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SUMMARY

A number of estimates and tests for mean life and other parameters derived under the exponential distribution assumption are studied under the alternative condition that the distribution has increasing (decreasing) failure rate. The estimates considered are, for the most part, based on censored and truncated samples. It is shown that these estimates generally favor the producer (consumer) in the IFR (DFR) case. Properties of order statistics and their spacings from distributions with increasing (decreasing) failure rate are presented.
1. Introduction. In a fundamental paper in the literature of life testing Epstein and Sobel (1953) introduce life test procedures based on the exponential distribution. These procedures have been codified in a Department of Defense handbook (1960) and are now widely employed. Zelen and Dannemiller (1961) show by sampling from Weibull distribution alternatives that these procedures are not robust in testing for mean life. However, as Antelman and Savage (unpub.) have pointed out they may be robust in testing for certain percentiles. For certain loss functions based on percentiles, these procedures seem to be robust. Since statistical procedures based on the exponential distribution have a great deal of intuitive appeal and computational simplicity we investigate their properties relative to alternative distributions having increasing failure rate (IFR) or decreasing failure rate (DFR).

This paper essentially confirms, theoretically and more generally, the sampling results of the Zelen-Dannemiller paper for statistics derived under the exponential assumption. Using Weibull distribution alternatives (with parameter values which insure that the distribution has increasing failure rate) Zelen-Dannemiller show that the use of these statistics may result in substantially increasing the probability of accepting items having poor mean lives. We show that these estimates for the mean are positively (negatively) biased when the distribution is IFR (DFR). Also we obtain bounds on the expected values of the exponential estimates for the distribution function and bounds on the expected values of the order statistics.
In the last section various properties of IFR (DFR) order statistics are presented.

**Preliminaries.** Let \( X \) denote a random variable with right continuous distribution \( F \) such that \( F(0^-) = 0 \). If \( F \) has density \( f \) then

\[
 r(t) = \frac{f(t)}{[1 - F(t)]^t} \tag{1}
\]

is known as the failure rate. Note that \( r(t) = -\frac{d}{dt} \log[1 - F(t)] \) when a density exists. For this reason, we say that \( F \) is IFR (DFR) for increasing (decreasing) failure rate if \( \log[1 - F(t)] \) is concave where finite (convex on \([0, \infty)\)). Note that any IFR (DFR) distribution with specified mean can be expressed as the limit of continuous IFR (DFR) distributions with the same mean. Hence for many of our results it is sufficient to confine attention to continuous IFR (DFR) distribution.

We often use the well known fact that if \( F \) is continuous, then \( Y = -\theta \log F(X) \) is exponentially distributed with mean \( \theta \) where \( F(x) = 1 - F(x) \). Repeatedly we use the fact that if \( F \) is IFR with mean \( \theta \) then there exists \( x_0 \geq \theta \) such that

\[
 y = -\theta \log F(x) \begin{cases} < x & \text{for } x < x_0 \\ \geq x & \text{for } x \geq x_0 \end{cases}
\]

This is evident from log concavity and the bounds on IFR distributions given in Barlow and Marshall (1964). The inequalities are reversed when \( F \) is DFR.

Unless otherwise indicated we denote ordered observations from a random sample of size \( n \) based on a random variable \( X \).
by $X_1 \leq \ldots \leq X_n$. We define $X_0 = 0$.

2. Estimates based on censored samples. Assume $n$ items are put on life test and let $X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \ldots \leq X_n$ denote the ordered observations. If $F$ has density $f$ such that

$$f(x; \theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}} & x \geq 0 \\ 0 & x < 0 \end{cases}$$

then

$$\hat{\theta}_{r, n} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{r} X_i + (n - r)X_r}{\sum_{i=1}^{r} 1} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{r} (n - i + 1)(X_i - X_{i-1})}{r}$$

($1 \leq r \leq n$) is the maximum likelihood and minimum variance unbiased estimate for $\theta$ based on the first $r$ order statistics (Epstein and Sobel, 1953).

The normalized spacings $D_i = (n - i + 1)(X_i - X_{i-1})$ which enter into the computation of $\hat{\theta}_{r, n}$ have a natural intuitive appeal. They have also been used as the basis for a statistic to test for IFR (Proschan and Pyke, in preparation). We shall derive and use several properties of these spacings when $F$ is IFR (DFR). Since the normalized spacings are independent and identically distributed in the exponential case (Epstein and Sobel, 1953), Theorem 2.1 below is quite intuitive.

A random variable $X$ is said to be stochastically smaller than a random variable $Y$ if and only if $P[X \geq x] \leq P[Y \geq x]$ for all $x$. 

Theorem 2.1. If \( F \) is IFR (DFR) the normalized spacings
\((n - i + 1)(X_i - X_{i-1})\) are stochastically decreasing (increasing) in \( i \).

**Proof.** Assume \( F \) is IFR and let \( F(x) = 1 - F(x) \). Note that
\[
P[nX_1 > x] = \left[ F\left( \frac{x}{n} \right) \right]^n \geq \left[ F\left( \frac{x}{n-1} \right) \right]^{n-1}
\]
since \( \left[ F(t) \right]^t \) is decreasing in \( t \). Let
\[
F_u(x) = \frac{F(u + x) - F(u)}{F(u)}
\]
and note \( F_u(x) \geq F(x) \). Given that \( X_1 = u \) is observed, \( X_2 - X_1 \) is distributed as the first order statistic from a sample of size \( n - 1 \) each with distribution \( F_u(x) \). Hence
\[
P[ (n - 1)(X_2 - X_1) > x \mid X_1 = u] = \left[ F_u\left( \frac{x}{n-1} \right) \right]^{n-1}.
\]
Conditioning on \( X_1 \) we have
\[
P[nX_1 > x] = \left[ F\left( \frac{x}{n} \right) \right]^n \geq \left[ F_u\left( \frac{x}{n-1} \right) \right]^{n-1}
\]
\[
= P[ (n - 1)(X_2 - X_1) > x \mid X_1 = u]
\]
for all \( u \geq 0 \). Unconditioning
\[
P[nX_1 > x] \geq \int_0^\infty \left[ F_u\left( \frac{x}{n-1} \right) \right]^{n-1} dG(u)
\]
\[
= P[ (n-1)(X_2 - X_1) > x]
\]
where \( G(u) = 1 - \left[ F(u) \right]^n \) is the distribution of \( X_1 \). Hence we have shown that \( nX_1 \) is stochastically larger than \( (n - 1)(X_2 - X_1) \).

In a similar manner we can show that \( (n - i + 1)(X_i - X_{i-1}) \) is stochastically larger than \( (n - i)(X_{i+1} - X_i) \) for \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \).

All inequalities are reversed for DFR distributions. \( \Box \)

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1 we have that
E\left\{ \frac{(n - i + 1)(X_{i} - X_{i-1})}{\sigma} \right\}

is decreasing (increasing) in $i$ for $\sigma \geq 0$ when $F$ is IFR (DFR). Using this fact we can show that $\hat{\theta}_{r, n}$ is positively biased when $F$ is IFR.

Corollary 2.2. If $F$ is IFR with mean $\theta$, then

$$\theta \leq E[\hat{\theta}_{r, n}] \leq n \frac{\theta}{r}$$

for $r = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. All inequalities are sharp.

Proof. From Barlow and Proschan (1964a, p.33) we know that

$$E[\hat{\theta}_{1, n}] > \theta.$$ 

Also

$$h(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \left\{ E\left[ \frac{(n - i + 1)(X_{i} - X_{i-1})}{\sigma} \right] - \theta \right\}$$

exhibits at most one sign change as a function of $r$ since

$$E\left[ \frac{(n - i + 1)(X_{i} - X_{i-1})}{\sigma} \right]$$

is decreasing in $i$ by Theorem 2.1. But $h(1) > 0$ and $h(n) = 0$, which implies $h(r) \geq 0$ for $r = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Hence

$$E[\hat{\theta}_{r, n}] \geq \theta.$$ 

Clearly the bound is attained by the exponential distribution so that it is sharp.

To show the upper bound we note

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} X_{i} + (n - r) X_{r} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i}$$

for every sample realization. Hence

$$E[\hat{\theta}_{r, n}] \leq n \theta$$

or

$$E[\hat{\theta}_{r, n}] \leq n \frac{\theta}{r}.$$
Since equality is attained with distributions degenerate at \( \theta \) (which is the limit of IFR distributions) the bound is sharp.

**Corollary 2.3.** If \( F \) is DFR with mean \( \theta \), then
\[
0 \leq E[\hat{\theta}_{r,n}] \leq \theta \quad \text{for } 1 \leq r < n.
\]

All inequalities are sharp.

**Proof.** The upper bound follows from Theorem 2.1 and the method of proof in Corollary 2.2. To show that the lower bound is sharp, let
\[
F(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x < 0 \\
\frac{e x}{\theta} & x > 0 
\end{cases}
\]
where \( \epsilon > 0 \) is arbitrary. Then \( F \) is DFR with mean \( \theta \) and
\[
P[X_i > x] = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{n}{j} [F(x)]^j [F(x)]^{n-j}
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{n}{j} \epsilon^{n-j} \frac{\epsilon(x(n-j))}{\theta^{n-j}}
\]
Hence
\[
E[X_i] = \left. \int_0^\infty P[X_i > x] \, dx \right|_{0}^{\epsilon} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{n}{j} \frac{\epsilon^{n-j} \theta}{(n-j)} < 2^n \epsilon \theta
\]
when \( 0 \leq \epsilon < 1 \). Since \( \epsilon \) is arbitrary we see that
\[
E[X_i] \geq 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < n
\]
is sharp.

For convenience we now denote the \( i \)-th order statistic from a sample of size \( n \) by \( X_{i,n} \).

**Theorem 2.4.** If \( F \) is IFR (DFR) \( (n-i+1)(X_{i,n} - X_{i-1,n}) \) is stochastically increasing (decreasing) in \( n \) for fixed \( i \). Hence
\[
E[\hat{\theta}_{r,n}] \leq E[\hat{\theta}_{r,n+1}] \quad \text{for } 1 \leq r \leq n.
\]
Proof. Assume $F$ is IFR. Let $G_{i,n}(x) = P[X_i \leq x]$ and note that $G_{i,n}(x) \leq G_{i,n+1}(x)$ for samples from any distribution.

Now

$$
P( (n - i)(X_{i+1} - X_i, n) \geq x ) = \left( \int_0^\infty \left[ F_u \left( \frac{x}{n+1-i} \right) \right]^{n+1-i} dG_{i,n}(u) \right)$$

$$\leq \int_0^\infty \left[ F_u \left( \frac{x}{n+1-i} \right) \right]^{n-i} dG_{i,n}(u)$$

$$\leq \int_0^\infty \left[ F_u \left( \frac{x}{n+1-i} \right) \right]^{n+1-i} dG_{i,n+1}(u)$$

$$= P( (n+1-i)(X_{i+1} - X_i, n+1) \geq x ).$$

The first inequality holds since $[F(t)]^t$ is decreasing in $t$ when $F$ is IFR.

All inequalities are reversed when $F$ is DFR.

Thus when $F$ is IFR, the estimate $\hat{\theta}_{r,n}$ of mean life based on a sample censored on the right becomes worse with increasing $n$ when $r \ (1 < r < n)$ remains fixed.

Acceptance Sampling. Statistical methods for testing hypotheses about the mean of an exponential distribution depend on the statistic $\hat{\theta}_{r,n}$, in the case of censored samples (Epstein, 1960a). For testing the hypothesis $H_0: \theta = \theta_0$ against the alternative $H_1: \theta = \theta_1 < \theta_0$ subject to $P[\text{reject } \theta = \theta_0 | \theta_0 \text{ true}] = \alpha$, the rejection region is of the form

$$\hat{\theta}_{r,n} < \frac{\theta_0 \chi^2_{1-\alpha}(2r)}{2r}.$$

If $\chi^2_{1-\alpha}(2r) < 2r$, then we shall prove, using Lemma 2.5, that
so that the exponential test provides a size $\alpha$ test when the failure distribution is IFR. To see (2.2) we need the following easily verified result which we present without proof.

**Lemma 2.5.** If $\phi$ is concave, $\phi(0) = 0$, and $a_i \geq 1$, $x_i > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$), then

$$\phi \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \phi(x_i)$$

Let $\phi^{-1}(y) = -\theta \log F(y)$, so that $X_i = \phi(Y_i)$

where $Y_i$ is the $i^{th}$ order statistic of an exponentially distributed random variable with mean $\theta$. Then

$$\hat{\theta}_{r, n} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \phi(Y_i) + (n - r) \phi(Y_r)$$

$$\geq \phi \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y_i + (n - r)Y_r \right]$$

by Lemma 2.5. Using the bounds on IFR distributions (Barlow and Marshall, 1964) and letting $Z_r^* = \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y_i + (n - r)Y_r$, we have

$$P_{\hat{\theta}} [\phi(Z_r^*) \leq c] \leq P_{\hat{\theta}} [Z_r^* \leq c]$$

when $c < \theta$. We obtain (2.2) by letting $\theta = \theta_0$ and
Sampling with Replacement. Suppose now that failed items are replaced at failure. In this case the bias of the usual estimate for \( \theta \) is even greater than in the non-replacement case.

Let \( X^*_i \) denote the time of the \( i \)th failure when failed items are replaced. The maximum likelihood estimate for \( \theta \) based on the exponential assumption is, in this case

\[
\hat{\theta}_{r,n} = \frac{1}{r} \left[ nX^*_1 + n(X^*_2 - X^*_1) + \ldots + n(X^*_r - X^*_{r-1}) \right] - \frac{nX^*_r}{r}
\]

(Epstein, 1960b).

**Theorem 2.5.** If \( F \) is IFR with mean \( \theta \), then

\[
\theta < E[\hat{\theta}_{r,n}] < E[\hat{\theta}^*_{r,n}] < \frac{n}{r} E[X_1^n] \quad 1 \leq r \leq n
\]

**Proof.** Clearly \( X^*_{r,n} \leq X_r \) for any distribution \( F \) so that the upper bound is obvious. To show the remaining inequality we introduce the following fictitious replacement policy:

**Policy A:** Replace a failed item with a good item of the same "age".

Let \( X^{**}_i \) denote the time of the \( i \)th failure under this policy and

\[
\hat{\theta}^{**}_{r,n} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^{r} (n - i + 1)(X^{**}_i - X^{**}_{i-1})
\]

It is clear that \( E[\hat{\theta}^{**}_{r,n}] = E[\hat{\theta}^*_{r,n}] \)

since under the IFR assumption the conditional mean life of an aged item is less than the mean life of a new item.
We need only show \( F(\hat{\mu}_{r, n}^*) \leq F(\hat{\mu}_{r, n}^{**}) \). Let
\[
F_u(x) = \frac{F(x + u) - F(u)}{F(u)} \quad \text{and} \quad G(u) = P[X_1 \leq u] \quad \text{. Then}
\]
\[
P[X_2 - X_1 \geq \frac{x}{n-1} \mid X_1 = u] = [F_u(\frac{x}{n-1})]^{n-1} \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
E[(n - 1)(X_2 - X_1)] = \int_0^x \int_0^x [F_u(\frac{x}{n-1})]^{n-1} \, dx \, dG(u) \quad \text{. Similarly}
\]
under Policy II,
\[
P[X_2^{**} - X_1^{**} \geq \frac{x}{n} \mid X_1 = u] = [F_u(\frac{x}{n})]^n
\]
and
\[
E[n(X_2^{**} - X_1^{**})] = \int_0^x \int_0^x [F_u(\frac{x}{n})]^n \, dx \, dG(u) \quad \text{.}
\]
Since 
\[
[F_u(\frac{x}{n})]^n \geq [F_u(\frac{x}{n-1})]^{n-1} \quad \text{when } F \text{ is IFR}
\]
we have
\[
E[(n - 1)(X_2 - X_1)] \leq E[n(X_2^{**} - X_1^{**})] \quad \text{.}
\]
To show
\[
E[(n - i + 1)(X_i - X_{i-1}^{**})] \leq E[(n - i + 1)(X_i^{**} - X_{i-1}^{**})] \quad \text{for } 2 < i < n
\]
we proceed as above except that the definition of \( G \) is different for the two policies. For example, for \( i = 3 \) let
\[
G(u_2 \mid u_1) = P[X_2 \leq u_2 \mid X_1 = u_1] = 1 - [F_{u_1}(u_2 - u_1)]^{n-1} \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
G^{*}(u_2 \mid u_1) = P[X_2^{**} \leq u_2 \mid X_1^{**} = u_1] = 1 - [F_{u_1}^*(u_2 - u_1)]^n \quad \text{.}
\]
Since 
\[
G(u_2 \mid u_1) \leq G^{*}(u_2 \mid u_1)
\]
we have...
Bounds on estimates for the reliability function. The minimum variance unbiased estimate for \( R(t) = \bar{F}(t) \) (t is fixed) under the exponential assumption is

\[
\hat{R}_1(t) = \max \{ 0, (1 - \frac{t}{\theta})^{r-1} \}
\]

where \( \theta = \sum_{i=1}^{r} X_i + (n-r)X_r \). For a discussion of such minimum variance unbiased estimates see Tate (1959). For convenience, assume that \( \theta = 1 \). Then, under the exponential assumption, \( Z_r \) has density

\[
g_r(y) = \frac{r-1}{(r-1)!} y^{r-1} e^{-y}.
\]

**Theorem 2.6.** If \( F \) is IFR with mean \( \theta = 1 \) and \( t < \theta = 1 \), then

\[
E[\hat{R}_1(t)] \geq \int_{t}^{1} \left[ 1 - \frac{y}{\theta} \right]^{r-1} g_r(y) \, dy + \int_{1-t}^{\infty} (1-t)^{r-1} g_r(y) \, dy.
\]

**Proof.** Without loss of generality we may assume \( F \) continuous (see preliminaries). Let \( \phi^{-1}(y) = -\log \bar{F}(y) \). Then \( \phi \) is concave, increasing and \( \phi(0) = 0 \). If \( Y_i \) is the \( i \)th order statistic.
from an exponentially distributed random variable with \( \theta = 1 \),
then \( X_i = \phi(Y_i) \) is the \( i \)th order statistic from an IFR random variable with distribution \( F \) and mean \( \theta = 1 \). Furthermore

\[
Z_r = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \phi(Y_i) + (n - r) \phi(Y_r)
\]

\[
\geq \phi \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y_i + (n - r)Y_r \right] = \psi \left[ Z_r \right]
\]

by the previous lemma. Therefore

\[
\hat{R}_1(t) = \max \left\{ 0, (1 - \frac{t}{Z_r})^{r-1} \right\}
\]

\[
\geq \max \left\{ 0, (1 - \frac{t}{\phi(Z_r)})^{r-1} \right\}
\]

Since

\[\phi(y) \begin{cases} \geq 1 & y < 1 \\ = 1 & y \geq 1 \end{cases}\]

we have

\[
E[\hat{R}_1(t)] \geq \left( 1 - \frac{t}{y} \right)^{r-1} g_r(y) dy + \left( 1 - t \right)^{r-1} g_r(y) dy
\]

The maximum likelihood estimate for \( R(t) \) under the exponential assumption is

\[\hat{R}_2(t) = e^{-\hat{\theta}_r n}\]

where \( \hat{\theta}_r n \) was defined in (2.1). Pugh (1963) has shown that
under the exponential assumption \( \hat{R}_2(t) \) is negatively biased when
the true reliability \( R(t) > \frac{1}{e} = 0.368 \). Assuming \( F \) is IFR
we can obtain a lower bound on \( E[\hat{R}_2(t)] \).

**Theorem 2.7.** If \( F \) is IFR with mean \( \theta = 1 \), then
The proof parallels that of Theorem 2.6.

**Estimates and confidence bounds on percentiles.** If \( F \) is IFR with mean \( \theta \) and \( p \) th percentile \( \xi_p \), then

\[
-\log(1 - p)\frac{\theta}{p} \leq \xi_p \leq \left(-\log(1 - p)\right)\frac{\theta}{p}.
\]

(See Barlow and Marshall (1964)). Hence by Theorem 2.1

\[
E[\hat{\xi}_p] \geq \frac{1}{\Phi} \int_0^1 e^{(y\theta)} r_r(y) dy + \frac{1}{\Phi} \int_1^\infty r_r(y) dy.
\]

and one might be tempted to use these estimates to bracket \( \xi_p \).

Intuitively, we want a confidence interval to have small expected width when it covers the true percentile. The usual distribution-free confidence intervals based on order statistics have smaller conditional expected width under the IFR (DFR) assumption than under the exponential assumption, given that the interval contains the true percentile. To see this let \( Y = -\frac{\xi_p}{\log(1 - p)} \int_0^1 \frac{\log F(x)}{I(x)} \) and note that \( Y \) is exponentially distributed with \( p \) th percentile \( \xi_p \) when \( F \) is continuous. Suppose that \( X_i \leq \xi_p \leq X_j \). Then clearly

\[
\frac{Y_j - Y_i}{X_j - X_i} \geq 1,
\]

which implies

\[
E[X_j - X_i | X_i \leq \xi_p \leq X_j] \leq E[Y_j - Y_i | Y_i \leq \xi_p \leq Y_j].
\]
Estimates based on truncated samples. If \( n \) items are placed on life test and if sampling is terminated at time \( T \), the associated sample is called a truncated sample. Let \( X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \ldots \leq X_n \) denote an ordered sample from a distribution \( F \) and let

\[
V(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} X_i + (n - r)T
\]

where \( r \) is a random variable and denotes the number of \( X \)'s less than \( T \). Then \( V(T) \) is the total life observed up to time \( T \). This statistic occurs, for example, in sequential life tests for the exponential case (Epstein and Sobel, 1955). It is not surprising that this statistic also has greater expected value under the IFR assumption.

For convenience, let \( G(x) = 1 - e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}} \).

Theorem 3.1. If \( F \) is IFR (DFR) with mean \( \theta \), then

\[
E_F[V(T)] \geq E_G[V(T)]
\]

Proof. Assume \( F \) IFR and let \( X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \ldots \leq X_n \) denote an ordered sample from \( F \). Without loss of generality we may assume \( F \) continuous. Let \( y = -\theta \log F(x) \). We know there exists \( x_0 > \theta \) such that \( x \geq -\theta \log F(x) \) for \( x \leq x_0 \) and \( x \leq -\theta \log F(x) \) for \( x > x_0 \) (Barlow and Marshall, 1964).

Let \( Y_i = -\theta \log F(X_i) \). If \( T \leq x_0 \), then

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{r} X_i + (n - r)T \geq \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y_i + (n - r)T \geq \sum_{i=1}^{s} Y_i + (n - s)T
\]

where \( r (s) \) denotes the number of \( X \)'s (\( Y \)'s) less than \( T \).
Hence for $T \leq x_0$

$$F_F[V(T)] \geq F_G[V(T)].$$

Let

$$Y_i^* = \begin{cases} V_i & \text{if } Y_i \leq T \\ T & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For $T > x_0$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r X_i + (n - r)T - \sum_{i=1}^s Y_i - (n - s)T$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^r X_i + (n - r)T - \sum_{i=1}^r Y_i^* - (n - r)T$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^r (X_i - Y_i) + \sum_{i=r+1}^n (X_i - Y_i)$$

since $X_i \leq Y_i$ for $i > r$. Hence

$$F_F[V(T)] - F_G[V(T)] \geq E\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] - E\left[\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i\right] = 0$$

for $T > x_0$.

A similar argument holds for the DFR case.

Consider the estimate

$$\hat{\theta}(T) = \frac{V(T)}{r} = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r X_i + (n - r)T}{r} & \text{if } r > 0 \\ nT & \text{if } r = 0 \end{cases}$$

When $F$ is the exponential distribution, $\hat{\theta}(T)$ is the maximum likelihood estimate of $\theta$. In this case

$$E[\hat{\theta}(T)] = \theta - \frac{\text{cov}(r, \hat{\theta}(T))}{1 - \exp(-\frac{T}{\theta})} > \theta.$$
since \( r \) and \( \hat{\theta}(T) \) are negatively correlated (Bartholomew, 1957). In the IFR case, this statistic exhibits even greater bias for \( T < \theta \). As before let \( G(x) = 1 - e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}} \).

**Theorem 3.2.** If \( F \) is IFR with mean \( \theta \), but not degenerate then

\[
E_F[\hat{\theta}(T) \mid r \geq 1] \geq E_G[\hat{\theta}(T) \mid r \geq 1] \quad \text{for} \quad T < \theta.
\]

**Proof.** Assume \( F \) is continuous and let \( Y_i = -\theta \log F(X_i) \) as before and let

\[
a_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X_i < T \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

\[
b_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Y_i < \theta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

We can write

\[
\hat{\theta}(T) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} [T - a_i(T - X_i)]}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i} \quad \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \geq 1.
\]

Assume \( T < \theta \). As in the previous proof \( X_i < T \) implies \( Y_i < T \) and hence \( a_i < b_i \). If \( a_i = 1 \), then \( b_i = 1 \) and

\[
T - X_i < T - Y_i. \quad \text{Hence if } \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \geq 1,
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} [T - a_i(T - X_i)] \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} [T - b_i(T - Y_i)]
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i
\]

and

\[
E_F[\hat{\theta}(T) \mid r \geq 1] \geq E_G[\hat{\theta}(T) \mid r \geq 1] \quad \text{for} \quad T < \theta.
\]
Inverse Binomial Sampling.

Nadler (1960) has considered the following type of sampling. An item having life distribution $F$ with mean $\theta$ is put on test until it fails or time $t$ has elapsed; at this time the item is replaced by a fresh item. This is repeated sequentially until $r$ actual failures are observed. The number $N_r$ of items that have to be tested until the $r$ actual failures are obtained is a random variable. Nadler (1960) showed that when $F(x) = 1 - e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}}$, an unbiased estimate of $\theta$ is

$$\hat{\theta}_r(t) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y_i + (N-r)t,$$

where the $Y_1, \ldots, Y_r$ are the $r$ life lengths not exceeding $t$.

We show next that when $F$ is IFR (DFR) with mean $\theta$, then $\hat{\theta}_r(t)$ is biased high (low).

**Theorem 3.3.** If $F$ is IFR (DFR) with mean $\theta$, then $E\hat{\theta}_r(t) > (<) \theta$.

**Proof.** Let $F$ be IFR. Let $Z_i$ denote test time elapsed between the $i$-th failure time and the $(i-1)$-th failure time, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$, where the 0-th failure time is defined to be 0. Then

$$\hat{\theta}_r(t) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^{r} Z_i.$$

Next consider an alternate testing procedure differing in that replacement occurs only upon failure. Let $Z'_i =$ test time elapsed between the $i$-th failure and the $(i-1)$-th failure. Now since $F$ is IFR, $Z'_i$ is stochastically larger than $Z_i$. It follows that
The inequality is reversed when \( F \) is DFR.

**Sampling with replacement.** In this case

\[
\hat{\theta}(T) = \frac{nT}{r} = \frac{nT}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i(T)}
\]

where \( N_i(T) \) denotes the number of replacements in the \( i \)th item position and \( r = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i(T) \) denotes the total number of replacements in \([0, T]\). Of course \( \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i(T)} \) is unbounded.

However, we know that \( \mathbb{E}[N_i(T)] \leq \frac{T}{r} \) for all \( r > 0 \) (Barlow and Proschan, 1964b). Hence this again indicates that \( \hat{\theta}(T) \) will tend to be larger in the IFR case than in the exponential case.

**4. Bounds on time to \( r \)th failure.** Under the exponential assumption, the distribution of the statistic \( \hat{\theta}_{r,n} \) depends only on \( r \) and not on \( n \). The choice of \( n \) in this case is usually determined by the ratio

\[
\frac{\mathbb{E}(X_{r,n})}{\mathbb{E}(X_{r,r})}
\]

which is an indirect measure of the expected saving in time due to putting more than \( r \) items on test but terminating at the \( r \)th failure (Epstein, 1960a). We always have

\[
\frac{\mathbb{E}(X_{r,n})}{\mathbb{E}(X_{r,r})} \leq 1
\]
Since the bound is attained by the degenerate distribution (which is the limit of IFR distributions), this is not a useful measure if we assume only IFR. However, we can obtain non-trivial bounds on $E(X_{r,n})$.

Assume $F$ is IFR, with mean 1, and continuous. We may write $Y_i = -\log F(X_i)$ where $Y_i$ is the $i$th order statistic in a sample of $n$ from distribution $G(x) = 1 - e^{-x}$, and is a convex function of $X_i$, where $X_i$ is the $i$th order statistic in a sample of $n$ from $F$. By Jensen's inequality

$$E(Y_i) \geq -\log F(E(X_i)),$$

so that

$$F(E(X_i)) \geq e^{-E(Y_i)}.$$

If $b(x)$ is a sharp upper bound on $F(x)$, then $b$ is decreasing to 0 and

$$b(E(X_i)) \geq e^{-E(Y_i)}.$$

Hence choosing $x_0$ such that

$$b(x_0) = e^{-E(Y_i)},$$

where of course

$$E(Y_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{1}{(n-j+1)},$$

we have

$$E(X_i) \leq x_0.$$

Using tabled upper bounds on $F$ given one or two moments of $F$ (Barlow and Marshall, 1963) we can obtain upper bounds on $E(X_i)$.

When $F$ is DFR we can, in a similar manner, obtain lower bounds on $E(X_i)$ using lower bounds on $F$. 
If we specify the first moment of $F$, explicit upper bounds can be given on $E(X_i)$ when $F$ is IFR, as shown in Theorem 4.1. If $X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \ldots \leq X_n$ are order statistics from an IFR random variable with mean $\theta$ and $Y_1 \leq Y_2 \leq \ldots \leq Y_n$ are the order statistics from $G(x) = 1 - e^{-x}$, then

(a) $\theta E(Y_1) \leq E(X_1) \leq \theta$

(b) $E(X_i) \leq \frac{\theta E(Y_i)}{1 - e^{-E(X_i)}}$ \quad $1 \leq i \leq n$

(c) $\theta \leq F(X_n) \leq \theta E(Y_n)$

(a) and (c) are sharp and (b) is non-trivial though not sharp.

Proof. (a) and (c) are shown in Barlow and Proschan (1964a, Chapter 2). Hence we need only prove (b) and we may assume $\theta = 1$.

First let us verify that (b) is non-trivial. Note that by (a),

$EX_{n-1} \leq EX_n \leq EY_n$, so that $EY_n$ is a trivial upper bound for $EX_{n-1}$. Therefore, a non-trivial upper bound for $EX_{n-1}$ must be less than $EY_n$ i.e., we must show that $\frac{EY_{n-1}}{1 - e^{-EY_{n-1}}} < EY_n$.

But for $z > 0$, $\frac{z}{1 - e^{-z}} < z + 1$; thus letting $z = EY_{n-1}$:

$\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n-1} + \ldots + \frac{1}{2} < EY_n$.

Therefore, we conclude

$\frac{EY_{n-1}}{1 - e^{-EY_{n-1}}} < \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n-1} + \ldots + \frac{1}{2} + 1 = EY_n$.

To show (b) use the bound

$F(x) \leq b(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq \theta \\ e^{-wx} & x > \theta \end{cases}$
where \( w \) depends on \( x \) and satisfies \( \int e^{-wu} du = \theta \).

(Barlow and Marshall, 1964).

Sharp bounds will be derived in a future publication. However, these are not as convenient as the bounds of Theorem 4.1.

Bounds on expected values of order statistics can also be given in terms of the \( p \)th percentile.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let \( X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \ldots \leq X_n \) denote the order statistics from \( F \), IFR with \( p \)th percentile \( \xi_p \). Then

\[
E(X_j) \leq \max \left\{ \xi_p, \frac{1}{n} + \ldots + \frac{1}{(n-j+1)} \right\}
\]

and

\[
E(X_j) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \binom{n}{i} \int_0^{\xi_p} \left( 1 - \frac{x \log q}{\xi_p} \right)^i \left( \frac{x \log q}{\xi_p} \right)^{n-i} dx
\]

where \( q = 1 - p \). All inequalities are sharp.

**Proof.** To show (4.1), let

\[
\sigma_\Delta(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & 0 \leq x \leq \Delta \\
q \exp \left( \frac{x - \xi_p}{\xi_p - \Delta} \log q \right) & x > \Delta
\end{cases}
\]

Note that \( \sigma_\Delta(\Delta) = 1 \) and \( \sigma_\Delta(\xi_p) = 1 - p = q \). Since \( \log F(x) \) is concave, there exists at least one value of \( \Delta \geq 0 \) such that \( \sigma_\Delta(x) \geq F(x) \) for all \( x \geq 0 \). Thus \( E(X_j) \leq \sup E(Y_j) \) where \( Y_j \) is the \( j \)th order statistic from \( G_\Delta \). Now

\[
E(Y_j) = \Delta + \int_\Delta^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \binom{n}{i} \left[ \sigma_\Delta(x) \right]^i \left[ \sigma_\Delta(x) \right]^{n-i} dx
\]

\[
= \Delta + \int_\Delta^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\Gamma(j+1)(n+1-j)} \int_{G_\Delta(x)} t^{j-1}(1-t)^{n-j} dt dx
\]
To find the maximizing $\Delta$, consider

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} E(Y_j) = 1 - \frac{\Gamma(n + 1)}{\Gamma(j + n + 1 - j)} \int_0^1 t^{j-1}(1-t)^{n-j} dt
$$

$$
+ \frac{\Gamma(n + 1)}{\Gamma(j + n + 1 - j)} \int_\Delta \big[ G(x) \big]^{j-1} [ \mathcal{G}(x) \big]^{n-j} \cdot q \exp\left[ \frac{x - \xi_p}{\xi_p - \Delta} \log q \right] \frac{x - \xi_p}{(\xi_p - \Delta)^2} dx .
$$

Since $G_\Delta(\Delta) = 0$, $- (\xi_p - \Delta) \frac{\partial E(Y_j)}{\partial \Delta}$ reduces to

$$
\frac{\Gamma(n + 1)}{\Gamma(j + n + 1 - j)} \int_\Delta \big[ G(\Delta) \big]^{j-1} \big[ \mathcal{G}(\Delta) \big]^{n-j} g_\Delta(x)(x - \xi_p) dx = F(Y_j) - \xi_p
$$

where $g_\Delta$ is the density of $G_\Delta$.

Hence

$$
- (\xi_p - \Delta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} E(Y_j) = \Delta - \frac{\xi_p - \Delta}{\log q} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \ldots + \frac{1}{n - j + 1} \right) \cdot \xi_p
$$

$$
= -(\xi_p - \Delta) \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{\log q} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \ldots + \frac{1}{n - j + 1} \right) \right].
$$

For $j$ such that $1 + \frac{1}{\log q} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \ldots + \frac{1}{n - j + 1} \right) \leq 0$, we have

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} E(Y_j) \leq 0.
$$

For $j$ such that $1 + \frac{1}{\log q} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \ldots + \frac{1}{n - j + 1} \right) \geq 0$, we have

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta} E(Y_j) \geq 0.
$$

Thus $E(Y_j)$ is maximized in the first case at $\Delta = 0$ and at $\Delta = \xi_p$ in the second case. When $\Delta = 0$, $E(Y_j) = \xi_p \log q \left( \frac{1}{n} + \ldots + \frac{1}{n - j + 1} \right)$; when $\Delta = \xi_p$, $E(Y_j) = \xi_p$.

To show (4.2). Let $\mathcal{G}(x) = \begin{cases} e^{x \log \xi_p} & \text{for } 0 \leq x < \xi_p \\ 0 & \text{for } \xi_p \leq x < \infty \end{cases}$.
Then \( \mathcal{G}(x) \leq \mathcal{F}(x) \) for all \( x \geq 0 \) and \( G \) has \( p \)th percentile \( \xi_p \). Thus \( E(Y_j) \leq E(X_j) \) where \( Y_j \) is the \( j \)th order statistic from \( G \). But

\[
E(Y_j) = \int_0^\infty \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \binom{n}{i} [G(x)]^i [\mathcal{G}(x)]^{n-i} \, dx .
\]

Using the above definition of \( G \), we obtain (4.2).

5. Further results on order statistics and spacings. In this section we present some results of theoretical interest concerning order statistics and their spacings from \( PF_\infty \) and IFR (DFR) distributions. Many of the results hold without the restriction \( F(0^-) = 0 \).

First we present some total positivity properties of the order statistics. A function \( K(x, y) \) of two real variables is said to be totally positive of order \( r \) (TP\(_r\)) if for all \( 1 < m < r; \)

\[
x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \ldots \leq x_m \text{ and } y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \ldots \leq y_m \text{ we have the determinant inequalities}
\]

\[
\left| K(x_i, y_j) \right|_{i, j=1}^m \geq 0 .
\]

The following lemma is of use later on, as well as of interest in its own right.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let \( F \) be a distribution having density \( f \) with \( f(x) \) not necessarily \( 0 \) for \( x < 0 \). Let \( f_i(x) \) be the density of the \( i \)th order statistic in a sample of size \( n \). Then \( f_i(x) \) is TP\(_0\) in \( i, x \) where \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) and \( -\infty < x < \infty \).

**Proof.**

(5.1)

\[
f_i(x) = \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!} F^{i-1}(x) F^{n-i}(x) f(x) .
\]
Since \( \left( \frac{F(x)}{F(x)} \right)^{1-i} \) is TP in \( i \) and \( x \), when \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \)
and \(-\infty < x < \infty\), the conclusion follows.

We may obtain a similar result concerning the right hand tail of the distribution of an order statistic.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let \( F \) be any distribution with \( F(x) \) not necessarily 0 for \( x < 0 \), \( F \) the corresponding distribution of the \( i \)th order statistic. Then \( F_i(x) \) is TP in \( i, x \), where \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) and \(-\infty < x < \infty\).

**Proof.**

\[
F_i(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{n}{j} F_j(x) F^{n-j}(x).
\]

Now \( \left( \frac{F(x)}{F(x)} \right)^j \) is TP in \( x, j \). Therefore

\[
F_i(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{j} F^n(x) \left( \frac{F(x)}{F(x)} \right)^j H(i - j) \text{ is also TP in } i \text{ and } x, \text{ where } H(k) = 1 \text{ for } k \geq 0, 0 \text{ otherwise.}
\]

In Barlow, Marshall, Proschan (1963), it is shown that the order statistics from an IFR distribution themselves have an IFR distribution. The next lemma shows a similar preservation of the PF property.

**Lemma 5.3.** Suppose the underlying density \( f \) is PF, with \( f(x) \) not necessarily \( \infty \) for \( x < 0 \). Then the density \( f_i \) of the \( i \)th order statistic is also PF for fixed \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \).
Proof. It is easy to verify that when \( f \) is \( \text{PF}_2 \), so is \( F \) and \( \bar{F} \). Thus \( \log f, \log F, \) and \( \log \bar{F} \) are concave. It follows from (5.1) that \( \log f_i \) is concave, or equivalently, \( f_i \) is \( \text{PF}_2 \) for fixed \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \).

Next we obtain some comparisons between the order statistics of an IFR (DFR) distribution and the corresponding order statistics of an exponential distribution.

**Theorem 5.4.** Let \( X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \ldots \leq X_n \), \( n \geq 2 \), be order statistics from \( F \), an IFR (DFR) distribution with mean \( \theta \), but \( \neq 1 - e^{-\theta} \). Let \( Y_1 \leq Y_2 \leq \ldots \leq Y_n \) be order statistics from \( G(t) = 1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\theta'}} \). Then

(a) \( E_{X_j} - E_{Y_j} \) has at most one change of sign as \( j \) goes from 1 to \( n \). Moreover if one change of sign does occur, then \( E_{X_j} - E_{Y_j} \) goes from positive (negative) to negative (positive) values.

(b) If \( \theta = \theta' \), then one change of sign does occur.

**Proof.**

(a) Assume \( F \) is a continuous IFR distribution with mean \( \theta \) and \( G \) is exponential with mean \( \theta' \). We have seen in Section 1 that if \( Y \) has distribution \( G \), then \( X = \phi\left(\frac{Y}{\theta'}\right) \) has distribution \( F \), where \( \phi^{-1}(x) = -\log \bar{F}(x) \), a convex increasing function which is 0 for \( x = 0 \).

Thus

\[
E_{X_i} - E_{Y_i} = \int_{0}^{\infty} \left\{ \phi\left(\frac{Y}{\theta'}\right) - y \right\} g_1(y) dy,
\]
where \( g_i \) is the density of the \( i \)th order statistic from the exponential distribution \( G \). By Lemma 5.1, \( g_i(y) \) is TV in \( i \) and \( v \). Also \( c(Y_i) - y \) changes sign at most once, and if once, from positive to negative values. By the variation diminishing property of totally positive functions (Karlin, 1964, p. 34), \( EX_i - EY_i \) also changes sign at most once, and from positive to negative values, if at all.

(b) If \( \theta = \theta' \), then \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} EX_i = \theta = \theta' = \sum_{i=1}^{n} EY_i \). Hence \( EX_i - EY_i \) must change sign at least once or be identically 0 for \( i \).

If \( F \) is IFR but not continuous, we may obtain the same result by using continuous IFR approximations.

Finally, a similar argument holds if \( F \) is DFR. Actually, under the same hypothesis we may prove a stronger version of (a) in which \( EX_i - EY_i \) is replaced by \( EX_i^\sigma - EY_i^\sigma \), \( \sigma > 0 \). If instead of assuming \( EX = EY \) in (b), we assume \( EX^\sigma = EY^\sigma \), then we may show that one change of sign of \( EX_i^\sigma - EY_i^\sigma \) does occur. We omit the details.

We may obtain further consequences of Theorem 5.4 using the notion of majorization. A vector \( \bar{a} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \) majorizes a vector \( \bar{b} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n) \) (written \( \bar{a} > \bar{b} \)) if...
Theorem 5.5. Let \( X_1 \leq \ldots \leq X_n \) be order statistics from \( F \), an IFR (DFR) distribution with mean \( \theta \), \( Y_1 \leq \ldots \leq Y_n \) be order statistics from \( G(t) = 1 - e^{-t} \). Then \((EY_1, EY_{n-1}, \ldots, EY_n)\) >\(<(EY_n, EY_{n-1}, \ldots, EX_1)\).

Proof. Let \( F \) be IFR. From Theorem 5.4 we know
\[
EY_{n-i+1} - EX_{n-i+1} \text{ has one change of sign, from plus to minus as } i \text{ goes from 1 to } n.
\]
We also know \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} EY_{n-i+1} = n\theta = \sum_{i=1}^{n} EX_{n-i+1} \).

Thus \( \sum_{i=1}^{j} EY_{n-i+1} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{j} EX_{n-i+1} \) for \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, n \). Finally, \( EY_{n-i+1} \) and \( EX_{n-i+1} \) are decreasing in \( i \). Thus the conclusion follows.

A similar argument holds if \( F \) is DFR.

Using Karamata's Theorem we obtain Theorem 5.6 below.

Karamata's Theorem states that if \( \psi \) is continuous and convex and
\[
a > b \text{, then } \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi(a_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi(b_i).
\]
(5.3)

See Hardy, Littlewood, Pólya (1952), p. 89.

Theorem 5.6. Let \( \psi \) be continuous and convex, \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \), \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \) as in Theorem 5.5. Then
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi(EY_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi(EX_i).
\]
Proof. Let $F$ be IFR. By Theorem 5.5, $(FY_1, \ldots, FY_n) > (EX_1, \ldots, EX_n)$. Hence by Karamata's Theorem, the conclusion follows. A similar argument holds if $F$ is DFR.

Using Theorem 5.5, we obtain

**Theorem 5.7.** Let $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \ldots \leq c_n$, $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ as in Theorem 5.5. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i Y_{n-i+1} > \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i X_{n-i+1}$.

Proof. Let $F$ be IFR. Defining $d_i = Y_{n-i+1} - EX_{n-i+1}$, write

$$n \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{n-i+1}(FY_{n-i+1} - EX_{n-i+1}) = (c_n - c_{n-1})d_1 + (c_{n-1} - c_{n-2})(d_1 + d_2)
$$

$$+ (c_{n-2} - c_{n-3})(d_1 + d_2 + d_3) + \ldots + (c_2 - c_1)(d_1 + \ldots + d_{n-1})
$$

$$+ c_1(d_1 + \ldots + d_n).$$

Since $c_i - c_{i+1} \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, $d_1 \geq \ldots \geq d_n \geq 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$, and $d_1 \ldots d_n = 0$, we conclude that

$$n \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{n-i+1}(FY_{n-i+1} - EX_{n-i+1}) > 0,$$

A similar argument holds when $F$ is DFR.

Finally we summarize some results concerning the covariance of order statistics obtained by Tukey (1958). He shows that if $F$ is IFR, then for $h \leq j < k$, $\text{cov}(X_k, X_h) > \text{cov}(X_j, X_h)$, where $X_j$ is the $j$th order statistic from $F$. He further shows that if $F$ satisfies both

(a) $\log F$ is concave (i.e., $F$ is IFR), and

(b) $\log F$ is concave,
(1) the covariance of any two order statistics is less than the variance of either, and

(2) the covariance between order statistics \( X_j, X_k \) is monotone in \( j \) and \( k \) separately, decreasing as \( j \) and \( k \) separate from one another.

Note that if \( f \) is \( PF \), then \( F \) satisfies both (a) and (b) above.

Next we derive properties of the spacings \( X_1, X_2 - X_1, \ldots, \)
\( X_n - X_{n-1} \) from \( PF \) and IFR (DFR) distributions similar to those of the order statistics \( X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \ldots \leq X_n \) obtained above.

We first consider total positivity properties.

**Theorem 5.8.** Let \( f \) be \( PF \) with \( f(x) \) not necessarily 0 for \( x < 0 \). Then \( h_i \), the density of \( X_i - X_{i-1} \), is \( PF \) for fixed \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \). If we assume further that \( f(x) = 0 \) for \( x < 0 \), then \( h_i \) is \( PF \), where \( h_i \) is the density of \( X_i \).

**Proof.**

\[
(5.4) \quad h_i(x) = \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!} \int F^{i-2}(u)f(u)f(u+x)F^{n-i-1}(u+x)\,du
\]

for \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \).

Since \( f \) is \( PF \), so is \( r(u) = F^{i-2}(-u)f(-u) \), \( s(u) = f(u)F^{n-i-1}(u) \). Hence so is

\[
(5.5) \quad h_i(x) = \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i-1)!} \int r(-u)s(u+x)\,du
\]

for fixed \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \).

Assuming \( f(x) = 0 \) for \( x < 0 \), we see that \( h_i \) is \( PF \), from
Theorem 5.9. If \( F \) is DFR, then \( H_i \) is DFR for fixed \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \).

Proof. Since DFR is preserved under convex combinations (Barlow, Marshall, Proschan, 1963, p. 381) we see from the representation
\[
\Pi'_1(x) = \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!} \int F^{i-1}(u) f(u) F^{n-i-1}(u) \, du,
\]
where \( F_u(x) = F(u+x) \), DFR in \( x \) for fixed \( u \), that \( H_i \) is DFR for fixed \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \).

Theorem 5.10. Let \( F \) be DFR with \( F(x) < 1 \) for all \( x > 0 \).
Then \( \Pi'_1(x) \) is TP in \( i, x \) where \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \) and \( x \geq 0 \).

Proof. \( F^{i-2}(u) f(u) \) is TP in \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \) and \( u \geq 0 \).
\( F^{n-i+1}(u+x) \) is TP in \( i, u \), in \( i, x \), and in \( u, x(u > 0, x > 0) \).
Thus by a theorem in the book by Karlin (in process)
\[
\Pi'_1(x) = \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!} \int F^{i-2}(u) f(u) F^{n-i-1}(u+x) \, du
\]
is TP in \( i, x \), where \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \) and \( x \geq 0 \).

* Theorem (Karlin) let \( \lambda, x, \xi \) traverse linear sets \( L, X, \Xi \) respectively. Suppose \( h(\lambda, x) = \int f(\lambda, x, \xi) g(\lambda, x) \, d\mu(\xi) \) is well defined on \( \Lambda \times X \), where \( \mu \) is a \( \sigma \)-finite measure, and
(i) \( f(\lambda, x, \xi) > 0 \) for all \( \lambda \) in \( \Lambda \), \( x \) in \( X \), and \( \xi \) in \( \Xi \), and \( f \) is TP in \( \lambda, x \) for each pair of variables when the third variable is held fixed.
(ii) \( g(\lambda, \xi) \) is TP in \( \lambda \).
Then \( h \) is TP in \( \lambda \).
Next we present some majorization properties of the normalized spacings \((n - 1 \cdot 1)(X_{i} - X_{i+1})\), \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\), similar to those developed above for the order statistics.

**Theorem 5.11.** Let \(X_{1} \leq X_{2} \leq \ldots \leq X_{n}\) be the order statistics from \(F\), an IFR distribution with mean \(\mu\), \(Y_{1} \leq Y_{2} \leq \ldots \leq Y_{n}\) the order statistics from \(G(t) = 1 - e^{t}\). Then
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i} \cdot F(n - 1)(X_{i} - X_{i+1}) > \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i} \cdot F(n - 1)(Y_{i} - Y_{i+1})
\]

**Proof.** Let \(F\) be IFR. By Theorem 2.1, \(F(n - 1 \cdot 1)(X_{i} - X_{i-1})\) is decreasing in \(i\). It is also easy to verify that \(E X_{i} \cdot F(n - 1)(X_{i} - X_{i+1}) = F(n - 1)(X_{i} - X_{i+1})\). Since
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} F(n - 1 \cdot 1)(X_{i} - X_{i+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} F(n - 1 \cdot 1)(Y_{i} - Y_{i+1})
\]
it follows that
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{j} F(n - 1 \cdot 1)(X_{i} - X_{i+1}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{j} F(n - 1 \cdot 1)(Y_{i} - Y_{i+1})
\]
for \(j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1\). Thus the conclusion follows.

A similar argument holds if \(F\) is DFR.

For normalized spacings, the analogue of Theorem 5.7 is

**Theorem 5.12.** Let \(c_{1} \geq \ldots \geq c_{n}\), \(X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{n}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}, \ldots, Y_{n}\) as in Theorem 5.11. Then
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} F(n - 1 \cdot 1)(X_{i} - X_{i+1}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} F(n - 1 \cdot 1)(Y_{i} - Y_{i+1})
\]
Proof. The proof parallels that of Theorem 5.7.

We immediately obtain:

Corollary 5.13. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ be as in Theorem 5.11. Then for $1 \leq r \leq n$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} E(n-i+1)(X_i - X_{i-1}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{r} E(n-i+1)(Y_i - Y_{i-1}).$$

Proof. Choose $c_1 = \cdots = c_r = 1, c_{r+1} = c_{r+2} = \cdots = c_n = 0$, so that $c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \cdots \geq c_n$. The result follows from Theorem 5.11.
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This paper studies the performance of the standard life test procedures developed for the exponential distribution when the underlying distribution actually has an increasing (decreasing) failure rate. The standard exponential life test procedures are shown to yield estimates of the unknown mean biased on the high side in the increasing failure rate case. The practical implications of these results are that the consumer tends to accept unduly often poor quality lots, when the producer has used an exponential life test procedure and the underlying failure distribution actually had increasing failure rate.

In addition a number of theoretical results are obtained concerning order statistics and their spacings from distributions with increasing failure rate. These results are useful in the study of the life test procedures and also are of independent interest.
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