Stats 300b: Theory of Statistics

Winter 2017

## Lecture 4 – January 19

Lecturer: John Duchi

Scribe: Xiaotong Suo

Warning: these notes may contain factual errors

Reading: VDV Chapter 3

## Outline of the lecture:

I Asymptotic Normality & Fisher information

- (a) Basic Asymptotic Normality result
- (b) Fisher information
  - i. Definitions, Examples
  - ii. Information Inequality (Cramer Rao Bound)

## 1 The basic normality result

As in the previous lecture, we assume as always that we have a model family  $\{P_{\theta}\}_{\theta\in\Theta}$ , each distribution  $P_{\theta}$  having density  $p_{\theta}$  with respect to some base measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ . We also use our usual notation that  $\ell_{\theta}(x) := \log p_{\theta}(x)$  is the log-likelihood. In order to get our asymptotic normality results, we require a number of conditions on the smoothness of the log-likelihood so as to perform appropriate Taylor expansions. Recall briefly that if a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$  that is k-times continuously differentiable, then

$$f(x+v) = f(x) + \nabla f(x)^T v + \frac{1}{2} v^T \nabla^2 f(x) v + \dots + \operatorname{Rem}(x+v)[v^{\otimes k}],$$

where  $v^{\otimes k}$  indicates the k-th order tensor of v, i.e. the tensor in  $\mathbb{R}^{n^k}$  indexed by  $[v^{\otimes k}]_{i_1,\ldots,i_k} = v_{i_1}\cdots v_{i_k}$ , and Rem is a remainder function such that  $\operatorname{Rem}(x+v)$  acts linearly on the argument  $v^{\otimes k}$  and  $\operatorname{Rem}(x+v) \to 0$  as  $v \to 0$ . In some instances, we may say stronger things, such as if the (k-1)th derivative is Lipschitz. To keep things concrete, suppose  $\nabla^2 f$  is Lipschitz, meaning that  $\||\nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(y)|\|_{\operatorname{op}} \leq M ||x-y||$  for some  $M < \infty$ . In this case, we may take the remainder term to satisfy  $\||\operatorname{Rem}(x+v)|\|_{\operatorname{op}} \leq M ||v||$ .

With these preliminaries out of the way, we begin with the major theorem we would like to prove, which is that so long as the log likelihood  $\ell_{\theta}(x) := \log p_{\theta}(x)$  is suitably smooth and that the MLE  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is consistent, then  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is asymptotically normal.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $X_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{\theta_0}$  where  $\theta_0 \in \text{int }\Theta$ . Assume that  $\ell_{\theta}(x) = \log p_{\theta}(x)$  is smooth enough that  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0}[\nabla \ell_{\theta_0} \nabla \ell_{\theta_0}^T]$  exists and that the Hessian  $\nabla^2 \ell_{\theta}(x)$  is M(x)-Lipschitz in  $\theta$ , that is,

$$\left\| \left\| \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_1}(x) - \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_2}(x) \right\| \right\|_{\text{op}} \le M \left\| \theta_1 - \theta_2 \right\|$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0}[M(X)^2] < \infty$ . Assume additionally that the MLE  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is consistent,  $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$ .

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \stackrel{d}{\to} \mathsf{N}(0, I_{\theta_0}^{-1})$$

where  $I_{\theta} = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\nabla \ell_{\theta} \nabla \ell_{\theta}^{T}]$  is the Fisher information.

**Proof** Let  $\hat{r}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be the remainder matrix in Taylor expansion of the gradients of the individual log likelihood terms around  $\theta_0$  guaranteed by Taylor's theorem (which certainly depends on  $\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0$ ), that is,

$$\nabla \ell_{\widehat{\theta}_n}(x) = \nabla \ell_{\theta_0}(x) + \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0}(x)(\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + \widehat{r}(x)(\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0),$$

where by Taylor's theorem  $\| \widehat{r}(x) \|_{\text{op}} \leq M(x) \| \widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0 \|$ . Writing this out using the empirical distribution and that  $\widehat{\theta}_n = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} P_n \ell_{\theta}(X)$ , we have

$$\nabla P_n \ell_{\widehat{\theta}_n} = 0 = P_n \nabla \ell_{\theta_0} + P_n \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0} (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + P_n \widehat{r}(X) (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0).$$
(1)

But of course, expanding the term  $P_n \hat{r}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , we find that

$$P_n \widehat{r}(X) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{r}(X_i) \text{ and } ||P_n \widehat{r}||_{\text{op}} \leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n M(X_i)}_{\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{\xrightarrow{\to}} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0}[M(X)]} \underbrace{||\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0||}_{\stackrel{p}{\to} 0} = o_P(1).$$

In particular, revisiting expression (1), we have

$$0 = P_n \nabla \ell_{\theta_0} + P_n \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0} (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + o_P(1) (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0).$$
  
=  $P_n \nabla \ell_{\theta_0} + \left( P_{\theta_0} \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0} + (P_n - P_{\theta_0}) \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0} + o_P(1) \right) (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0).$ 

The strong law of large numbers guarantees that  $(P_n - P_{\theta_0})\nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0} = o_P(1)$ , and multiplying each side by  $\sqrt{n}$  yields

$$\sqrt{n}(P_{\theta_0}\nabla^2\ell_{\theta_0} + o_P(1))(\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = -\sqrt{n}P_n\nabla\ell_{\theta_0}.$$

Applying Slutsky's theorem gives the result: indeed, we have  $T_n = \sqrt{n}P_n \nabla \ell_{\theta_0}$  satisfies  $T_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathsf{N}(0, I_{\theta_0})$  by the central limit theorem, and noting that  $P_{\theta_0} \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0} + o_P(1)$  is eventually invertible gives

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \stackrel{d}{\to} \mathsf{N}(0, (P_{\theta_0} \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0})^{-1} I_{\theta_0} (P_{\theta_0} \nabla^2 \ell_{\theta_0})^{-1})$$

as desired.

## 2 Fisher Information

**Definition 2.1.** For a model family  $\{P_{\theta}\}, \theta \in \Theta$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ . The fisher information is  $I_{\theta} = I(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\nabla l_{\theta_0} \nabla l_{\theta_0}^T] = \operatorname{Cov}_{\theta}(\nabla l_{\theta})$ . When  $\nabla$  and  $\mathbb{E}$  are interchangable, then

$$I_{\theta} = -\mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 \log P_{\theta}(x)]$$

**Example 1:** Normal location family.  $\{N(\theta, \sigma^2)\}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}}$ , where  $\theta$  is unknown,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log P_{\theta}(x) = \frac{\theta - x}{\sigma^2}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log P_{\theta}(x))^2] = \frac{\operatorname{Var}(X)}{\sigma^4} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$$

Heuristically speaking, if  $\sigma^2 \to 0$ , then it's easy to estimate the mean. If  $\sigma^2 \to 0$ , then it's hard to estimate  $\theta$  because heavy tails. So fisher information roughly tells us how easy or hard to estimate a parameter.

**Remark** What if we care about  $\tau = h(\theta)$  instead of  $\theta$ ? Then inverse function theorem yields:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} h^{-1}(\tau)(h(\theta)) = \frac{1}{h'(h^{-1}(\tau))} = \frac{1}{h'(\theta)}$$

Therefore, we have

$$I(\tau) = I(h(\theta)) = \frac{I(\theta)}{h'(\theta)^2}$$

when  $h'(\theta) \neq 0$ . We can see this using the chain rule:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \log P_{h^{-1}(\tau)} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \log P_{\theta} \\ &= \frac{\partial \log P_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \tau} \\ &= \frac{\partial \log P_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} \end{aligned}$$

**Example 2:** Normal location  $h(\theta) = \theta^2$ .  $h'(\theta) = 2\theta$ , so

$$I(\theta^2) = \frac{1}{4\theta^2}I(\theta) = \frac{1}{4\theta^2\sigma^2}$$

In particular, as  $\theta \to 0$ ,  $I(\theta) \to \infty$ . Suppose  $\theta = 0$ , let  $\hat{\theta}_n = (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2$ , then

$$n(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i)^2 = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i)^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} z^2$$

where  $z \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ . Therefore, we have an order of *n* convergence. In this case, our estimator converges faster than  $\sqrt{n}$ . So heuristically speaking, if we have a higher fisher information, our estimator is somehow better.

Additivity Property of Fisher information If  $x_1 \sim P_{\theta}$ ,  $x_2 \sim Q_{\theta}$ ,  $x_1, x_2$  independent, then  $I_{x_1,x_2}(\theta) = I_{x_1}(\theta) + I_{x_2}(\theta)$ . **Proof** Since  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are independent,

$$\operatorname{Cov}(\nabla \log P_{\theta}(x_1) + \nabla \log q_{\theta}(x_2)) = \operatorname{Cov}(\nabla \log P_{\theta}(x_1)) + \operatorname{Cov}(\nabla \log q_{\theta}(x_2)) = I_1 + I_2$$

**Corollary 2.** If  $x_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} p_{\theta}$ ,  $I(\theta) = Info(x_i)$ , then  $I_n(\theta) = nI(\theta)$ .

**Information Inequality** We start with proving covariance "lower bound".

For any decision procedure  $\delta : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$  and any function  $\psi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\operatorname{Var}(\delta) \ge \frac{\operatorname{Cov}(\delta, \psi)^2}{\operatorname{Var}(\psi)}$$

Proof The proof uses Cauchy Schwarz.

$$Cov(\delta, \psi) = \mathbb{E}[(\delta - \mathbb{E}\delta)(\psi - \mathbb{E}\psi)]$$
  
$$\leq \{\mathbb{E}[(\delta - \mathbb{E}\delta)^2]\}^{1/2} \{\mathbb{E}[(\delta - \mathbb{E}\delta)^2]\}^{1/2}$$
  
$$= \{Var(\delta)\}^{1/2} \{Var(\psi)\}^{1/2}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\operatorname{Var}(\delta) \ge \frac{\operatorname{Cov}(\delta,\psi)^2}{\operatorname{Var}(\psi)}$$

**Theorem 3.** (1 dimensional information inequality). Assume that  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta] = g(\theta)$  ids differentiable at  $\theta$  and  $P_{\theta}$  is regular enough that  $\dot{P}_{\theta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} P_{\theta}$ ,  $\int P_{\theta} d\mu = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \int P_{\theta} d\mu = 0$ , and  $\int \delta(x) P_{\theta}(x) d\mu = 0$  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta] = g'(\theta)$ . Then

$$\operatorname{Var}_{\theta_0}(\delta) \ge \frac{(g'(\theta_0))^2}{I(\theta_0)}$$

Why do we care about this? Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta] = 0$  and  $g(\theta) = \theta$ . Therefore,  $g'(\theta) = 1$  and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta}((\delta - \theta)^2) \ge \frac{1}{I(\theta)}$$

In 1 dimension, any unbiased estimator has  $MSE \geq \frac{1}{I(\theta)}$ . However, this result is not true when our estimator is biased. **Proof** Take  $\psi(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log P_{\theta}(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} l_{\theta}(x) = \frac{\dot{P}_{\theta}(x)}{P_{\theta}(x)}$ . By covariance inequality,

$$C_{\theta}^{\text{ov}}(\delta,\psi) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[(\delta - g(\theta))(\psi - E[\psi])]$$
  
$$= \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta,\psi]$$
  
$$= \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta\frac{\dot{P}_{\theta}(x)}{P_{\theta}(x)}]$$
  
$$= \int \delta(x)\dot{P}_{\theta}(x)\frac{P_{\theta}(x)}{P_{\theta}(x)}d\mu(x)$$
  
$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\int \delta P_{\theta}d\mu$$
  
$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta] = g'(\theta)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\operatorname{Var}(\delta) \ge \frac{\operatorname{Cov}(\delta,\psi)^2}{\operatorname{Var}(\psi)} = \frac{g'(\theta)}{I(\theta)}$$

Remark This result is unsatisfying in two senses:

- 1. Tied to mean square error (MSE)
- 2. Requires unbiasedness

We will cover a major theorem later in the class, which is better than this result. Roughly speaking, we will show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[L(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}_n-\theta))] \geq \mathbb{E}[L(Z)], \quad Z \sim \mathsf{N}(0, I(\theta)^{-1}), \quad \forall \widehat{\theta}_n$$

and symmetric quasi-convex  $L : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ . (In fact, this holds for *almost* all  $\theta$ , though not necessarily for all  $\theta$ .) More precisely, the following result holds true. Let  $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  be arbitrary, where  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is open. In addition, assume that the distributions  $P_{\theta}$  have log-likelihoods smooth enough that the conditions of Theorem ?? are satisfied. Then for any sequence of estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n : \mathcal{X}^n \to \Theta$  and any quasi-convex symmetric loss  $L : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$\liminf_{c \to \infty} \liminf_{n} \sup_{\|h\| \le c} \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0 + h/\sqrt{n}} \left[ L(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}_n - (\theta_0 + h/\sqrt{n}))) \right] \ge \mathbb{E}[L(Z)], \quad Z \sim \mathsf{N}(0, I_{\theta_0}^{-1}).$$

That is, under perturbations of the true parameter  $\theta_0$  by amounts shrinking as  $1/\sqrt{n}$ , we have a locally difficult estimation problem. (Here  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta}$  denotes expectation taken w.r.t. i.i.d. sampling under  $P_{\theta}$ .)

Multidimensional Information Inequality We now generalize the result to  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Lemma 4. Let  $\delta : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\psi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta}(\psi) = 0$ . Define  $\gamma = [\operatorname{Cov}(\delta, \psi_j]_{j=1}^d, C = \operatorname{Cov}_{\theta}(\psi) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\psi\psi^T] = 0$ . Then

$$\operatorname{Var}(\delta) \ge \gamma^T C^{-1} \gamma.$$

**Proof** Let  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be arbitrary. By 1 dimensional covariance inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}(\delta) &\geq \frac{\operatorname{Cov}(\delta, v^T \psi)^2}{\operatorname{Var}(v^T \psi)} \\ &= \frac{(\gamma^T v)^2}{v^T C v} = \gamma^T C^{-1} \gamma \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses the following fact:

Fact 5. If A > 0, then

$$\sup_{v} \frac{(v^T u)^2}{v^T A v} = u^T A^{-1} u$$

**Proof** We first use Cauchy Schwartz.

$$(v^{T}u)^{2} = (A^{1/2}v)^{T}(A^{-1/2}u)^{2} \le \|A^{1/2}v\|_{2}^{2}\|A^{-1/2}u\|^{2} = v^{T}Avu^{T}A^{-1}u$$

Therefore, for all v,

$$\frac{(v^T u)^2}{v^T A v} \le u^T A^{-1} u$$

Now, we take  $v = A^{-1}u$  to achieve this upper bound.  $\bigtriangledown$ 

**Theorem 6.** Let  $g(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta] \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with lots of regularity. Then we have

$$\operatorname{Var}_{\theta}(\delta) \ge \nabla g(\theta)^T I(\theta)^{-1} \nabla g(\theta)$$

where  $I(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\nabla l_{\theta} \nabla l_{\theta}^{T}].$ 

**Proof** Let  $\psi = \nabla l_{\theta}(x)$  in covariance lower bound.  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\psi] = 0$ ,  $\operatorname{Cov}(\delta, \psi) = \mathbb{E}[\delta \nabla l_{\theta}] = \nabla \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\delta] = \frac{\nabla \delta(\theta)}{\gamma}$ .

**Corollary 7.** If  $\hat{\theta} : x \to \Theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is unbiased,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[(\hat{\theta} - \theta)(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^{T}] \ge I(\theta)^{-1}$$

**Proof** Take  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\delta(x) = v^T \hat{\theta}$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}(\delta) = v^T \theta = g(\theta)$$
$$\implies \nabla g(\theta) = v$$

 $\operatorname{So}$ 

$$\mathbb{E}[(v^T(\hat{\theta} - \theta))^2] \ge v^T I(\theta)^{-1} v$$
$$= \mathbb{E}[v^T(\hat{\theta} - \theta)(\hat{\theta} - \theta)^T v]$$

|   |  | _ |  |
|---|--|---|--|
|   |  |   |  |
|   |  |   |  |
|   |  |   |  |
|   |  |   |  |
| _ |  |   |  |