

**CORRECTION TO**  
**ADMISSIBLE ESTIMATORS, RECURRENT DIFFUSIONS, AND**  
**INSOLUBLE BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS**

BY L. D. BROWN  
Cornell University

In the above paper (*Ann. Math. Statist.* **42** 855-903) we introduced the diffusion  $\{Z_t\}$  defined on  $E^m$  as having local mean  $\nabla \log f^*$  and local variance  $2I$ .

C. Srinivasan (private communication) has pointed out the following difficulty with this definition and our usage of  $\{Z_t\}$ . Since  $\nabla \log f^*$  is a  $C^\infty$  function  $Z_t$  may always be defined locally (see e.g. McKean (1969)). However it may happen that  $\{Z_t\}$  "explodes" in a finite time. To be precise, define the random time (time of explosion) as

$$\mathcal{T}^x = \sup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \inf \{t : Z_t^x \geq R\}.$$

Either  $\mathcal{T}^x = \infty$  w.p. 1, or not. In the latter case our definition of  $\{Z_t\}$  is defective for  $t \geq \mathcal{T}$ . To repair the definition let  $Z_t = \infty$  if  $t \geq \mathcal{T}$ .  $Z_t$  is then a well-defined diffusion on  $E^m \cup \{\infty\}$ .

Let us make some remarks to clarify the effect of this new definition of  $\{Z_t\}$ .

(1) All of the main results of the paper remain true with this new definition of  $\{Z_t\}$  exactly as they are stated in Brown (1971); except for Theorem 4.3.1 which requires a minor change. (See (5, vi) below.) This includes all the results labeled as Theorems or Corollaries. However, some of the Lemmas must be modified. See below.

(2) If  $\Pr\{\mathcal{T}_E^x < \infty\} > 0$  for some  $x \in E^m$  then  $\Pr\{\mathcal{T}^x < \infty\} > 0$  for all  $x \in E^m$ . In this case  $\{Z_t\}$  is transient according to the definition (4.1.4) (which remains appropriate even with the above, revised definition of  $\{Z_t\}$ ). These facts can be deduced from the discussion in McKean (1969, Section 4.4) and from previously described properties of  $\{Z_t\}$ .

(3) The situation  $\Pr\{\mathcal{T}^x < \infty\} > 0$  is possible for diffusions of the type considered here; but only if  $\sup\{f^*(x) : |x| = r\}$  increases exceedingly rapidly as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . As an example suppose  $m = 1$  and  $f^*({k}) = e^{k^2/2}/k!$   $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Then  $f^*(x) = \exp(e^x - x^2/2)$ . Hence  $\nabla \log f^*(x) = e^x - x$ . It follows from Feller's test for explosion that  $\Pr\{\mathcal{T}^x < \infty\} = 1$ . (See e.g. McKean (1969, page 65).)

On the other hand, if  $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \{\|\nabla \log f^*(x)\| : \|x\| = r\}/r < \infty$  then  $\Pr\{\mathcal{T}^x < \infty\} = 0$ , by Hasminskii's test (McKean (1969, page 102)). It can be shown that this is the case if  $\int_{|x| < r} dF(x) = O(e^{kr})$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $k < \infty$ .

(4) The only formal result in our paper which directly uses  $\Pr\{\mathcal{T} < \infty\} = 0$  in its statement or proof is Lemma 4.2.1. Some later results use this Lemma in their proof but otherwise make no use of  $\Pr\{\mathcal{T} < \infty\} = 0$ . Lemma 4.2.1 remains correct if  $m = 1$ , or if  $K = E^m$ . This is easy to check. Therefore: