

## Existence of estimators with bounded risks under an asymmetric loss function

Yoshikazu Takada

(Received February 1, 1999)

### 1. Introduction

Let  $\{X_i; i \geq 1\}$  be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with the probability density function  $\sigma^{-1}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)$  with respect to Lebesgue measure, where  $f$  is known and  $\theta=(\mu, \sigma)$  ( $\sigma > 0$ ) is unknown. We consider estimating  $\mu$  under the loss function

$$L(\theta, d) = \rho(d - \mu),$$

where  $\rho(u)$  is nonincreasing for  $u < 0$ , nondecreasing for  $u > 0$  and  $\rho(0) = 0$ . Let

$$M_{min} = \min(m_-, m_+), \quad M_{max} = \max(m_-, m_+),$$

where  $m_- = \lim_{u \rightarrow -\infty} \rho(u)$  and  $m_+ = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \rho(u)$ , which may be infinity. Let  $\delta(X)$  be an estimator based on  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . Then the purpose of this paper is to find if there exists an estimator  $\delta(X)$  such that

$$E_\theta\{L(\theta, \delta(X))\} \leq W, \tag{1.1}$$

for all  $\theta$ , where  $W (> 0)$  is an given constant.

Under a symmetric loss function Lehmann [3] showed that if the sample size  $n$  is predetermined, then no estimators meet (1.1) for  $W < M_{min} (= M_{max})$ . In Section 2 we shall show that the nonexistence is also true for an asymmetric loss function if  $W < M_{min}$ , but there does exist such an estimator if  $M_{min} < W < M_{max} < \infty$ . However, we can not show if the result also holds when  $M_{max} = \infty$ . In Section 3 employing two-stage procedures by Stein [6], we shall show that it is possible to construct an estimator meeting the requirement (1.1) for some distributions. Section 4 is devoted to the normal distribution and discuss the property of the proposed two-stage procedure.

## 2. Fixed sample size estimators

In this section we assume that the sample size  $n$  is predetermined. Then we get the following results.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $0 < W < M_{min}$ , then there do not exist any estimators whose risk is bounded by  $W$  for all  $\theta$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that an estimator  $\delta$  satisfies (1.1) for  $0 < W < M_{min}$ . Then for any  $d > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} W &\geq E_{\theta}\{\rho(\delta(X) - \mu)\} \\ &\geq \rho(d)P_{\theta}(\delta(X) - \mu \geq d) + \rho(-d)P_{\theta}(\delta(X) - \mu \leq -d) \\ &\geq \min(\rho(d), \rho(-d))P_{\theta}(|\delta(X) - \mu| \geq d). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \min(\rho(d), \rho(-d)) = M_{min}$ , there exists  $d$  such that  $0 < \alpha = W / \min(\rho(d), \rho(-d)) < 1$ . Hence

$$P_{\theta}(|\delta(X) - \mu| < d) > 1 - \alpha,$$

which contradicts the fact that there do not exist fixed-width confidence intervals of  $\mu$  when the sample size is fixed (e.g. Lehmann [3] and Takada [7]). Hence the proof is completed.

**Theorem 2.** *If  $M_{min} < W < M_{max} < \infty$ , then there exists an estimator whose risk is bounded by  $W$  for all  $\theta$ .*

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, let us assume  $m_- < m_+$ . Let  $\hat{\mu}(X)$  and  $\hat{\sigma}(X) (> 0)$  be any statistics satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}(aX + b) &= a\hat{\mu}(X) + b, \\ \hat{\sigma}(aX + b) &= a\hat{\sigma}(X) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $a (> 0)$  and  $b$ , where  $aX + b = (aX_1 + b, \dots, aX_n + b)$ . For example,  $\hat{\mu}$  is the sample mean and  $\hat{\sigma}$  the sample standard deviation. Let  $\delta(X) = \hat{\mu}(X) + t\hat{\sigma}(X)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\theta}\{L(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{X}))\} &= E_{\theta}\{\rho(\bar{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + t\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}) - \mu)\} \\
&= E_{(0, 1)}\{\rho(\bar{\mu}(\mu + \sigma\mathbf{X}) + t\bar{\sigma}(\mu + \sigma\mathbf{X}) - \mu)\} \\
&= E_{(0, 1)}\{\rho(\sigma(\bar{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + t\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}))\}\} \\
&\leq m_+ P_{(0, 1)}(\bar{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + t\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0) \\
&\quad + m_- P_{(0, 1)}(\bar{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + t\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}) < 0) \\
&= m_- + (m_+ - m_-) P_{(0, 1)}(\bar{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + t\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\alpha = (W - m_-)/(m_+ - m_-)$ . Then  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . So there exists  $t$  such that

$$P_{(0, 1)}(\bar{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + t\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0) = \alpha.$$

Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\theta}\{L(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{X}))\} &\leq m_- + (m_+ - m_-)\alpha \\
&= W,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

In the proof we used the condition that  $M_{max} < \infty$ . We do not know if Theorem 2 holds without the condition. But the next example suggests that such an estimator may exist for some problems.

**Example 1.** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be i.i.d. according to the exponential distribution ( $E(\mu, \alpha)$ ) with density  $\sigma^{-1}\exp(-(x - \mu)/\sigma)$ ,  $x > \mu$ . We want to estimate  $\mu$  under the loss function

$$\rho(u) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } u > 0 \\ -u, & \text{for } u \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence  $M_{min} = 1$  and  $M_{max} = \infty$ . Let  $\delta(\mathbf{X}) = \min(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . Then the risk function of  $\delta$  is one since  $\delta(\mathbf{X}) > \mu$ , so that for any  $W(1 < W < \infty)$

$$E_{\theta}\{L(\theta, \delta(\mathbf{X}))\} \leq W.$$

### 3. Two-stage estimation procedures

In this section we shall show that utilizing a two-stage procedure by Stein [6] may enable us to construct an estimator with bounded risk in some cases when there do not exist fixed sample size estimators.

For each  $n$ , let  $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . We suppose that there exist two sequences of statistics  $\{t_n(\mathbf{X}_n); n \geq n_0\}$  and  $\{s_n(\mathbf{X}_n); n \geq n_0\}$  ( $s_n(\mathbf{X}_n) > 0$ ) which satisfy the following assumptions.

**Assumption 1.** For any  $a(>0)$ ,  $b$  and  $n \geq n_0$

$$\begin{aligned}t_n(aX_n + b) &= at_n(X_n) + b, \\s_n(aX_n + b) &= as_n(X_n).\end{aligned}$$

**Assumption 2.** There exists a positive constant  $\beta$  such that

$$P_{(0, 1)}(n^\beta t_n(X_n) \leq x) = G(x)$$

is independent of  $n$ .

**Assumption 3.** There exists a positive integer  $m(\geq n_0)$  such that  $t_n(X_n)$  is independent of  $s_m(X_m)$  for  $n \geq m$ .

The similar assumptions are used in Ghurye [2] who considered an application of Stein's two-stage procedure of testing for a location parameter of the location-scale family. See also Mukhopadhyay [5].

Let  $S_m = s_m(X_m)$  and we assume that for each  $z > 0$

$$h_m(z) = \iint \rho\left(\frac{zx}{y}\right) G(dx) H_m(dy) < \infty, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $H_m(y) = P_{(0, 1)}(S_m \leq y)$ . Then  $h_m(z)$  is a nondecreasing function of  $z > 0$  and  $h_m(0) = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} h_m(z) &= m_+ \int_{x \geq 0} G(dx) + m_- \int_{x < 0} G(dx) \\ &= \alpha m_+ + (1 - \alpha) m_-\end{aligned}$$

with  $\alpha = \int_{x \geq 0} G(dx)$ . Hence if  $W < \alpha m_+ + (1 - \alpha) m_-$ , then there exists a positive constant  $z_m$  such that  $h_m(z_m) = W$ .

Now we shall give a two-stage estimator whose risk is bounded by  $W$ . Let  $X_m = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$  be the first sample and calculate  $S_m$ . Define the total sample size  $N$  by

$$N = \max\left\{m, \left[\left(\frac{S_m}{z_m}\right)^{1/\beta}\right] + 1\right\}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $[u]$  denotes the largest integer less than  $u$ . If  $N > m$ , take the second sample  $X_{m+1}, \dots, X_N$ . Then  $\mu$  is estimated by  $T_N = t_N(X_N)$ .

**Theorem 3.** *If Assumptions 1 to 3 are satisfied and  $W < \alpha m_+ + (1 - \alpha) m_-$ , then the estimator  $T_N$  meets the requirement.*

**Proof.** It follows from Assumption 3 that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta}\{L(\theta, T_N)\} &= E_{\theta}\{\rho(T_N - \mu)\} \\ &= \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} E_{\theta}\{I_{(N=n)}\rho(t_n(X_n) - \mu)\} \\ &= \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} P_{\theta}(N=n)E_{\theta}\{\rho(t_n(X_n) - \mu)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_{(N=n)}$  denotes the indicator function of the set  $\{N=n\}$ . Then from Assumptions 1 and 2 and the definition of  $N$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta}\{L(\theta, t_N(X_N))\} &= \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} P_{\theta}(N=n)E_{(\theta, 1)}\{\rho(\sigma t_n(X_n))\} \\ &= \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} P_{\theta}(N=n) \int \rho\left(\frac{\sigma x}{n^{\beta}}\right) G(dx) \\ &= E_{\theta}\left\{\int \rho\left(\frac{\sigma x}{N^{\beta}}\right) G(dx)\right\} \\ &\leq E_{\theta}\left\{\int \rho\left(\frac{z_m \sigma x}{S_m}\right) G(dx)\right\} \\ &= h_m(z_m) = W. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the proof is completed.

**Example 2.** Let  $\{X_i, i \geq 1\}$  be i.i.d. according to the exponential distribution  $E(\mu, \sigma)$ , and let  $t_n(X_n) = \min(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  and  $s_n(X_n) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - t_n(X_n))$ . Then  $t_n(X_n)$  and  $s_n(X_n)$  are independently distributed as  $E(\mu, \sigma/n)$  and  $\frac{1}{2(n-1)} \sigma \chi_{2n-2}^2$ , respectively, where  $\chi_{2n-2}^2$  denotes the chi squared distribution with  $2n-2$  degrees of freedom. It is easy to see that Assumptions 1 to 3 are satisfied with  $\beta=1$ , and that (3.1) is given by

$$h_m(z) = \int_0^{\infty} \rho\left(\frac{zu}{m-1}\right) f_{z, 2(m-1)}(u) du,$$

where  $f_{z, 2(m-1)}(u)$  is the density of  $F$  distribution with  $(2, 2(m-1))$  degrees of freedom. So we can get a two-stage estimator  $\min(X_1, \dots, X_N)$  whose risk is bounded by  $W (< m_+)$ . The total sample size  $N$  by (3.2) is

$$N = \max\left\{m, \left[\frac{S_m}{z_m}\right] + 1\right\},$$

where  $h_m(z_m) = W$  and  $S_m = s_m(X_m)$ .

#### 4. Normal distribution

Let  $\{X_i, i \geq 1\}$  be i.i.d. according to the normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ , and let  $t_n(\mathbf{X}_n) = \bar{X}_n \left( = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right)$ ,  $s_n(\mathbf{X}_n) = \sqrt{U_n}$  with  $U_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2$ . Then it is easy to see that Assumptions 1 to 3 are satisfied with  $\beta=1/2$ , and that (3.1) is given by

$$h_m(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(zu) g_{m-1}(u) du,$$

where  $g_{m-1}(u)$  is the density of  $t$  distribution with  $m-1$  degrees of freedom. So we can get a two-stage estimator  $\bar{X}_N$  whose risk is bounded by  $W(<(m_- + m_+)/2)$ . The total sample size  $N$  by (3.2) is

$$N = \max \left\{ m, \left[ \frac{U_m}{z_m^2} \right] + 1 \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where  $h_m(z_m) = W$ .

Now we consider properties of the two-stage procedure (4.1). Let

$$h(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(zu) \phi(u) du,$$

where  $\phi$  is the density function of the standard normal distribution. If  $\sigma$  were known, then

$$E_\theta \rho(\bar{X}_n - \mu) \leq W$$

if and only if  $n \geq n^* = (\sigma/z^*)^2$ , where  $h(z^*) = W$ . So  $n^*$  would be the optimal sample size if  $\sigma$  were known.

**Lemma 1.**  $z^* \geq z_m$ .

**Proof.** Suppose that  $X$  and  $Y$  are random variables with the standard normal distribution and  $t$  distribution with  $\nu (= m-1)$  degrees of freedom, respectively. Then it follows from Theorem 4 of Ghosh [1] that

$$P(|X| > c) \leq P(|Y| > c)$$

for any  $c > 0$ . That is,  $|Y|$  is stochastically larger than  $|X|$ . Since  $h(z) = E\rho(zX)$  and  $h_m(z) = E\rho(zY)$ , it can be shown that  $h_m(z) \geq h(z)$  (e.g. Lehmann [4], p. 116), from which the theorem is proved.

From (4.1) we get

$$\frac{U_m}{z_m^2} \leq N \leq \frac{U_m}{z_m^2} + m. \quad (4.2)$$

Hence

$$\left(\frac{z^*}{z_m}\right)^2 \frac{U_m}{\sigma^2} \leq \frac{N}{n^*} \leq \left(\frac{z^*}{z_m}\right)^2 \frac{U_m}{\sigma^2} + \frac{mz^{*2}}{\sigma^2}. \quad (4.3)$$

From the left inequality of (4.3) and Lemma 1 we get the following result.

**Theorem 4.** *For any fixed  $W$  and  $m$*

$$\frac{E_\theta(N)}{n^*} \geq \left(\frac{z^*}{z_m}\right)^2 \geq 1.$$

Next we consider the asymptotic properties of the two-stage procedure as  $W \rightarrow 0$ . We call the two-stage procedure asymptotically efficient if

$$\lim_{W \rightarrow 0} \frac{E_\theta(N)}{n^*} = 1.$$

It follows from (4.3) that

$$\left(\frac{z^*}{z_m}\right)^2 \leq \frac{E_\theta(N)}{n^*} \leq \left(\frac{z^*}{z_m}\right)^2 + \frac{mz^{*2}}{\sigma^2}.$$

So in order for the two-stage procedure to be asymptotically efficient it is necessary that  $m$  must be chosen such that

$$\lim_{W \rightarrow 0} \frac{z^*}{z_m} = 1 \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\lim_{W \rightarrow 0} mz^{*2} = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Then the next result is obtained.

**Theorem 5.** *If the initial sample size  $m$  is chosen such that (4.4) and (4.5) are satisfied, then the two-stage procedure is asymptotically efficient.*

**Example 3.** Suppose that

$$\rho(u) = \begin{cases} au^2, & \text{for } u > 0 \\ -bu, & \text{for } u \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $a > 0$  and  $b > 0$ . Then straightforward calculations show that

$$h(z) = cz + dz^2$$

$$h_m(z) = c_m z + d_m z^2,$$

where  $c = \frac{a}{2}$ ,  $d = \frac{b}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ ,  $c_m = c \frac{\nu}{\nu-2}$  and  $d_m = d \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}\right)\sqrt{\nu}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)\sqrt{2}}$  with  $\nu = m-1$ .

Hence

$$z^* = \frac{-d + \sqrt{d^2 + 4cW}}{2c}, \quad z_m = \frac{-d_m + \sqrt{d_m^2 + 4c_m W}}{2c_m}.$$

So

$$\frac{z^*}{z_m} = \frac{\sqrt{d_m^2 + 4c_m W} + d_m}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4cW} + d}$$

and

$$z^* = \frac{2W}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4cW} + d}.$$

Note that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} c_m = c$  and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d_m = d$ . If  $m$  is chosen such that  $m = o(W^{-2})$  as  $W \rightarrow 0$ , then (4.4) and (4.5) are satisfied and the two-stage procedure becomes asymptotically efficient.

## References

- [1] Ghosh, B. K., Some monotonicity theorem for  $\chi^2$ , F and t distribution with applications, J. Roy. Statist. Soc., B, **35** (1973), 48-492.
- [2] Ghurye, S. G., Note on sufficient statistics and two-stage procedures, Ann. Math. Statist. **29** (1958), 155-166.
- [3] Lehmann, E. L., Notes on the theory of estimation, University of Californian Press, Berkeley, 1951.
- [4] Lehmann, E. L., Testing Statistical Hypotheses, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York, 1986.
- [5] Mukhopadhyay, N., Stein's two-stage procedure and exact consistency, Scand. Actuarial J. (1982), 110-122.



- [6] Stein, C., A two-sample test for a linear hypothesis whose power is independent of the variance, *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **16** (1945), 245-258.
- [7] Takada, Y., The nonexistence of procedures with bounded performance characteristics in certain parametric inference problems, *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, **50** (1998), 325-335.

Yoshikazu Takada  
Department of Mathematics  
Faculty of Science  
Kumamoto University  
Kumamoto 860-855, Japan  
E-mail : takada@sci.kumamoto-u.ac.jp