

1.1. 2) Most of you have obtained correct rejection region

$$R = \left\{ x \mid f(x|0) < \underbrace{\frac{\pi(0)(1-k)}{\pi(1)}}_{\text{we denote it } k'} f(x|1) \right\}$$

3) One of possible solutions:

We observe that

$$\beta(0) = \int_R f(x|0) = 1 - \int_{R^c} f(x|0)$$

And use 1.1.2.

$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}$ If $k' \leq 1$ , compare it with $\int_R k' f(x 1)$	$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}$ If $k' > 1$ , compare it with $1 - \int_{R^c} k' f(x 1)$
---	--

1.2.4. Yes.

Many misinterpreted that  $k$  in 1.2. and 1.1. was the same and therefore justified the answer 'no'. This gave full score too.

1.3.3. Note that Karlin-Rubin theorem as formulated by Th. 8.3.17 in Casella & Berger works only for non-decreasing likelihood ratio in  $t$ .

1.3.4.

It is a UI test (check definition)

Under assumptions of both 1.3.1 and 1.3.3 — both most powerful and unbiased, see Keener (2010), ch. 12

Under assumptions of only 1.3.3 — no, it may be not most powerful although being unbiased and may be neither most power nor unbiased (find examples!)

1.3.5 See lectures

1.3.7 Note that there is not MLR in  $X$ , only MLR in  $t$

2.1.6 See 1.3.4 and Ch. 12 in Keener (2010)

2.2.3 Find  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  from comparing the loss in 2.2.3 and 2.2.1

2.2.4

$$\rho = E(|S|) \gamma_1 + P(M \notin S) \gamma_2 = \underbrace{\int P(M \in S) d\mu}_{\text{note that this varies with } \mu \text{ and thus cannot be just replaced with } (1-d)} + d \cdot \gamma_2$$

(Pratt theorem)

2.2.5

Set into 2.2.4  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  from 2.2.3 (and 2.1.3),

Check that  $\frac{E(|S|)}{G} = \begin{cases} \frac{2 z_{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{n}}, & G \text{ known} \\ \frac{2 t_{\frac{\alpha}{2}, n-1}}{\sqrt{n}} & E\left(\frac{\hat{G}}{G}\right) = \frac{2 t_{\frac{\alpha}{2}, n-1}}{\sqrt{n}}, G \text{ unknown} \end{cases}$

and set in  $E(|S|)$ .