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#### Abstract

Equality is shown of the g-inverse and Moore-Penrose inverse representation of the BLUE in the general linear model. The proof is based on a matrix identity which allows also to establish a functional relationship between the BLUE and Ridge-type estimates.


## 1. INTRODUCTION

The present communication focuses on some computational properties of the matrices that appear in BLUE and Ridge-type estimation in linear model theory. In Section 3 we shortly define what now we loosely call Ridge-type estimates, for its statistical import, however, the reader is referred to Hoerl \& Kennard (1970), Rao (1973, p.306), or Rolph (1976), the latter including many additional refer-
ences. Procedures for mean estimation are also useful for the estimation of variance components, see Pukelsheim (1976). Consider the general linear model

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi Y=X b, \quad \Sigma Y=\sigma^{2} v^{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Y$ is an $S^{n}$-valued random vector, $X$ is a known real $n \times p$ matrix, and $V^{2}$ is a known dispersion matrix written as the square of its unique nonnegative definite symmetric square root $V$. Interest concentrates on linear estimators by for the vector parameter $b$, and on appropriate justifications which $p \times n$ matrix $\hat{b}$ that is determining the estimator is to be chosen.

Section 2 deals with the g-inverse and the Moore-Penrose inverse representation of the BLUE. The class of all those matrices $\hat{b}$ leading to BLUEs q' $\hat{b} Y$ for all estimable linear forms $q ' b, q \in R^{p}$, has been given two different representations by Albert (1973, p.184):

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{+}\left(I-V(M V)^{+}\right)+Z\left(M-M V(M V)^{+}\right), \quad M=I-X X^{+} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and by Mitra \& Moore (1973, p.141):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x^{\prime}\left(v^{2}+x x^{\prime}\right)^{-} x\right)^{-} x^{\prime}\left(v^{2}+x x^{\prime}\right)^{-} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The multiplicity is generated in (2) by the arbitrariness of the $p \times n$ matrix $Z$, and in (3) by the choice of the g-inverses. Mitra \& Moore (1973, p.142) proved that

$$
\begin{equation*}
B:=X^{+}\left(I-V(M V)^{+}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

is in the class (3); Proposition 1 below states more exactly that $B$ is equal to the Moore-Penrose version in (3). Thus the naturally distinguished matrices in (2) and (3) coincide.

Section 3 turns to Ridge-type estimates since the term $X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}$not only arises in BLUE theory as in (3) but is even more important for Ridge-type estimation, see Hoerl \& Kennard (1970, p.57), Rao (1973, p.306), Rolph (1976, p.794). Proposition 2 shows how to compute the BLUE from Ridge-type estimates and vice versa; as a corollary we obtain various representations for Ridge-type estimates whose derivations follow easily from BLUE theory.

All proofs are collected in Section 4.

## 2. EQUALITY OF TWO BLUES

Proposition 1 proposes an answer to Albert's (1973, p.183) "question concerning the relationship between the matrices in (2) and (3)": Put $Z=0$ in (2) and choose MoorePenrose inverses in (3), and the resulting matrices are equal. Proposition 1: $B=\left(X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+} X\right)^{+} X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}$.

The proof is given in Section 4; its crucial step is the following matrix identity which follows from Cline's (1965, p.100) inverse for the sum of nonnegative definite matrices.

Lemma: $X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}=\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} B$.
Since the two terms in (2) are orthogonal with respect to the trace inner product of matrices, $B$ is the shortest matrix in (2) and Proposition 1 has the

Corollary 1: $\left(X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+} X^{+} X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}\right.$is of minimum norm in the class (3) with respect to the Euclidean matrix norm.

In model (1) the variance component $\sigma^{2}$ is unknown; since, however, in $X^{+}\left(I-त V(\cap M V)^{+}\right)$the $\sigma$ cancels out, Proposition 1 gives rise to the further $\frac{\text { Corollary 2: }}{c^{2}>0 .} \quad B=\left(X^{\prime}\left(r^{2} v^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+} X\right)^{+}\left(\sigma^{2} v^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}$for all

It is obvious from (2) that the BLUE admits a unique linear representation if and only if $Z\left(M-M V(M V)^{+}\right)=0$ for all 2 . But $M-M V(M V)^{+}$orthogonally projects onto the intersection of the nullspaces of $X^{\prime}$ and $V^{2}$, which is the orthogonal complement of range $X+$ range $V^{2}$, where range means column space. Thus we finally get the
Corollary 3: $B=\left(X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{-1} X^{\prime}\right)^{-} X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X^{\prime}\right)^{-\quad \text { for all }}$ choices of g-inverses if and only if $V^{2}+X X^{\prime}$ is nonsingular. In this case $\left(V^{2}+X X^{1}\right)^{-}=\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{-1}$.

Corollary 3 rather states that in (3) the versions of the g-inverses ore not, ingeneral, negligible in order to have equality with $B$.

While the estimator. $q^{\prime} \hat{b} \gamma$ for $q^{\prime} b$, with $\hat{b}$ from (2), need not be unbiased for all $q \in R^{p}$, it is always the minimum variance - minimum bias - linear estimator (MV-MB-LE) for $q$ 'b, see Rao (1973, p.307). Particularly when unbiasedness is not possible, one is interested in alternative estimation procedures.

## 3. RIDGE-TYPE ESTIMATES

In model (1) the mean square error of a linear estimator $\hat{q} \hat{q}^{\prime} y$ for $q^{\prime} b$ is $\sigma^{2}\|V \hat{q}\|^{2}+\left\|\left(X^{\prime} \hat{q}-q\right)^{\prime} b\right\|^{2}$ with maximum value $\sigma^{2}\|\hat{V q}\|^{2}+\beta^{2}\|X \cdot \hat{q}-q\|^{2}$ when the vector parameter $b$
varies subject to $\|b\| \leqq \beta$. Minimizing the maximal mean square error on the ball "b" $\Longleftarrow ?$ thus leads to the problem of minimizing

$$
\begin{equation*}
k \| \hat{V q} \vec{r}^{2}+" X \cdot \hat{q}-q{ }^{\prime 2}, \quad k>0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The resulting estimators are $q^{\prime} b_{k}^{*} \gamma$, where the defining equaiity for the $p \times n$ matrix $b_{k}^{*}$ is, see Rao (1973, p.306),

$$
\begin{equation*}
b_{k}^{*} \cdot\left(k v^{2}+x x^{\prime}\right)=x^{\prime} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the present communication we call, per definition, $b_{k}^{*} Y$ Ridge-type estimate for $b$ whenever $b_{k}^{*}$ solves (6).

The general solution to (6) is $b_{k}^{*}=X^{\prime}\left(k V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{-}$, and it follows from (3) that then ( $\left.b_{k}^{*} X\right)^{-} b_{k}^{*} Y$ is the MV-MB-LE for $b$, irrespective of the value of $k$. In particular, if $b_{k}^{*}=X^{\prime}\left(k V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}$, then $\left(b_{k}^{*} X\right)^{+} b_{k}^{*}=B$, by Proposition 1. Thus the MV-MB-LE may be computed when a Ridge-type estimate is given; Proposition 2 solves the converse problem. Proposition 2: If $\hat{b} Y$ is a $N V-H B-L E$ for $b$, i.e., $\hat{b}$ is representable as in (2), and if $k>0$, then $\left(I+k \hat{b} v^{2} b^{\prime}\right)^{-1} \hat{b} Y$ is a Ridge-type estimate.

The proof follows from the Lemma and is given in Section 4. The functional relationship of $\hat{b}$ and $b_{k}^{*}$ may be used to derive alternative representations for $b_{k}^{*}$. The Aitken estimator $\left(X^{\prime} V^{2+} X\right)^{+} X \cdot V^{2+} Y$ is a MV-MB-LE if and only if range $X$ crange $V^{2}$, see $Z y s k i n d$ (1975, p.658). The reader will then easily verify the

Corollary 4: $\left(k I+X^{\prime} V^{2+} X\right)^{-1} X^{\prime} V^{2+} Y$ is a Ridge-type estimate if and only if range $x \in$ range $v^{2}$.

The simple least squares estimator $X^{\dagger} Y$ is a MV-MB-LE if and only if range $V^{2} X$ c range $X$, see Zyskind (1975, $p .684$ ), hence

Corollary 5: $\left(I+k X^{+} V^{2} X^{+1}\right)^{-1} X^{+} Y$ is a Ridge-type estimate if and only if range $V^{2} X \in$ range $X$.

If $V^{2}=I$ then Corollaries 4 and 5 apply and yield the representations (2.1) and (2.3) in Hoerl \& Kennard (1970, p.57). We are now left with proving the Lemma and Propositions 1 and 2.

## 4. PROOFS

First, we prove the Lemma. Inverting the sum $V^{2}+X X$ ' with Cline's formula (1965, p.100) and some computation yield

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}=\left(I-B V K V X^{+}\right) \cdot B, \quad K=\left(I+V B^{\prime} B V\right)^{-1} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, $B V K=\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} B V$, and $B V^{2}(V M)^{+}=X^{+} V\left(I-(M V)^{+} M V\right)$. $\cdot V M(V M)^{+}=0$. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
I-B V K \cdot V X^{+\prime} & =I-\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} B V \cdot V \cdot\left(I-(V M)^{+} V+(V M)^{+} V\right) \cdot X^{+} \\
& =I-\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1}\left(B V^{2} B^{\prime}+O+I-I\right) \\
& =\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} . \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

The Lemma is then established by inserting (8) into (7).
Next, we prove Proposition 1. Clearly, $B X=X^{+} X$, and $B=X^{+} X B$. Using the Lemma, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(X ^ { \prime } \left(V^{2}\right.\right. & \left.\left.+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+} X\right)^{+} X^{\prime}\left(V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+} \\
& =\left(\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} B X\right)^{+}\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} B \\
& =\left(\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} X^{+} X\right)^{+}\left(\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} X^{+} X\right) \cdot B
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the ranges of $X^{+} X\left(I+B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1}$ and $X^{+} X$ coincide, so do their projectors. Thus the last equalities may be continued $=X^{+} X B=B$, establishing Proposition 1.

Finally, we prove Proposition 2. The Lemma implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(I+k \hat{b} V^{2} \hat{b^{\prime}}\right)^{-1} \hat{b} & =\left(I+k B V^{2} B^{\prime}\right)^{-1} B+Z\left(M-M V(M V)^{+}\right) \\
& =X^{\prime}\left(k V^{2}+X X^{\prime}\right)^{+}+Z\left(M-M V(M V)^{+}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

and postmultiplication with $k V^{2}+X X$ ' yields $X^{\prime}$, and Proposition 2 is established.
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