

# ON THE ASYMPTOTIC EFFICIENCY OF A SEQUENTIAL PROCEDURE FOR ESTIMATING THE MEAN<sup>1</sup>

BY NORMAN STARR<sup>2</sup>

*Columbia University and University of Minnesota*

**1. Introduction.** Let the independent, identically distributed random variables

$$(1) \quad X_1, X_2, \dots$$

be  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$  with  $\mu$  unknown and  $0 < \sigma < \infty$ . Define for  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$(2) \quad \bar{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \quad S_n^2 = (n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2,$$

and suppose that for fixed  $s, t > 0$  the loss incurred in estimating  $\mu$  by  $\bar{X}_n$  from a sample of fixed size  $n$  is

$$(3) \quad L_n = A|\bar{X}_n - \mu|^s + n^t \quad (A > 0),$$

with risk

$$(4) \quad \nu_n(\sigma) = E_\sigma L_n = A E_\sigma |\bar{X}_n - \mu|^s + n^t.$$

When  $\sigma$  is *known* the problem of finding the value of  $n$ , say  $n^0$ , for which the risk (4) is a minimum is perfectly straightforward; let  $\nu(\sigma)$ ,

$$(5) \quad \nu(\sigma) = \nu_{n^0}(\sigma) = \min_{n>0} \nu_n(\sigma),$$

denote the minimum risk. On the other hand, *in ignorance of  $\sigma$*  no procedure based on a fixed number  $n$  of observations of (1) will minimize (4) simultaneously for all  $0 < \sigma < \infty$ . Accordingly, the possibility of utilizing a sample of random size  $N$  determined by a certain sequential rule  $\mathfrak{R}$  to be specified later, will be considered. In analogy with (3) the loss using  $\mathfrak{R}$  is for fixed  $s, t > 0$  and  $N$ ,

$$(6) \quad L_N = A|\bar{X}_N - \mu|^s + N^t \quad (A > 0),$$

with risk

$$(7) \quad \bar{\nu}(\sigma) = E_\sigma L_N = A E_\sigma |\bar{X}_N - \mu|^s + E_\sigma N^t.$$

It would seem to be of considerable practical importance to compare the values of  $\nu(\sigma)$  and  $\bar{\nu}(\sigma)$  for values  $0 < \sigma < \infty$  of the parameter upon which these functions depend. For, either it will turn out that  $\nu$  and  $\bar{\nu}$  do not differ appreciably for any value of  $\sigma$ , in which case a very useful and easily applied statistical procedure will have been justified, or in the contrary case a horrible example of the dangers of "optional stopping" will have been exposed.

Received 19 November 1965.

<sup>1</sup> Research supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant NSF-GP-3694 at Columbia University and NSF-GP-3813 at the University of Minnesota.

<sup>2</sup> Now at Carnegie Institute of Technology.