CHAPTER II :

ON NECESSARY BEST ESTIMATOR

2.0 SUMMARY

In this chapter we consider the concept of NBE of various orders as introduced by Prabhu-Ajgaonkar [12] and defined in definition 1.2.5. We simplify the proof of Prabhu-Ajgaonkar for NBE of order 1 and also correct his assertion regarding NBE of order 2.

2.1 <u>NBE OF ORDER</u> 1

While introducing the concept of NBE, Prabhu--Ajgaonkar [12], proved that a NBE of order 1 exists and it coincides with the Horvitz-Thompson estimator given by

$$T(s,\underline{Y}) = \sum_{i \in s} [Y_i/\pi_i] \text{ where } \pi_i = \sum_{s > i} p(s) \text{ is the}$$

inclusion probability for unit i.

His original proof involves complicated notation. We give below a simpler proof for the same.

Let $t(s, \underline{Y})$ be a linear estimator of the population

total for the finite population $\mathcal{U} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Then $t(s, \underline{Y})$ has the form (1.2.6). Also $t(s, \underline{Y})$ is unbiased for \underline{Y} if, and only if

$$\sum_{s i=1}^{n} b(s,i) p(s) = 1, \quad i=1,2,...,N. \quad ...(2.1.1)$$

Further the variance of t(s, Y) is given by (1.2.10).

Then NBE of order 1 can be obtained by choosing the coefficients b(s,i) in (1.2.6) by minimising (1.2.10), subject to conditions (2.1.1), at those values of \underline{Y} for which exactly one \underline{Y}_i is non-zero. For this we consider

Here the h_i are Lagrange's multipliers. Differentiating (2.1.2) with respect to b(s,i) and equating the derivative to zero, we get

$$b(s,i) Y_{i}^{2} p(s) = \lambda_{i} p(s). \qquad \dots (2.1.3)$$

Since $p(s) > 0$,
 $b(s,i) = \lambda_{i} / Y_{i}^{2}. \qquad \dots (2.1.4)$

Thus it is clear from (2.1.4) that, for $s \in S$, the coefficient b(s,i) depends only upon i and not on the sample.

Now from (2.1.1) one can see that $b(s,i) = \frac{1}{\overline{n_i}}$. This completes the proof.

2.2 NBE OF ORDER 2

We now prove here that NBE of Order 2 and higher do not exist for a non-unicluster design. This contradicts a result of Prabhu-Ajgaonkar [12].

To get NBE of Order 2, the coefficients b(s,i) in (1.2.6) have to be obtained by minimising (1.2.10), subject to conditions (2.1.1), at those Y for which exactly two Y_i 's are non zero. We show that this procedure leads to a $t(s, \underline{Y})$ for which b(s,i) depends on i and not on s. We next show that this condition leads to a contradiction.

Choose s_1 , s_2 in S such that $s_1 \neq s_2$ and a unit is $s_1 \cap s_2$. This is possible because the design is non-unicluster. We may assume that some unit jes₁ but $j \not s_2$. Let \underline{Y} be such that only Y_1 and Y_j are non-zero. To minimise (1.2.10) subject to conditions (2.1.1) we consider

$$\begin{split} & \not \beta = \operatorname{Var} \left[\operatorname{t}(\mathbf{s},\underline{Y}) \right] - 2 \lambda_{\mathbf{i}} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \ni \mathbf{i}} \operatorname{b}(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{i}) \ \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) - 2 \lambda_{\mathbf{j}} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \ni \mathbf{j}} \operatorname{b}(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{j}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) \\ & \dots (2.2.1) \end{split} \\ & \text{where } \lambda_{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda_{\mathbf{j}} \quad \text{are Lagrange's multipliers.} \end{aligned}$$
Differentiating (2.2.1) with respect to $\operatorname{b}(\mathbf{s}_{1},\mathbf{i})$ and $\operatorname{b}(\mathbf{s}_{2},\mathbf{i})$ and equating the results to zero, we get

$$Y_{i}^{2}b(s_{1},i) p(s_{1}) + Y_{i}Y_{j}b(s_{1},j)p(s_{1}) = \lambda_{i}p(s_{1}) \dots (2.2.2)$$

and $Y_{i}^{2}b(s_{2},i) p(s_{2}) = \lambda_{i}p(s_{2}) \dots (2.2.3)$

Since $p(s_1)$ and $p(s_2)$ are positive, we get

$$b(s_1,i) Y_1^2 + b(s_1,j) Y_1 Y_j = \lambda_1 \qquad \dots (2.2.4)$$

and

$$b(s_2,i) Y_1^2 = \lambda_i$$
(2.2.5)

From (2.2.4) and (2.2.5), we get

$$[b(s_1,i)-b(s_2,i)] Y_i^2 + b(s_1,j) Y_iY_j = 0.$$
 ...(2.2.6)

Since (2.2.6) holds for all Y_i, Y_j , we must have

$$b(s_1,i) = b(s_2,i)$$
 and $b(s_1,j) = 0$.

Thus on the one hand b(s,i) depends only on i; but on other hand $b(s_1,j) = 0$. This shows that b(s,j) = 0 for all $s \neq j$.

This contradicts the unbiasedness of $t(s, \underline{Y})$. This contradiction proves that a NBE of Order 2 does not exist.

<u>Example</u>: Suppose that we take simple random samples of size 2 from a population of size 3. Then the samples with positive probabilities are $s_1 = \{1,2\}$; $s_2 = \{2,3\}$ and $s_3 = \{1,3\}$.

Let T_1 be the HT estimator. Then $E(T_1^2) = \frac{3}{4} \{ (Y_1 + Y_2)^2 + (Y_2 + Y_3)^2 + (Y_3 + Y_1)^2 \}$ $= \frac{3}{2} \{ Y_1^2 + Y_2^2 + Y_3^2 + Y_1Y_2 + Y_2Y_3 + Y_3Y_1 \}$

.

Consider the estimator T₂ for which

$$T_2(s_1, Y) = T_2(s_3, Y) = \frac{3}{2} Y_1$$
 and
 $T_2(s_2, Y) = 3(Y_2 + Y_3).$

Then

$$E(T_2^2) = \frac{3}{2} Y_1^2 + 3(Y_2 + Y_3)^2$$

= $\frac{3}{2} Y_1^2 + 3Y_2^2 + 3Y_3^2 + 6Y_2Y_3$.

Hence

....

$$\operatorname{Var}(\mathbf{T}_2) - \operatorname{Var}(\mathbf{T}_1) = \underbrace{\mathbf{Y}}_{\mathcal{H}} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{Y}}_{\mathcal{H}}$$

14

ļ

· ' ·

	,	Γο	-3/4	-3/4
, where	A =	-3/4	3/2	9/4
		-3/4	9/4	3/2 .

-

.

-

.

,

The leading 2 x 2 principal minor of A is negative. Thus T_1 is not a NBE of Order 2.

,

, 6

ι,