STATS 200: Introduction to Statistical Inference Lecture 19: The bootstrap

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

What is the bootstrap?

The **bootstrap** (Efron, 1979) refers to a simulation-based approach to understand the accuracy of statistical estimates.

There are many variants of the bootstrap; it is more of an idea underlying a collection of methods, rather than one single method.

Simulating the standard error

Typical question of interest: Given $X_1, \ldots, X_n \stackrel{IID}{\sim} f(x|\theta)$, what is the standard error of an estimator $\hat{\theta}$ for θ ?

Previous lectures: Use asymptotic theory to study the sampling distribution and variance of $\hat{\theta}$, when *n* is large.

The simulation approach: Repeatedly simulate $X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* \stackrel{IID}{\sim} f(x|\theta)$, compute $\hat{\theta}^*$ from X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* , and take the empirical standard deviation of $\hat{\theta}^*$ across simulations.

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

The bootstrap principle

We can't actually simulate $X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* \stackrel{IID}{\sim} f(x|\theta)$ in practice, because we don't know θ to begin with.

The bootstrap principle

We can't actually simulate $X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* \stackrel{ID}{\sim} f(x|\theta)$ in practice, because we don't know θ to begin with.

The bootstrap idea: Simulate X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* from an *estimate* of the true data distribution.

This is a plugin principle analogous to how we use $I(\hat{\theta})$ for $I(\theta)$ when estimating the standard error of the MLE. Here, we "plug in" an estimate of the data distribution for the true data distribution, and then simulate new data from this estimate.

The name comes from the English saying, "To pull oneself up by one's own bootstraps"

Numbers of alpha particles emitted by a sample of Americium-241 in 10-second intervals (Rice Chapter 8):



▲ロト ▲園ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト ニヨー のへ(で)

Fitting a Poisson(λ) model to this data, the MLE is $\hat{\lambda} = \bar{X} = 8.37$. What is the standard error of this estimate?

・ロト・日本・モート モー うへぐ

Fitting a Poisson(λ) model to this data, the MLE is $\hat{\lambda} = \bar{X} = 8.37$. What is the standard error of this estimate?

Using asymptotic theory (either by CLT or Fisher information):

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda).$$

We can estimate the standard error as $\sqrt{8.37/n} = 0.083$.

Fitting a Poisson(λ) model to this data, the MLE is $\hat{\lambda} = \bar{X} = 8.37$. What is the standard error of this estimate?

Using asymptotic theory (either by CLT or Fisher information):

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda)
ightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda).$$

We can estimate the standard error as $\sqrt{8.37/n} = 0.083$.

Using the bootstrap: Repeatedly simulate

$$X_1^*,\ldots,X_n^* \stackrel{IID}{\sim}$$
Poisson(8.37),

compute $\hat{\lambda}^* = \bar{X}^*$ for each simulation, and compute the empirical standard deviation of $\hat{\lambda}^*$ across simulations.

```
# Input: Data vector X
lambda_hat = mean(X)
n = length(X)
```

```
# Perform 100000 bootstrap simulations
B=100000
lambda_hat_star = numeric(B)
for (i in 1:B) {
   X_star = rpois(n,lambda_hat)
   lambda_hat_star[i] = mean(X_star)
}
print(sd(lambda_hat_star))
```

We obtain the same answer, 0.083.

The method on the preceding slides is called the **parametric bootstrap**. Suppose, more generally, we are interested in the standard error of some statistic $T := T(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$.

- 1. Fit a parametric model $f(x|\theta)$ to X_1, \ldots, X_n using an estimate $\hat{\theta}$ (say, the MLE)
- 2. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, B$:
 - a. Simulate $X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* \stackrel{IID}{\sim} f(x|\hat{\theta})$
 - b. Compute the statistic $T^* := T(X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^*)$ on the data X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^*
- 3. Return the empirical standard deviation of T^* across the *B* simulations

This is called the *parametric* bootstrap because the estimated distribution from which we simulate new data is obtained by fitting a parametric model $f(x|\theta)$.

A different method of performing the bootstrap is to "estimate" the true data distribution by the **empirical distribution** of the data, which is the discrete distribution that places mass $\frac{1}{n}$ at each of the observed data values X_1, \ldots, X_n .

I.e., given the observed data X_1, \ldots, X_n , this is the distribution of a random variable that can equal each of these observed values with probability $\frac{1}{n}$.

Q: What is the CDF of this empirical distribution?



A: The **empirical CDF** $F_n(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{X_i \le t\}$, which equals the fraction of data values $\le t$. This estimates the true CDF F(t).

Simulating IID samples X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* from the empirical distribution of the data amounts to sampling, with replacement, *n* values from X_1, \ldots, X_n .

(Note that it is highly likely for some of the values X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* to be the same, even if the original values X_1, \ldots, X_n were all distinct.)

This method of simulation is called the **nonparametric bootstrap**.

Suppose we are interested in the standard error of a statistic $T := T(X_1, ..., X_n)$. The nonparametric bootstrap does the following:

- 1. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, B$:
 - a. Simulate X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^* as *n* samples with replacement from the original data X_1, \ldots, X_n .
 - b. Compute the statistic $T^* = T(X_1^*, \dots, X_n^*)$ on the data X_1^*, \dots, X_n^*
- 2. Return the empirical standard deviation of T^* across the *B* simulations

There is no assumption of a parametric model!

```
# Input: Data vector X
n = length(X)
```

```
# Perform 100000 bootstrap simulations
B=100000
lambda_hat_star = numeric(B)
for (i in 1:B) {
    X_star = sample(X, size=n, replace=TRUE)
    lambda_hat_star[i] = mean(X_star)
}
print(sd(lambda_hat_star))
```

We obtain an estimated standard error of 0.085.

Let's consider what happens when we fit the Poisson(λ) model to data X_1, \ldots, X_n that do not follow a Poisson distribution. We compute the MLE $\hat{\lambda} = \bar{X}$.

Let's consider what happens when we fit the Poisson(λ) model to data X_1, \ldots, X_n that do not follow a Poisson distribution. We compute the MLE $\hat{\lambda} = \bar{X}$.

The true standard error of this MLE is σ/\sqrt{n} where σ is the standard deviation of the true distribution for the X_i 's.

The Fisher information is $1/\lambda$, so the plugin Fisher information estimate of the standard error is $\sqrt{\hat{\lambda}/n} = \sqrt{\overline{X}/n}$. This is incorrect if the mean of the distribution of X_i 's is not the same as its variance.

The sandwich estimate of the standard error of $\hat{\lambda}$ estimates separately $\operatorname{Var}[z(X, \lambda)]$ and $\mathbb{E}[z'(X, \lambda)]$:

$$\log f(x|\lambda) = x \log \lambda - \lambda - \log x!$$
$$z(x,\lambda) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log f(x|\lambda) = \frac{x}{\lambda} - 1$$
$$z'(x,\lambda) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log f(x|\lambda) = -\frac{x}{\lambda^2}$$

The sandwich estimate of the standard error of $\hat{\lambda}$ estimates separately $\operatorname{Var}[z(X, \lambda)]$ and $\mathbb{E}[z'(X, \lambda)]$:

$$\log f(x|\lambda) = x \log \lambda - \lambda - \log x!$$
$$z(x,\lambda) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log f(x|\lambda) = \frac{x}{\lambda} - z$$
$$z'(x,\lambda) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log f(x|\lambda) = -\frac{x}{\lambda^2}$$

Sample variance of $z(X_1, \bar{X}), \dots, z(X_n, \bar{X})$: S_X^2/\bar{X}^2 Sample mean of $z'(X_1, \bar{X}), \dots, z'(X_n, \bar{X})$: $-1/\bar{X}$

So the sandwich estimate of the standard error of $\hat{\lambda}$ is S_X/\sqrt{n} , which is a correct estimate of σ/\sqrt{n} .

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

For a simulated sample $X_1, \ldots, X_{100} \stackrel{ID}{\sim}$ Geometric(0.3):

Fisher information estimate $\sqrt{X/n}$:	0.14
Sandwich estimate S_X/\sqrt{n} :	0.22
Parametric bootstrap:	0.14
Nonparametric bootstrap:	0.22

Even if the statistic T of interest is motivated by a parametric model (for example, $T = \hat{\theta}$ is the MLE in this model), the nonparametric bootstrap may be used to estimate the standard error of T to guard against model misspecification.

The real world and the bootstrap world



Image from Efron and Tibshirani, An Introduction to the Bootstrap, 1993.

Bootstrap confidence intervals

There are many ways of using the bootstrap to construct a confidence interval for θ , using an estimator $\hat{\theta}$. We will discuss three simple methods in this class.

1. The normal interval:

Let $\hat{\theta} := \hat{\theta}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be the estimate computed on the original data, and let \hat{se} be the bootstrap estimate of the standard error of $\hat{\theta}$. Construct a $100(1 - \alpha)$ % confidence interval as

$$\hat{\theta} \pm z(\alpha/2) \, \widehat{se}.$$

Rationale: This is the procedure discussed last lecture, except replacing an asymptotic estimate of the standard error of $\hat{\theta}$ by a bootstrap estimate. It is valid if the distribution of $\hat{\theta}$ is approximately normal around θ .

Bootstrap confidence intervals

2. The percentile interval:

Let $\hat{\theta}^{*(\alpha/2)}$ and $\hat{\theta}^{*(1-\alpha/2)}$ be the $\alpha/2$ and $1-\alpha/2$ quantiles of the simulated values of $\hat{\theta}^*$. (If we performed *B* bootstrap simulations, these are the $(\alpha/2 \times B)^{\text{th}}$ and $((1-\alpha/2) \times B)^{\text{th}}$ ordered values of $\hat{\theta}^*$.) Construct a $100(1-\alpha)\%$ confidence interval as

$$[\hat{\theta}^{*(\alpha/2)}, \hat{\theta}^{*(1-\alpha/2)}].$$

Rationale: If $\hat{\theta}$ is close to θ , then the simulated distribution of $\hat{\theta}^*$ should be close to the theoretical distribution of $\hat{\theta}$.

Bootstrap confidence intervals

3. The "basic bootstrap" interval:

Estimate the distribution of $\hat{\theta} - \theta$ by the simulated distribution of $\hat{\theta}^* - \hat{\theta}$: The simulated $\alpha/2$ and $(1 - \alpha/2)$ quantiles of $\hat{\theta}^* - \hat{\theta}$ are $q_{\alpha/2} := \hat{\theta}^{*(\alpha/2)} - \hat{\theta}$ and $q_{1-\alpha/2} := \hat{\theta}^{*(1-\alpha/2)} - \hat{\theta}$. Since $\theta = \hat{\theta} - (\hat{\theta} - \theta)$, construct a 100 $(1 - \alpha)$ % confidence interval for θ as

$$[\hat{\theta}-q_{1-\alpha/2},\hat{\theta}-q_{\alpha/2}]=[2\hat{\theta}-\hat{\theta}^{*(1-\alpha/2)},2\hat{\theta}-\hat{\theta}^{*(\alpha/2)}].$$

Rationale: The deviations of $\hat{\theta}^*$ from $\hat{\theta}$ in the "Bootstrap World" should approximate the deviations of $\hat{\theta}$ from θ in the "Real World".

If the distribution of θ̂* around θ̂ is symmetric, then the basic bootstrap interval and the percentile interval are equivalent (because θ̂*(α/2) + θ̂*(1-α/2) ≈ 2θ̂).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- If the distribution of θ̂* around θ̂ is symmetric, then the basic bootstrap interval and the percentile interval are equivalent (because θ̂*(α/2) + θ̂*(1-α/2) ≈ 2θ̂).
- ► If in addition, the distribution of $\hat{\theta}^*$ around $\hat{\theta}$ is normal, then these are equivalent to the normal interval.
- ► If the sampled values of $\hat{\theta}^*$ do not appear normally distributed around $\hat{\theta}$, then the normal interval should not be used.

- If the distribution of θ̂* around θ̂ is symmetric, then the basic bootstrap interval and the percentile interval are equivalent (because θ̂*(α/2) + θ̂*(1-α/2) ≈ 2θ̂).
- ► If in addition, the distribution of $\hat{\theta}^*$ around $\hat{\theta}$ is normal, then these are equivalent to the normal interval.
- ► If the sampled values of $\hat{\theta}^*$ do not appear normally distributed around $\hat{\theta}$, then the normal interval should not be used.
- Rice sticks to the "basic bootstrap" interval, and says of the percentile interval: "Although this direct equation of quantiles of the bootstrap sampling distribution with confidence limits may seem initially appealing, its rationale is somewhat obscure."

Argument for the basic bootstrap interval: Suppose θ̂ is a positively biased estimate of θ. Then we expect θ̂* to be a positively biased estimate of θ̂. Hence the percentile interval "worsens" the bias of θ̂, whereas the basic bootstrap interval corrects for it.

- Argument for the basic bootstrap interval: Suppose θ̂ is a positively biased estimate of θ. Then we expect θ̂* to be a positively biased estimate of θ̂. Hence the percentile interval "worsens" the bias of θ̂, whereas the basic bootstrap interval corrects for it.
- Argument for the percentile interval: It is invariant under reparametrization—let η = g(θ) where g is an increasing function. If we compute the percentile interval [θ^{*(α/2)}, θ^{*(1-α/2)}] and then reparametrize, we get the interval [g(θ^{*(α/2)}), g(θ^{*(1-α/2)})] for η. If we reparametrize first by η^{*} = g(θ^{*}) and then compute the interval, we get [η^{*(α/2)}, η^{*(1-α/2)}], which is the same thing. This doesn't hold for the basic bootstrap interval: The quantiles of g(2θ̂ θ̂^{*}) are not the same as the quantiles of 2g(θ̂) g(θ̂^{*}).

Other intervals

There are other bootstrap intervals with theoretical and empirical support for having more accurate coverage:

- ► Studentized bootstrap intervals—estimate the distribution of $\frac{\hat{\theta}-\theta}{\hat{se}(\hat{\theta})}$ using the simulated distribution of $\frac{\hat{\theta}^*-\hat{\theta}}{\hat{se}^*(\hat{\theta}^*)}$.
- Bias-corrected and accelerated intervals—explicitly adjust for the bias and skewness of the bootstrap distribution.

We won't discuss these procedures in this class.