

Inverse Problems in Semiparametric Statistical Models

Guang Cheng

Department of Statistics, Purdue University

Applied Inverse Problems Conference
March 24th, 2011

Outline

Introduction

- Semiparametric Models
- Examples

Theoretical Foundations

- Intuition
- Rigorous Statement
- Semiparametric Efficient Estimation

Semiparametric Inferences

- Bootstrap Inferences
- Profile Sampler
- Sieve Estimation

Future (Theoretical) Directions

Semiparametric Models

- ▶ We observe i.i.d. data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{P_{\theta,\eta} : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$

Semiparametric Models

- ▶ We observe i.i.d. data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{P_{\theta,\eta} : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$
 - ▶ θ : Euclidean parameter of **interest**;

Semiparametric Models

- ▶ We observe i.i.d. data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{P_{\theta,\eta} : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$
 - ▶ θ : Euclidean parameter of **interest**;
 - ▶ η : an infinite dimensional *nuisance* parameter, e.g. some function.

Semiparametric Models

- ▶ We observe i.i.d. data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{P_{\theta,\eta} : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$
 - ▶ θ : Euclidean parameter of **interest**;
 - ▶ η : an infinite dimensional *nuisance* parameter, e.g. some function.
- ▶ Given the above observations, we intend to make inferences on the Euclidean parameter θ in the presence of an infinite dimensional nuisance parameter η :

Semiparametric Models

- ▶ We observe i.i.d. data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{P_{\theta,\eta} : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$
 - ▶ θ : Euclidean parameter of **interest**;
 - ▶ η : an infinite dimensional *nuisance* parameter, e.g. some function.
- ▶ Given the above observations, we intend to make inferences on the Euclidean parameter θ in the presence of an infinite dimensional nuisance parameter η :
 - ▶ give a consistent estimate $\hat{\theta}$;

Semiparametric Models

- ▶ We observe i.i.d. data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{P_{\theta,\eta} : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$
 - ▶ θ : Euclidean parameter of **interest**;
 - ▶ η : an infinite dimensional *nuisance* parameter, e.g. some function.
- ▶ Given the above observations, we intend to make inferences on the Euclidean parameter θ in the presence of an infinite dimensional nuisance parameter η :
 - ▶ give a consistent estimate $\hat{\theta}$;
 - ▶ give a confidence interval/credible set (hypothesis testing) for θ

Semiparametric Models

- ▶ We observe i.i.d. data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim \{P_{\theta,\eta} : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k, \eta \in \mathcal{H}\}$
 - ▶ θ : Euclidean parameter of **interest**;
 - ▶ η : an infinite dimensional *nuisance* parameter, e.g. some function.
- ▶ Given the above observations, we intend to make inferences on the Euclidean parameter θ in the presence of an infinite dimensional nuisance parameter η :
 - ▶ give a consistent estimate $\hat{\theta}$;
 - ▶ give a confidence interval/credible set (hypothesis testing) for θ
- ▶ Even we are only interested in θ , the estimation of η is usually unavoidable.

Model I. Cox Regression Model with Current Status Data

The hazard function of the survival time T of a subject with covariate Z is modelled as:

$$\lambda(t|z) \equiv \lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta} Pr(t \leq T < t + \Delta | T \geq t, Z = z) = \lambda(t) \exp(\theta' z),$$

where λ is an unspecified baseline hazard function.

Consider the current status data in which the event time T is unobservable but we know whether the event has occurred at the examination time C or not. Thus, we observe $X = (C, \delta, Z)$, where $\delta = I\{T \leq C\}$.

Based on the above proportional hazard assumption, we can write down the log-likelihood as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X) \\ &= \delta \log [1 - \exp(-\exp(\theta'Z)\eta(C))] - (1 - \delta) \exp(\theta'Z)\eta(C), \end{aligned}$$

where the nuisance (**monotone**) function $\eta(y) \equiv \int_0^y \lambda(t)dt$, also called as cumulative hazard function.

Example II: Conditionally Normal Model

We assume that $Y|(W = w, Z = z) \sim N(\theta'w, \eta(z))$. The log-likelihood can be easily written as

$$\log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \eta(Z) - \frac{(Y - \theta'W)^2}{2\eta(Z)},$$

where $\eta(z)$ is **positive**.

Model III. Partly Linear Model

We assume that

$$Y = \theta'W + \eta(Z) + \epsilon,$$

where ϵ is independent of (W, Z) and η is an unknown **smooth** function belonging to second order Sobolev space. We assume that ϵ is normally distributed (can be relaxed to some tail conditions).

Model IV. Semiparametric Copula Model

We observe random vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ with multivariate distribution function $F(x_1, \dots, x_d)$, and want to estimate the dependence structure in X . To avoid the curse of dimensionality, we will apply the following Copula approach.

According to Sklar (1959), there exists a unique Copula function $C_0(\cdot)$ such that

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_d) = C_0(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_d(x_d)),$$

where $F_j(\cdot)$ is the marginal distribution for X_j .

To model the dependence within X , we use the parametric Copula $C_\theta(\cdot)$, i.e., $C_{\theta_0} = C_0$. Thus, the log-likelihood is written as

$$\log \text{lik}(\theta, F_1, \dots, F_d)(X) = \log c_\theta(F_1(X_1), \dots, F_d(X_d)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \log f_j(X_j),$$

where f_j is the marginal density function and

$$c_\theta(t_1, \dots, t_d) = \frac{\partial^d}{\partial t_1 \dots \partial t_d} C_\theta(t_1, \dots, t_d).$$

Semiparametric Efficiency Bound

- ▶ We hope to obtain the **semiparametric efficient estimate** $\hat{\theta}$, which achieves the minimal asymptotic variance bound in the sense that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V^*),$$

where V^* is the minimal one over all the regular semiparametric estimators.

Semiparametric Efficiency Bound

- ▶ We hope to obtain the **semiparametric efficient estimate** $\hat{\theta}$, which achieves the minimal asymptotic variance bound in the sense that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V^*),$$

where V^* is the minimal one over all the regular semiparametric estimators.

- ▶ **IDEA:** The minimal V^* actually corresponds to the largest asymptotic variance over all the parametric submodels $\{t \mapsto \log \text{lik}(t, \eta_t) : t \in \Theta\}$ of the semiparametric model in consideration. The parametric submodel achieving V^* is called as the *least favorable submodel (LFS)*, see Bickel et al (1996).

Intuition I

- ▶ Now, let us turn our attention to LFS defined as

$$t \mapsto \log \text{lik}(t, \eta_t^*),$$

where η_t^* is called as the least favorable curve.

Intuition I

- ▶ Now, let us turn our attention to LFS defined as

$$t \mapsto \log \text{lik}(t, \eta_t^*),$$

where η_t^* is called as the least favorable curve.

- ▶ The LFS needs to pass the true value (θ_0, η_0) , i.e., $\eta_{\theta_0}^* = \eta_0$, and has the corresponding information matrix as

$$\tilde{l}_0 = E \tilde{\ell}_0 \tilde{\ell}_0', \quad \text{where } \tilde{\ell}_0 \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=\theta_0} \log(t, \eta_t^*).$$

(This is just the usual way to calculate the information in parametric models)

Intuition I

- ▶ Now, let us turn our attention to LFS defined as

$$t \mapsto \log \text{lik}(t, \eta_t^*),$$

where η_t^* is called as the least favorable curve.

- ▶ The LFS needs to pass the true value (θ_0, η_0) , i.e., $\eta_{\theta_0}^* = \eta_0$, and has the corresponding information matrix as

$$\tilde{I}_0 = E \tilde{\ell}_0 \tilde{\ell}_0', \quad \text{where } \tilde{\ell}_0 \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=\theta_0} \log(t, \eta_t^*).$$

(This is just the usual way to calculate the information in parametric models)

- ▶ Obviously, $V^* = \tilde{I}_0^{-1}$.

Intuition II

What is the mysterious η_t^* ?

Intuition II

What is the mysterious η_t^* ?

- ▶ In fact, Severini and Wong (1992) discovered that

$$\eta_t^* = \arg \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} E \log \text{lik}(t, \eta) \quad \text{for any fixed } t \in \Theta$$

after some simple derivations! This is not surprising since η_t^* behaves like the true value for η at each fixed θ .

Intuition III

- ▶ According to our discussions on LFS in the above, we expect to obtain an efficient estimate of θ if we can estimate the abstract LFS, i.e., η_t^* , accurately.

Intuition III

- ▶ According to our discussions on LFS in the above, we expect to obtain an efficient estimate of θ if we can estimate the abstract LFS, i.e., η_t^* , accurately.
- ▶ Let $S_n(\theta) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \hat{\eta}_\theta)(X_i)$.

Intuition III

- ▶ According to our discussions on LFS in the above, we expect to obtain an efficient estimate of θ if we can estimate the abstract LFS, i.e., η_t^* , accurately.
- ▶ Let $S_n(\theta) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \hat{\eta}_\theta)(X_i)$.
- ▶ In fact, we can easily show that

$$\hat{\theta} \equiv \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} S_n(\theta),$$

is semiparametric efficient if $\hat{\eta}_t$ is a consistent estimate for η_t^* .

Intuition III

- ▶ According to our discussions on LFS in the above, we expect to obtain an efficient estimate of θ if we can estimate the abstract LFS, i.e., η_t^* , accurately.
- ▶ Let $S_n(\theta) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \hat{\eta}_\theta)(X_i)$.
- ▶ In fact, we can easily show that

$$\hat{\theta} \equiv \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} S_n(\theta),$$

is semiparametric efficient if $\hat{\eta}_t$ is a consistent estimate for η_t^* .

- ▶ Therefore, we can claim that the efficient estimation of θ boils down to the estimation of the least favorable curve η_t^* .

Summary

Efficient estimation of θ in presence of an infinite dimensional η



Least favorable submodel: $t \mapsto \log \text{lik}(t, \eta_t^*)$



Consistent estimation of η_t^*

Summary

Efficient estimation of θ in presence of an infinite dimensional η



Least favorable submodel: $t \mapsto \log \text{lik}(t, \eta_t^*)$



Consistent estimation of η_t^*

- ▶ The estimation accuracy of η_t^* , i.e., convergence rate, determines the second order efficiency of $\hat{\theta}$ (Cheng and Kosorok, 2008);

Summary

Efficient estimation of θ in presence of an infinite dimensional η



Least favorable submodel: $t \mapsto \log \text{lik}(t, \eta_t^*)$



Consistent estimation of η_t^*

- ▶ The estimation accuracy of η_t^* , i.e., convergence rate, determines the second order efficiency of $\hat{\theta}$ (Cheng and Kosorok, 2008);
- ▶ How we estimate η_t^* depends on the parameter space \mathcal{H}_t , and different regularizations on η_t^* gives different forms of $\hat{\theta}$, see four examples to be presented.

Rigorous Statement

- ▶ In semiparametric literature,
 $\tilde{\ell}_0$ is called as Efficient Score Function;
 \tilde{I}_0 is called as Efficient Information Matrix.

Rigorous Statement

- ▶ In semiparametric literature,
 $\tilde{\ell}_0$ is called as Efficient Score Function;
 \tilde{I}_0 is called as Efficient Information Matrix.
- ▶ In fact, the efficient score function can be understood as the residual of the projection of the score function for θ onto the tangent space, which is defined as the closed linear span of the tangent set generated by the score function for η .

Rigorous Statement

- ▶ In semiparametric literature,
 $\tilde{\ell}_0$ is called as Efficient Score Function;
 \tilde{I}_0 is called as Efficient Information Matrix.
- ▶ In fact, the efficient score function can be understood as the residual of the projection of the score function for θ onto the tangent space, which is defined as the closed linear span of the tangent set generated by the score function for η .
- ▶ The LFS exists if the tangent set is closed. This is true for all of our examples in this talk.

Semiparametric Efficient Estimation

- ▶ As discussed above, we need to estimate η_t^* consistently in order to obtain the efficient $\hat{\theta}$. Recall that

$$\eta_t^* = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} E \log \text{lik}(t, \eta).$$

Semiparametric Efficient Estimation

- ▶ As discussed above, we need to estimate η_t^* consistently in order to obtain the efficient $\hat{\theta}$. Recall that

$$\eta_t^* = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} E \log \text{lik}(t, \eta).$$

- ▶ Therefore, a natural estimate for η_θ^* is

$$\hat{\eta}_\theta = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i) \quad (1)$$

for any fixed $\theta \in \Theta$.

- ▶ In the above, $\hat{\eta}_\theta$ is the NPMLE, $S_n(\theta)$ is just the profile likelihood $\log p_{I_n}(\theta)$, and $\hat{\theta}$ becomes the semiparametric MLE.
- ▶ The above maximum likelihood estimation works for our example I, i.e., Cox model, due to **monotone** constraints (see the work by Jon Wellner and his coauthors). However, the NPMLE is not always well defined. Thus, some form of regularization is needed especially when η needs to be estimated smoothly.

- ▶ Kernel estimation: This is particularly useful when η_θ^* has an explicit form. In our example II, i.e., conditionally normal model, we have

$$\hat{\eta}_{\theta, b_n}(z) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y - \theta' W)^2 K((z - Z_i)/b_n)}{\sum_{i=1}^n K((z - Z_i)/b_n)} > 0, \quad (2)$$

where $K(\cdot)$ is some kernel function and b_n is the related bandwidth.

- ▶ Penalized estimation: In our example III, i.e., partly linear model, we have

$$\hat{\eta}_{\theta, \lambda_n} = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i) - \lambda_n \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [\eta^{(2)}(z)]^2 dz \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where λ_n is some smoothing parameter.

- ▶ Penalized estimation: In our example III, i.e., partly linear model, we have

$$\hat{\eta}_{\theta, \lambda_n} = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i) - \lambda_n \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [\eta^{(2)}(z)]^2 dz \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where λ_n is some smoothing parameter.

- ▶ In the penalized estimation, we need to construct the penalized LFS, see Cheng and Kosorok (2009).

- ▶ Penalized estimation: In our example III, i.e., partly linear model, we have

$$\hat{\eta}_{\theta, \lambda_n} = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i) - \lambda_n \int_{\mathcal{Z}} [\eta^{(2)}(z)]^2 dz \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where λ_n is some smoothing parameter.

- ▶ In the penalized estimation, we need to construct the penalized LFS, see Cheng and Kosorok (2009).
- ▶ In this example, $\hat{\theta}$ is just the partial smoothing spline estimate.

- ▶ Sieve estimation: Here, we perform similar maximum likelihood estimation but replace the infinite dimensional parameter space \mathcal{H} by its sieve approximation \mathcal{H}_n , e.g., B-spline space.

- ▶ Sieve estimation: Here, we perform similar maximum likelihood estimation but replace the infinite dimensional parameter space \mathcal{H} by its sieve approximation \mathcal{H}_n , e.g., B-spline space.
- ▶ In our example IV, i.e., semiparametric copula model, we have

$$\hat{\eta}_{\theta, s_n} = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_n = \{\eta(\cdot) = \sum_{s=1}^{s_n} \gamma_s B_s(\cdot)\}$ is the B-spline space.

- ▶ Sieve estimation: Here, we perform similar maximum likelihood estimation but replace the infinite dimensional parameter space \mathcal{H} by its sieve approximation \mathcal{H}_n , e.g., B-spline space.
- ▶ In our example IV, i.e., semiparametric copula model, we have

$$\hat{\eta}_{\theta, s_n} = \arg \max_{\eta \in \mathcal{H}_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_n = \{\eta(\cdot) = \sum_{s=1}^{s_n} \gamma_s B_s(\cdot)\}$ is the B-spline space.

- ▶ An advantage of B-spline estimation is that we can transform the semiparametric estimation into the parametric estimation with increasing dimension as sample size.

Remark

- ▶ Under regularity conditions, all the above four estimation approaches yield the semiparametric efficient $\hat{\theta}$, see Cheng (2011) for more details.

Remark

- ▶ Under regularity conditions, all the above four estimation approaches yield the semiparametric efficient $\hat{\theta}$, see Cheng (2011) for more details.
- ▶ Cheng and Kosorok (2008) show that the second order semiparametric efficiency of $\hat{\theta}$ is determined by the smoothing parameters, i.e., b_n , λ_n and s_n , and the size of \mathcal{H} (in terms of entropy number).

Remark

- ▶ Under regularity conditions, all the above four estimation approaches yield the semiparametric efficient $\hat{\theta}$, see Cheng (2011) for more details.
- ▶ Cheng and Kosorok (2008) show that the second order semiparametric efficiency of $\hat{\theta}$ is determined by the smoothing parameters, i.e., b_n , λ_n and s_n , and the size of \mathcal{H} (in terms of entropy number).
- ▶ In some situations, it might be more proper to use other criterion function than the likelihood function, e.g., use the least square criterion function in the partly linear model (replace $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ by the sub-exponential tail condition).

In the end, I describe three (almost) automatic semiparametric inferential tools for obtaining the semiparametric efficient estimate and constructing the confidence interval/credible set in the literature.

In the end, I describe three (almost) automatic semiparametric inferential tools for obtaining the semiparametric efficient estimate and constructing the confidence interval/credible set in the literature.

- ▶ Bootstrap Inferences [Cheng and Huang (2010)]

In the end, I describe three (almost) automatic semiparametric inferential tools for obtaining the semiparametric efficient estimate and constructing the confidence interval/credible set in the literature.

- ▶ Bootstrap Inferences [Cheng and Huang (2010)]
- ▶ Profile Sampler [Lee, Kosorok and Fine (2005)]

In the end, I describe three (almost) automatic semiparametric inferential tools for obtaining the semiparametric efficient estimate and constructing the confidence interval/credible set in the literature.

- ▶ Bootstrap Inferences [Cheng and Huang (2010)]
- ▶ Profile Sampler [Lee, Kosorok and Fine (2005)]
- ▶ Sieve Estimation [Chen (2007)]

Bootstrap Inferences

The bootstrap resampling approach has the following well known advantages:

Bootstrap Inferences

The bootstrap resampling approach has the following well known advantages:

- ▶ Automatic procedure;

Bootstrap Inferences

The bootstrap resampling approach has the following well known advantages:

- ▶ Automatic procedure;
- ▶ Small sample advantages;

Bootstrap Inferences

The bootstrap resampling approach has the following well known advantages:

- ▶ Automatic procedure;
- ▶ Small sample advantages;
- ▶ Replace the tedious theoretical derivations in semiparametric inferences with routine simulations of bootstrap samples, e.g., the bootstrap confidence interval.

- The bootstrap estimator is defined as

$$(\hat{\theta}^*, \hat{\eta}^*) = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i^*), \quad (5)$$

where (X_1^*, \dots, X_n^*) is the bootstrap sample.

- ▶ The bootstrap estimator is defined as

$$(\hat{\theta}^*, \hat{\eta}^*) = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \eta \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \eta)(X_i^*), \quad (5)$$

where (X_1^*, \dots, X_n^*) is the bootstrap sample.

- ▶ Recently, Cheng and Huang (2010) showed that (i) $\hat{\theta}^*$ has the same asymptotic distribution as the semiparametric efficient $\hat{\theta}$; (ii) the bootstrap confidence interval is theoretically valid, for a general class of exchangeably weighted bootstrap resampling schemes, e.g., Efron's bootstrap and Bayesian bootstrap.

Profile Sampler

Profile Sampler

- ▶ We assign some prior $\rho(\theta)$ on the profile likelihood $\log p|_n(\theta)$. MCMC is used for sampling from the posterior of the profile likelihood. This resulting MCMC chain is called as the **profile sampler**.

Profile Sampler

- ▶ We assign some prior $\rho(\theta)$ on the profile likelihood $\log pI_n(\theta)$. MCMC is used for sampling from the posterior of the profile likelihood. This resulting MCMC chain is called as the **profile sampler**.
- ▶ The inferences of θ are based on the profile sampler. Lee, Kosorok and Fine (2005) showed that chain mean (the inverse of chain variance) approximates the semiparametric efficient $\hat{\theta}$ (\tilde{I}_0), and the credible set for θ has the desired asymptotic coverage probability.

Sieve Estimation

- ▶ Translate the semiparametric estimation into the parametric estimation with increasing dimension:

$$(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\gamma}) = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta, \gamma \in \Gamma} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \gamma' B)(X_i).$$

Sieve Estimation

- ▶ Translate the semiparametric estimation into the parametric estimation with increasing dimension:

$$(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\gamma}) = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta, \gamma \in \Gamma} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \text{lik}(\theta, \gamma' B)(X_i).$$

- ▶ An advantage of B-spline estimation is that we are able to give an explicit B-spline estimate for the asymptotic variance V^* as a byproduct of the establishment of semiparametric efficiency of $\hat{\theta}$. Indeed, it is simply the observed information matrix if we treat the semiparametric model as a parametric one after the B-spline approximation, i.e., $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_n$.

Future (Theoretical) Directions

- ▶ Limiting distribution of $\hat{\eta}$ (expected to be nonstandard, e.g., Chernoff's distribution);

Future (Theoretical) Directions

- ▶ Limiting distribution of $\hat{\eta}$ (expected to be nonstandard, e.g., Chernoff's distribution);
- ▶ Bootstrap Inferences for η (parametric bootstrap or m out of n bootstrap for nonstandard asymptotics);

Future (Theoretical) Directions

- ▶ Limiting distribution of $\hat{\eta}$ (expected to be nonstandard, e.g., Chernoff's distribution);
- ▶ Bootstrap Inferences for η (parametric bootstrap or m out of n bootstrap for nonstandard asymptotics);
- ▶ Joint inferences for (θ, η) (extremely difficult.....);

Thanks for your attention....

Assistant Professor Guang Cheng
Department of Statistics, Purdue University
chengg@purdue.edu