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#### Abstract

Based on independent random matices $X: p \times m$ and $S: p \times p$ distributed, respectively, as $N_{p m}\left(\mu, \Sigma \otimes I_{m}\right)$ and $W_{p}(n, \Sigma)$ with $\mu$ unknown and $n \geq p$, the problem of obtaining confidence interval for $|\Sigma|$ is considered. Stein's idea of improving the best affine equivariant point estimator of $|\Sigma|$ has been adapted to the interval estimation problem. It is shown that an interval estimator of the form $|S|\left(b^{-1}, a^{-1}\right)$ can be improved by $\min \{|S|, c \mid S$ $\left.+X X^{\prime} \mid\right\}\left(b^{-1}, a^{-1}\right)$ for a certain constant $c$ depending on $(a, b)$.
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## 1. Introduction

Let the random matrices $X: p \times m$ and $S: p \times p$ be independently distributed as $N_{p m}\left(\mu, \Sigma \otimes I_{m}\right)$ and $W_{p}(n, \Sigma)(n \geq p)$, respectively. This is the canonical form of the multivariate linear model. Assuming that $\Sigma$ is positive definite, we consider the problem of obtaining confidence interval for $|\Sigma|$ based on $(X, S)$.

Observing that the problem is invariant under the affine group of transformations, one can check that affine invariant interval estimators with confidence coefficient $\beta \in(0,1)$ are of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
J=|S|\left(b^{-1}, a^{-1}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $0<a<b<\infty$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{a}^{b} f_{p, n}(x) d x=\beta \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f_{p, n}$ is the density of $|S|$ when $\Sigma=I$. Further restrictions like

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{p, n+h}(a)=f_{p, n+h}(b) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some particular choices of $h$, will provide certain types of optimum invariant confidence intervals. For example, the shortest length invariant confidence interval
with confidence coefficient $\beta$ is given by (1.1)-(1.3) with $h=4$ (Sarkar (1989)); and, as it will be shown in this paper, the unbiased invariant confidence interval corresponds to $h=2$. These optimum intervals provide multivariate extensions of the corresponding optimum intervals known in the literature for normal variance. The confidence interval (1.1) with $a<b$ giving equal probabilities (i.e., $\beta / 2$ ), although does not have any other optimum property, is quite often used, at least in the univariate case. Also, instead of reducing the problem through invariance, if the likelihood ratio principle is used to construct an interval based on ( $X, S$ ), one would get (1.1), with $a<b$ satisfying (1.2) and another condition slightly different from (1.3).

For the problem of point estimation of $|\Sigma|$, Stein (1964) first showed that, when $p=1$, the best affine equivariant estimator, which is based on $|S|$, is inadmissible with respect to the class of estimators based on the minimal sufficient statistic ( $X, S$ ). Shorrock and Zidek (1976) and Sinha (1976) have extended this result to the multivariate case. In view of these results, it seems likely that an interval estimator based on $|S|$ would also be inadmissible in the class of interval estimators based on ( $X, S$ ). Considering $p=1$, Cohen (1972) first demonstrated this inadmissibility result for the shortest length confidence interval by adapting Brown's idea (1968). An extension of this result for general $p$ was given by Sarkar (1989). The idea of incorporating $X$ into the estimation procedure used in this improvement is, however, only restricted to the shortest length confidence interval. Moreover, the improvement is achieved only in terms of the coverage probability. A stronger result is obtained in this paper. We adapt Stein's idea of improving the best equivariant estimator of $|\Sigma|$ to the interval estimation problem. The Steintype improvement works for any interval of the form (1.1), where $0<a<b<\infty$ are subject to a condition that is less restricted than (1.3). Also, the improvement is obtained in terms of both the coverage probability and the length of interval. Our result is a multivariate extension of the recent paper by Nagata (1989).

In Section 3, we prove that (1.3) with $h=2$ is the condition of unbiasedness of an invariant confidence interval (1.1). Stein-type improvement of an interval of the form (1.1) is presented in Section 4. Section 2 contains the distributional properties of sample generalized variance that are useful in Sections 3 and 4.

## 2. Some necessary results

Suppose that $\Omega=\Sigma^{-1} \mu \mu^{\prime}$ is of rank $t(\leq s=\min (p, m))$. Let $C_{\kappa}(\Omega)$ denote the zonal polynomial of $\Omega$ corresponding to the partition $\kappa=\left(\kappa_{1}, \ldots, \kappa_{t}\right)$ of the integer $k \geq 0$ in terms of the integers $\kappa_{1} \geq \cdots \geq \kappa_{t} \geq 0$. This is a symmetric homogeneous polynomial in the characteristic roots of $\Omega$ and is known to be nonnegative because $\Omega$ is nonnegative definite. It is also known that

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\operatorname{tr} \Omega)^{k}=\sum_{\kappa:\|\kappa\|=k} C_{\kappa}(\Omega) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\|\kappa\|=\sum_{i=1}^{t} \kappa_{i}$. See Muirhead (1982) for the aforementioned and other properties of zonal polynomial. We use the following notations: $S^{*}=S+X X^{\prime}$ and
$F=\operatorname{Diag}\left(f_{1}, \ldots, f_{s}\right)$, where $1 \geq f_{1} \geq \cdots \geq f_{s} \geq 0$ are the ordered characteristic roots of $S^{*-1} X X^{\prime}$. Also, let $\chi_{n}^{2}$ denote the chi-squared random variable with $n$ degrees of freedom. We now have the following result which provides the first step in the derivation of Stein-type improvement.

Lemma 2.1. Conditionally given $\kappa=\left(\kappa_{1}, \ldots, \kappa_{t}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|S^{*}\right| /|\Sigma| \sim \prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}^{2} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

independently of $F$, where $\chi_{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}^{2}$ are independent, and $\kappa$ has the following probability distribution:

$$
\pi(\kappa, \Omega)= \begin{cases}\exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \Omega\right) C_{\kappa}\left(\frac{1}{2} \Omega\right) /\|\kappa\|! & \text { if } \kappa_{1} \geq \cdots \geq \kappa_{t} \geq 0  \tag{2.3}\\ 0 & \text { otherwise. }\end{cases}
$$

Proof. Without any loss of generality we can assume that $\Sigma=I_{p}$ and replace $\mu$ by $\nu=\Sigma^{-1 / 2} \mu$. Then, as Shorrock and Zidek ((1976), p. 635) proved, conditionally given $\kappa$, with the marginal distribution of $\kappa$ being given by (2.3), $S^{*}$ and $F$ are independent. The conditional density, $\phi_{\kappa}\left(S^{*}\right)$, of $S^{*}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{\kappa}\left(S^{*}\right)=\phi_{0}\left(S^{*}\right) C_{\kappa}\left(S^{*}\right) / E_{0} C_{\kappa}\left(S^{*}\right), \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\phi_{0}\left(S^{*}\right)$ is the density of $S^{*}$ under $\kappa=0$ (i.e., $\Omega=0$ ), which is that of $W_{p}(n+$ $m, I_{p}$ ), and $E_{0}$ denotes the expectation with respect to this central distribution. The conditional moments of $\left|S^{*}\right|$ obtained from (2.4) are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{\kappa}\left(\left|S^{*}\right|^{l}\right)=\frac{2^{p l} \Gamma_{p}\left(\frac{n+m+2 l}{2}\right)}{\Gamma_{p}\left(\frac{n+m}{2}\right)} \frac{E C_{\kappa}(A)}{E C_{\kappa}(B)} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A \sim W_{p}(n+m+2 l, I)$ and $B \sim W_{p}(n+m, I)$. The following formula (Muirhead (1982), p. 251)

$$
\begin{align*}
E_{\kappa} C_{\kappa}(B) & =2^{k}\left(\frac{n+m}{2}\right)_{\kappa} C_{\kappa}(I)  \tag{2.6}\\
& =\frac{2^{k} \prod_{i=1}^{p} \Gamma\left(\frac{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}{2}\right)}{\prod_{i=1}^{p} \Gamma\left(\frac{n+m-i+1}{2}\right)} C_{\kappa}(I)
\end{align*}
$$

simplifies (2.5) to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2^{p l} \prod_{i=1}^{p} \Gamma\left(\frac{n+m+2 l+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}{2}\right)}{\prod_{i=1}^{p} \Gamma\left(\frac{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}{2}\right)} \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are the corresponding moments of $\prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}^{2}$. Hence, the lemma follows.

The next lemma gives monotone likelihood ratio properties of the conditional distribution of $\left|S^{*}\right|$ obtained in Lemma 2.1. For this, let $h_{p}(x, \boldsymbol{n})$, with $\boldsymbol{n}=$ $\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{p}\right)$, denote the density of $\prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n_{i}}^{2}$, where $\chi_{n_{i}}^{2}$ are independent.

Lemma 2.2. The ratio $h_{p}\left(c^{-1} b, \boldsymbol{n}\right) / h_{p}\left(c^{-1} a, n\right)$ is (i) strictly increasing in each $n_{i}>0$, for any fixed $p \geq 1, c>0$, and $0<a<b<\infty$; (ii) strictly increasing in $c>0$, for any fixed $p \geq 1,0<a<b<\infty$, and $\boldsymbol{n}>\mathbf{0}$.

Proof. In Lemma 2.2 of Sarkar (1989) it is proved that $h_{p}(x,, n)$ is $T P_{2}$ in $\left(x, n_{i}\right)$, for fixed $\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{i-1}, n_{i+1}, \ldots, n_{p}\right)$, for each $i$. A close study of this proof would reveal that the inequalities involved there are, in fact, strict; so that $h_{p}(x, \boldsymbol{n})$ is strictly $T P_{2}$ in $\left(x, n_{i}\right)$, which is equivalent to the result stated in part (i) of the present lemma.

To prove part (ii), we need to show that $h_{p}\left(c^{-1} x, n\right)$ is strictly $T P_{2}$ in $(c, x)$. This result is known to be true for $p=1$. To see that it is also true for $p>1$, we first note that $c^{-1} h_{p}\left(c^{-1} x, \boldsymbol{n}\right)$, which is the density of $c \prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n_{i}}^{2}$ at $x$, can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
c^{-1} h_{p}\left(c^{-1} x, \boldsymbol{n}\right)=\int_{0}^{\infty} t^{-1} h_{1}\left(t^{-1} x, n_{1}\right) c^{-1} h_{p-1}\left(c^{-1} t, \boldsymbol{n}_{\mathbf{2}}\right) d t \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h_{p-1}\left(x, \boldsymbol{n}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)$, with $\boldsymbol{n}_{\mathbf{2}}=\left(n_{2}, \ldots, n_{p}\right)$, is the density of $\prod_{i=2}^{p} \chi_{n_{i}}^{2}$. The result then follows from the basic composition theorem for $T P_{2}$ functions (Karlin (1968), p. 17) and by using induction, which is the kind of arguments used in proving Lemma 2.2 of Sarkar (1989).
3. The unbiased invariant confidence interval

In this section, we prove that the unbiased invariant confidence interval with confidence coefficient $\beta$ is given by (1.1)-(1.3) with $h=2$.

Lemma 3.1. An invariant confidence interval of the form (1.1) is unbiased iff $0<a<b<\infty$ satisfy (1.3) with $h=2$.

Proof. The probability that (1.1) contains $|\Sigma|$ when $\Sigma^{\prime}$ is true is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\psi(\theta) & =P_{I}(\theta a<|S|<\theta b)  \tag{3.1}\\
& =\int_{\theta a}^{\theta b} f_{p, n}(x) d x
\end{align*}
$$

where $\theta=|\Sigma| /\left|\Sigma^{\prime}\right|$. The condition of unbiasedness in terms of $\psi(\theta)$ is that $\psi(\theta) \leq$ $\psi(1)$ for all $\theta$, a necessary condition for which is $\psi^{\prime}(1)=0$. Using

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi^{\prime}(\theta)=b f_{p, n}(\theta b)-a f_{p, n}(\theta a) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and Remark 2.2 of Sarkar (1989), we see that this necessary condition is same as (1.3) with $h=2$.

If (1.3) with $h=2$ is true, then we have using Lemma 2.2(ii) with $c=\theta^{-1}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi^{\prime}(\theta) \leq a f_{p, n}(\theta a)\left[\frac{b f_{p, n}(b)}{a f_{p, n}(a)}-1\right]=0 \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

iff $\theta \geq 1$, which implies the unbiasedness of (1.1). This proves the sufficiency part of the lemma.
4. Stein-type improvement of (1.1)

We illustrate in this section how an interval estimator of the form (1.1) can be improved by incorporating $X$ into the estimation procedure. The technique used is a multivariate analog of Nagata's univariate result (1989) and is an adaptation to the interval estimation problem of the method used by Shorrock and Zidek (1976) in improving the best affine equivariant point estimator of $|\Sigma|$.

Theorem 4.1. Let $J=|S|\left(b^{-1}, a^{-1}\right)$ be a confidence interval for $|\Sigma|$, where $0<a<b<\infty$. Assume that there exists a constant $g_{0}$ less than 1 satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{p, n+m+2}\left(g_{0}^{-1} b\right)=f_{p, n+m+2}\left(g_{0}^{-1} a\right) \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If

$$
\begin{equation*}
J^{*}=\min \left\{|S|, g_{0}\left|S+X X^{\prime}\right|\right\}\left(b^{-1}, a^{-1}\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then
(i) $P\left(J^{*}\right.$ contains $\left.|\Sigma|\right)>P(J$ contains $|\Sigma|)$, and
(ii) $E\left(\right.$ length $\left.\left(J^{*}\right)\right)<E($ length $(J))$,
uniformly in $(\mu, \Sigma)$.
Proof. All probabilities in the following are obtained when $\Sigma=I_{p}$. The right-hand side of (4.3) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
P(a<|S|<b)=P\left(a<\left|S^{*}\right| g(F)<b\right) \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $g(F)=\prod_{i=1}^{s}\left(1-f_{i}\right)$. Because of Lemma 2.1, (4.5) is equal to

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{(F, \kappa)} P\left(a<g(F) \prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}^{2}<b\right), \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the probability is obtained with respect to the conditional distribution of $\prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}^{2}$ given $F$ and $\kappa$, which is then integrated with respect to the distribution of $(F, \kappa)$. Using the notation $f_{p, n+m, \kappa}(x)$ for the density of
$\prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}^{2}$, we observe that the derivative of the probability in (4.6) with respect to $g$ is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{a}{g^{2}} f_{p, n+m, \kappa}\left(g^{-1} a\right)-\frac{b}{g^{2}} f_{p, n+m, \kappa}\left(g^{-1} b\right)  \tag{4.7}\\
& \quad=\frac{a}{g^{2}} f_{p, n+m, \kappa}\left(g^{-1} a\right)\left[1-\frac{b f_{p, n+m, \kappa}\left(g^{-1} b\right)}{a f_{p, n+m, \kappa}\left(g^{-1} a\right)}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, if $g_{\kappa}$ is such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
b f_{p, n+m, \kappa}\left(g_{\kappa}^{-1} b\right)=a f_{p, n+m, \kappa}\left(g_{\kappa}^{-1} a\right) \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

we get, using Lemma 2.2(ii), that as $g$ increases from 0 to 1 , the probability in (4.6) is strictly increasing for $g \in\left(0, g_{\kappa}\right)$ and strictly decreasing for $g \in\left(g_{\kappa}, 1\right)$. If we consider (4.8) for $\kappa=0$, so that $g_{0}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
b f_{p, n+m}\left(g_{0}^{-1} b\right)=a f_{p, n+m}\left(g_{0}^{-1} a\right) \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is same as (4.1) (because of Remark 2.2 in Sarkar (1989)), we see from Lemma 2.2 that $g_{\kappa}<g_{0}<1$. Hence, the probability in (4.6) is less than

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left(a<\min \left(g_{0}, g(F)\right) \prod_{i=1}^{p} \chi_{n+m+2 \kappa_{i}-i+1}^{2}<b\right) \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $(F, \kappa)$. Integrating (4.10) with respect to $(F, \kappa)$, we then obtain that the right-hand side of (4.3) is less than

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left(a<\min \left\{|S|, g_{0}\left|S^{*}\right|\right\}<b\right) \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the coverage probability of the left-hand side of (4.3). This proves part (i) of the theorem. The other part is obvious.

Remark. It is clear that if $g_{0}$ satisfying (4.1) is not less than 1 , then $J^{*} \equiv J$, which means that Stein-type improvement does not work in this case. Because of Lemma 2.2, if $0<a<b<\infty$ are obtained from Condition (1.3), then $g_{0}$ satisfying (4.1) is less than 1 iff $m+2>h$. Hence, the unbiased confidence interval ( $h=2$ ) can always be improved by Stein's idea. But, for the shortest length confidence interval $(h=4)$, we need $m \geq 3$.

Since the exact form of $f_{p, n}(x)$ for $p>2$ is complicated, the exact computation of $a<b$ from (1.2) and (1.3), and hence of $g_{0}$ from (4.1), becomes difficult for these values of $p$. When $n$ is large, we could, however, use the following approximation for $f_{p, n}$ :

$$
\gamma p^{-1} f_{\tau}\left(\gamma x^{1 / p}\right) x^{1 / p-1}
$$

where $f_{\tau} \equiv f_{1, \tau}$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma=p\left\{1-\frac{1}{2}(n+1)^{-1}(p-1)(p-2)\right\}^{1 / p} \\
& \tau=p(n-p+1)
\end{aligned}
$$

which is, of course, exact for $p=1$ and $p=2$ (Anderson (1984), p. 265).
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