✓ YUAN-TSUNG CHANG¹, NOBUO SHINOZAKI²,

- ✓ YUAN-TSUNG CHANG¹, NOBUO SHINOZAKI²,
- \checkmark ¹Mejiro University, Tokyo, JAPAN.

- ✓ YUAN-TSUNG CHANG¹, NOBUO SHINOZAKI²,
- \checkmark ¹Mejiro University, Tokyo, JAPAN.
- \checkmark ²Keio University, Yokohama, JAPAN.

In many practical situations, statistical inference under restrictions on parameters is quite important.

In many practical situations, statistical inference under restrictions on parameters is quite important.

/ Most works related to statistical inference under restrictions are reviewed by Barlow et al. (1972) and Robertson and Wright (1988) and

- In many practical situations, statistical inference under restrictions on parameters is quite important.
- ✓ Most works related to statistical inference under restrictions are reviewed by Barlow et al. (1972) and Robertson and Wright (1988) and
- ✓ in recent two monographs, Silvapulle and Sen (2004) and Van Eeden (2006).

We consider the problem of estimating the ordered means of two normal distributions with unknown ordered variances.

We consider the problem of estimating the ordered means of two normal distributions with unknown ordered variances.

✓ We discuss the estimation of two ordered means, individually and/or simultaneously, under Pitman closeness criterion. The definition of Pitman closeness criterion

\checkmark Let T_1 and T_2 be two estimators of θ .

The definition of Pitman closeness criterion

✓ Let T₁ and T₂ be two estimators of θ. ✓ Then T₁ is closer to θ than T₂ (or T₁ is prefered to T₂)

The definition of Pitman closeness criterion

✓ Let T₁ and T₂ be two estimators of θ.
 ✓ Then T₁ is closer to θ than T₂ (or T₁ is prefered to T₂)
 ✓ if

 $P_r\{|T_1 - \theta| < |T_2 - \theta|\} > 1/2.$

About Pitman closeness criterion

refer the reader to Rao (1981), Keating and Manson (1985), Peddada (1985), Rao, keating and Mason (1986), Khattree and Peddada (1987) for details.

About Pitman closeness criterion

- refer the reader to Rao (1981), Keating and Manson (1985), Peddada (1985), Rao, keating and Mason (1986), Khattree and Peddada (1987) for details.
- / Many works related to Pitman's criterion were published in the special issue of Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods A20 (11) in 1992 and

About Pitman closeness criterion

- refer the reader to Rao (1981), Keating and Manson (1985), Peddada (1985), Rao, keating and Mason (1986), Khattree and Peddada (1987) for details.
- / Many works related to Pitman's criterion were published in the special issue of Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods A20 (11) in 1992 and
- ✓ were unified in the monograph by Keating, Manson and Sen (1993).

The purpose

Here we consider the estimation of two ordered normal means when unknown variances are ordered using Pitman closeness criterion.

The purpose

Here we consider the estimation of two ordered normal means when unknown variances are ordered using Pitman closeness criterion.

✓ We propose the estimators which is closer to the unknown means than the usual estimators which ignore the order restriction on variances using the modified Pitman closeness criterion suggested by Gupta and Singh (1992).

The history background

First, we state some fundamental results on the estimation of common mean and ordered means when the MSE or stochastic domination is concerned.

the unbiased estimators of μ_i and σ_i^2 ,

✓ Let X_{ij} , $i = 1, 2, j = 1, ..., n_i$ be independent observations from normal distribution with mean μ_i and variance σ_i^2 , where both μ_i and σ_i^2 are unknown.

the unbiased estimators of μ_i and σ_i^2 ,

✓ Let X_{ij} , $i = 1, 2, j = 1, ..., n_i$ be independent observations from normal distribution with mean μ_i and variance σ_i^2 , where both μ_i and σ_i^2 are unknown.

/ Also let

$$\bar{X}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} X_{ij} / n_i \text{ and } s_i^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_i)^2 / (n_i - 1)$$

be the unbiased estimators of μ_i and σ_i^2 , respectively.

Estimation of Common mean

For the common mean problem when two variances are unknown and there is no order restriction between two variances, Graybill and Deal (1959) have proposed an estimator

Estimation of Common mean

For the common mean problem when two variances are unknown and there is no order restriction between two variances, Graybill and Deal (1959) have proposed an estimator

$$\hat{\mu}^{GD} = \frac{n_1 s_2^2}{n_1 s_2^2 + n_2 s_1^2} \bar{X}_1 + \frac{n_2 s_1^2}{n_1 s_2^2 + n_2 s_1^2} \bar{X}_2$$

Estimation of Common mean

For the common mean problem when two variances are unknown and there is no order restriction between two variances, Graybill and Deal (1959) have proposed an estimator

$$\hat{\mu}^{GD} = \frac{n_1 s_2^2}{n_1 s_2^2 + n_2 s_1^2} \bar{X}_1 + \frac{n_2 s_1^2}{n_1 s_2^2 + n_2 s_1^2} \bar{X}_2$$

✓ and gave a necessary and sufficient condition on n_1 and n_2 for $\hat{\mu}^{GD}$ to have a smaller variance than both \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2 .

\checkmark For the case when it is known that $\sigma_1^2 \leq \sigma_2^2$

✓ For the case when it is known that $\sigma_1^2 \le \sigma_2^2$ ✓ Nair (1982) modified $\hat{\mu}^{GD}$ and proposed an estimator

✓ For the case when it is known that $\sigma_1^2 \le \sigma_2^2$ ✓ Nair (1982) modified $\hat{\mu}^{GD}$ and proposed an estimator

$$\hat{\mu}^{Nair} = \begin{cases} \hat{\mu}^{GD}, & \text{if } s_1^2 \leq s_2^2 \\ \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \bar{X}_1 + \frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \bar{X}_2, & \text{if } s_1^2 > s_2^2, \end{cases}$$

✓ For the case when it is known that $\sigma_1^2 \le \sigma_2^2$ ✓ Nair (1982) modified $\hat{\mu}^{GD}$ and proposed an estimator

$$\hat{\mu}^{Nair} = \begin{cases} \hat{\mu}^{GD}, & \text{if } s_1^2 \leq s_2^2 \\ \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \bar{X}_1 + \frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \bar{X}_2, & \text{if } s_1^2 > s_2^2, \end{cases}$$

 \checkmark showed that $\hat{\mu}^{Nair}$ has smaller variance than $\hat{\mu}^{GD}$.

Elfessi and Pal (1992) showed that $\hat{\mu}^{Nair}$ stochastically dominates $\hat{\mu}^{GD}$. (As for the definitions of stochastic dominance and universal dominance, see Hwang (1985).)

estimation of k normal means satisfy simple order restriction and variances are known



For the case when k normal means satisfy simple order restriction and variances are known,

A Broad Class Estimators for Two Ordered Normal Means with Ordered Variances under Pitman's Comparison - p.12/??

For the case when k normal means satisfy simple order restriction and variances are known,

Lee (1981) showed that RMLE (restricted MLE) uniformly improves upon sample means under MSE.

- / For the case when k normal means satisfy simple order restriction and variances are known,
- Lee (1981) showed that RMLE (restricted MLE) uniformly improves upon sample means under MSE.
- Kelly (1989) and Hwang and Peddada (1994)
 proved that RMLE universally dominates sample means.

estimation of 2 normal means satisfy simple order restriction and variances are unknown

✓ For the case when σ_i^2 , i = 1, 2 are unknown and two normal means satisfy the simple order restriction, $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$,

estimation of 2 normal means satisfy simple order restriction and variances are unknown

✓ For the case when σ_i^2 , i = 1, 2 are unknown and two normal means satisfy the simple order restriction, $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$,

✓ Oono and Shinozaki (2005) proposed a truncated estimators of μ_i , i = 1, 2,

 $\hat{\mu}_1^{OS} = \min\{\bar{X}_1, \hat{\mu}^{GD}\}, \quad \hat{\mu}_2^{OS} = \max\{\bar{X}_2, \hat{\mu}^{GD}\},\$

estimation of 2 normal means satisfy simple order restriction and variances are unknown

✓ For the case when σ_i^2 , i = 1, 2 are unknown and two normal means satisfy the simple order restriction, $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$,

✓ Oono and Shinozaki (2005) proposed a truncated estimators of μ_i , i = 1, 2,

 $\hat{\mu}_1^{OS} = \min\{\bar{X}_1, \hat{\mu}^{GD}\}, \quad \hat{\mu}_2^{OS} = \max\{\bar{X}_2, \hat{\mu}^{GD}\},\$

✓ they showed that $\hat{\mu}_i^{OS}$ uniformly improves upon \bar{X}_i , if and only if the risk of $\hat{\mu}_i^{OS}$ is not larger than that of \bar{X}_i when $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. (See also Garren (2000).)

When order restrictions are given on both means and variances

When order restrictions are given on both means and variances, Chang and Shinozaki (2010) have considered the estimators based on the estimators given by Oono and Shinozaki (2005) as follow:

When order restrictions are given on both means and variances

$$\hat{\mu}_{1}^{CS} = \begin{cases} \hat{\mu}_{1}^{OS}, & \text{if } s_{1}^{2} \leq s_{2}^{2} \\ \min\{\bar{X}_{1}, \frac{n_{1}}{n_{1}+n_{2}}\bar{X}_{1} + \frac{n_{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}}\bar{X}_{2}\}, & \text{if } s_{1}^{2} > s_{2}^{2}. \end{cases}$$
$$\hat{\mu}_{1}^{CS} = \begin{cases} \hat{\mu}_{1}^{OS}, & \text{if } s_{1}^{2} \leq s_{2}^{2} \\ \min\{\bar{X}_{1}, \frac{n_{1}}{n_{1}+n_{2}}\bar{X}_{1} + \frac{n_{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}}\bar{X}_{2}\}, & \text{if } s_{1}^{2} > s_{2}^{2}. \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{2}^{CS} = \begin{cases} \hat{\mu}_{2}^{OS}, & \text{if } s_{1}^{2} \leq s_{2}^{2} \\ \max\{\bar{X}_{2}, \frac{n_{1}}{n_{1}+n_{2}}\bar{X}_{1} + \frac{n_{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}}\bar{X}_{2}\}, & \text{if } s_{1}^{2} \geq s_{2}^{2}. \end{cases}$$



When order restrictions are given on both means and variances

\checkmark They showed that $\hat{\mu}_2^{CS}$ stochastic dominates $\hat{\mu}_2^{OS}$,

✓ They showed that µ^{CS}₂ stochastic dominates µ^{OS}₂,
 ✓ but µ^{CS}₁ does not improve µ^{OS}₁ even in term of MSE.

- ✓ They showed that µ̂^{CS}₂ stochastic dominates µ̂^{OS}₂,
 ✓ but µ̂^{CS}₁ does not improve µ̂^{OS}₁ even in term of MSE.
- ✓ They also showed that $(\hat{\mu}_1^{CS}, \hat{\mu}_2^{CS})$ stochastic dominates $(\hat{\mu}_1^{OS}, \hat{\mu}_2^{OS})$ when estimating (μ_1, μ_2) , simultaneously.

- ✓ They showed that µ^{CS}₂ stochastic dominates µ^{OS}₂,
 ✓ but µ^{CS}₁ does not improve µ^{OS}₁ even in term of MSE.
- ✓ They also showed that $(\hat{\mu}_1^{CS}, \hat{\mu}_2^{CS})$ stochastic dominates $(\hat{\mu}_1^{OS}, \hat{\mu}_2^{OS})$ when estimating (μ_1, μ_2) , simultaneously.
- ✓ Shi (1994) and Ma and Shi (2002) discussed the order restricted MLE of μ_i and σ_i^2 under squared error loss.

 \checkmark Let that $\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}$, and γ^+ are functions of n_1, n_2, s_1^2 , s_2^2 , and $\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ and that $0 \leq \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \gamma^+ \leq 1$ and,

2 2 2

 \checkmark Let that $\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}$, and γ^+ are functions of n_1, n_2, s_1^2 , s_2^2 , and $\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ and that $0 \leq \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \gamma^+ \leq 1$ and,

 $\gamma^{+} = \begin{cases} \gamma, & \text{if } \gamma \geq \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2}, \\ \tilde{\gamma}, & \text{if } \gamma < \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2}. \end{cases}$

 \checkmark Let that $\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}$, and γ^+ are functions of n_1, n_2, s_1^2 , s_2^2 , and $\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ and that $0 \leq \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \gamma^+ \leq 1$ and,

$$\gamma^{+} = \begin{cases} \gamma, & \text{if } \gamma \geq \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2}, \\ \tilde{\gamma}, & \text{if } \gamma < \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2}. \end{cases}$$

Chang, Oono and Shinozaki(2011C) have considered estimators of the forms

$$\hat{u}_1(\gamma) = \min\{\bar{X}_1, \gamma \bar{X}_1 + (1-\gamma)\bar{X}_2\} \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma) = \max\{\bar{X}_2, \gamma \bar{X}_1 + (1 - \gamma) \bar{X}_2\}. \quad (1.5)$$

$$\checkmark$$
 if $\gamma = rac{n_1 s_2^2}{n_1 s_2^2 + n_2 s_2^2}$ then

$$\checkmark \text{ if } \gamma = \frac{n_1 s_2^2}{n_1 s_2^2 + n_2 s_2^2} \text{ then}$$

$$\checkmark$$

$$\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma) = \hat{\mu}_1^{OS}$$
and
$$\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma) = \hat{\mu}_2^{OS}$$

$$\checkmark \text{ if } \gamma = \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \text{ then}$$

$$\checkmark \text{ if } \gamma = \frac{n_1 s_2^2}{n_1 s_2^2 + n_2 s_2^2} \text{ then}$$

$$\checkmark \qquad \qquad \hat{\mu}_1(\gamma) = \hat{\mu}_1^{OS}$$
and
$$\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma) = \hat{\mu}_2^{OS}$$

$$\checkmark \text{ if } \gamma = \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \text{ then}$$

$$\checkmark \qquad \qquad \hat{\mu}_1(\gamma) = \hat{\mu}_1^{CS}$$
and
$$\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma) = \hat{\mu}_2^{CS}$$

Theorem Suppose that $P\{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)\} > 0$. Then $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+)$ stochastically dominates $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma)$

Theorem Suppose that $P\{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)\} > 0$. Then $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+)$ stochastically dominates $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma)$

 \checkmark if we choose $\tilde{\gamma}$ so that

$$\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \le \tilde{\gamma} \le 2\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} - \gamma, \quad \text{when } \gamma < \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2}$$
(3.2)

 $\checkmark \hat{\mu}_1(\gamma)$ has smaller MSE than $\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma^+)$ for sufficiently large $\Delta = \mu_2 - \mu_1$.

✓ Theorem Suppose that $P\{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)\} > 0$. If $\tilde{\gamma}$ is chosen to satisfy

✓ Theorem Suppose that $P{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)} > 0$. If $\tilde{\gamma}$ is chosen to satisfy

$$\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \le \tilde{\gamma} \le 2\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} - \gamma, \quad \text{when } \gamma < \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2},$$

Theorem Suppose that $P\{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)\} > 0$. If $\tilde{\gamma}$ is chosen to satisfy

$$\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \leq \tilde{\gamma} \leq 2 \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} - \gamma, \quad \text{when } \gamma < \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2},$$

/ then $(\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma^+), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+))$ dominates $(\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma))$
in the sense that

✓ Theorem Suppose that $P{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)} > 0$. If $\tilde{\gamma}$ is chosen to satisfy

$$\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \le \tilde{\gamma} \le 2\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} - \gamma, \quad \text{when } \gamma < \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2},$$

 $\checkmark \text{ then } (\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma^+), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+)) \text{ dominates } (\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma))$ in the sense that

$$P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{i}(\gamma^{+}) - \mu_{i}}{\tau_{i}}\right)^{2} \leq d\right\} \geq P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{i}(\gamma) - \mu_{i}}{\tau_{i}}\right)^{2} \leq d\right\}$$

$$P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_{i}(\gamma) - \mu_{i}}{\tau_{i}}\right)^{2} \leq d\right\}$$

Now, we state the modified Pitman's closeness criterion for estimating the ordered means.

Now, we state the modified Pitman's closeness criterion for estimating the ordered means.

For the case, when the estimators are equal with positive probability, Nayak (1990) modified Pitman's criterion as follows :

Now, we state the modified Pitman's closeness criterion for estimating the ordered means.

For the case, when the estimators are equal with positive probability, Nayak (1990) modified Pitman's criterion as follows :

 \checkmark T_1 is said to be closer to θ than T_2 if

$$P_r\{|T_1 - \theta| < |T_2 - \theta|\} > \frac{1}{2}P_r\{T_1 \neq T_2\}.$$



Motived by Nayak (1990), Gupta and Sinha (1992) defined the modified Pitman nearness (MPN) of T_1 compared to T_2 . Setting

Motived by Nayak (1990), Gupta and Sinha (1992) defined the modified Pitman nearness (MPN) of T_1 compared to T_2 . Setting

 $MPN_{\theta}(T_{1}, T_{2}) = P_{r}\{|T_{1} - \theta| < |T_{2} - \theta||T_{1} \neq T_{2}\}$ $= \frac{P_{r}\{|T_{1} - \theta| < |T_{2} - \theta|, T_{1} \neq T_{2}\}}{P_{r}\{T_{1} \neq T_{2}\}},$

Motived by Nayak (1990), Gupta and Sinha (1992) defined the modified Pitman nearness (MPN) of T_1 compared to T_2 . Setting

$$MPN_{\theta}(T_{1}, T_{2}) = P_{r}\{|T_{1} - \theta| < |T_{2} - \theta| | T_{1} \neq T_{2}\} \\ = \frac{P_{r}\{|T_{1} - \theta| < |T_{2} - \theta|, T_{1} \neq T_{2}\}}{P_{r}\{T_{1} \neq T_{2}\}},$$

 \checkmark T_1 is closer to θ than T_2 if $MPN_{\theta}(T_1, T_2) > 1/2$.



They showed that MLE of two ordered normal means with common variance,

$$\hat{\mu}_1^{GS} = \min\left\{ \bar{X}_1, \frac{n_1 X_1 + n_2 X_2}{n_1 + n_2} \right\},\$$

They showed that MLE of two ordered normal means with common variance,

$$\hat{\mu}_1^{GS} = \min\left\{\bar{X}_1, \frac{n_1 X_1 + n_2 X_2}{n_1 + n_2}\right\},\$$

$$\hat{\mu}_2^{GS} = \max\left\{\bar{X}_2, \frac{n_1 X_1 + n_2 X_2}{n_1 + n_2}\right\},\$$

are closer to respective means than \bar{X}_i , i = 1, 2, that is, $MPN_{\mu_i}(\hat{\mu}_i^{GS}, \bar{X}_i) > 1/2$, i = 1, 2.

Our results under modified Pitman's criterion

Theorem Suppose that $P\{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)\} > 0$, then the estimator $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+)$ is closer to μ_2 than $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma)$,

Our results under modified Pitman's criterion

✓ Theorem Suppose that $P\{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)\} > 0$, then the estimator $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+)$ is closer to μ_2 than $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma)$, ✓ i.e., for all $\mu_1 \le \mu_2$ and $\sigma_1^2 \le \sigma_2^2$,

 $MPN_{\mu_2}(\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma)) > 1/2,$

Our results under modified Pitman's criterion

✓ Theorem Suppose that $P\{\gamma < n_1/(n_1 + n_2)\} > 0$, then the estimator $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+)$ is closer to μ_2 than $\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma)$, ✓ i.e., for all $\mu_1 \le \mu_2$ and $\sigma_1^2 \le \sigma_2^2$, $MPN_{\mu_2}(\hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma)) > 1/2$,

 \checkmark if we choose $\tilde{\gamma}$ so that

$$\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \le \tilde{\gamma} \le 2\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} - \gamma, \quad \text{when } \gamma < \frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2}.$$

Theorem

The estimator $\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma^+)$ is not closer to μ_1 than $\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma)$ for sufficiently large Δ .

Theorem In simultaneous estimation of (μ_1, μ_2) ,

/ Theorem In simultaneous estimation of (μ_1, μ_2) ,

$$\checkmark$$
 If $\tilde{\gamma} < \frac{2n_1}{n_1+n_2} - \gamma$ then

 ✓ Theorem In simultaneous estimation of (µ₁, µ₂),
 ✓ If γ̃ < 2n₁/n₁+n₂ - γ then
 ✓ (µ̂₁(γ⁺), µ̂₂(γ⁺)) is closer to (µ₁, µ₂) than (µ̂₁(γ), µ̂₂(γ)), in the sense that

*

Theorem In simultaneous estimation of (μ_1, μ_2) , \checkmark If $\tilde{\gamma} < \frac{2n_1}{n_1 + n_2} - \gamma$ then \checkmark $(\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma^+), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma^+))$ is closer to (μ_1, μ_2) than $(\hat{\mu}_1(\gamma), \hat{\mu}_2(\gamma))$, in the sense that $MPN_{\mu}(\hat{\mu}(\gamma^+), \hat{\mu}(\gamma))$ $= \frac{P_r \{\sum_{i=1}^2 (\hat{\mu}_i(\gamma^+) - \mu_i)^2 / \tau_i^2 \le \sum_{i=1}^2 (\hat{\mu}_i(\gamma) - \mu_i)^2 / \tau_i^2, \hat{\mu}(\gamma^+) \ne \hat{\mu}(\gamma)\}}{P_r \{\hat{\mu}(\gamma^+) \ne \hat{\mu}(\gamma)\}}$ > 1/2.
Rao (1981) compared the minimum MSE and Pitman's closeness criteria and suggested that Pitman's closeness criterion could be used as an alternative criterion to compare estimators.

Rao (1981) compared the minimum MSE and
Pitman's closeness criteria and suggested that
Pitman's closeness criterion could be used as an
alternative criterion to compare estimators.

V However, Blyth (1972) pointed out the intransitivity drawback of Pitman's closeness criterion and also pointed out that there is some inconsistency among Pitman's closeness, minimum MSE, and minimum mean absolute error creiteria.

For the estimation problem of two ordered normal means with ordered variances, we have confirmed that the result obtained by using the Pitman's closeness criterion is consistent with the one obtained by using the MSE criterion.

For the estimation problem of two ordered normal means with ordered variances, we have confirmed that the result obtained by using the Pitman's closeness criterion is consistent with the one obtained by using the MSE criterion.

/ Thank you for your attention.