

## Lecture 22: Decision rules, loss, and risk

Statistical decision theory

$X$ : a sample from a population  $P \in \mathcal{P}$

Decision: an action we take after observing  $X$

$\mathcal{A}$ : the set of allowable actions

$(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}})$ : the action space

$\mathcal{X}$ : the range of  $X$

Decision rule: a measurable function (a statistic)  $T$  from  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}})$  to  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}})$

If  $X$  is observed, then we take the action  $T(X) \in \mathcal{A}$

Performance criterion: loss function  $L(P, a)$  from  $\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{A}$  to  $[0, \infty)$  and is Borel for each  $P$

If  $X = x$  is observed and our decision rule is  $T$ , then our “loss” is  $L(P, T(x))$

It is difficult to compare  $L(P, T_1(X))$  and  $L(P, T_2(X))$  for two decision rules,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , since both of them are random.

Risk: Average (expected) loss defined as

$$R_T(P) = E[L(P, T(X))] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} L(P, T(x)) dP_X(x).$$

If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a parametric family indexed by  $\theta$ , the loss and risk are denoted by  $L(\theta, a)$  and  $R_T(\theta)$

For decision rules  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ ,  $T_1$  is *as good as*  $T_2$  if and only if

$$R_{T_1}(P) \leq R_{T_2}(P) \quad \text{for any } P \in \mathcal{P},$$

and is *better* than  $T_2$  if, in addition,  $R_{T_1}(P) < R_{T_2}(P)$  for at least one  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Two decision rules  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are *equivalent* if and only if  $R_{T_1}(P) = R_{T_2}(P)$  for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Optimal rule: If  $T_*$  is as good as any other rule in  $\mathfrak{S}$ , a class of allowable decision rules, then  $T_*$  is  $\mathfrak{S}$ -*optimal* (or optimal if  $\mathfrak{S}$  contains all possible rules).

Sometimes it is useful to consider *randomized decision rules*.

Randomized decision rule: a function  $\delta$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that, for every  $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\delta(\cdot, A)$  is a Borel function and, for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\delta(x, \cdot)$  is a probability measure on  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}})$ .

If  $X = x$  is observed, our have a distribution of actions:  $\delta(x, \cdot)$ .

A nonrandomized decision rule  $T$  previously discussed can be viewed as a special randomized decision rule with  $\delta(x, \{a\}) = I_{\{a\}}(T(x))$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

To choose an action in  $\mathcal{A}$  when a randomized rule  $\delta$  is used, we need to simulate a pseudo-random element of  $\mathcal{A}$  according to  $\delta(x, \cdot)$ .

Thus, an alternative way to describe a randomized rule is to specify the method of simulating the action from  $\mathcal{A}$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

For example, a randomized rule can be a discrete distribution  $\delta(x, \cdot)$  assigning probability  $p_j(x)$  to a nonrandomized decision rule  $T_j(x)$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , in which case the rule  $\delta$  can be

equivalently defined as a rule taking value  $T_j(x)$  with probability  $p_j(x)$ , i.e.,

$$T(X) = \begin{cases} T_1(X) & \text{with probability } p_1(X) \\ \dots & \dots \\ T_k(X) & \text{with probability } p_k(X) \end{cases}$$

The loss function for a randomized rule  $\delta$  is defined as

$$L(P, \delta, x) = \int_{\mathcal{A}} L(P, a) d\delta(x, a),$$

which reduces to the same loss function we discussed when  $\delta$  is a nonrandomized rule. The risk of a randomized rule  $\delta$  is then

$$R_\delta(P) = E[L(P, \delta, X)] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{A}} L(P, a) d\delta(x, a) dP_X(x).$$

For  $T(X)$  defined above,

$$L(P, T, x) = \sum_{j=1}^k L(P, T_j(x)) p_j(x)$$

and

$$R_T(P) = \sum_{j=1}^k E[L(P, T_j(X)) p_j(X)]$$

**Example 2.19.** Let  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  be a vector of iid measurements for a parameter  $\theta \in \mathcal{R}$ .

Action space:  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}) = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$ .

A common loss function in this problem is the *squared error loss*  $L(P, a) = (\theta - a)^2$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $T(X) = \bar{X}$ , the sample mean.

The loss for  $\bar{X}$  is  $(\bar{X} - \theta)^2$ .

If the population has mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2 < \infty$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\bar{X}}(P) &= E(\theta - \bar{X})^2 \\ &= (\theta - E\bar{X})^2 + E(E\bar{X} - \bar{X})^2 \\ &= (\theta - E\bar{X})^2 + \text{Var}(\bar{X}) \\ &= (\mu - \theta)^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\theta$  is in fact the mean of the population, then

$$R_{\bar{X}}(P) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n},$$

is an increasing function of the population variance  $\sigma^2$  and a decreasing function of the sample size  $n$ .

Consider another decision rule  $T_1(X) = (X_{(1)} + X_{(n)})/2$ .

$R_{T_1}(P)$  does not have a simple explicit form if there is no further assumption on the population  $P$ .

Suppose that  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ . Then, for some  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $\bar{X}$  (or  $T_1$ ) is better than  $T_1$  (or  $\bar{X}$ ) (exercise), whereas for some  $\mathcal{P}$ , neither  $\bar{X}$  nor  $T_1$  is better than the other.

Consider a randomized rule:

$$T_2(X) = \begin{cases} \bar{X} & \text{with probability } p(X) \\ T_1(X) & \text{with probability } 1 - p(X) \end{cases}$$

The loss for  $T_2(X)$  is

$$(\bar{X} - \theta)^2 p(X) + [T_1(X) - \theta]^2 [1 - p(X)]$$

and the risk of  $T_2$  is

$$R_{T_2}(P) = E\{(\bar{X} - \theta)^2 p(X) + [T_1(X) - \theta]^2 [1 - p(X)]\}$$

In particular, if  $p(X) = 0.5$ , then

$$R_{T_2}(P) = \frac{R_{\bar{X}}(P) + R_{T_1}(P)}{2}.$$

The problem in Example 2.19 is a special case of a general problem called *estimation*.

In an estimation problem, a decision rule  $T$  is called an *estimator*.

The following example describes another type of important problem called *hypothesis testing*.

**Example 2.20.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of distributions,  $\mathcal{P}_0 \subset \mathcal{P}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{P \in \mathcal{P} : P \notin \mathcal{P}_0\}$ . A hypothesis testing problem can be formulated as that of deciding which of the following two statements is true:

$$H_0 : P \in \mathcal{P}_0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : P \in \mathcal{P}_1. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $H_0$  is called the *null hypothesis* and  $H_1$  is called the *alternative hypothesis*.

The action space for this problem contains only two elements, i.e.,  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ , where 0 is the action of accepting  $H_0$  and 1 is the action of rejecting  $H_0$ .

A decision rule is called a *test*.

Since a test  $T(X)$  is a function from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\{0, 1\}$ ,  $T(X)$  must have the form  $I_C(X)$ , where  $C \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}}$  is called the *rejection region* or *critical region* for testing  $H_0$  versus  $H_1$ .

0-1 loss:  $L(P, a) = 0$  if a correct decision is made and 1 if an incorrect decision is made, i.e.,  $L(P, j) = 0$  for  $P \in \mathcal{P}_j$  and  $L(P, j) = 1$  otherwise,  $j = 0, 1$ .

Under this loss, the risk is

$$R_T(P) = \begin{cases} P(T(X) = 1) = P(X \in C) & P \in \mathcal{P}_0 \\ P(T(X) = 0) = P(X \notin C) & P \in \mathcal{P}_1. \end{cases}$$

See Figure 2.2 on page 127 for an example of a graph of  $R_T(\theta)$  for some  $T$  and  $P$  in a parametric family.

The 0-1 loss implies that the loss for two types of incorrect decisions (accepting  $H_0$  when  $P \in \mathcal{P}_1$  and rejecting  $H_0$  when  $P \in \mathcal{P}_0$ ) are the same.

In some cases, one might assume unequal losses:  $L(P, j) = 0$  for  $P \in \mathcal{P}_j$ ,  $L(P, 0) = c_0$  when  $P \in \mathcal{P}_1$ , and  $L(P, 1) = c_1$  when  $P \in \mathcal{P}_0$ .

Admissibility

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  be a class of decision rules (randomized or nonrandomized). A decision rule  $T \in \mathfrak{S}$  is called  $\mathfrak{S}$ -*admissible* (or admissible when  $\mathfrak{S}$  contains all possible rules) if and only if there does not exist any  $S \in \mathfrak{S}$  that is better than  $T$  (in terms of the risk).

If a decision rule  $T$  is inadmissible, then there exists a rule better than  $T$ .

Thus,  $T$  should not be used in principle.

However, an admissible decision rule is not necessarily good.

For example, in an estimation problem a silly estimator  $T(X) \equiv a$  constant may be admissible.

If  $T_*$  is  $\mathfrak{S}$ -optimal, then it is  $\mathfrak{S}$ -admissible.

If  $T_*$  is  $\mathfrak{S}$ -optimal and  $T_0$  is  $\mathfrak{S}$ -admissible, then  $T_0$  is also  $\mathfrak{S}$ -optimal and is equivalent to  $T_*$ .

If there are two  $\mathfrak{S}$ -admissible rules that are not equivalent, then there does not exist any  $\mathfrak{S}$ -optimal rule.