

AD-A185 480

ERROR BOUNDS FOR EXPONENTIAL APPROXIMATIONS TO
GEOMETRIC CONVOLUTIONS(U) CITY COLL NEW YORK M BROWN
15 AUG 86 CUNY-MB-84-03 AFOSR-TR-87-1032 AFOSR-84-0095

1/1


UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 12/1

NL



END
PAGE
1



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

UNCLASSIFIED

AD-A185 480

000 518 000

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS REPORT

ELECTRONIC REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY C.D.		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) City College, CUNY No. MB84-03		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AFOSF 84-03 C.A.FOSR AFTR-840095-1032	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION City College, CUNY	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Air Force Office of Scientific Research	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) 138 Street and Convent Avenue New York, NY 10031		7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Directorate of Mathematical & Information Sciences, Bolling AFB DC 20332-6448	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION AFOSR	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) NM	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Bldg 410 Bolling AFB DC 20332-6448		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61102F	PROJECT NO. 2304
		TASK NO. K3	WORK UNIT NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Error Bounds for Exponential Approximations to Geometric Convolutions			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Mark Brown			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical Journal	13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO	14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) August 15, 1986	15. PAGE COUNT 25
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)			
Define Y_0 to be a geometric convolution of X if Y_0 is the sum of N_0 i.i.d. random variables distributed as X, where N_0 is geometrically distributed and independent of X. It is known that if X is non-negative with finite second moment then as $p \rightarrow 0$, Y_0/EY_0 converges in distribution to an exponential distribution with mean 1. We derive an upper bound for $d(Y_0)$, the distance between Y_0 and an exponential with mean Y_0, namely for $0 < p \leq 1/2$, $d(Y_0) \leq cp$ where $c = EX^2/(EX)^2$. This bound is asymptotically $(p \neq 0)$ tight. Also derived is a bound for $d(Y_0+Z)$ where $Z \neq 0$ is independent of Y_0.			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS ☐		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL M. J. Cawley		22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (202) 767-5025	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL NM

AFOSR-TR- 87 - 1032

Error Bounds for Exponential Approximations
of Geometric Convolutions

By
Mark Brown
The City College, CUNY


August 1986

City College, CUNY Report No. MB84-03
AFOSR Technical Report No. 84-03
AFOSR Grant No. 84-0095

Abstract

Define Y_0 to be a geometric convolution of X if Y_0 is the sum of N_0 i.i.d. random variables distributed as X , where N_0 is geometrically distributed and independent of X . It is known that if X is non-negative with finite second moment then as $p \rightarrow 0$, Y_0/EY_0 converges in distribution to an exponential distribution with mean 1. We derive an upper bound for $d(Y_0)$, the distance between Y_0 and an exponential with mean Y_0 , namely for $0 < p \leq 1/2$, $d(Y_0) \leq cp$ where $c = EX^2/(EX)^2$. This bound is asymptotically ($p \rightarrow 0$) tight. Also derived is a bound for $d(Y_0+Z)$ where $Z \geq 0$ is independent of Y_0 .

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution	
Availability	
Date	
A-1	



1. Introduction. If $\{X_i, i \geq 1\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence and N_0 is geometrically distributed ($\Pr(N_0=k) = q^k p, k=0,1,2,\dots$) and independent of $\{X_i\}$, then $Y_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} X_i$ is called a geometric convolution of X . Closely related is the random variable $Y = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ where $N = N_0+1$, which is also referred to as a geometric convolution.

Geometric convolutions arise naturally in many applied probability models. A recent paper of Gertsbakh (1984) discusses a rich variety of applications in reliability and queues and surveys research in the area, most of which was performed by Soviet authors. Feller (1971) Section XI.6 elegantly discusses terminating renewal processes, the time until termination being a geometric convolution. Several authors have studied random sampling or "thinning" of renewal processes which results in new renewal processes with geometric convolution interarrival times. Jacobs (1986) investigates a geometric convolution in the context of combining random loads and waiting for the stress to exceed a given level. In a $G|G|1$ queue in equilibrium the waiting time distribution is a geometric convolution and has been studied in this context by Szekli (1986) and Köllerström (1976). Finally, numerous applications arise in regenerative stochastic processes. Consider a regenerative process (Smith (1958)) where in each cycle an event A may or may not occur, independently of other cycles. The waiting time for A to occur is then of the form:

$$(1.1) \quad W = \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} X_i + Z = Y_0 + Z$$

where A occurs for the first time in cycle N_0+1 , N_0 is geometrically distributed with parameter equal to the probability of A occurring during a specified cycle, and Z is the waiting time from the beginning of cycle N_0+1 until A occurs.

Keilson (1966) recognized the prevalence of (1.1) and considered the case of small p . He showed that if the X_i are non-negative with finite second moment then W/EW converges in distribution to an exponential with mean 1 as $p \rightarrow 0$. Thus the waiting time for a rare event (small p) to occur is approximately exponential. Solov'yev, (1971) considered a sequence of random variables of the form (1.1) in which the distribution of X varies with p and obtained conditions for asymptotic exponentiality as $p \rightarrow 0$. Solov'yev also obtained error bounds for the exponential approximation.

In this paper we seek to bound the distance between a geometric convolution of non-negative random variables and an exponential distribution with the same mean. This problem is cited by Gertsbakh (1984) as being "of great interest for engineering applications". Defining X , Y and Y_0 as above, $q = 1-p$, $\mu = EX$, $\mu_2 = EX^2$, $\sigma^2 = \mu_2 - \mu^2$, and $\bar{F}_{Y_0}(t) = \Pr(Y_0 > t)$ we derive:

$$(1.2) \quad qe^{-\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{\mu} + 2\gamma - 1\right)} \leq \bar{F}_{Y_0}(t) \leq e^{-\frac{pt}{q\mu} + \frac{\gamma p}{\sigma^2}}.$$

Defining $d(Y_0)$ as the sup norm distance between Y_0 and an exponential distribution with mean $EY_0 = q\mu/p$, it follows from (1.2) that for $0 < p \leq 1/2$:

$$(1.3) \quad d(Y_0) \leq 2\gamma p = \mu_2 p / \mu^2 .$$

The bound (1.3) is asymptotically (as $p \rightarrow 0$) sharp in the following sense. Since the problem is scale invariant, the true upper bound is a function of γ and p , say $B(\gamma, p)$. We show (Section 4) that $2\gamma p / (2\gamma p + q) \leq B(\gamma, p)$ and thus $B(\gamma, p) = 2\gamma p(1 + o(1))$.

Bounds are also obtained for $d(Y_0 + Z)$ where Z is a non-negative random variable independent of Y_0 , for $d(Y)$, and for $d(Y^*)$ where Y^* is the stationary renewal distribution corresponding to Y and Y_0 .

The current bounds offer improvement over those of Solov'yev (1971) in that they are derived under less restrictive conditions, require less information about X and Z to compute, and are in general tighter. This comparison is discussed in Section 4.

In the above X is assumed non-negative with known first two finite moments. In Section 3 we restrict X further and obtain improved bounds. Perhaps the most interesting of these results is that if X is assumed NBUE (new better than used in expectation, defined in Section 2) then $d(Y_0)$ is exactly equal to p .

Our methodology is a combination of reliability and renewal theory geared to exploit the fact that Y_0 is NWU (new worse than used) as pointed out by Daley (1984) and Köllerström (1976). The technique of studying random variables through their aging properties was developed by several authors, most notably by Barlow, Marshall and Proschan, and is lucidly presented in the text of Barlow and Proschan (1975).

2. Bound for General X. A distribution F on $[0, \infty)$ is defined to be NWU (new worse than used) if:

$$(2.1) \quad \bar{F}(t+x) \geq \bar{F}(t)\bar{F}(x) \quad \text{for all } t, x \geq 0.$$

Similarly NBU (new better than used) is defined by reversing the inequality in (2.1). Thus F is NWU (NBU) if its survival distribution at age 0 is stochastically smaller (larger) than its survival distribution at age x for all $x > 0$.

Let $\{X_i, i \geq 0\}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of non-negative random variables, let N_0 be independent of this sequence with

$$\Pr(N_0=k) = q^k p, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad \text{and define } S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \quad \text{and } Y_0 = S_{N_0}.$$

The following simple but very useful result is due to Daley (1984) and Köllerström (1976).

Lemma 2.1. Y_0 is NWU.

Proof. For $t > 0$ let Y_t be distributed as the condition distribution of $Y_0 - t$ given $Y_0 > t$. Define $N_t = \max\{k: S_k \leq t\}$ and let X_t be distributed as the conditional distribution of $S_{N_t+1} - t$ given $Y_0 > t$. Then:

$$Y_t \stackrel{st}{=} X_t + Y_0 \stackrel{st}{\geq} Y_0$$

where X_t and Y_0 are independent. $\square$

Lemma 2.2, below, is a slight generalization of a known result (Barlow and Proschan (1975), p. 162), the generalization allowing for an atom at zero which will be required for Y_0 .

Lemma 2.2. Assume that W is NWU with an atom of size p at zero, but with no other atoms. Let F be the cdf of W and $M = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F^{(k)}$ the renewal function. Then:

$$\bar{F}(t) \geq qe^{-pq} e^{-(M(t)-1)} \geq e^{-(M(t)-1)}.$$

Proof. Let $\{N_1(t) - N_1(0), t > 0\}$ be a non-homogeneous Poisson process with $E(N_1(t) - N_1(0)) = -\ln(\bar{F}(t)/q)$. This process has its first event epoch T_1 distributed as $W|W > 0$. its next interarrival time $T_2 - T_1$ distributed as $W - T_1|W > T_1$ and in general its k^{th} interarrival time $T_k - T_{k-1}$ distributed as $W - T_{k-1}|W > T_{k-1}$. Since W is NWU we have:

$$(2.2) \quad T_k - T_{k-1} | T_1 \cdots T_{k-1} \stackrel{\text{st}}{\geq} W \text{ for } k \geq 2.$$

Next consider $\{N_2(t) - N_2(0), t \geq 0\}$ where N_2 is a renewal process with interarrival time W . The first event epoch of $N_2(t) - N_2(0)$ occurs at $S_1 \sim W|W > 0 \sim T_1$. Subsequent interarrival times are distributed as W . It follows from $S_1 \sim T_1$ and (2.2) that:

$$(2.3) \quad T_k \stackrel{\text{st}}{\geq} S_k \text{ for } k \geq 1.$$

Thus from (2.3):

$$(2.4) \quad N_1(t) - N_1(0) \stackrel{st}{\leq} N_2(t) - N_2(0) .$$

Taking expectations in (2.4):

$$(2.5) \quad -\ln(\bar{F}(t)/q) \leq M(t) - q^{-1} .$$

Finally, the result follows from (2.5) and the observation that $qe^{-pq^{-1}} \geq q(1+pq^{-1}) = 1$. $\square$

Corollary 2.1. Suppose that $X \geq 0$ has $F(0) < 1$ and $\mu_2 = EX^2 < \infty$.

Then:

$$\bar{F}_{Y_0}(t) \geq qe^{+pq^{-1}(t\mu^{-1} + 2\gamma - 1)} = qe^{-pq^{-1}(2\gamma - 1)} e^{-t/EY_0}$$

where $\gamma = \mu_2/2\mu^2$.

Proof. Case (i). We first consider the case in which X has no atoms.

Then Y_0 has an atom of size p at zero and no other atoms. Define

G_p as a geometrically distributed random variable with parameter

$p(\Pr(G_p = k) = q^k p, k = 0, 1, \dots)$. Define N_{Y_0} and N_X as renewal

processes with interarrival times Y_0 and X respectively, and

$$M_{Y_0} = EN_{Y_0}, \quad M_X = EN_X.$$

Note that N_{Y_0} has $1+G_p$ renewals at zero, and G_p renewals at each renewal epoch of N_X in $(0, \infty)$. Thus:

$$(2.6) \quad M_{Y_0}(t) = q^{-1} + pq^{-1}(M_X(t) - 1) = 1 + pq^{-1}M_X(t) .$$

Alternatively (2.6) can be easily proved using Laplace transforms.

Next, we note Lorden's (1970) upper bound for the renewal function:

$$(2.7) \quad M_X(t) \leq \frac{t}{\mu} + 2\gamma .$$

The result now follows from Corollary 2.1, (2.6), (2.7) and $EY_0 = pq^{-1}\mu$.

Case (ii). Now consider the general case. Define e_n to be uniformly distributed on $(0, \varepsilon_n)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, with $\lim \varepsilon_n = 0$, e_n independent of X , and $X_n = X + e_n$. Since X_n converges to X in quadratic mean, $\mu_n = EX_n \rightarrow \mu$ and $\gamma_n = EX_n^2 / 2\mu_n^2 \rightarrow \gamma$. Define $Y_{0,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{G_p} X_{n,i}$, the analogue of Y_0 with X replaced by X_n . Then by choosing $X_{n,i} = X_i + e_{n,i}$ we have $E(Y_{0,n} - Y_0)^2 = E(\sum_{i=1}^{G_p} e_{n,i})^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $Y_{0,n}$ converges in quadratic mean and thus in distribution to Y_0 . By Case (i):

$$(2.8) \quad \bar{F}_{Y_{0,n}}(t) \geq qe^{-pq^{-1}(t\mu_n^{-1} + 2\gamma_n - 1)} .$$

It follows by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.8) that the desired bound for $\bar{F}_{Y_0}(t)$ holds at all continuity points of Y_0 . But since $\bar{F}_{Y_0}$ is right continuous and the bound is a continuous function of t , it follows that the inequality must hold for all $t \geq 0$. $\square$

A non-negative random variable X with distribution F is defined to be NWUE (new worse than used in expectation) if $\mu = EX < \infty$

and:

$$(2.9) \quad E(X-t|X>t) \geq \mu \text{ for all } t \geq 0.$$

Similarly NBUE (new better than used in expectation) has the inequality reversed in (2.9), which implies that μ must be finite. Define X^* to be distributed as the stationary renewal distribution corresponding to X ; X^* has cdf $G(x) = \mu^{-1} \int_0^x \bar{F}(t) dt$. Let $h^*(x)$ to be the failure rate function of X^* defined by $h^*(x) = \bar{F}(x)/\mu \bar{G}(x)$. Noting that $h^*(x) = [E(X-x|X>x)]^{-1}$ it follows that NWUE is equivalent to each of the following:

$$(2.10) \quad h^*(x) \leq \mu^{-1} \text{ for all } x \geq 0$$

$$(2.11) \quad X \stackrel{st}{\leq} X^*.$$

Moreover, (2.10) implies:

$$(2.12) \quad X^* \stackrel{st}{\geq} \mu \epsilon.$$

Similarly X NBUE is equivalent to each of the reverse inequalities in (2.10) and (2.11), with (2.10) holding for all $x \geq 0$ with $\bar{F}(x) > 0$. Moreover NBUE distributions satisfy the reverse inequality in (2.12).

Define c_ϵ to be an exponentially distributed random variable with mean c . For $X_1 \sim F_1$, $X_2 \sim F_2$ define $D(X_1, X_2) = D(F_1, F_2) = \sup |F_1(t) - F_2(t)|$. Finally define $\rho_X = \left| \frac{\mu_2}{2\mu} - 1 \right|$.

Lemma 2.3. If X is either NWUE or NBUE then $\mathcal{D}(X^*, \mu\epsilon) \leq \rho_X$.

Proof. Consider the NWUE case, the NBUE case being totally analogous.

First, defining $A = \{t: \bar{F}(t) \geq e^{-t\mu^{-1}}\}$:

$$(2.13) \quad \mathcal{D}(X^*, \mu\epsilon) \leq \sup_B |G(B) - \int_B \mu^{-1} e^{-t\mu^{-1}} dt| = \mu^{-1} \int_A (\bar{F}(t) - e^{-t\mu^{-1}}) dt.$$

From (2.11), (2.12) and (2.13):

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{D}(X^*, \mu\epsilon) \leq \mu^{-1} \int_A (\bar{G}(t) - e^{-t\mu^{-1}}) dt \leq \mu^{-1} \int_0^\infty (\bar{G}(t) - e^{-t\mu^{-1}}) dt = \rho_X. \quad \square$$

Define Y^* to be the stationary renewal distribution corresponding to Y_0 and Y .

Corollary 2.2. If $X \geq 0$ with $F(0) < 1$ and $\mu_2 < \infty$, then

$$\mathcal{D}(Y^*, (EY_0)\epsilon) \leq pq^{-1}\gamma.$$

Proof. By simple computation $\rho_{Y_0} = pq^{-1}\gamma$. The result now follows from Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3. $\square$

Recall that $d(Y_0) = \mathcal{D}(Y_0, (EY_0)\epsilon)$, the sup norm distance between Y_0 and an exponential distribution with the same mean.

Theorem 2.1. If $X \geq 0$ with $F(0) < 1$ and $\mu_2 < \infty$, then:

$$(i) \quad qe^{-pq^{-1}(2\gamma-1)} e^{-t/EY_0} \leq \bar{F}_{Y_0}(t) \leq e^{-t/EY_0} + \gamma pq^{-1}$$

$$(ii) \quad d(Y_0) \leq p \max(2\gamma, \gamma q^{-1}) = \begin{cases} 2\gamma p, & 0 < p \leq 1/2 \\ \gamma q^{-1} p, & p > 1/2 \end{cases}$$

Proof. The bound on the left of (i) is the conclusion of Corollary

2.1. The upper bound follows from Lemma 2.1, (2.11) and Corollary 2.2

by:

$$(2.15) \quad \bar{F}_{Y_0}(t) - e^{-t/EY_0} \leq \bar{F}_{Y^*}(t) - e^{-t/EY_0} \leq \mathcal{O}(Y^*, (EY_0)\varepsilon) \leq \gamma p q^{-1}.$$

Finally (ii) follows from (i) noting that:

$$(2.16) \quad e^{-t/EY_0} \bar{F}_{Y_0}(t) \leq e^{-t/EY_0} [1 - qe^{-pq^{-1}(2\gamma-1)}] \\ \leq 1 - q(1 - pq^{-1}(2\gamma-1)) = 2\gamma p.$$

Thus, $d(Y_0) \leq \max(2\gamma p, \gamma p q^{-1}) \leq 2\gamma p$ for $p \leq 1/2$. $\square$

Corollary 2.3. Under the conditions of Theorem 2.1,

$$d(Y) \leq p q^{-1} \max(1 + \gamma q^{-1}, 2\gamma - 1) \sim p \max(1 + \gamma, 2\gamma - 1).$$

Proof. Since $\bar{F}_Y(t) = q^{-1} \bar{F}_{Y_0}(t)$ we can multiply all three sides of inequality (i) of Theorem 2.1 obtaining an upper and lower bound for $\bar{F}_Y(t)$. Subtracting $e^{-t/EY}$ from both $\bar{F}_Y(t)$ and the upper bound we obtain:

$$(2.17) \quad \bar{F}_Y(t) - e^{-t/EY} \leq \sup(q^{-1} e^{-t/EY_0} - e^{-t/EY}) + \gamma q^{-2} p \\ = p q^{-1} (1 + \gamma q^{-1}).$$

Subtracting $\bar{F}_Y(t)$ from $e^{-t/EY}$ and from the lower bound for $\bar{F}_Y(t)$ yields:

$$(2.18) \quad e^{-t/EY} - \bar{F}_Y(t) \leq \sup(e^{-t/EY} - b e^{-t/EY_0})$$

where $b = e^{-pq^{-1}(2\gamma-1)}$.

For $b \geq q$, the right side of (2.18) equals $pq^{p/q}e^{2\gamma-1}$ which is bounded above by p , while for $b < q$ the right side of (2.18) equals $1-b$ which is bounded above by $pq^{-1}(2\gamma-1)$. Thus $d(y)$ is bounded above by the larger of $pq^{-1}(1+\gamma q^{-1})$ and $pq^{-1}(2\gamma-1)$, and the result is thus proved. $\square$

We next seek bounds for $d(Y_0+Z)$ with $Z \geq 0$ and independent of Y_0 . A few simple preliminary results are first presented.

First, for $c_1 < c_2$, a routine calculus argument proves:

$$(2.19) \quad \mathcal{D}(c_1\varepsilon, c_2\varepsilon) = (1 - \frac{c_1}{c_2})(\frac{c_1}{c_2})^{c_1/c_2 - c_1} \leq 1 - \frac{c_1}{c_2}.$$

Next, note that for any constant β :

$$(2.20) \quad \mathcal{D}(W_1+\beta, W_2+\beta) = \mathcal{D}(W_1, W_2).$$

It follows from (2.18) that for any random variable V independent of W_1 and W_2 that:

$$(2.21) \quad \mathcal{D}(W_1+V, W_2+V) \leq \mathcal{D}(W_1, W_2).$$

Next let $Z \geq 0$ be independent of ε with Laplace transform $\hat{f}$.

Lemma 2.4. $\mathcal{D}(c\varepsilon, c\varepsilon+Z) \leq 1 - \hat{f}(c^{-1}) \leq 1 - e^{-c^{-1}EZ} \leq c^{-1}EZ.$

Proof. Let $F(t) = 1 - e^{-c^{-1}t}$. For $t \geq y \geq 0$:

$$(2.22) \quad F(y) = (\bar{F}(t-y) - \bar{F}(t)) / \bar{F}(t-y) \geq \bar{F}(t-y) - \bar{F}(t).$$

For $0 \leq t \leq y$:

$$(2.23) \quad F(y) = 1 - \bar{F}(y) \geq 1 - \bar{F}(t) = \bar{F}[(t-y)^+] - \bar{F}(t) .$$

Thus $F(y) \geq \bar{F}[(t-y)^+] - \bar{F}(t)$ for $y, t \geq 0$. Consequently:

$$(2.24) \quad \Pr(c\varepsilon + Z > t) - \Pr(c\varepsilon > t) = E[\bar{F}(t-Z)^+ - \bar{F}(t)] \leq EF(Z) .$$

Now:

$$(2.25) \quad EF(Z) = E[1 - e^{-c^{-1}Z}] = 1 - \mathbf{1}(c^{-1}) \leq 1 - e^{-c^{-1}EZ} . \quad \square$$

Finally, we need a simple but useful result:

Lemma 2.5. Suppose that X and Y are both either stochastically larger or stochastically smaller than Z . Then:

$$\mathcal{D}(X, Y) \leq \max(\mathcal{D}(X, Z), \mathcal{D}(Y, Z)) .$$

Proof. Immediate.

The above inequalities now enable us to derive:

Theorem 2.2. Let X be as in Theorem 2.1, and let $Z \geq 0$ be independent of X with $EZ < \infty$. Define $\delta_Z = EZ/\mu$. Then:

$$(i) \quad d(Y_0 + Z) \leq [2\gamma + \delta_Z q^{-1}]p, \text{ for } 0 < p \leq 1/2.$$

$$(ii) \quad d(Y^*) \leq \gamma p q^{-1} .$$

Proof. By the triangle inequality:

$$(2.26) \quad d(Y_0+Z) \leq \mathcal{D}(Y_0+Z, (EY_0)\epsilon+Z) + \mathcal{D}((EY_0)\epsilon+Z, (E(Y_0+Z))\epsilon) .$$

By (2.20) and Theorem 2.1:

$$(2.27) \quad \mathcal{D}(Y_0+Z, (EY_0)\epsilon+Z) \leq d(Y_0) \leq 2\gamma p, \text{ for } 0 < p \leq 1/2.$$

By Lemma 2.5:

$$(2.28) \quad \mathcal{D}((EY_0)\epsilon+Z, (E(Y_0+Z))\epsilon) \leq \max[\mathcal{D}((EY_0)\epsilon+Z, (EY_0)\epsilon) \\ \mathcal{D}((E(Y_0+Z))\epsilon, (EY_0)\epsilon)] .$$

By Lemma 2.4:

$$(2.29) \quad \mathcal{D}((EY_0)\epsilon+Z, (EY_0)\epsilon) \leq 1 - e^{-EZ/EY_0} = 1 - e^{-pq^{-1}\delta_Z} \leq pq^{-1}\delta_Z .$$

By (2.19):

$$(2.30) \quad \mathcal{D}((E(Y_0+Z))\epsilon, (EY_0)\epsilon) \leq 1 - \frac{EY_0}{E(Y_0+Z)} \leq \frac{EZ}{EY_0} = pq^{-1}\delta_Z .$$

Result (i) now follows from (2.27)-(2.30).

Finally by (2.12), Lemma 2.5, Corollary 2.2, and (2.19):

$$(2.31) \quad d(Y^*) \leq \max[\mathcal{D}(Y^*, (EY_0)\epsilon), \mathcal{D}((EY^*)\epsilon, (EY_0)\epsilon)] \\ \leq pq^{-1}\gamma .$$

Thus (ii) holds and the proof of Theorem 2.2 is complete.

3. Improved Bounds Under Additional Assumptions. In this section we outline the improvements in the results under various aging assumptions on the distribution of X .

3.1. NBUE. Suppose that X is NBUE distributed. Then $Y^* \stackrel{st}{=} Y_0 + X^* \stackrel{st}{\leq} Y_0 + X \stackrel{st}{=} Y$, thus Y is NBUE. Note that Y^* is the stationary renewal distribution corresponding to both Y_0 and Y . It thus follows from (2.10) that:

$$(3.1.1) \quad \frac{p}{\mu} \leq h_{Y^*}^{(t)} \leq \frac{p}{q\mu} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Consequently:

$$(3.1.2) \quad e^{-\frac{px}{q\mu}} \leq \frac{\bar{F}_{Y^*}(t+x)}{\bar{F}_{Y^*}(t)} \leq e^{-\frac{px}{\mu}} \quad \text{for all } t, x \geq 0.$$

Thus for p small, Y^* has an approximate lack of memory in that the residual age distribution varies with t by at most p in sup norm.

Note that from (3.1.1), $(EY_0)\epsilon \leq Y^* \leq (EY)\epsilon$ and from (2.11), $Y_0 \stackrel{st}{\leq} Y^* \stackrel{st}{\leq} Y$. Since $\mathcal{D}(Y, Y_0) \leq p$ and $\mathcal{D}((EY_0)\epsilon, (EY)\epsilon) \leq p$ it follows that:

$$(3.1.3) \quad \max(d(Y^*, Y_0), d(Y^*, Y), d(Y^*, (EY_0)\epsilon)) \leq p.$$

Furthermore by Lemma 2.3:

$$(3.1.4) \quad d(Y^*, (EY)\epsilon) \leq \rho_Y = p \rho_X.$$

From (3.1.3) and (3.1.4), using the methodology of Section 2 it is straightforward to derive:

$$(3.1.5) \quad d(Y_0) \leq p$$

$$(3.1.6) \quad d(Y) \leq p$$

$$(3.1.7) \quad d(Y^*) \leq p\rho_X$$

$$(3.1.8) \quad d(Y_0+Z) \leq p(1+q^{-1}\delta_Z)$$

$$(3.1.9) \quad \bar{F}_Y(t) \geq e^{-t/EY} - p\rho_X$$

$$(3.1.10) \quad e^{-t/EY_0} \leq \bar{F}_Y(t) \leq q^{-1}e^{-t/EY}.$$

Note that $\Pr(Y_0=0) = p/(1-q\Pr(X=0)) \geq p$. It follows that for any non-negative X with finite mean:

$$(3.1.11) \quad d(Y_0) \geq p.$$

Thus (3.1.5) and (3.1.11) show that for F NBUE:

$$(3.1.12) \quad d(Y_0) = p.$$

Finally, we mention that when $\rho_X < p/2$ we can improve on (3.1.6) by using Daley's (1986) bound for NBUE distributions applied to Y . This yields:

$$(3.1.13) \quad d(Y) \leq \sqrt{2\rho_Y} = \sqrt{2p\rho_X}$$

3.2. NBU. If X is NBU then an argument similar to the NBUE case of Section 3.1 shows that Y is also NBU. Now Y_0 is NWU, Y is NBU and $Y_0 - t | Y_0 > t \stackrel{st}{\leq} Y - t | Y > t$ for all $t \geq 0$. Thus:

$$(3.2.1) \quad Y_0 \stackrel{st}{\leq} Y - t | Y > t \stackrel{st}{\leq} Y$$

$$(3.2.2) \quad {}_q\bar{F}_Y(x) \leq \frac{\bar{F}_Y(t+x)}{\bar{F}_Y(t)} \leq \bar{F}_Y(x) \quad \text{for all } x, t \geq 0.$$

The residual age distributions thus cannot vary by more than p in sup norm.

Since Y is NBU we can derive an analogue of Corollary 2.1 for Y :

$$(3.2.3) \quad \bar{F}_Y(t) \leq e^p e^{-t/EY}.$$

Combine (3.1.9), (3.1.10) and (3.2.3) to obtain

$$(3.2.4) \quad \max(e^{-t/EY_0}, e^{-t/EY - p\rho_X}) \leq \bar{F}_Y(t) \leq e^p e^{-t/EY}.$$

3.3. NWUE. Assume that X is NWUE distributed. It follows from the argument of Section 2.1 that Y is also NWUE. Thus by Lemma 2.3:

$$(3.3.1) \quad \mathcal{D}(Y^*, (EY)\epsilon) \leq p\rho_X.$$

Since $Y \stackrel{st}{\leq} Y^*$ ((2.11)) it follows from (3.3.1) that:

$$(3.3.2) \quad \bar{F}_Y(t) - e^{-t/EY} \leq \bar{F}_{Y^*}(t) - e^{-t/EY} \leq p\rho_X.$$

$$(3.5.3) \quad d(Y_0+Z) \leq p(\gamma+\delta_Z q^{-1}) .$$

3.6. DFR. A random variable on $[0, \infty)$ is defined to be DFR (decreasing failure rate) distributed if $X-t|X > t$ is stochastically decreasing in $t \geq 0$. Shantikumar (1986) recently proved that geometric convolutions of DFR are DFR. Thus if X is DFR then so are Y_0 , Y and Y^* . Using the DFR property of Y and Y_0 it follows from Brown (1983) p. 422 that:

$$(3.6.1) \quad \max(d(Y), d(Y^*)) \leq \frac{p\rho_X}{p\rho_X+1}$$

$$(3.6.2) \quad d(Y_0) \leq \frac{\rho_{Y_0}}{\rho_{Y_0}+1} = \frac{pY}{pY+q} .$$

A geometric convolution of DFR random variables arises naturally in the study of time to first failure for repairable systems (Brown (1984a) p. 611).

3.7. IFR. Assume that X is IFR (increasing failure rate). Then it follows from Brown (1984b) that:

$$(3.7.1) \quad M(t) \geq \frac{t}{\mu} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2\mu}$$

where M is the renewal function corresponding to X . Then (3.6.1) and an analogue of Corollary 2.1 yields:

$$(3.7.2) \quad \bar{F}_Y(t) \leq e^{-p(M(t)-1)} \leq e^{2\rho_X p} e^{-t/EY} .$$

Since for X NBUE, $0 \leq \rho_X \leq 1/2$, we see that (3.7.2) improves upon (3.2.3).

3.8. $\Pr(X=0) = \beta \in (0,1)$, Known. If $\beta = \Pr(X=0)$ is known, with $0 < \beta < 1$, then an improvement in the bound for $d(Y_0)$ can be achieved. Define X' to be distributed as the conditional distribution of X given $X > 0$. Then:

$$(3.8.1) \quad \sum_1^{G_p} X_i \stackrel{\text{st}}{=} \sum_1^{G_{p^*}} X'_i, \text{ where } p^* = p/(1-\beta q)$$

$$(3.8.2) \quad \gamma_{X'} = (1-\beta)\gamma_X.$$

From Theorem (2.1):

$$(3.8.3) \quad d(Y_0) \leq 2\gamma_{X,p^*} = (2\gamma_X p)(1-\beta)/(1-\beta q).$$

The IMRL class is closed under the transformation $X' \rightarrow X$ for all $0 < \beta < 1$. Thus (3.5.1), (3.8.1) and (3.8.2) imply that for X IMRL:

$$(3.8.4) \quad d(Y_0) \leq (\gamma_X p)(1-\beta)/(1-\beta q).$$

4. Comments and Additions.

4.1. Consider $X_\alpha \sim \text{Bin}(1, \alpha)$, i.e. $\Pr(X_\alpha=1) = \alpha$, $\Pr(X_\alpha=0) = 1-\alpha$. Then $\gamma_\alpha = EX_\alpha^2 / 2(EX_\alpha)^2 = (2\alpha)^{-1}$, thus as α ranges from 1 to 0 γ_α ranges from $1/2$ to ∞ . Thus all possible values of γ are assumed

by the $\text{Bin}(1, \alpha)$ family. Now, let $Y_0(\alpha)$ be a sum of G_p , X_α 's. Then:

$$(4.1.1) \quad \Pr(Y_0(\alpha)=0) = \frac{p}{p+q\alpha} = \left(\frac{2}{q+2\gamma p}\right)\gamma p.$$

It follows from (4.1.1) that if $B(\gamma, p)$ denotes $\sup d(Y_0)$, over all Y_0 with common (γ, p) that:

$$(4.1.2) \quad B(\gamma, p) \geq \left(\frac{2}{q+2\gamma p}\right)\gamma p = 2\gamma p(1+o(1)).$$

Thus as mentioned in the introduction the bound $2\gamma p$ for $d(Y_0)$ is asymptotically ($p \rightarrow 0$) sharp.

4.2. Solov'yev's (1971) bounds require existence and knowledge of EX^m for some $m \in (2, 3]$, and of EZ^2 , in addition to our requirements. Defining $\gamma_m = [EX^m / (EX)^m]^{1/m-1}$, his bound are $O(\gamma_m p)$ as $p \rightarrow 0$ while ours are $O(\gamma p)$ (Solov'yev's bounds depend on γ_m^{m-2} and break down for $m=2$). By the log convexity of moments (Marhsall and Olkin (1979) p. 74), $\gamma_m \geq \gamma$ for $m > 2$. The ratio γ_m/γ can range from 1 to ∞ depending on EX^m . It is difficult to make a comparison to cover all possible cases but it appears that the current bounds are in general tighter. For example Solov'yev's bound for $d(Y_0)$ corresponding to $m=3$ is $6\gamma_3/\gamma \geq 6$ times as large as ours as $p \rightarrow 0$.

4.3. The bounds for $F_{Y_0}(t)$ derived in Sections 2 and 3 immediately yield bounds for the renewal function of a terminating renewal process (see Feller (1971) Section XI.6).

4.4. Defining $\lambda = 2\gamma p$, our upper bound for $d(Y_0)$ (Theorem 2.1) is λ . I conjecture that the best upper bound is $\lambda/\lambda+q$. This bound is achieved for the $\text{Bin}(1, \alpha)$ family discussed in Section 4.1.

4.5. Given a sequence $Y_{0,n} = \sum_1^{G(p_n)} X_{n,i}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ where X_n and p_n vary with n , it follows from Theorem 2.1 that $\lim \gamma_n p_n = 0$ is a sufficient condition for exponential convergence of $Y_{0,n}/EY_{0,n}$. This condition is not necessary as a slight modification of the example on p. 874 of Brown and Ge (1984) demonstrates. If the X_n are all NBUE then it follows from p. 872 of Brown and Ge (1984) that a necessary and sufficient condition for exponential convergence of Y_n/EY_n is $\lim p_n \rho_n = 0$ (recall $\rho_n = 1 - \gamma_n$ in the NBUE case), and a necessary and sufficient condition for exponential convergence of $Y_{0,n}/EY_{0,n}$ is $\lim p_n = 0$.

4.6. A simple argument is now presented to show that under very general conditions geometric convolutions are asymptotically exponential as $p \rightarrow 0$.

Consider a random sequence $\{X_i, i \geq 1\}$ which obeys the strong law of large numbers for $\mu \in (0, \infty)$, that is:

$$(4.6.1) \quad \Pr(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{X}_n = \mu) = 1$$

where $\bar{X}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n X_i$. Define G_p to a random variable which is geometrically distributed with parameter p . Consider $Y_0(p) = \sum_1^{G_p} X_i$. Now:

$$(4.6.2) \quad pY_0(p) = (pG_p)\bar{X}_{G_p}.$$

It follows from (3.1.12) that $d(pG_p) = p$ and thus pG_p converges in distribution to an exponential with mean 1. By (4.6.1), $\bar{X}_{G_p} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mu$, thus $pY_0(p)$ converges in distribution to an exponential with mean μ .

In the i.i.d. case $0 < EX < \infty$ suffices for exponential convergence of Y_0 . It is not necessary that X be non-negative, or that G_p be independent of $\{X_i, i \geq 1\}$, or that $EX^2 < \infty$.

It is also seen that a large variety of dependent sequences lead to exponential convergence of geometric convolutions, for example stationary ergodic sequences with $0 < \mu < \infty$. An interesting problem is to obtain error bounds for $d(Y_0)$ (also $d(Y)$ and $d(Y_0+Z)$) for various classes of dependent sequences $\{X_i, i \geq 1\}$.

If we relax (4.6.1) to convergence in probability but impose the condition that G_p be independent of $\{X_i\}$, then again $pY_0(p)$ is asymptotically exponential.

Acknowledgement. It is a pleasure to acknowledge stimulating correspondence with Professor D. J. Daley on various topics related to this paper.

References

- Barlow, R.E. and Proschan, F. (1975). Statistical Theory of Reliability and Life Testing. Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, New York.
- Brown, M. (1980). "Bounds, inequalities, and monotonicity properties for some specialized renewal processes." Ann. Probability, 8, 227-240.
- Brown, M. (1983). "Approximating IMRL distributions by exponential distributions, with applications to first passage times." Ann. Probability, 11, 419-427.
- Brown, M. (1984a). "On the reliability of repairable systems." Opns. Res., 32, 607-615.
- Brown, M. (1984b). "Inequalities for distributions with increasing failure rate." City College, CUNY. Report No. MB-5. To appear in Contributions to the Theory and Applications of Statistics.
- Brown, M. and Ge, G. (1984). "Exponential approximations for two classes of aging distributions." Ann. Probability, 12, 869-875.
- Daley, D.J. (1984). "Inequalities for a geometric random sum." Unpublished manuscript.
- Daley, D.J. (1986). "Tight bounds on the exponential approximations of some aging distributions." To appear in Ann. Probability.
- Feller, W. (1971). An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Volume II, Second Edition. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.

- Gertsbakh, I.B. (1984). "Asymptotic methods in reliability theory: A review." Adv. Appl. Prob., 16, 147-175.
- Jacobs, P.A. (1986). "First passage times for combinations of random loads." To appear in SIAM J. Appl. Math.
- Keilson, J. (1966). "A limit theorem for passage times in ergodic regenerative processes." Ann. Math. Statist., 37, 886-890.
- Köllerström, J. (1976). "Stochastic bounds for the single server queue." Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., 80, 521-525.
- Marshall, A.W. and Olkin, I. (1979). Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and its Applications. Academic Press, New York.
- Shantikumar, J.G. (1986). "DFR property of first passage times and its preservation under geometric compounding." Technical Report AFOSR-84-0205, Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona.
- Smith, W.L. (1958). "Renewal theory and its ramifications." J. Roy. Statist. Soc., Ser. B, 20, 243-302.
- Solov'yev, A.D. (1971). "Asymptotic behaviour of the time of first occurrence of a rare event." Engineering Cybernetics, 9 (6), 1038-1048.
- Szekli, R. (1986). "On the concavity of the waiting time distribution in some GI/G/1 queues." J. Appl. Prob., 22, (forthcoming).

END

DATE

FILMED

DEC.

1987