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## SUMMARY
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## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MODEL FRAMEWORK

Suppose we have two linear regressions of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i}=X_{i} \beta_{i}+\varepsilon_{i}, \quad i=1,2 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $y_{i}$ is $a\left(T_{i} \times 1\right)$ vector of observations on the dependent variable; $X_{i}$ is a $\left(T \times k_{i}\right)$ full column rank matrix of non-stochastic regressors with $k_{i}<T_{i}$; $\beta_{i}$ is $a\left(k_{i} \times 1\right)$ vector of parameters; and $\varepsilon_{i}$ is a ( $\left.T_{i} \times 1\right)$ vector of disturbance terms. We assume that $\varepsilon_{1}$ and $\varepsilon_{2}$ are independently generated from multivariate Student-t (Mt) distributions, with probablitity density functions (pdf):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{f}\left(\varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}} \mid \nu_{\mathrm{i}}, \sigma_{\mathrm{i}}\right)=\left(v_{\mathrm{i}}^{v_{\mathrm{i}} / 2}\right. & \left.\Gamma\left(\left(\nu_{\mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i}}\right) / 2\right)\right)\left(\pi_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i}} / 2} \Gamma\left(\nu_{\mathrm{i}} / 2\right) \sigma_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)^{-1} \\
& \times\left(v_{\mathrm{i}}+\varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}}^{\prime} \varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}} / \sigma_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}\right)-\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i}}+\nu_{\mathrm{i}}\right) / 2 ; \quad \mathrm{i}=1,2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

$v_{i}$ is the degrees of freedom parameter and $\sigma_{i}$ is the scale parameter of the distribution. If $\nu_{i}>2$, then $\mathrm{E}\left(\varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}}\right)=0$ and $\operatorname{Var}\left(\varepsilon_{\mathrm{i}}\right)=\sigma_{\varepsilon_{i}}^{2}=\nu_{i} \sigma_{i}^{2} /\left(\nu_{\mathrm{i}}-2\right)$. When $v_{\mathrm{i}}=1$, the pdf is Cauchy for which no finite integral moments exist; when $\nu_{\mathrm{i}}=\infty$ it is normal.

We suppose that the researcher desires an estimate of $\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}$, the variance of the first sample, when it is suspected that $\varepsilon_{2}$ may have the same variance. When the error variances are unequal we use the so-called never-pool estimator (NPE), $s_{N}^{2}$, to estimate $\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{N}^{2}=s_{1}^{2}=\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1} / v_{1} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $v_{i}=T_{i}-k_{i} ; M_{i}=I_{T_{i}}-X_{i}\left(X_{i}^{\prime} X_{i}\right)^{-1} X_{i}^{\prime} ; i=1,2 . \quad s_{N}^{2}$ uses only the information from the first sample. Alternatively, if $\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}=\sigma_{\varepsilon_{2}}^{2}$ it is then more efficient to use the "always-pool" estimator (APE), $s_{A}^{2}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{A}^{2}=\left(v_{1} s_{1}^{2}+v_{2} s_{2}^{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $s_{2}^{2}$ is defined analogously to $s_{1}^{2}$. Given the uncertainty about the equality of the error variances a typical strategy is to pre-test for homogeneity and then use $s_{N}^{2}$ if we reject homogeneity or use $s_{A}^{2}$ if we cannot reject homogeneity. The estimator actually reported after such a procedure is the so-called pre-test estimator (PTE) $s_{P}^{2}$ :

$$
s_{P}^{2}= \begin{cases}s_{A}^{2} & \text { if } J \leq c  \tag{4}\\ s_{N}^{2} & \text { if } J>c\end{cases}
$$

where $J=s_{2}^{2} / s_{1}^{2}$ is the test statistic used to test the hypothesis ${ }^{1} H_{0}: \sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}$ $=\sigma_{\varepsilon_{2}}^{2}$ vs. $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}: \sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}<\sigma_{\varepsilon_{2}}^{2}$ and $c$ is the critical value of the test corresponding to an $\alpha \%$ significance level.

$$
\text { If } \varepsilon^{\prime}=\left(\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} \varepsilon_{2}^{\prime}\right) \text { is distributed as a member of the elliptically }
$$ symmetric family of distributions then it is well known that $f(J)=$ $\phi^{-1} \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{F}_{\left(\mathrm{v}_{2}, \mathrm{v}_{1}\right)}\right)$ where $\phi=\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2} / \sigma_{\varepsilon_{2}}^{2}$ is a measure of the hypothesis error and $F_{\left(v_{2}, v_{1}\right)}$ is a central $F$ random variable with $v_{2}$ and $v_{1}$ degrees of freedom (see King (1979) and Chmielewski (1981)). However, if $\varepsilon_{1}$ and $\varepsilon_{2}$ are independent $M t$ random vectors then $J$ has a non-standard distribution. Ohtani (1990) derives the density of $J$ in this case:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(\mathrm{~J})=\left[\mathrm{B}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1} / 2, \mathrm{v}_{2} / 2\right) \mathrm{B}\left(\nu_{1} / 2, v_{2} / 2\right)\right]^{-1} e_{1}^{v_{1} / 2} \mathrm{~J}_{1}^{v_{1} / 2-1} \\
& \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{t}^{\left(v_{2}+v_{2}\right) / 2-1}(1-\mathrm{t})^{\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+v_{1}\right) / 2-1}(\mathrm{t}+\theta \mathrm{J}(1-\mathrm{t}))^{-\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right) / 2} \mathrm{dt}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\theta=\left(v_{2} / v_{1}\right)\left[\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2} /\left(\nu_{2} \sigma_{2}^{2}\right)\right]$ and $B(.,$.$) is the Beta function. Ohtani also$ tabulates a limited number of critical values for the test under this assumption, assuming a $5 \%$ significance level.

The particular pre-test problem considered here has been well
investigated in the literature but not under the above specified error term assumptions. For example, Bancroft (1944), Toyoda and Wallace (1975), Ohtani and Toyoda (1978), and Bancroft and Han (1983) all consider this problem from various aspects under normal errors ${ }^{2}$. Bancroft (1944) concludes from his numerical evaluations that the PTE which uses a critical value of unity strictly dominates the NPE.

Toyoda and Wallace (1975) show that the risk of the APE always has two intersections with the risk of the NPE and that one intersection always lies in the range $\phi \in(0,1)$. This implies that the NPE cannot strictly dominate the APE and vice versa. Toyoda and Wallace also show that a PTE with a critical value in the range $c \in(0,2)$ strictly dominates the NPE, and that the PTE with $c=1$ "almost always" dominates the APE, except in the neighbourhood of the null hypothesis. They consequently suggest $c=1$ as a reasonable choice for the pre-test (p.399) and go on to show that this choice of critical value maximises relative average efficiency.

Ohtani and Toyoda (1978) consider optimal critical values for this pre-test problem according to a minimax regret criterion. They show that the risk function for the PTE declines monotonically for $c \in(0,1]$, and obtains a local minimum at $c=1$. Using a minimax regret criterion they solve numerically for an "optimal" critical value, $c^{*}$. They find that $c^{*}$ depends on $v_{1}$ and $v_{2}$ and ranges from 1.7 to 2.8 (for the cases evaluated) which correspond to sizes from $6 \%$ to $22 \%$. Bancroft and Han (1983) also consider the choice of an optimal critical value according to another criterion - so called relative efficiency. Their results suggest significance levels ranging from $24 \%$ to $48 \%$, depending on $v_{1}$ and $v_{2}$.

As the processes generating many time-series are non-normal, Giles (1990, 1992) extends the above cited work to one where the joint error term in the model is distributed according to the scale mixture of normals family
of distributions, which are members of the elliptically symmetric family of distributions. It is then possible to consider error term assumptions which result in more or less kurtosis than under a normality assumption. One special member of this family is the Mt distribution which results in uncorrelated but dependent errors. She shows that the risk function for the PTE has a minimum when $c=1$ and also that for small values of the Mt shape parameter, $v$, (i.e. "fat-tailed" distributions) this PTE strictly dominates both the NPE and the APE.

Here we extend the error term assumptions further by assuming that the errors in each sample are Mt but are independent. This allows for the error distributions for the samples to have potentially different shape, as well as scale, parameters. The outline of this paper is as follows: Section 2 derives the risk functions of the NPE, APE and PTE under the independent Mt assumption and undertakes some comparisons of the risk properties of the three estimators. In Section 3 we consider some numerical evaluations of these risk functions. Here we use Ohtani's (1990) critical values where possible but we also consider that a researcher may incorrectly assume normality of the errors and so use critical values from the central-F distribution. For the latter, of course, the true significance level will differ from the assigned nominal significance level. We conclude with some final remarks in Section 4 followed by an appendix which contains brief proofs of the theorems.

## 2. THE RISK FUNCTIONS

Let $\bar{s}^{2}$ be any estimator of $\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}$ and let its risk under quadratic loss be defined by $R\left(\bar{s}^{2}\right)=E\left(\bar{s}^{2}-\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}\right)^{2}$. Then, if $\varepsilon_{1}$ and $\varepsilon_{2}$ are generated from independent Mt distributions with $\nu_{1}>4$ and $\nu_{2}>4$ we have:

Theorem 1:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{N}}^{2}\right)= & 2 v_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{4}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\nu_{1}-2\right) /\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-4\right)\right)  \tag{5}\\
\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2}\right)= & v_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{4}\left\{\left(v_{2}-4\right)\left[\mathrm{v}_{1}\left(2 \mathrm{v}_{1}+v_{1}\right)+\left(\mathrm{v}_{2}^{2}+\mathrm{v}_{1}\right)\left(v_{1}-4\right)\right]+\mathrm{v}_{2}\left(\mathrm{v}_{2}+2\right)\left(v_{2}-2\right)\left(v_{1}-4\right) / \phi^{2}\right. \\
& \left.-2 \mathrm{v}_{2}^{2}\left(v_{1}-4\right)\left(v_{2}-4\right) / \phi\right\} /\left(\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-4\right)\left(v_{2}-4\right)\right)  \tag{6}\\
\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{P}}^{2}\right)= & v_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{4}\left\{\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)^{2}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+2\right)\left(v_{1}-2\right)+\mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{v}_{2}\left(\mathrm{v}_{2}+2\right) \mathrm{P}_{0440}\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-4\right)\right. \\
& -\mathrm{v}_{2}\left(2 \mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+2\right) \mathrm{P}_{4004}\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-4\right)+2 \mathrm{v}_{1}^{2} \mathrm{v}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2222}\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-4\right) \\
& -2 \mathrm{v}_{1}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)\left(\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)\left(\nu_{1}-4\right)+\mathrm{v}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{0220}\left(v_{1}-2\right)\left(v_{1}-4\right)\right. \\
& \left.\left.-v_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2002}\left(v_{1}-2\right)\left(v_{1}-4\right)\right)+\mathrm{v}_{1}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-4\right)\right\} / \\
& \left(\mathrm{v}_{1}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}-2\right)\left(v_{1}-4\right)\right) \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{abij}}= & \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_{1}+v_{2}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_{1}}{2}\right)^{2} \Gamma\left(\frac{v_{2}}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{v_{2}^{-2}}{\phi}\right)^{v_{2} / 2}{v_{1}}^{\left(v_{2}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2}\left(\mathrm{cv}_{2}\right)^{\left(v_{1}-\mathrm{a}\right) / 2} \\
& \times 2^{-(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}) / 2}\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{\left(v_{1}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2} \int_{0}^{1} \mathrm{t}_{1}^{\left(v_{2}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2-1}{ }_{\left(1-\mathrm{t}_{1}\right)^{\left(v_{1}-\mathrm{a}\right) / 2-1}} \\
& \times\left(\mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{t}_{1}\left(v_{2}-2\right) / \phi+\left(v_{1}-2\right) \mathrm{cv}_{2}\left(1-\mathrm{t}_{1}\right)\right)^{\left(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}-v_{1}-v_{2}\right) / 2} \\
& \times \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{t}_{1}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(v_{2}+\mathrm{i}\right) ; \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{j}\right)\right) \mathrm{dt}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof: See the appendix.

## Remarks:

1. When $\mathrm{c}=0(\alpha=1)$ we always reject $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ and the risk of the PTE collapses to that of the NPE. Conversely, if $c \rightarrow \infty(\alpha \rightarrow 0)$ we never reject $H_{0}$ and $R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)$ $=R\left(s_{A}^{2}\right)$.
2. The risk functions of $s_{N}^{2}$ and $s_{A}^{2}$ have two intersections with respect to $\phi$. Let these be $\phi_{1}$ and $\phi_{2}$. Their values are $\phi_{1}=\left(\omega+\tau^{1 / 2}\right) / \zeta$ and $\phi_{2}$ $=\left(\omega-\tau^{1 / 2}\right) / \zeta$, where $\omega=-2 \mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{v}_{2}^{2}\left(\nu_{1}-4\right)\left(\nu_{2}-4\right), \quad \tau=8 \mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{v}_{2}^{2}\left(\nu_{2}-4\right)\left(\nu_{1}-4\right)$ $\times\left(2 \mathrm{v}_{1}^{2}\left(\nu_{2}-2\right)\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+2\right)-\mathrm{v}_{1}\left[\mathrm{v}_{2}^{2}\left(\nu_{1}-v_{2}-2\right)+\mathrm{v}_{2}\left(2-v_{2}\right)\left(\nu_{1}+2\right)-4\left(\nu_{2}-2\right)\left(v_{1}-2\right)\right]+\right.$ $\left.v_{2}\left(\nu_{2}-2\right)\left(v_{1}-2\right)\left(v_{2}+2\right)\right)$, and $\zeta=2 v_{2}\left(v_{2}-4\right)\left(4 v_{1}^{2}+v_{1}\left(4\left(v_{1}-2\right)-v_{2}\left(v_{1}-6\right)\right)+\right.$ $2 v_{2}\left(\nu_{1}-2\right)$. As $R\left(s_{A}^{2}\right)$ is a quadratic in $1 / \phi$, with an asymptote at $\phi=0$, one of these intersections will lie in the range $(0,-\infty)$ and the other in the range $(0,+\infty)$. There are three possibilities. First, one intersection lies in the range ( 0,1 ). This implies that neither of the NPE or the APE strictly dominates the other, and accords with the results under spherically symmetric disturbances. The second alternative is that the positive intersection is greater than unity. Then, the NPE strictly dominates the APE over the range $\phi \in(0,1]$. The third possibility is that there are no real intersections. This occurs when $\tau$ is negative and in this case the NPE again strictly dominates the APE. We consider these cases further in the next section.
3. When $v_{1} \rightarrow \infty$ and $v_{2} \rightarrow \infty$, the risk functions collapse to their normal counterparts (see, for example, Toyoda and Wallace (1975)). ${ }^{3}$
4. As $\phi \rightarrow 0, R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right) \rightarrow R\left(s_{N}^{2}\right)$ while $R\left(s_{A}^{2}\right) \rightarrow \infty$. That is, pre-testing leads us to follow the correct strategy when the prior information is very false.
5. Typically $R\left(s_{A}^{2}\right)<R\left(s_{N}^{2}\right)$ when $\phi=1$, although there are exceptions as
noted in the above point 2. It is also possible for $R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)<R\left(s_{A}^{2}\right)$ when $\phi=1$. We illustrate such cases in the next section.

## 6. Theorem 2:

Extrema of $R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)$ result when $c=0, c \rightarrow \infty$, and $c=1$.
Proof: See the appendix.
So, for any particular value of $\phi$, the minimum risk estimator among those considered in this paper may be either the APE, the NPE, or the PTE with $\mathrm{c}=1$.

## 3. NUMERICAL EVALUATIONS OF THE RISK FUNCTIONS

To illustrate the results we have numerically evaluated the risk functions. Various values of the arguments were considered: $\mathrm{v}_{1}, \mathrm{v}_{2}=10$, 30,$40 ; \nu_{1}, v_{2}=5,10,50,100, \infty$; those critical values corresponding to a true size of $5 \%$ (Ohtani (1990)), those from the central-F distribution corresponding to nominal sizes of $17,5 \%, 30 \%$ and $75 \%$ and a critical value of unity. Full details of these results are available on request. The evaluations were undertaken using a FORTRAN program written by the authors, which utilises several subroutines from Press et al. (1986). We executed the program on a VAX 7610 and a VAXstation 4000. Figures 1 to 4 provide representative results. The horizontal axis, in each figure, measures the extent of the hypothesis error $\phi \in(0,1]$. The vertical axis measures risk and we have assumed, without loss of generality, that $\sigma_{1}^{2}=1$. The following points can be noted:

1. The figures illustrate the possible cases referred to in the previous Section as point 2. Specifically, the risk functions of the NPE and APE can intersect at a value of $\phi \in(0,1)$ (see for example Figure 1). Our results suggest that this will occur for all values of $\mathrm{v}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{v}_{2}$
when $\nu_{2} \geq \nu_{1}$. Figure 2 provides an example where the NPE strictly dominates the APE for all $\phi \in(0,1]$. The evaluations suggest that this case is likely when $v_{2}$ is sufficiently smaller than $v_{1}$. So, if the error term of the model for the second sample has marginal distributions which have "fatter" tails than that for the first sample then it is never optimal to pool the data, even if the variances are equal. This result contrasts to that found when the joint disturbance is spherically symmetric. Then it is always preferable to pool the samples when the variances are equal rather than to simply ignore the prior information.
2. An increase in $v_{1}, v_{2}$ shifts the risk functions downwards, as does also an increase in $\nu_{1}, v_{2}$.
3. There is no strictly dominating estimator when the disturbances are normal or $v_{1}$ and $v_{2}$ are "large" (see for example Figure 3). Then, the APE has the smallest risk around the neighbourhood of $H_{0}$, while it is generally preferable to employ the PTE with $\mathrm{c}=1$ otherwise.
4. For small $v_{1}, v_{2}(e . g .5,10)$ the PTE can strictly dominate both the NPE and the APE (see for example Figure 4). Typically, the PTE which uses $c=1$ strictly dominates all other PTE's. This result accords with those of Toyoda and Wallace (1975), Ohtani and Toyoda (1978), and Giles (1992).
5. Using the central-F critical values, as opposed to the values provided by Ohtani (1990), typically has a significant effect on the risk function; that is, there is a significant difference between the nominal and true sizes for the F-test. The distortion in size increases as $\nu_{1}, \nu_{2}$ decrease.
6. The PTE which uses $\mathrm{c}=1$ always strictly dominates the NPE. It is never optimal to ignore the prior information.

## 4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper we have examined the risks of estimators of the regression error variance after a preliminary test for homogeneity, when the disturbances in each sample are Mt but independent. In summary our investigation suggests that for large $v_{1}$ and $\nu_{2}$ the results under the independent Mt assumption are qualitatively similar to those under normal errors (e.g. Toyoda and Wallace (1975)) - no strictly dominating estimator exists; the APE has the smallest risk around the neighbourhood of the null hypothesis; and the PTE with $\mathrm{c}=1$ strictly dominates the NPE. Secondly, our results suggest that for $\nu_{2} \geq \nu_{1}$ we have similar qualitative conclusions to Giles (1992) - neither the NPE nor the APE can strictly dominate the other; and the PTE with $c=1$ can strictly dominate both the APE and the NPE. Finally, if $v_{1}>v_{2}$ the NPE strictly dominates the APE, but both are then strictly dominated by the PTE which uses $c=1$. So, the optimal strategy when $\nu_{1}>v_{2}$ is to pre-test with $\mathrm{c}=1$.

There remain a number of issues for future work. For example, it would be interesting to consider this problem with a different variance mixing distribution ${ }^{4}$; to consider other pre-test problems under a similar disturbance assumption as used here; to investigate the choice of an optimal critical value according to some explicit optimality criterion; to assume that the disturbances are non-normal though identically independently distributed; and to consider the case where $\nu_{1}$ and $\nu_{2}$ are estimated rather than assumed to be known.

## APPENDIX

Proof of Theorem 1.

$$
R\left(s_{N}^{2}\right)=E\left(s_{1}^{2}-\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}\right)^{2}
$$

Now,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{f}\left(\varepsilon_{1}\right)=\int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{N}}\left(\varepsilon_{1}\right) \mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{1}\right) \mathrm{d} \tau_{1} \tag{A.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{N}}\left(\varepsilon_{1}\right)$ is the pdf of $\varepsilon_{1}$ when $\varepsilon_{1} \sim \mathrm{~N}\left(0, \tau_{1}^{2} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ with $\tau_{1}^{2}$ a positive scalar. (A.1) is the density of a Mt random variable when $\tau_{1}$ is an inverted gamma variate. Then,

$$
\mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{1}\right)=\left[\frac{2}{\Gamma\left(v_{1}^{\prime 2)}\right.}\right]\left(\frac{\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2}}{2}\right)^{\nu_{1} / 2} \tau_{1}^{-\left(\nu_{1}+1\right)} \mathrm{e}^{-v_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2} / 2 \tau_{1}^{2}}
$$

and we write $\tau_{1} \sim \operatorname{IG}\left(\nu_{1}, \sigma_{1}^{2}\right)$. So,

$$
R\left(s_{N}^{2}\right)=E\left(s_{1}^{4}\right)-2 E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right) E\left(s_{1}^{2}\right)+\left(E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}
$$

Now,

$$
E\left(s_{1}^{2}\right)=\int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N}\left(s_{1}^{2}\right) f\left(\tau_{1}\right) d \tau_{1}
$$

where $E_{N}(A)$ is the expected value of $A$ under the normality assumption. As $s_{1}^{2}=\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1}, M_{1}=I_{T_{1}}-X_{1}\left(X_{1}^{\prime} X_{1}\right)^{-1} X_{1}^{\prime}$, we have $\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1} / \tau_{1}^{2} \sim \chi_{v_{1}}^{2}$ under the assumption that $\varepsilon_{1} \sim N\left(0, \tau_{1}^{2} I_{T_{1}}\right)$. So, $E_{N}\left(s_{1}^{2}\right)=\tau_{1}^{2}$ and $E\left(s_{1}^{2}\right)=E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)$.

Likewise, $E\left(s_{1}^{4}\right)=\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4}\right) / v_{1}$. Then,

$$
R\left(s_{N}^{2}\right)=\left[\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4}\right)-v_{1}\left(E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\right] / v_{1}
$$

and equation (5) follows directly as $E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)=\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2} /\left(\nu_{1}-2\right)$ and $E\left(\tau_{1}^{4}\right)=$ $\nu_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{4} /\left(\left(\nu_{1}-2\right)\left(\nu_{1}-4\right)\right)$ when $\tau_{1} \sim \operatorname{IG}\left(\nu_{1}, \sigma_{1}^{2}\right)$.

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(s_{A}^{2}\right) & =E\left(s_{A}^{2}-\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2}\right)^{2} \\
& =E\left(s_{A}^{4}\right)-2 E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right) E\left(s_{A}^{2}\right)+\left(E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now,

$$
s_{A}^{2}=\left(\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1}+\varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} M_{2} \varepsilon_{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)
$$

where $M_{2}$ is defined analogously to $M_{1}$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left(s_{A}^{2}\right) & =\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N}\left(s_{A}^{2}\right) f\left(\tau_{1} \tau_{2}\right) d \tau_{1} d \tau_{2} \\
& =\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N}\left(s_{A}^{2}\right) f\left(\tau_{1}\right) f\left(\tau_{2}\right) d \tau_{1} d \tau_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

as $\varepsilon_{1}$ and $\varepsilon_{2}$ are independent. As $\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1} / \tau_{1}^{2} \sim \chi_{v_{1}}^{2}$ and $\varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} M_{2} \varepsilon_{2} / \tau_{2}^{2} \sim \chi_{v_{2}}^{2}$ when $\varepsilon_{1} \sim \mathrm{~N}\left(0, \tau_{1}^{2} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{T}_{1}}\right)$ and $\varepsilon_{2} \sim \mathrm{~N}\left(0, \tau_{2}^{2} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{T}_{2}}\right)$ respectively, we have that

$$
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{N}}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2}\right)=\left(\mathrm{v}_{1} \tau_{1}^{2}+\mathrm{v}_{2} \tau_{2}^{2}\right) /\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left(s_{A}^{2}\right) & =\frac{v_{1}}{v_{1}+v_{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \tau_{1}^{2} f\left(\tau_{1}\right) d \tau_{1} f\left(\tau_{2}\right) d \tau_{2} \\
& +\frac{v_{2}}{v_{1}+v_{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \tau_{2}^{2} f\left(\tau_{1}\right) d \tau_{1} f\left(\tau_{2}\right) d \tau_{2} \\
& =\left[v_{1} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)+v_{2} E\left(\tau_{2}^{2}\right)\right] /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right) \\
& =\left[v_{1} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)+v_{2} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right) / \phi\right] /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

as $\phi=\sigma_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2} / \sigma_{\varepsilon_{2}}^{2}$ and $\mathrm{E}\left(\tau_{2}^{2}\right)=\sigma_{\varepsilon_{2}}^{2}=\mathrm{E}\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right) / \phi$.
Likewise,

$$
E\left(s_{A}^{4}\right)=\left\{v_{1}\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4}\right)+v_{2}\left(v_{2}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{2}^{2}\right)\right.
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.+2 v_{1} v_{2} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right) E\left(\tau_{2}^{2}\right)\right\} /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2} \\
=\{ & v_{1}\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4}\right)+v_{2}\left(v_{2}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{2}^{4}\right) \\
& \left.\quad+\left(v_{2}^{2}-v_{1}^{2}\right)\left(E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}+2 v_{2}^{2}\left(E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} / \phi\right\} /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Using $\tau_{1} \sim \operatorname{IG}\left(\nu_{1}, \sigma_{1}^{2}\right), \tau_{2} \sim \operatorname{IG}\left(\nu_{2}, \sigma_{2}^{2}\right)$ then

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left(s_{A}^{4}\right)= & \left\{\frac{v_{1}\left(v_{1}+2\right) \nu_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{4}}{\left(v_{1}-2\right)\left(v_{1}-4\right)}+\frac{v_{2}\left(v_{2}+2\right) \nu_{1}^{2}\left(v_{2}-2\right) \sigma_{1}^{4}}{\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}\left(v_{2}-4\right) \phi^{2}}\right. \\
& \left.+\left(v_{2}^{2}-v_{1}^{2}\right) \frac{v_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{4}}{\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}}-2 v_{2}^{2} \frac{\left(v_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{4}\right)}{\left(v_{1}-2\right)^{2}}\right\} /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

so that $R\left(s_{A}^{2}\right)$ follows.
We now turn to the risk of the pre-test estimator:

$$
\begin{equation*}
R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)=E\left(s_{P}^{4}\right)-2 E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right) E\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)+\left(E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} \tag{A.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_{P}^{2}= & s_{N}^{2}+\left(s_{A}^{2}-s_{N}^{2}\right) I_{[0, c]}(\mathrm{J}) \\
& =\left(\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1}\right)\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)+\left(\mathrm{v}_{1} \varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} M_{2} \varepsilon_{2}-\mathrm{v}_{2} \varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1}\right) \\
& \times I_{[0, c]}\left(v_{1} \varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} M_{2} \varepsilon_{2} / v_{2} \varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathrm{I}_{[\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}]}(\mathrm{J})$ is an indicator function which takes the value one when J lies within the subscripted range, 0 otherwise. So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(\mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{P}}^{2}\right) & =\left\{\tau_{1}^{2}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)\left(\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}_{1} \varepsilon_{1} / \tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right. \\
& +\left[\tau_{2}^{2} \mathrm{v}_{1}\left(\varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}_{2} \varepsilon_{2} / \tau_{2}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{v}_{2} \tau_{1}^{2}\left(\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}_{1} \varepsilon_{1} / \tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right] \\
& \left.\times \mathrm{I}_{\left[0, \mathrm{c}^{*}\right]}\left(\left(\mathrm{v}_{1} \varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}_{2} \varepsilon_{2} / \tau_{2}^{2}\right) /\left(\mathrm{v}_{2} \varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}_{1} \varepsilon_{1} / \tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)\right\}\left(\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c^{*}=c \tau_{1}^{2} / \tau_{2}^{2}$.
Under the assumption that $\varepsilon_{1} \sim \mathrm{~N}\left(0, \tau_{1}^{2} \mathrm{I} \mathrm{T}_{1}\right)$ and $\varepsilon_{2} \sim \mathrm{~N}\left(0, \tau_{2}^{2} \mathrm{I}_{2}\right)$ and
using, for example, Lemma 1 of Clarke et al. (1987) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{N}}\left[\left(\varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}_{2} \varepsilon_{2} / \tau_{2}^{2}\right) \mathrm{I}\left[0, \mathrm{c}^{*}\right]\right. \\
& (.)]=\mathrm{v}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{20}, \\
& \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{N}}\left[\left(\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}_{1} \varepsilon_{1} / \tau_{1}^{2}\right) \mathrm{I}_{\left[0, \mathrm{c}^{*}\right]}(.)\right]=\mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{02}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{i j} & =\operatorname{Pr} \cdot\left[F_{\left(v_{2}+i, v_{1}+j\right)} \leq\left(c^{*} v_{2}\left(v_{1}+j\right)\right) /\left(v_{1}\left(v_{2}+i\right)\right)\right] \\
& =I_{x}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(v_{2}+i\right) ; \frac{1}{2}\left(v_{1}+j\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

and $x=c \tau_{1}^{2} v_{2} /\left(v_{1} \tau_{2}^{2}+c v_{2} \tau_{1}^{2}\right) . \quad I_{x}(. ;$.$) is the incomplete beta function. So,$

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)=\left\{\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)+v_{2} E\left(\tau_{2}^{2} P_{20}\right)-v_{2} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2} P_{02}\right)\right\} /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right) \tag{A.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Following similar steps,

$$
\begin{align*}
E\left(s_{P}^{2}\right) & =\left\{\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4}\right)+v_{1} v_{2}\left(v_{2}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{2}^{4} P_{40}\right)\right. \\
& \left.-v_{2}\left(2 v_{1}+v_{2}\right)\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4} P_{04}\right)+2 v_{1}^{2} v_{2} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2} \tau_{2}^{2} P_{22}\right)\right\} /\left(v_{1}\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2}\right) \tag{A.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting (A.2) and (A.3) into (A.1) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right) & =\left\{\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2}\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4}\right)+v_{1} v_{2}\left(v_{2}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{2}^{4} P_{40}\right)\right. \\
& -v_{2}\left(2 v_{1}+v_{2}\right)\left(v_{1}+2\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{4} P_{04}\right)+2 v_{1}^{2} v_{2} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2} \tau_{2}^{2} P_{22}\right) \\
& -2 E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right) v_{1}\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)\left[\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right) E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)+v_{2} E\left(\tau_{2}^{2} P_{20}\right)-v_{2} E\left(\tau_{1}^{2} P_{02}\right)\right] \\
& \left.+v_{1}\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2}\left(E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\right\} /\left(v_{1}\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)^{2}\right) . \tag{A.5}
\end{align*}
$$

To evaluate (A.5) under the inverted gamma assumptions we require the following lemma:

Lemma:

$$
\mathrm{E}\left(\tau_{1}^{\mathrm{a}} \tau_{2}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right)=\left(\nu_{1}^{2} \sigma_{1}^{2}\right)^{(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}) / 2} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{abij}}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{abij}}=\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_{1}+\nu_{2}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_{1}}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_{2}}{2}\right)} 2^{-(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}) / 2}\left(\frac{\nu_{2}-2}{\phi}\right)^{\nu_{2} / 2} \\
& \times \mathrm{v}_{1}\left(\nu_{2}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2\left(\mathrm{cv}_{2}\right)^{\left(\nu_{1}-\mathrm{a}\right) / 2}\left(\nu_{1}-2\right)^{\left(\nu_{1}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2} \\
& \times \int_{0}^{\infty} t_{1}\left(v_{2}-b\right) / 2-1\left(1-t_{1}\right)^{\left(v_{1}-a\right) / b-1}\left[v_{1} t_{1}\left(v_{2}-2\right) / \phi\right. \\
& \left.+\left(\nu_{1}-2\right) c v_{2}\left(1-t_{1}\right)\right]^{\left(a+b-v_{1}-v_{2}\right) / 2} I_{t_{1}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(v_{2}+i\right) ; \frac{1}{2}\left(v_{1}+j\right)\right) d t_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left(\tau_{1}^{a} \tau_{2}^{b} P_{i j}\right)=\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \tau_{1}^{a} \tau_{2}^{b} I_{x}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(v_{2}+i\right) ; \frac{1}{2}\left(v_{1}+j\right)\right] \\
& \quad \times \mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{1}\right) \mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{2}\right) \mathrm{d} \tau_{1} \mathrm{~d} \tau_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting in $\mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{1}\right)$ and $\mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{2}\right)$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left(\tau_{1}^{\mathrm{a}} \tau_{2}^{\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{P}}}\right)=\frac{4}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_{1}}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_{2}}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2}}{2}\right)^{\nu_{1} / 2}\left(\frac{\nu_{2} \sigma_{2}^{2}}{2}\right)^{\nu_{2} / 2} \\
& \quad \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \tau_{1}^{\mathrm{a}-\nu_{1}-1} \tau_{2}^{\mathrm{b}-\nu_{2}-1} \exp \left[-\left(\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2} / \tau_{1}^{2}+\nu_{2} \sigma_{2}^{2} / \tau_{2}^{2}\right) / 2\right] \\
& \quad \times I_{x\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(v_{2}+\mathrm{i}\right) ; \frac{1}{2}\left(v_{1}+\mathrm{j}\right)\right] \mathrm{d} \tau_{1} \mathrm{~d} \tau_{2} .} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $I_{x}($.$) does not depend on \tau_{1}$ or $\tau_{2}$. Now, using the following changes of variables:

1. $z_{1}=\tau_{1}^{2}, z_{2}=\tau_{2}^{2}$
2. $t_{1}=\mathrm{cv}_{2} z_{1} /\left(\mathrm{cv}_{2} z_{1}+v_{1} z_{2}\right), t_{2}=z_{2}$
3. $\mathrm{s}=\mathrm{p} /\left(2 \mathrm{t}_{2}\right), \mathrm{t}_{1}=\mathrm{t}_{1}$
where $\mathrm{p}=\nu_{2} \sigma_{2}^{2}+\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2} \mathrm{cv}_{2}\left(1-\mathrm{t}_{1}\right) /\left(\mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right)$, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left(\tau_{1}^{\mathrm{a}} \tau_{2}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right)=\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_{1}+v_{2}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_{1}}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_{2}}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2}}{2}\right)^{(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}) / 2}\left(\frac{\nu_{2}-2}{\phi}\right)^{\nu_{2} / 2} \\
& \times \mathrm{v}_{1}{ }^{\left(\nu_{2}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2}\left(\mathrm{cv}_{2}\right)^{\left(\nu_{1}-\mathrm{a}\right) / 2}\left(\nu_{1}-2\right)^{\left(\nu_{1}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2} \\
& \times \int_{0}^{1} \mathrm{t}_{1}{ }^{\left(\mathrm{v}_{2}-\mathrm{b}\right) / 2-1}{ }_{\left(1-\mathrm{t}_{1}\right)}{ }^{\left(\nu_{1}-\mathrm{a}\right) / \mathrm{b}-1}\left[\mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{t}_{1}\left(v_{2}-2\right) / \phi\right. \\
& \left.+\left(v_{1}-2\right) \mathrm{cv}_{2}\left(1-\mathrm{t}_{1}\right)\right]^{\left(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}-v_{1}-v_{2}\right) / 2} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{t}_{1}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{v}_{2}+\mathrm{i}\right) ; \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}+\mathrm{j}\right)\right) \mathrm{dt}_{1} \\
& =\left(\nu_{1} \sigma_{1}^{2}\right)^{(a+b) / 2} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{abij}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using this Lemma repeatedly in (A.5) gives the desired result.

Proof of Theorem 2.
Now,

$$
\begin{aligned}
R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)= & E\left[s_{A}^{2} I_{[0, c]}^{(J)+s_{N}^{2}}{ }^{I}(c, \infty)\right. \\
& =E\left[\left(s_{A}^{2}-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} I_{[0, c]}(J)\right. \\
& \left.\left.\left.+\left(s_{N}^{2}-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right]^{2}\right)\right)^{2} I_{(c, \infty)}(J)\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\mathrm{q}_{1}=\varepsilon_{1}^{\prime} M_{1} \varepsilon_{1}$ and $\mathrm{q}_{2}=\varepsilon_{2}^{\prime} M_{2} \varepsilon_{2}$ so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s_{A}^{2}=\left(q_{1}+q_{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right), s_{N}^{2}=q_{1} / v_{1} ; J=v_{1} q_{2} /\left(v_{2} q_{1}\right) \text { and } \\
& R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)=E\left\{\left[\left(q_{1}+q_{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right]^{2} I\left[q_{2} \leq v_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right]\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.+\left(q_{1} / v_{1}-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\left(1-I\left[q_{2} \leq \mathrm{cv}_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right]\right)\right\} \\
& =\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N}\left[\left(\left(q_{1}+q_{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} I\left[q_{2} \leq c v_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right]\right. \\
& \left.+\left(q_{1} / v_{1}-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\left(1-I\left[q_{2} \leq \operatorname{cv}_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right]\right)\right\} f\left(\tau_{1}\right) f\left(\tau_{2}\right) d \tau_{1} d \tau_{2} \\
& =\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N_{q_{1}}}\left[E_{N_{q_{2}}}\left(\left(q_{1}+q_{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} I\left[q_{2} \leq \mathrm{cv}_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right]\right. \\
& \left.+\left(q_{1} / v_{1}-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\left(1-I\left(q_{2} \leq c v_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right)\right)\right] \\
& \times \mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{1}\right) \mathrm{f}\left(\tau_{2}\right) \mathrm{d} \tau_{1} \mathrm{~d} \tau_{2} \\
& =\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N_{q_{1}}}\left\{\int_{0}^{x}\left(\left(q_{1}+q_{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} f_{N}\left(q_{2}\right) d q_{2}\right. \\
& \left.+\left(q_{1} / v_{1}-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\left(1-\int_{0}^{x} f_{N}\left(q_{2}\right) d q_{2}\right)\right\} f\left(\tau_{1}\right) f\left(\tau_{2}\right) d \tau_{1} d \tau_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $x=\mathrm{cv}_{2} \mathrm{q}_{1} / \mathrm{v}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{N}}\left(\mathrm{q}_{2}\right)$ is the density function of a Chi-squared random variable with $v_{2}$ degrees of freedom.

So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial R\left(s_{P}^{2}\right)}{\partial c} & =\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N_{q_{1}}}\left\{\frac { \partial x } { \partial c } \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{0}^{x}\left(\left(q_{1}+q_{2}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} f_{N}\left(q_{2}\right) d q_{2}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.-\left(q_{1} / v_{1}-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{0}^{x} f_{N}\left(q_{2}\right) d q_{2}\right]\right\} \\
& \times f\left(\tau_{1}\right) f\left(\tau_{2}\right) d \tau_{1} d \tau_{2} \\
& =\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} E_{N_{q_{1}}}\left\{\left(\frac{v_{2} q_{1}}{v_{1}}\right) f_{N}\left(\frac{c v_{2} q_{1}}{v_{1}}\right)\right. \\
\times & {\left[\left(\left(q_{1}+\mathrm{cv}_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\right.}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\left.\left.-\left(q_{1} / v_{1}-E\left(\tau_{1}\right)\right)^{2}\right]\right\} f\left(\tau_{1}\right) f\left(\tau_{2}\right) \mathrm{d} \tau_{1} \mathrm{~d} \tau_{2}
$$

A sufficient condition for this derivative to be zero is $c=0, c \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\left(\left(q_{1}+c v_{2} q_{1} / v_{1}\right) /\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}-\left(\left(q_{1} / v_{1}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\right]=0 \tag{A.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This will hold if $c=1$ or $1-2 v_{1}\left(v_{1}+v_{2}\right)\left(\left(q_{1} / v_{1}\right)-E\left(\tau_{1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2} /\left(q_{1} v_{2}\right)=0$. It does not appear possible to sign the second partial derivative with respect to $c$ and so it was not possible to analytically confirm whether $\mathrm{c}=1$ corresponds to a minimum or a maximum. Our numerical evaluations suggested a minimum.
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## FOOTNOTES

* The authors are grateful to David Giles for his helpful comments and suggestions.

1. For simplicity we assume a one-sided alternative hypothesis. It is straightforward, though tedious, to extend our analysis to the two-sided case.
2. See Giles and Giles (1993) for a survey of this literature.
3. Note that although the risks under normality are a special case of our results, those of Giles (1992) are not.
4. For example, Giles (1992) also considers the case where the mixing distribution is gamma.
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