ and $T\mathbf{X}$ is equal to t as a function of θ . Now this I can write as probability of $T\mathbf{X}$ is equal to t of course as a function of θ and then into conditional probability. Probability of $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to small $\mathbf{x}$ given that $T\mathbf{X}$ is equal to t and this will also be a function of θ . So this is by applying the conditional probability result.

Now I know that, $T\mathbf{X}$ is a sufficient statistics; therefore this factor will not involve any θ . so I can write this term simply as probability of $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to small $\mathbf{x}$ given that $T\mathbf{X}$ is equal to t because it does not involve θ $\times$ $T\mathbf{X}$ is a sufficient statistic. So this term, now I can expand the in terms of the joint PMF summation of joint PMF for those value of $\mathbf{x}$ for which $T\mathbf{X}$ is equal to t into this part.

Now this is a function which does not involve any parameter or the statistics it is simply a function of $\mathbf{X}$. So that way we have establish that this joint PMF is product of g and h , where g is a function of θ and $T\mathbf{X}$ and h is a function of $\mathbf{X}$ only and it is given by this probability of $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to small $\mathbf{x}$, given that $T\mathbf{X}$ is equal to t , so we have proved this part.

(Refer Slide Time: 14:14)

Proof...

Conversely, suppose $p(\mathbf{x}) = g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))h(\mathbf{x})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta) &= \frac{P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta)}{P(T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta)} \\ &= \frac{P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}; \theta)}{P(T(\mathbf{X}) = t; \theta)} \\ &= \frac{g(\theta, t)h(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}: T(\mathbf{x})=t} g(\theta, t)h(\mathbf{x})} \\ &= \frac{g(\theta, t)h(\mathbf{x})}{g(\theta, t) \sum_{\mathbf{x}: T(\mathbf{x})=t} h(\mathbf{x})} \\ &= \frac{h(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}: T(\mathbf{x})=t} h(\mathbf{x})} \end{aligned}$$

which does not depend on θ .

Now let us see the converse part, suppose $p_{\mathbf{x}}$ is equal to g of θ $T(\mathbf{x})$ into $h(\mathbf{x})$. This is true and then we have to show that $T(\mathbf{x})$ is a sufficient statistics. Now, this conditional PMF probability that $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to small $\mathbf{x}$ given that $T(\mathbf{x})$ is equal to t as a function of θ . Now, you apply the definition of conditional probability; that is probability of $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to small $\mathbf{x}$ and this comma is for n $T(\mathbf{x})$ is a function of θ divided by the marginal probability, probability that $T(\mathbf{x})$ is equal to t as a function of θ .

Now since $T(\mathbf{x})$ is a function of $\mathbf{x}$ this we can write as probability of $\mathbf{X}$ is equal to small $\mathbf{x}$ θ divided by probability of $T(\mathbf{x})$ equal to t as a function of θ . Now we will apply this factorization result, so we will get g of θ t into $h(\mathbf{x})$ divided by summation g of t into $h(\mathbf{x})$. $\mathbf{x}$ subset $T(\mathbf{x})$ is equal to t . So this g of θ T will become 1 for all, so we are taking common here and therefore this denominator will be g of θ T into summation $h(\mathbf{x})$, such that $T(\mathbf{x})$ is equal to t .

So this g of θ T and this g of θ T will get concerned therefore it will be simply $h(\mathbf{x})$ divided by summation $h(\mathbf{x})$, such that $T(\mathbf{x})$ is equal to t and clearly this expression that is this conditional PMF does not involve any parameter θ , therefore $T(\mathbf{x})$ is a sufficient statistic. Therefore we have proof for both necessary and sufficient conditions.

(Refer Slide Time: 16:22)

Thus,

❖ For the discrete case,

$T(\mathbf{x})$ is sufficient if and only if

$$p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))h(\mathbf{x})$$

❖ For the continuous case,

$T(\mathbf{x})$ is sufficient if and only if

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta) = g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))h(\mathbf{x})$$

So for discrete case TX is sufficient if and only if this joint PMF is a product of two function g and h and similarly for the continuous case also we can establish that TX is sufficient if and only if the joint PDF is product of two factors; one is function of theta and TX, other is simply a function of X.

(Refer Slide Time: 16:50)

Example 2

❖ Suppose $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$ are iid Gaussian random variables with unknown mean μ and known variance 1. Then

$T(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ is a sufficient statistic for μ . Because

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \mu) &= \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x_i - \mu)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^N} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \mu)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^N} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \mu^2 \sum_{i=1}^N 1} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2} \end{aligned}$$

❖ The ^{2nd} exponential is a function of $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$ and the ^{1st} exponential is a function of μ and $T(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$. Therefore $T(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$ is a sufficient statistics of μ .

We will consider an example; suppose X_1, X_2 up to X_N are iid Gaussian random variables with unknown mean μ and known variance 1. Then, $T X$ is equal to summation X_i , i going from 1 to N is a sufficient statistic for μ because we will write this now joint PDF as a function of μ , this is product of the individual PDF marginal PDFs and all are iid's; so same mean and same variance 1.

And this product we are writing as summation and this now we can expand $\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \mu)^2$, so that we will get two factors here, now one factor is this and the other factor is this. We observed that, this second factor this is a function of X_i only and the first factor is function of both this statistic and μ . Therefore, we conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ is equal to summation $\sum_{i=1}^N X_i$, i going from 1 to N is a sufficient statistic for μ .

So through factorization theorem because this joint PDF is factorized into two terms; one term involves X_i only other term involves this statistic and the parameter.

(Refer Slide Time: 18:19)

Rao-Blackwell Theorem

❖ Suppose $\hat{\theta}$ is an unbiased estimator of θ and $T(\mathbf{X})$ is a sufficient for θ .
Then $\hat{\theta} = E(\hat{\theta} / T(\mathbf{X}))$ is unbiased and $\text{var}(\hat{\theta}) \leq \text{var}(\hat{\theta})$.

Proof: We have

$$E\hat{\theta} = E(E(\hat{\theta} / T(\mathbf{X})))$$

❖ Using the property of conditional expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\hat{\theta} &= E(E(\hat{\theta} / T(\mathbf{X}))) \\ &= E(\hat{\theta}) \\ &= \theta \end{aligned}$$

$\therefore \hat{\theta}$ is an unbiased estimator of θ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(\hat{\theta}) &= E(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2 \\ &= E(E(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2 / T(\mathbf{X})) \\ &\geq E(E((\hat{\theta} - \theta) / T(\mathbf{X}))^2) \\ &= E(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2 \\ &= \text{var}(\hat{\theta}) \end{aligned}$$

Handwritten note: $E(E(X/Y)) = E(X)$

Now we will establish one very important theorem, Rao Blackwell theorem; suppose $\hat{\theta}$ is an unbiased estimator of θ and $T(\mathbf{X})$ is a sufficient statistic for θ . Then another estimator will get θ , that is the conditional expectation of $\hat{\theta}$ given $T(\mathbf{X})$; this is the conditional expectation, this is unbiased, not only unbiased but its variance of $\hat{\theta}$ is less than or equal to the variance of $\hat{\theta}$.

So this is the Rao Blackwell theorem corresponding to any unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}$, we have another unbiased estimator with lower or equal variance. We will prove this; E of $\hat{\theta}$ will be E of $\hat{\theta}$ because $\hat{\theta}$ is equal to this E of $\hat{\theta}$ given $T(\mathbf{X})$. Now using the property of conditional expectation, so we have a property like E of X given Y so this will be same as E of X .

So this conditional expectation which is a random variable in terms of Y and if we take the conditional expectation in terms of Y then we will get E of X . Now we apply the property of

conditional expectation E of theta head is equal to the expectation of this conditional expectation E of E of theta at this given $T(X)$ and this will be same as E of theta head dash and this is unbiased therefore it will be equal to theta.

Therefore, E of theta head is equal to theta, therefore theta head is an unbiased estimator of theta. So we got the unbiased property of theta head. Now let us see the variance of theta head dash by definition it is equal to E of theta head minus theta whole squared because it is an unbiased estimator. Now I apply this conditional expectation property that will be E of E of theta head dash minus theta whole square given $T(X)$.

Now this mean square value theta head dash minus theta whole square is greater than equal to the square of the mean. So that way we can write in terms of square of the mean here, so now E of theta head given $T(X)$ that will be equal to theta head and this is a constant quantity. So E of theta given $T(X)$ will be theta itself. This quantity will be equal to E of theta head minus theta whole squared.

Therefore variance of theta head dash is greater than equal to variance of theta dash. That means variance of theta dash is less than or equal to variance of theta head, this that we established.

(Refer Slide Time: 21:38)

Rao-Blackwell Theorem...

- ❖ Thus, the sufficient statistic $T(X)$ helps us to find a better estimator $\hat{\theta} = E(\hat{\theta}' / T(X))$ given any unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}'$.
- ❖ $\text{var}(\hat{\theta}) \leq \text{var}(\hat{\theta}')$.
- Is $\hat{\theta} = E(\hat{\theta}' / T(X))$ MVUE?

We have to discuss one more concept, -Complete Statistic

Thus, the sufficient statistic $T(X)$ help us to find a better estimator theta head is equal to E of theta head dash given $T(X)$ and variance of that estimator theta head is less than or equal to variance of theta head dash but still we have the question, is theta head that is equal to E of

theta head dash given TX is their minimum variance unbiased estimator to answer this question we have to discuss one more concept that is the complete statistic.

(Refer Slide Time: 22:17)

Complete statistic

- ❖ A statistic $T(\mathbf{X})$ is said to be complete if for any θ and a bounded function $g(T(\mathbf{X}))$, the condition
$$E(g(T(\mathbf{X}))) = 0 \text{ for } \forall \theta$$
implies that
$$P(g(T(\mathbf{X})) = 0) = 1 \text{ for } \forall \theta$$
- ❖ There is no non-zero unbiased estimator for 0!
- ❖ Completeness is a property of the distribution of $T(\mathbf{X})$

Complete statistic, a statistic TX is said to be complete if for any theta and a bounded function g of TX, the condition E of g TX is equal to 0 for all theta implies that probability of g TX is equal to 0 is equal to 1. That means g TX will be 0 with probability one, it also means that there is no nonzero unbiased estimator for 0. Suppose, zero is the quantity and we want to find out any estimator for zero such that E of g TX is equal to zero this is the definition for unbiased estimator.

But then this g TX must be equal to zero and there is no non-zero unbiased estimate or for zero. That way also we can interpret and completeness is a property of the distribution of TX. Same estimator TX may be complete for one distribution but may not be complete for another distribution.

(Refer Slide Time: 23:31)

Example 3

Suppose $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$ are iid $B(1, \theta)$ random variables and

$$T(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$$

Clearly $T(\mathbf{X}) \sim \text{Bi}(N, \theta)$ and $T(\mathbf{X})$ takes values $t = 0, 1, \dots, N$.

Thus,

$$p(t; \theta) = \binom{N}{t} \theta^t (1-\theta)^{N-t}, \quad t = 0, 1, \dots, N$$

$$\therefore E(g(T(\mathbf{X}))) = \sum_{t=0}^N g(t) \binom{N}{t} \theta^t (1-\theta)^{N-t}$$

We will give an example; suppose X_i 's are iid Bernoulli random variable, this is the symbol for Bernoulli random variable; it is symbolic like binomial with n is equal to 1. That is why we are writing $B(1, \theta)$ and parameter θ is the probability parameter and $T(\mathbf{X})$ is equal to summation X_i , i is equal to 1 to N . Clearly $T(\mathbf{X})$ is a binomial distribution with parameter N and is the number of repetition and θ is the success parameter because $T(\mathbf{X})$ is a sum of individual Bernoulli random variables.

So it is a binomial with parameter n and θ and $T(\mathbf{X})$ takes value successfully 0, 1 up to N thus the probability mass function of at point T will be given by $\binom{N}{t} \theta^t (1-\theta)^{N-t}$, t going from 0 to N and expected value of $g(T(\mathbf{X}))$, $T(\mathbf{X})$ is a function of $\mathbf{X}$. Now, so if I consider expected value of any bounded function $g(T(\mathbf{X}))$ it will be given by this summation T going from 0 to N , $g(t)$ into $\binom{N}{t} \theta^t (1-\theta)^{N-t}$. Now we will apply the condition for completeness.

(Refer Slide Time: 25:02)

Example...

$$\begin{aligned}\therefore E(g(T(X))) &= \sum_{t=0}^N g(t) \binom{N}{t} \theta^t (1-\theta)^{N-t} = 0 \quad \forall \theta \in (0,1) \\ &\Rightarrow (1-\theta)^N \sum_{t=0}^N g(t) \binom{N}{t} \left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right)^t = 0 \quad \forall \theta \in (0,1) \\ &\Rightarrow \sum_{t=0}^N g(t) \binom{N}{t} \left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right)^t = 0\end{aligned}$$

❖ The left hand side are polynomials in $\left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right)$ and can be zero if and only if the coefficients vanish

$$\therefore g(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$$

Hence T is complete statistic.

So, E of g TX will be this summation I showed earlier; now 1 minus theta to the power N is common, so that I can take out so it will be a same as 1 minus theta to the power N summation t going from 0 to N, gT into N c T into theta by 1 minus theta to the power t is equal to 0. So this equality can be written as this for all theta in the open interval 0 to 1 so theta can be anything between 0 & 1 excepting 0 & 1.

Therefore we get now one condition this part we can cancel out summation t going from 0 to N, gT into N c T into theta by 1 minus theta to the power T is equal to 0. Now this condition will be satisfied because it is a polynomial in theta by 1 minus theta. So this polynomial can be 0 if and only if all coefficients vanished, that means G T must be equal to 0 for t is equal to 0, 1, 2 up to N and hence T is a complete statistic. So in this case we prove that T is a complete statistic.

(Refer Slide Time: 26:24)

Example 4

Suppose $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$ are iid $N(0, \sigma^2)$ random variables and

$$T(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$$

Clearly $T(\mathbf{X}) \sim N(0, N\sigma^2)$

and $ET(\mathbf{X}) = 0$

$\therefore E g(T(\mathbf{X})) = 0$
has a non-trivial solution $g(T(\mathbf{X})) = T(\mathbf{X})$.

Therefore, $T(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ is not a complete statistic in this case.

Now we will consider another example; suppose X_1, X_2 up to X_N are iid normal zero mean variance σ^2 random variables. They are normally distributed with mean 0 and variance σ^2 and $T(\mathbf{X})$ is equal to summation X_i , i going from 1 to N . Clearly, because it is a sum and all X_i have mean 0, $T(\mathbf{X})$ will be normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $N\sigma^2$ and we observe that $E(T(\mathbf{X})) = 0$.

So this is for non-trivial X , therefore if we consider the equation $E(g(T(\mathbf{X}))) = 0$ it will have non-trivial solution $g(T(\mathbf{X})) = T(\mathbf{X})$. If we substitute $g(T(\mathbf{X})) = T(\mathbf{X})$ then this equation will be satisfied. Therefore $T(\mathbf{X})$ that is equal to summation X_i , i going from 1 to N is not a complete statistic in this case.

(Refer Slide Time: 27:36)

Summary

❖ A statistic $T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ of θ is called sufficient if the conditional PDF $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta | T=t)$ or the conditional PMF $p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta | T=t)$ does not involve θ .

❖ Factorization theorem-

For continuous RVS $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$, the statistic $T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ is a sufficient statistic for θ if and only if

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta) = g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))h(\mathbf{x})$$

For the discrete case,

$T(\mathbf{x})$ is sufficient if and only if

$$p(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = g(\theta, T(\mathbf{x}))h(\mathbf{x})$$

Let us summarize the class statistics $T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ of θ is called sufficient, if the conditional PDF that is conditional PDF of $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ as a function of θ given that T is equal to t or the conditional PMF p of $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$ as a function of θ given T is equal to t does not involve parameter θ . Conditional PDF or conditional PMF does not involve the parameter θ .

Then we discussed the factorization theorem; for continuous random variables $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$, this statistic $T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ is a sufficient statistic for θ if and only if. We can factorize the joint PDF as a two factors one factor g is a function of $\theta, T(X)$ and other one is a $h(X)$ which is simply a function of $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N$. For discrete case, the $T(X)$ is sufficient statistic if and only if joint PMF is product of these two factors.

(Refer Slide Time: 28:54)

Summary...

- ❖ Rao Blackwell theorem- Given an unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}$, the sufficient statistic $T(X)$ helps us to find a better estimator $\hat{\theta} = E(\hat{\theta} | T(X))$ with $\text{var}(\hat{\theta}) \leq \text{var}(\hat{\theta})$.
- ❖ A statistic $T(X)$ is said to be complete if for any θ and a bounded function $g(T(X))$, the condition

$$E(g(T(X))) = 0 \text{ for } \forall \theta$$
 implies that

$$P(g(T(X)) = 0) = 1 \text{ for } \forall \theta$$

We will look into the MVUE in terms of a complete sufficient statistic in the next lecture.

Now Rao Blackwell theorem given an unbiased estimator θ , the sufficient statistic $T(X)$ helps us to find a better estimator θ head dash is equal to E of θ head dash given $T(X)$. This is the conditional expectation of θ head dash given $T(X)$. Now this estimator has the property that, it is not only unbiased but its variance is lower than or equal to the variance of θ head dash.

Then we discuss about complete statistic, a statistic $T(X)$ is said to be complete if for any θ and a bounded function g of $T(X)$, the condition E of $g(T(X))$ equal to 0 for all θ implies that P of $g(T(X))$ is equal to 0 with probability 1. So this is the definition of complete statistic. Now, we will look into the MVUE in terms of a complete sufficient statistic in the next lecture, thank you.