

Mini-Review of the Main Points from P598AEM Lecture 11:

Consider carrying out N “experiments” where for ***each*** experiment, we perform a ***single*** measurement x_i of a ***random variable*** x , and where we are trying to “determine” (*i.e.* ***estimate***) a single parameter λ from the ***collection (ensemble)*** of the N measurements of x_i .

Later, when we look at practical schemes, we will treat the case of several measurements per experiment and also the (simultaneous) determination of several parameters.

After we have carried out N independent measurements of the random variable x : x_1, x_1, \dots, x_N , we construct a function $S(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ whose ***value*** is an ***estimator*** of the parameter of interest λ .

The ***numerical value*** of the function S (“the ***estimator***”) is ***itself*** a ***random variable***. (*e.g.* repeat the N “experiments” 10^6 times – the value of S for one repetition will be similar, but not identical to those obtained for S in the other 99999 repetitions). Thus, S has a mean and a width, along with higher moments of the S -distribution...

We define the ***bias*** $B(\lambda)$ associated with the ***estimator*** S of the parameter λ as: $B(\lambda) \equiv E[S] - \lambda$

A “***good estimator***” will be ***unbiased***, *i.e.* have $B(\lambda) \equiv E[S] - \lambda = 0$. Then: $E[S] = \lambda$.

Let $f(x; \lambda)$ be the P.D.F. describing the measurement of the random variable x . λ is the parameter we wish to determine by a series of measurements x_1, \dots, x_N . The joint P.D.F. of this series is $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) = f(x_1; \lambda) \cdot f(x_2; \lambda) \cdot \dots \cdot f(x_N; \lambda)$ provided that the N individual measurements of x_i are independent.

Define: $\mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^N f(x_i; \lambda)$

Define: $\ell(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) \equiv \ln \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N \ln f(x_i; \lambda)$

Define: $\ell'(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) \equiv \frac{d\ell(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda)}{d\lambda} \equiv \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) = \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \ln f(x_i; \lambda) \right\}$

Define: $\ell''(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) \equiv \frac{d^2 \ell(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda)}{d\lambda^2} \equiv \frac{d^2}{d\lambda^2} \ln \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) = \frac{d^2}{d\lambda^2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \ln f(x_i; \lambda) \right\}$

We then showed (for ***unbiased estimators*** S) that a ***lower bound*** existed for the ***variance*** of S :

$$\sigma_S^2 \geq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\ell'}^2} = \frac{1}{E[\ell'^2(\lambda)]} = -\frac{1}{E[\ell''(\lambda)]} = \frac{1}{I(\lambda)}$$

Where: $E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] = E\left[\left\{\frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln \mathcal{L}(\lambda)\right\}^2\right] = -E[\ell''(\lambda)] = -E\left[\frac{d^2}{d\lambda^2} \ln \mathcal{L}(\lambda)\right] \equiv I(\lambda)$

$I(\lambda)$ is called the ***Information*** of the sample associated with the parameter λ .

More Information on Information:

The **Information** $I(\lambda) \equiv E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] = E\left[\left\{\frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln \mathcal{L}(\lambda)\right\}^2\right] = -E[\ell''(\lambda)] = -E\left[\frac{d^2}{d\lambda^2} \ln \mathcal{L}(\lambda)\right]$

depends (linearly) on N , the number of measurements carried out in the experiment.

We can show that $I(\lambda)$ depends on the P.D.F. $f(x; \lambda)$, but does **not** depend on the **particular** values of the individual x_i 's measured in the experiment.

In P598AEM Lect. Notes 11 (p. 6), we defined the quantity: $\phi(x_i; \lambda) \equiv \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)}$ and showed that:

$$\ell'(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln f(x_i; \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{df(x_i; \lambda)/d\lambda}{f(x_i; \lambda)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(x_i; \lambda)$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] &= E\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \phi(x_i; \lambda) \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(x_j; \lambda)\right] \\ &= E\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \{\phi(x_i; \lambda)\}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i}^N \phi(x_i; \lambda) \phi(x_j; \lambda)\right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N E[\{\phi(x_i; \lambda)\}^2] + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i}^N E[\phi(x_i; \lambda) \phi(x_j; \lambda)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N E[\{\phi(x_i; \lambda)\}^2] + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i}^N E[\phi(x_i; \lambda)] \cdot E[\phi(x_j; \lambda)] \end{aligned}$$

Since the N measurements of the x_i are **independent**.

Next, we show that $E[\phi(x_i; \lambda)] = 0$. Take $\frac{d}{d\lambda}$ of: $\left\{1 = \int f(x; \lambda) dx\right\}$, which yields:

$$0 = \int f'(x; \lambda) dx = \int \frac{f'(x; \lambda)}{f(x; \lambda)} f(x; \lambda) dx = E[\phi(x; \lambda)]$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] &= \sum_{i=1}^N E[\{\phi(x_i; \lambda)\}^2] = \sum_{i=1}^N \int \phi^2(x_i; \lambda) f(x_i; \lambda) dx \\ &= N \int \phi^2(x; \lambda) f(x; \lambda) dx = NE[\phi^2(x; \lambda)] \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the **Information**:

$$I(\lambda) = E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] = -E[\ell''(\lambda)] = NE\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \phi^2(x_i; \lambda)\right] = NE\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)}\right)^2\right] = NE\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln f(x_i; \lambda)\right)^2\right]$$

simply depends on the **form** of the P.D.F. of the measurements $f(x; \lambda)$, and also depends **linearly** on the **number** of measurements, N .

Finally, for **unbiased** estimators, the **lower bound** on the **variance** of S is:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_s^2 &\geq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\ell'}^2} = \frac{1}{I(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{E[\ell'^2(\lambda)]} = -\frac{1}{E[\ell''(\lambda)]} = \frac{1}{NE\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \phi^2(x_i; \lambda)\right]} \\ &= \frac{1}{NE\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)}\right)^2\right]} = \frac{1}{NE\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln f(x_i; \lambda)\right)^2\right]}\end{aligned}$$

A **minimum variance estimator** is a choice of S for which the **equality** holds in the above relation – i.e. (in the **unbiased** case):

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_s^2 &= \frac{1}{\sigma_{\ell'}^2} = \frac{1}{I(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{E[\ell'^2(\lambda)]} = -\frac{1}{E[\ell''(\lambda)]} = \frac{1}{NE\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \phi^2(x_i; \lambda)\right]} \\ &= \frac{1}{NE\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)}\right)^2\right]} = \frac{1}{NE\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln f(x_i; \lambda)\right)^2\right]}\end{aligned}$$

We recall (P598AEM Lect. Notes 4) that the **covariance inequality** became an **equality** when the variables were **linearly** related (**specifically**: $\text{cov}(x, y) = \pm 1$ if $y = ax + b$).

The **covariance** here is: $\text{cov}(S, \ell')$, so the **equality** will hold if: $\ell'(\lambda) = rS + t$, where r and t are “**constants**”, i.e. they do **not** depend on x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N , (but they **can/may** depend on λ).

Recall that (by definition), S **cannot** be a function of λ , i.e. $S \neq fcn(\lambda)$.

Also, recall that $E[\ell'(\lambda)] = 0$. Thus: $E[\ell'(\lambda) = rS + t] \Rightarrow 0 = rE[S] + t$, or: $t = -rE[S]$.

Using this, we can rewrite: $\ell'(\lambda) = rS + t = r(S - E[S])$

Thus, if we have an **unbiased estimator** S , for which $\ell'(\lambda) = r(\lambda) \cdot \{S(\lambda) - E[S]\}$ then the **variance** of the **unbiased estimator** S is a **minimum**.

The condition $\ell' = r(\lambda) \cdot \{S - E[S]\}$ can be shown to be **necessary** and **sufficient** for the **variance** of the **unbiased estimator** S to be a **minimum**.

Let us assume that we **have** found such an **unbiased estimator** S , satisfying:

$$\ell'(\lambda) = r(\lambda) \cdot \{S - E[S]\}$$

Then:

$$\ell'^2(\lambda) = r^2(\lambda) \cdot \{S - E[S]\}^2$$

And:

$$E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] = r^2(\lambda) E[\underbrace{\{S - E[S]\}^2}_{= \sigma_S^2}] = r^2(\lambda) \sigma_S^2 = I(\lambda)$$

Since this is a **minimum variance unbiased estimator**, then: $\sigma_s^2 = \frac{1}{I(\lambda)}$

$$\text{Hence: } \sigma_s^2 = \frac{1}{I(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{r^2(\lambda)\sigma_s^2} \quad \text{or: } \sigma_s^4 = \frac{1}{r^2(\lambda)} \quad \text{or: } \sigma_s^2 = \frac{1}{r(\lambda)}$$

Thus, once we find $\ell'(\lambda) = r(\lambda)\{S - E[S]\}$, we can immediately determine $\sigma_s^2 = 1/r(\lambda)$.

Let us return now to the “weighted mean” example that we worked on in P598AEM Lecture 11, where we had N independent measurements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N of the random variable x described by

the Gaussian P.D.F. $f(x; \alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-(x-\alpha)^2/2\sigma^2}$ and which led to:

$$\ell(\alpha) \equiv \ln \mathcal{L}(\alpha) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(x_i - \alpha)^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \text{constant}$$

$$\ell'(\alpha) \equiv \frac{d\ell(\alpha)}{d\alpha} = \frac{d \ln \mathcal{L}(\alpha)}{d\alpha} = + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_i - \alpha}{\sigma_i^2}$$

and the ***estimator*** S (for the value of α which maximizes the above $\ell(\alpha)$), which (here in this case) is the ***weighted mean***:

$$S = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_i}{\sigma_i^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} \quad (\text{n.b. previously, we called this } \alpha^*)$$

Then:
$$E[S] = E \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_i}{\sigma_i^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} \right] = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{E[x_i]}{\sigma_i^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hat{x}}{\sigma_i^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} = \hat{x} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} \right) = \hat{x} = \alpha$$

Rewrite:
$$\ell'(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_i - \alpha}{\sigma_i^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_i}{\sigma_i^2} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_i^2} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_i}{\sigma_i^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} - \alpha \right\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \right\} \{S - \alpha\}$$

This is of the form: $\ell'(\alpha) = r(\alpha)\{S - E[S]\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \right\} \{S - \alpha\}$

Since: $E[S] = \alpha$, and (here): $\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma_\alpha^2} = r(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \quad (\neq \text{fcn}(\alpha))$

So we have shown that S is an **unbiased, minimum variance estimator** of the parameter α .

The **variance** of the **estimator** S : $\sigma_s^2 = \sigma_\alpha^2 = \frac{1}{r(\alpha)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}}$ or: $\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma_\alpha^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}$

In the case of $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ (i.e. “equal errors”) then: $\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma_\alpha^2} = \frac{N}{\sigma^2}$, and: $\sigma_s = \sigma_\alpha = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}$ $\checkmark\checkmark$

Actually, we could have arrived at the same result for $1/\sigma_\alpha^2$ simply by doing **error propagation** (assuming small uncertainties). But we now know that the **estimator** S for finding α when the P.D.F. is a Gaussian, $f(x; \alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} e^{-(x-\alpha)^2/2\sigma^2}$ is **the** best there is!

This **estimator** S is **unbiased**, has **minimum variance** and leads to an estimate of α that is closer to the “**true**” value than **any other** estimate!

For many calculations, it is useful to re-express the **Information**:

$$I(\lambda) = E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] = -E[\ell''(\lambda)] = NE \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \phi^2(x_i; \lambda) \right] = NE \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)} \right)^2 \right] = NE \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln f(x_i; \lambda) \right)^2 \right]$$

$$\text{Consider: } \ell(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N \ln f(x_i; \lambda) \quad \text{and:} \quad \ell'(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln f(x_i; \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)}$$

$$\text{Then: } \ell''(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(\frac{f'}{f} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f f'' - f' f'}{f^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f''}{f} - \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{f'}{f} \right)^2$$

$$\text{Thus: } E[\ell''(\lambda)] = E \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f''}{f} \right] - E \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{f'}{f} \right)^2 \right] = E \left[\underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{f''}{f}}_{=0} \right] - E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] = -E[\ell'^2(\lambda)]$$

We can show that the first term on the RHS is zero:

$$\text{Start with: } 1 = \int f(x; \lambda) dx$$

$$\text{Take } \frac{d}{d\lambda}: \quad 0 = \int f' dx$$

$$\text{Take another } \frac{d}{d\lambda}: \quad 0 = \int f'' dx = \int \left[\frac{f''}{f} \right] f dx = E \left[\frac{f''}{f} \right]$$

$$\therefore \quad I(\lambda) = E[\ell'^2(\lambda)] = -E[\ell''(\lambda)]$$

For example, for N **independent** measurements of a Gaussian-distributed **random variable** x , we saw that the **log likelihood** was:

$$\ell(\alpha) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(x_i - \alpha)^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \text{constant}$$

$$\ell'(\alpha) = + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{x_i - \alpha}{\sigma_i^2}$$

$$\ell''(\alpha) = - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}$$

Thus:
$$I(\alpha) = E[\ell'^2(\alpha)] = -E[\ell''(\alpha)] = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}$$

And:
$$\sigma_\alpha^2 = \frac{1}{I(\alpha)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} \quad \text{as we have already seen.}$$

It is interesting to note, from the above, that for Gaussian-distributed measurements of a **random variable** x , the **Information** $I(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}$, is **constant**, independent of the x 's or their **expectation value**, and depends **only** on the individual σ 's.

Let us now look at measurements described by the **Poisson Distribution**:

$$P(n; v) = \frac{v^n}{n!} e^{-v} = \text{probability of observing } n \text{ events when } v \text{ are expected.}$$

We have already seen that: $E[n] = v$ and: $\sigma_n^2 = v$.

Suppose that we are studying some phenomenon which we believe is **Poisson distributed**. Let us consider, for example, an “experiment” in which we count for one minute, and that $x = n$, the number of counts recorded. We repeat the experiment N times, and then calculate the **likelihood**:

$$\mathcal{L} = \prod_{i=1}^N P(x_i; v) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{v^{x_i}}{(x_i)!} e^{-v}$$

$$\ell(v) = \ln \mathcal{L}(v) = \sum_{i=1}^N \{-v + x_i \ln v - \ln(x_i!)\}$$

$$\ell'(v) = \frac{d\ell(v)}{dv} = \frac{d \ln \mathcal{L}(v)}{dv} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ -1 + \frac{x_i}{v} \right\}$$

We solve for the value of $v = v^*$, at which $\ell'(v^*) = \frac{d\ell(v^*)}{dv} = 0$:

$$0 = \ell'(v) \Big|_{v=v^*} = \frac{d\ell(v)}{dv} \Big|_{v=v^*} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ -1 + \frac{x_i}{v^*} \right\} = -N + \frac{1}{v^*} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i = -N + \frac{1}{v^*} N \bar{x} = N \left(\frac{\bar{x}}{v^*} - 1 \right)$$

which yields the **estimator**: $S = v^* = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i = \bar{x}$, the **sample mean** – i.e. **simple/arithmetic mean**.

Note that **this** S **is** an **unbiased** estimator, since: $E[S] = \hat{x} = v^*$

We also have:

$$\ell'(v) = \frac{d\ell(v)}{dv} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{x_i}{v} - 1 \right\} = \frac{1}{v} \sum_{i=1}^N \{x_i - v\} = \frac{1}{v} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N x_i - Nv \right\} = \frac{1}{v} \{N\bar{x} - Nv\} = \frac{N}{v} \{\bar{x} - v\} = N \left\{ \frac{\bar{x}}{v} - 1 \right\}$$

But from above: $S = v^* = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i = \bar{x}$, the **sample mean**, and: $E[S] = v$

Thus:
$$\ell'(v) = \frac{N}{v} \{\bar{x} - v\} = \frac{N}{v} \{v^* - v\} = \frac{N}{v} \{S - E[S]\}$$

This **is** of the form: $\ell'(v) = r(v) \{S - E[S]\}$,

and is **the necessary** and **sufficient** condition such that **this** S **is** a **minimum variance estimator**!

Furthermore, we see from comparing the above $\ell'(v)$ relations, that: $\sigma_{v^*}^2 = \frac{1}{r(v^*)} = \frac{v^*}{N}$.

Now let us return to the **Maximum Likelihood Method (M.L.M.)**

We will show that this completely general method is **unbiased** and also gives **minimum variance** for the case of $N \rightarrow \infty$.

The M.L.M. takes $\ell(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda) \equiv \ln \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \lambda)$ and evaluates it for measured random variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N .

Then $\ell'(\lambda) = \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ell(\lambda) = \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is set to zero.

Let us assume that the solution for $\ell'(\lambda) = 0$ has only a single root, at: $\lambda = \lambda^*$.

Then the **estimator** S is just λ^* . Note that this **defines** the **estimator** S **implicitly**, rather than as an **explicit** function $S(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$.

In some cases (as in the previous examples, above), S turns out to be an **explicit** function $S(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$, but this will **not** be true in general.

In order to handle this, we expand $\ell'(\lambda)$ in a Taylor series about $\lambda = \lambda^*$:

$$\ell'(\lambda) = \underbrace{\ell'(\lambda^*)}_{=0} + (\lambda - \lambda^*) \ell''(\lambda^*) + \dots = (\lambda - \lambda^*) \ell''(\lambda^*) + \dots \quad \text{since } \ell'(\lambda^*) = 0.$$

Now:
$$\frac{\ell''(\lambda^*)}{N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left\{ \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)} \right\} \bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda^*}$$

If N is **large enough**, we **can** replace the **sample mean** $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i$ by the **expectation value** $E[Q]$.

\therefore for **large** N :
$$\frac{\ell''(\lambda^*)}{N} \Rightarrow E \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left\{ \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)} \right\} \bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda^*} \right]$$

Since the set of N measurements all originate from the **same** P.D.F., the **expectation value** on the RHS is the **same** for all i :

$$\ell''(\lambda^*) \Rightarrow NE \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left\{ \frac{f'(x_i; \lambda)}{f(x_i; \lambda)} \right\} \bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda^*} \right] = NE \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d^2}{d\lambda^2} \ln f(x_i; \lambda) \bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda^*} \right]$$

In fact, the expression on the right is just: $E[\ell''(\lambda)]_{\lambda=\lambda^*} = E[\ell''(\lambda^*)] = -I(\lambda^*)$

Thus, for N **large enough**, we can expand $\ell'(\lambda)$ in a Taylor series about $\lambda = \lambda^*$:

$$\ell'(\lambda) = (\lambda - \lambda^*) \ell''(\lambda^*) + \dots \approx -I(\lambda^*) (\lambda - \lambda^*) + \dots$$

We assume that higher orders can be neglected (for small $|\lambda - \lambda^*|$) and so:

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \ell(\lambda) = \ell'(\lambda) \approx -I(\lambda^*) (\lambda - \lambda^*) \quad (\text{n.b. } I(\lambda^*) \text{ is just a **number**.)}$$

Solving this 1st-order linear differential equation for $\ell(\lambda)$:

\therefore
$$\ell(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{2} I(\lambda^*) (\lambda - \lambda^*)^2 + \text{constant} = \ln \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$$

And thus:
$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = C e^{-(\lambda - \lambda^*)^2 / (2/I(\lambda^*))} = C e^{-(\lambda - \lambda^*)^2 / 2\sigma_\lambda^2}, \quad \text{with: } \sigma_\lambda^2 = \frac{1}{I(\lambda^*)}.$$

So for **large** N , we see that the **likelihood function** $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ **is** Gaussian near $\lambda = \lambda^*$ (the mean), and has a **variance** $\text{var}(\lambda) \equiv \sigma_\lambda^2 = 1/I(\lambda^*)$.

We are **estimating** λ , so we choose the **estimator** $S = \lambda^*$.

Since $\lambda^* = \hat{\lambda}$, we see that S is an **unbiased estimator** of λ .

Since $\ell'(\lambda) \simeq -I(\lambda^*)(\lambda - \lambda^*) = I(\lambda^*)\{S - E[S]\}$, which is of the general form:

$$\ell'(\lambda) = r(\lambda)\{S - E[S]\}, \text{ hence: } \sigma_\lambda^2 = \frac{1}{r(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{I(\lambda^*)}.$$

Thus, we also see that $S = \lambda^*$ is a minimum variance estimator of λ .

Summary:

In the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the Maximum Likelihood Method (M.L.M.) gives an estimate of the parameter λ which is unbiased and of minimum variance. The likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is Gaussian. The mean of the parameter λ is λ^* , the variance of the parameter λ is given by:

$$\sigma_\lambda^2 = \sigma_{\lambda^*}^2 = \frac{1}{I(\lambda^*)} = -\frac{1}{E[\ell''(\lambda^*)]} = \frac{1}{E[\ell'^2(\lambda^*)]}$$

Warning:

In practice, the M.L.M. is often used for N very much less than ∞ . No general rules exist to determine whether all of these results hold for finite N , e.g. how much Bias an estimator S may have, how far from minimum variance the solution will be, etc. These details will depend on the particular $f(x; \lambda)$ as well as N . Proceed with due caution in such situations!