

## STA2212: Inference and Likelihood

### A. Notation

**One random variable:** Given a model for  $X$  which assumes  $X$  has a density  $f(x; \theta)$ ,  $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ , we have the following definitions:

likelihood function	$L(\theta; x) = c(x)f(x; \theta)$	$\mathcal{L}(\theta)$
log-likelihood function	$\ell(\theta; x) = \log L(\theta; x) = \log f(x; \theta) + a(x)$	
score function	$u(\theta) = \partial \ell(\theta; x) / \partial \theta$	$\ell'(\theta; \theta)$
observed information function	$j(\theta) = -\partial^2 \ell(\theta; x) / \partial \theta \partial \theta^T$	$J(\theta) = E_\theta\{j(\theta)\}$
expected information (in one observation)	$i(\theta) = E_\theta\{U(\theta)U(\theta)^T\}^1$	$I(\theta)$ (p.245)

**Independent observations:** When we have  $X_i$  independent, identically distributed from  $f(x_i; \theta)$ , then, denoting the observed sample  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  we have:

likelihood function	$L(\theta; \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i; \theta)$	$\mathcal{L}(\theta)$
log-likelihood function	$\ell(\theta) = \ell(\theta; \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta; x_i)$	$\ell(\theta)$
maximum likelihood estimate	$\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \sup_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$	$S(\mathbf{X})$
score function	$U(\theta) = \ell'(\theta) = \sum U_i(\theta)$	$\mathbf{S}(\theta)$ (p.273)
observed information function	$j(\theta) = -\ell''(\theta) = -\ell''(\theta; \mathbf{x})$	$nJ(\theta) = E_\theta\{-\ell''(x; \theta)\}$
observed (Fisher) information	$j(\hat{\theta})$	$n\widehat{I(\theta)}$ (p.254)
expected (Fisher) information	$i(\theta) = E_\theta\{U(\theta)U(\theta)^T\} = ni_1(\theta)$	$I_n(\theta) = nI(\theta)$

### Comments:

1. the maximum likelihood estimate  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is usually obtained by solving the *score equation*  $\ell'(\theta; \mathbf{x}) = 0$ . Lazy notation is  $\hat{\theta}$ , but for asymptotics  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is preferred.
2. It doesn't really matter for the definitions above if the observations are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), or only independent, but the theorems that are proved in [MS Ch. 5](#) and [AoS Ch. 9](#) assume i.i.d..
3. There are important distinctions to be careful about in the notation for likelihood and its quantities:
  - (a) Are we working with a single observation  $x, X$  or  $n$  observations  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}$ ?
  - (b) Do we want to find the distribution of something; so  $\ell(\theta; X)$  or calculate data summaries;  $\ell(\theta; x)$ ?

---

<sup>1</sup> $U(\theta) = u(\theta; X)$

## B. First order asymptotic theory [MS §5.4](#)

### 1. $\theta$ is a scalar

If the components of  $\mathbf{X}$  are i.i.d., then the score function  $U(\theta; \mathbf{X})$  is a sum of i.i.d. random variables, and we can show that it has expected value 0 and variance  $I_n(\theta)$  (or  $i(\theta)$  in my notation). Under some regularity conditions on the density  $f(x_i; \theta)$  ([MS A1-A6, p.245](#)), the central limit theorem gives

$$\frac{U(\theta)}{I_n^{1/2}(\theta)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \text{ equivalently } \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}U(\theta) \xrightarrow{d} N\{0, I(\theta)\}. \quad (1)$$

Almost everything else follows from this result and Slutsky's theorem. For example, we can show that

$$(\hat{\theta} - \theta)I_n^{1/2}(\theta) = U(\theta)/I_n^{1/2}(\theta) + o_p(1),$$

where  $o_p(1)$  means a remainder term that goes to 0 in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so we have the second result

$$(\hat{\theta} - \theta)I_n^{1/2}(\theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1). \quad (2)$$

These limit theorems give us two corresponding approximations to use with  $n$  fixed:

$$U(\theta) \sim N(0, I_n(\theta)), \quad (3)$$

and

$$\hat{\theta} - \theta \sim N(0, 1/I_n(\theta)). \quad (4)$$

The notation  $\sim$  is read as “is approximately distributed as”.

The proof of [MS Theorem 5.3](#) allows that  $I(\theta) = \text{var}\{\ell'(\theta; X_i)\}$  and  $J(\theta) = E\{-\ell''(\theta; X_i)\}$  might be different, which is handy later for the study of misspecified models.

Having the unknown quantity  $\theta$  in the variance in (3) and (4) is inconvenient, but to the same order of approximation, we can replace  $I_n(\theta)$  by  $I_n(\hat{\theta})$  or by  $j(\hat{\theta})$ ; the latter is denoted  $\widehat{I_n(\theta)}$  in [MS, p. 254](#). In [AoS](#),  $I_n^{-1/2}(\theta)$  is called **se** and  $I_n^{-1/2}(\hat{\theta})$  is called  **$\widehat{\text{se}}$** , but the use of  $j(\hat{\theta}) = -\ell'''(\hat{\theta}; \mathbf{x})$  is not mentioned.