

**Solution 1** The log likelihood contribution from a single observation,

$$\ell(\alpha, \lambda) = \alpha \log \lambda + (\alpha - 1) \log y - \lambda y - \log \Gamma(\alpha), \quad \alpha, \gamma > 0,$$

has first derivatives  $\ell_\alpha = \log \lambda + \log y - \Psi(\alpha)$ ,  $\ell_\lambda = \alpha/\lambda - y$  and second derivatives  $\ell_{\alpha\alpha} = -\Psi'(\alpha)$ ,  $\ell_{\alpha\lambda} = 1/\lambda$ ,  $\ell_{\lambda\lambda} = -\alpha/\lambda^2$ , so the observed information matrix equals the expected information matrix,

$$i(\alpha, \lambda) = ni_1(\alpha, \lambda) = n \begin{pmatrix} \Psi'(\alpha) & -1/\lambda \\ -1/\lambda & \alpha/\lambda^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

- (a) The score statistic is  $\ell_\alpha$  for the sample divided by the square root of its asymptotic variance  $n\Psi'(\alpha)$ , all evaluated at  $\alpha = 1$ ; this gives

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \log(\lambda Y_j) - n\Psi(1)}{\{n\Psi'(1)\}^{1/2}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

- (b) The score statistic is  $\ell_\alpha^T \hat{j}^{\alpha\alpha} \ell_\alpha$ , evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimator when  $\alpha = 1$ , i.e., at  $(\alpha, \hat{\lambda}_\alpha)|_{\alpha=1} = (1, 1/\bar{Y})$ , and with

$$j^{\alpha\alpha} = (\hat{j}_{\alpha\alpha} - \hat{j}_{\alpha\lambda} \hat{j}_{\lambda\lambda}^{-1} \hat{j}_{\lambda\alpha})^{-1} = (\hat{i}_{\alpha\alpha} - \hat{i}_{\alpha\lambda} \hat{i}_{\lambda\lambda}^{-1} \hat{i}_{\lambda\alpha})^{-1} = \frac{1}{n\{\Psi'(\alpha) - 1/\alpha\}}$$

evaluated at  $\alpha = 1$ . Hence the score statistic is

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \log(Y_j/\bar{Y}) - n\Psi(1) \right\}^2 / [n\{\Psi'(1) - 1\}] \sim \chi_1^2;$$

in fact here, since the interest parameter is scalar, we might use the approximation

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \log(Y_j/\bar{Y}) - n\Psi(1)}{[n\{\Psi'(1) - 1\}]^{1/2}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

- (c) (i) The log likelihood function in terms of  $\mu = \alpha/\lambda$  is obtained by setting  $\lambda = \alpha/\mu$ , and is

$$\ell^*(\alpha, \mu) \equiv \alpha \log \alpha - \alpha \log \mu + (\alpha - 1) \log y - \alpha y/\mu - \log \Gamma(\alpha), \quad \alpha, \mu > 0,$$

giving  $\ell_{\alpha\mu}^* = y/\mu^2 - 1/\mu$ , which has expectation zero; hence  $\mu$  and  $\alpha$  are orthogonal. This could also be found by using the Jacobian  $J$  for the transformation  $(\alpha, \mu) \mapsto (\alpha, \lambda)$  to compute  $i^*(\alpha, \mu) = J i(\alpha, \lambda) J$ . (ii) The original log likelihood function can be written as  $\ell(\alpha, \lambda) \equiv \alpha \log y - \lambda y + \alpha \log \lambda - \log \Gamma(\alpha) - \log y$ , so the complementary mean parameter for  $\alpha$ ,  $E(Y) = \alpha/\lambda = \mu$ , is orthogonal to  $\alpha$  by Example 57.

In the orthogonal parametrisation  $\ell_\alpha^* = 1 + \log(y/\mu) - y/\mu + \log \alpha - \Psi(\alpha)$  and  $\ell_{\alpha\alpha}^* = 1/\alpha - \Psi'(\alpha)$ . Now  $\hat{\mu}_\alpha = \bar{Y}$ , and owing to the orthogonality  $\hat{j}^{\alpha\alpha} = \hat{j}_{\alpha\alpha}^{-1} = 1/[n\{\Psi'(\alpha) - 1/\alpha\}]$ , which gives  $1/[n\{\Psi'(1) - 1\}]$  when  $\alpha = 1$ . The numerator of the score statistic is  $\sum_{j=1}^n \{1 + \log(Y_j/\mu) - Y_j/\mu + \log \alpha - \Psi(\alpha)\}$  evaluated at  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\mu = \hat{\mu}_1 = \bar{Y}$ , and the upshot is that the statistic is the same as in (b).

## Solution 2

The log likelihood for a sample  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  from the  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  distribution is

$$\ell(\mu, \sigma^2) \equiv -\frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^n (y_j - \mu)^2 = -\frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n (y_j - \bar{y})^2 + n(\bar{y} - \mu)^2 \right\}.$$

- (a) With  $\mu = \theta$  and  $\sigma^2 = 1$  the formula above reduces to

$$\ell(\theta) \equiv -\frac{n}{2}(\bar{y} - \theta)^2 \equiv n\bar{y}\theta - n\theta^2/2, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

and  $\hat{\theta} = \bar{y}$ , so

$$r(\theta) = \text{sign}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \sqrt{2\{\ell(\hat{\theta}) - \ell(\theta)\}} = \text{sign}(\bar{y} - \theta) \sqrt{n(\bar{y} - \theta)^2} = \sqrt{n}(\bar{y} - \theta).$$

The log likelihood has second derivative  $-n$ , so  $\hat{j} = n$ , and therefore  $t(\theta) = \hat{j}^{1/2}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) = r(\theta)$ . Hence  $\log\{q(\theta)/r(\theta)\} = 0$ , so  $r^*(\theta) = r(\theta)$ , i.e., inferences based on either will be the same. This is not surprising, because  $r(\theta) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  exactly.

- (b) For the second model  $\mu = 0$  and  $\sigma^2 = 1/\theta$ , giving log likelihood

$$\ell(\theta) = \frac{n}{2} \log \theta - \frac{\theta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n y_j^2 = \frac{n}{2} (\log \theta - \theta \bar{s}), \quad \theta > 0,$$

say. This has second derivative  $-n/(2\theta^2)$  and gives  $\hat{\theta} = 1/\bar{s}$ , so  $\hat{j} = n\bar{s}^2/2$ . Hence

$$r(\theta) = \text{sign}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \sqrt{2\{\ell(\hat{\theta}) - \ell(\theta)\}} = \text{sign}(1 - \bar{s}\theta) \sqrt{n\{\bar{s}\theta - \log(\bar{s}\theta) - 1\}},$$

because  $\bar{s} > 0$ , and  $q(\theta) = t(\theta) = \sqrt{n/2}(1 - \bar{s}\theta)$ . As  $\bar{s}$  is an average of  $n$  variables each with mean  $1/\theta$  and variance  $2/\theta^2$ , the mean and variance of  $q(\theta)$  are 0 and 1, as we would expect.

This is the same as in Example 45 but with  $n$  replaced by  $n/2$ , so the accuracy will be as high as it was there (i.e.,  $r^*(\theta)$  gives nearly perfect inferences, when  $n = 2$  here, or  $n = 1$  in Example 45).

### Solution 3

- (a) The modified likelihood root depends on  $r(\psi)$  and  $q(\psi)$ , and we need only consider how  $q(\psi)$  is affected by this change, which does not affect the information matrices. But

$$\varphi(\hat{\theta}) - \varphi(\hat{\theta}_\psi) \mapsto B\{\varphi(\hat{\theta}) - \varphi(\hat{\theta}_\psi)\}, \quad \varphi_\lambda(\hat{\theta}_\psi) \mapsto B\varphi_\lambda(\hat{\theta}_\psi), \quad \varphi_\theta(\hat{\theta}_\psi) \mapsto B\varphi_\theta(\hat{\theta}_\psi),$$

so

$$\frac{|\varphi(\hat{\theta}) - \varphi(\hat{\theta}_\psi)|}{|\varphi_\theta(\hat{\theta})|} \mapsto \frac{|B\varphi(\hat{\theta}) - B\varphi(\hat{\theta}_\psi)|}{|B\varphi_\theta(\hat{\theta})|} = \frac{|B| \times |\varphi(\hat{\theta}) - \varphi(\hat{\theta}_\psi)|}{|B| \times |\varphi_\theta(\hat{\theta})|},$$

which leaves  $q(\psi)$  unchanged, because  $|B|$  cancels from top and bottom.

- (b) If  $h$  is normal, then  $\log h(u) \equiv -u^2/2$ , so  $(\log h)' \{(y_j^o - \eta)/\tau\} = -(y_j^o - \eta)/\tau^2$ , and in the notation of the example (recall that  $e_j^o = (y_j^o - \hat{\eta}^o)/\hat{\tau}^o$ ) this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\theta) &= \left( \sum_{j=1}^n (\eta - y_j^o)/\tau^2, \sum_{j=1}^n (\eta - y_j^o)/\tau^2 \times e_j^o \right)^T \\ &= (n\eta/\tau^2 - a/\tau^2, b\eta/\tau^2 - c/\tau^2)^T \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} n & a \\ b & c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta/\tau^2 \\ 1/\tau^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= B \begin{pmatrix} \eta/\tau^2 \\ 1/\tau^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

for  $a = -\sum y_j^o$ ,  $b = \sum e_j^o$  and  $c = -\sum y_j^o e_j^o$  that depend only on the data  $y^o$  and are easily computed, and  $B$  is non-singular with probability one.

In view of (a) we can therefore take  $\varphi(\theta) = (\eta/\tau^2, 1/\tau^2)^T$  for computing  $q(\theta)$ . This invariance can also greatly simplify computations in other examples.

**Solution 4** The log likelihood in the non-orthogonal parametrization is

$$\ell^*(\psi, \gamma) = \log \gamma - \gamma y_1 + \log(\gamma \psi) - \gamma \psi y_2 = 2 \log \gamma + \log \psi - \gamma(y_1 + \psi y_2), \quad \gamma, \psi > 0,$$

so its observed and Fisher information matrices have elements  $-\ell_{\gamma\gamma}^* = 2/\gamma^2$ ,  $-\ell_{\gamma\psi}^* = y_2$  and  $-\ell_{\psi\psi}^* = 1/\psi^2$ , and  $i_{\gamma\gamma}^* = 2/\gamma^2$ ,  $i_{\gamma\psi}^* = 1/(\gamma\psi)$  and  $i_{\psi\psi}^* = 1/\psi^2$ . Hence the partial differential equation giving the orthogonal parametrization is

$$\frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial \psi} = -i_{\gamma\gamma}^{*-1}(\psi, \gamma) i_{\gamma\psi}^*(\psi, \gamma) = -\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \frac{1}{\gamma\psi} = -\frac{\gamma}{2\psi}, \quad \gamma, \psi > 0,$$

as required.

To check that  $\lambda = \gamma\psi^{1/2}$  is orthogonal to  $\psi$ , we write  $\gamma = \lambda\psi^{-1/2}$  so the log likelihood becomes

$$\ell(\psi, \lambda) = 2 \log \lambda - \lambda \psi^{-1/2}(y_1 + \psi y_2),$$

and note that  $\ell_{\lambda\psi} = (y_1 - \psi y_2)/(2\psi^{3/2})$  has expectation  $\{\gamma^{-1} - \psi/(\gamma\psi)\}/(2\psi^{3/2}) = 0$ . Hence  $\lambda$  is orthogonal to  $\psi$ , as required.

The question only asks you to check that the given solution provides an orthogonal transformation, so the material below is included only to show how the PDE

$$2\psi \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial \psi} = -\gamma$$

would be solved if the solution had not been given in the question. Now (e.g., Theorem 2, page 50 of Sneddon, *Elements of Partial Differential Equations*, 1957),

“The general solution of the linear partial differential equation

$$P \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} + Q \frac{\partial z}{\partial y} = R$$

is  $F(u, v) = 0$ , where  $F$  is an arbitrary function and  $u(x, y, z) = c_1$  and  $v(x, y, z) = c_2$  form a solution of the equations

$$\frac{dx}{P} = \frac{dy}{Q} = \frac{dz}{R}.$$

In the present setting  $z = \gamma$ ,  $x = \psi$ ,  $P = 2\psi$ ,  $Q = 0$  and  $R = -\gamma$ , so we need to solve

$$\frac{d\psi}{2\psi} + \frac{d\gamma}{\gamma} = 0 \quad \implies \quad \frac{1}{2} \log \psi + \log \gamma = c \quad \implies \quad \gamma\psi^{1/2} = c,$$

and thus according to the theorem, the general solution is any function of  $\gamma\psi^{1/2}$ , such as  $\lambda(\psi, \gamma) = \gamma\psi^{1/2}$ .