11: Moment-Generating Functions

PSTAT 120A: Summer 2022

Ethan P. Marzban July 20, 2022

University of California, Santa Barbara

- Axioms of Probability, Probability Spaces, Counting
- Conditional Probabilities, independence, etc.
- Basics of Random Variables (classification, p.m.f., c.m.f., moments)
- Discrete Distributions
- Continuous Distributions
- Transformations of Random Variables
- Double Integrals
- Random Vectors and the basics of multivariate probability
- Independence of random variables, and covariance/correlation
- Sums of Random Variables; Indicators

Moment Generating Functions

Leadup

- Suppose we have two random variables X and Y.
- If E(X) = E(Y), can we conclude that X and Y have the same distribution (sometimes notated X = Y)?
 - No! Counterexample: X ~ Bin(20, 0.1) and Y ~ Pois(2).
- What if, in addition to $\mathbb{E}(X) = \mathbb{E}(Y)$, we have Var(X) = Var(Y)?
 - Still No! Counterexample: X ~ Geom(0.5) and Y ~ Pois(2).
- So, what is enough?
- Turns out, equality in *all* moments is enough; $\mathbb{E}(X^n) = \mathbb{E}(Y^n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- That's a lot of moments we need to check! Wouldn't it be nice if there is some quantity that gives us access to the moments of a distribution?

• There *is* such a quantity, and it is called the Moment Generating Function.

Definition: Moment Generating Function The Moment Generating Function of X, denoted $M_X(t)$, is defined as $M_X(t) := \mathbb{E}\left[e^{Xt}\right]$ (1)

• As it stands, this definition works equally well for discrete and continuous random variables! Now, it is true that exactly *how* we compute the expectation on the RHS depends on whether *X* is discrete or continuous; specifically,

$$M_X(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_k e^{kt} \rho_X(k) & \text{if } X \text{ is discrete} \\ \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{xt} f_X(x) \, dx & \text{if } X \text{ is continuous} \end{cases}$$

• Why the name? Because of the following theorem:

Theorem

Given a random variable X with moment-generating function $M_X(t)$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[X^n] = M_X^{(n)}(0)$$

provided that $M_X(t)$ is finite in an interval containing the origin. Here, $M_X^{(n)}$ denotes the n^{th} derivative of M_X .

- I may post a proof for this in a bit, for those who are curious.
- Also note the following:

$$\mathcal{M}_X(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{tX}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(tX)^k}{k!}\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[X^k]}{k!} \cdot t^k$$

This fact is used in the proof of the above theorem, but you will be using it during section to find a way of extracting moments without the need for differentiation.

Moment Generating Functions

- Suppose *X* ~ Geom(*p*).
- Then $M_X(t) := \mathbb{E}(e^{Xt}) \sum_{k} e^{kt} \mathbb{P}(X = k)$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{kt} \cdot p \cdot (1-p)^{k-1}$$

= $\frac{p}{1-p} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} [(1-p)e^t]^k$
= $\frac{p}{1-p} \times \frac{(1-p)e^t}{1-(1-p)e^t} = \frac{pe^t}{1-(1-p)e^t}$

• Of course, this is valid only if the geometric series above converges, which occurs when $(1-p)e^t < 1 \implies t < -\ln(1-p)$; otherwise, the MGF is infinite. Thus,

$$M_X(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\rho e^t}{1 - (1 - \rho)e^t} & \text{if } t < -\ln(1 - \rho) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

• With this formula, we can re-derive the expectation of the Geometric Distribution. Assuming $t < -\ln(1-p)$, we have

$$M'_X(t) = \frac{pe^t \cdot [1 - (1 - p)e^t] - pe^t \cdot [-(1 - p)e^t]}{[1 - (1 - p)e^t]^2}$$
$$= \frac{pe^t - p(1 - p)e^{2t} + p(1 - p)e^{2t}}{[1 - (1 - p)e^t]^2}$$
$$= \frac{pe^t}{[1 - (1 - p)e^t]^2}$$
$$M'_X(0) = \frac{p \cdot e^0}{[1 - (1 - p)e^0]^2} = \frac{p}{p^2} = \frac{1}{p}$$

Suppose $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$.

- (a) Derive an expression for $M_X(t)$, the moment-generating function (MGF) of X. Be sure to specify where the MGF is finite and where it is infinite!
- (b) Use your answer to part (a) to derive a formula for $\mathbb{E}[X^n]$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Distribution	MGF at t			
Bin(<i>n</i> , <i>p</i>)	$(1- ho+ ho e^t)^n$, $orall t\in \mathbb{R}$			
Geom(<i>p</i>)	$\begin{cases} \frac{pe^{t}}{1-(1-p)e^{t}} & \text{if } t < -\ln(1-p) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$			
NegBin(<i>r</i> , <i>p</i>)	$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{pe^t}{1-(1-p)e^t}\right)^r & \text{if } t < -\ln(1-p) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$			
$Pois(\lambda)$	$e^{\lambda(e^t-1)}$, $orall t\in \mathbb{R}$			

Distribution	MGF at t			
$Exp(\lambda)$	$\begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - t} & \text{if } t < \lambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$			
$Gamma(r, \lambda)$	$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-t}\right)^r & \text{if } t < \lambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$			
$\mathcal{N}(\mu,\sigma^2)$	$\exp\left\{\mu t + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \cdot t^2\right\}; \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$			
Unif[<i>a</i> , <i>b</i>]	$\begin{cases} \frac{e^{tb} - e^{ta}}{t(b-a)} & \text{if } t \neq 0\\ 1 & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}$			

Equality in Distribution

- Let me go back to one of the points I made at the beginning of this lecture; namely, that MGF's are enough to determine a distribution.
- I'll phrase this a bit more formally:

Theorem

Let *X* and *Y* be two random variables with moment-generating functions $M_X(t)$ and $M_Y(t)$, respectively. Suppose there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for every $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$ we have $M_X(t) = M_Y(t)$ [and that both of these values are finite]. Then *X* and *Y* have the same distribution.

• A slight rephrasing:

Theorem

Let *X* and *Y* be two random variables with moment-generating functions $M_X(t)$ and $M_Y(t)$, respectively. If $M_X(t) = M_Y(t)$ for all *t*, then *X* and *Y* have the same distribution [i.e. the same pmf's/pdf's]

• So, for example, suppose X is a random variable with MGF

$$M_X(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{0.2e^t}{1-0.8e^t} & \text{if } t < -\ln(0.8)\\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then, we can immediately conclude that $X \sim \text{Geom}(0.2)$, since the MGF is continuous and finite over a small interval containing the origin.

Given a random variable *X* with MGF $M_X(t)$, and another random variable Y := aX + b for constants *a*, *b*, then $M_Y(t) = e^{bt}M_X(at)$.

Proof.

By the definition of MGF's,

$$M_Y(t) := \mathbb{E}[e^{tY}]$$

• Since Y = aX + b, we can substitute aX + b in place of Y in our equation above:

$$M_Y(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{t(aX+b)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{taX+tb}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{(at)X}e^{bt}] = e^{bt}\mathbb{E}[e^{(at)X}] = e^{bt}M_X(at)$$

Suppose X is a random variable with MGF given by

$$M_X(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{0.2e^{3t}}{1-0.8e^{3t}} & \text{if } t < -1/_3 \cdot \ln(0.8) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and say I wish to compute $\mathbb{P}(X = 3)$. Here is the logic:

• The MGF looks a bit like that of the Geom(0.2) distribution; as such, suppose $Y \sim$ Geom(0.2). Then

$$M_Y(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{0.2e^t}{1-0.8e^t} & \text{if } t < -\ln(0.8)\\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

• Now, suppose X = 3Y. Then, by the previous theorem,

$$M_X(t) = M_Y(3t) \begin{cases} \frac{0.2e^{3t}}{1-0.8e^{3t}} & \text{if } 3t < -\ln(0.8) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

which is indeed the MGF we started with.

Hence, X = 3Y where Y ~ Geom(0.2), meaning

$$\mathbb{P}(X = 3) = \mathbb{P}(3Y = 3) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1) = (1 - 0.2)^{1 - 1} \cdot (0.2) = 0.2$$

14

MGF's of Sums

Theorem

Given two independent random variables X and Y with MGF's $M_X(t)$ and $M_Y(t)$, respectively, and given a new random variable Z := X + Y, we have

$$M_Z(t) = M_X(t) \cdot M_Y(t)$$

Proof.

• By the definition of MGF's,

$$M_Z(t) := \mathbb{E}[e^{tZ}]$$

• Since Z = X + Y, we can substitute X + Y in place of Z in our equation above:

$$M_Z(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X+Y)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{tX} \cdot e^{tY}]$$

• We know that functions of independent random variables are also independent; hence, since $X \perp Y$ we have $e^{tX} \perp e^{tY}$, and so

$$M_Z(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X+Y)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{tX} \cdot e^{tY}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{tX}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{tY}] = M_X(t) \cdot M_Y(t)$$

Given a collection of independent random variables X_i each with MGF $M_{X_i}(t)$, and defining $S := \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$, we have

$$M_S(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n M_{X_i}(t)$$

- We have previously seen that if $X, Y \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\lambda)$, then $(X + Y) \sim \text{Gamma}(2, \lambda)$. The way we proved this before was using the convolution formula.
- We can re-derive this result much quicker using MGF's. Observe:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{M}_{X+Y}(t) &= \mathcal{M}_X(t) \cdot \mathcal{M}_Y(t) & \text{[by independence]} \\ &= \left(\begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - t} & \text{if } t < \lambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \cdot \left(\begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - t} & \text{if } t < \lambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \right) & \text{[MGF of Exp]} \\ &= \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda - t} \right)^2 & \text{if } t < \lambda \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \text{[MGF of Exp]} \end{split}$$

which we recognize as the MGF of the Gamma(2, λ) distribution.

• This can be generalized to derive the sum of *n* i.i.d. $Exp(\lambda)$ distributed random variables, or even to derive the distribution of the sum of *n* independent Gamma(r_i , λ) distributions!

If
$$X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_X, \sigma_X^2)$$
 and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_Y, \sigma_Y^2)$ with $X \perp Y$, then
 $(X + Y) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_X + \mu_Y, \sigma_X^2 + \sigma_Y^2)$

Proof. On the Chalkboard.

If we have a collection of independent random variables $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$, then

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i X_i\right) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \mu_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^2 \sigma_i^2\right)$$

Proof.

Omitted.

Inversions?

- Now, everything we have done thus far (by way of using MGF's to identify distributions) has required us to recognize the MGF that results.
- What happens if that's not the case?
- In other words, given an MGF, is there a way to "invert" the MGF to obtain the original p.m.f./p.d.f., without having to resort to lookup tables?
- The answer, surprisingly, is "not really!"
- There is one exception, however:

Theorem

Given a random variable X with MGF given by

$$M_X(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i e^{tk_i}; \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$$

for constants k_i and p_i such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i = 1$, then the p.m.f. of X is given by $p_X(k_i) = p_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Suppose X has MGF given by

$$M_X(t) = rac{1}{5}e^{-4t} + rac{3}{5} + rac{1}{5}e^{3.2t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$$

• Note that this MGF is of the form listed in the previous theorem with n = 3 and $k_1 = -4$, $k_2 = 0$, and $k_3 = 3.2$ (note that there is a "hidden" e^{0t} attached to the (3/5) in the MGF). This means that the state space of X is

$$S_X = \{-4, 0, 3.2\}$$

• Additionally, the PMF values can be read off directly as the coefficients associated with each of the exponential terms:

k	-4	0	3.2
$p_X(k)$	¹ /5	³ /5	¹ / ₅

- By the way: now that we have the PMF of X, we can compute $\mathbb{E}[X]$ in two ways.
- Using MGF's:

$$M'_X(t) = -4 \cdot \frac{1}{5}e^{-4t} + 3.2 \cdot \frac{1}{5}e^{3.2t}$$
$$\mathbb{E}[X] = M'_X(0) = -4 \cdot \frac{1}{5}e^{-4\cdot 0} + 3.2 \cdot \frac{1}{5}e^{3.2\cdot 0} = -4 \cdot \frac{1}{5} + 3.2 \cdot \frac{1}{5} = -0.16$$

• Using the definition of expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{k} k p_X(k)$$
$$= (-4) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{5}\right) + (0) \cdot \left(\frac{3}{5}\right) + (3.2) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{5}\right) = -0.16$$