IS THE MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATE OF THE COMMON MEAN OF SEVERAL NORMAL POPULATIONS ADMISSIBLE?

By BIMAL KUMAR SINHA Indian Statistical Institute

SUMMARY. Let $X_t \sim N(\mu, \sigma_1^2)$, i = 1, ..., k be independent with $\sigma_1^2, ..., \sigma_k^2$ known and μ unknown. It is known that the maximum likelihood estimate $(m.l.o.)^2\mu$, $o(\mu_s)^2\mu \in (\Sigma X/\sigma_s^2)$ ($(\Sigma 1/\sigma_1^2)$, is admissible for μ in the class of all estimators under a fairly general type of less which includes any positive power of the absolute error less as a special case. In the case when σ_s^{ν} is are unknown and are given independent $S_s^2 \sim \sigma_t^2 \times_{m_s}^2 / |m|, i = 1, ..., k$, also independent of the X_s^{ν} , it is shown that the m.l.o. μ^* of μ , $\mu^* = (\Sigma X/\sigma_s^2)/(\Sigma 1/\sigma_s^2)$, is inadmissible for μ even in an appropriate natural class of estimators of μ under a very general type of less whenever it is known a priori that for some known i and j, $1 \le i \ne j \le k$, $\sigma_s^2 \le \sigma_s^2$.

1. Introduction

For estimating the common unknown moon of several normal populations with known variances, the usual estimator is the weighted average of the sample means with weights proportional to the inverses of their population variances. Specifically, if $X_t \sim N(\mu, \sigma_t^2)$, i = 1, ..., k be independent with σ_t^2 's known, $-\infty < \mu < \infty$ unknown, the usual estimator of μ is

$$\hat{\mu} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \frac{k}{2} X_i / \sigma_i^2 \right) / \left(\begin{array}{cc} \frac{k}{2} 1 / \sigma_i^2 \right).$$

It is well known that $\hat{\mu}$ is the maximum likelihood estimate (m.l.e.) and also the unique best linear unbiased estimate of μ . On the other hand, since $\hat{\mu}$ is expressible as

$$\hat{\mu} = X_1 + \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \frac{k}{2} (X_i - X_1) / \sigma_i^2 \end{array} \right\} / \left(\begin{array}{c} \frac{k}{2} 1 / \sigma \end{array} \right),$$

it follows that $\hat{\mu}$ is equivariant under the usual translatic: group of transformations. It is also known that $\hat{\mu}$ is the best equivariant estimator in the sense of having minimum mean equare error. The estimator $\hat{\mu}$ enjoys yet another optimum property, namely, that of admissibility in the class of all estimators under a very general type of loss which includes any positive power of the absolute error loss as a special case (Blyth, 1951).

The problem discussed in this paper corresponds to the case when the variances $\sigma_i^{\mathbf{r}}$ is are unknown and along with the $X_i^{\mathbf{r}}$ is mentioned above, we are given k independent estimates $S_i^{\mathbf{r}}$, ..., $S_k^{\mathbf{r}}$ (also independent of the $X_i^{\mathbf{r}}$) of the k variances with the distributions $m_i S_k^{\mathbf{r}} | \sigma_i^{\mathbf{r}} \sim \chi_{m_i}^{\mathbf{r}}$, i = 1, ..., k. In this case a natural and reasonable estimator of μ is provided by

$$\mu^{\bullet} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} k \\ \Sigma X_t / S_t^2 \end{array} \right\} \left| \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ \Sigma 1 / S_t^2 \end{array} \right).$$

It is well known that μ^{\bullet} is the m.l.o. of μ and also unbiased. Many authors have investigated proporties of μ^* or variations of it. For k=2. Zacks (1966) proposed a so-called 'testimator' for \(\mu \) and investigated in details through numerical computations of the relevant variances conditions under which the testimator has more or less variance than u. Graybill and Deal (1959) found out, for k=2, conditions under which μ^{\bullet} has less variance than both X, and X. A different set of necessary and sufficient conditions for arbitrary k has been given recently by Norwood and Hinkelmann (1977). However, unlike & as in the preceding paragraph, no exact optimum property of u° as rogards to its admissibility or minimaxity is known so far. It sooms difficult to establish such optimum properties of μ^{\bullet} or their negation in the class of all estimators. It turns out however that uo is inadmissible for u even in a natural subclass of estimators of μ for a very general type of less whonever it is known a priori that for some known subscripts i and $j \neq i$, σι < σι. The inadmissibility proof which is in the same spirit as in Stein (1964) and Sinha (1976) is given in Section 2.

Inadmissibility of the M.L.E. μ^{*}

In this section we prove that μ^* is inadmissible for μ for a very general type of less under some prior information about the unknown variances. To be specific, assume that the less function

$$L(\mu,d) = W(d-\mu) \qquad \dots \qquad (2.1)$$

satisfica

$$W(t) = W(-t)$$
, $W(0) = 0$, $W(t)$ is strictly increasing in $|t|$

and

$$\forall$$
 $0 < C < \infty$, $\int_{0}^{\infty} W(Cl) \phi(l) dl < \infty$

where

$$\phi(t) = (\sqrt{2\pi})^{-1} \exp(-t^3/2).$$
 (2.2)

Assume further it is known a priori that for some known subscripts i and j, $1 \le i \ne j \le k$, $\sigma_i^2 \le \sigma_i^2$. Without any loss of generality let us assume

$$\sigma_1^2 \leqslant \sigma_{i_0}^2$$
 for some known $i_0 > 2$ (2.3)

The main result of the paper is the following.

Theorem 2.1: Under (2.1) - (2.3), μ^{\bullet} is inadmissible for μ in \mathfrak{C} defined below.

Proof: The proof is in the same spirit as in Stoin (1964) and Sinha (1976). It is easy to verify that the underlying estimation problem remains invariant under the affine group G of transformations acting on the X_i 's, S_i^* 's, μ and σ_i^* 's as

$$X_t \rightarrow aX_t + b, S_t^2 \rightarrow a^2S_t^2, \quad i = 1, ..., k$$

 $\mu \rightarrow a\mu + b, \sigma_t^2 \rightarrow a^2\sigma_t^2, \quad i = 1, ..., k \quad ... \quad (2.4)$

where $a \neq 0$, $-\infty < b < \infty$, and that any affine equivariant estimator ψ is of the form

$$\psi(X_1,...,X_k;S_1^2,...,S_k^2)$$

$$= X_1 + S_1 \phi(X_2 - X_1)/S_1, ..., (X_k - X_1)/S_1; S_2^2/S_1^2, ..., S_k^2/S_1^2). ... (2.5)$$

A subclass \mathcal{C} of the class of affine equivariant estimators is obtained by choosing ϕ as

$$\begin{split} \phi((X_2-X_1)|S_1, \, ..., \, (X_k-X_1)|S_1; \, S_2^2|S_1^2, \, ..., \, S_k^2|S_1^2) \\ &= S_1^{-1} \, \sum_{k}^k \, (X_i-X_1) \, \phi_i \, (S_2^2/S_1^2, \, ..., \, S_k^2/S_1^2), \end{split}$$

resulting in w as

$$\psi(X_1,...,X_k; S_1^1,...,S_k^1) = X_1 \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i\right) + \sum_{i=1}^k X_i \phi_i ... (2.6)$$

where $\phi_i\left(S_i^2/S_1^2,...,S_i^2/S_1^2\right)$ is abbreviated as ϕ_i , i=2,...,k. It is trivial to varify that $\mu^*\in\mathcal{C}$ with

$$\phi_{i, \, \mu \bullet} = (S_1^2/S_1^2) / \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ \Sigma \\ S_1^2/S_2^2 \end{array} \right), \quad i > 2.$$
 ... (2.7)

We now show that given any estimator $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$, it is possible to improve over it in view of the condition (2.3) provided

$$\sum_{i \neq i_0} \phi_i > 0 \text{ and } \phi_{i_0} > \frac{1}{2} \text{ hold with positive probability. ...} (2.8)$$

Towards this end, let us first note that the risk of any $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$ can be expressed as

$$R(\psi) = E\{W(\psi - \mu)\}$$

$$= E\left[E\left\{W\left(\left[\sigma_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \phi_i\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi_i^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} |X|\right)\right\}\right] \dots (2.9)$$

where the inner expectation is w.r.t. $X \sim N(0, 1)$, keeping ϕ_i 's fixed, and the outer expectation is w.r.t. the S_i^* 's.

Dofino

$$\phi_{i_0}^* = \min(\phi_{i_0}, \frac{1}{2})$$

and

$$\psi^* = X_1 \left(1 - \phi_{i_0}^* - \sum_{i \neq i_0} \phi_i \right) + \sum_{i \neq i_0} X_i \phi_i + X_{i_0} \phi_{i_0}^*. \quad \dots \quad (2.10)$$

We show that ψ^* which trivially ϵ c is an improvement over ψ . It is enough to show in view of (2.9) that

$$\sigma_{1}^{2}\left(1-\frac{k}{2}\phi_{i}\right)^{2}+\frac{k}{2}\sigma_{1}^{2}\phi_{1}^{2} > \sigma_{1}^{2}\left(1-\sum_{\epsilon\neq i_{0}}\phi_{i}-\phi_{i_{0}}^{*}\right)^{2}+\sum_{\epsilon\neq i_{0}}\sigma_{1}^{2}\phi_{i}^{*}\sigma+\frac{v}{i_{0}}\phi_{i_{0}}^{*2}$$
... (2.11)

with probability 1, and that strict inequality in (2.11) holds with positive probability. But (2.11) after some simplification is equivalent to

$$\begin{split} &\sigma_{t_0}^2 \left(\phi_{t_0}^2 - \phi_{t_0}^{*^2} \right) \geqslant \sigma_1^2 \left(\phi_{t_0} - \phi_{t_0}^* \right) \left(2 - \sum_{1}^{k} \phi_{i} - \sum_{i \neq t_0} \phi_{i} - \phi_{t_0}^* \right) \\ &\iff \left(\phi_{t_0} - \phi_{t_0}^* \right) \left[\left(\sigma_{t_0}^2 + \sigma_1^2 \right) \left(\phi_{t_0} + \phi_{t_0}^* \right) - 2\sigma_1^2 \left(1 - \sum_{i \neq t_0} \phi_{i} \right) \right] \geqslant 0. \\ & \qquad \qquad \dots \end{aligned}$$

That (2.12) holds with probability one follows from the fact that over the set $\{\phi_{t_0} = \phi_{t_0}^*\}$, (2.12) holds trivially and over the complementary set $\{\phi_{t_n} > \phi_{t_n}^* = \frac{1}{2}\}$ also, (2.12) holds because

$$\phi_{i_0} + \phi_{i_0}^{\bullet} > 1 \ge 2\sigma_1^2/(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_{i_0}^2),$$

by (2.3). Also, the inequality in (2.12) and hence in (2.11) is strict with positive probability by (2.8).

Finally, since the condition (2.8) is satisfied with $\phi_{t_0} = \phi_{t_0^*, \mu^0}$, it follows that μ^* is inadmissible for μ and this completes the proof of the theorem.

Remark: The estimator ψ^{\bullet} can be viewed as a sort of 'testimator' which uses ψ or a variant of it as an estimator of μ depending on whether $\phi_{i_0} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$ or $> \frac{1}{2}$. If the apriori information (2.3) is strongthened as giving $\sigma_1^2 \leqslant \sigma_1^2$, $l = i_1, ..., i_r, 1 \leqslant r \leqslant k-1$, $I = (i_1, ..., i_r) \subseteq (2, ..., k)$, then defining

$$\psi^{\bullet} = X_1 \left(1 - \sum_{i \notin I} \phi_i - \sum_{i \in I} \phi_i^{\bullet}\right) + \sum_{i \notin I} X_i \phi_i + \sum_{i \in I} X_i \phi_i^{\bullet}$$

with $\phi_l^* = \min\left(\phi_l, \frac{1}{2}\right) l = i_1, ..., i_r$, it can be shown using the same arguments as given above that ψ^* improves over ψ provided at least one of the ϕ_l 's $(l = i_1, ..., i_r)$ is greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ with positive probability.

REFERENCES

BLUTH, C. R. (1951): On minimax statistical decision procedures and their admissibility. Ann.
Math. Statist., 22, 22-42.

GRAYBILL, F. A. and DEAL, R. B. (1959): Combining unbiased estimators. Biometrics, 15, 543-550.

NOBWOOD, T. E. and HIVELLMANN, K. (1977): Estimating the common mean of several normal populations. Ann. Statist., 5, 1047-1050.

SINHA, B. K. (1978): On improved estimators of the generalized variance. Jour. Mult. Analysis, 6, 617-625.

STEIN, C. (1964): Inadmissibility of the usual estimator for the variance of a normal distribution with unknown mean. Ann. Inst. Statist. Math., 16, 155-160.

ZACES, S. (1966): Unbiased estimation of the common mean. Jour. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 81, 407-476.

Paper received: January, 1978. Revised . January, 1979.