

Prof. David Draper  
Department of Statistics  
University of California, Santa Cruz

**STAT 131: Quiz 3** [15 total points]

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Bayes's Theorem is the only known approach to learning from data that satisfies two important properties: (a) it's logically internally consistent (meaning that it cannot produce contradictory conclusions such as {An unknown quantity  $\theta$  of interest to me cannot be negative, but Bayes's Theorem says that my best estimate of  $\theta$  is  $-2.3$ }, and (b) it combines information external and internal to your dataset in such a way that no extraneous information is inadvertently smuggled into your answer. However, it's possible to use Bayes's Theorem in a way that defeats its ability to help you learn from the world around you. The result we'll explore below in this quiz that illustrates this was called *Cromwell's Rule* by the great British Bayesian statistician Dennis Lindley (1923–2013).

Let  $U$  be a true-false proposition whose truth status is Unknown to you, and let  $D$  be another true-false proposition (representing Data) whose truth status is known to you; an example would be  $U =$  (person  $P$  really is infected with COVID–19) and  $D =$  (this PCR screening test *says* that person  $P$  is infected with COVID–19) (note that  $U$  and  $D$  are not the same; the PCR test could be wrong). Recall that Bayes's Theorem in this situation says, assuming that  $P(D) > 0$ , that

$$P(U | D) = \frac{P(U) P(D | U)}{P(D)}, \quad (1)$$

in which  $P(U)$  is your *prior* information about the truth of  $U$  (in the example above, this would be the prevalence of COVID–19 among people similar to person  $P$  in all relevant ways).

(a) Show that if you assume that  $P(U) = 0$ , then you would have to conclude that  $P(U | D) = 0$ , no matter how the data information  $D$  came out [5 points].

(b) Show that if you assume that  $P(U) = 1$ , then you would have to conclude that  $P(U | D) = 1$ , no matter how the data information  $D$  came out [5 points].

(c) Briefly explain in what sense your results in (a) and (b) imply that

*Putting prior probability 0 or 1 on anything renders Bayes's Theorem incapable of helping you learn from data.*

What practical conclusion should we draw about the assignment of prior probabilities? Explain briefly [5 points].