

# 1. Introduction

Welcome to the series of E-learning modules on Likelihood Ratio Test Procedure. In this module we are going to cover the basic terminology, concepts and principles of Likelihood Ratio Test Procedure, properties and the test criteria of Likelihood Ratio Test Procedure.

By the end of this session, you will be able to:

- Describe the basic terminologies of Likelihood Ratio Test Procedure (or LRTP)
- Explain the fundamental concept and principle of LRTP
- Describe the properties and test procedure of LRTP

In any testing problem, the following should be obvious from the description of the problem:

- The form of the population distribution
- The parameters of interest and
- The framing of a null and alternative hypothesis

The most crucial step is the choice of the best test that is the best statistic and the critical region  $C$

By best we mean the one which in addition to controlling  $\alpha$  at any desired low level has the minimum type two error  $\beta$ , or maximum power  $1 - \beta$  compared to  $\beta$  of all other tests having this  $\alpha$ .

This leads to Most Powerful test and Uniformly Most Powerful tests.

Most Powerful test is the test procedure used to test the simple null hypothesis against a simple alternative hypothesis.

However when we need to test a simple or composite null hypothesis against a simple or composite alternative hypothesis the test procedure adopted is known as a Uniformly Most Powerful test.

Neymann Pearson Lemma based on the magnitude of the ratio of the two probability density functions provides the best test for testing a simple null hypothesis against a simple alternative hypothesis.

The best test in any given situation depends upon the *nature of the population distribution* and the *form of the alternative hypothesis* being considered.

In this topic we shall discuss a general method of test construction called the Likelihood Ratio.

A test was introduced by Neyman and Pearson for testing a hypothesis simple or composite against a simple or composite alternative hypothesis. This test is related to the maximum likelihood estimates.

Before defining the test let us discuss about some notations and terminologies.

Parameter space:

Let us consider a random variable  $X$  with probability density function  $f$  of  $(x, \theta)$ .

In most common applications, though not always, the functional form of population distribution is assumed to be known except for the value of some unknown parameter  $\theta$  which may take any value on a set  $\Omega$ .

This is expressed by writing a probability density function in the form  $f(x, \theta)$

$\theta$  belongs to  $\Omega$ .

The set  $\Omega$  which is the set of all possible values of  $\theta$  is called the parameter space. Such a situation gives rise not to one probability distribution but a family of probability distributions which we write as  $\{f(x, \theta) : \theta \in \Omega\}$ .

For example:  $X$  follows Normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ , then the parameter space  $\Omega$  is equal to  $\{(\mu, \sigma^2) : -\infty < \mu < \infty, 0 < \sigma^2 < \infty\}$

In the following discussion we shall consider a general family of distributions

$\{f(x, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_k) : \theta_i \in \Omega_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$

Let  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  be a random sample of size  $n$  greater than one from a population with p. d.  $f$ ,

$F(x, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_k)$ , where  $\Omega$ , the parameter space, is the totality of all the points that  $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_k)$ , can assume.

Then we are interested to test the null hypothesis that  $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_k)$  belongs to the parameter space under the null hypothesis against alternative hypothesis of the type

$H_0: (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_k) \in \Omega_0$  belongs to the parameter space under the alternative hypothesis where parameter space under the alternative hypothesis is equal to  $\Omega - \Omega_0$ .

Hence the entire parameter space  $\Omega$  can be thought to be composed of two sub parameter spaces, namely parameter space under the null hypothesis and parameter space under the alternative hypothesis.

That is,  $\Omega = \Omega_0 \cup \Omega_1$

Where the symbol " $\Omega_0$ " is the parameter space under the null hypothesis  $H_0$  which belongs to the parameter space  $\Omega$  and the symbol " $\Omega_1$ " is the parameter space under the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  which is also a part of the parameter space  $\Omega$ .

## 2. Maximum Likelihood Estimates

A likelihood function of a number of sample observations is defined to be their joint density function.

To obtain a maximum likelihood estimate, one first specifies the joint density function for all observations.

For an independently identically distributed sample, this joint density function is,  $F$  of  $(x_1, x_2, \text{ etc till } x_n, \theta)$  is equal to  $f$  of  $(x_1, \theta)$  into  $f$  of  $(x_2, \theta)$  into etc  $f$  of  $(x_n, \theta)$ .

In case the sample observations are independent, the likelihood function happens to be the product of the density functions of the random observations. Then, the likelihood function of the random observations denoted by  $L$  is equal to  $L$  of  $(x_1, x_2, \text{ etc till } x_n, \theta)$  is given by product of  $f$  of  $(x_i, \theta)$ ;  $i$  runs from one to  $n$ , where  $f$  of  $(x_i, \theta)$  is the probability density function of the population.

The method of maximum likelihood is the one in which for a given set of values  $x_1, x_2, \text{ etc till } x_n$  an estimator of  $\theta$  is found that maximizes  $L$ .

Thus if there exists  $\theta_{\text{cap}}$ , a function of  $x_1, x_2, \text{ etc till } x_n$  for which  $L$  is maximum for variations in  $\theta$ .

Which implies  $\theta_{\text{cap}}$  is the m.l.e of  $\theta$ , and then  $\Delta L$  by  $\Delta \theta$  is equal to zero and  $\Delta^2 L$  by  $\Delta \theta^2$  is less than zero.

Substituting these estimates we obtain the maximum values of the likelihood function for the variation of the parameters in the parameter space.

Then the criteria for the likelihood ratio tests are defined as the quotient of these two maxima that is maximum under parameter space under the null hypothesis and a total parameter space.

In statistics, a likelihood ratio test is a statistical test used to compare the fit of two models, one of which (the null model) is a special case of the other (the alternative model).

The test is based on the likelihood ratio, which expresses how many times more likely the data are under one model than the other.

This likelihood ratio, or equivalently its logarithm, can then be used to compute a p-value, or compared to a critical value to decide whether to reject the null model in favour of the alternative model.

When the logarithm of the likelihood ratio is used, the statistic is known as a *log-likelihood ratio statistic*, and the probability distribution of this test statistic, assuming that the null model is true, can be approximated using Wilks' theorem.

In the case of distinguishing between two models, each of which has no unknown parameters, use of the likelihood ratio test can be justified by the Neyman–Pearson lemma, which demonstrates that such a test has the highest power among all competitors.

Suppose a composite null hypothesis  $H_0$  that  $\theta$  belongs to the parameter space

under the null hypothesis  $H_0$ , is to be tested against a composite alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  that  $\theta$  belongs to parameter space under the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$ .

For testing the above null hypothesis a test procedure called Likelihood ratio test procedure is followed which is explained as follows:

Let a random sample  $x_1, x_2$  etc till  $x_n$  of size  $n$  be drawn from the given population with probability density function,  $f(x, \theta)$ .

Let  $\lambda$  be equal to  $\frac{\sup_{\theta \in \omega_0} L(\theta, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)}{\sup_{\theta \in \omega} L(\theta, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)}$  when  $\theta$  belongs to the parameter space under the null hypothesis  $H_0$  divided by  $\sup_{\theta \in \omega} L(\theta, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  when  $\theta$  belongs to the entire parameter space  $\omega$ .

Since the supremum in the denominator is over a larger set of numbers,  $\lambda \leq 1$ .

Also likelihood functions are nonnegative and hence  $\lambda \geq 0$ .

Thus  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ .

That is, the test procedure is as follows.

If  $\lambda$  is very large that is  $\lambda \geq \lambda_\alpha$ , the null hypothesis is accepted and if  $\lambda$  is very small that is  $\lambda < \lambda_\alpha$  the null hypothesis is to be rejected.

The constant  $\lambda_\alpha$  is so chosen that the size of the test is  $\alpha$ .

# 3. The Principle of LRTP

If the null hypothesis is true the sample drawn must have a larger likelihood under null hypothesis so that the numerator of lambda may be larger and consequently lambda may be larger.

So for higher values of lambda the null hypothesis may be accepted and if the value of lambda is small, the hypothesis may be rejected.

## Background

The likelihood ratio, often denoted by the capital Greek letter lambda, is the ratio of the likelihood function varying the parameters over two different sets in the numerator and denominator.

A likelihood-ratio test is a statistical test for making a decision between two hypotheses based on the value of this ratio.

It is central to the Neyman–Pearson approach to statistical hypothesis testing, and, like statistical hypothesis testing generally, is both widely used and much criticized.

## Interpretation

Being a function of the data  $x_i$ , the Likelihood ratio lambda is therefore a statistic.

The likelihood-ratio test rejects the null hypothesis if the value of this statistic is too small.

How small is too small depends on the significance level of the test, that is, on what probability of Type one error is considered tolerable ("Type one" errors consist of the rejection of a null hypothesis that is true).

The numerator corresponds to the maximum likelihood of an observed outcome under the null hypothesis.

The denominator corresponds to the maximum likelihood of an observed outcome varying parameters over the whole parameter space.

The numerator of this ratio is less than the denominator.

The likelihood ratio hence is between zero and one.

Lower values of the likelihood ratio mean that the observed result was much less likely to occur under the null hypothesis as compared to the alternative.

Higher values of the statistic mean that the observed outcome was more than or equally likely or nearly as likely to occur under the null hypothesis as compared to the alternative and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Hence the statistic lambda is bound to be between zero and one. (Likelihoods are non-negative and the likelihood of the smaller model can't exceed that of the larger model because it is *nested* on it).

Values close to zero indicate that the smaller model is not acceptable, compared to the larger model, because it would make the observed data very unlikely. Values close to one indicate that the smaller model is almost as good as the large model, making the data just as likely.

# 4. Assumptions of the Model

## Assumptions of the model can be tested using LRTP

1. Calculate the maximum likelihood of the sample data based on an assumed distribution model (the maximum occurs when unknown parameters are replaced by their maximum likelihood estimates).

Repeat this calculation for other candidate distribution models that also appear to fit the data (based on probability plots).

If all the models have the same number of unknown parameters, and there is no convincing reason to choose one particular model over another based on the failure mechanism or previous successful analyses, then pick the model with the largest likelihood value.

2. Many model assumptions can be viewed as putting restrictions on the parameters in a likelihood expression that effectively reduce the total number of unknown parameters.

Example where assumptions can be tested by the Likelihood Ratio Test

It is suspected that a type of data, typically modelled by a Weibull distribution, can be fit adequately by an exponential model.

The exponential distribution is a special case of the Weibull, with the shape parameter gamma set to one.

If we write the Weibull likelihood function for the data, the exponential model likelihood function is obtained by setting gamma to one, and the number of unknown parameters has been reduced from two to one.

Clearly, we could come up with many more examples like this, for which an important assumption can be restated as a reduction or restriction on the number of parameters used to formulate the likelihood function of the data.

In all these cases, there is a simple and very useful way to test whether the assumption is consistent with the data.

Alternate Method for The Likelihood Ratio Test Procedure

Let  $L_{one}$  be the maximum value of the likelihood of the data without the additional assumption.

In other words,  $L_{one}$  is the likelihood of the data with all the parameters unrestricted and maximum likelihood estimates substituted for these parameters.

Let  $L_{naught}$  be the maximum value of the likelihood when the parameters are restricted (and reduced in number) based on the assumption.

Assume  $k$  parameters were lost (i.e.,  $L_{naught}$  has  $k$  less parameters than  $L_{one}$ ).

Form the ratio  $\lambda$  is equal to  $L_{naught}$  by  $L_{one}$ .

This ratio is always between zero and one and the less likely the assumption is, the smaller  $\lambda$  will be.

Under certain regularity conditions, minus twice the log of the likelihood ratio has

approximately in large samples a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the difference in the number of parameters between the two models.

Since  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ ,  $-2 \ln \lambda$  is an increasing function of  $\lambda$  and approaches infinity when  $\lambda$  tends to zero.

The critical region for  $-2 \ln \lambda$  being the right hand tail of the Chi square distribution.

This can be quantified at a given confidence level as follows:

- Calculate chi square is equal to  $-2 \ln \lambda$ . The smaller  $\lambda$  is, the larger chi square will be.
- We can tell when chi square is significantly large by comparing it to the  $(1 - \alpha)$  percentile point of a Chi Square distribution with  $k$  degrees of freedom.
- The likelihood ratio test computes chi square and rejects the assumption if chi square is larger than a Chi-Square percentile with  $k$  degrees of freedom, where the percentile corresponds to the confidence level chosen by the analyst.

# 5. Demerits, Applications and Properties

## Demerits:

While Likelihood Ratio test procedures are very useful and widely applicable, the computations are difficult to perform by hand, especially for censored data, and appropriate software is necessary.

The tests discussed in this paper are asymptotically equivalent, and are therefore expected to give similar results in large samples.

Their small-sample properties are not known, but some simulation studies suggest that the likelihood ratio test may be better than its competitors in small samples.

## Applications:

Likelihood ratio may refer to:

- The ratio of two likelihood functions
- Likelihood-ratio test, a statistical test for comparing two models
- Likelihood ratios in diagnostic testing, ratios based on sensitivity and specificity, used to assess diagnostic tests
- Bayes factor, ratio of likelihoods used to update prior probabilities to posterior in Bayes' theorem and Bayesian inference

## Properties of LRTP

Likelihood Ratio Test principle is an intuitive one.

If we are testing a simple null hypothesis against a simple alternative hypothesis, then the Likelihood Ratio Principle leads to the same test as given by Neyman Pearson Lemma.

This suggests that Likelihood Ratio Test has some desirable properties, especially large sample properties.

In Likelihood ratio test the probability of Type one error is controlled by suitably choosing the cut off point  $\lambda$ .

Likelihood ratio test is generally Uniformly Most Powerful if an UMP test at all exists.

The important asymptotic properties of Likelihood ratio test are:

- Under certain conditions  $-2 \ln \lambda$  has an asymptotic Chi square distribution that is  $-2 \ln \lambda$  is distributed as central Chi square when null hypothesis holds
- Under certain conditions Likelihood ratio test is consistent
- LR test procedure is at least asymptotically unbiased

This is because as 'n' tends to infinity  $P_T$  of  $\theta$  tends to one for all  $\theta$  belongs to the parameter space under alternative hypothesis by consistency and therefore infimum of  $P_T$  of  $\theta$  when  $\theta$  belongs to the parameter space under alternative hypothesis is equal to one is greater than or equal to Supremum of  $P_T$  of  $\theta$  when  $\theta$  belongs to the parameter space under null hypothesis.



Here's a summary of our learning in this session:

- Basic concept of terminologies used in Likelihood ratio test
- Principle and Properties of the test
- Procedure to construct likelihood ratio test and its application