

PM 1) Let  $w_B \sim N_p\left(0, \frac{\Sigma}{B}\right)$ . Then  $w_B \xrightarrow{D} w$ . Find  $w$ . as  $B \rightarrow \infty$

$w \sim N_p(0, 0)$   $P(w=0) = 1$  point mass at 0

20

2) Let  $w_n^* \sim N_p(0, \Sigma_n)$ . If  $\Sigma_n \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma$ , then  $w_n^* \xrightarrow{D} w$ . Find  $w$ . as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$w \sim N_p(0, \Sigma)$

( $\Sigma_n$  and  $\Sigma$  are constant w.r.t.  $w$  and  $w^*$  dist)

20

3) Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be iid with mean  $E(x) = \mu$  and variance  $V(x) = \sigma^2 > 0$ . Show that  $\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}_n)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu + \mu - \bar{x}_n)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 - n(\bar{x}_n - \mu)^2$ .

PM

10 a)  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2 \xrightarrow{P} \theta$ . What is  $\theta$ ?

$$\theta = E(x_i - \mu)^2 = \sigma^2 = V(x)$$

by WLLN

$\rightarrow$  b)  $n(\bar{x}_n - \mu)^2 = [\sqrt{n}(\bar{x}_n - \mu)]^2 \xrightarrow{D} W$ . What is  $W$ ? Fd22

$\sqrt{n}(\bar{x}_n - \mu) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2) \approx z \sim \sigma N(0, 1)$  by CLT

so  $W = z^2 \sim \sigma^2 \chi^2_1$

20

continuous mapping th

4) The table below shows simulation results for bootstrapping OLS (reg) and forward selection (vs) with  $C_p$  when  $\beta = (1, 1, 0, 0)^T$ . The  $\beta_i$  columns give coverage = the proportion of CIs that contained  $\beta_i$  and the average length of the CI. The test is for  $H_0 : (\beta_3, \beta_4)^T = \mathbf{0}$  and  $H_0$  is true. The "coverage" is the proportion of times the prediction region method bootstrap test failed to reject  $H_0$ . Since 1000 runs were used, a cov in  $[0.93, 0.97]$  is reasonable for a nominal value of 0.95. Output is given for three different error distributions. If the coverage for both methods  $\geq 0.93$ , the method with the shorter average CI length was more precise. (If one method had coverage  $\geq 0.93$  and the other had coverage  $< 0.93$ , we will say the method with coverage  $\geq 0.93$  was more precise.)

a) For  $\beta_2, \beta_3$ , and  $\beta_4$ , which method, forward selection or the OLS full model, was more precise?

forward selection  $8.9 < 10.6, 2.7 < 3.2, 4.6 < 5.4$

Table 1: Bootstrapping Forward Selection,  $n = 100, p = 4, \psi = 0.9, B = 1000$

		$\beta_1$	$\beta_2$	$\beta_3$	$\beta_4$	test
reg	cov	0.93	0.95	0.95	0.94	0.95
	len	1.266	10.703	10.666	10.650	2.547
vs	cov	0.95	0.93	0.997	0.995	0.989
	len	1.260	8.901	8.986	8.977	2.759
reg	cov	0.94	0.93	0.95	0.94	0.95
	len	0.393	3.285	3.266	3.279	2.475
vs	cov	0.94	0.97	0.998	0.997	0.995
	len	0.394	2.773	2.721	2.733	2.703
reg	cov	0.95	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.95
	len	0.656	5.493	5.465	5.427	2.493
vs	cov	0.93	0.95	0.998	0.998	0.977
	len	0.657	4.599	4.655	4.642	2.783

b) The test "length" is the average length of the interval  $[0, D_{(U_B)}] = D_{(U_B)}$  where the test fails to reject  $H_0$  if  $D_0 \leq D_{(U_B)}$ . The OLS full model is asymptotically normal, and hence for large enough  $n$  and  $B$  the reg len row for the test column should be near  $\sqrt{\chi_{2,0.95}^2} = 2.477$ .

Were the three values in the test column for reg within 0.1 of 2.477?

Yes

40  $2.477 \pm 0.1 = [2.377, 2.577]$   
 $2.547, 2.475, 2.493$   
 2