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#### Abstract

We consider estimation of a multivariate normal mean vector under sum of squared error loss. We propose a new class of smooth estimators parameterized by $\alpha$ dominating the James-Stein estimator. The estimator for $\alpha=1$ corresponds to the generalized Bayes estimator with respect to the harmonic prior. When $\alpha$ goes to infinity, the estimator converges to the James-Stein positive-part estimator. Thus the class of our estimators is a bridge between the admissible estimator $(\alpha=1)$ and the inadmissible estimator $(\alpha=\infty)$. Although the estimators have quasi-admissibility which is a weaker optimality than admissibility, the problem of determining whether or not the estimator for $\alpha>1$ admissible is still open.


1. Introduction. Let $X$ be a random variable having $p$-variate normal distribution $N_{p}\left(\theta, I_{p}\right)$. Then we consider the problem of estimating the mean vector $\theta$ by $\delta(X)$ relative to quadratic loss. Therefore every estimator is evaluated based on the risk function

$$
R(\theta, \delta)=E_{\theta}\left[\|\delta(X)-\theta\|^{2}\right]=\int_{R^{p}} \frac{\|\delta(x)-\theta\|^{2}}{(2 \pi)^{p / 2}} \exp \left(-\frac{\|x-\theta\|^{2}}{2}\right) d x
$$

The usual estimator $X$, with the constant risk $p$, is minimax for any dimension $p$. It is also admissible when $p=1$ and 2 , as shown in [1] and [13], respectively. [13] showed, however, that when $p \geq 3$, there exists an estimator dominating $X$ among a class of equivariant estimators relative to the orthogonal transformation group which have the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{\phi}(X)=\left(1-\phi\left(\|X\|^{2}\right) /\|X\|^{2}\right) X . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

[7] succeeded in giving an explicit form of an estimator improving on $X$ as

$$
\delta_{J S}(X)=\left(1-(p-2) /\|X\|^{2}\right) X
$$

which is called the James-Stein estimator. More generally, a large class of better estimators than $X$ has been proposed in the literature. The strongest tool for this is [14]'s identity as follows.

[^0]Lemma 1.1 (14]). If $Y \sim N(\mu, 1)$ and $h(y)$ is any differentiable function such that $E\left[\left|h^{\prime}(Y)\right|\right]<\infty$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
E[h(Y)(Y-\mu)]=E\left[h^{\prime}(Y)\right] . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By using the identity (1.2), the risk function of the estimator of the form $\delta_{g}(X)=X+g(X)=\left(X_{1}+g_{1}(X), \ldots, X_{p}+g_{p}(X)\right)^{\prime}$ is written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(\theta, \delta_{g}\right) & =E_{\theta}\left[\left\|\delta_{g}(X)-\theta\right\|^{2}\right] \\
& =E_{\theta}\left[\|X-\theta\|^{2}\right]+E_{\theta}\left[\|g(X)\|^{2}\right]+2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} E_{\theta}\left[(X-\theta)^{\prime} g(X)\right] \\
& =p+E_{\theta}\left[\|g(X)\|^{2}\right]+2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} E_{\theta}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} g_{i}(X)\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where $g_{i}(x)$ is assumed to be differentiable and $E\left|\left(\partial / \partial x_{i}\right) g_{i}(X)\right|<\infty$ for $i=1, \ldots, p$. Since a statistic $\hat{R}(\delta(X))$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
p+\|g(X)\|^{2}+2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} g_{i}(X) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

does not depend on the unknown parameter $\theta$ and satisfies $E(\hat{R}(\delta(X)))=$ $R(\theta, \delta)$, it is called the unbiased estimator of risk. Clearly if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|g(x)\|^{2}+2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} g_{i}(x) \leq 0 \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $x$, then $\delta_{g}(X)$ dominates $X$.
To make the structure of estimators improving on $X$ more comprehensible, we consider a class of orthogonally equivariant estimators of a form given in (1.1). Assigning $g(x)=-\phi\left(\|x\|^{2}\right) x /\|x\|^{2}$ in (1.4), (1.4) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(w)(2(p-2)-\phi(w)) / w+4 \phi^{\prime}(w) \geq 0 \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $w=\|x\|^{2}$. The inequality (1.5) is, for example, satisfied if $\phi(w)$ is monotone nondecreasing and within $[0,2(p-2)]$ for any $w \geq 0$.

Since $\phi(w)=c$ for $0<c<2(p-2)$ satisfies the inequality (1.5),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1-c /\|X\|^{2}\right) X \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $0<c<2(p-2)$ dominates $X$. The estimator $\delta_{J S}$, (1.6) with $c=p-2$, is the best estimator among a class of estimators (1.6) because the risk function of (1.6) is given by

$$
p+c(c-2(p-2)) E\left[\|X\|^{-2}\right]
$$

and hence minimized by $c=p-2$.
It is however noted that when $\|x\|^{2}<p-2$, the James-Stein estimator yields an over-shrinkage and changes the sign of each component of $X$. The James-Stein positive-part estimator

$$
\delta_{J S}^{+}(X)=\max \left(0,1-(p-2) /\|X\|^{2}\right) X
$$

eliminates this drawback and dominates the James-Stein estimator. We notice here that the technique for proving the inadmissibility of $\delta_{J S}$ is not from the Stein identity or the unbiased estimator of risk given in (1.3). The risk difference between $\delta_{J S}$ and $\delta_{\phi}$ is given by

$$
R\left(\delta_{J S}, \theta\right)-R\left(\delta_{\phi}, \theta\right)=E\left[-\frac{\left(\phi\left(\|X\|^{2}\right)-p+2\right)^{2}}{\|X\|^{2}}+4 \phi^{\prime}\left(\|X\|^{2}\right)\right]
$$

but $\phi_{J S}^{+}(w)=\min (w, p-2)$ which makes the James-Stein positive-part estimator does not satisfy the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
-(\phi(w)-p+2)^{2}+4 w \phi^{\prime}(w) \geq 0 \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $w \geq 0$. In Section 2, we will show that there is no $\phi$ which satisfies (1.7) for any $w \geq 0$, that is, the Stein identity itself is not useful for finding estimators dominating $\delta_{J S}$. We call such optimality for the James-Stein estimator quasi-admissibility. We will explain the concept and give a sufficient condition for quasi-admissibility in Section 2.

In spite of such difficulty, some estimators which dominate the JamesStein estimator have been given by several authors. [11] and [6] considered the class of estimators of forms $\delta_{L K}(X)=\left(1-\phi_{L K}\left(\|X\|^{2}\right) /\|X\|^{2}\right) X$ where

$$
\phi_{L K}(w)=p-2-\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} w^{-b_{i}}
$$

where $a_{i} \geq 0$ for any $i$ and $0<b_{1}<b_{2}<\cdots<b_{n}$. For example when $n=1$, they both showed that, $\delta_{L K}(X)$ for $0<b_{1}<4^{-1}(p-2)$ and $a_{1}=2 b_{1} 2^{b_{1}} \Gamma\left(p / 2-b_{1}-1\right) / \Gamma\left(p / 2-2 b_{1}-1\right)$ is superior to the James-Stein
estimator. 10] gave two estimators which shrink toward the ball with center $0, \delta_{K T}^{i}(X)=\left(1-\phi_{K T}^{i}\left(\|X\|^{2}\right) /\|X\|^{2}\right) X$ for $i=1,2$ where

$$
\begin{gathered}
\phi_{K T}^{1}(w)= \begin{cases}0 & w \leq r^{2} \\
p-2-\sum_{i=1}^{p-2}\left(r / w^{1 / 2}\right)^{i} & w>r^{2}\end{cases} \\
\phi_{K T}^{2}(w)= \begin{cases}0 & w \leq\{(p-1) /(p-2)\}^{2} r^{2} \\
p-2-r /\left(w^{1 / 2}-r\right) & w>\{(p-1) /(p-2)\}^{2} r^{2}\end{cases}
\end{gathered}
$$

They showed that when $r$ is sufficiently small, these two estimators dominate the James-Stein estimator. However, these estimators are not appealing since they are inadmissible. In our setting, the estimation of a multivariate normal mean, [3] showed that any admissible estimator should be generalized Bayes. Since the shrinkage factor $\left(1-\phi_{L K}(w) / w\right)$ becomes negative for some $w$ and $\phi_{K T}^{i}$ for $i=1,2$ fail to be analytic, neither $\delta_{L K}$ nor $\delta_{K T}^{i}$ can be generalized Bayes or admissible.

In general, when we propose an estimator ( $\delta_{*}$, say) dominating a certain inadmissible estimator, it is extremely important to find it among admissible estimators. If not, a more difficult problem (finding an estimator improving on $\delta_{*}$ ) just occurs. To the best of our knowledge, the sole admissible estimator dominating the James-Stein estimator is [8]'s estimator $\delta_{K}(X)=\left(1-\phi_{K}\left(\|X\|^{2}\right) /\|X\|^{2}\right) X$ where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{K}(w)=p-2-2 \frac{\exp (-w / 2)}{\int_{0}^{1} \lambda^{p / 2-2} \exp (-w \lambda / 2) d \lambda} \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The estimator is generalized Bayes with respect to the harmonic prior density $\|\theta\|^{2-p}$ which was originally suggested by [14]. The only fault is, however, that it does not improve upon $\delta_{J S}(X)$ at $\|\theta\|=0$. (See Section 3 for the detail.) Shrinkage estimators like (1.1) make use of the vague prior information that $\|\theta\|$ is close to 0 . It goes without saying that we would like to get the significant improvement of risk when the prior information is accurate. Though $\delta_{K}(X)$ is an admissible generalized Bayes estimator and thus smooth, it has no improvement on $\delta_{J S}(X)$ at the origin $\|\theta\|=0$. On the other hand, $\delta_{J S}^{+}(X)$ improves on $\delta_{J S}(X)$ significantly at the origin, but it is not analytic and is thus inadmissible by [3]'s complete class theorem. Therefore a more challenging open problem is to find admissible estimators dominating the James-Stein estimator especially at $\|\theta\|=0$. In this paper, we will consider a class of estimators

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{\alpha}(X)=\frac{\int_{0}^{1}(1-\lambda) \lambda^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp \left(-\|X\|^{2} \alpha \lambda / 2\right) d \lambda}{\int_{0}^{1} \lambda^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp \left(-\|X\|^{2} \alpha \lambda / 2\right) d \lambda} X \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\alpha \geq 1$. In Section 3, we show that $\delta_{\alpha}$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ improves on the James-Stein estimator and that it has strictly risk improvement at $\|\theta\|=0$. Furthermore we see that $\delta_{\alpha}$ approaches $\delta_{J S}^{+}$as $\alpha$ goes to $\infty$. Since $\delta_{\alpha}$ with $\alpha=1$ corresponds to $\delta_{K}$, the class of $\delta_{\alpha}$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ is a bridge between $\delta_{K}$ which is admissible and $\delta_{J S}^{+}$which is inadmissible. Although we show that $\delta_{\alpha}$ with $\alpha>1$ is quasi-admissible, which is introduced in Section 2, we have no idea on its admissibility at this stage.
2. Quasi-admissibility. In this section, we introduce the concept of quasi-admissibility and give a sufficient condition for quasi-admissibility. We deal with a reasonable class of estimators which have the form

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta_{m} & =X+\nabla \log m\left(\|X\|^{2}\right)  \tag{2.1}\\
& =\left\{1+2 m^{\prime}\left(\|X\|^{2}\right) / m\left(\|X\|^{2}\right)\right\} X
\end{align*}
$$

where $\nabla$ is a differential operator $\left(\partial / \partial x_{1}, \ldots, \partial / \partial x_{p}\right)^{\prime}$ and $m$ is a positive function. If $m(w)=w^{-c}$ for $c>0$, (2.1) becomes the James-Stein type estimator (1.6). Any (generalized) Bayes estimator with respect to spherical symmetric measure $\pi$ should also have the form (2.1) because it is written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\int_{R^{p}} \theta \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta)}{\int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta)} \\
& =x+\frac{\int_{R^{p}}(\theta-x) \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta)}{\int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta)} \\
& =x+\frac{\nabla \int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta)}{\int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta)} \\
& =x+\nabla \log \int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta) \\
& =x+\nabla \log m_{\pi}\left(\|x\|^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $m_{\pi}\left(\|x\|^{2}\right)=\int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \pi(d \theta)$. [2] and [5] called an estimator of the form (2.1) pseudo-Bayes and quasi-Bayes, respectively. If, for given $m$, there exists a nonnegative measure $\nu$ which satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(\|x\|^{2}\right)=\int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|\theta-x\|^{2} / 2\right) \nu(d \theta) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

the estimator of the form (2.1) is truly generalized Bayes. However it is often difficult to determine whether or not $m$ has such an exact integral form.

Suppose that $\delta_{m, k}(X)=\delta_{m}(X)+k\left(\|X\|^{2}\right) X$ is a competitor of $\delta_{m}$. Then substituting $g(x)=\nabla \log m\left(\|x\|^{2}\right)=2 x m^{\prime}\left(\|x\|^{2}\right) / m\left(\|x\|^{2}\right)$ and $g(x)=$ $2 x m^{\prime}\left(\|x\|^{2}\right) / m\left(\|x\|^{2}\right)+k\left(\|x\|^{2}\right) x$ in (1.3) respectively, we have the unbiased estimators of risk as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{R}\left(\delta_{m}\right)=p-4 w\left(\frac{m^{\prime}(w)}{m(w)}\right)^{2}+4 p \frac{m^{\prime}(w)}{m(w)}+8 w \frac{m^{\prime \prime}(w)}{m(w)} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $w=\|x\|^{2}$ and $\hat{R}\left(\delta_{m, k}\right)=\hat{R}\left(\delta_{m}\right)+\Delta(m, m k)$ where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta(m, m k)=4 w \frac{m^{\prime}(w)}{m(w)} k(w)+2 p k(w)+4 w k^{\prime}(w)+w k^{2}(w) . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If there exists $k$ such that $\Delta(m, m k) \leq 0$ for any $w \geq 0$ with strict inequality for some $w$, that implies that $\delta_{m}$ is inadmissible, that is, $R\left(\theta, \delta_{m k}\right) \leq$ $R\left(\theta, \delta_{m}\right)$ for all $\theta$ with strict inequality for some $\theta$. If there does not exist such $k, \delta_{m}$ is said to be quasi-admissible. Hence quasi-admissibility is a weaker optimality than admissibility. Now we state a sufficient condition for quasi-admissibility. The idea is originally from [4], but the paper is not so accessible. See also [12], where quasi-admissibility is called permissibility.

Theorem 2.1. The estimator of the form (2.1) is quasi-admissible if

$$
\int_{0}^{1} w^{-p / 2} m(w)^{-1} d w=\infty \text { as well as } \int_{1}^{\infty} w^{-p / 2} m(w)^{-1} d w=\infty
$$

Proof. We have only to show that $\hat{R}\left(\delta_{m, k}\right) \leq \hat{R}\left(\delta_{m}\right)$, that is, $\Delta(m, m k) \leq$ 0 implies $k(w) \equiv 0$. Let $M(w)=w^{p / 2} m(w)$ and $h(w)=M(w) k(w)$. Then we have

$$
\Delta(m, m k)=4 w \frac{h^{\prime}(w)}{M(w)}+w \frac{h^{2}(w)}{M^{2}(w)}=\frac{4 w h^{2}(w)}{M(w)}\left(-\frac{d}{d w}\left\{\frac{1}{h(w)}\right\}+\frac{1}{4 M(w)}\right) .
$$

First we show that $h(w) \geq 0$ for all $w \geq 0$. Suppose to the contrary that $h(w)<0$ for some $w_{0}$. Then $h(w)<0$ for all $w \geq w_{0}$ since $h^{\prime}(w)$ should be negative. For all $w>w_{0}$, the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d w}\left(\frac{1}{h(w)}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4 M(w)} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

should be satisfied. Integrating both sides of (2.5) from $w_{0}$ to $w^{*}$ leads to

$$
\frac{1}{h\left(w^{*}\right)}-\frac{1}{h\left(w_{0}\right)} \geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{w_{0}}^{w^{*}} M^{-1}(t) d t
$$

As $w^{*} \rightarrow \infty$, the right-hand side of above inequality tends to infinity, and this provides a contradiction since the left-hand side is less than $-1 / h\left(w_{0}\right)$. Thus we have $g(w) \geq 0$ for all $w$.

Similarly we can show that $g(w) \leq 0$ for all $w$. It follows that $h(w)$ is zero for all $w$, which implies that $k(w) \equiv 0$ for all $w$. This completes the proof.

Combining Theorem [2.1] and [3]'s sufficient condition for admissibility, we see that a quasi-admissible estimator of the form (2.1) is admissible if it is truly generalized Bayes, that is, there exists a nonnegative measure $\nu$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(\|x\|^{2}\right)=\int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|x-\theta\|^{2} / 2\right) \nu(d \theta) . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

However, for given $m$, it is often quite difficult to determine whether $m$ has such an integral form. Furthermore, even if we find that $m$ does not have an integral form like (2.6), that is, the estimator is inadmissible, it is generally very difficult to find an estimator dominating the inadmissible estimator.

The function $m$ for the James-Stein estimator is $m(w)=w^{2-p}$, which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.1. The James-Stein estimator is quasi-admissible.
In this case, it is not difficult to find an estimator dominating $\delta_{J S}$ by taking positive part. But it is not easy to find a large class of estimators dominating the James-Stein estimator. In Section 3, we introduce an elegant sufficient condition for domination over $\delta_{J S}$ proposed by $[9]$.
3. A class of quasi-admissible estimators improving upon the James-Stein estimator. In this section, we introduce [9]'s sufficient condition for improving upon the James-Stein estimator and propose a class of smooth quasi-admissible estimators satisfying it.
[9] showed that if $\lim _{w \rightarrow \infty} \phi(w)=p-2$ then the difference of risk functions between $\delta_{J S}$ and $\delta_{\phi}$ can be written as

$$
\begin{align*}
& R\left(\theta, \delta_{J S}\right)-R\left(\theta, \delta_{\phi}\right) \\
& \begin{aligned}
&=2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \phi^{\prime}(w)\left(\phi(w)-(p-2)+\frac{2 f(w, \lambda)}{\int_{0}^{w} y^{-1} f_{p}(y, \lambda) d y}\right) \\
& \times \int_{0}^{w} y^{-1} f_{p}(y, \lambda) d y d w,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\lambda=\|\theta\|^{2}$ and $f_{p}(x ; \lambda)$ denotes a density of a non-central chi-square distribution with $p$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\lambda$.

Moreover by the inequality

$$
f_{p}(w ; \lambda) / \int_{0}^{w} y^{-1} f_{p}(y ; \lambda) d y \geq f_{p}(w) / \int_{0}^{w} y^{-1} f_{p}(y) d y
$$

where $f_{p}(y)=f_{p}(y ; 0)$, which can be shown by the correlation inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R\left(\theta, \delta_{J S}\right)-R\left(\theta, \delta_{\phi}\right) \\
& \geq 2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \phi^{\prime}(w)\left(\phi(w)-\phi_{0}(w)\right)\left(\int_{0}^{w} y^{-1} f_{p}(y, \lambda) d y\right) d w,
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\phi_{0}(w)=p-2+2 f_{p}(w) / \int_{0}^{w} y^{-1} f_{p}(y) d y
$$

Since $\phi_{0}=\phi_{K}$ given in (1.8) by an integration by parts and $\lim _{w \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{K}(w)=$ $p-2$, we have the following result.

Theorem $3.1([9])$. If $\phi(w)$ is nondecreasing and within $\left[\phi_{K}(w), p-\right.$ 2] for any $w \geq 0$, then $\delta_{\phi}(X)$ of form (1.1) dominates the James-Stein estimator.

The assumption of the theorem above is satisfied by $\phi_{K}$ and $\phi_{J S}^{+}$. By (3.1), we see that the risk difference at $\|\theta\|=0$ between $\delta_{J S}$ and $\delta_{\phi}$, the limit of which is $p-2$, is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \phi^{\prime}(w)\left(\phi(w)-\phi_{K}(w)\right)\left(\int_{0}^{w} y^{-1} f_{p}(y) d y\right) d w . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence $\delta_{K}$ does not improve upon $\delta_{J S}(X)$ at $\|\theta\|=0$, although $\delta_{K}(X)$ is an admissible generalized Bayes estimator and thus smooth. On the other hand, $\delta_{J S}^{+}(X)$ improves on $\delta_{J S}(X)$ significantly at the origin, but it is not analytic and is thus inadmissible by [3]'s complete class theorem. Therefore a more challenging problem is to find admissible estimators dominating the James-Stein estimator especially at $\|\theta\|=0$.

In this paper, we propose a class of estimators

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta_{\alpha}(X)=\left(1-\phi_{\alpha}\left(\|X\|^{2}\right) /\|X\|^{2}\right) X \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
\phi_{\alpha}(w) & =w \frac{\int_{0}^{1} \lambda^{\alpha(p / 2-1)} \exp (-w \alpha \lambda / 2) d \lambda}{\int_{0}^{1} \lambda^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp (-w \alpha \lambda / 2) d \lambda} \\
& =p-2-\frac{2 \exp (-w \alpha / 2)}{\alpha \int_{0}^{1} \lambda^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp (-w \alpha \lambda / 2) d \lambda} \\
& =p-2-\frac{2}{\alpha \int_{0}^{1}(1-\lambda)^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp (w \alpha \lambda / 2) d \lambda} . \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

The main theorem of this paper is as follows.
Theorem 3.2. 1. $\delta_{\alpha}(X)$ dominates $\delta_{J S}(X)$ for $\alpha \geq 1$.
2. The risk of $\delta_{\alpha}(X)$ for $\alpha>1$ at $\|\theta\|=0$ is strictly less than the risk of the James-Stein estimator at $\|\theta\|=0$.
3. $\delta_{\alpha}(X)$ approaches the positive-part James-Stein estimator when $\alpha$ tends to infinity, that is,

$$
\lim _{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{\alpha}(X)=\delta_{J S}^{+}(X)
$$

Clearly $\delta_{1}(X)=\delta_{K}(X)$. The class of $\delta_{\alpha}$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ is a bridge between $\delta_{K}$ which is admissible and $\delta_{J S}^{+}$which is inadmissible.

Proof. [part 1] We shall verify that $\phi_{\alpha}(w)$ for $\alpha \geq 1$ satisfies assumptions in Theorem 3.1. Applying the Taylor expansion to a part of (3.4), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{0}^{1}(1-\lambda)^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp (w \alpha \lambda / 2) d \lambda \\
& =\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} w^{i} \prod_{j=0}^{i}(p-2+2 j / \alpha)^{-1}=\psi(\alpha, w) \quad(\text { say. })
\end{aligned}
$$

As $\psi(\alpha, w)$ is increasing in $w, \phi_{\alpha}(w)$ is increasing in $w$. As $\lim _{w \rightarrow \infty} \psi(\alpha, w)=$ $\infty$, for any $\alpha \geq 1$, it is clear that $\lim _{w \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{\alpha}(w)=p-2$. In order to show that $\phi_{\alpha}(w) \geq \phi_{K}(w)=\phi_{1}(w)$ for $\alpha \geq 1$, we have only to check that $\psi(\alpha, w)$ is increasing in $\alpha$. It is easily verified because the coefficient of each term of $\psi(\alpha, w)$ is increasing in $\alpha$. We have thus proved the theorem.
[part 2] Since $\phi_{\alpha}$ for $\alpha>1$ is strictly greater than $\phi_{K}$ and strictly increasing in $w$, the risk difference of $\delta_{\alpha}$ for $\alpha>1$ and $\delta_{J S}$ at $\|\theta\|=0$, which is given in (3.2), is strictly positive.
[part 3] Since $\psi(\alpha, w)$ is increasing in $\alpha$, it converges to

$$
(p-2)^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{w}{p-2}\right)^{i}
$$

by the monotone convergence theorem when $\alpha$ goes to infinity. Considering two cases: $w<(\geq) p-2$, we obtain $\lim _{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{\alpha}(w)=w$ if $w<p-2 ;=p-2$ otherwise. This completes the proof.

The estimator $\delta_{\alpha}$ is expressed as $X+\nabla \log m_{\alpha}\left(\|X\|^{2}\right)$ where

$$
m_{\alpha}(w)=\left\{\int_{0}^{1} \lambda^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp \left(-\frac{\alpha w}{2} \lambda\right) d \lambda\right\}^{1 / \alpha}
$$

Since $m_{\alpha}(w) \sim w^{2-p}$ for sufficiently large $w$ by Tauberian's theorem and $0<m_{\alpha}(0)<\infty$, we have the following result by Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 3.1. $\quad \delta_{\alpha}(X)$ is quasi-admissible for $p \geq 3$.
Needless to say, we are extremely interested in determining whether or not $\delta_{\alpha}(X)$ for $\alpha>1$ is admissible. Since $\delta_{\alpha}(X)$ with $\alpha>1$ is quasi-admissible, it is admissible if it is generalized Bayes, that is, there exists a measure $\nu$ which satisfies

$$
\int_{R^{p}} \exp \left(-\|\theta-x\|^{2} / 2\right) \nu(d \theta)=\left(\int_{0}^{1} \lambda^{\alpha(p / 2-1)-1} \exp \left(-\alpha\|X\|^{2} \lambda / 2\right) d \lambda\right)^{1 / \alpha}
$$

I have no idea on the way to construct such a measure $\nu$ so far. Even if we find that there is no $\nu$, which implies $\delta_{\alpha}$ is inadmissible, it is very difficult to find an estimator dominating $\delta_{\alpha}$ for $\alpha>1$.
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