

ADMISSIBLE ESTIMATES IN THE IMPORTANT CLASS OF ESTIMATES OF THE COVARIANCE MATRIX**

XIE MINYU*

Abstract

Let $X_1, \dots, X_N$ (where $N > m$) be independent $N_m(\mu, \Sigma)$ random vectors, and put

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \quad \text{and} \quad T'T = A = \sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})',$$

where T is upper-triangular with positive diagonal elements. The author considers the problem of estimating Σ , and restricts his attention to the class of estimates $\mathbb{D} = \{T'\Delta^*T + Nb^*\bar{X}\bar{X}': \Delta^*$ is any diagonal matrix and b^* is any nonnegative constant} because it has the following attractive features:

- (a) Its elements are all quadratic forms of the sufficient and complete statistics $(\bar{X}, T)$.
- (b) It contains all estimates of the form $aA + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$ ($a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$), which construct a complete subclass of the class of nonnegative quadratic estimates $\mathbb{D}^* = \{X'BX : B \geq 0\}$ (where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)'$) for any strict convex loss function.
- (c) It contains all invariant estimates under the transformation group of upper-triangular matrices.

The author obtains the characteristics for an estimate of the form

$$T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}' \quad (\Delta = \text{diag}\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b \geq 0)$$

of Σ to be admissible in $\mathbb{D}$ when the loss function is chosen as $\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}\hat{\Sigma} - I)^2$, and shows, by an example, that $aA + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$ ($a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$) is admissible in $\mathbb{D}^*$ can not imply its admissibility in $\mathbb{D}$.

Keywords Covariance matrix, Admissible estimate, Bartlett's decomposition.

1991 MR Subject Classification 62C15, 62H12.

Let $X_1, \dots, X_N$ be independent $N_m(\mu, \Sigma)$ random vectors, where $N > m$, $\mu \in R^m$ and $\Sigma > 0$ are parameters, and put

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \quad \text{and} \quad T'T = A = \sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})',$$

where T is the Bartlett's decomposition of A , that is, T is upper-triangular with positive diagonal elements. In this paper, we consider the problem of admissibility of the estimate

Manuscript received July 6, 1992. Revised July 9, 1993.

*Department of Mathematics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430070, China.

**Project supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China

of the form $T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$ (where $\Delta = \text{diag}\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\} \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$) on Σ using the loss function

$$L(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma}) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}\hat{\Sigma} - I)^2, \quad (1)$$

considered by Olkim and Selliah^[1] and Haff^[2], and restrict our attention to the class of estimates $\mathbb{D} = \{T'\Delta^*T + Nb^*\bar{X}\bar{X}' : \Delta^*$ is any diagonal matrix and b^* is any nonnegative constant $\}$.

The class of estimates $\mathbb{D}$ has the following attractive features:

- (a) Any element in $\mathbb{D}$ is a quadratic form of the sufficient and complete statistics $(\bar{X}, T)$.
- (b) $\mathbb{D}$ contains all estimates of the form $aA + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$ (where a and b are nonnegative constants), and the latter constructs a complete subclass of the class of nonnegative quadratic estimates $\mathbb{D}^* = \{X'BX : B \geq 0\}$ (where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)'$) for any strict convex loss function $L_1(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma})$.

It is clear that $\mathbb{D}$ contains all estimates of the form $aA + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$. What remains is only to show that the latter constructs a complete subclass of $\mathbb{D}^*$. For this purpose, let

$$Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_N)' = HX,$$

where H is an orthogonal matrix with the first row

$$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right).$$

Then $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_N$ are independent,

$$Z_1 \sim N(\sqrt{N}\mu, \Sigma), \quad Z_k \sim N(0, \Sigma), \quad k = 2, \dots, N,$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}Z_1, \quad A = \sum_{k=2}^N Z_k Z_k',$$

$$E(Z_1 Z_1' | \bar{X}, A) = N\bar{X}\bar{X}' \quad \text{and} \quad E(Z_k Z_k' | \bar{X}, A) = \frac{1}{N-1}A, \quad k = 2, \dots, N. \quad (2)$$

Now write $C = (c_{ij})_{N \times N} = H B H' \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{(\mu, \Sigma)}[L_1(\Sigma, X' B X)] \\ &= E_{(\mu, \Sigma)}[L_1(\Sigma, Z' C Z)] \\ &= E_{(\mu, \Sigma)}\{E[L_1(\Sigma, Z' C Z) | \bar{X}, A]\} \\ &\geq E_{(\mu, \Sigma)}\{L_1[\Sigma, E(Z' C Z | \bar{X}, A)]\} \quad (\text{by Jensen's inequality}) \\ &= E_{(\mu, \Sigma)}[L_1(\Sigma, aA + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}')] \quad (\text{by (2)}) \end{aligned}$$

for every (μ, Σ) , and a necessary and sufficient condition under which the above equality holds for every (μ, Σ) is that $X' B X = aA + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$, where $b = c_{11} \geq 0$ and

$$a = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k=2}^N c_{kk} \geq 0.$$

- (c) $\mathbb{D}$ contains all invariant estimates $\Phi(A)$ under the transformation group of upper-triangular matrices Q , that is,

$$\Phi(Q' A Q) = Q' \Phi(A) Q \quad (3)$$

for all upper-triangular matrices Q .

To show (c), let $A = I$ in (3). Then

$$\Phi(Q'Q) = Q'\Phi(I)Q. \quad (4)$$

Take $Q = \text{diag}\{\pm 1, \pm 1, \dots, \pm 1\}$ in (4). Then $Q'Q = I$ and (4) becomes

$$\Phi(I) = Q'\Phi(I)Q \quad (5)$$

for all such matrices Q . It follows from (5) that $\Phi(I)$ is a diagonal matrix. Now write $A = T'T$. Then

$$\Phi(A) = \Phi(T'T) = T'\Phi(I)T \in \mathbb{D},$$

namely, the proof of (c) is completed.

Now let us compute the risk function of $T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$

$$R(\mu, \Sigma, \Delta, b) = E_{(\mu, \Sigma)}\{\text{tr}[\Sigma^{-1}(T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}') - I]^2\}.$$

If we write Σ^{-1} as $\Sigma^{-1} = LL'$, where L is upper-triangular with positive diagonal elements, then

$$L(\Sigma, \hat{\Sigma}) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}\hat{\Sigma} - I)^2 = \text{tr}(L'\hat{\Sigma}L - I)^2, \quad (6)$$

$$L'\bar{X} \sim N_m(L'\mu, N^{-1}I) \quad \text{and} \quad (TL)'(TL) = L'AL \sim W_m(n, I) \quad \text{with } n=N-1. \quad (7)$$

Note that TL is upper-triangular with positive diagonal elements. Then

$$\begin{aligned} R(\mu, \Sigma, \Delta, b) &= E_{(\mu, \Sigma)}\text{tr}[(TL)'\Delta(TL) + Nb(L'\bar{X})(L'\bar{X})' - I]^2 \quad (\text{by (6)}) \\ &= R(L'\mu, I, \Delta, b) \quad (\text{by (7)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

From (8), without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Sigma = I$. Right now, from independence of T and $\bar{X}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &R(\mu, I, \Delta, b) \\ &= E\text{tr}(T'\Delta T)^2 + 2\text{tr}[E(T'\Delta T)E(Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}' - I)] + E\text{tr}(Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}' - I)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where all expectations are computed with (μ, I) . From Bartlett's decomposition theorem, the elements t_{ij} of T are all independent,

$$t_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{n-i+1}^2 \quad (1 \leq i \leq m) \quad \text{and} \quad t_{ij} \sim N(0, 1) \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq m),$$

where χ_k^2 is the random variable which has the central χ^2 distribution with k degrees of freedom. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &E\text{tr}(T'\Delta T)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i^2(n+m-2i+1)(n+m-2i+3) + \sum_{i < j} \delta_i \delta_j (n+m-2j+1) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &E(T'\Delta T) \\ &= \text{diag}\{\delta_1 n, \delta_1 + \delta_2(n-1), \dots, \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_{m-1} + \delta_m(n-m+1)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Since $\sqrt{N}\bar{X} \sim N_m(\sqrt{N}\mu, I)$, we have

$$E(Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}' - I) = b(I + N\mu\mu') - I = Nb\mu\mu' - (1-b)I \quad (12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & E\text{tr}(Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}' - I)^2 \\ &= b^2 E[\chi_m^2(N\|\mu\|^2)]^2 - 2bE[\chi_m^2(N\|\mu\|^2)] + m \\ &= b^2[(m + N\|\mu\|^2)^2 + 2m + 4N\|\mu\|^2] - 2b(m + N\|\mu\|^2) + m, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\chi_m^2(N\|\mu\|^2)$ is the random variable which has the noncentral χ^2 distribution with m degrees of freedom and noncentral parameter $N\|\mu\|^2$. Putting

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m)', \quad \beta = N(\mu_1^2, \dots, \mu_m^2)', \\ h &= (n + m - 1, \dots, n + m - 2k + 1, \dots, n - m + 1)', \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$B = (b_{ij})_{m \times m} \quad \text{and} \quad C = (c_{ij})_{m \times m}, \quad (15)$$

where μ_k is the k -th element of μ ,

$$b_{ij} = \begin{cases} (n + m - 2j + 1), & i < j, \\ (n + m - 2j + 1)(n + m - 2j + 3), & i = j, \\ (n + m - 2i + 1), & i > j, \end{cases}$$

and

$$c_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & i < j, \\ (n - i + 1), & i = j, \\ 0, & i > j, \end{cases}$$

and substituting (10), (11), (12) and (13) in (9), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} R(\mu, I, \Delta, b) &= \delta' B \delta - 2(1 - b)\delta' h + m[b^2(m + 2) - 2b + 1] \\ &\quad + 2b[\delta' C + (bm + 2b - 1)\mathbf{1}']\beta + b^2(\mathbf{1}'\beta)^2 \\ &\doteq g(\beta, \delta, b), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the m -vector with all elements being 1.

If we put

$$f(t, \beta) = g[\beta, \delta + t(\delta^* - \delta), b + t(b^* - b)], 0 \leq t \leq 1, \delta^* \in R^m \text{ and } b^* \geq 0,$$

from (16), we then have

Lemma. A necessary and sufficient condition for the estimate $T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$ of Σ to be inadmissible in $\mathbb{D}$ is that there are $\delta^* \in R^m$ and $0 \leq b^* \leq b$ such that

$$f'_t(0, \beta) < 0 \quad (17)$$

for every $\beta \in R_+^m = \{\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)' : \beta_i \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, where

$$f'_t(t_0, \beta) = \left. \frac{\partial f(t, \beta)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=t_0}.$$

Proof. Necessity. Let $T'\Delta^*T + Nb^*\bar{X}\bar{X}' (\in \mathbb{D})$ beat $T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$. Then from (16),

$$g(\beta, \delta, b) \geq g(\beta, \delta^*, b^*)$$

for all $\beta \in R_+^m$ with the strict inequality for at least some β , which implies $b^* \leq b$ and

$$f(0, \beta) \geq f(1, \beta) \quad (18)$$

for all $\beta \in R_+^m$. Noting that $f(t, \beta)$ is a strict convex function of t for every $\beta \in R_+^m$, and from (18), we have (17).

Sufficiency. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f'_t(t, \beta) \\
 &= 2(\delta^* - \delta)'B[\delta + t(\delta^* - \delta)] + 2(b^* - b)[\delta + t(\delta^* - \delta)]'h \\
 &\quad - 2[1 - b - t(b^* - b)](\delta^* - \delta)'h + 2m(b^* - b)\{(m+2)[b + t(b^* - b)] - 1\} \\
 &\quad + 2(b^* - b)\{[\delta + t(\delta^* - \delta)]'C + [(b + t(b^* - b))(m+2) - 1]\mathbf{1}'\}\beta \\
 &\quad + 2[b + t(b^* - b)][(\delta^* - \delta)'C + (m+2)(b^* - b)\mathbf{1}']\beta \\
 &\quad + 2(b^* - b)[b + t(b^* - b)](\mathbf{1}'\beta)^2 \\
 &= f'_t(0, \beta) + 2t\{(\delta^* - \delta)'B(\delta^* - \delta) + 2(b^* - b)(\delta^* - \delta)'h + m(m+2)(b^* - b)^2 \\
 &\quad + 2(b^* - b)[(\delta^* - \delta)'C + (m+2)(b^* - b)\mathbf{1}']\beta + (b^* - b)^2(\mathbf{1}'\beta)^2\},
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 f'_t(0, \beta) &= 2(\delta^* - \delta)'[B\delta - (1-b)h + bC\beta] + 2(b^* - b)\{m(m+2)b \\
 &\quad - m + \delta'h + \delta'C\beta + [2(m+2)b - 1]\mathbf{1}'\beta + b(\mathbf{1}'\beta)^2\}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

When $b^* < b$, taking t_1 ($0 < t_1 < 1$) such that

$$(b^* - b)[b + t_1(b^* - b)] < 0,$$

and noting (19), we see that there is a sufficient large positive constant M such that

$$f'_t(t_1, \beta) < 0 \tag{21}$$

for all $\mathbf{1}'\beta > M$. On the other hand, from (17), (19) and the continuity of $f'_t(t, \beta)$ in the closed interval $\{(t, \beta) : 0 \leq t \leq 1, \mathbf{1}'\beta \leq M\}$, there is a sufficient small t_2 ($0 < t_2 < 1$) such that

$$f'_t(t_2, \beta) < 0 \tag{22}$$

for all $\mathbf{1}'\beta \leq M$. Now put $t_0 = \min\{t_1, t_2\}$. From (21) and (22), and noting that $f'_t(t, \beta)$ is an increasing function of t for every $\beta \in R_+^m$, we have

$$f'_t(t_0, \beta) < 0 \tag{23}$$

for every $\beta \in R_+^m$. (17) and (23) imply that

$$T'[\Delta + t_0(\Delta^* - \Delta)]T + N[b + t_0(b^* - b)]\overline{X}\overline{X}'$$

beats $T'\Delta T + Nb\overline{X}\overline{X}'$.

When $b^* = b$, (19) and (20) become

$$f'_t(t, \beta) = f'_t(0, \beta) + 2t(\delta^* - \delta)'B(\delta^* - \delta). \tag{24}$$

and

$$f'_t(0, \beta) = 2(\delta^* - \delta)'[B\delta - (1-b)h + bC\beta], \tag{25}$$

respectively. From (17) and (25), we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{\|\beta\| \rightarrow \infty} f'_t(0, \beta) < 0. \tag{26}$$

(17) and (26) imply that there is a constant $d > 0$ such that

$$f'_t(0, \beta) < -d \quad (27)$$

for all $\beta \in R_+^m$. From (24) and (27), there is a sufficient small $t_0 > 0$ such that (23) holds. So

$$T'[\Delta + t_0(\Delta^* - \Delta)]T + N[b + t_0(b^* - b)]\bar{X}\bar{X}'$$

beats $T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$.

In the light of the above statements, the proof of the Lemma is completed.

Now put

$$D = (d_1, \dots, d_m) = B\delta - (1 - b)h$$

and

$$e_k = \begin{cases} d_m, & k = m, \\ d_k - \sum_{i=k+1}^m \frac{e_i}{n-i+1}, & 1 \leq k < m. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

By using the above lemma, we can obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the estimate $T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$ of Σ to be admissible in $\mathbb{D}$, as the following result shows.

Theorem. *A necessary and sufficient condition for the estimate $T'\Delta T + Nb\bar{X}\bar{X}'$ of Σ to be admissible in $\mathbb{D}$ is that*

- (i) when $b = 0, \delta = B^{-1}h$; or
- (ii) when $b > 0$,

$$e_k \leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad (29)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & m(m+2)b^2 - mb + \delta'h - \delta'B\delta + [2(m+2)b-1][(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta] \\ & + [(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta]^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Proof. We first prove the case of $b = 0$. Right now $b^* = 0$ and $f'_t(0, \beta) = 2(\delta^* - \delta)'(B\delta - h)$ by (20). Hence $f'_t(0, \beta) \geq 0$ for all $\delta^* \in R^m$ if and only if $\delta = B^{-1}h$. From the above lemma, the proof of the case is completed.

We next consider the case of $b > 0$. From (29), we can take

$$\beta = \beta^0 = (\beta_1^0, \beta_2^0, \dots, \beta_m^0),$$

where $\beta_k^0 = -\frac{1}{b(n-k+1)}e_k \geq 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Hence,

$$B\delta - (1 - b)h + bC\beta^0 = D - D = 0 \quad (\text{by (28)}) \quad (31)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}'\beta^0 &= n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'C\beta^0 = n^{-1}b^{-1}\mathbf{1}'[(1-b)h - B\delta] \\ &= b^{-1}[(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta] \quad (\text{by (31)}). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Substituting (31) and (32) into (20), and from (30), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} f'_t(0, \beta^0) &= 2(b^* - b)\{m(m+2)b - m + \delta'h + b^{-1}\delta'[(1-b)h - B\delta] \\ &\quad + [2(m+2)b - 1]b^{-1}[(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta] + b^{-1}[(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta]^2\} \\ &= 2b^{-1}(b^* - b)\{m(m+2)b^2 - mb + \delta'h - \delta'B\delta \\ &\quad + [2(m+2)b - 1][(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta] + [(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta]^2\} \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $\delta^* \in R^m$ and all $b^* \leq b$. From the above lemma, the proof of the sufficiency of the case is completed.

Necessity. If there is a k_0 such that $e_{k_0} > 0$, taking

$$b^* = b, \quad \delta_{k_0}^* < \delta_{k_0}$$

and

$$\delta_k^* = \begin{cases} \delta_k, & k < k_0, \\ \delta_k - \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{j=k_0}^{k-1} (\delta_j^* - \delta_j), & k > k_0 \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'_t(0, \beta) &= 2(\delta^* - \delta)'[B\delta - (1-b)h + bC\beta] \quad (\text{by (20) and (33)}) \\ &= 2(\delta^* - \delta)'C\left[\left(\frac{e_1}{n}, \frac{e_2}{n-1}, \dots, \frac{e_m}{n-m+1}\right)' + b\beta\right] \quad (\text{by (31)}) \\ &= 2(\delta_{k_0}^* - \delta_{k_0})[e_{k_0} + b(n - k_0 + 1)\beta_{k_0}] \quad (\text{by (33)}) \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

for all $\beta \in R_+^m$. It follows from the above lemma that $T'\Delta T + Nb\overline{X}\overline{X}'$ is inadmissible in $\mathbb{D}$. This is contradictory to the assumption of the necessity. Hence (29) holds.

If (30) does not hold, taking $b^* < b$ and

$$\delta^* = \delta - b^{-1}(b^* - b)\{\delta + n^{-1}[2(m+2)b - 1]\mathbf{1} + 2n^{-1}[(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta]\mathbf{1}\}$$

and substituting for them in (20), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'_t(0, \beta) &= 2(b^* - b)\{m(m+2)b - m + \delta'h + \delta'C\beta + [2(m+2)b - 1]\mathbf{1}'\beta \\ &\quad + b(\mathbf{1}'\beta)^2\} - 2b^{-1}(b^* - b)\{\delta' + n^{-1}[2(m+2)b - 1]\mathbf{1}' \\ &\quad + 2n^{-1}[(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta]\mathbf{1}'\}[B\delta - (1-b)h + bC\beta] \\ &= 2b^{-1}(b^* - b)\{m(m+2)b^2 - mb + \delta'h - \delta'B\delta + [2(m+2)b - 1][(1-b)m \\ &\quad - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta] + [(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta]^2 + [(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta - b\mathbf{1}'\beta]^2\} \\ &\leq 2b^{-1}(b^* - b)\{m(m+2)b^2 - mb + \delta'h - \delta'B\delta + [2(m+2)b - 1][(1-b)m \\ &\quad - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta] + [(1-b)m - n^{-1}\mathbf{1}'B\delta]^2\} \\ &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $\beta \in R_+^m$. It follows from the above lemma that $T'\Delta T + Nb\overline{X}\overline{X}'$ is inadmissible in $\mathbb{D}$. This is contradictory to the assumption of the necessity, so (30) holds.

In the light of the above statements, the proof of the Theorem is completed.

Remark. From (b), $\mathbb{D}$ contains all estimates of the form $aA + Nb\overline{X}\overline{X}'$ ($a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$), which construct a complete subclass of $\mathbb{D}^*$. Therefore, that $aA + Nb\overline{X}\overline{X}'$ ($a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$) is admissible in $\mathbb{D}$ can imply its admissibility in $\mathbb{D}^*$. But its converse is not correct. For example, $(n+m)^{-1}A$ is admissible in $\mathbb{D}^*$ from Theorem 2 in [3], but it is inadmissible in $\mathbb{D}$ from the above theorem.

REFERENCES

- [1] Olkin, I. & Selliah, J. B., Estimating covariances in a multivariate normal distribution, in statistical decision theory and related topics (S. S. Gupta and D. S. Moore, eds) Vol.II, 313-326, Academic Press, New York, 1977.
- [2] Haff, L. R., Empirical bayes estimation of the multivariate normal covariance matrix, *Ann. Statist.*, **8**, (1980), 586-597.
- [3] Xie Minyu, Admissibility of quadratic estimators for covariance matrix under the various comparative criteria of the risk size, the collection of theses of the Fourth China-Japan Symposium on Statistics, Kunming, China, 1991, 395-398.
- [4] Muihead, R. J., Aspect of multivariate statistical theory, wiley, New York, 1982.