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Abstract
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1. Introduction

Consider the following problem. Suppose that an experimenter (a customer) wishes to purchase $M$ items of some product. We assume that these items are supplied by $k$ different manufacturers (suppliers), say, $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k$. At first, the experimenter carries out an inspection on each of the $k$ suppliers’ product by using $m$ items of the product to obtain data for determining the quality of each. Then, based on the resulting data, he allocates the remaining $M - km$ items to the $k$ suppliers, say, $N_1, \ldots, N_k$, respectively, where $N_i, i = 1, \ldots, k$, are nonnegative integers such that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i = M - km$. Let $\theta_i$ denote a measure of the quality of the product from the $i$th manufacturer $\pi_i$. Let $\theta_{[1]} \leq \ldots \leq \theta_{[k]}$ be the ordered values of the parameters $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k$. It is assumed that the exact pairing between the ordered and the unordered parameters is unknown. The supplier $\pi_i$ with $\theta_i = \theta_{[k]}$ is called the best. Of course, the experimenter would ideally like to allocate (purchase) the remaining $M - km$ items from the “best” supplier. Thus, the experimenter is faced with the so-called two-stage allocation and selection problem.

For the two-stage allocation problem described above, we define the corresponding loss function to be:

$$L(\theta; m, N_1, \ldots N_k) = m \sum_{i=1}^{k} (\theta_{[k]} - \theta_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i(\theta_{[k]} - \theta_i),$$

where $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k)$, $0 \leq m \leq \lfloor \frac{M}{k} \rfloor$, $0 \leq N_i \leq M - km$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i = M - km$, and $[y]$ denotes the largest integer not greater than $y$. Note that the first summation in (1.1) is the loss due to the choice of the common initial number of items to be supplied by each of the $k$ manufacturers, and the second summation in (1.1) is the loss due to the allocation made at the second stage. Our goal here is to derive optimal two-stage allocation procedures with respect to the loss function (1.1). We study the problem for normal populations, say $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k$, with unknown means $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k$, and a common known variance $\sigma^2$. The unknown means $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k$ are assumed to be independent and identically distributed with a normal prior distribution $N(\theta_0, \tau^2)$, where the value of the parameter $\tau^2$ may be either known or unknown.
We note that Somerville (1970, 1974) studied a two-stage minimax allocation procedure for the normal distribution model with a different loss function. However, since the loss function considered by Somerville (1970) is not bounded, the minimax solution does not exist (see Ofosu (1974) for a comment). Ofosu (1975) also studied a two-stage allocation procedure via a Bayesian approach (see Gupta and Panchapakesan (1979)).

2. Normal Model

We study the allocation problem in terms of normal populations, say \( \pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k \), with unknown means \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k \), and a common known variance \( \sigma^2 \). The unknown means \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k \) are assumed to be independently and identically distributed with a normal prior distribution \( N(\theta_0, \tau^2) \). In this section, we assume that the value of the parameter \( \tau^2 \) is known. Also, for simplicity, we assume that \( M = kN \) for some positive integer \( N \).

2.1. Bayes Allocation Procedure for a Fixed \( m \).

First, we take \( m, 0 < m < N \), random observations from each of the \( k \) populations. Let \( \bar{X}_i \) denote the sample mean of the \( m \) random observations taken from population \( \pi_i \); and let \( \bar{Y}_i \) denote the associated observed value, \( i = 1, \ldots, k \). At the second stage, based on the observed values \( \bar{X} = (\bar{X}_1, \ldots, \bar{X}_k) \), allocate \( N_i(\bar{X}) \) random observations from population \( \pi_i \), \( i = 1, \ldots, k \), where \( N_1(\bar{X}), \ldots, N_k(\bar{X}) \) are nonnegative integers such that \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i(\bar{X}) = k(N - m) \). Let \( \bar{Y}_i \) denote the sample mean of the \( N_i(\bar{X}) \) random observations taken from the population \( \pi_i \) at the second stage, and let \( \bar{Y}_i \) be the associated observed value, \( i = 1, \ldots, k \). Also, let \( \bar{Y} = (\bar{Y}_1, \ldots, \bar{Y}_k) \). Note that when either \( m = 0 \) or \( m = N \), the above allocation procedure is reduced to a one-stage allocation procedure.

At stage two, given \( \bar{X} = \bar{X} \) and \( \bar{Y} = \bar{Y} \), respectively, the posterior expected loss is:

\[
\tau_m(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) = E[L(\theta, m, N_1(\bar{X}), \ldots, N_k(\bar{X}))|\bar{X} = \bar{X}, \bar{Y} = \bar{Y}]
\]

\[
= kN E[\theta_k|\bar{X} = \bar{X}, \bar{Y} = \bar{Y}] - \sum_{j=1}^{k} (m + N_j(\bar{X})) E[\theta_j|\bar{X} = \bar{X}, \bar{Y} = \bar{Y}].
\]

(2.1)
Therefore, at stage one, given $\bar{X} = \bar{\xi}$, the posterior expected loss is given by

$$r_m(\bar{\xi}) = E[r_m(\bar{X}, \bar{\xi}) | \bar{X} = \bar{\xi}]$$

$$= kN E[\theta_k | \bar{X} = \bar{\xi}] - m \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(m + N_j(\bar{\xi})) E[\theta_j | \bar{X} = \bar{\xi}]}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}$$

$$= kN E[\theta_k | \bar{X} = \bar{\xi}] - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(m + N_j(\bar{\xi})) \theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 \bar{z}_j}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}$$

$$= kN E[\theta_k | \bar{X} = \bar{\xi}] - m \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 \bar{z}_j}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2} - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{N_j(\bar{\xi}) \theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 \bar{z}_j}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}. \tag{2.2}$$

For each observed $\bar{X} = \bar{\xi}$, let $A(\bar{\xi}) = \{i | \bar{z}_i = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \bar{z}_j\}$. Then, for a fixed $m$, the Bayes allocation at the second stage is to choose the nonnegative integers $N_1(\bar{\xi}), \ldots, N_k(\bar{\xi})$ such that

$$\sum_{i \in A(\bar{\xi})} N_i(\bar{\xi}) = k(N - m).$$

Then, conditional on $m$ and the observed value $\bar{X} = \bar{\xi}$, the minimum posterior expected loss is:

$$r_m^B(\bar{\xi}) = kN E[\theta_k | \bar{X} = \bar{\xi}] - m \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 \bar{z}_j}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}$$

$$= k(N - m)[\theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \bar{z}_i]$$

$$- \frac{k(N - m) \{\theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 E[\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \bar{z}_j] \}}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}, \tag{2.3}$$

and the minimum Bayes risk for a fixed $m$ is:

$$r_m^B = E[r_m^B(\bar{X})]$$

$$= kN E[\theta_k] - m \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 E[\bar{z}_j]}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}$$

$$= k(N - m)[\theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 E[\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \bar{z}_j]]$$

$$- \frac{k(N - m) \{\theta_0 \sigma^2 + m\tau^2 E[\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \bar{z}_j] \}}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}. \tag{2.4}$$

Note that under the statistical model, $\bar{X}_1, \ldots, \bar{X}_k$ are iid and have a marginal normal distribution with mean $\theta_0$ and variance $\frac{\sigma^2}{m} + \tau^2$. Thus, $E[\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \bar{X}_i] = \theta_0 + \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{m} + \tau^2} E[\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} Z_j] = \theta_0 + \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{m} + \tau^2} \alpha$, where $Z_1, \ldots, Z_k$ are iid $N(0, 1)$ and $\alpha = E[\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} Z_j]$. Also, $E[\theta_k] = \theta_0 + \tau \alpha$. Hence, we have

$$r_m^B = k\tau \alpha \{N - \frac{(N - m) \sqrt{m \tau}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}}\}. \tag{2.5}$$
Note that the minimum Bayes risk \( r_m^B \) does not depend on the parameter \( \theta_0 \).

2.2. Optimal Initial Sample Size.

Next, we want to find an integer, say \( m_B \), \( 0 \leq m_B \leq N \) such that \( r_m^B \leq r_m^B \) for all integers \( m \) in \([0, N]\). We call such an integer \( m_B \) as an optimal initial sample size. When \( m_B \) is determined, a Bayes two-stage allocation procedure, say \( P_B \), is given as follows:

First, take \( m_B \) random observations from each of the \( k \) populations. Compute the observed sample mean \( \bar{x}_i, \ i = 1, \ldots, k \). Then, take \( k(N - m_B) \) random observations from the population which yields the largest sample mean value.

Note that finding an integer \( m \) in \([0, N]\) to minimize the Bayes risk \( r_m^B \) is equivalent to finding an integer \( m \) in \([0, N]\) to maximize \((N - m)\sqrt{m/\sigma^2 + mr^2}\) [see (2.5)]. In general, we assume \( m \) to be a variable and for each fixed \( r^2 > 0 \), let

\[
H_{t^2}(m) = \frac{(N - m)^2 m}{\sigma^2 + mr^2}
\]

be a function defined on the interval \([0, N]\). Then, the first derivative of the function \( H_{t^2}(m) \) with respect to \( m \) is

\[
H'_{t^2}(m) = \frac{(m - N)(3m - N)\sigma^2 + 2m^2r^2}{(\sigma^2 + mr^2)^2},
\]

which is nonpositive if \( \frac{N}{3} \leq m \leq N \). That is, the function \( H_{t^2}(m) \) is nonincreasing in \( m \) for \( m \) in the interval \([\frac{N}{3}, N]\). Thus, to find a number \( m \) in the interval \([0, N]\) to maximize the function \( H_{t^2}(m) \), it suffices to consider those \( m \) in the subinterval \([0, \frac{N}{3}]\). Let

\[
G(m) = (m - N)(3m - N)\sigma^2 + 2m^2r^2, \ m \in [0, \frac{N}{3}].
\]

Then,

\[
G'(m) = (3m - 2N)(2\sigma^2 + 2mr^2) < 0, \ \text{for all} \ m \in [0, \frac{N}{3}].
\]

In other words, \( G(m) \) is a decreasing function of \( m \) for \( m \in [0, \frac{N}{3}] \). Also, note that \( G(0) > 0, \ G(\frac{N}{3}) < 0 \). Thus, there exists a unique number in \((0, \frac{N}{3})\), say \( m^* \), such that \( G(m^*) = 0 \). Hence.
$H_r(m) > 0$ for all $m \in [0, m^*)$; $H_r(m) < 0$ for all $m \in (m^*, \frac{N}{3})$, and $H_r(m^*) = 0$. This implies that the function $H_r(m)$ achieves its maximum at $m = m^*$. Note that $m^*$ is the positive solution of the equation $(3m - N)\sigma^2 + 2m^2\tau^2 = 0$. That is,

$$m^* = \frac{-3\sigma^2 + \sqrt{9N\tau^2\sigma^2 + 9\sigma^4}}{4\tau^2} \quad (2.7)$$

$$= \frac{2N\sigma}{\sqrt{9N\tau^2 + 9\sigma^2 + 3\sigma}}.$$

Let

$$m_B = \begin{cases} 
[m^*] & \text{if } H_r([m^*]) \geq H_r([m^*] + 1), \\
[m^*] + 1 & \text{if } H_r([m^*]) < H_r([m^*] + 1). 
\end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

Therefore, the minimum Bayes risk, denoted by $r^B$, of the Bayes two-stage allocation procedure is:

$$r^B = k\tau\alpha \{N - \frac{(N - m_B)\sqrt{m_B}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + m_B\tau^2}}\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Remarks 2.1

a) For fixed $N$ and $\sigma^2$, the optimal initial sample size $m_B$ can be viewed as a function of the parameter $\tau^2$, and hence is denoted by $m_B(\tau^2)$. From (2.6), (2.7), (2.8), one can see that

$$1 \leq m_B(\tau^2) \leq \left[\frac{N}{3}\right] + 1 \quad \text{for any } \tau^2 > 0.$$

Furthermore, we have the following results:

$$\lim_{\tau^2 \to \infty} m_B(\tau^2) = 1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\lim_{\tau^2 \to 0} m_B(\tau^2) = \begin{cases} 
\left[\frac{N}{3}\right] & \text{if } N \equiv 0 \text{ or } 1 \pmod{3}, \\
\left[\frac{N}{3}\right] + 1 & \text{if } N \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. 
\end{cases}$$

b) From (2.7), $m^*$ is a decreasing function of the parameter $\tau^2$. Thus, from (2.8), one may expect that $m_B(\tau^2)$ is nonincreasing in $\tau^2$. Actually, we have the following results:

$$\begin{cases} 
\text{If } \tau_1^2 > \tau_2^2, \text{ then } m_B(\tau_1^2) \leq m_B(\tau_2^2). \\
\text{If } m_B(\tau_1^2) < m_B(\tau_2^2), \text{ then } \tau_1^2 > \tau_2^2. 
\end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

which can be obtained directly from the following lemma.
Lemma 2.1. Let $H_{\tau^2}(m) = \frac{(N-m)^2 m}{\sigma^2 + m\tau^2}$, $1 \leq m \leq \lceil N/3 \rceil + 1$ and $\tau^2 > 0$. If $H_{\tau^2}(m) \geq H_{\tau^2}(m+1)$, then $H_{\tau^2}(m) > H_{\tau^2}(m+1)$ for all $\tau^2 > \tau_2^*$. 

Proof: By the given condition,

$$0 \leq H_{\tau^2}(m) - H_{\tau^2}(m+1) = \frac{(N-m)^2 m[\sigma^2 + (m+1)\tau^2] - (\sigma^2 + m\tau^2)(N-m-1)^2(m+1)}{(\sigma^2 + m\tau^2)[\sigma^2 + (m+1)\tau^2]}.$$ 

Let

$$h(\tau^2) = (N-m)^2 m[\sigma^2 + (m+1)\tau^2] - (\sigma^2 + m\tau^2)(N-m-1)^2(m+1).$$

Hence, $h(\tau^2) \geq 0$. Also, the first derivative of $h(\tau^2)$ with respect to $\tau^2$ is

$$h'(\tau^2) = \frac{d h(\tau^2)}{d\tau^2} = m(m+1)[2(N-m) - 1] > 0$$

for all $1 \leq m \leq \lceil N/3 \rceil + 1$,

which implies $h(\tau^2)$ is an increasing function of $\tau^2$. Thus, $h(\tau_1^2) > h(\tau_2^2) \geq 0$ since $\tau_1^2 > \tau_2^2$.

Therefore, we have $H_{\tau_1^2}(m) > H_{\tau_2^2}(m+1)$.

3. An Adaptive Two-Stage Allocation Procedure

In this section, we still assume the normal model except that the value of the parameter $\tau^2$ is unknown. Thus, the Bayes two-stage allocation procedure derived in Section 2 can not be applied in this situation. To overcome this difficulty, we propose an adaptive two-stage allocation procedure via the empirical Bayes approach.

We now consider the following situation. Suppose that one is confronted repeatedly and independently with a sequence of the allocation problems as described in Section 1. We can then use the past observations at hand to construct an estimator for the unknown parameter $\tau^2$. This estimator is then applied to form an adaptive two-stage allocation procedure for the next allocation problem. Suppose now, we are at time $t = n + 1$. We have already had $n$ past observations at hand. We let $m_j$ denote the adaptive optimal initial sample size taken at stage one at time $t = j$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. The determination of $m_j$ will be described later. From Remark 2.1 a),
1 ≤ m_j ≤ \left[ \frac{N}{k} \right] + 1. That is, we take at least one observation from each of the k populations at each time j = 1, ..., n. We let X_ij denote the one observation taken from population π_i at time j, j = 1, ..., n. Then, under the normal model, X_ij has a marginal normal distribution with mean θ_0 and variance \( \sigma^2 + \tau^2 \). Also, following the usual empirical Bayes formulation (for example, see Robbins (1983) or Gupta and Liang (1987)), we can assume that \( X_{ij}, \ j = 1, ..., n; \ i = 1, ..., k, \) are independently distributed. In the following, we only consider the case when the value of the parameter θ_0 is unknown. Thus, let

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{X}(n) &= \frac{1}{kn} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij}, \\
S^2(n) &= \frac{1}{kn-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}(n))^2.
\end{align*}
\]

(3.1)

Then, \( (kn - 1)S^2(n)/(\sigma^2 + \tau^2) \) has a \( \chi^2 \)-distribution with degrees of freedom \( kn - 1 \). Since \( \tau^2 \) is positive, we suggest using

\[
\tau_{n+1}^2 = (S^2(n) - \sigma^2)^+
\]

(3.2)

to estimate the unknown parameter \( \tau^2 \), where \( y^+ = \max(0, y) \). When \( \tau_{n+1}^2 > 0 \), we define \( m_{n+1} \), the adaptive optimal initial sample size at time \( t = n + 1 \), to be an integer in the interval \([0, N]\) which maximizes the function \( H_{s+1}^2(m) = \frac{(N-m)^2m}{\sigma^2 + m\tau_{n+1}^2} \) among all the integers in the interval \([0, N]\).

From Remark 2.1 a), \( 1 ≤ m_{n+1} ≤ \left[ \frac{N}{s} \right] + 1 \). When \( \tau_{n+1}^2 = 0 \), we let \( m_{n+1} = \left[ \frac{N}{s} \right] \) (or \( \left[ \frac{N}{s} \right] + 1 \)) if \( H_{s+1}^2(\left[ \frac{N}{s} \right]) \geq (>) H_{s+1}^2(\left[ \frac{N}{s} \right] + 1) \). Note that when \( n = 0 \), i.e. there is no past observation available, we choose any integer \( m_1 \) in the interval \([1, \left[ \frac{N}{s} \right] + 1]\) as the initial sample size.

We then propose an adaptive two-stage allocation procedure, say \( P_{n+1} \), at \( t = n + 1 \) as follows:

At time \( t = n + 1 \), first take \( m_{n+1} \) observations from each of the \( k \) populations. Compute the observed sample mean \( \bar{X}_i \) based on the \( m_{n+1} \) observations taken from population \( \pi_i \). Then, take \( k(N-m_{n+1}) \) random observations from the population which yields the largest sample mean value.

We denote the conditional Bayes risk given \( m_{n+1} \) and the Bayes risk of the adaptive two-stage allocation procedure \( P_{n+1} \) by \( r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) \) and \( r_{n+1} \), respectively. That is,

\[
\begin{align*}
\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) = k\tau_a \{ N - \frac{(N-m_{n+1})^2m_{n+1}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1}\tau_{n+1}^2}} \} , \\
r_{n+1} = E[r_{n+1}(m_{n+1})].
\end{array} \right.
\]

(3.3)
where the expectation $E$ is taken with respect to $m_{n+1}$ or the probability space generated by

$(X_{ij}, j = 1, \ldots, n, i = 1, \ldots, k)$.

Note that $r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) - r^B \geq 0$ since $r^B$ is the minimum Bayes risk, and therefore $r_{n+1} - r^B \geq 0$. The two differences $r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) - r^B$ and $r_{n+1} - r^B$ are always used as measures of the performance of the proposed two-stage allocation procedure $P_{n+1}$.

**Definition 3.1**

a) The sequence of adaptive two-stage allocation procedures $\{P_{n+1}\}$ is said to be asymptotically optimal in probability of order $\{\alpha_n\}$ if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $P\{r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) - r^B \geq \varepsilon\} \leq 0(\alpha_n)$ as $n \to \infty$ where $\{\alpha_n\}$ is a sequence of positive numbers such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \alpha_n = 0$.

b) The sequence of adaptive two-stage allocation procedures $\{P_{n+1}\}$ is said to be asymptotically optimal of order $\{\beta_n\}$ if $r_{n+1} - r^B < 0(\beta_n)$ as $n \to \infty$ where $\{\beta_n\}$ is a sequence of positive numbers such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \beta_n = 0$.

In the following, we will investigate some asymptotically optimal properties of the proposed adaptive two-stage allocation procedures $\{P_{n+1}\}$.

Let $I = \{m|m$ is an integer in $[1, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1]$ such that $H_{r^2}(m_B) - H_{r^2}(m) \neq 0\}$, and let $c = \min\{H_{r^2}(m_B) - H_{r^2}(m)|m \in I\}$. Then, by the definitions of $m_B$ and the set $I$, $c > 0$.

**Lemma 3.1.**

a) Suppose that $m_{n+1} \in I$ and $m_{n+1} < m_B$. Then

$$c \leq H_{r^2}(m_B) - H_{r^2}(m_{n+1}) \leq d^{-1}(r^2_{n+1} - r^2)$$

where $d^{-1} = N^4/(16\sigma^4)$.

b) Suppose that $m_{n+1} \in I$ and $m_{n+1} > m_B$. Then,

$$c \leq H_{r^2}(m_B) - H_{r^2}(m_{n+1}) \leq d^{-1}(r^2 - r_{n+1}^2).$$
Proof:

a) By Lemma 2.1, as \( m_{n+1} \in I \) and \( m_B > m_{n+1} \), we have \( \tau^2 < \tau_{n+1}^2 \). Thus, on the event that \( m_{n+1} \in I \) and \( \tau^2 < \tau_{n+1}^2 \), we have

\[
c < H_{r^2}(m_B) - H_{r^2}(m_{n+1})
\]

\[
= \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau^2}
\]

\[
= \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right] + \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right]
\]

\[
= \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right] + \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right]
\]

In (3.4), \( \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \) \leq 0 \) which is obtained by the definition of \( m_{n+1} \), and

\( \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} < 0 \) by noting that \( \tau^2 < \tau_{n+1}^2 \). Thus, we obtain

\[
c \leq H_{r^2}(m_B) - H_{r^2}(m_{n+1})
\]

\[
\leq \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2}
\]

\[
= \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau_{n+1}^2} \left( \frac{\tau_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau^2 (\tau_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2)} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{N^4}{16 \sigma^4} (\tau_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2)
\]

\[
= d^{-1}(\tau_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2)
\]

which completes the proof of part a).

b) By Lemma 2.1 again, as \( m_{n+1} \in I \) and \( m_B < m_{n+1} \), we have \( \tau^2 > \tau_{n+1}^2 \). Thus, under the event that \( m_{n+1} \in I \) and \( \tau^2 > \tau_{n+1}^2 \), we have

\[
c \leq H_{r^2}(m_B) - H_{r^2}(m_{n+1})
\]

\[
= \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau^2}
\]

\[
= \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right] + \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right]
\]

\[
= \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right] + \left[ \frac{(N - m_B)^2 m_B}{\sigma^2 + m_B \tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2 m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1} \tau_{n+1}^2} \right]
\]
where \( \frac{(N-m_B)^2m_B}{\sigma^2+m_B\tau_{n+1}^2} \) < 0 since \( \tau^2 > \tau_{n+1}^2 \) and \( \frac{(N-m_B)^2m_B}{\sigma^2+m_B\tau_{n+1}^2} \leq 0 \), by the definition of \( m_{n+1} \). Therefore,

\[
\begin{align*}
    c & \leq H_{\tau^2}(m_B) - H_{\tau_{n+1}^2}(m_{n+1}) \\
    & \leq \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1}\tau_{n+1}^2} - \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2m_{n+1}}{\sigma^2 + m_{n+1}\tau_{n+1}^2} \\
    & = \frac{(N - m_{n+1})^2m_{n+1}^2}{(\sigma^2 + m_{n+1}\tau_{n+1}^2)(\sigma^2 + m_{n+1}\tau_{n+1}^2)} (\tau^2 - \tau_{n+1}^2) \\
    & \leq d^{-1}(\tau^2 - \tau_{n+1}^2).
\end{align*}
\]

**Lemma 3.2.**

a) \( P\{r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) > r_B\} \leq P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq dc\}. \)

b) \( r_{n+1} - r_B \leq k\alpha r^2[H_{\tau^2}(m_B)]^2 P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq dc\}. \)

**Proof:**

a) 

\[
P\{r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) > r_B\}
\]

\[
= P\{H_{\tau^2}(m_B) - H_{\tau_{n+1}^2}(m_{n+1}) > 0, m_{n+1} \in I\}
\]

\[
= P\{H_{\tau^2}(m_B) - H_{\tau_{n+1}^2}(m_{n+1}) \geq c, m_{n+1} \in I\}
\]

(by the definition of the set \( I \))

\[
= P\{H_{\tau^2}(m_B) - H_{\tau_{n+1}^2}(m_{n+1}) \geq c, m_{n+1} \in I, m_B < m_{n+1}\}
\]

\[
+ P\{H_{\tau^2}(m_B) - H_{\tau_{n+1}^2}(m_{n+1}) \geq c, m_{n+1} \in I, m_B > m_{n+1}\}
\]

\[
\leq P\{\tau^2 - \tau_{n+1}^2 \geq dc\} + P\{\tau_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2 \geq dc\}
\]

(by Lemma 3.1)

\[
= P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq dc\}.
\]
b) 

\[ r_{n+1} - r_B \]

\[ = E[r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) - r_B] \]

\[ = E[\kappa \alpha^2 ((H_{r,2}(m_B))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (H_{r,2}(m_{n+1}))^{\frac{1}{2}})] \]

\[ \leq \kappa \alpha^2 [H_{r,2}(m_B)]^{\frac{1}{2}} P\{H_{r,2}(m_B) - H_{r,2}(m_{n+1}) > 0\} \]

\[ = \kappa \alpha^2 [H_{r,2}(m_B)]^{\frac{1}{2}} P\{H_{r,2}(m_B) - H_{r,2}(m_{n+1}) \geq \epsilon\} \]

\[ \leq \kappa \alpha^2 [H_{r,2}(m_B)]^{\frac{1}{2}} P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq dc\} \]

where the last equality is obtained from the definition of the constant \( c \), and the last inequality is obtained from the proof of part a) of this lemma.

From Lemma 3.2, in order to investigate the asymptotic behavior of \( P\{r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) > r_B\} \) and \( r_{n+1} - r_B \), it suffices to study the asymptotic behavior of the probability \( P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq dc\} \).

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( \{\tau_{n+1}^2\}_{n=1}^\infty \) be a sequence of estimators defined in (3.2). Then, \( \tau_{n+1}^2 \) converges to \( \tau^2 \) in probability. Furthermore, for any \( \epsilon > 0 \), we have \( P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq \epsilon\} \leq 0\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \) as \( n \to \infty \).

**Proof:** First note that \( Y \equiv \frac{(kn-1)S^2(n)}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2} \) follows a \( \chi^2 \)-distribution with \( (kn-1) \) degrees of freedom.

By the definition of \( r_{n+1}^2 \) given in (3.2), letting \( \epsilon_1 = \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2} \), we have

\[ P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq \epsilon\} \]

\[ = P\{r_{n+1}^2 \geq \tau^2 + \epsilon\} + P\{r_{n+1}^2 \leq \tau^2 - \epsilon\} \]

\[ \leq P\{S^2(n) \geq \tau^2 + \sigma^2 + \epsilon\} + P\{S^2(n) \leq \tau^2 + \sigma^2 - \epsilon\} \]

\[ = P\{Y \geq (kn-1)(1 + \epsilon_1)\} + P\{Y \leq (kn-1)(1 - \epsilon_1)\} \]

\[ = P\left\{\left|\frac{Y - (kn-1)}{\sqrt{2(kn-1)}}\right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{kn-1}{2}} \epsilon_1\right\} \]

\[ \leq \frac{(kn-1)\epsilon_1^2}{2} \]

which can be obtained by Chebyshev's inequality. Hence we obtain that

\[ P\{|r_{n+1}^2 - \tau^2| \geq \epsilon\} \leq 0\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \text{ as } n \to \infty. \]
From Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we conclude the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** The sequence of adaptive two-stage allocation procedures \( \{P_{n+1}\} \) is asymptotically optimal in probability of order \( \{n^{-1}\} \) and asymptotically optimal of order \( \{n^{-1}\} \). That is,

\[
P\{r_{n+1}(m_{n+1}) - r^B \geq \epsilon\} \leq O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \text{ as } n \to \infty \text{ for any } \epsilon > 0,
\]

and

\[
r_{n+1} - r^B \leq O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\]
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This paper deals with the problem of deriving two-stage allocation procedures for selecting the best normal population. If the prior distribution is assumed to be known, an exact Bayes two-stage allocation procedure is obtained. If the prior distribution depends on some unknown parameter, an adaptive two-stage allocation procedure is proposed. Using the empirical Bayes formulation, we prove that the proposed adaptive two-stage allocation procedure has some asymptotic optimality property.
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