

## ON A CLASS OF UNIFORMLY ADMISSIBLE ESTIMATORS OF A FINITE POPULATION TOTAL<sup>1</sup>

BY W. A. ERICSON

*University of Michigan*

**1. Introduction.** In a recent paper Godambe (1969) established the uniform admissibility of a class of estimators of a finite population total. In the present note we extend this class. The notation and definitions of this section follow that of Godambe (1969).

Any subset  $s$  of the integers,  $1, \dots, N$ , which label the  $N$  distinguishable population units, is called a sample. A sampling design is defined by a probability mass function,  $p$ , on  $S$ , the set of all possible samples. Let  $x_i$  be the real (unknown) value associated with the  $i$ th population unit and let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in R^N$ . Any real-valued function  $e(\mathbf{x}, s)$  which depends on  $\mathbf{x}$  only through those values  $x_i$  for  $i \in s$  will be termed an estimator. We will be concerned with estimation of the population total,  $T(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$ , under quadratic losses.

**DEFINITION 1.1.** For any given sampling design  $p$ , an estimator  $e'$  is said to *dominate* the estimator  $e$  if for all  $\mathbf{x} \in R^N$

$$\sum_S p(s)[e'(s, \mathbf{x}) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2 \leq \sum_S p(s)[e(s, \mathbf{x}) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

with strict inequality for at least one  $\mathbf{x}$ .

**DEFINITION 1.2.** A pair  $(e', p')$  of an estimator  $e'$  and a sampling design  $p'$  is said to *uniformly dominate* another pair  $(e, p)$  if for all  $\mathbf{x} \in R^N$

$$\sum_S p'(s)[e'(s, \mathbf{x}) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2 \leq \sum_S p(s)[e(s, \mathbf{x}) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2$$

with strict inequality for at least one  $\mathbf{x}$ .

The notions of *admissibility* of an estimator for a given sampling design and that of *uniform admissibility* of a pair  $(e, p)$  for  $p$  in a class,  $C$ , of designs are then defined in the standard manner.

If  $C_n = \{p \mid \sum_S p(s)n(s) = n\}$  where  $n(s)$  is the cardinality of  $s$  then the main result of Godambe (1969) is that with respect to the class  $C_n$  the pair  $(e^*, p^*)$  is uniformly admissible where  $e^*(s, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in s} x_i + \sum_{i \notin s} \lambda_i$ ,  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$  being *any* fixed values and where  $p^*$  is *any* member of  $C_n$ .

**DEFINITION 1.3.** For  $0 < n < N$ ,  $D_n \equiv \{p \mid p(s) = 0 \text{ if } n(s) \neq n\}$  i.e.,  $D_n$  is the class of fixed size sample designs.

The main result of this note is then

---

Received July 25, 1969; revised December 19, 1969.

<sup>1</sup> This research was partially sponsored by the National Science Foundation under Grant NSF-GP-8881.

THEOREM 1.1. *With respect to the class of designs  $D_n$  the pair  $(e^*, p^*)$  is uniformly admissible where*

$$(1.1) \quad e^*(s, \mathbf{x}) = \alpha_n \sum_{i \in s} x_i + \beta_n$$

$\alpha_n$  and  $\beta_n$  being any fixed arbitrary values such that  $1 < \alpha_n < N/n$ , and  $p^*$  is any member of  $D_n$ .

Note that for this class of estimators the coefficient of  $\sum_{i \in s} x_i$  is realistically allowed to depend on the sample size,  $n$ . A proof of this theorem as well as some other results are given in the next section. A brief discussion of the estimator is given in Section 3.

**2. Proof of main and supplementary results.** It is clear that for any prior distribution,  $\omega$ , on  $R^N$

$$(2.1) \quad e(s, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in s} x_i + \sum_{i \notin s} E_\omega(x_i | s, x_j: j \in s)$$

is a Bayes estimator of  $T(\mathbf{x})$  provided that the conditional expectation above exists. The following is then immediate.

THEOREM 2.1. *For any specified fixed values  $\beta_n$  and  $1 < \alpha_n < N/n$  the estimator,  $e^*(s, \mathbf{x})$  in (1.1), is a Bayes estimator under any prior distribution,  $\omega$ , for which*

$$\sum_{i \notin s} E_\omega(x_i | s, x_j: j \in s) = (\alpha_n - 1) \sum_{i \in s} x_i + \beta_n$$

for all  $\mathbf{x} \in R^N$  and all  $s$  for which  $n(s) = n$ .

To prove admissibility properties of  $e^*$  we will utilize the following definitions:

DEFINITION 2.1. Let  $\Omega$  denote any class of discrete prior distributions on  $R^N$  such that for any point  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in R^N$  there exists an  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that  $\omega(\mathbf{x}_0) > 0$ .

DEFINITION 2.2. Let  $\Omega^*$  denote the class of discrete prior distributions,  $\omega$ , on  $R^N$  such that

(i)  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  when distributed as  $\omega$  are *exchangeable* and possess a variance,  $\sigma_\omega^2$  and

(ii) For all  $\mathbf{x} \in R^N$ , all  $s$  for which  $n(s) = n$ , and all  $i \notin s$   $E_\omega(x_i | s, x_i: i \in s) = \alpha_n' \sum_{i \in s} x_i + \beta_n'$ ,  $\alpha_n'$  and  $\beta_n'$  being any fixed values satisfying  $0 < \alpha_n' < 1/n$ .

In order to prove the main results we use the following lemmas.

LEMMA 2.1. (Godambe) *Let  $\Omega$  satisfy Definition 2.1. If  $e$ , given in (2.1), is a Bayes estimator for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and if  $p$  is any arbitrary sampling design, then  $e$  is admissible.*

LEMMA 2.2. *For any point  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in R^N$  there exists an  $\omega_0 \in \Omega^*$  such that  $\omega_0(\mathbf{x}_0) > 0$ .*

PROOF. For the given  $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_{10}, \dots, x_{N0})$  let  $y_1, \dots, y_{r-1}$  be the set of distinct values of the  $x_{i0}$ 's. Let  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{r-1}, y_r\}$  where  $y_r$  is determined by (2.3) below. For any  $\mathbf{x} \in R^N$  let  $n_i$  be the number of the  $N$  coordinate  $x_j$ 's equal to  $y_i$

$i = 1, \dots, r$ . We then assign a discrete probability distribution to  $R^N$  as follows. Let

$$(2.1) \quad \omega_0(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_1^r n_i < N,$$

$$= P_r(n_1, \dots, n_r) = \frac{\Gamma(N+1) \prod_1^r \Gamma(n_i + \varepsilon_i) \Gamma(\varepsilon)}{\prod_1^r \Gamma(n_i + 1) \Gamma(N + \varepsilon) \prod_1^r \Gamma(\varepsilon_i)} \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_1^r n_i = N;$$

where  $\varepsilon_i > 0, n_i = 0, 1, \dots, N, \varepsilon = \sum_1^r \varepsilon_i$ .

This distribution, variously called the Dirichlet-Multinomial (Ericson (1969)), the compound multinomial (Mosimann (1962)) etc. clearly satisfies the discreteness, exchangeability, and  $\omega_0(\mathbf{x}_0) > 0$  requirements. It also is easily seen that under this prior  $\sigma_{\omega_0}^2 = \sum_1^r y_i^2 \varepsilon_i / \varepsilon - (\sum_1^r y_i \varepsilon_i / \varepsilon)^2$ . In addition, it can be shown (Ericson (1969)), that for  $i \notin s$

$$(2.2) \quad E_{\omega_0}(x_i | s, x_j : j \in s) = \sum_{i \in s} x_i / (n + \varepsilon) + \sum_1^r y_i \varepsilon_i / (n + \varepsilon)$$

and thus it is clear that one can choose  $\varepsilon, y_r$ , and the  $\varepsilon_i$ 's such that for any specified  $0 < \alpha_n' < 1/n$  and  $-\infty < \beta_n' < \infty$

$$(2.3) \quad \alpha_n' = 1/(n + \varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_n' = \sum_1^r y_i \varepsilon_i / (n + \varepsilon).$$

From these two lemmas we then have

**THEOREM 2.2.** *For any fixed sample size,  $p$ , the estimator  $e^*$  in (1.1) for any fixed  $\beta_n$  and  $1 < \alpha_n < N/n$  is admissible.*

To prove Theorem 1.1 we utilize the following result.

**THEOREM 2.3.** (Godambe) *Let  $\Omega$  satisfy Definition 2.1. If  $e$ , given in (2.1) is a Bayes estimator for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and if  $C$  is a class of sampling designs such that for all  $p \in C$  and all  $\omega \in \Omega$  the Bayes risk is independent of  $p \in C$ , i.e.,*

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{R^N} \omega(\mathbf{x}) \{ \sum_S p(s) [e(s, \mathbf{x}) - T(\mathbf{x})]^2 \} = c_\omega,$$

where  $c_\omega$  does not depend upon  $p$ , then with respect to the class  $C$  the pair  $(e, p)$ , where  $p$  is any element of  $C$ , is uniformly admissible.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 then follows from Theorem 2.3, Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 by taking  $\Omega = \Omega^*$  in Theorem 2.3, taking  $C = D_n$ , taking  $e$  as in (2.1), and noting that for any  $\omega \in \Omega^*$  the Bayes risk of  $e$  is constant over  $p \in D_n$ . The latter observation follows since for  $\omega \in \Omega^*$ , by (2.1) and Definition 2.2,  $e(s, \mathbf{x}) = [(N - n)\alpha_n' + 1] \sum_{i \in s} x_i + (N - n)\beta_n'$ .

Hence, on interchanging the order of summation and summing first on  $\mathbf{x} \in R^N$  such that  $x_i$  for  $i \in s$  are fixed, the Bayes risk, (2.4), becomes

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_S p(s) E_{x_i : i \in s} \text{Var} [T(\mathbf{x}) | s, x_i : i \in s]$$

$$= \sum_S p(s) [\text{Var} (T(\mathbf{x})) - \text{Var}_{x_i : i \in s} \{E(T(\mathbf{x}) | s, x_i : i \in s)\}]$$

$$= N\sigma_\omega^2 + N(N - 1)\rho_\omega \sigma_\omega^2 - [(N - n)\alpha_n' + 1]^2 (n\sigma_\omega^2 + n(n - 1)\rho_\omega \sigma_\omega^2) \equiv c_\omega$$

for all  $p \in D_n$  and where  $\rho_\omega$  is the common correlation coefficient under  $\omega \in \Omega^*$  of  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ . Finally we make the identification  $\alpha_n = [(N - n)\alpha_n' + 1]$  and  $\beta_n = (N - n)\beta_n'$ .

**3. Discussion.** It follows as a simple corollary of Theorem 1.1 that with respect to  $D_n$  uniformly admissible estimators of  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = T(\mathbf{x})/N$  are given by

$$(3.1) \quad e_\mu(s, \mathbf{x}) = n\alpha_n \bar{x}/N + \beta_n/N \equiv \alpha_n^* \bar{x} + \beta_n^*$$

where  $n/N < \alpha_n^* < 1$ .

Note that the uniform admissibility of the estimators in (1.1) and (3.1) for  $\alpha_n = 1$  and  $\alpha_n^* = n/N$  respectively was shown by Godambe (1969). The restriction  $\alpha_n^* \geq n/N$  seems intuitively reasonable and under the class  $\Omega^*$  of priors it corresponds to the restriction that  $\text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) \geq 0$ .

The class of estimators, (3.1), of  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  also has intuitive appeal from a Bayesian viewpoint for it has been shown (Ericson (1969)) that if  $e_\mu(s, \mathbf{x})$ , (3.1), is a Bayes estimator of  $\mu$  for some  $\omega \in \Omega^*$  then  $\beta_n^* = (1 - \alpha_n^*)E(\mu(\mathbf{x}))$  and  $\alpha_n^* = \text{Var}(\mu(\mathbf{x}))/\text{Var}(\bar{x})$  or  $\alpha_n^* = \text{Var}(\mu(\mathbf{x}))/[\text{Var}(\mu(\mathbf{x})) + E_{\bar{x}}\text{Var}(\mu(\mathbf{x})|\bar{x})]$ . It then follows that  $e_\mu$  has the interpretation of being a weighted average of  $\bar{x}$ , the sample mean, and  $E(\mu(\mathbf{x}))$ , the prior mean, with weights inversely proportional to the prior expectation of the sampling variance of  $\bar{x}$  and the prior variance of  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  respectively.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] ERICSON, W. A. (1969). Subjective Bayesian models in sampling finite populations (with discussion). *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B.* **31** 195–233.
- [2] GODAMBE, V. P. (1969). Admissibility and Bayes estimation in sampling finite populations V. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **40** 672–676.
- [3] MOSIMANN, J. E. (1962). On the compound multinomial distribution, the multivariate  $\beta$ -distribution, and correlations among proportions. *Biometrika* **49** 65–82.