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#### Abstract

This paper is devoted to the linear admissible estimate and admissible estimate in the class of homogeneous estimates. For Gauss-Markov model, a necessary and sufficient condition for admissible estimation is proposed when variance is positive. © 2007 World Academic Press, UK. All rights reserved.
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## 1. Introduction

For the sake of convenience, throughout the paper, we will use the following notations: $A$ is an $m \times n$ matrix, $A^{\prime}$ is a transpose of $A$; if an $n \times n$ matrix $A$ is nonsingular, $A^{-1}$ and $\operatorname{tr}(A)$ denotes its inversion matrix and trace respectively; $I_{n}$ is an $n \times n$ unit matrix; $\mu(A)$ is a linear metric space by column vector of $A$. Let us consider Gauss-Markov model

$$
\begin{equation*}
H: Y=X \beta+\varepsilon, E(\varepsilon)=0, \operatorname{Var}(\varepsilon)=\sigma^{2} V, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Y$ is an $n$-dimension observable random vector, $X$ is an $n \times p$ design matrix, $\beta$ is one unknown $p$-dimension parameter vector; $\varepsilon$ is a $n$-dimensional random vector, where $V \geq 0$ is known, $\sigma^{2}>0$ is an unknown parameters. Already homogeneous linear estimates for regression coefficients almost are obtained in a linear model. Rao [1] proposeed a matrix loss function; the loss function with $V>0$ has been obtained in [2]. The linear minimax estimators under quadratic loss function were developed in [3-5]. Although some interesting results have been obtained, they are not satisfactory enough. In this paper, the proposed loss function is different in denominator; it has the minimax admissibility characterization under the linear model $H: Y=X \beta+\varepsilon, \varepsilon \sim N\left(0, \sigma^{2} V\right)$ the quadratic loss function:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, \mathbf{d}\right)=\frac{(d-S \beta)^{\prime}(d-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}, \quad R\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, \mathbf{d}\right)=\frac{E\left\{(d-S \beta)^{\prime}(d-S \beta)\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}, \quad T=X^{\prime} V^{-1} X(V>0) . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $V>0$, we want to get a necessary and sufficient condition which is given for a linear admissible estimate and admissible estimate in the class of homogeneous estimates.

## 2 Some Lemmas

The following lemmas are necessary for the proof of our results. In the model (1.2) the quadratic loss function without the denominator has been discussed. So we do not describe it.

Definition 2.1. $A Y$ is said to be identically superior to $B Y$ in the linear model $H$ if random variable $\left(\beta, \sigma^{2}\right)$ satisfies

$$
R\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, A Y\right) \leq R\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, B Y\right)
$$

and there exists at least $\left(\beta, \sigma^{2}\right)$ such that the above inequality happens to be strict one. $A Y$ is said to be admissible characterization estimate of $S \beta$ if there are no estimates which are identically superior to $A Y$ in the linear model $H$.

Lemma 2.1 Let $H$ be a linear model, $L$ a $k \times n$ matrix, and $L Y$ an estimate of $S \beta$. For any random parameter vector $\beta \in R^{p}$ and $\sigma^{2}>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L Y-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \geq \frac{E(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)^{\prime}(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, (2.1) happens to be equality if and only if one of the following conditions holds:
(1) $L=L X T^{-} X V^{-1}$,
(2) $\mu\left(V L^{\prime}\right) \subset \mu(X)$.

Proof. By deducing, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E(L X \bar{\beta})=E L Y=L X \beta, \quad E\left(Y^{\prime} Y^{\prime}\right)=\sigma^{2} V+X \beta \beta^{\prime} X, \\
& E(L Y-L X \bar{\beta})^{\prime}(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)=\frac{\operatorname{tr}\left\{E(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)(L Y-L X \bar{\beta})^{\prime}\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\operatorname{tr}\left\{E L X \bar{\beta}(L Y-L X \bar{\beta})^{\prime}\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, we get a quadratic loss function:

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, L Y\right) & =\frac{E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L Y-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L Y-S \beta)+E(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)^{\prime}(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \\
& \geq \frac{E(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)^{\prime}(L X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above formula, the equality holds if and only if

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{E(L Y-L X \bar{\beta})^{\prime}(L Y-L X \bar{\beta})}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} & =\frac{\operatorname{tr}\left\{E(L Y-L X \bar{\beta})(L Y-L X \bar{\beta})^{\prime}\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \\
& =\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left\{L\left(I-X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}\right) V\left(I-X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1} L^{\prime}\right)\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

It is evident that, the above formula holds if and only if $L\left(I-X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}\right) V=0$, which is equivalent to $L=L X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}$.
"(1) $\Leftrightarrow(2)$ ". By virtue of $V L^{\prime}=X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}$, it is easy to obtain $\mu\left(V L^{\prime}\right) \subset \mu(X)$. On the other hand, if $\mu\left(V L^{\prime}\right) \subset \mu(X)$, there exists a matrix $M$ such that $V L^{\prime}=X M$. Therefore, we have

$$
L X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}=(L V) V^{-1} X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}=M^{\prime} X^{\prime} V^{-1} X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}=M^{\prime} X^{\prime} V^{-1}=L V V^{-1}=L
$$

Thus, the proof of the lemma is complete.
Lemma 2.2 If the matrix $A$ is not symmetrical, then there exists an orthogonal matrix $P$ such thattr $(P A)>\operatorname{tr}(A)$.
Proof. Suppose $A$ is a $2 \times 2$ matrix, denoted by $A=\left(\begin{array}{ll}a & c \\ d & b\end{array}\right)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $c>d$. Then, we can take an orthogonal matrix ${ }_{P_{c}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}1-\varepsilon & -g \\ g & 1-\varepsilon\end{array}\right)$, where $\varepsilon>0$ is small enough, and we let $g=\sqrt{2 \varepsilon-\varepsilon^{2}}$. Thus, it is obtained that

$$
\operatorname{tr}\left(P_{\varepsilon} A\right)>\operatorname{tr}(A)=\varepsilon(a+b)+g(c-d)
$$

Because $c>d, g>0$ and $\varepsilon>0$ small enough, it follows that

$$
\operatorname{tr}\left(P_{a} A\right)>\operatorname{tr}(A) .
$$

On the other hand, when $d>c$, we let $g=-\sqrt{2 \varepsilon-\varepsilon^{2}}$. By mathematical induction, we suppose that the conclusion of the lemma holds when matrix $A$ is $(n-1) \times(n-1)$ matrix. Now we suppose $A$ is a $n \times n$ matrix. Because $A$ is asymmetrical, it must have an $(n-1) \times(n-1)$ main submatrix. We may suppose $A$ has the form $A=\left(\begin{array}{ll}A_{n-1} & b \\ d & c\end{array}\right)$. As $A_{n-1}$ is asymmetrical, by the assumption, we have $(n-1) \times(n-1)$ orthogonal matrix $P_{n-1}$, which satisfies $\operatorname{tr}\left(P_{n-1} A_{n-1}\right)>\operatorname{tr}\left(A_{n-1}\right)$.

Now we assume $P=\left(\begin{array}{cc}P_{m-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right)$. It is easy to see that $P$ is an orthogonal matrix. As a consequence,

$$
\operatorname{tr}(P A)=\operatorname{tr}\left(P_{n-1} A_{n-1}\right)+c>\operatorname{tr}\left(A_{n-1}\right)+c=\operatorname{tr}(A) .
$$

Lemma 2.3 Under the model $H$, if $L Y \sim S \beta$ holds, then to any $1 \times k$ matrix $K$, the following relation holds:

$$
K L Y \sim K S \beta
$$

The lemma has been proved in $[3,5]$.
Lemma 2.4 Supposes $w \in R^{p}, t \in R^{n}$ under model $H$, the $w^{\prime} \beta$ linearity be estimated, then $t^{\prime} Y \sim w^{\prime} \beta$ essential condition is:
(1) $t^{\prime}=t^{\prime} X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}$,
(2) $t^{\prime} X T^{-} X^{\prime} t \leq t^{\prime} X T^{-} w$.

Proof. (1) It is easy to get the result by applying Lemma 2.1. Now we prove (2).
As $\beta \in R^{p}$, thus as the assumed the risk of $w^{\prime} \beta, t^{\prime} Y$ is

$$
R\left(w^{\prime} \beta, \sigma^{2}, t^{\prime} Y\right)=\frac{E\left(t^{\prime} Y-w^{\prime} \beta\right)^{2}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} t^{\prime} V t+\left[\beta^{\prime}\left(X^{\prime} t-w\right)\right]^{2}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} .
$$

Let $t^{\prime}=b t^{\prime} X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}-(1-b) w^{\prime} T^{-} V^{-1}$, and $b \in(0,1)$. Thus $t^{\prime}$ satisfies (2.2) and as the assumed risk of $w^{\prime} \beta, t^{\prime} Y$ is sign to the following equation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(w^{\prime} \beta, \sigma^{2}, t^{\prime} Y\right)^{2} & =\frac{E\left(t t^{\prime} Y-w^{\prime} \beta\right)^{2}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} t^{\prime} V t+\left[\beta^{\prime}\left(X^{\prime} t-w\right)\right]^{2}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \\
& =\frac{\sigma^{2}\left(b t^{\prime} X+(1-b) w^{\prime}\right) T^{-}\left(b X^{\prime} t+(1-b) w\right)+b^{2}\left(\beta\left(X^{\prime} t-w\right)\right)^{2}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If there is $t^{\prime} Y \sim w^{\prime} \beta$, it is sufficient to show the relations

$$
t^{\prime} V t \leq\left[b t^{\prime} X+(1-b) w\right] T^{-}[b X t+(1-b) w], \text { for any } b \in(0,1) .
$$

This means when $t$ satisfies (1), thus we can obtain the inequality like

$$
(1-b)^{2} t^{\prime} X T^{-} X^{\prime} t \leq(1-b)^{2} w^{\prime} T^{-} w^{\prime}+2 b(1-b)^{2} t^{\prime} X T^{-} w^{\prime} .
$$

Let both sides of the inequality above divide $(1-b)^{2}$, at the same time $b \uparrow 1$. Then we get

$$
t^{\prime} X T^{-} X^{\prime} t \leq t^{\prime} X T^{-} w
$$

As a result, (2) is proved.

## 3 The admissible characteristic in the linear model $H$

Theorem 3.1 Let $L$ and $S$ be two $k \times n, k \times p$ constant matrixes. We suppose that $S \beta$ is linearly estimable in the model $H . L Y$ is the permissible estimate of $S \beta$ in the linear model $H$ if and only if:
(1) $L=L X T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}$,
(2) $L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime} \leq L X T^{-} S^{\prime}$.

Proof. "Necessity" From Lemma 2.1, (1) is proved immediately. From Lemma 2.3 and the condition $L Y \sim S \beta$, we know that for any $k$ dimensional constant vector $t$ which satisfies $t^{\prime} L Y \sim t^{\prime} S \beta$. Thus, from Lemma 2.4, for any $t \in R^{k}$, we obtain

$$
t^{\prime} L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime} t \leq t^{\prime} L X T^{-} S^{\prime} t
$$

In order to prove (2), it is necessary to prove that $L X T^{-} S^{\prime}$ is symmetrical.
By contraditon, we assume $L X T^{-} S^{\prime}$ is asymmetric, and then $(S-L X) T^{-} S^{\prime}$ is asymmetric. From Lemma 2.2 , there exists an orthogonal matrix $P$ which satisfies

$$
\operatorname{tr}\left(P(S-L X) T^{-} S^{\prime}\right)>\operatorname{tr}\left((S-L X) T^{-} S^{\prime}\right)
$$

Let $M=(S-P(S-L X)) T^{-} X^{\prime} V^{-1}$. By deducing, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, M Y\right) & =\frac{E(M Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(M Y-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left(M V M^{\prime}\right)+\beta^{\prime}(M X-S)^{\prime}(M X-S) \beta}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \\
& =\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left\{S T^{-} S^{\prime}+(S-L X) T^{-}(S-L X)^{\prime}-2 P(S-L X) T^{-} S^{\prime}\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}+\frac{\beta^{\prime}(M X-S)^{\prime}(M X-S) \beta}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \\
& <\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left\{S T^{-} S^{\prime}+(S-L X) T^{-}(S-L X)-2(S-L X) T^{-} S^{\prime}\right\}+\beta^{\prime}(M X-S)^{\prime}(M X-S) \beta}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
=\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left(L V L^{\prime}\right)+\beta^{\prime}(L X-S)^{\prime}(L X-S) \beta}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L Y-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=R\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, L Y\right)
$$

And it conflicts to $L Y \sim S \beta$, so $L X T^{-} S^{\prime}$ is symmetric.
"Sufficiency". $M$ is an arbitrary $k \times n$ constant matrix, and from Lemma 2.1, it is necessary to prove $M X \bar{\beta}$ is no way superior to $L Y$ which will be discussed under two different conditions. Above all, let's give two equalities as follows:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L Y-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{trLVL^{\prime }}+\beta^{\prime}(L X-S)^{\prime}(L X-S) \beta}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr} L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}(L X-S)^{\prime}(L X-S) \beta}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}  \tag{3.1}\\
\frac{E(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)^{\prime}(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr} M X T^{-} X^{\prime} M^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}(M X-S)^{\prime}(M X-S) \beta}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} . \tag{3.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

In the first step we consider the case $L X=S$.
(1) When $M X=S$, it is not hard to see that

$$
R\left(S \beta, \sigma^{2}, L Y\right)=\frac{E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L X-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{E(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)^{\prime}(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} t r S T^{-} S^{\prime}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}
$$

Evidently, $M X \bar{\beta}$ is impossibly superior to $L Y$.
(2) If $M X \neq S$, then from (3.1), (3.2) we can obtain the result below by selecting a proper $\beta$ :

$$
\frac{E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L Y-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}<\frac{E(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)^{\prime}(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}
$$

So, $M X \bar{\beta}$ is impossibly superior to $L Y$.
Next we discuss the case $L X \neq S$.
(1) In case of $M X=S$. Let $\beta=0$. Then from (3.1) and (3.2), we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{E(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)^{\prime}(M X \bar{\beta}-S \beta)-E(L Y-S \beta)^{\prime}(L Y-S \beta)}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta}=\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left\{M X T^{-} X^{\prime} M^{\prime}\right\}-\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left\{L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \\
& =\frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left\{(L X-S) T^{-}(L X-S)^{\prime}+2 L X T^{-} S^{\prime}-2 L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \geq \frac{\sigma^{2} \operatorname{tr}(L X-S) T^{-}(L X-S)^{\prime}}{\sigma^{2}+\beta^{\prime} T \beta} \geq 0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $M X \bar{\beta}$ is impossibly superior to $L Y$.
(2) Now we check the reverse conclusion $M X \neq S$. When $M X=L X$, from (3.1) and (3.2), it is easy to verify that $L Y$ has the same risk as $M X \bar{\beta}$, so $M X \bar{\beta}$ is impossibly superior to $L Y$. On the other hand, $M X \neq L X$. If $M X \bar{\beta}$ superior to $L Y$, then one has that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{tr} M X T^{-} X^{\prime} M^{\prime} \leq \operatorname{tr} L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
(M X-S)^{\prime}(M X-S) \leq(L X-S)^{\prime}(L X-S) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

And at least one of (3.3) and (3.4) is not true. From (3.4), it is sufficient to show that $\mu\left((M X-S)^{\prime}\right) \subset \mu\left((L X-S)^{\prime}\right)$. That is to say,

$$
(M X-S)^{\prime}=(M X-S)^{\prime}(L X-S)(L X-S)^{\prime}+(L X-S)(M S-S)^{\prime}
$$

Taking

$$
F=(L X-S)(L X-S)^{\prime}+(L X-S)(M S-S)^{\prime}
$$

then there exists the equation

$$
(M X-S)^{\prime}=(L X-S) F
$$

Thus from (3.4), it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F F^{\prime} \leq(L X-S)(L X-S)^{\prime}+(L X-S)(L X-S)^{\prime} \leq I \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, from (3.5), we can find it as follows,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{tr}\left\{M X T^{-} X^{\prime} M^{\prime}\right\}-\operatorname{tr}\left\{L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\} \\
& =\operatorname{tr}\left\{\left(F^{\prime} L X+\left(I-F^{\prime}\right) S\right) T^{-}\left(X^{\prime} L^{\prime} F+S^{\prime}(I-F)\right)-L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\} \\
& =\operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)\left(I-F^{\prime}\right)\right\} S T^{-} S^{\prime}+2 F(I-F) S T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}+F F^{\prime} L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}-L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime} \\
& =\operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)\left(I-F^{\prime}\right) S T^{-} S^{\prime}+2 F(I-F) S T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}-\left(I-F F^{\prime}\right) L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\} \\
& =\operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)\left(I-F^{\prime}\right) S T^{-} S^{\prime}+2 F(I-F) S T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}-\left(I-F F^{\prime}\right) L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\} \\
& \geq \operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)\left(I-F^{\prime}\right) S T^{-} S^{\prime}-2(I-F) S T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}+\left(I-F F^{\prime}\right) L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\} \\
& =\operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)\left(I-F^{\prime}\right) S T^{-} S^{\prime}-\left(I-F-F+F F^{\prime}\right) S T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\} \\
& =\operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)\left(S T^{-} S^{\prime}-S T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right)\left(I-F^{\prime}\right)\right\} \\
& \left.=\operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)(L X-S) T^{-}(L X-S)+(S-L X) T^{-} X L\right)(I-F)\right\} \\
& \geq \operatorname{tr}\left\{(I-F)(L X-S) T^{-}(L X-S)^{\prime}(I-F)\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that

$$
(L X-S)^{\prime}(I-F)=(L X-S)-(M X-S)=L X-M X \neq 0
$$

Therefore, we have

$$
\operatorname{tr}\left\{M X T^{-} X^{\prime} M^{\prime}\right\}>\operatorname{tr}\left\{L X T^{-} X^{\prime} L^{\prime}\right\}
$$

This contradicts to (3.3). Thus the sufficiency is proved.
Based on the theorem 3.1, a necessary and sufficient condition for admissible estimation has been accomplished when variance is positive.
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