

Sequential Estimation of the Mean of a Class of Skewed Distributions

Mohamed Tahir¹

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a sequential procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ for estimating the mean, μ , of a class of skewed probability density functions, subject to the loss function $L_a = a^2(\hat{\mu}_t - \mu)^2 + t$, where a is a given positive number, t is a stopping time of the type proposed by Robbins (1959) and $\hat{\mu}_t$ is a bias-corrected estimator of μ . We provide a second-order asymptotic expansion, as $a \rightarrow \infty$, for the regret with respect to the loss L_a . For the Pareto and Skew-uniform distributions, the proposed sequential procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ performs better than the procedure (t, \bar{X}_t) , in the sense that it has a lower asymptotic regret. Moreover, the regret is negative for large values of a under the Gamma, Pareto, Rayleigh and Skew-uniform distributions. Using the loss considered by Chow and Yu (1981) and Martinsek (1988), we propose a bias-corrected estimator of μ and provide a second-order asymptotic expansion, as $a \rightarrow \infty$, for the incurred regret.

¹ Department of Mathematics, University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates.
E-mail: mtahir@sharjah.ac.ae

Mathematics Subject Classification: 62F10; 62L10; 62L12

Keywords: Asymptotic expansion, bias-corrected estimator, excess over the stopping boundary, loss function, regret, skewness, stopping time.

1 Introduction

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be independent random variables with common probability density function $f_\theta(x)$, where the value of θ is unknown, but lies in some interval $\Omega \subset (-\infty, \infty)$. Suppose that X_1, X_2, \dots are to be observed sequentially up to stage n at a cost of one unit per observation and that when observation is terminated, the population mean

$$\mu = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} xf_\theta(x)dx$$

is estimated by an appropriate estimator, $\hat{\mu}_n$, and the loss incurred is of the form

$$L_a(\hat{\mu}_n, \theta) = a^2(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2 + n, \quad (1)$$

where a is a known positive number, determined by the cost of estimation relative to the cost of a single observation. Robbins (1959) proposed the sequential procedure (t, \bar{X}_t) , which stops the sampling process after observing X_1, \dots, X_t and estimates μ by $\hat{\mu}_t = \bar{X}_t$, where

$$t = \inf \left\{ n \geq m_a : n > a \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2}{n}} \right\} \quad (2)$$

with m_a being a positive integer.

Let \mathcal{E} denote the class of skewed probability density functions, $f_\theta(x)$, $\theta \in \Omega$, for which the skewness is independent of θ . This class contains, among

others, the density functions of the following distributions:

1- GAMMA(α, θ): the Gamma distribution with known shape parameter α and scale parameter $\beta = \theta$. Its density function is

$$f_{\theta}(x) = \frac{1}{\theta^{\alpha} \Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} e^{-x/\theta}, x > 0 \text{ and its skewness is } \gamma = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha}}.$$

2- PARETO(α, θ): the Pareto distribution with known shape parameter $\alpha > 0$

and scale parameter $\beta = \theta$. Its density function is $f_{\theta}(x) = \frac{\alpha \theta^{\alpha}}{x^{\alpha+1}}, x \geq \theta$ and its

skewness is $\gamma = \frac{2(1+\alpha)}{\alpha-3} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha}}$ for $\alpha > 3$.

3- RAYLEIGH(θ): the Rayleigh distribution with shape parameter $\alpha = \theta$. Its

density function is $f_{\theta}(x) = \frac{x}{\theta^2} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\theta^2}}, x > 0$ and its skewness is $\gamma = \frac{2\sqrt{\pi}(\pi-3)}{(4-\pi)^{3/2}}$.

4- SKEWUNIFORM(λ, θ): the Skew-uniform distribution with known λ and

unknown θ . Its density function is $f_{\theta}(x) = \frac{1}{\theta^2} [\max\{\min\{\lambda x, \theta\}, -\theta\} + \theta]$,

for $-\theta < x < \theta$ and its skewness is $\gamma = \frac{2\lambda(5\lambda^2-9)}{5(3-\lambda^2)^{3/2}}$ for $-\sqrt{3} < \lambda < \sqrt{3}$.

In this paper, we propose a bias-corrected estimator $\hat{\mu}_t$ of μ and provide a second-order asymptotic expansion, as $a \rightarrow \infty$, for the regret $r_a(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ with respect to the loss defined by (1). It is seen that the asymptotic regret is negative for the Gamma, Pareto, Rayleigh and Skew-uniform distributions. We also provide second-order asymptotic expansion, as $a \rightarrow \infty$, for the regret with respect to the more general loss function considered by Chow and Yu (1981) and Martinsek (1988).

In the Normal case, Starr and Woodroffe (1969) showed that $r_a(t, \bar{X}_t) = O(1)$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$. Woodroffe (1977) showed that $r_a(t, \bar{X}_t) = 0.5 + o(1)$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$ if $m_a \geq 4$. For the Gamma and Poisson cases, Starr and Woodroffe (1972) and Vardi (1979) obtained bounded regret using stopping times different from the one in (2). For the distribution-free case, Ghosh and Mukhopadhyay (1979) and Chow and Yu (1981) established asymptotic risk efficiency based on (2) under certain conditions. Tahir (1989) proposed a class of bias-reduction estimators of the mean of the one-parameter exponential family and provided a second order approximation for the regret.

2 Preliminary Notes

Let t be as in (2). Martinsek (1988) indicated that

$$E[\bar{X}_t] = \mu - \frac{\gamma}{2a} + o\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) \quad (3)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, provided that $E[|X_1|^{\delta+p}] < \infty$ for some $p > 0$, where γ denotes the population skewness; that is, $\gamma = \sigma^{-3}E[(X_1 - \mu)^3]$, where σ is the population standard deviation. Thus, \bar{X}_t is an asymptotically biased estimator of μ if $f_\theta(x) \in \mathcal{E}$. Consider the bias-corrected estimator

$$\hat{\mu}_n = \bar{X}_n + \frac{\gamma}{2a} \quad (4)$$

for $n \geq 1$. Then, $E[\hat{\mu}_t] = \mu + o(1)$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$, by (3).

In order to define the regret incurred by the sequential procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ under the loss (1), we first assume that X_1, \dots, X_n have been observed sequentially up to a predetermined stage n from a population with density function $f_\theta(x) \in \mathcal{E}$. The risk incurred by estimating μ by (4), subject to the loss (1), is

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_a(n, \theta) &= E[L_a(n, \hat{\mu}_n)] \\
 &= E[a^2(\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2] + \frac{a^2\gamma}{a^2} E[(\bar{X}_n - \mu)] + \frac{\gamma^2}{4} + n \\
 &= \frac{a^2\sigma^2}{n} + \frac{\gamma^2}{4} + n,
 \end{aligned}$$

This risk is minimized with respect to n by choosing n as the greatest integer less than or equal to $n_a = a\sigma$. The minimum risk is

$$R_a^*(\theta) = R_a(n_a, \theta) = 2a\sigma + \frac{\gamma^2}{4}$$

for $a > 0$. Since σ is unknown, there is no fixed-sample-size procedure that attains the minimum risk in practice. Therefore, we propose to use the sequential procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$, where t be as in (2). The performance of this procedure is measured by its regret, which is defined below.

Definition 2.1 *The regret of the procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ under the loss (2) is defined as*

$$r_a(t, \hat{\mu}_t) = E[L_a(t, \hat{\mu}_t)] - R_a^*(\theta) = E[a^2(\hat{\mu}_t - \mu)^2 + t] - 2a\sigma - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} \tag{5}$$

for $a > 0$.

The stopping time t in (2) can be rewritten as

$$t = \inf \left\{ n \geq m_a : n \left(\frac{V_n}{n} \right)^{-1/2} > a \right\},$$

where

$$V_n = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2 \tag{6}$$

for $n \geq 1$. Let $U_a = t(V_t/t)^{-1/2} - a$ denote the excess over the stopping boundary. Chang and Hsiung (1979) showed that U_a converges in distribution to a random variable U as $a \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let t be as in (2). Then, $\frac{t}{a} \rightarrow \sigma$ w.p.1 as $a \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, If $E[|X_1|^{\delta+p}] < \infty$ for some $p > 0$, then*

$$E[t] = a + \nu - 0.5 - \frac{3}{8}\sigma^4(\kappa - 1) + o(1)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, where $\nu = E[U]$ is the asymptotic mean of the excess over the boundary and $\kappa = \sigma^{-4}E[(X_1 - \mu)^4]$ is the population kurtosis.

Proof: The first assertion follows from Lemma 1 of Chow and Robbins (1965). The second assertion is adopted from Chang and Hsiung (1979).

3 Main Results

3.1 Asymptotic regret under the loss (1)

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be as in Section 1. The following theorem provides a second-order asymptotic expansion for the regret in (5).

Theorem 3.1. Let t be defined by (2) with m_a being such that $\delta\sqrt{a} \leq m_a = o(a)$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. For any probability density function $f_\theta(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ with respect to which $E[|X_1|^{\delta+p}] < \infty$ for some $p > 0$,

$$r_a(t, \hat{\mu}_t) = 2.75 - 0.75\kappa + 2\gamma^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2} + o(1)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: Substituting (4) in (5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} r_a(t, \hat{\mu}_t) &= E[a^2(\bar{X}_t - \mu)^2 + t - 2a\sigma] + a\gamma E[(\bar{X}_t - \mu)] \\ &= r_a(t, \bar{X}_t) + a\gamma E[(\bar{X}_t - \mu)] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for $a > 0$. Moreover,

$$aE[(\bar{X}_t - \mu)] = -\gamma/2 + o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad r_a(t, \bar{X}_t) = 2.75 - 0.75\kappa + 2\gamma^2 + o(1) \quad (8)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, by (3) and Martinsek (1983). Take the limit as $a \rightarrow \infty$ in (7) and use (8) to complete the proof.

The distributions considered in Tables 1-5 in Section 4 below are positively skewed, except for the Skew-uniform distribution with $-\sqrt{3} < \lambda < -\frac{3}{\sqrt{5}}$ and Skew-Laplace distribution with $\lambda = 0.5$. For Table 1, the minimum value of ρ^* is $75/28 \approx 2.68$, which is attained when $\alpha = 49$. The tables show that

1- the sequential procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ is a clear improvement over the procedure

(t, \bar{X}_t) since its asymptotic regret is lower, except for the Skew-uniform distribution with $\lambda = -1.4$.

2- the asymptotic regret of the procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ under the PARETO(5, θ) and SKEWUNIFORM(λ , θ) distributions is negative; which means that, for large values of a that the procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ performs better for these distributions than the best fixed-sample-size procedure.

3.2 Asymptotic regret under a more general loss function

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be as in Section 1 and suppose that the loss function for estimating μ is of the form considered by Chow and Yu (1981) and Martinsek (1988); that is,

$$L_a(\mu_n^*, \theta) = a^2 \sigma^{2\beta-2} (\mu_n^* - \mu)^2 + n \quad (9)$$

for $a > 0$, where β is a given positive number and μ_n^* is an estimator of μ . If θ is estimated by $\mu_n^* = \bar{X}_n$, Martinsek (1988) proposed to use the stopping time

$$T = \inf \left\{ n \geq m_a : n > a \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}_n)^2 \right)^{\beta/2} \right\} \quad (10)$$

and showed that the regret of the procedure (T, \bar{X}_T) under the loss (9) is

$$\begin{aligned} r_a^*(T, \bar{X}_T) &= E[a^2 \sigma^{2\beta-2} (\bar{X}_T - \mu)^2 + T] - 2a\sigma^\beta \\ &= 3\beta - \frac{\beta^2}{4} + \left(\frac{\beta^2}{4} - \beta \right) \kappa + (\beta^2 + \beta)\gamma^2 + o(1) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, provided that $E[|X_1|^{\delta+p}] < \infty$ for some $p > 0$. Straightforward calculations yield that, for large values of a ,

1) $r_a^*(T, \bar{X}_T)$ is negative under the Gamma distribution with $\alpha = 0.5$ if $0 < \beta < 0.1$.

2) $r_a^*(T, \bar{X}_T)$ is negative under the Pareto distribution with $\alpha = 5$ if $0 < \beta < 1.24$.

Martinsek (1988) also indicated that

$$E[\bar{X}_T] = \mu - \frac{\beta\gamma}{2a\sigma^{\beta-1}} + o\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) \quad (12)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, if the distribution of X_1 is not symmetric, then \bar{X}_T is biased for large values of a .

Proposition 3.2: *Suppose that γ does not depend on θ and let*

$$\mu_n^* = \bar{X}_n + \frac{\beta\gamma}{2a^{1/\beta} n^{1-1/\beta}}$$

for $n \geq 1$, where $\beta > 1$. Let T be defined by (10) with m_a being such that $\delta\sqrt{a} \leq m_a = o(a)$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. For any probability density function $f_\theta(x) \in \mathcal{L}$ with respect to which $E[|X_1|^{\delta+p}] < \infty$ for some $p > 0$,

$$E[\mu_T^*] = \mu + o(1) \text{ as } a \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof: For $a > 0$,

$$aE[\mu_T^* - \mu] = aE[\bar{X}_T - \mu] + \frac{\beta\gamma}{2} E\left[\left(\frac{T}{a}\right)^{-(1-1/\beta)}\right]. \quad (13)$$

Next, $E[(T/a)^{-(1-1/\beta)}] \rightarrow \sigma^{1-\beta}$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$ if $\beta > 1$, by the fact that $T/a \rightarrow \sigma^\beta$

w.p.1 as $a \rightarrow \infty$ and (2.2) of Martinsek (1983). Taking the limit as $a \rightarrow \infty$ in (13), using this fact and (12) yields the desired result.

Let $r_a^*(T, \mu_T^*)$ denote the regret of the biased-corrected procedure (T, μ_T^*) under the loss (9). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} r_a^*(T, \mu_T^*) &= E[a^2 \sigma^{2\beta-2} (\bar{X}_T - \mu)^2 + T - 2a\sigma^\beta] + \beta\gamma\sigma^{2\beta-2} a^{2-1/\beta} E\left[\frac{1}{T^{1-1/\beta}} (\bar{X}_T - \mu)\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma^2 \sigma^{2\beta-2}}{4} E\left[\frac{a^{2-2/\beta}}{T^{2-2/\beta}}\right] \\ &= r_a^*(T, \bar{X}_T) + \beta\gamma\sigma^{2\beta-2} E\left[\frac{a^{1-1/\beta}}{T^{1-1/\beta}} a(\bar{X}_T - \mu)\right] + \frac{\gamma^2 \sigma^{2\beta-2}}{4} E\left[\frac{a^{2-2/\beta}}{T^{2-2/\beta}}\right] \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Lemma 3.3: *Let T be as in (3.2) with $\beta > 1$. If $E[|X_1|^{\delta+p}] < \infty$ for some $p > 0$, then*

$$E\left[\frac{a^{1-1/\beta}}{T^{1-1/\beta}} a(\bar{X}_T - \mu)\right] = \frac{2(\beta-1)}{\sigma^{2\beta+1}} - \frac{\beta\gamma}{2\sigma^{2(\beta-1)}} o(1)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: First, observe that

$$E\left[\frac{a^{1-1/\beta}}{T^{1-1/\beta}} a(\bar{X}_T - \mu)\right] = E\left[\left(\frac{a^{1-1/\beta}}{T^{1-1/\beta}} - \frac{1}{\sigma^{\beta-1}}\right) a(\bar{X}_T - \mu)\right] + \frac{1}{\sigma^{\beta-1}} aE[\bar{X}_T - \mu] \quad (15)$$

for $a > 0$. Moreover,

$$aE[\bar{X}_T - \mu] = -\frac{\beta\gamma}{2\sigma^{\beta-1}} + o(1) \quad (16)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, by (12). Next, expand $g(y) = 1/y^{1-1/\beta}$ at $y = \sigma^\beta$, substitute $y = a/T$ and multiply by $a(\bar{X}_T - \mu)$ to obtain

$$\left(\frac{a^{1-1/\beta}}{T^{1-1/\beta}} - \frac{1}{\sigma^{\beta-1}}\right) a(\bar{X}_T - \mu) = \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 1\right) T_*^{1/\beta-2} \left(\frac{T}{a} - \sigma^\beta\right) a(\bar{X}_T - \mu), \quad (17)$$

where T_* is a random variable such that $|T_* - \sigma^\beta| \leq |T/a - \sigma^\beta|$. Next, rewrite T in as $T = \inf\{n \geq m_a: n(V_n/n)^{\beta/2} > a\}$, where V_n is as in (6), and let

$$U_a^* = T \left(\frac{V_T}{T} \right)^{-\beta/2} - a$$

denote the excess over the stopping boundary. Expanding $h(y) = y^{-\beta/2}$ at $y = \sigma^2$, substituting $y = V_T/T$ and multiplying by T yields

$$T \left(\frac{V_T}{T} \right)^{-\beta/2} = \frac{T}{\sigma^\beta} - \frac{\beta}{2\sigma^{\beta+2}} (V_T - T\sigma^2) + \frac{\beta(\beta+2)}{8\lambda_T^{\beta/2+2}} \frac{(V_T - T\sigma^2)^2}{T}$$

for $a > 0$, where λ_T is a random variable between V_T/T and σ^2 . Furthermore, write $V_T = \sum_{i=1}^T (X_i - \mu)^2 - T(\bar{X}_T - \mu)^2$ to obtain

$$U_a^* = \frac{T}{\sigma^\beta} - a - \frac{\beta}{2\sigma^{\beta+2}} (W_T - T\sigma^2) + \frac{\beta}{2\sigma^{\beta+2}} T(\bar{X}_T - \mu)^2 + \frac{\beta(\beta+2)}{8\lambda_T^{\beta/2+2}} \frac{(V_T - T\sigma^2)^2}{T}$$

for $a > 0$, where $W_T = \sum_{i=1}^T (X_i - \mu)^2$. It follows from easily that

$$\frac{T}{a} - \sigma^\beta = \frac{\sigma^\beta}{a} (U_a^* - \xi_T) + \frac{\beta}{2a\sigma^2} (W_T - T\sigma^2) \quad (18)$$

for $a > 0$, where

$$\xi_T = \frac{\beta}{2\sigma^{\beta+2}} T(\bar{X}_T - \mu)^2 + \frac{\beta(\beta+2)}{8\lambda_T^{\beta/2+2}} \frac{(V_T - T\sigma^2)^2}{T}.$$

Substituting (18) in (17) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{a^{1-1/\beta}}{T^{1-1/\beta}} - \frac{1}{\sigma^{\beta-1}} \right) a(\bar{X}_T - \mu) &= \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 1 \right) \sigma^\beta T_*^{1/\beta-2} (U_a - \xi_T)(\bar{X}_T - \mu) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 1 \right) \frac{\beta}{2\sigma^2} T_*^{1/\beta-2} (W_T - T\sigma^2)(\bar{X}_T - \mu) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 1 \right) \sigma^\beta I_1(a) + \frac{1-\beta}{2\sigma^2} I_2(a), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

say. Let $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$, $n \geq 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 E[|I_1(a)|] &= E\left[\left|\frac{T_*^{1/\beta-2}}{T}(U_a - \xi_T)(S_T - \mu T)\right|\right] = \frac{\sigma^\beta}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}} E\left[\left|(U_a - \xi_T)\frac{a}{T}T_*^{1/\beta-2}\frac{(S_T - \mu T)}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}}\right|\right] \\
 &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\sigma^\beta}}{\sqrt{a}} \sqrt{E[(U_a - \xi_T)^2]} \sqrt{E\left[T_*^{2/\beta-4}\left(\frac{a}{T}\right)^2\left(\frac{S_T - \mu T}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}}\right)^2\right]} \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \sqrt{2\sigma^\beta E[U_a^2] + 2\sigma^\beta E[\xi_T^2]} \sqrt{E\left[T_*^{2/\beta-4}\left(\frac{a}{T}\right)^2\left(\frac{S_T - \mu T}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}}\right)^2\right]} \\
 &\rightarrow 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, by Hölder's inequality, the fact that $T_* \rightarrow \sigma^\beta$ ($|T_* - \sigma^\beta| \leq |T/a - \sigma^\beta| \rightarrow 0$ w.p.1 since $T/a \rightarrow \sigma^\beta$, as in the first assertion of Lemma 1), $\frac{S_T - \mu T}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}}$ converges in

distribution to a Standard Normal random variable by Anscombe's theorem, the facts that $E[U_a^2] \rightarrow E[U^2] < \infty$ and $E[\xi_T^2] = O(1)$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$ and (2.3), (2.8) and

(2.9) of Martinsek (1983). To evaluate $E[I_2(a)]$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_2(a) &= \frac{2a\sigma^\beta}{T} T_*^{1/\beta-2} \frac{(W_T - T\sigma^2)(S_T - \mu T)}{a\sigma^\beta} = 2\sigma^\beta \frac{a}{T} T_*^{1/\beta-2} \left(\frac{W_T - \sigma^2 T}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}} + \frac{S_T - \mu T}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}} \right)^2 \\
 &\quad - 2\sigma^\beta \frac{a}{T} T_*^{1/\beta-2} \left(\frac{W_T - \sigma^2 T}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}} \right)^2 - 2\sigma^\beta \frac{a}{T} T_*^{1/\beta-2} \left(\frac{S_T - \mu T}{\sqrt{a\sigma^\beta}} \right)^2 \\
 &\xrightarrow{\text{in distribution}} 2\sigma^{1-2\beta} (ZZ)^2 - 2\sigma^{1-2\beta} Z^2 - 2\sigma^{1-2\beta} Z^2 = 4\sigma^{1-2\beta} Z^2
 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, by Anscombe's theorem and the fact that $T_* \rightarrow \sigma^\beta$ w.p.1 as $a \rightarrow \infty$,

where Z is a random variable having the Standard Normal distribution. Thus,

$$E[I_2(a)] = 4\sigma^{1-2\beta} + o(1) \tag{22}$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$, by (21) and (2.3) and (2.4) of Martinsek (1983). Taking expectation in (19) and using (20) and (22) yields

$$E\left[\left(\frac{a^{1-1/\beta}}{T^{1-1/\beta}} - \frac{1}{\sigma^{\beta-1}}\right)a(\bar{X}_T - \mu)\right] = \frac{2(1-\beta)}{\sigma^{2\beta+1}} + o(1) \tag{23}$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$. The lemma follows by taking the limit, as $a \rightarrow \infty$, in (15) and using (23) and (16).

Theorem 3.4: Let T be defined by (3.2) with m_a being such that $\delta\sqrt{a} \leq m_a = o(a)$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$ and $\beta > 1$. Then, for any probability density function $f_\theta(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ with respect to which $E[|X_1|^{\delta+p}] < \infty$ for some $p > 0$,

$$r_a^*(T, \mu_T^*) = 3\beta - \frac{\beta^2}{4} + \left(\frac{\beta^2}{4} - \beta\right)\kappa + (\beta^2 + \beta)\gamma^2 + \frac{2\beta(\beta-1)\gamma}{\sigma^3} - \frac{\beta^2\gamma^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma^2}{4} + o(1)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: The theorem follows by taking the limit, as $a \rightarrow \infty$, in (14) and using (11), Lemma 3.3 and the fact that

$$E\left[\frac{a^{2-2/\beta}}{T^{2-2/\beta}}\right] = \frac{1}{\sigma^{2\beta-2}} + o(1)$$

as $a \rightarrow \infty$ if $\beta > 1$, by the fact that $T/a \rightarrow \sigma^\beta$ w.p.1 as $a \rightarrow \infty$ (see the first assertion of Lemma 2.2) and (2.2) of Martinsek (1983).

4 Tables

The tables below show the values of ρ and ρ^* for certain skewed distributions, where $\rho^* = \rho - \frac{\gamma}{2}$ is the asymptotic regret incurred by the procedure $(t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ and $\rho = 2.75 - 0.75\kappa + 2\gamma^2$ represents the asymptotic regret incurred by the procedure (t, \bar{X}_t) .

Table 1: GAMMA(α, θ) with known α

γ	κ	ρ	ρ^*
$\frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$	$\frac{6}{\alpha}$	$2.75 + \frac{3.5}{\alpha}$	$2.75 + \frac{3.5}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$

Table 2: PARETO(5, θ)

γ	κ	ρ	ρ^*
$\frac{2(1+\alpha)}{\alpha-3} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha}} = 4.6476$	$\frac{6(\alpha^3 + \alpha^2 - 6\alpha - 2)}{\alpha(\alpha-3)(\alpha-4)} + 3 = 73.8$	-9.4	-11.7238

Table 3: RAYLEIGH(θ)

γ	κ	ρ	ρ^*
$\frac{2\sqrt{\pi}(\pi-3)}{(4-\pi)^{3/2}} = 0.6311$	$3 - \frac{6\pi^2 - 24\pi + 16}{(4-\pi)^2} = 3.2451$	1.11245	0.7969

Table 4: SKEW-UNIFORM(λ, θ) with $\lambda = -1.4$ and $\lambda = 1.35$

$\gamma = \frac{2\lambda(5\lambda^2 - 9)}{5(3 - \lambda^2)^{3/2}}$	$\kappa = \frac{2\lambda(5\lambda^2 - 9)}{5(3 - \lambda^2)^{3/2}}$	ρ	ρ^*
$\gamma < 0$ if $\lambda \in \left(-\sqrt{3}, -\frac{3}{\sqrt{5}}\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{3}{\sqrt{5}}\right)$	$\kappa > 0$ if $-\sqrt{3} < \lambda < \sqrt{3}$	-29.9109 ($\lambda = -1.4$)	-29.6997 ($\lambda = -1.4$)
$\gamma > 0$ if $-\frac{3}{\sqrt{5}} < \lambda < 0$		-0.7671 ($\lambda = 1.35$)	-0.7909 ($\lambda = 1.35$)

5 Conclusion

We have proposed a bias-corrected estimator of the mean of a class of skewed probability density functions and provided a second-order asymptotic expansion for the regret under the squared error loss. The results indicate that the proposed procedure performs better than the best fixed-sample-size procedure when the observations are taken from the Gamma, Pareto, Rayleigh or Skew-uniform distribution. For a more general loss function, we have proposed bias-corrected estimator of the mean and provided a second-order asymptotic expansion for the incurred regret.

References

- [1] F. Anscombe, Large sample theory of sequential estimation, *Proceedings Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, **48**, (1952), 600 – 607, 1952.
- [2] C. Chang, A.K. Gupta and W.J. Huang, Some skew-symmetric models, *Random Operators and Stochastic Equations*, **10**, (2002), 133 – 140.
- [3] I.S. Chang and C.A. Hsiung, Approximations to the expected sample size of certain sequential procedures, *Proceedings of the Conference on Recent Developments in Statistical Methods and Applications*, Taipei, December 1979, Inst. Of Math. Acad. Sinica, (1979), 71 – 82.
- [4] Y.S. Chow and K.F. Yu, The performance of a sequential procedure for the estimation of the mean, *Annals of Statistics*, **9**, (1981), 189 – 198.
- [5] M. Ghosh and N. Mukhopadhyay, Sequential point estimation of the mean when the distribution is unspecified, *Communications in Statistics -Theory & Methods*, **A8**, (1979), 637 – 652.
- [6] A.T. Martinsek, Second order approximation to the risk of a sequential procedure, *Annals of Statistics*, **11**, (1983), 827 – 836.
- [7] A.T. Martinsek. Negative regret, optional stopping and the elimination of

- outliers. *J. A. S. A.*, **83**, (1988), 160 – 163.
- [8] H. Robbins, Sequential estimation of the mean of a normal population, *Probability and Statistics*, The Harold Cramer Volume, (1959), 235 – 245.
- [9] N. Starr and M. Woodroffe, Remarks on sequential point estimation. *Proceedings Nat. Acad. Sci.*, **63**, (1969), 285 – 288.
- [10] M. Tahir, An asymptotic lower bound for the local minimax regret in sequential point estimation, *Annals of Statistics*, **17**, (1989), 1335 – 1346.
- [11] Y. Vardi, Asymptotic optimal sequential estimation: the Poisson case. *Annals of Statistics*, **7**, (1979), 1040 – 1051.
- [12] M. Woodroffe, Second order approximations for sequential point and interval estimation, *Annals of Statistics*, **5**, (1977), 984 – 995.
- [13] M. Woodroffe, *Non Linear Renewal Theory in Sequential Analysis*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 1982.