

Ensemble minimaxity of James-Stein estimators

Yuzo Maruyama, Lawrence D. Brown and Edward I. George

Kobe University and University of Pennsylvania
e-mail: maruyama@port.kobe-u.ac.jp; edgeorge@wharton.upenn.edu

Abstract: This article discusses estimation of a multivariate normal mean based on heteroscedastic observations. Under heteroscedasticity, estimators shrinking more on the coordinates with larger variances, seem desirable. Although they are not necessarily minimax in the ordinary sense, we show that such James-Stein type estimators can be *ensemble minimax*, minimax with respect to the ensemble risk, related to empirical Bayes perspective of Efron and Morris.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62C20; secondary 62J07.

Keywords and phrases: ensemble minimaxity, minimaxity, Stein estimation.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbf{X} \sim N_p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ where $p \geq 3$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p)^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2)$. Let us assume

$$\sigma_1^2 > \sigma_2^2 > \dots > \sigma_p^2. \quad (1.1)$$

We are interested in the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with respect to the ordinary squared error loss function

$$L(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|\boldsymbol{\delta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2,$$

where the risk of an estimator $\boldsymbol{\delta}(\mathbf{X})$ is $R(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = E[L(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\theta})]$. The MLE \mathbf{X} with constant risk $\sum \sigma_i^2$ is shown to be extended Bayes and hence minimax for any p and any $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.

In the homoscedastic case $\sigma_1^2 = \dots = \sigma_p^2$, [James and Stein \(1961\)](#) showed that the shrinkage estimator

$$\left(1 - \frac{c}{\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{X}}\right) \mathbf{X} \text{ for } c \in (0, 2(p-2)) \quad (1.2)$$

dominates the MLE \mathbf{X} for $p \geq 3$. There is some literature discussing the minimax properties of shrinkage estimators under heteroscedasticity. [Brown \(1975\)](#) showed that the James-Stein estimator (1.2) is not necessarily minimax when the variances are not equal. Specifically, it is not minimax for any $c \in (0, 2(p-2))$ when $2\sigma_1^2 > \sum_{i=1}^p \sigma_i^2$. [Berger \(1976\)](#) showed that

$$\left(\mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \frac{c}{\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-2} \mathbf{X}}\right) \mathbf{X} \text{ for } c \in (0, 2(p-2)) \quad (1.3)$$

is minimax for $p \geq 3$ and any $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. However, [Casella \(1980\)](#) argued that the James-Stein estimator (1.3) may not be desirable even if it is minimax. Ordinary

minimax estimators, as in (1.3), typically shrink most on the coordinates with smaller variances. From Casella's (1980) viewpoint, one of the most natural James-Stein variants is

$$\left(\mathbf{I} - \Sigma \frac{c}{\|\mathbf{X}\|^2} \right) \mathbf{X} \text{ for } c > 0,$$

which we are going to rescue, by providing some minimax properties related to Bayesian viewpoint.

In many applications, θ_i are thought to follow some exchangeable prior distribution π . It is then natural to consider the compound risk function which is then the Bayes risk with respect to the prior π

$$\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \pi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} R(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (1.4)$$

Efron and Morris (1971, 1972a,b, 1973) addressed this problem from both the Bayes and empirical Bayes perspective. In particular, they considered a prior distribution $\boldsymbol{\theta} \sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, \tau \mathbf{I}_p)$ with $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, and used the term "ensemble risk" for the compound risk. By introducing a set of ensemble risks

$$\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} R(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{1}{(2\pi\tau)^{p/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2}{2\tau}\right) d\boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad (1.5)$$

we can define ensemble minimaxity with respect to a set of priors

$$\mathcal{P}_\star = \{N_p(\mathbf{0}, \tau \mathbf{I}_p) : \tau \in (0, \infty)\},$$

that is, an estimator $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is said to be ensemble minimax with respect to \mathcal{P}_\star if

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0, \infty)} \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta}'} \sup_{\tau \in (0, \infty)} \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}', \tau).$$

As a matter of fact, the second author in his unpublished manuscript, Brown, Nie and Xie (2011), has already introduced the concept of ensemble minimaxity. In this article, we follow their spirit but propose a simpler and clearer approach for establishing ensemble minimaxity of estimators.

Our article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we elaborate the definition of ensemble minimaxity and explain Casella's (1980) viewpoint on the contradiction between minimaxity and well-conditioning. In Section 3, we show the ensemble minimaxity of various shrinkage estimators including a variant of the James-Stein estimator

$$\left(\mathbf{I} - \Sigma \frac{p-2}{(p-2)\sigma_1^2 + \|\mathbf{X}\|^2} \right) \mathbf{X}$$

as well as the generalized Bayes estimator with respect to the hierarchical prior

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} | \lambda \sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, (\sigma_1^2/\lambda)\mathbf{I} - \Sigma), \quad \pi(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-2} I_{(0,1)}(\lambda)$$

which is a generalization of the harmonic prior $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^{2-p}$ for the heteroscedastic case.

2. Minimaxity, Ensemble Minimaxity and Casella's viewpoint

If the prior $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ were known, the resulting posterior mean $E[\boldsymbol{\theta} | \boldsymbol{x}]$ would then be the optimal estimate under the sum of the squared error loss. However, it is typically not feasible to exactly specify the prior. One approach to avoid excessive dependence on the choice of prior, is to consider a set of priors \mathcal{P} on Θ and study the properties of estimators based on the corresponding set of ensemble risks. As in classical decision theory, there rarely exists an estimator that achieves the minimum ensemble risk uniformly for all $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$. A more realistic goal as pursued in this paper is to study the ensemble minimaxity of James-Stein type estimators.

Recall that with ordinary risk $R(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is said to be minimax if

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} R(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta}'} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} R(\boldsymbol{\delta}', \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Similarly for the case of ensemble risk we have the following definition. Note the Bayes risk of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ under the prior π is given by (1.4). The estimator $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is said to be ensemble minimax with respect to \mathcal{P} if

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}} \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \pi) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta}'} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}} \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}', \pi).$$

The motivation for the above definitions comes from the use of the empirical Bayes method in simultaneous inference. Efron and Morris (1972b), derived the James-Stein estimator through the parametric empirical Bayes model with $\boldsymbol{\theta} \sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, \tau \mathbf{I}_p)$. Note that in such an empirical Bayes model, τ is the unknown non-random parameter. Given the family $\mathcal{P}_* = \{N_p(\mathbf{0}, \tau \mathbf{I}_p) : \tau \in (0, \infty)\}$, the Bayes risk is a function of τ as follows,

$$\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} R(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{1}{(2\pi\tau)^{p/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2}{2\tau}\right) d\boldsymbol{\theta}.$$

Hence, with $\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau)$, the estimator $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is said to be ensemble minimax with respect to \mathcal{P}_* if

$$\sup_{\tau \in (0, \infty)} \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta}'} \sup_{\tau \in (0, \infty)} \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}', \tau),$$

which may be seen as the counterpart of ordinary minimaxity in the empirical Bayes model.

Clearly the usual estimator \mathbf{X} has constant risk, has constant Bayes risk and hence \mathbf{X} is ensemble minimax. Then the ensemble minimaxity of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ follows if

$$\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau) \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \sigma_i^2, \quad \forall \tau \in (0, \infty).$$

Remark 2.1. Note that ensemble minimaxity can also be interpreted as a particular case of Gamma minimaxity studied in the context of robust Bayes analysis by Good (1952); Berger (1979). However, in such studies, a “large” set consisting of many diffuse priors are usually included in the analysis. Since this is

quite different from our formulation of the problem, we use the term ensemble minimaxity throughout our paper, following the Efron and Morris papers cited above.

A class of shrinkage estimators which we consider in this paper, is given by

$$\delta_\phi = \left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G} \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right) \mathbf{x}, \quad \text{for } z = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x} = \sum \frac{g_i x_i^2}{\sigma_i^2}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{G} = \text{diag}(g_1, \dots, g_p)$ with

$$0 < g_i \leq 1, \quad \forall i.$$

Berger and Srinivasan (1978) showed, in their Corollary 2.7, that, given positive-definite \mathbf{C} and non-singular \mathbf{B} , a necessary condition for an estimator of the form

$$\left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{B} \frac{\phi(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}} \right) \mathbf{x}$$

to be admissible is $\mathbf{B} = k \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{C}$ for some constant k , which is satisfied by estimators among the class of (2.1).

A version of Baranchik's (1964) sufficient condition for ordinary minimaxity is given in Appendix A; For given \mathbf{G} which satisfies

$$h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}) = 2 \left(\frac{\sum g_i \sigma_i^2}{\max(g_i \sigma_i^2)} - 2 \right) > 0,$$

δ_ϕ given by (2.1) is ordinary minimax if

$$\phi(\cdot) \text{ is non-decreasing and } 0 \leq \phi \leq h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}).$$

Berger (1976) showed that, for any given $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$,

$$\max_{\mathbf{G}} h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}) = 2(p-2), \quad \arg \max_{\mathbf{G}} h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}) = \sigma_p^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = \text{diag} \left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_1^2}, \dots, \frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_{p-1}^2}, 1 \right)$$

which seems the right choice of \mathbf{G} . However, from the ‘‘conditioning’’ viewpoint of Casella (1980) which advocates more shrinkage on higher variance estimates, the descending order

$$g_1 > \dots > g_p \quad (2.2)$$

is desirable, whereas $\mathbf{G} = \sigma_p^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$ corresponding to the ascending order $g_1 < \dots < g_p$ under $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ given by (1.1). As Casella (1980) pointed out, ordinary minimaxity cannot be enjoyed together with well-conditioning given by (2.2) when

$$h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, c\mathbf{I}) \leq 0 \text{ or equivalently } \sum \sigma_i^2 \leq 2\sigma_1^2$$

for some $0 < c \leq 1$. In fact, when $h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, c\mathbf{I}) \leq 0$ and $c = g_1 > \dots > g_p$, we have

$$c\sigma_1^2 = g_1\sigma_1^2, \quad c\sigma_2^2 > g_2\sigma_2^2, \quad \dots, \quad c\sigma_p^2 > g_p\sigma_p^2$$

and hence $h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}) < 0$ follows. The motivation of Casella (1980, 1985) seems to provide a better treatment for the case. Actually Brown (1975) pointed out essentially the same phenomenon from a slightly different viewpoint.

Ensemble minimaxity, based on ensemble risk given by (1.5), provides a way of saving shrinkage estimators with well-conditioning, estimators which are not necessarily ordinary minimax.

3. Ensemble minimaxity

3.1. A general theorem

We have the following theorem on ensemble minimaxity of $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi$ with general \mathbf{G} , though we will eventually focus on $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi$ with \mathbf{G} with the descending order $g_1 > \dots > g_p$ as in (2.2).

Theorem 3.1. *Assume $\phi(z)$ is non-negative, non-decreasing and concave. Also $\phi(z)/z$ is assumed non-increasing. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi = \left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G} \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right) \mathbf{x}, \quad \text{for } z = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x} = \sum \frac{g_i x_i^2}{\sigma_i^2}$$

is ensemble minimax if

$$\phi(p \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \leq 2(p-2) \frac{\min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)}{\max_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)}, \quad \forall \tau \in (0, \infty). \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Recall, for $i = 1, \dots, p$,

$$x_i | \theta_i \sim N(\theta_i, \sigma_i^2), \quad \text{and } \theta_i \sim N(0, \tau).$$

Then the posterior and marginal are given by

$$\theta_i | x_i \sim N\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} x_i, \frac{\tau \sigma_i^2}{\tau + \sigma_i^2}\right) \quad \text{and } x_i \sim N(0, \tau + \sigma_i^2),$$

respectively, where $\theta_1 | x_1, \dots, \theta_p | x_p$ are mutually independent and x_1, \dots, x_p

are mutually independent. Then the Bayes risk is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi, \tau) &= \sum_{i=1}^p E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} E_{\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}} \left[\left\{ \left(1 - g_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right) x_i - \theta_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p E_{\mathbf{x}} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{x}} \left[\left\{ \left(1 - g_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right) x_i - \theta_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p E_{\mathbf{x}} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{x}} \left[\left\{ \left(1 - g_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right) x_i - E[\theta_i | x_i] + E[\theta_i | x_i] - \theta_i \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\left\{ \left(1 - g_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right) x_i - E[\theta_i | x_i] \right\}^2 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^p \text{Var}(\theta_i | x_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} x_i - g_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} x_i \right)^2 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\tau \sigma_i^2}{\tau + \sigma_i^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the first term of the r.h.s. of the above equality is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^p E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} x_i - g_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} x_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{\sigma_i^2}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} \right)^2 E_{\mathbf{x}}[x_i^2] - 2E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\sigma_i^2 g_i x_i^2 \phi(z)}{\tau + \sigma_i^2 z} \right] + E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^p g_i^2 x_i^2 \frac{\phi^2(z)}{z^2} \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\sigma_i^4}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} - 2E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\sigma_i^2 g_i x_i^2 \phi(z)}{\tau + \sigma_i^2 z} \right] + E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^p g_i^2 x_i^2 \frac{\phi^2(z)}{z^2} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi, \tau) - \sum \sigma_i^2 = -2E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\sigma_i^2 g_i x_i^2 \phi(z)}{\tau + \sigma_i^2 z} \right] + E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^p g_i^2 x_i^2 \frac{\phi^2(z)}{z^2} \right]. \quad (3.2)$$

Let

$$w_i = \frac{x_i^2}{\sigma_i^2 + \tau}, \quad w = \sum_{i=1}^p w_i \quad \text{and} \quad t_i = \frac{w_i}{w} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, p.$$

Then

$$w \sim \chi_p^2, \quad \mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_p)^\top \sim \text{Dirichlet}(1/2, \dots, 1/2),$$

and w and \mathbf{t} are mutually independent. With the notation, we have

$$x_i^2 = w t_i (\sigma_i^2 + \tau) \quad \text{and} \quad z = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{g_i x_i^2}{\sigma_i^2} = w \sum_{i=1}^p t_i g_i \left(1 + \frac{\tau}{\sigma_i^2} \right)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum g_i^2 x_i^2 \frac{\phi^2(z)}{z^2} \right] &= E_{w, \mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\sum t_i g_i^2 (\sigma_i^2 + \tau)}{\sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \frac{\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))^2}{w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \right] \\ &= E_{\mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\sum t_i g_i^2 (\sigma_i^2 + \tau)}{\sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} E_{w | \mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))^2}{w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi(w)/w$ is non-increasing and $\phi(w)$ is non-decreasing, by the correlation inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{w | \mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))^2}{w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \right] &\leq E_{w | \mathbf{t}} \left[\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \right] E_{w | \mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))}{w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \right] \\ &\leq E_{w | \mathbf{t}} \left[\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \right] E_w \left[\frac{\phi(w \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))}{w \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum g_i^2 x_i^2 \frac{\phi^2(z)}{z^2} \right] &\leq E_w \left[\frac{\phi(w \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))}{w \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \right] \\ &\quad \times E_{\mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\sum t_i g_i^2 (\sigma_i^2 + \tau)}{\sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} E_{w | \mathbf{t}} \left[\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \right] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

In the first part of the r.h.s. of the inequality (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_w \left[\frac{\phi(w \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))}{w} \right] &\leq E_w [1/w] E_w \left[\phi(w \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\phi(E_w [w] \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))}{p-2} \\ &= \frac{\phi(p \min_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2))}{p-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where the first and second inequality follow from the correlation inequality and Jensen's inequality, respectively. In the second part of the r.h.s. of the inequality (3.3), by the inequality

$$\sum t_i g_i^2 (\sigma_i^2 + \tau) \leq \max_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2) \sum t_i g_i \sigma_i^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\sum t_i g_i^2 (\sigma_i^2 + \tau)}{\sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} E_{w | \mathbf{t}} \left[\phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \right] \right] &= E_{w, \mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\sum t_i g_i^2 (\sigma_i^2 + \tau)}{\sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \right] \\ &\leq \max_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2) E_{w, \mathbf{t}} \left[\frac{\sum t_i g_i \sigma_i^2}{\sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} \phi(w \sum t_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \right] \\ &= \max_i g_i (1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2) E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum \frac{\sigma_i^2 g_i x_i^2}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

By (3.3), (3.4) and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum g_i^2 x_i^2 \frac{\phi^2(z)}{z^2} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\phi(p \min_i g_i(1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \max_i g_i(1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)}{p-2} E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum \frac{\sigma_i^2 g_i x_i^2 \phi(z)}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{z} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and, by (3.2) and (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi, \tau) - \sum \sigma_i^2 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{\phi(p \min_i g_i(1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)) \max_i g_i(1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)}{p-2} - 2 \right) E_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum \frac{\sigma_i^2 g_i x_i^2 \phi(z)}{\tau + \sigma_i^2} \frac{1}{z} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which guarantees $\bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi, \tau) - \sum \sigma_i^2 \leq 0$ for all $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ under the condition (3.1). \square

Given $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, the choice $\mathbf{G} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/\sigma_1^2$ with descending order $g_1 > \dots > g_p$, is one of the most natural choice of \mathbf{G} from Casella's (1980) viewpoint. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\min_i g_i(1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)}{\max_i g_i(1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2)} &= \frac{\min_i \{\sigma_i^2 + \tau\}}{\max_i \{\sigma_i^2 + \tau\}} = \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau}, \\ p \min_i g_i(1 + \tau/\sigma_i^2) &= \frac{p}{\sigma_1^2} \min_i (\sigma_i^2 + \tau) = p \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence a following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Assume that $\phi(z)$ is non-negative, non-decreasing and concave. Also $\phi(z)/z$ is assumed non-increasing. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi = \left(\mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \frac{\phi(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/\sigma_1^2)}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2} \right) \mathbf{x}$$

is ensemble minimax if

$$\phi(p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)/\sigma_1^2) \leq 2(p-2) \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau}, \quad \forall \tau \in (0, \infty). \quad (3.7)$$

3.2. An ensemble minimax James-Stein variant

As an example of Corollary 3.1, we consider

$$\phi(z) = \frac{c_1 z}{c_2 + z} \quad (3.8)$$

for $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 \geq 0$, which is motivated by Stein (1956) and James and Stein (1961). Under $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$, Stein (1956) suggested that there exist estimators dominating the usual estimator \mathbf{x} among a class of estimators $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi$ with ϕ given by

(3.8) for small c_1 and large c_2 . Following Stein (1956), James and Stein (1961) showed that δ_ϕ with $0 < c_1 < 2(p-2)$ and $c_2 = 0$ is ordinary minimax. The choice $c_2 = 0$ is, however, not good since, by Corollary 3.1, c_1 cannot be larger than $2(p-2)\sigma_p^2/\sigma_1^2$. With positive c_2 , we can see that c_1 can be much larger as follows.

Note that $\phi(z)$ given by (3.8) is non-negative, increasing and concave and that $\phi(z)/z$ is decreasing. Then the sufficient condition in (3.7) is

$$\frac{c_1 p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)/\sigma_1^2}{c_2 + p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)/\sigma_1^2} \leq 2(p-2) \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau} \quad \forall \tau \in (0, \infty),$$

which is equivalent to

$$2(p-2) \{ \sigma_1^2 c_2 + p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau) \} - c_1 p(\sigma_1^2 + \tau) \geq 0 \quad \forall \tau \in (0, \infty)$$

or

$$p\tau \{ 2(p-2) - c_1 \} + 2(p-2)\sigma_1^2 \left\{ c_2 - p \left(\frac{c_1}{2(p-2)} - \frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_1^2} \right) \right\} \geq 0 \quad \forall \tau \in (0, \infty).$$

Hence we have a following result.

Theorem 3.2. 1. When

$$0 < c_1 \leq 2(p-2) \text{ and } c_2 \geq \max \left(0, p \left(\frac{c_1}{2(p-2)} - \frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_1^2} \right) \right), \quad (3.9)$$

the shrinkage estimator

$$\left(\mathbf{I} - \Sigma \frac{c_1}{c_2 \sigma_1^2 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2} \right) \mathbf{x}$$

is ensemble minimax.

2. It is ordinary minimax if

$$2 \left(\sum \sigma_i^4 / \sigma_1^4 - 2 \right) \geq c_1.$$

Part 2 above follows from Theorem A.1.

It seems to us that one of the most interesting estimators with ensemble minimaxity from Part 1 is

$$\left(\mathbf{I} - \Sigma \frac{p-2}{(p-2)\sigma_1^2 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2} \right) \mathbf{x}$$

with the choice $c_1 = c_2 = p-2$ satisfying (3.9). It is clear that the i -th shrinkage factor

$$1 - \frac{(p-2)\sigma_i^2}{(p-2)\sigma_1^2 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2}$$

is nonnegative for any \mathbf{x} and any Σ , which is a nice property.

3.3. A generalized Bayes ensemble minimax estimator

In this subsection, we provide a generalized Bayes ensemble minimax estimator. Following [Strawderman \(1971\)](#), [Berger \(1976\)](#) and [Maruyama and Strawderman \(2005\)](#), we consider the generalized harmonic prior

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \lambda \sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, \lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{G}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \quad \pi(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-2} I_{(0,1)}(\lambda) \quad (3.10)$$

where $\mathbf{G} = \text{diag}(g_1, \dots, g_p)$ satisfies $0 < \forall g_i \leq 1$. Note that for $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{I}_p$, the density of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is exactly $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^{2-p}$, since $\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{G}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \{(1-\lambda)/\lambda\} \mathbf{I}_p$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2}} \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right)^{p/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2}{2(1-\lambda)}\right) \lambda^{-2} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2}} \int_0^\infty g^{p/2-2} \exp(-g \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2/2) dg \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(p/2 - 1) 2^{p/2-1}}{(2\pi)^{p/2}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^{2-p}. \end{aligned}$$

The prior $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^{2-p}$ is called the harmonic prior and was originally investigated by [Baranchik \(1964\)](#) and [Stein \(1974\)](#). [Berger \(1980\)](#) and [Berger and Strawderman \(1996\)](#) recommended the use of the prior (3.10) mainly because it is on the boundary of admissibility.

By the way of [Strawderman \(1971\)](#), the generalized Bayes estimator with respect to the prior is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_* = \left(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G} \frac{\phi_*(z)}{z} \right) \mathbf{x}, \quad \text{for } z = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}$$

with

$$\phi_*(z) = z \frac{\int_0^1 \lambda^{p/2-1} \exp(-z\lambda/2) d\lambda}{\int_0^1 \lambda^{p/2-2} \exp(-z\lambda/2) d\lambda},$$

where $\phi_*(z)$ satisfies the following properties

- H1 $\phi_*(z)$ is increasing in z .
- H2 $\phi_*(z)$ is concave.
- H3 $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \phi_*(z) = p - 2$.
- H4 $\phi_*(z)/z$ is decreasing in z .
- H5 The derivative of $\phi_*(z)$ at $z = 0$ is $(p - 2)/p$.

Under the choice $\mathbf{G} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/\sigma_1^2$ and with the condition of [Corollary 3.1](#), we have a following result.

Theorem 3.3. 1. The estimator $\boldsymbol{\delta}_*$ is ensemble minimax.
2. The estimator $\boldsymbol{\delta}_*$ is ordinary minimax when

$$2 \left(\sum \sigma_i^4 / \sigma_1^4 - 2 \right) \geq p - 2.$$

3. The estimator δ_* is conventional admissible.

Proof. [Part 1] Recall that the sufficient condition for ensemble minimaxity is given by Corollary 3.1. By H1–H5, we have only to check (3.7) in Corollary 3.1.

For $\tau \geq \max(0, \sigma_1^2 - 2\sigma_p^2)$, we have

$$2(p-2)\frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau} \geq p-2.$$

By the properties H1 and H3,

$$\phi_*(p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)/\sigma_1^2) \leq p-2.$$

for $\tau \in (0, \infty)$. Hence for $\tau \geq \max(0, \sigma_1^2 - 2\sigma_p^2)$, it follows that

$$\phi_*(p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)/\sigma_1^2) \leq 2(p-2)\frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau}.$$

So it suffices to show

$$\phi_*(p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)/\sigma_1^2) \leq 2(p-2)\frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau}$$

when $\sigma_1^2 - 2\sigma_p^2 > 0$ and $0 < \tau < \sigma_1^2 - 2\sigma_p^2$. By the properties H2 and H5, we have $\phi_*(z) \leq \{(p-2)/p\}z$ for all $z \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 2(p-2)\frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau} - \phi_*(p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)/\sigma_1^2) &\geq 2(p-2)\frac{\sigma_p^2 + \tau}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau} - \frac{p-2}{p}\frac{p(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)}{\sigma_1^2} \\ &= (p-2)(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)\left(\frac{2}{\sigma_1^2 + \tau} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{(p-2)(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)}{\sigma_1^2(\sigma_1^2 + \tau)}(\sigma_1^2 - \tau) \\ &\geq \frac{(p-2)(\sigma_p^2 + \tau)}{\sigma_1^2(\sigma_1^2 + \tau)}2\sigma_p^2 \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

[Part 2] It follows from Theorem A.1 in Appendix A.

[Part 3] It follows from Theorem 6.4.2 of Brown (1971). □

3.4. A numerical experiment

Let $p = 10$ and

$$\Sigma = \text{diag}(a^9, a^8, \dots, a, 1)$$

for $a = 1.01, 1.05, 1.25, 1.5$. Approximately a^9 is 1.09, 1.55, 7.45, 38.4, respectively. We investigate numerical performance of two ensemble minimax estimators of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi = \left(\mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \frac{\phi(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/\sigma_1^2)}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2} \right) \mathbf{x},$$

where the one is the generalized Bayes estimator (GB) with

$$\phi_*(z) = z \frac{\int_0^1 \lambda^{p/2-1} \exp(-z\lambda/2) d\lambda}{\int_0^1 \lambda^{p/2-2} \exp(-z\lambda/2) d\lambda}$$

and the other is the James-Stein variant (JS) with

$$\phi_{\text{JS}}(z) = \frac{(p-2)z}{p-2+z}.$$

As in Part 2 of Theorem 3.2 and Part 2 of Theorem 3.3, a sufficient condition for both estimators to be ordinary minimax is given by

$$2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \sigma_i^4/\sigma_1^4 - 2 \right) = 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^p a^{2(i-10)} \right) \geq p-2, \quad (3.11)$$

where the equality is attained by $a \approx 1.066$. Hence the inequality (3.11) is satisfied by $a = 1.01, 1.05$ and is not by $a = 1.25, 1.5$.

Table 1 provides relative ordinary risk difference given by

$$1 - R(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi)/\text{tr}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$$

at

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = m\{\text{tr}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\}^{1/2} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{10}}{\sqrt{10}} = m \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{10} a^{i-1} \right\}^{1/2} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{10}}{\sqrt{10}}$$

for $m = 0, 2, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100$. For both estimators, we see that, for larger m and $a = 1.25, 1.5$, the differences are negative, which implies that these two estimators are not ordinary minimax for $a = 1.25, 1.5$.

Table 2 provides relative Bayes risk difference given by

$$1 - \bar{R}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau)/\text{tr}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$$

for $\tau = 1, 5, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100$. We see that, for even $a = 1.25, 1.5$, the differences are all positive, which supports the ensemble minimaxity of two estimators.

In summary these tables support the theory presented in Theorems 3.2 and 3.3.

TABLE 1
Ordinary Risk Difference

$a \setminus m$	0	2	20	40	60	80	100	
GB	1.01	0.79	0.14	1.7×10^{-3}	4.8×10^{-4}	2.5×10^{-4}	1.7×10^{-4}	1.3×10^{-4}
	1.05	0.75	0.14	1.7×10^{-3}	4.3×10^{-4}	2.0×10^{-4}	1.2×10^{-4}	8.0×10^{-5}
	1.25	0.63	0.19	1.9×10^{-3}	2.5×10^{-4}	-5.6×10^{-5}	-1.7×10^{-4}	-2.2×10^{-4}
	1.5	0.63	0.27	2.7×10^{-3}	1.6×10^{-4}	-3.0×10^{-4}	-4.6×10^{-4}	-5.4×10^{-4}
JS	1.01	0.80	0.14	1.7×10^{-3}	4.8×10^{-4}	2.5×10^{-4}	1.7×10^{-4}	1.3×10^{-4}
	1.05	0.79	0.14	1.7×10^{-3}	4.3×10^{-4}	2.0×10^{-4}	1.2×10^{-4}	8.0×10^{-5}
	1.25	0.72	0.19	1.9×10^{-3}	2.5×10^{-4}	-5.6×10^{-5}	-1.7×10^{-4}	-2.2×10^{-4}
	1.5	0.71	0.25	2.7×10^{-3}	1.6×10^{-4}	-3.0×10^{-4}	-4.6×10^{-4}	-5.4×10^{-4}

TABLE 2
Bayes Risk Difference

$a \setminus \tau$	1	5	20	40	60	80	100	
GB	1.01	0.429	0.139	0.039	0.020	0.013	0.010	0.008
	1.05	0.374	0.144	0.042	0.021	0.015	0.011	0.008
	1.25	0.105	0.082	0.038	0.021	0.014	0.011	0.009
	1.5	0.023	0.022	0.019	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.008
JS	1.01	0.406	0.137	0.039	0.020	0.014	0.010	0.008
	1.05	0.393	0.143	0.042	0.022	0.015	0.011	0.009
	1.25	0.122	0.079	0.034	0.020	0.014	0.011	0.009
	1.5	0.028	0.025	0.018	0.013	0.010	0.008	0.007

Appendix A: Ordinary minimaxity

We assume

- A1 $0 < g_i \leq 1$ for any i .
- A2 $\phi(z) \geq 0$.
- A3 ϕ is absolutely continuous.
- A4 ϕ is monotone non-decreasing.

Let

$$h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}) = 2 \left(\frac{\sum g_i \sigma_i^2}{\max(g_i \sigma_i^2)} - 2 \right).$$

Then we have a following result.

Theorem A.1. *Suppose \mathbf{G} satisfies A1 and $h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}) > 0$. Then δ_ϕ is conventional minimax if ϕ satisfies A2, A3, A4 and $\phi \leq h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G})$.*

Proof. The risk of δ_ϕ is expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} R(\delta_\phi, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^p E \left[\left\{ \left(1 - g_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right) x_i - \theta_i \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p E [(x_i - \theta_i)^2] + E \left[\frac{\phi(z)^2}{z^2} \sum g_i^2 x_i^2 \right] - 2 \sum_{i=1}^p E \left[g_i (x_i - \theta_i) x_i \frac{\phi(z)}{z} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Noting $z = \sum g_i x_i^2 / \sigma_i^2$ and using Stein's (1981) identity under Assumption A3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum \sigma_i^2 \\ &= E \left[\frac{\phi(z)^2}{z^2} \sum g_i^2 x_i^2 \right] - 2 \sum_{i=1}^p E \left[g_i \sigma_i^2 \left\{ \frac{\phi(z)}{z} + x_i \frac{2g_i x_i}{\sigma_i^2} \left(\frac{\phi'(z)}{z} - \frac{\phi(z)}{z^2} \right) \right\} \right] \\ &= E \left[-2 \sum g_i \sigma_i^2 \frac{\phi(z)}{z} + \sum g_i^2 x_i^2 \left(\frac{\phi(z)^2}{z^2} - 4 \frac{\phi'(z)}{z} + 4 \frac{\phi(z)}{z^2} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By A1, we have

$$\frac{z}{\sum g_i^2 x_i^2} = \frac{\sum g_i x_i^2 / \sigma_i^2}{\sum g_i^2 x_i^2} = \frac{\sum g_i x_i^2 / \sigma_i^2}{\sum \{g_i \sigma_i^2\} \{g_i x_i^2 / \sigma_i^2\}} \geq \frac{1}{\max(g_i \sigma_i^2)}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then, by Assumptions A2 and A4, and (A.1), we have

$$R(\boldsymbol{\delta}_\phi, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum \sigma_i^2 \leq -E \left[\sum g_i^2 x_i^2 \frac{\phi(z)}{z^2} \{h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \mathbf{G}) - \phi(z)\} \right],$$

which completes the proof. \square

References

- BARANCHIK, A. J. (1964). Multiple regression and estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution Technical Report No. 51, Department of Statistics, Stanford University.
- BERGER, J. O. (1976). Admissible minimax estimation of a multivariate normal mean with arbitrary quadratic loss. *Ann. Statist.* **4** 223–226. [MR0397940](#)
- BERGER, R. L. (1979). Gamma minimax robustness of Bayes rules. *Comm. Statist. A—Theory Methods* **8** 543–560. [MR528674](#)
- BERGER, J. (1980). A robust generalized Bayes estimator and confidence region for a multivariate normal mean. *Ann. Statist.* **8** 716–761.
- BERGER, J. O. and SRINIVASAN, C. (1978). Generalized Bayes estimators in multivariate problems. *Ann. Statist.* **6** 783–801. [MR0478426](#)
- BERGER, J. O. and STRAWDERMAN, W. E. (1996). Choice of hierarchical priors: admissibility in estimation of normal means. *Ann. Statist.* **24** 931–951. [MR1401831](#)
- BROWN, L. D. (1971). Admissible estimators, recurrent diffusions, and insoluble boundary value problems. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **42** 855–903. [MR0286209](#)
- BROWN, L. D. (1975). Estimation with incompletely specified loss functions (the case of several location parameters). *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **70** 417–427. [MR0373082](#)
- BROWN, L. D., NIE, H. and XIE, X. (2011). Ensemble minimax estimation for multivariate normal means. unpublished manuscript, (available at: https://repository.upenn.edu/statistics_papers/44/).

- CASELLA, G. (1980). Minimax ridge regression estimation. *Ann. Statist.* **8** 1036–1056. [MR585702](#)
- CASELLA, G. (1985). Condition numbers and minimax ridge regression estimators. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **80** 753–758. [MR803264](#)
- EFRON, B. and MORRIS, C. (1971). Limiting the risk of Bayes and empirical Bayes estimators. I. The Bayes case. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **66** 807–815.
- EFRON, B. and MORRIS, C. (1972a). Empirical Bayes on vector observations: an extension of Stein’s method. *Biometrika* **59** 335–347.
- EFRON, B. and MORRIS, C. (1972b). Limiting the risk of Bayes and empirical Bayes estimators. II. The empirical Bayes case. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **67** 130–139.
- EFRON, B. and MORRIS, C. (1973). Stein’s estimation rule and its competitors—an empirical Bayes approach. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **68** 117–130.
- GOOD, I. J. (1952). Rational decisions. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B.* **14** 107–114. [MR0077033](#)
- JAMES, W. and STEIN, C. (1961). Estimation with quadratic loss. In *Proc. 4th Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Prob., Vol. I* 361–379. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif. [MR0133191](#)
- MARUYAMA, Y. and STRAWDERMAN, W. E. (2005). A new class of generalized Bayes minimax ridge regression estimators. *Ann. Statist.* **33** 1753–1770. [MR2166561](#)
- STEIN, C. (1956). Inadmissibility of the usual estimator for the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. I* 197–206. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles. [MR0084922](#)
- STEIN, C. (1974). Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. In *Proceedings of the Prague Symposium on Asymptotic Statistics (Charles Univ., Prague, 1973), Vol. II* 345–381. Charles Univ., Prague. [MR0381062](#)
- STEIN, C. (1981). Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *Ann. Statist.* **9** 1135–1151. [MR630098](#)
- STRAWDERMAN, W. E. (1971). Proper Bayes minimax estimators of the multivariate normal mean. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **42** 385–388. [MR0397939](#)