NEYMAN-PEARSON DETECTION

In deriving the Bayes detector we assumed $\pi_i = P(H_i)$ to be known. Some times this is a reasonable assumption, other times it isn't.

Examples

1. Binary communication channel



$\pi_0 = \pi_1 = \frac{1}{2}$

2. Search for extra-terrestrial life

H_0: $\underline{X} \sim$ cosmic radiation

H_1: $\underline{X} \sim$ cosmic radiation + intelligent signal

$P(H_1) = ?$



In a binary hypothesis testing problem

$$H_0 : \underline{X} \sim f_0(\underline{x})$$
$$H_1 : \underline{X} \sim f_1(\underline{x})$$

we assign names to the four possible outcomes

decision			
	H_0	rejection	miss
	H_1	false alarm	detection
		H_0	H_1
		truth	

$P_D = P(H_1 \mid H_1)$ "detection probability"

$P_M = P(H_0 / H_1)$ " miss " "

$P_F = P(H_1 \mid H_0)$ "false alarm " "

$P_R = P(H_0 / H_0)$ " rejection " "

Note that

$$P_D = 1 - P_M$$

$$P_F = 1 - P_R$$

so there are only <u>two degrees of freedom</u> for evaluating a hypothesis test.

Also note: P_D and P_F do not involve <u>prior probabilities</u> on $\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1$.

Idea: formulate a detection criterion in terms of P_D, P_F.

Example

$$H_0: X \sim \mathcal{N}(-1, 1)$$
$$H_1: X \sim \mathcal{N}(1, 1)$$



Consider the decision rule

$$x \underset{H_0}{\overset{H_1}{\gtrless}} \gamma$$

As γ increases,

P_F decreases (good)

P_D decreases (bad)

More generally, P_F and P_D are indirectly related through the <u>decision region</u> R_1:

$$P_D = \int_{R_1} f_1(\underline{x})\,d\underline{x}$$

$$P_F = \int_{R_1} f_0(\underline{x})\,d\underline{x}$$

As R_1 <u>expands</u>, P_D and P_F increase

As R_1 <u>shrinks</u>, P_D and P_F decrease

Ideally, we would like

$$P_D = 1 \quad , \quad P_F = 0$$

but this is only possible when

ⓐ

So what is the best way to choose R_1?

$\boxed{\text{The Neyman-Pearson Criterion}}$

The Neyman-Pearson (NP) detector solves the following optimization problem:

$$\max \; P_D$$
$$\text{s.t. } P_F \leq \alpha$$

In words, the NP detector has the largest detection probability among all detectors with false alarm probability no greater than α.

<u>Terminology</u>

P_D = <u>power</u>

P_F = <u>size</u>

So the NP detector is the <u>most powerful test of size</u> (not exceeding) <u>α.</u>

The Neyman-Pearson Lemma

Let $\alpha \in [0,1]$. The NP detector is

$$\Lambda(\underline{x}) \underset{H_0}{\overset{H_1}{\gtrless}} \eta$$

where $\Lambda(\underline{x}) = \dfrac{f_1(\underline{x})}{f_0(\underline{x})}$ and η is

chosen such that

$$P_F = \int_{\Lambda(\underline{x}) > \eta} f_0(\underline{x})\, d\underline{x} = \alpha$$

Note / It may not always be possible to set η such that $P_F = \alpha$, such as in the case of discrete data. We will return to this case later. For now, assume $P_F = \alpha$ is achievable.

So the optimal detector is once again a <u>likelihood ratio test.</u>

The Bayes detector and NP detector lead to the same test. The difference is in how we select the <u>threshold</u> η.

- For the Bayes detector:

$$\eta = \frac{\pi_0}{\pi_1} \cdot \frac{(c_{10} - c_{00})}{(c_{01} - c_{11})}$$

- For the NP detector

$$\eta = P_F^{-1}(\alpha)$$

where

$$P_F(\eta) = \int_{\Lambda > \eta} f_0(\underline{x})\, d\underline{x}$$

We can prove the NP Lemma using the theory of constrained optimization (Lagrange multiplier theory)

Constrained Optimization

Consider the problem

$$\max_{x \in \Omega} h(x) \quad \text{subject to } g(x) \le C,$$

where $h, g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}$, and Ω is an arbitrary set.

Theorem Let $\lambda \geq 0$ and suppose $x_0(\lambda) \in \Omega$ maximizes

$$L(x, \lambda) \equiv h(x) - \lambda g(x)$$

for each λ. Then $x_0(\lambda)$ maximizes h over all x such that $g(x) \le g(x_0(\lambda))$.

Corollary: If λ^* is such that $g(x_0(\lambda^*)) = C$, then $x_0(\lambda^*)$ maximizes $h(x)$ over all x such that $g(x) \le C$.

Proof of Theorem:

By assumption, $x_0 = x_0(\lambda)$ satisfies

$$h(x_0) - \lambda g(x_0) \geq h(x) - \lambda g(x)$$

for all $x \in \Omega$. Equivalently,

$$h(x_0) - h(x) \geq \lambda(g(x_0) - g(x_0))$$

for all $x \in \Omega$. Define

$$S = \{ x \in \Omega \mid g(x) \le g(x_0) \}.$$

Then for all $x \in S$,

$$h(x_0) - h(x) \geq \lambda(g(x_0) - g(x))$$
$$\geq 0$$

so $h(x_0) \geq h(x) \quad \forall x \in S.$ $\blacksquare$

Proof of Neyman-Pearson Lemma

Apply constrained optimization theorem with

$$h = P_D$$
$$g = P_F$$
$$C = \alpha$$
$$x = R_1$$
$$\Omega = \text{all possible decision regions}$$

To do this, we must find $R_1 = R_1(\lambda)$ that maximizes

$$L = P_D - \lambda P_F$$
$$= \int_{R_1} f_1(\underline{x})\,dx - \lambda \int_{R_1} f_0(\underline{x})\,d\underline{x}$$
$$= \int_{R_1} [f_1(\underline{x}) - \lambda f_0(\underline{x})]\,d\underline{x}$$

So choose

$$R_1 = \left\{ \underline{x} : \frac{f_1(\underline{x})}{f_0(\underline{x})} > \lambda \right\}.$$

Now, to maximize P_D over all R_1 such that $P_F \le \alpha$, we take λ such that

$$P_F = \int_{\Lambda > \lambda} f_0(\underline{x})\,d\underline{x} = \alpha$$

$\blacksquare$

Setting the threshold

Computing η such that $P_F = \alpha$ is not always easy. It usually requires the use of monotonic transformations and test statistics as the following example demonstrates.

Example DC signal in AWGN

$$H_0 : \underline{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\underline{0}, \sigma^2 \underline{\underline{I}})$$

$$H_1 : \underline{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(A\underline{1}, \sigma^2 \underline{\underline{I}}) \quad , \quad A > 0$$

Let's design a NP detector

From the last lecture we saw

$$\Lambda(\underline{x}) \underset{H_0}{\overset{H_1}{\gtrless}} \eta$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} x_n \equiv t \underset{H_0}{\overset{H_1}{\gtrless}} \gamma \equiv \frac{\sigma^2}{NA}\ln(\eta) + \frac{A}{2}$$

Recall $t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{\sigma^2}{N})$ under H_0

$t \sim \mathcal{N}(A, \frac{\sigma^2}{N})$ under H_0

Exercise | (a) Use the Q function to express P_F, P_D in terms of γ and known quantities (b) Find γ for the NP detector of size α (c) Express P_D in terms of P_F and SNR.

Solution

$$P_F = \text{Prob}(t > \gamma \mid H_0)$$

$$= Q\left(\frac{\gamma}{\sigma/\sqrt{N}}\right) \le \alpha$$

$$P_D = \text{Prob}(t > \gamma \mid H_1)$$

$$= Q\left(\frac{\gamma - A}{\sigma/\sqrt{N}}\right)$$

To set the threshold, we take

$$P_F = \alpha$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \gamma = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}} Q^{-1}(\alpha)$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad P_D = Q\left(Q^{-1}(P_F) - \frac{A\sqrt{N}}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$= Q\left(Q^{-1}(P_F) - \sqrt{SNR}\right)$$

The Receiver Operating Characteristic

The ROC of a detector is a plot of P_D vs. P_F.



Ex

$$P_D = Q\left(Q^{-1}(P_F) - \frac{A\sqrt{N}}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$SNR = \frac{A^2 N}{\sigma^2}$$

Fact The ROC of the LRT is concave.

$$P_D(\eta) = \Pr(\Lambda(\underline{x}) > \eta \mid H_1)$$

$$P_F(\eta) = \Pr(\Lambda(\underline{x}) > \eta \mid H_0)$$



In other words, for all $\eta_1, \eta_2 \geq 0$,

the line segment

$$\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} P_F(\eta_1) \\ P_D(\eta_1) \end{bmatrix} + (1-\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} P_F(\eta_2) \\ P_D(\eta_2) \end{bmatrix}, \ \lambda \in [0,1] \right\}$$

is below the ROC.

Let's prove this. Suppose it's not true.

Then $\exists\, \eta_1, \eta_2$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$ such that

$$\lambda \begin{bmatrix} P_F(\eta_1) \\ P_D(\eta_1) \end{bmatrix} + (1-\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} P_F(\eta_2) \\ P_D(\eta_2) \end{bmatrix}$$

is <u>above</u> the ROC.

Consider the rule

$$\begin{cases} \text{use } \Lambda(\underline{x}) \gtrless \eta_1 & \text{with prob. } \lambda \\ \text{use } \Lambda(\underline{x}) \gtrless \eta_2 & \text{with prob } 1-\lambda \end{cases}$$

Then
$$P_F = \lambda P_F(\eta_1) + (1-\lambda) P_F(\eta_2)$$
$$P_D = \lambda P_D(\eta_1) + (1-\lambda) P_D(\eta_2)$$



This <u>contradicts</u> the optimality of the LRT.

Fact 2 The ROC of the LRT is above the line $P_D = P_F$.

Ⓑ **Proof?**



Fact 3 The **slope** of the ROC (for the LRT) at a point $(P_F(\eta), P_D(\eta))$ is η.



That is,

$$\frac{dP_D}{dP_F} = \eta$$

Discrete data

Suppose the data $\underline{X}$ is discrete.

Then

$$P_F = \sum_{\underline{x} : \Lambda(\underline{x}) > \eta} f_0(\underline{x})$$

So it may not be possible to have $P_F = \alpha$ for all α in the current setup.



What if we choose η so that P_F is as large as possible? Does the LRT still solve

$$\begin{aligned} &\max \; P_D \\ &\text{s.t. } P_F \le \alpha \end{aligned} \quad ?$$

Not quite.

We must now be concerned with the case $\Lambda(\underline{x}) = \eta$, which can occur with <u>nonzero</u> probability.

Let $\alpha \in [0,1]$, and let η^* be as small as possible such that

$$\Pr(\Lambda > \eta^* | H_0) < \alpha$$

Choose $\rho \in [0,1)$ such that

$$\Pr(\Lambda > \eta^* | H_0) + \rho \Pr(\Lambda = \eta^* | H_0) = \alpha$$



Consider the decision rule

$$\begin{cases} \text{declare } H_1 & \text{if } \Lambda(\underline{x}) > \eta^* \\ \text{flip a "}\rho\text{-coin"} & \text{if } \Lambda(\underline{x}) = \eta^* \\ \text{declare } H_0 & \text{if } \Lambda(\underline{x}) < \eta^* \end{cases}$$

Then $P_F = \alpha$

A "ρ-coin" turns up heads (H_1) with probability ρ.

If you think back to the proof of the NP Lemma, we can redistribute

$$\{\underline{x} : \Lambda(\underline{x}) = \eta\}$$

as we see fit and still maximize the Lagrangian. We use just enough probability mass to bring P_F up to α and use the rest to increase P_D.

The modified LRT is now optimal for the case of disrete data.

Intuition:



Old LRT: $\Lambda \gtrless \eta$

operates at discrete set of (P_F, P_D)

New LRT (with coin flip)

ROC = "convex hull" of old ROC

Summary

- Neyman-Pearson detector:

  maximizes P_D s.t. $P_F \leq \alpha$

- NP criterion does not assume knowledge of <u>prior probabilities</u> of each hypothesis (<u>frequentist</u>)

- The Bayes risk detector <u>does</u> (<u>Bayesian</u>)

- Optimal detector for both criteria given by <u>LRT</u>.

<u>Key</u> a. $\text{support}(f_0) \cap \text{support}(f_1) = \emptyset$

b. The line $P_D = P_F$ corresponds to random guessing, and the NP detector does at least as well as that.