

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER
AD003584
NEW LIMITATION CHANGE
TO Approved for public release, distribution unlimited
FROM Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative/Operational Use; FEB 1953. Other requests shall be referred to Commanding Officer, Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA 22217.
AUTHORITY
ONR ltr, 26 Oct 1977

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED
AND CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE
UNDER DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND
NO RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED UPON
ITS USE AND DISCLOSURE.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

Reproduced by

7

Armed Services Technical Information Agency
DOCUMENT SERVICE CENTER

KNOTT BUILDING, DAYTON, 2, OHIO

AD -

3584

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NO. 3584
ASTIA FILE COPY

SOME RESULTS ON TRUNCATED LIFE TESTS IN THE EXPONENTIAL
DISTRIBUTION

BY

BENJAMIN EPSTEIN

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 4
FEBRUARY 15, 1953

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT Nonr-451(00)
(NR-012-017)

FOR

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
WAYNE UNIVERSITY
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

SOME RESULTS ON TRUNCATED LIFE TESTS
IN THE EXPONENTIAL CASE

by

Benjamin Epstein
Department of Mathematics
Wayne University

I. Summary

In this report we consider life tests which are truncated as follows. n items are placed on test and it is decided in advance that the experiment will be terminated at $\min(X_{r_0, n}, T_0)$, where $X_{r_0, n}$ is a random variable equal to the time at which the r_0 'th failure occurs and T_0 is a truncation time, beyond which the experiment will not be run. Both r_0 and T_0 are assigned before experimentation starts. If the experiment is terminated at $X_{r_0, n}$ (i.e., r_0 failures occur before time T_0) then the action in terms of hypothesis testing is the rejection of some specified null-hypothesis. If the experiment is terminated at time T_0 (i.e., the r_0 'th failure occurs after time T_0) then the action in terms of hypothesis testing is the acceptance of some specified null-hypothesis. While truncated procedures can be considered for any life distribution, we limit ourselves here to the case where the underlying life distribution is specified by a p.d.f. of the exponential form (1), $f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$, $x > 0$, $\theta > 0$. Two situations are considered. The first is the non-replacement case where a failure when it occurs during the test is not replaced by a new item. The second is the replacement case where failed items are replaced at once by new items drawn at

(1) The practical justification for using this kind of distribution as a first approximation to a number of test situations is discussed in a recent paper by Davis [1].

considered as the original problem. The values are given for $E_{\theta}(r)$, the expected number of observations to come to a decision; $E_{\theta}(T)$, the expected waiting time for reaching a decision; and $L(\theta)$, the probability of accepting the hypothesis that $\theta = \theta_0$ (θ_0 being the value associated with the null-hypothesis) when θ is the true value. Some procedures are worked out for finding truncated tests meeting specified conditions and a practical illustration is given. Detailed tables will appear elsewhere. Truncated tests considered as special cases of sequential procedures will also be treated in another place.

II. The Derivation of a Truncated Test in the Non-Replacement Case

Let n items drawn at random from a population be placed on life test. Let the underlying p.d.f. of life be of the form $f(x; \theta)$. Items that fail are not replaced and the experiment is truncated at time $\min(X_{r_0, n}, T_0)$, where $X_{r_0, n}$ is the time when the r_0 'th failure occurs and r_0 and T_0 will be taken as preassigned. T_0 is a truncation time beyond which the experiment does not run. If we define $F(T_0; \theta)$ in the usual way as $F(T_0; \theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{T_0} f(x; \theta) dx$, then it follows at once that the probability of reaching a decision requiring exactly k failures is given by

$$(1) \quad \Pr(r=k | \theta) = \binom{n}{k} [F(T_0; \theta)]^k [1 - F(T_0; \theta)]^{n-k}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, r_0 - 1$$

and

$$(2) \quad \Pr(r=r_0 | \theta) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k | \theta).$$

- (2) For convenience we consider the variate to be time. It is perfectly clear that it can be other things depending on the physical application one is concerned with. Generally the variate (e.g., if it is time) will be non-negative.

Further the expected number of observations to reach a decision is given by

$$(2) \quad E_{\theta}(r) = \sum_{k=0}^{r_0} k \Pr(r=k|\theta).$$

The formula for $E_{\theta}(T)$, the expected waiting time for reaching a decision is given by (3)

$$(4) \quad E_{\theta}(T) = \sum_{k=0}^n \Pr^{*}(r=k|\theta) E_{\theta}(T|r=k) \\ = T_0 \left[\sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr^{*}(r=k|\theta) \right] + \sum_{k=r_0}^n \Pr^{*}(r=k|\theta) E_{\theta}(X_{r_0,n} | r=k).$$

In (4), $\Pr^{*}(r=k|\theta) = \binom{n}{k} [F(T_0;\theta)]^k [1-F(T_0;\theta)]^{n-k}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Suppose the truncation rule is such that a hypothesis H_0 associated with $\theta = \theta_0$ is accepted if $\min(X_{r_0,n}, T_0) = T_0$, i.e., in the particular sample of size n , the waiting time required to observe $X_{r_0,n}$, the r_0 'th failure, is more than T_0 . Then if $L(\theta)$ is defined as the probability of accepting $\theta = \theta_0$ when θ is true, it follows that

$$(5) \quad L(\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta).$$

In the special case where the p.d.f. of the life of items is given by $f(x;\theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$, $x > 0$, $\theta > 0$, the formulae (1)-(5) become substantially simpler. This is in particular true for $E_{\theta}(T)$. For the exponential density, (1) and (2) become

-
- (3) It should be noted that there is an essential difference between $\Pr(r=k|\theta)$ and $\Pr^{*}(r=k|\theta)$ for $r_0 \leq k \leq n$. $\Pr^{*}(r=k|\theta)$ is simply the probability that exactly k out of n failures will occur in the interval $(0, T_0)$ while $\Pr(r=k|\theta)$ is the probability that a decision will be reached after exactly k failures are observed. Clearly from the definition of the truncation procedure $\Pr(r=k|\theta) = \Pr^{*}(r=k|\theta)$ for $0 \leq k \leq r_0-1$. Further $\Pr(r=k|\theta) = 0$ for $r_0 + 1 \leq k \leq n$.

$$(1') \quad \Pr(r=k|\theta) = \binom{n}{k} \left[1 - e^{-T_0/\theta} \right]^k \cdot e^{-(n-k)T_0/\theta}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, r_0-1$$

and

$$(2') \quad \Pr(r=r_0|\theta) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta).$$

In the case where the underlying p.d.f. is exponential, (3) becomes

$$(3') \quad E_\theta(r) = \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} k b(k;n,p_\theta) + r_0 \left[1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} b(k;n,p_\theta) \right],$$

where $p_\theta = 1 - e^{-T_0/\theta}$ and $b(k;n,p_\theta) = \binom{n}{k} p_\theta^k (1 - p_\theta)^{n-k}$.

It can be readily shown that (3') simplifies to

$$(3'') \quad E_\theta(r) = np_\theta \left[\sum_{k=0}^{r_0-2} b(k;n-1,p_\theta) \right] + r_0 \left[1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} b(k;n,p_\theta) \right].$$

This is in a convenient form for calculation. For any preassigned n , T_0 , and r_0 , $E_\theta(r)$ can be found easily from the Binomial Tables [5] or the Tables of the Incomplete Beta Function [6].

We now derive a simple formula for $E_\theta(T)$ in the exponential case. We first note that for any $f(x;\theta)$, $E_\theta(X_{r_0,n})$, the expected waiting time for the r_0 'th failure, is given by

$$(6) \quad E_\theta(X_{r_0,n}) = \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta) E_\theta(X_{r_0,n} | r=k) + \sum_{k=r_0}^n \Pr(r=k|\theta) E_\theta(X_{r_0,n} | r=k).$$

Comparing (4) and (6) it is clear that

$$(7) \quad E_\theta(T) = E_\theta(X_{r_0,n}) + \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta) \left[T_0 - E_\theta(X_{r_0,n} | r=k) \right].$$

Formula (7) is perfectly general. Let us now make use of the properties of an exponential p.d.f. to simplify (7). This is best done through two lemmas.

Lemma 1: If the underlying p.d.f. of the life distribution is $f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$, $x > 0$, $\theta > 0$, then the conditional expected waiting time for the r_0 'th failure in a sample of size n given that exactly k failures, $0 \leq k \leq r_0 - 1$, have occurred by time T_0 is given by

$$(8) \quad E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n} | r=k) = T_0 + E_{\theta}(X_{r_0-k, n-k}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, r_0 - 1.$$

In (8), $E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n} | r=k) = E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n} | X_{k, n} \leq T_0, X_{k+1, n} \geq T_0)$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, r_0 - 1$

is the conditional expected waiting time for which we seek a formula.

$E_{\theta}(X_{r_0-k, n-k})$ is the unconditional expected waiting time to get the (r_0-k) 'th failure in a random sample of size $(n-k)$. The proof of Lemma 1 follows directly from results in [3].

Lemma 2: $E_{\theta}(X_{r_0-k, n-k}) = E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) - E_{\theta}(X_{k, n})$, $0 \leq k \leq r_0$

where $E_{\theta}(X_{0, n})$ is defined as zero for all $n \geq 1$. The proof of Lemma 2 is immediate. In [2] it was shown that

$$(9) \quad E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) = \theta \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n-1} + \dots + \frac{1}{n-r_0+1} \right).$$

Thus for any integer k such that $0 \leq k \leq r_0$, it follows (subject to the convention about $k = 0$) that

$$(10) \quad E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) - E_{\theta}(X_{k, n}) = \theta \left(\frac{1}{n-k} + \frac{1}{n-k-1} + \dots + \frac{1}{n-r_0+1} \right) = E_{\theta}(X_{r_0-k, n-k}).$$

Thus Lemma 2 follows.

Using both Lemmas 1 and 2, (7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 (7') \quad E_{\theta}(T) &= E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta) [E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) - E_{\theta}(X_{k, n})] \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta) E_{\theta}(X_{k, n}) + \left[1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta) \right] E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{r_0} \Pr(r=k|\theta) E_{\theta}(X_{k, n}), \text{ since } E_{\theta}(X_{0, n}) = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in the exponential case, formula (4) for $E_{\theta}(T)$ simplifies to (7').

We remark parenthetically that for any underlying life distribution (including the exponential), the c.d.f. of the waiting time T , $G_{\theta}(t)$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 (11) \quad G_{\theta}(t) &= \Pr(T \leq t|\theta) = \Pr(X_{r_0, n} \leq t|\theta), \text{ if } t < T_0 \\
 &= 1, \text{ if } t \geq T_0.
 \end{aligned}$$

This result can be useful in finding out more about the waiting time than just its expectation.

In a practical situation one might want a truncated test without replacement which has the following properties:

- (i) T_0 is preassigned.
- (ii) The O.C. curve should be such that $L(\theta_0) \geq 1 - \alpha$ and $L(\theta_1) \leq \beta$. θ_0 and θ_1 are preassigned and $\theta_0 > \theta_1$.

It is quite easy to accomplish this since conditions (i) and (ii) mean in effect that we are dealing with a binomial situation in which we are testing $p_0 = 1 - e^{-T_0/\theta_0}$ against $p_1 = 1 - e^{-T_0/\theta_1}$ with $L(p_0) \geq 1 - \alpha$ and $L(p_1) \leq \beta$. Stated in binomial terms, we are seeking a sample size n and a rejection number r_0 such that we will accept the hypothesis that

$p = p_0$ if the number of defectives (failures) in the sample is $\leq r_0 - 1$. The hypothesis that $p = p_0$ will be rejected if the number of defectives in the sample of size n is $\geq r_0$. The detailed calculations in any given situation are greatly facilitated by the Binomial Tables [8] or Tables of the Incomplete Beta Function [6]. Tables of practical interest will appear elsewhere.

III. Formulas in the Replacement Case

In this section we assume throughout that the underlying p.d.f. of the life of items is given by $f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$, $x > 0$, $\theta > 0$. The test is started with n items and any item that fails is replaced at once by a new item drawn at random from the underlying p.d.f. The experiment is truncated at time $\min(X_{r_0, n}, T_0)$, where $X_{r_0, n}$ is the time (measured from the beginning of the entire experiment) when the r_0 'th failure occurs and T_0 is a truncation time beyond which the experiment does not run. It is then easy to show that the probability of terminating the experiment after exactly k failures have occurred is given by

$$(12) \quad \Pr(r=k | \theta) = \frac{1}{k!} e^{-n T_0 / \theta} (n T_0 / \theta)^k, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, r_0 - 1$$

and

$$(13) \quad \Pr(r = r_0 | \theta) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k | \theta).$$

The expected number of observations to reach a decision is given by

$$(14) \quad E_{\theta}(r) = \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} k \Pr(r=k | \theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} k p(k; \lambda_{\theta}) + r_0 \left[1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} p(k; \lambda_{\theta}) \right],$$

where $p(k; \lambda_{\theta}) = \frac{\lambda_{\theta}^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda_{\theta}}$ and $\lambda_{\theta} = n T_0 / \theta$.

It can be readily shown that (14) simplifies to

$$(15) \quad E_{\theta}(r) = \lambda_{\theta} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{r_0-2} p(k; \lambda_{\theta}) \right] + r_0 \left[1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} p(k; \lambda_{\theta}) \right].$$

This is in a convenient form for computation. For any preassigned nT_0 and r_0 , $E_{\theta}(r)$ can be found easily from Molina's tables on the Poisson distribution [5] or from the tables on the Incomplete Γ -function [7].

The expected waiting time $E_{\theta}(T)$ is given by a particularly simple formula. Exactly as in the non-replacement case it can be shown that

$$(16) \quad E_{\theta}(T) = E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) + \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|D) \left[T_0 - E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n} | r=k) \right].$$

Formula (16) can be simplified by using some properties of the exponential p.d.f. Two lemmas are now stated.

Lemma 3: Let the underlying p.d.f. of the life distribution be $f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$, $x \geq 0$, $\theta > 0$. Let n items be drawn at random from this p.d.f. and put on life test. Let an item that fails be replaced at once by a new item drawn from the underlying p.d.f., then the conditional expected waiting time for the r_0 'th failure (time measured from the beginning of the experiment) given that exactly k failures, $0 \leq k \leq r_0 - 1$ have occurred by time T_0 is given by

$$(17) \quad E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n} | r=k) = T_0 + E_{\theta}(X_{r_0-k, n}) \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, r_0 - 1.$$

This lemma depends on results proved elsewhere [3].

$$\text{Lemma 4: } E_{\theta}(X_{r_0-k, n}) = E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) - E_{\theta}(X_{k, n}) = \frac{(r_0-k)\theta}{n}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq r_0.$$

This is a consequence of the fact that $E_{\theta}(X_{s, n}) = s \theta/n$ for any integer s .

From Lemmas 3 and 4, (16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 (18) \quad E_{\theta}(T) &= E_{\theta}(X_{r_0, n}) - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta) \left[\frac{(r_0-k)\theta}{n} \right] \\
 &= \frac{\theta}{n} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} k \Pr(r=k|\theta) + r_0 \left(1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r_0-1} \Pr(r=k|\theta) \right) \right] \\
 &= \frac{\theta}{n} E_{\theta}(r).
 \end{aligned}$$

Also in analogy with formula (7') in the non-replacement case, one can write

$$(18') \quad E_{\theta}(T) = \sum_{k=1}^{r_0} \Pr(r=k|\theta) E_{\theta}(X_{k, n})$$

as the formula which expresses the expected waiting time for the truncated procedure in terms of the unconditional waiting times to get the first r_0 failures.

In (7'), $E_{\theta}(X_{k, n}) = \theta \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n-1} + \dots + \frac{1}{n-k+1} \right)$ (non-replacement).

In (18'), $E_{\theta}(X_{k, n}) = \frac{k\theta}{n}$ (replacement).

Also $\Pr(r=k|\theta)$ is given respectively by (1'), (2') or (12), (13).

Formula (18) bears a strong analogy to Wald's fundamental identity in sequential analysis in which it is shown that under suitable conditions [4], $E(\sum Z_i) = E(Z) E(n)$. The Z_i 's are identically distributed random variables and n is the smallest integer for which $a < \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i < b$ is not satisfied and where a and b are preassigned constants. There is the important difference, however, that in the Wald case information becomes available in discrete amounts, whereas in the life test situation information becomes available continuously. In the Wald case a decision can be made only after some integral number of observations has been taken. In the present case it is possible to stop, however, if it takes too long to

make the k 'th observation, $0 \leq k \leq r_0$. In a life test, information becomes available in such a way that one does not actually fail a first item, if it takes too long to wait for the first item to fail. More generally, if one has k failures and a decision has not yet been reached to either accept or reject, then one does not actually fail the $(k+1)$ st item if it takes too long to get it. Much more will be said about this question when we treat sequentialized life tests.

In a practical situation one might want to find a truncated test with replacement which has the following properties:

(i) T_0 is preassigned.

(ii) The O.C. curve should be such that $L(\theta_0) \geq 1 - \alpha$ and $L(\theta_1) \leq \beta$,

where θ_0 and θ_1 are preassigned and $\theta_0 > \theta_1$. Viewed as a test of one Poisson parameter $\lambda_0 = 1/\theta_0$ against another $\lambda_1 = 1/\theta_1$ (the λ 's are expected number of failures per unit time), this is equivalent to finding a test procedure which will entail observing a Poisson process having average occurrence rate $\lambda_0 = 1/\theta_0$ for a length of time equal to nT_0 and taking the action of accepting H_0 if the number of occurrences observed in the time nT_0 is $\leq r_0 - 1$ and rejecting H_0 if the number of occurrences in the time nT_0 is $\geq r_0$.

The details for carrying out the foregoing in any given situation are facilitated by Molina's tables [5] and the tables on the incomplete Γ function [7]. Using these tables, suitable integers n and r_0 can always be found so as to make $L(\theta_0) \geq 1 - \alpha$ and $L(\theta_1) \leq \beta$. Several tables dealing with the truncated replacement test have been prepared and will appear elsewhere.

IV. A Test Which Is Not Truncated At A Fixed Time T_0

In [2] it was proved that the "best" region of acceptance for H_0 in the Neyman-Pearson sense, in the non-replacement case, for testing a hypothesis H_0 that $\theta = \theta_0$ against alternatives of the form $\theta = \theta_1$ ($\theta_0 > \theta_1$) based on the first r out of n ordered observations from an exponential distribution is of the form $\hat{\theta}_{r,n} > C$, where

$$(19) \quad \hat{\theta}_{r,n} = \frac{x_{1,n} + x_{2,n} + \dots + x_{r,n} + (n-r)x_{r,n}}{r}.$$

Both r and n are preassigned integers. It is easily verified that

$$(20) \quad x_{1,n} + x_{2,n} + \dots + x_{r,n} + (n-r)x_{r,n} = nx_{1,n} + (n-1)(x_{2,n} - x_{1,n}) + \dots + (n-r+1)(x_{r,n} - x_{r-1,n}).$$

Introducing new random variables $\tilde{z}_i$ defined by

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{z}_1 &= nx_{1,n} \\ \tilde{z}_i &= (n-i+1)(x_{i,n} - x_{i-1,n}), \quad i = 2, 3, \dots, r \end{aligned}$$

it is clear that $\hat{\theta}_{r,n} > C$ can be rewritten as

$$(22) \quad \tilde{z}_1 + \tilde{z}_2 + \dots + \tilde{z}_r > rC.$$

It is now asserted that (22) carries with it the implication that the test is truncated. This is evident since the $\tilde{z}_i$'s are positive random variables which are monotonically non-decreasing as time goes on. More precisely the experiment will be truncated at time t_1 (with acceptance of H_0) if no failures have occurred by time $t_1 = rC/n$. More generally, suppose that i failures ($1 \leq i \leq r-1$) have occurred, without reaching a decision; i.e., suppose

that $\sum_{k=1}^i \tilde{z}_k < rC$, then the experiment can be truncated before the $(i+1)$ st failure occurs, if the time t_{i+1} between the i th and $(i+1)$ st failure is such that

$$(23) \quad t_{i+1} > t(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_k) = \frac{rC - \sum_{k=1}^i \xi_k}{n-i}.$$

Truncation would occur after an additional waiting time of rC beyond the time $x_{i,n}$ (when the i th failure occurs). If none of the inequalities (23) are true for any $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ (define $\sum_{k=1}^i \xi_k = 0$, if $i = 0$) then the experiment will be terminated after the occurrence of the first r failures. In this case

$$(24) \quad \sum_{i=1}^r \xi_i < rC.$$

The action taken on the basis of (24) is the rejection of H_0 , and the total time required before taking this action would be $x_{r,n}$.

We now proceed to derive certain properties of the test based on $\hat{\theta}_{r,n}$. To do so we recall, [2], that the ξ_i are independent random variables, each of which is distributed with the same p.d.f. $\frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$, $x > 0$, $\theta > 0$. Thus the problem has been reduced to one to which the theory of section 3 can be applied. From the theory developed there it follows at once that

$$(25) \quad \Pr(\varphi = k | \theta) = p(k; \mu_\theta), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, r-1$$

and

$$(26) \quad \Pr(\varphi = r | \theta) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} p(k; \mu_\theta).$$

$$\text{In (25) and (26) } \mu_\theta = rC/\theta \text{ and } p(k; \mu_\theta) = \frac{\mu_\theta^k}{k!} e^{-\mu_\theta}.$$

Thus in analogy with (14) and (15) we have

$$(27) \quad E_\theta(\varphi) = \sum_{k=0}^r k \Pr(\varphi = k | \theta) = \mu_\theta \left[\sum_{k=0}^{r-1} p(k; \mu_\theta) \right] + r \left[1 - \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} p(k; \mu_\theta) \right].$$

Further $E_\theta(T)$, the expected waiting time to reach a decision, can be written as

$$(28) \quad E_{\theta}(T) = \sum_{k=1}^r \Pr(\varphi = k | \theta) E_{\theta}(X_{k,n})$$

where $\Pr(\varphi = k | \theta)$ is given by (25) and (26) and $E_{\theta}(X_{k,n})$ is given by (9) with r_0 replaced by k .

Finally $L(\theta)$, the probability of accepting $\theta = \theta_0$ when θ is true is given by $L(\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} p(k; \theta)$.

Up to this point in the present section we have been treating the non-replacement situation. It is interesting to see what happens if failed items are replaced at once by new items drawn from the p.d.f. $\frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$. As in Section 3, let $x_{k,n}$ be the time when the k th failure occur (whether it be an original item or replacement item) measured from the beginning of the experiment. It can be shown, in the replacement case, that if one starts with n items, then the "best" region of acceptance for H_0 in the Neyman-Pearson sense for testing a hypothesis H_0 that $\theta = \theta_0$ against alternatives of the form $\theta = \theta_1$ ($\theta_1 > \theta_0$) based on the first r failure times $x_{1,n}, x_{2,n}, \dots, x_{r,n}$ is of the form $\hat{\theta}_{r,n} > C$, where $\hat{\theta}_{r,n}$ is now simply equal to

$$(29) \quad \hat{\theta}_{r,n} = n x_{r,n} / r.$$

Thus the region of acceptance for H_0 is of the form $x_{r,n} > C^*$. But this means, of course, that we are dealing with a truncated test. $x_{r,n} > C^*$ as a region of acceptance means in words that the test is terminated at $\min(x_{r,n}, C^*)$ with acceptance of H_0 if truncation occurs at C^* and rejection of H_0 if truncation occurs at $x_{r,n}$. Thus the theory of Section 3 is completely applicable.

V. A Numerical Example

As an illustration of the theory we consider three test procedures which have essentially the same O.C. curve. Specifically, it is assumed that

that the underlying p.d.f. is $f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$, $x > 0$, $\theta > 0$. We wish to test $H_0: \theta_0 = 1500$ hours against $H_1: \theta_1 = 500$ hours, with $\alpha = \beta = .05$; i.e., we want $L(\theta_0) = 1 - \alpha = .95$ and $L(\theta_1) = \beta = .05$. Due to the fact that we are limiting discussion to non-randomized tests, we will be satisfied with a test procedure for which $L(\theta_0) = .95$ and $L(\theta_1) \leq .05$.

Using the results in [2] and in the earlier part of this report it can be readily verified that the following three tests have virtually the same O.C. curve:

(A) 20 items are taken at random from the lot and placed on test. Items which fail are not replaced. At each moment t , compute $\sum_{k=1}^i (n-k+1)x_{k,n} + (n-i)(t-x_{i,n})$, where i is the number of failures which have occurred before time t . If this sum exceeds 8150 for any i such that $0 \leq i \leq 9$, stop the experiment at time t and accept H_0 . If 10 failures occur and this sum is less than 8150, then reject H_0 (accept H_1). As pointed out in Section 4 this test is equivalent to accepting H_0 if $\hat{\theta}_{10,20} > 815$ and rejecting H_0 if $\hat{\theta}_{10,20} < 815$.

(B) 20 items are taken at random from the lot and placed on test. Failed items are not replaced. If $\min[X_{10,20}, 540] = 540$ truncate the experiment at time 540 hours with the acceptance of H_0 . If $\min[X_{10,20}, 540] = X_{10,20}$ truncate the experiment at $X_{10,20}$ with the rejection of H_0 .

(C) 20 items are taken at random from the lot and placed on test. An item which fails is replaced at once by a new item from the original lot. The time $X_{i,n}$ when the i th failure occurs is measured from the beginning of the experiment. If $\min[X_{10,20}, 407.5] = 407.5$, truncate the experiment at 407.5 hours with the acceptance of H_0 . If $\min[X_{10,20}, 407.5] = X_{10,20}$, truncate the experiment at $X_{10,20}$.

It follows from Sections 3 and 4 that the O.C. curves and the probability of terminating experimentation with exactly $r = k$ observations ($0 \leq k \leq 10$) and hence (in particular) $E_{\theta}(r)$ are exactly the same for procedures A and C. In Table 1 we give $L(\theta)$, $E_{\theta}(r)$, and $E_{\theta}(T)$ for the tests A, B, C at selected values of θ .

Table 1
Properties of Three Test Procedures

Mean Life θ	$L(\theta)$			$E_{\theta}(r)$			$E_{\theta}(T)$		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
250	.000	.000	.000	10	10	10	167.2	167.2	125.0
500	.038	.043	.038	9.93	9.94	9.93	331.4	331.6	248.3
750	.355	.366	.355	9.10	9.25	9.10	444.7	453.5	341.3
1000	.698	.702	.698	7.68	8.06	7.68	481.8	509.1	384.0
1250	.876	.877	.876	6.39	6.93	6.39	484.8	529.2	399.3
1500	.950	.950	.950	5.39	6.02	5.39	474.7	536.0	404.5
1750	.979	.979	.979	4.64	5.30	4.64	466.0	538.3	406.3
2000	.991	.991	.991	4.07	4.73	4.07	458.3	539.4	407.0
2250	.996	.996	.996	3.62	4.27	3.62	452.3	539.7	407.3
2500	.998	.998	.998	3.26	3.88	3.26	447.3	539.9	407.4

It is easy to verify that for all three procedures $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} E_{\theta}(r) = 10$ and $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} E_{\theta}(r) = 0$. Further for procedures A and B, $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} E_{\theta}(T)/F(X_{10,20}) = 1$. Hence $E_{\theta}(T) \sim .668779$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0$. For procedure C, $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} E_{\theta}(T)/\theta = 1/2$. As $\theta \rightarrow \infty$, $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} E_{\theta}(T) = 407.5$ in procedures A and C and $= 540$ in procedure B.

It is quite clear that Procedures A, B, and C are not optimum in general respects. It should be possible to truncate with a smaller $E_{\theta}(r)$ as θ gets small and with a smaller $E_{\theta}(T)$ as θ gets large. We shall study this question in a report dealing with sequentialized life tests. In any event we can see already that by taking advantage of the fact that failures are ordered in time, it will be possible:

(1) to come to a decision (rejection of H_0) after a short waiting time (small $E_{\theta}(T)$) if the mean life is low and

(2) to come to a decision (acceptance of H_0) after a small number of failures (small $E_{\theta}(r)$) if the mean life is large. If the mean life $\rightarrow \infty$, it will be possible to stop (with acceptance of H_0) at some time T^* without any failures at all occurring.

Bibliography

1. D. J. Davis, "An Analysis of Some Failure Data," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 47, 113-150, 1952.
2. B. Epstein and M. Sobel, "Life Testing I," To appear.
3. B. Epstein and M. Sobel, "Some Theorems Relevant to Life Testing from an Exponential Distribution," submitted for publication.
4. A. Wald, "Sequential Analysis," John Wiley and Sons, 1947.
5. E. C. Molina, "Poisson's Exponential Binomial Limit," D. Van Nostrand and Co., 1949.
6. K. Pearson, editor, "Tables of the Incomplete Beta Function," University Press, Cambridge, England, reissue, 1948.
7. K. Pearson, "Tables of the Incomplete Γ -Function," Cambridge University Press, reissued, 1951.
8. "Tables of the Binomial Probability Distribution," Nat. Bur. of Stds. Applied Mathematics Series 6, 1950.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Wayne University Technical Reports Nour 451(00)

Dr. Edward Paulson Head, Statistics Branch Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	5	Commanding General Army Chemical Center Quality Assurance Branch Edgewood, Maryland	2
Scientific Section Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy 1000 Geary Street San Francisco 9, California	2	Dr. Clifford Maloney Chief, Statistics Branch Chemical Corps. Biological Laboratories Physical Science Division Camp Detrick, Maryland	1
Director, Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Technical Information Officer	9	Commanding Officer 9926 Technical Service Unit Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Inspection Division 84 Sands Street Brooklyn, New York	1
Chief of Naval Research Office of Naval Research Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code 432 (Mathematics Branch)	2	Asst. Chief of Staff, G-4 United States Army Procurement Division Standards Branch Washington 25, D. C.	15
Office of the Assistant Naval Attache for Research Naval Attache American Embassy Navy #100 Fleet Post Office New York, N. Y.	2	Chairman, Munitions Board Material Inspection Agency Washington 25, D. C.	2
Planning Research Division Deputy Chief of Staff Comptroller, U. S. Air Force The Pentagon Washington, D. C.	1	Chief of Ordnance United States Army Research and Development Division Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Brig. General L. E. Simon Mr. Charles Bickling	1 1
Commanding Officer Signal Corps Procurement Agency 2800 South 20th Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	2	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy Quality Control Division Washington 25, D. C.	2
Commanding General New York Quartermaster Procurement Agency, Inspection Division 111 East 16th Street New York, N. Y.	2	Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics Department of the Navy Code 231 Washington 25, D. C.	2
		Commanding Officer Frankford Arsenal Philadelphia 37, Pennsylvania	1

Los Angeles Engineering Field Office Air Research and Development Command 5504 Hollywood Boulevard Los Angeles 28, California Attn: Captain Norman E. Nelson	1	Naval Ordnance Laboratory Library Silver Springs 19, Maryland	1
Chief, Bureau of Ships Asst. Chief for Research and Development - Code 373 Washington 25, D. C.	2	Chairman Research and Development Board The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C.	2
Commanding General Air Materiel Command Quality Control Division MCPLXP Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio	15	Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4 for Research and Development U. S. Army Washington 25, D. C.	1
Headquarters, USAF Director of Research and Development Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief of Naval Operations Operations Evaluation Group - OP342E The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C.	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office The John Crerar Library Building Tenth Floor, 86 E. Randolph St. Chicago 1, Illinois	1	Commanding General Air Proving Ground Eglin Air Force Base Eglin, Florida	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, N. Y.	1	Commander U. S. Naval Proving Ground Dahlgren, Virginia	1
Officer in Charge Office of Naval Research London Branch Office Fleet Post Office - Navy 44100 New York, N. Y.	2	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station Inyokern, China Lake, Calif.	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena 1, California	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Proving Ground Aberdeen, Maryland Attn: Ballistics Research Lab.	2
Major M. H. Pardee Director of Procurement Statistical Quality Control Branch Air Materiel Command Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio	1	Rand Corporation 1500 Fourth Street Santa Monica, California	1
		Office of Naval Research Logistics Branch - Code 436 T-3 Building Washington 25, D. C.	1
		Logistics Research Project George Washington University 707 - 22nd Street, N. W. Washington 7, D. C.	1
		Mr. J. L. Dolby Electro-Mechanical Division General Engineering Laboratory 1 River Road Schenectady 5, New York	3

Mr. H. F. Dodge
Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.
463 West Street
New York, N. Y.

1

Prof. W. Allen Wallis
Committee on Statistics
University of Chicago
Chicago 37, Illinois

1

Dr. Walter Shewhart
Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.
Murray Hill, New Jersey

1

Professor A. H. Bowker
Department of Statistics
Stanford University
Stanford, California

1

Professor M. A. Girshick
Department of Statistics
Stanford University
Stanford, California

1

Professor J. Neyman
Statistics Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California

1

Professor E. G. Olds
Dept. of Mathematics
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

1

Mr. David Schwartz
Inspection Division
Army Quartermaster Corp.
111 East 16th Street
New York, N. Y.

1

U. S. Air Force Engineering Liaison
Office

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory
Moffett Field
Mountain View, California
Attn: Mr. Carl Tusch

1

Dr. Jerome Rothstein
Camp Evans
Belmar, New Jersey

1

Professor Sebastian Littauer
Department of Industrial Engineering
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

1

Statistics Laboratory
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

1

Professor David H. Blackwell
Department of Mathematics
Howard University
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Professor W. G. Cochran
Department of Biostatistics
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore 5, Maryland

1

Professor S. S. Wilks
Department of Mathematics
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

1

Professor J. Wolfowitz
Department of Mathematics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

1

Department of Mathematical Statistics
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

1

Mr. Max Halperin
National Heart Institute
Federal Security Agency
Bethesda, Maryland

1

Dr. E. J. Gumbel
441 Ocean Avenue
Apt. 6M
Brooklyn 26, New York

1

Statistical Engineering Laboratory
National Bureau of Standards
Washington 25, D. C.
Attn: Dr. Churchill Eisenhart

1

Statistical Engineering Laboratory
National Bureau of Standards
Washington 25, D. C.
Attn: Mr. Julius Lieblein

1

Dr. Max Scherberg
Office of Air Research
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, Ohio

1

Director
Evans Signal Laboratory
Belmar, New Jersey
Attn: Mr. J. Weinstein
Applied Physics Branch

1

Director of Research
Operations Research Office
U. S. Army
Fort McNair
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Asst. for Operations Analysis
Headquarters U. S. Air Force
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Mr. Millard Rosenfeld
Procurement Data Branch
Signal Corps Engineering Labs.
Watson Area
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

1

Dr. J. R. Steen
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
1740 Broadway
New York 19, New York

1

Mr. Hamilton Brooks
Capacitor Section
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
East Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

1

Mr. Leonard G. Johnson
General Motors Laboratories (M.E.1)
General Motors Building
Detroit, Michigan

1

Professor H. A. Thomas, Jr.
Graduate School of Engineering
Cambridge, Massachusetts

1

Mr. George Thomson
Research Laboratory
Ethyl Corporation
Detroit, Michigan

1

Professor Karl Spangenberg
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
Stanford University
Stanford, California

1

Professor W. G. Shepherd
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

1

Dr. M. M. Flood
Department of Sociology
Columbia University
New York, New York

1

U. S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
1220 East Washington Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan
Attn: George F. Lunger

1

U. S. N. Engineering Experiment Station
Annapolis, Maryland
Attn: Mr. Francis R. DelPriori

1

Mr. William E. Kure
Special Weapons Department
Northrop Aircraft, Inc.
Hawthorne, California

1

Mr. Alan A. Gromstein
Sylvania Electric
70 Forsyth Street
Boston, Massachusetts

1

Dr. Eugene W. Pike
Applied Physics Section
Engineering Division
Raytheon Manufacturing Company
148 California Street
Newton, Massachusetts

1

Professor Andrew Schultz, Jr.
Department of Industrial and
Engineering Administration
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

1

Dr. C. West Churchman
Case Institute of Technology
Cleveland, Ohio

1

Professor T. J. Dolan
Department of Theoretical and
Applied Mechanics
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

1

Professor Robert Bachhofer
Department of Industrial Engineering
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

1

Chief of Naval Materiel
Code M553
Department of the Navy
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Mr. Mark S. Jones
Aeronautical Radio, Inc.
Military Contract Division
1520 New Hampshire Ave., N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

1