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Abstract

We consider equivariant estimation of location/scale parameters of a general bivariate distribution, under quite general conditions on underlying distributions and the loss function, when it is known apriori that these parameters satisfy an order restriction. This problem is broadly studied in the literature for specific probability models having independent marginals and specific loss functions. In most of these studies, sufficient conditions for inadmissibility of best location/scale equivariant estimators are provided. This paper generalizes these results by considering a quite general bivariate model and a quite general loss function. We provide sufficient conditions for inadmissibility of any location/scale equivariant estimator under general probability model (statistical dependent) and general loss function. We also provide some applications of the results obtained in this paper to specific probability models and loss functions that are not studied in the literature.
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1. Introduction

The problem of estimating order restricted location/scale parameters (say, \(\theta_1\) and \(\theta_2\)) of two distributions is of great interest in many real-life situations. For an account of such applications one may refer to Barlow et al. (1972) and Robertson et al. (1988). Such estimation problems have been extensively studied in the literature. Early studies in the literature are focused on studying isotonic regression and/or restricted maximum likelihood estimators of order restricted parameters. Afterwards the problem was studied using decision theoretic approach with focus on obtaining estimators improving over the unrestricted best location (scale) equivariant estimators (BLEE (BSEE)) and/or unrestricted maximum likelihood estimators (MLE) by exploiting the prior information that parameters are order restricted. A lot of these studies are centered around specific distributions and specific loss functions. Only a few studies are carried out for general probability models and

It is worth mentioning here that Stein (1964) proposed a technique to show that the usual estimator of variance of the normal distribution with an unknown mean is inadmissible and obtained a dominating estimator which is non-smooth (a testimator). This technique is generalized by Brewster and Zidek (1974) to obtain improvements over equivariant estimators. Brewster and Zidek (1974) proposed another technique to improve best equivariant estimators that produces smooth dominating estimators (generally the generalized Bayes estimator with respect to non-informative prior). Kubokawa (1994) unified the two techniques of Stein (1964) and Brewster and Zidek (1974) by using a representation of difference of risk functions in terms of a definite integral. He named this unified technique the integral expression risk difference (IERD) method.

Using the techniques of Stein (1964), Brewster and Zidek (1974) and Kubokawa (1994), several authors have considered problems of improving equivariant estimators for specific probability models (mostly, having independent marginals) and specific loss functions. For componentwise estimation of order restricted location/scale parameters of \( k \geq 2 \) independent exponential distributions under the square error loss function, Vijayasree et al. (1995) obtained sufficient conditions for inadmissibility of any location/scale equivariant estimators, and derived better estimators. Similar results are also obtained by Misra and Dhariyal (1995) for ordered scale parameters of \( k \geq 2 \) independent uniform distributions. For simultaneous estimation of ordered means of bivariate normal distribution having known variances, under the squared error loss function, Patra and Kumar (2017) have obtained sufficient conditions for inadmissibility of any equivariant estimator. In such cases they also derive the dominating estimators. In this paper, we consider a general location/scale bivariate probability model and a general loss function and generalize several results of the literature by providing sufficient conditions for inadmissibility of any location/scale equivariant estimator using the prior information of order restriction on parameters.

In Section 2, we introduce a useful lemma and a few definitions that will be used later in the paper. In Section 3 (4), we consider a general bivariate location (scale) family of distributions and deal with componentwise estimation of location (scale) parameters under a general bowl-shaped loss function, when it is known apriori that these parameters satisfy a order restriction. We will use the Stein (1964) technique to derive sufficient conditions for the inadmissibility of any location (scale) equivariant estimator. We obtain the Stein (1964) type improvements over these inadmissible
location (scale) equivariant estimators. We also provide some applications of our results to a few probability models and/or loss functions not studied in the literature.

2. Preliminaries

We will use the following definition (see Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007)) later in the paper.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be random variables with the Lebesgue pdfs $f(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$, respectively. We say that the r.v. $X$ is smaller than the r.v. $Y$ in the likelihood ratio ordering (denoted by $X \leq_{lr} Y$) if $f(x)g(y) \geq f(y)g(x)$, whenever $-\infty < x < y < \infty$.

The following lemma, whose proof is straightforward, will be used in proving the main results of the paper.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be a fixed constant and let $M_i : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty)$, $i = 1, 2$, be non-negative functions such that

$$M_1(s)M_2(s_0) \geq \frac{1}{s} \leq \frac{1}{s_0}$$

and

$$M_1(s)M_2(s_0) \leq \frac{1}{s} \geq \frac{1}{s_0}, \quad \forall s > s_0.$$

Let $M : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function, such that $M(s) \leq 0$, $\forall s < s_0$, and $M(s) \geq 0$, $\forall s > s_0$. Then

$$M_2(s_0) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M(s)M_1(s)ds \leq \frac{1}{s} \geq \frac{1}{s_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M(s)M_2(s)ds.$$ 

Also, we will use the following notations in the paper:

- $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, \infty)$ (the real line); $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$; $\mathbb{R}_{++} = (0, \infty)$;
- For any random variables $S$ and $T$, $S \overset{d}{=} T$ would indicate that $S$ and $T$ are identically distributed;
- For any random variables $S$, $T$ and $U$, and for any $s$ in the distributional support of $S$, the notation $U \overset{d}{=} T|S = s$ would mean that the distribution of random variable $U$ is the same as the conditional distribution of $T$ given $S = s$;
- For $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ would denote the normal distribution with mean $\mu$ and standard deviation $\sigma$;
- For any differentiable function $k : A \to \mathbb{R}$, where $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $k'(t)$ will denote the derivative of $k$ at the point $t \in A$;
- $\phi(\cdot)$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ would denote the pdf and the distribution function (df) of $N(0, 1)$ distribution;
- For $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$ and function $h : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$, $h'(\cdot)$ denotes its derivative.

When we say that an estimator $\delta_1$ dominates (or improves upon) another estimator $\delta_2$, it is used in non-strict sense, i.e., it means that the risk of $\delta_2$ is nowhere smaller than the risk of the estimator $\delta_1$. 
3. Improvements over Equivariant Estimators of Location Parameters

Let $\underline{X} = (X_1, X_2)$ be a random vector with joint pdf

$$f_{\underline{g}}(x_1, x_2) = f(x_1 - \theta_1, x_2 - \theta_2), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\underline{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Theta_0 = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t_1 \leq t_2\}$ is the vector of unknown location parameters.

Consider estimation of location parameter $\theta_i$ under a general loss function $L_i(\underline{\theta}, a) = W(a - \theta_i), \quad \underline{\theta} \in \Theta_0, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}, \quad i = 1, 2,$ where $W : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty)$ is a specified non-negative function and $W(\cdot)$ satisfy the following conditions:

- $C_1$: $W(0) = 0$, $W(t)$ is decreasing on $(-\infty, 0)$ and increasing on $(0, \infty)$;
- $C_2$: $W(t)$ is non-decreasing almost everywhere.

The above problem of estimating of location parameter $\theta_i (i = 1, 2)$, is invariant under the group of transformation $\mathcal{G} = \{g_c : c \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $g_c(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 + c, x_2 + c), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}$. Under the group of transformation $\mathcal{G}$, any location equivariant estimator of $\theta_i$ is of the form

$$\delta_{\psi_i}(\underline{X}) = X_i - \psi_i(D),$$

for some function $\psi_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad i = 1, 2,$ where $D = X_2 - X_1$. Let us denote the the risk function of $\delta_{\psi_i}(\underline{X})$ by $R_i(\underline{\theta}, \delta_{\psi_i}) = E_\underline{g}[W(\delta_{\psi_i}(\underline{X}) - \theta_i)], \quad \underline{\theta} \in \Theta_0, \quad i = 1, 2$. Note that the risk function $R_i(\underline{\theta}, \delta_{\psi_i}), \quad i = 1, 2$, depends on $\underline{\theta} \in \Theta_0$ only through $\lambda = \theta_2 - \theta_1 \in [0, \infty)$.

We define some notations related to probability model (3.1): Let $Z_i = X_i - \theta_i, \quad i = 1, 2$, and let $f_i(\cdot)$ denote the pdf of $Z_i, \quad i = 1, 2$. Also, let $S_i$ denote the distributional support of $Z_i, \quad i = 1, 2$. For any fixed $\lambda \geq 0$, let $S_\lambda$ denote the support of the r.v. $D = X_2 - X_1$, and, for any fixed $t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 0} S_\lambda$, let $\Lambda_t = \{\lambda \geq 0 : t \in S_\lambda\}$. Then the joint pdf of $\underline{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2)$ is $f(t_1, t_2), \quad (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Also, let $Z = Z_2 - Z_1$ and $Z_s^{(i)} \overset{d}{=} Z \mid Z_i = s, \quad s \in S_i, \quad i = 1, 2$, i.e., for $s \in S_i$, $Z_s^{(i)}$ has the same distributions as the conditional distribution of $Z$ given $Z_i = s, \quad i = 1, 2$. Denote $h_i(z|s)$ as the pdf of $Z_s^{(i)}, \quad s \in S_i, \quad i = 1, 2$, such that

$$h_1(z|s) = \frac{f(s, z + s)}{f_1(s)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, \quad s \in S_1, \quad \text{and} \quad h_2(z|s) = \frac{f(s - z, s)}{f_2(s)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, \quad s \in S_2.$$

Now we list some distributional assumptions that will be required to prove the main results of this section.

- $D_1$: $Z_s^{(1)} \overset{ir}{\leq} Z_s^{(1)}$, whenever $s_1, s_2 \in S_1$ and $s_1 < s_2$;
- $D_2$: $Z_s^{(1)} \overset{ir}{\leq} Z_s^{(1)}$, whenever $s_1, s_2 \in S_1$ and $s_1 < s_2$;
- $D_3$: $Z_s^{(2)} \overset{ir}{\leq} Z_s^{(2)}$, whenever $s_1, s_2 \in S_2$ and $s_1 < s_2$;
D4: \( Z^{(2)}_{s_1} \leq Z^{(2)}_{s_2} \), whenever \( s_1, s_2 \in S_2 \) and \( s_1 < s_2 \).

Note that the unrestricted best location equivariant estimator (BLEE) of \( \theta_1 \), under the parameter space \( \Theta = \mathbb{R}^2 \), loss function \( L_i(\cdot, \cdot) \) and the additive group of transformations \( G_0 = \{ g_{c_1, c_2} : (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \} \), where \( g_{c_1, c_2}(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 + c_1, x_2 + c_2) \), \( (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), \( (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), is \( \delta_{0,i}(x) = X_i - c_{0,i} \), where \( c_{0,i} \) is the unique solution of the equation \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c) f_i(s) ds = 0 \), \( i = 1, 2 \).

3.1. Estimation of the Smaller Location Parameter \( \theta_1 \). The risk function of location equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\psi_i}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1(D) \) of \( \theta_1 \) is

\[
R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}) = E \left[ W(X_1 - \psi_1(D) - \theta_1) \right] \\
= E \left[ W(Z_1 - \psi_1(Z + \lambda)) \right] \\
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(s - \psi_1(t + \lambda)) h_1(t|s) f_1(s) \, ds \, dt \\
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(s - \psi_1(t)) h_1(t - \lambda|s) f_1(s) \, ds \right] \, dt \\
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt, \quad \lambda \geq 0,
\]

where, for \( c \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
r_{1,\lambda}(c, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(s - c) h_1(t - \lambda|s) f_1(s) \, ds.
\]

The following assumption also required for proving the main results.

A1: For any fixed \( \lambda \geq 0 \) and \( t \in S_\lambda \), the equation

\[
(3.1.1) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c) h_1(t - \lambda|s) f_1(s) \, ds = 0
\]

has the unique solution \( c = c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) \in S_1 \) such that \( h_1(t - \lambda|c_{0,1}(\lambda, t)) > 0 \).

Lemma 3.1.1. Suppose that assumptions \( C_1, C_2, A_1 \) and \( D_1 \) \( (C_1, C_2, A_1 \) and \( D_2) \) hold. Then, for any \( t, \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) such that \( 0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty \) and \( t \in S_{\lambda_1} \cap S_{\lambda_2} \),

\[
c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) \leq (\geq) c_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t).
\]

Proof. Let us fix \( t, \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \), so that \( 0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty \), and \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in S_t \) (i.e., \( t \in S_{\lambda_1} \cap S_{\lambda_2} \)). From the assumption A1, we have \( c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) \in S_1 \), \( c_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t) \in S_1 \), \( h_1(t - \lambda_1|c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) > 0 \), \( h_1(t - \lambda_2|c_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)) > 0 \),

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) h_1(t - \lambda_1|s) f_1(s) \, ds = 0
\]

and

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)) h_1(t - \lambda_2|s) f_1(s) \, ds = 0.
\]
Taking $s_0 = c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)$, $M(s) = W'(s - c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) f_1(s)$, $M_1(s) = h_1(t - \lambda_1 | s)$ ($M_1(s) = \min h_1(t - \lambda_2 | s)$ and $M_2(s) = h_1(t - \lambda_2 | s)$ ($M_2(s) = \min h_1(t - \lambda_1 | s)$), and using hypotheses of the Lemma 2.1, we conclude that

$$0 = h_1(t - \lambda_2 | c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) \frac{h_1(t - \lambda_1 | s)}{f_1(s)} ds$$

$$\leq (\geq) h_1(t - \lambda_1 | c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) \frac{h_1(t - \lambda_2 | s)}{f_1(s)} ds$$

$$\Rightarrow \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) h_1(t - \lambda_2 | s) f_1(s) ds \geq (\leq) 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)) h_1(t - \lambda_2 | s) f_1(s) ds > (>) 0,$$

due to assumption $A_1$ and the assumption that $c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) \neq c_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)$.

Now using the fact that the function

$$k_1(c|t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c) \frac{h_1(t - \lambda_2 | s)}{f_1(s)} ds$$

is a non-increasing function of $c$, and $k_1(c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)|t) > (>) 0$, and $k_1(c_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)|t) = 0$, we conclude that $c_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) < (>) c_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)$. Hence the result follows. \(\square\)

Define, for any fixed $t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 0} S_\lambda$,

(3.1.2) \[ c_{0,1,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t), \]

and

(3.1.3) \[ c_{0,1}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t). \]

In order to find $c_{0,1,*}(t)$ and $c_{0,1}^*(t)$, Lemma 3.1.1 may turn out to be handy.

**Theorem 3.1.1.** Under assumptions $C_1$, $C_2$ and $A_1$, let $\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1(D)$ be a location equivariant estimator of $\theta_1$, where $\psi_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $P_{\theta}[\psi_1(D) \in [c_{0,1,*}(D), c_{0,1}^*(D)]] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$. Then

$$R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}) \leq R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}), \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,$$

where $\delta_{\psi_1^*}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1^*(D)$, and $\psi_1^*(t) = \max\{c_{0,1,*}(t), \min\{\psi_1(t), c_{0,1}^*(t)\}\} = \min\{c_{0,1}^*(t), \max\{\psi_1(t), c_{0,1,*}(t)\}\}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

**Proof.** Note that,

$$\psi_1^*(t) = \begin{cases} c_{0,1,*}(t), & \text{if } \psi_1(t) < c_{0,1,*}(t) \\ \psi_1(t), & \text{if } c_{0,1,*}(t) \leq \psi_1(t) \leq c_{0,1}^*(t) \\ c_{0,1}^*(t), & \text{if } \psi_1(t) > c_{0,1}^*(t) \end{cases}$$
Assumptions $A_1$, $C_1$ and $C_2$ imply that, for any $\lambda \geq 0$ and $t \in S_\lambda$,

$$r_{1,\lambda}(c, t) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty W(s - c) h_1(t - \lambda s) f_1(s) \, ds$$

is non-increasing in $c \in (-\infty, c_{0,1}(\lambda, t)]$, non-decreasing in $c \in [c_{0,1}(\lambda, t), \infty)$, with unique minimum at $c = c_{0,1}(\lambda, t)$.

Since, for any fixed $\lambda$ and $t$, such that $\lambda \geq 0$ and $t \in S_\lambda$, $c_{0,1}^*(t) \leq c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) \leq c_{0,1}^*(t)$, it follows that $r_{1,\lambda}(c, t)$ is non-increasing in $c \in (-\infty, c_{0,1}(t)]$ and non-decreasing in $c \in [c_{0,1}(t), \infty)$. Thus $r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \geq r_{1,\lambda}(c_{0,1}(t), t)$, for $\psi_1(t) < c_{0,1}(t)$ and $r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \geq r_{1,\lambda}(c_{0,1}^*(t), t)$, for $\psi_1(t) > c_{0,1}^*(t)$.

Let $A = \{t \in S_\lambda : \psi_1(t) < c_{0,1}(t)\}$, $B = \{t \in S_\lambda : c_{0,1}(t) \leq \psi_1(t) \leq c_{0,1}^*(t)\}$ and $C = \{t \in S_\lambda : \psi_1(t) > c_{0,1}^*(t)\}$. Then

$$R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt$$

$$= \int_A r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt + \int_B r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt + \int_C r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt$$

$$\geq \int_A r_{1,\lambda}(c_{0,1}(t), t) \, dt + \int_B r_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt + \int_C r_{1,\lambda}(c_{0,1}^*(t), t) \, dt$$

$$= R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}^*), \quad \theta \in \Theta_0.$$

Hence the result follow. \hfill \Box

The proof of the following Corollary is contained in the proof of the above theorem, hence omitted.

**Corollary 3.1.1.** Suppose that assumptions $C_1$, $C_2$ and $A_1$ hold and let $\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1(D)$ be a location equivariant estimator of $\theta_1$, where $\psi_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $P_2[\psi_1(D) \in [c_{0,1}(D), c_{0,1}^*(D)]] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$. Let $\psi_{0,1} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\psi_1(t) \leq \psi_{0,1}(t) \leq c_{0,1}(t)$, whenever $\psi_1(t) \leq c_{0,1}(t)$, and $c_{0,1}(t) \leq \psi_{0,1}(t) \leq \psi_1(t)$, whenever $c_{0,1}(t) \leq \psi_1(t)$. Also let $\psi_{0,1}(t) = \psi_1(t)$, whenever $c_{0,1}(t) \leq \psi_1(t) \leq c_{0,1}^*(t)$. Then

$$R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_{0,1}}) \leq R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,$$

where $\delta_{\psi_{0,1}}(X) = X_1 - \psi_{0,1}(D)$.

**Remark 3.1.1.** Under the unrestricted parameter space i.e., $\theta \in \Theta = \mathbb{R}^2$, the unrestricted best location equivariant estimator (BLEE) of $\theta_1$ is $\delta_{0,1}(X) = X_1 - c_{0,1}$, where $c_{0,1}$ is the unique solution of the equation $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(z - c) f_1(z) \, dz = 0$. Suppose that assumptions $C_1$, $C_2$ and $A_1$ hold and $P_2[c_{0,1} \in [c_{0,1}(D), c_{0,1}^*(D)]] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$. Then, using Theorem 3.1.1, the unrestricted BLEE $\delta_{0,1}(X)$ is inadmissible for estimating $\theta_1$ and is dominated by the estimator $\delta_{\psi_{0,1}}(X) = X_1 - \psi_{0,1}^*(D)$, where
\[ \psi_{0.1}^*(D) = \max\{c_{0.1,*}(D), \min\{c_{0.1}, c_{0.1}^*(D)\}\}. \]

Now we will provide some applications of Theorem 3.1.1 and Corollary 3.1.1.

**Example 3.1.1.** Let \( X = (X_1, X_2) \) follow a bivariate normal distribution with joint pdf

\[
f_{0.1}(x, y) = f(x - \theta_1, x_2 - \theta_2), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Theta_0,\]

where, for known positive real numbers \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \) and known \( \rho \in (-1, 1) \), the joint pdf of \( Z = (Z_1, Z_2) = (X_1 - \theta_1, X_2 - \theta_2) \) is

\[
f(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_1\sigma_2\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2(1-\rho^2)}\left[\frac{z_1^2}{\sigma_1^2} - 2\rho \frac{z_1 z_2}{\sigma_1\sigma_2} + \frac{z_2^2}{\sigma_2^2}\right]}, \quad \mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2.
\]

Consider estimation of \( \theta_1 \) under the squared error loss function (i.e., \( W(t) = t^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \)). We have \( S_1 = S_2 = \mathbb{R} \) and, for any \( s \in S_1 \), \( Z_s^{(1)} \sim N\left(\frac{\eta_s}{\sigma_1}, \xi_s^2\right) \), where \( \eta_1 = \rho\sigma_2 - \sigma_1 \) and \( \xi_1^2 = (1 - \rho^2)\sigma_2^2 \). Then, it can be verified that

\[
c_{0.1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s h_1(t - \lambda|s)f_1(s)ds}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_1(t - \lambda|s)f_1(s)ds} = \frac{\sigma_1\eta_1}{\tau^2}(t - \lambda) = -(1 - \beta_0)(t - \lambda), \quad \lambda \geq 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},
\]

where \( \tau^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - 2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 \) and \( \beta_0 = 1 + \frac{\sigma_1\eta_1}{\tau^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\left(1 - \frac{\rho\eta_1}{\sigma_0^2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\rho\eta_1}{\sigma_1^2}\right)^{-1} \).

The unrestricted BLEE of \( \theta_1 \) is \( \delta_{0.1}(\mathbf{X}) = X_1 \). Consider the class of mixed estimators \( D_{1,M} = \{\delta_{0.1}^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \), where \( \delta_{0.1}^\alpha(X) = \begin{cases} X_1, & X_1 \leq X_2 \\
\alpha X_1 + (1 - \alpha)X_2, & X_1 > X_2 \end{cases} \)

\( X_1 - \psi_{1,\alpha}(D) \) and \( \psi_{1,\alpha}(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \geq 0 \\
-(1 - \alpha)t, & t < 0 \end{cases}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

Note that \( \delta_{0.1}^1 \) is the unrestricted BLEE and, for \( \beta_0 = 1 + \frac{\sigma_1\eta_1}{\tau^2} \), \( \delta_{\beta_0}^{(1)} \) is the MLE of \( \theta_1 \) (see Patra and Kumar (2017)).

**Case-I** \( \eta_1 < 0 \) (i.e., \( \rho\sigma_2 < \sigma_1 \))

Here one can verify that \( Z_s^{(1)} \leq Z_s^{(1)} \), whenever \( -\infty < s_1 < s_2 < \infty \) (i.e., assumption \( D_1 \) holds). Using Lemma 3.1.1, we get

\[
c_{0.1,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0.1}(\lambda, t) = c_{0.1}(0, t) = \frac{\sigma_1\eta_1}{\tau^2}(1 - \beta_0)t = -(1 - \beta_0)t
\]

and \( c_{0.1}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0.1}(\lambda, t) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} c_{0.1}(\lambda, t) = \infty. \)

In this case \( \beta_0 = \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\left(1 - \frac{\rho\eta_1}{\sigma_0^2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\rho\eta_1}{\sigma_1^2}\right)^{-1} < 1. \)

Let \( \delta_{\psi_1}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1(D) \) be an equivariant estimator of \( \theta_1 \), such that \( P_0[|\psi_1(D)| \geq \frac{1}{2}] \)
Consider the mixed estimators \( \{ \delta_\alpha^{(1)} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \} \), as defined above. Note that, for \( \alpha > \beta_0, P_\theta[\psi_1,\alpha(D) \geq c_{0,1,\star}(D)] = P_\theta(D \geq 0) < 1, \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Using Theorem 3.1.1, it follows that the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_1^{(1)}(X) = X_1 \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \) and is dominated by the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_0^{(1)}(X) = X_1 \). Using Corollary 3.1.1, it follows that for \( \beta_0 \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \infty, R_1(\theta, \delta_1^{(1)}) \leq R_1(\theta, \delta_0^{(1)}), \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \). In particular it follows that the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_1^{(1)}(X) = X_1 \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \) and is dominated by the restricted MLE \( \delta_0^{(1)}(X) \).

**Case-II** \( \eta_1 = 0 \) (i.e., \( \rho \sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \))

In this case \( Z_1^{(1)} \sim N(0, \xi_1^2) \), \( \forall s \in S_1 \) and \( c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,1,\star}(t) = c_{0,1}(0, t) = 0, \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \lambda \geq 0 \). Using Theorem 3.1.1, it follows that the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_1^{(1)}(X) = X_1 \) dominates any other equivariant estimator of \( \theta_1 \).

**Case-III** \( \eta_1 > 0 \) (i.e., \( \rho \sigma_2 > \sigma_1 \))

In this case it is easy to verify that \( Z_1^{(1)} \leq Z_2^{(1)} \), whenever \( -\infty < s_1 < s_2 < \infty \) (i.e., assumption \( D_2 \) holds) and \( \beta_0 > 1 \). Moreover, by Lemma 3.1.1,

\[
c_{0,1,\star}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = -\infty
\]

and

\[
c_{0,1}(0, t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,1}(0, t) = \frac{\sigma_1 \eta_1}{\tau^2} t = -(1 - \beta_0)t.
\]

We have, for \( \alpha < \beta_0, P_\theta[\psi_1,\alpha(D) \leq c_{0,1}^{\star}(D)] = P_\theta(D \geq 0) < 1, \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Thus, using Theorem 3.1.1, it follows that mixed estimators \( \{ \delta_\alpha^{(1)} : \alpha < \beta_0 \} \) are inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \) and the estimator \( \delta_\alpha^{(1)} \), for \( \alpha < \beta_0 \), is dominated by the estimator

\[
\delta_{\psi_1,\alpha}(X) = X_1 - \min\{c_{0,1}^{\star}(D), \psi_1,\alpha(D)\} = \begin{cases}
X_1, & X_1 \leq X_2 \\
\beta_0 X_1 + (1 - \beta_0) X_2, & X_1 > X_2
\end{cases} = \delta_{b_0}^{(1)}(X),
\]

which is the restricted MLE of \( \theta_1 \).

**Example 3.1.2.** Let \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) be two dependent random variables with the
joint pdf \( f_{\mathbf{x}}(x_1, x_2) = f(x_1 - \theta_1, x_2 - \theta_2), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Theta_0, \) where

\[
f(z_1, z_2) = \begin{cases} 
2z_1z_2 e^{-z_1}e^{-z_2}, & 0 < z_1 < z_2 < \infty \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

is the joint pdf of \((Z_1, Z_2) = (X_1 - \theta_1, X_2 - \theta_2)\). The marginal pdfs of \(Z_1\) and \(Z_2\) are

\[
f_1(z) = \begin{cases} 
2z(z + 1)e^{-2z}, & 0 < z < \infty \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

and

\[
f_2(z) = \begin{cases} 
2ze^{-z}(1-e^{-z}(1+z)), & 0 < z < \infty \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

respectively.

For estimation of \(\theta_1\), consider the LINEX loss function \(L_1(\theta, a) = W(a - \theta_1), a \in \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}, \quad \theta \in \Theta_0, \) where \(W(t) = e^t - t - 1, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}\). Here \(W(t)\) satisfies conditions \(C_1\) and \(C_2\).

Also, we have \(S_1 = S_2 = (0, \infty) = S\) (say) and for every \(s \in S\), the pdf of \(Z^{(s)}_1\) is

\[
h_1(z|s) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{(s+z)}{(s+1)}e^{-z}, & 0 < z < \infty \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

It is easily seen that, for \(0 < s_1 < s_2 < \infty\) and \(-\infty < z_1 < z_2 < \infty, h_1(z_1|s_1)h_1(z_2|s_2) \leq h_1(z_1|s_2)h_2(z_2|s_1)\), i.e., assumption \(D_1\) holds.

We have \(S_\lambda = [\lambda, \infty)\) and, for \(t \in S_\lambda\) (i.e., \(t \geq \lambda\),

\[
c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \ln \left( \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^s h_1(t - \lambda | s) f_1(s) ds}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_1(t - \lambda | s) f_1(s) ds} \right) = \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + t - \lambda)}{1 + t - \lambda} \right)
\]

For \(t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 0} S_\lambda = [0, \infty),\) using Lemma 3.1.1, we have

\[
c_{0,1,\ast}(t) = \inf_{0 \leq \lambda \leq t} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,1}(0, t) = \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + t)}{1 + t} \right)
\]

and

\[
c_{0,1,\ast}^\ast(t) = \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq t} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \lim_{\lambda \to t} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \ln(8).
\]

For any equivariant estimator \(\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1(D)\), define

\[
\psi_1^\ast(D) = \max \left\{ \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + D)}{1 + D} \right), \min\{\psi_1(D), \ln(8)\} \right\}
\]

Using Theorem 3.1.1, we conclude that the equivariant estimator \(\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1(D)\) is inadmissible, provided that \(P_{\theta}(c_{0,1,\ast}(D) \leq \psi_1(D) \leq c_{0,1}^\ast(D)) < 1,\) for some \(\theta \in \Theta_0\). In this case an improved estimator is given by \(\delta_{\psi_1^\ast}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1^\ast(D)\).

The unrestricted BLEE of \(\theta_1\) is \(\delta_{0,1}(X) = X_1 - c_{0,1},\) where \(c_{0,1} = \ln(E(e^{Z_1})) = \ln(6)\).

Clearly,

\[
P_{\theta} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + D)}{1 + D} \right) \leq \ln(6) \leq \ln(8) \right] < 1, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0.
\]
Hence, using Theorem 3.1.1, the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_{0,1}(X) = X_1 - \ln(6) \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \) and an estimator dominating the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_{0,1}(X) = X_1 - \ln(6) \) is

\[
\delta_{\phi_{0,1}^*}(X) = X_1 - \psi_{0,1}^*(D) = X_1 - \max \left\{ \ln(6), \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + D)}{1 + D} \right) \right\} = \begin{cases} X_1 - \ln(6), & X_2 \geq X_1 + 1 \\ X_1 - \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + D)}{1 + D} \right), & X_2 < X_1 + 1 \end{cases}.
\]

**Example 3.1.3.** Let \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) be independent random variables with \( X_i \) having the pdf \( f_i(x - \theta_i) \), where

\[
f_i(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma_i} e^{-\frac{z}{\sigma_i}}, & z \geq 0 \\ 0, & z < 0 \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, 2,
\]

\( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \) are known positive constants and \( \theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Theta_0 \) is the vector of unknown restricted location parameters \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) \((-\infty < \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 < \infty \)). Consider estimation of \( \theta_1 \) under the squared error loss function

\[
L_1(\theta, a) = W(a - \theta_1) = (a - \theta_1)^2, \quad \theta \in \Theta_0, \quad a \in \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}.
\]

We have \( S_1 = S_2 = (0, \infty) = S \) (say) and for \( s \in S \), the pdf of \( Z^{(1)}_s \) is

\[
h_1(z|s) = f_2(z + s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma_2} e^{-\frac{z + s}{\sigma_2}}, & z \geq -s \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

For every \( s_1, s_2 \in S \) and \( s_1 < s_2 \), we have \( h_1(t_1|s_1)h_1(t_2|s_2) \leq h_1(t_1|s_2)h_1(t_2|s_1) \), whenever \( t_1 < t_2 \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). Hence the assumption \( D_1 \) holds. We have \( S_\lambda = \mathbb{R}, \forall \lambda \geq 0 \) and, for \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s h_1(t - \lambda|s)f_1(s)ds}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_1(t - \lambda|s)f_1(s)ds} = \max\{0, -t + \lambda\} + \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}.
\]

Clearly, for \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
c_{0,1,\ast}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,1}(0, t) = \max\{0, -t\} + \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}
\]

and \( c_{0,1}^*(t) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} c_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \infty \).

Let \( \delta_{\phi}(X) = X_1 - \psi(D) \) be an equivariant estimator of \( \theta_1 \), such that \( P_{\theta}[\psi_1(D) \geq c_{0,1,\ast}(D)] < 1 \), for some \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Then, using Theorem 3.1.1, it follows that the equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\phi}(X) = X_1 - \psi(D) \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \) and it is dominated by \( \delta_{\phi_1^*}(X) = X_1 - \psi_1^*(D) \), where

\[
\psi_1^*(D) = \max\{c_{0,1,\ast}(D), \min\{\psi_1(D), c_{0,1}^*(D)\}\} = \max\{c_{0,1,\ast}(D), \psi_1(D)\}.
\]

The restricted MLE of \( \theta_1 \) is \( \delta_{\phi_{1,M}}(X) = \min\{X_1, X_2\} = X_1 - \max\{0, -D\} \), where \( \psi_{1,M}(D) = \max\{0, -D\} \). Clearly \( \delta_{\phi_{1,M}} \) is a location equivariant estimator of \( \theta_1 \) with
\[ P_{\theta}[\psi_{1,M}(D) \geq c_{0,1,*}(D)] = 0, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0. \] Using Theorem 3.1.1, it follow that the restricted MLE \( \delta_{\psi_{1,M}} \) is inadmissible and the estimator

\[ \delta_{c_{0,1,*}}(X) = X_1 - c_{0,1,*}(D) = \min\{X_1, X_2\} - \frac{\sigma_1 \sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}. \]

dominates it.

Under squared error loss function the unrestricted BLEE of \( \theta_1 \) is \( \delta_{0,1}(X) = X_1 - \sigma_1 = X_1 - \psi_0(D) \), say, where \( \psi_1(t) = \sigma_1, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \). Clearly, \( P_{\theta}[\sigma_1 \geq c_{0,1,*}(D)] = P\left(D \geq \frac{-\sigma_1}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}\right) < 1, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \). It follows that the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_{0,1}(X) \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \) and is dominated by \( \delta_{\psi_0}(X) = X_1 - \psi_0(D) \), where

\[ \psi_0(t) = \max\{c_{0,1,*}(t), \sigma_1\} = \max\left\{\frac{\sigma_1 \sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2} - t, \sigma_1\right\}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \]

i.e.,

\[ \delta_{\psi_0}(X) = \min\left\{X_2 - \frac{\sigma_1 \sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}, X_1 - \sigma_1\right\}. \]

The above results, which are easy consequences of Theorem 3.1.1, are obtained in [Vijayasree et al. (1995)]. Also, [Garren (2000)] has shown the universal dominance of estimator \( \delta_{\psi_0}(X) \) over the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_{0,1}(X) = X_1 - \sigma_1 \).

### 3.2. Estimation of the Larger Location Parameter \( \theta_2 \)

In this subsection we deal with estimation of the larger location parameter \( \theta_2 \) under the general loss function \( L_2(\theta, a) = W(a - \theta_2), \quad \theta \in \Theta_0, \quad a \in \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R} \), when it is known apriori that \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Assume that \( W(\cdot) \) satisfies assumptions \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \).

The form of any location equivariant estimator of \( \theta_2 \) is

\[ (3.2.1) \]

\[ \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D), \]

for some function \( \psi_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \), where \( D = X_2 - X_1 \). The risk function of \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) \) is

\[ R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}) = E_\theta[W(X_2 - \psi_2(D) - \theta_2)] \]

\[ = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} r_{2,\lambda}(\psi_2(t), t) dt, \quad \lambda \geq 0, \]

where, for \( c \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[ r_{2,\lambda}(c, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(s - c) h_2(t - \lambda s) f_2(s) ds. \]

We need the following assumption for finding improvements over location equivariant estimators of \( \theta_2 \).

\[ A_2: \] For any fixed \( \lambda \geq 0, \quad t \in S_\lambda \) (the support of \( D \)), the equation

\[ (3.2.2) \]

\[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W'(s - c) h_2(t - \lambda s) f_2(s) ds = 0 \]

has the unique solution \( c = c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) \in S_2 \) such that \( h_2(t - \lambda c_{0,2}(\lambda, t)) > 0 \).
Now we will state the main results of this subsection. The proofs of the following lemma, theorem and corollary are similar to those of Lemma 3.1.1, Theorem 3.1.1 and Corollary 3.1.1, respectively, and hence skipped.

**Lemma 3.2.1.** Suppose that assumptions $C_1$, $C_2$, $A_2$ and $D_3$ ($C_1$, $C_2$, $A_2$ and $D_4$) hold. Then, for any fixed $t$, $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ such that $0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty$ and $\lambda_1$, $\lambda_2 \in S_t$ (i.e., $t \in S_{\lambda_1} \cap S_{\lambda_2}$),

$$c_{0,2}(\lambda_1, t) \leq (\geq) c_{0,2}(\lambda_2, t).$$

Define, for any fixed $t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 0} S_{\lambda}$,

$$c_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t),$$

and

$$c_{0,2}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t).$$

The following theorem provides a set of sufficient conditions under which an arbitrary location equivariant estimator is inadmissible. In such cases the theorem also provides dominating estimators.

**Theorem 3.2.1.** Suppose that assumptions $C_1$, $C_2$ and $A_2$ hold. Let $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$ be a location equivariant estimator of $\theta_2$, where $\psi_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is some function. Define $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2^*(D)$, where $\psi_2^*(D) = \max\{c_{0,2,*}(D), \min\{\psi_2(D), c_{0,2}^*(D)\}\} = \min\{c_{0,2}(D), \max\{\psi_2(D), c_{0,2}^*(D)\}\}$. Then,

$$R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}) \leq R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}), \ \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,$$

provided that $P_\theta[\psi_2(D) \in [c_{0,2,*}(D), c_{0,2}^*(D)]] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$.

One may use Lemma 3.2.1 to determine $c_{0,2,*}(D)$ and $c_{0,2}^*(D)$ defined in the above theorem.

**Corollary 3.2.1.** Under the assumptions $C_1$, $C_2$ and $A_2$, let $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$ be a location equivariant estimator, where $\psi_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $P_\theta[\psi_2(D) \in [c_{0,2,*}(D), c_{0,2}^*(D)]] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$. Let $\psi_{0,2} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\psi_2(t) \leq \psi_{0,2}(t) \leq c_{0,2,*}(t)$, whenever $\psi_2(t) \leq c_{0,2,*}(t)$, and $c_{0,2}^*(t) \leq \psi_2(t) \leq c_{0,2}^*(t)$, whenever $c_{0,2}^*(t) \leq \psi_2(t)$. Also let $\psi_{0,2}(t) = \psi_2(t)$, whenever $c_{0,2,*}(t) \leq \psi_2(t) \leq c_{0,2}^*(t)$. Then

$$R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_{0,2}}) \leq R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}), \ \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,$$

where $\delta_{\psi_{0,2}}(X) = X_2 - \psi_{0,2}^*(D)$.

Now we will apply Theorem 3.2.1 and Corollary 3.2.1 to specific probability models.

**Example 3.2.1.** Let $X = (X_1, X_2)$ have the bivariate normal distribution as described in Example 3.1.1. Consider estimation of $\theta_2$ under the squared error loss function $L_2(\theta, a) = (a - \theta_2)^2$, $\theta \in \Theta_0$, $a \in A = \mathbb{R}$ (i.e., $W(t) = t^2$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$).
For any \( s \in S_2 = \mathbb{R} \), \( Z_s^{(2)} \sim N \left( \frac{\eta s}{\rho}, \xi^2_2 \right) \), where \( \eta_2 = \sigma_2 - \rho \sigma_1 \) and \( \xi^2_2 = (1 - \rho^2) \sigma_1^2 \). Here \( S_\lambda = \mathbb{R}, \forall \lambda \geq 0 \). For any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\sigma^2 \eta_2}{\tau^2} (t - \lambda), \quad \lambda \geq 0.
\]

The unrestricted BLEE of \( \theta_2 \) is \( \delta_{0,2}(X) = X_2 = X_2 - \psi_{0,2}(D) \) (say), where \( \psi_{0,2}(t) = 0, \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \), and the restricted MLE of \( \theta_2 \) is

\[
\delta_{\beta_0}^{(2)}(X) = \begin{cases} 
X_2, & X_1 \leq X_2 \\
\beta_0 X_1 + (1 - \beta_0) X_2, & X_1 > X_2
\end{cases} = X_2 - \psi_{2,\beta_0}(D),
\]

where \( \psi_{2,\beta_0}(t) = \begin{cases} 
0, & t \geq 0 \\
\beta_0 t, & t < 0
\end{cases} \) and \( \beta_0 = 1 + \frac{\sigma \eta}{\tau} = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{\tau^2}} (1 - \frac{2 \rho}{\sigma})}{\frac{1}{\tau^2} (1 - \frac{2 \rho}{\sigma}) + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} (1 - \frac{2 \rho}{\sigma})} = \frac{\sigma^2 \eta_2}{\tau^2} \).

Consider a more general class of mixed estimators \( D_{2,M} = \{ \delta_{\alpha}^{(2)} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \} \), where

\[
\delta_{\alpha}^{(2)}(X) = \begin{cases} 
X_2, & X_1 \leq X_2 \\
\alpha X_1 + (1 - \alpha) X_2, & X_1 > X_2
\end{cases} = X_2 - \psi_{2,\alpha}(D)
\]

and \( \psi_{2,\alpha}(t) = \begin{cases} 
0, & t \geq 0 \\
\alpha t, & t < 0
\end{cases}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \)

Note that \( \delta_{0}^{(2)} \) is the unrestricted BLEE of \( \theta_2 \) and \( \delta_{\beta_0}^{(2)} \) is the restricted MLE of \( \theta_2 \). The following three cases arise:

**Case-I** \( \eta_2 < 0 \) (i.e., \( \rho \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 \))

We have, for \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
c_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,2}(0, t) = \frac{\sigma^2 \eta_2}{\tau^2} t = \beta_0 t
\]

and \( c_{0,2}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \infty \),

where \( \beta_0 = \frac{\sigma^2 \eta_2}{\tau^2} < 0 \).

For any equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D) \), let

\[
\psi_{2,*}(D) = \max \{ c_{0,2,*}(D), \min \{ \psi_2(D), c_{0,2}^*(D) \} \} = \max \{ \beta_0 D, \psi_2(D) \}.
\]

Suppose that \( P_{\theta} [\psi_2(D) \geq c_{0,2,*}(D)] < 1 \), for some \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Then, using Theorem 3.2.1, it follows that the equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D) \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_2 \) and is dominated by the estimator \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2^*(D) = X_2 - \max \{ \beta_0 D, \psi_2(D) \} \).

Consider the mixed estimators \( \{ \delta_{\alpha}^{(2)} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \} \), defined above, where \( \delta_{\alpha}^{(2)}(X) = X_2 - \psi_{2,\alpha}(D), \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \). Define

\[
\psi_{2,\alpha,*}(D) = \max \{ c_{0,2,*}(t), \psi_{2,\alpha}(D) \} = \begin{cases} 
\beta_0 D, & D \geq 0 \\
\min \{ \alpha, \beta_0 \} D, & D < 0
\end{cases}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
Note that, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\theta \in \Theta_0$,
\[
P_2[\psi_{2,\alpha}(D) \geq c_{0,2,*}(D)] = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } \alpha > \beta_0 \\
P_2[D < 0], & \text{if } \alpha \leq \beta_0,
\end{cases}
\]
implying that $P_2[\psi_{2,\alpha}(D) \geq c_{0,2,*}(D)] < 1$, $\forall \theta \in \Theta_0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Now, using Theorem 3.2.1, it follows that all the mixed estimators $\{\delta^{(2)}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ are inadmissible for estimating $\theta_2$. The mixed estimator $\delta^{(2)}_\alpha(X) = X_2 - \psi_{2,\alpha}(D)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, is dominated by the estimator
\[
\delta^{*}_{2,\alpha}(X) = X_2 - \psi^{*}_{2,\alpha}(D) = \begin{cases} 
\beta_0 X_1 + (1 - \beta_0) X_2, & X_2 \geq X_1 \\
\min\{\alpha, \beta_0\} X_1 + (1 - \min\{\alpha, \beta_0\}) X_2, & X_2 < X_1.
\end{cases}
\]
In particular it follows that the unrestricted BLEE $\delta^{(2)}_{0,2}(X) = \delta^{(2)}_0(X) = X_2$ and the restricted MLE $\delta^{(2)}_{\beta_0}(X) = X_2 - \psi_{2,\beta_0}(D)$ are inadmissible for estimating $\theta_2$. The unrestricted BLEE $\delta^{(2)}_{0,2}$ is dominated by the restricted MLE $\delta^{(2)}_{\beta_0}$ and $\delta^{(2)}_{\beta_0}$ is further dominated by the estimator $\delta^{*}_{2,\beta_0}(X) = \beta_0 X_1 + (1 - \beta_0) X_2$.

**Case-II** $\eta_2 = 0$ (i.e., $\rho \sigma_2 = \sigma_1$)

In this case $c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,2,*}(t) = c^{*}_{0,2}(t) = 0$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, using Theorem 3.2.1, it follows that the unrestricted BLEE $\delta^{(2)}_{0,2}(X) = X_2$ dominates any other equivariant estimator of $\theta_2$.

**Case-III** $\eta_2 > 0$ (i.e., $\rho \sigma_1 > \sigma_2$)

In this case
\[
c_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad c^{*}_{0,2}(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\sigma_2 \eta_2}{\tau^2} t = \beta_0 t,
\]
where $\beta_0 = \frac{\sigma_2 \eta_2}{\tau^2} > 0$.
For an equivariant estimator $\delta^{(2)}_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$, define
\[
\psi^{*}_2(D) = \min\{c^{*}_{0,2}(D), \max\{\psi_2(D), c_{0,2,*}(D)\}\} = \min\{\beta_0 D, \psi_2(D)\}.
\]
Using Theorem 3.2.1, it follows that the equivariant estimator $\delta^{(2)}_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$ is inadmissible for estimating $\theta_2$, provided that $P_2[\psi_2(D) \leq c^{*}_{0,2}(D)] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$. In this case the estimator $\delta^{*}_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi^{*}_2(D) = X_2 - \max\{\beta_0 D, \psi_2(D)\}$ dominates the estimator $\delta^{(2)}_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$.

Consider the mixed estimators $\delta^{(2)}_{\alpha}(X) = X_2 - \psi_{2,\alpha}(D)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, defined above. Define
\[
\psi^{*}_{2,\alpha}(D) = \min\{c^{*}_{0,2}(D), \psi_{2,\alpha}(D)\} = \begin{cases} 
\beta_0 D, & D \geq 0 \\
\max\{\beta_0, \alpha\} D, & D < 0,
\end{cases} \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
We have, for any \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \), and \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \),
\[
P_{\theta} [\psi_{2,\alpha}(D) \leq c_{0,2}^{*}(D)] = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } \alpha < \beta_0 \\
P_{\theta}[D < 0], & \text{if } \alpha \geq \beta_0 ,
\end{cases}
\]
implying that \( P_{\theta} [\psi_{2,\alpha}(D) \leq c_{0,2}^{*}(D)] < 1 \), \( \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \), \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \). This further implies the inadmissibility of all mixed estimators \( \{\delta_{\alpha}^{(2)} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \). The mixed estimator \( \delta_{\alpha}^{(2)}(X) = X_2 - \psi_{2,\alpha}(D) \), \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \), is dominated by the estimator
\[
\delta_{\psi_{2,\alpha}^{*}}(X) = X_2 - \psi_{2,\alpha}^{*}(D) = \begin{cases} 
\beta_0 X_1 + (1 - \beta_0) X_2, & X_2 \geq X_1 \\
\max\{\beta_0, \alpha, \} X_1 + (1 - \max\{\beta_0, \alpha, \}) X_2, & X_2 < X_1 .
\end{cases}
\]
In particular the unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_0^{(2)}(X) = X_2 \) and the restricted MLE \( \delta_{\beta_0}^{(2)}(X) = X_2 - \psi_{2,\beta_0}(D) \) are inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_2 \). The unrestricted BLEE \( \delta_0^{(2)}(X) \) is dominated by the restricted MLE \( \delta_{\beta_0}^{(2)}(X) \) and also the restricted MLE \( \delta_{\beta_0}^{(2)}(X) \) is dominated by the estimator \( \delta_{\psi_{2,\beta_0}^{*}}(X) = \beta_0 X_1 + (1 - \beta_0) X_2 \).

**Example 3.2.2.** Let \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) be dependent random variables as described in Example 3.1.2. Consider the estimation of \( \theta_2 \) under the LINEX loss function \( L_2(\theta, a) = W(a - \theta_2), \ \theta \in \Theta_0, \ a \in A = \mathbb{R} \), where \( W(t) = e^t - t - 1, \ t \in \mathbb{R} \). Here \( W(t) \) satisfies assumptions \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \). For every \( s \in S = (0, \infty) \), the pdf of \( Z_s^{(2)} \) is
\[
h_2(t|s) = \begin{cases} 
(\frac{t}{s})t e^{\frac{s-t}{t}} e^{-s}, & 0 < t < s \\
0, & \text{otherwise} .
\end{cases}
\]
It is easy to verify that, for \( 0 < s_1 < s_2 < \infty \), \( Z_{s_1}^{(1)} \leq Z_{s_2}^{(1)} \), i.e., the assumption \( D_4 \) holds. Here \( S_\lambda = [\lambda, \infty) \) and, for \( t \in S_\lambda \),
\[
c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \ln \left( \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^s h_2(t - \lambda|s)f_2(s)ds}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_2(t - \lambda|s)f_2(s)ds} \right) \\
= \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + t - \lambda)}{(1 + t - \lambda)e^{t + \lambda}} \right) \\
= t - \lambda + \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + t - \lambda)}{1 + t - \lambda} \right).
\]
Here, using Lemma 3.2.1, we get
\[
c_{0,2,\ast}(t) = \inf_{0 \leq \lambda \leq t} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,2}(t, t) = \ln(8)
\]
and
\[
c_{0,2}^{\ast}(t) = \sup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq t} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = c_{0,2}(0, t) = t + \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + t)}{1 + t} \right).
\]
Let \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D) \) be an equivariant estimator. Define
\[
\psi_2^{\ast}(D) = \max \left\{ \ln(8), \min \left\{ \psi_2(D), D + \ln \left( \frac{4(2 + D)}{1 + D} \right) \right\} \right\}.
\]
Using Theorem 3.2.1, we conclude that the equivariant estimator $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$ is inadmissible for estimating $\theta_2$ and is dominated by the estimator $\delta_{\psi_2}^*(X) = X_2 - \psi_2^*(D)$, provided that $P_{\theta_2} \left[ \ln(8) \leq \psi_2(D) \leq D + \ln \left( \frac{4(2+D)}{1+D} \right) \right] < 1$, for some $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta_0$. Note that the unrestricted BLEE of $\theta_2$ does not exists as $E[e^{Z_2}] = \infty$.

**Example 3.2.3.** Let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be independent exponential random variables as considered in Example 3.1.3. Here we consider estimation of $\theta_2$ under the squared error loss function $L_2(\theta, a) = (a - \theta)^2$, $a \in \Theta_0$, $a \in \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $W(t) = t^2$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

For any $s \in S = (0, \infty)$,

$$h_2(t|s) = f_1(t-s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma_1} e^{-\frac{t-s}{\sigma_1}}, & t \geq s \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$ 

One can verify that, for $0 < s_1 < s_2$, $Z_{s_1}^{(2)} \leq Z_{s_2}^{(2)}$, i.e., the assumption $D_4$ holds. We have $S_\lambda = \mathbb{R}$, $\forall \lambda \geq 0$, and, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s \ h_2(t-\lambda|s)f_2(s)ds}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_2(t-\lambda|s)f_2(s)ds} = \max\{0, t-\lambda\} + \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}.$$

Clearly,

$$c_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{0,2}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} c_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2} + t, & t > 0 \\ \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}, & t \leq 0 \end{cases}.$$ 

Consider an equivariant estimator $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$, for some function $\psi_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Define

$$\psi_2^*(D) = \max\left\{ c_{0,2,*}(D), \min\{\psi_2(D), c_{0,2}^*(D)\} \right\} = \max\left\{ \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}, \min\left\{ \psi_2(D), \max\{0, D\} + \frac{\sigma_1\sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2} \right\} \right\}.$$ 

From Theorem 3.2.1, the equivariant estimator $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = X_2 - \psi_2(D)$ is inadmissible and the estimator $\delta_{\psi_2}^*(X) = X_2 - \psi_2^*(D)$ dominates it, provided that $P_{\lambda}[\psi_2^*(D) = \psi_2(D)] < 1$, for some $\lambda \geq 0$.

The restricted MLE of $\theta_2$ is $\delta_{\psi_2,M}(X) = X_2$. Obviously the restricted MLE is dominated by the unrestricted BLEE $\delta_{0,2}(X) = X_2 - \sigma_2 = X_2 - \psi_{0,2}(D)$ (say), where...
ψ_{0,2}(t) = σ_2, \ \forall \ t \in \mathbb{R}. \text{ Consider } \psi_{0,2}(D) = \max\{c_{0,2,\ast}(D), \min\{ψ_{0,2}(D), c_{0,2}^{\ast}(D)\}\} = \max\left\{\frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2}, \min\left\{σ_2, \max\{0, D\} + \frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2}\right\}\right\} = \begin{cases} σ_2, & D ≥ \frac{σ_2^2}{σ_1 + σ_2} \\ D + \frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2}, & 0 ≤ D < \frac{σ_2^2}{σ_1 + σ_2} \\ \frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2}, & D < 0 \end{cases}.

Since $P_θ[ψ_{0,2}(D) \in [c_{0,2,\ast}(D), c_{0,2}^{\ast}(D)]] = P_θ\left[\frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2} ≤ σ_2 ≤ \max\{0, D\} + \frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2}\right] = P_θ\left[D ≥ \frac{σ_2^2}{σ_1 + σ_2}\right] < 1, \ \forall \ θ \in \Theta_0,$ using Theorem 3.2.1, it follows that the unrestricted BLEE $δ_{0,2}(X) = X_2 - σ_2$ is inadmissible for estimating $θ_2$ and it is dominated by the estimator $δ_{ψ_{0,2}}(X) = X_2 - ψ_{0,2}^{\ast}(D) = \begin{cases} X_2 - \frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2}, & X_2 < X_1 \\ X_1 - \frac{σ_1σ_2}{σ_1 + σ_2}, & X_1 ≤ X_2 < X_1 + \frac{σ_2^2}{σ_1 + σ_2} \\ X_2 - σ_2, & X_2 ≥ X_1 + \frac{σ_2^2}{σ_1 + σ_2} \end{cases}.$

These results are also derived by Vijayasree et al. (1995).

4. Improvements over Equivariant Estimators of Scale Parameters

Let $X = (X_1, X_2)$ be a random vector with the joint pdf

\begin{equation}
(4.1) \quad f_θ(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{θ_1θ_2} f\left(\frac{x_1}{θ_1}, \frac{x_2}{θ_2}\right), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2,
\end{equation}

where $θ = (θ_1, θ_2) \in \Theta_0 = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2_{++} = (0, ∞) : t_1 ≤ t_2\}$ is the vector of unknown restricted scale parameters. Throughout, we assume that the distributional support of $X = (X_1, X_2)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^2_{++}.$

For estimation of $θ_i$, consider the loss function $L_i(θ, a) = W(\frac{a}{θ_i}), \ \ θ \in Θ, \ a \in A = \mathbb{R}_{++}, \ i = 1, 2,$ where $W : (0, ∞) → [0, ∞)$ is a function satisfying the following two conditions:

$C_1$: $W(1) = 0, W(t)$ is decreasing on $(0, 1]$ and increasing on $[1, ∞);$  
$C_2$: $W'(t)$ is non-decreasing on $\mathbb{R}_{++}.$

The problem of estimating $θ_i$ under the restricted parameter space $Θ_0$ and the loss function $L_i, i = 1, 2,$ is invariant under the multiplicative group of transformations $G = \{g_b : b ∈ (0, ∞)\},$ where $g_b(x_1, x_2) = (b x_1, b x_2), \ (x_1, x_2) ∈ \mathbb{R}^2, \ b ∈ (0, ∞).$ For $D = \frac{X_i}{X_1},$ the form of any scale equivariant estimator of $θ_i$ is

\begin{equation}
(4.2) \quad δ_{ψ_i}(X) = ψ_i(D)X_i,
\end{equation}
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for some function \( \psi_i : \mathbb{R}_{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++} \), \( i = 1, 2 \). The risk function of the equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\psi_i} \) is given by

\[
R_i(\theta, \delta_{\psi_i}) = E_x \left[ W \left( \frac{\delta_{\psi_i}(X)}{\theta_i} \right) \right], \quad \theta_i \in \Theta_0,
\]

which depends on \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \) only through \( \lambda = \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1} \in [1, \infty) \). Let \( Z_1 = \frac{X_1}{\theta_1}, \ Z_2 = \frac{X_2}{\theta_2}, \ Z = \frac{Z_2}{Z_1} \) and let \( S_i \) denote the support of r.v. \( Z_i, \ i = 1, 2 \). Denote \( f_i(\cdot), \ i = 1, 2, \) as the marginal pdf of \( Z_i, \ i = 1, 2 \). We assume, throughout, that the support of \( Z = (Z_1, Z_2) \) is a subset of \( \mathbb{R}_{++} \). For \( s \in S_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{++} \), let \( Z_s^{(i)} \) be the r.v. such that \( Z_s^{(i)} \overset{d}{=} Z | Z_i = s, \ i = 1, 2, \) and let \( h_i(s|z) \) denote as the pdf of \( Z_s^{(i)} \), \( s \in S_i \), \( i = 1, 2 \). Then

\[
h_1(z|s) = \frac{s f(s, sz)}{f_1(s)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, \ s \in S_1, \quad \text{and} \quad h_2(z|s) = \frac{s f(s^2, s)}{z^2} \frac{f_2(s)}{f_2(s)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, \ s \in S_2.
\]

We require the following assumptions to prove the main results of this section.

**D5:** \( Z_s^{(1)} \leq Z_s^{(1)} \), whenever \( s_1, s_2 \in S_1 \) and \( s_1 < s_2 \);

**D6:** \( Z_s^{(1)} \leq Z_s^{(1)} \), whenever \( s_1, s_2 \in S_1 \) and \( s_1 < s_2 \);

**D7:** \( Z_s^{(2)} \leq Z_s^{(2)} \), whenever \( s_1, s_2 \in S_2 \) and \( s_1 < s_2 \);

**D8:** \( Z_s^{(2)} \leq Z_s^{(2)} \), whenever \( s_1, s_2 \in S_2 \) and \( s_1 < s_2 \).

Note that the unrestricted best scale equivariant estimator (BSEE) of \( \theta_i \), under the parameter space \( \Theta = \mathbb{R}^2_{++} \), loss function \( L_i(\cdot, \cdot) \) and the multiplicative group of transformations \( \mathcal{G}_0 = \{ g_{b_1, b_2} : (b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2_{++} \} \), where \( g_{b_1, b_2}(x_1, x_2) = (b_1 x_1, b_2 x_2) \), \( (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \ (b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2_{++} \), is \( \delta_{0_i}(X) = b_{0_i} X_i \), where \( b_{0_i} \) is the unique solution of the equation

\[
f_0 \int_0^\infty s W'(cs) f_i(s) ds = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

In the following two subsections, we consider componentwise estimation of order restricted scale parameters \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) and derive sufficient conditions that ensure inadmissibility of a scale equivariant estimator. In such cases we also provide dominating estimators. Applications of main results are illustrated through various examples dealing with specific probability models.

### 4.1. Estimation of The Smaller Scale Parameter \( \theta_1 \)

Consider estimation of \( \theta_1 \) under the loss function \( L_1(\cdot, \cdot) \), when it is known apriori that \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Consider a scale equivariant estimator

\[
\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1(D) X_1,
\]

for some function \( \psi_1 : \mathbb{R}_{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++} \).

Using the notations described above, the risk function of \( \delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1(D) X_1 \)
can be written as
\[
R_1(\theta_1, \delta_{\psi_1}) = E_{\theta_1} \left[ W \left( \frac{X_1 \psi_1(D)}{\theta_1} \right) \right] \\
= E_{\theta_1} [W(\psi_1(\lambda Z)Z)] \\
= \int_0^\infty \left[ \int_0^\infty W(\psi_1(\lambda t)s) h_1(t|s) f_1(s) ds \right] dt \\
= \int_0^\infty \left[ \int_0^\infty W(\psi_1(t)s) \frac{1}{\lambda} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} | s \right) f_1(s) ds \right] dt \\
= \int_0^\infty l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) dt, \ \lambda \geq 1,
\]
where, for \( b \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \),
\[
l_{1,\lambda}(b, t) = \int_0^\infty W(bs) \frac{1}{\lambda} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} | s \right) f_1(s) ds.
\]
We will need the following assumption for proving the results of this section. Let \( S_\lambda \) denote the support of \( D \), and for any fixed \( t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} S_\lambda \), let \( \Lambda_t = \{ \lambda \geq 1 : t \in S_\lambda \} \).

\[A_3: \] For any fixed \( \lambda \geq 1 \) and \( t \in S_\lambda \), the equation
\[
(4.1.2) \quad \int_0^\infty s W'(bs) \frac{1}{\lambda} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} | s \right) f_1(s) ds = 0
\]
has the unique solution \( b = b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) \) such that \( \frac{1}{b_{0,1}(\lambda, t)} \in S_1 \) and \( h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} | \frac{1}{b_{0,1}(\lambda, t)} \right) > 0 \).

The following lemma examines the monotonicity of the function \( b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) \) with respect to \( \lambda \).

**Lemma 4.1.1.** Under the assumptions \( C_1, C_2, A_3 \) and \( D_5 \) \( (C_1, C_2, A_3 \) and \( D_6 \), let \( t, \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) be such that \( 1 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty \) and \( t \in S_{\lambda_1} \cap S_{\lambda_2} \). Then
\[
b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) \geq (\leq) b_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t).
\]

**Proof.** Let us fix \( t, \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \), so that \( 1 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty \) and \( t \in S_{\lambda_1} \cap S_{\lambda_2} \).

Suppose that \( b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) \neq b_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t) \). Using assumption \( A_3 \), we have
\[
\frac{1}{b_{0,1}(\lambda_i, t)} \in S_1, \ i = 1, 2, \text{ and } h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda_i} | \frac{1}{b_{0,1}(\lambda_i, t)} \right) > 0, \ i = 1, 2,
\]
\[
\int_0^\infty s W'(b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)s) \frac{1}{\lambda_1} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda_1} | s \right) f_1(s) ds = 0
\]
and
\[
\int_0^\infty s W'(b_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)s) \frac{1}{\lambda_2} h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda_2} | s \right) f_1(s) ds = 0.
\]
Taking \( s_0 = \frac{1}{b_{0,1}(\lambda_i, t)} \), \( M(s) = s W'(b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)s) f_1(s), M_1(s) = h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda_1} | s \right) (M_1(s) = h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda_1} | s \right) \) and \( M_2(s) = h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda_2} | s \right) (M_2(s) = h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda_2} | s \right) \) in Lemma 2.1 and using the
assumptions $C_1$, $C_2$, $A_3$ and $D_5$ ($D_6$) and the fact that $b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) \neq b_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)$, we get
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} sW'(b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)s) h_1\left(\frac{t}{\lambda_2}\right) f_1(s) \, ds > (>) 0.
\]
Now using the facts that the function
\[
k_3(c|t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} sW'(cs) h_1\left(\frac{t}{\lambda_2}\right) f_1(s) \, ds
\]
is a non-decreasing function of $c$, $k_3(c|t) = 0$ has the unique solution $c = b_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)$ and $k_3(b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t)|t)(<) 0$, we conclude that $b_{0,1}(\lambda_1, t) > (<) b_{0,1}(\lambda_2, t)$. Hence the result follows. \qed

For any fixed $t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} S_\lambda$, define
\[
b_{0,1,\ast}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{0,1}(t) = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t).
\]
Note that Lemma 4.1.1 can be used to determine $b_{0,1,\ast}(t)$ and $b_{0,1}(t)$.

**Theorem 4.1.1.** Suppose that assumptions $C_1$ and $C_2$ hold and let $\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1(D)X_1$ be a scale equivariant estimator of $\theta_1$, where $\psi_1 : \mathbb{R}_{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is such that $P_\theta[\psi_1(D) \in [b_{0,1,\ast}(D), b_{0,1}^\ast(D)]] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$. Then
\[
R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}) \leq R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,
\]
where $\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1^\ast(D)X_1$, $\psi_1^\ast(D) = \max\{b_{0,1,\ast}(D), \min\{\psi_1(D), b_{0,1}^\ast(D)\}\} = \min\{b_{0,1}^\ast(D), \max\{\psi_1(D), b_{0,1,\ast}(D)\}\}$.

**Proof.** Note that,
\[
\psi_1^\ast(D) = \begin{cases} 
  b_{0,1,\ast}(D), & \text{if } \psi_1(D) < b_{0,1,\ast}(D) \\
  \psi_1(D), & \text{if } b_{0,1,\ast}(D) \leq \psi_1(D) \leq b_{0,1}^\ast(D) \\
  b_{0,1}^\ast(D), & \text{if } \psi_1(D) > b_{0,1}^\ast(D)
\end{cases}.
\]
Assumptions on $W(\cdot)$ imply that, for any fixed $\lambda \geq 1$ and $t \in S_\lambda$,
\[
l_{1,\lambda}(b, t) = \int_{0}^{\infty} W(bs) \frac{1}{\lambda} h_1\left(\frac{t}{\lambda}\right) f_1(s) \, ds.
\]
is non-increasing in $b \in (0, b_{0,1}(\lambda, t)]$ and non-decreasing in $b \in [b_{0,1}(\lambda, t), \infty)$ with minimum at $b \equiv b_{0,1}(\lambda, t)$.

Since, for any fixed $\lambda$ and $t$, such that $\lambda \geq 1$ and $t \in S_\lambda$, $b_{0,1,\ast}(t) \leq b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) \leq b_{0,1}^\ast(t)$, it follows that, for any fixed $\lambda$ and $t$, such that $\lambda \geq 1$ and $t \in S_\lambda$, $l_{1,\lambda}(b, t)$ is non-increasing in $b \in (0, b_{0,1,\ast}(t)]$ and non-decreasing in $b \in [b_{0,1}^\ast(t), \infty)$. Thus $l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \geq l_{1,\lambda}(b_{0,1,\ast}(t), t)$, for $\psi_1(t) < b_{0,1,\ast}(t)$ and $l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \geq l_{1,\lambda}(b_{0,1}^\ast(t), t)$, for $\psi_1(t) > b_{0,1}^\ast(t)$. 
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For $\lambda \geq 1$, let $A = \{t \in S_\lambda : \psi_1(t) < b_{0,1,*}(t)\}$, $B = \{t \in S_\lambda : b_{0,1,*}(t) \leq \psi_1(t) \leq b_{0,1}^*(t)\}$ and $C = \{t \in S_\lambda : \psi_1(t) > b_{0,1}^*(t)\}$. Then

$$R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt$$

$$= \int_{A} l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt + \int_{B} l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt + \int_{C} l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt$$

$$\geq \int_{A} l_{1,\lambda}(b_{0,1,*}(t), t) \, dt + \int_{B} l_{1,\lambda}(\psi_1(t), t) \, dt + \int_{C} l_{1,\lambda}(b_{0,1}^*(t), t) \, dt$$

$$= R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}^*), \quad \theta \in \Theta_0.$$

Hence the result follow. \hfill \Box

The proof of the following Corollary is contained in the proof of the above theorem, hence omitted.

**Corollary 4.1.1.** Suppose that assumptions $C_1$ and $C_2$ hold and let $\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1(D)X_1$ be an scale equivariant estimator of $\theta_1$, where $\psi_1 : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is such that $P_{\theta}[^{\psi_1(D)} \in [b_{0,1,*}(D), b_{0,1}^*(D)]] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$. Let $\psi_{0,1} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be such that $\psi_1(t) \leq \psi_{0,1}(t) \leq b_{0,1,*}(t)$, whenever $\psi_1(t) \leq b_{0,1,*}(t)$, and $b_{0,1}^*(t) \leq \psi_0(t) \leq \psi_1(t)$, whenever $b_{0,1}^*(t) \leq \psi_1(t)$. Also let $\psi_{0,1}(t) = \psi_1(t)$, whenever $b_{0,1,*}(t) \leq \psi_1(t) \leq b_{0,1}^*(t)$. Then

$$R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_{0,1}}) \leq R_1(\theta, \delta_{\psi_1}), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,$$

where $\delta_{\psi_{0,1}}(X) = \psi_{0,1}(D)X_1$.

Now we will consider some applications of Theorem 4.1.1 and Corollary 4.1.1 to obtain improvements over various equivariant estimators under specific probability models and specific loss functions.

**Example 4.1.1.** Let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be two dependent random variables with joint pdf

$$f_{\tilde{\theta}}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{\theta_1 \theta_2} f \left( \frac{x_1}{\theta_1}, \frac{x_2}{\theta_2} \right), (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\tilde{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ is a vector of unknown restricted scale parameters ($0 < \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 < \infty$) and

$$f(z_1, z_2) = \begin{cases} e^{-z_1}(1 - e^{-z_2}), & 0 < z_2 < z_1 \\ e^{-z_2}(1 - e^{-z_1}), & 0 < z_1 < z_2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$  

The above bivariate distribution is a special case of Cherian and Ramabhadran’s bivariate gamma distribution (see [Kotz et al. (2000)]). Here random variable $X_1$ and $X_2$ are identically distributed with common gamma pdf $f_1(z) = f_2(z) = f(z) = z e^{-z}, z > 0$.

For estimation of scale parameter $\theta_1$, consider the squared error loss function

$$L_1(\tilde{\theta}, a) = \left( \frac{a}{\theta_1} - 1 \right)^2, \quad \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta_0, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (\text{i.e., } W(t) = (t - 1)^2, t > 0).$$
We have \( S_1 = S_2 = [0, \infty) = S \) (say) and \( S_\lambda = [0, \infty), \forall \lambda \geq 1 \). For any \( s \in S \), we have

\[
h_1(t|s) = \begin{cases} 
1 - e^{-st}, & 0 < t \leq 1 \\
e^{-s(t-1)}(1 - e^{-s}), & 1 < t < \infty 
\end{cases}
\]

It is easy to verify that assumption \( D_5 \) holds.

From (4.1.2), for any \( \lambda \geq 1 \), we have

\[
b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} | s \right) f_1(s)ds}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s^2 h_1 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} | s \right) f_1(s)ds} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{3} \frac{\lambda}{(t+\lambda)^2}, & 0 < t < \lambda \\
\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{(t+\lambda)^3}, & t \geq \lambda 
\end{cases}
\]

Using Lemma 4.1.1, we have

\[
b_{0,1}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{1}{4}
\]

and \( b_{0,1}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = b_{0,1}(1, t) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{(t+1)^3}, & 0 < t < 1 \\
\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{(t+1)^4}, & t \geq 1 
\end{cases} \]

By the application of Theorem 4.1.1, any equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\psi}(X) = \psi(X)X_1 \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \), provided that \( P_\theta[b_{0,1}^*(D) \leq \psi(D) \leq b_{0,1}(D)] < 1 \), for some \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \). In this case a dominating estimator is given by \( \delta_{\psi^*}(X) = \psi^*(D)X_1 \), where \( \psi^*(D) = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \min \left\{ \psi(D), b_{0,1}^*(D) \right\} \right\} \).

The unrestricted BSEE of \( \theta_1 \) is \( \delta_{0,1}(X) = \frac{1}{3}X_1 = \psi_{0,1}(D)X_1 \), (say), where \( \psi_{0,1}(t) = \frac{1}{3}, \forall t > 0 \).

Define

\[
\psi^*_{0,1}(D) = \max\{b_{0,1}^*(D), \min\{\psi_{0,1}(D), b_{0,1}^*(D)\}\} = \max\left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \min\left\{ \frac{1}{3}, b_{0,1}^*(D) \right\} \right\} = \min\left\{ \frac{1}{3}, b_{0,1}^*(D) \right\}.
\]

Also

\[
P_\theta[b_{0,1}^*(D) \leq \psi_{0,1}(D) \leq b_{0,1}(D)] = P_\theta\left[ \frac{1}{4} \leq \frac{1}{3} \leq b_{0,1}(D) \right] = P_\theta\left[ b_{0,1}^*(D) \geq \frac{1}{3} \right] < 1, \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,
\]
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as it can be easily verified that \(b_{0,1}(t)\) is increasing in \(t > 0\), with \(b_{0,1}^*(D)\) taking all values in the interval \((\frac{1}{\lambda}, \infty)\).

Using Theorem 4.1.1, it follows that the unrestricted BSEE \(\delta_{0,1}(X) = \frac{X}{\theta}\) is inadmissible for estimating \(\theta_1\) and is dominated by the estimator \(\delta_{0,1}^*(X) = \psi_{0,1}^*(D)X_1\).

**Example 4.1.2.** Let \(X_1\) and \(X_2\) be independent random variables with joint pdf

\[
f_\theta(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{\theta_1 \theta_2} f \left( \frac{x_1}{\theta_1}, \frac{x_2}{\theta_2} \right), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2,
\]

where \(\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Theta_0 = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+ = (0, \infty) : t_1 \leq t_2\}\) is the vector of unknown scale parameters and, known positive constants \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\), and the pdf of \(Z_i = \frac{X_i}{\theta_i}\) is

\[
f_i(z) = \begin{cases} \alpha_i z^{\alpha_i-1}, & 0 < z < 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

Consider estimation of \(\theta_1\) under the squared error loss function \(L_1(\theta, a) = W \left( \frac{a}{\theta_1} \right), \quad \theta \in \Theta, \quad a \in \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}_++\), where \(W(t) = (t - 1)^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_++\). Here \(S_1 = S_2 = [0, 1] = S\) (say), \(S_\lambda = [0, \infty), \lambda \geq 1,\) and, for \(s \in S,\)

\[
h_1(t|s) = sf_2(ts) = \begin{cases} \alpha_2 s^{\alpha_2} t^{\alpha_2-1}, & 0 < z < \frac{1}{s} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.
\]

One can easily verify that the assumption \(D_5\) holds here. Let \(b_{0,1}(\lambda, t)\) be as defined in assumption \(A_3\), so that, for \(\lambda \geq 1\) and \(t > 0,\)

\[
b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \int_0^\infty s h_1(\frac{1}{\lambda}|s)f_1(s)ds = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max \left\{1, \frac{t}{\lambda} \right\}.
\]

Thus, for \(t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} S_\lambda = [0, \infty),\)

\[
b_{0,1,\ast}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{0,1}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max\{1, t\}.
\]

For any equivariant estimator \(\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1(D)X_1,\) define

\[
\psi_1^*(D) = \max\{b_{0,1,\ast}(D), \min\{\psi_1(D), b_{0,1}^*(D)\}\}
\]

\[
= \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}, \min \left\{ \psi_1(D), \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max\{1, D\} \right\} \right\}.
\]

Using Theorem 4.1.1, it follows that an equivariant estimator \(\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1(D)X_1\) is inadmissible for estimating \(\theta_1\) and is dominated by \(\delta_{\psi_1}^*(X) = \psi_1^*(D)X_1,\) provided that \(P_{\theta}[b_{0,1,\ast}(D) \leq \psi_1(D) \leq b_{0,1}^*(D)] < 1,\) for some \(\theta \in \Theta_0.\)
The restricted MLE of \( \theta_1 \) is \( \delta_{1,M}(X) = X_1 \) and is dominated by the unrestricted BSEE \( \delta_{0,1}(X) = \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\alpha_1 + 1} X_1 = \psi_{0,1}(D) X_1 \) (say), where \( \psi_{0,1}(t) = \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\alpha_1 + 1} \), \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \). Note that
\[
P_g[b_{0,1,*}(D) \leq \psi_{0,1}(D) \leq b_{0,1}^*(D)] = P_g \left[ D \geq \frac{(\alpha_1 + 2)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1)}{(\alpha_1 + 1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2)} \right] < 1, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0.
\]
Therefore, from Theorem 4.1.1, the unrestricted BSEE \( \delta_{0,1}(X) = \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\alpha_1 + 1} X_1 \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_1 \) and is dominated by \( \delta_{\psi_{0,1}}(X) = \psi_{0,1}^*(D) X_1 \), where
\[
\psi_{0,1}^*(D) = \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + 1}, \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\}
\]
\[
= \begin{cases} \\
\frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} D, & 1 \leq D \leq \frac{(\alpha_1 + 2)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1)}{(\alpha_1 + 1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2)} \end{cases}
\]
\[
\frac{\alpha_1 + 2}{\alpha_1 + 1}, & D > \frac{(\alpha_1 + 2)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1)}{(\alpha_1 + 1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2)}
\]

Misra and Dhariyal (1995) derived the similar results.

Example 4.1.3. Let \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) be two independent gamma random variables so that
\[
f_{g}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{\theta_1 \theta_2} f_1 \left( \frac{x_1}{\theta_1} \right) f_2 \left( \frac{x_2}{\theta_2} \right), \quad (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2,
\]
where \( \theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \Theta_0 \) is the vector of unknown restricted scale parameters and, for known positive constants \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \), the pdf of \( Z_i = \frac{X_i}{\theta_i} \) is
\[
f_i(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha_{i-1} e^{-z}}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)}, & z > 0 \\
0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

Consider estimation of the smaller scale parameter \( \theta_1 \), under the squared error loss function (i.e., \( W(t) = (t-1)^2 \), \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \)). Here \( S_1 = S_2 = [0, \infty), S_\lambda = [0, \infty), \forall \lambda \geq 1 \), and, for \( s \in [0, \infty) \),
\[
h_1(t|s) = s f_2(st) = \frac{s^{\alpha_2} t^{\alpha_2-1} e^{-st}}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)}, \quad t > 0.
\]

It is easy to verify that the assumption \( D_5 \) holds.

From (4.1.2), we have
\[
b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \int_0^\infty s h_1(t|s) f_1(s) ds = \frac{1 + \frac{t}{\lambda}}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}, \quad t \in (0, \infty), \lambda \geq 1.
\]

Consequently, for any \( t > 0 \),
\[
b_{0,1,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{0,1}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,1}(\lambda, t) = \frac{1 + t}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}.
\]
By an application of Theorem 4.1.1, any equivariant estimator $\delta_{\psi_1}(X) = \psi_1(D)X_1$ is inadmissible and the estimator $\delta_{\psi_1}^*(X) = \psi_1^*(D)X_1$ improves upon it, provided that $P_\theta[b_{0,1,\star}(D) \leq \psi_1(D) \leq b_{0,1}^*(D)] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$, where $\psi_1^*(D) = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}, \frac{1 + D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\} \right\}$.

The restricted MLE of $\theta_1$ is $\delta_{\psi_{1,\star}}(X) = \min \left\{ \frac{X_1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{X_1 + X_2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \right\} = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{1 + D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\} X_1$. Define

$$\psi_{1,\star}^*(D) = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}, \frac{1 + D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\} \right\} = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\}.$$

We have $P_\theta[b_{0,1,\star}(D) \leq \psi_{1,\star}(D) \leq b_{0,1}^*(D)] = P_\theta \left[ D \geq \frac{\alpha_2 + 1}{\alpha_1} \right] < 1, \ \forall \ \theta \in \Theta_0$.

Consequently, the restricted MLE $\delta_{\psi_{1,\star}}(X) = \min \left\{ \frac{X_1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{X_1 + X_2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \right\}$ is inadmissible for estimating $\theta_1$ and an improved estimator is $\delta_{\psi_{1,\star}}^*(X) = \psi_{1,\star}^*(D)X_1 = \min \left\{ \frac{X_1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{X_1 + X_2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\}$.

The unrestricted BSEE of $\theta_1$ is $\delta_{0,1}(X) = \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + 1}X_1 = \psi_{0,1}(D)X_1$ (say), where $\psi_{0,1}(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + 1}, \ t > 0$.

Define

$$\psi_{0,1}^*(D) = \max \left\{ b_{0,1,\star}(D), \min \left\{ \psi_{0,1}(D), b_{0,1}^*(D) \right\} \right\} = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}, \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + 1}, \frac{1 + D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\} \right\} = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + 1}, \frac{1 + D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\}.$$

Since

$$P_\theta[b_{0,1,\star}(D) \leq \psi_{0,1}(D) \leq b_{0,1}^*(D)] = P_\theta \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + 1} \leq \frac{1 + D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right] = P_\theta \left[ D \geq \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1 + 1} \right] < 1, \ \forall \ \theta \in \Theta_0,$$

using Theorem 4.1.1, it follows that the unrestricted BSEE $\delta_{0,1}(X) = \frac{1}{\alpha_1 + 1}X_1$ is inadmissible for estimating $\theta_1$ and it is dominated by the estimator $\delta_{\psi_{0,1}}(X) = \psi_{0,1}^*(D)X_1$.

Similar results are also obtained by Vijayasree et al. (1995), for the case when $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ are known positive integers.

### 4.2. Estimation of The Larger Scale Parameter $\theta_2$. For estimation of $\theta_2$ under the prior information $\theta \in \Theta_0$ and loss function $L_2(\cdot, \cdot)$, any scale equivariant estimator of $\theta_2$ is of the form

$$\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2,$$

(4.2.1)
for some function \( \psi_2 : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) where \( D = \frac{X_2}{X_1} \).

The risk function of \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2 \) is

\[
R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}) = E_\theta \left[ W \left( \frac{X_2\psi_2(D)}{\theta_2} \right) \right]
= \int_0^\infty \left[ \int_0^\infty W(\psi_2(t)s) \frac{1}{\lambda} h_2 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} s \right) f_2(s) \, ds \right] \, dt
= \int_0^\infty l_{2,\lambda}(\psi_2(t), t) \, dt, \quad \lambda \geq 1,
\]

where, for \( c \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \),

\[
l_{2,\lambda}(c, t) = \int_0^\infty W(cs) \frac{1}{\lambda} h_2 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} s \right) f_2(s) \, ds.
\]

We require the following assumption to prove the results of this subsection.

\[ A_4: \] For any fixed \( \lambda \geq 1 \) and \( t \in S_\lambda \) (the support of \( D \)), the equation

\[
(4.2.2) \quad \int_0^\infty s \, W'(cs) \frac{1}{\lambda} h_2 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} s \right) f_2(s) \, ds = 0
\]

has the unique solution \( c = b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) \), such that \( \frac{1}{b_{0,2}(\lambda, t)} \in S_2 \) and \( h_2 \left( \frac{t}{\lambda} \frac{1}{b_{0,2}(\lambda, t)} \right) > 0 \).

The proofs of following lemma, theorem and corollary are on similar lines as of Lemma 4.1.1, Theorem 4.1.1 and Corollary 4.1.1, respectively, and hence their proofs are omitted.

**Lemma 4.2.1.** Suppose that assumptions \( C_1, C_2, A_4 \) and \( D_7 \) (\( C_1, C_2, A_4 \) and \( D_8 \)) hold. Then, for any fixed \( t, \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \), such that \( 1 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty \) and \( t \in S_{\lambda_1} \cap S_{\lambda_2} \),

\[
b_{0,2}(\lambda_2, t) \leq (\geq) b_{0,2}(\lambda_1, t).
\]

Define, for any fixed \( t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} S_\lambda \),

\[
b_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{0,2}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_t} b_{0,2}(\lambda, t).
\]

To determine \( b_{0,2,*}(t) \) and \( b_{0,2}^*(t) \), one may use Lemma 4.2.1.

**Theorem 4.2.1.** Suppose that assumptions \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) hold and let \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2 \) be a scale equivariant estimator of \( \theta_2 \), where \( \psi_2 : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R} \) is such that \( P_\theta[\psi_2(D) \in [b_{0,2,*}(D), b_{0,2}^*(D)]] < 1 \), for some \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Then

\[
R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}) \leq R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0,
\]

where \( \delta_{\psi_2^*}(X) = \psi_2^*(D)X_2 \) and \( \psi_2^*(D) = \max\{b_{0,2,*}(D), \min\{\psi_2(D), b_{0,2}^*(D)\}\} = \min\{b_{0,2}^*(D), \max\{\psi_2(D), b_{0,2,*}(D)\}\} \).

**Corollary 4.2.1.** Under the assumptions \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \), let \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2 \).
be a scale equivariant estimator of \(\theta_2\), where \(\psi_2 : \mathbb{R}_{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}\) is such that \(\Pr_{\theta}[\psi_2(D) \in [b_{0,2,*}(D), b_{0,2}^*(D)]] < 1\), for some \(\theta \in \Theta_0\). Let \(\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2\) be another equivariant estimator such that \(\psi_2(t) \leq \psi_0(\theta)(t) \leq b_{0,2,\ast}(t)\), whenever \(\psi_2(t) \leq b_{0,2,\ast}(t)\), \(b_{0,2}^*(t) \leq \psi_2(t) \leq \psi_0(t)\), whenever \(b_{0,2}^*(t) \leq \psi_2(t)\) and \(\psi_0(t) = \psi_2(t)\), whenever \(b_{0,2,\ast}(t) \leq \psi_2(t) \leq b_{0,2}^*(t)\). Then

\[
R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_2}) \leq R_2(\theta, \delta_{\psi_0}), \ \forall \ \theta \in \Theta_0.
\]

Now, we will consider some specific probability models and specific loss functions to illustrate some applications of the results obtained in this subsection.

**Example 4.2.1.** Let \((X_1, X_2)\) be a vector of dependent random variables as defined in Example 4.1.1. Here \(S_1 = S_2 = [0, \infty) = S\) (say), \(S_\lambda = [0, \infty), \ \forall \ \lambda \geq 1\) and for any \(s \in [0, \infty)\), the pdf of \(Z_s^{(2)} = Z|Z_2 = s\) is

\[
h_2(t|s) = \frac{s f(\frac{t}{s}, s)}{z^2 f_2(s)} = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{t e^{-1-\frac{s}{e}}}}{(1-\frac{s}{e})^2}, & 0 < t \leq 1 \\ \frac{e^{t e^{-1-\frac{s}{e}}}}{(1-\frac{s}{e})^3}, & 1 < t < \infty \end{cases}
\]

It is easy to verify that, for \(0 < s_1 < s_2 < \infty\), \(Z_{s_1}^{(2)} \leq Z_{s_2}^{(2)}\), i.e., the assumption \(D_8\) holds.

Now for estimation of the larger scale parameter \(\theta_2\), under the squared error loss function (i.e., \(W(t) = (t - 1)^2\), \(t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\)), we have, from (4.2.2),

\[
b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{1 + 1 - \frac{1}{e}} e^{-1-\frac{s}{e}}, & 0 < t \leq 1 \\ \frac{3}{1 + 1 - \frac{1}{e}} e^{-1-\frac{s}{e}}, & 1 < t < \infty \end{cases}, \ \lambda \geq 1.
\]

Using Lemma 4.2.1, it follows that, for every fixed \(t \in (0, \infty)\), \(b_{0,2}(\lambda, t)\) an increasing function of \(\lambda \in [0, \infty)\). Consequently,

\[
b_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 1} \psi_{2,\ast}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{1 + 1 - \frac{1}{e}} e^{-1-\frac{s}{e}}, & 0 < t \leq 1 \\ \frac{3}{1 + 1 - \frac{1}{e}} e^{-1-\frac{s}{e}}, & 1 < t \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \end{cases}
\]

and \(b_{0,2}^*(t) = \sup_{1 \leq 1} \psi_{2,\ast}(t) = \infty, \ t > 0\).

Let \(\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2\) be an equivariant estimator of \(\theta_2\). Define

\[
\psi_2^*(D) = \max\{b_{0,2,*}(D), \min\{\psi_2(D), b_{0,2}^*(D)\}\} = \max\{b_{0,2,*}(D), \psi_2(D)\}.
\]

By Theorem 4.2.1, the equivariant estimator \(\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2\) is inadmissible for estimating \(\theta_2\) and is dominated by \(\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2^*(D)X_2\), provided that \(\Pr_{\theta}[b_{0,2,*}(D) \leq \psi_2(D)] < 1\), for some \(\theta \in \Theta_0\).

The unrestricted BSEE is \(\delta_{0,2}(X) = \frac{1}{3} X_2\) and it is easy to verify that \(\Pr_{\theta}[b_{0,2,*}(D) \leq \frac{1}{3}] < 1\), \(\forall \ \theta \in \Theta_0\).
Define
\[ \psi_{0,2}^*(D) = \max \left\{ b_{0,2,*}(D), \frac{1}{3} \right\}. \]

Using Theorem 4.2.1, it follows that, the unrestricted BSEE \( \delta_{0,2}(X) = \frac{1}{3} X_2 \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_2 \) and is improved upon by the estimator \( \delta_{\psi_{0,2}^*}(X) = \psi_{0,2}^*(D) X_2 \).

**Example 4.2.2.** Let \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) be two independent variables as described in Example 4.1.2. Consider estimation of \( \theta_2 \) under the squared error loss function
\[ L_2(\theta, a) = \left( \frac{a}{\theta_2} - 1 \right)^2, \quad \theta \in \Theta_0, \quad a \in (0, \infty), \text{i.e.,} \quad W(t) = (t - 1)^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}. \]

Here \( S_1 = S_2 = [0, 1] = S \) (say), \( S_\lambda = [0, \infty), \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1 \). For any \( s \in (0, 1) \), \( Z_s(2) = Z|Z_2 = s \) has the pdf
\[ h_2(t|s) = \frac{s}{t^2} f_1 \left( \frac{s}{t} \right) = \frac{\alpha_1 s^{\alpha_1}}{t^{\alpha_1+1}}, \quad s < t < \infty. \]

It is easy to verify that the assumption \( D_s \) holds here.

Let \( b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) \) be as defined in the assumption \( A_4 \), so that, for \( \lambda \geq 1 \) and \( t \in S_\lambda = [0, \infty) \),
\[ b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \int_{0}^{\infty} s h_2 \left( \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} | s \right) f_2(s) ds = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{t} \right\}. \]

Therefore, for \( t \in \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} S_\lambda = [0, \infty) \),
\[ b_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{t} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{0,2,*}(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 1} b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \infty. \]

For any equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D) X_2 \), define
\[
\psi_{2}^*(D) = \max \left\{ b_{0,2,*}(D), \min \{ \psi_2(D), b_{0,2}^*(D) \} \right\} = \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\}, \psi_2(D) \right\}.
\]

Using Theorem 4.2.1, we conclude that any equivariant estimator \( \delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D) X_2 \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_2 \) and is dominated by the estimator \( \delta_{\psi_2^*}(X) = \psi_2^*(D) X_2 \), provided that \( P_\theta [b_{0,2,*}(D) \leq \psi_2(D)] < 1 \), for some \( \theta \in \Theta_0 \).

The restricted MLE of \( \theta_2 \) is \( \delta_{2,M}(X) = \max \{ X_1, X_2 \} = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{D} \right\} X_2 = \psi_{2,M}(D) X_2 \) (say), where \( \psi_{2,M}(t) = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{1}, \frac{1}{D} \right\}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}. \)

Define
\[ \psi_{2,M}^*(D) = \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\}, \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\} \right\} = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\}. \]

Here \( P_\theta [b_{0,2,*}(D) \leq \psi_{2,M}(D)] = 0, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \). Hence restricted MLE \( \delta_{2,M}(X) = \max \{ X_1, X_2 \} \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_2 \) and \( \delta_{\psi_{2,M}^*}(X) = \psi_{2,M}^*(D) \) is a better estimator.
The unrestricted BSEE of $\theta_2$ is $\delta_{0,2}(X) = \frac{\alpha + 2}{\alpha_2 + 1} X_2 = \psi_{0,2}(D)X_2$ (say), where $\psi_{0,2}(t) = \frac{\alpha + 2}{\alpha_2 + 1}$, $t > 0$.

Define

$$\psi_{0,2}^*(D) = \max\{b_{0,2,*}(D), \min\{\psi_{0,2}(D), b_{0,2}^*(D)\}\} = \max\left\{\frac{\alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_2 + 1}, \frac{\alpha + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} D\right\},$$

and $\delta_{0,2}(X) = \psi_{0,2}^*(D)X_2 = \max\left\{\frac{\alpha + 2}{\alpha_2 + 1} X_2, \frac{\alpha + \alpha_2 + 2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} X_1\right\}$.

Since $P_\theta[b_{0,2,*}(D) \leq \psi_{0,2}(D)] = P_\theta\left[D \geq \frac{\alpha_2 + 1}{\alpha_2 + 1} \right] < 1$, for all $\theta \in \Theta_0$, using Theorem 4.2.1, it follows that the unrestricted BSEE $\delta_{0,2}(X) = \frac{\alpha + 2}{\alpha_2 + 1} X_2$ is inadmissible for $\theta_2$ and is dominated by the estimator $\delta_{0,2}^*(X) = \psi_{0,2}^*(D)X_2$. This improved estimator is also obtained by Misra and Dharival (1995).

**Example 4.2.3.** Let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be independent gamma random variables as defined in Example 4.1.3. Here $S_1 = S_2 = [0, \infty)$, $S_\lambda = [0, \infty)$, $\forall \lambda \geq 1$, and, for any $s \in [0, \infty)$, the pdf of $Z_s^{(2)} = Z|Z_2 = s$ is

$$h_2(t|s) = \frac{s^\alpha}{t^2} f_1 \left(\frac{s}{t}\right) = \frac{s^{\alpha_1}}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)} \frac{e^{-\frac{s}{t}}}{t^{\alpha_1 + 1}}, \, t > 0,$$

Here the assumption $D_8$ holds (i.e., for $0 < s_1 < s_2 < \infty$, $Z_{s_1}^{(2)} \leq Z_{s_2}^{(2)}$). Consider estimation of $\theta_2$, under the squared error loss function (i.e., $W(t) = (t - 1)^2$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$). From (4.2.2), we have

$$b_{0,2}(\lambda, t) = \frac{\int_0^\infty s h_2(s^\frac{1}{\lambda}|s) f_2(s) ds}{\int_0^\infty s^2 h_2(s^\frac{1}{\lambda}|s) f_2(s) ds} = \frac{(1 + \lambda)}{\lambda t^{\lambda + 1}}, \, t \in (0, \infty), \, \lambda \geq 1.$$

Clearly, for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$,

$$b_{0,2,*}(t) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 1} \psi_{2,\lambda}(t) = \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}}{1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{0,2}^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 1} \psi_{2,\lambda}(t) = \infty.$$

Let $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2$ be an arbitrary equivariant estimator of $\theta_2$. Define

$$\psi_2^*(D) = \max\{b_{0,2,*}(D), \min\{\psi_2(D), b_{0,2}^*(D)\}\} = \max\left\{\psi_2(D), \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}}{1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}\right\}.$$

By Theorem 4.2.1, the equivariant estimator $\delta_{\psi_2}(X) = \psi_2(D)X_2$ is inadmissible for estimating $\theta_2$ and is dominated by the estimator $\delta_{\psi_2}^*(X) = \psi_2^*(D)X_2$, provided that $P_\theta[b_{0,2,*}(D) \leq \psi_2(D)] < 1$, for some $\theta \in \Theta_0$.

The restricted MLE of $\theta_2$ is $\delta_{\psi_{2,M}}(X) = \max\left\{\frac{X_2}{\alpha_2}, \frac{X_1 + X_2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}\right\} = \psi_{2,M}(D)X_2$, where $\psi_{2,M}(D) = \max\left\{\frac{1}{\alpha_2}, \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}\right\}$. 
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Define
\[
\psi^*_2, M(D) = \max \left\{ \frac{1 + \frac{D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}, \psi_{2, M}(D) \right\} = \max \left\{ \frac{1 + \frac{D}{\alpha_2 + 1}}{\alpha_2}, \frac{1 + \frac{D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \right\}.
\]
Here since \( P_\theta [b_{0,2},*(D) \leq \psi_{2, M}(D)] = 1, \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \), Theorem 4.2.1 can not be used for proving the inadmissibility of the restricted MLE \( \delta_{\psi_{2, M}}(X) \) and finding the dominating estimator.

The unrestricted BSEE of \( \theta_2 \) is \( \delta_{0,2}(X) = \frac{1}{\alpha_2 + 1} X_2 = \psi_{0,2}(D) X_2 \) (say), where \( \psi_{0,2}(t) = \frac{1}{\alpha_2 + 1}, t > 0. \)

Define
\[
\psi^*_{0,2}(D) = \max \left\{ \frac{1 + \frac{D}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1}, \frac{1}{\alpha_2 + 1} \right\}.
\]

Since \( P_\theta [b_{0,2,*,}(D) \leq \psi_{0,2}(D)] = P_\theta \left[ D \geq \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2 + 1} \right] < 1, \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 \), using Theorem 4.2.1, we conclude that the unrestricted BSEE \( \delta_{0,2}(X) \) is inadmissible for estimating \( \theta_2 \) with an improved estimator given by \( \delta_{\psi^*_{0,2}}(X) = \psi^*_{0,2}(D) X_2 = \max \left\{ \frac{x_2}{\alpha_2 + 1}, \frac{|x_1 + x_2|}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1} \right\} \). This results is also reported in [Vijayasree et al. (1995)].

5. Concluding Remarks

For the problem of estimating order restricted location/scale parameters of two distributions, we unify various results carried out in the literature for specific probability distributions, having independent marginal distributions, and specific loss functions. We unify these studies by considering a general bivariate probability model (possibly having dependent marginals) and a quite general loss function. We derive sufficient conditions for the inadmissibility of an arbitrary location/scale equivariant estimator. In such cases, we also obtain the dominating estimators. The following table lists details of various studies that are unified in this paper (i.e., results proved in these studies can be obtained using general results proved in our paper).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Probability Model</th>
<th>Loss Function</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kushary and Cohen (1989)</td>
<td>Independent Exponential Distributions with Location</td>
<td>Square Error Loss</td>
<td>Particular case of Theorem 3.1.1-3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Scale) Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Theorem 4.1.1-4.2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayasree et al. (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubokawa and Saleh (1994)</td>
<td>Independent Normal Distributions with Location Parameters</td>
<td>Square Error Loss</td>
<td>Particular case of Theorem 3.1.1-3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misra and Dharival (1995)</td>
<td>Independent Uniform Distributions with Scale Parameters</td>
<td>Square Error Loss</td>
<td>Particular case of Theorem 4.1.1-4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garren (2000)</td>
<td>Independent Exponential Distributions with Location Parameters</td>
<td>Square Error Loss</td>
<td>Particular case of Theorem 3.1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31
REFERENCES


