

## Solutions to the Exercises of Section 2.2.

2.2.1. Since the distribution  $\tau$  degenerate at  $\theta$  has risk  $r(\tau, \delta) = R(\theta, \delta)$ , we have  $\sup_{\tau \in \Theta^*} r(\tau, \delta) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} R(\theta, \delta)$ . Suppose that  $\sup_{\tau \in \Theta^*} r(\tau, \delta) > \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} R(\theta, \delta)$ . This implies there exists a  $\tau$  such that  $R(\theta, \delta) < r(\tau, \delta)$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . But  $r(\tau, \delta)$  is the expectation of  $R(\theta, \delta)$  over  $\theta$  using the distribution  $\tau$  and so is also less than  $r(\tau, \delta)$ , a contradiction that completes the proof.

2.2.2. We are given that the game has a value,

$$\inf_{\delta} \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta) = \sup_{\tau} \inf_{\delta} r(\tau, \delta),$$

that  $\tau_0$  is least favorable,

$$\inf_{\delta} r(\tau_0, \delta) = \sup_{\tau} \inf_{\delta} r(\tau, \delta),$$

and that  $\delta_0$  is minimax,

$$\sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta_0) = \inf_{\delta} \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta).$$

We are to show that  $\delta_0$  is Bayes with respect to  $\tau_0$ , i.e. that

$$r(\tau_0, \delta_0) \leq \inf_{\delta} r(\tau_0, \delta).$$

This follows in one line:

$$r(\tau_0, \delta_0) \leq \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta_0) = \inf_{\delta} \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta) = \sup_{\tau} \inf_{\delta} r(\tau, \delta) = \inf_{\delta} r(\tau_0, \delta).$$

2.2.3. We are given that the game has a value,

$$\inf_{\delta} \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta) = \sup_{\tau} \inf_{\delta} r(\tau, \delta),$$

and that  $\delta_0$  is minimax,

$$\sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta_0) = \inf_{\delta} \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta).$$

We are to show that  $\delta_0$  is extended Bayes, i.e. we must show that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a prior,  $\tau$ , such that

$$r(\tau, \delta_0) \leq \inf_{\delta} r(\tau, \delta) + \epsilon.$$

The proof is by contradiction. Suppose the conclusion is false. Then there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for every prior  $\tau$ ,

$$r(\tau, \delta_0) > \inf_{\delta} r(\tau, \delta) + \epsilon.$$

Then, taking the supremum on both sides, we have

$$\sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta_0) \geq \sup_{\tau} \inf_{\delta} r(\tau, \delta) + \epsilon = \inf_{\delta} \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta) + \epsilon > \inf_{\delta} \sup_{\tau} r(\tau, \delta),$$

contradicting the assumption that  $\delta_0$  is minimax.