Gene Quinn

A more abstract property of considerable theoretical importance is *sufficiency* 

A more abstract property of considerable theoretical importance is *sufficiency* 

Losely speaking, an estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is said to be a **sufficient** estimator for the parameter  $\theta$  if  $\hat{\theta}$  contains all of the information relevant to  $\theta$  that it is possible to get from the sample.

A more abstract property of considerable theoretical importance is *sufficiency* 

Losely speaking, an estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is said to be a **sufficient estimator** for the parameter  $\theta$  if  $\hat{\theta}$  contains all of the information relevant to  $\theta$  that it is possible to get from the sample.

A common example is the following: Very often the sample mean  $\overline{x}$  is a sufficient estimator for the population mean  $\mu$ .

If we know the sample mean  $\overline{x}$ , knowledge of the individual  $x_i$  values often does not provide any additional information about  $\mu$ .

A formal definition of sufficiency is necessarily rather technical.

A formal definition of sufficiency is necessarily rather technical.

Suppose  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$  is a random sample of size *n* from a distribution with density function  $f(x; \theta)$ .

The estimator  $\hat{\theta} = h(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is said to be **sufficient** for  $\theta$  if the likelihood function of the sample factors into the product of the density function of  $\hat{\theta}$  and other factors that do not involve  $\theta$ .

That is,

$$L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(x_i; \theta) = f_{\hat{\theta}}(\hat{\theta}; \theta) \cdot b(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

**Example**: We saw that for a random sample  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$  from an exponential distribution, the maximum likelihood and method of moments estimators are both equal to the sample mean  $\overline{x}$ ,

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = \overline{x}$$

The likelihood function of the sample is

$$L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\theta} \exp\left(-\frac{x_i}{\theta}\right) = \frac{1}{\theta^n} \exp\left(-\frac{n\overline{x}}{\theta}\right)$$

Note that, once we have written  $L(\theta)$  in terms of  $\overline{x}$ , the individual  $x_i$  values no longer appear in the expression.

The likelihood function of the sample is

$$L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\theta} \exp\left(-\frac{x_i}{\theta}\right) = \frac{1}{\theta^n} \exp\left(-\frac{n\overline{x}}{\theta}\right)$$

Note that, once we have written  $L(\theta)$  in terms of  $\overline{x}$ , the individual  $x_i$  values no longer appear in the expression.

This reflects the fact that  $\overline{x}$  is a sufficient estimator for  $\theta$ .

Of course, the likelihood function  $L(\theta)$  does depend on the  $x_i$  values in the sense that  $\overline{x}$  depends on the  $x_i$  values.

Of course, the likelihood function  $L(\theta)$  does depend on the  $x_i$  values in the sense that  $\overline{x}$  depends on the  $x_i$  values.

However, *any* random sample  $z_1, \ldots, z_n$  with sample mean equal to  $\overline{x}$  will produce the same likelihood function.

Of course, the likelihood function  $L(\theta)$  does depend on the  $x_i$  values in the sense that  $\overline{x}$  depends on the  $x_i$  values.

However, *any* random sample  $z_1, \ldots, z_n$  with sample mean equal to  $\overline{x}$  will produce the same likelihood function.

When we say that  $L(\theta)$  does not depend on the individual  $x_i$  values, we mean that for a given value of  $\overline{x}$ , all random samples with sample mean equal to  $\overline{x}$  have the same likelihood.

**Example**: Let  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$  be a sequence of zeros and ones corresponding to a random sample consisting of n independent Bernoulli trials with probability of success p. The likelihood function of the sample is

$$L(p) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i} = p^{\sum x_i} (1-p)^{n-\sum x_i}$$

and the maximum likelihood estimator of p is  $\hat{p} = \sum x_i/n = \overline{x}$ 

**Example**: Let  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$  be a sequence of zeros and ones corresponding to a random sample consisting of n independent Bernoulli trials with probability of success p. The likelihood function of the sample is

$$L(p) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p^{x_i} (1-p)^{1-x_i} = p^{\sum x_i} (1-p)^{n-\sum x_i}$$

and the maximum likelihood estimator of p is  $\hat{p} = \sum x_i/n = \overline{x}$ 

We can write the likelihood function in terms of  $\overline{x}$  as

$$L(p) = p^{n\overline{x}}(1-p)^{n(1-\overline{x})}$$

and once again the  $x_i$  values disappear from the expression, indicating that  $\overline{x}$  is a sufficient estimator for p.

As before, once  $\overline{x}$  is fixed, the likelihood function L(p) no longer depends on the individual  $x_i$  values.