

# On the Nile Problem by Sir Ronald Fisher

Abram M. Kagan<sup>a</sup> and Yaakov Malinovsky<sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

<sup>b</sup> Department of Mathematics and Statistics , University of Maryland, Baltimore County,  
Baltimore, MD 21250, USA

<sup>a</sup> *email:* amk@math.umd.edu

<sup>b</sup> *email:* yaakovm@umbc.edu, \*Corresponding author

## Summary

The Nile problem by Ronald Fisher may be interpreted as the problem of making statistical inference for a special curved exponential family when the minimal sufficient statistic is incomplete. The problem itself and its versions for general curved exponential families pose a mathematical-statistical challenge: studying the subalgebras of ancillary statistics within the  $\sigma$ -algebra of the (incomplete) minimal sufficient statistics and closely related questions of the structure of UMVUEs.

In the paper a new method is developed that proves that in the classical Nile problem no statistic subject to mild natural conditions is a UMVUE. The result almost solves an old problem of the existence of UMVUEs. The method is purely statistical (vs. analytical) and requires the existence of an ancillary subalgebra. An analytical method that uses only first order ancillarity (and thus works in the setups when the existence of ancillary subalgebras is an open problem) proves nonexistence of UMVUEs for curved exponential families with polynomial constraints on the parameters.

*Key words:* Ancillarity, Complete sufficient statistics; Curved exponential families; UMVUEs

# 1 Introduction

The so called Nile problem formulated by Fisher gave rise to interesting mathematical-statistical problems. The original statement of the problem in a unique Fisher's style is in Fisher (1936) (it is cited verbatim in Fisher (1973), p.122):

*The agricultural land of a pre-dynastic Egyptian village is of unequal fertility. Given the height to which the Nile will rise, the fertility of every portion of it is known with exactitude, but the height of the flood affects different parts of the territory unequally. It is required to divide the area, between the several households of the village, so that the yields of the lots assigned to each shall be in pre-determined proportion, whatever may be the height to which proportion the river rises.*

Fisher himself (Fisher (1973), p. 169) specified the problem as making statistical inference for a population with density

$$f(x, y; \theta) = e^{-(x\theta + y/\theta)}, \quad x > 0, y > 0, \quad (1)$$

with  $\theta > 0$  as a parameter.

If  $((X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n))$  is a sample from population (1), the pair  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  of the sample means is an incomplete (minimal) sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ . Due to incompleteness, there might exist (and in this setting actually exists) an ancillary statistic, (i.e., a statistic whose distribution does not depend on the parameter), in the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\sigma(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  generated by  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ .

Due to incompleteness of the minimal sufficient statistic, the existence and construction of UMVUEs do not follow from the Rao-Blackwell and Lehmann-Scheffé theorems and become a nontrivial problem which requires a new approach. Nayak and Sinha (2012) mentioned the existence of UMVUEs in the models (1) and (3) (see below) as an open problem.

Another interpretation of the Nile problem (see Flato and Shepp (1990)) is statistical

inference on the correlation coefficient  $\rho$  of a bivariate Gaussian vector with density

$$\varphi(x, y; \rho) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2-2\rho xy}{2(1-\rho^2)}}. \quad (2)$$

The minimal sufficient statistic for  $\rho$  is  $(X^2 + Y^2, XY)$ . Note that the pair  $(X^2 + Y^2, XY)$  is in one-to-one correspondence with a quadrable  $((X, Y), (Y, X), (-X, -Y), (-Y, -X))$ .

If  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$  is a sample from (2), the minimal sufficient statistic for  $\rho$  is  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^2 + Y_i^2), \sum_{i=1}^n X_i Y_i\right)$ . The minimal sufficient statistic is again incomplete (even in case of  $n = 1$ ) and the problem of the existence of an ancillary statistic in the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\sigma\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^2 + Y_i^2), \sum_{i=1}^n X_i Y_i\right)$  generated by  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^2 + Y_i^2), \sum_{i=1}^n X_i Y_i\right)$  remains open (see Lehmann and Ron (2005), pp. 397-398).

The following observation by Flato and Shepp (1990) solves a related, but different problem. Let  $A$  be a set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with finite Lebesgue measure,  $\lambda(A) < \infty$ . If  $A$  is ancillary, i.e.,

$$\int_A \int \varphi(x, y; \rho) dx dy = c, \text{ a constant,}$$

then  $\lambda(A) = 0$  (and thus  $c = 0$ ). The condition  $\lambda(A) < \infty$  which is essential in the proof, seems artificial from the statistical point of view. However, a first order ancillary statistic  $H(X, Y)$  is measurable with respect to  $\sigma(X^2 + Y^2, XY)$ , defined by  $E_\rho H(X, Y) = \text{const}$ , exists. Indeed, set

$$H(x, y) = H(x) + H(y),$$

where  $H(u) = \mathbb{1}_{|u| \leq 1}$ . One can easily see that  $H(x, y) = H(y, x) = H(-x, -y)$  and  $E_\rho H(X, Y) = \text{const}$  since the marginal distributions of  $X$  and  $Y$  do not involve  $\rho$ . Though  $\int \int H(x, y) dx dy = \infty$ , the finiteness of this integral is not required in the definition of the first order ancillarity.

From general results on curved exponential family in Kagan and Palamodov (1967a,b) (see also supplement in Linnik (1968), and for another proof see Unni (1978)) it follows that the only UMVUEs from a sample  $((X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n))$  from (2) are constants.

Note that from the analytical point of view, inference problems from a sample  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  from a population with density

$$f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi c\theta}} e^{-\frac{(x-\theta)^2}{2c^2\theta^2}} \quad (3)$$

with  $\theta > 0$  as a parameter,  $c > 0$  known, are very close to the Nile problem. The assumption that the standard deviation is proportional to the mean seems reasonable in the setup of direct measurements. These problems were studied in a number of papers (see, e.g., Khan (1968); Gleser and Healy (1976); Hinkley (1977)). The minimal sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  is a pair  $(\bar{X}, S)$  of the sample mean and standard deviation. The sufficient statistic is incomplete and there exists a convenient ancillary statistic in  $\sigma(\bar{X}, S)$ . Combining this with results from Rao (1952) on the structure of UMVUEs and Kagan (1966), Barra (1971) and Bondesson (1975) on sufficiency, we prove by purely statistical tools that the only UMVUEs are constant. An analytical proof using general results for curved exponential families can be found in Kagan and Palamodov (1967a,b, 1968) and the dissertation of Unni (1978).

Extrapolating from the above three different interpretations of the Nile problem, the following problem seems to be of a general interest. Let  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$  be a family of probability distributions on a measurable space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$  and let  $T : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{B})$  be an incomplete sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ . Set  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = T^{-1}\mathcal{B}$ . Describe, if they exist,  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ -measurable (i.e., function of  $T$ ) ancillary statistics.

## 2 Sufficiency, Ancillarity and UMVUEs

Let  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$  be a family of probability distributions parameterized by a general parameter  $\theta$  of a random element  $X$  taking values in a measurable space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ . A subalgebra  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$  is called ancillary if  $P_\theta(B) = \text{const}$  in  $\theta$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . A statistic  $T(X)$  is called ancillary if the subalgebra it generates is ancillary. A statistic  $T(X)$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}$

with  $E_\theta|T(X)| < \infty$  is called a first order ancillary if  $E_\theta T(X) = \text{const}$  in  $\theta$ . A well known theorem due to Basu (1955, 1958) says that if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a linked family, i.e., for any pair  $\theta', \theta'' \in \Theta$  there exist a sequence  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_n, \theta_{n+1}$  with  $\theta_0 = \theta', \theta_{n+1} = \theta''$  such that  $P_{\theta_j}, P_{\theta_{j+1}}$  are not mutually singular (i.e.,  $P_{\theta_j}(A) = 1 \Rightarrow P_{\theta_{j+1}}(A) > 0$ ), then any subalgebra  $\mathcal{B}$  which is  $\mathcal{P}$ -independent of a sufficient subalgebra  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  (i.e.,  $P(\tilde{A} \cap B) = P(\tilde{A})P(B)$  for any  $\tilde{A} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, B \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ ) is ancillary. A straightforward conversion of the Basu result is plainly false: there exist ancillary subalgebras within the algebra of sufficient statistics (see examples 1, 2 below).

Note in passing that if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a complete sufficient algebra, then any ancillary algebra is  $\mathcal{P}$ -independent of  $\mathcal{C}$  (this result does not require  $\mathcal{P}$  to be a linked family). In this case there is no  $\mathcal{C}$ -measurable ancillary statistic.

**Example 1.** Let  $((X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n))$  be a sample from

$$f(x, y; \theta) = e^{-(x\theta + y/\theta)}, \quad x > 0, y > 0, \theta > 0.$$

The minimal sufficient statistic is  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  and one can easily see that  $\bar{X}\bar{Y}$  is an ancillary statistic.

**Example 2.** Let  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  be a sample from

$$f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}} e^{-\frac{(x-\theta)^2}{2\theta^2}}, \quad \theta > 0.$$

The minimal sufficient statistic is  $(\bar{X}, S)$  and one can check that the statistic  $\bar{X}/S$  is ancillary.

However, if a subalgebra  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{A}$  which is  $\mathcal{P}$ -independent of an ancillary subalgebra  $\mathcal{B}$  is large enough, then  $\mathcal{C}$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{P}$ . This observation is due to Kagan (1966) and independently Barra (1971) and Bondesson (1975).

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose that a subalgebra  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -independent of an ancillary algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  and together with  $\mathcal{B}$  generates  $\mathcal{A}$ , i. e.,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra that contains both  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $\sigma(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{P}$ .*

For the sake of completeness, there is a short proof of Lemma 1 from Barra (1971) (the result was proved in Kagan (1966), Barra (1971) and Bondesson (1975)).

*Proof.* For any  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{B}$

$$P_\theta(C \cap B | \mathcal{C}) = E_\theta(\mathbb{1}_{C \cap B} | \mathcal{C}) = \mathbb{1}_C P(B),$$

due to ancillarity of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ -independent of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Similarly, for  $A = \cup_{i=1}^n (C_i \cap B_i)$  for pairwise disjoint  $C_1 \cap B_1, \dots, C_n \cap B_n$  with  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}, B_i \in \mathcal{B}, i = 1, \dots, n$

$$P_\theta(A | C) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{C_i} P(B_i) = P(A | C)$$

does not depend on  $\theta$ . Thus for any  $A$  from the algebra  $\mathcal{A}_0$  generated by  $\cup_{i=1}^n (C_i \cap B_i)$ ,

$$P_\theta(A \cap C) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} P_\theta(A | C) dP_\theta = \int_{\mathcal{X}} P(A | C) dP_\theta.$$

Since,  $P_\theta(A \cap C)$  for  $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$  determines  $P_\theta(A \cap C)$  via monotone convergence for  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , one has for any  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ ,

$$P_\theta(A \cap C) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} P_\theta(A | C) dP_\theta = \int_{\mathcal{X}} P(A | C) dP_\theta, \quad A \in \mathcal{A},$$

proving sufficiency of  $\mathcal{C}$  for  $\mathcal{P}$ . □

Based on a paragraph in Fisher (1973), p. 168, it is likely that Fisher's definition of an ancillary algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  required existence of a  $\mathcal{P}$ -independent complement  $\mathcal{C}$ , i.e., that  $\sigma(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{A}$ . If so, he knew that  $\mathcal{C}$  is sufficient for  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Basu (1955, 1958) theorem was useful in characterization distributions by independence of statistics (see, e.g., Ferguson (1964, 1967), Klebanov (1973), Kagan (2002) and an expository paper by Gather (1996)). Here we want to demonstrate that combining Lemma 1 with Rao's result (Rao, 1952) on the structure of UMVUEs proves triviality of UMVUEs in the models (1) and (3). The proof which is purely statistical seems new and is of interest in its own. An analytical method covering curved exponential families with polynomial constraints on the natural parameters was developed in Kagan and Palamodov (1967a,b) and simplified in Unni (1978). It is based on a result by Wijsman (1958) on the existence of the first order ancillary statistics for samples from curved exponential families with polynomial constraints on the natural parameters.

To state Rao's result, recall that if an observation  $X \sim P_\theta$  with  $\theta \in \Theta$  as a parameter, a statistic  $g(X)$  with  $E_\theta |g(X)|^2 < \infty$  is UMVUE iff it is uncorrelated with any unbiased estimator of zero  $U(X)$  with  $E_\theta |U(X)|^2 < \infty$ , i.e.,  $E_\theta \{g(X)U(X)\} = 0$ ,  $\theta \in \Theta$  (unbiased estimators of zero are also called zero-mean statistics).

Rao (1952) observed that if a statistic  $T = g(X)$  is a UMVUE, then, provided that  $E_\theta |g(X)U(X)|^2 < \infty$ ,  $T^2$  is also a UMVUE. Proceeding in the same way under the assumption  $E_\theta |g(X)|^k < \infty$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  we observe that any polynomial of  $T$  is UMVUE. Assuming moreover that the polynomials of  $T$  are complete in  $L_\theta^2(T(X))$ , the Hilbert space of functions  $h(T)$  with  $E_\theta |h(T)|^2 < \infty$ , one gets that any statistic  $h(T)$  with  $E_\theta |h(T)|^2 < \infty$  is a UMVUE (actually, the UMVUE of  $E_\theta h(T)$ ).

In particular, if  $S$  is an ancillary statistic, the  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\sigma(T)$  and  $\sigma(S)$  are independent for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . If the pair  $(T, S)$  determines the sample point  $X$  or, equivalently,  $\sigma(T, S) = \sigma(X) = \mathcal{A}$ , by virtue of Lemma 1  $T$  is sufficient for  $\theta$ .

Note that the problem of describing the  $\sigma$ -algebra of UMVUEs for a general family of distributions seems rather difficult, as examples (Bondesson (1983), Kagan and Konikov

(2006)) when this algebra is a nontrivial proper subalgebra of the minimal sufficient algebra, demonstrate.

### 3 The Original Nile Problem

Let  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$  be a sample from

$$f(x, y; \theta) = e^{-(x\theta + y/\theta)}, \quad x > 0, y > 0,$$

with  $\theta > 0$  as a parameter. The inference from the above sample is what is usually referred to as the Nile problem by Ronald Fisher. Plainly, the vector  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  is the minimal sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  and  $W = \bar{X}\bar{Y}$  is an ancillary statistic. The minimal sufficient statistics is incomplete and this makes the problem of existence and description of UMVUEs nontrivial.

We present here a new general method for obtaining a strong necessary condition for a statistic to be a UMVUE. Applied to the Nile problem, the method allows us to prove that a statistic satisfying rather general “regularity type” conditions (Conditions 1, 2, 3a, b below) is not a UMVUE (the existence of a nonconstant UMVUE is an open problem, according to Nayak and Sinha (2012)). The conditions below are not uniformly stronger than the ones required by the analytical method, e.g., they do not require polynomiality of the constraints.

Here are the conditions imposed on a statistic  $g = g(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ .

Condition 1.

$$E_\theta |g(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})|^k < \infty, k = 1, 2, \dots, \quad \theta > 0. \quad (4)$$

Condition 2.

$$\text{span}_\theta \{1, g, g^2, \dots\} = L_\theta^2(g), \quad (5)$$



where  $L_\theta^2(g)$  denotes the Hilbert space of function  $h(g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}))$  with the inner product  $(h_1, h_2)_\theta = E_\theta(h_1 h_2)$  and  $\text{span}_\theta\{1, g, g^2, \dots\}$  is the closure in  $L_\theta^2(g)$  of the sums  $\sum_j c_j g^j$ .

Condition 3a.

$$\sigma(g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})) \subset \sigma(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) \quad (\text{strict inclusion}). \quad (6)$$

Condition 3b.

$$\sigma(g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}), \overline{X} \overline{Y}) = \sigma(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}). \quad (7)$$

Conditions 3a and 3b refer to the  $\sigma$ -algebras, one generated by  $g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$  and the other by ancillary statistic  $\overline{X} \overline{Y}$ . Roughly speaking, the first condition means that the equation  $g(u, v) = a$  does not determinate  $u, v$ , while the second means that the system  $g(u, v) = a, uv = b$  does. The Condition 3a is satisfied by any reasonable  $g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$ . Only for pathological statistics, one might have  $\sigma(g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})) = \sigma(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$ .

**Theorem 1.** *A statistic  $g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$  satisfying Conditions 1, 2, 3a, 3b cannot be a UMVUE.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $g = g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$  is a UMVUE. Then for any zero-mean statistic  $U = U(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$  with  $E_\theta|U|^2 < \infty$  one has

$$E_\theta(gU) = 0, \quad \theta > 0. \quad (8)$$

In particular, since  $W = \overline{X} \overline{Y}$  is an ancillary statistic, (8) implies

$$E_\theta(g|W) = E_\theta(g), \quad \theta > 0. \quad (9)$$

Turn now to  $g^2$ . For any bounded non-zero statistic  $U$ , the statistic  $U_1 = gU$  is, by virtue of (8) and Condition 1 also zero-mean statistic with finite second moment,  $E_\theta(U_1) = 0$ ,  $E_\theta(|U_1|^2) < \infty$ ,  $\theta > 0$ . Thus, from  $g = g(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$  being a UMVUE, follows that  $E_\theta(gU_1) =$

$E_\theta(g^2 U) = 0$ ,  $\theta > 0$ , implying

$$E_\theta(g^2 | W) = E_\theta(g^2), \quad \theta > 0. \quad (10)$$

Proceeding in the same way, one can prove that

$$E_\theta(g^k | W) = E_\theta(g^k), \quad k = 3, 4, \dots \quad \theta > 0. \quad (11)$$

Notice again that the above arguments are essentially due to Rao (1952).

Let now  $h = h(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \in L_\theta^2(g)$ . Take a sequence of the finite sums  $\sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k$  with

$$E_\theta \left( \sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k - h \right)^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Such sequence exists due to Condition 2. Since  $\left| E_\theta \left( \sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k - h \right) \right|^2 \leq E_\theta \left( \left| \sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k - h \right|^2 \right)$  one has

$$E_\theta \left( \sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k \right) \rightarrow E_\theta(h), \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta \left\{ E_\theta \left( \sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k - h | W \right) \right\}^2 &= E_\theta \left\{ E_\theta(\sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k | W) - E_\theta(h | W) \right\}^2 \\ &= E_\theta \left\{ E_\theta(\sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k) - E_\theta(h | W) \right\}^2 \leq E_\theta \left( \sum_k c_{k,m} g_m^k - h \right)^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $E_\theta(h | W) = E_\theta(h)$ . Therefore, any  $h \in L_\theta^2(g)$  has a constant conditional expectation on  $\sigma(W)$ , i. e.,  $\sigma(g(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}))$  and  $\sigma(W)$  are independent for any  $\sigma > 0$ .

By virtue of Lemma 1 and Condition 3b, the statistic  $g(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  (or, equivalently,  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\sigma(g(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}))$ ) is sufficient for  $\theta$ . Due to Condition 3a,  $\sigma(g(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}))$  is a proper subalgebra of the minimal sufficient  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\sigma(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ , what is impossible. Notice in conclusion that the trivial UMVUE's,  $g(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) = \text{const}$ , do not satisfy Condition 3b.  $\square$

Turn now to a natural class of estimators of  $\theta$ . A statistic  $\tilde{\theta}(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  is called an equivariant estimator of  $\theta$  if

$$\tilde{\theta}(\bar{X}/\lambda, \bar{Y}\lambda) = \lambda \tilde{\theta}(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \quad \text{for any } \lambda > 0. \quad (12)$$

The equivariant estimators in the Nile problem were studied in Kariya (1989).

Plainly, an equivariant estimator can be written as

$$\tilde{\theta} = \bar{Y}h(W) \quad (13)$$

for some  $h$ . Here  $\bar{Y}$  here may be replaced with any statistic of degree of homogeneity one in sense of (12), e. g.,  $\sqrt{\bar{Y}/\bar{X}}$  (the latter is the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of  $\theta$ , as noticed by Fisher himself), or  $1/\bar{X}$ . If (13) is an unbiased estimator of  $\theta$ , then, as can be easily seen

$$h(W) = \frac{1}{E_1(\bar{Y} | W)}, \quad (14)$$

where  $E_1$  is the expectation taken when  $\theta = 1$  and

$$E_1(\bar{Y} | W = w) = \frac{\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{z^2} e^{-n(\frac{1}{z} + wz)} dz}{\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{z} e^{-n(\frac{1}{z} + wz)} dz}. \quad (15)$$

If (13) is a UMVUE, then (see (11)) one has  $E(\tilde{\theta}^2 | W) = E(\tilde{\theta}^2)$ , but

$$E(\tilde{\theta}^2 | W) = h^2(W) E(\bar{Y}^2 | W) = \theta^2 \frac{E_1(\bar{Y}^2 | W)}{(E_1(\bar{Y} | W))^2} \text{ and straightforward calculations using}$$

(15) show that  $E(\tilde{\theta}^2 | W)$  depends on  $W$ . Thus, (13) is **not** a UMVUE.

Similar arguments show that no estimator of the form  $\bar{Y}^k h(W)$  or  $\bar{X}^k h(W)$  is a UMVUE.

## 4 Problems Closely Related to the Nile Problem

The following setup of direct measurements, being of an interest in its own, has the same basic features as the Nile problem: an incomplete minimal sufficient statistic and an ancillary statistic which is a function of the sufficient one.

Let  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  be a sample from a normal population  $N(\theta, c^2\theta^2)$  with  $\theta$  as a parameter, and  $c > 0$  is known. In other words,

$$X_i = \theta + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$  are independent random variables distributed as  $N(0, c^2\theta^2)$ . In the standard setups of direct measurements, the distribution function  $F(x)$  of  $\varepsilon_i$  (not necessarily normal) is assumed independent of  $\theta$  so that  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  is a sample from  $F(x - \theta)$  with a location parameter  $\theta$ . Estimation of a location parameter in small samples was originated in Pitman (1939a). Since then it has been thoroughly studied, especially for the quadratic loss function; see, e. g., monographs Lehmann and Casella (1998); Cassella and Berger (2002); Kagan *et al.* (1973); Zacks (1971) and recent papers Kagan and Rao (2006); Kagan *et al.* (2012) and references therein. A special role of normal distribution  $\Phi(x)$  in estimation of a location parameter is due to the fact that in the class  $\{F\}$  with given variance  $\sigma^2$ , the Fisher information on  $\theta$  contained in an observation  $X_i \sim F(x - \theta)$  is minimized at  $F(x) = \Phi(x/\sigma)$ , with the minimum equal  $1/\sigma^2$ . A closely related result is that under the quadratic loss function,  $\bar{X}$  is an admissible estimator of  $\theta$  if and only if  $F = \Phi$ . The if part is due to Hodges and Lehmann (1951) and only if part due to Kagan *et al.* (1965).

The setup with  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  being a sample from  $N(\theta, c^2\theta^2)$  differs significantly from that with  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  taken from  $N(\theta, \sigma^2)$  with  $\sigma^2$  independent of  $\theta$ . Firstly, the Fisher information on  $\theta$  in  $X_i \sim N(\theta, c^2\theta^2)$  equals to  $\frac{1}{\theta^2} \left(2 + \frac{1}{c^2}\right)$  and it exceeds the information in  $X_i \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2)$  calculated at  $\sigma^2 = c^2\theta^2$  which equals  $\frac{1}{c^2\theta^2}$ . Secondly, the minimal sufficient statistic for sample from  $N(\theta, c^2\theta^2)$  is the pair  $(\bar{X}, S^2)$  of the sample mean and variance and it is incomplete while from the sample from  $N(\theta, \sigma^2)$  with known  $\sigma^2$  it is  $\bar{X}$  and it is complete and for sample from  $N(\theta, \sigma^2)$  with  $(\theta, \sigma^2) \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$  the pair  $(\bar{X}, S^2)$  is complete sufficient statistic.

The setup of small and large samples from  $N(\theta, c^2\theta^2)$  was studied in a number of papers. Khan (1968) found the BLUE (linear in  $\bar{X}, S^2$ ) of  $\theta$  and showed that it is asymptotically efficient. Gleser and Healy (1976) proved admissibility of the best (scale)-equivariant estimator of  $\theta$ . Since it is different from (also equivariant) MLE, the latter is inadmissible. See also Hinkley (1977) and Kariya (1989) for related results. According to Nayak and Sinha (2012), the problem of existence of UMVUEs is open.

Since in samples from a normal population,  $\bar{X}$  and  $S$  are independent, the setup of sampling from  $N(\theta, c^2\theta^2)$  is very similar to the Nile problem:  $(\bar{X}, S^2)$  is an incomplete sufficient statistic and  $W = \frac{\bar{X}}{S}$  is an ancillary statistic. To show the latter, write

$$\frac{\bar{X}}{S} = \frac{(\bar{X} - \theta + \theta)/\theta}{S/\theta} = \frac{\frac{\bar{X}-\theta}{\theta} + 1}{S/\theta}$$

and notice that the distributions of  $\frac{\bar{X} - \theta}{\theta}$  and  $\frac{S}{\theta}$  do not depend on  $\theta$ . A direct application of the method used in proving Theorem 1 proves the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $g(\bar{X}, S)$  be a statistic satisfying Conditions 1, 2, 3a, 3b with  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  replaced with  $(\bar{X}, S)$  and  $W$  with  $\bar{X}/S$ . Then  $g(\bar{X}, S)$  is not a UMVUE.*

## 4.1 Analytical Method

We shall show now that Theorem 2 holds true without (unnecessary) Conditions 1, 2, 3a, 3b due to the fact that the family of normal distributions  $N(\theta, c^2\theta^2)$  with  $\theta$  as a parameter is a curved exponential family with polynomial constraints on the natural parameter. It is straightforward corollary of Lemma 2 below whose proof is purely analytical. The idea of the proof goes back to Wijsman (1958). As one can easily see, the pdf of the minimal sufficient statistic (based on the sample of size  $n$ )  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2\right)$  at the point  $(u, v)$  is

$$f(u, v; \eta_1, \eta_2) = h(u, v)e^{\eta_1 u + \eta_2 v - \psi(\eta_1, \eta_2)}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}, v \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where the explicit form of  $h(u, v)$  does not matter, but what matters for our purpose is a constraint  $\eta_1^2 + \frac{2}{c^2}\eta_2 = 0$  on the natural parameters  $\eta_1 = \frac{1}{c^2\theta}$ ,  $\eta_2 = -\frac{1}{2c^2\theta^2}$ . The structure of UMVUEs for samples from natural exponential families (NEFs) with polynomial constraints on the parameters was studied in Kagan and Palamodov (1967a,b) and Unni (1978) where the following result was proved.

**Lemma 2.** *Let the distribution of the vector of sufficient statistics  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_s)$  is given by a density*

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_s; \theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) = h(t_1, \dots, t_s) e^{\theta_1 t_1 + \dots + \theta_s t_s - \psi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s)}$$

*with the parameter set being the intersection  $\Xi \cap \Pi$  where  $\Xi$  is an open set in  $\mathbb{R}^s$  and  $\Pi$  the algebraic manifold defined by polynomial constraints*

$$\Pi_1(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) = 0, \dots, \Pi_m(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) = 0. \quad (16)$$

*A statistic  $Q(T)$  is a UMVUE if and only if there exists a linear reparametrization*

$$\theta_1 = a_{11}\theta'_1 + \dots + a_{1s}\theta'_s$$

$\dots$

$$\theta_s = a_{s1}\theta'_1 + \dots + a_{ss}\theta'_s$$

*such that the constraints (16) involve only  $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_m$ ,  $m \leq s$  and the remaining components  $\theta'_{m+1}, \dots, \theta'_s$ ,  $m \leq s$  run an open set in  $\mathbb{R}^{s-m}$  in which case  $Q$  depends only on*

$$T_{m+1} = a_{1,m+1}T_1 + \dots + a_{s,m+1}T_s, \dots, T_s = a_{1,s}T_1 + \dots + a_{s,s}T_s.$$

*Proof.* See Kagan and Palamodov (1967a,b) and Unni (1978). □

Sufficiency part simply means that under the new parametrization,  $(T_{m+1}, \dots, T_s)$  is complete sufficient statistic for  $(\theta'_{m+1}, \dots, \theta'_s)$  for any fixed values of  $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_m$ . Bondesson (1983) noticed that if  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_{\theta, \eta}\}$  is a family of distributions of a random element  $X \in (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ .

parameterized by a “bivariate” parameter  $(\theta, \eta)$  and a statistic  $T = T(X)$ ,  $T : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{B})$  is complete sufficient for  $\theta$  for any fixed value of  $\eta$ , then  $\sigma(T)$  is an algebra of UMVUEs.

Lemma 2 provides an analytical proof of non-existence of nontrivial UMVUEs from the samples from populations (1), (2) and (3). All three densities are from exponential families with polynomial constraints on the natural parameters,  $\eta_1 = -\theta$ ,  $\eta_2 = -\frac{1}{\theta}$  with  $\eta_1\eta_2 - 1 = 0$  in case of (1),  $\eta_1 = -\frac{1}{2(1-\rho^2)}$ ,  $\eta_2 = \frac{\rho}{1-\rho^2}$  with  $2\eta_1 - \eta_2^2 + 4\eta_1^2 = 0$  in case of (2), and  $\eta_1 = -\frac{1}{2c^2\theta^2}$ ,  $\eta_2 = \frac{1}{c^2\theta}$  with  $\eta_1 + c^2/2\eta_2^2 = 0$  in case (3).

## Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank C.R. Rao and Bimal K. Roy who helped to get access to the dissertation of K. Unni defended in the Indian Statistical Institute back in 1978, and Larry Shepp for many helpful discussions. The work of the second author was partially supported by a 2012 UMBC Summer Faculty Fellowship grant.

## References

- Bahadur, R.R. (1957). On unbiased estimates of uniformly minimum variance. *Sankhya Ser. A*, **18**, 211-224.
- Barra, J-R. (1971). *Notions Fondamentales de Statistique Mathématique*. Dunod, Paris.  
(English Translation (1981): *Mathematical Basis of Statistics*. Academic Press, New York).
- Basu, D. (1955). On statistics independent of a complete sufficient statistic. *Sankhya* **15**, 377-380.
- Basu, D. (1958). On statistics independent of sufficient statistics. *Sankhya* **18**, 223-226.

- Bondesson, L. (1975). Uniformly Minimum Variance Estimation in Location Parameter Families. *Ann. Statist.*, **3**, 637–600.
- Bondesson, L. (1983). On uniformly minimum variance unbiased estimation when no complete sufficient statistics exist. *Metrika*, **30**, 49–54.
- Casella, G., Berger, R. L. (2002). Statistical inference. Second edition. Duxbury.
- Ferguson, T. S. (1964). A characterization of the exponential distribution. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **35**, 1199–1207.
- Ferguson, T. S. (1967). On characterizing distributions by properties of order statistics. *Sankhya A* **29**, 265–277.
- Fisher, R. A. (1936). Uncertain Inference. *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* **71**, 245–258.
- Fisher, R. A. (1973). Statistical Methods and Scientific Inference. Third Edition. Hafner Press.
- Flatto, F., and Shepp, L. (1990). Problem of the Nile. *SIAM Review* **32**, 302–304.
- Gather, U. (1996). Characterizing distributions by properties of order statisticsa partial review. H.N. Nagaraja, P.K. Sen, D.F. Morrison (Eds.), Statistical Theory and Applications., Springer, Berlin, 89-103.
- Gleser, L .J., Healy, J. D. (1976). Estimating the Mean of a Normal Distribution with Known Coefficient of Variation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **71**, 977-981.
- Hodges, J. L., Jr.; Lehmann, E. L. (1951). Some applications of the Cramér-Rao inequality. *Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1950*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 13-22.



- Hinkley, D.V. (1977). Conditional inference about a normal mean with known coefficient of variation. *Biometrika*, **64**, 105-108.
- Kagan, A. M., Linnik, Yu.V., Rao, C.V. (1965). On a characterization of the normal law based on a property of the sample average. *Sankhya Ser. A*, **27**, 405-406.
- Kagan, A. M. (1966). Two remarks on characterization of sufficiency (Russian). *Limit Theorems Statist. Inference, Izdat. "Fan", Tashkent*, 60-66.
- Kagan, A. M., Palamodov, V.P. (1967a). Incomplete exponential families and minimum variance unbiased estimators, I. *Theor. Probability Appl.*, **12**, 36-46.
- Kagan, A. M., Palamodov, V.P. (1967b). Conditions of optimal unbiased estimation of parametric functions for incomplete exponential families with polynomial constraints. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **175**, 1216-1218.
- Kagan, A. M., Palamodov, V.P. (1968). New results in the theory of estimation and testing hypotheses for problems with nuisance parameters. *Supplement to Linnik's "Statistical problems with nuisance parameters"*. Translated from the Russian by Scripta Technica. American Mathematical Society, Providence.
- Kagan, A. M., Linnik, Yu.V., Rao, C.V. (1973). Characterization Problems in Mathematical Statistics. Wiley.
- Kagan, A. M. (2002). Sufficiency and ancillarity in characterization problems. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, **102**, 223-228.
- Kagan, A. M., Rao, C. R. (2006). On estimation of a location parameter in presence of an ancillary component. *Theory Probab. and Its Applications*, **50**, 172-176.

- Kagan, A. M., Kinikov, M. (2006). The Structure of the UMVUEs from Categorical Data. *Theory Probab. and Its Applications*, **50**, 466-473.
- Kagan, A. M., Yu, T., Barron, A., Madiman, M. (2012). Contribution to the theory of Pitman estimators. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)*, **408**, 245–267.
- Kariya, T. (1989). Equivariant Estimation in a Model with an Ancillary Statistic. *Ann. Statist.*, **17**, 920–928.
- Klebanov, L.B. (1973). On the characterization of a family of distributions by the property of independence of statistics *Theory Prob. Appl.*, **18**, 608–611.
- Khan, R.A. (1968). A Note on Estimating the Mean of a Normal Distribution with Known Coefficient of Variation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **63**, 1039-1041.
- Lehmann , E., Casella, G. (1998). Theory of Point Estimation. Springer; 2nd edition.
- Lehmann , E., Romano, J.P. (2005). Testing Statistical Hypotheses. Springer; 3rd edition.
- Linnik, Y. V. (1968). Statistical problems with nuisance parameters. Translated from the Russian by Scripta Technica. American Mathematical Society, Providence.
- Nayak, T.K., Sinha, B. (2012). Some aspects of minimum variance unbiased estimation in presence of ancillary statistics *Stat. Prob. Letters*, **82**, 1129-1135.
- Pitman, E.J.G. (1939a). The estimation of the location and scale parameters of a continuous population of any given form. *Biometrika*, **30**, 391-421.
- Pitman, E.J.G. (1939b). Tests of Hypotheses Concerning Location and Scale Parameters. *Biometrika*, **31**, 200-215.

- Rao, C.R. (1952). Some theorems on minimum variance estimation. *Sankhya Ser. A*, **12**, 27-42.
- Unni, K. (1978). The theory of estimation in algebraic and analytical exponential families with applications to variance components models. PhD. Thesis, Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, India.
- Wijsman, R.A. (1958). Incomplete sufficient statistics and similar tests. *The Annals of Math. Stat.* **29**, 1028-1045.
- Zacks, S. (1971). The theory of statistical inference. Wiley.