

ADMISSIBILITY OF THE USUAL CONFIDENCE INTERVAL IN LINEAR REGRESSION

SHORT RUNNING TITLE: ADMISSIBILITY IN REGRESSION

PAUL KABAILA^{1*}, KHAGESWOR GIRI² AND HANNES LEEB³

1. *Department of Mathematics and Statistics*

La Trobe University

Bundoora Victoria 3086

Australia

2. *Future Farming Systems Research*

Department of Primary Industries

600 Sneydes Road

Werribee 3030 Victoria

Australia

3. *Department of Statistics*

University of Vienna

Universitätsstr. 5/3, A-1010 Vienna

Austria

Summary

Consider a linear regression model with independent and identically normally distributed random errors. Suppose that the parameter of interest is a specified linear combination of the regression parameters. We prove that the usual confidence interval for this parameter is admissible within a broad class of confidence intervals.

Keywords: admissibility; compromise decision theory; confidence interval; decision theory.

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, La Trobe University, Victoria 3086, Australia. Tel.: +61 3 9479 2594, fax: +61 3 9479 2466, e-mail: P.Kabaila@latrobe.edu.au

1. Introduction

Consider the linear regression model $Y = X\beta + \varepsilon$, where Y is a random n -vector of responses, X is a known $n \times p$ matrix with linearly independent columns, β is an unknown parameter p -vector and $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$ where σ^2 is an unknown positive parameter. Let $\hat{\beta}$ denote the least squares estimator of β . Also, define $\hat{\sigma}^2 = (Y - X\hat{\beta})^T(Y - X\hat{\beta})/(n - p)$.

Suppose that the parameter of interest is $\theta = a^T\beta$ where a is a given p -vector ($a \neq 0$). We seek a $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for θ . Define the quantile $t(m)$ by the requirement that $P(-t(m) \leq T \leq t(m)) = 1 - \alpha$ for $T \sim t_m$. Let $\hat{\Theta}$ denote $a^T\hat{\beta}$, i.e. the least squares estimator of θ . Also let v_{11} denote the variance of $\hat{\Theta}$ divided by σ^2 . The usual $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for θ is

$$I = [\hat{\Theta} - t(m)\sqrt{v_{11}}\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\Theta} + t(m)\sqrt{v_{11}}\hat{\sigma}]$$

where $m = n - p$. Is this confidence interval admissible? The admissibility of a confidence interval is a much more difficult concept than the admissibility of a point estimator, since confidence intervals must satisfy a coverage probability constraint. Also, admissibility of confidence intervals can be defined in either weak or strong forms (Joshi, 1969, 1982).

Kabaila & Giri (2009, Section 3) describe a broad class \mathcal{D} of confidence intervals that includes I . The main result of the present paper, presented in Section 3, is that I is strongly admissible within the class \mathcal{D} . An attractive feature of the proof of this result is that, although lengthy, this proof is quite straightforward and elementary. Section 2 provides a brief description of this class \mathcal{D} . For completeness, in Section 4 we describe a strong admissibility result, that follows from the results of Joshi (1969), for the usual $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for θ in the somewhat artificial situation that the error variance σ^2 is assumed to be known.

2. Description of the class \mathcal{D}

Define the parameter $\tau = c^T\beta - t$ where the vector c and the number t are given and a and c are linearly independent. Let $\hat{\tau}$ denote $c^T\hat{\beta} - t$ i.e. the least squares estimator of τ . Define the matrix V to be the covariance matrix of $(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\tau})$ divided

by σ^2 . Let v_{ij} denote the (i, j) th element of V . We use the notation $[a \pm b]$ for the interval $[a - b, a + b]$ ($b > 0$). Define the following confidence interval for θ

$$J(b, s) = \left[\hat{\Theta} - \sqrt{v_{11}} \hat{\sigma} b \left(\frac{\hat{\tau}}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{v_{22}}} \right) \pm \sqrt{v_{11}} \hat{\sigma} s \left(\frac{|\hat{\tau}|}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{v_{22}}} \right) \right] \quad (1)$$

where the functions b and s are required to satisfy the following restrictions. The function $b : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an odd function and $s : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Both b and s are bounded. These functions are also continuous except, possibly, at a finite number of values. Also, $b(x) = 0$ for all $|x| \geq d$ and $s(x) = t(m)$ for all $x \geq d$ where d is a given positive number. Let $\mathcal{F}(d)$ denote the class of pairs of functions (b, s) that satisfy these restrictions, for given d ($d > 0$).

Define \mathcal{D} to be the class of all confidence intervals for θ of the form (1), where c, t, d, b and s satisfy the stated restrictions. Each member of this class is specified by (c, t, d, b, s) . Apart from the usual $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval I for θ , the class \mathcal{D} of confidence intervals for θ includes the following:

- (a) Suppose that we carry out a preliminary hypothesis test of the null hypothesis $\tau = 0$ against the alternative hypothesis $\tau \neq 0$. Also suppose that we construct a confidence interval for θ with nominal coverage $1 - \alpha$ based on the assumption that the selected model had been given to us *a priori* (as the true model). The resulting confidence interval, called the naive $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval, belongs to the class \mathcal{D} (Kabaila & Giri, 2009, Section 2).
- (b) Confidence intervals for θ that are constructed to utilize (in the particular manner described by Kabaila & Giri, 2009) uncertain prior information that $\tau = 0$.

Let K denote the usual $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for θ based on the assumption that $\tau = 0$. The naive $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval, described in (a), may be expressed in the following form:

$$h \left(\frac{|\hat{\tau}|}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{v_{22}}} \right) I + \left(1 - h \left(\frac{|\hat{\tau}|}{\hat{\sigma} \sqrt{v_{22}}} \right) \right) K \quad (2)$$

where $h : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the unit step function defined by $h(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0, q]$ and $h(x) = 1$ for all $x > q$. Now suppose that we replace h by a continuous increasing function satisfying $h(0) = 0$ and $h(x) \rightarrow 1$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ (a similar construction is extensively used in the context of point estimation by Saleh, 2006). The confidence interval (2) is also a member of the class \mathcal{D} .

3. Main result

As noted in Section 2, each member of the class \mathcal{D} is specified by (c, t, d, b, s) . The following result states that the usual $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for θ is strongly admissible within the class \mathcal{D} .

Theorem 1. *There does not exist $(c, t, d, b, s) \in \mathcal{D}$ such that the following three conditions hold:*

$$(a) \quad E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } J(b, s)) \leq E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } I) \quad \text{for all } (\beta, \sigma^2). \quad (3)$$

$$(b) \quad P_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\theta \in J(b, s)) \geq P_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\theta \in I) \quad \text{for all } (\beta, \sigma^2). \quad (4)$$

$$(c) \quad \text{Strict inequality holds in either (3) or (4) for at least one } (\beta, \sigma^2).$$

The proof of this result is presented in Appendix A.

An illustration of this result is provided by Figure 3 of Kabaila & Giri (2009). Define $\gamma = \tau/(\sigma\sqrt{v_{22}})$. Also define

$$e(\gamma; s) = \frac{\text{expected length of } J(b, s)}{\text{expected length of } I}.$$

We call this the scaled expected length of $J(b, s)$. Theorem 1 tells us that for any confidence interval $J(b, s)$, with minimum coverage probability $1 - \alpha$, it cannot be the case that $e(\gamma; s) \leq 1$ for all γ , with strict inequality for at least one γ . This fact is illustrated by the bottom panel of Figure 3 of Kabaila & Giri (2009).

Define the class $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ to be the subset of \mathcal{D} in which both b and s are continuous functions. Strong admissibility of the confidence interval I within the class \mathcal{D} implies weak admissibility of this confidence interval within the class $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, as the following result shows. Since $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ is a sufficient statistic for (β, σ) , we reduce the data to $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$.

Corollary 1. *There does not exist $(c, t, d, b, s) \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ such that the following three conditions hold:*

$$(a') \quad (\text{length of } J(b, s)) \leq (\text{length of } I) \quad \text{for all } (\hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}^2). \quad (5)$$

$$(b') \quad P_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\theta \in J(b, s)) \geq P_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\theta \in I) \quad \text{for all } (\beta, \sigma^2). \quad (6)$$

$$(c') \quad \text{Strict inequality holds in either (5) or (13) for at least one } (\beta, \sigma^2).$$

This corollary is proved in Appendix B.

4. Admissibility result for known error variance

In this section, we suppose that σ^2 is known. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\sigma^2 = 1$. As before, let $\hat{\beta}$ denote the least squares estimator of β . Since $\hat{\beta}$ is a sufficient statistic for β , we reduce the data to $\hat{\beta}$. Assume that the parameter of interest is $\theta = \beta_1 / \sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1)}$. Thus the least squares estimator of θ is $\hat{\Theta} = \hat{\beta}_1 / \sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1)}$. Define

$$\hat{\Delta} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\beta}_2 - \ell_2 \hat{\beta}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\beta}_p - \ell_p \hat{\beta}_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where ℓ_2, \dots, ℓ_p have been chosen such that $\text{Cov}(\hat{\beta}_j - \ell_j \hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_1) = 0$ for $j = 2, \dots, p$. Now define

$$\delta = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_2 - \ell_2 \beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_p - \ell_p \beta_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that $(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta})$ is obtained by a one-to-one transformation from $\hat{\beta}$. So, we reduce the data to $(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta})$. Note that $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\hat{\Delta}$ are independent, with $\hat{\Theta} \sim N(\theta, 1)$ and $\hat{\Delta}$ with a multivariate normal distribution with mean δ and known covariance matrix. Define the number z by the requirement that $P(-z \leq Z \leq z) = 1 - \alpha$ for $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. Let $I = [\hat{\Theta} - z, \hat{\Theta} + z]$. Define

$$\varphi(\hat{\theta}, \theta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta \in [\hat{\theta} - z, \hat{\theta} + z] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This is the probability that θ is included in the confidence interval I , when $\hat{\theta}$ is the observed value of $\hat{\Theta}$. The length of the confidence interval I is $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(\hat{\theta}, \theta) d\theta = 2z$. Let $p_\theta(\cdot)$ denote the probability density function of $\hat{\Theta}$ for given θ . The coverage probability of I is $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(\hat{\theta}, \theta) p_\theta(\hat{\theta}) d\hat{\theta} = 1 - \alpha$.

Now let $\mathcal{C}(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta})$ denote a confidence set for θ . Define

$$\varphi_\delta(\hat{\theta}, \theta) = P_{\theta, \delta}(\theta \in \mathcal{C}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Delta})),$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ denotes the observed value of $\hat{\Theta}$. For each given $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$, the expected Lebesgue measure of $\mathcal{C}(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta})$ is $E_{\theta, \delta} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_\delta(\hat{\Theta}, \theta) d\theta \right)$. For each given $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$, the coverage probability of $\mathcal{C}(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta})$ is $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_\delta(\hat{\theta}, \theta) p_\theta(\hat{\theta}) d\hat{\theta}$. Theorem 5.1 of Joshi (1969) implies the following strong admissibility result. Suppose that $\varphi_\delta(\hat{\theta}, \theta)$ satisfies the following conditions

$$(i) E_{\theta, \delta} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_{\delta}(\hat{\theta}, \theta) d\theta \right) \leq E_{\theta, \delta} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(\hat{\theta}, \theta) d\theta \right) \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

$$(ii) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_{\delta}(\hat{\theta}, \theta) p_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) d\hat{\theta} \geq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(\hat{\theta}, \theta) p_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}) d\hat{\theta} \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $\varphi_{\delta}(\hat{\theta}, \theta) = \varphi(\hat{\theta}, \theta)$ for almost all $(\hat{\theta}, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. This result is true for each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$. Using standard arguemnts, this entails that $I \setminus \mathcal{C}(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta}) \setminus I$ are Lebesgue-null sets, for (Lebesgue-) almost all values of $(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Delta})$.

Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 1

Suppose that c is a given vector (such that c and a are linearly independent), t is a given number and d is a given positive number. The proof of Theorem 1 now proceeds as follows. We present a few definitions and a lemma. We then apply this lemma to prove this theorem.

Define $W = \hat{\sigma}/\sigma$. Note that W has the same distribution as $\sqrt{Q/m}$ where $Q \sim \chi_m^2$. Let f_W denote the probability density function of W . Also let ϕ denote the $N(0, 1)$ probability density function. Now define

$$R_1(b, s; \gamma) = \frac{\text{expected length of } J(b, s)}{\text{expected length of } I} - 1.$$

It follows from (7) of Kabaila & Giri (2009) that

$$R_1(b, s; \gamma) = \frac{1}{t(m)E(W)} \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-d}^d (s(|x|) - t(m)) \phi(wx - \gamma) dx w^2 f_W(w) dw. \quad (7)$$

Thus, for each $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$, $R_1(b, s; \gamma)$ is a continuous function of γ .

Also define $R_2(b, s; \gamma) = P(\theta \notin J(b, s)) - \alpha$. We make the following definitions, also used by Kabaila & Giri (2009). Define $\rho = v_{12}/\sqrt{v_{11}v_{22}}$ and $\Psi(x, y; \mu, v) = P(x \leq Z \leq y)$, for $Z \sim N(\mu, v)$. Now define the functions

$$k^{\dagger}(h, w, \gamma, \rho) = \Psi(-t(m)w, t(m)w; \rho(h - \gamma), 1 - \rho^2)$$

$$k(h, w, \gamma, \rho) = \Psi(b(h/w)w - s(|h|/w)w, b(h/w)w + s(|h|/w)w; \rho(h - \gamma), 1 - \rho^2).$$

It follows from (6) of Kabaila & Giri (2009), that

$$R_2(b, s; \gamma) = - \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-d}^d (k(wx, w, \gamma, \rho) - k^{\dagger}(wx, w, \gamma, \rho)) \phi(wx - \gamma) dx w f_W(w) dw. \quad (8)$$

Thus, for each $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$, $R_2(b, s; \gamma)$ is a continuous function of γ .

Now $E(W^2) = 1$ and so

$$\int_0^\infty w^2 f_W(w) dw = 1.$$

It follows from (7) that

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty R_1(b, s; \gamma) d\gamma = \frac{2}{t(m)E(W)} \int_0^d (s(x) - t(m)) dx. \quad (9)$$

Thus $\int_{-\infty}^\infty R_1(b, s; \gamma) d\gamma$ exists for all $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$.

Since $k(wx, w, \gamma, \rho)$ and $k^\dagger(wx, w, \gamma, \rho)$ are probabilities,

$$|R_2(b, s; \gamma)| \leq \int_0^\infty \int_{-d}^d \phi(wx - \gamma) dx w f_W(w) dw,$$

so that

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty |R_2(b, s; \gamma)| d\gamma \leq 2d \int_0^\infty w f_W(w) dw = 2dE(W) < \infty.$$

Thus $\int_{-\infty}^\infty R_2(b, s; \gamma) d\gamma$ exists for all $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$.

Thus, we may define

$$g(b, s; \lambda) = \lambda \int_{-\infty}^\infty R_1(b, s; \gamma) d\gamma + (1 - \lambda) \int_{-\infty}^\infty R_2(b, s; \gamma) d\gamma,$$

for each $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$, where $0 < \lambda < 1$. Kempthorne (1983, 1987, 1988) presents results on what he calls compromise decision theory. Initially, these results were applied only to the solution of some problems of point estimation. Kabaila & Tuck (2008) develop new results in compromise decision theory and apply these to a problem of interval estimation. The following lemma, which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1, is in the style of these compromise decision theory results.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that c is a given vector (such that c and a are linearly independent), t is a given number and d is a given positive number. Also suppose that λ is given and that (b^*, s^*) minimizes $g(b, s; \lambda)$ with respect to $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$. Then there does not exist $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$ such that*

(a) $R_1(b, s; \gamma) \leq R_1(b^*, s^*; \gamma)$ for all γ .

(b) $R_2(b, s; \gamma) \leq R_2(b^*, s^*; \gamma)$ for all γ .

(c) *Strict inequality holds in either (a) or (b) for at least one γ .*

Proof. Suppose that c is a given vector (such that c and a are linearly independent), t is a given number and d is a given positive number. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that there exist $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$ such that (a), (b) and (c) hold. Now,

$$g(b^*, s^*; \lambda) - g(b, s; \lambda) = \lambda \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (R_1(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_1(b, s; \gamma)) d\gamma \\ + (1 - \lambda) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (R_2(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_2(b, s; \gamma)) d\gamma$$

By hypothesis, one of the following 2 cases holds.

Case 1 (a) and (b) hold and $R_1(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_1(b, s; \gamma) > 0$ for at least one γ . Since $R_1(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_1(b, s; \gamma)$ is a continuous function of γ ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (R_1(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_1(b, s; \gamma)) d\gamma > 0.$$

Thus $g(b^*, s^*; \lambda) > g(b, s; \lambda)$ and we have established a contradiction.

Case 2 (a) and (b) hold and $R_2(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_2(b, s; \gamma) > 0$ for at least one γ . Since $R_2(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_2(b, s; \gamma)$ is a continuous function of γ ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (R_2(b^*, s^*; \gamma) - R_2(b, s; \gamma)) d\gamma > 0.$$

Thus $g(b^*, s^*; \lambda) > g(b, s; \lambda)$ and we have established a contradiction.

Lemma 1 follows from the fact that this argument holds for every given vector c (such that c and a are linearly independent), every given number t and every given positive number d . □

We will first find the (b^*, s^*) that minimizes $g(b, s; \lambda)$ with respect to $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$, for given λ . We will then choose λ such that $J(b^*, s^*) = I$, the usual $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for θ . Theorem 1 is then a consequence of Lemma 1.

By changing the variable of integration in the inner integral in (8), it can be shown that $R_2(b, s; \gamma)$ is equal to

$$- \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^d \left((k(wx, w, \gamma, \rho) - k^\dagger(wx, w, \gamma, \rho)) \phi(wx - \gamma) + \right. \\ \left. (k(-wx, w, \gamma, \rho) - k^\dagger(-wx, w, \gamma, \rho)) \phi(wx + \gamma) \right) dx w f_W(w) dw$$

Using this expression and the restriction that b is an odd function, we find that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_2(b, s; \gamma) d\gamma$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^d \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\Psi(b(x)w - s(x)w, b(x)w + s(x)w; \rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right. \\ & \quad - \Psi(-t(m)w, t(m)w; \rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \\ & \quad + \Psi(-b(x)w - s(x)w, -b(x)w + s(x)w; -\rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \\ & \quad \left. - \Psi(-t(m)w, t(m)w; -\rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right) \phi(y) dy w f_W(w) dw dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, to within an additive constant that does not depend on (b, s) , $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_2(b, s; \gamma) d\gamma$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^d \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\Psi(b(x)w - s(x)w, b(x)w + s(x)w; \rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Psi(-b(x)w - s(x)w, -b(x)w + s(x)w; -\rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right) \phi(y) dy w f_W(w) dw dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to within an additive constant that does not depend on (b, s) ,

$$g(b, s; \lambda) = \int_0^d q(b, s; x) dx,$$

where $q(b, s; x)$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2\lambda}{t(m)E(W)} s(x) \\ & - (1 - \lambda) \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\Psi(b(x)w - s(x)w, b(x)w + s(x)w; \rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Psi(-b(x)w - s(x)w, -b(x)w + s(x)w; -\rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right) \phi(y) dy w f_W(w) dw. \end{aligned}$$

Note that x enters into the expression for $q(b, s; x)$ only through $b(x)$ and $s(x)$. To minimize $g(b, s; \lambda)$ with respect to $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$, it is therefore sufficient to minimize $q(b, s; x)$ with respect to $(b(x), s(x))$ for each $x \in [0, d]$. The situation here is similar to the computation of Bayes rules, see e.g. Casella & Berger (2002, pp. 352–353). Therefore, to minimize $g(b, s; \lambda)$ with respect to $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$, we simply minimize

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}(b, s) &= \frac{2\lambda}{t(m)E(W)} s \\ & - (1 - \lambda) \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\Psi(bw - sw, bw + sw; \rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Psi(-bw - sw, -bw + sw; -\rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \right) \phi(y) dy w f_W(w) dw \end{aligned}$$

with respect to $(b, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)$, to obtain (b', s') and then set $b(x) = b'$ and $s(x) = s'$ for all $x \in [0, d]$.

Let the random variables A and B have the following distribution

$$\begin{bmatrix} A \\ B \end{bmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Note that the distribution of A , conditional on $B = y$, is $N(\rho y, 1 - \rho^2)$. Thus

$$\Psi(bw - sw, bw + sw; \rho y, 1 - \rho^2) = P(bw - sw \leq A \leq bw + sw \mid B = y)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \Psi(bw - sw, bw + sw; \rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \phi(y) dy w f_W(w) dw \\ &= \int_0^\infty P(bw - sw \leq A \leq bw + sw) w f_W(w) dw. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Let Φ denote the $N(0, 1)$ cumulative distribution function. For every fixed $w > 0$ and $s > 0$,

$$P(bw - sw \leq A \leq bw + sw) = \Phi(bw + sw) - \Phi(bw - sw)$$

is maximized by setting $b = 0$. Thus, for each fixed $s > 0$, (10) is maximized with respect to $b \in \mathbb{R}$ by setting $b = 0$.

Now let the random variables \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} have the following distribution

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A} \\ \tilde{B} \end{bmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\rho \\ -\rho & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Note that the distribution of \tilde{A} , conditional on $\tilde{B} = y$, is $N(-\rho y, 1 - \rho^2)$. Thus

$$\Psi(-bw - sw, -bw + sw; -\rho y, 1 - \rho^2) = P(-bw - sw \leq \tilde{A} \leq -bw + sw \mid \tilde{B} = y)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \Psi(-bw - sw, -bw + sw; -\rho y, 1 - \rho^2) \phi(y) dy w f_W(w) dw \\ &= \int_0^\infty P(-bw - sw \leq \tilde{A} \leq -bw + sw) w f_W(w) dw. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For every fixed $w > 0$ and $s > 0$,

$$P(-bw - sw \leq \tilde{A} \leq -bw + sw) = \Phi(-bw + sw) - \Phi(-bw - sw)$$

is maximized by setting $b = 0$. Thus, for each fixed $s > 0$, (11) is maximized with respect to $b \in \mathbb{R}$ by setting $b = 0$.

Therefore, $\tilde{q}(b, s)$ is, for each fixed $s > 0$, minimized with respect to b by setting $b = 0$. Thus $b' = 0$ and so $b^*(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, to find s' we need to minimize

$$\frac{\lambda}{t(m)E(W)}s - (1 - \lambda) \int_0^\infty (2\Phi(sw) - 1) w f_W(w) dw$$

with respect to $s > 0$. Therefore, to find s' we may minimize

$$r(s) = \ell(\lambda) s - 2 \int_0^\infty \Phi(sw) w f_W(w) dw$$

with respect to $s > 0$, where

$$\ell(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \lambda)t(m)E(W)}.$$

Note that $\ell(\lambda)$ is an increasing function of λ , such that $\ell(\lambda) \downarrow 0$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ and $\ell(\lambda) \uparrow \infty$ as $\lambda \uparrow 1$. Choose $\lambda = \lambda^*$, where

$$\ell(\lambda^*) = 2 \int_0^\infty \phi(t(m)w) w^2 f_W(w) dw.$$

Note that $0 < \ell(\lambda^*) < \sqrt{2/\pi}$. Now

$$\frac{dr(s)}{ds} = \ell(\lambda^*) - 2 \int_0^\infty \phi(sw) w^2 f_W(w) dw.$$

Since $\int_0^\infty \phi(sw) w^2 f_W(w) dw$ is a decreasing function of $s > 0$, $dr(s)/ds$ is an increasing function of $s > 0$. Also, for $s = 0$, $\int_0^\infty \phi(sw) w^2 f_W(w) dw = 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$. Thus, to minimize $r(s)$ with respect to $s > 0$, we need to solve

$$\ell(\lambda^*) - 2 \int_0^\infty \phi(sw) w^2 f_W(w) dw = 0$$

for $s > 0$. Obviously, this solution in $s = t(m)$. Thus $s^*(x) = t(m)$ for all $x \geq 0$. In other words, $J(b^*, s^*) = I$. By Lemma 1, there does not exist $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$ such that

$$(a) \quad E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } J(b, s)) \leq E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } I) \quad \text{for all } (\beta, \sigma^2). \quad (12)$$

$$(b) \quad P_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\theta \in J(b, s)) \geq P_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\theta \in I) \quad \text{for all } (\beta, \sigma^2). \quad (13)$$

(c) Strict inequality holds in either (12) or (13) for at least one (β, σ^2) .

Theorem 1 follows from the fact that this argument holds for every given vector c (such that c and a are linearly independent), every given number t and every given positive number d .

Appendix B: Proof of Corollary 1

The proof of Corollary 1 is by contradiction. Suppose that c is a given vector (such that c and a are linearly independent), t is a given number and d is a given positive number. Also suppose that there exists $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$ such that both b and s are continuous and (a') , (b') and (c') , in the statement of Corollary 1, hold. Now (a') implies that

$$E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } J(b, s)) \leq E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } I) \quad \text{for all } (\beta, \sigma^2),$$

so that (a) holds. By hypothesis, one of the following two cases holds.

Case 1 $(\text{length of } J(b, s)) < (\text{length of } I)$ for at least one $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$. Now

$$(\text{length of } J(b, s)) = 2\sqrt{v_{11}}\hat{\sigma} s \left(\frac{|\hat{\tau}|}{\hat{\sigma}\sqrt{v_{22}}} \right),$$

which is a continuous function of $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$. Hence $(\text{length of } I) - (\text{length of } J(b, s))$ is a continuous function of $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$. Thus

$$E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } J(b, s)) < E_{\beta, \sigma^2}(\text{length of } I) \quad \text{for at least one } (\beta, \sigma^2).$$

Thus there exists $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$ such that (a) , (b) and (c) , in the statement of Theorem 1, hold. We have established a contradiction.

Case 2 There is strict inequality in (b') for at least one (β, σ^2) . Thus there exists $(b, s) \in \mathcal{F}(d)$ such that (a) , (b) and (c) , in the statement of Theorem 1, hold. We have established a contradiction.

Corollary 1 follows from the fact that this argument holds for every given vector c (such that c and a are linearly independent), every given number t and every given positive number d .

References

- CASELLA, G. & BERGER, R.L. (2002). *Statistical Inference*, 2nd ed.. Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.
- JOSHI, V.M. (1969). Admissibility of the usual confidence sets for the mean of a univariate or bivariate normal population. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **40**, 1042–1067.

- JOSHI, V.M. (1982). Admissibility. On pp.25–29 of Vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, editors-in-chief, Samuel Kotz, Norman L. Johnson ; associate editor, Campbell B. Read. New York: John Wiley.
- KABAILA, P. & GIRI, K. (2009). Confidence intervals in regression utilizing prior information. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **139**, 3419–3429.
- KABAILA, P. & TUCK, J. (2008). Confidence intervals utilizing prior information in the Behrens-Fisher problem. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics* **50**, 309–328.
- KEMPTHORNE, P.J. (1983). Minimax-Bayes compromise estimators. In *1983 Business and Economic Statistics Proceedings of the American Statistical Association*, Washington DC, pp.568–573.
- KEMPTHORNE, P.J. (1987). Numerical specification of discrete least favourable prior distributions. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing* **8**, 171–184.
- KEMPTHORNE, P.J. (1988). Controlling risks under different loss functions: the compromise decision problem. *Ann. Statist.* **16**, 1594–1608.
- SALEH, A.K.MD.E. (2006) *Theory of Preliminary Test and Stein-Type Estimation with Applications*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.