## Solutions to Homework #2 Math 6070-1, Spring 2006

Let  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$  be random variables, all i.i.d., and with the same distribution function F that has density f := F'. Define for all  $p \ge 1$ ,

$$Q_n^{(p)}(F) := \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - F(x) \right|^p f(x) \, dx \right\}^{1/p}.$$

This is a kind of "distance" between  $\hat{F}_n$  and F, although it is different from  $D_n(F)$ .

1. Prove that  $Q_n^{(p)}(F) \leq 2$ , so  $Q_n^{(p)}(F)$  is always finite.

**Solution:** The inequality for  $Q_n^{(p)}(F)$  follows readily from the facts that: (i)  $|\hat{F}_n(x) - F(x)| \leq \hat{F}_n(x) + F(x) \leq 2$ ; and (ii)  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) dx = 1$ .

2. Compute  $Q_n^{(p)}(F_u)$  where  $F_u(x) = x$  for  $0 \le x \le 1$ ,  $F_u(x) = 0$  if x < 0, and  $F_u(x) = 1$  if  $x \ge 1$ .

**Solution:** Because  $f_u(x) := F'_u(x) = 1$  for  $0 \le x \le 1$ ,

$$Q_n^{(p)}(F) := \left\{ \int_0^1 \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - x \right|^p \, dx \right\}^{1/p}.$$

3. Prove that  $Q_n^{(p)}(F)$  is distribution-free. That is, if F and G are strictly increasing distribution functions such that F' and G' both exist, then the distribution of  $Q_n^{(p)}(F)$  is the same as that of  $Q_n^{(p)}(G)$ .

**Solution:** Let  $F^{-1}$  denote the inverse function to F. Then, a change of variables  $[x = F^{-1}(x)]$  yields the following:

$$Q_n^{(p)}(F) = \left\{ \int_0^1 \left| \hat{F}_n \left( F^{-1}(z) \right) - z \right|^p f \left( F^{-1}(z) \right) \, dF^{-1}(z) \right\}^{1/p} \\ = \left\{ \int_0^1 \left| \hat{F}_n \left( F^{-1}(z) \right) - z \right|^p \, dz \right\}^{1/p}$$

In the last line we used the fact that if z = F(x) then  $dz = f(x) dx = f(F^{-1}(z)) dx$ ; whence it follows that  $dF^{-1}(z) = dz/f(F^{-1}(z))$ . Finally, note that

$$\hat{F}_n(F^{-1}(z)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{I} \{ X_j \le F^{-1}(z) \}$$
$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{I} \{ F(X_j) \le z \},$$

and this is the empirical distribution function based on i.i.d. uniform-(0, 1) variables  $F(X_1), \ldots, F(X_n)$ . Hence,  $Q_n^{(p)}(F)$  has the same distribution as  $Q_n^{(p)}(F_u)$ . The asserted distribution-free-ness follows readily from this, because  $Q_n^{(p)}(G)$  has the same distribution as  $Q_n^{(p)}(F_u)$  too, and for the same reasons.

4. Prove that under F, as  $n \to \infty$ ,  $Q_n^{(2)}(F) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ , provided that F is strictly increasing and has a density. Do this by first proving that

$$\mathbf{E}_F\left[\left|Q_n^{(2)}(F)\right|^2\right] = \frac{1}{6n}$$

**Solution:** Because of distribution-free-ness we can and will assume that  $F = F_u$ . Because  $E_{F_u}[\hat{F}_n(x)] = F_u(x) = x$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\mathbf{E}_{F_{u}}\left[\left|Q_{n}^{(2)}(F_{u})\right|^{2}\right] = \mathbf{E}_{F_{u}}\left[\int_{0}^{1}\left|\hat{F}_{n}(x) - x\right|^{2}\,dx\right] = \int_{0}^{1}\mathrm{Var}_{F_{u}}\left(\hat{F}_{n}(x)\right)\,dx$$

But recall that the preceding variance is equal to x(1-x)/n. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{F_u}\left[\left|Q_n^{(2)}(F_u)\right|^2\right] = \frac{1}{n} \int_0^1 x(1-x) \, dx = \frac{1}{6n}$$

**Warning:** The original version of this exercise asked you to prove that  $Q_n^{(p)}(F)$  goes to zero in probability for any p [not just p = 2]. The reason is this: Because  $|\hat{F}_n(x) - F(x)|^p \leq \{D_n(F)\}^p$ , it follows that  $Q_n^{(p)}(F) \leq D_n(F)$ , and so the Glivenko–Cantelli theorem does the rest.

 Suppose F is strictly increasing has a density. Then provide a heuristic justification of the fact that, under F, as n→∞,

$$\sqrt{n} \ Q_n^{(p)}(F) \xrightarrow{d} \left\{ \int_0^1 |B^\circ(x) - x|^p \ dx \right\}^{1/p}$$

where  $B^{\circ}$  denotes the Brownian bridge on [0,1]. Later on in a Project we will see how to simulate the distribution of the latter limiting object.

**Solution:** We can alternatively prove that as  $n \to \infty$ ,

$$n^{p/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - F(x) \right|^p f(x) \, dx \stackrel{d}{\to} \int_0^1 \left| B^{\circ}(x) - x \right|^p \, dx.$$

Because we are interested in the asymptotic distribution of  $Q_n^{(p)}(F)$ , we can and will assume that  $F = F_u$  [the distribution-free property]. Now, the CLT argument in the lecture notes provides a rigorous justification of

the following: For all  $k \ge 1$ ,

$$n^{p/2} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left| \hat{F}_n\left(\frac{j}{k}\right) - \frac{j}{k} \right|^p = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left| \sqrt{n} \left( \hat{F}_n\left(\frac{j}{k}\right) - \frac{j}{k} \right) \right|^p$$
$$\stackrel{d}{\to} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left| B^\circ\left(\frac{j}{k}\right) - \frac{j}{k} \right|^p.$$

On the other hand, as  $k \to \infty,$  then Riemann-sum approximations reveal that:

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left| \hat{F}_n\left(\frac{j}{k}\right) - \frac{j}{k} \right|^p \to \int_0^1 \left| \hat{F}_n(x) - x \right|^p \, dx; \text{ and}$$
$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left| B^\circ\left(\frac{j}{k}\right) - \frac{j}{k} \right|^p \to \int_0^1 \left| B^\circ(x) - x \right|^p \, dx.$$

So the assertion of the exercise is feasible. [It is in fact correct, although our "proof" falls short of completely proving it.]

6. Use 4 to test  $H_0$ :  $F = F_0$  versus  $H_1$ :  $F \neq F_0$  for a known distribution function  $F_0$  that is strictly increasing and has a density.

**Solution:** Find c such that

$$\mathbf{P}_F\left\{Q_n^{(p)}(F) \ge c/\sqrt{n}\right\} = 1 - \alpha.$$

By the distribution-free property, this c does not depend on F. So it can be either found by simulation, or by approximation via

$$P\left\{\int_{0}^{1} |B^{\circ}(x) - x|^{p} dx \ge c^{p}\right\} = 1 - \alpha.$$

[You would do well to check the arithmetic!] Then, we opt to reject  $H_0$  if and only if  $Q_n^{(p)}(F) \ge c/\sqrt{n}$ .

7. Suppose F has a density f which satisfies f(x) > 0 for all x. Then prove that F is strictly increasing.

**Solution:** This follows from the identity,  $F(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} f(u) du$ . [To be completely honest we need f to have some minimal regularity properties. For instance, "f = piece-wise continuous" will do. Remember that this sort of regularity is needed even to define the integral of f via Riemann-sum approximations. So assuming this sort of regularity is natural as well as inevitable.]